CHAPTER II
THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE
Every institution is characterised by the ideas which affect its manner of operations or working. These ideas also affect the way its members would like to see that institution, besides their own place or roles within, and outside that institution.

If we look at journalists from the same viewpoint, their ideas in their workplace, would determine not only their behaviour but also their actions i.e., writings. They may not have a very strong ideological base to share with each other but the unwritten, subtle, latent structures of ideas emanating from their work culture of time/space constraints, profit orientation of the industry they work in etc. would certainly be of significance in determining the tenor of their writings. We have taken up an extensive explanation of ideology in this chapter, to enable us to give extra meaning to our topic. We feel, there are two ways of looking at ideology. One, that it is constructed by people (in our case journalists). And two, it is a storehouse of categories, or, ways of constituting the world, which is what newsmakers, we feel, may be engaging in. The Press in our opinion does a lot of what ideology does. In fact, it may be a case fit for 'ideology objectified.' What follows, is a survey of relevant theoretical perspectives, for harnessing insights and conceptual orientations from other studies.

Luard, E,¹ distinguishes between social ideology (i.e., a general set of ideas that guide and influence and justify the life of the society as a whole, "a

set of closely related beliefs and ideas, or even attitudes, characteristic of a
group or community", and political ideology i.e., ‘a set of ideas that explains
and identifies the beliefs and attitudes of a particular group or class. While the
latter is usually concerned, directly or indirectly to criticize the existing order
and to show reasons why it is to be changed, or must inevitably change, the
former will seek to justify and maintain the existing order." The same author
also feels that while the assumptions of a political ideology would be accepted
by particular groups only, i.e., mainly those groups seeking radical change, the
social ideology would be by and large shared by the society’s members, even
if it is in different degrees.

This latter understanding of the term ideology would be applicable to our
perception vis-a-vis journalists’ way of thinking which in turn influences their
manner of writing.

According to Luard, there are different ways in which a social ideology
influences behaviour and relations. Firstly, by the language it uses - it
establishes a set of concepts and categories which explain or justify the existing
social relationships; it may be only implicit in the choice of terms without
explicitly justifying the same. The establishment of the concept of beauty, for
instance, in largely Western and commercialised senses, almost justifies the

3 Luard, op.cit., p.90.
widespread coverage given to beauty pageants by the media, including newspapers.

Secondly, the concepts and categories will establish an image of society that influences a section within it. They will also, finally, establish a set of value standards which will imply approval for existing relationships. This would ensure legitimacy for the approved social or political system besides surrounding it with an element of respect.

"The importance of ideology is its effect on action: on the aspirations and behaviour of the members of society generally...." 4

The entire issue of 'making news' as Gaye Tuchman would use it, is relevant in so far as we look at the common denominator or set of ideas which govern journalists' stereotypical stances or perspectives on issues that involve public concern on a large scale and have a high visibility, like Indo-Pak relations, environmental pollution like the one during Bhopal Gas Tragedy, beauty pageants etc.

This is of concern to us from the point of view of looking at the newspaper as an important determinant and also an expression of changing social perceptions. Before dealing with the press and its 'constructions' we would like to sociologically deal with the theoretical perspectives relevant for this study.

---

4 ibid, pp.91-92.
As compared with other patterns of beliefs, ideologies are relatively highly systematized or integrated around one or a few preeminent values such as salvation, equality or ethnic purity. They are more insistent on their distinctiveness from, and, unconnectedness with, the outlooks, creeds and other ideologies existing in the same society. They are resistant to innovations in their beliefs and deny the existence or significance of those which do occur. Their acceptance and promulgation are accompanied by highly affective overtones. Complete individual subservience to the ideology is demanded of those who accept it and it is regarded as essential and imperative that their conduct be completely permeated by it.

Consensus among all those who affirm their adherence is likewise demanded; all adherents of the ideology are urgently expected to be in complete agreement with each other.\(^5\)

Since the ideal always diverges from the existent, the ideology contends for the realization of a state of affairs which its proponents alleged, either never existed previously, or, existed in the past but exists no longer. Every ideology however great the originality of its creations-arises in the midst of an ongoing culture - it therefore cannot entirely distance itself from important elements of that culture. Ideology differs from an outlook because of its greater explicitness, internal integration and (systematization), comprehensiveness.

---

urgency of its application, intensity of concentration focused on certain central propositions or evaluations. So all ideologies,

whether progressive or traditionalistic, revolutionary and reactionary entail an aggressive alienation from the existing society; they recommend the transformation of the lives of their exponents in accordance with specific principles; they insist on consistency and thoroughness in their exponents application of principles; and they recommend either their adherents complete dominion over the societies in which they live or their total self protective withdrawal from these societies.  

Ideologies are always concerned with authority in whichever form, and due to this reason they have a political colour except when there is an extreme reaction -formation of complete withdrawal from society. The evaluation of authority is the centre of ideological outlook and around it are integrated all other objects and their evaluations. An ideology is the product of man's need for imposing intellectual order on the world. They arrive in conditions of crises and become popular within those groups of society to whom the existing outlook has become unacceptable. This means that an ideology arises because of strongly felt needs which have been dissatisfied by the prevailing outlook. The disposition towards ideological construction is one of the fundamental characteristics of the human race, once it reaches a certain stage of intellectual development. However the chief bearer of an ideology is referred to as an ideological primary group(Shils). A comrade is a comrade by virtue of his beliefs which are perceived as his most significant qualities. A fully developed

---

6 ibid, p.68.
ideological primary group is separated by sharply defined boundaries from the "world" from which it seeks to protect itself or over which it seeks to triumph.

