

**CONSTRUCTING NATIONAL MORALITY: A  
 CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF U.S  
 POLICY SHIFTS TOWARD RUSSIA IN THE  
 CONTEXT OF UNITED NATIONS GENERAL  
 ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION ES-11/7**

**Dwiki Rahman Khan**  
*dwikirahman1903@gmail.com*  
 085155288154

**Abstract**

*This study explores the construction of national morality in the United States' policy shift toward the Russia-Ukraine war, employing a Concurrent Triangulation Mixed Methods approach. The primary focus is to examine the ideological polemic between President Joe Biden and the Democratic Party and President-elect Donald Trump regarding the ongoing conflict in Ukraine. It investigates how national morality is constructed through official statements and diplomatic positions of the respective administrations. Many Democrats have expressed full support for Ukraine's independence and consistently backed UN resolutions that emphasize Ukraine's sovereignty and its freedom from the influence and territorial control of the Russian Federation. However, Ukraine, as an independent nation, must now face a different reality, as President Donald Trump seeks peace between both parties. This rapid shift has compelled the United States to alter its political stance due to the divergent political direction established by President Trump. This study will analyze how such a swift transformation occurred, particularly when the United States rejected the United Nations General Assembly ES 11/7, which identified Russia as the aggressor.*

**Keywords:** *Russia-Ukraine conflict, Critical Discourse Analysis, Constructing Global Morality, Western Countries, NATO, European*

مستخلص

البحث

**Abstract**

كلمات

أساسية

Keyword

## 1. INTRODUCTION (مقدمة)

War is something that no one desires, due to its destructive impacts on the economy, humanity, territorial boundaries, national honor, and the massive devastation it causes across a country. Since ancient times, humans have fought against one another, between coalitions, or through betrayals. In the modern era, many countries no longer wish for war, especially after the end of World War II, which devastated Europe completely and led to the formation of the United Nations in an effort to maintain world peace. However, there is always a small loophole that some countries exploit to justify declaring war on other nations.

The Russia-Ukraine war has brought devastation to both sides, resulting in numerous casualties, the movement of tanks into Ukraine's independent territory, and violations of national borders that have drawn the global geopolitical sphere into efforts to reach a resolution between the two parties. Among the conflicting sides, there exists the United States, NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization), European Union, and G7. However, there was a change in leadership with Donald Trump from the Republican Party winning the 2024 General Election, immediately shifting the political direction of the United States. Initially, the U.S. fully supported the UN resolutions on Russia's invasion of Ukraine, but in UN Resolution ES-11/7, the United States refused to recognize the aggression carried out by Russia.

From a national morality perspective, an invasion is clearly wrong on any side, including according to the UN Charter. Although numerous studies have explained the political rhetoric used by both Ukraine and Russia, most of them focus on the Western press, the economic impact on European countries, or global food security. There is limited discussion, however, on the implications that caused the shifting political dynamics within the United States and their impact on the construction of American national morality. The United States was founded on the principles of freedom and independence and has long been the strongest advocate of national sovereignty. However, Russia, which has openly violated the United Nations Charter, was not condemned by the United States as the main aggressor against Ukraine. Interestingly, this rapid change went largely unnoticed by many because the United States, which almost always supports European and American interests, has now aligned itself with Russia, the main adversary of Europe as well as NATO, the G7, and the United States itself, when casting its vote in the United Nations General Assembly ES-11/7.

This study aims to explain how United States rapidly changed its political perspective in shaping national morality toward the Russia-Ukraine conflict. However, the overt invasion carried out by the Russian Federation against the independent territory of Ukraine has received various responses from different parties in America, especially Democrat and Republican. Many Democrats choose to stand next to Ukraine, while President Donald Trump has supported resolutions to establish peace between Russia

and Ukraine. Although many Democratic politicians continued to support Ukraine's independence, Trump took a different path from his predecessor, marking a new chapter in U.S. political policy. This study will examine how this rapid change occurred and its impact on the UN Resolution, the moral standing of a nation, and the policies that influenced U.S. allies, particularly NATO and the European Union, making the United States the first Western nation and part of the Western Core to reject the United Nations General Assembly ES 11/7, standing in opposition to the mainstream political current of the Western world.

## 2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK (نظريات)

### THEORETICAL UNDERPINNINGS

This study employs Teun A. van Dijk's Socio-Cognitive Model as the theoretical underpinning of this research. According to Van Dijk (1998) identifies three key components of this model: Discourse, Cognition, and Society. These three components play a pivotal role in shaping each country's stance, as every nation has its own policies regarding the ongoing conflict. The use of this model is highly effective in explaining how different presidents or political parties in United States construct their discourses about the conflict. Furthermore, the cognitive dimension involves "mental models," which refer to shared beliefs among societies, officials, and states that influence their decisions. In addition, political alliances and military coalitions also shape the social structures that underlie their positions on the conflict.

### CRITICAL REVIEW OF PRIOR WORK

Several previous studies have analyzed the impact of this conflict on the world using Critical Discourse Analysis. For instance, according to Latif et al. (2023) discussed how framing strategies, lexical choices, and the construction of "us" versus "them" influence how the war is portrayed on social media. However, this study focused on Western media outlets such as *The New York Times*, *The Washington Post*, *The Guardian*, and *The Times* (UK). The findings revealed a polemic narrative in which Ukraine is depicted as the weak party, while Russia is framed as the aggressor. Another study by Tarique and Shaheen (2023) examined how Prime Minister Imran Khan visited Russia in a diplomatic effort to prevent the Russia and Ukraine conflict. However, the Pakistani media, which ideally should have adopted a peace journalism approach, tended to follow the rhythm of war journalism. This tendency further intensified the situation and can be explained through Critical Discourse Analysis. As a result, previous studies have primarily focused on political dialectics analyzed through CDA with an emphasis on media. Therefore, this study focuses on examining how United States prioritize its political stances depending on the prevailing political context by analyzing shifts in support for or rejection of Russia's aggression against Ukraine or the opposite.

