

"Constructing Solidarity in the Global South: A Critical

Discourse Analysis of Indonesia–Brazil Diplomatic Narratives"

Anggriani Alamsyah

10.22146/globalsouth.113618

Universitas Islam Negeri Alauddin Makassar
anggriani.alamsyah@uin-alauddin.ac.id

Although Indonesia–Brazil diplomatic relations are not a new phenomenon, the relations that unfolded in 2025 are particularly interesting to study, as they were forged within the framework of Global South solidarity. This qualitative study integrates Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), framing theory, and the concept of symbolic hegemony to examine President Prabowo's diplomatic speeches on the bilateral relationship and their representation in Indonesia's national media. The findings of this study highlight three key dynamics: first, solidarity within the Global South is constructed through discursive strategies that emphasize the common ground between the two sides and their shared geopolitical interests; second, the integration of soft power and hard power through narratives of development cooperation and technological exchange, which align with defense narratives as symbols of a nation's capabilities; third, the reconstruction of diplomatic messages through national media framing, which highlights the image of leadership and symbols of state power. These dynamics give rise to the practice of "double addressing," in which diplomatic communication simultaneously generates international legitimacy through narratives of Global South solidarity and domestic legitimacy through representations of state power, thereby producing what is termed "Hybrid Symbolic Diplomacy" as an analytical framework for understanding the symbolic diplomatic practices of Global South countries.

Keywords: *diplomatic speeches; Global South; Hybrid Symbolic Diplomacy; media framing; political legitimacy*

Introduction

Over the past two decades, the global political landscape has been shaped by the growing role of Global South countries as key players in international relations, marked by the increasing economic and political capacity of developing nations, alongside the waning dominance of Global North countries. The Global South is no longer an object of global development, but rather a political subject actively shaping alternative

narratives within the new world order. This shift indicates that the contemporary international structure is increasingly characterized by multipolarity, normative diversity, and symbolic contestation among nations (Winanti & Alvian, 2019; Wu, 2024).

Global South solidarity, which was initially rooted in shared historical experiences of colonialism and the anti-imperialist struggle, has evolved into the strengthening of a collective stance

within the framework of South-South Cooperation (SSC), through various forms of cooperation such as technology transfer, technical assistance, health diplomacy, and joint advocacy in global governance. Rao et al. (2025) demonstrate that South–South cooperation plays a crucial role in advancing the global social justice agenda, particularly in the field of health. Meanwhile, Robledo (2015) emphasizes that emerging donor countries in Latin America, including Brazil, use SSC as a tool to expand their economic and geopolitical influence. However, Kusumadewi (2025) points out that solidarity within the Global South is also shaped by internal hierarchical dynamics that can influence the bargaining power of developing countries in international negotiations.

Language and symbols play a crucial role in Global South diplomacy in establishing a country's political legitimacy and identity on the international stage. Banks (2019) demonstrates that domestic symbols, historical narratives, and political metaphors can shape a country's foreign policy orientation. Narratives of solidarity and shared interests are employed to construct a collective image of an egalitarian South–South political community, enabling states to project their moral identity and political stance on the global stage. Strange (2024) reinforces this by stating that developing countries also utilize infrastructure projects, cultural programs, and foreign policies as symbols of progress and sovereignty in international diplomacy.

Since assuming office, President Prabowo Subianto's foreign policy has

demonstrated a pragmatic orientation characterized by engagement with multiple geopolitical actors rather than alignment with any single power bloc. Indonesia has simultaneously strengthened strategic relations with Western countries through defense and economic cooperation while maintaining close partnerships with China in trade, investment, and infrastructure development. At the same time, the administration has intensified its engagement with Global South platforms, including BRICS and South–South Cooperation initiatives, as part of Indonesia's broader strategy to expand its diplomatic influence within an increasingly multipolar international order (Winanti & Alvian, 2019; Margiansyah, 2020; Wu, 2024). Within this broader foreign policy context, President Prabowo's diplomatic engagement with Brazil in 2025 represents more than a routine bilateral encounter. As one of the leading powers of the Global South and an influential member of BRICS, Brazil provides a particularly relevant empirical case for examining how Indonesia constructs solidarity, negotiates strategic cooperation, and projects political legitimacy across both international and domestic audiences. Consequently, the Indonesia–Brazil diplomatic engagement serves as an appropriate case for developing the concept of Hybrid Symbolic Diplomacy, rather than representing an isolated rhetorical event.

