CHAPTER 4

DATA ANALYSIS

4.1. Data Findings and Analysis

In this section, the analysis focuses on the data source, which is the transcript of Rishi Sunak's speech concerning the Israel–Palestine conflict. The analysis will be carried out in several stages: first, by examining the text as a whole; second, by analyzing it at the word level; and finally, by providing a contextual interpretation based on the findings.

4.1.1 Analyzing Text as a Whole

In terms of Analyzing Text as a Whole, Huckin (1997) already divided it into 5 points of analysis, these are:

1. Genre

The speech is structured with clear persuasive intentions, beginning with emotional appeals, followed by a strong positioning of *"us"* versus *"them,"* and ending with a motivational and unifying conclusion.

In this speech, the purpose is not only to deliver a political stance but also to reinforce national unity and moral clarity. For example, when Sunak says,

> **"We stand with Israel. The United Kingdom stands with Israel against this terrorism today, tomorrow and always,"**

he is not just giving an opinion but inviting the audience to adopt the same moral view. This genre functions to reduce complexity in the situation by making the moral lines appear very clear.

Moreover, the ceremonial tone using expressions of solidarity like

"I wanted to come here tonight to stand with you."

adds an emotional touch to the persuasive purpose. It transforms the political speech into a communal expression of support, especially for the Jewish community in the UK. This emotional and ceremonial layer supports the genre's role in guiding public opinion.

The repetition of the phrase *"stand with you"* and *"stand with Israel"* is typical of persuasive speeches where solidarity is central. These phrases are not only rhetorical devices but are also genre markers that reflect the function of bonding and aligning the speaker with the audience. Sunak uses this genre to speak as a national leader and a protector of shared moral values.

2. Framing

In this speech, Sunak uses a problem-solution framing. First, he introduces the issue as a tragic terrorist attack,

"To stand with you in this hour of grief as we mourn the victims of an utterly abhorrent act of terror."

Framing it as an *"utterly abhorrent act of terror."* This immediately sets a strong emotional tone and shows the audience that the speech is about a moral and national crisis.

The way the speech is structured also reflects the classic framing of moral urgency. In the beginning, the speaker expresses emotional solidarity, saying, *"To stand with you in this hour of grief..."* This line shows that the speech is not only informative but is also meant to provide comfort and reassurance. Then, in the body of the speech, the framing shifts to strong moral judgment. He uses specific examples like,

"Teenagers at a festival of peace, gunned down in cold blood,"

Which are emotionally impactful and frame the situation as beyond debate.

The middle of the speech clearly identifies who is to blame. Sunak states,

> **"The people who support Hamas are fully responsible for this appalling attack."**

This line is crucial because it frames the conflict as one-sided and paints Hamas as the only wrongdoer, using emotionally charged words like *"terrorists," "barbaric,"* and *"evil."* There is no attempt to explain the broader political context.

Finally, the framing ends with a motivational appeal. Sunak states,

> **"But when we say that we stand with Israel, we mean it. Not just today, not just tomorrow, but always."**

This ending frames the future as one that demands continued support and action. The framing used by the speaker makes it easier for the audience to emotionally follow and support the message.

3. Presupposition

Presupposition refers to assumptions that are treated as already known or accepted by the audience. In the line,

> **"The people who support Hamas are fully responsible for this appalling attack,"**

There is a presupposition that there is no doubt about who caused the violence. Another example is the statement,

"I know that at moments like this, when the Jewish people are under attack in their homeland, Jewish people everywhere can feel less safe."

Here, the speaker presupposes that Israel is the unquestioned homeland of all Jewish people. This may be accepted by many, but for some, especially those aware of the Palestinian claims, it is a contested idea. However, Sunak treats it as a given truth.

The sentence,

"There are not two sides to these events,"

also carries a strong presupposition. It assumes that any attempt to present a different perspective is invalid or morally wrong. This discourages critical thinking and encourages the audience to accept a single narrative.

By embedding such presuppositions, the speaker simplifies a complex conflict and guides the audience to support his view without offering alternative explanations. This contributes to his strong and confident tone throughout the speech.

4. Foregrounding

In this speech, Sunak foregrounds emotional unity, extreme violence, and moral duty. The phrase,

"I wanted to come here tonight to stand with you,"

is repeated, showing that emotional closeness and support are the key themes being emphasized.

Another strong example of foregrounding is the use of violent imagery:

"Innocent men, women and children abducted, raped, slaughtered."

These words are not neutral. They are intentionally vivid and painful, meant to catch the reader's or listener's attention. Sunak does not present numbers or military facts but chooses to foreground human suffering to strengthen emotional appeal.

Israel's identity is also foregrounded through positive imagery. Sunak describes it as

> **"This extraordinary land, this democracy, the only one in the Middle East where you can vote, where you can be gay, this technological superpower which delivers breakthroughs in science and medicine that are a gift to the world, this promised homeland of the Jewish people."**

These are not just compliments they are rhetorical strategies to highlight Israel's value to the world and, by contrast, imply the moral failure of the opposing side.

What is backgrounded in the speech is the suffering or viewpoint of Palestinians. There is no mention of casualties or suffering on the other side. This deliberate choice shows how foregrounding and backgrounding work together to build the speaker's desired narrative.

5. Discursive Difference

Discursive difference, as explained by Huckin, involves contrasting conflicting discourses within the text. In this speech, Sunak creates a strong binary. He says,

> **"They are not militants. They are not freedom fighters. They are terrorists."**

This triple repetition strengthens the boundary between good and bad, friend and enemy.

Israel is framed as the civilized, peaceful, and democratic side. Sunak praises it

> **"This extraordinary land, this democracy, the only one in the Middle East where you can vote, where you can be gay, this technological superpower which**

delivers breakthroughs in science and medicine that are a gift to the world, this promised homeland of the Jewish people."

By calling it *"extraordinary," "a technological superpower,"* and *"a promised homeland."* These descriptions make Israel look morally superior. In contrast, Hamas is described as evil and violent, with words like *"barbaric"* and *"heinous."* This contrast makes the listener feel there is no middle ground.

There is also a discursive difference in terms of values. The speech suggests that the values of the West (freedom, democracy, science, equality) are represented by Israel, while the other side is seen as against those values. The Palestinian civilians or their political context are not even mentioned. This silence helps to erase alternative views and reinforces a one-sided narrative.

This use of discursive difference strengthens the speaker's ideological position and makes it difficult for the audience to question or challenge his message. By reducing the conflict to a simple moral binary, the speech becomes more emotionally persuasive but less analytically balanced.

4.1.2. Analyzing Text from Word-level Analysis

1. Topicalization

In Sunak's speech, one of the most frequently topicalized elements is solidarity and empathy with the Jewish community and the state of Israel. For instance, the repeated phrase,

"I wanted to come here tonight to stand with you"

is foregrounded in the opening paragraph and repeated throughout, emphasizing emotional connection and moral support. This framing indicates that the emotional presence and unity are at the center of the speech's intention.

Additionally, political stance is another central theme highlighted through topicalization. The declarative line,

"The people who support Hamas are fully responsible for this appalling attack"

Places blame and moral judgment at the forefront, suggesting the speaker's desire to frame the narrative with moral clarity. By prioritizing this evaluation, Sunak shifts attention from broader geopolitical complexities to a singular interpretation rooted in justice and blame.

The emphasis on shared grief, national identity, and unity against terrorism, repeatedly placed at the beginning of statements, also reveals that Sunak aims to build both emotional appeal and national consensus. Through topicalization, the speech becomes not only an expression of support but also a call for collective agreement and ideological alignment.

2. Agency

In Sunak's speech, the agency is mainly attributed to Hamas and its supporters, who are positioned as active perpetrators of violence. The sentence,

"They are not militants. They are not freedom fighters. They are terrorists"

Identifies them clearly as the ones committing evil, reinforcing their role as aggressors in the narrative.

Conversely, the speaker positions himself and the UK government as defenders. Lines like,

"My first duty is to protect you"

"I will stop at nothing to keep you safe"

Present the Then Prime Minister as an agent of security and care. This self-representation not only builds trust but strengthens the speaker's political legitimacy.

However, agency is selectively applied. While Hamas is directly blamed, the speech omits agency for actions carried out by the Israeli military, especially regarding civilian casualties in Gaza. This selective use of agency aligns with the speaker's ideological stance, foregrounding enemies while backgrounding allies.