According to John B Thompson\(^7\) to study ideology is in someway to study language in the social world. It is to study the ways in which language is used in every day social life from the most mundane encounter between friends and family members to the most privileged forums of political debate. It is to study the ways in which the multifarious uses of the languages intersect with power nourishing it, sustaining it, enacting it. The theory of ideology invites us to see that language is not simply a structure which can be employed for communication or entertainment but a social - historical phenomenon which is embroiled in human conflict.

According to Thompson the term can be used in two fundamentally different ways -

1. Ideology, as if it were a purely descriptive term "systems of thought", "systems of belief Symbolic practices" which pertain to social action or political projects - neutral conception of ideology.

2. Ideology - linked to the process of sustaining asymmetrical relations of power i.e to the process of maintaining domination - critical conception of ideology. - (it preserves a negative connotation which has been conveyed by the term through out most of its history and it binds the analysis of ideology to the question of critique.

The author has tried to redirect this theory away from the search for collectively shared values and towards the study of the complex ways in which

meaning is mobilised for the maintenance of relations of domination. The author feels that we must resist the view that ideology is pure illusion, an inverted or distorted image of what is "real". Once we recognise that ideology operates through language and that language is a medium of social action we must also acknowledge that ideology is partially constitutive of what, in our societies, is "real". Ideology is not a pale image of the social world, but is part of that world, a creative and constitutive element of our social life.

By using language, we are constantly engaged in a creative, imaginary activity, besides being involved in extending the meaning of words, in producing new meaning to metaphor, word play and interpretation; we are thereby also involved, knowingly or not, in altering undermining or reinforcing our relations with others in the world. To study ideology is to study in part the ways in which these creative imaginary activities serve to sustain social relations which are asymmetrical with regard to power. Ideologies may not necessarily replicate the facts of experience which they claim to interpret and dominate. Even the most systematically elaborated ideology like all systems of belief, scientific and non-scientific contains inconsistencies and ambiguities. Ideologies may change because of the pressure of external reality.

Ideologies are often accepted by persons who, by temperament, or by culture, are ideologically predisposed. Such persons might be inclined to express their view with aggressive effect, might feel a strong need to
distinguish between comrades and enemies, or might have been raised in a salvationary, apocalyptic culture.

The question of the relationship between truth and ideology has been raised by the tradition of European thought which culminated in Marxism and in the Sociology of knowledge developed by Mannheim. According to this view, ideology is by its nature untruthful since it entails a "Masking" or "veiling" of unavowed and unperceived motives or "interest". These interests distort reality for the ideologist and for their antagonists. Thus in this view, ideology is a manifestation of a "false consciousness" with reference to the cognitive truthfulness of ideologies, it should be pointed out that no great ideology has ever regarded the disciplined pursuit of truth-by scientific procedures and in the mood characteristic of modern science as part of its obligations. Journalists too, we feel, may not want to project the truth as much as wanting to project something in a certain manner.

This view is also expressed in the proposition that ideologies must necessarily be distortions of reality because they are impelled by consideration of prospective advantage or of interest. Like the ideological orientation, the view which asserts the inevitability of false consciousness assumes - that cognitive motives and standards play little part in the determination of success or failure in the assessment of reality.

The ideological culture in some senses does often interfere with the attainment of truth. This is, however a result of the closure of the ideological disposition to new evidence and its distrust of
all who do not share the same ideological disposition. The chief source of tension between ideology and truth lies therefore in the concurrent demands of the exponents of ideologies for unity of belief and disciplined adherence on the part of their fellow believers. Both these features of the ideological orientation make for dogmatic inflexibility and unwillingness to allow new experience to contribute to the growth of truth. This applies particularly to the social sciences, the subject matter of which overlaps so considerably with that of ideology and which is therefore so often the object of ideological and quasi-ideological judgements. The tension is less pronounced with respect to the natural sciences. However, here also ideologies tend to inhibit the growth of understanding, because of their concern with man's nature and the nature of the universe and because of their insistence on the unity of knowledge. 8

In so far as the social sciences have been genuinely intellectual pursuits, which have their own rules of observation and judgement and are open to criticism and revision, they are antipathetic to ideology.

H.M. Johnson has enlisted some of the major sources of ideology as social strain, vested interests, bitterness, limited social perceptsives, and, outmoded science.

Social strain may be caused by dissatisfaction with some aspect of the functioning of the system with for eg. the level of goal attainment or with the distribution of rewards, opportunities, authority or facilities. The most important external source of strain may be cultural change. Changes in religion, science or technology may have a profound impact on peoples conceptions of what is possible and what is tolerable. An internal source of strain is anomie: inadequacy of the cultural patterning of social interaction, as

8 Shils, op.cit., p.74.
manifested in uncertainty and anxiety about rights and obligations and about the functioning of the social system as it affects particular social groups, categories and persons-in roles.

Closely connected with some of the above kinds of strain is concern for vested interests or prospective gains. By "vested interests" are meant all kinds of advantages tangible and intangible, that enjoy some measure of legitimacy and protection from the status quo at any given time. In this context, the vested interests of managers/owners of newspaper organisations may be seen.