Against this broader foreign policy background, this pattern was reflected in President Prabowo's diplomatic remarks during his meeting with Brazilian President

Da Silva, in which he emphasized the equality of the two nations and the importance of defense cooperation, as well as the development of military technology as a form of cooperation between the two countries. Furthermore, the media also played a significant role in framing these diplomatic communications as news stories on their respective platforms, interpreting specific aspects of a political event (Entman, 1993), which sometimes leads to differing interpretations between diplomatic messages intended for an international audience and the representations implied in the domestic public sphere. Ong'ong'a (2021) demonstrates that framing in digital diplomacy can shape global perceptions of a country's foreign policy, while Grincheva and Lu (2016) found that Russian and Chinese media employ specific framing in their coverage of BRICS meetings to reinforce the image of their countries' leadership. In the Indonesian context, Saragih (2025) also points out that media framing is often used to reinforce the image of leadership in political reporting. This distinction illustrates that political communication operates on two tracks simultaneously: the international and the domestic.

To gain a comprehensive understanding of this phenomenon, this study employs three complementary analytical frameworks: Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), framing theory, and the concept of symbolic hegemony. CDA enables an analysis of how diplomatic language shapes political identities and power relations within the international system (Fairclough, 1985; Fenyi & Sapa-

ty, 2021). Framing theory explains how the media shapes the public's interpretation of political events through the selection and highlighting of information (Entman, 1993). Meanwhile, the concept of symbolic hegemony developed by Laclau and Mouffe (1985) and Joseph (2002) helps explain how political symbols and narratives are used to build ideological consensus within society.

Numerous studies have certainly examined Global South diplomacy from the perspectives of media framing and discourse analysis separately, but it appears that few have combined all three of these concepts when discussing Global South diplomacy. This study seeks to address this gap by analyzing how solidarity within the Global South is constructed in diplomatic discourse on Indonesia-Brazil cooperation, how domestic media frames it, and how the interplay between diplomatic language, political symbols, and media representations shapes the practice of symbolic diplomacy within the international system.

Theoretical Framework

To examine this phenomenon comprehensively, the study integrates three theoretical frameworks: Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), framing theory, and symbolic hegemony. CDA (Fairclough, 1985; van Dijk in Fenyi & Sapaty, 2021) enables the analysis of linguistic and ideological structures within diplomatic speeches and reveals how language reflects power relations. CDA is particularly relevant when states deploy moral metaphors such as *brotherhood* or *shared destiny* to construct moral legitimacy.

Gera (2023) shows that CDA is capable of uncovering ideological layers within political rhetoric, such as Hungary's anti-LGBTQ campaign. Similarly, Prasetya (2024) notes that linguistic structures in political discourse are often designed to reinforce specific power agendas. In diplomatic contexts, CDA provides analytical tools to trace how solidarity messages are shaped through lexical choices, sentence constructions, and rhetorical strategies.

Framing theory complements CDA by examining how media construct and disseminate meaning. Media are never neutral; they select, highlight, and modify messages based on audience interests and political contexts (Entman, 1993). Within Global South diplomacy, framing plays a critical role in shaping a country's image. Ong'ong'a (2021) demonstrates that Kenya's digital diplomacy framing influences global perceptions of the state. Grincheva and Lu (2016) identify similar patterns in Russian and Chinese media coverage of BRICS summits. In Indonesia, Saragih (2025) observes that diplomatic visits are frequently framed to strengthen leadership imagery. Saliu and Abrashi (2023) further assert that framing is integral to contemporary public diplomacy.

The framework of symbolic hegemony (Laclau & Mouffe, 1985; Joseph, 2002) extends these approaches by analyzing how political symbols are used to build ideological consensus. In Global South diplomacy, symbols such as solidarity, sovereignty, and military nationalism function as *floating signifiers*—discursive elements whose

meanings can be molded according to state interests. Wu (2024) argues that states with histories of marginalization employ such symbols to negotiate their position in the global structure. Mooy's (2024) study on symbolism in Indonesia's foreign aid to the Pacific region demonstrates that symbols operate not only as communicative devices but also as instruments of political hegemony.

