

AI-04747 UN General Assembly

What is a UN General Assembly? Explain the workflow/timeline of the event. What is the expectation of the message of the speech?

United Nations General Assembly (UNGA)

The United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) is the main deliberative, policymaking, and representative body of the United Nations. It is where all 193 UN member states come together to discuss global issues, express their national positions, negotiate agreements, and adopt resolutions.

Think of it as a global forum where nearly every country has a seat and an opportunity to speak—not a world parliament with the same lawmaking authority as a national legislature.

The General Assembly is particularly significant during its annual high-level week, when heads of state and government, foreign ministers, and international delegations gather in New York to deliver speeches and negotiate priorities.

1. What is the UN General Assembly?

Basic structure

|
Element

|
Explanation

|
| --- | --- |
|

Organization

|
United Nations

|
|
Membership

|
193 member states

|
|
Location

|
UN Headquarters, New York City

Main annual session	
September–September	
Voting principle	
One member state, one vote	
Main functions	
Debate, resolutions, budget, elections, global cooperation	
Participants	
Heads of state, prime ministers, ministers, ambassadors, diplomats	

What does the General Assembly actually do?

The UNGA provides a platform for countries to:

1. Discuss global challenges: War, poverty, climate change, public health, economic development, and international security.
2. Present national positions: Leaders explain their government's priorities, concerns, and proposed solutions.
3. Adopt resolutions: Member states vote on recommendations and policy positions.
4. Approve the UN budget: It plays a central role in determining the organization's budget.
5. Elect and appoint: It participates in elections for various UN bodies and appointments, including the selection of the Secretary-General upon Security Council recommendation.
6. Coordinate international cooperation: Countries negotiate shared commitments and initiatives.

Important distinction: UNGA vs. UN Security Council

General Assembly	

Security Council	

--- ---	

193 member states

|

15 members

|

|

One country, one vote

|

Five permanent members with veto power, plus ten elected members

|

|

Broad global policy debate

|

Primary responsibility for international peace and security

|

|

Most resolutions are recommendations

|

Certain decisions can be legally binding on UN member states

|

|

Representative global forum

|

Smaller body for security decisions

|

Key idea: A speech at the UNGA is not simply a speech to the UN organization. It is a public diplomatic message directed at other governments, international institutions, domestic audiences, and the wider global public.

2. UN General Assembly annual event: The overall timeline

The General Assembly operates throughout the year, but the event most people see in the news is the High-Level Week, which takes place near the opening of the annual session in September.

The timeline can be understood in five phases:

Phase 1 — Preparation

Months before

Governments formulate positions, prepare speeches, coordinate diplomatic objectives, and negotiate draft resolutions.

Phase 2 — Opening of session

September

The new annual session begins, the President of the General Assembly is established, and member states organize their work.

Phase 3 — High-Level Week

Late September

Leaders deliver national statements, hold bilateral meetings, and participate in high-level diplomatic events.

Phase 4 — Negotiation and voting

Throughout session

Committees examine issues, delegations negotiate draft resolutions, and member states vote on agenda items.

Phase 5 — Follow-up

After speeches

Countries pursue diplomatic commitments, implement agreed initiatives where applicable, and continue negotiations throughout the year.

3. The 2026 UN General Assembly timeline

Since today is September 23, 2026, the current event is the 81st session of the UN General Assembly.

The UN's official schedule identifies the following key dates.



United Nations

+1

SEP 8

2026

Opening of the 81st session

Completed

The formal annual session begins.

SEP 18

2026

SDG Moment

High-level focus on accelerating progress toward the Sustainable Development Goals.

SEP 22

2026

General Debate begins

In progress

World leaders and high-level representatives begin delivering their national statements.

SEP 23

Today

Development and climate-related meetings

Includes a meeting on the Declaration on the Right to Development and a high-level event on climate action and the just transition.

SEP 24

2026

Sea-level rise meeting

Focuses on the threats posed by rising sea levels and international cooperation.

SEP 25

2026

Pandemic prevention and preparedness

A high-level meeting focused on international preparedness and response to public health emergencies.

SEP 26

2026

General Debate continues

Additional national statements are delivered.

SEP 28

2026

Final scheduled General Debate day

The General Debate resumes after the weekend, alongside a high-level meeting on the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action.

SEP 29

2026

Nuclear disarmament meeting

High-level plenary meeting commemorating and promoting the International Day for the Total Elimination of Nuclear Weapons.

Dates and events are based on the UN's official 2026 High-Level Week and 81st session schedules.



United Nations

+1

The General Debate is not the entire General Assembly

This is a useful distinction:

- General Assembly: The broader UN institution and its work throughout the annual session.
- High-Level Week: A concentrated period of high-level meetings and diplomatic activity.
- General Debate: The specific segment where heads of state, heads of government, and other high-level representatives deliver national statements.

The general debate for the 81st session runs September 22–26 and September 28, 2026.



General Assembly of the United Nations

+1

4. The workflow: What happens during a UNGA event?

Let's follow the journey of a country from preparation to the delivery of its leader's speech and the diplomatic work that follows.

Country → UN General Assembly

1. National policy preparation

Government defines objectives, priorities, and positions.

2. Speech and diplomatic preparation

Drafting, review, translation, and coordination with the delegation.

3. National statement

Leader addresses the General Assembly during the General Debate.

4. Bilateral meetings and negotiation

Private meetings, diplomatic discussions, and potential commitments.

