

FACE THREATENING ACTS (FTA) IN X COMMENTS ON THE PALESTINE RECOGNITION BY FRANCE AND THE UK

Lisa¹

Universitas Negeri Surabaya

Lisetyo Ariyanti²

Universitas Negeri Surabaya

Ayunita Leliana³

Universitas Negeri Surabaya

Adam Damanhuri⁴

Universitas Negeri Surabaya

[lisa.22082@mhs.unesa.ac.id¹](mailto:lisa.22082@mhs.unesa.ac.id)

Submit, 13-04-2026

Accepted, 26-04-2026

Publish, 27-04-2026

ABSTRACT

This research was driven by the emergence of a variety of intense reactions on social media X (Twitter) in response to the UK and French governments' policies for recognizing the sovereignty of the Palestinian state. The aim of this study is to find out what kinds of Face-Threatening Acts (FTA) strategies are employed by online users and examine how these strategies represent the sociopolitical context. The researcher analyzed 100 units of FTA data from 73 selected comments using a descriptive qualitative method and the politeness theory framework by Brown and Levinson (1987). According to the study's findings, netizens frequently employ language in a straightforward and aggressive way, preferring the Order strategy to call for humanitarian action and the Insult strategy to undermine the legitimacy of governmental power. The findings of this study demonstrate a clear polarization in the digital realm, where the use of harsh language is encouraged by the efficiency of communication on platform X and an intense sense of moral and security urgency. The researcher came to the conclusion that when it comes with truly sensitive global issues, the boundaries of politeness are frequently ignored in order to directly communicate political demands and public anger to those in authority.

Keywords: Face Threatening Acts (FTAs), Palestine Recognition, Politeness Theory, Political Discourse, X (Twitter)

INTRODUCTION

Nowadays, the dynamics of international communication have drastically changed to the digital sphere, where platform X (previously Twitter) has become the primary forum for very lively worldwide political discussions. However, individuals do not hesitate to avoid the rules of etiquette since freedom of speech on this platform often gets uncontrolled. X has evolved into a digital battleground, since user interactions have become a conflict of narratives rather than just an information exchange. It is well acknowledged that the Palestinian issue is one of the most sensitive and combative concerns discussed on this forum. The fact that UN Secretary-General António Guterres even described the Gaza situation as "a wound that is open and risks infecting the entire region" shows how deeply the international community views this problem (Bahrain, 2024). This assertion reaffirms that every conversation on Palestine involves a complex exchange of identity and human tensions rather than just a standard policy dispute. This problem is very significant to language studies to be investigated using the idea of Face Threatening Acts (FTAs), since it is in this digital realm that we may observe the way someone's freedom of speech, dignity, and self-esteem are publicly threatened or assaulted via the power of words.

FTAs, conceptualized by Brown & Levinson (1987), are communicative acts that threaten an individual's "face" or public self-image, often manifesting as accusations, critique, sarcasm, or threats. The continuous controversy regarding the Palestinian effort for independence, which started in 1967 when Israel invaded Palestinian territory, was the cause of this linguistic strain. Since the United Kingdom (UK) and France formally recognized independence on September 21 and 22, 2025, the conflict has now escalated to a new level of intensity (Ali, 2025). This essential diplomatic step sparked an incredibly broad emotional response from the international community on the X platform, where ideological disagreements led to an unavoidable outburst of verbal assault. Everyone who commented attempted to defend their ideological beliefs in the comments area by attacking the "face" or dignity of others who held opposing opinions. It's interesting to note that users often used domestic issues like starvation or crime rates in their own countries to justify their verbal abuse. In the end, this combination produced a very unhealthy conversation environment, illustrating how significant global concerns may simultaneously generate very rude and defensive linguistic behavior.

Several previous studies have been conducted on politeness strategies and FTAs. Dridi (2020) examined the American Israel Public Affairs Committee's (AIPAC) yearly addresses from 2006 to 2012. The findings demonstrated that in order to foster a feeling of unity, political speakers tended to keep clear of off-record strategies and prioritize positive politeness. Njuki & Mbaka (2021) examines how Negative FTA are used in Kenyan legislative discussions.

According to this research, when politicians tried to get parliamentary support, they often used negative FTAs including orders, recommendations, and threats.

Adi et al. (2021) conducted a research that assessed the 2020 US presidential debate between Joe Biden and Donald Trump. The findings demonstrated that verbal aggressiveness was most prevalent via accusations and interruptions that targeted positive face of the other person. Kimathi & Onyango (2022) investigated the verbal communication patterns of Kenya's political elite during the discussion over the amendment to the constitution proposed by the Building Bridges Initiative (BBI). The study's findings demonstrate that politicians deliberately use speech actions that harm the opposition's self-worth in an effort to advance their own goals. Aldrian et al. (2024) as a fifth research examines Palestinian military figure Abu Ubaidah's address on Al Jazeera. According to the study's findings, language that damages the opponent's dignity is deliberately used to undermine their legitimacy while fostering internal unity.

While previous researches have demonstrated the effectiveness of the FTA theory in analyzing formal political language, including speeches by military figures, lobbying groups, parliamentary debates, and presidential debates, there is still a significant research gap. To the extent of the researchers' understanding, no study has explicitly examined the use of harsh language by the general public or online users on the X platform in reaction to a significant event, such as the September 2025 recognition of Palestinian statehood by the UK and France. The primary distinction between this research along with others is the fact that it looks at the spontaneous responses of regular people on social media, while other studies concentrate on significant individuals in planned circumstances. This novelty is crucial to comprehending how a worldwide policy may quickly lead to a wildfire of hate speech at the level of the community.