3. Deletion/Omission

Deletion or omission involves what is left unsaid or backgrounded in the text (Huckin, 1997). In Sunak's speech, notable omissions relate to the Palestinian perspective, especially the humanitarian crisis in Gaza. While the violence against Israeli civilians is explicitly described in vivid detail, such as,

"Teenagers at a festival of peace, gunned down in cold blood,"

There is no mention of Palestinian casualties or suffering.

This strategic omission simplifies the conflict into a one-sided narrative. It excludes any acknowledgment of the Israeli military's role in escalating the violence, avoiding potential criticism or controversy. The effect of this omission is to create a moral binary: one side is humanized and victimized, while the other is demonized and excluded from empathy.

By omitting alternative views or complexities of the conflict, the speaker constructs a controlled narrative that seeks to unify the audience under a single moral interpretation. This omission serves to protect the speaker's political stance from scrutiny and maintain ideological clarity.

4. Insinuation

One strong example of insinuation appears in the phrase

"We've already seen vile words on our streets and attempts to stir up community tensions."

This sentence implies that certain groups within Britain are expressing support for Hamas or spreading antisemitism, without naming who they are.

Such vague but suggestive language allows the speaker to raise concerns and call for vigilance without risking direct accusations. It reinforces the narrative that external threats are not only abroad but also present within the nation, subtly promoting policies of surveillance or crackdown.

Another example can be found in

"This democracy, the only one in the Middle East where you can vote, where you can be gay..."

This indirectly criticizes other Middle Eastern countries by praising Israel's liberal values, insinuating that others lack freedom and human rights. The technique strengthens Israel's image while undermining others without overt confrontation.

5. Connotation

Throughout the speech, Sunak uses strong connotative language to intensify emotional reactions and align the audience with his moral position. Phrases such as *"barbaric acts"* and *"acts of evil"* invoke deep moral revulsion and religious undertones, reinforcing the sense of absolute right and wrong.

Descriptive terms such as

"sickening evidence posted online"

"gunned down in cold blood"

They're deliberately chosen to evoke shock, horror, and sadness. These words paint the events as not just tragic but morally outrageous, urging the audience to feel urgency and take sides.

At the same time, Israel is described with connotatively positive language such as *"this extraordinary land," "a technological superpower,"* and "a gift to the world." These phrases help construct a heroic and admirable image of Israel, further widening the emotional gap between *"us"* and *"them."*

6. Register

Sunak's speech blends formal political rhetoric with intimate emotional language, reflecting his dual role as both Then Prime Minister and moral supporter. Formal phrases like

"My first duty is to protect you"

carry institutional authority, while personal lines such as

"I wanted to come here tonight to stand with you"

Add warmth and emotional closeness.

This dual register is used strategically to appeal to both national duty and communal solidarity. The high-formality sections deliver policy positions and condemnations, while the low-formality sections build empathy and emotional resonance with the Jewish community. This mixture allows Sunak to maintain both his political stance and personal appeal.

Additionally, the repetition of ,

"Not just today, not just tomorrow, but always"

adopts a ceremonial and poetic tone, giving the speech an almost liturgical character. This elevates the message into a timeless vow, enhancing its emotional impact and moral weight.

7. Modality

Sunak's speech features high modality throughout, especially in his commitments to action and judgment. Statements like

"I will stop at nothing to keep you safe"

Demonstrate strong obligation and resolve, reinforcing his role as a protector.

Similarly, the assertion

"There is no question of balance"

Eliminates any room for doubt or debate. This high-certainty modality is used to control the interpretation of events, making Sunak's stance seem not only correct but unquestionable.

Modality is also used to forecast future commitment, as in

"We stand with Israel… today, tomorrow and always."

This phrase signals not just current alignment but an enduring promise, further solidifying the speaker's position as unwavering and loyal.

4.2. Discussion

In this section, the findings will be discussed further by adding the theory from several experts according to the theory of CDA. The discussion will be carried out in several stages: first, by examining the text as a whole; second, by analyzing it at the word level; and finally, by providing a contextual interpretation based on the findings.

4.2.1. Analyzing Text as a Whole

1. Genre

In analyzing the genre of Rishi Sunak's speech, this research uses Huckin's (1997) theory in CDA. According to Huckin (1997), genre is not only about the structure or form of a text, but also about how language is used for social and ideological purposes. This means that genre is connected to the context where the speech is delivered and to the goals the speaker wants to achieve. In this speech, Sunak speaks during an international conflict between Israel and Hamas, and his words are not just to give information. He also wants to influence people's opinions, show moral values, and strengthen political relationships. The genre of the speech helps the speaker show his power and send his ideological message to the audience. As Then Prime Minister, Sunak uses his authority to make his support for Israel seem more serious and trustworthy.

This idea is also supported by Santoso and Aji (2021), who analyzed Joko Widodo's speech using the same theory by Huckin (1997). They also found that the speech genre is persuasive, especially when talking about national issues like development. The same thing is seen in Sunak's speech, where he uses persuasive language to show support for Israel. Both speeches use the genre to show ideological messages and to express the power of the speaker.

The speech also follows a structure that can be explained using Monroe's (1969) Motivated Sequence. Monroe explained that a persuasive speech usually has five parts: attention, need, satisfaction, visualization, and action. All of these can be found in Sunak's speech. The first part is attention. For example, when Sunak says, *"I wanted to come here tonight to stand with you,"* he tries to build emotional closeness with the Jewish community. He uses this sentence to show empathy and get the audience's attention.

Next, in the need step, Sunak talks about the problem. He says, *"The people who support Hamas are fully responsible for this appalling attack."* This sentence is very direct and strong. It makes the audience feel that the situation is urgent. Sunak also gives examples of violence like, *"Teenagers gunned down in cold blood,"* and *"Even a Holocaust survivor taken away as a captive."* These strong images are used to make people feel anger and sadness. According to Huckin (1997), emotional language like this helps the speaker control how the audience feels and thinks.

In the satisfaction part, Sunak gives some solutions. He says, *"We will not tolerate this hate. We will not tolerate this anti-Semitism. And I promise you, I will stop at nothing to keep you safe."* These words make the audience feel protected. Sunak uses strong words to show that the government will take action. The language here builds trust in the speaker's power.

In the visualization step, Sunak describes Israel in a very positive way. He says, *"This democracy, the only one in the Middle East where you can vote, where you can be gay… a technological superpower."* These words create a good image of Israel. They make the audience believe that Israel is a strong, modern, and fair country. According to Huckin (1997), this is a way of showing ideology through language. By saying this, Sunak builds support for Israel and shows that the UK shares the same values.

In the action part, Sunak calls for long-term support. He says, *"Not just today, not just tomorrow, but always."* This sentence is repeated and sounds emotional. It encourages people to stay loyal and committed. According to Johnston (1989), repetition like this helps the audience remember the message and makes it more powerful.

The language used in the speech also shows persuasive features. First, there is emotive language, such as *"utterly abhorrent act of terror"* and "*heinous acts, redolent of the worst of humanity."* These words are used to make the audience feel shock and sadness. Second,

repetition is used to create emphasis and rhythm. For example: *"to stand with you... we stand with Israel... not just today, not just tomorrow, but always."* This kind of language builds a strong emotional connection.

Sunak also uses personal pronouns like *"I," "we,"* and *"you"* to create closeness. These pronouns help him connect with the audience and show that he is part of their struggle. Johnston (1989) says that using personal pronouns helps the speaker build trust and reduce the distance between the leader and the people.

Another important feature is high modality. Words like *"we will not tolerate," "I promise,"* and *"I will stop at nothing"* show strong certainty and commitment. These kinds of words make the speaker sound confident and powerful. Huckin (1997) explains that such language is used to show authority and remove doubt, helping the speaker sound like a responsible and strong leader.

Compared with previous studies, we can also see how language builds ideology. In Javaid et al. (2022), Imran Khan used persuasive speech to talk about the differences between the West and Muslims. Although the topic is different, the method is the same. Both leaders use the persuasive genre to build a strong position, show their values, and gain support from the audience. In Khan's case, he talks about religious identity. In Sunak's case, he talks about alliance and moral duty.

The genre of Sunak's speech is persuasive and also full of ideological messages. It follows a clear structure using Monroe's theory and uses persuasive techniques explained by Johnston (1989). The speech is not just about giving information, it is about using language to show power, build unity, and support a political message. Based on Huckin's (1997) theory, this shows how the genre of a speech can help control meaning and influence people's thinking in a political context.

