The COP29-negotiations in Baku: Political communication as a strategic tool during multilateral climate negotiations

Department of Politics and Society

Author: Astrid Nørby Hansen

Supervisor: Andreas Beyer Gregersen

Assignment: IR MA Thesis

Date: 28-05-2025

Keystrokes: 108.440

Abstract

This thesis critically examines how political communication serves as a strategic tool in multilateral climate negotiations, focusing on the COP29 held in Baku, Azerbaijan. Through a critical discourse analysis of multiple speeches delivered by representatives from small island developing states (SIDS) in the Global South and developed countries in the Global North, the study primarily investigates how these two groups frame their climate agendas and how they strategically position themselves within the broader climate negotiation landscape.

The findings reveal a consistent and clear discursive divide: while SIDS often utilise emotive and urgent narratives grounded in vulnerability and justice as main appeals, developed countries tend to adopt a more technocratic and power-based narrative, emphasising innovation and leadership - often framing climate responsibility as an opportunity.

While both groups more or less pivots towards solidarity, the communicative strategies expose underlying power asymmetries in power, resources, priorities, and climate vulnerability.

This thesis argues that such strategic framing does not only reflect the geopolitical realities, it also shapes negotiation dynamics and political outcomes.

The thesis further explains how the delegations at COP29 can learn from the outcome to refine their political communication strategies, build better partnerships, and strive towards outcomes that better align with the goals from the Paris Agreement's long-term objectives.

Finally, this thesis underlines the importance of political communication not being peripheral but central to the negotiation process.

As the climate crisis deepens, it is essential to understand that strategic use of language is essential, since these negotiations take time and patience is required in order to see small progress turn into long-term obtained goals.

Table of Content

List of abbreviations

AMOC	Atlantic Meridional Overturning Circulation
AOSIS	Alliance of Small Island States
CBAM	Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism
CBDR-RC	Common But Differentiated Responsibilities and Respective Capabilities
CDA	Critical Discourse Analysis
COP	Conference of Parties
EU	European Union
G20	Group of Twenty
GDP	Gross domestic product
LDC	Least Developed Countries
MDB	Multilateral Development Bank
NCQG	New Collective Quantified Goal
NDC	Nationally Determined Contributions
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
PR	Public Relations
SIDS	Small Island Developing States
UK	United Kingdom
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
US	United States

1. Introduction

Since its constitution in 1992, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate (UNFCCC), has combated the existing reality of climate change through international cooperation through various global efforts in order to reach the established goal of stabilising greenhouse gas concentrations "at a level that would prevent dangerous anthropogenic (human induced) interference with the climate system" (UNFCCC, n.d.). The UNFCCC convention states that "such a level should be achieved within a time-frame sufficient to allow ecosystems to adapt naturally to climate change, to ensure that food production is not threatened, and to enable economic development to proceed in a sustainable manner (ibid).

According to the UN, it is well-known that climate change is an undeniable reality for many people around the world, and the consequences thereof are showing across the globe. With rising temperatures in the atmosphere, in the ocean and over land, human activities have caused unprecedented changes in Earth's climate - burning fossil fuels and changes in land use - releasing greenhouse gases that trap heat in the atmosphere. The Earth is warming, and scientists have known for decades (IPCC, n.d.); this growing framework of evidence is what led to the constitution of the UNFCCC Treaty in 1992, with the attempt to coordinate a global response to the challenges that has emerged due to climate change. Signed and ratified by nearly 198 countries, the UNFCCC treaty is one of the most widely adopted international agreements with the EU also being a party to it (United Nations, n.d.). To set emission reduction targets, the UNFCCC led to more legally binding agreements like the 1997 Kyoto Protocol and 2015 Paris agreement, which was built on the convention (UN Women, n.d.).

As a part of the mission to combat climate change, the UNFCCC typically arranges a Conference of Parties (COP) annually; a summit serving as the formal meetings of the Conference of the Parties. COP's are where governments from all over the world come together to negotiate and address the climate crisis, such as the key Paris Agreement constructed to limit the temperature rise as close as possible to 1.5°C,

helping vulnerable communities adapt to the effects of climate change through financial aid and achieving net-zero emissions by 2050 (UNFCCC, n. d.)

The COP summits have created significant global milestones for the climate movement, setting critical standards and advancing action such as reducing carbon emissions, accelerating the transition to clean energy, and helping countries in adapting to and building resilience against the growing impacts on climate change. These conferences are vital, not only for bringing governments together but also for mobilising the private sector, civil society, industries, and industries in the collective effort to address the climate crisis (United Nations, n.d.)

However, policymakers and climate leaders have made arguments that over the years, potency of these meetings has declined, and COP summits are no longer "fit for purpose" (Arora, 2025, 121).

Since it came into effect in 2016, the Paris Agreement has become the main international treaty in the climate sector. Signed by 196 countries, the treaty binds countries to work towards keeping global temperatures down and below 2°C above pre-industrial levels while making efforts to limit temperature rise to 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels. However, some segments of the agreement, specifically Article 6 remained under negotiations without any wide-reaching implementation till now. Article 6 includes the transfer of carbon credits obtained by a country or organisation through the reduction of their greenhouse gas emissions to other countries or organisations for financial value. This allows for countries to voluntarily cooperate with one another in order to implement adaptations and mitigation strategies and simultaneously achieve their nationally determined contributions (NDC's) (Ibid, 122).

This thesis investigates and critically examines the use of strategic communication during the COP29 negotiations, respectively, by governments from the Small Island Developing States (SIDS) and governments from industrialised nations, including how they navigate the climate negotiation landscape in order to further their own agenda. Moreover, the strategic communication will be analysed through the method of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), analysing key speeches and statements delivered at the COP29 negotiations to demonstrate how language reflects and reproduces global power relations, ideological positions, and policy preferences. Thereby, the research contributes to a deeper understanding of the rhetorical dynamics present in multilateral climate governance and the role discourse plays in influencing the perceptions and outcomes in global climate politics.

But why is communication in climate negotiations important?

Just like in any other communication situation, communication in climate negotiations is not just a technical necessity - it is a tool of power, persuasion, identity-building and alliance formation (Dimitrov, 2012, 73).

Likewise, countries utilise communication to frame problems, allocate responsibility, as well as provide solutions that align with their national interests.

It is initially about building consensus and building bridges between developed and developing countries to combat global issues. Furthermore, it is essential for the building of trust and consensus that there is open communication and transparency when informing parties about intentions and motives (La Viña, 2013, 3).

Moreover, it is the use of communication in a strategic manner that ultimately determines the success rate of the outcome of the established goal to begin with. This will be elaborated on in the theory chapter.

1.1. The 29th Conference of Parties: COP29

The 29th COP was held in Baku, the capital of Azerbaijan, from 11 to 22 November 2024. It was named the "finance COP" by the media due to its heavy focus on climate finance, including funding from developed countries to developing countries into the loss-and-damage fund. (IIGCC, 2024).

Primarily, the agendas set for the COP29 summit were to fully operationalise Carbon Trading markets, deliver a new finance goal in order to mobilise fundings for developing countries, and lastly, bring last years global stocktake and loss-and-damage fund into action (Arora, 2025, 121). However the summit was encompassed by several controversies that occurred over the two weeks of the

negotiation process.

This was not only the second time but the third time in a row that the COP summit was hosted by a "petrostate"; a state or a country who is heavily dependent on oil and gas extraction and export. The number of oil and gas sector lobbyists present at the COP29 even surpassed the numbers of delegates sent by most of the countries, calling into speculation about the credibility of the host nation's motives at the summit.

Moreover, comments from the president of Azerbaijan branding gas and oil as "a gift from god", as he welcomed delegates to the COP29 summit and several reports of countries trying to stop further progress on transitioning away from fossil fuel use are only some of the many controversies during the COP29 summit.

1.2. Key outcomes

Even after so much trouble and issues, several agreements were reached, and a new finance goal was set. A new global target for climate finance will replace an earlier goal of $100 billion with $300 billion from developed countries to developing countries by 2035. This is the core of the "new collective quantified goal on climate finance (NCQG), which countries agreed to establish in 2015 during COP21, when the Paris Agreement was adopted. However, this agreement was met with disappointment by the developing countries from the Global South, who will need trillions of dollars to transition to cleaner economies and protect their population from climate change which will need to be provided by developed countries (International Trade Union Confederation, 2024) .

Under the United Nations (UN) framework, only 24 developed countries, including the US, the EU, and Japan are required to provide climate finance to "developing" countries. These countries have sought to ease their financial responsibilities by attempting to involve other contributors in the private sector as well. This is reflected in the second part of the NCQG agreement. Developing countries were persistent and firm in their demand that they needed $1.3 trillion annually solely by developed countries. However, the agreement instead urges "all actors" to increase funding from "all public and private sources" to at least $1.3 trillion by 2035.

These final outcomes resulted in intense negotiations that went into overtime, including a walk-out by climate-vulnerable countries and last-minute objections by India calling the agreement "an optical illusion" (Aljazeera, 2024).

It was concluded that the COP29 summit had more than 65,000 delegates registered to attend the summit with Azerbaijan having the largest delegation with 2,229 people in total.

Moreover, countries failed to reach to an agreement about how the outcomes of last yea's "global stocktake", which included a pledge to transition away from fossil fuels should proceed - instead pushing the decision to COP30 next year in Brazil. However, they did manage to find agreement regarding the raining sections of Article 6 on carbon markets, marking that all elements of the Paris Agreement has been finalised, nearly 10 years after it was signed.

1.3. Azerbaijan: a petrostate as a host nation for a climate summit

Azerbaijan was announced as the host of the COP29 towards the end of COP28 in Dubai. Russia had vetoed any EU member in eastern Europe taking up the presidency, leaving just Azerbaijan and Armenia as viable options. Armenia initially vetoed Azerbaijan due to the long-standing conflict between the two countries, before withdrawing its candidacy leaving Azerbaijan as the final candidate for host country. Armenia agreed to lift its veto on Azerbaijan in exchange for the release of 32 Armenian prisoners (Carbon Brief, 2024)

As previously mentioned, the location of the COP29 meeting sparked controversy, as Azerbaijan is a country known to be heavily reliant on fossil fuels and is known to have a poor human rights record (European Student Think Tank, 2025). The country pumps less than 1% of the world's oil and gas but has an economy that is heavily reliant on fuel production. Fossil fuels make up more than 90% of all exports and two-thirds on government revenue. This led to the country facing accusations of conflict of interest and malpractice, with one minister referring to its hosting style as "deplorable" (Carbon Brief, 2024).

1.4. Research Question

The two research questions this thesis seeks to answer is as follows:

"How do governments from Small Island Developing States (SIDS) and developed countries strategically frame their climate agendas through communication during the COP29 negotiations in Baku? and *"what can the delegations learn based on the outcome of COP29 in order for a more profitable outcome in order to reach the goals set by the Paris Agreement?"*

2. Theory: Strategic Political Communication and Political Public Relations

This chapter outlines the theoretical framework guiding the thesis. It investigates how various governments craft persuasive messages, by drawing on literature in strategic political communication and public relations (PR).

