COGNITIVE PRAGMATIC MECHANISMS, AND IDEOLOGICAL FRAMING OF JUSTICE AND PEACE IN IMRAN KHAN'S UNO SPEECH (2019)

Tehreem Javaid

MPhil Scholar, Department of English, M. Phil Linguistics, National University of Modern Languages Faisalabad
Email: tehreemjavaid31@gmail.com

Ayesha Naz

MPhil Scholar, Department of English, M. Phil Linguistics, National University of Modern Languages Faisalabad
Email: nazayesha468@gmail.com

Amna Arshad

Lecturer at National University of Modern Languages Faisalabad
Email: amna.arshad@numl.edu.pk

Abstract

*This study explores the cognitive-pragmatic mechanisms, grammatical patterns such as nominalization. It focuses on modality and ideological framing in Imran Khan's 2019 UN General Assembly (UNGA) speech. The research integrates three central perspectives: Cognitive Pragmatics, Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG), and Ideological Framing Theory. **It shows how language and thinking work together to create meanings of justice and peace.** The study uses qualitative discourse analysis of the speech transcript. It relies on Sperber and Wilson's Relevance Theory, Halliday's Systemic Functional Grammar, and Van Dijk's Socio-Cognitive Model of Ideology. Imran Khan's speech makes use of pragmatic inference, implicature, and presupposition to create his moral authority. Grammatical tools such as transitivity, nominalization, and modality affect how people understand agency, obligation, and moral certainty. Nominalization turns abstract ideas like injustice, oppression, and peace into fixed truths. This hides human actions and makes certain beliefs seem natural. Modality shows how necessary, likely, or morally strong something is. Phrases like "we must act" and "the world should respond" turn moral points into universal rules, not just personal views. The way we think about justice and peace shapes how speakers connect with audiences. They use common moral ideas to bring people together. The analysis shows that cognitive-pragmatic and grammatical features work together. They reinforce the divides between oppressors and the oppressed. This portrays Pakistan as a moral player in the global struggle for justice. This synthesis helps cognitive linguistics and critical discourse studies. It shows how cognition, grammar, and ideology work together to shape political meaning.*

Keywords: *Cognitive Pragmatics, Grammar, Modality, Nominalization, Ideology, Justice, Peace, Discourse Analysis, Imran Khan, UNO Speech.*

Introduction

1.1 Background of the Study

Speeches at global venues, such as the United Nations General Assembly, influence how a country is seen and its moral position. Imran Khan's 2019 UNGA speech shows the connection between language, thought, and belief in politics. He spoke about climate change, corruption, Islamophobia, and the Kashmir issue. Yet, the deeper message of his speech focused on moral justice and peace. The power of his address came not only from what he said but from how he said it. The words, tone, and structure guided how people understood his ideas. In politics, language is not just for sharing facts. It helps shape how people see the world and what they believe about it.

Researchers like Fairclough and Fowler say grammar carries hidden meanings. It organizes ideas in ways that reflect values and beliefs. In Khan's speech, grammar helped express these ideas. For example, turning actions into nouns changes how people see responsibility. Instead of saying, "powerful nations oppress the weak," one might say, "oppression exists." This hides who is acting and makes the issue sound like a natural fact.

Another key element is modality, shown in words like *must*, *should*, and *can*. These words express duty, urgency, or possibility. In Khan's speech, they created a sense of shared moral responsibility. He urged the world to act on issues that affect everyone.

To study such speeches, two useful tools are Cognitive Pragmatics and Systemic Functional Grammar. Cognitive Pragmatics looks at how people use language to express beliefs and thoughts. Systemic Functional Grammar studies how grammar shapes meaning and reflects social purpose. Using both tools together shows how Khan's speech connects language and thought. His word choices reveal how moral ideas and political beliefs are built through language. Each phrase reflects how he wants listeners to understand justice and fairness. His grammar and tone strengthen his call for ethical action and peace.

In short, Khan's UNGA speech is not only about issues but about how words shape minds. Through careful use of grammar and thought, he built a story of unity, duty, and hope. This shows how language can influence global perception and create moral power in politics.

1.2 Problem Statement

Imran Khan's speeches are often known for their moral tone and popular appeal. However, few studies explore how his words build deeper ideas and beliefs. Most research focuses on style, emotion, or main themes like global issues and justice. Ahmed and Javed (2022) discuss these themes but do not study his grammar or thought patterns.

This study looks at what earlier work missed. It examines how grammar and thinking work together in his speech. The goal is to show how small language choices shape big ideas. It focuses on three tools of meaning: nominalization, modality, and pragmatic inference.

Nominalization turns actions into things, hiding who is responsible. Modality shows duty or certainty using words like *must* and *should*. Pragmatic inference helps listeners guess the speaker's deeper intent. Together, these features guide how people understand the message.

This research connects language, thought, and belief in one frame. It shows how Khan's speech builds ideas of justice and peace. The study shows how grammar and cognition come together to build his view of moral and political order.

1.3 Purpose and Research Questions

This research studies how Imran Khan used language in his 2019 UN speech. It explores how his words and grammar shaped ideas of justice and peace. The study looks at how thought and language work together to build meaning. It focuses on how he used nominalization and modality to express moral and political ideas. These choices show how language can shape beliefs and guide public understanding.

It addresses three core questions:

1. What cognitive and practical tools does Imran Khan use to shape views on justice and peace? Think about implicature, presupposition, and inference.
2. How do grammar features, like nominalization and modality, express power, duty, and beliefs?
3. How do these practical and grammar tools work together? They tell ideological stories and shape audience thinking.

