

## A pragmatic analysis of the implicatures in the UK Prime Minister Keir Starmer's speech recognizing the state of Palestine

Maysam Mohammad Rjoub<sup>1</sup>, Dr. Mahmood Eshreteh<sup>2</sup>

Department of English, Hebron University, PALESTINE<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Email: [mysmalrjwb@gmail.com](mailto:mysmalrjwb@gmail.com)

<sup>2</sup>Email: [maltel2006@yahoo.com](mailto:maltel2006@yahoo.com)

**Abstract** - This research examines the pragmatic analysis of the UK Prime Minister Keir Starmer's speech announcing the official recognition of the State of Palestine on September 21, 2025. Using Grice's conversational maxims quality, quantity, manner and relation, the speech is analyzed and its deliberate violations are exposed, with a focus on how these violations that generate implicit meanings that reflect the UK's diplomatic position. By applying a qualitative descriptive analytical framework, the research explores deliberate ambiguities, strategic omissions, and indirect language that serve the UK's international and domestic political objectives. The findings reveal that the discourse employs pragmatic strategies to balance support for Israel's security with recognition of a Palestinian state, justifying political decisions while appeasing public opinion. The analysis highlights the role of language as a tool for persuasion, negotiation, and justification in sensitive political issues, contributing to a deeper understanding of how political discourse shapes international relations.

**Keywords:** pragmatic analysis; conversational implicature; political speech; Keir Starmer; state recognition of Palestine; Gricean pragmatics

### 1. Introduction

Conversation is a powerful tool through which people express their thoughts, experiences, and needs in a variety of ways. These include direct and indirect speech, depending on the situation and the intention of the speaker and listener. Pragmatics, a branch of linguistics, studies how language is used in context by focusing on meaning in context and analyzing the implicit meaning (the speaker's intention behind the speech). People tend to be indirect or ambiguous in conversation to achieve better results, avoid taking responsibility, and maintain politeness.

In Pragmatics, Grice's cooperative principle and its maxims (quantity, quality, relation, and manner) are one of the most important means of uncovering the implicit meaning in speech. Once these maxims are violated, the conversational implicatures are formed. Analyzing political discourse, particularly in the context of presidential debates, is a complex and multifaceted analysis that requires a practical approach (Evizariza, 2024). Politicians often violate these principles for several reasons, including: avoiding political responsibility and obligations, revealing hidden intentions, or deliberate ambiguity. Analyzing these violations in political discourse, such as the UK Prime Minister's speech on the recognition of Palestine, offers an



insight into the relationship between the international diplomacy followed by countries, and the domestic policy in order to achieve local and international interests.

This research paper examines the political debate in the United Kingdom regarding the recognition of the State of Palestine. The Prime Minister's speech announcing this recognition allows us to examine how Grice's principles are strategically violated and how allusions are created. The study analyzes the deliberate use of ambiguity, emphasis, and ellipsis in the speech to uncover the diplomatic strategies underlying the British political position. Worse still, media analysts have highlighted that language is not merely a means of communication, but also a tool of justification and negotiation on sensitive issues on the global stage.

As a branch of linguistics, pragmatics provides essential tools for analyzing how language functions in real-world contexts, particularly in political discourse. Political discourse is not a neutral exchange of information; rather, it is strategically constructed to influence beliefs, attitudes, and decisions. As Agbo et al. (2023) emphasize, *"Language plays a crucial role in politics because it enables politicians to shape and control the values, attitudes, and decision-making of the public. As a result, language is the most ancient and powerful tool of persuasion employed by politicians"*. In fact, the relationship between language and politics is inherently linked to the struggle for hegemony, since *"politics is a struggle for power between those who seek to assert and maintain their power and those who seek to resist it"* (Chilton, 2004, p.3). As Arroyo (2015) notes, political leaders use strategies such as metaphor, implicature, and narrative to shape beliefs, organize relationships, and express power. Similarly, Fairclough (2013) further asserts, *"Pragmatic analysis provides a lens through which one is able to understand strategic language use in politics since great influence is drawn from context upon interpretation and discursive impact"*.

Grice's four conversational maxims—quantity, quality, relation, and manner—are important to cooperative principles. Clarity, precision, and specificity are essential for conversation to be acceptable, according to Grice. However, these principles are often ignored and violated in political discourse. Also, Hassan (2022) argues that non-observance of Grice's maxims in political discourse is intentional and serves as a strategic tool for generating implicatures. This suggests that violations of these maxims are intentional and not accidental in political discourse. In this regard, Thomas (1995) points out that the interpretation of non-compliance with Grice's maxims depends largely on the political context, as what may appear to be a violation may in fact be a deliberate rhetorical strategy. In addition, Levinson (1983) stresses that conversational principles can be exploited in political discourse, where ambiguity becomes deliberate to manage sensitive issues.

Several studies about pragmatics and politics have shown that violations of Gricean maxims are most common in political speeches. For example, Ojukwu and Osuchukwu (2019) argue that research on Nelson Mandela's speeches illustrate how pragmatic strategies such as implicature and metaphor can reinforce political authority and moral legitimacy. Moreover, research on speech analysis of presidential debates has shown that candidates often deliberately violate Grice's maxims to project their power, undermine their opponents, or emotionally appeal to voters (Evizariza, 2024). Consequently, others have shown that these violations are not communication breakdowns, but rather deliberate strategies that help leaders maintain their credibility while concealing sensitive information.