These theories provide critical insight into how communication is used, and not just to inform, but to persuade, build identity, and form alliances during global climate negotiations.

While PR is mostly applied to individuals or organisations, this thesis focuses on political PR, which extends the corporate sphere and solely focuses on PR in a political context.

American author, Edward Bernays, pioneered the field of PR and was one of the first to provide one of the first definitions of PR, which, in fact, was labeled as the activities of the public relations counsel. He defined it as the one *"who directs and supervises the activities of his clients wherever they impinge upon the daily life of the public. He interprets the client to the public, which he is enabled to do in part because he interprets the public to the client"* (Edward Bernays, 1923, 14).

One of the more often quoted definitions is presented by Cutlip, Center, and Broom, who claimed that "public relations is the management function that establishes and maintains mutually beneficial relationships between an organization and the publics on whom its success or failure depends" (Cutlip, Center, and Broom, 2000, 6). Similarly, another prominent quoted definition originates from Grunig and Hunt, who argue that public relations is about the "management of communication between an organization and its publics" (Grunig & Hunt, 1984, 6).

While Bernays perceives public relations as persuasive manipulation, Cutlip, Center, and Broom redefines it as strategic relationship management, leading up to dialogic and ethical models provided by Grunig and Hunt.

In the context of modern politics, communication is hardly spontaneous.

Scholars define political strategic communication as deliberate use of communication tactics by political actors to influence public opinion, frame political issues, and achieve specific political goals (Gonçalves, 2014, 99-100). One certain way for political actors to obtain this is through PR which can be called a form of expression of strategic political communication in order to build a mutually beneficial relationship with the public and gain successful political outcomes (Strömbäck & Kiousis, 2000, 2).

According to Strömbäck and Kiousis, important political PR tactics and strategies include relationship management, reputation management, voter segmentation and targeting, rhetoric, and persuasion (ibid).

Theory and practice of political communication and PR offer a practical model for how political actors communicate strategically making it a highly valuable communication tool for political actors in order to obtain their political goals. Strömbäck and Kiousis explain that political communication today is increasingly strategic, including planned efforts, to influence public opinion, media coverage and political outcomes.

In the book "Political Public Relations; Concepts, Principles and Applications" the scholars mentions that public relations can be defined: "as a management process by which political actors inform, engage, and persuade the public to achieve specific objectives (Strömbäck and Kiousis, 2020, 8).

While strategic political communication refers broadly to the planned use of communication to obtain political goals, political public relations can be defined as a specific, institutionalised form of such communication.

As defined by Ström and Kiousis, political PR sets the focus on the management of public perception though deliberate messaging, making it a relevant theoretical framework for analysing strategic political communication efforts at international events like COP29.

Studied and identified by political scientists and communication scholars, framing has for a long time existed as an effective communication strategy to connect a broad audience to the issues caused by climate change.

Framing is identified by "remaining true to the underlying science of the issue while applying research from communication and other fields to tailor messages to the existing attitudes, values, and perceptions of different audiences.

Messages are developed to highlight certain aspects of climate change, such as the environmental implications, national security, or the economic costs and benefits of adaptation and mitigation technologies. Moreover, climate change has also been portrayed as an opportunity to strengthen our moral commitment to communities vulnerable to climate change and to future generations to come.

In order to boost public awareness of climate change, mainstream media and opinion leaders repeatedly communicate these new meanings using different framing tools such as catchphrases, metaphors, and soundbites (Li, 2023, 1)

These tools will all be applied when conducting the analysis, gaining insight in the strategic political communication and PR-related methods utilised by countries in climate negotiations in order to frame climate change to further their own agenda.

3. Methodology

In this section of the thesis, the methods and procedures that were utilised in order to conduct the research are outlined. Initially, the methodological framework is presented along with a detailed description of the research design. Additionally, the collected data will be presented and, finally, how the analysis was carried out is included.

3.1. Methodological Framework: Critical Discourse Analysis by Fairclough

This thesis draws on Fairclough's understanding of discourse as a form of social practice rooted in broader structures of power and ideology, referred to as Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). As Faircloughs affirms, CDA aims to "*to develop ways of analysing language which address its involvement in the workings of contemporary capitalist societies*" (Fairclough, 1995, 1). Fairclough argues that the focus on capitalist societies is that it is the most dominant economic system globally, and because the character of the economic system affects all aspects of social life (ibid). The relevance for this approach to the COP29 summit lies in the fact that climate discourse is not ideologically neutral; it is a deeply political and discursive space, where factors such as power, ideology, and strategic communication intersect and are negotiated through language.

The CDA will be conducted on 13 different political speeches presented at the COP29 in order to uncover patterns of meaning, ideology, and power in a broader communicative context.

As Faircloigh states: *"Discourse is not simply an entity we can define independently: we can only arrive at an understanding of it by analysing sets of relations. Having said that, we can say what it is in particular that discourse brings into the complex relations which constitute social life: meaning, and making meaning."* (Fairclough, 3). By including multiple political speeches to the data collection, it provides the most valuable insights and nuanced perspectives on global climate discourse.

Moreover, Fairclough introduces the concept of intertextuality. In his work "Discourse and Social Change" he used the concept of intertextuality by making it more concrete by using it to analyse texts and thereafter set out the potential of the concept to critical discourse analysis in a more systematic manner as a part of the development of an analytical framework (Fairclough, 1992, 101).

Drawing on Fairclough's three-dimensional model of CDA, this study aims at approaching political communication and PR not merely as an exchange of information but as a set of power relations that are enacted and contested carefully and strategically.

CDA is thus a method concerned with language, power, and ideology operating at three individual levels (Fairclough, 1992, 62). Therefore, CDA has been utilised to identify how political actors at COP29 use language strategically to promote specific ideological positions, legitimise policy agendas, and construct specific representations of climate responsibility.

3.1.2. Norman Fairclough's three-dimensional model

In his seminal work "Discourse and Social Change", Fairclough introduces and elaborates on his three-dimensional model of CDA. In the book, he conceptualises any discursive event, whether spoken or written, as encompassing three interrelated dimensions:

Textual analysis, which is the level that involves analysing the actual content such as the vocabulary, grammar, and relevant rhetorical strategies. He highlights rhetorical devices such as metaphors, repetition, and pronoun use (Fairclough, 1992, 76-77). There are all main elements that will be identified in the analysis of the speeches.

Thereafter, discursive practice is the level that takes into consideration how the text is produced, distributed, and consumed, focusing on intertextuality and the audience that the text appeals to (ibid, 72)

Lastly, social practice is the level that analyses and operates with the wider socio-political and cultural landscape shaping and shaped by the discourse (ibid, 66)

As fairclough states, CDA enables "*linguistic description of the language text, interpretation of the relationship between the discursive processes and the text, and explanation of the relationship between discursive processes and social processes*" (Fairclough, 1992, 73).

By applying this multi-level framework, this thesis exceeds surface-level interpretations to investigate how language serves as a tool of power, legitimacy, and resistance within global climate discourse.

The approach is especially appropriate and valuable in the context of COP negotiations, where political actors often engage in strategic positioning, advocacy, and soft power signaling, making discourse crucial for challenging responsibility, affirming leadership, and forming alliances.

3.2. Research Design: Data Collection and Selection of Data

This chapter of the thesis presents a complete overview of the course of the thesis, showcasing the decisions made in order to narrow and clarify the scope of the research.

The main objective of the research is to study the difference in how governments from SIDS and developed countries strategically frame their climate agenda in order to conduct a comparative analysis along with a thematic analysis of the findings. In order to provide the answers to the research, a collection of various data sets was assembled consisting of five political speeches presented by five different governments from SIDS and five political speeches presented by five different developed countries, serving as the primary empirical material, which constitutes CDA. As secondary empirical material, three speeches have further been selected and analysed through CDA; the opening and closing speech by the secretariat along with a statement by a representative from India, making the data collection a total of 13 speeches and statements.

These data sets have primarily been collected via the UNFCCC's website. Secondarily, video clips uploaded on the medium YouTube by UNFCCC and the government's respective channels have also been utilised. All speeches have been transcribed and are referred to as appendixes.

Relevant quotes have been selected and analysed through Fairclough's three-dimensional model in order to gain substantial understanding of how political actors use language, discursive power, and the socio-political setting in order to advance

their climate agenda at the COP29 summit. The theory of political communication and political public relations are then applied to the selected quotes in order to connect theory with practice.

The second research question is addressed through a discussion based on the findings that appeared during the analytical process, suggesting improvement for the upcoming COP's based on the outcome of COP29.

Based on the conduction of the findings, a conclusion of the findings will be provided as well as the limitations of the thesis.

3.3. AI Declaration

AI technology has been utilised in three different ways: In practicality, AI has been utilised to replace traditional search engines most of the time.

In the very beginning of this thesis, it was utilised to generate ideas such as thesis topics, theory ideas, and political events. After the ideas were generated, I evaluated them and made them even more specific if I found one of the suggestions useful. This made the idea generating phase increasingly less challenging and demanding, as it provided support and creative ideas.

Another way that AI is used for this thesis was through literature suggestions and sources that provided evidence for certain statements. I found this helpful everytime a statement was lacking a source. In this way, I got exposed to other sources that provided me with new information or new perspectives to include in the thesis.

A third way that AI was used was for suggestions on words and their synonyms, as well as other linguistic elements.

Finally, it also provided help with creating the formal layout of the sources, producing them as correct references for the reference chapter in the correct order. This prevented me from creating the reference list manually which is quite time consuming for the writing process.

4. Critical Discourse Analysis of Political Communication and PR in COP29 Speeches and Statements

This chapter presents a detailed critical discourse analysis of the selected official speeches and official statements from COP29, applying the theoretical framework of political communication and PR. Using Fairclogh's three-dimensional model, the objective is to uncover how language is strategically implemented to construct power relations, shape public opinion, and promote certain ideological positions.

As previously mentioned and outlined in chapter 3, the analysis consists of two main data groups; data group 1, which is made up of 10 official speeches and official statements during the COP29. These speeches are further divided evenly into two groups consisting of five speeches each from the following developed countries: US, UK, Ireland, Germany, and Australia, and five speeches from the SIDS which includes Saint Kitts and Nevis, St. Lucia, Solomon Islands, Timor-Leste, and the Bahamas. Data group 2 consists of three speeches, respectively two speeches made by the Deputy Executive Secretary at UNFCCC, Simon Stiell, at the opening and closing ceremony at the COP29 summit, and a speech delivered by India after the climate finance goal proposal made after negotiations.

Furthermore, I will consider and reflect on every single actors' position during the negotiations and their interaction with one another, national alliances or other concepts that are relevant for the results and the outcomes of the negotiations. Based on Fairclough's discoveries and concept developed of the three-dimensional model and the concepts of political strategic communication and political PR, the analytical tools that will be used primarily are:

Lexical analysis: recurring words or metaphors

Framing analysis: how issues are defined

Modality: the use of modal verbs such as "must" "should" "could"

Intertextuality: references to other speeches, UN documents etc.

Data group 1:
- Developed countries: the UK, the US, Germany, Australia and Ireland
- SIDS: St. Lucia, St. Kitts and Nevis, Solomon Islands, Timor-Leste, and the Bahamas.

