

# A Study of Mood Usage in a Japanese Newspaper Editorial

Xiaojian Xie

## 1. Introduction

On the Fifth of April 2009, President Barack Obama delivered a historic speech in Prague in which he stated “America’s commitment to seek the peace and security of a world without nuclear weapons”. The speech attracted great media attention throughout the world, especially in Japan, where opposition to nuclear weapons is a deep-rooted national policy. However, it is never possible for journalists to “simply report the facts”. Like all other users of language, journalists cannot do otherwise than produce texts under the influence of various ideologies. The influence of ideologies on textual meaning is reflected linguistically in numerous ways. In order to investigate such ideologies, in a previous study, Xie (2013), I conducted an investigation of ideational meaning through a Transitivity analysis of the original Japanese version of an *Asahi Shimbun* newspaper editorial about the Prague speech published on 7th April, 2009. The present study, which is a continuation of the previous one, extends the investigation to consider interpersonal meaning by analyzing the Mood usage in the original Japanese editorial.

## 2. Theory and method

The theoretical and methodological framework for this investigation is Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). Although there are many schools of CDA (see Wodak & Meyer 2009), the fundamental insight common to all is that language is a material form of ideology (Fairclough 1995: 73). Fairclough defines ideologies as “representations of aspects of the world which can be shown to contribute to establishing, maintaining and changing social relations of power, domination and exploitation” (Fairclough 2003: 9).

The version of CDA that I have drawn on in this study is the one that has been developed by Norman Fairclough and his colleagues at Lancaster University in the UK (Fairclough 2003). One characteristic feature of this version is the emphasis given to the close linguistic analysis of texts. While other versions of CDA focus on more abstract levels of discourse, the Faircloughian version argues that ideological analysis must be firmly based on evidence derived from textual analysis. To analyse texts Fairclough draws on the

theoretical framework and methodological tools of Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL).

The key insight underlying SFL is that languages are ‘meaning potentials’ that provide users with choices, arranged as ‘system networks’, about how to express their thoughts. At the level of lexis the ideological implications of this fact are widely recognized (such as in the differential use of “terrorist” and “freedom-fighter”). However, what is less well recognized is the ideological nature of grammar. To take an extremely simple example, we can describe what we see out of the window as “The girl is chasing the dog” or “The dog is being chased by the girl”. The choice between the use of active and passive voice here provides a clear illustration of the impossibility of neutrality in reporting. Since we cannot utter both active and passive statements simultaneously, in practice we must choose to say either one or the other. While the former statement construes the situation in terms of an answer to the question “What is the girl doing?” the latter construes it in terms of “What is happening to the dog?”. Such choices, which the language system both enables and forces us to make in every utterance, are precisely the points at which the operation of ideology can and does occur.

The founder of SFL and the author of its key text, *An Introduction to Functional Grammar* (2004) is the English linguist Michael Halliday. Although the theory has been most fully developed by Halliday and others with respect to the English language, it is potentially applicable to all human languages (and indeed all human systems of semiosis including art and music) and was, in fact, originally developed by Halliday with respect to Chinese. As for Japanese, at present the most fully elaborated study is that by Kazuhiro Teruya (2007). In this paper I have drawn extensively on Teruya’s study although there are a number of technical points where I have chosen to conform more closely to Halliday’s model, particularly as elaborated by Eggins (2003).

### **3. Previous studies**

As I shall demonstrate through my analysis, the representation of the polarization of ideological positions (between ingroup and outgroup) is a prominent feature of this editorial text. The investigation of polarization is an important aspect of the ideological study of media texts and much work has been conducted on this topic. In this section, however, I will limit my review to the work of just three scholars.

In a study of news texts, Van Dijk (1998) found a general strategy for the expression of shared, group-based attitudes and ideologies through mental models. This strategy of polarization between positive ingroup description and negative

outgroup description has the following abstract evaluative structure (Figure 1), which the author names the “Ideological Square”.

Ingroup and Outgroup are often represented by “we/our” and “they/their” respectively. Van Dijk explained that “our” may refer to the ingroup itself or its friends and allies, and “their” to the outgroup or its friends and allies. As I shall demonstrate below, this point is important in relation to the editorial text about Obama’s Prague speech.

Takagi (2004) used the “Ideological Square” model of Van Dijk to analyze editorials about the Iraq War in the *International Herald Tribune* focused on what she called the “We-group” without analyzing the “They-group.” Thus, although her study was extremely insightful, Takagi did not explore the quintessence of Van Dijk’s model, despite the fact that the conflict between “We- or Ingroup” and “They- or Outgroup” is particularly important for the “Ideological Square.”

Kellner (2007) analyzed the rhetoric of President George W. Bush in the “War on Terror” and argued that the Bush administration, aided by the US corporate media, manipulated a politics of fear to promote a right-wing agenda that included the Patriot Act, a dramatic expansion of the US military and US-led military intervention in Afghanistan and Iraq. Several rhetorical strategies, such as the use of terms like “axis of evil” and “good and evil” (where “we” are the good and the “other” is evil), were clearly demonstrated by Kellner.

All the above studies provide great insights into the use of polarization in English media texts. In this paper I will analyze my Japanese data and compare my finding with the previous studies.

#### 4. Data

The text selected for analysis here is an editorial from the Japanese *Asahi Shimbun* newspaper published on the morning of the 7th April 2009. One of the five major national daily newspapers in Japan, the *Asahi Shimbun* has a daily circulation of approximately eight million copies and is generally regarded as reflecting a relatively left-wing political position. Consequently, it has a potentially significant influence on the formation of public opinion in Japan (Nohara 2007: 34).

