

# “Words Must Mean Something”: A Critical Discourse Analysis of Some Aspects of Ideational Meaning in a Japanese Newspaper Editorial

Xiaojian Xie

## 1. Introduction

On the Fifth of April 2009, less than three months after being inaugurated as the 44th president of the United States, President Barack Obama delivered a historic speech in Prague, the capital city of the Czech Republic, in which he stated “America’s commitment to seek the peace and security of a world without nuclear weapons”.<sup>1</sup> The speech attracted great attention throughout the world, not least because it came less than one day after North Korea launched a rocket capable of carrying a nuclear warhead. In Japan, where opposition to nuclear weapons is a deep-rooted national policy and relations with North Korea are poor partly due to concerns over its nuclear program, the speech was widely reported and discussed by the news media. Since no official Japanese translation of the speech was produced and only a very small minority of Japanese people was likely to have either heard the speech or read a full transcript of it, the media had a great responsibility to convey information about it to the public. However, as is now widely recognized, it is never possible for journalists to “simply report the facts”. Like all other users of a language, journalists cannot do otherwise than create texts on the basis of certain attitudes, values and beliefs or, in short, on ideology. Accordingly, three key questions for scholars working in the field of critical media discourse studies are: what ideologies do journalists have, how do those ideologies influence their production of texts and what can the analysis of texts tell us about the ideologies that underpin them? This paper seeks to investigate, in maximal linguistic detail, how an editorial in a Japanese newspaper represented President Obama’s speech and how such representation can be interpreted as reflecting certain ideological positions held by the journalists.

## 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). It follows that linguistic relations are also ideological relations or relations of power. Hence, Fairclough defines ideologies as “representations of aspects of the world which can

---

<sup>1</sup> The full text of this speech is available at the website shown in the References. This version, which lacks page numbers, is the one from which all quotations used in this paper have been taken.

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). Fairclough’s approach has been widely used by scholars in many fields including media studies and indeed he himself has worked extensively on media discourse (see, for example, Fairclough 1995). 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 express their thoughts. At the level of lexis the ideological implications of this fact are widely recognized (such as in the distinction between “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 boy is kicking the ball” or “The ball is being kicked by the boy”. 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. But whereas the former construes the situation in terms of an answer to the question “What is the boy doing?” the latter construes it in terms of “What is happening to the ball?” 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.

SFL identifies three overarching ‘metafunctions’ in human language (and other semiotic) systems: to express and share meanings, to negotiate identities and relationships and to organize the flow of semiosis into coherent messages. These are referred to, respectively, as the ideational, interpersonal, and textual metafunctions. I shall take it as axiomatic that ideology operates on and within the choice systems related to all three of these metafunctions. However, due to limitations of space I have been obliged to limit my investigation in this paper to the ideational metafunction only. Moreover, I have needed to restrict the focus even further to the ways in which this metafunction has been realized at the lexicogrammatical level of individual clauses (and clause complexes, that is, sentences). That is to say, I have not examined the ways in which clauses are linked into larger units of text or at the generic structure of the editorial as a whole. At the level of lexicogrammar, the ideational metafunction concerns the way people,

things and events are represented through choices of lexis (vocabulary) and grammar. The sub-system within the grammar of the clause that organizes ideational meanings is the transitivity system. This system concerns the entities represented (Participants), the various kinds of actions that they are involved in (Processes) and the circumstances in which they occur (Circumstances). I have chosen to structure the analysis presented in this paper in terms of the Processes but both Participants and Circumstances will also be discussed where necessary.

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**

The present study draws principally on two areas of previous research: ideological studies of news discourse and linguistic studies of news texts. However, most such work has been conducted on English language media and there are relatively few studies in either area on Japanese. As far as I have been able to discover, there have been no previous studies of Japanese news media that combine both the ideological and SFL-based linguistic perspectives. This is not perhaps surprising given the fact that until very recently only a handful of works in CDA had been translated into Japanese. In this section, I will limit my review of the literature to the work of four scholars who have focused specifically on Japanese newspaper editorials.

Firstly, Shipilova (2004a, 2004b) used a chronological perspective to examine the evolution of the “ideology of peace” in the editorials of three newspapers (*Asahi Shimbun*, *Yomiuri Shimbun*, and *Mainichi Shimbun*) since World War II. She focused on how this ideology was represented as a central part of Japanese national identity. Secondly, in a series of articles Ito (2004, 2005, 2009) investigated the historical changes in the media agenda of the editorials of the *Asahi Shimbun* relating to the development and use of nuclear power in Japan since World War II. He notes that in the early years the paper voiced virtually no criticism of nuclear power but that the agenda changed to a more critical one following the Chernobyl disaster in 1986. Thirdly, Watanabe (2011) analyzed five newspapers’ coverage and editorials of the 2011 Tohoku Earthquake, focusing on the similarities and differences in emphasis and perspective

displayed by the national and the prefectural newspapers. Finally, Takekawa (2012) used Entman's news framing theory to analyse editorials and news reports in two newspapers, the *Asahi Shimbun* and the *Yomiuri Shimbun*, concerning the 2001 history textbook controversy. He argues that the two newspapers framed the controversy differently according to their differing definitions of it. He found that the *Asahi* in its editorials tended to define the controversy as a domestic problem while the *Yomiuri* explained it as an international or diplomatic problem.

While all of these studies offer useful insights into the ideology of Japanese newspaper editorials, for the most part they are quantitative studies rather than interpretative and none of them focus in detail on individual texts or employ linguistic analysis. Therefore, as far as I am aware, this is the first study to attempt such an analysis.

#### 4. Data

The text selected for analysis here is an editorial from the *Asahi Shimbun* newspaper published on the morning of Tuesday, 7th April 2009. One of the five major national daily newspapers in Japan, the *Asahi Shimbun* is generally regarded as reflecting a politically left-wing position and has a daily circulation of approximately 8 million copies. Commensurate with this, it has a significant influence on the formation of public opinion (Nohara, 2007, 34). The reason for choosing an editorial text in preference to a straight news report is that editorials are the section of a newspaper where factual reporting is intermingled with comment and opinion reflecting the collective perspective of the newspaper. From a critical discourse perspective, Fowler argues that editorials in English newspapers are interesting because they employ textual strategies which foreground the speech act of offering values and beliefs (Fowler, 1991, 208-209). One aim of the overall study of which this paper forms one part is to ascertain whether the same strategies are employed in Japanese newspaper editorials. The text of the editorial and an English translation are given below. Because of the narrow linguistic focus of this paper, in the translation I have prioritized closeness to the Japanese original in terms of vocabulary and expression rather than adjust these to make a more natural-sounding English text.