Data group 2:
- Deputy Executive Secretary at UNFCCC, Simon Stiell's "opening speech" and "closing speech"
- India's speech on climate finance proposal

The objective is to analyse and interpret the findings in relation to political communication and critical discourse analysis as a way to tie the theoretical framework and methodology together in order to treat it holistically.

The chapter is organised thematically around key discursive patterns identified in the data.

In doing so, I seek to demonstrate how political communication and PR operates not merely as a transmission of information, but rather as a field of ideological battle and meaning-making.

The climate discourse that unfolds at global summits like COP29 is shaped by different political actors such as states, NGOs and civil society (media, the press etc.) each promoting different narratives, priorities and ideologies. By including multiple representatives in the analysis, the study can better capture the struggles over meaning-making, the different narratives, and which discourses are excluded in the broader context of climate politics shaped by global capitalism.

4.1. The Secretariat: Deputy Executive Secretary at UNFCCC, Simon Stiell's "opening speech" at COP29

The opening speech delivered by Deputy Executive Secretary at UNFCCC, Simon Stiell, sets the rhetorical and political agenda for the climate summit, positioning COP29 as a decisive moment in the global response to the escalating challenges that emerge from climate change.

Including Simon Stiell's opening speech at COP29 is particularly relevant to this study of strategic communication during climate negotiations, as it offers critical insight into how global climate discourse operates and is shaped at the highest diplomatic level. As the UNFCCC Deputy Executive Secretary, Stiell's remarks set the tone for the summit, expressing not only the urgency of the climate crisis but also the expectation and priorities for the negotiation process. By analysing the speech, we gain a clearer understanding of how legitimacy is constructed, how public engagement is facilitated, and how discourse shapes the perceived credibility and direction of the COP process.

This full text of the speech is provided in appendix 1.

At the textual level, Stiell's opens the speech with a personal anecdote: "The lady I'm standing with in this picture is my neighbour, Florence". The choice of including a personal, emotional strategic story-telling is a classic key PR technique to convey messages that evokes empathy and engages the audience in an effective manner (Keith, 2023, 53).

The use of rhetorical questions such as: "Do you want your grocery and energy bills to go up?", inserts reflection and frame climate in economic and personal expressions. This creates a sense of urgency through relatable stakes.

Statements such as: "knocked down and getting back up again" and "we must (..)" reinforce persistence and determination as core values and inclusive modality while also conveying resilience and collective determination.

Stiell also uses inclusive language in phrases such as "we must agree", "our agreements", "we're here in Baku" which builds collective agency that aligns with political communication strategies aimed at fostering global unity.

At the discursive level, Stiell blends moral urgency with economic rationality by emphasising that climate finance is not a "charity" but as enlightened self-interest. Climate inaction will lead to economic instability, insecurity and political risks for all. The speech utilises intertextuality, referencing elements like Article 6, NDCs, and transparency reports to appeal and engage with policy makers, while emotionally connecting with citizens and the broader public through the personal story of Florence. At the same time, he addresses critics and the media by acknowledging the frustration with the slow progress, but frames COP as the only legitimate forum for multilateral action.

Finally, at the level of social practice, The speech mainly focuses on appealing to the shared global consequences: "If at least two thirds of the world's nations cannot afford(…) then every nation pays a brutal price". This statement actively showcases that Simon challenges the dominant Global North vs Global South power dynamics, reframing vulnerability as a global risk, promoting interdependence over hierarchy. His statement that "global cooperation is not down for the count" further strengthens the ideological legitimacy of rules-based global governance in the middle of geopolitical tensions. He appeals to equity and justice. Through empathetic appeals with the personal story of Florence, the speech manages to emphasise frontline vulnerability giving voice, in a symbolic way, to those most affected by climate changes, aligning with climate justice narratives even if not explicitly using the term.

4.2. The Secretariat: Deputy Executive Secretary at UNFCCC, Simon Stiell's "closing speech" at COP29

After several days of intense negotiations, Simon Stiell delivered his closing speech at COp29 24 November 2024 in Baku, Azerbaijan. In his closing remarks, he described the newly agreed finance goal on $300 billion annually by 2035 and

acknowledged the challenges ahead, affirming that while meaningful and substantial progress has been made, significant work remains in order to meet the requirements set by the Paris Agreement.

The inclusion of the closing speech to be analysed, holds relevance as it encapsulates the outcomes of the negotiations and offers a critical reflection on the process. As a communicative act, the closing speech's purpose is to interpret and frame the results of the conference whether in terms of success, compromise or shortfall. Furthermore, it provides insight to how the UNFCCC secretariat seeks to shape the narrative around what is achieved and to manage expectations among several stakeholders, including governments, the media, civil society, and the public. In this way, the closing speech ties back to the opening speech, framing the negotiations and enabling a comparative analysis of intention vs outcome in both discourse and diplomacy.

The full text of the speech is provided in appendix 2.

On the textual level, Stiehl describes the newly agreed finance goal metaphorically: "This new finance goal is an insurance policy for humanity", framing climate finance through a neoliberal logic where security depends on investment, that is, security is accessible if you pay, implying shared but market-conditional responsibility.

Alliterative phrases such as "Protect people, prosperity, and the planet", uses tripartite structure, in order to express completeness and resonate emotionally, a classic speechwriting device (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, 2022). Furthermore, the repeated use of deontic modality such as "we must embed the targets" and "governments must pick up the pace" puts a light on obligation and urgency, a key tool in political persuasion. (Khafaga & Alqhatani, 2023, 401)

In one of the speech's most expressive lines -"The many other issues we need to progress may not be headlines, but they are lifelines for billions of people".

In this statement, he does not only resist the media-driven logic that only valuing visible wins is valid but he also promotes an alternative ideology of long-term, equity-driven policymaking which happens to align with other broader discourses of climate justice and global South inclusion of the developing countries (SIDS).

Stiell relies on a powerful rhetorical contrast that displays central tension in climate communication, namely, the inequality between media-driven narratives and the significant priorities of global climate policy.

The use of "headlines" symbolises temporary media visibility and political virtue-signaling, while "lifelines" refer to the life-critical, often overlooked policies that affect vulnerable populations and communities.

The statement: "we need to progress" includes inclusive and modal language, placing both the speaker and audience on the same level in the ongoing global transformation.

At the discursive practice level, Stiell performs strategic framing by positioning COP29 as a "success": "we've delivered a deal", even with acknowledging gaps: "no country got everything they wanted". This dual narrative aids in maintaining credibility while simultaneously directing the media narrative.

He also utilises multiple audience targeting, addressing stakeholders such as governments which he explicitly addresses: "governments still need to pick up the pace", civil society through statement such as: "your work helps us make progress" and the UN and staff when he claims: "I have never seen a harder working group" - through inclusive acknowledgement, Stiell manages to create a sense of shared ownership and collective achievement, a PR strategy that builds trust and collective ownership (Goedkoop & Devine Wright, 2016, 137)

On the social practice level, the speech legitimises global climate governance by reinforcing the legitimacy of the UNFCCC framework, referring to the Paris Agreement as "Humanity's life-raft", a powerful metaphor and intertextuality that awakens existential urgency while positioning the UN as highly crucial and necessary. By presenting COP29 as the pivotal moment that: "tripled climate finance" and secured "global agreement", Stiell positions COP29 as a historically significant event in the midst of criticism and underlying tensions.

Overall, the closing speech by Simon stiell serves not only as a reflection of climate diplomacy but also as a strategic communicative act that intends to shape public opinion and perceivement, and secure the institutional legitimacy of the UNFCCC and multilateral climate action.

4.3. India: Representative, Chandni Raina's statement at COP29

India's intervention provides a compelling case to analyse in regards to how climate discourse functions as both a communicative and political strategy in climate negotiations.

This speech was delivered as a response after a sum of $300 billion in climate finance was proposed. The proposal was completely and utterly rejected by India's which rapidly gained international media attention, placing the speech as a defining moment in the summit's proceedings.

The speech was delivered by India's negotiator, Chandni Raina, sharply criticizing the $300 billion commitment by developing nations, referring to it as "abysmally small" and was referred to as "an optical illusion" (The Guardian, 2024).

It was described as "fiery", "fierce" and "fuming" by various media outlets (climatechangenews, 2024) (timesofindia, 2024).

This speech was selected for analysis due to the fact that it exposes underlying inequalities and power dynamics that are asymmetrical between developed countries and developing countries. As a major developing country and a predominant voice in the Global South, India's stance often reflects the broader concerns of countries that are unequally impacted by climate change yet have contributed less historically to emissions.

In summation, the speech demonstrates how the Global South challenges the dominant political-economic agendas of developed countries and negotiates justice in climate discourse.

The full text of the speech is provided in appendix 3.

At the textual level, the frequent use of highly emotional-charged, using powerful language regarding the $300 billion by 2035 proposal, with terms such as "stage-managed", "extremely hurt", "optical illusion", "abysmally small" and "paltry sum". These choice of words help convey deep frustration, disillusionment, and subtle anger with the proposal, also referring to it as "too little, too distant". The repetition of

the word "trust", mentioned more than ten times, underlines its central and extremely vital role in climate diplomacy and the growing awareness that this trust is being wrecked.

The speech contains strong negative modality with phrases such as "we do not accept", "we cannot accept", "we oppose", and "we are not happy" delivering a firm and unambiguous rejection of the proposal.

By using collective nouns such as "we", "our", and "us", India speaks not just for itself but also on behalf of the Global South, aligning its stance with other developing countries who feel similarly in the same position on the global climate finance agenda.

The speech utilises a range of rhetorical strategies in order to deliver a forceful and morally grounded critique. It begins with direct confrontation, directly and openly accusing the COP Presidency and the UNFCCC Secretariat of injustice, which is revealed in the following statement: "Gavelling and trying to ignore parties from speaking does not behold the UNFCCC system". This is a rather bold move, as it challenges the legitimacy of how the climate finance procedures and proposal was handled. It also shifts the critique of the proposal from just the outcome to the legitimacy of the process itself , insinuating a crisis of trust and governance in climate governance.

Through delegimisation, the draft document is referred to as "an optical illusion" and "not right" which frames it as misleading and fundamentally flawed both in substance and process.

The speech also relies heavily on moral framing as principles like equity Common But Differentiated Responsibilities and Respective Capabilities (CBDR–RC) are evoked to argue for a more fair and balanced approach to climate responsibilities. Finally, the speech utilises contrast and irony in order to to expose the perceived hypocrisy of developed nations, those historically most responsible for emissions, now demanding financial contributions from developing countries still struggling with poverty, development challenges, and lack of resources necessary to contribute financially, a move that is framed as both unfair and indefensible.

The speech follows a structure that begins with objection to the procedure and the proposal. Thereafter, it transitions into a broader moral, legal, and financial critique, challenging not only how the procedures were handled but the fairness of the content, its alignment with international principles as well. Finally, it concludes with a

clear-cut rejection of the New Collective Quantitfied Goal (NCQG) leaving no doubt that India does not approve and refuse to endorse a proposal it perceives as unjust, unrepresentative, and out of touch with the needs of the populations in the Global South.