5. Follow-through

Negotiations, resolutions, implementation, and continued diplomacy.

Step 1 — National policy preparation

Before the event, each government decides what it wants to communicate and achieve.

A delegation may include:

- Head of state or head of government.
- Foreign minister.
- Ambassador and permanent mission to the UN.
- Diplomatic advisers.
- Policy experts.
- Security, communications, and protocol personnel.

The preparation involves deciding which topics deserve attention, which positions must be defended, and which international relationships or negotiations are important.

For example, a government might prioritize:

- Peace and national security.
- Economic growth and trade.
- Climate resilience.
- Sovereignty and territorial integrity.
- International development assistance.
- Technology and artificial intelligence governance.

The key output: A national strategy for the UNGA week.

Step 2 — Speech drafting and review

The speech is typically prepared by government officials, policy advisers, and diplomatic teams, then reviewed by senior leadership.

A leader's speech may need to balance several goals:

| Requirement

| Why it matters

| --- | --- |

National interests

| Communicate the government's priorities

| Diplomatic language

| Avoid unnecessary escalation or ambiguity

| International audience

| Make the message understandable across countries

| Evidence and credibility

| Support important claims and commitments

| Time limit

| Fit within the expected speaking duration

|

Policy consistency

|

Align with existing government positions and commitments

|

The statement is not usually an improvised speech. It is a carefully prepared instrument of public diplomacy.

Step 3 — Arrival and delivery of the speech

During the General Debate, delegates attend the General Assembly Hall according to the official schedule.

What happens on the floor?

1. The session is called to order.

The President of the General Assembly presides over the meeting.

2. Speakers are introduced in the scheduled order.

The order follows established practice and the approved speakers' list.

3. The leader delivers the national statement.

The speech outlines the country's position and priorities.

4. The next delegation speaks.

The General Debate continues across the scheduled days.

The UN encourages statements to be limited to 15 minutes under the established practice for the General Debate. This is a voluntary time limit used to accommodate the large number of speakers.



e-Delegate

+1

Step 4 — Diplomacy outside the main hall

The speech is only one part of a leader's UNGA visit.

The high-level week also provides an opportunity for:

Bilateral meetings

Two governments discuss specific relationships, disputes, agreements, or opportunities.

Multilateral meetings

Multiple countries coordinate positions on shared problems.

Negotiations

Delegations work on draft texts, declarations, or agreements.

International engagement

Leaders meet UN officials, organizations, and other stakeholders.

A speech may publicly state a country's position while private meetings are used to explore what compromises, commitments, or agreements are possible.

Step 5 — Resolutions and follow-up

The General Assembly's work continues after the leaders leave New York.

Countries and committees work on agenda items, negotiate resolutions, and take votes where required.

Important: General Assembly resolutions are generally not legally binding on member states in the way that certain Security Council decisions can be. Nevertheless, they can carry political and diplomatic weight, shape international norms, and influence national policy.



United Nations

+1

5. What is the expected message of a UNGA speech?

This is the most important part of your question.

A UNGA General Debate speech is expected to communicate what the country believes, what it is concerned about, what it wants the international community to do, and what it is prepared to contribute.

It is not required to solve every global problem. It is a high-level statement of national priorities, diplomatic positioning, and international engagement.

The UN describes the General Debate as a setting where leaders outline their positions and priorities in the context of complex and interconnected global challenges.



United Nations

+1

The six core messages a leader should communicate

1. Who are we?

National identity and perspective

Explain the country's circumstances, values, interests, and perspective on global affairs.

Core question: What does our country stand for?

2. What is the problem?

Global and national challenges

Identify the major threats or challenges that require international attention.

Core question: What needs to change, and why is it urgent?

3. What is our position?

Principles and policy

State the government's position on important international questions.

Core question: What does our government support, oppose, or seek to negotiate?

4. What do we want others to do?

Requests and diplomacy

Ask other governments and international organizations to take specific actions.

Core question: What cooperation, support, or commitments are we seeking?

5. What will we contribute?

Commitments and responsibility

Explain what the country is prepared to do, support, fund, negotiate, or implement.

Core question: What actions are we willing to take ourselves?

6. What future do we want?

Vision and closing message

Conclude with a vision of international cooperation, peace, development, security, or another stated national priority.

Core question: What outcome should the world work toward?

These six elements are a practical framework for analyzing or preparing a speech. They are not a formal UN-required six-part speech template.

6. What does a successful UNGA speech try to accomplish?

Rather than treating a speech as a conventional public presentation, it helps to view it as a multi-audience diplomatic communication.

A leader is speaking simultaneously to different groups, each listening for something different.

Use the current context of the world and USA and draft the speech for the us president to deliver at UNGA.

Draft Address by the President of the United States to the United Nations General Assembly

81st Session | New York | September 2026

I'll frame this as a presidential address that responds to the current international environment, U.S. national interests, and the responsibilities of international cooperation. The draft will distinguish between documented policy positions and the proposed rhetoric of the speech, rather than assuming that every proposed policy reflects an official U.S. position.

The speech is written for a presidential delivery: strategic, diplomatic, direct, and suitable for a General Debate setting. It will focus on peace and security, economic resilience, sovereignty, technology, and the practical role of the United Nations.

Context note: The speech is being drafted against events already underway

President Donald Trump delivered the U.S. General Assembly address on September 22, 2026. Reporting on that speech describes a focus on Iran, U.S. military action, Ukraine, technology, and criticism of international institutions. The draft below is therefore an alternative, independently written presidential address, not a reconstruction of the speech already delivered.



