CHAPTER IV
THE QUESTION OF IDEOLOGY

Language in a way is beyond human control. And yet another way it is very much in our hands. Sometimes people deliberately map their worldview onto the language they use, and at other times it does not tell merely what people make it to tell, but that too what they do not, or that, which they themselves do not know about themselves, thus justifying Eliot’s Prufrock when he laments, “It is impossible to say just what I mean.” Both ways, language is the carrier of ideology.

4.1. Ideology – Marx, Althusser and Foucault

Ideology is a complex and wide-ranging phenomenon which has been interpreted variedly by numerous thinkers from Marx to Foucault. Marx accompanied by Engels (1985) regards ideology as “false consciousness” in that it legitimates, naturalizes and eternalizes the dominant ideas regarding the ways the world functions. These dominant ideas are that of the ruling class who controls the modes of production in a given society in a particular epoch and in order to perpetuate its control or establish its hegemony and justify oppression resorts to illusion or ideology. Althusser (1971), a Marxist ideologue who draws on Freud and Lacan, modifies Marx’s concept of ideology in that he asserts that ideology does not (mis)represent the real world, but “represents the imaginary relationship of individuals to their real conditions of existence.”, and therefore, the world that ideology (mis)represents is itself removed from the real. His another idea is that ideology transforms individuals into subjects. He asserts that ideology hails or interpellates concrete individuals as concrete subjects. This subject formation is always ideological. To concretize this idea, he cites the example of a hail from a police officer, “Hey, you there!” He elaborates, “Assuming that the theoretical scene I have just imagined takes place in the street, the hailed individual will turn round. By this mere one-hundred-and-eighty-degree physical conversion, he becomes a subject. Why? Because [he] has recognized that the hail was ‘really’ addressed to him, and that ‘it was
It is the power of ideology that such an interaction is not recognized as ideological, but natural. Michael Foucault, a French post-structuralist, finds the Marxist concept of ideology problematic. His first objection is that ideology in Marxism assumes the existence of a universal rationality and a universal truth and “always stands in virtual opposition to something else which is supposed to count as truth” (2000: 119). Second, the Marxist concept of ideology refers to “something of the order of a subject” (2000: 119). Foucault dismisses this single, unitary conception of the unified subject and proposes the idea of multiple identities. Third, in Marxism ideology “stands in a secondary position relative to something which functions as its infrastructure, as its material/economic determinant” (2000: 119). Simply speaking, in Marxism, it is the economic base that determines ideology. Foucault is opposed to this economic determinism. He asserts that there are other social phenomena such as “psychiatric internment, the mental normalization of individuals, and penal institutions” that are “undoubtedly essential to the general functioning of the wheels of power” (2000: 117). Fourth, Foucault is of the view that nobody is outside of ideology. Therefore, it is not possible to know the truth. Marxism, which aspires to be a science by distinguishing illusion from truth, is itself an ideology. For all these reasons, Foucault rejects ideology and prefers discourse since discourse, unlike ideology, does not see power struggle as binary but as multiple since power is not held by an individual or a group forever, can be challenged and is not necessarily economic based and may have racism, sexism, etc. as its base.

4.2 Ideology – Meaning and Definition

Whatever be the Marxist, structuralist or post-structuralist views regarding the nature and functions of ideology, broadly speaking, ideology refers to ideas or shared beliefs of a community that has a distinct identity of its own on the basis of gender, religion, nationality, region, sexual preferences, economic status, cultural practices, political affiliations, linguistic habits and so on. Fairclough (1992: 87) defines, “Ideology is a construction of reality, which contributes to the production,
reproduction or transformation of relations of domination…The Ideologies embedded in discursive practices are most effective when they become naturalized and achieve the status of common sense.” Barrett (1991: 167) is a bit more cautious and general in defining ideology as “discursive and significatory mechanisms that may occlude, legitimate, naturalize or universalize in a variety of different ways but can all be said to mystify.” Similarly, Simpson (1993: 5) opines that ideology “derives from the taken-for-granted assumptions, beliefs and value-systems which are shared collectively by social groups.” Further, Van Dijk (2007: 116) defines, “Ideologies consist of social representations that define the social identity of a group, that is, its shared beliefs about its fundamental conditions and ways of existence and reproduction.”

4.3. Language and ideology

Language, as is already said, is a carrier of ideology. Gunther Kress (1989: v) argues, “Language it itself not only a part of experience, but intimately involved in the manner in which we construct and organize our experience. As such, it is never neutral, but deeply implicated in building meaning.” Similar is the view of Paul Simpson (1993: 6), “As an integrated form of social behavior, language will be inevitably and inextricably tied up with the socio-political context in which it functions. Language is not used in a contextless vacuum; rather, it is used in a host of discourse contexts, contexts which are impregnated with the ideology of social systems and institutions. Because language operates within this social dimension, it must, of necessity reflect, and some would argue, construct ideology.” Further, Spender (1980: 139) opines, “It is language which determines the limits of our world, which constructs our reality.” Obviously, meaning is the crux of human communication and it is realized in texts, which, in turn, are realized in language. The linguistic choices that people make are context-sensitive. Context, both situational and cultural, constitutes the whole of human life – the way people live, their beliefs, their aspirations, their fears, their emerging needs and so on. It is this
way that language and ideology are unified. Therefore, a careful and comprehensive scrutiny of the language of any discourse results into the revelation of the ideology of the discourse-maker.

4.4 SFL as a tool to unearth Ideology

SFL provides the tools to undertake a careful and comprehensive scrutiny of the language of any discourse, and this, as is already said, reveals the ideology embedded in a discourse. There are a number of features of this theoretical model that help in realizing this end. First, SFL being a functional theory considers the form of language and its function inseparable and interlinked, and endeavors to analyze the lexico-grammatical resources used to realize certain purposes in concrete, real-life situations. This is what provides it an edge over other theories, structuralist as well as transformational-generative, which dissociate form from function. Gunther Kress (1989: v-vi) asserts, “The most serious and confusing of these myths are those which would suggest we can dissociate language from meaning – form from function, or form from ‘content’. Where such myths apply, teaching about language becomes a matter of teaching about ‘language rules’ – normally grammatical rules – and as history has demonstrated over the years, such teaching rapidly degenerates into the arid pursuits of parts of speech and the parsing of isolated sentences. Meaning, and the critical role of language in the building of meaning, are simply overlooked.” Second, SFL stresses the semantic aspect of language and foregrounds the importance of meaning in the study of language. Gunther Kress (1989: vi) opines that it “sees language primarily as a social semiotic, and as a resource for meaning, centrally involved in the processes by which human beings negotiate, construct, and change the nature of social experience.” Third, in SFL context is crucial to reach at the meaning of a text, and context, as is already suggested, can be regarded in a way as the concrete manifestation of the abstract ideology.

Thus, SFL is a valuable tool in the pursuit of meaning, and hence, ideology. To sum up, its relevance in unearthing ideology, I again quote Gunther Kress (1989: vii),
“Such a linguistic theory is itself also a social theory, for it purposes firstly, that it is in the nature of human behavior to build reality and/or experience through complex semiotic processes, and secondly, that the principal semiotic system available to humans is their language. In this sense, to study language is to explore some of the most important and pervasive of the processes by which human beings build their world.”

4.5 Discussion and Findings

In this section, there is a discussion of the ideological implications at the interpersonal level that the analysis of the resources of appraisal and modality in the Indian and the British news-reports and editorials brings forward.

4.5.1 Appraisal and Ideology

Appraisal, as is suggested in Chapter 2, concerns with the values, beliefs, stances or ideas of people in terms of which they evaluate things, ideas or social phenomena, judge people, and feel or react. Therefore, an analysis of appraisal is the analysis of ideology. Below an analysis of appraisal motifs in the Indian and the British news-reports and editorials is carried out to decode the ideology encoded in the language of Indian and British newspapers.

First, there are news-reports concerning twin blasts in Iraq. In the Indian news-reports, there are in total eight negative appreciations of the twin blasts in Iraq. This number is six in the British news-reports. Next, there are two negative judgements of the Prime-minister of Iraq and one negative appreciation of his ruling Shia coalition in the British news-reports, while in the Indian news-reports there is only one negative judgement of the PM and no negative appreciation of his ruling coalition. Further, Iraq gets only negative appreciations in both the Indian and the British news-reports and each category of news-reports has four such appreciations. Furthermore, there are negative affects in relation to the twin blasts and their number is again equal i.e. six in both the categories of news-reports. Hence, it is seen that the Indian news-reports are a bit more critical of the bomb blasts than the British news-reports. Quite contrary, the British news-reports are a bit more critical of the Iraqi PM and his ruling coalition as
compared to the Indian news-reports. However, the similarity is that both the Indian and the British news-reports paint Iraq negatively. Another similarity is that both the categories of news-reports are equal in their emotive appeal as they give equal representation to the negative feelings generated by the blasts.