At the level of discursive practice, the speech was delivered at a tense moment during multilateral climate negotiations which indicates that it both functions as a diplomatic intervention but also as a symbolic act.

On one level, it serves as a formal objection to a proposal, making sure that India's disapproval is entered into the official record. On another level, it is also a performative act designed for international audiences and even the other delegations present at the COP29, the speech was received with applause from several delegations demonstrating their support and alignment with the unjust principles that India advocates for during the speech.

The speech makes several references to past agreements such as COP21, the Paris Agreement, and the principle of Common But Differentiated Responsibilities and Respective Capabilities (CBDR-RC).

It also cites current policy mechanisms such as the NCQG process, Multilateral Development Bank (MDB) recapitalisation, and EU's Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism (CBAM), constructively connecting India's national concerns to much broader systemic imbalances in the global climate finance system. By invoking COP21 and the Paris Agreement, India showcases that they do not undermine the UN process - rather, it is defending its original soul, which positions India, not as a spoiler, but as a defender of climate justice for the Global South. In elaboration, the use of collective pronouns and inclusive language creates a strong sense of alignment with other countries from the Global South, giving them a voice.

The speech reaches out to multiple audiences. Firstly, the UNFCCC presidency, developed countries and key negotiators - those who are largely responsible for shaping and approving climate finance frameworks.

Secondly, the broader Global South, the Indian public, and climate justice advocates are appealed to, demonstrating strong leadership and solidarity.

Finally, the international media such as outlets and civil society groups in the Global South, effectively making sure that the message reaches beyond the negotiation room at COP29 and continues to shape public opinion and global discourse.

Socially, the speech directly challenges the dominant Global North framing on climate finance, as it rejects narratives that position support as a generosity and instead framing it as a responsibility. Furthermore, it reaffirms the moral authority of developing nations by underlining historical responsibility for emissions, thereby exposing the structural inequities rooted in the global climate system. Climate finance is reframed not as charity, but as a matter of justice and entitlement, firmly anchored in principles like equity and CBDR-RC.

By accusing the UNFCCC system as being procedurally flawed, it questions the perceived neutrality and fairness of global climate governance, exposing the institutional power imbalances that are present in the international global system that continues to disadvantage the Global South.

India carefully manages its international image by framing itself as a victim of procedural injustices. The speech emphasises solidarity with the Global South, positioning India as a collective voice for those most affected and most vulnerable in climate policies while deflecting blame for climate inaction.

The moral outrage can be considered a PR move, as it strategically seeks to awaken public sentiment and capture media attention, which it, in the end, succeeded to do.

5. Speeches from Developed Countries

This chapter presented a detailed analysis of speeches presente by representatives og governements from developed countries during rh COP29 negotiations. These speeches have carefully been selected in order to illustrate how developed countries strategically communicate their climate agendas. the purpose of this chapter is to showcase how language is employed to frame responsibility, use authority, and justify political choices wihtin a diplomatic context such as the COP29 negotiations. Furthermore, the examining lexical choices, framing implementations, and intertextual references intends to uncover the underlying narratives that take in part in shaping developed country's climate diplomacy.

While these texts offer reflection of official positions, they also underline broader ideological positions and negotiation strategies that influence the dynamics of global climate governance.

This chapter builds on the framework, previously established in earlier chapters, applying CDA to gain a meaningful understanding of how power, interests, and values are communicated through strategically employed rhetoric at global climate summits such as COP29.

5.1. UK: Prime Minister, Keir Starmer's speech at COP29

The speech by UK prime minister, Keir Starmer, is essential to include in this thesis, as it reflects how developed countries seek to position themselves in global climate negotiations via the language of leadership, responsibility, and (technological) innovation. The UK's gross domestic product (GDP) per head grew by 70.7% from 1987 and up until 2016, indicating substantial economic growth (Office for National Statistics, 2019). Furthermore, the UK was one of the first countries to undergo industrial development, thereby using extensive fossil fuels. Data suggests that the UK's increasing CO2 emissions since the Industrial revolution positions it as among the top contributors globally (Ritchie & Roser, 2020)

As the leader of a major economy and historical emitter, Starmer's speech serves as a strategic gesture in climate diplomacy, aimed at restating that the UK is a committed participant to climate goals while also navigating domestic political pressures and international inspection.

Including Keir Starmer's speech this provides a valuable insight into the mechanics of how climate communication not only serves to negotiate agreements but also to shape global narratives around climate action and leadership.

The full text of the speech is provided in appendix 4.

On the textual level, Starmer includes persuasive rhetorical strategies such as a pair of binaries: "(..) there are two paths ahead: one, the path of inaction and delay (..) or second, the path we walk, eyes wide open". Binary rhetoric often helps simplify complex realities into a structural and moral contrast, often used in political

speeches, in order to position the speaker's agenda as the only rational and reasonable choice (Coe et al., 2004, 236).

He uses a lot of repetitions and anaphora, evident in statements such as "there is no national security, there is no economic security, there is no global security without climate security". This phrase heightens the urgency and connects climate change to fundamental political priorities, both security and economy.

The frequent mention of national themes such as "(..) maximise opportunities for Britain" and "security for our nation" demonstrates national interests which reinforces Starmer's alignment with the domestic voters and a PR strategy that showcases a strong devotion and leading role in the climate crisis combat also referred to as "climate patriotism", emphasising climate leadership as an expression of British power and innovation and thereby also providing a win-win solution to preventing mass-scale migration (Terzi, 2024, 14).

Following the climate and green energy lingo, Starmer mentions "Green hydrogen", "carbon capture", "economic of tomorrow", and "clean power by 2030", framing technology as an optimistic manner which paints climate action as innovation-led growth, promoting a modern, forward-facing British identity.

At the discursive level, Keir Starmer's speech is not solely informational and factual - it is also persuasive and performative. He reframes environmental policy in ways that resonate and are compatible with conservative economic values such as jobs, investment, growth, and security, attempting to position the UK as a leader in climate diplomacy .

The message targets several audiences such as domestic voters through references such as "cheaper bills", which show a political messaging which is aimed at level-up regions and working-class interests. Secondly, he appeals to the business community, with terms such as "open for business" as well as international partners, as he highlights the UK's role in global clean energy alliances and mentions Siemens Gamesa. Generally, there is a strong emphasis on "business", "investment" along with statements such as "(..) the UK is open for business".

Starmer merges environmental, economic, and national security discourses, making the speech a case of interdiscursivity. He does not present climate change as a moral issue but rather as one central to economic competitiveness and national strength and durability.

At the social level, the dominant ideology in Keir Starmer's speech is one of neoliberal environmentalism and green growth, leveraging market mechanisms and technological innovation in the pursuit of environmental goals. Climate policy is not framed in terms of justice and equity, but as a strategic opportunity with profitability. He reclaims UK leadership in the combat of climate change, not merely in virtue but through financial and technological superiority. The speech also discreetly suggests a hierarchical relationship with developing countries, where the UK provides support, investment and technological expertise, by mentioning the UK's ability to provide support, technology, and their expertise for developing nations which suggests a hierarchical relationship.

Depolitisation is also suggested. The statement "We are delivering on our promise for good jobs, cheaper bills, and higher growth" individualises climate action outcomes, in such a way that it shifts focus from systemic change to consumption benefits. Even though international cooperation and solidarity is supplicated, climate justice, loss and damage, and/or historical accountability are remarkably absent.

In conclusion, the UK speech by Keith Starmer constructs the UK as a benevolent leader in global climate politics, while sidestepping deeper issues like equity, responsibility, or structural reform. This results in the maintenance of traditional power asymmetries even with a progressive agenda setting

5.2. US: special presidential envoy, John Podesta's speech at COP29

Including the speech by US climate negotiator, John Podesta, is especially relevant and a crucial component of this thesis, as it provides insight into how the world's largest emitter frames its role and positions itself and its responsibilities in the international climate agenda. It is especially relevant, given that the United State's role in both global emissions and climate diplomacy is tremendous. Podesta's speech carries significant weight given the political context; It comes after a period of climate diplomacy reversal under the Trump administration, during which the US formally withdrew from the Paris Agreement and signaled a wider pullback from

global climate commitments. Furthermore, Trump's open denial of climate change and rejection of multilateral environmental efforts remarkably undermined the US credibility in the global arena. In contrast, John Podesta's addresses can be perceived as an effort to restore trust and rebuild legitimacy, to reframe American climate policy, and globally present a renewed sense of responsibility and efforts. The full text of the speech is provided in appendix 5

At the textual level, Podesta utilises emotionally charged language and apocalyptic framing to set the tone from the beginning: "2024 will be the hottest year on record" and references to "unimaginable climate disasters". These statements insinuate urgency and fear early in order to prime the audience. It also sets the emotional tone before the introduction to the solutions. He proceeds strongly by listing climate-related consequences such as ""Hurricanes(…) starvation(…) torrential rain(…) displaced 100,000".

The interlinked consequences of climate change are listed to reinforce the urgency of policy action with a strong emphasis on vulnerability and the tangible human cost of climate inaction, as well as to heighten the moral of the message".

The pronoun shifts, from third-person references such as "That's why president Biden and Vice President Harris have marshalled" into inclusive calls such as "We know what to do. Let's get to work". The back and forth shifting between pronouns are strategically inserted to demonstrate leadership and collective effort, a strategic combination to show both authority and unity.

At the discursive level, the speech blends disaster discourse, a sense of humanitarian urgency, and technocratic leadership. Podesta frames climate change not just as an environmental problem, but also as a threat to security and human rights which demand urgent action. He presents vivid imagery of climate suffering before offering solutions, following a classic crisis-communication structure; highlight the problem, then make the case for action, then justify action (Jugo, 2013, 799-800).

Although this source analyses crisis communication from a corporate perspective, it is also applicable to political crises, underlining the sequence of highlighting the problem,making the case for action and justifying political action is a fundamental aspect of crisis communication in PR.

His references to American leadership hint at American exceptionalism, positioning the US as a major key participant in the global climate agenda. By delivering the speech on behalf of President Biden, Podesta gives it presidential authority, and underlines the institutional weight of the US government while also showing diplomatic formality to signal hierarchical legitimacy.

The primary audiences include developing countries and vulnerable states. Podesta frequently refers to those most affected by climate change thus leaning towards a more empathic rhetoric, though mostly in a passive way.

Another primary audience are negotiating parties. By making detailed references to Articles, financing structures, and reporting mechanisms, Podesta signals that this is a policy-focused discourse intended to influence other delegates at the summit.

Finally, the private sector is also appealed to. By including the Inflation Reduction Act and $11 billion finance underscores US credibility in investment terms.

This speech reveals a case of interdiscursivity; the climate justice themes are slightly and lightly hinted at while the economic discourse is also woven in but in a more protruding way with terms such as sustainability, finance, prosperity being prominent. In this way, Podesta manages to position climate as a broader part of a development model.

Socially, the speech aligns with the ideology of pragmatic multilateralism, that global problems are to be solved via "international cooperation, governed by norms and principles, with rules that apply (by and large) equally to all states" (European Parliamentary Research Service, 2017, 2).

He frames climate change as a technical and administrative challenge rather than a political or moral issue.