In addition, recent literature highlights that Global South diplomacy increasingly adapts to global shifts. Margiansyah (2020) introduces the concept of innovation diplomacy, while Hutabarat (2023) demonstrates how Indonesia employs "vegetable oil diplomacy" to enhance its position in global trade. Brazil, through cultural diplomacy and soft power (Rahmahwati & Lestari, 2021; Timofeeva, 2023), has expanded its influence in Latin America and within BRICS. In the sphere of security, Hanafiah et al. (2025) and Manurung (2025) underscore the significance of defense diplomacy as a strategic instrument. Lamsal (2022) and Karadağ (2016) note that military symbols can function as forms of soft power.

Nevertheless, much prior research has not integrated the three dimensions of discourse—CDA, framing, and symbolic hegemony—into a single analytical model capable of explaining how diplomacy and media operate simultaneously in producing global and domestic legitimacy. Few studies have examined how diplomatic speeches generate divergent meanings once mediated through domestic media within the context of double addressing. Thus, an important research gap remains.

This study therefore aims to: (1) analyze discourse strategies of Global South solidarity in Indonesia–Brazil diplomatic speeches; (2) identify how domestic media reconstruct these messages through framing; (3) explain how these dual layers of meaning generate global and domestic legitimacy; and (4) develop a hybrid model of symbolic diplomacy illustrating the relationships between language, symbols, and power. This approach not only uncovers the structural dimensions of Indonesia's diplomatic discourse but also demonstrates how Global South states employ increasingly complex political strategies through symbolic and narrative instruments.

Theoretically, this study contributes to understanding how Global South solidarity is constructed not only through economic or technical cooperation but through symbolic discursive production that intertwines colonial memory, moral claims, and geopolitical aspirations. Empirically, the study advances insights into Indonesia's diplomacy, particularly in its relations with Brazil as a fellow Global South state. This research provides a foundation for foreign policy analysis that is more sensitive to symbolic, narrative, and multimodal dimensions—both in diplomatic speeches and in their mediated representations within domestic contexts.

Method

This study is a qualitative research project that employs Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) as its primary methodological approach to analyze how diplomatic language

shapes political meaning, collective identity, and legitimacy in international relations. CDA is understood not as a single theory, but rather as an analytical tool for examining the relationship between language, power, and ideology in the practice of political communication (Fairclough, 1985; Wodak & Meyer, 2016). Using this approach, the study analyzes President Prabowo Subianto's diplomatic speech regarding Indonesia–Brazil relations in 2025 to construct a narrative on Global South solidarity, strategic cooperation, and Indonesia's position within the dynamics of international geopolitics.

Framing theory is also used to analyze how this diplomatic discourse is reframed by the Indonesian national media, illustrating how the media selects, highlights, and interprets certain aspects of a political event to shape public understanding of the issue (Entman, 1993). In this study, CDA is used to analyze discourse construction at the political elite level, while framing is used to examine how that discourse is reproduced and reinterpreted in the public sphere through media coverage.

In addition to the two approaches mentioned above, the concept of symbolic hegemony developed by Laclau and Mouffe (1985) and Joseph (2002) is also used to explain how political symbols and narratives that appear in diplomatic speeches and media coverage contribute to the establishment of political legitimacy. This concept helps us understand how meaning produced through diplomatic communication can foster ideological consensus and strengthen public acceptance of the state's portrayal of

international relations.

The primary data for this study consists of President Prabowo Subianto's diplomatic speech on Indonesia–Brazil relations in 2025, obtained from official government records and public video recordings, which were then transcribed and quoted verbatim to ensure that the discursive interpretation is based on the text actually delivered by the political actor. The secondary data were drawn from Indonesian national media reports, specifically Kompas, CNN Indonesia, and Republika, which were purposively selected to represent the variety of editorial orientations and audience segments within the Indonesian media landscape. Kompas is known for its moderate and institutional journalism, which prioritizes political stability and public policy. While CNN Indonesia is a global news platform offering multimedia-based breaking news coverage, Republika, as is widely known, is a publication for the Muslim middle class; many of its articles present sociocultural perspectives that are heavily influenced by Islamic values. The researcher believes that the selection of these three media outlets allows for an analysis that focuses on differences in editorial culture, audience orientation, and ideological context as the basis for the framing process regarding diplomatic events. The framing process does not present a neutral reality, but rather a construction influenced by institutional routines, journalistic norms, audience expectations, and, of course, the ideological stance of the media outlet in question (Entman, 1993; Grincheva & Lu, 2016;

Saragih, 2025). The analysis was conducted by identifying sections of the speech that represent constructions of Global South solidarity, analyzing the discursive strategies employed in the speech, and examining how domestic media framed these diplomatic events through issue selection and the highlighting of specific symbols.