1.4 Significance of the Study

This research supports Cognitive Pragmatics, Systemic Functional Linguistics, and Critical Discourse Studies. It deepens our understanding in both theory and practice. It expands Cognitive Pragmatics by connecting grammar to thought using modality and nominalization. It shows how non-Western leaders use language and ideas to shape beliefs in global forums. The study shows how grammar and thinking work together. This makes ideas seem natural and true. It also shows how modality creates a sense of moral duty. Plus, nominalization can obscure who is responsible. This understanding helps research on political speech and global communication. It shows how language and thought create ideological power.

1.5 Contextual Background: The 2019 UNGA Speech

Imran Khan gave his UN speech in September 2019 amid growing tensions in South Asia. It happened shortly after India took away Kashmir's special status under Article 370. In his speech, Khan described Pakistan's view as moral and humanitarian, not just political. He often mentioned justice, faith, and humanity to appeal to global moral awareness. His speech also built a mental divide between "the oppressed" and "the oppressors."

His language used strong words like "oppression," "injustice," "responsibility," and "peace." These words turned actions into concepts. They masked who was responsible but added moral weight to the message. He also used modality in lines like "we must act now" and "the world should awaken." Such phrases expressed duty and urgency, showing action as a shared moral task.

These grammar choices worked with cognitive tools like presupposition, inference, and implicature. Together, they built the idea that justice must come before peace.

1.6 Theoretical Premises

This study integrates three complementary theoretical perspectives:

1. **Cognitive Pragmatics** (Sperber & Wilson, 1995): Communication is an inferential process guided by relevance. Political leaders use context and subtle hints to shape ideas without direct persuasion.
2. **Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG)** (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014): Grammar is a resource for meaning-making. Transitivity structures, nominalization, and modality express how speakers encode agency, obligation, and authority.
3. Framing and Ideology Theory (Lakoff, 2004; Van Dijk, 2006): Ideological frames shape how we think and view our morals. Justice and peace are seen through moral metaphors and social splits, such as "us" and "them."

This study merges frameworks to view discourse as a cognitive-grammatical act. It views ideological framing as influenced by practical reasoning and word choice. These elements work together to support ideological narratives.

1.7 Scope and Limitations

The research looks closely at Imran Khan's 2019 UNGA speech, focusing on its official English transcript. The analysis gives clear insight into how ideology is built in thought and language. However, it doesn't apply these findings to Khan's wider rhetoric. Cognitive processes are understood through language and context, not by direct measurement.

1.8 Organization of the Paper

This paper is set out as follows: Section 2 discusses the literature on Cognitive Pragmatics, Grammar, and Ideology. It focusing on nominalization, modality, and Framing Theory. Section 3 presents the **Theoretical Framework**, integrating these perspectives. Section 4 covers the Methodology. Section 5 presents the Analysis and Discussion. It applies the frameworks to Khan's speech. Section 6 concludes with key findings and implications.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Cognitive Pragmatics

Cognitive Pragmatics sees communication as a process shaped by context and understanding. Meaning comes from how listeners interpret a speaker's intent, not just from words. Listeners use shared knowledge and relevance to find meaning in what is said.

In political speech, leaders use tools like presupposition and implicature. These help them mask their ideology with neutral language. For example, the line "if there is no justice, there can be no peace" suggests peace depends on justice. This idea supports the speaker's moral and political stance.

These language choices are key to moral persuasion. Chilton (2004) points out that politicians use thought cues and inferences to shape public views on issues. In Khan's speech, implicatures build ideas of morality and victimhood. They create empathy and urgency without stating arguments directly.

2.2 Grammar and Ideological Representation

2.2.1 Grammar as Ideology

Systemic Functional Grammar (Halliday, 1994) sees grammar as a social semiotic system. It encodes three types of meaning: ideational, interpersonal, and textual. Ideationally, **transitivity structures** assign agency; interpersonally, **modality** expresses evaluation and obligation. Fairclough (1992) and Fowler (1991) say grammar is ideological. It shows reality in ways that support certain viewpoints.

2.2.2 Nominalization and Ideology

Nominalization is turning actions into nouns, like "to oppress" becoming "oppression." It serves as a strong ideological tool. It removes the nuances of human action, downplays individual agency. It turns vibrant realities into rigid concepts (Fairclough, 2003). For example, "the oppression of Kashmiris continues" shows the action but doesn't say who is doing it. This grammatical transformation naturalizes social hierarchies by depersonalizing responsibility. In Khan's UNGA speech, he uses words like corruption, oppression, justice, and peace. This helps him frame moral issues as universal truths, not just political acts. The result is a higher moral discussion that goes beyond individual actors. This strengthens Pakistan's moral stance and reduces direct conflict.

2.2.3 Modality and Moral Evaluation

Modality shows how a speaker feels about duty, possibility, or need. Words like *must*, *should*, *can*, and *will* express levels of force or choice. In political speech, such words reflect moral belief and responsibility. Phrases like "we must act" or "the world should understand" express a feeling of obligation and common responsibility.

In Imran Khan's speech, modality serves two main purposes. It shows moral certainty, as in "there must be justice." It also builds collective action, as in "we should all stand for humanity." These patterns connect grammar to belief. They shape moral duty into a clear language form.

2.3 Framing and Ideology

Framing theory explains how language shapes thought through shared mental structures. Political leaders use framing to highlight values and justify actions. In Imran Khan's speech, the link between justice and peace forms a moral pattern. It suggests that peace depends on justice.

This idea is supported by nominalization. It changes "justice" and "peace" into abstract concepts. Modality also supports it by showing necessity, as in "there can be no peace without justice."

Lakoff says such frames awaken deep moral ideas like "justice as balance" and "peace as harmony." Van Dijk says ideology uses these frames to split groups into "us, the just" and "them, the unjust.""

2.4 Summary

Research shows that political meaning forms where thought, grammar, and belief meet. Cognitive Pragmatics explains how people infer meaning in context. Systemic Functional Grammar shows how nominalization and modality express ideology through grammar. Framing Theory explains how these tools create moral stories and guide understanding.