#### オバマ演説 核なき世界へ共に行動を

「米国は、核保有国として、そして核兵器を使ったことがある唯一の核保有国として、行動する道義的責任がある」。オバマ米大統領がプラハで行った演説の一節である。

広島、長崎への原爆投下から今年で64年。米国大統領が「道義的責任」を語り、核廃絶への決意を表明した。被爆国の国民として、「核のない世界」を目指し、時代の歯車を回そうという呼びかけを重く受け止めたい。

この演説の直前に、北朝鮮がミサイル発射を強行し、世界に冷水を浴びせた。だか

からこそ「核の脅威に対応するため、より厳しい新たな手法が必要だと改めて思い起こした」というオバマ氏の言葉に共感する。

核廃絶の中心になるのは、核不拡散条約（NPT）体制の強化である。NPTは、米ロ英仏中の5カ国を核兵器国として認め、他国には核兵器の保有を禁じている。それでも多くの非核国が加盟してきたのは、NPTが核兵器国に「誠実に核軍縮交渉を行う義務」を課しているからだ。

オバマ氏はロシアのメドベージェフ大統領と、核兵器を大幅削減する新条約を年内に締結すると合意した。来年にはNPT再検討会議も開かれる。米ロが真剣に核軍縮に取り組めば、インド、パキスタン、北朝鮮などに非核化を求める立場を強めることになる。

オバマ氏は、ブッシュ前政権がストップをかけていた包括的核実験禁止条約を批准し、さらに兵器用核分裂物質の生産禁止条約の交渉開始を目指すと言明した。条約発効までには多くの困難が予想されるが、米国が先頭に立てば打開の道は開けるはずだ。

オバマ氏は核兵器が存在する限り抑止力は維持するとしながらも、「米国の安全保障戦略の中での核兵器の役割を減らす」と宣言した。大量の核保有を正当化してきた軍事戦略を修正するということだ。中国を含む他の核保有国も、同じ検討に着手すべきだ。

核兵器は存在そのものが、危険だ。オバマ政権がそう考える背景には、核テロが差し迫った脅威になったという認識がある。その対策としてオバマ氏は、核テロを封じるための国際機関の創設、核物質を安全な管理下におくための体制づくり、核の安全管理に関する首脳会議、などを提案した。

こうした手段を尽くしても、核廃絶への道は険しい。「私が生きている間は不可能だろう」とそのことを認めたオバマ氏だが、しかし、「あきらめることは簡単で、そして臆病（おくびょう）なことだ」と、行動への決意を強調した。

日本にとっても「あきらめる」という選択肢はない。オバマ政権が打ち出した核廃絶構想に、同盟国として協力できることは多い。「核のない世界」を実現する政策を、日本からも発信していきたい。<sup>2</sup>

### Obama's Speech: Acting Together for a Nuclear-Free World

“The United States, as a nuclear power, and as the only nuclear power to have used a nuclear weapon, has a moral responsibility to act”. This is one part of the speech given by President Obama in Prague.

This year – 64 years since the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The U.S. President talked of “moral responsibility” and declared America’s commitment to the

<sup>2</sup> *Asahi Shimbun*, 7 April 2009 (Morning Edition), p.3.

elimination of nuclear weapons. As citizens of a country that has suffered atomic bombing, we want to take seriously this call to turn the cogwheels of the era towards a “world without nuclear weapons”.

Just before the speech, North Korea forcefully carried out a missile launch and doused the world with cold water. That is precisely why we agree with Obama’s statement that “we remember again that we need a more rigorous new approach to address the nuclear threat”.

What is central to the elimination of nuclear weapons is strengthening the system of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT). The NPT recognizes five countries, the US, Russia, Britain, France and China, as nuclear powers and prohibits other countries from possessing nuclear weapons. Even so, the reason why many non-nuclear countries join the NPT is that it imposes an “obligation to conduct nuclear disarmament talks in good faith”.

Obama has agreed with President Medvedev of Russia to conclude a new treaty within this year to greatly reduce their nuclear weapons. Next year a conference to reconsider the NPT will also be held. If the US and Russia grapple seriously with nuclear disarmament, this will strengthen the international community’s position in asking India, Pakistan, North Korea and others to denuclearize.

Obama declared that he would ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, which was stopped by the previous Bush administration and, furthermore, that he will aim to start negotiations on a treaty to prohibit the production of fissile material for military use. Many difficulties are to be expected before the treaties come into effect but, if the US takes the lead the way to a breakthrough should open up.

Obama declared that, although as long as nuclear weapons exist a deterrent would be maintained, he would reduce the role of nuclear weapons in America’s security strategy. That is, the military strategy that has justified holding large quantities of nuclear weapons will be revised. Other nuclear powers, including China, should begin to consider doing likewise.

The very existence of nuclear weapons is dangerous. Against the background of the Obama administration thinking like that, there is recognition of the threat posed by nuclear terrorism. As measures for this, Obama proposed such things as the establishment of an international organization to contain nuclear terrorism, the creation of a system to safely manage nuclear material and a summit meeting on nuclear safety.

But even by using all such means, the road to the elimination of nuclear weapons is steep. Obama, who observed that “perhaps elimination will not be possible during my lifetime”, nevertheless, saying “giving up is easy, and it is a cowardly thing”, he emphasized his determination to act.

For Japan too, giving up is not an option. There are many ways in which, as an ally,

Japan can cooperate with the plans for the elimination of nuclear weapons set out by the Obama administration. We want to send out measures to realize a “world without nuclear weapons” from Japan too.<sup>3</sup>

## 5. Generic structure

Before starting the clausal analysis of the text, it is useful to briefly consider its overall generic structure. This can be divided into six stages, with subdivisions, as shown below. Note that the figures in brackets refer to sentence numbers.

### Stage 1. Responsible America, Irresponsible North Korea (Paragraphs 1 to 3)

- Presentation of Obama’s declaration of “moral responsibility” (1)
- Contextualization (spacio-temporal) of Obama’s declaration (2)
- Contextualization (historical) of Obama’s declaration (3)
- Evaluation (positive) of Obama’s declaration (4, 5)
- Description of action of North Korea and its evaluation (negative) (6)
- Presentation of Obama’s response and expression of support for it (7)

### Stage 2. Non-Proliferation Treaty (Paragraph 4)

- Explanation of Non-Proliferation Treaty (8, 9, 10)

### Stage 3. Nuclear States (Paragraphs 5 to 7)

- Description of Obama’s proposals regarding the nuclear weapons possessed by states (11 to 18)

### Stage 4. Nuclear Terrorism (Paragraph 8)

- Description of Obama’s proposals regarding nuclear terrorism (19, 20, 21)

### Stage 5. Difficulty and determination (Paragraph 9)

- Prediction regarding difficulty of achieving aims (22)
- Presentation of Obama’s declaration of determination (23)

### Stage 6. Japan’s response (Paragraph 10)

- Statement of implications of Obama’s speech for Japan (24)
- Assertion of opinion concerning Japan’s response (25, 26).

Classification into these stages is based on the rhetorical function of each part of the editorial. The important point to note here is that, as will become clear in the clausal analysis, the lexicogrammatical transitivity features of the individual clauses are closely linked to their rhetorical function. Indeed, they are motivated by the rhetorical purpose of the writer.

---

<sup>3</sup> Translated by the author

## 6. Transitivity analysis

The text of the *Asahi Shimbun* editorial has been analysed using the categories of SFL as developed by Teruya (2007). 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 ideational (representational) aspects of ideology, the text has been coded only in terms of the transitivity system (Participants, Processes and Circumstances). The coding has been done according to the Key shown below.