2. Framing

Framing in Rishi Sunak's speech plays a very important role in shaping how the audience understands the conflict between Israel and Hamas. Based on Huckin (1997), framing is not just about organizing information, but also about how the speaker uses language to lead the audience toward a certain way of thinking. The way Sunak builds his message is not neutral. It is carefully made to support one political and ideological position. The words and phrases that he uses reflect values, power, and judgment. As Santoso and Aji (2021) also found in their study on Joko Widodo's speech, framing is used not only to deliver facts but also to support a political idea by using emotional language and focusing on certain topics.

To help understand the framing in detail, this research uses Entman's (1993) framing theory. Entman (1993) explains that framing can be divided into six important parts: problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, treatment recommendation, salience, and frame location. These parts help show how language is used not only to explain an event, but to control how people feel and think about it. Each part shows how the speaker wants to shape public understanding.

The first part is how the speaker defines the problem. Sunak says, *"To stand with you in this hour of grief as we mourn the victims of an utterly abhorrent act of terror."* In this sentence, words like *"grief," "victims,"* and *"abhorrent act of terror"* are very emotional and negative. By choosing to call the incident an *"act of terror,"* Sunak creates an image of clear evil, not a complex political conflict. This makes the situation easier to understand as good versus bad, removing the chance for a deeper view. In the same way, Javaid et al. (2022) found that Imran Khan's speech also used emotional framing to define Muslims as victims of Western

discrimination. Both speakers used framing to influence how people see the situation and to support a political belief.

Next, the speech gives a strong causal interpretation. Sunak directly says, *"The people who support Hamas are fully responsible for this appalling attack. They are not militants. They are not freedom fighters. They are terrorists."* The repetition in this line is a way to remove doubt. Sunak does not allow any other explanation. According to Huckin (1997), when a speaker gives agency like this, they are controlling the narrative by pointing blame clearly. This makes the audience focus only on one cause and not think about the history or deeper issues behind the conflict.

Then, Sunak gives a moral evaluation. He uses strong words like *"barbaric"* and *"evil"* to describe the acts of Hamas. When he says, *"Their barbaric acts are acts of evil,"* he is not just telling the audience what happened, he is telling them how to feel. These words make the audience feel angry and shocked. Huckin (1997) explains that moral evaluations in speeches help create a clear emotional side. It shows who is right and who is wrong. This kind of language helps the speaker gain moral support from the public and positions his political actions as morally correct.

After that, the speaker gives a treatment recommendation. Sunak says, *"We stand with Israel. The United Kingdom stands with Israel against this terrorism today, tomorrow and always."* He also says, *"My first duty is to protect you… I will stop at nothing to keep you safe."* These lines are not just suggestions—they are promises. The use of words like *"always"* and *"stop at nothing"* makes his message sound strong and committed. Huckin (1997) believes that this kind of language is used to show power and leadership. The speaker wants to be seen as someone who can act and protect his people, which makes the audience feel secure and trust him more.

Salience is also used in the speech. This means the speaker decides what is important to talk about and what is not. Sunak gives detailed examples of Israeli victims, like, *"Teenagers at a festival of peace, gunned down in cold blood,"* and *"Even a Holocaust survivor taken away as a captive."* These images are sad and powerful, making the audience feel sympathy. But, at the same time, there is no mention of Palestinian suffering. Huckin (1997) says that leaving out some information is also part of framing. What the speaker does not say is as important as what he says. In this case, Palestinian voices are silenced, and only one side is made to look like the victim.

Another key part is frame location. This is about where the speaker places the issue in a bigger context. Sunak says, *"This extraordinary land, this democracy, the only one in the Middle East where you can vote, where you can be gay…"* This is not only a description of Israel, it is a way of showing that Israel shares Western values like freedom and democracy. According to Huckin (1997), this is how ideology enters a text. The speaker creates an image that Israel is *"like us,"* while Hamas and Palestinians are not. This helps the audience feel emotionally closer to Israel and believe that supporting Israel is the right thing to do.

All of these framing elements, problem definition, cause, judgment, solution, focus, and context, work together to deliver one strong message: the UK must fully support Israel. The speech does not give space for other views. Huckin (1997) explains that this kind of framing simplifies a difficult situation into a clear story of *"us versus them,"* and *"good versus evil."* Through strong language and selective information, the speaker controls how the audience sees the situation and guides them to support his political goals.

The way Sunak frames his speech is very powerful and strategic. It uses emotional language, strong moral words, repeated ideas, and selective silence to build one clear story. This framing is not just a way of telling a story, it is a way of using language to hold power and push an ideology. As Huckin (1997) explains, framing in political speech is always about

more than communication, it is about building a reality that benefits the speaker's position. Through framing, Sunak not only explains the conflict but also shapes how people should think, feel, and react toward it.

3. Presupposition

In Rishi Sunak's speech, presupposition plays an important role in showing his authority and building his ideological message. According to Huckin (1997), presupposition is a language strategy where the speaker presents some ideas as if they are already true or accepted by everyone. These ideas are not explained in detail or questioned. Instead, they are given as background knowledge. This way, the speaker uses language to control what the audience believes without needing to argue directly. Yule (1996) explains that there are several types of presupposition: existential, factive, lexical, structural, non-factive, and counterfactual. Each of these types can be found in the speech and shows how language is used to build power and support a specific political point of view.

One clear example is the **existential presupposition**, which means assuming something exists. Sunak says, *"To stand with you in this hour of grief as we mourn the victims of an utterly abhorrent act of terror."* This sentence assumes that the victims exist and that the whole audience agrees they are mourning together. It doesn't give the audience a chance to think differently. This kind of sentence creates emotional unity between the speaker and the audience. According to Huckin (1997), this helps the speaker build support through shared emotion. A similar finding can be seen in the study by Santoso and Aji (2021), where Joko Widodo also used presupposition to make development goals seem obvious and good for everyone. However, in Sunak's case, the presupposition supports a message of grief and urgency, not development.

Another existential presupposition appears in the line *"Teenagers at a festival of peace, gunned down in cold blood."* Here, it is assumed that the event happened exactly this way. The speaker does not give details or background. Instead, he shows a clear picture of innocent victims. This kind of sentence uses strong emotional language to make the audience feel sad and angry. According to Huckin (1997), these emotional reactions make it easier for the speaker to push his political position.

The speech also uses **factive presupposition**, which is when something is assumed to be true because of the verb or sentence structure. For example, Sunak says *"The people who support Hamas are fully responsible for this appalling attack."* The word *"are"* makes the blame sound like a fact. There is no explanation or evidence. The sentence presents the guilt as already decided. Huckin (1997) says this kind of sentence hides ideology behind what looks like a simple statement. But actually, it pushes the speaker's opinion as if it is the only truth.

Another factive presupposition is found in, *"We've already seen vile words on our streets and attempts to stir up community tensions."* This sentence assumes that such events have already happened. It creates a feeling of fear and urgency in the audience. It also builds the speaker's image as someone who needs to protect the people. These assumptions are powerful because they help the speaker push for more control and justify his actions.

The speech also shows **structural presupposition**, which is when the sentence structure itself makes some ideas sound normal. Sunak says, *"There are not two sides to these events. There is no question of balance."* This structure already tells the audience that any other view is wrong. There is no place for another opinion. According to Huckin (1997), this is one way that language is used to create power. It blocks other ideas and only allows one version of the story, the speaker's version.

Counterfactual presupposition also appears in the line, *"They are not militants. They are not freedom fighters. They are terrorists."* Here, Sunak talks about how others might describe Hamas, but quickly rejects those views. This sentence shows that the speaker knows there are other perspectives, but he refuses to accept them. Huckin (1997) says this is a way to silence other voices while still sounding fair. Javaid et al. (2022) also found this strategy in Imran Khan's speech, where he used presuppositions to show the West as responsible for Islamophobia. In both cases, the speaker uses language to control how the audience understands the issue.

Lexical presupposition is another strategy used in this speech. It happens when a word already includes an assumption. For example, when Sunak says, *"My first duty is to protect you,"* the word *"protect"* presupposes that there is a danger. He does not need to explain what the danger is. The audience is expected to feel fear and trust the speaker to keep them safe. Another example is when he says, *"We will not tolerate this hate. We will not tolerate this anti-Semitism."* The word *"tolerate"* assumes that hate and anti-Semitism already exist. This makes the audience agree that action is needed, even if there is no clear proof in the speech.

These presuppositions are not just ways to share information. They are ways to guide how people think. Huckin (1997) explains that language can create a version of reality that supports the speaker's goals. In this speech, Sunak uses presuppositions to make his ideas sound like common sense. He makes his audience feel that they must agree with him. The speech builds a world where the UK is morally right, Israel is a victim, and Hamas is the only one to blame. There is no space for another story.

