



IJELLH

**International Journal of English Language,
Literature in Humanities**

Indexed, Peer Reviewed (Refereed) Journal

ISSN-2321-7065



Editor-in-Chief

Volume V, Issue IV April 2017

www.ijellh.com

**[About Us](#) | [Editorial Board](#) | [Submission Guidelines](#) | [Call for Paper](#) | [Paper](#)
[Submission](#) | [FAQ](#) | [Terms & Condition](#) | [More.....](#)**

ISSN :2455-0108

[IJO-Science](#)

(INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL ONLINE OF SCIENCE)

**THE SRI LANKAN ETHNIC CONFLICT, INDIAN INTERVENTION AND
GLOBAL RELATIONS
-A DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF A SRI LANKAN ENGLISH NEWSPAPER
EDITORIAL**

**JEYASEELAN GNANASEELAN
SENIOR LECTURER IN ENGLISH
ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING UNIT
VAVUNIYA CAMPUS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF JAFFNA
PARK ROAD, VAVUNIYA, SRI LANKA**

ABSTRACT

This paper traces the functions of discourse features in an editorial of the national Sri Lankan English newspaper, *Morning Leader* of the Sunday Leader publications focusing on the official visit of the newly-elected Sri Lankan President to India in December 2005. It investigates how these features represent Sri Lanka's stand on the global commitments of India toward resolving the conflict in the background of the history of Indo-Lanka relations on the implications of being proximate neighbors, India's growing regional and global power status, the proposed Joint Defense Cooperation Agreement and India's decline of direct intervention. It is an ideological discourse analysis of the text in terms of discourse and sociocultural practices and of the three levels of analysis of meaning: textual, ideational, and interpersonal. It mainly focuses on the discourse features that support issues of globalized political and economic relations that enhance the presence of the State, ethnic and party power-based and power-biased discourse and socio-political ideologies dominated by the majority community in Sri Lanka. The newspaper's discursive practices identify the naturalization of the ideologies. They also support implicitly for unilateral ethnonationalistic foreign policy interests and thus fall in line with those theorists who argue that globalization is an advantage that facilitates inter state-security, not intra-state security and implicate a productive analysis of global politics in harmony with that of domestic politics. Thus, representing India's role with positive and negative attributes clearly demonstrates these covert ideological positions of the Sri Lankan media discourse.

Article Type: Research Paper

Key words: editorial discourse, global security, international relations, terrorism, ethno-nationalism, ideology

1. Introduction

In this paper, a case study of the discourse of the editorial of the national Srilankan English newspaper, *Morning Leader* of the Sunday Leader publications, appeared on Wednesday, January 4, 2006, during the official visit of the newly-elected Srilankan President to India in December 2005 was undertaken to trace the latent ideologies of the press, specifically of the ways in which India as a regional or international super power is represented; the choice of the discourse features of the English language used by the newspaper referring to the Indo-Lanka international relations and politics in relation to ‘the interests and expectations of Sri Lanka’ especially in resolving the three decade old intense ethnic crisis under this new globalized security framework and War against Terrorism.

Though there are limitations in studying one sample and generalizing the results of it to the Sri Lankan media discourse as a whole, being a case study, this qualitative analysis pioneers a study like this on Sri Lankan media discourse unearthing the innovative research interest on the discourse analysis (DA) so that further advanced research can be persuaded. Though a sentence by sentence approach is dominant, it, however, provides a discourse analysis of paragraphs and text as a whole consistently. Ideologies are unfolded at lexical, clause, paragraph and body text levels.