The speech also reveals that the US continuously positions itself as a resource-provider and standard-bearer, and leader, not as a co-equal in vulnerability. This reproduces and reestablishes North-South asymmetries in climate governance. Furthermore, there is no mention of climate responsibility in terms of historical responsibility, colonial repercussions nor loss-and-damage reparations, suggesting a selective engagement with justice discourses. Podesta positions climate change as a shared challenge, downplaying historical responsibility and the unequal contributions to its causes - suggesting a continuation of liberal internationalist climate discourse rather than a radical shift.

Moreover, the speech omits references to fossil fuel subsidies, domestic fossil fuel exports, and ongoing pipeline investments. This creates a discursive gap between US climate leadership and its internal policy contradictions.

Even though president Biden and his administration, represented by Podesta's speech, sought to claim the US in climate, the outcome of the American election 2024, won by Donald Trump, means that Trump inaugurated on January 20, 2025, marking a sharp shift away from climate the current climate agenda and climate obligations (Council on Foreign Relations, 2025). Trump's previous administration withdrew the US from the Paris Agreement and rolled back several climate regulations, signaling that many of the climate finance plans, transparency efforts, and emissions targets that Podesa is promoting, could slow down or weaken (European Parliament, 2025).

This upcoming shift is an exemplary example of the fragility of multilateral climate progress, as it may depend on the policy outcome of one single nation, which highlights the importance of constructing international agreements that are able to withstand political ups and downs.

5.3. Germany: National Statement by Germany's Foreign Minister Analena Baerbock presented by State Secretary Jennifer Morgan at COP29

The speech from Germany delivered by State Secretary Jennifer Morgan on behalf of Germany's Foreign Minister, Annalena Baerbock, emphasises Germany's unique rhetoric style, climate positioning, and ideological framing, especially in contrast with the speeches from the UK and the US

It is a key inclusion in this thesis, as it reflects the voice of major European power that seeks to act as a link between ambitious climate leadership and global cooperation. Germany's speech is particularly relevant for understanding how countries with strong climate abilities, yet still a part of the global North, navigate and handle both moral responsibility and geopolitical influence. By including this speech, it illustrates the layered dynamics of climate communication, where trust-building, historical responsibility, and identity regarding leadership intersect.

This offers a valuable comparative perspective on how climate commitments are constructed and framed by key participants in different global geopolitical contexts. The full text of the speech is provided in appendix 6.

The speech is opened with a moral imperative by grounding climate action in generational ethics rather than geopolitics or economics. By taking a look at the linguistic and rhetorical features, it can be argued that Morgan uses emotive framing and makes sure to express that previous generations should be held accountable, through statements such as "did you do what you could?" and "this is a question that our children will ask us".

A focus on immediate action is repeated throughout, in contrast to empty future promises.

Morgan uses time as a discourse resource to press urgency and press for action "effectively immediately", using strong modal verbs such as "we need" and inclusive calls to action, which provides a sense of collective responsibility, but also leadership.

She also uses contrastive framing with statements such as "We cannot address the needs of today with the recipes of the 1990's". She dismisses and juxtaposes old ways of thinking next to modern needs to call out resistance to change and legitimise innovation and reform. By noting that Germany closed 16 coal-fired power plants in 2024 and with renewable energy already making up a growing part of its energy mix, she strengthens her credibility by backing up with concrete figures. By backing statements up with number and quantifying it enhances her credibility and demonstrates leadership, showing action is already in progress"

Finally, Morgan frames the climate crisis as "the greatest economic opportunity of this generation", pointing out that global investments in green energy are now twice as high, which frames environmental action as not just a necessity, but also a financially smart and positive step towards the future.

As previously mentioned, the speech is presented and delivered on behalf of Foreign Minister Annalena Baerbock, a high-ranking political figure known for climate diplomacy. At the discursive level, we find that her Green Party adds a layer of credibility and authenticity within environmental discourse (World Economic Forum, n.d.)

The intended audiences include domestic and European stakeholders, by reaffirming German's leadership, developing countries, by recognising climate finance and its important role in climate action, private sector and investors, by highlighting economic transformation, and lastly, the younger generations, as she frames climate action with moral accountability.

This speech is also a case of interdiscursivity; environmental discourse intersects with development finance, intergenerational justice, and the broader agenda on green energy modernisation. References to global investment trends and finance architecture is also being included, positioning the speech as a neoliberal climate governance paradigm, although softened with justice-oriented language.

The social level reveals that Germany presents itself as a climate stabiliser, emphasising both moral responsibility, and technological-economic leadership, which aligns with ideological positions such as green modernity, promoting progress without regression.

She proceeds to criticise past structures: "We cannot address the needs of today with the recipes of the 1990's". The implicit critique of the global finance system, the inactivity of the Kyoto-protocol and outdated climate strategies, calling for reform, innovation and progress.

Furthermore, climate justice is slightly implied, though not as explicit statements than those from many of the Global South speeches, the discourse still acknowledges the importance of accessibility, equity, and shared responsibility especially in climate finance distribution.

Unlike the US, Germany does not utilise hegemonic language such as "we lead the world" indirectly. Instead, it frames its role through leadership, delivery, and shared benefit. This recognition helps build partnership legitimacy.

Towards the end of the speech, Germany makes an anti-regressive warning: "To all who have thoughts about turning the clock back - be warned!".

This warning is both political and economic, as it is mostly aimed at right-wing populists, fossil lobbies, or broader climate rollback movements - this signals a strong commitment to progress.

In conclusion, it can be claimed that Germany's discourse is moralising but not moralistic - combining both green pragmatism and strategic ambition.

5.4. Ireland: Minister, Aemon Ryan's, speech from Ireland at COP29

Minister, Aemon Ryan, delivers Ireland's national statement at COP29.

The speech provides a meaningful addition to this thesis, as it illuminates how smaller yet influential developed countries contribute to climate negotiations through a discourse rooted in credibility, solidarity, and value-based diplomacy. In contrast to larger powers such as the US, UK, or Germany, Ireland does not claim a dominant position in the geopolitical landscape, but often acts as a bridge, supporting climate justice, multilateral cooperation, and development financing, especially in relations to the global South.

Including Ireland's speech in the thesis adds nuance to the thesis by showcasing that effective climate communication is not merely shaped by size or emissions, but also by perceived integrity, alliance formation, and ethical framing.

The full text of the speech is provided in appendix 7.

The speech strategically combines emotive, factual, and inclusive language, calling for urgent climate action. Lexical choices such as "collapse", "ravaged" "perilous times", and "freezing temperatures" setting an alarming tone filled with pathos, while unifying words such as "we", "our", and "together" underscore collective responsibility and solidarity.

This emotional appeal is balanced by scientific evidence with references to the Atlantic Meridional Overturning Circulation (AMOC), net zero, and greenhouse gas emissions.

Strong modal verbs such as "must", "need to", "cannot" and "will" highlight a sense of urgency and non-negotiability, framing climate action as a moral imperative.

Rhetorically, the speech uses contrasts to highlight global inequality, e.g. the poorest countries bearing the least responsibility yet suffering the most.

Moreover, and establishes ethos by framing Ireland as a nation that is responsible and a proactive contributing actor to global climate effort. Mentioning the 6.8%

emissions reduction and backing it up with scientific evidence adds to the factual weight, enhancing the speech's credibility.

Structurally, the speech follows a clear structure: it begins with outlining the challenges and injustices setting the context and urgency of the matter. Next, Ireland presents its response underlining the exact actions it has taken to address the problem, framing the country as a committed active leader in global climate efforts. Finally, the focus shifts to a much broader appeal, demanding global cooperation and fairness in order to ensure a unified and fair solution.

The speech commences with a clear diagnosis of the global climate crisis. Presented and delivered at a high-profile international event like COP, the speech is most likely written and/or shaped by ministries, advisors, and climate experts reflecting Ireland's official position. At the same time, it is not solely a speech just stating policy. It is also a strategic tool designed to frame Ireland as a serious, responsible climate leader among the developed countries.

The message is not just constructed for delegates in the room to hear - it is also appealing to a global audience observing what Ireland states - and how it acts.

The speech makes several key international references such as The Paris Agreement, COP28 in Dubai, recent World Meteorological Organisation (WMO) report, and the African Union. The several references ground the messaging in a broader climate discourse, building a sense of continuity and a shared purpose. By aligning with established international frameworks and institutions, Ireland strengthens its legitimacy and indicates its commitment to multilateral action

The speech applies to multiple audiences. Domestically, it showcases Ireland's progress on emissions to secure citizens and voters for upcoming elections that climate commitments are being met.

Internationally, it appeals to a diverse global audience - it corresponds to the global South, in particular Small Island Developing States (SIDS) and Least Developed Countries (LDC)

while reaching out to the major powers like the Group of Twenty (G20) at the same time.

Lastly, the message is also designed to appeal to media, NGOs, and global public opinion, magnifying Ireland's image as an actor of responsibility, credibility, and commitment.

On the social level, it can be argued that Ireland communicates climate leadership as part of Ireland's global identity. The speech upholds moral vulnerability by underscoring grant-based aid and strong support for adaptation especially for those at risk the most.

Climate action is framed as a staple, long-term national commitment, non-partisan and resilient to election cycles which helps opposing the rise of populist skepticism The speech serves a clear public relations purpose, namely, helping Ireland manage Ireland's international reputation and presenting Ireland as a responsible and just contributor to global climate finance. By using data-driven success and measurable progress it prevents criticism and ensures credibility. Moreover, it reinforces Ireland's alignment with the EU climate policies, strengthening the EU's collective identity which further strengthens legitimacy and diplomatic influence.

The speech promotes a vision of green growth and presents it as a realistic path where economic success can be achieved without increasing emissions. Furthermore, it advocates for climate justice, acknowledging the burden that those, who are least responsible, bear as they often face the harshest consequences of climate change.

At the same time, it also calls for a reform of the global financial system, challenging the inaction of current systems in a gentle manner as well as advocating for more equitable and accessible climate finance for the countries who are in most need of such resources.

5.5. Australia: Minister for Climate Change and Energy, Chris Bowen's national statement at COP29

The speech delivered by Australia is a strategic inclusion in this thesis, as it summarises the unique position of a developed country that historically has been viewed as a "climate laggard" while experiencing significant climate impacts at home at the same time (itnews, 2022). Given that Australia is reliant on coal and other fossil fuels exports, which positions it at the center of a global debate on the future of energy and the speed of transitioning to low-carbon energy. Compared to speeches from countries like Germany or Ireland, which underline leadership and solidarity, or

33

India, which emphasises historical responsibility and equity, Australia's rhetoric is more about demonstrating strategic ambiguity, acknowledging global expectations while defending national interests at the same time.

Including this speech provides for a critical analysis of how climate communication is used to negotiate political tensions and managing international perception in the landscape of global climate governance.

The full text of the speech is provided in appendix 8.

At the textual level, Bowen uses repetitive phrases like "Australia is back", "accelerating our transformation", and "indispensable part of the global net zero economy" framing Australia as a proactive, cooperative and essential actor in the global arena.

Following cooperative framing, the frequent use of collective nouns such as "we" and "our" builds unity, shared responsibility and expresses "institutional identity", which is a classical PR strategy that fosters national pride and trust in leadership (Fajar, 2019, p. 68-69).