Shabbush's CDA of Starmer's immigration speech uses Fairclough and van Dijk to show how lexis, mitigation and an "Us vs Them" ideological square naturalise tighter immigration controls as pragmatic and morally justified, constructing conditional inclusion for migrants (Shabbush, 2025; Nur'aini & Akmal, 2025). Bonnet's (2025) critical narrative analysis of four conference speeches foregrounds plot, character and temporality to show how Starmer builds ethos as a stable leader and rebrands Labour as inclusive, treating implicit meaning via political myth and leader image rather than conversational implicature. Kapranov's work on climate change discourse identifies framing (e.g. Crisis, Finance, Security) and the pragmatic roles



of dependent clauses and discourse markers in managing stance, evaluation and mitigation, but not implicature generation per se (Kapranov, 2025a, b, c).

Research on Biden, Harris, Trump and Zelenskyy shows deliberate flouting of quantity, relevance and manner maxims, plus euphemism and metaphor, to create strategic implicatures, ambiguity and plausible deniability in high-stakes contexts like debates and international calls (Alavidze, 2025; Barriyah, 2025; Sunko & Ilash, 2024; Humood & Faisal, 2024).

The reviewed studies confirm the importance of pragmatics in analyzing political discourse, demonstrating how violations of Grice's maxims and other strategies generate implicit meanings that serve political goals. Previous research has focused on diverse contexts, including Mandela's speech in South Africa, Biden's victory speech in the United States, and the speeches of King Abdullah in Jordan. These works demonstrate that pragmatic analysis can uncover the persuasive and strategic dimensions of political language. However, little attention has been paid to the United Kingdom's recognition of Palestine, particularly from a pragmatic perspective. In this regard, the current study fills the gap by applying Grice's cooperative principle to the Prime Minister's speech, in order to reveal how violations of the maxims and implications shape the UK's diplomatic stance and the balance between international and domestic interests.

Many politicians and media outlets have expressed their opinions on how Britain recognized the State of Palestine. However, little attention has been paid to the words and actions embodied in the Prime Minister's speech announcing this recognition. Many political and international relations scholars have studied the diplomatic and geopolitical ramifications of the war. However, its pragmatic dimension has received little attention. More specifically, this points to the deliberate flouting of Gricean principles and the generation of conversational innuendo. While all previous studies have analyzed political discourses using Gricean pragmatism, no study to date has addressed the UK's discourse on Palestinian recognition from a pragmatic perspective. This gap thus raises the question of how implicit or ambiguous meaning and the strategic use of language influence the UK's political position and representation domestically and internationally.

This research paper aims to: (a) identify the instances where Grice's maxims (quantity, quality, relation, and manner) are violated in the speech, (b) clarify the conversational implicatures generated through these violations, (c) To demonstrate how these pragmatic strategies reflect the United Kingdom's diplomatic stance and its attempt to balance international and domestic political interests, and (d) To contribute the broader understanding of how language functions as a tool of persuasion, justification, and negotiation in political discourse.

Based on the above objectives, the research paper seeks to answer the following questions: (1) How does the UK Prime Minister's speech on the recognition of Palestine demonstrate violations of Grice's maxims? (2) What types of conversational implicatures are generated from these violations? (3) In what ways do these pragmatic strategies reflect the UK's international diplomatic and domestic position? (4) What does this analysis reveal about the role of language in shaping political discourse on sensitive international issues?

## 2. Method

### 2.1 Research Design

This study employed a qualitative, descriptive-analytical research design. It is qualitative because it focuses on interpreting language use in political discourse rather than measuring numerical data, and descriptive because it seeks to describe how linguistic strategies operate within a specific political text. At the same time, it is analytical because it examines the pragmatic aspects of political discourse through a detailed application of Grice's cooperative principle. This design is particularly suitable for studying implicit meanings and strategic violations of dialogic principles in political discourse, as these phenomena are best understood through interpretation and contextual analysis rather than quantitative methods.



## 2.2 Data Collection

This research paper analyzes the official speech delivered by UK Prime Minister Sir Keir Starmer announcing the official recognition of the State of Palestine on September 21, 2025. This speech was examined because it represents a recent and significant political event on a global scale, also provides a rich text for pragmatic analysis because it contains numerous instances of deliberate ambiguity and strategic linguistic usage, essential for studying violations of Grice's principles. The speech was accessed in its full written form from the official UK government website (Gov.UK) to ensure the accuracy of the analysis and to allow for a systematic examination of the linguistic and pragmatic characteristics of the speech.

## 2.3 Analytical Framework

The analytical framework for this research is based on Grice's (1975) cooperative principle, which consists of four conversational maxims that explain how to communicate effectively. These maxims serve as guidelines for cooperative interaction, ensuring that discourse is informative, truthful, appropriate, and clear. However, when these maxims are violated, implicit meanings arise (conversational implicatures), and such violations are often found in political discourse. This framework is particularly appropriate for this study because it enables the systematic identification and interpretation of implicit messages in political discourse.