<b>Ingroup</b>	<b>Ingroup</b>
Emphasize good actions	Mitigate bad actions
<b>Outgroup</b>	<b>Outgroup</b>
Mitigate good actions	Emphasize bad actions

Fig. 1 The Ideological Square (Van Dijk 1998)

## 5. Mood analysis

The text of the Japanese *Asahi Shimbun* editorial has been analyzed using the categories of SFL as developed by Teruya (2007) based on Halliday's categories for English texts (Halliday 2004). The first step in such an analysis is always to divide the text into its individual clauses and groups of clauses (sentences). Then each element in each clause is coded, that is, labeled according to its grammatical function. Since in this paper my focus is on interpersonal aspects of ideology, particularly at the level of the individual clause or clause complex (sentence), the text has been coded only in terms of the Mood system, that is, the system for relating Subject and Predicator. The coding has been done according to the Key shown below.

### 5.1 KEY for Mood Analysis

Regarding the Key and the coding, the following points should be kept in mind.

- (1) The text is divided into sentences and labeled with Arabic numbers (1, 2, 3 ...).
- (2) The sentences are divided into clauses and labeled with Roman numbers (i, ii, iii ...).
- (3) Embedded clauses are shown in [[double square brackets]].
- (4) Double slashed lines // indicate clause boundaries within embedded clauses.
- (5) Where Participants and associated verbal elements have been ellipsed from a clause they are shown in {single curly brackets} whenever possible.
- (6) In some Verbal process clauses, the main verb occurs in what appears to be a new clause separated from the rest of the clause by an interrupting projected clause or clause complex. However, this is actually a continuation of the first clause. Such continued clauses are shown prefixed with a lower case "c" (e.g. c11i) and the interrupting element is indicated by << double angled brackets >>.
- (7) For further details of the coding system employed, refer to Teruya (2007) and Eggins (2003).

**S** = Subject;

**P** = Predicator; **Pma** = modalized (probability, usability etc); **Pmu** = modulated (obligation, inclination etc). **Pe** = evidentiality; **Ps** = suggestive; **Po** = optative

**C** = Complement.

**A** = Adjunct; **Ac** = circumstantial; **Aj** = conjunctive; **Am** = mood.

**mn** = Minor clause.

## 5.2. Clausal Analysis

In this section, the editorial text has been analyzed sequentially, to show how the interpersonal meanings are made, clause by clause, as the text progresses. Note that the English translations are taken directly from the English version of the editorial published one day later.

### Stage 1. Responsible America, Irresponsible North Korea

#### Presentation of Obama's declaration of "moral responsibility"

1. 「米国は (S)、核保有国として (Ac)、そして (Aj) [[ [核兵器を (C) 使った (P)] ことがある (P)] 唯一の核保有国として (Ac)、[[ 行動する (P)] 道義的責任がある (P)]。 [Beikoku wa (S), kakuho-yuukoku toshite (Ac), soshite (Aj) [[ [kakuheiki o (C) tsukatta (P)] koto ga aru (P)] yuiitsu no kakuho-yuukoku toshite (Ac), [[koudou suru (P)] dougiteki sekinin ga aru (P)] .

*"As a nuclear power, as the only nuclear power to have used a nuclear weapon, the United States has a moral responsibility to act,"*

The editorial text opens with a direct quotation, albeit in translation from the original English. In Halliday's SFL model, language use in the Mood system is viewed as being concerned with speech functions and the exchange of messages realized through patterns of Subject and Predicator. Sentence 1 (henceforward S1), is a declarative clause. In Hallidayan terms, it functions with the speech role of "giving" and the commodity being exchanged is "information".

It is noteworthy that S1 uses a Circumstantial Adjunct — "kakuho-yuukoku" ("nuclear power") — to identify the role of the Subject — the US. The Predicator — "koudou suru" ("act") refers to the phrase "seek the peace and security of a world without nuclear weapons" that Obama used in the Prague speech. Obama was trying to set a new agenda of multilateralism and peaceful national security to replace Bush's unilateralism and armed intervention in Afghanistan and Iraq. However, in the Japanese editorial text, "koudou suru (act)" modifies "dougiteki sekinin" (moral responsibility)", which occurs at the very end of the clause and thus forms the main focus of the sentence. In other words, whereas Obama places the emphasis on (future) action, the editorial places the emphasis on (past and present) responsibility.

The editorial writers emphasized the link between Obama's "moral

responsibility” and America’s usage of nuclear weapons in order to allude to the nuclear bombing of Japan. In other words, they foregrounded Japan’s atomic bomb victim role. Obama’s admission of “moral responsibility” is highly relevant for the editorial writers, which is why they used an embedded Predicator, “koudou suru” (“act”), to modify “dougiteki sekinin” (“moral responsibility”).

From the perspective of Van Dijk’s “Ideological Square,” Obama emphasized “our” (America’s) good action, namely that the US is seeking to disarm its nuclear weapons. The editorial writers directly quoted Obama’s words to show this, but through their Mood selections they also indicated that America is Japan’s “them” or “other”, which acted badly towards Japan in the past.

### **Contextualization (spacio-temporal) of Obama’s declaration**

2. {これは (S)}[[オバマ米大統領が (S) プラハで (Ac) 行った (P)]] 演説の一節である (P)。  
{Kore wa (S)} [[Obama beidaitouryou ga (S) Puraha de (Ac) okonatta (P)]]  
enzetsu no issetsu dearu (P).

*U.S. President Barack Obama said in his address in Prague on Sunday.*

This sentence identifies the source of the quotation by using the Circumstantial Adjunct (“Prague”) to tell us that the editorial is based on Obama’s Prague speech. Note that while the Japanese version uses a separate clause here, the English version combines S1 and S2 into a clause complex.

### **Contextualization (historical) of Obama’s declaration**

3. 広島、長崎への原爆投下から (Ac) 今年で (Ac) 64年 (mn)。

Hiroshima, Nagasaki e no genbaku touka kara (Ac) kotoshi de (Ac) 64 nen (mn).