Presupposition in Sunak's speech is used to make the audience accept certain beliefs without question. Using Huckin's (1997) and Yule's (1996) frameworks, we can see how language is used to create authority, support ideology, and block other ideas. The speech does

not just inform, it shapes how people understand the conflict and who they support. Through presupposition, the speaker uses language to hold power and build an ideological message.

4. Foregrounding

In CDA, foregrounding means making certain ideas or words stand out in a speech to help the audience focus on what the speaker thinks is most important. According to Huckin (1997), foregrounding is a language strategy used to highlight some information while hiding or minimizing others. This is not a random act, it is done on purpose to show certain beliefs or ideologies. Foregrounding can help the speaker control the way people understand a situation. In Rishi Sunak's speech, foregrounding is used to show support for Israel, build sympathy for the Jewish community, and present the United Kingdom as a strong moral ally.

One strong example of foregrounding in the speech is the repeated sentence, ***"I wanted to come here tonight to stand with you."*** This sentence is used many times with small changes, like *"stand with you in grief"* or *"stand with you in prayer."* The speaker repeats this idea to make the audience feel emotionally connected. Huckin (1997) explains that repetition can help make certain ideas feel natural and accepted. In this speech, the idea being repeated is that the UK supports Israel completely. The speaker wants to create the feeling that this support is not just political, but also emotional and moral. This is similar to the findings of Santoso and Aji (2021), who studied Joko Widodo's speech and found that foregrounding was used to highlight national progress. But while Widodo's speech focused on unity and development, Sunak's speech focuses on shared pain and strong loyalty.

Sunak also uses very emotional and detailed words to talk about the victims of the Hamas attack. For example, he says, ***"Teenagers at a festival of peace, gunned down in cold blood,"*** and ***"Innocent men, women and children abducted, raped, slaughtered."*** These descriptions are not simple facts. They use strong emotional language to make the audience feel anger and

sadness. Huckin (1997) calls this type of word choice "lexical foregrounding," which is used to bring attention to certain emotional or moral ideas. In this case, the speaker is showing only one side of the conflict, the pain of the Israeli victims, while saying nothing about the suffering of Palestinians. This shows that the speech is not just telling a story, but choosing which story to tell.

Another part of the speech uses foregrounding to show a clear moral judgment. Sunak says, ***"They are not militants. They are not freedom fighters. They are terrorists."*** This sentence is very strong and clear. By repeating what the attackers are *not*, the speaker makes the word *"terrorist"* feel like the only right label. Huckin (1997) says that choosing labels like this can control how people think about a group. By using the word *"terrorists,"* the speaker blocks any other ideas, like thinking about political reasons behind the conflict. This helps to build a simple "good versus bad" story.

We can also see this kind of strategy in the speech of Imran Khan at the United Nations, as analyzed by Javaid et al. (2022). In that speech, Khan used foregrounding to show how Muslims are often treated unfairly by the West. He used emotional language to talk about how Muslims are called things like *"vermin"* in the media. Just like Sunak, Khan focused on one group's pain to build a strong message. But while Khan's speech was challenging Western ideas, Sunak's speech supports them by showing Israel as a victim and Hamas as the enemy.

Sunak also uses foregrounding to show that he is a strong and responsible leader. He says, ***"My first duty is to protect you. We will not tolerate this hate. We will not tolerate this anti-Semitism. And I promise you, I will stop at nothing to keep you safe."*** These sentences make the speaker look like a protector. Huckin (1997) calls this kind of language institutional positioning. It helps the speaker show that he has power and that people can trust him. The words *"will"* and *"stop at nothing"* make the promises sound very serious. This kind of language helps the audience feel safe and makes them more likely to support the speaker.

Another example of ideological foregrounding can be found when Sunak talks about Israel as a country that shares Western values. He says, ***"This democracy, the only one in the Middle East where you can vote, where you can be gay."*** This sentence shows Israel in a very positive way. It makes the audience think of Israel as a modern, fair, and free country. Huckin (1997) explains that speakers often use shared cultural ideas to help the audience agree with them more easily. This sentence also suggests that the countries against Israel do not support these values, creating a clear division between *"us"* and *"them."*

Sunak also repeats time-based phrases, like ***"Not just today. Not just tomorrow, but always."*** These words are meant to show that the UK's support for Israel is not temporary. It is something that will last forever. Huckin (1997) calls this temporal foregrounding, which means using time-related words to make an idea feel like a permanent truth. This kind of language makes the speaker's message feel even stronger and harder to argue with.

Another example of foregrounding is when Sunak says, ***"Together we hold fast to that hope of 2,000 years."*** This sentence connects the present situation with a long history of Jewish struggle. It makes the audience feel like this moment is part of something very big and important. Huckin (1997) says that using historical references can help justify current political choices. By linking today's actions to history, the speaker gives more power and meaning to his words.

Foregrounding in this speech is not just about which words are used. It is about using language to guide emotions, control opinions, and show power. Through emotional repetition, selective storytelling, strong moral labels, and promises of protection, the speaker creates a clear picture where the UK and Israel are good, and their enemies are bad.

5. Discursive Difference

In this speech, one of the most important language strategies used is discursive difference. According to Huckin (1997), discursive difference is when a speaker creates strong distinctions between two sides in a conflict. This is usually done by highlighting one group as good and moral, while the other group is shown as bad or dangerous. In this speech, Rishi Sunak builds a strong contrast between Israel and the UK as the victims and moral actors, and Hamas as the enemy who is violent and evil. This kind of language is used not only to tell a story, but to give power to one group and take away the voice of the other.

One of the strongest examples of discursive difference is in the sentence *"They are not militants. They are not freedom fighters. They are terrorists. Their barbaric acts are acts of evil."* This line repeats negative terms like *"barbaric"* and *"evil"* to make the audience see Hamas as not just an opponent, but as a threat to humanity. The repetition of *"They are not…"* is a way to close other opinions. This is a strategy of language that makes the speaker's version of truth seem like the only truth. According to Huckin (1997), this kind of labeling builds an ideological frame that does not allow debate.

This clear separation between *"us"* and *"them"* shows how language is used to shape ideology. In this speech, the UK and Israel are described using positive and emotional language. Words like *"hope," "democracy," "technological superpower,"* and *"gift to the world"* give a strong moral image to Israel. At the same time, the other side is described only in violent and negative terms. There is no space for understanding why Hamas acted, or the suffering of Palestinian civilians. This one-sided description gives all the moral value to one group and removes it from the other.

The speaker also says *"There are not two sides to these events. There is no question of balance."* This sentence directly removes the idea that there could be another perspective. According to Huckin (1997), when a speaker closes space for other viewpoints, it is a use of discursive power. In this case, Sunak uses his authority as Former Then Prime Minister to

decide how people should think. He does not invite people to question or analyze. He tells them what to believe. This shows how language becomes a tool of ideological control.

The speech also uses emotional language to guide the audience's feelings. Descriptions like *"Teenagers at a festival of peace, gunned down in cold blood"* or *"Holocaust survivor taken away as a captive"* are not just factual, they are built to create sadness and anger. Huckin (1997) explains that language like this is used to foreground emotions, and in discursive difference, it helps create sympathy only for one side. By doing this, the speaker can build emotional power and lead the audience to support his message more easily.

Another important discursive strategy is the exclusion of other narratives. Nowhere in the speech does Sunak mention the deaths or pain of Palestinian civilians. According to Huckin (1997), what is not said in a text is just as important as what is said. This silence is a way of removing the identity and suffering of the other side. If one group is invisible in the speech, then their point of view is also not important. This is how language shapes power: it decides who gets to speak, and who is silenced.

Furthermore, Sunak presents Israel as sharing British and Western values. He says, *"This democracy, the only one in the Middle East where you can vote, where you can be gay…"* This sentence gives the idea that Israel is modern, tolerant, and moral, just like UK. This is an ideological move to place Israel in the "good side" of the world, while making the enemy appear backwards and dangerous. Huckin (1997) points out that this kind of ideological embedding in discourse makes the audience feel emotionally and morally closer to the speaker's preferred side.

Repetition is also used to strengthen this ideological position. The sentence *"We stand with Israel. The United Kingdom stands with Israel… Not just today, not just tomorrow, but always."* is repeated to make the message feel permanent. This rhetorical strategy makes it

harder for the audience to imagine a different position. It builds loyalty and moral certainty. As Huckin said, repetition can be used to naturalize ideologies and make them seem like common sense.