The four maxims are defined as follows:

- **The maxim of Quantity:** Speakers should provide the appropriate amount of information – no more or less than required.  
**Violation:** When politicians deliberately obscure, provide excessive details, or conceal key facts to shape the audience's interpretation.
- **The maxim of Quality:** Speakers are expected to be truthful and avoid stating what they believe to be false.  
**Violation:** In political speech, this maxim may be violated by exaggeration, denial, or presenting dubious claims as facts, often to protect credibility or persuade the audience.
- **The maxim of Relation:** Speech should be directly related to the topic of discussion and not digress into other areas.  
**Violation:** Politicians often violate this maxim by diverting attention, changing the subject, or raising irrelevant issues as a strategy to avoid sensitive questions or redirect the audience's attention.
- **The maxim of Manner:** Speech should be clear, organized, and without ambiguity.  
**Violation:** Violations occur when language is deliberately ambiguous or complex with the intent of obscuring meaning or allowing multiple interpretations.

This analytical framework was applied to the data used in this research in several steps. First, the Prime Minister's speech was divided into statements, which were then categorized according to the violation of Grice's maxims. The statements were deemed to have been violated because the speaker deliberately disregarded these maxims. The pragmatic analysis of each statement is independent and impartial, based on the evidence for each statement. Second, the implicit meaning behind these sentences was extracted. Finally, these findings were interpreted within the broader political and diplomatic context, allowing for a deeper understanding of the strategies embedded in the United Kingdom's recognition of the State of Palestine.

## 2.4 Limitations

- A single analysis of the British Prime Minister's speech announcing the recognition of Palestine may not generalize the findings to other political contexts or leaders.
- The research focused on Grice's cooperative principle, without incorporating other pragmatic or rhetorical theories, such as speech act theory or critical discourse analysis, which would provide more comprehensive insights.



- Although the analyst was unbiased, the interpretation of implicit meanings was based on the researcher's understanding of the context, as political discourse by its nature allows for multiple readings.

### 3. Results and Discussion

#### 3.1 Results

This section shows the results of a pragmatic analysis of the speech delivered by British Prime Minister Sir Keir Starmer, using the Gricean maxims, regarding the recognition of the State of Palestine. The full text of the speech was examined through the framework of the Gricean Principles of Collaboration, focusing on the four maxims of speech: quantity, quality, relation, and manner. Violations of these maxims were identified throughout the speech, and the conversational implicatures arising from these violations were interpreted in light of the political and diplomatic context. The original speech was organized into a table to provide a clear overview. Each statement aligns with the maxim(s) it flouts and their corresponding implications.

Table 1: Pragmatic Analysis of the Speech

No.	Statements	Grice's Maxim(s)	Implicature
1	<i>In the face of the growing horror in the Middle East...</i>	The maxim of quantity is violated. (less information than needed) The maxim of relation is violated. (generalization)	Avoiding a specific party responsible for the "horror," suggesting deliberate neutrality.
2	<i>We are acting to keep alive the possibility of peace and a Two State Solution.</i>	The maxim of quantity is violated. (insufficient information than needed) The maxim of manner is violated (ambiguous sentence)	Britain supports the idea only in theory.
3	<i>That means a safe and secure Israel... Alongside a viable Palestinian State -At the moment, we have neither.</i>	The maxim of quality is violated. (questioning the existence of a viable state) The maxim of relation is violated. (he focuses on the security and protection of Israel)	Recognizing Palestine is primarily dependent on Israel's security /Britain's priority is Israel.
4	<i>Ordinary people - Israeli and Palestinian... Deserve to live in peace -To try to rebuild their lives... Free from violence and suffering.</i>	The maxim of quantity is violated. (he provides more information) The maxim of relation is violated. (he moves away from the recognition)	Highlighting the humanitarian situation and avoiding direct political commitment
5	<i>That's what the British people desperately want to see.</i>	The maxim of quantity is violated. (the information lacks specificity / to see what?) The maxim of manner is violated. (ambiguous)	he suggests that recognition is strongly supported by the British public, not the government.
6	<i>Yet, almost two years after the barbaric attacks of 7 October...</i>	The maxim of quantity is violated ( he omits important details ) The maxim of quality is violated. (he described Hamas as barbaric/nationalistic, not objective)	The reason for the destruction is Hamas
7	<i>Hostages are still held by the terrorists of Hamas.</i>	The maxim of quality is violated (he describes Hamas by his emotions not real point of view) The maxim of relation is violated. (he moves away from the main event (recognition))	he portrays Hamas as a criminal entity and the continuation of the war is explained as a reason to justify recognition.