*Sixty-four years have passed since the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki in August 1945.*

The editorial writers mentioned “genbaku touka” (“atomic bombing”) by using a Circumstantial Adjunct. However, Obama never mentioned Hiroshima, Nagasaki or “genbaku touka” (“atomic bombing”). Instead, he said “*as the only nuclear power to have used a nuclear weapon*”. As we can see, the writer underlines the wider historical context by specifically locating America’s “use” of nuclear weapons. In addition, Obama chose to say “use”, a word with non-specific or neutral connotations. By contrast, the editorial writers chose “genbaku touka” (“atomic

bombing”), a phrase loaded with a far more shocking meaning and much more interpersonal force.

Obama’s choice of “use” reflects the official viewpoint of the US which has always been that through the use of nuclear weapons, World War II was brought to an end sooner than it would otherwise have been and many American soldiers’ lives were thereby saved (Nakazawa 2007; Sawada 2009). In other words, the US government believes that the use of nuclear weapons in Japan was the right decision. So in the Prague speech, Obama focuses on “act” and “how to act” and tries to present America’s role as that of the global leader. In contrast, the editorial writers emphasized the atomic bombing explicitly and linked it with “*dougiteki sekinin*” (“moral responsibility”) indirectly. However, most Japanese scholars, such as Nakazawa (2007) and Sawada (2009), view the atomic bombing as a tragedy where many innocent lives were lost unnecessarily.

Finally, we may note here that this sentence is a Minor clause since there is no Predicator. From the English version of the *Asahi Shimbun*, we could infer that the ellipsed Predicator is “has passed”. As the only Minor clause in the whole editorial, this sentence stands out as having a somewhat timeless and universal value.

#### **Evaluation (positive) of Obama’s declaration**

- 4i. 米大統領が (S) 「道義的責任」を (C) 語り (P)、  
 Beikoku daitouryou ga (S) 「*dougiteki sekinin*」o (C) katari (P),  
*The president of the United States has acknowledged America’s moral responsibility and,*
- 4ii. {彼が (S)} 核廃絶への {彼の} 決意を (C) 表明した (P)。  
 {kare ga (S)} kaku haizetsu e no {kare no} ketsui o (C) hyoumei shita (P).  
*{he} voiced his resolve to abolish nuclear weapons.*

In terms of speech functions, these two clauses are both giving information: specifically, a description of Obama’s words. We may note the direct quotation of “moral responsibility” used for the second time here. Actually, in the Prague speech, Obama did not explain in detail what kind of “moral responsibility” the US had. Although the editorial writers used “moral responsibility” again here they did not explain it either. Instead, the writers used an indirect hint to imply the linkage of “moral responsibility” to “*the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki*”.

5. {我々が(S)} 被爆国の国民として(Ac)、[[「核のない世界」を(C)目指し(Ps)、// 時代の歯車を(C)回そう(Ps)という]]呼びかけを(C)重く(Ac)受け止めたい(Po)。 {Wareware ga(S)} hibaku koku no kokumin toshite(Ac), [[「kaku no nai sekai」o(C)mezashi(Ps), // jidai no haguruma o(C)mawasou(Ps)to iu]] yobikake o(C)omoku(Ac)uketometai(Po).

*As citizens of the only country ever subjected to nuclear attacks, Japanese must respond fully to Obama's call for turning the wheels of history to realize "a world without nuclear weapons".*

This is the first Optative Mood clause in the editorial. Furthermore it is combined with an Embedded clause of the Suggestive Mood type. The usage of “- tai” (“want to”) is the sign of Optative Mood in Japanese. The Optative Mood realizes a “desire” or “urge” to do something (Teruya 2007: 192). The Optative Mood is used in an Imperative clause. It means that in terms of Halliday’s Speech Roles this clause is “demanding” rather than “giving” and in terms of commodity exchange it is “commanding” rather than “offering”. The editorial writers appear to be demanding that the Subject, “wareware” (“we”), should respond to Obama’s call. At the same time, it is noteworthy that this clause lacks a Subject. In order to make sense of this clause, readers must supply this Subject by themselves. Because subjectlessness is a common phenomenon in Japanese (Hori 1992), “wareware” (“we”) is likely to have been inferred unproblematically by most readers. Although the Subject, “wareware” (“we”), was omitted, the Circumstantial Adjunct, “hibakukoku no kokumin” (“citizens of the only country ever subjected to nuclear attacks”), makes this clear. Incidentally, it is interesting to note that the English version emphasizes that Japan is “the only” country to have been bombed with nuclear weapons. Perhaps this was added to remind non-Japanese readers of this fact.

The editorial writers demand that their fellow Japanese respond to Obama’s call to seek a non-nuclear world. This may be evaluated as a positive action by the international community. In other words, this sentence could be viewed as doing what Van Dijk called “emphasizing our good actions”.

Now, let us turn to the Suggestive Mood of the Embedded clause. This kind of Mood is one in which the speaker invites the audience to get involved in a proposal (Teruya 2007: 185). The Suggestive Mood is also an Imperative clause, which means the Embedded clause is also “demanding” (in terms of speech role)

and “commanding” (in terms of commodity exchange). In other words, Obama is the speaker, who demands that the audience gets involved in turning the wheels of history to realize a non-nuclear world. In fact, Obama’s original words were “I state clearly and with conviction America’s commitment to seek the peace and security of a world without nuclear weapons”. This is not an Imperative Mood clause at all. Moreover, there is no sentence in the speech like “turning the wheels of history”. Thus, it is readily apparent that the Embedded clause was an interpretation in Suggestive Mood by the editorial writers themselves. The fact that both the Embedded clause and the ranking clause are of the Imperative Mood type, might reflect the editorial writers’ strong desire for nuclear disarmament.

### **Description of action of North Korea and its evaluation (negative)**

6i. この演説の直前に (Ac)、北朝鮮が (S) ミサイル発射を (C) 強行し (P)、  
Kono enzetsu no chokuzen ni (Ac), kitachousen ga (S) misairu hassha o (C)  
kyoukou shi (P),

6ii. {北朝鮮が (S)} 世界に (Ac) 冷水を (C) 浴びせた (P)。  
{Kitachousen ga (S)} sekai ni (Ac) reisui o (C) abiseta (P).