Results and Discussion

The discussion focused on President Prabowo Subianto's diplomatic remarks during his visit to Brazil and President Lula da Silva's return visit to Indonesia. Several key points were highlighted.

Representation of Global South Solidarity

Relations between Indonesia and Brazil are constructed through language that emphasizes relational closeness, shared interests, and the promotion of strategic cooperation between the two Global South nations. From a CDA perspective, this construction of solidarity emerges not only through specific terms but also from how political actors position their countries within international relations. One of President Prabowo's statements explicitly demonstrates this relational construction:

"I would like to express to you my strong admiration for your brave leadership, and that is why I feel very close to Brazil, and I would like to increase the real cooperation between Brazil and Indonesia."

The statement "I feel very close to Brazil" indicates a discursive strategy that fosters political closeness between the two countries; from a CDA perspective, this

serves as a subject-positioning strategy—that is, a way for political actors to position Indonesia and Brazil as equal and mutually respectful partners.

This construction of solidarity is further reinforced through statements that emphasize shared interests, as reflected in the following sentence:

"We have so many common interests. We have so many resources that we can really benefit each other." (Prabowo Subianto, 2025)

The phrase "common interest" in President Prabowo's speech functions as a discursive device that fosters a collective identity between Indonesia and Brazil, as illustrated by the narrative that the two countries are interconnected actors in the Global South due to their shared development interests and aligned geopolitical aspirations. This finding is supported by Kowalski's (2017) research on the use of solidarity rhetoric in China's diplomacy with Central and Eastern European countries. In the Indonesian context, solidarity narratives also emerge within the framework of South-South Cooperation (SSC), which emphasizes horizontal development partnerships that are mutually beneficial (Hutabarat, 2023).

Support for this finding can also be found in the international relations literature, which indicates that such constructions of solidarity are often used to build a collective geopolitical identity among developing countries (Milani & Klein, 2020). There are also studies showing that Global South solidarity often functions as a flexible symbolic strategy that depends on specific political contexts (Amanor, 2013). From

the above discussion, it can be concluded that Global South solidarity in Prabowo's diplomatic speech is constructed through a subject-positioning strategy that positions Indonesia and Brazil as two equal nations with shared interests within the international system.

The Fusion of Soft Power and Hard Power as a Hybrid Diplomatic Strategy

The combination of soft power and hard power is evident in the following analysis, where soft power is manifested through the narratives of "cooperation," "joint development," and "technology exchange." Meanwhile, hard power is manifested through "defense cooperation" and "military capacity building," where this combination forms complementary discourse architecture. This is evident from President Prabowo's statement, namely:

"We would like to increase joint military personnel training and technological collaboration on missile and submarine systems." (Prabowo Subianto, 2025)

This statement describes political cooperation within a broader spectrum, namely as a form of technological collaboration and strategic capacity building between these two developing nations. Saaïda (2023) argues that soft power operates through normative appeal and the values of cooperation, which, in the context of Indonesian diplomacy, are embodied in the values of solidarity, partnership, and shared development. Brazil demonstrates the same approach through the principles of horizontal cooperation and non-interference

enshrined in its foreign policy (Campos & Cerqueira, 2015).

Villa and Sundaram (2021) refer to this as “hybrid power performance,” a strategy that combines symbolic legitimacy with the state’s material capabilities. From this perspective, the military is not an instrument of aggression, but rather a symbol of national stability and the state’s capacity to demonstrate its role in international cooperation. Sukhonina and Golovin (2024) reinforce this with their findings regarding military symbolism in the formation of political identity, as well as Parashar’s (2018) analysis of militarization in the politics of the Global South.

Representation of Military Nationalism in National Media Framing

This section focuses on how the national media transforms diplomatic messages into narratives of domestic nationalism, examined through framing analysis (Entman, 1993), which yields three main patterns: first, the media engages in issue selection by highlighting aspects of Indonesia–Brazil defense cooperation, with an emphasis on collaboration in military technology development; second, symbolic amplification occurs, featuring military symbols as part of diplomatic representation; third, military nationalism as a symbol of a modern state’s capacity, which in the Indonesian context is presented as strategic strength and independence.