Therefore, this study was conducted to analyze the FTAs used by X users in their comments and how these FTAs reflect the context of online interactions related to the issue of UK and France's recognition of Palestine. The research objectives are 1) to identify the Face-Threatening Acts (FTAs) are used by X users in commenting on France and the UK's recognition of Palestine and 2) to analyze how the Face-Threatening Acts (FTAs) reflects the context of Palestinian recognition in X comments by France and the UK.

LITERATUR REVIEW

This study is framed within the field of pragmatics, which focuses on meaning conveyed by speakers and understood by listeners in a social context (Yule, 1996). Central to this is the concept of "Face," which is defined as the public self-image that an individual asserts for themselves (Goffman, 1976, as cited from Dianitami, 2024). Face is emotionally invested and requires

constant maintenance, and individuals generally cooperate to keep each other's face intact.

Face is composed of two primary aspects:

1. Positive Face: The fundamental desire of every person to be liked, appreciated, and seen as belonging to the same social group. It represents the desire for one's views and personality to be favorably acknowledged.
2. Negative Face: The desire for autonomy, freedom from imposition, and the ability to act without coercion or restriction. It relates to the respect of an individual's personal space.

FTA is a concept developed by Brown & Levinson (1987) in their theory of politeness in their book entitled *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. FTA is a form of communication that can threaten a person's "face," which is their self-esteem or social image. They can occur through direct criticism, accusations, sarcasm, or over-urgent requests. Brown & Levinson (1987) classify FTAs based on the type of threat:

- Positive FTA: Threats to the desire to be liked and appreciated. This occurs when a speaker expresses disapproval, criticizes, or ridicules, thereby damaging the hearer's reputation or social standing.
- Negative FTA: Threats to the desire for autonomy and freedom from imposition. This happens when the speaker puts pressure on the hearer to perform or not perform an act, such as giving commands or threats, causing defensiveness, anger, or embarrassment.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study employs descriptive qualitative methodologies, focusing on the interpretation of meanings and processes derived from the words used in social media comments.

Object of the Study:

The object of this study is the social media platform X. This platform has become the main place for political discussions that happen in real time and in the present. Because of this, it is naturally (spontaneously) and without intentional design open to the creation of FTAs.

Data and Source of the Data:

The source of the data utilized in this research were user comments on X that are significant to the controversy over France and the UK's recognition of Palestine. The data is the linguistic units, such as words, phrases, clauses, or sentences, found in the filtered X comments. This data does not include the whole text of the comments (the data source); instead, it only includes sentences,

phrases, or single words that were clearly or indirectly characterized as comprising FTAs.

Data Collection Technique and Instrument:

The study uses a documentation technique, where X comments were collected and categorized. The data gathering was restricted to comments published between September 21 and October 5, 2025, capturing the immediate, intense dynamic following the geopolitical event.

Data Analysis Technique:

The analysis follows the interactive model proposed by Miles et al. (2014), which involves three concurrent activities:

- **Data Condensation:** Selecting, focusing, simplifying, abstracting, and transforming the raw data from the X comments.
- **Data Display:** Organizing the condensed data (e.g., in tables) to allow for easier pattern recognition and interpretation of the FTAs.
- **Conclusion Drawing and Verification:** Drawing and verifying conclusions based on the interpreted patterns of FTAs and their correlation with the sociopolitical context, using Brown and Levinson's (1987) theory as the primary framework.

FINDING

In this section, the researcher presented all the data gathered from social media platform X about netizens' reactions to the French and UK governments' recognition of Palestinian. The data shown is the outcome of a display matrix that was created by filtering comments on international news accounts and those of relevant political actors.

The following matrix is intended to provide a comprehensive overview of the ways in which Face-Threatening Acts (FTA) strategies appear in public discourse. Along with the coding of the kind of FTA technique and the underlying situational analysis, each comment is presented in its full to maintain the original context.

Table 1. Matrix Data Display

No.	Full Comment Quote	FTA Code (RQ 1)	Type of Threat	Contextual Analysis (RQ 2)
1.	<i>Rewarding terrorism, well done you fuckwits.</i>	Insult	Positive Face	The speaker criticizes the UK and France's recognition of Palestine as supporting terrorism, using the term "fuckwits" to express anger and insult the government's intelligence.