*Hours before Obama’s address, North Korea threw cold water on the international community with a missile launch.*

In contrast to S5, in this sentence the Subject, North Korea, is not ellipsed but explicit. The writers’ evaluation is clearly expressed through the use of “sekai ni reisui o abiseta” (“threw cold water on the international community”). The action taken by North Korea was viewed as a highly negative one by the editorial writers. So negatively, indeed, that they relied on metaphor to create the desired rhetorical effect. In other words, we could say that the editorial writers emphasized the outgroup’s (North Korea’s) bad action in terms of Van Dijk’s Ideological Square.

From the comparison between S5 and S6, we can see how the writers highlight the good action aspect of Japan (accepting Obama’s call for nuclear disarmament) and the bad action aspect of North Korea (launching a missile). Because of the comparison established here, the later demand to the nuclear powers, including China, which is included in S18 becomes easier for the writers to make. One thing that should be noted here is that the negative evaluation of North Korea was made by the editorial writers themselves without quoting Obama’s words. In fact, Obama said the following:

*Just this morning, we were reminded again of why we need a new and more rigorous approach to address this threat. North Korea broke the rules once again by testing a rocket that could be used for long range missiles. (Obama 2009)*

Obama used a modal verb, “could”, to show that he did not positively identify the launch as being that of a missile. Although North Korea itself described the launch as that of a “rocket” intended for peaceful purposes, the editorial writers viewed it as a missile intended for military use. Obama, unlike the editorial writers, challenged North Korea’s action in a relatively soft and legalistic way by using the modality verb “could” and “broke the rules”.

### **Presentation of Obama’s response and expression of support for it**

7. だからこそ (Aj) [[ [ [ [ [核の脅威に (C) 対応する (P)] ] ] ] ] ため (Aj)、より (Am) 厳しい新たな手法が (S) 必要だ (P) と ] ] 改めて (Am) 思い起こした (P) ] という ] ] オバマ氏の言葉に (C) {我々は (S)} 共感する (P)。

Dakarakoso (Aj) [[ [ [ [ [kaku no kyōi ni (C) taiou suru (P)] ] ] ] ] tame (Aj), yori (Am) kibishii arata na shuhou ga (S) hitsuyou da (P) to] aratamete (Am) omoiokoshita (P) ] to iu] Obama-shi no kotoba ni (C) {wareware wa (S)} kyōkan suru (P).

*We could not agree more with the U.S. president who noted “Just this morning, we were reminded again why we need a new and more rigorous approach to address this threat”.*

In this sentence, the editorial writers appear to be firmly aligning themselves with President Obama by directly quoting Obama’s words again. However, there is one point which is noteworthy in terms of Mood selection. The original words by Obama were as we have just seen above. The point concerns “this threat” in Obama’s speech and “kaku no kyōi” (“nuclear threat”) in this sentence. Obama said “this threat”, which means North Korea’s “rocket” launch. By contrast, the editorial writers used “nuclear threat”. What I want to claim is that the editorial writers upgraded the interpersonal force of Obama’s words by using “nuclear” instead of “this.” It is difficult to describe a missile without a nuclear warhead as constituting a “nuclear threat”. However, a rocket could be used for delivering missiles with nuclear warheads. The way in which the editorial writers changed Obama’s words here seems closely related to their ideology that North Korea is a very dangerous

geopolitical risk for Japan.

On the other hand, in this sentence we see again how the ellipsed Subject, probably “wareware” (“we”), is used in a rather complex way. It does not matter very much whether the Subject is the *Asahi Shimbun* writers or the whole of the Japanese public. The editorial writers express their close agreement with Obama by using the Predicator “kyoukan suru” (“agree”). In other words, the ellipsed Subject, “wareware” (“we”), could be viewed as belonging to the same group as Obama.

## Stage 2. Non-Proliferation Treaty

### Explanation of Non-Proliferation Treaty

8. [[核廃絶の中心になる (P)]] のは (S), 核不拡散条約 (N P T) 体制の強化である (P)。  
[[Kaku haizetsu no chuushin ni naru (P)]] no wa (S), kaku fukakusan jyouyaku (NPT) taisei no kyouka dearu (P).

*Bolstering the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty is central to the pursuit of a nuclear-free world.*

We may note that the idea of the centrality of strengthening the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT) is represented here as the opinion of the editorial writers. On the other hand, President Obama not only mentioned the NPT but also some other international treaties such as the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). The editorial writers preferred to focus exclusively on the NPT, probably because the CTBT did not come into force until December 2012. In other words, in April 2009, when the editorial was published, the CTBT was not yet operative. Moreover, the nuclear powers, including the US and China, did not ratify the CTBT. By contrast, the NPT entered into force in 1970 and is recognized by all the nuclear powers. However, the process by which the nuclear powers are to disarm is far from clear and, as is well known, North Korea withdrew from the NPT in 2003.

- 9i. N P T は (S)、米ロ英仏中の 5 カ国を (C) 核兵器国として (Ac) 認め (P)、  
NPT wa (S) Bei-Ro-Ei-Futsu-Chuu no 5 ka koku o (C) kaku heiki koku toshite (Ac) mitome (P),

*The treaty acknowledges the United States, Russia, Britain, France and China as “nuclear-weapon states” and,*

- 9ii. |N P T が (S)| 他国には (Ac) 核兵器の保有を (C) 禁じている (P)。

{NPT ga (S)} takoku ni wa (Ac) kaku heiki no hoyuu o (C) kinjite-iru (P).  
*{the treaty} bans the possession of nuclear weapons by any other nation.*

Here we find the editorial's description of the NPT. The editorial writers offer some information about the NPT's rules. However, they did not criticize the NPT's acceptance of the five countries as legal nuclear powers or the fact that although the treaty is now over 40 years old it has made virtually no progress in reducing nuclear weapons. Moreover, the NPT can do nothing to help deal with non-signatory countries like North Korea so clause 9ii is actually not strictly true.