The globalized issue of the conflict has been understood and criticized by the editorial in terms of the ways in which “domestic politics and the civil war have been influenced by and has been related to two parallel and closely inter-dependent trajectories relating to the global economy and global politics” (Venugopal, 2003). This analysis tries to reveal the ideologies of the editorial board of the newspaper aligning its ethno-centric identities with the Sinhala majority community and the Srilankan government represented in its contents under the guise of the discourse of global and international security and international terrorism. That its discourse is founded on whether the fear of giving in to the demands of the Tamil minority in the form of federal political

autonomy or independent separate state or the fear of loss of Sinhala cultural identity as the Sri Lanka's national identity as a result of perceiving Tamils as 'other', 'different', and 'threatening' is to be studied in the background of the conflict " which has taken various forms since the inception of the separatist movement in the early 1970s, (and) spans a number of distinct historical phases that straddle important external political, economic and cultural changes, including the end of the cold war, the rise of a global liberal economic order, and the effects of the emerging global "war on terrorism" – all of which are playing an important role in the dynamics of the conflict" (Venugopal, 2003).

The grammatical structure of this editorial content is 'meaning potential' (Halliday, 1985). It obviously brings out 'what can be said' rather than a set of rules of 'what must be said'. The ideologies of Sri Lankan mass media are traceable from the existing presuppositions and propositional attitudes by the use of the discourse conventions related to "knowledge production, distribution and consumption" (Fairclough, 1995) such as topicalization, foregrounding, backgrounding, suppression, nominalization, passivization, authorization or victimization of the agents, ideas and actions, which is of classic importance in Discourse Analysis.

2. Literature Review

This study is confidently based on the theories of 'Critical Discourse Analysis' developed by Fairclough (1989, 1992a, 1993, 1995) and the Ideological Discourse Analysis developed by van Dijk (1995a). It mainly focuses on the social nature of language and its functions. It is 'critical' social practice with 'causes and effects' which can not be visible or interpretable 'under normal conditions', (Bourdieu, 1977). There is a strong association between the use of language and the exercise of power. On the other hand, the term, the international system is defined as 'organized and ordered around several forms of regulation for the sake of instilling order, including international regimes, formal treaties and agreements, and norms of practice' (Appeltshauser, 2014). She further says that 'the interpretative discourses expose the dominant interpretation, its contestation, and the justifications uttered to explain, excuse, or assert a certain behavior'. The standard definition for International Relations (IR) is that it is 'an international system composed of territorial states which acknowledge no superior authority over matters which they consider of vital interest. It deals with the nature of the changing relations between states and with non-state

actors It studies the functioning of the international system – the forces, factors and interests, the customs, rules, norms, institutions and organisations from which the theory and history of its development are formed’ (LSE, 2016). The foreign policy making of a given State is a priority.

Appeltshauser (2014) describes that ‘the majority of discourse analysis in IR endorses a constructivist, Habermasian understanding: speech situations, processes of bargaining and arguing are subjected to discourse analysis, but mostly within international institutions, (non-)governmental fora, and the wider realm of diplomacy’. She says ‘the focus of the discipline is clearly on the discourse of those (governments and institutions) who yield power, not on the counter-discourse of those groups, actors and subjects that resist global power structures, and claim equality and justice on a global level – the subaltern’.

The readers of press media ‘take for granted a whole range of ideologically potent assumptions about rights, relationships, knowledge, and identities’ (Fairclough, 1995). Andrew Goatly (2000) quoting from Thompson (1984) defines ideology as ‘knowledge in the service of power’ which is aptly demonstrated in this analysis. ‘Discourse’ is a concept originally used by the social theorists (e.g. Foucault 1972, Fraser, 1989) and linguists (e.g. Stubbs 1983, van Dijk 1985). Discourse refers to spoken and written language use as a social practice within a socio-cultural context. It is “a socially and historically situated mode of action in a dialectical relationship with other facets of the social” (Fairclough, 1995). It is simultaneously constitutive of (1) social identities, (2) social relations and (3) systems of knowledge and belief (1995). O’Keeffe (2006) defines media discourse as ‘interactions that take place through a broadcast platform, whether spoken or written, in which the discourse is oriented to a non-present reader, listener or viewer’. Nawaz et al. (2013) state that ‘the thing really is something different from the explanation of media. Actually, media tries to communicate in a subjective manner rather than objective one. The words spoken or written by media seem to be objective but actually, they are subjective and implicitly laden with the ideologies of media. “The world of the Press is not the real world rather a partial one which is skewed and judged” (Fowler, 1991, p.11 quoted from Nawaz et al. 2013)’. This editorial analysis intends to reveal them within the discursive practices proper to editorial writing. It reflects social struggle and conflict. According to Fairclough (1995), “orders of discourse can be seen as one domain of potential cultural hegemony and power, with dominant groups struggling to assert and maintain particular structuring within and between them”.