Social change usually takes place only against opposition, and even if it is successful, those who have lost something as a result of it are, of course, likely to be embittered. Thus an important source of ideology is the bitter feeling of groups, social categories or individuals who have lost social prestige, wealth, income or authority. The press, for instance during the freedom movement, happened to be one of the few sources of reflecting the crisis of self-image amongst the embittered masses.

It may be presumed that a very general cause of distortion is the fact that everyone occupies a limited number of social positions, and therefore does not have an opportunity to acquire firsthand knowledge of most of the system. In our opinion, journalists may be occupying a certain social position due to which many of them may be unable to empathise with people belonging to certain strata in society.
The fact that ideology is distorted or selective does not necessarily prevent it from having positive effects. An ideology is likely to be a relatively simple definition of a complex situation - able to 'explain' difficulties for a large number of people and able to activate them according to a common definition of the situation and common plan.

Johnson\(^9\) proposes that "understanding" ideology is more than grasping the fact that distortion exists. It involves explaining why distortion exists, and why this particular distortion.

The word 'ideology' was first used in the late eighteenth century to mean "the study of ideas" but it soon came to refer to ideas about society, with the connotation that these ideas were distorted or unduly selective from a rational objective point of view. A narrow definition of ideology consists only of those parts or aspects of a system of social ideas which are distorted or unduly selective from a scientific point of view so an ideology is a more or less coherent system of ideas in which ideological distortion is important.

Since social life is complex, distorted ideas about social systems are quite common. By simplifying complex situations, these ideas help many diverse people to cooperate toward the social change, and at other times facilitates desirable or undesirable resistance to social pressure for change.

Literally referring to a science(or logos) of ideas, the term was used in that sense by the French philosopher, Destutt-de-Tracy in his book *Elements* -

\(^9\) H.M.Johnson in Shils (ed) *Encyclopedia of Social Science*. 38
*Ideologic* published in 1801. For Tracy, words merely encapsulate what our sensations tell us. It follows that if we alter our sensations or rather, the environment that gives rise to those sensations, then our thinking also will change. Together with other Enlightenment philosophers, de Tracy was trying to define a way of discovering "truth" other than through faith and authority - the traditional methods encouraged by Church and State.

The negative connotations of the term arose with Napoleon who denounced the "ideologists" as irresponsible speculators who were subverting morality and patriotism. As a republican, Napoleon had been sympathetic to the ideas of philosophers; as Emperor, he recognised the importance of religious orthodoxy for the maintenance of the state.

So, it was Napoleon who, by chance, gave the word 'ideology' its modern meaning. When Tracy and his colleagues tried to thwart Napoleon's imperial ambitions, he scornfully called them "ideologists", meaning people who wanted to substitute abstract considerations for *real* politics as it was later called. From then onwards ideology signified those abstract theories allegedly based on reason or science, which tried to map-out the social order and guide political action.

Ideology is associated with a *science of ideas*, the notion that ideas are derived from some underlying extra-ideational basis (Physiology, class, the struggle for power etc.) the denunciation of ideas as visionary and subversive
and hence the association of doctrines or myths with some group or movement bent on putting a dangerous political or cultural plan into effect.

The pejorative meaning of ideology became a stand by of the political struggle during the nineteenth century as the politics of the notables gave way to the development of political parties with their appeals to the masses.

A related theoretical perspective to be gained from, for our study is the sociology of knowledge which may be broadly defined as that branch of sociology which studies the relation between thought and society. It is concerned with the social or existential conditions of knowledge i.e. it attempts to relate ideas to the socio-historical settings in which they are produced and received. Several philosophers of Enlightenment (Condorcet particularly) inquired about the social preconditions of different types of knowledge and A. Comte's famous "law of 3 stages" assisting the intimate relationship between types of social structure and types of knowledge, might well be considered a contribution to the sociology of knowledge. For Marx, as a materialist, "existence determined consciousness" and any attempt to draw a picture of reality from ideas alone could produce only "false consciousness". He analysed the ways in which systems of ideas appeared to depend on the social position - particularly the class positions of their proponents.

There are four main aspects of Marx's theory of ideology. The first is concerned with the manner in which the economic basis of society conditions the thinking of the members of that society. The second concerns the effect the
development of the division of labour has on our thinking. The third concerns the way in which in an ideology, the effects of history on our contemporary thinking and position are overlooked. The fourth aspect is concerned with the way in which ideological control manifests itself in the cultural dominance of the ruling class in society.

So, the main thesis of Marx’s theory of ideology material production provides the foundation of human experience and is therefore of crucial importance in the formation of an individual’s thinking. In this view, the development of the division of labour is more than anything else responsible for the emergence or growth of ideological-thinking.

The division of labour is a ‘structural’ cause of ideological thinking. In the first place, it makes thinking the separate activity of one group, abstracting this group from the rest of society. Thinking for the first time becomes a ‘higher’ activity hence the mysterious select quality of members of the priesthood. The modern capitalist division of labour, limits the development of the individual to one aspect of production. The individual is a journalist rather than a printer, a musician rather than a painter, assembles cars rather than designs them. This splitting up of roles and tasks under a capitalist employer leads to the productive process becoming the master of the individual which leads to latent conflict between the interests of the individuals and the

---

10 Marx and Engels have dealt at length with ideology in ‘German Ideology’ written in 1845-46 in Brussels where they sought refuge from the german and French secret police.
interests of the society as a whole. Ideology, for Marx, forms a 'vicious circle' which can only be broken at the level of economic activity.