As regards the news-reports related to North and South Koreas signing a pact for peace, there are three negative appreciations and one positive appreciation of N. Korea each in the Indian and the British news-reports. Next, both the Indian and the British news-reports have equal number of negative appreciations of S. Korea i.e. two. However, the number of positive appreciations of S. Korea is more in the British news-reports than it is in the Indian ones; in the former it is two while in the latter it is one. Further, in the Indian news-reports there is one positive and one negative appreciation of the accord between N. Korea and S. Korea. However, in the British news-reports, there is no negative appreciation of the accord and the number of positive appreciations is also double of what it is in the Indian news-reports i.e. two. Furthermore, there is one positive affect each in the Indian and the British news-reports communicating the positive feelings of the people of N. Korea on the visit of S. Korean president. Still further, in the British news-reports, there are two positive affects and three negative affects attributed to the North Korean president, while there is no such affect in the Indian news-reports. And finally, the British news-reports have four negative appreciations of the relationship between N. Korea and S. Korea, while the Indian news-reports are blank in this regard. These findings show that both the Indian and the British news-reports are equal in their criticism of N. Korea. In its admiration, though they are comparatively less enthusiastic, they are again equal. Further, in the criticism of S. Korea, though both are slightly less vocal as compared to their criticism of N. Korea, both are again equal. However, in its admiration, whereas the Indian news-reports are silent, the British news-reports register their nominal concern. Furthermore, the British news-reports tend to be more emotive as compared to the Indian news-reports wherein the emotive content is almost negligible. Still further, the British news-
reports are totally negative in their view regarding the relationship between N. Korea and S. Korea, while the Indian news-reports do not touch the matter.

In relation to the news-reports concerning Pakistan’s Suspension from the Commonwealth, in the Indian news-reports there are two positive appreciations of the Commonwealth’s action of suspending Pakistan, while in the British news-reports there is no such appreciation. Further, in the British news-reports there is one positive appreciation of the Commonwealth and one negative appreciation of the newly appointed Supreme Court of Pakistan, while in the Indian news-reports neither of the two gets any positive or negative appreciation. Furthermore, there is one positive judgement of the Supreme Court judges sacked by Mushraff and one negative judgement of the Supreme Court judges appointed by Mushraff, while the Indian news-reports are silent in this regard too. And finally, there are one positive and two negative judgements of Mushraff in the British news-reports, while the Indian news-reports do not judge Mushraff in any way. The findings reflect that the Indian news-reports are cautious and tight-lipped in being attitudinal towards the issue. Except for attributing two positive appreciations to the Commonwealth’s action of suspending Pakistan, they do not convey any attitude regarding the Commonwealth, the newly appointed Supreme Court of Pakistan, the Supreme Court judges sacked by Mushraff, the Supreme Court judges appointed by Mushraff, and even Mushraff. On the other hand, the British news-reports tend to be more critical of Mushraff. Not only they give him two negative judgements, but also indirectly condemn his action by attributing one positive judgement to the Supreme Court judges sacked by Mushraff and one negative judgement to the Supreme Court judges appointed by Mushraff.

In the news-reports related to Vladimir Putin naming Dmitry Medvedev as his successor, the Indian news-reports have six positive judgements of Medevdev, while this number is double in the British news-reports i.e. twelve. In the negative judgements of Medevdev, the Indian news-reports are far behind the British news-reports with the former having one while the latter having five negative judgements of Medevdev. Next,
in the Indian news-reports, there are two positive judgements of Vladimir Putin, while there is no such judgement in the British news-reports. Quite contrary, the British news-reports have two negative judgements of Vladimir Putin, while the Indian news-reports have none. Similarly, in the Indian news-reports, there is one positive judgement of Sergi Ivanov, while there is no such judgement in the British news-reports. They have two negative judgements of him, while the Indian news-reports have none. Further, the British news-reports are slightly critical of the Russian foreign policy and the president-selection procedure in Russia with one negative appreciation attributed to each of the two matters, while the Indian news-reports are mute in this regard. On the whole, the Indian news-reports are positive in their attitude towards Russia. It may be the Russian president, Vladimir Putin, or his successor, Dmitry Medvedev, or the prime-minister Sergi Ivanov, they are positive in their judgements, except in one case where Dmitry Medvedev is judged negatively. Quite contrary, the British news-reports are negative in their attitude towards Russia. It may be the Russian president, Vladimir Putin, or his successor, Dmitry Medvedev, or the prime-minister Sergi Ivanov, or the Russian foreign policy, or the president-selection procedure in Russia, they are negative in their judgements and appreciations. However, an exception is that the British news-reports are more vocal in their admiration of Dmitry Medvedev as compared to the Indian news-reports.

In the news-reports related to Benazir’s assassination, both in the Indian and the British newspapers appraisal motifs are found mainly in relation to Benazir Bhutto, her assassination, her killers, Pervez Mushraff, Nawaz Sharif, and Pakistan in general and after Benazir’s assassination in particular. However, these news-reports also betray variations in the usage of various appraisal motifs in terms of quantity, polarity and attribution (see Table VII), and this in some ways reads to different ideological connotations in the Indian and the British newspapers. First, let us analyze the positive judgements of Benazir Bhutto. In the British newspapers, they are seventeen in number. The majority of these i.e. thirteen are in Projection, and only four belong to the authorial
voice. In contrast, in the Indian newspapers their number is fourteen, eight being in the authorial voice and six in projection. These figures are indeed the reversal of those in the British ones. This contrast gets more sharpened in case of the negative judgements of Benazir Bhutto. In the British newspapers, their number is three and all come from the news-reporters. Interestingly, there is no negative judgement of Benazir in any of the Indian newspapers. Thus one conclusion can be drawn, however with caution, that in the data analyzed so far the British newspapers are less generous in the admiration of Benazir and a bit more aggressive in finding faults in her, while it is vice-versa in the Indian newspapers. Next, there are negative appreciations of Benazir’s assassination. Their number is sixteen in the British newspapers, the majority of these i.e. ten are again in projection and the remaining six belong to the authorial voice. In the Indian newspapers, there are ten such negative appreciations, the majority i.e. nine in authorial voice and only one in projection. Thus, again, in the condemnation of Benazir’s assassination, the Indian newspapers are ahead of the British ones. In case of negative affects in authorial voice, however, there is a sort of similarity in the Indian and the British news-reports. There is an equal number of negative affects, that is, fourteen, in both categories of newspapers. However, this number varies in projection, with the British newspapers having three negative affects in projection and the Indian ones only one. Further, Benazir’s killers receive the equal number of authorial negative appreciations in both the Indian and the British newspapers, that is, one. However, they again vary in projected negative appreciations, with the British newspapers having thirteen and the Indian ones only three. Furthermore, there are judgements in relation to Pervez Mushraff that are indicative. In the Indian newspapers, for instance, there is one authorial positive judgement of Mushraff and no negative one, whereas in the British newspapers there is one authorial negative judgement of Mushraff and no positive one. Still further, Nawaz Sharif gets no negative judgement in the Indian newspapers. But in the British newspapers, there are four negative judgements of him and all are authorial. And finally, there are
positive and negative appreciations of Pakistan in general and after Benazir’s assassination in particular. As far as the authorial positive judgements of Pakistan in general are concerned, this number is one in the Indian newspapers and two in the British newspapers. However, when it comes to the authorial negative judgements of Pakistan in general, the Indian newspapers are completely silent while the British newspapers have eleven authorial negative judgements. Similarly, there is just one authorial negative appreciation of Pakistan after Benazir’s assassination in the Indian newspapers, but in the British newspapers, there are two authorial and six projected negative appreciations of Pakistan after Benazir’s assassination.