The statement "Climate action makes economic sense at every level(…)" reflects a strategic positioning of climate action with economic interests, appealing to multiple audiences such as voters through statements such as "family homes with cheaper bills"", investors when he states "It makes sense for businesses to harness the cheapest energy known to us", and global partners as he includes "And it makes sense for Australia's economy".

He also mentions key figures from the summit such as President Mukhtar Babayev and Minister Foaud, which demonstrates diplomacy and strategic alignment with global leadership.

Furthermore, there is an emphasis on numbers and investments by mentioning statistics like *"$20 billion investment", "$3 billion finance", "82% renewable electricity", and "32 gigawatts of energy".* By quantifying the results, it works as a way to legitimise actions and presenting them with data and measurable results to reinforce credibility

Statements such as "we've come far, but not far enough" and "Friends -", the repeated messaging function as a rhetorical device to signal openness and urgency at the same time.

The speech employs intertextuality, as Bowen makes several references to the Paris Agreement, Global Stocktake, and Loss and Damage Fund positions the speech with global climate discourse. He also appeals to shared goals such as the "1.5 degree", creating a sense of alignment with international work, a classic PR tool that demonstrates global responsibility (Allen & Craig, 2016, 2).

On the social level of Fariclough's model, we find that the speech promotes an ideology that align with neoliberalism and eco-modernism, namely that climate is good for business, development and national image (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, n.d.) and that technological development can protect the environment and ecosystems (University of Oxford, 2022)

Moreover, the framing of climate change as an opportunity for economic development and moral obligation, especially to Pacific nations, give strength to Australia's soft power diplomacy.

From a PR standpoint, it can be argued that the speech works as reputation management. Due to the history of Australia being criticised for climate inaction, this discourse seeks to rebuild Australia's national image as a progressive leader.

Another important thing to point out is, that the co-hosting bid for COP31 is necessarily not just logical but a strategic PR move to insert Australia deeper into the climate governance landscape.

The speech also reveals and reproduces power asymmetries, as Australia presents itself as a helper to "friends and neighbours". This framing strengthen a hierarchy despite the use of language that indicates partnership

While raising the Pacifics voice, Australia still maintains discursive control by presenting itself as a benevolent leader, a role typically displayed in PR narratives to enhance their international image and influence (Surowiec, 2016, 2).

6. Speeches from Small Island Developing State (SIDS)

This chapter of the thesis focuses on the speeches delivered by SIDS governments during the COP29 negotiations. These speeches are highly significant, given the increased vulnerability of SIDS to the impacts of climate change and their historical role as moral voices in climate diplomacy.

This chapter investigates how these countries utilise language strategically in order to call attention to existential threats, demand climate justice, and to stronger international commitments. Through CDA, particular attention is given to how SIDS frame their messages regarding urgency, equity, and survival. This analysis provides a foundation of insights into how rhetorical strategies are utilised to impact climate negotiations and to raise the voice of the Global South and those most affected by the consequences imposed by climate change.

6.1. St. Kitts and Nevis: Minister of Sustainable Development, Environment, and Climate Action and Constituency Empowerment: Hon. Dr. Joyelle Clarke's speech at COP29

The inclusion of the speech from St. Kitts and Nevis further strengthens this thesis by underlining the unified yet diverse voices of Small Island Developing States (SIDS) within the climate negotiation landscape.
The full text of this speech is provided in appendix 9.

At the discursive level, the speech by St. Kitts and Nevis is delivered by using powerful emotional appeals presented from a moral and justice-oriented point of view, and not a technocratic lingo through statements such as ""Our children… our women.. deserve better" and "Not seduced by incrementalism".
This contrasts heavily with Australia's heavy focus on investment-oriented rhetoric. Pronouns are carefully used to create a group identity. The repetition of "our" such as "our youth" "our elderly" builds on the idea of collective and shared identity that emphasises community protection and solidarity.

Along with the inclusion of marginalised and vulnerable groups such as "indigenous people" "girls" and "women", St. Kitts and Nevis demonstrates support for inclusion and fairness.

The Speech takes on a *call to action* statement with the phrase: "Let Baku be the place for co-creation of finance justice", calling for urgency and collective responsibility and taking bold steps toward equitable climate finance. It also takes on a poetic and visionary tone, as seen in the phrase: "Children… co-creators and co-managers of the future they deserve"

It is a message that states "values first" and not "market first". This narrative can also be referred to as values-led PR, prioritising moral values and justice over economic opportunity (Verwey, Benecke & Muir, 2017, 69), which contrasts Australia's speech.

This speech is directed for Global climate leaders (the appeal to justice), fellow island nations (calling for unity and shared identity via SIDS and AOSIS), the younger generation, and marginalised populations (giving them a voice and centering them in the conversation).

The speech is likely written in collaboration with youth advocacy and civil society groups, embedded in the SIDS movement.

In contrast to Australia's attempt to showcase leadership and control, St. Kitts and Nevis disrupts dominant climate discourse followers by statements such as "Not seduced by incrementalism", which refers to the political process of implementing small changes gradually over timer which later on might lead to larger transformations (EBSCO, 2024).

The speech also explicitly references China and Taiwan, reaffirming the country's recognition of One China Policy and expressing solidarity with the People's Republic of China. This inclusion indicates the strategic diplomatic positioning of SIDS in global politics.

This reference tells us various things; it shows that St. Kitts and Nevis align with China's position, likely because of interests such as maintaining diplomatic ties or economic cooperation. It also underlines how small states use soft power in the form of symbolic gestures in diplomacy to ensure strategic partnerships.

This is an example of how speeches are employed to publicly affirm international loyalties and positions.

Lastly, it informs that St. Kitts and Nevis engages with global power dynamics, maintaining its relevance through carefully crafted and delivered messages.

The speech carries strong messages such as climate justice, collective responsibility, and intergenerational equity

St. Kitts and Nevis frames and positions other island states not as aid recipients but as agents of change such as by being co-hosts at the Global Sustainable Island Summit with the environmental consultant, Island Innovation, in order to advance the SIDS agenda.

The speech also reveals power relations, as it challenges exclusion through the statement "supersedes exclusional processes" and rejects performative partnerships that lack genuine commitment to justice and urgency.

Compared to Australia's more cautious, status-quo preserving approach by using economic lingo to stay in leadership circles, the speech by St. Kitts and Nevis seeks fundamental and systemic transformation of the global system itself along with reaffirming its alliance and loyalty to China and Taiwan.

6.2. St. Lucia: Parliamentary Secretary - Ministry of Education, Sustainable Development, Innovation, Science, Technology and Vocational Training, Hon. Dr. Pauline Antoine-Prospere's speech at COP29

The speech from St. Lucia adds an amount of essential depth and balance to this thesis by forefronting the experiences and moral authority of small island developing states (SIDS) in climate negotiations. Being one of the most threatened by rising sea levels, escalating storms, and economic disruption due to climate issues, St. Lucia represents a population whose survival is directly tied to the ambition and fairness of global climate action.

Including this speech contrasts largely with those of large emitters such as the US, Australia, or the UK, whose rhetoric revolves more around innovation, leadership, and balancing growth. By analysing the speech from St. Lucia, the thesis captures the diversity of voices at the climate summit and at the negotiation table.

Furthermore, it highlights how emotional appeals, lived experiences, and moral coherence shape the discourse of climate justice during the COP negotiations. The full text of the speech is provided in appendix 10.

On the textual level, it is revealed that the characteristic form of the speeches by SIDS repeats with the emotive, urgent tone with statements such as "one that demands urgency, and decisive action to ensure our humanity(...) and "this stark injustice of a crisis we did not create".

The high emotional intensity of the two statements evokes empathy and encourages people to take responsibility.

Powerful metaphors and repetition are also to be found. In a statement such as "Pilgrimage to COP", the act of participation becomes framed as sacred and burdensome.

The repetition of hardship and impact with words and phrases such as "ravaged", "trail of deaths", "severe", and "undermined" underscore vulnerability

St. Lucia also uses quantitative data but in a moral-coded manner: "SIDS spent 18 times more in debt repayments than they have received in climate finance". In this scenario, numbers and statistics are not used to show progress, but on the contrary, to highlight inequity and moral urgency.

The speech also makes intertextual references to climate finance discourses, UN climate frameworks, SIDS vulnerability narratives, and the exclusion of Taiwan from the UN system, like the speech from St. Kitts and Nevis.

The speech's inclusion of external actors, like Taiwan, praising the country's support and advocating for its formal inclusion highlights the importance of alliances beyond traditional power structures while also challenging geopolitical exclusions, reaffirming SIDS' alliance and loyalty to China and Taiwan.

At the discursive level, it is evident that the primary audience consists of international policy-makers, COP negotiators, and development financiers.

The secondary audience consists of fellow SIDS, local communities, and solidarity movements.

Furthermore, the speech makes use of strategic PR messaging. It combines evidence such as the lived impact of Hurricane Beryl with advocacy where it calls for justice-oriented finance systems (Australian Government Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, n.d.)

The language functions both as a form of witnessing and as a tool of persuasion, aligning the speech with moral advocacy and not economic brand-building as observed in the speech from Australia.

Moreover, there is an emphasis on the legitimacy of SIDS, not through economic power but through moral credibility, lived experience, and resilience.

The speech aligns with the broader climate justice movement, portraying st. Lucia both as a victim of structural injustice including colonialism and unjust climate finance and as a proactive agent actively, advancing its own adaptation laws and strategies.

Like St. Kitts and Nevis, St. Lucia challenges existing traditional hierarchies in climate diplomacy. This is visible in statements such as "We cannot afford the climate crisis on our own", "Grants for adaptation take too long to access..". These statements reveal the dysfunctions of global systems, particularly finance and governance.

The PR move here is not to attract investment, like the developed nations, but to demand transformation of the underlying structures and flow of aid, recognition, and influence.

6.3. Solomon Islands: Minister for Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management and Meteorology, Hon. Trevor Manemahaga's speech at COP29

The speech from the Solomon Islands, is a critical contribution to this thesis, as it brings in the perspective of Pacific Small Island Developing States, which face existential threats like their Caribbean counterparts. By adding the speech from the Solomon Islands to the analysis, it brings to light how small island states can reshape global climate discourse and put pressure on larger actors towards more just and ambitious climate action.

The full tex of the speech is provided in appendix 11.

Delivered by the Minister of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management and Meteorology, mr. Trevor Manemahaga, the speech from Solomon Islands uses formal diplomatic language such as "Mr. President, Excellencies, Esteemed Delegates". These terms set a formal and ceremonial tone and position the speaker within a formal international context.

Mr. Manemahaga frequently uses assertive modal verbs such as "must", "cannot", "urge", and "need" in order to imply urgency that are non-negotiable and moral obligation.