The essence of Marx's later version of a communist society is not that every one can do what they like, but that the combined activity of producers should be regulated by a common plan. It is this common plan of production which brings the division of labour properly under society's control that ultimately dispels the confusions of ideology. For Marx and Engels, ideological thinkers are those thinkers who fail to see the connection between their thinking and their historically determined circumstances.

In one respect therefore, history deceives us all. Since we as well as the material and social phenomena we observe, are products of history, we come initially to look at things in a way which is impregnated with the past. Our finest efforts to understand something cannot help but be influenced by previous conceptions and preconceptions.

Those who write history for the most part belong to the society which is being studied. Moreover, they not infrequently belong to the ruling groups in that society. Ideological thinking will cease to have a hold only where those social, material circumstances giving rise to it are removed. But there are severe obstacles to removing the social circumstances which give rise to ideology. This is because the ideology of an epoch is the ideology of the ruling class of that epoch and so permeates the thinking of all social classes. Shades of this approach, as we can see, may be easily applied to the ideology of
journalists who if not belonging to the ruling group, do certainly represent an upper or middle class perspective in their writings.

It is only natural that individual should encourage the spread of ideas which are favourable to their class. And with the increase and growth in the division of labour, the ruling class will employ a special group of intellectual producers to carry out this task for them.

The persistent tendency in western thought is due to the underlying assumption that ideas cannot and should not be taken at face value, but must be analysed in terms of the 'forces' that lie behind them.\(^\text{11}\)

Marx was much less interested in finding out whether it is externally imposed by reality on these classes, than in showing the origin of ideology as a kind of practice a restricted practice which is the basis of both the contradictory reality and ideology.\(^\text{12}\) Ideology cannot, then be "dissolved by mental criticism ... but only by the practical overthrow of the actual social relations which gave rise to this idealistic humbug....\(^\text{13}\)

Here one can only point to the fact that a distinction between idealistic superstructure and ideology implies that the class character of certain ideas does

---

11 Several references like Theses on Feurbach, 1845, Communist Manifesto, 1848, Capital 1867, show that throughout his career, Marx placed his own work at the centre of his world-historical distinction between ideology and truth.


not suffice to characterise them as ideology and, moreover, that not all errors or distortions are necessarily ideological.\textsuperscript{14}

The selection from The German Ideology is a representative statement of the Marxian conception of ideology as a reflection of class interests. Although ideology arises out of the social rendition that characterize any historical period, the ideology itself can become a developing force, shaping the behaviour of the individuals living under it.

\textit{In the German Ideology} his conception of the relationship between the mind and society leads him to the conclusion that the forces of production ultimately determine the mental structure of a particular epoch. Marx grants that the ideological structure can, in turn, influence social conditions, but this influence itself is always traceable to the underlying structure. Thus ideological influence at any particular time is analogous to a sieve, which simply filters predetermined phenomena without affecting them appreciably.\textsuperscript{15}

Ideology develops as a function of particular social class within a predetermined structure that also has a predetermined content. Marx believed that class position can also determine an "Ideological advantage" for the power elite of any society. Thus, those who occupy positions of power in any society have an ideology that trickles down through the social structure and contaminates that of the proletarian classes. The ruinous effect of the ideology


of the ruling class is heightened by the fact that economic and political power go hand in hand; to control the ideology in one realm is, by definition, to control it in the other. Objective superiority in the class system means subjective superiority, i.e. the power of ideological exploitation. As industrial society becomes more complex, therefore, one has the paradoxical combination of ideological exploitation of the masses and a diversifying ideological structure.

For Marx the illusions of men can easily be explained by their practical position in life, their job, and the division of labour. This again would be applicable to the perception of journalists who we feel may be writing for the benefit of certain strata in society.

For *Emile Durkheim* the individual factor is negligible. The mind of the individual, according to Durkheim is only one aspect of the collective mind of the social order. The mental level of social organization in a society is manifested in the collective consciousness which serves to bind the individual to the social group. The collective consciousness consists of the various symbols and shared representations that develop out of the group's perception of itself relative to the object that it utilizes. Durkheim's sociology is representative of the French approach to the sociology of knowledge and is also linked to the concern of the American social behaviourists.

Although Durkheim (1858-1927) does not provide a systematic analysis of the concept of ideology, at least he uses the term and proposes a certain
understanding of it. The context in which Durkheim first deals with ideology is the attempt in The Rules to lay the foundations of sociology as a science of social facts. Starting from the methodological tenet that social facts should be considered as things, Durkheim sees that men form some ideas or pre-concepts on things, which naturally tend to substitute themselves for the real things. These ideas or preconception may become the subject of science and speculation instead of the things themselves. A science concerned with these ideas can only produce what Durkheim calls an 'ideological analysis', that is to say, it becomes a science which 'proceeds from ideas to things, not from things to ideas'.

Durkheim defines ideology in contrast with science, and he depicts it as those preconceptions or ideas which constitute an obstacle to the scientific understanding of reality. However, ideology also refers to ideas that harmonize men's actions with their environment. "Men need to regulate their behaviour by means of certain notions which allow them to adjust to reality...." Pre-notions have precisely this adaptive role although they are theoretically false.

Ideology is simply an illusion derived from an innate predisposition of the human mind and fixed by habit. Although a crucial phenomenon for the emergence of a science of social facts, ideology is not itself considered as a

17 Ibid, p.15.
social fact. However, there exists a clear contrast between Durkheim's analysis of religion and his early concept of ideology.