2.	<i>[a] Recognizing Palestine while you're helping to erase it is political theater. [b] Recognize Israel's genocide, occupation and apartheid, use your power to end it, and hold the perpetrators accountable. That would be meaningful political action.</i>	<i>[a] Criticism [b] Order</i>	<i>[a] Positive Face [b] Negative Face</i>	The speaker highlighted the urgent need for decisive action to address the conflict between military support for Israel and Palestinian authority, arguing that diplomacy has failed to prevent genocide.
3	<i>[a] UK and France are no longer our allies. [b] Hell, those two governments are not even allies to their own people.</i>	<i>[a] Criticism [b] Accusation</i>	<i>[a] Positive Face [b] Positive Face</i>	UK and France ended their partnership following Palestine's recognition, leading to accusations of government betrayal.
4	<i>[a] Macron jumped like a tiger and landed as Hamas's doormat. I used to like him. That's over. [b] Pathetic Doormat. □</i>	<i>[a] Ridicule [b] Insult</i>	<i>[a] Positive Face [b] Positive Face</i>	The speaker criticized President Macron's stance on Palestine, likening it to a "doormat" to highlight perceived weakness and inconsistency.
5	<i>Stop killing Palestinians</i>	<i>Order</i>	<i>Negative Face</i>	The speaker emphasized the urgent need to prioritize saving lives by advocating for an end to violence over diplomatic niceties.
6	<i>Fuck off. No terrorist trash is allowed on my screen.</i>	<i>Insult</i>	<i>Positive Face</i>	Speakers criticized the State of Palestine's recognition harshly to swiftly oppose perceived government support for terrorism, particularly on social media.
7	<i>Thank you, but it's not enough. [a] You need to implement many sanctions to stop this Israeli genocide. [b] Please hurry.</i>	<i>[a] Order [b] Request</i>	<i>[a] Negative Face [b] Negative Face</i>	The speaker values the government's acknowledgment of Palestine but calls for stronger actions like real sanctions instead of symbolic gestures.
8	<i>[a] They wait so long to do the right!! Why just now, after millions de4th?!? We can't stop to show what's happening there. [b] We must fight fascism and genocides!!!</i>	<i>[a] Criticism [b] Order</i>	<i>[a] Positive Face [b] Negative Face</i>	The speaker condemned the government's slow recognition of Palestine, highlighting the potential lives saved through prompt diplomatic action and the urgency for humanitarian support.
9	<i>France has done the worst thing possible</i>	<i>Criticism</i>	<i>Positive Face</i>	The speaker criticized France's recognition of Palestine, citing

	<i>for the hostages and most likely Gaza</i>			potential risks for hostages and the need to prioritize lives in Gaza.
10	<i>Now they need to unrecognize Israel.</i>	Order	Negative Face	The speaker contends that France's diplomatic ties with Israel hinder proper recognition of Palestine and urges a reassessment of this position.
11	<i>Can the BBC tell me the name of the leader of Palestine? And the address of their legislative body?</i>	Ridicule	Positive Face	The speaker criticized France's recognition of Palestine, questioning its administrative foundations and the government's decision.
12	<i>Recognizing a pile of terrorist rubble as a state is wild.</i>	Criticism	Positive Face	The speaker condemns the government's recognition of Palestine as irrational, dismissing the area as "terrorist rubble" to challenge its legitimacy.
13	<i>[a] Way to go you cheese eating surrender monkeys. [b] Wait till the animals take over Paris</i>	<i>[a] Insult [b] Warning</i>	<i>[a] Positive Face [b] Negative Face</i>	The speaker makes racist comments in response to the French government's recognition of Palestinian statehood, attempting to discredit its position and raise safety concerns.
14	<i>Good step but not enough..they should halt all the arm shipment and impose sanctions on them for violating sovereignty of Palestine</i>	Advice	Negative Face	The speaker argued that stopping weapons supplies is more important than recognizing Palestine, advocating for policies that promote Palestinian statehood through real actions.
15	<i>Great □Now we must push out Hamas and Israel from Gaza. Gaza is Palestine land and they must have all land Israel have occupied. Israel have a border on paper and everyone no the border.</i>	Order	Negative Face	The speaker stressed the urgent need to remove Israel and Hamas from Gaza to restore its boundaries after recognizing Palestinian statehood.
16	<i>GENERAL ELECTION NOW</i>	Order	Negative Face	After Palestine's recognition, there were calls for immediate elections to ensure a government that reflects citizens' foreign policy views.
17	<i>We need to designate the United Kingdom a terrorist state. Immediately.</i>	Order	Negative Face	The speaker urges the UK to be labelled a terrorist state due to the Labour Party's commitment to recognizing Palestine, highlighting a need for constitutional change.

18	<i>[a] You've been doing your absolute fucking best to have it wiped off the map for the last year and a bit, [b] ... so forgive me if I still think your soulless war criminals.</i>	<i>[a] Accusation [b] Insult</i>	<i>[a] Positive Face [b] Positive Face</i>	The speaker accuses the UK government of being "war criminals" for its past policies that contributed to the destruction of Palestine.
	<i>Congratulations. The Labour Party has just legitimized terrorism. No-one is surprised.</i>	Accusation	Positive Face	The speaker sarcastically criticized the Labour Party's recognition of Palestine for legitimizing terrorism and undermining the government's diplomatic stance.
19	<i>And when are they going to stop exporting weapons to Israel?</i>	Criticism	Positive Face	The speaker criticized the UK's foreign policy on weapons transfers after recognizing Palestine and called for concrete actions to meet humanitarian needs.
20	<i>You can recognize, I don't agree & never will.</i>	Disapproval	Positive Face	The speaker clearly expresses their strong disapproval of the Labour Party's diplomatic shift without engaging in a lengthy debate.
21	<i>[a] Macron has no majority, no power, no legitimacy. [b] 5 PM in 3 years: just clownish government. [c] He is nothing.</i>	<i>[a] Criticism [b] Ridicule [c] Insult</i>	<i>[a] Positive Face [b] Positive Face [c] Positive Face</i>	President Macron faced criticism over his political legitimacy following France's recognition of Palestine, reflecting concerns about the country's foreign policy effectiveness amid internal political uncertainty.
22	<i>[a] Shame on him! [b] A huge majority of French people disagree strongly with this declaration! Shame on him!</i>	<i>[a] Reprimand [b] Disapproval</i>	<i>[a] Positive Face [b] Positive Face</i>	The speaker criticizes Macron's stance on Palestinian autonomy, highlighting a gap between government policy and public opinion in France.
23	<i>So now it's time to put an embargo on exports of weapons and suspend the EU-Israel association agreement.</i>	Order	Negative Face	The speaker called for immediate actions, including a weapons embargo, in response to France's recognition of the Palestinian state, stressing the need for effective military and economic strategies.
24	<i>France must recognize the ongoing genocide in Gaza and stop delivering military equipment to □</i>	Order	Negative Face	The speaker called on the French government to recognize Palestine and stop military aid to address the genocide in Gaza.
25	<i>Until unless there is no concrete action on Hamas..the Palestinians can</i>	Order	Negative Face	The speaker emphasized that achieving true harmony necessitates action against Hamas and prioritizing security over Palestine's recognition