### 6.1 KEY for Transitivity Analysis

Regarding the Key and the coding the following points should be borne 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).

#### Process Types

**P** = Process; **Pm** = Material; **Pme** = Mental; **Pv** = Verbal; **Pr** = Relational; **Prp** = Relational (Possessive); **Prx** = Relational (Existential).

#### Participants

**A** = Actor; **G** = Goal; **R** = Recipient; **Sc** = Scope.

**S** = Senser; **Ph** = Phenomenon.

**Sy** = Sayer; **Rv** = Receiver; **Vb** = Verbiage.

**Cr** = Carrier; **At** = Attribute; **At/Pr** = fused Attribute and Relational Process; **CD** = Carrier-Domain; **T** = Token; **V** = Value; **Or** = Possessor; **Ed** = Possessed; **E** = Existent.

#### Circumstances

**C** = Circumstance; **Ca** = Accompaniment; **Cc** = Cause; **Cl** = Location; **Cm** = Manner;

**Co** = Role; **Cg** = Angle; **Ct** = Matter.

## 6.2. Clausal Analysis

In this section, the editorial text has been analysed sequentially, to show how the ideational meanings are made, clause by clause, as the text progresses.

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

#### **Presentation of Obama’s declaration of “moral responsibility”**

1. 「米国は (Or)、核保有国として (Co)、そして [[ [[ 核兵器を (G) 使った (Pm)]] ことが<sup>s</sup> (Ed) ある (Prp)]] 唯一の核保有国として (Co)、 [[ 行動する (Pm)]] 道義的責任が (Ed) ある (Prp)」。

[Beikoku wa (Or), kakuho-yuukoku toshite (Co), soshite [[ [[kakuheiki o (G) tsukatta (Pm)]] koto ga (Ed) aru (Prp)]] yuiitsu no kakuho-yuukoku toshite (Co), [[koudou suru (Pm)]] dougiteki sekinin ga (Ed) aru (Prp)] .

*“The United States, as a nuclear power, and as the only nuclear power to have used a nuclear weapon, has a moral responsibility to act.”*

The editorial opens with what is represented as a direct quotation. This is the only Possessive Relational ranking clause in the editorial. It serves to ascribe an abstract Possessed entity “moral responsibility to act” to the United States as Possessor. Although at this point the precise nature of the “act” is not explicitly stated, the use of two Role Circumstantials, the second of which ascribes a unique identity to the US, implies that it will have something to do with nuclear weapons.

At this point in the analysis we should note two important points relating to the intertextual nature of media discourse. Firstly, we need always to bear in mind that, although for the purpose of analysis we are obliged to remove texts from their context, in reality readers normally encounter texts as part of a more or less continuous flow. Thus, in this case, a high proportion of Asahi readers were probably already aware of the topic and the identity of the source of the quotation before they began to read this editorial (and, of course, the heading also provides a strong hint). The general point to make here in relation to ideology is that there is always a degree of mutual understanding or shared “common sense” between the producers and consumers of texts, and this is something that is built up over time through repeated interaction. Most importantly, this understanding includes not simply knowledge but also attitudes, values, and beliefs, all of which can be influenced by ideology. Therefore, to fully account for the ideological functioning of media texts the analysis of individual texts needs to be related to the wider intertextual context.

The second point is that texts are multi-voiced (polyvocal) or, in the Bakhtinian sense,

“dialogic”. They may, like this editorial, appear to possess a high degree of spatio-temporal unity as, monovocally, “a text”, but from a discursal perspective they are more like a patchwork of disparate voices brought together temporarily for some specific purpose. The use of a direct quotation here illustrates the general point that when seeking to subject “a text” to ideological critique one needs to be clear about precisely whose words one is critiquing.

In this sentence, the words are (ostensibly and, of course, in translation) not those of the editorial writer(s) but of President Obama or whoever was responsible for producing the speech. As such, it is noteworthy that he says “used” in relation to nuclear weapon. Neither in this sentence quoted here or anywhere else in his speech does he represent this action in any more concrete or evaluative (either positive or negative) terms than this most non-specific, unmodalized and neutral Material process verb. As such, the logical link between the usage of these weapons and “moral responsibility” is obscure here (and remains so throughout both his speech and this editorial).

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

2. {これは (T)}[[ オバマ米大統領が (A) プラハで (Cl) 行った (Pm)]] 演説の一節 (V) である (Pr)。

{Kore wa (T)} [[Obama beidaitouryou ga (A) Puraha de (Cl) okonatta (Pm)]] enzetsu no issatsu (V) dearu (Pr).

*{This is} one part of the speech given by President Obama in Prague.*

This sentence, the first in the editorial writers’ own voice, identifies the source of the quotation using a Relation process for which, as is highly characteristic of Japanese, the Identified Subject (in this case, a Token), is ellipsed because it can be unproblematically recovered by readers from the context.

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

3. 広島、長崎への原爆投下から (Cl) 今年で (Cl) 64年。

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

*This year – 64 years since the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.*

Interrupting the editorial’s description of the speech itself, in this sentence the writer underlines the wider historical context by alluding to America’s “use” of nuclear weapons. This makes an interesting contrast with Obama’s words. Firstly, nowhere in his speech does Obama mention the names of the two cities that were bombed, whereas for the editorial writers they are of the

greatest importance. Secondly, on the one hand, America is not actually named here, but on the other the nature of that “use” is made explicit with “genbaku touka” (“atomic bombing”). This agentless nominalization contrasts with the option of saying, for example, “since America dropped two atomic bombs”, which would make agency (and culpability) explicit. In this way, the editorial writers signal that their attitude towards Japan’s former enemy and current ally is non-critical.

We may note here that this sentence is actually a Minor clause since there is no process although it is possible that the ellipsis of a Material process such as “has passed” or a Relational process such as “{It} is” may be inferred by some readers. As the only Minor clause in the whole editorial, this clause stands out in isolation, somewhat like a headline, outside the flow of meanings.

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

- 4i. 米大統領が<sup>s</sup> (Sy) 「道義的責任」を (Vb) 語り (Pv),  
 Beikoku daitouryou ga (Sy) 「dougiteki sekinin」o (Vb) katari (Pv),  
*The U.S. President talked of “moral responsibility” and,*
- 4ii. {彼が<sup>s</sup> (Sy)} 核廃絶への {米国の} 決意を (Vb) 表明した (Pv)。  
 {kare ga (Sy)} kaku haizetsu e no {Beikoku no} ketsui o (Vb) hyoumei shita (Pv).  
*{he} declared {America’s} commitment to the elimination of nuclear {weapons}.*

Here the editorial’s description of Obama’s words is resumed using a pair of Verbal processes. Such so-called “reporting verbs” offer writers a wide range of options for characterizing the words that are being reported and for evaluating them. Contrast, for example, the different impression created by saying “‘I love you’, he *whispered / shouted / murmured / argued / opined / lied*”. Here however, the writers have chosen two relatively neutral verbs “speak” and “declare”, which may be regarded as reflecting the professional journalists ideological (or perhaps we should say “ethical” here) commitment to the value of objectivity in relation to reporting “the facts”.