Durkheim implicitly evokes his old conception of ideology, according to which religion itself is not ideological but the idea which some people have of religion is ideological. Although the term ideology is no longer used, the phenomenon described follows the conception elaborated in The Rules. Religion would be a social fact but instead of analysing it as a thing, philosophers would be content to analyse the idea or pre-notion which they have made for themselves of religion.

While Durkheim traces ideology back to the subjectivity of the general form of society, Marx specifies historical practices, contradictions and material conditions which, within society, determine it. For Marx it was crucial to grasp material production not as a general category but in definite historical form in order to examine its connection with spiritual production. Durkheim, on the contrary, tends to conceive of representations as social in the sense that there is a collective subject that 'thinks' them

Durkheim accuses Marx of reducing consciousness to a mere epiphenomenon of its morphological basis. But he can be accused in turn of reducing consciousness to the result of a hypostatized collective experience. By describing the social as prior to men's practice, Durkheim somehow substantialises it as a kind of second nature. The logical consequences is that social facts like, ideology, became normative with respect to men's practice,
whatever their value and whatever men do about it.\textsuperscript{18} In a strange way and
despite Durkheim's disregard for psychology, his conception of ideology ends
up very near a psychological conception. While \textit{Freud} looks for the substratum
of ideology in the individual psyche, Durkheim looks for it in the collective
consciousness. But in both cases ideology, separated from historical social
contradiction, has become attached to be a general form, be it the Oedipus
complex or the collective idiosyncrasy. Both substrata appear as given,
ahistorical facts which substitute for specific determinations.\textsuperscript{19}

\textit{Mannheim's} orientation allowed for the probability that all ideas, even
'truths' were related to, and hence influenced by the social and historical
situation from which they emerged. The very fact that each thinker is affiliated
with particular groups in society that he occupies a certain status and enacts
certain social roles - colours his intellectual outlook. For Mannheim all
knowledge and all ideas, although to different degrees, are "bound to a
Location" within the social structure and the historical process.

So, in Mannheim's view all human knowledge is socially conditioned.
Mannheim distinguished between the Particular and The Total Conception of
Ideology. \textit{The particular Conception of ideology} looks upon the individual in
a utilitarian way. Every individual, it is agreed, in pursuit of self interest will
interpret the facts according to his or her needs at the time. To Counter the

\textsuperscript{18} \textsuperscript{18} Larrain, op.cit., p.99.
\textsuperscript{19} \textsuperscript{19} Ibid, p.99.
weakness of the particular psychological view of ideology, Mannheim puts forward his *total conception of ideology* as that which requires the use of a radically different technique from the particular conception. It not only brings into question the individuals underlying assumptions but also the underlying assumption of the culture of the social group to which the individual belongs. Concentration of or on a psychology of interest is replaced by a concentration upon *objective social and economic circumstances*. What is crucial are not subjective inclinations or feelings but the effect of social settings upon an individual's perspectives. Mannheims primary concern is to move beyond the partisan character of earlier accounts and to transform the analysis of ideology into a sociology of knowledge, which would be based on the general formulation of the total conception of ideology.

So, Mannheim's fundamental theses on ideology is similar to that of Marx where all human knowledge is socially conditioned. He sees ideology developing from a particular conception to total conception, and from the special formulation of the latter to its general formulation, that is, the sociology of knowledge. The particular conception of ideology consists of a certain scepticism with which one judges the adversary's ideas. These are regarded as more or less conscious deceptions which disguise the pursuance of partial interest. The total conception of ideology operates at a sociological level, in contrast with the psychological approach of the particular conception. It calls into question the opponent's total "Weltanschauung" it challenges the whole
outlook of a social group, not merely the partial ideas of individuals. That is why the total conception entails a radical criticism.

Mannheim even points out the limitations of the particulars view of ideology. It focuses entirely upon the individual Mannheim especially objects to the application of the particular conception of ideology to the thinking of groups. A reductionist approach such as this, which breaks up each group into a number of individuals motivated by self-interest, entirely misjudges the nature of ideology.

It brings into question the underlying assumptions of both the individuals as well as the cultures of their social groups. What are crucial here are not subjective inclinations or feelings but the effect of social settings upon an individuals perspective. Thus as soon as the total conception of ideology is used, we attempt to reconstruct the whole outlook of a social group and neither the concrete individual nor the abstract sum of them can legitimately be considered as bearers of this ideological thought system as a whole. Both the personality of the individual and the personality of the group, is formed by the collective ideology.

Mannheim also distinguished between ideological thought and utopian thought. The term 'ideological' is reserved for a special sort of distortion which 'fails to take account of the new realities applying to a situation' and which attempts to conceal them by thinking of them in categories which are inappropriate. According to Mannheim, this mentality has not yet 'grown up
to the present (Ideology and Utopia). The utopian distortion on the other hand, transcends the present and is orientated towards the future: it originates in a mentality which is "beyond the present".

So, an additional prerequisite for the utopian mentality is a tendency to destroy in practice the status quo. According to Mannheim, it is not always easy to distinguish ideologies from utopia: both are beyond present reality and, therefore, a value-judgement is required as to what reality is.

One can safely expect the representative of a given order to think of reality as the present structures, which support their interests: consequently, they label as utopian all transformatory point of views. Conversely, those who want a change think of reality as these facts of social life which points towards a new order that will represent their interest: they consequently label as ideological the conservative point of view.20

According to Mannheim

Ideologies are the situationally transcendent ideas which never succeed de facto in the realization of their projected contents".21

Ruling classes have on the whole failed to distinguish between Utopias and Ideologies and for the most part, have even profited from their confusion. Utopias according to Mannheim are more socially progressive than ideologies.