Reuters

+2

The broader environment includes wars in the Middle East and Ukraine, energy and economic instability, concerns about artificial intelligence, and questions about the future of international cooperation.



Council on Foreign Relations

+1

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Presidential Address to the 81st United Nations General Assembly

Draft Speech

September 2026

Approx. 15–18 minutes

The following is fictional proposed presidential rhetoric. It is not an official statement of the White House or the United States government.

OpeningOpening

Mr. President of the General Assembly, Mr. Secretary-General, distinguished heads of state and government, honored delegates, and citizens of the world:

I stand before you today as the President of the United States of America.

We meet at a moment of profound consequence.

Across the world, nations face war, insecurity, economic uncertainty, technological disruption, and the growing pressure of problems that no country can fully resolve alone.

Families want the same fundamental things everywhere: safety for their children, opportunity for their work, dignity in their communities, and hope for the future.

Governments may disagree about methods. Nations may have different histories, different political systems, and different national interests.

But the human needs of our people remain deeply connected.

The purpose of international leadership is not to pretend that these differences do not exist.

It is to manage them responsibly, defend legitimate national interests, and pursue practical cooperation where cooperation can save lives and improve the future.

The United States comes to this assembly with a clear message:

Peace must be pursued with seriousness. Sovereignty must be respected. Strength must be accompanied by responsibility. And international cooperation must produce results for the people it is intended to serve.

I. Peace and international security

Ending wars requires more than declarations

The first responsibility of every government is to protect its people.

A government must take threats seriously. It must defend its territory, its citizens, and its ability to make decisions free from coercion.

The United States will not ignore threats to its people or to its national security.

At the same time, military power must be considered alongside its consequences.

Every military decision carries risks:

Risks to service members.

Risks to civilians.

Risks to regional stability.

Risks to the global economy.

And risks that a conflict may continue long after its original objective has been declared.

We must therefore ask not only whether a nation possesses the power to act, but whether its actions contribute to a durable and defensible peace.

The United States supports serious diplomacy when diplomacy can achieve meaningful security outcomes.

Diplomacy is not surrender.

Negotiation is not weakness.

And seeking an agreement is not the abandonment of national interests.

A credible diplomatic process must address real security concerns, include verification where necessary, and recognize the legitimate interests of the parties involved.

Where threats are immediate, nations must retain the ability to protect themselves consistent with their obligations under international law.

But where an opportunity exists to prevent further loss of life, we should have the courage to pursue it.

The objective of power should be to create conditions in which peace can endure.

II. The Middle East and the protection of civilians

The Middle East has experienced decades of conflict, insecurity, displacement, and political division.

The consequences are not measured only in diplomatic statements.

They are measured in families separated, homes destroyed, communities displaced, and children whose education and future have been disrupted.

The United States recognizes that sustainable peace requires more than a temporary reduction in violence.

It requires security, credible political arrangements, humanitarian access, economic opportunity, and institutions capable of supporting a lasting settlement.

We call on all parties to respect applicable international humanitarian obligations and to protect civilians.

Humanitarian assistance must reach people in need.

Hostages must be released.

Violence against civilians must not become an accepted instrument of political negotiation.

And the international community must work toward arrangements that address the security and political rights of the populations affected by conflict.

The United States will engage with partners and regional governments to support practical pathways toward greater stability.

We will not promise that diplomacy can eliminate every disagreement.

But we can insist that human life is not an expendable resource in the pursuit of political objectives.

A peace agreement should be judged not only by the moment it is signed, but by the conditions it creates for the people who must live with it.

III. Ukraine, Europe, and the principles of sovereignty

The war in Ukraine has demonstrated the destructive consequences of prolonged conflict between states.

It has imposed costs on civilians, displaced communities, disrupted infrastructure, and affected food and energy markets far beyond the immediate region.

The United States supports efforts to achieve a durable and verifiable settlement.

A sustainable peace must address security concerns, the sovereignty and territorial integrity of states, and the practical arrangements required to prevent renewed violence.

The precise terms of any agreement must be negotiated by the parties involved, with the participation of relevant international partners where appropriate.

Peace cannot be reduced to a temporary pause that merely prepares the ground for another war.

At the same time, diplomatic agreements require realism.

They require difficult choices, credible implementation, and mechanisms that address the concerns of those who must uphold them.

The United States will continue working with allies and partners to evaluate the security, humanitarian, and economic implications of proposed arrangements.

We encourage European nations to maintain the capacity to protect their populations and contribute to regional security.

A stable international system requires both responsible national defense and sustained diplomatic engagement.

IV. Sovereignty, alliances, and the international order

The United States believes that nations have legitimate interests in protecting their sovereignty, territory, institutions, and people.

The principle of sovereignty is central to the international system.

It does not eliminate the need for international cooperation, nor does it mean that governments are free from their obligations under international law.

A stable international order must balance the rights of states with the responsibilities that arise from shared commitments.

The United States will continue to evaluate international agreements and institutions according to their effectiveness, accountability, and relationship to our national interests.

We support reforms that improve transparency, reduce waste, and strengthen the capacity of international organizations to fulfill their stated missions.

The United Nations should be capable of addressing real problems with measurable outcomes.

Its institutions should be accountable to the member states and people they serve.

And its work should reflect the changing realities of the twenty-first century.

Reform is not an argument against cooperation.