	never live peacefully... <i>The world should take stringent action to eliminate this mindless group. for peace and prosperity..</i>			as a sovereign state.
26	<i>[a] You are a disgrace. You are a WEAK leader. [b] You just stabbed the Jewish people and Israel in the back, siding with Islamic terrorists. [c] We will never forgive you.</i>	<i>[a] Insult [b] Accusation [c] Warning</i>	<i>[a] Positive Face [b] Positive Face [c] Negative Face</i>	The speaker criticized Keir Starmer for acknowledging Palestine, calling him a "weak leader" and warning of serious repercussions.
27	<i>[a] England. The time is now. Take your nation back from those terrorists. It doesn't matter what Keir says, it matters what you will do to save your country. [b] Keir, you're a traitor to your own nation</i>	<i>[a] Order [b] Insult</i>	<i>[a] Negative Face [b] Positive Face</i>	The speaker criticized the UK's recognition of Palestinian statehood and called Starmer a "traitor" for prioritizing foreign policy.
28	<i>Are you still sending weapons and intelligence to the military forces currently committing genocide against the people you've just recognized?</i>	Accusation	Positive Face	The UK's military support for Israel, despite recognizing Palestine, highlights inconsistencies and the need to stop weapon supplies for a true diplomatic resolution.
29	<i>This is great. Now stop providing arms to Israel and recognize the ethnic cleansing and genocide of Palestinians.</i>	Order	Negative Face	The speaker called for immediate actions to stop violence, despite acknowledging Palestinian sovereignty.
30	<i>But what are you doing to stop the genocide? Are you putting sanctions on Israel?</i>	Criticism	Positive Face	The speaker argued that recognizing statehood is futile without strong economic pressure to tackle the humanitarian crisis in Gaza.
31	<i>[a] Radical leftist who wants to destroy UK, [b] you have to RESIGN NOW! □</i>	<i>[a] Accusation [b] Order</i>	<i>[a] Positive Face [b] Negative Face</i>	The speaker demanded Starmer's resignation due to his foreign policies on Palestine, which they believe threaten the UK's internal stability.

32	<p><i>[a] This is not what the British people want.</i> <i>[b] Sick man. Traitor.</i> <i>[c] Resign</i></p>	<p><i>[a] Disapproval</i> <i>[b] Insult</i> <i>[c] Order</i></p>	<p><i>[a] Positive Face</i> <i>[b] Positive Face</i> <i>[c] Negative Face</i></p>	<p>The speaker argues that the British public is reluctant to recognize a Palestinian state and criticizes leaders for their inconsistent choices, urging for new leadership.</p>
33	<p><i>[a] It was surely about time... however what land will you give to the few survivors of this genocide.</i> <i>[b] Stop sending weapons to Israel, sanctions, condemn... we have none of that.</i> <i>[a] And this recognition comes too late and will do nothing.</i></p>	<p><i>[a] Criticism</i> <i>[b] Order</i></p>	<p><i>[a] Positive Face</i> <i>[b] Negative Face</i></p>	<p>The speaker argues that the Labour Party's delayed and ineffective response stems from a historical neglect of the need for peace.</p>
34	<p><i>this is a big trap. fuck Israel and fuck the two-state solution.</i></p>	<p>Insult</p>	<p>Positive Face</p>	<p>The speaker harshly rejected Starmer's two-state solution, viewing it as a political trap.</p>
35	<p><i>Might be a good idea to STOP the killings of the innocent people first.</i></p>	<p>Criticism</p>	<p>Positive Face</p>	<p>The speaker called for the government to focus on ending violence and implementing real protections for civilians.</p>
36	<p><i>Please remove Israel from the list of UN member countries</i></p>	<p>Request</p>	<p>Negative Face</p>	<p>The speaker called for stronger international actions from the government to support Palestinian statehood and increase diplomatic pressure on Israel.</p>
37	<p><i>Stop hypocrisy one side recognize phalestine and other side arming Israel for Phalestinian people's Genocide</i></p>	<p>Order</p>	<p>Negative Face</p>	<p>The speaker criticized the government's hypocrisy and called for a change in foreign policy, emphasizing that diplomatic recognition is ineffective without military support.</p>
38	<p><i>It's about time. But UK's complicity in the zgaza genocide and support of Israel will need to be answered for in a court of law, and all politicians who supported it must be prosecuted.</i></p>	<p>Warning</p>	<p>Negative Face</p>	<p>The speaker cautioned politicians about legal repercussions related to the Gaza conflict while praising the UK for acknowledging Palestinian statehood.</p>