In contrast to other political leaders like Joko Widodo, who according to Santoso and Aji (2021) used softer language to build national unity, Sunak's speech is more confrontational. It uses discursive difference not to unify but to divide clearly between friend and enemy. While Widodo focused on development and collective progress, Sunak focuses on protection, punishment, and loyalty. This shows how different leaders use discursive strategies to shape different kinds of power.

Discursive difference in this speech is used to shape the audience's mind and emotions. Through strong contrasts, emotional descriptions, exclusions, and repetition, the speaker builds an ideological story where only one side is good and moral. This use of language is powerful. It not only informs, it influences. It does not just explain a conflict, it tells the audience how to feel and who to support.

4.2.2. Analyzing Text From Word Level Analysis

1. Topicalization

Topicalization is a strategy in language where the speaker puts the most important idea at the beginning of the sentence. According to Huckin (1997), topicalization is not only about sentence structure but also about showing power and ideology. By choosing what to say first, the speaker can show what should be noticed and what should be ignored. In political speech, this is often used to show authority, create unity, and support certain beliefs.

In Rishi Sunak's speech, topicalization is used to shape the audience's understanding of the conflict. Many sentences begin with emotional or political focus, like *"To stand with you," "We stand with Israel,"* or *"My first duty is to protect you."* These beginning phrases are

important because they tell the audience what the speaker wants them to focus on. Huckin (1997) explains that when certain ideas are put at the front, they are seen as more important and believable. This is how language creates power: by guiding what the public sees as true or necessary.

The line *"I wanted to come here tonight to stand with you"* is repeated in different ways throughout the speech. This repetition and topical placement make the idea of *solidarity* very strong. It shows that the speaker is not just a leader but a personal supporter of the Jewish community. Huckin (1997) calls this *discursive power*, where emotional connection helps build the speaker's authority.

Topicalization is also used to show support for one group while ignoring the other. For example, the sentence *"We stand with Israel. The United Kingdom stands with Israel against this terrorism today, tomorrow and always"* puts the focus on loyalty and national support. It does not mention any suffering from the Palestinian side. By leaving that out, the speaker creates a one-sided message. This is what Huckin (1997) calls *backgrounding*, when some ideas are pushed away while others are shown clearly. In this case, only Israeli suffering is seen, and Palestinian voices are erased.

Another example is when Sunak says *"The people who support Hamas are fully responsible for this appalling attack."* This sentence starts with the blame. The speaker chooses to put the guilty group at the front. According to Huckin (1997), this is a way to define who is the enemy. It makes the listeners believe that there is only one side that is wrong. The sentence gives no context about why the conflict started or what the other side might feel. This helps the speaker build a simple story: one side is good, and the other is evil.

Topicalization is also used to increase emotion. The line *"Teenagers at a festival of peace, gunned down in cold blood"* starts with innocent victims. This is a strong way to make

the audience feel shock and sadness. Huckin (1997) said that emotional examples placed at the beginning can control the feelings of the audience. Here, the speaker chooses to describe the violence in a dramatic way to gain sympathy and support.

Leadership is also highlighted through topicalization. When Sunak says, *"My first duty is to protect you,"* he places his responsibility first. This shows that his role as protector is central. By doing this, he positions himself as a strong and caring leader. Wodak (2001) explains that this kind of personal reference in political speech helps to gain trust and make the leader look like a moral guide. The speaker is not only giving information, but also shaping how people see him.

The sentence *"Together we hold fast to that hope of 2,000 years"* starts with "*Together,"* which focuses on unity. It makes the audience feel included in a long history and shared identity. Huckin (1997) says that putting these types of phrases in the front of the sentence builds collective identity, which is important in political and national speeches.

The phrase *"Not just today. Not just tomorrow. But always."* is repeated and placed at the beginning of short sentences. This structure shows strong loyalty. It also makes the speech sound poetic and memorable. According to Huckin (1997), repetition and topicalization together can make ideological messages feel like common sense. In this case, the message is that supporting Israel is a moral truth that should never change.

Topicalization in Rishi Sunak's speech is a powerful tool to show his ideology and political position. It helps him focus the audience's attention on emotions, loyalty, blame, and protection. By choosing what ideas come first in each sentence, the speaker controls what the audience believes is important.

2. Agency

In CDA, agency means who is shown as doing something in the sentence. It tells us who has the power to act and who does not. Huckin (1997) explains that agency is important because it shows how language can give power to some people or groups, while taking it away from others. In political speeches, agency is often used to support ideology and to make the audience believe certain ideas. In this speech, Rishi Sunak uses agency to make himself look strong, show support for Israel, blame Hamas, and create a clear division between good and bad people.

At the beginning of the speech, the speaker gives strong agency to himself. Sentences like *"I wanted to come here tonight to stand with you"* and *"I will stop at nothing to keep you safe"* show that he is taking action. This makes him look like a good leader who cares about his people. Huckin (1997) says that this kind of language helps the speaker to build his image as someone with power and responsibility. Fairclough (1989) also explains that political leaders use language to make themselves look important and trusted by the public.

The speaker also uses the word *"we"* to show collective agency. For example, *"We stand with Israel"* and *"We will not tolerate this hate".* Here, the speaker includes the British people in his message. He wants the audience to feel like they are part of the same team. According to Huckin (1997), using *"we"* helps to build unity and make the speaker's message stronger. Wodak (2001) says that this kind of language helps create national identity, where the leader and the people are working together. It also helps to push the same beliefs and emotions to everyone in the group.

On the other hand, Hamas is shown with negative agency. The speaker says *"The people who support Hamas are fully responsible for this appalling attack."* This sentence makes Hamas look like the only group to blame. Huckin (1997) explains that this kind of sentence makes it easy for people to take sides. There is no discussion of the background or reasons for the conflict. It only shows that Hamas is the bad side. Van Dijk (2001) also says that this is a

way to show *"us"* as the good group and *"them"* as the enemy. It builds a strong division and makes people more afraid or angry toward the other side.

In some parts of the speech, the speaker hides the agent completely. For example, he says *"Teenagers at a festival of peace, gunned down in cold blood"* and *"Even a Holocaust survivor taken away as a captive."* These sentences do not say who did the action. This is called agent deletion. Huckin (1997) says that when the agent is missing, it makes people focus on the victim's pain instead of thinking about who caused it. Fairclough (1989) also agrees that this kind of sentence can hide who is responsible and make the message more emotional. It helps the speaker build sympathy without discussing the full story.

The Jewish community is also given emotional agency. When the speaker says *"Jewish people everywhere can feel less safe",* he is not talking about actions, but about feelings. Huckin (1997) says this is used to show that the group needs protection. It creates an image of Jewish people as innocent victims, and the speaker as their defender. Wodak (2001) says that this kind of language helps to justify political action, especially when the leader wants to show that he is protecting vulnerable people.

Positive agency is also given to Israel, but in a different way. The speaker says that Israel is *"a technological superpower"* and *"a gift to the world".* This shows Israel as a country that brings good things like science and medicine. Huckin (1997) explains that this kind of agency helps to make a country look moral and successful. It supports the idea that Israel should be protected and respected. Van Dijk (2001) calls this *positive self-presentation*, where the speaker's side is always shown in a good way.

The speech also uses agency to bring the audience into the situation. The sentence *"We've already seen vile words on our streets"* makes the people feel like they have experienced the problem too. Huckin (1997) says that this helps build agreement. It makes the

issue feel personal and real, so the audience is more likely to support the speaker's message. Wodak (2001) calls this *involvement strategy*, where the speaker tries to create emotional connection and agreement from the audience.

There is also repetition used to strengthen agency. For example, the sentence *"They are not militants… they are terrorists"* is repeated. This gives Hamas a strong negative identity. Huckin (1997) says that this kind of repetition is used to block other ways of thinking. The speaker wants the audience to see Hamas in one way only. This kind of language helps the speaker control the narrative and justify his actions.

Agency in this speech is used to show power and spread ideology. The speaker gives himself and his country active roles, gives the Jewish people emotional roles, and gives Hamas only negative roles. Sometimes, the agent is even removed to make the message more emotional.

3. Deletion/Omission

Deletion or omission is a strategy where the speaker leaves out certain information on purpose. Huckin (1997) explains that what is not said in a text can be just as powerful as what is said. By omitting details, the speaker can hide background facts, avoid responsibility, or reduce complexity. This helps control the audience's focus and push them to accept one specific idea. Fairclough (1989) also believes that omission is a strong way to keep dominant ideologies in place, while Wodak (2001) says that silence and deletion are often used to support national identity and political goals. Van Dijk (2001) agrees that omission in political texts often hides the full story, which influences what the public believes.