Discourse Analysis can be defined as a ‘set of methods and theories for investigating language in use and language in social context’ (Wetherell et al.2001). It is ‘the linguistic analysis of naturally occurring speech or written discourse. It refers to attempts to study the organization of language above the sentence or above the clause, and therefore to study larger linguistic units, such as conversational exchanges or written texts. It is also concerned with language use in social contexts, and in particular with interaction or dialogue between speakers’ (Stubbs 1983:1). It is an analysis of a text in contexts and with co-texts at both micro and macro-levels of the genre as linguistic and social practices. It is tied to social relations and identities, power, inequality and social struggle, essentially language use as a matter of practices rather than just structures.

Ideologies are “systems that are at the basis of the socio-political cognitions of groups” (Lau and Sears, 1986). Generally, they are “social group attitudes consisting schematically-organized general opinions about relevant social issues” (Eagly and Chaiken, 1993). They “feature a group-relevant, self-serving selection of fundamental socio-cultural values. Ideologies are “constructed from group defining categories as Identity/Membership, Activities, Goals, Norms and Values, Social positions and Resources” (van Dijk, 1995a, 1995b). Appelshausen (2014) says that the media discourse on IR and internal conflicts ‘needs to detach itself to some extent from the political institutions of global governance, and from its inter-state-centric nature, but rather learn from area studies, global ethics, social movement studies, postcolonial theory and literature studies in order to be able to listen to discourse, counter-discourse, and silence’. In this study, the media discourse analysis in IR more specifically touches on legitimacy, justice and equality at the intra-state level which should be respected even at the interstate level relations. When the IR is related to ethnic conflicts within countries, Roychoudhury (2016) states that ‘Internal ‘ethnic’ conflicts have been a subject of extensive concern, theoretical expositions and statistical analysis in the discipline of International relations (IR) since the last quarter of the nineteenth century. Civil wars, internal conflicts or internal wars spawn ‘within states’, and IR has systematically endeavoured to theorize their tendencies, causes, dynamics and possible redressal’.

On defining the discourse features, nominalization is ‘the turning of a verb or an adjective into a noun’ (Goatly, 2000) which contributes to passivisation in omitting the Actor, Experiencer and

Sayer and gives a timeless sense. It smuggles in existential presupposition which make us “assume something exists which is being referred to.” Propositional attitude reveals the writer’s attitude to these presupposed propositions or presuppositions. Foregrounding makes certain expressions with certain propositions and attitudes in a text more visible and assertive whereas backgrounding makes less visible and less assertive. Suppression or hiding totally avoids mentioning them directly or indirectly and intentionally or unintentionally. Topicalization simply places certain expressions in the place of the subject of the sentence. However, the Actor, Experiencer and Sayer may be may be direct or indirect and not placed as the subject of the sentence. So, all these DA features are manipulated to either reproduce or resist the existing ideologies, attitudes, group norms and behavioral patterns of the dominant or marginalized communities.

3. The Organization of the Editorial Text and Discourse Practices

The metaphorical title of the editorial summarizes the objective in a simple sentence in active voice and in present tense while topicalizing India as the agent or Actor: *India wants an armchair instead of a co-chair*. This hyperbolic rhetorical verbal irony criticizes the Indian government’s denial of directly involving as a co-chair along with the other member states in resolving the half-century old Srilankan ethnic crisis and persuades it to do so by giving various justifications and surprisingly, threatening as well, and finally emphasizes the need for a strategic change in the policies of Sri Lankan international and national relations with India to find an end to this crisis.