However, few studies use all these frameworks together for non-Western leaders. This study joins them to explore Imran Khan's 2019 UN speech. It shows how he presents justice and peace as moral duties through both language and thought.

3. Theoretical Framework

This study takes three linked approaches to explore how language shapes ideology in Imran Khan's 2019 UN speech. The approaches are Cognitive Pragmatics, Systemic Functional Grammar, and Ideological Framing Theory.

Cognitive Pragmatics explains how people infer meaning beyond the literal words. Systemic Functional Grammar illustrates how grammar conveys power and status by using nominalization and modality. Framing Theory explores how moral and mental patterns shape political stories.

Together, these frameworks give a full view of how thought and language work together. They explain how political ideas take form through both grammar and cognition.

3.1 Cognitive Pragmatics: Inference and Ideological Intentionality

Cognitive Pragmatics, founded by Sperber and Wilson, treats communication as a form of reasoning, not just word decoding. Speakers give clues about what they mean, and listeners use context and shared knowledge to understand. Meaning grows from how words and thought connect in real situations.

In political speech, this process helps shape ideology. Capone says leaders use hidden cues and assumptions. This helps guide listeners to shared beliefs. Imran Khan states, "If there is no justice, there can be no peace." This means peace relies on justice. This link is not stated directly but understood through shared moral logic.

Cognitive Pragmatics treats such lines as acts of ideological thought. Language triggers reasoning that matches the speaker's beliefs. Chilton calls this the mental connection between language and thought. Here, words shape our social ideas. Leaders create moral reality with their words by using features like implicature, presupposition, deixis, and entailment.

In Khan's address, inferential meaning appears often. Phrases like "the world must understand" and "our Prophet taught us compassion" rest on shared values and beliefs. They invite listeners to fill in moral meaning without long explanations. This style makes his speech clear, emotional, and deeply persuasive through shared understanding.

3.2 Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG): Nominalization and Modality as Ideological Devices

Cognitive Pragmatics looks at how we interpret meaning. In contrast, Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG) was created by Halliday in 1994. Halliday and Matthiessen updated it in 2014. SFG looks at how grammar serves as a tool. It helps us express experiences, relationships, and organize texts. According to SFG, language simultaneously realizes three metafunctions:

1. **Ideational Metafunction** – representing experience through transitivity and participant roles.
2. **Interpersonal Metafunction** – expressing evaluation, attitude, and modality.
3. **Textual Metafunction** – organizing discourse for coherence.

Among these, the **ideational** and **interpersonal** metafunctions are particularly significant for analyzing ideology.

3.2.1 Nominalization as Ideological Abstraction

Nominalization is when you turn actions into nouns. For example, "oppress" becomes "oppression," and "act justly" turns into "justice." It is common in political speech because it serves both cognitive and ideological goals.

It hides who is acting, making responsibility unclear. For example, "the oppression of Kashmir continues" does not name the oppressor. This makes events sound natural or fixed.

It also turns actions into stable ideas. Words like *justice*, *peace*, and *corruption* become moral truths instead of political acts. These words carry strong emotional meaning and help express complex ideas simply.

From a thinking view, nominalization shortens mental effort. It turns complicated realities into small, clear ideas. This helps listeners accept beliefs as moral facts instead of political claims.

In Imran Khan's UN speech, words like justice, oppression, humanity, corruption, and responsibility have a lot of impact. They turn political issues into shared human values. When he says, "there can be no peace without justice," *justice* becomes a moral rule that stands above politics.

In Systemic Functional Grammar, nominalization shapes meaning and belief at once. It changes how experience is described and turns ideology into a form of moral truth.

3.2.2 Modality as Moral and Epistemic Stance

Modality shows how sure the speaker is about a statement. It also indicates necessity or obligation. In SFG, modality is part of the interpersonal metafunction. It shows how the speaker feels about the listener and the message. Halliday (1994) identifies two primary types:

- **Deontic Modality:** Obligation, permission, or moral necessity (*must, should, ought to*). ●
Epistemic Modality: Degrees of certainty or belief (*may, might, probably*).

In political discourse, modality is a key site of **ideological authority**. Van Leeuwen (2008) notes that deontic modality builds legitimacy through moral evaluation and a sense of obligation. Statements like "we must act," "the world should wake up," or "the international community cannot ignore this" create a sense of moral duty. They link the speaker's beliefs to shared ethical values.

In Imran Khan's speech, modality performs both **interpersonal** and **cognitive** functions. It shows authority and moral leadership. It also helps the audience reach shared conclusions. For example, "the world must act to prevent injustice" shows strong moral obligation. It views inaction as wrong. It suggests that following moral guidelines is the only sensible option.

Furthermore, modality interacts with **nominalization** to enhance ideological force. The phrase "justice must prevail" mixes the noun "justice" with the strong word "must." This creates a clear moral statement that allows no room for debate. Such combinations transform ideology into grammatical necessity, embedding moral certitude within linguistic form.

3.2.3 The Cognitive-Grammatical Interface

Nominalization and modality affect how people think and judge ideas. Nominalization promotes abstract and timeless thinking. Modality controls belief and shows how sure or committed a speaker is.

When used together, they form a link between thought and grammar. This link shows that ideology operates through both meaning and sentence structure.

In Imran Khan's speech, this mix shows up in lines like "injustice must end" and "peace cannot exist without justice."" The modal words highlight duty and need, while the abstract nouns reflect shared moral values.

Together, they make moral duties sound like logical truths. This connection links what the speaker thinks with what the audience knows.