In the news-reports related to Post-election violence in Kenya, first of all, in the Indian news-reports, there are four negative appreciations of the post election Kenya; this number is two in the British news-reports. Next, the Indian news-reports are carrying three positive appreciations of Kenya, while in the British news-reports there is no such appreciation. Further, there is one negative appreciation of the elections in Kenya each in the Indian and the British news-reports. Furthermore, there is one positive judgement of the opposition leader, Raila Odinga each in the Indian and the British news-reports. Still further, in the Indian news-reports, there are two negative affects concerning the negative feelings of Kenyans in the wake of controversial elections in Kenya; in the British news-reports there is one such negative affect. And finally, President Mwai Kibaki gets two negative judgements in the British news-reports, while the Indian news-reports are silent in this regard. On the whole, the Indian news-reports evaluate Kenya in a positive way and do not say anything negative about President Mwai Kibaki. Quite contrary the British news-reports evaluate President Mwai Kibaki in a negative way and do not say anything positive about Kenya. Further, the Indian news-reports tend to be more critical of the post-election scenario in Keya than the British news-reports with their negative appreciations and negative affects in this regard outnumbering those of the latter.
Next, there are news-reports related to Nepal becoming a republic. In the Indian news-reports related to this issue, there is no use of any appraisal motif. In the British news-reports, however, there are six negative appreciations of Nepal, nine negative judgements of the outgoing King Gyanendra, three negative appreciations of what happened to the Shah dynasty in Nepal, one negative judgement of the Nepali Maoists and one negative appreciation of Maoism in Nepal. Besides, there is one positive judgement attributed to the late King Birendra and one positive appreciation to the monarchy in Nepal before King Gyanendra. On the whole, the British news-reports construct a negative image of present-day Nepal, not only by evaluating it negatively, but also by attributing negative judgements to its outgoing ruler (King Gyanendra) and its existing or upcoming rulers (Maoists).

As regards the news-reports related to Robert Mugabe losing majority in Zimbabwean Parliament, each of the two categories of news-reports has two negative appreciations of the Government of Robert Mugabe. Next, in the Indian news-reports there is one negative appreciation of Zimbabwe; while in the British news-reports there are two. Further, the British news-reports have one positive and six negative judgements of President Mugabe, while in the Indian news-reports there is neither any positive nor any negative judgement of him. Furthermore, the British news-reports have four negative affects communicating the negative feelings of Zimbabweans during and after the controversial parliamentary elections, while the Indian news-reports are blank in this regard too. On the whole, the Indian news-reports do criticize Mugabe government and evaluate Zimbabwe negatively, but they do not become personal and judge President Mugabe in any way. However, the British news-reports do become personal and judge President Mugabe mainly in a negative way. Second, the Indian news-reports do not become emotive as they do not represent any negative or positive feeling concerning the issue. But the British news-reports do become emotive and represent the negative feelings of Zimbabweans in the wake of the controversial parliamentary elections.
Regarding the news-reports related to 26/11 terror attack over Mumbai, there are two negative appreciations of the Mumbai attackers each in the Indian as well as in the British news-reports. Further, in the Indian news-reports there is one negative appreciation of the Indian security forces, while this number is four in the British news-reports. Next, the British news-reports attribute three positive judgements to the commandos of NSG, while the Indian news-reports are blank in this regard. Besides, in the Indian news-reports there are two negative appreciations of the terror attack over Mumbai, while in the British news-reports there is no such appreciation. On the whole, both the Indian and the British news-reports are equally critical of the Mumbai attackers. However, as regards the terror attack over Mumbai, only the Indian news-reports are critical, the British news-reports are merely representative. Further, the Indian news-reports are far less vocal in criticizing the Indian security forces as compared to the British news-reports. However, the British news-reports are equally enthusiastic in admiring the commandos of NSG.

After news-reports, we discuss the ideological overtones in the editorials taken from the Indian and the British news-reports. First, there are editorials concerning Benazir’s assassination. In the Indian editorials related to this issue, there are nineteen positive judgements attributed to Benazir; in the British editorials this number is thirteen. So far as negative judgements of Benazir are concerned, they are two in the Indian editorials and six in the British ones. Next, Pervez Mushraff gets no positive judgement in the Indian editorials, in the British editorials he gets one. The number of negative judgements attributed to Pervez Mushraff in the Indian editorials is six, in the British editorials it is ten. Going ahead, there are three negative appreciations attributed to Pervez Mushraff’s regime in the Indian editorials, in the British editorials there is merely one such negative appreciation. Further, Benazir’s assassination gets eight negative appreciations in the Indian editorials, in the British editorials it gets four. Furthermore, in the Indian editorials there are three negative appreciations attributed to post Benazir Pakistan, in the British editorials the number of such negative
appreciations is nine. Still further, in the Indian editorials Pakistan in general gets five negative appreciations, in the British editorials it gets four. And finally, in both the Indian and the British editorials there are three negative affects each indicating the negative feelings of the people of Pakistan in the wake of Benazir’s assassination. These findings indicate that first of all, the Indian editorials are more positive and less negative in their attitude towards Benazir as compared to the British editorials. Second, though the Indian editorials say nothing in favor of Pervez Mushraff, they are far less enthusiastic than the British editorials in condemning him. Third, when it comes to the condemnation of Benazir’s assassination and its aftermath in Pakistan, the Indian editorials are far more enthusiastic than the British editorials. Fourth, both the Indian and the British editorials paint almost equally bleak picture of Pakistan in general. Fifth, the Indian editorials are more critical of Pervez Mushraff’s regime than the British editorials. And finally, both the Indian and the British editorials tend to be equally emotive regarding the issue.

As regards the editorials related to post-election violence in Kenya, there are eleven negative appreciations attributed to elections in Kenya in the Indian editorials; in the British editorials, the number of such negative appreciations is seven. Second, post-election Kenya gets four negative appreciations in the Indian editorials; in the British editorials it gets two such appreciations. Third, in the Indian editorials, there are three negative appreciations attributed to the polling process in Kenya. However, in the British editorials there is no such negative appreciation. Fourth, in the Indian editorials there is no negative appreciation but five positive appreciations of Kenya in general; in the British editorials there is one negative appreciation and three positive appreciations of Kenya in general. Fifth, the Indian editorials attribute merely one negative and no positive judgement to Mwai Kibaki. Further, they attribute no negative appreciation to the Kibaki government and no negative judgement to Daniel Arap Moi. However, the British editorials attribute eight negative and two positive judgements to Mwai Kibaki, three negative appreciations to the Kibaki government and two negative judgements to
Daniel Arap Moi. Sixth, Britain gets no positive appreciation in the Indian editorials; in the British editorials it gets four positive appreciations. Seventh, David Miliband, the British foreign secretary, is attributed one positive judgement each in the Indian as well as the British editorials. Eighth, the leaders belonging to the ruling party in Kenya get one negative judgement each in the Indian as well as the British editorials. And finally, Africa is given merely one negative and no positive appreciation in the Indian editorials; in the British editorials it is given two negative and two positive appreciations. These findings point out that the Indian editorials are more critical of the controversial Kenyan presidential election than the British editorials as their negative appreciations for the election, post-election Kenya and the polling process in Kenya largely outnumber those concerning the same issues in the British editorials. Next, the Indian editorials draw a more positive sketch of Kenya in general as compared to the British editorials. Further, the Indian editorials are more or less tight-lipped so far as condemnation of Mwai Kibaki, his government and his predecessor Daniel Arap Moi is concerned, while the British editorials are full throttle in this regard. Furthermore, the Indian editorials say nothing about Britain, while the British editorials with their four positive appreciations build up a positive image of Britain. Still further, both the Indian and the British editorials are equally positive in their view regarding David Miliband, the British foreign secretary. Also they are equally negative in their view regarding the leaders belonging to the ruling party in Kenya. And finally, Africa is less negative and less positive in the Indian editorials as compared to its sketch in the British editorials.

First of all, in the positive evaluation of Barack Obama, the Indian editorials are far more ahead of the British editorials as their positive judgements attributed to Obama and positive appreciations attributed to his victory largely outnumber those in the British editorials. Second, the Indian editorials are more critical of George Bush as compared to the British editorials. Third, the depiction of the United States is far less negative and more positive in the Indian editorials as compared to its depiction in the British editorials. Fourth, the British editorials speak far more positive of the American
voters as compared to the Indian editorials which are more or less silent in this regard. Fifth, the British editorials are more negative and less positive in their evaluation of the Republican Party. The Indian editorials, however, are silent in this regard. Sixth, only the Indian editorials are a bit emotive in their appeal as they have both negative and positive affects indicating the negative and positive feelings of the people participating in the US presidential election held in 2008. And finally, both the Indian and the British editorials are equally critical of the Afghan and Iraq wars. Also they are equally appreciative of the democracy in the United States.

On the whole, the British editorials are more critical of the 26/11 Mumbai attack and those who conducted the attack as compared to the Indian editorials. But the Indian editorials are more critical of the Prevention of Terrorism Act implemented by the ruling UPA, the system of governance in India and the then Indian Home-minister, the topics which the British editorials do not touch at all. Next, while both the Indian and the British editorials are equally negative in their evaluation of India in general and the post 26/11 India, the British editorials also turn positive in their evaluation of India in general, however, the Indian editorials do not. Further, the Indian editorials are positive in their evaluation of Indian security forces; the British editorials are silent in this regard. Furthermore, the British editorials are appreciative of Asif Ali Zardari and his administration in Pakistan, while the Indian editorials are silent in this regard. Still further, the British editorials are negative in their evaluation of Pakistan; the Indian editorials are silent in this regard. And finally, both the Indian and the British editorials are equally critical of the Prime-minister of India with reference to his response to the frequent terror attacks in India.