Mannheim made Marx's viewpoint more systematic and tried to avoid the uncertainty to which it led by developing the concept of the 'free-floating intelligentsia: according to Mannheim intellectuals held a position which is

---

20 Larrain, 1979, op.cit., p.113.
21 ibid, p.175.
essentially detached or ‘floating’ in respect of the different classes which make up what has come to be called the ‘social structure’.

*Mannheim’s* orientation, allowed for the probability that all ideas, even "truths" were related to, and hence influenced by the social and historical situation from which they emerged. The very fact that each thinker is affiliated with particular groups in society - that he occupies a certain status and enacts certain social roles - colours his intellectual outlook.

‘For Mannheim, the sociology of knowledge, as general social inquiry, is destined to play a considerable role in the intellectual and political life of society, particularly in an age of dissolution and conflict, by examining sociologically the very conditions which have given rise to competing ideas, political philosophies, ideologies and diverse cultural products. According to Mannheim the sociology of knowledge must also be a diagnosis of its time and provide practical solutions in an age of disenchantment and disorientation.

According to Larrain in the first version every point of view has an ideological character. It is therefore very difficult to envisage what is really specific to the concept of ideology. When the concept is universalized in such a way that it may cover all parties in all epochs, it ends up with very little meaning and loses its critical capability. In the second version ideology is confined to the conscious lies and illusions of political parties and groups.

It is not that ideology could not exist as a conscious deception; we know that it takes this form on many occasions. "The problem real would arise when one would reduce the ideological
phenomenon to this one case, leaving aside the vast field of distorted knowledge produced as a result of social contradictions, but not as conscious lie. Ideology is psychologized. It assumes a moral connotation which unduly links it more with political decisions than with objective contradictions. Hence ideology risks losing its anchorage in social reality to become a kind of free decision attributable to the will of social groups.\textsuperscript{22}

One of the best-known latter-day examples of the sociology of knowledge perspective is Robert K. Merton’s paradigm for the sociology of knowledge. The function of Merton’s paradigm is to present a series of questions, the answers to which should provide the information necessary for a complete theory of the sociology of knowledge. On the basis of the paradigm, Merton is able to criticize many of the traditional approaches to the sociology of knowledge. The paradigm provides the sociologist of knowledge with a tool for investigating relationships between the socio cultural environment and mental productions. Merton’s work can be seen as an attempt to demonstrate the many ways in which facets of social existence influence mental productions through their relationship to the existential bases. Thus, for example, whereas the bureaucrat develops his motivations and responses under the influence of particular cultural pattern, the scientist may develop and pursue his interests under the influence of a different mental structure.

Ideological Analysis, Merton says, help to debunk the ‘Face value’ of the Statements, beliefs etc.

\textsuperscript{22} ibid.
In his paradigm, for the sociology of knowledge - Merton raises the following questions, for a detailed exploration:

1. Where is the existential basis of Mental production located? and answer the same by enumerating as social basis and cultural basis.

2. What mental productions are being sociologically analysed?

3. How are mental production related to the existential basis?

4. Why are manifest and latent functions imputed to these existentially conditioned mental productions?

5. When do the imputed relations of the existential base and knowledge obtain?23

*Boudon*24 has classified the various interpretations of ideology by reference to two criteria - Marxist tradition/Non-Marxist tradition; definition based/non-based on the criterion of truth and falsehood.

Boudon opines that the word ‘ideology’ made its appearance, took on its present day meaning, and became widespread when, at the end of the eighteenth century and in the nineteenth century, great efforts were made to use Reason and Science as a basis for a social order which until then had been built on Tradition.

Taking a stance in favour of the Marx-Aron-Parsons definition of ideology, Boudon25, summarizes his own arguments as follows:


25 Ibid, p.28
1. The word ‘ideology’ achieved salience in the nineteenth century because it described a new social reality, that is, the more and more widespread trend to explain the bases of social order and political action by analysis of a scientific kind. Simultaneously, the pejorative nature of the word showed the limitations of this and the risk of distortion to which it was open.

2. Most ideologies, whether major or minor, ‘left wing’ or ‘right wing’ are characterized by the fact that they are based on doctrines conforming to the scientific approach.

**Types of Definition of Ideology**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Tradition</th>
<th>Based on the Criterion of True/False</th>
<th>Not Based on the Criterion of True/false</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marxist Tradition</td>
<td>MARX: Ideology as false science</td>
<td>LENIN: Ideology as a weapon in the class struggle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theorists of Consciousness Reflection</td>
<td>ALTHUSSER: Ideology as the atmosphere indispensable to social respiration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-MARXIST TRADITION</td>
<td>ARON: Ideology as not deriving directly from the criterion of true and false, but deriving indirectly from it.</td>
<td>GEERTZ: Ideology as symbolic action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PARSONS: Ideology as a deviation from scientific objectivity</td>
<td>SHILS: Ideology as a specific type of belief system.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Another very significant view for our study is Peter Berger and Luckman's interpretative approach.\textsuperscript{26}

Berger's main target was the classical sociology of knowledge which he believed to be determinist, thereby denying, the role of the individual in actively creating bodies of knowledge'. Mannheim on the other hand has stressed the primacy of social structures in the social construction of reality.