### JUSTIFICATION FOR CURRENT RESEARCH

Previous research has mostly focused on how political rhetoric has been represented in media coverage of the Russia-Ukraine conflict, particularly by major international news outlets. However, there is a limitation in exploring how United States swiftly changed its political point of view from supporting Ukraine's independence to denying Russian aggression in the United Nations General Assembly ES-11/7. Since the beginning of the war, United States strongly supports Ukraine's sovereignty and

territorial integrity, and suddenly United States changed its sides to supporting Russian's claimed territory over Ukraine. Therefore, this study aims to investigate how the official statements from United States respond to the Russia-Ukraine conflict and how this position influences the formation of global morality regarding Russia's large-scale invasion of Ukraine.

### 3. METHOD (طريقة \ منهج البحث)

This study employs a Concurrent Triangulation Mixed-Methods Design by Creswell and Clark (2018), combining qualitative and quantitative approaches to explain how official statements issued by political officials, state representatives, ambassadors, or their equivalents correspond to the number of countries that support, or reject in relation to Russia's unilateral invasion of Ukraine. This research aims to explore how the language used in these official statements influences subsequent changes in levels of support, or rejection regarding Ukraine's sovereignty that have been clearly violated by Russia. It also seeks to understand how the construction of national morality, which should uphold national sovereignty, has been contradicted by the significant changing United States' policy in supporting Ukraine over recent years, especially with United Nations General Assembly ES-11/7.

The qualitative component of this research applies Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) as proposed by Van Dijk (1998), which consists of three essential structures: Society, Discourse, and Cognition. This part examines official statements from state officials, public figures, political leaders, ambassadors, and other equivalent positions to analyze how their discourse reflects shifts in support for Ukraine's sovereignty over time. Furthermore, it investigates how these statements represent evolving national stances and how such effects extend to surrounding, particularly non-Western, countries regarding their support for Ukraine's sovereignty.

The quantitative component employs a descriptive research design. According to Creswell (2018) analyze changes in the number of countries supporting, abstaining, rejecting, or being absent. The collected data will be presented using tables to visualize whether shifts occurred in countries' public policy decisions, specifically regarding their voting behavior (support, rejection, abstention, or absence) in United Nations General Assembly E-11/7.

### SAMPLING AND PARTICIPANTS

The target population of this study consists of all official United Nations member states that cast their votes regarding the Russia-Ukraine conflict. During this period, the United Nations issued several resolutions seeking the best possible solutions to address the conflict. A continuing polemic has arisen because of changing patterns of support, and rejection. These shifts are influenced by different ideologies and political interests, which have made it difficult to achieve peace between the two sides.

For the quantitative approach, this study uses the Total Population Sampling Technique, according to Teddlie and Yu (2007). All countries involved in the decision-making process of United Nations resolutions on the Russia-Ukraine conflict are included. This method is important because peace can only be achieved when the majority of United Nations members reach a common agreement. The research aims to understand United States' policy on United Nations General

### Assembly ES-11/7.

For the qualitative approach, a Purposive Sampling Strategy is used in this research according to Creswell (2014), which applies a data collection which directly related to United States policy toward the Russia-Ukraine conflict. The qualitative data include official policies, public statements, and speeches made by public officials, state representatives, politicians, and other equivalent figures whose discourse reflects or influences its country's political stance. These texts are selected to understand how political views, public sentiment, and rhetorical strategies have contributed to significant policy changes between United States and Russia-Ukraine conflict.

### DATA COLLECTION:

The data for this study were collected from the official United Nations website. The quantitative data collection technique employed Secondary Data Analysis, according to Glaser (1963), defined as "*the re-analysis of data for the purpose of answering the original research questions with better statistical techniques or answering new questions with old data.*" This study utilized existing datasets provided by the UN. The process of data extraction and organization was conducted using Microsoft Excel as a tool to manage and visualize changes in quantitative data regarding support, rejection, abstention, or absence among countries, particularly between Western and non-Western states.

The quantitative data collection procedures were carried out through the following stages:

1. Data were collected from the official United Nations website, accredited sources, official government portals, and official statements issued by public officials, state representatives, political figures, ambassadors, or other equivalent positions.
2. The data were systematically gathered from the beginning of the Russia-Ukraine conflict, from Biden era to Trump era.
3. The data were analyzed using Microsoft Excel in tabular form to categorize countries that expressed support, rejection, abstention, or absence regarding the conflict, examining whether changes occurred over the years.
4. After compiling the data into tables, the next step involved visualizing the results through line graphs in Microsoft Excel to illustrate the fluctuations in support, rejection, abstention, or absence throughout the conflict especially between western and non-western countries decision.

In addition, the study also employed a qualitative data collection technique by examining official statements made by public officials, political leaders, ambassadors, or other equivalent figures through Document or Content Analysis, according to Berelson (1952), who described it as "*a research technique for the objective, systematic, and quantitative description of the manifest content of communication.*" This approach aimed to investigate how a country's official statements could influence surrounding nations, especially non-Western states, and how national beliefs or stances may be shaped by public sentiment within the country.

The qualitative data collection procedures were conducted through the following stages:

1. The researcher collected official statements made by countries regarding the conflict through government websites, foreign ministry platforms, and verified social media accounts, as well as statements issued by public officials, government representatives, political figures, or other equivalent authorities.

2. These data were compiled and organized in Microsoft Word and Cambridge Dictionary to examine patterns of change in support, rejection, abstention, or absence during the conflict.
3. The collected data were then analyzed using Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) to uncover the underlying meanings within the statements and to explore how ideological influences shaped political decisions and state policies. This analysis also aimed to identify how these shifts contributed to United States in its attitudes toward support, rejection, abstention, or absence.