10. それでも (Aj)[[多くの非核国が (S) 加盟してきた (P)]] のは (S)、[[NPTが (S) 核兵器国に (Ac) 「[[誠実に (Ac) 核軍縮交渉を (C) 行う (P)]] 義務」を (C) 課している (Pmu)]] からだ (Pe)。

Soredemo (Aj) [[ooku no hikaku koku ga (S) kamei shite kita (P)]] no wa (S), [[NPT ga (S) kaku heiki koku ni (Ac) 「[[seijitsu ni (Ac) kaku gunshuku koushou o (C) okonau (P)]] gimu」 o (C) kashite-iru (Pmu)]] (V) kara da (Pe).  
*Yet, many non-nuclear-weapon states have joined the NPT, because the treaty requires nuclear states to “pursue negotiations” in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament.*

This sentence has two functional predicators. One is “kara da” which has the function of evidentiality and plays a reasoning role (Teruya 2007: 219). By using this function, the editorial writers emphasized the importance and obligation of the NPT in order to show the reason why they viewed the NPT as having a central role in nuclear disarmament. The other is “kashite-iru” as the function of modulation, and plays an obligation function to show the nuclear powers' obligation to nuclear disarmament. However, nuclear disarmament talks have only taken place between the US and Russia. Other nuclear powers, like Britain, France and China have never joined nuclear disarmament talks, as far as I know. Thus, we can see that the editorial writers supported the NPT strongly and did not criticize its ineffective points.

**Description of Obama's proposals regarding the nuclear weapons possessed by states**

- 11i. オバマ氏は (S) ロシアのメドベージェフ大統領と (Ac)、 <<11ii>> 合意した (P)。  
Obama-shi wa (S) Roshia no Medobeijefu daitouryou to (Ac), ... gouishita (P).  
*Obama and Russian President Dmitry Medvedev have agreed ...*
- 11ii. <<[[ 核兵器を (C) 大幅 (Ac) 削減する (P)]] 新条約を (C) 年内に (Ac) 締結する (P) と >>  
<< [[kaku heiki o (C) oohaba (Ac) sakugen suru (P)]] shinjyouyaku o (C) nennai ni (Ac) teiketsu suru (P) to>>  
*...to sign a bold, new strategic nuclear arms reduction treaty by the end of this year.*

The treaty referred to here is not the NPT but a renewal of the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START) between the US and Russia. On the surface, this sentence seems to have nothing to do with the NPT, offering information about START instead. However, it talks about the nuclear disarmament treaty between the US and Russia that is related to the NPT's obligation of conducting nuclear disarmament as mentioned in S10.

Moreover, this sentence emphasizes the good action of Obama in terms of the Ideological Square, because the Subject is Obama and Medvedev is only a Circumstantial Adjunct. If the Subject were Medvedev and the Circumstantial Adjunct were Obama, the beginning of the sentence would become "Medvedev has agreed with Obama...". Or if Obama and Medvedev were both the Subject, the sentence would begin "Obama and Medvedev have agreed...". The actual choice of Subject illustrates the fact that the editorial writers were in support of Obama or at least were foregrounding his preeminent role, which may well have been what the speech was intended to do.

12. 来年には (Ac) N P T再検討会議も (C) 開かれる (P)。  
Rainen ni wa (Ac) NPT saikentou kaigi mo (C) hirakareru (P).  
*And next year, the 2010 NPT Review Conference will be held.*

The editorial writers are still focusing on the importance of the NPT, continuing to ignore the fact that the NPT has not make any great progresses during the last 40 years.

- 13i. 米ロが (S) 真剣に (Ac) 核軍縮に (C) 取り組めば (P)、  
Bei-Ro ga (S) shinken ni (Ac) kaku gunshuku ni (C) torikumeba (P),  
*If the United States and Russia aggressively pursue nuclear disarmament,*
- 13ii. {これは (S)} [[ [[インド、パキスタン、北朝鮮などに (Ac) 非核化を (C) 求める (P)]]  
{彼らの} 立場を (C) 強める (P)]] ことになる (P)。  
{kore wa (S)} [[ [[Indo, Pakisutan, Kitachousen nado ni (Ac) hikakuka o (C)  
motomeru (P)]] {karera no} tachiba o (C) tsuyomeru (P)]] koto ni naru (P).  
*They will be in a stronger position to urge India, Pakistan, North Korea and  
others to denuclearize.*

In terms of Mood, we may note that America (“Bei”) is listed first here and Russia (“Ro”) second. This is the normal ordering in Japanese and reflects the ideological alignment of Japan with the US.

- 14i. オバマ氏は (S)、<<14ii >> 明言した (P)。  
Obama shi wa (S) ... meigen-shita (P).
- 14ii. << [[ ブッシュ前政権が (S) ストップを (C) かけていた (P)]] 包括的核実験禁止条  
約を (C) 批准し (P)、// さらに (Aj) 兵器用核分裂物質の生産禁止条約の交渉開始  
を (C) 目指す (P) と >>  
<< [[Busshu zenseiken ga (S) sutoppu o (C) kakete-ita (P)]] houkatsuteki  
kakujikken kinshi jyoyaku o (C) hijyun shi (P), sarani (Aj) heikiyou  
kakubunretsubusshitsu no seisan kinshi jyoyaku no koushou kaishi o (C)  
mezasu (P) to >>  
*While the preceding administration of George W. Bush was against ratifying  
the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, Obama declared that his administration  
“will immediately and aggressively pursue U.S. ratification” of the CTBT  
and “seek a new treaty that verifiably ends the production of fissile materials  
intended for use in state nuclear weapons.”*

In this sentence the editorial writers present Obama’s nuclear disarmament steps in a positive light, and contrast this with a negative representation of Bush’s actions. While this sentence is “emphasizing the good action of Obama”, in terms of the Ideological Square, we should remember that even now, almost five years later, the US has still not ratified the CTBT.