39	<i>[a] Shameless liar Why not asking to stop the genocide in Gaza? [b] It's all about to distract the masses□□</i>	<i>[a] Accusation [b] Criticism</i>	<i>[a] Positive Face [b] Positive Face</i>	The speaker condemned Starmer as deceitful, asserting that the government's recognition was a diversion from addressing genocide and that diplomatic efforts lacked genuine outcomes.
40	<i>Actually now Isreal should be de recognized and neto force should go there and clear the land and hand over to the Palestinian</i>	<i>Order</i>	<i>Negative Face</i>	The speaker called for immediate military intervention and the cancellation of Israel's recognition to address Palestinian statehood and sovereignty.
41	<i>[a] I'm a UK citizen and starmer does not speak for me. [b] He's now supporting terrorists. [c] He needs to resign immediately.</i>	<i>[a] Disapprov al [b] Accusation [c] Order</i>	<i>[a] Positive Face [b] Positive Face [c] Negative Face</i>	The speaker condemned the regulation for failing to reflect citizens' wishes, opposed Palestinian sovereignty recognition, and urged for immediate leadership change due to government discontent.
42	<i>FANTASTIC. Now stop sending arms to the genocidal which despite its genocide despite which it whinges and pretends to be the victim.</i>	<i>Order</i>	<i>Negative Face</i>	The speaker called for an immediate stop to weapon supplies, criticizing the opposing side and urging urgent military action against groups accused of genocide.
43	<i>Rewarding terrorists again. Remember what happened last time? □ MASSACRE!</i>	<i>Warning</i>	<i>Negative Face</i>	The speaker cautioned against recognizing Palestinian statehood due to potential security risks and past disasters affecting public safety.
44	<i>[a] You have rewarded murderers. Resign. [b] Your morality is in the gutter.</i>	<i>[a] Accusation [b] Insult</i>	<i>[a] Positive Face [b] Positive Face</i>	The speaker criticized the government for honouring killers and called for the leader's resignation over immoral actions related to Palestine's recognition.
45	<i>[a] But you'll continue to sell arms and do nothing to stop wholesale genocide? [b] You damn hypocrite! You are all EVIL</i>	<i>[a] Accusation [b] Insult</i>	<i>[a] Positive Face [b] Positive Face</i>	The speaker condemned the government's hypocrisy in recognizing Palestine while continuing to export weapons, calling it empty rhetoric without real action.
46	<i>[a] Nope not my PM he doesn't speak for me or the majority of Great Britain [b] so get lost Keir Starmer you idiot</i>	<i>[a] Disapprov al [b] Insult</i>	<i>[a] Positive Face [b] Positive Face</i>	The speaker condemns the leader for failing to represent citizens and advocates for using personal insults to reject the government's foreign strategy, emphasizing the urgency of the issue.

47	<i>[a] I can't stand this wankers face anymore, enough is enough, [b] can we have a new election</i>	<i>[a] Insult [b] Request</i>	<i>[a] Positive Face [b] Negative Face</i>	The speaker's dismissal of Starmer's plans and demands for new elections reflect a public yearning for substantial political change.
48	<i>[a] You and the rest of the UK government supportjbg this are moral cowards. You have rewarded terror without a thought to its victims. [b] Shame on you.</i>	<i>[a] Insult [b] Reprimand</i>	<i>[a] Positive Face [b] Positive Face</i>	The speaker condemned the government's integrity and policies, expressing public disappointment through insults.
49	<i>An incredibly ignorant decision.</i>	Disapproval	Positive Face	The speaker criticized the recognition choice as unfounded and detrimental to the government's ability to tackle the Middle East crisis.
50	<i>Terrible move. History will remember you.</i>	Warning	Negative Face	The speaker warns that the policy will harm the government's credibility in the future.
51	<i>It is a foolish decision made without the support of the general public.</i>	Criticism	Positive Face	The speaker criticized Starmer's strategy for not aligning with public acceptance and emphasized prioritizing domestic desires in diplomacy.
52	<i>[a] You should have demanded peace, & the release of prisoners, first, [b] you moral reprobate.</i>	<i>[a] Advice [b] Insult</i>	<i>[a] Negative Face [b] Positive Face</i>	The speaker criticizes the government for ignoring prisoners' freedom and peace, blending insults with policy suggestions.
53	<i>They should try to stop the genocide instead of trying to wash their bloody hands with this announcement.</i>	Accusation	Positive Face	The speaker believes recognizing Palestine distracts from addressing genocide and prioritizing meaningful action.
54	<i>We demands sanctions and arms embargo....otherwise, this is nonsense...!!</i>	Order	Negative Face	The speaker stressed that a weapons embargo and sanctions are essential for effective diplomatic efforts in Gaza.
55	<i>[a] NOW SANCTION ISRAEL! [b] Or bomb it, preferably.</i>	<i>[a] Order [b] Suggestion</i>	<i>[a] Negative Face [b] Negative Face</i>	The speaker calls for immediate sanctions and military action against France for recognizing Palestine, arguing that diplomacy is insufficient.
56	<i>Next mission is to deassociate yourself with Israel, no weapons for Israel, no nothing. This is for the rest of</i>	Order	Negative Face	The speaker calls for severing all ties between France and Israel in favour of international isolation.