One of the most obvious omissions in this speech is the lack of the Palestinian side. The speaker talks a lot about Israeli victims, using emotional words like *"teenagers at a festival of peace"* or *"a Holocaust survivor taken away",* but never mentions the Palestinian civilians

who also suffer. Huckin (1997) explains that this kind of omission is ideological, it makes one group Israel look like the only victim. Van Dijk (2001) also says that when we don't hear the voice of the *"other group,"* it makes us feel only for one side. It helps create a story where one side is always good, and the other is always wrong.

The speech also omits political and historical background. For example, it calls Hamas's attack *"an utterly abhorrent act of terror",* but does not say what events happened before the attack. There is no mention of the Gaza blockade, occupation, or past violence. According to Huckin (1997), leaving out this context makes a complicated conflict look like a simple story of good vs. evil. Fairclough (1989) adds that removing historical facts from a speech makes it easier to protect powerful groups and avoid criticism. Wodak (2001) calls this *"strategic silence"*, where the speaker avoids deeper explanations to focus only on emotions.

The speaker also uses passive voice to hide who is responsible for violent actions. For example, in *"Teenagers at a festival of peace, gunned down in cold blood",* the sentence does not say who did the shooting. Another example is *"Innocent men, women and children abducted, raped, slaughtered."* Huckin (1997) explains that this kind of sentence makes people focus on the pain and suffering but forget to ask who caused it. Fairclough (1989) also says that passive voice is often used to hide actors when it is politically sensitive.

In some parts, the speaker uses vague language that avoids naming anyone. For example, *"We've already seen vile words on our streets"* does not explain who said these things or what they said. Huckin (1997) believes that this kind of vagueness is used to create fear or moral panic without proof. It lets the audience guess and believe what they already assume. Van Dijk (2001) adds that this strategy works because it connects to the listener's beliefs, even when there is no detail.

Another example of omission is found in *"Peace may feel further away than it has in a very long time."* The speaker says that peace feels distant but does not explain why. He does not mention broken peace talks, political mistakes, or the role of both sides. Huckin (1997) explains that this kind of omission makes the situation look like a sad mystery instead of the result of human actions. Wodak (2001) says that this is a way to remove blame from powerful people and systems.

The speaker also refuses to accept other opinions. He says, *"There are not two sides to these events."* This sentence clearly deletes the idea that someone might see the situation differently. According to Huckin (1997), this kind of language closes the debate and stops people from thinking critically. Fairclough (1989) also says that when speakers limit what can be said or believed, they keep power and stop others from sharing different views.

Even when praising Israel, omission is used. The speaker says Israel is *"the only democracy in the Middle East where you can vote, where you can be gay."* But he does not talk about any problems in Israel or mention other countries. Huckin (1997) says that selective omission like this helps create a very positive image of one side. Van Dijk (2001) explains that powerful speakers often talk about their group in a good way while ignoring bad actions.

The speaker also avoids certain words completely. Words like *"Palestine," "Gaza,"* or *"occupation"* are never used. Huckin (1997) explains that this kind of lexical omission is very ideological. If a word is not used, then the idea behind that word is also hidden from the audience. Fairclough (1989) calls this control of vocabulary, where choosing not to say certain words stops people from asking deeper questions. Wodak (2001) also agrees that this silence is not accidental, it is connected to who has power and who does not.

Omission in this speech is used to support power and ideology. By removing the Palestinian voice, skipping history, using vague language, and leaving out key terms, the

speaker tells a one-sided story. This makes the audience feel emotion but not ask questions. Huckin (1997) says that omission is not just forgetting, it is a tool to shape what people believe. In this speech, the speaker uses omission to control the story, protect dominant ideas, and silence the other side.

4. Insinuation

In CDA, insinuation means suggesting something indirectly, without saying it openly. Huckin (1997) explains that speakers often use insinuation to insert ideological messages in a subtle way. This is useful when the speaker wants to influence the audience but avoid sounding too harsh or controversial. Insinuation can help create feelings, guide opinions, and shape how people think about events or groups. Fairclough (1989) also says that ideology often works behind the text, through hidden meanings. Wodak (2001) adds that politicians often use insinuation to include some people and exclude others, without looking biased. Van Dijk (2001) explains that insinuation affects how people mentally imagine situations and helps create *"us vs. them"* thinking.

One strong example of insinuation in this speech is the sentence *"Even a Holocaust survivor taken away as a captive."* The speaker does not directly compare Hamas with the Nazis, but by using the word *"Holocaust,"* the audience may automatically feel that this attack is like a historical tragedy. This makes the current attackers seem just as evil as those in the past, without saying it directly. Van Dijk (2001) explains that using powerful references like this activates people's emotional memory and helps the speaker create a moral comparison.

Another example is the phrase *"Teenagers at a festival of peace, gunned down in cold blood."* The words *"festival of peace"* and *"cold blood"* make the attackers sound heartless. Huckin (1997) says that using emotional words like these can lead the audience to imagine that the enemy hates peace and joy. Even though the speaker does not explain why the attack happened, the audience will still feel that the enemy is cruel. Fairclough (1989) says this kind

of language is not just emotional, but also ideological, because it tells people how to feel and think.

Insinuation is also found in this sentence *"They are not militants. They are not freedom fighters. They are terrorists."* This repetition is not only a denial but also a way to suggest that people who use the words *"freedom fighters"* are wrong or bad. Huckin (1997) explains that denial is one way to use insinuation. By saying what something is not, the speaker also suggests what it really is. This line helps create a clear moral line between good and evil. Wodak (2001) says that denying ideas like this can make other opinions seem wrong, even if they are never directly mentioned.

The use of the word *"barbaric"* in *"Their barbaric acts are acts of evil"* is another good example. The word *"barbaric"* is often used to describe people who are uncivilized or wild. The speaker does not say Hamas are monsters, but the word makes the audience feel like they are not human. Huckin (1997) says that this kind of word has hidden meaning and supports ideological judgment. Van Dijk (2001) also explains that words with strong negative feelings make the enemy seem worse and the speaker's side seem better.

Another example is the sentence *"Much of this sickening evidence posted online."* This line suggests that the attackers are proud of their violence. The speaker does not explain what was posted or by whom, but the idea is already in the audience's mind. Huckin (1997) says this kind of statement lets the audience imagine the worst. Fairclough (1989) also says that when people use vague words, they let the listener complete the meaning themselves, which is a strong way to share ideology without needing facts.

When the speaker says *"There are not two sides to these events,"* it is a very strong insinuation. He does not accuse anyone directly, but the message is clear that anyone who sees the conflict differently is wrong. Huckin (1997) explains that insinuation can make certain

ideas look dangerous without arguing. Wodak (2001) says this is how exclusion works in political talk: by making alternative opinions look unacceptable. This sentence stops debate and makes the speaker's opinion seem like the only correct one.

Insinuation also appears when the speaker says *"vile words on our streets"* and *"attempts to stir up community tensions."* These phrases do not name anyone or give examples, but they suggest that some people in the UK are dangerous or support the enemy. Huckin (1997) says that this kind of vagueness can make people afraid of others in their own community. Van Dijk (2001) calls this a form of ideological control, where fear and blame are used to keep power and unity inside the speaker's group.

A different kind of insinuation happens when the speaker says that Israel is *"the only one in the Middle East where you can vote, where you can be gay."* He does not say anything bad about other countries, but the comparison is clear. Huckin (1997) says that positive statements about *"us"* often mean negative things about *"them."* This line makes Israel look modern and free, while other countries look closed and unfair. Fairclough (1989) explains that this way of talking shapes identity by showing who is *"good"* through contrast.

The repetition *"Not just today. Not just tomorrow. But always,"* and the ending *"Am Yisrael Chai"* work like emotional symbols. They are not arguments, but they make people feel strong loyalty and moral pride. Huckin (1997) says that these rhetorical styles work as insinuation because they make people feel the truth without needing proof. Wodak (2001) also explains that repeating emotional lines builds group identity and emotional unity.

Insinuation in this speech is a soft but powerful way to shape the audience's thoughts. By using emotional words, denying other views, making comparisons, and letting the audience imagine meanings, the speaker creates a strong ideological message. Through insinuation, the

speaker makes his message feel true and makes other views feel wrong, without needing to explain or debate.