- 15i. 条約発効までには (Ac) 多くの困難が (S) 予想されるが (P)、  
 Jyoyuyaku hakkou made ni wa (Ac) ooku no konnan ga (S) yosou-sareru ga (P),  
*Many challenges will have to be overcome before such a treaty can come into effect.*
- 15ii. 米国が (S) 先頭に (Ac) 立てば (P)  
 Beikoku ga (S) sentou ni (Ac) tateba (P)
- 15iii. 打開の道は (C) 開けるはずだ (Pmu).  
 dakai no michi wa (C) hirakeru hazu da (Pmu).  
*But we believe it can be done with the United States leading the way.*

Sentence 15 includes three clauses one of which has a modulated predicator “hazu da” (“should”), which could be interpreted as “expectation” in terms of its modulation function. “Hazu da” is interpreted by Teruya as fulfilling the reasoning function of evidentiality (Teruya 2007: 219). However, in the case of clause 15iii, it is clear that “hazu da” does not play a reasoning role. Instead it plays an expecting function (Teruya 2007: 214). Moreover, we can see again here the editorial writers’ positive evaluation of the US.

- 16i. オバマ氏は (S) <16ii> 宣言した (P)。  
 Obama-shi wa (S) ... sengenshita (P).  
*While Obama noted that ...*
- 16ii.<<核兵器が(S)存在する限り(P) // 抑止力は(S)維持するとしながらも(P) // 「米国の安全保障戦略の中での核兵器の役割を(C)減らす」(P)と>>  
 <<kakuheiki ga (S) sonzaisuru kagiri (P) // yokushi ryoku wa (S) ijisuru to shinagara mo (P) // 「Beikoku no anzen hoshou senryaku no naka deno kakuheiki no yakuwari o (C) herasu」(P) to >>  
*...the United States will “maintain a safe, secure and effective nuclear arsenal to deter any adversary” as long as nuclear weapons exist, he also vowed, “We will reduce the role of nuclear weapons in our national security strategy.”*

This sentence is a summary of Obama’s declaration and the Subject is Obama himself. The action will be taken by the US and is represented as a good action in terms of the Ideological Square.

The clause complex in 16ii is composed of three hypotactically linked clauses that form the projection for the dominant clause in 16i that is focused on the Predicator “sengenshita” (“declared”). One point that needs to be noted here is

that the editorial writers have changed the order of the three hypotactically linked clauses to emphasize that Obama would reduce the role of nuclear weapons in America's security strategy. Let us compare this with Obama's original words.

*To put an end to Cold War thinking, we will reduce the role of nuclear weapons in our national security strategy, and urge others to do the same. Make no mistake: as long as these weapons exist, the United States will maintain a safe, secure and effective arsenal to deter any adversary, and guarantee that defense to our allies – including the Czech Republic. (Obama 2009)*

Obama first made his commitment to reduce nuclear weapons. Then later he emphasized that the deterrence would still exist and would apply to its allies. The editorial reflects the ideology of reducing nuclear weapons and ignores the aspect of protecting America's allies.

17. {これは (S)} [[ [[大量の核保有を (C) 正当化してきた (P)]] 軍事戦略を (C) 修正する という (P)]] ことだ (P)。

{[Kore wa (S)} [[ [[tairyō no kakuho-yū o (C) seitōka shite-kita (P)]] gunji senryaku o (C) shūsei suru to iu (P)]] koto da (P).

*In short, Obama is revising the traditional U.S. military strategy that justified the possession of a massive nuclear arsenal.*

This is a restatement of Obama's declaration. The fact that the writers decided to include it here supports the idea that they are focusing specifically on reducing nuclear weapons as was suggested in reference to S16 above.

18. [[中国を (C) 含む (P)]] 他の核保有国も (S)、同じ検討に (C) 着手すべきだ (Pmu)。  
[[Chūgoku o (C) fukumu (P)]] hoka no kakuho-yūkoku mo (S), onaji kentō ni (C) chakushu subeki da (Pmu).

*We believe China and other nuclear powers should consider following Obama's lead.*

We may note that in this sentence the editorial writers are demanding that other nuclear powers should start to "consider." Thus, once again, it is fulfilling a "demanding" function. As shown below, Obama himself said almost the same thing:

*To put an end to Cold War thinking, we will reduce the role of nuclear weapons in our national security strategy, and urge others to do the same. (Obama 2009)*

In Halliday's terms, Obama is using a "command" here in that he is "demanding" a form of "Goods and Services" (Halliday 2004: 107). However, the difference between Obama and the editorial writers is that he intends to simply "urge" non-specified "others." In contrast, the editorial writers referred to the nuclear powers and singled out China but not any other countries such as Britain or France. The grammatical function and lexis used by Obama reflects the status of the US as a global power and its global strategy. However, the editorial writers are more interested in Japan's national security in relation to China. Moreover, they use modality "Beki da" ("should") here to express the obligation function in a modulation predicator (Teruya 2007: 214). By using the obligation function to express their view that nuclear powers have an obligation to disarm, they allow themselves more freedom than Obama felt able to give himself in his speech.

#### **Stage 4. Nuclear Terrorism**

##### **Description of Obama's proposals regarding nuclear terrorism**

19. 核兵器は (S) 存在そのものが (S)、危険だ (P)。

Kakuheiki wa (S) sonzai sono mono ga (S), kiken da (P).

Nuclear weapons are dangerous in themselves.

In terms of interpersonal meaning, this categorical assertion appears to be voiced by the writers themselves. However, the next sentence implies that it comes from Obama or his administration and in fact in his speech Obama states that, "The existence of thousands of nuclear weapons is the most dangerous legacy of the Cold War".