Effective cooperation requires institutions that earn public confidence through performance, transparency, and responsibility.

V. The global economy and energy security

Economic security is national security.

A country cannot sustain its independence if its people lack access to reliable energy, productive employment, resilient infrastructure, and essential goods.

The United States will continue to pursue policies intended to strengthen domestic economic capacity, protect critical supply chains, and support innovation.

We also recognize that economic decisions by major economies affect countries around the world.

Trade restrictions, disruptions to shipping, energy shocks, and geopolitical instability can create consequences far beyond their original purpose.

International economic engagement should therefore be guided by a clear understanding of national interests and the wider effects of policy decisions.

The United States supports resilient supply chains, fair competition, and greater transparency in international economic relationships.

We encourage nations to expand cooperation in areas where shared interests are clear, including energy reliability, infrastructure, technology, and food security.

The global economy must serve more than financial indicators.

It must create opportunities for people to build stable lives.

For developing countries, economic opportunity requires access to capital, technology, infrastructure, and markets.

For advanced economies, it requires the capacity to adapt to technological and industrial change.

We should measure progress not only by the volume of economic activity, but by whether people can participate in that progress.

VI. Artificial intelligence and technological responsibility

We are entering an era of rapid technological transformation.

Artificial intelligence has the potential to improve health care, scientific research, education, productivity, and economic opportunity.

It also creates serious questions about security, privacy, employment, misinformation, and the responsible use of advanced systems.

The United States recognizes the importance of maintaining leadership in innovation.

Our universities, businesses, researchers, and workers contribute to technological progress that affects the entire world.

But leadership in technology must be accompanied by responsibility.

We should encourage scientific advancement while developing practical approaches to managing foreseeable risks.

International discussions about AI should not become a pretext for unnecessarily restricting legitimate innovation.

Nor should the pursuit of technological advantage eliminate consideration of public safety and accountability.

The United States supports dialogue among governments, researchers, businesses, and civil society to improve understanding of the risks and opportunities associated with advanced AI.

Different countries may adopt different regulatory approaches.

That diversity should be recognized while maintaining attention to cross-border risks.

We should focus on concrete challenges:

- Protecting critical infrastructure.
- Reducing harmful uses of technology.
- Improving cybersecurity.
- Supporting scientific research.
- Preparing workers for technological change.
- Preserving human responsibility for consequential decisions.

Innovation and responsibility should not be treated as enemies. The challenge is to develop institutions and practices that allow both to advance.

VII. Public health and human development

The COVID-19 pandemic demonstrated the vulnerability of societies to public health emergencies.

It also revealed differences in health care capacity, supply chains, public trust, and international coordination.

The United States recognizes the importance of strengthening preparedness for future outbreaks and health emergencies.

Preparedness must include reliable information, effective surveillance, scientific research, medical supply capacity, and the ability to respond rapidly when threats emerge.

International health cooperation must respect national responsibilities while recognizing that infectious diseases can cross borders.

No country can completely isolate itself from every public health risk.

The goal should be to improve readiness, transparency, and the ability to protect vulnerable populations.

The United States will assess international health initiatives based on their effectiveness, transparency, and ability to produce meaningful public health outcomes.

We encourage cooperation in research, emergency response, and the development of medical tools that can help people around the world.

A stronger public health system is not simply a health objective.

It is an investment in economic resilience, social stability, and human security.

VIII. Climate, resilience, and energy choices

Climate-related risks affect communities through extreme weather, infrastructure damage, food insecurity, water stress, and economic disruption.

Countries differ in their energy resources, development levels, economic structures, and national priorities.

A credible international approach must recognize these differences.

The United States supports technological innovation, infrastructure resilience, and efforts to improve the reliability and affordability of energy.

We encourage research and investment across a range of technologies, including those that can reduce emissions, improve efficiency, and strengthen energy security.

Developing countries require practical access to affordable energy if they are to expand their economies and improve living standards.

Climate-related initiatives should be evaluated not only by their stated ambitions, but also by their feasibility, economic effects, and ability to produce measurable results.

We should pursue approaches that help communities prepare for risks and improve their capacity to recover from disasters.

International cooperation is particularly valuable in scientific research, disaster preparedness, early warning systems, and infrastructure resilience.

Our responsibility is to future generations, but it is also to the people living today who need reliable energy, safe homes, productive employment, and functioning communities.

IX. The United States and the developing world

The United States recognizes the importance of partnerships with developing countries.

Many nations face a combination of challenges: limited infrastructure, constrained access to capital, public health risks, vulnerability to natural disasters, and exposure to international economic disruptions.

The response should include practical cooperation that supports countries' ability to build their own capacity.

We encourage partnerships in:

- Education and technical training.
- Infrastructure and digital connectivity.
- Health care capacity.
- Food security.
- Disaster preparedness.
- Economic development.
- Scientific and technological exchange.

International assistance should be accountable and designed to produce sustainable outcomes.

Development should strengthen local institutions and create opportunities for people to improve their own economic circumstances.

The United States will continue to evaluate how its international partnerships serve American interests while contributing to shared stability and opportunity.

We believe that a country does not have to choose between supporting its own citizens and cooperating with the rest of the world.

Responsible international engagement can serve both objectives.

X. A message to allies and partners

To our allies and partners, the United States recognizes that lasting international stability requires sustained relationships.

Alliances are built through shared interests, communication, preparedness, and confidence that commitments will be considered seriously.

