

## CHAPTER 5

### CONCLUSION

#### 5.1. Conclusion

This research aimed to analyze how Rishi Sunak used language to shape power and ideology in his political speech delivered on October 10, 2023, following the outbreak of violence between Israel and Hamas. Using Huckin's (1997) Critical Discourse Analysis framework, the study focused on how the speaker chose and structured language to influence public understanding and support a particular political position.

The analysis found that Sunak's speech used emotional, assertive, and symbolic language to strengthen his authority and promote a clear ideological stance. He framed Israel as a moral and democratic ally by using words with positive connotations such as "*extraordinary*," "*democracy*," and "*gift to the world*," while framing Hamas as inhuman and evil with terms like "*terrorists*," "*barbaric*," and "*acts of evil*." This language creates a moral binary, dividing the world into "good" and "evil", which helps the speaker present his side as righteous and the other as unacceptable.

To assert his power, Sunak used many high-modality expressions such as "*We will not tolerate this hate*" and "*There are not two sides to these events*." These statements show certainty and control, making his opinion seem like fact and limiting space for other views. He also used topicalization to put his key messages, solidarity, loyalty, and national protection, at the front of sentences, which guided the audience's focus and interpretation.

The speaker also used presupposition and insinuation to embed his values indirectly. For example, by referring to a Holocaust survivor taken captive, he encouraged the audience to connect present events with historical trauma, which helped justify his moral and political

position. In addition, he gave agency to himself and his government to show leadership, while blaming Hamas with strong, active verbs, and hiding the suffering of Palestinian civilians through omission and passive voice.

Furthermore, Sunak used different registers, emotional, political, nationalistic, and religious, to appeal to multiple audiences and to strengthen his role as both a compassionate leader and a strong protector. His choice of words, tone, and repetition helped build a sense of unity, especially with the British Jewish community, and presented support for Israel as a shared moral duty.

In conclusion, this study shows that language in political discourse is never neutral. In Rishi Sunak's speech, language is used as a tool to shape public opinion, express political power, and promote a specific ideology. Through careful word choices, strategic sentence structures, and emotional appeals, the speaker constructs a version of reality that supports his agenda and silences opposing views. This research highlights the importance of analyzing political speeches critically, because behind every speech, there is not only a message, but also power and ideology.

## 5.2. Suggestion

This study has analyzed the ideological dimensions of Rishi Sunak's speech through Huckin's (1997) framework, supported by word-level strategies such as modality, connotation, insinuation, and topicalization. However, future research can expand upon this by conducting a **comparative discourse analysis** between multiple political leaders addressing the same conflict, such as speeches by leaders from **non-Western countries** or representatives of the **Palestinian side**. This would provide a more balanced perspective on how language is used differently across political and cultural contexts to construct competing narratives and ideologies. Additionally, scholars may consider incorporating **multimodal discourse analysis**,

examining not only textual elements but also **visuals, gestures, or delivery style** to better understand how power and persuasion operate in live political communication. Finally, longitudinal research could explore how the **discursive framing of the Israeli–Palestinian conflict evolves over time**, offering insights into how political ideologies shift in response to international pressure, media discourse, or public opinion.