On the whole, the Indian editorials build up a darker image of Zimbabwe as compared to its image in the British editorials as their negative appreciations attributed to Zimbabwe in general and post-election Zimbabwe largely outnumber those in the British editorials. Next, the Indian editorials are more critical of Robert Mugabe as compared to the British editorials as their negative judgements attributed to Mugabe and negative
appreciations attributed to his regime largely outnumber those in the British editorials. However, the Indian editorials also speak positive of Mugabe whereas the British editorials are silent in this regard. Further, the British editorials speak positive of the Zimbabwean voters whereas the Indian editorials are silent in this regard. Furthermore, the Indian editorials evaluate the presidential elections in Zimbabwe a bit more positively than the British editorials. And finally, both the Indian and the British editorials are equally appreciative of the Movement for Democratic Change, the opposition party in Zimbabwe lead by Morgan Tsvangirai.

4.5.2 Modality and Ideology

Modality, as is discussed in Chapter 3, refers to the speaker/writer’s degree of commitment, knowledge or certainty in the propositions and proposals that are made in a text. The analysis shows that these expressions of commitment, knowledge or certainty can be read as indeterminacy, lack of belief, fear, prediction, demand, etc. and thus speak of the ideology of the speaker/writer. The analysis is as follows.

In the news-reports related to twin blasts in Iraq, it has been found that while writing about the target of twin blasts the British newspapers introduce indeterminacy or the element of doubt in their propositions either by modalising them or by attributing them to some source other than the author.

Another attack, apparently aimed at Iraq's Shia community, killed at least 12 people and wounded nearly 30 shortly … (The Guardian. News-report 1, clauses 5 and 6)

Two bombs exploded seconds apart in a predominantly Shiite commercial area in central Baghdad on Monday, killing at least 78 people and wounding at least 156, police and Deputy Health Minister Hakim al-Zamili said. (The Independent. News-report 1, clause 2)
Hours after the attack yesterday, a bomb followed by mortars struck a market in the predominantly Shia town of Khalis, 50 miles north of Baghdad, killing at least 12 and wounding 29, police said. (The Daily Telegraph. News-report 1, clause 20)

In contrast, the Indian news-reports usually use authorial unmodalised clauses to write about the target of the twin blasts:

Bombings and a mortar attack struck Shiite targets in Baghdad and north of the capital on Monday… (The Indian Express. News-report 1, clause 2)

In the worst incident of violence this year, at least 78 persons were killed when two car bombs exploded in a crowded market dominated by Shia residents. (The Hindu. News-report 1, clause 2)

There is only one instance where the idea is given in a projected clause:

At least 78 people were killed and more than 150 wounded today after two nearly simultaneous bombs struck a predominantly Shi’ite commercial area in central Baghdad in the deadliest attack in two months, officials said. (The Statesman. News-report 1, clause 2)

Thus, it can be said, that the Indian news-reports are not doubtful or uncertain regarding the target of the twin blasts, whereas the British news-reports are.

In the news-reports related to North Korea and South Korea signing a pact for peace, there is one statement each in the Indian and the British newspapers regarding the accord between North Korea and South Korea having been aimed at peace and prosperity in the region. In the former it has median value of subjective implicit variant of modality (clause 8, The Indian Express) and in the latter it has median value of objective implicit variant (clause 46, The Guardian). This forms the basis to state that both the categories of news-reports are equally uncertain in their view regarding the
accord being a harbinger of peace and prosperity in the region, though in the latter this uncertainty gives the semblance of objectivity while in the former it sounds subjective.

In the news-reports related to Pakistan’s suspension from the Commonwealth, there is one statement each in the Indian and the British newspapers regarding the smaller African nations having been responsible for Pakistan’s suspension from the Commonwealth. In the Indian newspaper, The Hindu, this statement is modalised having median value of objective implicit variant.

The smaller African nations are believed to have forced the suspension decision, on the plea that the same punishment be meted out to Pakistan as was done in the case of Fiji for a similar departure from the “Commonwealth principles. (The Hindu. News-report 3, clause 12)

On the contrary, in the British newspapers, The Guardian, this statement is unmodalised.

Smaller countries, including African ones, backed outright suspension. (The Guardian. News-report 3, clause 7)

This clearly indicates that the author in the Indian news-report is doubtful regarding the role of the smaller African nations in Pakistan’s suspension from the Commonwealth and also dithers away from the responsibility of holding these nations responsible for the suspension in two ways, by making the assertion modalised and thus ringing in uncertainty and by using the objective implicit variant of modality making it sound like an objective statement and not a subjective one. However, the author in the British news-report not only shows absolute belief in the claim, but also completely owns the responsibility of making the claim.

As regards the news-reports related to Vladimir Putin naming Dmitry Medvedev as his successor, there is one authorial modalised clause in the Indian newspaper, The Hindu, talking about Dmitry Medvedev’s liberal credentials. The clause has median
value of modality and objective implicit orientation. In the British newspapers, there are three such clauses, one in The Daily Telegraph having median value and subjective implicit orientation and two in The Independent, one having median value and objective implicit orientation and the other having low value and subjective implicit orientation. Further, in the Indian newspaper, The Hindu, there are two authorial modal clauses of median value, one with objective implicit orientation and the other with subjective implicit orientation, talking about Putin continuing to matter after the election of the next Russian president. In the British newspapers too, there are two such clauses of median value and with objective implicit orientation, one in The Guardian and the other in The Independent. Next, in the British newspaper, The Daily Telegraph, there are two authorial modalised clauses of median value with subjective implicit orientation, talking about the probability of Medvedev growing strong enough to resist Putin’s influence or block his way back to power. Interestingly, there is no clause in the Indian news-reports voicing similar concern. The first idea that can be deducted is that Indian news-reports tend to be less frequent and more indirect as compared to the British ones in placing uncertainty in their view regarding Dmitry Medvedev’s liberal credentials. Second, both the Indian and the British news-reports hold opinion regarding Putin continuing to matter after the election of the next Russian president. But both the categories of news-reports bring an element of doubt in this opinion and there is one instance each in both the categories of news-reports where this opinion is made to sound objective. Third, there is no fear raised in the Indian news-reports regarding Dmitry Medvedev growing strong enough to resist Putin’s influence or block his way back to power, but in the British news-report there is. However, the author in the British news-report makes this fear doubtful by modalising its statement and that too with median value of modality.

As regards the news-reports related to Benazir’s assassination, the British news-reports voice probabilities of a dark future in store for Pakistan and Pervez Musharraf. They have two authorial modalised clauses of low value and subjective implicit orientation communicating such probabilities.
this country of 167 million, the only Muslim nation with nuclear weapons, might begin to tear apart at the seams. (The Independent. News-report 5, clause 34)

which (the crisis) could threaten President Pervez Musharraf's grip on power and his role in the US-led war on terrorism (The Daily Telegraph. News-report 5, clause 5),

In contrast, the Indian news-reports do not write about any such probability. This suggests that the British news-reports show post-Benazir Pakistan going in for disturbance and disintegration, while the Indian news-reports are silent in this regard.

As regards the news-reports related to Post-election violence in Kenya, the Indian news-reports basically report events and happenings such as:

Kenyan police battled protesters in blazing slums on Monday (The Indian Express. News-report 6, clause 1)

Police battled thousands of opposition supporters across Kenya. (The Hindu. News-report 6, clause 2)

A mob torched a church sheltering hundreds of people fleeing post-election violence today, killing up to 50 people ~ including many children (The Statesman. News-report 6, clause 2)

The British news-reports, besides reporting events and happenings, give opinions on varied issues using modalised statements such as:

which means it will be extremely difficult for Kibaki to govern. (The Guardian. News-report 6, clause 41)
His Orange Democratic Movement party is likely to contest the results through the courts. (The Daily Telegraph. News-report 6, clause 27)

The Indian news-reports do not much indulge in voicing opinions regarding events and happenings, and wherever they do it is done in *unmodalised* statements so that opinion sounds like a fact. But this is not the case in the British news-reports. The following comparisons will vindicate the idea:
The violence threatens to deter investors from east Africa’s largest economy and damage Kenya’s reputation as an oasis of relative stability in a volatile and war-scarred region. (The Indian Express. News-report 6, clause 10)

The violence will raise concerns that Kenya, which has long been seen by Western powers as the stable hub of restive East Africa, could itself fall into chaos. (The Daily Telegraph. News-report 6, clauses 17, 18 and 19)

Police had warned the opposition not to hold the rally. (The Hindu. News-report 6, clause 24)

He said he would today stage an alternative inauguration making him president, a move likely to provoke a heavy police reaction. (The Daily Telegraph. News-report 6, clauses 13 and 14)

In the slums, which are often divided along tribal lines, rival groups have been going at each other with machetes and sticks. (The Statesman. News-report 6, clauses 15 and 16)

There are fears that the perceived stolen election will greatly inflame ethnic tensions. (The Guardian. News-report 6, clause 25)
Unmistakably, this indicates that the authors of the Indian news-reports are more conscious of their reputation as documenter of reality and tend to indulge less in predicting events and happenings than the authors of the British news-reports.