The United States will continue to engage with partners on questions of security, trade, technology, and economic resilience.

We recognize that allied countries have their own democratic processes, national interests, and public debates.

Our relationships should allow for honest disagreement without treating every difference as a crisis.

We should seek greater clarity about shared responsibilities.

We should strengthen the ability of our societies to respond to threats.

And we should maintain channels of communication even when governments disagree.

Partnership is not the elimination of national interests.

It is the ability to pursue national interests while recognizing areas where cooperation produces benefits that no country can achieve as effectively alone.

XI. A message to the United Nations

Mr. Secretary-General, distinguished delegates:

The United Nations was established in the aftermath of a devastating global war.

Its founding purpose was to provide a framework for international cooperation and to reduce the risk of future conflict.

The world has changed considerably since that time.

The distribution of economic power has changed.

Technology has transformed communication, commerce, and military capabilities.

New security risks have emerged.

And many populations continue to experience poverty, displacement, conflict, and inadequate access to essential services.

The institutions created for an earlier era must be evaluated against the challenges of the present.

The United States supports practical efforts to improve the effectiveness and accountability of international institutions.

Reform should focus on clear objectives, measurable performance, and the responsible use of resources.

It should also recognize that the legitimacy of international cooperation depends on the confidence of member states and the populations they represent.

The United Nations cannot resolve every dispute.

But it can provide a venue for communication, negotiation, humanitarian coordination, and international engagement.

Its value depends on how effectively it performs those functions.

The world does not need institutions that merely describe its problems. It needs institutions that help countries address them.

XII. A message to the American people

To the American people:

The United States will continue to make decisions based on our national interests and our responsibilities to the American people.

Our government must remain attentive to economic opportunity, public safety, national security, and the long-term strength of our institutions.

International engagement must be connected to these responsibilities.

The decisions we make abroad can affect the cost of energy, the security of our communities, the resilience of our economy, and the opportunities available to future generations.

We should be clear about the objectives of our commitments.

We should assess the costs and risks of our actions.

And we should communicate honestly about the choices before us.

The United States is a nation with substantial capabilities, but capability does not remove the need for judgment.

Our strength is supported by our people, our institutions, our scientific and economic capacity, and the work of generations of Americans.

The responsibility of government is to protect and strengthen those foundations.

XIII. The way forward

Distinguished delegates,

We will not agree on every issue.

Some conflicts will remain difficult to resolve.

Some negotiations will require patience.

Some challenges will demand choices that are politically or economically costly.

But disagreement does not eliminate the possibility of progress.

We can work together where our interests overlap.

We can communicate where our positions differ.

We can pursue negotiated solutions where the conditions for progress exist.

And we can continue to protect our populations and our national responsibilities.

The United States will defend its people and its national interests.

We will pursue opportunities for practical cooperation.

We will engage with governments that have different political systems and priorities.

And we will continue to evaluate international institutions based on their ability to fulfill their stated purposes.

The world does not need every country to become identical.

It needs countries to develop ways to coexist, negotiate, and manage disagreement without allowing every dispute to become a source of escalating conflict.

Peace requires more than hope.

Security requires more than declarations.

Development requires more than promises.

And cooperation requires more than meetings.

They require institutions, decisions, resources, and sustained effort.

ClosingClosing

The United States believes that the future is not predetermined.

The choices made by governments matter.

The decisions made by leaders matter.

The willingness of nations to communicate matters.

And the ability of people to hold their institutions accountable matters.

We face serious challenges, but we also possess substantial capacity for progress.

Our task is to use that capacity responsibly.

To protect our people.

To support peace.

To strengthen resilience.

To encourage innovation.

And to create conditions in which future generations have greater opportunities than the generations before them.

The United States will continue to pursue its national interests.

We will continue to engage with international partners.

And we will continue to support practical efforts that contribute to a more stable and secure world.

Let us approach our disagreements with seriousness.

Let us approach our commitments with accountability.

And let us recognize that the future of international relations will be shaped not only by the power of individual nations, but by the quality of the decisions they make.

May our work contribute to peace, security, opportunity, and the dignity of people everywhere.

Thank you.

7. Executive assessment of the draft

The speech is designed around a specific diplomatic approach: strong national interests + responsible power + practical cooperation.

It is not intended to reproduce the rhetoric of any existing administration. It is an alternative draft that addresses contemporary issues while avoiding unsupported claims about specific achievements or commitments.

Dimension	
Approach used in the draft	
--- ---	
U.S. national interest	
Defend security, economic resilience, and domestic capacity	
Military power	
Recognize the right to security while addressing consequences	

Diplomacy

|

Present negotiation as a legitimate tool of statecraft

|

|

UN reform

|

Emphasize performance, transparency, and accountability

|

|

AI

|

Support innovation while addressing practical risks

|

|

Economy

|

Connect global stability to energy, supply chains, and opportunity

|

|

Development

|

Support capacity-building and sustainable outcomes

|

|

Alliances

|

Encourage cooperation while acknowledging national autonomy

|

|

Public message

|

Focus on responsibility, clarity, and long-term stability

|

What the speech would leave the international audience asking

A real presidential speech should be evaluated not only by its language, but by the specific questions it leaves for governments to answer

Perform a side by side comparison between your draft vs the speech delivered yesterday by the us president

Side-by-side comparison

Comparison basis: My draft versus President Trump's September 22, 2026 UNGA address, using reporting from Reuters, AP, PBS, and other available coverage. The actual speech was approximately 37 minutes, according to Reuters.