20. [[オバマ政権が (S) そう (C) 考える (P)]] 背景には (Ac), [[[核テロが (S) 差し迫った (P)]] 脅威に (C) なったという (P)]] 認識が (S) ある (P)。

[[Obama seiken ga (S) sou (C) kangaeru (P)]] haikai ni wa (Ac), [[[kakaturo ga (S) sashisematta (P)]] kyoui ni (C) natta to iu (P)]] ninshiki ga (S) aru (P).

*The Obama administration is fully cognizant of this, because nuclear terrorism has become a real and imminent threat.*

This sentence reflects the comment that Obama made near the end of his speech: “So, finally, we must ensure that terrorists never acquire a nuclear weapon. This is the most immediate and extreme threat to global security.” Here Obama creates a “potential conflict” between nuclear terrorists and the global community. However, the editorial did not point out to whom the threat was targeted so readers need to guess whether the threat was to the US or the whole world.

21. その対策として (Ac) オバマ氏は (S)、[[核テロを (C) 封じる (P)]] ための国際機関の創設 (C)、[[核物質を (C) 安全な管理下に (C) おく (P)]] ための体制づくり (C)、[[核の安全管理に (C) 関する (P)]] 首脳会議、などを (C) 提案した (P)。

Sono taisaku toshite (Ac) Obama shi wa (S), [[kakutero o (C) fuujiru (P)]] tame no kokusai kikan no sousetsu (C), [[kakubusshitsu o (C) anzen na kanrika ni (C) oku (P)]] tame no taisei zukuri (C), [[kaku no anzen kanri ni (C) kan-suru (P)]] shunou kaigi, nado o (C) teian-shita (P).

*To deal with this threat, Obama made several proposals, such as the creation of “durable international institutions” to combat nuclear terrorism, the establishment of “a new international effort to secure all vulnerable nuclear material around the world,” and holding a “global summit on nuclear security,” which Obama said the United States “will host within the next year.”*

This sentence belongs to what Martin and White (2005: 164) call the “reporter voice” of the editorial writers (as opposed to the “commentator voice”) since it gives a succinct account of the essential facts without any authorial intrusion through the use of evaluative lexis or modality. On the other hand, those proposals made by Obama in order to pursue nuclear disarmament could be viewed as examples of “good action”. Therefore, even though this sentence appears to be an “objective” report, it is nevertheless emphasizing the good action of Obama in terms of the Ideological Square.

### Stage 5. Difficulty and determination

#### Prediction regarding difficulty of achieving aims

22i. [[こう (C) した (P)]] 手段を (C) 尽くしても (P)、  
[[Kou (C) shita (P)]] shudan o (C) tsuku-shite mo (P),  
*For all such efforts,*

22ii. 核廃絶への道は (S) 険しい (P)。  
kaku haizetsu e no michi wa (S) kewashii (P).



This sentence is the only completely negative clause in the whole text. The writers used unmodalized negative polarity (“nai”) here in order to reject the “akirameru” (“giving up” or, as in the English version, “shrugging off”) option for Japan. This was represented using a Circumstantial Adjunct. Here again we see the writers expressing their belief that they are in a position to tell the whole country what it should and should not be doing.

### Assertion of opinion concerning Japan’s response

25. [[ オバマ政権が (S) 打ち出した (P)] 核廃絶構想に (Ac)、 [[ 同盟国として (Ac) {日本が (S)} 協力できる (Pma)]] ことは (S) 多い (P)。

[[Obama seiken ga (S) uchidashita (P)]] kaku haizetsu kousou ni (Ac),  
[[doumeikoku toshite (Ac) {Nihon ga (S)} kyouryoku dekiru (Pma)]] koto wa (S)  
ooi (P).

*As an ally of the United States, Japan can cooperate on many of the proposals made by the Obama administration to rid the world of nuclear weapons.*

In this sentence we find another use of a Circumstantial Adjunct to specify the (ellipsed) Subject (“Japan”) in the modalized Predicator “kyouryoku dekiru” (“can cooperate”) as a “doumeikoku” (“ally”). In this closing section the writers want to reinforce their representation of the closeness between the two countries. By using the modalized Predicator “kyouryoku dekiru”, the writers try to show that Japan has the ability to support the US on the nuclear disarmament issue.

Even though the Subject, “Japan”, was ellipsed in this sentence, the Circumstantial Adjunct, “doumeikoku” (“ally”), shows the relations between Japan and the US. From the view of the Ideological Square, the US and Japan are both members of the ingroup and this sentence serves once again to “emphasize our good action”.

26. {我々は (S)} [[ 「核のない世界」を (C) 実現する (P)]] 政策を (C)、日本からも (Ac) 発信していきたい (Po)。

{Wareware wa (S)} [[「kaku no nai sekai」o (C) jitsugen-suru (P)]] seisaku o (C),  
Nihon kara mo (Ac) hasshin-shite-ikitai (Po).

*And the Japanese government ought to propose its own policy for realizing a nuclear-free world.*

This is the second Optative Mood clause in the editorial. In Japanese, the usage of “tai” (“want to”) indicates the Optative Mood. But here it is not wanting about oneself but about someone else. The writers want Japan to propose something. In the English version however, the Mood is not Optative but demanding. The English editorial writers are representing themselves in the stronger role of demanding (“ought to”) that the Japanese government proposes its own nuclear-free policy. In both versions though, Japan’s action is seen as something which could be evaluated as positive action by the international community. In other words, despite the editorial being about Obama’s speech, this sentence concludes by “emphasizing our good action”. It would be interesting to know how often foreign news is used in this way by editorials.

### 5.3 Summary

In this paper, to discuss the interpersonal meanings expressed in the editorial via the writers’ choices from the Mood system, I have used Van Dijk’s Ideological Square as my model. According to the analysis above, I found that his category of “Mitigating their good actions,” was not used at all. In this editorial, the only country represented as belonging to the outgroup is North Korea. North Korea was criticized in this editorial and no “good actions” of that country were mentioned. On the other hand, “Mitigating our bad actions” was not used either. Here, “our” means the ingroup, including both Japan and the US. It is easy to understand why, in the eyes of the writers, Japan has done no bad action in relation to nuclear disarmament.