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

*As citizens of a country that has suffered atomic bombing, {we} want to take seriously this call*

*to turn the cogwheels of the era towards a “world without nuclear {weapons}”.*

In contrast to Sentence 4, in this sentence the writers' evaluation is clearly expressed through the use of the desiderative Mental process reinforced by a Circumstance of Manner in the phrase “omoku uketometai” (“want to take seriously”). From this point on, I would suggest, the reader is in no doubt as to the ideological position that the writers are (apparently sincerely) articulating. Thus from here on readers must decide (at some more or less conscious level) whether to accept, in Stuart Hall's terms, the offered “preferred” reading position or to adopt a more negotiated or even oppositional position.

One further aspect of the transitivity structure of this sentence is the nature of the Senser engaged in the Mental process. Two points should be noted here. Firstly, because the subject is ellipsed, in order to make sense of the sentence, readers must supply it by themselves. I believe that my choice, “wareware” (“we”), is likely to have been chosen by many readers. However, secondly, this leads us to a consideration of to whom, *precisely*, this “we” refers. The ideologically slippery nature of this personal pronoun has been frequently discussed by scholars of CDA. In this case, it seems to be embracing the entire citizenry of Japan, as implied by the Circumstance of Role that accompanies it, but as we shall see later in the editorial it can also be used in a more restricted way.

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

6i. この演説の直前に (Cl)、北朝鮮が (A) ミサイル発射を (G) 強行し (Pm)、

Kono enzetsu no chokuzen ni (Cl), kitachousen ga (A) misairu hassha o (G) kyokou shi (Pm),  
*Just before the speech, North Korea forcefully carried out a missile launch and,*

6ii. {北朝鮮が (A)} 世界に (R) 冷水を (G) 浴びせた (Pm)。

{Kitachousen ga (A)} seikai ni (R) reisu o (G) abiseta (Pm).

*{North Korea} doused the world with cold water.*

This sentence consists of two paratactically linked Material processes clauses. Rather than being a quotation from Obama's speech, it is a statement voiced by the editorial writers themselves. The only place in his speech where Obama referred to North Korea was where he discussed the threat posed by non-nuclear states “breaking the rules” by not abiding by the terms of the NPT:

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. This provocation underscores the need for action – not just this afternoon at the U.N. Security Council, but in our determination to prevent the spread

of these weapons.

Rules must be binding. Violations must be punished. Words must mean something. The world must stand together to prevent the spread of these weapons. Now is the time for a strong international response [applause] and North Korea must know that the path to security and respect will never come through threats and illegal weapons. All nations must come together to build a stronger, global regime. And that’s why we must stand shoulder to shoulder to pressure the North Koreans to change course.

This section of his speech was followed by a slightly longer section concerning the threat supposedly posed by Iran’s “nuclear and ballistic missile activity”. That this topic was not mentioned in this editorial reflects the ideological nature of journalists’s choices about what “facts” to report. To the people of the Czech Republic, where America had planned to locate part of a highly controversial missile defense system to deal with the threat of long-range Iranian nuclear missiles, this latter section was probably of more interest. Of course, the North Korean action was particularly newsworthy because of its timing but, even discounting that, geographical proximity means that for Japan the actions of North Korea are always likely to be of more concern.

Returning to the transitivity choices made by the editorial writers, it is noticeable that whereas Obama refers quite non-judgementally to “testing” “a rocket” that “could” “be used for long range missiles”, the editorial uses “kyoukou” (“forcefully carry out”), a word with military connotations such as in the phrase 強行突破 “kyoukou toppa” (“force one’s way through [an enemy’s line]”) and describes the object in question, the Goal of the Process, as a “misairu” (“missile”). At the time, North Korea itself described it as a “rocket” intended for the peaceful purpose of putting a radio broadcasting satellite into orbit. Unlike the editorial writers, Obama seems to have taken care not to have directly challenged this view. Their respective choices clearly reflect their underlying ideologies: Obama wished to present himself as the world’s dotting guardian of freedom and democracy, even-handed and ever ready to cooperate. The editorial writers felt freer to censure as suggested by the inclusion of the phrase about dousing the world with cold water.

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

7. だからこそ [[ [[ 「[[ 核の脅威に (G) 対応する (Pm)]] ため (Cc)、より厳しい新たな手法が (Cr) 必要 (At) だと (Pr)]] 改めて (Cm) 思い起こした (Pme) ] という ] ] オバマ氏の言葉に (Ph){ 我々が (S) } 共感する (Pme)。

Dakarakoso [[ [[ 「[[ kaku no kyoui ni (G) taiou suru (Pm)]] tame (Cc), yori kibishii arata na

shuhou ga (Cr) hitsuyou (At) da to (Pr) ]] aratamete (Cm) omoiokoshita (Pme) ] to iu ]]  
Obama-shi no kotoba ni (Ph) {wareware ga (S)} kyoukan suru (Pme).

*That is precisely why {we} agree with Obama's statement that "we remember again that we need a more rigorous new approach to address the nuclear threat".*

Here, despite the ideological differences noted in the analysis of the previous sentence, the editorial writers appear to be firmly aligning themselves with President Obama. In this sentence we see again how the ellipsed subject, probably "wareware" ("we") is used in a rather complex way. Principally, it may refer to the editorial writers themselves and, by extension, to the Asahi newspaper as a collective entity. But it might also be seen as embracing the paper's readers and even the Japanese public as a whole (although whether the half a million or more resident ("Zainichi") Koreans would feel themselves included here is debatable).

## Stage 2. Non-Proliferation Treaty

### Explanation of Non-Proliferation Treaty

8. [[核廃絶の中心に (E) なる (Prx)]] のは (T)、核不拡散条約 (N P T) 体制の強化 (V) である (Pr)。

[[Kaku haizetsu no chushin ni (E) naru (Prx)]] no wa (T), kaku fukakusan jyoyaku (NPT) taisei no kyouka (V) dearu (Pr).

*What is central to the elimination of nuclear weapons is strengthening the system of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT).*

We may note here that this categorical assertion appears to be in the voice of the editorial writers. President Obama himself did not assign such a central role to the NPT in his speech. Rather, he referred to it together with three other treaties (the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty, the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and the proposed Fissile Material Cut-Off Treaty). We may also note that North Korea is no longer a members of the NPT (having withdrawn in 2003) so precisely how strengthening the system would help deal with issues such as the North Korean rocket/missile is not clear.

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

*The NPT recognizes five countries, the US, Russia, Britain, France and China, as nuclear powers and,*

9ii. {N P T が (Sy)} 他国には (Rv) 核兵器の保有を (Vb) 禁じている (Pv)。

{NPT ga (Sy)} takoku ni wa (Rv) kaku heiki no hoyuu o (Vb) kinjite-iru (Pv).