3.3 Ideological Framing Theory: Justice and Peace as Moral Cognition

Framing Theory was developed by Goffman and later enhanced by Lakoff. It explains how language affects our thoughts and experiences. Frames are mental patterns that guide how people see and interpret the world. They decide what details stand out and what fade into the background. Ideological framing uses language to shape moral views and social identity. In Imran Khan's speech, the "Justice–Peace Frame" links peace directly with justice. It suggests that peace cannot exist unless justice is achieved. This idea fits with Lakoff's view that moral thinking links ethical values to real results.

Justice is often seen as balance or light, while injustice is imbalance or darkness. These images help people understand abstract ideas through emotion and sense. Nominalization helps by making justice and peace real things that can exist or fade away.

Modality shows moral duty. Phrases like "justice must prevail" and "peace cannot exist without justice" show this clearly." Together, these grammar tools build a strong frame that feels natural and right.

Van Dijk's model adds that ideology lives in shared mental images. Khan's Justice–Peace Frame builds shared models by stressing fairness, duty, and empathy. Listeners then accept these moral ideas as truth, not persuasion.

3.4 Integrative Model of Analysis

The combination of these frameworks results in a Cognitive-Grammatical Ideological Model (CGIM) with three linked layers:

1. **Cognitive-Pragmatic Layer:** Identifies inferential strategies—implicature, presupposition, inference—that shape ideological meaning.
2. **Grammatical Layer (SFG):** Examines how nominalization and modality encode moral stance, agency, and obligation.
3. Ideological-Framing Layer: This shows how language and thought work together to create moral frames, like saying justice comes before peace.

This model sees discourse as a system with multiple layers of meaning. Grammar shows us the surface form. Pragmatics helps us understand it. Framing keeps the ideology consistent.

3.5 Summary

In essence, this study combines Cognitive Pragmatics, Systemic Functional Grammar, and Ideological Framing Theory. It focuses on Imran Khan's 2019 UNGA speech. Through nominalization, abstract moral ideas gain linguistic form and appear more concrete. Through modality, moral duties are expressed as grammatical obligations. Through pragmatic inference, ideological meanings are suggested rather than directly stated. Together, these methods show how political language shapes thought. It turns grammar and cognition into tools of ideology. Language lets us express our moral beliefs using structure and reasoning.

4. Research Methodology

4.1 Research Design

This study uses a qualitative and interpretive research design. It uses Critical Discourse Analysis and takes ideas from Cognitive Pragmatics and Systemic Functional Grammar. The goal is not to count linguistic patterns. It aims to understand how grammar and pragmatics create ideological meaning. This explores how nominalization, modality, and cognitive inferences construct ideological frames in Imran Khan's 2019 UNGA speech.

A qualitative approach fits this study because political speeches depend on context. Meaning is formed through society and thought, not through numbers. This interpretive design allows close study of grammar, intention, and ideology. It supports Fairclough's view that discourse is both language and social practice.

4.2 Data Source

The data includes the official English transcript of Imran Khan's speech at the 74th UN General Assembly. He delivered it on 27 September 2019 in New York. The transcript came from verified UN sources. We also checked it against audio recordings to ensure accuracy. This speech was chosen for a reason. It showcases one of Khan's most important rhetorical moments. It also captures his views on justice, peace, faith, and morality.

The text comprises approximately **5,800 words**, segmented into four major thematic parts:

1. Climate change and environmental justice
2. Economic inequality and corruption
3. Islamophobia and religious misunderstanding
4. The Kashmir issue and global moral responsibility

Each section provides clear examples of cognitive and grammatical strategies for ideological framing. This makes it perfect for the study's goals.

4.3 Analytical Framework

The analysis uses a three-level model taken from the Cognitive-Grammatical Ideological Model (CGIM) outlined in Section 3. This framework operationalizes three interrelated analytical layers:

1. **Cognitive-Pragmatic Analysis** – identifying pragmatic mechanisms such as implicature, presupposition, inference, and deixis that guide ideological interpretation.
2. **Grammatical Analysis (SFG)** – focusing specifically on **nominalization** and **modality** as grammatical devices encoding ideological stance.
3. **Ideological Framing Analysis** – This focuses on how practical and grammatical methods form the justice–peace frame and other moral divides.

Each layer supports the others. Pragmatics shows how we infer meaning. Grammar explains how meaning is structured. Framing reveals its ideological integration.

4.4 Analytical Procedures

4.4.1 Data Preparation

The transcript had four main sections, each matching a theme from the speech. We looked at each segment one line at a time to find pragmatic and grammatical features linked to the theoretical model. We used colour coding and tables to code instances of nominalization, modality, and pragmatic cues. This helped us compare them systematically.

Example coding symbols:

- **NOM:** Nominalization
- **MOD:** Modality (deontic or epistemic)

- **INF:** Inferential mechanism (implicature, presupposition)
- **FR:** Ideological frame (justice, peace, faith, oppression, etc.)

4.4.2 Step 1 – Cognitive-Pragmatic Analysis

The first stage identifies **pragmatic features** that construct inferential meaning. This involves detecting:

- **Implicatures** (unstated implications drawn by the listener)
- **Presuppositions** (assumed background information)
- **Deictic markers** (pronouns and references that construct group identity) ● **Speech acts** that convey ideological stance (assertives, directives, commissives)

The statement "If there is no justice, there can be no peace" shows that justice leads to peace. The choice of "we" or "they" shows deictic positioning. It helps form in-group and out-group identities. This is an important ideological tool (Van Dijk, 2006).

Pragmatic analysis also considers the **principle of relevance** (Sperber & Wilson, 1995). Khan's speech boosts moral feelings like empathy and outrage. It keeps things easy to understand by using familiar moral ideas. This makes the message relevant and easy to process.

4.4.3 Step 2 – Grammatical Analysis: Nominalization and Modality

The second analytical layer examines how nominalization and modality shape ideological meaning in the Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG) framework.