For Berger, the classical sociology of knowledge, has been overly concerned with the study of the theoretical or the opinions, beliefs and theories of intellectuals and with the implications for the truth and falsity of the beliefs concerned.

For Berger the everyday life world is experienced as an ordered reality, an inter-subjective reality and also an objective reality that is, a reality 'out there' which appears independent of volition.\textsuperscript{27}

In trying to apply the sociology of knowledge to the problem of identity, Berger's contribution also has a social-psychological interpretation of modernity. In the Social Construction of Reality the authors contend that the Sociology of Knowledge must concern itself with whatever passes for "knowledge" in a society, regardless of the ultimate validity or invalidity of such "knowledge" and in so far as "all human knowledge is developed

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
transmitted and maintained in social situation. "...The sociology of knowledge is concerned with the analysis of the social construction of reality." 28

For Berger an individual's biography, is continually involved in a bargaining between an objective identity (What society tells him is) and a subjective identity (What he perceives himself). So far his identity is not an ontological given but a socially constructed phenomena. In tackling the range of possible selves Berger draws a contrast between traditional and modern types. In traditional society there was always a relatively high degree of symmetry objectively assigned and subjectively appropriated identities. 29 Berger and Luckman have examined the processes whereby persons create a personal view of social reality as they are socialized into any society (The subjective view of reality) and the ways in which such views are objectified as institutions that come to be seen as obdurate factors in any social system (The objective view of reality). For Berger,

to be a sociologist need not mean that one become either a heartless observer or a propagandist. Rather it should mean that each act of understanding stands in an existential tension with one's values, even those, indeed especially those, that one holds most passionately. 30

Something quite applicable to the journalist, we feel.

28 Berger and Luckman, op.cit., p.15.


Berger does point to two positions of avoiding the pain and difficulty of doing sociology.\textsuperscript{31}

One way is to segregate the process of sociological understanding from all questions of value to the point where the sociologist tries to fashion himself into an utterly detached observer, or, alternatively, adheres to his own values without any reference to sociological insights. This is either dehumanizing (the individual as such, not just a particular intellectual activity of his, then becomes value free), or it constitutes a surrender to irrationality (the individual holding on his values in a realm of the mind that is inaccessible to reasonable argument). The other way, probably the simpler one, is to reject the ideal of value free understanding, to declare it to be impossible, or undesirable, or both. Such rejection then permits the individual to interpret the social world in accordance with his own value preferences - in effect; to see the world as he would like to see it. The attempt to bridge the macro and micro, value-free and value-laden, structuralist and interactionist, as well as theoretical and relevant, sociologies is apparent in Berger’s works. He thrusts himself into the middle of the "painful business" of sociology, attempting to analyse the manner in which reality is constructed.\textsuperscript{32}

Berger believes, like the phenomenologists that there are multiple realities rather than a single reality. However, for him the most important reality is ‘the reality of everyday life’. This, he feels is perceived as an ordered and patterned reality and is usually taken for granted, as it is shared with others in ‘typified’ [patterned] interactions. ‘Berger stresses that this reality has both objective and subjective dimensions, through the processes of

\textsuperscript{31} Ibid.

externalization and internalization. What is of significance to our study, is the concluding paragraph of Berger and Luckmann’s work, which states,

...our conception of the sociology of knowledge implies a specific conception of sociology in general. It does not imply that sociology is not a science, that its methods should be other than empirical, or that it cannot be ‘value free’. It does imply that sociology takes its place in the company of the sciences that deal with man as man; that it is, in that specific sense, a humanistic discipline. An important consequence of this conception is that sociology must be carried on in a continuous conversation with both history and philosophy or lose its proper object of inquiry. This object is society as part of a human world, made by men, inhabited by man, and, in turn, making men, in an ongoing historical process.

According to Andre Beteille

an ideology is that set of ideas and beliefs which seeks to articulate the basic values of a group of people—what they cherish for themselves and for others—to the distribution of power in society. An ideology is not a systematic theory, although it has systematic properties and it often strives to be a theory. An ideology may or may not succeed in articulation of basic values to the distribution of power, but such articulation is part of its purpose and design. Ideologies have a range of concerns from the abstract to the concrete. In concrete terms their most important concerns are with the institutions of society. For it is these institutions that embody the values cherished by people and are at the same time objects of contention among them in their struggle for power. It is thus that the institutions of work and leisure, of family, caste and community come to occupy a central place in ideological debate and discourse.

33 According to Berger and Luckmann, internalisation or socialisation helps a person to become a member of society, while externalisation is the process by which people, collectively construct a new reality. For more details, refer to The Social Construction of Reality by the same authors.

34 Berger and Luckmann, op.cit., p.211.

Beteille feels that the view that ideology is false consciousness is no less simple-mined than the view that accepts an ideology at its face value. Indeed, the two views often co-exist in the mind of the same person: the ideology of the other person is false consciousness, hence it has to be explained in terms of interests; one's own ideology strives to realize what it says ought to be realized, hence it must be understood in terms of values.

Ideologies seek to change world not merely through the pursuit of ideas but also through the pursuit of power. The pursuit of power has its own demands, which sooner or later transform the concern for truth as such into a concern for rectitude, for party reasons or for reasons of state. An ideology is not an outcome of a disinterested pursuit of ideas, a pursuit of ideas for their own sake; ideologues view such pursuits with hostility, which is often a disguise for fear.  