*{the NPT} prohibits other countries from possessing nuclear weapons.*

That Japan is an enthusiastic supporter of the NPT is well known. The Asahi editorial seems to share this view. No mention is made here of the fact that although the treaty is now over 40 years old it has made virtually no progress in reducing, let alone eliminating, the approximately 22,000 nuclear weapons that the five nuclear states possess. Neither does the article question the ethical justification for the treaty’s stipulation that only states which tested nuclear weapons prior to 1967 may be allowed to possess them. The choice of what “facts” to convey to readers on such an important issue is surely not merely a journalistic one relating to matters such as the customary length of editorial texts but also an ideological one.

10. それでも [[ 多くの非核国が (A) 加盟してきた (Pm)]] のは (T)、 [[ N P T が (A) 核兵器国に (R) [[ 誠実に (Cm) 核軍縮交渉を (G) 行う (Pm)]] 義務 ] を (G) 課している (Pm)]] (V) からだ (Pr)。

Soredemo [[ooku no hikaku koku ga (A) kamei shite kita (Pm)]] no wa (T), [[NPT ga (A) kaku heiki koku ni (R) [[seijitsu ni (Cm) kaku gunshuku koushou o (G) okonau (Pm)]] gimu ] o (G) kashite-iru (Pm)]] (V) kara da (Pr).

*Even so, the reason why many non-nuclear countries join the NPT is that it imposes an “obligation to conduct nuclear disarmament talks in good faith”.*

The implication of this sentence is that countries like India, Pakistan and North Korea do not or will not negotiate “seijitsu ni” (“in good faith”) which is clearly an ideologically based evaluative position since, were one to ask those countries whether they would negotiate in good faith, their answer would of course be in the affirmative.

### Stage 3. Nuclear States

Although this section is by far the longest in this editorial, the topics of the sentences are of a largely factual and descriptive nature. Therefore, in order to allow greater space for discussion elsewhere in this paper, I have limited my comments here to only the most important features.

#### Description of Obama’s proposals regarding the nuclear weapons possessed by states

11i. オバマ氏は (Sy) ロシアのメドベージェフ大統領と (Ca)、 <<11ii>> 合意した (Pv)。

Obama-shi wa (Sy) Roshia no Medobeijefu daitouryou to (Ca), ... goishita (Pv).

*Obama has agreed with President Medvedev of Russia ...*

11ii. <<[[核兵器を (G) 大幅 (Cm) 削減する (Pm)]] 新条約を (G) 年内に (Cl) 締結する (Pm) と >>

<< [[kaku heiki o (G) oohaba (Cm) sakugen suru (Pm)]] shinjyouyaku o (G) nennai ni (Cl) teiketsu suru (Pm) to>>

... to conclude a new treaty within this year to greatly reduce their nuclear weapons.

Despite the editorial's emphasis on the NPT in the previous three sentences, the treaty referred to here is not the NPT but a renewal of the START treaty. It is possible that this somewhat confusing juxtaposition of information reflects the editorial writer's ideology since whereas Japan is a key player in the NPT it has no role in START. Incidentally, the new treaty is formally known as "Measures for the Further Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms" although it is more frequently referred to as "New START". The two presidents actually signed the new treaty, in Prague, almost exactly one year later, on 8 April 2010.

12. 来年には (Cl) N P T 再検討会議も (G) 開かれる (Pm)。

Rainen ni wa (Cl) NPT saikentou kaigi mo (G) hirakareru (Pm).

*Next year a conference to reconsider the NPT will also be held.*

Passive voice constructions are frequently discussed in the CDA literature for their potential to hide or at least background agency in potentially ideological ways. However, we cannot assume that there is an ideological skeleton hiding in every passive clause cupboard. The motivation for each instance needs to be interpreted in context. This is the first ranking passive clause in this text (the only other is 15i) and, in this case, what is most newsworthy is the conference itself rather than its hosts so there would appear to be no particularly ideological basis for the choice of passive. The conference was held in May 2010 in New York. It was generally regarded as a success because unlike the previous such conference held in 2005 consensus was achieved regarding a number of issues.

13i. 米ロが (A) 真剣に (Cm) 核軍縮に (G) 取り組みば (Pm)、

Bei-Ro ga (A) shinken ni (Cm) kaku gunshuku ni (G) torikumeba (Pm),

*If the US and Russia grapple seriously with nuclear disarmament,*

13ii. {これは (T)} [[ [[ インド、パキスタン、北朝鮮などに (Rv) 非核化を (Vb) 求める (Pv)]]  
{国際コミュニティの} 立場を (G) 強める (Pm)]] ことに (V) なる (Pr)。

{kore wa (T)} [[ [[Indo, Pakisutan, Kitachousen nado ni (Rv) hikakuka o (Vb) motomeru (Pv)]]  
{kokusai komyuniti no} tachiba o (G) tsuyomeru (Pm)]] koto ni (V) naru (Pr).

*{this will} strengthen {the international community's} position in asking India, Pakistan, North Korea and others to denuclearize.*

Of all the ellipsed words and phrases in this editorial, the modifier of “tachiba” (“position”) here is the most difficult to recover. I have assumed that it refers to the international community but it might refer just to America and Russia or even, possibly, Japan. The fact that texts like this frequently require readers to make “educated guesses” about inexplicit meanings means that there is always a possibility for ideological manipulation through tacit “complicity” between writers and readers.

It is noticeable in this sentence that, in addition to North Korea, whose inclusion could be predicted given what was written in 6, India and Pakistan are also named in the embedded Verbal process clause. Obama does not refer to these countries in his speech, so it appears that they have been purposefully included by the editorial writers. However, whether this was simply to provide concrete details for the readers or for some more ideological purpose is not clear.

14i. オバマ氏は (Sy)、 <<14ii >> 明言した (Pv)。

Obama shi wa (Sy) ... meigen-shita (Pv).

*Obama declared ...*

14ii. << [[ ブッシュ前政権が (A) ストップを (G) かけていた (Pm)]] 包括的核実験禁止条約を (G) 批准し (Pm)、 // さらに兵器用核分裂物質の生産禁止条約の交渉開始を (G) 目指す (Pm) と >>

<< [[Busshu zenseiken ga (A) sutoppu o (G) kakete-ita (Pm)]] houkatsuteki kakujikken kinshijyoyaku o (G) hijyun shi (Pm), // sarani heikiyou kakubunretsubusshitsu no seisan kinshijyoyaku no koushou kaishi o (G) mezasu (Pm) to >>

*... that he would ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, which was stopped by the previous Bush administration and, furthermore, that he will aim to start negotiations on a treaty to prohibit the production of fissile material for military use.*

The editorial’s positive portrayal of President Obama is contrasted here with the negative representation of his predecessor as someone who stopped what the *Asahi* regards as a worthwhile process. The absence of any explanation for Bush’s action means that readers must either accept this evaluation at face value or assume a more oppositional reading position.