A. Nominalization Analysis

Nominalization happens when verbs or processes turn into nouns. This follows the models by Halliday (1994) and Fairclough (2003). Each nominalized form is analyzed for:

- The **suppression of agency** (who performs the action)
- The **abstraction of moral concepts** (turning actions into ideas)
- The **ideological naturalization** of processes (presenting moral claims as timeless truths)

For example:

- "Oppression" (from *to oppress*) — hides the oppressor while highlighting the moral wrong.
- "Corruption" (from *to corrupt*) — abstracts a social issue into a moral entity. ● "Justice" and "Peace" — moral ideals reified as achievable conditions.

Each case of nominalization is looked at for its ideological role. This includes supporting Pakistan's moral view or questioning global hypocrisy. The analysis shows how abstract nouns serve as ideological condensations. They pack moral ideas but hide political complexity.

B. Modality Analysis

Modality is examined as an indicator of **moral and epistemic stance**. Each modal expression is categorized as:

- **Deontic modality** – expressing obligation or necessity (*must, should, ought to*). ● **Epistemic modality** – expressing probability or belief (*may, might, could*).

We focus on high-value modality words like "must," "cannot," and "will never." These words show strong ideological certainty. The analysis explores:

- The **frequency** and **distribution** of modal verbs.
- Their **ideological function** (constructing urgency, moral duty, or divine necessity).
- You can see the link between modality and nominalization in phrases like "justice must prevail" and "oppression cannot continue.""

This step uses Simpson's (1993) model of modality as an evaluative stance. It also incorporates Van Leeuwen's (2008) idea of legitimation through obligation. In Khan's speech, modality gives a sense of moral certainty. It suggests a moral law based on divine and humanitarian authority.

4.4.4 Step 3 – Ideological Framing Analysis

The final stage looks at how the identified cognitive and grammatical features work together to create ideological frames. Following Lakoff's (2004) and Van Dijk's (2014) frameworks, the analysis identifies recurring conceptual structures—particularly the **Justice–Peace Frame**, but also auxiliary frames such as:

- **Faith–Morality Frame** (linking Islam to universal compassion)
- **Oppression–Resistance Frame** (framing Pakistan as defender of the oppressed)
- **Humanity–Hypocrisy Frame** (contrasting moral rhetoric of powerful nations with their actions)

Each frame is checked for how it uses:

- Pragmatic inference (implicit reasoning)
- Nominalized concepts (moral ideas)
- Modalized expressions (necessary stance)

For example, the phrase *"the world must act for justice"* combines all three levels:

- Pragmatic inference: implies moral failure of inaction.
- Nominalization: "justice" as an abstract, de-agented ideal. ● Modality: "must" conveys moral urgency.

These features show how language, thought, and beliefs mix to form strong moral arguments.

4.5 Analytical Tools and Coding Criteria

Although the study is qualitative, systematic coding ensures analytical rigor. We use a manual close-reading method with thematic coding, similar to NVivo, to ensure reliability. Analytical categories include:

Category	Description	Theoretical Source
NOM	Nominalization (abstracted moral concept, obscured agency)	Halliday, 1994; Fairclough, 2003
MOD	Modality (obligation, necessity, certainty)	Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014; Simpson, 1993

INF	Pragmatic inference (implicature, presupposition)	Sperber & Wilson, 1995
FR	Ideological Frame (Justice–Peace, Faith–Morality, etc.)	Lakoff, 2004; Van Dijk, 2014

Each coded instance is analysed in its context to prevent misinterpretation.

4.6 Validity, Reliability, and Reflexivity
4.6.1 Validity
Validity is ensured through **theoretical triangulation**—combining Cognitive Pragmatics, SFG, and Framing Theory. This cross-framework approach boosts interpretive accuracy. It connects surface language, like grammar, to deeper thinking. This includes pragmatics and the logic of ideas, known as framing.
4.6.2 Reliability
Reliability is achieved through **intra-coder consistency checks**. The researcher read the speech several times at different intervals. They re-coded and compared the results to reduce bias in interpretation. Citations and examples are provided to ensure transparency.

4.6.3 Reflexivity
The researcher knew that discourse analysis is subjective. They kept an eye on their biases, especially since the speech was sensitive to social and political issues. Interpretations focus on linguistic and cognitive mechanisms rather than political endorsement or critique.

4.7 Ethical Considerations
The data comes from political texts that are publicly available, so we don't need participant consent. However, the analysis adheres to academic integrity and avoids manipulative quotation. Citations from the speech are included only for language examples. They are fully credited to the original source.
4.8 Limitations of Methodology
Several limitations are acknowledged:
1. **Single-text focus:** The analysis is restricted to one speech, limiting generalizability.
2. **Inferential reconstruction:** Cognitive mechanisms are inferred through textual evidence, not directly observed.
3. **Researcher interpretation:** As with all qualitative work, interpretive subjectivity is inevitable despite triangulation.

The study's framework and careful coding make up for these limitations. They offer a deep, theory-based view of how meaning is created.

4.9 Summary

This method offers a structured yet flexible way to study Imran Khan's 2019 UNGA speech. It examines how Cognitive Pragmatics, nominalization, and modality build ideological meaning. The Cognitive-Grammatical Ideological Model guides the analysis. It shows how pragmatic inference shapes ideological thought. It also reveals how grammar expresses moral stance. Together, these elements work within ideas of justice and peace. The next section applies this method to the speech. It shows how inference, grammar, and ideology connect in meaning.

5. Data Analysis

5.1 Overview

This section offers a detailed qualitative analysis of Imran Khan's 2019 UNGA speech. It applies the integrated framework explained in the methodology. The goal is to explore how cognition, grammar, and ideology interact. The focus is on nominalization, modality, and pragmatic meaning. Together, these features build a moral story about justice and peace. They also highlight ideas of oppression and global duty.