	<i>the countries btw including Saudi.</i>			
57	<i>France is full of cowards</i>	Insult	Positive Face	The speaker condemned France's foreign policies as cowardly and weak.
58	<i>Palestine might be recognized now, but kids in Gaza are still being killed. The world needs to step in and stop Israel.</i>	Order	Negative Face	The speaker emphasized the critical situation in Gaza and the necessity for international intervention beyond the UK's diplomatic recognition.
59	<i>This is a good step. But what about the weapons that the UK has supplied to Israel? Will the UK stop sending its military aid and weapons to Israel that it uses to kill innocents?</i>	Criticism	Positive Face	The speaker calls for an immediate halt to UK weapons transfers, criticizing inconsistent policy and ethical concerns.
60	<i>Biggest mistake of his political career (which soon will be over).</i>	Criticism	Positive Face	The speaker criticized the government's actions, predicting the leader's political downfall and highlighting the swift rejection of Palestine's recognition by opposing parties.
61	<i>A useless man.</i>	Insult	Positive Face	The speaker attacks the UK leader's integrity by calling them "useless," undermining their legitimacy in diplomacy.
62	<i>The biggest and the most cruelest occupiers in the world's history. □</i>	Ridicule	Positive Face	The speaker argues that the UK's colonial past undermines its moral authority to govern other nations.
63	<i>That's a good news but not enough. Now it's a time to consider widespread sanctions on Israel.</i>	Order	Negative Face	The speaker called for the UK to implement comprehensive sanctions to support diplomatic recognition with economic pressure.
64	<i>Now the United Kingdom needs to quit sending Israel money!!!</i>	Order	Negative Face	The speaker stresses the urgency of financial action and the recognition of sovereignty.
65	<i>A state with no government or defined borders. Embarrassing posturing.</i>	Criticism	Positive Face	The speaker criticizes the UK's actions as political posturing that harms its diplomatic standing.
66	<i>big move, but they should have done it before thousands of people suffered</i>	Criticism	Positive Face	The speaker claims the UK's efforts to address past suffering are ineffective due to a history of neglecting humanitarian needs.
67	<i>The uk is irrelevant. They have zero power</i>	Insult	Positive Face	The speaker trivializes Palestine and the UK's global standing while

	<i>in the world. No one cares what they do. Also, Palestine doesn't exist.</i>			downplaying the need for urgent diplomatic efforts.
68	<i>FINALLY NOW STOP THE GENOCIDE</i>	Order	Negative Face	The speaker urged immediate action to halt violence and address Gaza's humanitarian crisis.
69	<i>So basically uk is doomed</i>	Threat	Negative Face	The speaker predicts the UK's foreign policy will lead to destruction and instability, expressing anger and anxiety.
70	<i>Recognizing. Now make it right.</i>	Order	Negative Face	The speaker demanded immediate changes and moral accountability from the UK government after a formal announcement.
71	<i>Took you long enough Now stop funding Israel and recognize the genocide</i>	Order	Negative Face	The speaker stressed the importance of stopping military funding and recognizing genocide for effective diplomacy.
72	<i>Then quit giving Israel money!!!!</i>	Order	Negative Face	The speaker called for the complete cancellation of financial assistance, highlighting the UK's political intentions.

The Types of Face-Threatening Acts (FTAs) Used by X Users

This section provides an answer to the first research question on the kinds of FTA that X users have adopted in reaction to the UK and France's recognition of the Palestinian authority. The researcher discovered a total of 100 FTA data units based on the examination of 73 comments that were gathered. Overall, the frequency of results indicates that strategies that endanger the target's Negative Face predominate (42 data), although attacks on the Positive Face (58 data) occur more often by using a variety of insults, criticisms, and accusations. These results demonstrate a significant polarization, in which the FTA is employed by both those who are advocating for justice in Palestine and those who are condemning the recognition policy as a political error. Overall, the following table shows the frequency distribution of different kinds of FTA:

Table 2. Frequency of FTA Types

No	Types of Threat	FTA Code	Frequency
1	Positive Face	Insult	19
		Criticism	16
		Accusation	11
		Ridicule	4
		Disapproval	6
		Reprimand	2
2	Negative Face	Order	30

		Threat	1
		Advice	2
		Suggestion	1
		Warning	5
		Request	3
Total			100

The following provides an expanded explanation of how each of these type is used in netizen comments:

In the category of strategies that pose a threat to Negative Face (a total of 42 data points), the Order strategy emerged as the most frequent form of FTA, with a total of 30 findings. This demonstrates the public's significant pressure on the government to do more than just display diplomatic recognition. The comment "Now stop funding Israel and recognize the genocide" in data number 72 and the statement "Then quit giving Israel money!!!!" in data number 73 demonstrate how often netizens employ strong imperative phrases. Furthermore, the Warning strategy was used five times in addition to directives. For example, data number 51 declared, "History will remember you," while data number 13 unit [b] issued a racist/ideological warning about domestic security, saying, "Wait till the animals take over Paris."

Three instances of the Request technique were identified. For instance, in data number 48 unit [b], netizens asked for a change in leadership by using the phrase "can we have a new election." In addition, the Advice strategy was used twice, for example in data number 53 unit [a] ("You should have demanded peace..."), while the Threat strategy was used once in data number 70 ("So basically the UK is doomed") and also one Suggestion in data number 56 unit [b] ("Or bomb it, preferably") to highlight the possibility of violence or serious military actions.

However, this research found strategies that endangered Positive Face (a total of 58 data points), in which online users purposefully mocked the honor and moral character of public leaders. With a frequency of 19 occurrences, the Insult approach was the most often used in this category. The vulgarity "well done you fuckwits" in data number 1 used by individuals who opposed the recognition policy and the phrase "so get lost Keir Starmer you idiot" in data number 47 unit [b] both explicitly displayed the usage of negative labels. The Criticism method was used 16 times, for instance in data number 2 unit [a], when the government's program was referred to as "political theater." Eleven instances of the Accusation strategy were employed to increase attacks on the government's image, including the severe accusation that the government had "legitimized terrorism" in data number 19.