These findings align with the research by Dada et al. (2022) on military framing in Nigeria, as well as studies by Lamsal (2022)

and Paudel (2022), which show that the media often portrays the military as a symbol of national resilience. In the Indonesian context, military framing also appears as an image of firm leadership and a symbol of state sovereignty, while Global South solidarity is highlighted as a national strength. All of this indicates that the media does not merely function as a conveyor of information but as a producer of political legitimacy within the domestic public sphere.

Double Addressing as a Mechanism of Dual Legitimacy

Another finding in this study is the phenomenon of “double addressing,” a term coined by Huang and Wang (2022) to describe “intermestic communication”—that is, a blend of international and domestic communication—in which distinct focuses are evident for international and domestic audiences. Specifically for the national audience, diplomatic speeches emphasize cooperation, solidarity, and shared responsibility in global governance, built upon a narrative of partnership among Global South nations. Meanwhile, for the domestic audience, the media highlights themes of national strength, sovereignty, and military capacity, where defense cooperation and military symbols are constructed as representations of national power. It is evident that in this context, the media plays a crucial role in tailoring diplomatic messages to the needs of the domestic audience through audience design mechanisms (Hwang et al., 2015; Tippenhauer et al., 2020).

These findings are further supported by the research of Duncombe (2019) and Xu (2024), which explains that modern states are increasingly using diplomatic communication as a strategy that simultaneously targets international and domestic audiences; the findings of Villa and Sundaram (2021) also indicate that cross-audience communication involves various rhetorical strategies such as persuasion, mediation, and the reconstruction of meaning. Thus, diplomacy essentially functions not only as a tool for communication between states but also as a means of producing national identity within the domestic public sphere.

Synthesis and Theoretical Model of Hybrid Symbolic Diplomacy

A synthesis of the overall findings suggests that Indonesia–Brazil diplomacy can be understood as a form of Hybrid Symbolic Diplomacy. This model consists of five interrelated main components.

First, moral language that constructs narratives of solidarity and cooperation within the Global South. Second, military symbols that represent a nation's strategic capabilities and stability. Third, media framing that reconstructs the meaning of diplomacy within narratives of domestic nationalism. Fourth, double addressing that allows diplomatic messages to operate simultaneously on both global and domestic audiences. Fifth, symbolic hegemony emerges when these narratives and symbols are widely accepted in the public sphere.

This model expands upon the analytical frameworks developed by Fairclough

(1985) in Critical Discourse Analysis, Enman (1993) in framing theory, and Joseph (2002) in the study of symbolic hegemony. The main contribution of this research lies in demonstrating that the diplomatic power of Global South countries is constructed not only through formal policies but also through symbolic production that operates across communication spaces.

By integrating discourse analysis, media representation, and ideological symbols, the Hybrid Symbolic Diplomacy model offers an analytical framework for understanding how countries in the Global South negotiate legitimacy within an increasingly multipolar international system.

Conclusion

In conclusion, solidarity within the Global South in Indonesian–Brazilian diplomacy is built on a partnership of equals, emphasizing relational closeness, shared interests, and strategic cooperation, which positions Indonesia and Brazil as actors with shared geopolitical aspirations—a dynamic understood within the CDA framework as a practice of subject-positioning. The combination of soft power and hard power is another key finding of this study, where narratives of development, solidarity, and technological exchange are aligned with symbols of national resilience. Meanwhile, national media framing exhibits a practice of “double addressing”: while the same diplomatic message generates global legitimacy through solidarity narratives, domestic legitimacy is simultaneously achieved through representations of state power.

This study proposes the concept of Hybrid Symbolic Diplomacy as an analytical framework for understanding the diplomatic practices of Global South countries, demonstrating that contemporary diplomacy relies not only on material policies such as trade or military cooperation, but also on symbolic production that shapes political identity, state legitimacy, and public perception through the interplay of the moral language of solidarity, symbols of state power, media framing, cross-audience communication, and symbolic hegemony in the public sphere. Theoretically, this study contributes to the fields of political communication and international relations by emphasizing the importance of discourse analysis in understanding Global South diplomacy as a symbolic practice that shapes meaning, identity, and legitimacy within the international system, rather than merely a process of policy negotiation between states. Empirically, this study enriches our understanding of Indonesia's diplomatic strategies in building partnerships with countries in the Global South, particularly Brazil, by demonstrating how diplomatic language, political symbols, and media representations interact in shaping public perceptions of international relations. Future research is expected to adopt a multimodal discourse approach that encompasses visual symbols, digital communication, and social media diplomacy, or to conduct comparative studies with other Global South countries such as India, South Africa, or Turkey to understand the dynamics of symbolic diplomacy in an increasingly multipolar international system.