The analysis is organized around four major thematic sections of the speech:

1. **Justice and Global Responsibility** 2. **Corruption and Economic Inequality** 3. **Islamophobia and Religious Representation** 4. **The Kashmir Crisis and Global Morality**

For each theme, we look at parts of the speech. This highlights how Cognitive Pragmatics, Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG), and Ideological Framing merge to produce meaning.

5.2 Justice and Global Responsibility

5.2.1 Cognitive-Pragmatic Inference and Moral Logic

Excerpt (1):

"There can be no peace without justice."

This short line shows the power of simple political language. It carries a deep moral message within few words. Pragmatically, it works as a conditional idea. Listeners understand that no justice means no peace. As Sperber and Wilson (1995) note, such phrases demand little effort but create strong meaning. The audience relies on shared moral sense that justice builds peace.

The line also shapes what Chilton (2004) calls a moral-causal model. It connects moral action with social result. Justice becomes the root of peace and the key to order. Ideologically, it turns this belief into a global truth. Listeners then see peace without justice as wrong and impossible.

5.2.2 Nominalization: Moral Abstraction and Ideological Universality

Grammatically, *justice* and *peace* are **nominalizations**—abstract nouns derived from verbs (*to justify*, *to pacify*). Through nominalization, Khan transforms dynamic processes into timeless moral entities. According to Fairclough (2003), such abstraction **erases human agency** and **universalizes moral claims**. No specific actors are mentioned; injustice and peace become global conditions, not political processes.

This de-agentive form is ideologically significant: it allows the speaker to criticize global structures without directly accusing particular nations, thus maintaining diplomatic decorum while implying moral culpability. The grammatical condensation supports what Van Dijk (2014) terms **"ideological universality"**—the presentation of one's ideological stance as a universal moral truth.

5.2.3 Modality: Obligation and Moral Imperative

Excerpt (2):

"The world must act to ensure justice."

Here, the **deontic modal verb** *must* encodes obligation and moral necessity. The proposition presupposes global inaction ("the world has not acted") and implies moral failure. In Halliday's (1994) SFG terms, the **interpersonal metafunction** expresses the speaker's evaluative stance, framing justice not as an option but as a duty.

The high-value modality (*must*) strengthens the ideological force by transforming moral advocacy into moral command. This linguistic pattern—**nominalization + deontic modality**— creates what Simpson (1993) calls **modal authority**: the speaker grammatically assumes moral leadership, positioning himself as the voice of ethical rationality.

5.2.4 Ideological Framing: Justice–Peace Frame

Through these devices, Khan constructs the **Justice–Peace Frame**, a conceptual structure where peace is an effect of justice and injustice is the root of global disorder. This frame operates at both cognitive and ideological levels. Cognitively, it offers a simple cause–effect schema; ideologically, it delegitimizes global power systems perceived as unjust while legitimizing Pakistan's moral stance.

Thus, through pragmatic inference, nominalization, and modality, Khan's language transforms political discourse into moral reasoning—an appeal that resonates both intellectually and emotionally.

5.3 Corruption and Economic Inequality

5.3.1 Cognitive Framing of Corruption as Moral Disease

Excerpt (3):

"Corruption is the root cause of poverty and injustice."

This sentence exemplifies **conceptual framing** (Lakoff, 2004): *corruption* is metaphorically conceptualized as a **root**, suggesting organic spread and embeddedness. The metaphor activates a cognitive model of disease or infestation, implying that moral purification is required for global health.

Pragmatically, the statement carries a **causal implicature**—audiences infer that eliminating corruption will eliminate poverty and injustice. Such causality invites moral rather than technical reasoning, aligning with Charteris-Black's (2014) idea of **moral metaphorization** in political rhetoric.

5.3.2 Nominalization: Erasure of Agency

Here, *corruption*, *poverty*, and *injustice* are all **nominalized abstractions**. The grammatical pattern suppresses agency—no corruptor or oppressor is directly named. This **erasure of agency** shifts focus from individuals to systemic conditions, creating the impression of moral inevitability. As Fowler (1991) notes, nominalization transforms political acts into naturalized facts, allowing the speaker to criticize global inequality without direct confrontation.

Khan's recurrent nominalizations (e.g., *corruption*, *injustice*, *exploitation*) thus function ideologically as **moral constants**. By reifying social problems, he abstracts them from specific contexts and turns them into universal moral categories accessible to a global audience.

5.3.3 Modality and Moral Accountability

Excerpt (4):

"We must bring back the stolen wealth from corrupt elites."

The modal *must* express **moral compulsion** rather than practical obligation. It constructs a sense of **collective agency ("we")** and **moral necessity ("must")**. The modal choice also presupposes the legitimacy of the speaker's stance—the imperative tone transforms policy into moral mission. This combination of **inclusive pronoun + high-value modality** enacts a collective moral frame. According to Van Leeuwen (2008), such language legitimizes political positions through **moral evaluation**—by implying that inaction equates to complicity.

Khan's repeated use of *must*, *cannot*, and *should* linguistically enforces moral direction, making ideology appear as divine or humanitarian necessity rather than political opinion.

5.4 Islamophobia and Religious Representation
5.4.1 Pragmatic Appeals and Inferential Empathy
Excerpt (5):
"When you mock our Prophet, it hurts us deeply because we love him."

At the cognitive-pragmatic level, this statement invites **empathic inference**. The listener is expected to infer emotional equivalence: the pain of Muslims corresponds to the offense against sacred belief. The use of "you" and "us" introduces **deictic opposition** (Chilton, 2004), constructing an intergroup moral relationship.

This direct address establishes a **communicative bridge**—rather than confrontation, the statement appeals to shared human emotion. It aligns with Relevance Theory's (Sperber & Wilson, 1995) principle of cognitive empathy: effective communication minimizes inferential distance by activating shared affective schemas.