The repetition of imperative phrases such as "must deliver", "must not lose sight", and "must be transformative" showcases a sense and need for urgency, and non-negotiability, aligning the speech with political advocacy strategies

Mr. Manemahaga uses emotionally charged language through words and phrases such as "loss", "displacement", "suffering", and "erosion of culture". This is common in public diplomacy, where moral positioning and collective problem-solving is strategically employed to gain global solidarity (Zaharna & Huang, 2022, 2). Furthermore, the use of collective pronouns such as "we" and "our" create a shared identity and a sense of global collectivism aiming to foster global solidarity, the same PR strategy utilised in the speech from Australia. Moreover, on the lexical level, terms such as "mitigation", "stocktake" , "loss and damage", "fossil fuel subsidies", and "NCQG" show alignment with the UNFCCC discourse. In other terms, the choice of these terms demonstrates alignment with institutional language, a key political communication tactic.

Mr. Manamehaga represents the Government and people of Solomon Islands, speaking from a perspective of collective national identity and drawing moral authority from the country's position as a frontline victim of climate change. There are several targeted audiences that is appealed to in the speech;

Firstly, the COP presidency and the host - these audiences are explicitly and formally acknowledged to maintain diplomatic politeness. Secondly, the high-emitting countries are being called out. They are indirectly being criticised with appeals for increased mitigation. Thirdly, the UNFCCC negotiators and parties are appealed to by urging them to take immediate action on the climate change agenda. Fourthly and lastly, the speech is also directed at the global public and media. It can be argued that the speech also functions as a tool of soft power aimed at drawing international attention to SIDS's vulnerability in the global climate landscape.

The speech is designed to reach several platforms such as global news platforms, social media as well as the UNFCCC repositories, which is where this document was discovered.

Its rhetorical structure is designed for fragmentation using short, punchy phrases like "1.5 is not negotiable" and "grant-based finance". This choice of rhetorical style aligns with PR strategies to make key messages clear and spread easily.

On the social practice level, geopolitical asymmetry is revealed. Coming from a small island developing state (SIDS) with minimal global emissions but a high risk of and exposure to climate consequences, the speech shows how those on the margins of global power still speak directly to the core in climate politics. Moreover, the Solomon islands constructs themselves as a country with moral authority in climate discourse, framing inaction from wealthy nations as a moral and structural failure, that the developed countries have failed developing countries.

The speech reinforces the key expectations of the UN climate system, such as meeting the goals from the Paris Agreement, the $100 B pledge, and the Global stocktake, also making it a case of interdiscursivity.

The Solomon Islands uses the UN stage as a PR platform by pushing finance, mitigation, and the 1.5°C goal to the top of the agenda.

By highlighting their proactive goals such as "calling for a swift operationalisation of the Loss and Damage fund", the Solomon Islands manage their image as not only victims, but also as constructive partners on the global scene. This reflects the evolving nature of international diplomacy where speeches not only function as negotiations but also as media performances and moral claims.

6.4. Timor-Leste: Ambassador Adão Soares Barbosa's speech at COP29

Timor-Leste's speech offers a critical perspective that complements this thesis by underlining the intersection of climate vulnerability, development struggles, and rebuilding after conflict.

As one of the world's least developed nations, Timor-Leste brings a voice to the negotiation table that is often underrepresented in the global climate agenda. Compared to SIDS such as St. Lucia or the Bahamas, who often center their rhetoric around oceanic threat and survival, Timor-Leste provides a grounded narrative rooted in poverty, limited capacity, and calls for support that go beyond finance, including technology sharing, stronger institutions, and shared development.

By including this speech, the geographic and political diversity of the analysis expands, as underlines the way climate communication is shaped by each country's historical and cultural context.

The full text of the speech is provided in appendix 12.

At the discursive level, the speech from Timor-Leste's follows the diplomatic protocol and formal register: "Excellencies (...) distinguished delegates" which aligns with the formal UN diplomatic norms, providing the speaker with credibility and legitimacy. There is a frequent use of ethical appeals though phrases such as "Climate justice must be at the core". This indicates a normative claim about fairness and places ethical responsibility on the higher carbon-emitting nations.

Like St. Lucia, Timor-Leste is portrayed as a victim of climate change, with references to floods, droughts, and rising sea levels, using emotional appeals that are common in climate diplomacy from vulnerable counties.

Furthermore, the Solomon Islands both utilises crisis and call-to-action rhetoric. Phrases like "We must act decisively" and "we urge" showcases a clear sense of urgency and assertiveness shifting from passive language to one that emphasises agency and action.

Furthermore, the Solomon Islands also makes use of statistical financial evidence. The call for $1.3 trillion per year from 2026 to 2035 introduces technocratic legitimacy, framing the demand as based on concrete projections rather than normal abstract moral pleas.

Mentions of terms such as "NCQG" and "National Adaptation Plan" align the speech with technical lingo of the UNFCCC, enabling it to fit into discussions within elite industrial arenas.

Strategic repetition and parallel structures are also to be found. "Finance", "technology", and "capacity building" are consistently repeated, highlighting the main policy demands.

The repeated emphasis on "grant-based" rather than "not loans" sharpens and enhances the message.

Discursively, this speech was designed to meet multiple strategic aims: engaging diplomatically with developed countries, moral advocacy on behalf of LDCs and SIDS, and lastly, making financial appeals grounded in policy making and institutional frameworks.

Delivered by Ambassador Adáo Soares Barbosa, the speaker acts not merely as national representative but also as a voice for structurally marginalised states in climate negotiations.

The main targeted audiences consist of developed country parties, as they are relatively urged to meet financial and moral obligations, COP29 leadership and UNFCCC bodies, as they are being called to deliver technical operational decisions particularly based on finance and loss and damage funding. Thirdly, the International Civil Society and media is also being appealed to, as they are indirectly addressed through morally charged language, which is meant to constitute solidarity and put pressure on policy makers.

The speech is designed to reach media outlets, policy briefs, and civil society reports. The use of sound bites such as "Business as usual is no longer appropriate" and "grant-based finance" further enhances the speech's adaptability for wider advocacy and media distribution (Li, 2017, 1).

Socially, the speech is framed within broader global climate inequalities, particularly regarding the imbalance between those most responsible for the climate crisis and those most vulnerable to its impacts and the consequences thereof.

It critiques the disproportionate burden of a low-emitting state like Timor-Leste itself as a result of the actions of industrialised nations.

Therefore, Timor-Leste aligns with the climate justice narrative emphasising equity, reparations, and redistribution. This speech challenges the dominant neoliberal approach to climate finance by advocating for non-debt based support.

The demand for institutional reforms such as simplified access to finance and the establishment of national entities, reflects insider discourse, positioning Timor-Leste not only as a victim but as a competent and engaged actor.

6.5. The Bahamas: Prime Minister the Hon. Philip Davis' speech at COP29

The inclusion of The Bahama's speech adds further depth into this thesis by illuminating how Small Island Developing States (SIDS) implement sea and ocean-centered rhetoric to frame its climate vulnerability. The Bahamas, like the Solomon Islands, frames its climate vulnerability via its intimate and inseparable relationship with the ocean.

When compared to other Caribbean SIDS such as St. Lucia, and St. Kitts and Nevis, which focuses heavily on addressing justice and finance, the Bahamas brings a voice that combines urgent environmental concerns with a strong sense of cultural identity.

The full text of the speech is provided in appendix 13.

In the speech by the Bahamas, we witness another case of emotionally charged language such as: "we are dangerously close(...)" and "there is no return" in order to underline the existential urgency of the climate crisis.

Metaphors such as "Line beyond which there are no return" and "our sea grasses are its hidden blue heart" insert a poetic tone to deepen and secure an emotional resonance.

Another unique rhetorical that separates the Bahama's speech from the other ones, is the way that "the climate" is attributed with personal qualities. We witness this in the following quote: "The climate is not just a system; it "demands" action and does not "pause" for election". This personification is a figurative language technique and a powerful rhetorical tool, as it helps awaken empathy and emotional responses, helps simplify complex systems and helps resonate internationally as it bridges linguistic and cultural gaps.

In continuation of rhetorical devices, the speech also makes use of anaphora and rhetorical repetition. This is revealed in statements such as "We know this. We know this" and "We do not, cannot accept (..)". The short pause before the repetition helps with emphasising the graveness of the message, creating a serious and heavy emphasis on undeniable truths.

The use of pronouns such as "we" and "our" builds collective responsibility as well as solidarity, and the use of the pronoun "you" addresses other nations directly, creating personal accountability.

If one were to look into the structure and tone of the speech, one will find that it is strategically constructed in a manner that almost works as story-telling. It commences with a formal tone and expression of gratitude, then it builds into an alarm, informing about the warnings and consequences of inaction. Finally, it ends with a call to moral responsibility and collaborative action.

Discursively, the speech was most likely written and designed with the help of different climate policy advisors and PR strategists. As it is written for multilateral forum, the speech's targeted audience spans widely in the societal actors, as it is intended for both international leaders, NGO's, media, and citizens, and it is distributed through various mediums such as news outlets, diåplomatic briefings, and social media, among other things, magnifying political narratives.

The text makes use of intertextuality drawing upon UNFCCC and the Paris Agreement, climate science consensus, other global crises such as COVID-19 and war financing, as well as shared global remembrances such as the Amazon and climate disasters.

Climate change is framed as a moral and existential crisis where the G20 countries are pushed for accountability and the leading part in operationalising climate finance. In contrast, the Bahamas' positions themselves as a moral leader, climate front runner and victim of global climate inaction.

Power relations are revealed, as SIDS speak with moral authority, pushing back against global North power holders, especially the G20.

The speech challenges historical injustice, mentioning debt burden, and uneven carbon emissions, invoking ideas from the climate justice movement.

The speaker pushes back against climate denial and inaction, demands global solidarity instead of narrow national self-interest, and critiques short-term politics.

The speech also serves a socio-political function, as it aims to pressure major polluters into funding mechanisms. Moreover, it aims to promote multilateral cooperation and keep the climate endeavors going, regardless of who is in power.

Lastly, it also aims to shape the Bahama's image and international brand as a resilient, forward-thinking nation that plays a major key role in environmental protection.

46

6.6. Conclusion on Analytical Findings

The analysis of the political speeches at COP29 underlines how governments tailor their message to reflect national identity, interests, and geopolitical positioning. To provide an example, Saint Kitts and Nevis emphasises the historical injustice of emissions contributions, framing the climate crisis as repercussion consisting of colonial and industrial systems. This approach stands in marked contrast to the UK's more future-oriented rhetoric which focuses primarily on green leadership along with technological innovation.

Similarly, while St. Lucia utilises emotive, justice-based language that puts moral obligation at the center, the US focuses on a more calculated tone, prioritising partnerships and economic solutions, without addressing and accepting historical responsibility.

Timor-Leste highlights national sovereignty and dignity in climate action, whilst Australia frames its commitment by underlining adaptation financing and a practical economic approach. Solomon islands signalises survival and existential risk, while Germany communicates the need for technological leadership and a target to reduce emissions. This indicates an emphasis on credibility within the international system over direct engagement with historical accountability.

These contrasts paint a crystal clear picture of a divide in priorities between SIDS and developed countries but also different communicative strategies, which is rooted in unequal power structures.

Essentially, the speeches demonstrate that climate negotiations at COP29 are not solely a technological process. It is a highly rhetorical and political performance where countries employ language, framing, and discursive practices to assert power and shape norms, build alliances and ultimately influence outcomes.