## DATA ANALYSIS STRATEGIES

The data will be analyzed using a Concurrent Triangulation Mixed-Methods Design as proposed by Creswell (2018), which combines two key elements: qualitative and quantitative methods. This approach is employed to examine global shifts in support or rejection and to identify patterns in the stance of the United States. Initially, the United States supported Ukraine's independence under President Joe Biden; however, a rapid change occurred when power shifted from Joe Biden to President Donald Trump, altering America's perspective on Ukraine's sovereignty. This study therefore requires both quantitative and qualitative data. By integrating these two methods, the study ensures a comprehensive analysis, strengthening the research from both methodological perspectives.

The qualitative method employed is Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), following Van Dijk (1998). This method is essential for understanding the shift in the United States' support for the United Nations General Assembly Resolution ES-11/7. It is particularly relevant because the General Assembly has repeatedly passed resolutions to uphold Ukraine's territorial sovereignty. However, changes in U.S. political dynamics have made this goal difficult to achieve, especially as President Donald Trump reoriented the nation's political agenda around the principle of "*America First*." This shift was also influenced by ideology, the discourse constructed by political elites, and the interpretations of these narratives by American society, particularly those shaped by public statements of U.S. leaders, including Trump himself.

For the quantitative method, a descriptive approach is applied, also based on Creswell (2018). Quantitative data collection is crucial to trace the evolution of U.S. support from the initial UN resolutions on Ukraine to the eventual decline of recognition regarding Russia's aggression, as reflected in Resolution ES-11/7. The use of tables in this research facilitates the visualization of how U.S. support evolved over time, incorporating lexical interpretations from the *Cambridge Dictionary*, the constructed discourse, and the categorization of countries based on their respective positions.

## 4. FINDINGS & DISCUSSION (بحث ومناقشة)

In this study, the research will explain how a nation's morality is deeply influenced by the perspectives it upholds, particularly in the case of the United States. Since World War II, the United States has been recognized as a global superpower, successfully spreading Western Enlightenment ideals across the world, such as freedom, human rights, state sovereignty, and national independence. The United States has shown strong commitment and firm support toward these principles, especially in relation to the ongoing and deeply concerning territorial conflict between Ukraine and Russia.

According to Samuel P. Huntington (1996) in his book *The Clash of Civilizations*, the United States, along with the European Union and NATO, represents the Western core and serves as the foundation of global Western liberalism. However, in recent years, a significant political shift has occurred in the United States with the re-election of Donald Trump as President of the United States of America. This shift has led to major changes within the American government and consequently affected the country's stance toward Ukraine's independence and its territories that were illegally annexed by the Russian Federation.

Due to the changes and governmental transition under Donald Trump, the United States' foreign policy underwent a total and drastic shift influenced by the administration's ideology, political thinking, and public opinion regarding its support for Ukraine's independence. Through this context, the researcher will present the voting results based on the United Nations General Assembly Resolution ES-11/7, which show that the United States rejected the resolution declaring Russia as the aggressor in this conflict.

According to United Nations General Assembly Resolution **ES-11/6**

Vote	Tally	Countries
Yes	93	Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, The Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia, Moldova, Monaco, Morocco, Montenegro, Myanmar, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, São Tomé and Príncipe, Saudi Arabia, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Sudan, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, <b>United States</b> , Uruguay, Vanuatu, Yemen, Zambia
No	18	Belarus, Eritrea, Mali, Nicaragua, North Korea, Russia, Syria

According to United Nations General Assembly Resolution **ES-11/5**

Vote	Tally	Countries
------	-------	-----------

Yes	94	Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia, Moldova, Monaco, Montenegro, Myanmar, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, North Macedonia, Norway, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, South Korea, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Seychelles, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Togo, Turkey, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Zambia
No	14	Belarus, Central African Republic, China, Cuba, North Korea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Iran, Mali, Nicaragua, Russian Federation, Syria, Zimbabwe

According to United Nations General Assembly Resolution **ES-11/4**

Vote	Tally	Countries
Yes	143	Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea- Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia, Moldova, Monaco, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, South Korea, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Suriname, Sweden,

		Switzerland, Timor-Leste, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, <b><i>United States, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Yemen, Zambia</i></b>
No	5	Belarus, North Korea, Nicaragua, Russia, Syria

According to United Nations General Assembly Resolution **ES-11/3**

<b>Vote</b>	<b>Tally</b>	<b>Countries</b>
Yes	93	Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kiribati, Latvia, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Micronesia, Moldova, Monaco, Montenegro, Myanmar,[a] Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Korea, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Timor-Leste, Tonga, Turkey, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Kingdom, <b><i>United States, Uruguay</i></b>
No	5	Algeria, Belarus, Bolivia, Burundi, Central African Republic, China, Congo, Cuba, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Iran, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Laos, Mali, Nicaragua, North Korea, Russia, Syria, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, Vietnam, Zimbabwe

According to United Nations General Assembly Resolution **ES-11/2**

<b>Vote</b>	<b>Tally</b>	<b>Countries</b>
Yes	140	Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia, Moldova, Monaco, Montenegro, Myanmar, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger,

		Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, South Korea, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, São Tomé and Príncipe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Sudan, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, <b>United States</b> , Uruguay, Vanuatu, Yemen, Zambia
No	5	Belarus, Eritrea, North Korea, Russia, Syria

According to United Nations General Assembly Resolution **ES-11/1**

Vote	Tally	Countries
Yes	140	Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia, Moldova, Monaco, Montenegro, Myanmar, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, South Korea, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, São Tomé and Príncipe, Saudi Arabia, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, <b>United States</b> , Uruguay, Vanuatu, Yemen, Zambia
No	5	Belarus, Eritrea, North Korea, Russia, Syria

Based on information from United Nations Resolutions ES 11/1, ES 11/2, ES 11/3, ES 11/4, ES 11/5, and ES 11/6, a consistent pattern can be observed. The United States has shown full support through NATO, the G7, military equipment, and humanitarian aid. The U.S. has refused to recognize territories seized by Russia,

including Crimea, the Donetsk and Luhansk Republics, Zaporizhzhia, and Kherson, and has demanded that Russia completely withdraw to its own sovereign territory. The pattern shows that the U.S., as the core of the Western world, supported Ukraine's independence throughout 2021. According to data from the Russian government, the United States was classified as an unfriendly nation toward Russia until the end of the Democratic administration under Joe Biden, which led to a decline in full American support for Ukraine. This situation caused an immediate shift in trend. Based on van Dijk's Socio-Cognitive Model, discourse, cognition, and society are interconnected, as revealed through the use of critical discourse analysis.