15i. 条約発効までには (Cl) 多くの困難が (Ph) 予想されるが (Pme)、

Jyoyaku hakkou made ni wa (Cl) ooku no konnan ga (Ph) yosou-sareru ga (Pme),  
*Many difficulties are to be expected before the treaties come into effect but,*

15ii. 米国が (A) 先頭に (Cl) 立てば (Pm)

Beikoku ga (A) sentou ni (Cl) tateba (Pm)

*if the US takes the lead*

15iii. 打開の道は (A) 開けるはずだ (Pm)。

dakai no michi wa (A) hirakeru hazu da (Pm).

*the way to a breakthrough should open up.*

Again here we see the editorial writers' positive evaluation of America (under Obama), this time as the rightful leader of global efforts towards nuclear disarmament. As was the case in 12, the use of the passive voice in 15i seems to be motivated more by the subject matter than any ideological desire to obscure the identity of those doing the expecting.

16i. オバマ氏は (Sy) <16ii> 宣言した (Pv)。

Obama-shi wa (Sy) ... sengenshita (Pv).

*Obama declared ...*

16ii. <<核兵器が (E) 存在する限り (Prx) // 抑止力は (G) 維持するとしながらも (Pm) // 「米国の安全保障戦略の中での核兵器の役割を (G) 減らす」 (Pm) と >>

<<kakuheiki ga (E) sonzaisuru kagiri (Prx) // yokushi ryoku wa (G) ijisuru to shinagara mo (Pm)

// 「Beikoku no anzen hoshou senryaku no naka deno kakuheiki no yakuwari o (G) herasu」

(Pm) to >>

*... that, although as long as nuclear weapons exist a deterrent would be maintained, {he} would reduce the role of nuclear weapons in America's security strategy.*

The clause complex composed of three hypotactically linked clauses that forms the projection for the dominant clause focused on “sengenshita” (“declared”) is one of the two most elaborate grammatical structures in this text (the other being that composed of 23ii and 23iii). In this complex the rhetorical force of the third clause is reduced somewhat by making it conditional on the two preceding clauses but, on the other hand, the writers have switched from indirect to direct quotation which has the effect of emphasizing the importance of Obama's statement.

It is interesting to compare this sentence with what Obama actually said, which was as follows:

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 explicitly states that the deterrence would apply to its allies but the editorial writers do not mention this important point. Perhaps they assumed that all their readers would understand that this would be the case, but it is also possible that reference to Japan’s dependence on the American nuclear umbrella would be felt as somewhat at odds with the paper’s strong anti-nuclear weapons ideology.

17. {これは (T)} [[ [[ 大量の核保有を (G) 正当化してきた (Pm)]] 軍事戦略を (G) 修正する という (Pm)]] こと (V) だ (Pr)。

{Kore wa (T)} [[ [[tairyō no kakuho-yū o (G) seitōka shite-kita (Pm)]] gunji senryaku o (G) shūsei suru to iu (Pm)]] koto (V) da (Pr).

*That is, the military strategy that has justified holding large quantities of nuclear weapons will be revised.*

This is a restatement of Obama’s declaration which seems to spell out what Obama was implying by his reference to “Cold War thinking”.

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

*Other nuclear powers, including China, should begin to consider doing likewise.*

In this sentence, we find the only use of deontic modality “chakushu subeki” (“should begin”) in the whole text. In his speech, Obama says America will “urge others” to reduce their nuclear arsenals but here the formulation is both more forceful and, due to the highly significant addition of the embedded clause, specific. Whereas, no doubt for ideological reasons, Obama never mentions China in his speech, the editorial writers have purposefully chosen to name this particular country but no others. They could equally well have said “including Britain” or “including France”. Alternatively, they could have used the formulation chosen by the editorial writers of the *Chunichi Shimbun* who, in their editorial about this speech, published on the same day, wrote as follows:

まずは、米ロさらに英仏中の五カ国が核削減に向け動き出すよう期待する。

Mazu wa, Bei-Ro sara ni Ei-Butsu-Chuu no gokakoku ga kakusakugen ni muke ugokidasu you kitai suru.

*{We} look forward to the five countries of the U.S. and Russia, and also Britain, France and China, beginning to move toward nuclear disarmament.*

The choice made by the Asahi writers seems to have been ideologically motivated, with China being seen as the most threatening one amongst these nuclear powers for Japan, though not as threatening as North Korea which, as we have seen, was represented as the Actor in two Material processes in 6 whereas China is only represented here much more weakly as a Goal.

Finally, let us not forget that for the majority of readers of this editorial who did not know the original speech in detail, it is the writers who are making this demand, not Obama. Hence, the writers are presenting themselves as being in the powerful position of being able to make demands on other states in this way. On the other hand, however, whereas Obama is urging states to actually reduce their nuclear arsenals, the editorial is demanding only that states “begin” “considering” doing so. This difference may reflect the writers’ view that, although they would like to make strong demands to China, they cannot ignore the fact that Japan needs to maintain good relations with this country, not least in connection with the so-called “Six Party Talks” concerning North Korea’s nuclear weapons program.

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

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

19. 核兵器は (CD) 存在そのものが<sup>s</sup> (Cr)、危険 (At) だ (Pr)。

Kakuheiki wa (CD) sonzai sono mono ga (Cr), kiken (At) da (Pr).

*The very existence of nuclear weapons is dangerous.*

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”. So once again we find a blurring of the distinction between voices in this text, with the Asahi’s ideology being textually aligned with that of Obama. We also find once more that Obama’s reference to the Cold War, a topic of huge historical significance for the people of Prague and one much alluded to by Obama in his speech, has not been included in the editorial since it does not fit with the ideological focus of the writers.

20. [[ オバマ政権が (S) そう (Ph) 考える (Pme)]] 背景には (Cl), [[ [[ 核テロが (A) 差し迫った (Pm)]] 脅威に (E) なったという (Prx)]] 認識が (T) ある (Prx)。

[[Obama seiken ga (S) sou (Ph) kangaeru (Pme)]] haikai ni wa (Cl), [[ [[kakutero ga (A) sashisematta (Pm)]] kyōi ni (E) natta to iu (Prx)]] ninshiki ga (T) aru (Prx).

*Against the background of the Obama administration thinking like that, there is recognition of the threat posed by nuclear terrorism.*

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.” From the perspective of transitivity the editorial’s sentence is interesting because it uses an Existential Relational process “ninshiki ga aru” (“there is recognition”) rather than a more congruent Mental process. This latter would require a Senser as subject – someone or something that does the recognizing – but it is not clear what motivated the less congruent choice since a Senser such as “Obama” or “the Obama administration” or even “many people” would have been possible.

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

Sono taisaku toshite (Cc) Obama-shi wa (Sy), [[kakutero o (G) fuujiru (Pm)]] tame no kokusai kikan no sousetsu (Vb), [[kakubusshitsu o (G) anzen na kanrika ni (Cm) oku (Pm)]] tame no taisei zukuri (Vb), [[kaku no anzen kanri ni (G) kan-suru (Pm)]] shunou kaigi, nado o (Vb) teian-shita (Pv).

*As measures for this, Obama proposed such things as the establishment of an international organization to contain nuclear terrorism, the creation of a system to safely manage nuclear material and a summit meeting on nuclear safety.*

This sentence belongs to 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. However, as we shall see below, it is the last such “objective” sentence in this editorial text.