The first paragraph summarizes three aspects: (1) the context orientation, that is, the president’s Rajapakse’s visit and his hope of getting India involve in the Sri Lankan issues; (2) the primary source orientations, that is, the reports from New Delhi indicating India’s unwillingness to be as a co-chair in the peace process along with other countries; (3) the editorial topic or thesis statement, that is, India’s offering only to be armchair (*hansiputuwa*), keeping aloof from the Sri Lankan situation. From paragraph 2 to 9, the editorial lists out one justification, accusation or reason for India’s current position in each paragraph. The editorial first insisting on the Indian diplomatic assistance (Co-chair membership) at the beginning goes on to emphasize its delay in military assistance (the Defence Agreement and direct intervention) and on its refusal, questions

India's moral status, as an emerging global power, on claiming the global power status and its past implications in the crisis and reminds its consequent responsibilities to Sri Lanka. From paragraph 10 to 12, finally, disappointed, it gives suggestions for being self-dependent and self-confident for the Sri Lankan president in the last three paragraphs.

There is an obvious overall pattern here. The almost majority of the themes (topics and agents) always refer to India, its capital, and its top most representatives or political power (prime ministers and ministers) and its activities and attitudes directly or indirectly (28 times out of 61 themes) whereas it is 16 times to Sri Lanka. According to the analytic frame work of Halliday (1994), India is referred as the Actor or Agent and Sri Lanka as the Victim or the Beneficiary. Another notable feature is that the actions of India are either of material (action) or verbal (voice) processes whereas the reactions of Sri Lanka are either of relational (fixed state) and mental (passive perception) processes. The pronoun used for referring India *it* (5 times) represents the country as a whole which must take the responsibility for many accusations pointed out by the editorial. However, nowhere is Sri Lanka referred as *it* in this same sense but uses *its* for referring Sri Lanka in passivised and victimized sense in 9.1 and 9.2. Out of the 16 references to Sri Lanka, only two times *Sri Lanka* is mentioned. The rest are referred to either the individual presidents and their actions mostly using the pronouns *he* and *his* so that the responsibility for certain mishaps related to the crisis goes to the individuals not to the country as a whole collectively.

The position of the point of the Paragraphs, that is, the appearance of the generalized topic sentence at the beginning or at the end of paragraphs, can be deductive or inductive. This editorial features the point –first deductive methods (Nash, 1980). The genre of editorial as a whole has the major generalized topic sentences at the beginning of the paragraphs and the succeeding supporting sentences giving particular examples, illustrations and arguments based on the topic sentences. This deductive method finding comfort in already established generalized norms and terms of global relations and security argues against the current India's relations with Sri Lanka and its global power status and reconstructs another notion that India has failed in its global political commitments regarding the Sri Lankan situation. Thus it tactfully avoids the verification of the authenticity, validity and reliability of the generalized statements and by using the deductive method, goes on either to assert or negate the ideas posited in them.

The Balance (Nash, 1980) suggests a weighing-up of descriptive facts, or arguments for and against a proposition, giving equal proportion to each side. However, this editorial depicts an unequal balance and makes many concessions to the Sri Lankan side by backgrounding and suppressing certain facts and arguments weighing on the Indian side. Since the editorial's objective is to criticize the Indian side strongly, majority of the facts and arguments are chosen in favor of the Sri Lankan side. Much of the existing literature on the external dimensions of the Sri Lankan conflict has arisen within the global framework of international relations and security studies. According to Venugopal, R. (2003),

'Kadian (1990), Muni (1993), Bullion (1995), and a number of others have discussed the conflict in terms of the Indo-Sri Lankan confrontation of the 1980s. In contrast, during the 1990s the external dimensions of the conflict have been discussed with respect not to international relations, but rather international terrorism. For example, Gunaratna (1997) is directed at alerting foreign governments to the international security threat posed by the LTTE. Most of the literature examines the intersection of the conflict with the outside world not in terms of international relations, but the political economy of development. The major preoccupations of this literature have been to examine the relationship between structural adjustment and conflict, and the role of aid donors in conflict reduction and post-conflict reconstruction.

