Discussion: Language's Impact: Britain's Monarchy

The most important point that stood out to me was regarding the calm, steady personality of Queen Elizabeth II. Indeed, at that time, the country was going through tremendous grief. Still, her tone of communication was slow, steady, and deliberate. She chose every word with utter compassion and dignity. She analysed “warmth, “compassion’ and “devotion to her sons” have been reflected as acknowledgement of emotional truth of the moment. Still, she was formal all the time. The Queen mostly concealed her personal emotions and feelings to avoid being noticed by the public. Thus, her speaking, drowned in vulnerability, made my message feel even more substantial.

The pronouns she used, like "we", "us", and "as a grandmother", formed a sense of unity between the public and herself. Rather than behaving or speaking like a reserved monarch, she placed herself as a part of the bereaved community. Her choice assuaged the message and made it feel more benevolent. Her words, such as "upset", "shocked", and "trying to help" added psychological strain through their connotations, assisting the audience in feeling relieved.

Hearing a world-class leader talk straight during a tragic event matters due to their stability. Leaders cannot eliminate the pain, though their words and presence can assist people to stay mentally stable and supported. In the perplexity or sorrow, an exclusive message can make the people remember that their emotions are heard, valued, and shared.

The biggest takeaway I have from this speech is that leadership is not limited to authority only. Leadership also necessitates emotional intelligence. The Queen portrayed that public service often requires broadening the horizon to meet people's emotional needs. Her message was a

memoir of the legacy which she shaped, not only by working on her power, but also by humility, empathy, and speaking ability with compassion and honesty.