#### Stage 5. Difficulty and determination

### Prediction regarding difficulty of achieving aims

22i. [[ こう (G) した (Pm)]] 手段を (G) 尽くしても (Pm),

[[Kou (G) shita (Pm)]] shudan o (G) tsuku-shite mo (Pm),

*But even by using all such means,*

22ii. 核廃絶への道は (Cr) 険しい (At/Pr)。

kaku haizetsu e no michi wa (Cr) kewashii (At/Pr).

*the road to the elimination of nuclear weapons is steep.*

Here the writers voice their opinion (and prediction) about the future through the use of a metaphorical expression. It is one of the four noticeably metaphorical expressions in this text (the others being “turn the cogwheels of the era” (5); “doused the world with cold water” (6); and “the way to a breakthrough should open up” (15iii)). In each of these cases, the choice of using a metaphorical expression is motivated by a desire to make the text more vivid and effective. Here, as is almost always the case, the metaphors occur at points where the writers are expressing their own opinions. The use of metaphors for rhetorical and ideological purposes is well-known and it should not be surprising to find them being used here.

### Presentation of Obama’s declaration of determination

23i. [[ [[[[ 私が (A) 生きている (Pm)]] 間 (Cl) { 核廃絶が (Cr) } 不可能 (At) だろう (Pr) ]]]  
とそのことを (Ph) 認めた (Pme)]] オバマ氏 (E) だが (Prx),

[[ [[ [[[[ Watashi ga (A) ikite-iru (Pm)]] aida wa (Cl) { kaku haizetsu ga (Cr) } fukanou (At)  
darou (Pr) ] ] ] ] ] to sono koto o (Ph) mitometa (Pme)]] Obama-shi (E) da ga (Prx),

*Obama, who observed that “perhaps {elimination of nuclear (weapons)} will not be possible during my lifetime”,*

23ii. しかし、{彼が (Sy)}

shikashi, {kare ga (Sy)}

*nevertheless, saying*

23iii. << [[ あきらめる (Pm)]] ことは (Cr) 簡単 (At) で (Pr)、// そして {それは (Cr)} 臆病 (おくびょう) なこと (At) だ (Pr) と >>、

<< [[[[ akirameru (Pm)]] koto wa (Cr) kantan (At) de (Pr), // soshite {sore wa (Cr)} okubyou na koto (At) da (Pr) to >>、

*“giving up is easy, and {it} is a cowardly thing”,*

c23ii. 行動への決意を (Vb) 強調した (Pv)。

koudou e no ketsui o (Vb) kyouchou-shita (Pv).

*{he} emphasized {his} determination to act.*

In this grammatically intricate sentence we find Obama’s words being quoted apparently directly because, presumably, of their perceived importance in the eyes of the editorial writers. These words are particularly important for them, as we shall see below, for the basis they provide for their conclusion to this editorial. However, as quoted here they differ significantly from what Obama actually said, leading us to question how much faith we may place in the accuracy of direct quotations in newspaper texts such as this. As for the first quotation, what Obama said was: “This goal [the elimination of nuclear weapons] will not be reached quickly – perhaps not in my lifetime”. This is not so different from the editorial’s version. But the second quotation is based on the following words from the speech: “To denounce or shrug off a call for cooperation is an easy but also a cowardly thing to do” in place of which editorial substitutes “akirameru” (“give up”). So why was this substitution made?

“Denounce” is defined by the *Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary* as “to strongly criticize somebody or something that you think is wrong, illegal, etc.” and also as “to tell the police, the authorities, etc. about somebody’s illegal political activities”. In relation to Obama’s “call for cooperation” regarding nuclear disarmament, both of these senses of the word are far away from the ideology of the Asahi newspaper and, possibly, the majority of its readers, so it is understandable that the writers did not want to use it. Likewise, the dictionary definition of “shrug off” as “to treat something as if it is not important” does not fit with the attitude of the writers because they see themselves, and Japan, as already actively engaged in working with Obama towards achieving this goal. Hence the need for a more positive, active term. Of course, “give up” is not obviously positive, but the point is that only people who are already actively doing something can “give up” doing it.

### Stage 6. Japan’s response

Statement of implications of Obama’s speech for Japan

24. 日本にとっても (Co) [[ 「あきらめる (Pm)」 という ]] 選択肢は (E) ない (Prx)。

Nihon ni totte mo (Co) [[ 「akirameru (Pm)」 to iu]] sentakushi wa (E) nai (Prx).

*For Japan too, giving up is not an option.*

This sentence, in the voice of the writers, again quotes the words supposedly (but actually not) spoken by Obama to make an unambiguous categorical assertion. However, the question of precisely what the writers might be referring to when they talk of “giving up” is never made clear.

A major component of the transitivity system is the sub-system of Circumstantial elements. Although not as central to the meaning of the clause as the Participants and Processes, they nevertheless serve to specify the meaning of the clause in various ways. For reasons of space I have not discussed the use of Circumstances in this text in any great detail but it is worth noting here how in this sentence the editorial writers specify the scope of their assertion using “Nihon ni totte mo” (“For Japan too”) as a Role Circumstance. Here again we see the writers expressing their belief that they have the right 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 (A) 打ち出した (Pm) ]] 核廃絶構想に (Ct), [[ 同盟国として (Co) }日本が (A) } 協力できる (Pm) ]] ことは (Cr) 多い (At/Pr)。

[[Obama seiken ga (A) uchidashita (Pm) ]] kaku haizetsu kousou ni (Ct), [[doumeikoku toshite (Co) }Nihon ga (A) } kyouryoku dekiru (Pm) ]] koto wa (Cr) ooi (At/Pr).

*There are many ways in which, as an ally, {Japan} can cooperate with the plans for the elimination of nuclear weapons set out by the Obama administration.*

In this sentence we find another use of Role Circumstance to specify the (ellipsed) Actor (“Japan”) in the Material process “kyouryoku” (“cooperate”) as a “doumeikoku” (“ally”). Here the choice of Circumstance differs markedly from that used in 5 (“hibaku koku no kokumin” (“citizens of a country that has suffered atomic bombing”) because in this closing section the writers want to reinforce their representation of the closeness between the two countries. However, the rather vague formulation of the nature of the cooperation, which is not specified further in this editorial, rather undermines the strength of this rhetorically asserted alliegence.

26. {我々は (Sy)} [[「核のない世界」を (G) 実現する (Pm) ]] 政策を (Vb), 日本からも (Cl) 発信していきたい (Pv)。

{Wareware wa (Sy)} [[「kaku no nai sekai」o (G) jitsugen-suru (Pm) ]] seisaku o (Vb), Nihon kara mo (Cl) hasshin-shite-ikitai (Pv).