According to United Nations General Assembly Resolution **ES-11/7**

Vote	Tally	Countries
<b>Yes</b>	93	Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, Comoros, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Egypt, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, The Gambia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Moldova, Monaco, Montenegro, Myanmar,[a] Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom, Uruguay, Vanuatu
<b>No</b>	18	Belarus, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Central African Republic, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Haiti, Hungary, Israel, Mali, Marshall Islands, Nicaragua, Niger, North Korea, Palau, Russia, Sudan, <b>United States</b>

The data above show that the United States became the primary and firm opponent in the United Nations General Assembly Resolution ES-11/7, something that stands in stark contrast to the nation's long-held ideals of freedom, liberalism, and independence. What is most striking is that support for Ukraine has noticeably weakened, as reflected in the periodic table presented above. The data below demonstrate how the USA has consistently participated in and fully supported Ukraine's independence in every resolution, including United Nations General Assembly Resolution ES-11/1, ES-11/2, ES-11/3, ES-11/4, ES-11/5, and ES-11/6. They have always firmly and strongly backed Ukraine's independence and, in all circumstances, continue to oppose Russia's dominance over Ukrainian territory.

According to Franklin D. Roosevelt (1941), "*freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom from want, and freedom from fear*" are fundamental rights for all people

around the world. Franklin D. Roosevelt was the American leader during the attack on Pearl Harbor by Japan and World War II. As a Democratic president, his political influence significantly shaped the future policies of the Democratic Party. His principles profoundly affected the party's political direction, especially in defending freedom and opposing any form of oppression, as seen in the Democratic Party's firm stance against the Russian Federation's suppression of freedom in the Russia-Ukraine conflict. Consequently, the Democratic Party's policies have strongly supported Ukraine, viewing the country as a victim of intimidation and loss of independence, while its people live in fear of invasion.

Based on the United Nations General Assembly Resolution ES-11/1, it “*reaffirms its commitment to the sovereignty, independence, unity, and territorial integrity of Ukraine within its internationally recognized borders, extending to its territorial waters.*” The United States, NATO, the G7 Coalition, the European Union, and the majority of the international community have unanimously supported Ukraine's sovereignty and independence. This position aligns with the Democratic Party's progressive foreign policy direction, grounded in modern liberalism. The Democratic Party's and President Joe Biden's support for Ukraine have only strengthened following the adoption of Resolution ES-11/2, which reaffirmed the global commitment to continue backing Ukraine's political struggle against Russia's invasion. A press video from CNBC Television on February 25th, 2022, showed President Joe Biden delivering a speech expressing his concern over Russia's invasion of Ukraine. Biden stated, “*The Russian military has begun a brutal assault on the people of Ukraine without provocation, without justification, without necessity. This is a premeditated attack.*” This correlation aligns with Van Dijk's (1998) theory of *Society, Discourse, and Cognition*, which explains how ideological structures and cognitive framing influence political discourse and social perception.

According to Cambridge Dictionary:

Vocabularies	Meaning
Brutal	Cruel, violent, and completely without feeling
Assault	A violent attack

According to the Cambridge Dictionary, the words above have the power to influence public perception, shaping the view that this conflict requires serious action. This aligns with Van Dijk's (1998) theory of *Discourse, Society, and Cognition*. In this context, the discourse delivered by President Joe Biden carries a strong message to Russia, declaring that the invasion is illegal in any form. This corresponds with the concept of *Society*, as the American public, at the beginning of the conflict, held liberal views aligned with the ideological direction of the Democratic Party. As a result, the interpretation promoted by President Joe Biden was widely accepted by the American people, reinforcing the perception that this war is illegal, brutal, and immoral. This was later reiterated by President Joe Biden on April 21st, 2022, through *The Guardian News*, stating, “*We're taking steps to support the people of Ukraine and to hold Putin accountable for his brutal and bloody war.*” President Joe Biden once again employed similar rhetorical language in his continued effort to support Ukraine's independence.

According to Cambridge Dictionary:

Vocabularies	Meaning
Brutal	Cruel, violent, and completely without feeling
Bloody	Used to express anger or to emphasize what you are saying in a slightly rude way
War	Armed fighting between two or more countries or groups

According to the Cambridge Dictionary, the words used by President Joe Biden became increasingly strong and harsh toward President Putin, as this war has been extremely bloody and has caused casualties on both sides. Through this statement, President Joe Biden once again reaffirmed his support for the people of Ukraine and emphasized that Putin is responsible for the brutality and bloodshed of this war. This aligns with Van Dijk's (1998) theory of *Discourse, Society, and Cognition*, which explains how discourse shapes public understanding. In this case, Biden's rhetoric served to convince the American public that Putin must be held accountable for this brutal and bloody war, intensifying public interpretation and sentiment in the United States. This stands in stark contrast to the ideology of liberalism promoted by the Democratic Party and its foreign policy direction, which has been strongly influenced since the era of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Another expression of support for Ukraine's independence came from a Democrat, Reverend Warnock, who stated, "*The United States must continue to stand with Ukraine. I support the efforts already underway to bolster Ukraine's defense forces, including the provision of American defense aid. I also strongly support the imposition of severe sanctions on Russia to compel President Putin to cease this catastrophic effort and to hold him and his allies accountable.*" This aligns with President Joe Biden of the Democratic Party, who has repeatedly reaffirmed Ukraine's independence from the Russian Federation.