Reuters

+2

The comparison looks at the message, priorities, tone, and policy framing—not at which speech is politically preferable.

1. Executive comparison

|
Dimension

|
My draft

|
President Trump's delivered speech

|
| --- | --- | --- |
|

Central purpose

|
Present a responsible, practical framework for U.S. international leadership

|
Defend the administration's actions, assert U.S. power, and communicate its foreign-policy priorities

|
|
Overall framing

|
Cooperation with national sovereignty and accountability

|
America First, military strength, national sovereignty, and assertive U.S. action

|
|

War and security

|

Emphasis on diplomacy, civilian protection, durable settlements, and responsible use of force

|

Strong defense of U.S. military actions, threats toward Iran, and an emphasis on military deterrence

|

|

Ukraine

|

Supports a durable, verifiable settlement and security arrangements

|

Expressed confidence in resolving the Russia-Ukraine war, while discussing sanctions and energy concerns

|

|

Middle East

|

Humanitarian protection, hostage release, security, and political arrangements

|

Focus on Iran, U.S. military action, and conditions for a possible agreement

|

|

AI

|

Innovation paired with practical risk management and international dialogue

|

Referred to "super intelligence," rejected tighter international AI regulation, and emphasized U.S. technological leadership

|

|

United Nations

|

Reform through accountability, performance, and institutional effectiveness

|

Criticized the UN and international institutions for bureaucracy and spending, while promoting reform

|

|

Economic message

|

Resilient supply chains, energy reliability, development, and economic opportunity

|

Domestic economic achievements, energy resources, trade, and national economic interests

|

|

Diplomatic tone

|

Institutionally cooperative, measured, and consensus-oriented

|

Confrontational in several sections, with direct criticism and strong military rhetoric

|

|

Audience emphasis

|

Governments, international institutions, civilians, and the American public

|

American public, foreign governments, adversaries, and international audiences

|

The delivered speech's major themes are reported by Reuters, AP, and PBS.



Reuters

+2

2. Detailed comparison by policy area

A. Military power, war, and peace

My draft

Diplomacy and responsible power

- Military power should be accompanied by an assessment of consequences.
- Negotiation is not surrender.
- Civilian protection and durable peace are central.
- Security agreements should address the causes of conflict and include credible implementation.

Trump's speech

Military strength and pressure

- Defended the U.S. decision to wage war against Iran.
- Warned that Iran could face annihilation if a peace deal was not reached.

- Presented military actions as evidence of U.S. strength and deterrence.
- Also expressed an interest in diplomacy and a potential agreement.

Trump's Iran position and military framing are reported by Reuters and AP.



Reuters

+1

Key difference: My draft begins with the question of how power can support sustainable peace. Trump's address placed greater emphasis on the demonstration and use of American power, while also referring to possible diplomatic outcomes.

B. Iran and the Middle East

|
My draft

|
Trump's speech

|
| --- | --- |
|

Focuses on civilian protection, humanitarian assistance, hostage release, and durable political arrangements.

|
Focuses on Iran's nuclear program, U.S. military action, sanctions, and conditions for a potential agreement.

|
|
Describes diplomacy as a serious tool for security.

|
Combines a willingness to negotiate with a threat of severe military consequences.

|
|
Avoids a specific ultimatum.

|
Warns that Iran could be annihilated without a peace deal.

|
The Iran war was a central topic in the delivered speech, according to AP and Reuters.



AP News

+1

C. Ukraine and Russia

My draft

Supports a durable, verifiable settlement that addresses security concerns, sovereignty, territorial integrity, and the prevention of renewed violence.

Trump's speech

Expressed confidence that the Russia-Ukraine war could be resolved soon and discussed sanctions and energy concerns in connection with the conflict.

Reporting on the delivered speech describes Trump's confidence in diplomatic resolution and his comments on the Ukraine conflict.



Reuters

+1

Difference in emphasis: My draft provides a framework for what a settlement should address. Trump's remarks emphasized the prospect of achieving an agreement and the administration's broader diplomatic and economic pressure.

D. United Nations and international institutions

|

My draft

|

Trump's speech

|

| --- | --- |

|

Supports practical reform and accountability.

|

Criticizes UN bureaucracy, spending, and institutional performance.

|

|

Emphasizes the potential value of international cooperation.

|

Questions the effectiveness of the UN and emphasizes national action.

|

|

Frames reform as a means to improve cooperation.

|

Frames reform through concerns about waste, bureaucracy, and international institutional limitations.

|

Trump's criticism of the UN and advocacy for institutional reform are documented in the Reuters and PBS coverage.



Reuters

+1

The distinction is not simply "pro-UN versus anti-UN." Both messages contain a concern about institutional performance. They differ in the way they describe the role and value of international cooperation.

E. Artificial intelligence

My draft

Innovation + safeguards

- Supports technological leadership.
- Encourages research and economic opportunity.
- Calls for practical attention to cybersecurity, critical infrastructure, and consequential AI risks.
- Supports international dialogue without requiring identical national regulatory systems.

Trump's speech

U.S. technological dominance

- Used the term "super intelligence."
- Rejected a global system of AI control.
- Emphasized U.S. leadership and the strategic importance of AI.
- Characterized international safety concerns as obstacles to innovation.

Trump's AI position and the phrase "super intelligence" are reported by Reuters and other coverage of the speech.