5.4.2 Nominalization and Universalization of Faith
Excerpt (6):
"Islamophobia has created division and hatred in the world."

Here, *Islamophobia* functions as a **nominalized process**—an abstraction representing complex social behaviors. Through nominalization, Khan transforms what could be described as discriminatory acts into a singular global condition. The nominalized form erases agents (those who propagate Islamophobia) while emphasizing the consequence (*division* and *hatred*).

This **grammatical abstraction** enables global moral appeal: by depersonalizing blame, the speaker can criticize global injustice without direct accusation. Fairclough (2003) calls this the **ideological function of abstraction**—shifting the focus from personal accountability to moral awareness.

5.4.3 Modality as Ethical Necessity
Excerpt (7):
"The world must understand that mocking religion leads to division."

The **deontic modal** *must* construct moral instruction. The sentence has both **assertive** and **directive** force—it declares truth and instructs moral behavior simultaneously. This **double function of modality** is what Halliday (1994) identifies as the interface between the interpersonal and ideational metafunctions: expressing moral truth as a factual statement.

Ideologically, this expression frames *religious respect* as a **universal moral duty**, not a regional or Islamic demand. Modality thus performs ideological expansion, universalizing the speaker's faith-based appeal.

5.5 The Kashmir Crisis and Global Morality
5.5.1 Cognitive-Pragmatic Construction of Victimhood
Excerpt (8):
"Eight million people are locked down by the Indian army in Kashmir."

This statement triggers **contextual inference**. The listener infers suffering, injustice, and moral urgency from factual description. Pragmatically, the clause operates as a **communicative implicature**: the explicit content (lockdown) implies moral content (oppression).

Cognitive Pragmatics explains that such implicatures rely on **shared scripts** the audience's knowledge of humanitarian suffering thus producing moral identification with the victims (Wilson & Carston, 2019).

5.5.2 Nominalization and De-Agentivization

Excerpt (9):

"Oppression in Kashmir must end."

The abstract noun *oppression* nominalizes the verb *to oppress*, thereby **removing the oppressor** from discourse. This allows criticism of an action without naming the actor—a common strategy in diplomatic rhetoric. However, the combination with the modal *must* reinserts **moral agency**: someone is implicitly responsible for ending it.

According to Halliday (1994), this tension between nominalization and modality is central to ideological expression—it enables indirect accusation through moral obligation. Khan thus frames *oppression* as universally wrong while implying specific culpability.

5.5.3 Modality and Ideological Urgency

Excerpt (10):

"The world community cannot remain silent."

The **negative epistemic modality** (*cannot*) expresses impossibility—silence is incompatible with moral conscience. It combines moral evaluation with epistemic certainty, producing what Simpson (1993) terms **modal polarization**: dividing moral space between ethical action and unethical silence.

This statement exemplifies how modality enacts **ideological urgency**. It appeals not just to logic but to the listener's conscience, constructing complicity through passivity. In doing so, the speaker transforms an international political issue into a **global moral test**.

5.6 Interaction of Nominalization, Modality, and Pragmatics

The analysis reveals that **nominalization, modality, and pragmatic inference** function not as isolated linguistic devices but as **interdependent ideological mechanisms**. Their combined effect is summarized below:

Mechanism	Linguistic Example	Cognitive Function	Ideological Effect
Nominalization	*justice, oppression, corruption*	Abstracts processes; reduces cognitive load	Universalizes moral claims; hides agency

Modality	*must, cannot, should*	Encodes moral necessity and certainty	Constructs moral urgency and obligation
Pragmatic Inference	*If there is no justice, there can be no peace*	Guides listener's reasoning via implicature	Produces moral causality and emotional alignment

Together, these mechanisms create what Fairclough (1995) calls **"moral hegemony"** the linguistic naturalization of ideology as common sense. Khan's speech demonstrates how cognitive and grammatical resources work synergistically to present political vision as ethical truth.

Discussion:

The findings confirm that Imran Khan's 2019 UNGA speech operates as a **cognitive-grammatical system of ideology**. At the **cognitive level**, inferential reasoning invites audiences to align with moral logic; at the **grammatical level**, nominalization and modality encode obligation and universality; and at the **ideological level**, these mechanisms reinforce frames of *justice–peace*, *oppression–resistance*, and *faith–humanity*. This integration illustrates Van Dijk's (2014) claim that ideology is not merely expressed through language but **constructed through cognitive processing of linguistic cues**. The moral universality of justice and peace, as articulated in Khan's speech, exemplifies how linguistic structures can shape collective cognition and moral perception. Ultimately, Khan's discourse blends **religious ethics**, **political reasoning**, and **humanitarian appeal** through a sophisticated interplay of cognitive and grammatical strategies. His repeated use of **nominalized moral entities** (*justice*, *oppression*, *humanity*) and **high-modality imperatives** (*must act*, *cannot stay silent*) transforms political speech into moral performance—a rhetorical enactment of ideology as truth.

6.1 Summary of Findings

This study examined Imran Khan's 2019 United Nations General Assembly speech through the lens of **Cognitive Pragmatics, Systemic Functional Grammar, and Ideological Framing**. The primary objective was to understand how **nominalization, modality, and pragmatic mechanisms** contribute to the **construction of justice and peace as ideological concepts**.

The analysis yielded several key findings:

1. **Cognitive-Pragmatic Mechanisms**:
   ○ The speech extensively employs **inferential implicatures** and **empathic appeals**, guiding the audience toward specific moral interpretations.
   ○ Statements such as *"There can be no peace without justice"* exemplify **moralcausal reasoning**, where the audience draws connections between ethical principles and social outcomes.
2. **Nominalization**:
   ○ Abstract nouns such as *justice, peace, corruption, oppression,* and *Islamophobia* transform dynamic actions into timeless moral entities.