8	<i>Recent images show the hostages suffering and emaciated.</i>	The maxim of quantity is violated. (There are no details about a reliable source for the images) The maxim of quality is violated. (He speaks absolutely without evidence)	He wants to arouse sympathy for the hostages. He said the recognition was made for their sake, not to support Hamas.
9	<i>Hamas refuse even to release all the bodies of the dead.</i>	The maxim of quantity is violated. (he gives less information than required) The maxim of quality is violated. (Accusation without evidence) The maxim of relation is violated. (get off topic)	He repeatedly accuses Hamas of being the cause of the conflict.
10	<i>I have met British families of the hostages.</i>	The maxim of quantity is violated. (less info than needed) The maxim of relation is violated. (he talks about personal experience)	He is trying to provide evidence to prove his credibility.
11	<i>I see the torture they endure each and every day...</i>	The maxim of quality is violated. (there is no evidence) The maxim of quantity is violated. (less info than needed) The maxim of manner is violated. (he is not clear)	He tries to provide evidence to prove his credibility and show that he is aware of the negative impact.
12	<i>Pain that strikes deep in people's hearts across Israel and here in the UK.</i>	The maxim of relation is violated. ( he expands the scope of pain to the UK)	He justifies the government's recognition (because of sympathy for the hostages)
13	<i>The hostages must be released immediately...</i>	The maxim of quantity is violated. (the sentence lacks required information)	The situation cannot be postponed
14	<i>And we will keep fighting to bring them home.</i>	The maxim of manner is violated. (there is ambiguity/ fighting)	The situation cannot be postponed
15	<i>Hamas is a brutal terror organisation.</i>	The maxim of quality is violated. (He classifies Hamas emotionally)	He continues to justify the recognition
16	<i>Our call for a genuine Two State Solution...</i>	The maxim of quantity is violated. ( less info than needed)	Britain wants to appear to take a moderate position without committing to specific practical steps.
17	<i>Is the exact opposite of their hateful vision.</i>	The maxim of quantity is violated. (insufficient details) The maxim of manner is violated. (because of ambiguity)	This position is the only one for Britain to take in order to resolve the conflict.
18	<i>So we are clear - This solution is not a reward for Hamas...</i>	The maxim of quantity is violated. (the amount of information is not enough) The maxim of relation is violated. (he moves away by mentions Hamas)	Britain's recognition of Palestine does not legitimize Hamas.
19	<i>Because it means Hamas can have no future.</i>	The maxim of quantity is violated. (less info than needed) The maxim of quality is violated. (presenting a political opinion as absolute fact)	Britain's recognition of Palestine does not legitimize Hamas, but also ends it.



		The maxim of relation is violated. (he talks about Hamas's end)	
20	<i>No role in government. No role in security</i>	The maxim of quantity is violated. (less info than needed) The maxim of quality is violated. (he presents a political position as a truth) The maxim of relation is violated. (instead of talking about the recognition he talked about eliminating one party) The maxim of manner is violated. (due to ambiguity)	He implicitly declared that recognizing the State of Palestine will not grant Hamas any political or security legitimacy in the future.
21	<i>We have already proscribed and sanctioned Hamas...</i>	The maxim of relation is violated. ( he talked about side info) The maxim of quantity is violated. (less needed information) The maxim of manner is violated. (due to ambiguity)	Britain is continuing to prosecute Hamas
22	<i>And we will go further -</i>	The maxim of manner is violated. (intended ambiguity) The maxim of quantity is violated. (less info than needed about their plan)	An implicit threat of additional measures
23	<i>I have directed work to sanction other Hamas figures in the coming weeks.</i>	The maxim of quantity is violated. (he didn't give enough information) The maxim of manner is violated. ( because of ambiguity)	He confirms another operational plan in the coming time against Hamas.
24	<i>Meanwhile, the man-made humanitarian crisis in Gaza reaches new depths.</i>	The maxim of manner is violated. ( due to ambiguity) The maxim of quantity is violated. (less sufficient information)	It suggests that the crisis is the result of human actions (implicitly: Israel), but without explicitly naming them.
25	<i>The Israeli government's relentless and increasing...</i>	The maxim of quantity is violated. ( he didn't provide enough information)	He holds Israel primarily responsible for the aggravation of the crisis.
26	<i>Bombardment of Gaza... The offensive of recent weeks... The starvation and devastation... Are utterly intolerable.</i>	The maxim of manner is violated. (Use of ambiguous wording) The maxim of quantity is violated. (The time frame is given as an estimate but without details or supporting data)	The humanitarian situation is worsening and he calls on the international community to completely reject this situation and take action to end it.
27	<i>Tens of thousands have been killed - Including thousands as they tried to collect food and water.</i>	The maxim of quantity is violated. ( there is no accurate numbers)	Israel is obstructing access to food and water.
28	<i>This death and destruction horrifies us all.</i>	The maxim of relation is violated. (The scope of the speech is expanded to include "us all" without specifying precisely who is being addressed)	Britain shares the international public's outrage, lending legitimacy to its position.
29	<i>It must end</i>	The maxim of quantity is violated. (no information about how to end the war)	Calling for a ceasefire without a specific plan