References

Books

- Joseph, J. (2002). *Hegemony: A realist analysis*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Laclau, E., & Mouffe, C. (1985). *Hegemony and socialist strategy*. Verso.
- Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2016). *Methods of critical discourse studies* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.

Journal Article (retrieved online, with DOI)

- Amanor, K. (2013). Banks, M. (2019). Symbolic politics and the domestic sources of international action. *International Political Sociology*, 13(4), 404–421. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ips/olz018>
- Campos, I., & Cerqueira, M. (2015). Horizontal cooperation and Brazilian South–South diplomacy. *Revista Brasileira de Política Internacional*, 58(2), 23–40. <https://doi.org/10.1590/0034-7329201500203>
- Dada, S., Ibrahim, M., & Ojo, T. (2022). National resilience and military symbolism in Nigerian newspapers. *Defence & Security Analysis*, 38(4), 433–452. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14751798.2022.2134519>
- Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43(4), 51–58. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1993.tb01304.x>
- Fairclough, N. L. (1985). Critical and descriptive goals in discourse analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 9(6), 739–763. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(85\)90002-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(85)90002-5)
- Fenyi, A., & Sapaty, S. L. (2021). Socio-cognitive structures in political categorization. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 20(6), 849–869. <https://doi.org/10.1075/jlp.20058.fen>

- Gera, S. (2023). "Here, the Hungarian people will decide how to raise our children": Populist rhetoric and social categorization in Viktor Orbán's anti-LGBTQ campaign in Hungary. *New Perspective*, 31 (2), 104 – 129. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2336825X231164311>
- Grincheva, N., & Lu, J. (2016). Cultural diplomacy and BRICS media framing. *Global Media Journal*, 14(27). <https://doi.org/10.24064/GMJ.2016.14.27>
- Hanafiah, A., Raharjo, T., & Santoso, I. (2025). *Strategi diplomasi pertahanan Indonesia dalam menghadapi eskalasi geopolitik*. <https://doi.org/10.54543/syntaximperatif.v6i2.686>
- Huang, J., & Wang, X. (2022). *An intermestic approach to China's public diplomacy: a case study of Beijing's COVID-19 communication in the early stages*. *Journal of Communication Management* 27(1). <https://doi.org/10.1108/JCOM-04-2022-0042>
- Hutabarat, A. (2023). *Vegetable oil diplomacy and Indonesia's global trade positioning*. <https://doi.org/10.20473/jgs.17.1.2023.131-152>
- Hwang, S., Ma, X., & McClish, G. (2015). Audience design in political communication. *Discourse Processes*, 52(5–6), 404–423. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0163853X.2015.1027407>
- Karadağ, A. (2016). Military diplomacy as soft power. *Uluslararası İlişkiler*, 13(52), 23–40. <https://doi.org/10.33458/ui-dergisi.452147>
- Kowalski, B. (2017). *China's foreign policy towards Central and Eastern Europe: The "16+1" format in the South–South cooperation perspective. Cases of the Czech Republic and Hungary*. *Cambridge Journal of Eurasian Studies*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.22261/7R65ZH>
- Kusumadewi, R. (2025). *Hierarchy and subalternity in Southeast Asian South–South politics*. *Global South Review*, 7 (2), <https://doi.org/10.22146/global-south.99811>
- Lamsal, R. (2022). Military diplomacy and the making of national unity in Nepal. *Small Wars & Insurgencies*, 33(6–7), 660–681. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09592318.2022.2067408>
- Manurung, H., Prihantoro, M., Hendarwoto, Y. (2025). Indonesia–Türkiye Defence Cooperation: Opportunities and Challenges in the Indo-Pacific Era. August 2025. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.13712.52483>
- Margiansyah, D. (2020). Innovation diplomacy in Indonesia's digital economy. *Jurnal Hubungan Internasional*, 13(2), 110–125. <https://doi.org/10.18196/hi.13247>
- Milani, C., & Klein, M. (2020). *South–South cooperation and foreign policy: Challenges and dilemmas in the perception of Brazilian diplomats*. *International Relations*, 35 (2), <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047117820920906>
- Mooy, M. (2024). *Symbolism in Indonesia's Pacific foreign aid*. *Global South Review*, 6 (2), 19 – 35. <https://doi.org/10.22146/global-south.94620>
- Ong'ong'a, D. O. (2021). Digital diplomacy and framing of Kenya's foreign policy. *Journal of African Media Studies*, 13(2), 287–303. <https://doi.org/10.1386/jams.00045.1>
- Paudel, B. (2022). Military cooperation and regional peace-building. *Asian Security*, 18(3), 243–260. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14799855.2021.1921821>
- Parashar, S. (2018). The postcoloniality of militarism. *Security Dialogue*, 49(1–2), 43–56. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0967010617746816>
- Prasetya, R. (2024). *Analyzing Political Discourse: Linguistic and Semiotic Perspectives*. *Journal of Political Science and Public Affairs*, 12 (1), 1 – 2. <https://doi.org/10.35248/2332-0761.24.12.044>
- Rahmahwati, E., & Lestari, N. (2021). Brazilian cultural diplomacy and global influence. *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial dan*