5. Connotation

Connotation means the emotional or cultural meaning of a word, not just its dictionary meaning. According to Huckin (1997), words with connotations are used to create feelings, show values, and support certain ideas. In political speeches, speakers often choose words that make the audience feel sympathy for one group and anger or fear toward another. These word choices are important because they help shape power and ideology. Fairclough (1989) also says that connotative language is very important in building ideologies because it controls how people emotionally understand messages. Wodak (2001) adds that emotional words can help make people feel like they are part of a group, while van Dijk (2001) says that connotation makes people remember social beliefs and stereotypes without needing a long explanation.

One strong example of connotation in this speech is the phrase *"an utterly abhorrent act of terror."* The word *"abhorrent"* does not only mean *"bad"* and it means something deeply disgusting and morally wrong. Huckin (1997) says that strong words like this are used to guide the audience's emotions. In this case, the word makes the attack sound unforgivable, and that makes it easier to support strong action against the attacker. Van Dijk (2001) explains that such words help create a clear line between *"us"* and *"them,"* with *"them"* being completely wrong and dangerous.

The speaker also repeats words like *"terrorists,"* *"barbaric,"* and *"evil"* to describe Hamas. These are not neutral words, they carry heavy negative emotions. The word *"terrorist"* makes people think of fear and violence. *"Barbaric"* suggests that the attackers are uncivilized, and *"evil"* gives the situation a moral or even religious tone. Huckin (1997) says these kinds of labels are ideological tools because they stop the audience from thinking about the reasons behind the attack. Instead, they make the enemy look like monsters. Fairclough (1989) explains

that these labels become normal ideas if they are repeated often. Wodak (2001) adds that such emotional words help people feel like they must reject the enemy and support the speaker's side.

On the other hand, when the speaker talks about the victims, the words are soft and emotional. For example, *"Teenagers at a festival of peace, gunned down in cold blood"*. The phrase *"festival of peace"* gives the image of happiness and safety, while *"cold blood"* suggests cruelty. Huckin (1997) says this kind of emotional language helps people feel sad for the victims and makes them take the speaker's side more easily. Van Dijk (2001) says that such emotional phrases make people stop asking questions and just feel sympathy.

Another powerful phrase is *"Even a Holocaust survivor taken away as a captive."* This sentence connects the past with the present. The word *"Holocaust"* has a strong historical and emotional meaning. Huckin (1997) explains that such references make the audience remember past pain and link it with current events. This helps the speaker increase the emotional effect of the speech. Wodak (2001) also says that talking about shared historical trauma can make people agree more easily with political messages.

The speaker also uses connotation to show himself as a strong and moral leader. Words like *"duty,"* *"protect,"* and *"stop at nothing"* give the image of a leader who is brave and responsible. For example, when he says *"My first duty is to protect you,"* the word *"duty"* shows honor and responsibility. Huckin (1997) says that this kind of language makes the speaker sound trustworthy. Fairclough (1989) adds that this helps increase the speaker's authority, especially during a crisis.

Positive connotation also appears in the word *"hope,"* in the sentence *"Together we hold fast to that hope of 2,000 years."* The word "*hope*" gives a sense of strength, survival, and something meaningful. Huckin (1997) explains that emotional words like this help make the

audience feel united. Wodak (2001) says that connecting current events to long history makes people feel they are part of something bigger, and this supports political messages more strongly.

When the speaker describes Israel, he uses phrases like *"this extraordinary land," "this democracy,"* and *"a gift to the world."* These phrases show positive connotation. "Extraordinary" means special or great, "democracy" means freedom and fairness, and "gift to the world" praises Israel's global value. Huckin (1997) explains that these words help the audience see Israel as not only a victim, but also as a strong, modern, and good country. Van Dijk (2001) says this is called positive self-presentation, where one side is shown as good and right, so the audience supports it more easily.

Even the sentence *"There are not two sides to these events"* has strong connotation. It sounds like a simple fact, but actually it says that any other opinion is wrong. Huckin (1997) warns that such sentences can close debate. They make it hard for people to ask questions or offer different views. Fairclough (1989) says this kind of language hides power inside *"common sense"* phrases. Wodak (2001) says that it also limits what people can say, because anything different sounds offensive or wrong.

Connotation is used in this speech not only to describe events but to control emotions and ideas. The speaker uses strong emotional words to create sympathy, fear, pride, and loyalty. These words help build a clear division between good and evil and make the audience agree more easily. As Huckin (1997) says, connotative language is never neutral, it always supports power and ideology. In this speech, connotation helps shape public opinion by making some ideas feel good and others feel wrong or dangerous. It is a powerful tool in political discourse.

6. Register

Register means the level of formality and tone used in a speech or text. It also includes the kind of language used in different situations. According to Huckin (1997), analyzing register is important because different types of language can send different messages and support different ideologies. In political speeches, leaders often change their register, from formal to emotional, or from religious to patriotic, to connect with different audiences and promote certain ideas. Fairclough (1989) says that register helps to build power and identity. Wodak (2001) also explains that register is part of political strategy, and it helps to make people feel they belong to the same group. Van Dijk (2001) says that different registers can also trigger shared values and beliefs in the audience.

In Rishi Sunak's speech, register is used in many ways to build emotional connection, show leadership, and support one side of the conflict. The speech starts with a formal and emotional tone. Phrases like *"this hour of grief,"* *"to stand with you,"* and *"in solidarity in Israel's hour of need"* use respectful and ceremonial language. Huckin (1997) says that emotional language like this helps build trust and make the speaker seem caring. The speaker uses this register to show empathy and make the audience feel close to him. Wodak (2001) says emotional register like this also helps to create shared feelings and a sense of moral duty.

The speaker also uses a political and serious register when he says, *"As the Prime Minister of this country, I am unequivocal."* The word *"unequivocal"* is very formal and clear. Huckin (1997) explains that formal language like this shows power and leadership. It makes the speaker's message sound strong and certain. Fairclough (1989) says that this kind of formal political language is often used by leaders to show authority and gain respect.

When talking about the victims, the speaker uses a dramatic and emotional register. Words like *"gunned down in cold blood,"* *"abducted,"* *"raped,"* and *"slaughtered"* are very emotional and shocking. Huckin (1997) says that this kind of language is used to affect people's feelings more than their thinking. It helps the audience feel horror and sadness, and it supports

the speaker's side by making them feel sympathy. Van Dijk (2001) explains that emotional language like this creates strong group feelings and helps people take sides more easily.

But when the speaker talks about Hamas, he uses a harsh and negative register. He calls their actions *"barbaric acts"* and *"acts of evil."* This type of language shows strong moral judgment. Huckin (1997) says this is an ideological register, where the speaker uses emotional words to support a specific belief. This kind of language makes Hamas look completely bad and dangerous, which makes it easier for the audience to agree with the speaker. Fairclough (1989) explains that these register choices are used to include some people and exclude others, to show who is *"good"* and who is *"bad."*

Later, the speech uses a patriotic and protective register. Sentences like *"Not in our country. Not in this century,"* and *"My first duty is to protect you"* sound like the speaker is defending the country and its values. Huckin (1997) says this register builds a strong connection between the leader and the people. It supports the idea that the speaker is a protector of the nation. Van Dijk (2001) explains that this kind of language makes people feel united and loyal, especially in times of crisis.

The speaker also uses a celebratory and respectful register when he talks about Israel. Phrases like *"this extraordinary land,"* *"this democracy,"* and *"a gift to the world"* show admiration and pride. Huckin (1997) says that positive language like this helps to build a good image of the group the speaker supports. This makes Israel look moral, modern, and valuable. Fairclough (1989) adds that this type of praise is often used to justify political partnerships, and Van Dijk (2001) says it helps create a strong group identity that feels morally right.

Sometimes the speaker uses a religious or historical register. For example, he says *"the hope of 2,000 years"* and *"Am Yisrael Chai."* These phrases are spiritual and cultural. Huckin (1997) explains that this kind of language connects political speech to shared traditions and

beliefs. Wodak (2001) says that using historical memory in speech helps people feel part of a long story, and it gives political action a deeper meaning.

The speaker also uses rhetorical repetition, which is part of a poetic register. The line *"Not just today. Not just tomorrow. But always."* is short, rhythmic, and emotional. Huckin (1997) says this kind of repetition helps the message stay in people's minds and builds strong feelings. It also makes the speaker's message sound permanent and unquestionable. Fairclough (1989) says that repeating emotional phrases like this helps to make the ideology feel normal and powerful.