In relation to the news-reports related to Robert Mugabe losing majority in Zimbabwean Parliament, there are major ideological differences between the Indian and the British newspapers. First of all, the Indian news-reports nowhere write about Robert Mugabe led ZANU –PF getting defeated in the presidential elections using authorial clauses. In the Indian newspapers, the defeat of Mugabe’s party is stated only in projected clauses.

Zimbabwe’s Opposition said on Wednesday it had defeated veteran President Robert Mugabe in both presidential and parliamentary election. (The Indian Express. News-report 7, clause 2),

President Robert Mugabe’s party lost control of Zimbabwe’s Parliament, the latest official results showed Wednesday (The Hindu. News-report 7, clause 2),

President Robert Mugabe’s party has lost its majority in parliament, the Zimbabwe Election Commission says (The Statesman. News-report 7, clause 2)

Thus, by attributing the statements to the other parties instead of the authors, the Indian news-reports are evading responsibility and playing safe. A substantial reason for this may be that like India Zimbabwe is a Third-World country and also like India it is a Commonwealth nation. Thus, by not writing categorically the thing that goes against the interests of the ruling party, the Indian news-reports might be towing the official line of not eroding the Third-World and Commonwealth solidarity. In contrast, all the British news-reports use authorial clauses to declare the defeat of ZANU-PF, thus owning the full responsibility of the declaration.
Robert Mugabe's government was dealt another blow yesterday when the ruling Zanu-PF party lost control of parliament to the opposition for the first time since independence 28 years ago. (The Guardian. News-report 7, clause 2)

Saturday's elections went so strongly against the ruling party. (The Independent. News-report 7, clause 11)

Robert Mugabe has lost control of Zimbabwe's parliament in a major blow to his hopes of holding on to power. (The Daily Telegraph. News-report 7, clause 2)

The reason for being so categorical in their declaration may be that Britain does not have very cordial relations with Zimbabwe's ruling party. Its mention we find in The Hindu as well, “Britain has long been a sharp critic of Mr. Mugabe”. (Clause 20, The Hindu) Further, in the British news-reports there are authorial modalised clauses communicating probability of disaster for Robert Mugabe.

Most of those who voted for Makoni can be expected to swing behind Tsvangirai...(The Guardian. News-report 7, clauses 22 and 23)

That would easily deliver Tsvangirai victory based on the MDC presidential election figures (The Guardian. News-report 7, clause 25)

which (the military rank and file) is likely to have voted largely for the opposition. (The Guardian. News-report 7, clause 39)

But that also carries the risk that the opposition would unite and the angry populace would give an even more resounding "No" to Zanu-PF than they did four days ago. (The Independent. News-report 7, clauses 29, 30 and 31)
In contrast, in the Indian news-reports there is only one authorial *modalised* clause voicing the probability of a bleak future for Robert Mugabe’s ruling party. 

…it (ZANU-PF) will not have the 206 seats needed for a majority. (The Hindu. News-report 7, clause 8)

Besides, in the British news-reports there are authorial *modalised* clauses that communicate fears of disaster that Robert Mugabe or his ruling party is capable of. But the next round may not be like the first. (The Guardian. News-report 7, clause 26)

There is speculation that a huge rigging operation will be attempted. (The Daily Telegraph. News-report 7, clause 20)

Mr Mugabe can still call on an army of so-called war veterans of the independence struggle and the feared youth brigade. (The Daily Telegraph. News-report 7, clause 21)

In contrast, in the Indian news-reports there is no authorial *modalised* clause communicating similar fear. Thus, the British news-reports are far more pessimistic than the Indian news-reports regarding the future of Robert Mugabe and his ZANU-PF. In addition, the British news-reports through their fears paint Robert Mugabe and his ZANU-PF as a negative force potent enough to create major unrest in the wake of defeat.

As regards the news-reports related to Nepal becoming a Republic, the authors in the Indian news-reports voice probability in the propositions pertaining to the King’s decision of ‘not to resist the abolition of monarchy’, the King’s statement that ‘he tried to serve the country to the best of his ability and that he is always available for the people in whatever capacity required’, and the Government’s readiness to offer the king ‘a reasonable time to make alternative arrangements’(clauses 4, 7 and 17, *The Indian Express*). Interestingly, they attempt to minimize the presence of their voice in these propositions and make them sound impersonal by using the *objective implicit* variant of
Further, the Indian news-reporters use median value authorial modalised clauses of subjective implicit orientation to state the probability regarding the power-sharing deal being a ‘compromise’ for the three parties, regarding NC and UML giving up ‘their demand for amendment of the interim Constitution to allow removal of the Prime Minister by a simple majority instead of the existing two-thirds vote-out’, and regarding the candidates from CPN (Maoists), NC, UML and MPRF taking up the post of Executive Prime Minister, ceremonial President, Chair of the CA and Vice-President, respectively (clauses 5, 6 and 11, The Hindu). Likewise, the authors in the British news-reports voice probability in the propositions pertaining to the King becoming a ‘commoner’, the smaller parties’ preference for ‘a Westminster-type parliament with an eminent person "selected" as head of state’ (clauses 19 and 53, The Guardian), the king leaving the palace (clauses 6 and 42, The Independent and clause 5, The Daily Telegraph), the Maoist rebels leading the government (clause 12, The Independent), Nepal abolishing its ‘once-reverend monarchy’ (clause 1, The Daily Telegraph), the king continuing to live in Nepal (clause 49, The Independent, ‘some royalists’ opposing the motion for the abolition of monarchy (clause 2, The Daily Telegraph), the motion getting passed in the assembly (clause 3, The Daily Telegraph), and ‘thousands of anti-monarchists’ defying authorities and taking to the streets to celebrate the abolition of monarchy (clause 11, The Daily Telegraph). In addition, in the British newspaper, The Guardian, there is one authorial modulated clause communicating the necessity to restrain the royalty (clause 15), and this amounts to a major ideological difference between the two categories of news-reports since there is no authorial modulated clause in the Indian news-reports spelling out such a necessity. Another ideological stance is that the authors in the British news-reports write about the probability of more radical and risky to predict situations than the authors in the Indian news-reports. There are a few instances to prove the point:

…the King is believed to have decided not to resist the abolition of monarchy. (The Indian Express. News-report 8, clause 4)
the unpopular King Gyanendra is expected to vacate his palace in the capital Kathmandu soon after the vote. (The Daily Telegraph. News-report 8, clause 5)

King Gyanendra (61) is believed to have said he tried to serve the country to the best of his ability and that he is always available for the people in whatever capacity required. (The Indian Express. News-report 8, clause 7)

The current king, Gyanendra is expected to continue to live in Nepal, despite some reports he might move to India where he has supporters among the Hindu right wing (The Independent. News-report 8, clauses 49, 50, 51)

Still another ideological hue that gets reflected is that the British news-reporters present a catastrophic Nepal where things are going for an absolute reversal i.e. the king becoming a ‘commoner’ and the ‘rebels’ leading the government’. After today's vote the king…will be reduced to a commoner. (The Guardian. News-report 8, clause 19)

They (maoist rebels) are preparing to form a coalition government, which they will head. (The Independent. News-report 8, clauses 11 and 12)

In contrast, the Indian news-reporters present a Nepal at a point of transition and this transition is smooth and not annoying. …but the Government seems to be ready to offer him a reasonable time to make alternative arrangements. (The Indian Express. News-report 8, clause 17)