- Politik*, 24(3), 289–301. <https://doi.org/10.22146/jsp.56470>
- Rao NV, Tomar P, Kickbusch I, Clark H, Reddy KS, Basu P, et al. (2025). Shifting power dynamics in global health governance: a challenge and an opportunity for Asia and the Global South. *BMJ Global Health*. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjgh-2025-021565>
- Robledo, C. (2015). *New donors, same old practices? South-South Cooperation of Latin American emerging donors*. Bandung : Journal of Global South, 2 (1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40728-014-0008-0>
- Saaida, M., et al. (2023). *The Role of Soft Power in Contemporary Diplomacy*. International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews, 4 (4), 3119-3130. <https://doi.org/10.55248/gengpi.4.423.36302>
- Saliu, H., & Abrashi, A. (2023). *The Return of Media Diplomacy: Examples from Kosovo*. Jurnal Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik Volume 27 (1), 74 – 89. <https://doi.org/10.22146/jsp.73710>
- Strange, A. (2024). Prestige projects and symbolic diplomacy in emerging economies. *Review of International Political Economy*, 31(2), 366–389. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09692290.2023.2253514>
- Sukhonina, K., & Golovin, P. (2024). Military symbolism and patriotic narratives in Russian state media. *Media, War & Conflict*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/17506352241234567>
- Timofeeva, Y.A. (2023). Brazil's cultural diplomacy: origins and modernity. *Latinskaia Amerika*. <https://doi.org/10.31857/s0044748x0023817-7>
- Tippenhauer, M., Jones, R., & Malik, A. (2020). Audience design in digital state communication. *Government Information Quarterly*, 37(4). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2020.101505>
- Villa, R., & Sundaram, J. (2021). Hybrid power performance and Global South legitimacy strategies. *International Affairs*, 97(3), 789–806. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ia/iab020>
- Vivek, R., Nanthagopan, Y., & Piriya-tharshan, S. (2023). *Beyond Methods: Theoretical Underpinnings of Triangulation in Qualitative and Multi-Method Studies*. SEEU Review, 18, 105-122. <https://doi.org/10.2478/seeur-2023-0088>
- Winanti, P., & Alvian, R. (2019). *Indonesia's South–South cooperation: when normative and material interests converged*. International Relations of the Asia-Pacific, 21 (2), 201-232. <https://doi.org/10.1093/irap/lcz021>
- Wu, Z. (2024). Postcolonial identity and Global South activism. *Third World Quarterly*, 45(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/01436597.2023.2269987>

Journal Article (retrieved online, without DOI or page numbers)

- Duncombe, C. (2019). *Representation, recognition, and international diplomacy*.
- Saragih, S. (2025). *Speech Acts and Implicature in Media Framing: A Pragmatic Study of Gus Miftah's 'Goblok' Controversy on Detik.com*. English Teaching and Linguistics Journal (ETLiJ), 6 (2), 34 – 40.