According to Cambridge Dictionary:

Vocabularies	Meaning
Catastrophic	Causing sudden and very great harm or destruction
Bolster	To support or improve something or make it stronger
Compel	To force someone to do something

According to the Cambridge Dictionary, vocabulary carries profound meaning, as Warnock used words such as "catastrophic," "bolster," and "compel." This aligns with President Joe Biden, who used synonyms of these words in his own statements, emphasizing that pressure must be exerted on President Putin to end this devastating catastrophe and that the United States must continue to *bolster* Ukraine to ensure its independence. Warnock's discourse was clearly influenced by the political ideology of the Democratic Party to which he belongs, as well as by the ongoing narrative that the Russia-Ukraine conflict must end and Ukraine must be freed from President Putin's grip. This discourse has also shaped how the American public interprets the conflict, as their political perceptions are influenced by the Democratic Party's policies at that time.

This message has been continuously echoed by the Democratic Party, President Joe Biden, and the American public, expressing their absolute support for Ukraine's independence from the bloody invasion of the Russian Federation. The situation was further intensified by the *Final Report of the Congressional Commission on the Strategic Posture of the United States* (2023), which stated: "The militarily troubling and increasingly aggressive behaviors of Russia and

China over the past decade led Congress to direct a review of the strategic posture of the United States, including nuclear weapons policy, strategy, and force structure.” Based on this report, the United States views Russia and China as increasingly problematic and aggressive in recent years. Consequently, the report identifies Russia as the primary adversary of the United States, reviving tensions reminiscent of the Cold War in the 1990s.

This situation compels the United States to act with great caution in making any policy related to Russia. The pattern described by Van Dijk (1998) has further strengthened the relationship between *society*, *cognition*, and *discourse* among the American people. The society, influenced by the ongoing war discourse repeatedly emphasized by President Joe Biden and the Democratic Party, continues to uphold the belief that freedom is the right of every nation, echoing the ideals proclaimed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt. Because this pattern continues to reinforce each element, support for Ukraine grows even stronger. This is also supported by the Secretary General of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), Jens Stoltenberg, who stated, “*This is a pivotal moment in the war and the need for a significant increase in support for Ukraine. If we want a negotiated peaceful solution tomorrow, we need to provide more weapons today.*”

According to Cambridge Dictionary:

Vocabularies	Meaning
Pivotal	Central and important
Weapons	Any object used in fighting or war, such as a gun, bomb, knife, etc.

Stoltenberg used language emphasizing that this conflict is of great importance to NATO, and as a Western military alliance that is geographically adjacent to Ukraine, it has become his top priority to continue providing significant support to Ukraine. He stated that “*if peace is to be achieved, NATO must supply Ukraine with even more weapons.*” This statement further reinforces that the discourse constructed by the United States inevitably influences the NATO military alliance because both share the same political stance, which is freedom for Ukraine. As a result, the discourse built by President Joe Biden and Democratic Party politicians, whose ideology is rooted in liberalism, has shaped the political outlook of the American public and spread widely among NATO coalition countries. This demonstrates, in line with Van Dijk’s (1998) theory, how ideology influences the decision-making of the United States and its impact across the NATO military alliance.

**NATO members:**

Total	NATO members
-------	--------------

31	Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Montenegro, the Netherlands, North Macedonia, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Turkey, the United Kingdom, and the United States, Finland.
----	--

NATO is a military alliance that seeks to support Ukraine's independence from the Russian invasion. However, the significant political shifts within the United States have weakened support for Ukraine, as the U.S. is the largest and most powerful contributor to NATO. The implication of this is the weakening of the Western military alliance's strength in confronting Russia's invasion.

**According to Russian government:**

Total	Unfriendly Countries
49	United States, Czech Republic, Australia, Austria, Albania, Andorra, Netherlands, Belgium, United Kingdom, Bulgaria, Estonia, Finland, Hungary, Ireland, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Germany, Canada, South Korea, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, North Macedonia, Malta, Federated States of Micronesia, Monaco, Montenegro, Norway, Poland, Portugal, France, Romania, San Marino, New Zealand, Singapore, Cyprus, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Republic of China (Taiwan), Ukraine, Denmark, Croatia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Greece, and the Bahamas.

In 2022, Russia announced that there were 49 countries in the world considered unfriendly toward the Russian people, Russian companies, and the Russian state. This situation further intensified global tensions at that time because international support for Ukraine was very strong. The United States became the largest financial contributor to Ukraine's independence and one of its main suppliers of military weapons. The NATO military alliance provided almost full support through social, military, and financial assistance. The G7 countries, consisting of Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, the United Kingdom, and the United States, fully supported Ukraine's independence against Russia's military invasion. The Secretary General of NATO, Jens Stoltenberg, stated, "NATO stands with you today, tomorrow, and for as long as it takes." NATO, as the Western military alliance, is a unique organization because it is founded on Article 5, which declares:

*"The Parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all and consequently they agree that, if such an armed attack occurs, each of them, in exercise of the right of individual or collective self-defence recognized by Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, will assist the Party or Parties so attacked by taking forthwith, individually and in concert with the other Parties, such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force, to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area."*

This condition worsens the Russia-Ukraine conflict, as an attack on any NATO member state would be considered an attack on all, making the adversary a shared enemy. Ukraine receives support from nearly all NATO member countries, which further strengthens and intensifies the backing it has. This aligns with Van Dijk's

theory of *Discourse, Society, and Cognition*, which explains that when a discourse is continuously constructed, society will begin to perceive it as truth. In practice, this is reflected in how the American public strongly supports Ukraine's independence from Russia's invasion. As a result of this constructed discourse, the European Union, led by Ursula von der Leyen, along with all EU member states, has strongly supported Ukraine's independence from a humanitarian perspective. Social and humanitarian aid has been mobilized by the European Union to help ensure Ukraine's freedom. According to Ursula von der Leyen, "*Ukraine will prevail because Ukrainians will neither flinch nor step back. And Ukraine will prevail because Europe and its partners and allies will stand firm.*"

### European Union's members

Total	European Union's members
27	Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, and Sweden.