The speaker uses different kinds of register throughout the speech to support his political and ideological goals. He changes between emotional, formal, religious, patriotic, and celebratory tones to make the audience feel close, angry, proud, or respectful. According to Huckin (1997), register is not just about how formal or casual the language is, it's a tool to guide feelings and shape beliefs. In this speech, the register helps the speaker look like a strong leader, present one side as good, and make the audience support his message without questioning it. It shows how language can be used to build power and ideology in a subtle but effective way.

7. Modality

Modality is the way a speaker shows their degree of certainty, possibility, or obligation when saying something. According to Huckin (1997), modality is important because it shows how much the speaker believes in what they say. It also helps the speaker to sound more powerful or more careful. In political speeches, modality is often used to make some ideas feel like facts and to reject other opinions. Modality can guide the audience to agree with the speaker without giving them space to question it. Fairclough (1989) says that modality can show the speaker's authority and how they want to control the message. Wodak (2001) adds

that politicians use modality to justify their actions and beliefs. Van Dijk (2001) also explains that modality can control what people believe is true or not in a specific situation.

In Rishi Sunak's speech, modality is used many times to show power, emotion, and ideology. One strong example is when he says, *"There are not two sides to these events."* This sentence shows very high modality, meaning the speaker is totally sure. There is no space for other views. Huckin (1997) says that high modality like this is used to control how people think. This sentence tells the audience that the speaker's view is the only correct one. Wodak (2001) says this is also a way to exclude other opinions and stop any debate.

Another example of high modality is the repeated sentence, *"We stand with Israel."* The word *"stand"* is strong and clear. It shows that support for Israel is not optional, it is a duty. Huckin (1997) says that repeating strong words like this helps create the feeling that everyone agrees. Van Dijk (2001) explains that using *"we"* in high modality makes people feel like they are part of the same group and should believe the same thing. It also makes it hard for anyone to disagree without feeling like an outsider.

The speaker also uses high modality when talking about protection. He says, *"We will not tolerate this hate,"* and *"I will stop at nothing to keep you safe."* The modal verb *"will"* shows that something is definite. *"Stop at nothing"* makes the statement even stronger. Huckin (1997) explains that high modality like this is used to make the speaker look like a strong and caring leader. Wodak (2001) says that such sentences help to show that the speaker has moral responsibility and is ready to act. It builds trust with the audience.

Sometimes the speaker uses low modality to show emotion. For example, he says, *"Jewish people everywhere can feel less safe."* The phrase *"can feel"* is not certain, but it shows empathy. Huckin (1997) says that lower modality like this is used to create an emotional bond with the audience. It shows that the speaker understands their fear and feelings. Van Dijk

(2001) says this type of language makes people feel closer to the speaker and more loyal to his message.

High modality is also used when labeling the enemy. For example, the speaker says, *"They are not militants. They are not freedom fighters. They are terrorists."* The verb *"are"* shows strong certainty. Huckin (1997) says this is a way to make the label seem like a fact, not just an opinion. Fairclough (1989) says that such statements are called "truth claims" because they stop people from thinking about other possibilities. Wodak (2001) explains that this is a way to delegitimize the other side without discussion.

The sentence, *"Peace may feel further away than it has in a very long time,"* uses the word *"may,"* which shows low modality. It means there is a possibility, but not certainty. Huckin (1997) says that low modality can still carry ideology. This sentence creates a feeling of sadness and fear. It prepares the audience to accept that more conflict may happen. Wodak (2001) says that soft language like this helps to build a feeling of collective suffering and emotional unity. Van Dijk (2001) explains that even uncertainty can be used to guide people's emotions.

Another example is when the speaker says, *"I know this too. The hope of Israel is built on the very best of humanity."* The phrase *"I know"* is high modality. It tells the audience that the speaker is sure. Huckin (1997) explains that such words show the speaker as someone with moral knowledge. Fairclough (1989) adds that statements like this can make the audience feel like they must agree with the speaker, because he is speaking with confidence and authority.

In this speech, modality is used in different ways to support the speaker's power and beliefs. High modality is used to show strength, leadership, and moral truth. Low modality is used to create empathy and emotional connection. Both are used to shape the audience's thoughts and guide them to support Israel and reject the other side. Huckin (1997) reminds us

that modality is not just about grammar, it is a tool of ideology. It helps the speaker to show what is true, what is important, and what should be ignored. In this speech, modality helps to build a clear line between good and evil, and between those who support the speaker and those who do not.

4.2.3. Contextual Interpretation

According to Huckin (1997), language is not just for communication, it is also used to express power and promote ideology. Van Dijk (2001) also says that language can show and repeat dominance in society, and Fairclough (1989) believes that language is a social practice that can support inequality. In this case, the speech by Rishi Sunak, delivered on October 10, 2023, is a good example of how a political leader uses language to shape public opinion, especially during a time of international crisis.

This speech was given just three days after a large-scale surprise attack by Hamas on southern Israel on October 7, 2023. The attack included rocket fire and infiltration, which killed over 1,000 people in Israel and led to many being taken hostage. This event shocked the world and quickly escalated into a new and intense round of violence between Israel and Hamas, a militant group based in the Gaza Strip. In response, Israel launched heavy airstrikes on Gaza, which also caused a high number of Palestinian civilian casualties. This conflict reactivated strong emotions, international reactions, protests, and calls for ceasefire in many countries— including the United Kingdom.

At the same time, there were rising tensions and protests in the UK. Many people, including pro-Palestinian supporters, criticized the government's one-sided support for Israel. Sunak's speech, delivered during a gathering of British Jewish communities, responded directly to this situation. He used the moment to declare full support for Israel and condemn Hamas, aiming to show strong leadership during a difficult and emotional time.

In the speech, Sunak uses many emotional and moral words like *"abhorrent act of terror"* and *"acts of evil."* These are not just descriptive, they make the audience feel angry and afraid. Huckin (1997) says that this type of language helps the speaker push a certain point of view. Van Dijk (2001) also explains that these words help build a simple picture in people's minds, one side is innocent, and the other side is evil. Sunak's word choice clearly shows his support for Israel and his rejection of any other explanation.

Sunak also shows power through his role as Prime Minister and by using high-modality statements like *"We will not tolerate this hate"* and *"There are not two sides to these events."* These sentences sound very sure and leave no room for disagreement. Huckin (1997) says that using this kind of language makes the speaker look strong and in control. Fairclough (1989) explains that this is an example of "power behind discourse," where language shows the speaker's high status and authority. Wodak (2001) says this strategy is common when leaders want to push one moral truth and avoid public debate.

Another way the speech shows ideology is through omission. Sunak does not talk about the suffering of Palestinians, the blockade in Gaza, or the history of occupation. He only tells the story from one side. Huckin (1997) explains that what is not said can be just as powerful as what is said. Wodak (2001) adds that silence in political discourse helps build one-sided national identities. By ignoring the other side of the conflict, the speech encourages the audience to see the conflict in a black-and-white way, Israel as good, and Hamas (and by connection, Palestinians) as evil.

The speech also builds national unity and shared identity. Sunak uses phrases like *"We stand with Israel"* and *"My duty is to protect you."* This kind of language creates a group feeling and tells people what side they should be on. Van Dijk (2001) says this is called "ingroup and outgroup" framing. The Jewish community is shown as part of the British *"us,"*

while anyone who protests or disagrees is seen as part of *"them."* This kind of speech makes people feel like they are doing the right thing by following the speaker's view.

Sunak also uses historical references, like when he says, *"Even a Holocaust survivor taken away as a captive."* This connects today's events to past trauma. Huckin (1997) and Wodak (2001) both say that talking about history in this way creates strong emotion and makes the speaker's side seem morally correct. Referring to the Holocaust, one of the most serious events in Jewish history, builds support for Israel and stops people from criticizing it.

The way the speech is structured and the register used also help support the ideology. Sometimes Sunak uses formal political words, and other times he uses emotional or religious language, such as "*Am Yisrael Chai"* (meaning *"The people of Israel live"*). Fairclough (1989) says that changes in register show the speaker's identity and how he wants to connect with different groups. Sunak uses these different tones to speak to Jewish people, to the general public, and to international leaders at the same time. Huckin (1997) says this is an effective way to make the message feel more personal and powerful.

The context of Sunak's speech, given right after a tragic and violent event, during a time of rising tension in the UK, helps explain why the language is so emotional and one-sided. The speaker uses strong words, avoids talking about certain things, and speaks with confidence to create a clear and simple message: Israel is good, Hamas is evil, and Britain must support Israel. The speech is not just a response to violence, it is also a way to build support, silence other views, and show who has the power to define what is right and wrong.