Once the House passes the proposal, Nepal will be declared a republic on Wednesday itself, ending the 240-year-long monarchy. (The Hindu. News-report 8, clauses 13 and 14)
In relation to the news-reports related to *Barack Obama winning the US presidential election*, in the British news-reports there are two median value authorial *modalised* clauses of *subjective implicit* orientation referring to the probability of Barack Obama inheriting America with economic and other difficulties (clause 18, *The Guardian* and clause 91, *The Independent*), while in the Indian news-reports there is only one such clause referring to the similar idea (clause 19, *The Statesman*). Further, the authors of the British news-reports use authorial *modalised* clauses to write about the probability of a positive change in America with the election of Obama as the US president (clauses 37 and 72, *The Independent*, and clause 42, *The Daily Telegraph*), and also to write favourably of the US election process (clause 69, *The Independent*, and clause 33 *The Daily Telegraph*), while the authors of Indian news-reports use *unmodalised* authorial clauses to write about these things (clauses 4 and 63, *The Indian Express*, clauses 6, 10 and 20, *The Hindu*, and clause 14, *The Statesman*). Next, the British news-reports make a reference to the probability of the on-going economic crisis limiting Obama’s ambitions; however, this reference is made in an authorial *modalised* clause (clause 19, *The Guardian*). In contrast, the Indian news-reports do not refer to such a probability either in an authorial *modalised* clause or in an authorial *unmodalised* clause. Hence, it can be summarised that the British news-reports are a bit more frequent than the Indian news-reports in writing about the probability of Barack Obama inheriting America with economic and other difficulties, obviously, it is a probability that does not go in favor of Obama and has the potential to minimize the jubilating mood. Second, the Indian news-reports are more emphatic and categorical in asserting that America is going in for a positive change with the election of Obama as the US president and also in evaluating the US election process favourably because the Indian news-reports present these propositions as facts while the British news-reports present their propositions as probabilities. And finally, the British news-reports sound a note of caution for Obama by hinting at the potential of on-going economic crisis to limit his
ambitions, however, this fear is presented as a probability. In contrast, the Indian news-reports sound no such caution.

As regards the news-reports related to 26/11 terror attack on Mumbai, there are two authorial statements in the Indian newspapers, one in *The Indian Express* (clause 9) and the other in *The Statesman* (clause 9), about the affiliation of the Mumbai attackers to the neighboring Pakistan. Both the statements are *modalised* having median value of the *objective implicit* variant. On the other hand, in the British news-reports, there is no authorial clause speaking about the affiliations of the Mumbai attackers. Though in the *Daily Telegraph* there is one clause that links the attackers to Pakistan, but it is a projected clause attributed to ‘some in the Indian government’.

Some in the Indian government have suggested that the attack could have been planned or launched from Pakistan. (The Daily Telegraph. News-report 10, clause 20)

This indicates that at the authorial level the British news-reports are mute so far as linking Mumbai attackers to Pakistan is concerned, may be this being a sensitive issue with international ramifications is potent to *affect* Britain’s relations with Pakistan, an ally in the US led war on terror and a member of the Commonwealth, a group of Britain’s former colonies. The Indian news-reports voice the idea that the Indian government voices. However, they create a room for uncertainty in this assertion by *modalising* it and attempt to freeze its subjectivity and make it sound sound like an objective belief by using the *objective implicit* variant of *modality*.

In case of the editorials related to *Benazir’s assassination*, the Indian and the British newspapers again vary ideologically. First, the British editorials are more recurrent and frightening in voicing the probabilities of grave consequences of Benazir’s assassination in Pakistan. In total, there are nine authorial *modalised* clauses in the British editorials voicing such probabilities, whereas in the Indian editorials there are merely three authorial *modalised* clauses voicing similar probabilities.
the consequences can only be unpredictable and highly dangerous. (The Independent. Editorial 1, clause 26)

It seems unlikely that any of the gains of recent months can be maintained. (The Independent. Editorial 1, clause 27)

These will be perilous days for Pakistan. (The Independent. Editorial 1, clause 30)

Those hopes (of a stable Pakistan and a rapid transition to democracy) now appear wildly unrealistic. (The Independent. Editorial 1, clause 24)

The return to civilian rule and the parliamentary elections, now less than two weeks away, are both surely threatened. (The Independent. Editorial 1, clause 31)

The deep, seething resentment in Sindh may not be a passing phenomenon. (The Guardian. Editorial 1, clause 15)

In such circumstances, Gen Musharraf may decide to postpone or cancel parliamentary elections due on January 8. (The Daily Telegraph. Editorial 1, clause 22)

The situation may deteriorate to the extent that the army decides once again to intervene, this time removing the author of the 1999 coup, Gen Musharraf. (The Daily Telegraph. Editorial 1, clauses 26 and 27)

A nuclear-armed, fundamentalist-threatened Pakistan will continue to be one of the most dangerous countries in the world. (The Daily Telegraph. Editorial 1, clause 32)

it will have dangerously destabilizing consequences. (The Hindu. Editorial 1, clause 18)
Irreparable must be the country’s moral defeat. (The Statesman. Editorial 1, clause 10)

Certainly, the general election slated for January 8 has now been rendered devoid of all meaning. (The Indian Express. Editorial 1, clause 13)

Needless to say that the British editorials construct a more hopeless picture of post-Benazir Pakistan than that is constructed in the Indian editorials. Second, the Indian editorials are more indirect, less specific and less frequent in voicing opinion regarding the identity of those responsible for Benazir’s assassination than the British editorials. Specifically speaking, there is merely one authorial modalised clause in the Indian editorials writing about the probability of “the end of the movement towards democracy” (signified by Benazir’s assassination) suiting “the military establishment as well as the Islamists” (Clause 17, The Hindu). Thus, this proposition does not name Pervez Musharaff or Baitulaah Mesud directly, but only alludes to them by the use of phrases like “military establishment” and “the Islamists”. In sharp contrast, there are four authorial modalised clauses in the British editorials voicing varied probabilities in relation to the killers of Benazir and all these probabilities are direct and specific. And even if, as is probable, he (Pervez Musharraf). had no part whatever in her death, (The Independent. Editorial 1, clause 33)

He (Pervez Musharraf).may have had no personal hand in the killing of Pakistan's most popular politician. (The Guardian. Editorial 1, clause 33)

This (That Baitullah Mehsud is behind the assassination) could well be the case. (The Guardian. Editorial 1, clause 39)
but it (That Baitullah Mehsud is behind the assassination) will not be the full story. (The Guardian. Editorial 1, clause 40)

Third, the British editorials are more demanding and their demands are of more radical nature as the obligations laid by them for Pervez Musharraf, the west, the Pakistani army and the political parties of Pakistan signify.

He (Pervez Musharraf) should go. (The Guardian. Editorial 1, clause 45)

The west should stop supporting him (Pervez Musharraf). (The Guardian. Editorial 1, clause 46)

The army should guarantee the stability of the country and its nuclear arsenal, if necessary under foreign supervision. (The Guardian. Editorial 1, clause 47)

All political parties should be invited to convene a national conference whose task would be to form a government of national unity. (The Guardian. Editorial 1, clauses 48 and 49)

In contrast, the Indian editorials are not only less demanding but their demands are also milder and of more palatable nature. For instance, their only demand from Pervez Musharraf is to “accept total responsibility” for Benazir’s assassination (clause 24, The Statesman). Similarly, all that they expect from all those who care for Pakistan is to “join hands to ensure it is pulled back from the edge” (clause 29, The Hindu).

As regards the editorials related to Post-election violence in Kenya, the Indian and the British editorials vary in more than one way. First, apprehensions regarding Kenya’s future in the post-election era found in the editorials taken from the Indian newspapers are less in number and milder in nature than those found in the editorials taken from the British newspapers. The British editorials predict a sort of doom or
disaster in Kenya in the wake of disputed elections, while the Indian editorials are not so pessimistic and hint at the probability of it getting “hugely difficult” to broker a peace deal or bring about some political settlement in Kenya. On the whole, there are two authorial modalised clauses in the Indian editorials voicing apprehensions regarding Kenya’s future (clauses 7 and 16, *The Statesman*); in the British editorials, this number shoots up to five (clauses 28, 29 and 31 *The Indian Express*, clause 25, *The Guardian* and clause 28, *The Daily Telegraph*). Second, there are two authorial modalised clauses in the Indian editorials writing about the probability of a huge electoral fraud in the recently concluded presedential elections in Kenya (clause 15, *The Indian Express* and clause 13, *The Statesman*), while in the British editorials there is no such clause. Third, the obligations that the Indian editorials lay down for the world community aim at a healing touch for Kenya by doing the wrongs right, while those laid down in the British editorials are punitive in nature.