Along with these harsh attacks, netizens used a number of different strategies to show their dissatisfaction or mockery of the government. The Disapproval strategy was used 6 times. For instance, data number 21, where it was said, "You can recognize, I don't agree & never will". The Ridicule strategy was employed 4 times to disparage the target in a sarcastic way, as evidenced by data number 4 unit [a], which called Macron as " Hamas's doormat". Lastly, the researcher discovered the Reprimand approach twice, including in data number 49 unit [b], where it was written, "Shame on you." All of these strategies together demonstrate how social media X has evolved into a place where the limits of politeness are frequently overlooked in favor of effectively expressing anger and making political demands.

In accordance to the first research question, the results indicate that X users are more willing to use confrontational and forceful strategies from a range of political viewpoints. In the context of worldwide crises that cause polarization, the limits of politeness are overlooked for the purpose to gain communication efficiency in transmitting anger and urgent demands, as seen by the dominance of the Order and Insult methods in the total of 100 data points.

How FTAs Reflect the Context of Palestine Recognition

The purpose of this section is to examine how the kinds of FTA that were previously mentioned relate to the context underlying the French and British governments' recognition of Palestine. The researcher discovered from the study data matrix that netizens on the X platform did not use strategies for language at random, but rather in direct reaction to an urgent crisis scenario. These results largely capture two primary aspects of digital communication among netizens: the effectiveness of message transmission and the humanitarian crisis's moral urgency.

The factor of communication efficiency provides insight into the initial contextual reflection. The Insult and Criticism strategies' dominance demonstrates that netizens choose for the most efficient method of delegitimizing the government in the face of the rapid flow of information on X. Many opposition group netizens believe that this strategy is a fatal error in the context of sovereignty recognition. This is shown by the use of direct labels to express dissatisfaction quickly and without prolonged argumentation, as in data number 45 unit [b] ("Your morality is in the gutter") and data number 27 unit [a] ("You are a disgrace. You are a WEAK leader"). In a heated circumstance, the FTA method serves as the most effective means of communication to undermine government authority.

The usage of FTAs not only shows efficiency but also strongly expresses conflicting aspects of urgency. The humanitarian urgency to prevent genocide is

reflected in the establishment of a dominating Order approach (30 data points) for pro-Palestinian parties, as seen by data point number 5 ("Stop killing Palestinians"). The opposing party, on the other hand, sees this acknowledgment as an encouragement of terrorism and believes that the FTA reflects the urgency of security. The accusation that British officials have "...stabbed the Jewish people and Israel in the back" is expressed in data number 27 unit [b]. This reflection of urgency demonstrates that politeness in language is no longer deemed essential when government policy is perceived to undermine ideological stability or human lives.

Overall, this investigation demonstrates that the FTA strategy implemented by netizens is indicative of significant social fragmentation. Efficiency and urgency (both humanitarian and political) are prioritized over the preservation of leaders' faces in the context of Palestinian recognition, which establishes a new standard of communication. The usage of aggressive language is a reflection of the direct moral and political pressure that netizens apply to state authority through digital space. To conclude the second research question, the FTA strategy is representative of the context of Palestinian recognition as a crisis that necessitates tangible accountability. The effectiveness of insulting and the urgency of commands demonstrate that the public considers this to be a serious moral and security problem, making the utilization of aggressive language an appropriate way of communication.

DISCUSSION

Analysis of Face-Threatening Acts in Political Discourse

In this section, the researcher employs the fundamental ideas of Brown and Levinson (1987) to assess results on various types of FTAs. According to the frequency findings in Table 2, strategies that target positive face (58 data) are clearly more common than those that target negative face (42 data). This demonstrates that rather than just applying pressure on political leaders' freedom of action, netizens on platform X emphasize attempts to undermine their moral integrity and character. Netizens prefer to utilize clear on-record techniques (to the point), demonstrating that communication efficiency is considerably more essential than minimizing risks to the interlocutor's "face."

The Order strategy's dominance (30 data points) is indicative of a pattern that was also examined by Njuki & Mbaka (2021). In this framework, FTA against negative face is strategically employed to pressure the interlocutor to execute particular steps in the future. The researcher discovered a distinctive aspect of this data, though: the Order strategy not only consists of formal instructions but also often involves intense emotional pressure to stop military financing (as seen in data number 73). This research offers an obvious

contrast to that conducted by Adi et al. (2021) regarding the Biden-Trump debate. In formal debates, assaults are restricted by procedural structures that maintain the flow of the conversation. However, netizens on the X platform have eliminated all such constraints. Consequently, the digital environment lacks comprehensive social control, resulting in the emergence of coercive strategies in their most aggressive form.

Additionally, the high number of strategies that damage positive face, such as Insult (19 data) and Criticism (16 data), shows how politicians' public image is being destroyed. This phenomena contrasts sharply with the results of Murti (2020), who examined comments on Indonesian politicians' accounts and found that netizens continued to employ a variety of polite strategies to preserve social harmony. According to the study, internet users believe they have the "moral right" to overlook politeness in the context of Palestinian recognition. Interestingly, these assaults came from two different directions: those who supported Palestine attacked the government for being unreliable or dishonest, while those who opposed recognition used insults to accuse the government of being terrorist sympathizers (see data number 1). This demonstrates how FTA serves as a tool to quickly undermine opponents' credibility in digital political discourse.

The Reflection of Sociopolitical Efficiency and Urgency in Netizens' Comments

This section's study focuses on how the selected 100 units of FTA data represent the sociopolitical context in two key ways: the communication efficiency and the urgency of the crisis. The researcher discovered that the extensive implementation of the bald on-record strategy was a pragmatic reaction to a crisis that was no longer considered to necessitate linguistic subtlety.