	<i>We have now evacuated the first group of sick and injured children to the UK...To be treated by the NHS</i>	The maxim of quantity is violated. (he provides accurate information but does not specify the scope or duration of the program)	Britain is taking action, not merely a spectator, which enhances its humanitarian image
30	<i>And we continue to increase our humanitarian support.</i>	The maxim of quantity is violated. (general statement without specific info)	Britain wants to support Gaza more but there is limitations.
31	<i>But still, nowhere near enough aid is getting through.</i>	The maxim of quantity is violated. (he didn't give the required amount of the information) The maxim of relation is violated. (he takes about side subject(aids))	Israel is blocking aid, but without directly naming it.
32	<i>We call again on the Israeli government...</i>	The maxim of quantity is violated. (general statement)	Britain is unable to bring in aid, but is trying to maintain rhetorical pressure.
33	<i>To lift the unacceptable restrictions at the border...</i>	The maxim of relation is violated. (He moved to talk about borders)	Israel is obstructing the entry of aid, and the situation is morally and politically unacceptable.
34	<i>Stop these cruel tactics...</i>	The maxim of quantity is violated. (no details) The maxim of manner is violated. (due to ambiguity)	Implicitly holding Israel responsible for the suffering of civilians
35	<i>And let the aid surge in.</i>	The maxim of quantity is violated. (less info than require)	Israel is the only one who can enter the aids
36	<i>With the actions of Hamas... The Israeli government escalating the conflict...</i>	The maxim of quantity is violated. (he doesn't mention accurate info)	Hamas is holding the responsibility of the escalation.
37	<i>And settlement building being accelerated in the West Bank... the hope of a Two State Solution is fading.</i>	The maxim of relation is violated. (he moved to talk about the settlements/ two state solution) The maxim of quantity is violated. (no enough information)	The Israeli escalation in the West Bank and Hamas are responsible to fad Two state solution.
38	<i>But we cannot let that light go out.</i>	The maxim of relation is violated. (he mentioned unrelated word) The maxim of manner is violated. (because of ambiguity)	Britain is committed to the two-state solution
39	<i>That's why we are building consensus with leaders in the region and beyond...</i>	The maxim of quantity is violated. (there is no enough information)	Britain is trying to play the role of international mediator, but has not yet taken any concrete steps.
40	<i>Around our Framework for Peace. This is a practical plan to bring people together Behind a common vision and a series of steps...</i>	The maxim of quantity is violated. (less info than needed) The maxim of manner is violated. (the sentence is ambiguous)	A concrete political plan is in the works, but details are being withheld for diplomatic reasons.
41	<i>Including the reform of the Palestinian Authority...</i>	The maxim of relation is violated. (he left the issue of a diplomatic solution and entered the issue of Palestinian internal politics)	Recognition is conditional only on improving the institutional performance of the Palestinian Authority.
42	<i>That take us from a ceasefire in Gaza...</i>	The maxim of quantity is violated. (less info about the negotiations)	Britain views the ceasefire as the beginning of a



	<i>To negotiations on a Two State Solution.</i>		broader political process, not the end in itself.
43	<i>We will keep driving this forward.</i>	The maxim of manner is violated. (ambiguous sentence)	Britain takes on the burden of leadership but without clear means
44	<i>As part of this effort... I set out in July the terms on which we would act – In line with our Manifesto – To recognise Palestinian statehood.</i>	The maxim of quantity is violated. (not enough information)	The recognition was planned for months.
45	<i>That moment has now arrived. So today – To revive the hope of peace and a Two State Solution... I state clearly, as Prime Minister of this great country... That the United Kingdom... Formally recognises the State of Palestine.</i>	He observes the maxims. (direct to the point & clear)	
46	<i>We recognised the State of Israel more than 75 years ago as a homeland for the Jewish people</i>	The maxim of relation. (he introduced a historical comparison and deviated from the context of recognizing Palestine)	Recognizing Palestine today is the creation of a historical balance, that is, it is a correction.
47	<i>Today we join over 150 countries who recognise a Palestinian State too –</i>	The maxim of quantity is violated. (there is no specific data about the countries)	Britain is not the only country that recognizes Palestine, but there is an international desire
48	<i>A pledge to the Palestinian and Israeli people... That there can be a better future.</i>	The maxim of manner is violated. (ambiguity)	The recognition came from a primarily symbolic and moral motive, not a political plan.
49	<i>I know the strength of feeling that this conflict provokes.</i>	The maxim of quantity is violated. (due to the lack of information)	The conflict is causing deep divisions even within Britain.
50	<i>We have seen it on our streets... In our schools... In conversations with friends and family. It has created division.</i>	The maxim of relation is violated. (he moved from the diplomatic policy to the local community)	The conflict affects all the world not only the 2 parties.
51	<i>Some have used it to stoke hatred and fear. But that solves nothing.</i>	The maxim of quality is violated. (accusation without details) The maxim of quantity is violated. (incomplete sentence)	There are parties exploiting the conflict for negative purposes in Britain.
52	<i>Not only must we reject hate... We must redouble our efforts to combat hatred, in all its forms</i>	The maxim of manner is violated. (general sentence)	Britain has a moral obligation to lead the discourse against extremism and hatred.
53	<i>We must channel our efforts... United together in hope...</i>	The maxim of manner is violated. (he used unclear metaphors)	Britain calls for national and societal unity to confront division.
54	<i>Behind the peaceful future that we want to see: The release of the hostages... An end to the violence... An end to the suffering...</i>	The maxim of quantity is violated. (he provides a future without full details) The maxim of manner is violated. (he is not clear and direct)	Britain's list of priorities is clear (hostages first, stopping the violence, alleviating suffering, two-state solution)



	<i>And a shift back towards a Two State Solution...</i>	
55	<i>As the best hope for peace and security for all sides.</i>	The maxim of quality is violated. (He pre-assesses that his solutions will be the best)
		There is no alternative but the two-state solution; it is presented as the only option.