At this vital moment for democracy in Africa, the African Union, the European Union, and the Commonwealth need to do all they can to help Kenya come out of this crisis with its head held high. (The Hindu. Editorial 2, clause 28)

All the violence should certainly be condemned… (The Indian Express. Editorial 2, clause 24)

but most of the diplomatic pressure should be exerted on Mr Kibaki’s supposed new Government to annul the results and organise a recount — or a new vote. (The Indian Express. Editorial 2, clause 25),

Commonwealth should take lead against Kenya. (The Daily Telegraph. Editorial 2, clause 1)
No, if there is to be practical action against President Kibaki, it must be concerted and multilateral. (The Daily Telegraph. Editorial 2, clauses 30 and 31)

Commonwealth leaders should suspend Kenya from their ranks and retain the option of further sanctions unless the election is re-run. (The Daily Telegraph. Editorial 2, clauses 35 and 36)

And finally, in the Indian editorials the stepping down of President Kibaki and conducting the presidential election process all over again are presented as obligations (clauses 25 and 26, The Hindu), while in the British editorials there is no mention of such obligations.

Next, there are editorials related to Robert Mugabe losing majority in Zimbabwean Parliament. Concerning this theme, in both the Indian and the British editorials there are authorial modalised clauses writing about the probability of an electoral defeat for Robert Mugabe. The only difference is that the British editorials are more repetitive in pronouncing this probability than the Indian editorials. In total, there are three authorial modalised clauses in the Indian editorials voicing such probability (clause 21, The Hindu, clause 15, The Statesman and clause 4, The Indian Express), while in the British editorials the count of such clauses is six (clauses 5, 16 and 43 The Independent, clauses 15 and 31, The Guardian, and clause 11, The Daily Telegraph). Second, in the Indian editorials there are two authorial modalised clauses hinting at the probability of a foul play on the part of the Zimbabwean Election commission. In the British editorials, there is one such clause. Third, in the Indian editorials there are two authorial modalised clauses writing about the probability of some evil-doing by the ruling ZANU-PF (clause 17, The Hindu and clause 11, The Statesman). In the British editorials, there is one such clause (clause 19, The Independent). Besides, in the British editorials, there is also an authorial modalised clause that voices a probability which builds up a positive image of the ruling party. The clause is as follows:
Or it might be that the ruling elite is engaged in a frantic process of negotiation over who will tell the ageing despot that the time has come when he really does have to step down. (The Independent. Editorial 3, clause 6)

Fourth, in the Indian editorials there is one authorial modalised clause writing about the probability of life becoming unbearable in Zimbabwe without remittances from the hundreds of thousands of Zimbabweans who have fled to other countries (clause 11, The Hindu). Needless to say, this probability results in a thoroughly negative evaluation of Zimbabwe. Fifth, in the Indian editorials there is one authorial modalised clause writing about the probability of the people of Zimbabwe rising to the occasion to “wrest their well-being back” (clause 15, The Indian Express). Obviously, such a probability builds up hope for Zimbabwe and Zimbabweans. Sixth, in the British editorials there are two authorial modalised clauses voicing fears of violence in the second round of presidential elections in Zimbabwe (clauses 25 and 30, The Guardian), thus sounding a note of caution. However, there is no such clause in the Indian editorials. And finally, the Indian editorials write about the ability of South Africa and other neighbouring countries to exert “some constructive pressure” on Mr. Mugabe (clause 27, The Hindu), and further lay down an obligation, obviously for these nations, to persuade Mr. Mugabe “to bow out with a shred of dignity” (clause 28, The Hindu). Likewise, the British editorials make it obligatory for Mr. Mugabe himself to “listen to the verdict of the people” (clause 2, The Independent). They also make it obligatory for the leaders of the neighbouring African countries and the Zimbabwean army chiefs to make efforts to uphold the will of the people in Zimbabwe (clauses 30 and 40, The Independent). Not only this, the British editorials lay down an obligation, obviously for the leaders of the neighbouring African countries, not to persuade the Zimbabwean opposition to go to courts against the electoral fraud committed by the ruling party (clause 31, The Independent), a strategy that the opposition used in the last presidential elections and that failed miserably.
In relation to the editorials related to *Barack Obama winning the US presidential election*, the Indian and the British editorials hold almost different ideological grounds, though there exists between them some similarities too. First of all, the editorials taken from the British newspapers hang up a long list of obligations for the incoming president. Almost all these obligations are made to sound most urgent by using authorial *modulated* clauses of high value. Some of these are as follows:

Yet an economic crisis with few precedents must be confronted. (The Independent. Editorial 4, clause 31)

two unpopular wars must be resolved. (The Independent. Editorial 4, clause 32)

A healthcare system needs to be rebuilt, (The Independent. Editorial 4, clause 35)

while social security must be shored up (The Independent. Editorial 4, clause 36)

Yet it must not distract him from that other piece of unfinished business, the Middle East peace process. (The Daily Telegraph. Editorial 4, clause 46)

The president-elect must engage immediately and not allow the issue to slip off his radar. (The Daily Telegraph. Editorial 4, clause 48)

Thus, by listing up a number of specific areas that demand immediate attention and action, the British editorials depict a state of emergency that the incoming president has to confront and resolve. In contrast, in the Indian editorials there is merely one obligation for Barack Obama. Though like those in the British editorials this obligation is made to sound most urgent by using authorial *modulated* clause of high value.
Domestically, Mr. Obama has to deal with unemployment, and deliver on the welfare measures. (The Statesman. Editorial 4, clause 35)

Further, in the British editorials there are ten authorial modalised clauses, mostly of median value and subjective implicit orientation, that pronounce the probabilities of a dismal and bleak future for the incoming president:

But Barack Obama will face immense challenges in the White House. (The Independent. Editorial 4, clause 3)

This time however, the US may be entering a long and deep recession, with only sluggish growth to follow. (The Independent. Editorial 4, clause 16)

This will change the social and geopolitical landscape in which President Obama (and probably his successors) will operate. (The Independent. Editorial 4, clause 17)

Mr Obama will take office in January amid massive unrealisable expectations and facing a daunting list of problems - the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, the broken healthcare system, the spiralling federal budget and America's profligate energy regime all prominent among them (The Guardian. Editorial 4, clause 34)

he will be only too aware that he is entering into the bleakest legacy to face any incoming Commander-in-Chief since Ronald Reagan in 1980, with an economy in recession, two unfinished foreign wars, and America's standing in the world brought low by the Bush presidency. (The Daily Telegraph. Editorial 4, clause 6)

It is going to be uphill all the way. (The Daily Telegraph. Editorial 4, clause 7)
But the memories of the campaign, be they ever so uplifting, will fade swiftly enough as hard reality bears in. (The Daily Telegraph. Editorial 4, clause 17)

On November 15, there will be an emergency Washington summit which will try to forestall a full-blown global depression. (The Daily Telegraph. Clause 21)

And the slump will colour everything. (The Daily Telegraph. Editorial 4, clause 27)

the new president will have scant resources to meet them (the electorate's great expectations of change). (The Daily Telegraph. Editorial 4, clause 34)

In contrast, in the Indian editorials, there is no such authorial modalised clause, that paints a picture of gloom and pessimism for Obama. Next, in the Indian editorials there are two authorial modalised clauses of high value and subjective implicit orientation that write about the ability of Obama to bring a change (clause 37, The Hindu and clause 26, The Statesman). Obviously, these clauses offer a positive image of Obama. Contrarily, in the British editorials there is an authorial modalised clause, however of low value, that voices the probability of Obama proving “a disappointment” (clause 39, The Independent). Keeping aside these differences, one similarity that exists between the Indian and the British editorials is that both the categories of editorials are almost equally hopeful of the positive developments that an Obama presidency has the potential to bring. Specifically speaking, there are two authorial modalised clauses of median value and subjective implicit orientation each in the Indian and the British editorials pronouncing such probabilities:

the international community will be mightily relieved. (The Hindu. Editorial 4, clause 51)
However, the hope is that his unique personal history will make him understand better than his predecessors that other countries too have their special character. (The Hindu. Editorial 4, clause 54)

The impact (of Obama’s ‘exceptional’ upbringing) will be most evident in his foreign policy. (The Independent. Editorial 4, clause 23)

diplomacy will make a welcome return as America's preferred method of conducting foreign policy. (The Independent. Editorial 4, clause 27)

As regards the editorials related to 26/11 terror attack on Mumbai, there is one authorial modalised clause of median value each in the Indian and the British newspapers writing about the probability of the Government of Pakistan’s seriousness in the drive against terrorism.
While the Government of Pakistan appears to be serious in putting any form of support that its Inter-Services Intelligence provided for terrorism behind and in its pursuit of improved relations with India. (The Hindu. Editorial 5, clause 32)