The strategy of “Emphasizing their bad action” was used only once, in S6. North Korea’s bad action was represented by using the militarily nuanced Predicator — “kyoukou” (“forcefully carried out”). On the other hand, the “Emphasizing our good action” strategy was extensively used and this use can be divided into two parts. The first part is that in which “our” means Japan. “Emphasizing Japan’s good action” could be seen in S5, S25 and S26. The second part is where “our” means “our ally”, the US. As I have noted regarding S25, the US could be viewed as a member of the “ingroup” for the editorial writers. “Emphasizing America’s good action” appeared in S1, S11, S14, S16, S21 and S23. It is reasonable that “emphasizing America’s good action” made many appearances, because this editorial is about Obama’s Prague speech which in turn focused on a topic highly valued in Japan, namely nuclear disarmament. What I would like to posit here is that in the case of this editorial Van Dijk’s Ideological Square model

becomes more like an ideological pyramid as shown below (Figure 2).

Van Dijk's Ideological Square should be considered as a general model and as such it is highly valuable. However, in this editorial text, the "Mitigate our bad actions" and "Mitigate their good actions"



Fig. 2 The Ideological Pyramid

strategies of the Ideological Square were not used. And even the "Emphasize their bad action" strategy was less used. "Emphasize Japan's good action" was used three times, but "Emphasize America's good action" was used most. In this way an Ideological Pyramid was built in this text. It should be emphasized that this is not a model however. It is just a description of how the Ideological Square was selectively applied by the editorial writers. Nevertheless, it may represent a more generalizable aspect of *Asahi Shimbun* editorials. That is, firstly, that ingroup bad actions are simply not selected as topics in the first place whereas the outgroup good actions are simply not regarded as newsworthy; and secondly, that within the ingroup it is the peripheral members whose good actions are emphasized more.

## 6. Conclusion

The founder of SFL, Michael Halliday, has argued that the advantage of using a theoretical and analytical framework such as SFL is that it allows us to understand not only what texts mean but how they mean. That is, it allows us to understand how the options made available by the linguistic resources of a particular language are selectively drawn on by text producers to express their meanings.

In this paper I have tried to show how aspects of the Mood system usage in this text are related to the ideology of the text producers. Limitations of space have meant that I have not been able to discuss every aspect of the Mood of every clause in the text. Furthermore, we should not forget that Mood is only one aspect of a text's overall meaning. In addition to the Interpersonal metafunction, SFL posits other metafunctions (the Textual, realized through the Thematic system and the Ideational, realized through the Transitivity system) which I have not been able to discuss at all here although I intend to do so in the larger study of which this paper reports one small part.

From the perspective of Critical Discourse Analysis, this paper is also rather limited because it has not been possible here to adequately consider the discursive and cultural context in which this text was produced. To do so would involve a consideration of how this editorial relates to the *Asahi Shimbun's* other coverage of this speech and other nuclear-related topics, but again these are matters that shall be reported on in future publications.

## 7. References

- Eggins, Suzanne (2003). *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics*. 2nd ed. London: Continuum.
- Fairclough, Norman (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Longman.
- Fairclough, Norman (2003). *Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research*. London: Longman.
- Halliday, M.A.K. and Matthiessen, Christian (2004). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. 3rd ed. London: Arnold.
- Hori, Motoko (1992). Subjectlessness and Honorifics: Text Construction of Japanese. *Bulletin of Tokai Women's College*, **12**, 17-32, Tokai Gakuin University/Tokai Women's Junior College.
- Kellner, Douglas (2007). Bushspeak and the Politics of Lying: Presidential Rhetoric in the "War on Terror". *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, **37(4)**, 622-645.
- Martin, James and White, Peter (2005). *The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Nakazawa, Shiho (2007). Henry L. Stimson and the Creation of the Orthodox Position on the Use of the Atomic Bomb. *Journal of Bunka Gakuen University. The Humanities & Social Sciences*, **15**, 51-63, Bunka Gakuen University.
- Obama, Barack (2009). Remarks by President Barack Obama, Hradcany Square, Prague, Czech Republic. <[http://www.whitehouse.gov/the\\_press\\_office/Remarks-By-President-Barack-Obama-In-Prague-As-Delivered/](http://www.whitehouse.gov/the_press_office/Remarks-By-President-Barack-Obama-In-Prague-As-Delivered/)> (Last accessed 15<sup>th</sup> October 2013).
- Sawada, Aiko (2009). Inheritance of the Memories of Atomic Bombings in Japanese Society: Its Difficulties and Possibility. *Studies in Philosophical Anthropology*, **39**, 91-114, Philosophical Anthropology Association, Sophia University.
- Takagi, Sachiko (2004). Media desukosu no ideorogi hyoushutsu sutorateji: Iraku sensou kanren no shasetsu ni okeru "We-group" no kousatsu (Strategies for Articulating Ideologies in Media Discourse: A Study of "We-group" in Editorials

- on Iraq War). *Language and Culture*, **3**, 9-19, Osaka Prefecture University.
- Teruya, Kazuhiro (2007). *A Systemic Functional Grammar of Japanese*. London: Continuum.
- Van Dijk, Teun (1998). Opinions and Ideologies in the Press. In Allan Bell and Peter Garrett (eds.), *Approaches to Media Discourse* 21-63. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Wodak, Ruth and Meyer, Michael (ed.) (2009) *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. 2nd ed. London: Sage.
- Xie, Xiaojian (2013). “Words Must Mean Something”: A Critical Discourse Analysis of Some Aspects of Ideational Meaning in a Japanese Newspaper Editorial. *Studies in Media and Society*, **5**, 41-67, Graduate School of Languages and Cultures, Nagoya University.