The European Union has become a major supporter in the Russia-Ukraine conflict. The people of the European Union have united to provide financial, military, logistical, and humanitarian assistance to Ukraine throughout this war. Ursula von der Leyen has repeatedly stated that the people of the European Union stand firmly with Ukraine in this conflict. All 27 EU member states support the preservation of Ukraine's independence from Russia. The discourse built around this conflict has spread across all European countries, where European societies have interpreted the conflict through the lens of Van Dijk's (1998) discourse theory. This has further strengthened the political relationship between Europe and Ukraine, as it has become embedded within the structure of power in the European Union.

However, the 2024 United States presidential election took place between President Donald Trump (Republican) and Vice President Kamala Harris (Democrat). Both candidates expressed sharply contrasting views regarding the conflict in Ukraine. President Donald Trump stated, "*I want to get the war settled, I know Zelensky very well and I know Putin very well, I have a good relationship and they respect your president, okay, they respect me.*" Here, Trump expressed a position that is significantly different from that of the NATO Secretary General, the leaders of the European Union, the American public, and the Democratic Party regarding the Russia-Ukraine conflict.

In response, Vice President Kamala Harris said, "*Ukraine stands as an independent and free country. If Donald Trump were president, Putin would be sitting in Kyiv (Ukraine's capital) right now. Understand what that would mean because Putin's agenda is not just about Ukraine. Understand why the European allies and our NATO allies are so thankful that you are no longer president and that we understand the importance of the greatest military alliance the world has ever known, which is NATO, and what we have done to preserve the ability of Zelensky and the Ukrainians to fight for their independence. Otherwise, Putin would be sitting in Kyiv with his eyes on the rest of Europe, starting with Poland. And why don't you tell the 800,000 Polish Americans right here in Pennsylvania how quickly you would give up for the sake of favor and what you think is a friendship with what is known to be a dictator who would eat you for lunch.*"

During the 2024 United States presidential debate, a political dilemma emerged within American society. President Trump, known for his slogan MAGA, Make America Great Again, stood in stark contrast to Vice President Kamala Harris and the Democratic Party. Based on the statements given by Vice President Kamala Harris, she accused Trump of potentially weakening NATO, allowing Putin to invade Ukraine all the way to Kyiv, and making Europe increasingly vulnerable if he were elected president. This aligns with the theory proposed by Bourdieu (1977), who stated, *“The most successful ideological effects are those which have no need of words, and ask no more than a complicitous silence.”* This theory suggests that the most successful ideology is not spread through words but is experienced naturally by society. This has created a political dilemma because American public opinion began to shift. Support for Ukraine, which is geographically distant but economically burdensome to the United States, as stated by President Trump, *“We gave 350 million dollars to Ukraine,”* combined with the Republican Party’s populist stance on stopping illegal immigration and its highly publicized MAGA agenda, has complicated the political landscape.

This significant change certainly occurred during the 2024 United States presidential election, where President Trump won the U.S. election, defeating the Democratic candidate, Kamala Harris. President Trump holds a populist view, advocating for MAGA, Make America Great Again!, aiming to prioritize the interests of the nation over other considerations. This is in stark contrast to the Democrats’ liberal and progressive stance, which fully supports Ukraine. Trump took the opposite approach, stating, “This war should not have happened, as long as I am President,” a statement that was quite shocking coming from him.

This led to UN Resolution ES-11/7, which contains several key points regarding the Russia- Ukraine conflict:

5. The UN Resolution states: *“Noting with concern that the full-scale invasion of Ukraine by the Russian Federation has persisted for three years and continues to have devastating and long-lasting consequences not only for Ukraine, but also for other regions and global stability.”*
6. The UN Resolution states: *“Recalls the need for full implementation of its relevant resolutions adopted in response to the aggression against Ukraine, in particular its demand that the Russian Federation immediately, completely and unconditionally withdraw all of its military forces from the territory of Ukraine within its internationally recognized borders, and its demand for an immediate cessation of the hostilities by the Russian Federation against Ukraine, in particular of any attacks against civilians and civilian objects.”*
7. The UN Resolution states: *“Calls upon the parties to the armed conflict to fully comply with international law, including international humanitarian law, notably with regard to the protection of civilians, especially women and children, and persons hors de combat, as well as civilian objects, and to ensure safe and unhindered humanitarian access to those in need.”*
8. The UN Resolution states: *“Calls for a de-escalation, an early cessation of hostilities and a peaceful resolution of the war against Ukraine, marked by enormous destruction and human suffering, including among the civilian population, in line with the Charter of the United Nations and international law.”*

Vocabularies	Meaning
Civilian	A person who is not a member of the police or armed forces

Hostility	Unfriendly and not liking something
-----------	-------------------------------------

According to the Cambridge Dictionary, the vocabulary above indicates that Russia violated UN Charter Article 3, which states, *“Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person.”* However, this did not serve as a moral basis for the United States, because the direction of American public opinion had shifted toward populism, marked by Donald Trump’s victory as President from the Republican Party. The points above clearly indicate that Russia is regarded as the aggressor in this conflict, which led the United States to vote “No” on the resolution. This stance contradicts the table below, which shows that since the adoption of UN resolutions related to this conflict, the USA, together with the European Union, NATO, and the G7, has united to oppose any form of aggression by the Russian Federation.