○ Nominalization **de-agentivizes responsibility**, allowing criticism of systemic injustice without direct confrontation, while reinforcing universality of moral claims.

3. **Modality**:
   ○ Deontic and epistemic modalities (*must, cannot, should*) encode moral necessity, obligation, and ethical evaluation.
   ○ Combined with pronouns like *we* and *the world*, modalities construct **collective moral responsibility**, creating a sense of urgency and imperative action.

4. **Ideological Framing**:
   ○ The speech constructs multiple conceptual frames, notably **Justice–Peace, Oppression–Resistance, and Faith–Humanity**.
   ○ These frames integrate cognitive inference, grammatical abstraction, and moral evaluation to establish Khan's ideological stance as **universal and ethically authoritative**.

5. **Interdependence of Mechanisms**:
   ○ Nominalization, modality, and pragmatic inference operate synergistically, producing moral universality, emotional engagement, and ideological legitimation.
   ○ Linguistic strategies do not merely communicate political positions but actively **shape cognitive perception of global justice and peace**.

In summary, Khan's speech demonstrates how **linguistic structures encode ideology**, transforming political discourse into moral reasoning. The combined cognitive-grammatical mechanisms amplify the ethical authority of the speaker, construct moral universality, and influence audience perception, aligning with Van Dijk's (2014) model of **cognitive ideology construction**.

6.2 Theoretical Implications
The study contributes to multiple areas of discourse and linguistic research:

1. **Cognitive Pragmatics and Political Discourse**:
   ○ This research provides empirical evidence that **inferential reasoning and empathic alignment** are crucial for ideological persuasion in global political speeches.
   ○ It supports Relevance Theory (Sperber & Wilson, 1995) as a framework for analyzing moral and political discourse.

2. **Grammar and Ideology**:
   ○ Nominalization and modality emerge as **strategic grammatical devices** in political rhetoric, supporting Fairclough's (2003) claim that **grammatical structures encode ideological meaning**.
   ○ The study highlights the importance of examining grammar not only as structural but as functional in constructing moral universality.

3. **Ideological Framing**:
   ○ By mapping **Justice–Peace, Oppression–Resistance, and Faith–Humanity frames**, the research demonstrates how cognitive and grammatical mechanisms interact to **naturalize political ideology as ethical truth**.
   ○ This integrated framework may serve as a model for analyzing political discourse across cultures and contexts.

6.3 Practical Implications

The findings have practical relevance for **political communication, diplomacy, and media analysis**:

1. **Policy Advocacy**:
   - Politicians and global leaders can strategically use **nominalization and modality** to frame moral narratives without alienating specific audiences.
   - Such framing can increase **international support** for humanitarian and justicerelated causes.
2. **Media and Discourse Analysis**:
   - Understanding **cognitive-pragmatic mechanisms** enables media analysts to critically evaluate speeches, distinguishing **ethical appeals from purely political rhetoric**.
3. **Education and Linguistic Training**:
   - The study offers a framework for teaching students of linguistics, communication, and political science how language shapes **moral and ideological perception**.

Recommendations for Future Research

Based on the study's findings, the following directions are recommended:

Compare political speeches from different cultural and religious contexts to examine whether **nominalization, modality, and pragmatic strategies** are universally applied or culture-specific. Employ corpus-based methods to **measure frequency and co-occurrence patterns** of nominalization and modality in political speeches for statistical validation of cognitive-ideological effects. Investigate audience interpretation to determine how **cognitive-pragmatic mechanisms influence perception** of justice and moral authority in international discourse. Further refine the **Cognitive-Grammatical Ideological Model (CGIM)** to integrate additional linguistic features such as metaphor, modality gradation, and speech acts for more robust predictive power.

6.5 Concluding Remarks

Imran Khan's 2019 UNGA speech shows how language builds moral ideas. He blends cognitive meaning, grammar, and ideology to discuss justice, peace, and oppression. The result is a message that feels moral and global in scope. Language here is not neutral. It acts as a tool that shapes thought and belief. Through it, leaders turn politics into moral duty. Knowing these methods helps scholars and policymakers read global messages critically. It also helps them see how moral framing shapes public understanding. Nominalization, modality, and pragmatic inference work together in this process. Together, they reveal how leaders express ethics, power, and responsibility before the world.

References:

Ahmed, S., & Javed, M. (2022). A rhetorical analysis of Imran Khan's speeches at international forums: Themes of justice and global peace. *Journal of Political Discourse Studies, 5*(2), 45–62.

Charteris-Black, J. (2014). *Analysing political speeches: Rhetoric, discourse and metaphor*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Chilton, P. (2004). *Analysing political discourse: Theory and practice*. Routledge.

Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. Longman.

Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and power* (2nd ed.). Pearson Education.

Fowler, R. (1991). *Language in the news: Discourse and ideology in the press*. Routledge.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). *An introduction to functional grammar* (2nd ed.). Edward Arnold.

Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2014). *Halliday's introduction to functional grammar* (4th ed.). Routledge.

Lakoff, G. (2004). *Don't think of an elephant! Know your values and frame the debate*. Chelsea Green.

Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (1995). *Relevance: Communication and cognition* (2nd ed.). Blackwell.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1998). *Ideology: A multidisciplinary approach*. SAGE Publications.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2006). Discourse and manipulation. *Discourse & Society, 17*(3), 359–383. https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926506060250

Van Dijk, T. A. (2008). *Discourse and context: A sociocognitive approach*. Cambridge University Press.

Wilson, D., & Sperber, D. (2012). *Meaning and relevance*. Cambridge University Press. Wodak, R. (2001). The discourse-historical approach. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 63–94). SAGE Publications.