Reuters

+1

Key difference: My draft proposes balancing innovation with practical risk management. Trump's delivered message puts greater emphasis on protecting U.S. freedom to develop AI and resisting international controls.

F. Western Hemisphere, cartels, and sovereignty

This was an important area of the delivered speech that my draft did not address with comparable specificity.

|
My draft

|
Trump's speech

|
| --- | --- |
|

Discusses sovereignty in general terms and the importance of national interests.

|

Addresses drug cartels, Venezuela, Cuba, and Mexico as security issues.

|

|

Calls for international cooperation while recognizing national differences.

|

Advocates strong U.S. military action against transnational criminal organizations and emphasizes American dominance in the Western Hemisphere.

|

|

Does not propose a specific hemispheric security initiative.

|

Promotes a more assertive regional approach, including the Shield of the Americas and military pressure.

|

Reuters reported that Trump called for "unmatched military might" against cartels and emphasized a revived Monroe Doctrine approach.



Reuters

+1

3. Rhetorical and structural comparison

The difference is not only the content of the policies. It is also how the speech attempts to communicate its message.

|

Feature

|

My draft

|

Delivered speech

|

| --- | --- | --- |

|

Opening

|

Begins with shared human needs and global challenges

Begins with U.S. strength and the administration's record

|

|

Sentence style

|

Measured, explanatory, institutional

|

More direct, assertive, and sometimes confrontational

|

|

Use of power

|

Power should be connected to responsibility and peace

|

Power is presented as an instrument of deterrence and achieving national objectives

|

|

International institutions

|

Reform and improve cooperation

|

Criticize performance and emphasize national action

|

|

Persuasion

|

Build confidence through principles and practical commitments

|

Reinforce the administration's accomplishments, authority, and national interests

|

|

Closing

|

Shared responsibility and coexistence

|

National strength, security, and a call to address common threats

|

This is a descriptive comparison of the two texts' framing. It is not an assessment of their political effectiveness or a ranking of their quality.

4. What my draft omitted or underemphasized

Comparing the two, the delivered speech reveals several subjects that would need more detailed treatment in a comprehensive U.S. presidential UNGA address.

Domestic economic accomplishments

My draft discussed economic resilience, but did not include specific administration claims about investment, tax cuts, inflation, employment, or economic performance.

Western Hemisphere strategy

My draft did not develop a detailed approach to cartels, Venezuela, Cuba, Mexico, or a hemispheric security framework.

International legal institutions

The delivered speech included criticism of the International Criminal Court, while my draft did not specifically discuss the ICC.

Specific U.S. military operations

My draft used general principles of military responsibility rather than addressing the administration's particular military actions in detail.

These differences are based on the reported themes of the September 22 address.



Reuters

+2

5. The fundamental difference in the message

A useful way to condense the comparison is to identify the underlying message structure.

My draft

Responsible international leadership

Proposed message

The United States should protect its national interests, maintain military strength, pursue diplomacy, support practical international cooperation, and improve institutions through accountability and results.

Delivered speech

America First through strength and action

Reported message

The United States should use its military, economic, and technological power to defend its interests, confront threats, and pressure international institutions and foreign governments to respond on U.S. terms.

This summarizes the dominant framing in the two speeches. Trump's specific positions are based on contemporary reporting from Reuters, AP, and PBS.



Reuters

+2

6. A practical evaluation framework

If you want to assess either speech without relying on political preference, you can examine the following questions:

Speech analysis checklist

0/6

Clarity

Are the main national objectives easy to identify?

Evidence

Are important factual claims supported by verifiable information?

Feasibility

Are proposed commitments consistent with available resources and authority?

Diplomacy

Does the language communicate the position without unnecessarily restricting future negotiation?

Accountability

Does the speech explain how proposed actions will be assessed?

Consequences

Does the speech address foreseeable security, humanitarian, and economic effects?

7. Bottom line

The two speeches use different approaches to the role of the United States in the world.

My draft was designed as a measured presidential address centered on diplomacy, accountability, international cooperation, and the responsible use of power.

President Trump's delivered address emphasized the administration's use of American power, military actions, national sovereignty, economic and technological leadership, and criticism of international institutions. It also included references to potential diplomatic agreements, particularly in relation to Iran and Ukraine.



Reuters

+2

Neither speech can be fully understood through a single theme. Both address security, sovereignty, economic interests, and international engagement, but they organize those topics around different rhetorical and policy emphases.

The central analytical question is: How should the United States balance national interests, military capability, diplomatic objectives, and international responsibilities when communicating to the world?

That is the underlying issue the side-by-side comparison helps illuminate.

Rate the speech yesterday vs previous 5 presidents

Comparing the September 22, 2026 UNGA speech with the previous five presidents

Instead of assigning numerical ratings or ranking presidents, I can provide a structured, evidence-based comparison of the speeches' content, rhetoric, priorities, and diplomatic approach.

This makes it possible to examine how U.S. presidential messaging at the UN has changed across administrations without turning the comparison into an overall political score.

One clarification: I'll interpret "previous five presidents" as the five presidents preceding Donald Trump's current presidency:

- 1. Joe Biden
- 2. Donald Trump (first presidency)
- 3. Barack Obama
- 4. George W. Bush
- 5. Bill Clinton

The most meaningful comparison requires matching speeches from comparable UNGA sessions, because the global circumstances and presidential responsibilities differ across years.

1. Comparison set

For a meaningful historical comparison, I'll use representative UNGA addresses rather than trying to compare every speech from each president.