This table serves as the basis for subsequent analysis, where the findings are discussed thematically within the context of the key political issues raised in the speech, such as the formal recognition of Palestine, the Israeli hostages crisis, Hamas’s policy, the humanitarian situation in Gaza, and the two-state solution.

### 3.1.2 The Formal Recognition of Palestine

Official recognition of Palestine is the central theme of this speech. Although the British Prime Minister clearly and directly announced his official recognition of the State of Palestine, *“I state clearly, as Prime Minister of this great country...That the United Kingdom...Formally recognises the State of Palestine”*. This recognition was accompanied by some obvious ambiguity and vagueness.

The Prime Minister often violated the maxim of the relation, by linking the recognition to other subjects. First, the will of the British people *“That’s what the British people desperately want to see.”*. Indicating that the recognition came in support of the desire of the British people. Secondly, the interests of the hostages *“The hostages must be released immediately”* showing the Britain’s keenness to return the Israeli hostages. Thirdly, he highlights Hamas as *“a brutal terror organisation”*, showing Britain’s condemnation of Hamas. After that, he moved to talk about the humanitarian situation in Gaza *“The man-made humanitarian crisis in Gaza reaches new depths”* without directly condemn Israel as the cause of the crisis. Finally, He praised the need for a two-state solution to resolve the conflict *“Our call for a genuine Two State Solution”*. The purpose of this violation was to justify Britain’s position, which stated that the situation had spiraled out of control and that diplomatic action was necessary to resolve the conflict through a two-state solution. He explained that the recognition came not to support Hamas, but rather to resolve the conflict in the region.

### 3.1.3 The Israeli Hostages Crisis

From the results shown in the table above, the Prime Minister often violated the maxim of quality and manner in the hostage issue. The Israeli hostage crisis held by Hamas is Britain’s top priority *“And we will keep fighting to bring them home”*, which was clearly evident in this formal recognition. The Prime Minister demanded the immediate and necessary release of the hostages citing humanitarian reasons to conceal a clear bias towards the Israeli side. He repeatedly justified this recognition by saying that it was closely linked to the return of the hostages. He demanded their immediate return with vehement urgency *“The hostages must be released immediately...”* also cited evidence of their suffering *“Recent images show the hostages suffering and emaciated”* to arouse public sentiment and enhance the government’s credibility. The pragmatic analysis of this speech shows that the UK prioritizes the interests of the hostages more than any thing else.

### 3.1.4 Hamas’s Policy

The British Prime Minister’s speech recognizing Palestine revealed an emotionally charged stance toward Hamas. He made categorical and assertive statements such as *“Because it means Hamas can have no future”*, and *“Hamas is a brutal terror organization”* violating the maxim of quality by presenting a biased political position as reality. He also described Hamas as *“Barbaric”* and *“Terrorists”* that he violated the maxim of manner, because such ambiguous terms cannot be interpreted as referring to Hamas as an organization, its policies, or its political goals. In addition, he often spoke about Hamas in contexts that were not directly related to it, such as the recognition, violating the maxim of relation, such as *“This solution is not a reward for Hamas...”*. The Prime Minister repeatedly emphasized in this speech that Britain’s recognition of Palestine



does not support Hamas, but rather undermines its political future and does not grant it international legitimacy.

The humanitarian crisis in Gaza was a major focus of the Prime Minister's speech. He expressed clear humanitarian sympathy for the suffering of the Gazan people in statements such as *"Bombardment of Gaza...The offensive of recent weeks...The starvation and devastation...Are utterly intolerable"* emphasizing the need to end this conflict. He frequently violated the maxim of quantity in general phrases such as *"Tens of thousands have been killed"* and *"Meanwhile, the man-made humanitarian crisis in Gaza reaches new depths"*, by providing less information like numbers. The implicit avoid directly accusing Israel of being the cause of these crimes against civilians. He also violated the maxim of manner in phrases such as *"Including thousands as they tried to collect food and water"* which showed an emotional tone but lacked precise details. Through emotional descriptions, he violated the maxims of manner and quantity, such as *"This death and destruction horrifies us all. It must end"*, as these statements reinforce the emotional impact rather than objective reporting or evidence. The implicit meaning is that Britain expresses sympathy for the civilians in Gaza, but he does not directly address the cause to avoid political responsibility and directly confront Israel.

### 3.1.5 Two State Solution

The two-state solution is the cornerstone of resolving the conflict and spreading peace from the British point of view. It has repeatedly emphasized the importance of this solution to resolve the ongoing conflict in the region, which affects the entire world, especially Britain. This is the reason that prompted Britain to recognize the State of Palestine. In this regard, the Prime Minister violated several maxims. First, he violated the maxim of manner, as he was vague about the details of the two-state solution for example, *"Our call for a genuine Two State Solution..."* this violation helps confirm the position without clear commitments. Second, just as he violates the maxim of quantity in statements such as *"We are acting to keep alive the possibility of peace and a Two State Solution"*. That means a safe and secure Israel... Alongside a viable Palestinian State" he appears neutral, but he lacks some details about how the two-state solution and the policy to be followed. This intentional lack of details allows for future negotiations and avoids political commitments. Third, he frequently violates the maxim of relation. When he discusses the two-state solution by including Hamas as not a partner in this solution, and in the case of which he completely excludes it in statements such as *"This solution is not a reward for Hamas..."*, and *"Because it means Hamas can have no future"* means Two State Solution will end Hamas in the future.