6.7. Comparative Table

Themes	Saint Kitts and Nevis	St. Lucia	Timor-Leste	The Bahamas	Solomon Islands	UK	US	Australia	Ireland	Germany
Climate justice	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	—	—	—	—	✓
Historical responsibilities	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	—	—	—	—	
Finance demands	✓	✓	—	✓	✓	—	✓	—	—	—
Moral appeals	—	✓	✓	✓	✓	—	—	✓		—
Sovereignty/agency	✓	—	✓	—	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Technological solutions	✓	—	—	—	—	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Vulnerable framing	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	—	✓	—	—	—

6.8. Limitations of Study

Although this study provides valuable insights into how governments from SIDS and developing countries frame their climate agenda during COP29, it is important that several limitations are acknowledged. Firstly, the corpus size inserts limitations for the thesis. Due to the limited space of the thesis,the analysis is based on a limited number of official speeches, which may not fully capture the complexity of discursive strategies utilised across all participating delegations. Moreover, the study exclusively focuses on public communication, such as plenary speeches and therefore does not take into account the informal speeches or the behind-closed-doors diplomatic exchanges that may have a significant effect on the outcomes. Additionally, by only examining one COP event, the study only provides a temporal picture of climate discourse, as it does not account for shifts or patterns overtime. By incorporating major global forces such as BRICS, would also allow for a new perspective for the study. Their desire to create counterweight to Western influence in global politics and institutions while being geographically spread across the globe but more powerful, compared to AOSIS, would help gain another perspective on

alliance forming in global politics in the attempt to challenge the global North hegemony that dominates in the global climate discourse.

While the comparisons between SIDS and developed countries are analytically useful, it may overlook the diversity and unique perspectives within these categories. These limitations indicate areas for further research such as tracking climate changes over time and introducing a wider range of actors, such as countries, organisations, political actors or the media and the press.

7. Discussion: COP29 - What have we learned?

In order to provide an answer for the second part of the research question - what can the delegations learn based on the outcome of COP29 in order for a more profitable outcome in order to reach the goals set by the Paris Agreement?

First and foremost, they can evaluate how well their communication strategies turned into tangible outcomes - identifying what worked, what did not, and why.

Researchers revealed that framing has a crucial impact on people's value-belief system and their behaviors when climate change is framed as a threat to their regional identity. When exposed to a message framing the negative impact on climate change in local environments, people were more likely to change their opinions on climate change compared to reading a message underlining global impact (Li, 2013, 3).

Countries should therefore have a stronger focus on framing climate change as a local risk, encouraging more active participation and cooperation from stakeholders who feel personally affected.

Learning from both the successes and failures of COP29 allows for a more targeted multilateral cooperation, clearer messages, and stronger alignment with global temperature and finance goals which are inevitable.

Furthermore, it can be argued that improved transparency, stronger coordination initiatives, and better integration of climate science into policy proposals might lead to an increase in credibility and impact.

In India's speech, we witnessed that one of the failures in reaching a satisfactory climate finance goal was a result of lack of trust in developed countries to developing countries. Delegations should therefore prioritise inclusive dialogue with vulnerable states and non-state actors in order to build trust and legitimacy.

Finally, in order to make real progress and maintain momentum, countries will need to do so through follow-up actions, such as national policy updates and public engagement campaigns.

Shortly described, treating the COP as a learning platform rather than an endpoint, can help countries get closer to meeting the long-term goals of the Paris Agreement. Figuratively speaking, climate negotiations are not a sprint, it is a marathon, and there are lots of improvements needed. However, even small steps forward can make a significant difference over time.

8. Conclusion

This thesis set out to examine the strategic use of political communication, hereunder PR in order to convey messages that persuades the audience and furthers political actors' climate agenda. By employing CCA by Fairclough, elongating the research with Fairclough's three-dimensional model in order to identify linguistic features, understand how meaning is constructed and how it is distributed and consumes, as well as explain how discourse contributes to maintaining or challenging existing social structures and power dynamics. These insights, in a broader perspective, seek to understand how governments from SIDS and developed countries strategically communicate in order to further their own agenda, as well as the differences in order to conclude a comparative analysis.

The research question guiding this thesis stands: *"How do governments from Small Island Developing States (SIDS) and developed countries strategically frame their climate agendas through communication during the COP29 negotiations in Baku and What can we learn from the outcome of COP29 in order for delegations to get closer to reach the goals states in the Paris Agreement?"*

Through a in-depth analysis of the political speeches presented by the 10 different delegations along with three speeches presented by the secretariat and one from India in protest to the climate finance proposal, and the framing of their climate agenda's through the implementation of CDA, this research provided nuanced answers to these questions through various findings:

First and foremost, Simon Stiell's opening and closing speech at COP29 complement each other, both in a rhetorical and strategic manner. The opening speech highlights emotional appeal and moral urgency, using a passive narrative through the Florence story, in order to humanise climate vulnerability and construct a strong shared ethical responsibility. From the very beginning, he frames the negotiations as a moral imperative, calling for global action, and sets high expectations. In contrast, the closing speech employs a more institutional and legitimising tone. Achievement, collective effort, and outcome framing is being emphasised, revealing a discursive shift from "crisis narrative" to "solution narrative". While the opening of a COP sets the tone and pushes for momentum, the closing is the one that leaves a mark, showing what was actually achieved and reinforcing the legitimacy of UNFCCC's framework and why it is crucial in the process in driving global climate action.

India's forceful intervention at COP29 presents a strong rhetorical and ideological contrast to the celebratory framing of the closing speech. While Stiell presents a discourse of progress, consensus, and global momentum, India's speech exposes the cracks in multilateral trust and underlines the North-South inequalities, especially among climate finance and responsibility.

Across the 10 speeches analysed, it was found that a clear divide in discourse emerges between the SIDS and the developed countries, reflecting deep asymmetry in climate vulnerability, power, and responsibility. SIDS continuously adapt a language that highlights climate change as an existential issue, framing climate change as a matter of survival with emotional appeals typically centered around loss, justice, and moral urgency.

Their speeches primarily revolves around lived experiences, raising awareness of environmental consequences while demanding historical responsibility and more in climate finance from the developed countries. Their argument follows the logic, that

even though the SIDS produces the least emissions, they end up being the victims of a crisis that they did not create in order to put moral pressure on the developed countries who are the most responsible for emissions.

In contrast, the developed countries mostly utilise technocratic and solution-focused language, with the majority underlining their own contributions and commitments. While the majority nods to solidarity, the developed countries rhetoric tends to reflect a reframing of responsibility into opportunity, shifting focus from obligation to voluntary action in a subtle manner.

This contrast between the two groups emphasises persistent tensions in global climate negotiations: between those who are the most impacted and the least responsible, and those with the resources and power to act, but often with a narrative that tones down their accountability.

References

Aljazeera. "UN Climate Talks in Disarray as Developing Nations Stage Walkout." *Al Jazeera*, November 23, 2024. https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2024/11/23/un-climate-talks-in-disarray-as-developing-nations-stage-walkout.

Arora. "COP29: achieving net zero though financial sustainability ." PDF file. Accessed April 17, 2025. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s42398-025-00337-z

Australian Government Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade. *Public Diplomacy and Advocacy Handbook*. Accessed March 24, 2025. https://www.dfat.gov.au/about-us/publications/people-to-people/public-diplomacy-advocacy-handbook/Pages/part-four-advocacy-and-strategic-communication.

Baerbock, Annalena. Profile. *World Economic Forum*. https://www.weforum.org/people/annalena-baerbock/.

Carbon Brief. "COP29: Key Outcomes Agreed at the UN Climate Talks in Baku." *Carbon Brief*. https://www.carbonbrief.org/cop29-key-outcomes-agreed-at-the-un-climate-talks-in-baku/.

Council on Foreign Relations. "2024 Election by the Numbers." Accessed March 2025. https://www.cfr.org/article/2024-election-numbers.

Cutlip, Scott M., Allen H. Center, and Glen M. Broom. *Effective Public Relations*. 8th ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 2000.

European Parliament Think Tank. *Understanding the EU's Stance at COP29 and Its Implications for COP30*. Accessed March 2025. https://esthinktank.com/2025/03/12/lack-of-politics-and-lack-of-outcomes-understanding-eus-stance-at-the-cop29-and-its-implications-for-cop30/.

Fairclough, Norman. *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1992.

Gonçalves, Gisela. Research profile. *ResearchGate*. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Gisela-Goncalves-2.

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). "Climate Change in Data." Accessed March 24, 2025. https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar6/wg1/resources/climate-change-in-data/.

International Trade Union Confederation (ITUC). "COP29: Talks End with Utterly Inadequate Deal on Climate Finance." *ITUC*. https://www.ituc-csi.org/COP29-Talks-end-with-utterly-inadequate-deal.

La Viña, Antonio G.M. *Consensus Building in the UNFCCC*. Climate & Development Knowledge Network. Accessed March 26, 2025. https://cdkn.org/sites/default/files/files/Background-Paper-Tony-La-Vina-Consensus-building-in-the-UNFCCC.pdf.

Li, Nan. "Framing in Climate Change Communication." *New Prairie Press*. https://newprairiepress.org/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2189&context=jac.

Office for National Statistics. "The Decoupling of Economic Growth from Carbon Emissions: UK Evidence." *ONS*, October 2019. https://www.ons.gov.uk/economy/nationalaccounts/uksectoraccounts/compendium/economicreview/october2019/thedecouplingofeconomicgrowthfromcarbonemissionsukevidence.

Our World in Data. "CO2 Emissions: United Kingdom." Accessed March 2025. https://ourworldindata.org/co2/country/united-kingdom.

Pickard, Victor. "No Shades of Gray: The Binary Discourse of Civil Liberties vs. National Security." PDF. Accessed March 2025. https://victorpickard.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/pickard-2004-no_shades_of_gray.pdf.

Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. "Neoliberalism." Accessed March 2025. https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/neoliberalism/.

United Nations. "UN Climate Change Convention." Accessed March 24, 2025. https://www.un.org/en/climatechange/un-climate-conferences.

UNFCCC. "What is the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change?" Accessed March 24, 2025. https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/what-is-the-united-nations-framework-convention-on-climate-change.

World Bank/ResearchGate. "The Politics of Persuasion: UN Climate Change Negotiations." *ResearchGate*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/286704945_The_politics_of_persuasion_UN_climate_change_negotiations.

United Nations "UN Climate Change Convention" accessed March 24

https://www.un.org/en/climatechange/un-climate-conferences#:~:text=The%20UNFCCC%20is%20a%20multilateral,interference%20with%20the%20climate%20system.%E2%80%9D

IPCC "Climate Change in Data" accessed March 24
https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar6/wg1/resources/climate-change-in-data/

UNFCCC: https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/what-is-the-united-nations-framework-convention-on-climate-change#:~:text=The%20ultimate%20objective%20of%20the,ecosystems%20to%20adapt%20naturally%20to accessed March 24

https://cdkn.org/sites/default/files/files/Background-Paper-Tony-La-Vina-Consensus-building-in-the-UNFCCC.pdf?utm_source=chatgpt.com accessed March 26