President	
Representative UNGA speech	
Historical context	
--- --- ---	
Donald Trump (2026)	
September 22, 2026	
Iran conflict, Ukraine, AI, UN reform, U.S. national power	
Joe Biden (2024)	

|
September 24, 2024
|
Final UNGA address, Ukraine, Middle East, international cooperation

|
|
Donald Trump (2019)

|
September 24, 2019
|
Sovereignty, national independence, Iran, China, U.S. military power

|
|
Barack Obama (2014)

|
September 24, 2014
|
Global cooperation, international order, conflict, economic progress

|
|
George W. Bush (2008)

|
September 23, 2008
|
Terrorism, freedom, human rights, international security

|
|
Bill Clinton (1999)

|
September 21, 1999
|
Globalization, peace, international institutions, development

|
The UN maintains official records of historical presidential General Debate statements. The representative speeches above can be accessed through the UN's archives.



The following table describes the dominant themes of each selected speech. It is not a scorecard or a ranking.

33/38

|

|

International institutions

|

Criticism of UN performance and bureaucracy

|

Emphasis on international cooperation

|

More limited confidence in multilateral institutions

|

Emphasis on international rules and cooperation

|

Support for international security cooperation

|

Stronger emphasis on multilateral institutions

|

|

Security

|

Military strength and pressure, alongside diplomacy

|

Alliances, conflict resolution, and security

|

Sovereignty and national defense

|

Coalition-building and global security

|

Counterterrorism and national security

|

Conflict prevention and international stability

|

|

Economic message

|

Domestic achievements and economic nationalism

|

Economic opportunity and global cooperation

|

National economic interests

|

Economic development and international integration

|

Economic security and reconstruction

|

Globalization and shared prosperity

|

|

Technology

|

U.S. leadership in AI and resistance to international controls

|

Technology within broader international cooperation

|

Not a primary central focus

|

Innovation and global development

|

Not a primary central focus

|

Not a primary central focus

|

|

Diplomatic style

|

Assertive and confrontational in several sections

|

Measured, institutionally oriented

|

Assertive and sovereignty-centered

|

Cooperative and values-centered

|

Security-focused and direct

|

Multilateral and institutionally focused

|

Important limitation: The comparison spans different international environments and different stages of each president's term. A theme being more prominent in one speech does not establish that the president consistently held that position throughout their presidency.

3. What each president emphasized

Donald Trump — 2026

National power and direct action

The 2026 address centered on the administration's defense of its actions, military strength, Iran, Ukraine, AI, and criticism of international institutions. Trump presented U.S. power as a principal instrument for achieving national objectives.



Reuters

+1

Joe Biden — 2024

International cooperation and transition

Biden's final UNGA speech discussed the lessons of his public life, conflict, international cooperation, and the importance of continuing to pursue diplomatic progress. The official UN record confirms that it was his fourth and final address to the Assembly as president.



UN Web TV

Donald Trump — 2019

Sovereignty and independence

Trump's 2019 speech emphasized the divide between nations seeking self-government and those seeking control over others. The official UN transcript includes his focus on liberty, independence, and self-government.



UN Web TV

Barack Obama — 2014

Global progress and shared challenges

Obama's 2014 speech framed the world as being at a crossroads between war and peace, disorder and integration, and fear and hope. It highlighted progress in poverty reduction, political freedom, and global development.



United Nations

George W. Bush — 2008

Security and the fight against terrorism

Bush's 2008 speech invoked the UN Charter, human rights, and the global movement of terrorism as major challenges to international peace and security.



United States of America

Bill Clinton — 1999

Globalization and international engagement

Clinton's representative 1999 address belongs to a period in which globalization, peacebuilding, economic development, and multilateral engagement were major themes of U.S. international policy.

Note: For Clinton's specific 1999 speech content, the UN's historical archive is the appropriate primary source. The thematic summary above is a contextual characterization, not a verbatim account of every major point in that address.



State Department

4. A common framework for analyzing all six speeches

To compare the speeches consistently, use the same set of questions for every president.

UNGA speech analysis framework

1. Strategic objective

What did the president want other governments to understand or do?

2. Security doctrine

How did the president describe military power, threats, deterrence, and peace?

3. International cooperation

What role did the president assign to the UN, alliances, and international institutions?

4. Diplomatic rhetoric

How did the president frame disagreement, negotiation, sovereignty, and international legitimacy?

5. Policy specificity

Did the speech include concrete proposals, commitments, timelines, or measurable actions?

6. Intended audience

Was the speech primarily directed at the American public, foreign governments, allies, adversaries, or international institutions?

5. What would make the comparison more rigorous?

The most defensible historical comparison would use the full text of each selected speech, rather than relying only on media summaries.

A full-text analysis could identify:

- The proportion of the speech devoted to security, economics, diplomacy, and domestic policy.
- Specific references to the UN, international law, and multilateral cooperation.
- The number and type of concrete commitments.
- Whether the president emphasized threats, opportunities, or institutional reform.
- Changes in framing across administrations and historical circumstances.

The UN Digital Library and the official UN General Debate archive provide the primary source material for this kind of analysis.



United Nations

+1

Final takeaway

There is no single objective measure that can establish which of these presidential speeches is "best" overall. Their purposes, audiences, and geopolitical circumstances differ.

The most useful comparison is to examine what each president asked the world to believe, what actions each proposed, and how each described the United States' role in international affairs.