*{We} want to send out measures to realize a “world without nuclear {weapons}” from Japan too.*

In this final sentence we find the main point underlying the editorial. The editorial as a whole can be very roughly summarized in two sentences: “President Obama has called for a world without nuclear weapons and suggested some ways to achieve this. We, the writers of this editorial, agree with him and want Japan to help”. The first sentence is news. The second is

comment. The editorial itself can be similarly broken down into these two strands and thus may be seen as a generic hybrid. As such, it is worth looking back to see where the “commentator voice” was most clearly articulated prior to this sentence. Firstly, there was the use of the Mental processes “omoku uketometai” (“take seriously”) in 5 and “kyoukan” (“agree”) in 7, both with an implied “wareware” (“we”) as Senser. These provide the reader with information about the mental state of the writers, specifically their reaction to Obama’s words. Such information is provided, ideologically, in the hope that readers will align themselves with it. Secondly, there was the deontic modalized Material process “kentou ni chakushuu subeki” (“must begin to consider”) in 18 where the Agent is “Chuugoku o fukumu hoka no kakuhoyuukoku” (“other nuclear powers, including China”). This also provides information about the writers’ opinion, slipped in, as it were, via the modal auxiliary. But in this final sentence we find the only instance in the whole text of a process with (an implied) “we” as Subject that may be interpreted as Verbal, namely “hasshin” (“send out”). This word actually covers a range of meanings including “sending (a message etc.)” and “telling (someone about one’s ideas)”. Here the verb has been inflected both aspectually (“shite-iki”, meaning to do something with the future in mind) and modally (“tai”, meaning “want to”). Thus, it is only here, in this final sentence, that we hear the point that the writers want to make: namely, that they want to go forward sending out (ideas for) measures from Japan. This seems like a rather weak conclusion, however, since no details are given of who is expected to devise these measures, or indeed what they might be, and no explanation is given for why the writers think like this. Of course, their words reflect the anti-nuclear ideology of the paper (and mainstream Japan) that has been subtly reflected throughout this editorial and, within such a social and discursive context, it is likely that most readers would not experience any cognitive dissonance in reading it.

## 7. Conclusion

In his Prague speech, President Obama declared that “words must mean something”. In this paper I have made extensive use of Systemic Functional Linguistics to analyse the words used in the editorial text. 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 transitivity 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 transitivity of every clause in the text and there are, indeed, many other points that could be made about this subject,

particularly in terms of Circumstance usage. And we should not forget that transitivity is only one aspect of textual meaning since, in addition to the ideational metafunction that is realized through the transitivity system, SFL posits two other metafunctions (the interpersonal, realized through the Mood system and the Textual, realized through the Thematic 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. Furthermore, all of these systems relate only to the semantic patterning *within* clauses. There is another entire stratum of meanings that are made in texts between clauses but again, it has not been possible to consider these here.

From the perspective of Critical Discourse Analysis, this paper is also rather limited because it has not been possible here to adequately consider the dicoursal 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.

## REFERENCES

- Eggs, 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.
- Fowler, Roger (1991). *Language in the News: Discourse and Ideology in the Press*. London: Routledge.
- Halliday, M.A.K. and Matthiessen, Christian (2004). *An introduction to functional grammar*. 3rd ed. London: Arnold.
- Ito, Hiroshi (2004). Genshiryoku kaihatsu•riyou o meguru medexia gidai: Asahi shimbun shasetsu no bunseki (Ue) (A Media Agenda Regarding the Development and Use of Nuclear Energy: The Analysis of the Editorial of the Asahi Shimbun (1)). *Puuru gakuin daigaku kenkyu kiyou (Journal of Poole Gakuin University)*, 44, 63-76, Poole Gakuin University.
- Ito, Hiroshi (2005). Genshiryoku kaihatsu•riyou o meguru medexia gidai: Asahi shimbun shasetsu no bunseki (Chu) (A Media Agenda Regarding the Development and Use of Nuclear Energy: The Analysis of the Editorial of the Asahi Shimbun (2)). *Puuru gakuin daigaku kenkyu kiyou (Journal of Poole Gakuin University)*, 45, 111-126, Poole Gakuin

- University.
- Ito, Hiroshi (2009). ‘Genshiryoku kaihatsu•riyou o meguru media gidai: Asahi shimbun shasetsu no bunseki (Shita)’ (A Media Agenda Regarding the Development and Use of Nuclear Energy: The Analysis of the Editorial of the Asahi Shimbun (3)). *Puuru gakuin daigaku kenkyu kiyou (Journal of Poole Gakuin University)*, 49, 101-116, Poole Gakuin University.
- Nohara, Hitoshi (2007). Nagarakawa kakouzeki mondai ni kan suru Asahi Chunichi ryoushi shasetsu no bunseki (An Analysis of Asahi Shimbun’s and Chunichi Shimbun’s editorials on the dam at the mouth of Nagara River’s problem). *Gifu daigaku chiiki kagakubu kenkyu houkoku (Bulletin of the Faculty of Regional Studies, Gifu University)*, 21, 33-79, Gifu University.
- Obama, Barack (2009). Remarks by President Barack Obama, Hradcany Square, Prague, Czech Republic. < [http://www.whitehouse.gov/the\\_press\\_office/Remarks-By-President-Obama-In-Prague-As-Delivered](http://www.whitehouse.gov/the_press_office/Remarks-By-President-Obama-In-Prague-As-Delivered) > (Last accessed 18<sup>th</sup> October 2012).
- Shipilova, Anna (2004a). Kokumin aidentiti toshite no ‘heiwa shugi’ (Ichi): 8 gatsu 15 nichi tsuki shinbun shasetsu no bunseki (“Ideology of Peace” as Japanese National Identity (1): Analysis of Editorial Articles on August 15). *Hiroshima hougaku (The Hiroshima Law Journal)*, 27(4), A1-A26, Hiroshima University.
- Shipilova, Anna (2004b). Kokumin aidentiti toshite no ‘heiwa shugi’ (Ni): 8 gatsu 15 nichi tsuki shinbun shasetsu no bunseki (“Ideology of Peace” as Japanese National Identity (2): Analysis of Editorial Articles on August 15). *Hiroshima hougaku (The Hiroshima Law Journal)*, 28(1), A45-A72, Hiroshima University.
- Takegawa, Shunichi (2012). Shasetsu to houdou ni yoru fureimingu bunseki: 2001 nen rekishi kyoukasho mondai ni kan suru Asahi to Yomiuri o jirei ni (Framing of News through Editorials and Articles: An Analysis of the Asahi and Yomiuri Shimbun regarding the 2001 History Textbook Controversy). *Masu komyunikeshon kenkyuu (Journal of Mass Communication Studies)*, 80, 211-229, The Japan Society for Studies in Journalism and Mass Communication.
- Teruya, Kazuhiro (2007). *A Systemic Functional Grammar of Japanese*. London: Continuum.
- Watanabe, Yoshitomo (2011). Shibun no higashi nihon daishinsai houdou (Japanese Press Coverage of the 2011 Tohoku Earthquake). *Aoyama gakuin jyoshi tanki daigaku kiyou (Journal of Aoyama Gakuin Women’s Junior College)*, 65, 63-82, Aoyama Gakuin Women’s Junior College.
- Wodak, Ruth and Meyer, Michael (ed.) (2009) *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. 2nd ed. London: Sage.