First, the utilization of FTA is representative of the efficiency of communication on platform X. Due to social media's demands for speed and character constraints, netizens must contend with the attacks directly. When contrasted to Dridi (2020) study on AIPAC speeches, this provides a significant difference. Dridi discovered that in order to preserve alliances, politicians in the diplomatic field often combine FTA with redressive action. On the contrary, platform X netizens are not constrained to such diplomatic responsibility. Language efficiency is employed to immediately undermine authority through the use of concise yet sharp labels such as "useless man" (data number 62) and "pathetic doormat" (data number 4 unit [b]). According to Kirwa et al. (2022), politics is a "word game," and on platform X, the primary tool for influencing public opinion is the effectiveness of selecting insults or accusations.

Second, there is a strong sociopolitical urgency that motivates the efficiency aspect. As seen by the emergence of the 30 Order strategies, the public

views the acknowledgment of sovereignty as a relatively late beginning rather than the conclusion of the process. The "bloodshed" in Gaza establishes a communication standard in which being polite is considered as a way to ignore the sorrow of the victims. This is consistent with the research of Aldrian et al. (2024), which emphasizes how speakers are compelled to employ urgent language in situations of serious conflict. The urgency of the situation is demonstrated in data number 69 by the order "STOP THE GENOCIDE." Netizens believe that the politeness strategies frequently observed in Murti (2020) research; which focuses on social harmony; are no longer applicable in a crisis.

Furthermore, the group that opposes the recognition of Palestine also reflects this urgency in a contradictory way. They believe that security is under danger, thus they use the Warning and Accusation technique (see data number 27). This demonstrates how platform X becomes into a place where the "urgency" of the ideological conflict between the two parties is communicated through the "efficiency" of language. According to Adi et al. (2021) study, although there are attacks in official debates, the urgency on social media is even more intense because users believe they have direct control over the government in real time.

In conclusion, these 100 data points from the FTA strategy demonstrate that the recognition of Palestine is seen as a crisis. The urgency of moral/security on the ground and the necessity for efficiency on social media have resulted in netizens abandoning all politeness strategies, rendering language the most effective tool for political pressure against the UK and French governments.

CONCLUSION

This study confirms the applicability of Brown and Levinson's (1987) FTA theory in analyzing spontaneous digital political discourse. The analysis of X users' comments regarding the UK and France's recognition of Palestine revealed a high frequency of explicit FTAs targeting both Positive and Negative Face. Specifically, Positive FTAs were realized through moral accusations and insults (e.g., calling the government "occupied"), and Negative FTAs were expressed through harsh demands (e.g., "Give us a general election now").

These explicit FTAs serve as a direct linguistic reflection of the heightened sociopolitical urgency and a drive for communicative efficiency amidst ideological conflict. The findings underscore that in a dynamic, non-elite digital public sphere, the perception of an issue's urgency, combined with the need for immediate, clear, and high-impact communication, drives the selection of the most efficient (direct/bald-on-record) linguistic strategies. Consequently, users willingly set aside conventional politeness to achieve maximum communicative impact and assert moral dominance.

REFERENCES

- Adi, R. Z., Hartono, & Nirwana, R. (2021). "Face Threatening Act in US Presidential Candidate First Debate Between Joe Biden and Donald Trump on Daily Mail and YouTube 's Sky news 2020". *TheGist*. 4, 2. 26–39.
- Aldrian, Muassomah, & Halimi. (2024). "Social Context of Face- Threatening Acts in Abu Ubaidah ' s Speech on Al Jazeera Channel". *International Journal of Arabic Language Teaching*. 07, 02. 92–109. <https://doi.org/10.32332/ijalt.v7i01.9987>
- Ali, M. (2025). *Which are the 150+ countries that have recognised Palestine as of 2025?* <https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2025/9/23/which-are-the-150-countries-that-have-recognised-palestine-as-of-2025>
- Bahrain, M. (2024). *Secretary-General's remarks to the Summit of the League of Arab States [scroll down for Arabic] [as delivered]*title. <https://www.un.org/sg/en/content/sg/statements/2024-05-16/secretary-generals-remarks-the-summit-of-the-league-of-arab-states-scroll-down-for-arabic-delivered>
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587263>
- Dianitami, A. A. (2024). *Politeness Strategy in Vladimir Putin's English Transcript Speech on the Russian-Ukraine War 2022*. State University of Surabaya.
- Dridi, T. (2020). "Politeness in Political Discourse: Face Threatening Acts (FTAs) in American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC) Speeches". *Journal of Interdisciplinary Sciences*. 4, 2. 29–42.
- Kirwa, K., Kimathi, C. K., & Onyango, O. V. (2022). "Face Threatening Acts in Political Discourse : A Case of the Building Bridges Initiative in Kenya". *The International Journal of Humanities & Social Studies*. 10, 8. 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.24940/theijhss/2022/v10/i8/HS2208-036>
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: a methods sourcebook* (Third). SAGE Publications, Inc, California.
- Murti, R. W. (2020). *An Analysis of Politeness Strategies on Comments Indonesians' Politicians Twitter Account*. State Institute for Islamic Studies (IAIN) of Salatiga.
- Njuki, E., & Mbaka, N. W. (2021). "Negative Face Threatening Acts Used By Kenya ' s Members ff The 12 th National Assembly". *IOSR Journal of Humanities And Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)*. 26, 7. 09–18. <https://doi.org/10.9790/0837-2607040918>
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics* (pp. 437–456). Oxford University Press, Oxford. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316779194.021>