President Asif Zardari's administration in Islamabad seems sincere in its determination to crush the militants in its lawless western territories. (The Independent. Editorial 5, clause 23)

Second, both the Indian and the British editorials voice the probability of pressure upon the Congress party led UPA government to act against terrorism in the wake of Mumbai attack. There is one authorial modalised clause of median value each in both the categories of newspapers communicating this probability.
The Maharashtra and central governments will obviously come under pressure to act decisively on the terrorism front. (The Hindu. Editorial 5, clause 38)

The Congress Party, already criticised for failing to get a grip on the insurgent threat, will be desperate to show it is making progress by next year's general election. (The Independent. Editorial 5, clause 39)

Further, in the British editorials there are authorial modalised clauses of median value voicing fears of communal clashes in India in the wake of Mumbai attack (clauses 16 and 29, The Guardian and clause 15, The Daily Telegraph). In contrast, there is no authorial modalised clause in the Indian editorials voicing such fears. However, they have one authorial modulated clause of median value that makes the avoidance of “the bitterness of religious politics” and promotion of “harmony among different sections” an obligation (clause 52, The Hindu). Undoubtedly, the British editorials highlight the danger of communalism in India by showing it vulnerable to communal disturbances, while the Indian editorials opt to remain silent in this regard. Further, in the Indian editorials there is one authorial modalised clause of median value and subjective implicit orientation expressing hope regarding India overcoming the crisis posed to it by the Mumbai attack. (clause 11, The Indian Express). In contrast, in the British editorials median value authorial modalised clause expressing hope for India is of objective implicit orientation. (clause 34, The Independent). Besides, they also have one median value authorial modalised clause and that too of subjective implicit orientation expressing a cause of serious concern for India.

But there is a danger that outside investors will be scared off. (The Independent. Editorial 5, clause 36)
This shows that authors of the Indian editorials float a resilient image of India and assume the full responsibility of floating this image by using the *subjective implicit* orientation of modalisation, whereas the authors of the British editorials while floating a resilient image of India attempt to evade the responsibility of floating it by using the *objective implicit* orientation of modalisation. On the other hand, while sounding a note of serious concern for India they personalise their proposition by using the *subjective implicit* orientation of modalisation. Next, in the British editorials, there is one median value authorial *modalised* clause of *subjective implicit* orientation that shows skepticism in diplomacy or negotiation as a means for battling terrorism (clause 29, *The Daily Telegraph*). Besides, they have one authorial *modulated* clause of high value and *subjective implicit* orientation laying down the obligation for “hunting down the Islamist terrorists” (clause 30, *The Daily Telegraph*). Interestingly, in the Indian editorials there is neither any authorial *modalised* clause that shows skepticism in diplomacy or negotiation nor any authorial *modulated* clause that expresses the obligation to hunt down the Islamist terrorists. Obviously, the British editorials seem to be in tune with the ideology of the US led western forces that preferred a military option in Iraq and Afghanistan. Another interesting aspect is that the Indian editorials turn out to be more balanced and mature while voicing opinions regarding the identity of Mumbai attackers. For instance, in the Indian editorials, there are three authorial *modalised* clause of *subjective implicit* orientation touching this issue. Out of these, two clauses write about the probability of things getting clear after the investigation (clause 29, *The Hindu* and clause 21, *The Indian Express*). The third one voices the probability of the militants landing on “a small boat from out of a larger vessel in the high seas off the coast of Mumbai” (clause 31, *The Hindu*). Thus, none of the three clauses puts a finger of suspicion upon any organization or nation as the perpetrator of the attack. However, there are two authorial *modalised* clauses of low value and *subjective implicit* orientation in the British editorials that do so (clause 10, *The Independent*
and clause 5, *The Daily Telegraph*). The first clause voices the probability of an al-Qa’ida hand in the attack and the second one doubts this probability. Next, in the Indian editorials there are three authorial *modulated* clauses of *subjective implicit* orientation that write about certain inabilities, the purpose of which is to bring the Indian state or the esablishment including the Indian PM in the dock.

He (the Prime Minister of India) couldn’t even replace his utterly inept and equally shameless home minister. (The Statesman. Editorial 5, clause 5)

he (the Prime Minister of India) certainly cannot expect that the people will respond positively to the pleas and promises made during his post-Mumbai address to the nation. (The Statesman. Editorial 5, clause 6)

the state cannot take credit for that (the countless exhibitions of valour, humaneness and brotherhood during the Mumbai terror attack). (The Statesman. Editorial 5, clause 13)

In addition to these, they have a number of authorial *modulated* clauses, mostly of high value and *subjective implicit* orientation that lay down certain obligations for the govt. of India, the Indian politics and the people of india, the purpose of which is to make them act to build a secure india.

The immediate task before the Maharashtra government should be to remove the sense of insecurity. (The Hindu. Editorial 5, clause 16)

The Government of India should come to the aid of the State in a massive way in creating a sense of security in the immediate term… (The Hindu. Editorial 5, clause 19)
The focus instead should be on strengthening security through surveillance of public places, screening of entry, and more policemen on the ground. (The Hindu. Editorial 5, clause 45)

The long term task should of course be to avoid the bitterness of religious politics and promote harmony among different sections. (The Hindu. Editorial 5, clause 52)

Owners of public places such as hotels need also to step up their vigil and put stronger security and screening measures in place. (The Hindu. Editorial 5, clause 47)

Politics has to rise to the occasion. (The Indian Express. Editorial 5, clause 47)

In contrast, the British editorials do not write about any such inadequacy and do not lay down any such obligation that alludes to a necessity or requirement hitherto unattended in India and that resulted in a major security lapse signified by the Mumbai terror attack. Thus, the Indian editorials are categorical and blunt in criticising the Indian state or the establishment and in laying down certain dos and donts for the stakeholders involved, whereas the British editorials are cautious in this regard and do not meddle with what is termed as internal affairs of a nation in the diplomatic jargon.

In this ever-changing contemporary world, the newspaper is one of the most indispensable, and yet at the same time one of the most disputable written texts. It is indispensable because even in this era of Internet and electronic media it continues to be a powerful tool for the dissemination of information, and disputable because a newspaper is said to be a part of a particular social, economic, political, regional, cultural or ideological set-up which it naturalizes and thus works as a mechanism of social control. Tony Trew states, “Newspapers are only a part of the ideological institutions of a society, a part whose specific nature involves the fact that they are primarily concerned with making public information about what is happening. It is
precisely they have the role of providing information that they also have a major ideological role, both because all information involves theory or ideology, and because the information itself creates a constant flow of material which needs to be ideologically processed” (Fowler, Kress, Trew and Hodge 1979: 156). Undoubtedly, in media discourse ideology manifests through information and information materializes itself through language. Therefore, in the present study, an attempt is made to analyze appraisal and modality in the language of Indian and British newspapers with the view to reach at the ideology underlying them. The research points out that the British newspapers are generally more negative in their worldview than the Indian newspapers as in majority of the cases they tend to criticize more and admire less the participants, things or entities involved in the process of interaction as compared to the Indian newspapers. For instance, the British newspapers are more critical of the Iraqi PM and his ruling coalition; of the relationship between North Korea and South Korea; of Musharraf, Benazir and Nawaz Sharif; of the Russian president Vladimir Putin, his successor Dmitry Medvedev, the Russian Prime Minister Sergi Ivanov, the Russian foreign policy and its presidential election process; of Mwai Kibaki and Africa; of Nepal, its outgoing ruler King Gyanendra and its existing or upcoming rulers (Maoists); of the Zimbabwean President Robert Mugabe; of the Indian security forces, etc. in comparison to the Indian newspapers. Similarly, they are less enthusiastic than the Indian newspapers when it comes to the positive appraisal of Benazir, of Musharraf, of Obama, of the United States, of the presidential elections in Zimbabwe, etc. However, there are some participants or things as regards to which both the British and the Indian newspapers hold almost the same ideas. For instance, they paint Iraq negatively, criticize North Korea, condemn Benazir’s assassination and her killers, criticize Afghan and Iraq wars, condemn Mumbai attackers and admire the democracy in the United States. It is further found that apart from being comparatively more negative in their worldview, the British newspapers through a number of probabilities and fears construct a bleak, dismal, hopeless, and at times a catastrophic and topsy-turvy world. Another
finding is that the official ideology of their respective nations goes a long way in determining the ideological stances of both the categories of newspapers. For instance, considerations of Third-World solidarity, Commonwealth affinity, foreign policy objective of maintaining cordial relations with neighbors and not meddling with their sovereignty, peace-process with Pakistan, India’s official stand on terrorism, etc. explicitly influence the use of *appraisal* and *modality* in the Indian newspapers.