**According to United Nations General Assembly Resolution Voting.**

ES-11/1	ES-11/2	ES-11/3	ES-11/4	ES-11/5	ES-11/6	ES-11/7
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Joe Biden	Donald Trump					
Democratic Party	Republican Party					

The table above shows that the era under President Joe Biden, along with the Democratic Party, strongly supported Ukraine because they hold an Idealpolitik perspective, emphasizing that the Democrats’ liberal and progressive ideology would naturally influence both their domestic and foreign policies. However, according to the theory proposed by Bourdieu (1977), power inevitably flows according to the mindset of the society, including that of the United States. President Trump stated that the U.S. spent 350 billion dollars on Ukraine while the country itself was struggling, especially with issues like immigration and unemployment, which shifted public opinion in the United States. This illustrates the Discourse, Cognition, and Society model proposed by Van Dijk (1998) in relation to Bourdieu’s theory (1977), showing how societal influence is constructed through discourse based on actual events. This aligns with the Realpolitik perspective, a political view requiring leaders to focus on realities on the ground rather than ideological positions. President Donald Trump repeatedly expressed “America First” and “Make America Great Again!” Through discourse continuously shaped by Trump and political thinking influenced by populism or Realpolitik, American society was persuaded that the interests of the U.S. should take priority over those of other nations. This aligns closely with the theories developed by Van Dijk (1998) and Bourdieu (1977). The impact of this policy indicates that the morality of a nation or state heavily depends on its prevailing political direction, and the effects of such policies influence surrounding countries as well. As reported by *The Times of Israel*: *“Israel joined the US and Russia in voting against a United Nations General Assembly resolution calling to reaffirm Ukraine’s territorial integrity on Monday, rejecting a strongly worded condemnation of Russia’s invasion of its neighbor on the war’s third anniversary.”* This demonstrates that changes in the morality of a nation, such as the United States, influence its surrounding environment, including Israel. This can be seen from President Donald Trump’s statement calling [Ukraine’s leadership] a “dictator without elections,” a stance sharply opposed to that of the European Union, NATO, or previous administrations. As reported by Reuters, *“Trump’s plan for Ukraine comes into focus: NATO off the table and concessions on territory.”* The influence of

this political theory illustrates how President Donald Trump, holding a populist perspective, sought to pressure his closest allies, NATO, to step back from negotiations and support territorial concessions in Ukraine.

This approach starkly contrasts with the policies of the Western world, particularly the European Union, NATO, and the G7, which firmly reject recognition of territories occupied by Russia. Yet President Trump consistently stated, *“They’re dying, Russians and Ukrainians. I want them to stop dying. And I’ll have that done – I’ll have that done in 24 hours,”* as reported by CNN Town Hall. Due to Trump’s policy of prioritizing America while seeking to create peace in Ukraine, he rejected UN Resolution E-11/7, which called for the non-recognition of Ukraine’s territorial integrity. This marks the first time that the United States has changed its political policy toward Ukraine due to a shift in a portion of American public opinion regarding the conflict. Based on this research, it can be confirmed that the morality of a nation or state is closely dependent on how society, cognition, and discourse are interconnected. To this day, President Trump continues to strive to bring peace to Ukraine. However, this significant shift conveys an important message: the relationship between society, discourse, and cognition is highly interdependent. It also indicates that the morality of a nation depends on who holds power, changes in public political views, and how political ideology influences individuals.

## 6. CONCLUSIONS (خلاصة \ خاتمة)

Overall, this study examines how the rapid political changes in the United States and the restructuring of a nation’s morality are highly dependent on the public’s political views, the discourses constructed, and the ideologies influencing political elites and society. This is explored through various linguistic and socio-political theories such as Creswell (2018) Concurrent Triangulation Mixed Methods. It employs Van Dijk’s (1998) qualitative Critical Discourse Analysis to explain the interconnection of three political elements: Society, Discourse, and Cognition. It also uses a quantitative descriptive approach developed by Creswell (2018) to analyze original visual data from United Nations voting records, observing changing patterns so that qualitative and quantitative methods are interrelated.

This study investigates how the rapid political shifts in the United States regarding the Russia Ukraine conflict are heavily influenced by the constructed Society, Discourse, and Cognition. Donald Trump’s victory as U.S. President implementing populist policies clearly illustrates how these three patterns are interconnected. Previously, President Joe Biden, Vice President Kamala Harris, and the Democratic Party strongly and fully supported Ukraine’s independence and demanded the return of all of Ukraine’s legitimate territories. Their political views rooted in liberalism and progressivism, as well as the influence of President Franklin D Roosevelt’s legacy, guided their full support for Ukraine. This is evident in the list of unfriendly countries issued by the Russian government in 2022. The Final Report of the Congressional Commission on the Strategic Posture of the United States (2023) states that *“The militarily troubling and increasingly aggressive behaviors of Russia and China over the past decade led Congress to direct a review of the strategic posture of the United States, including nuclear weapons policy, strategy, and force structure”* and labels Russia as a U.S. adversary in 2023 before Donald Trump’s inauguration. This study also employs a descriptive research design as proposed by Creswell (2018). This approach is highly valuable for this research because it presents authentic and non-

manipulated data from the United Nations voting records. The aim is to examine how the United States, which in previous resolutions consistently took the lead in rejecting any form of Russian aggression, including the recognition of illegitimate republics, the annexation of Crimea, and Russia's invasion that forced Ukraine to relinquish its territories, shifted its stance under Donald Trump. When Trump came to power, he immediately rejected the resolution that declared Russia as an aggressor. The connection between quantitative and qualitative approaches strengthens this study because the quantitative method presents the data, while the qualitative method interprets and explains the underlying meanings or factors behind that data.

Therefore, while this study is limited in exploring how public morality can rapidly change due to flexible political dynamics as suggested by expert theories, it does not fully address how these changes influence U.S. policies in the United Nations General Assembly E11 7. Further research is needed to examine the correlation between Ukraine, Russia, and the United States in shaping future policies that could bring peace to both parties.