According to Daniel Bell, Ideology is the conversion of ideas into social bearers and it derives to force from its passion the most important latent function of ideology is to tap emotion. He goes on further to elaborate that a social movement can be effective only if it is able to simplify ideas, establish a claim to truth, and in the union of the two, demand commitment to action. So, ideology besides transforming ideas transforms people.

He also feels that the end of ideology is not should not be the end of utopia as well. The fact is that ideologists are 'terrible Simplifiers' Ideology makes it unnecessary for people to confront individual issues on their individual

36 Ibid, p.23.
merits. One simply turns to the ideological reading machine and out comes the prepared formula.\textsuperscript{37}

Those who spoke of the end of ideology did not assert or imply that the human race had reached a condition or a stage of development in and after which ideologies could no longer occur. On the contrary, the potentiality for ideology seems to be a permanent part of the human construction. In conditions of crisis, when hitherto prevailing elites fail and are discredited and when the central institutions and culture with which they associate themselves seem unable to find the right course of action ideological propensities are heightened.

What is meant by this thesis is merely, that, in certain advanced societies there is, or may be, a tendency for intellectuals to be less attracted to grandiose social doctrines, doctrines that contain a few simple principles purporting to explain any and all social events, doctrines that favour drastic revolution in pursuit of utopian goals. The "end of ideology" writers cannot by any means fairly be said to be opposed to social change in general or even to revolution in general.

According to Mattelart,

An 'ideology is not the abstract construction of' single individual or class. It is intimately related to the particular mode of production and social formation it is functional to it and enables it to be reproduced along with the hegemony of the class which represents capital.

\textsuperscript{37} Bell, op.cit., p.405.
The author goes on to add that,

both the bourgeoisie use of the mass media and of the ideological instance as a whole and the left's response to this at various levels, are particularly illustrative of the intimate relationship which exists between the superstructure and the business of mass mobilisation.\textsuperscript{38}

\textit{Of significance to this study is his answer to}

\textit{How does a newspaper fulfil its role as a catalyst? For a newspaper, a piece of news is simply raw material from which it creates collective representations, images and stereotypes. It is both fact and image. A fact is simply a pretext for presenting to the reader not only the mythic web of an ideology, but also the ruling classes' seditious intentions.}

\textit{Thompson (1990)}\textsuperscript{39} draws our attention to the ways in which meaning is mobilized in the service, of dominant groups, that is, the ways in which the meaning is constructed and conveyed by symbolic forms, serves, in particular circumstances, to establish and sustain structured social relations from which some individuals and groups benefit more than others, and which some individuals and groups have an interest in preserving while other may seek to contest it. The study of ideology, understood in this sense, thus plunges the analyst into a realm of meaning and power, of interpretation and counter-interpretation where the object of analysis is a weapon employed in a battle carried out on the terrain of symbols and signs.
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It is obvious therefore that ideology is tied to shared experience, the core meanings of which may be conveyed through images or metaphors.

Through their enactment and emotional resonance, ideology provides action with both personally and socially germane assumption about the existing world and moral visions of what it ought to be.  

And, as has been very aptly stated that

at a fundamental level, ideology constitutes the normative principles that enter into the construction of social reality. The transition from theological to philosophical to finally sociological modes of construction of social reality clearly brings out the ideological moorings of normative constructs of society.

A brief note on conflict/crises is warranted, before we take up the organisation and ethics of newsmaking. Crisis is a moment of transition in which something that held before does not hold any longer and there is not yet something new. And in this sense, crisis biologically, physically, culturally speaking, is a permanent state... even in politics, in culture, that so called state of crisis is always a positive state. Every new scientific discovery is a moment of crisis which destroys the previous world view. Social crisis arrives when people are unable to face this reality.

Crisis for us is signified in the way people treat communities, whether they be religious, national or gender based ones. The convoluted ideas of beauty, for instance, as are propagated by certain vested, mainly commercial interests are


41 Yogendra Singh, Image of Man.

also symptomatic of a crisis - of identity. Conflicts too, are an inevitability of social life. Almost any aspect of conflict however destructive requires interaction between the antagonists, considerable communication, and the reciprocity of subtle understandings. "The course of social conflicts, as of other human enterprises, hinges crucially on how the actors in them define, or interpret the (changing) situation, actions and reactions and to the others intentions. Between what your intentions are and how I interpret them, there can be a large margin of difference, especially if I assume, and do not try to verify, what your intentions really are."

Conflicts to us are also an indicator of a breakdown of communication. Whether they be in the form of inter-state (Indo-Pak) relations, in the cross purposes of those who own multinational companies as against those who get exploited in them (Bhopal Gas Plant), those who fight for their rights and those who pander to religious fanaticism and political (Shah Bano Case) or those who find terrorism the only means of propagation (Punjab or Kashmir), they are all representative of the breakdown of channels of communication. Which is what brings us to the one channel from where there can be an element of hope, of expectation. The expectation being that of cordiality, of trust, of honesty, of equality and most of all cultural rootedness. The role of the media, the newspapers as channels of communication, is being explored in the next few chapters. What is the kind of reportage (besides reporters) that goes into

making news? Is there an ideology of the Press which decides what goes where and for whom. It is this disposition towards ideological construction, by the press which may give it a limited social perspective.

Notwithstanding the fact that ideology is the web of meanings and discourses, existing in social practices, consciousness, identities etc., media scholars are divided as to whether journalists are ideologues of ideologically neutral. And that, happens to be our subject of study in the next few chapters.