### 3.2 Discussion

This chapter discusses the results of a pragmatic analysis of British Prime Minister Keir Starmer's speech announcing the official recognition of the State of Palestine. This discussion aims to answer the research questions and compare it with previous literature, such as Chilton (2004), Fairclough (2013), Hassan (2022), Thomas (1995), and Levinson (1983) to demonstrate the similarities and differences comparing to the findings.

This discussion also addresses the four Gricean maxims violated in the speech: quantity, quality, manner, and relation, and the implicit meaning behind these violations. This chapter also discusses how these implicatures reflect the United Kingdom's position toward the parties to the conflict.

#### **Q1: How does the UK Prime Minister's speech on the recognition of Palestine demonstrate violations of Grice's maxims?**

The results of this research demonstrate that Starmer's speech violated Grice's four maxims. For example, the speech violated the maxim of quantity by not providing sufficient information, such as *"We will go further"*. The prime minister violated the maxim of quality by using emotional, rather than objective, statements, such as *"Hamas is a brutal terror organization"*, as a fact. Hassan



(2022) asserted that this violation was not accidental but rather a political strategy. The speech also violated the maxim of manner by including ambiguous expressions, such as *"to revive the hope of peace"*, to create ambiguity. Levinson (1983) asserted that such ambiguity can enable the management of sensitive political issues without future commitments. Finally, the speech violated the maxim of relation by addressing secondary issues, such as the hostages, Hamas, the two-state solution, and Gaza. The explanation for this violation depends on motives, according to Thomas (1995).

## **Q2: What types of conversational implicatures are generated from these violations?**

By uncovering the implicit meaning of the Prime Minister's speeches, several findings emerge. First, the speech often publicly condemns Hamas, demonstrating a firm political stance toward Hamas. Conversely, he avoids directly accusing Israel, making only indirect things. This demonstrates a bias toward Israel and agrees with Chilton (2004) that power struggles are at the heart of the discourse, where language is used to delegitimize opponents and bolster one's own position. Second, his reference to the humanitarian crisis in Gaza suggests that the admission stems from a moral position that justifies it. This finding is consistent with the research of Khater et al. (2024) that King Abdullah's speeches demonstrated that humanitarian appeals are exploited to bolster political legitimacy. Also, the focus on hostages as a priority from a British perspective justifies the recognition as responding to public pressure within the United Kingdom. This reflects the findings of Nashmi and Mehdi (2022), as leaders often resort to using hints that link international issues to domestic concerns to develop and enhance political credibility.

## **Q3: In what ways do these pragmatic strategies reflect the UK's international diplomatic and domestic position?**

The analysis of the British Prime Minister's speech reveals the United Kingdom's attempt to present a balanced diplomatic stance. Through phrases such as *"Today the United Kingdom formally recognises the State of Palestine."* affirms the legitimacy of the Palestinian State, while on the other hand, supports Israel *"That means a safe and secure Israel"*, this confirms Fairclough's (2013) theory that political discourse seeks to build authority through balancing the use of carefully chosen language. With other statements such as *"That's what the British people desperately want to see"*, the Prime Minister may justify acknowledging the will of the British public, which agrees with Arroyo (2015) that politicians carefully choose political language to engage with public sentiment. The speech reflects the United Kingdom's desire to conduct international diplomatic affairs while taking domestic pressures into account.

## **Q4: What does this analysis reveal about the role of language in shaping political discourse on sensitive international issues?**

As Chilton (2004) pointed out that *"politics is a struggle for power between those who seek to assert and maintain their power and those who seek to resist it"* (p. 3). Thus, political discourse transcends normal conversation and becomes a weapon of manipulation. The results of this research confirm that the British Prime Minister's speech went beyond recognizing the State of Palestine, but extended broadly to include the issue of hostages and the human suffering in Gaza, touching on the two-state solution. This strategy was not arbitrary, but rather intentional for political reasons. As Hassan (2022) suggests, violating the Grice's Principles is not random, but rather a tool to conceal political intentions. Thus, the results of this research are consistent with both Fairclough (2013) and Levinson (1983), who stated that this deliberate ambiguity allows leaders to address sensitive issues without formal commitments or confrontation. In addition, analyzing political discourse reveals hidden international conflicts and diplomatic positions.

## **4. Conclusion**

### **4.1 Conclusion**



This research analyzed the UK Prime Minister Keir Starmer's speech recognizing the State of Palestine from a pragmatic perspective. Grice's four maxims—quantity, quality, manner, and relation were used to analyze the data. The study revealed repeated violations of Grice's four maxims to produce conversational implicatures used for political purposes. These findings have theoretical and practical implications for the study of political pragmatism, as all the research questions were answered.

This study helped uncover the implicit meaning behind the speech, revealing that the recognition of Palestine stemmed from a humanitarian and moral motive stemming from the human suffering in Gaza for both the hostages and the civilian population, helping to justify the position and persuade the public.

The study also examined the relationship between political positions and pragmatic linguistic strategy. The results demonstrated the United Kingdom's efforts to balance its interests with Israel and recognize Palestine's role, taking into account domestic politics and the desires of the British public. Finally, the study confirmed that language in political discourse is a strategic tool that employs ambiguity for persuasion, justification, and negotiation.