## 7. REFERENCES (قائمة المراجع)

Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice* (R. Nice, Trans.). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511812507>

Brown, E. K., Miller, J. E., & Miller, J. E. (2013). *The Cambridge dictionary of linguistics*. Cambridge University Press.

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). SAGE Publications. [https://www.ucg.ac.me/skladiste/blog\\_609332/objava\\_105202/fajlovi/Creswell.pdf](https://www.ucg.ac.me/skladiste/blog_609332/objava_105202/fajlovi/Creswell.pdf)

CNBC Television. (2022, February 25). President Joe Biden addresses the Ukraine invasion [Video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=J0ccuDVE7jE>

CNN. (2023, Mei 11). Trump won't say whether he wants Russia or Ukraine to win war [Video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L07fMoafVh4>

European Commission. (2023, July 4). Statement by the President in Tallinn [Press release]. [https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/hu/statement\\_23\\_1201](https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/hu/statement_23_1201)

Franklin D. Roosevelt address to Congress; 1/6/1941; First Carbon Files; Speeches of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, 1933 - 1945; Collection FDR-PPF: Papers as President, President's Personal File; Franklin D. Roosevelt Library, Hyde Park, NY. [Online Version, <https://docsteach.org/document/fdr-four-freedoms-speech/>, October 25, 2025]

Glaser, B. G. (1963). Retreading research materials: The use of secondary analysis by the independent researcher. *American Behavioural Scientist*, 6(1), 10-18. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000276426300601003>

Jakupec, V. (2025). Trump-Proofing Ukraine Aid: NATO and EU Geopolitics. In *The West's Response to the Ukraine War: Military Struggles, NATO Challenges*,

*and the Reimagining of Global Politics (pp. 39-62). Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland.*

*Jongduk, K. I. M. (2024). Trump's Second Term: The Global Ramifications of a "Great Again" America. [KIEP] KIEP Opinions, 305, 1-4.*

*KAMPMARK, B. (2023). NATO Provoked Putin: Stoltenberg Comes Clean on the Ukraine War. CounterPunch.*

*Latif, F., Zaidi, S., Naz, S., Idrees, U., Arslan, M., Yar, S., & Ali, S. (2024). Constructing the other: A critical discourse analysis of Ukrainian-Russian war in western press. Kurdish Studies, 12(3), 193-204.*

*North Atlantic Treaty Organization. (2023, Juli 4). NATO's Strategic Concept.*  
[https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics\\_110496.htm](https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_110496.htm)

*United Nations. (2022). Aggression against Ukraine. A/RES/ES-11/1.*  
<https://docs.un.org/en/A/RES/ES-11/1>

*United Nations. (2022). Humanitarian consequences of the aggression against Ukraine. A/RES/ES-11/2.*  
[https://www.securitycouncilreport.org/atf/cf/%7B65BFCF9B-6D27-4E9C-8CD3-CF6E4FF96FF9%7D/a\\_res\\_es-11\\_2.pdf](https://www.securitycouncilreport.org/atf/cf/%7B65BFCF9B-6D27-4E9C-8CD3-CF6E4FF96FF9%7D/a_res_es-11_2.pdf)

*United Nations. (2022). Suspension of the rights of membership of the Russian Federation in the Human Rights Council. A/RES/ES-11/3.*  
<https://www.securitycouncilreport.org/un-documents/document/a-res-es-11-3.php>



*United Nations. (2022). Territorial integrity of Ukraine: Defending the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. A/RES/ES-11/4. <https://docs.un.org/en/A/RES/ES-11/4>*

*United Nations. (2022). Furtherance of remedy and reparation for aggression against Ukraine: Resolution / adopted by the General Assembly. A/RES/ES-11/5. <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/3994481?ln=en&v>*

*United Nations. (2023). Principles of the Charter of the United Nations underlying a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in Ukraine: Resolution / adopted by the General Assembly. A/RES/ES-11/6. <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/4004933?ln=en>*

*United Nations. (2023). Official records of the General Assembly, Seventy-seventh session, Supplement No. 4 (A/77/4), paras. 189-197. <https://docs.un.org/en/A/ES-11/L.7>*

*United States. Congress. (2023). America's strategic posture: The final report of the Congressional Commission on the Strategic Posture of the United States. Institute for Defense Analyses. <https://www.ida.org/research-and-publications/publications/all/a/am/americas-strategic-posture>*

*United Nations. (1948). Universal declaration of human rights. <https://www.un.org/en/about-us/universal-declaration-of-human-rights>*

*Slattery, G., & Landay, J. (2024, December 4). Trump's plan for Ukraine comes into focus: NATO off the table and concessions on territory. Reuters. <https://www.reuters.com/world/trumps-plan-ukraine-comes-into-focus-territorial-concessions-nato-off-table-2024-12-04/>*

*Tarique, M., & Shaheen, L. (2023). War Journalism Where There's No War: Critical Discourse Analysis of Russo-Ukraine Conflict in Pakistani Elite National Press. Athens Journal of Mass Media & Communications, 9(4).*

*TOI STAFF (2025, February 25). Joining US, Israel votes against UN motion condemning Russian invasion of Ukraine. THE TIMES OF ISRAEL. <https://www.timesofisrael.com/in-shift-israel-votes-against-un-motion-reaffirming-ukraines-territorial-integrity/>*

*Trump, D. J. (2024). Time to get tough: Make America great again. Simon and Schuster.*

*Ukrainska Pravda. (2023, January 18). NATO Secretary General: Ukraine needs a "significant increase" in weapons at a pivotal moment in Russia's invasion. <https://www.pravda.com.ua/eng/news/2023/01/18/7385438/>*

*Van Dijk, T. A. (2015). Critical discourse analysis. Dalam D. Tannen, H. E. Hamilton, & D. Schiffrin (Eds.), The handbook of discourse analysis (hal.*