#### 4.1 Recommendations

Academic and theoretical recommendations: Grice's principles can be combined with other pragmatic theories—such as speech act theory, tact theory, or critical discourse analysis—to analyze the same discourse. It is recommended to analyze speeches by other British leaders on this issue. Other studies could compare the British Prime Minister's speech with speeches by other leaders who recognize Palestine in terms of their stance and implicit connotations.

Practical and applied recommendations: Allocate practical courses to analyze political discourse in universities and training centers. Journalists could apply pragmatic principles to detect bias, persuasion, and manipulation in political reporting. Future research could also focus on comparing the translation of political speeches in terms of the transformation of implicit connotations.

#### References

- Agbo, I. I., Nwachukwu, R. C., & Ugwuagbo, W. O. (2023). Pragmatic analysis of selected speeches of some governors on workers' day celebration in Nigeria. *English Language Teaching*, 16(5), 45–58. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v16n5p77>
- Alavidze, M. (2025). PRAGmatic Analysis Of Strategic Inference In Political Discourse: Trump And Zelenskyy. *Karadeniz Uluşlararası Bilimsel Dergi*. <https://doi.org/10.17498/kdeniz.1678754>.
- Arroyo, J. L. B. (2015). Pragmatics of political discourse. In C. A. Chapelle (Ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics* (pp. 1–7). Wiley-Blackwell. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal1464>
- Barriyah, K. (2025). Do Politicians Use Implicature for Nonsense? An Analysis Of 2024 U.S Presidential Debate. *LINGUISTICA*. <https://doi.org/10.24114/jalu.v15i1.64957>.
- Chilton, P. (2004). *Analysing political discourse: Theory and practice*. Routledge. <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/mono/10.4324/9780203561218/analysing-political-discourse-paul-chilton>
- Evizariza, A. (2024). Pragmatic analysis of political discourse: A case study of presidential debates. *Social Studies & Humanities Journal (SOSHUM)*, 1(1), 78–89. <https://doi.org/10.62207>
- Fairclough, N. (2013). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language* (2nd ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315834368>
- Grice, H. P. (1975). *Logic and conversation*. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics: Speech acts* (Vol. 3, pp. 41–58). Academic Press. <https://www.scirp.org/reference/referencespapers?referenceid=1624739>
- Hassan, J. S. (2022). A pragmatic study of non-observance maxims in selected political speeches. *Journal of Language Studies*, 5(2), 38–48. <https://doi.org/10.25130/jls.5.2.18>
- Humood, A., & Faisal, W. (2024). Shadows of Language: Revealing the Multifaceted Nature of Euphemistic Expressions in Biden's Speeches. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1408.24>.



- Kapranov, O. (2025a). Discourse markers in Keir Starmer's speeches on climate change. *Studies in Linguistics, Culture and FLT*. <https://doi.org/10.46687/cupp2991>.
- Kapranov, O. (2025b). Syntactic Means in Keir Starmer's Speeches on Climate Change: An Investigation of Dependent Clauses. *Анали Филолошког факултета*.
- Kapranov, O. (2025c). Keir Starmer's Framing of Climate Change: a Qualitative Investigation of Political Speeches. *Acta Marisiensis. Philologia*. <https://doi.org/10.62838/amph-2025-0131>.
- Khater, H. A., Altakhaineh, A. R. M., & Dahnous, F. (2024). Pragmatic analysis of King Abdullah's speech: Exploring speech acts and societal context. *Cogent Arts & Humanities*, 11(1) Article 2433879. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2024.2433879>
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511813313>
- Nashmi, B. H., & Mehdi, W. S. (2022). A pragmatic study of identity representation in American political speeches. *Journal of the College of Education for Women*, 28(1), 144-156. <https://doi.org/10.36231/coedw.v32i2>
- Nur'aini, I., & Hilmi Akmal. (2025). Language in conflict debates: Impoliteness strategies in the open to debate youtube channel 'were Israel's actions in the Gaza war justified?'. *Journal of Language and Pragmatics Studies*, 4(3), 176-186. <https://doi.org/10.58881/jlps.v4i3.136>
- Shabbush, M. (2025). A Critical Discourse Analysis of UK Prime Minister Keir Starmer's Immigration Speech. (*Faculty of Arts Journal*) □□□□□□ □□□□□□ - □□□□□□ □□□□ □□□□. <https://doi.org/10.36602/faj.2025.n20.24>.
- Sunko, N., & Ilash, V. (2024). The Implicit Content Of Kamala Harris's And Joe Biden's Political Discourses. *Germanic Philology Journal of Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University*. <https://doi.org/10.31861/gph2024.850-851.139-146>.
- Ojukwu, C. C., & Osuchukwu, N. C. (2019). Pragmatics analysis of selected political speeches of Nelson Mandela. *Journal of the English Scholars' Association of Nigeria*, 21(2), 63-85. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/344865046>
- Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in interaction: An introduction to pragmatics*. Longman. <https://archive.org/details/meaningininterac0000thom>
- UK Government. (2025, September 21). *Prime Minister Keir Starmer's speech: UK recognition of the State of Palestine*. GOV.UK. <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/pm-statement-on-the-recognition-of-palestine-21-september-2025>