The newspaper mostly has the Sri Lankan Sinhalese as its readers. The proprietors are Sinhalese, belonging to the majority community of Sri Lanka and the dominant governing community. They have to satiate the expectations and disappointments of the readership of that community. The interpersonal function is a significant point to ponder at this juncture. The inter-textual approach of the DA constrains the editors to reflect and correlate the discourse of the editorial to sound similar to this aforesaid readership. Their politics of power relations with the minority Tamils and India and their ideologies related to race, language, religion, socio-political histories should be taken into account. Being a pro-UNP (the Opposition Party at present) newspaper, it has to represent the party's position as well; but surprising, although the UNP is overtly adopting a policy of finding a peaceful solution through negotiation, the editorial indirectly represents the significance of realizing the proposed Defense Agreement with India which can debilitate the political confidence of the minority Tamils towards India and the Sri Lankan government at this

junction. For, the generic structure of news report of van Dijk (1986) reveals some clues to the discourse structure of news editorial. The hidden values, ideologies and power relations can be identified by tracing the categorizations and subcategories of News discourse and in the ordering and selection of items: summary and news story, episodes (events, background, event and verbal reactions as consequences) and comments. Bell 1991: 224 says that the organization of a news story has great potential for distorting and misrepresenting the news and the headline foregrounds one sort of information rather than another, and gives a false interpretation of what comes later and so on. This can be applicable to this editorial analysis. Regarding maintaining ‘objectivity’, Galtung and Ruge (1973) speaks a number of factors or biases in these processes: reference to elite persons/nations, cultural proximity, intensity, unexpectedness, and negativity.

4. Ideological Discourse Analysis

4.1. Discourse of International Relations and Intervention

(Paragraph 1 and Sentence 1-3)

1.1. *PRESIDENT Mahinda Rajapakse, before leaving for New Delhi for his first official visit to India, had hoped that India would at least join in the Srilankan peace process by being a Co-chair with the other foreign powers- United States, European Union, Japan, and Norway.* 1.2. *Reports from New Delhi indicated that India had at the most been willing to be an observer in the peace process along with the four Co-Chairs thus not being actively involved in Srilankan affairs.* 1.3. *This meant that India was offering only to be armchair (hansiputuwa), keeping aloof from the Srilankan situation.*

Exploiting the discourse of global security and global relations, the editorial evokes the Propositional Attitude (PA) through the Sri Lankan president that India would join in the Sri Lanka’s peace process (PA1). It originates from an Existential Presupposition (EP) that there is ‘an genuine Sri Lankan peace process’ going on in Sri Lanka (EP1); Sri Lanka has a right to place its hope on India (EP2); the hope of Sri Lanka is personalized as the hope of President Mahinda Rajapakse. The subject positioning or topicalization of *PRESIDENT Mahinda Rajapakse* as Experiencer in the main clause, and *India* as Actor in the subordinate clause as topics, and the significance of attributing the main verb of mental process *had hoped* with the leadership of Sri Lanka foreground this position. The sentences (S1.1 and S1.3) given in quasi-direct discourse and the S1.2 in indirect discourse try to construct the ‘objectivity’ of the reported

facts. However, they are inter-textually and interpersonally associated with the past relations and related activities of these two countries and of the press and its dominant readership in Sri Lanka. The editorial does not quote a reliable source of the president's hope. The hope is based on the India's perceived threat of the separatist cause of Sri Lankan Tamil armed resistance movements and its fall-out in Tamil Nadu. Hence India's insistence on Sri Lanka devolving power on federal framework is understandable. For Sri Lanka, this movements' struggle is a threat to the unitary character of the country and the existing ethno-nationalistic hegemonic domination of Sri Lankan politics. The transitivity of the verbal action '*had hoped*' entails the mental process -an inactive helpless perception but '*would join*' entails a material process- an active helpful concrete event. This India's position would affect '*the Sri Lankan peace process*' as its victim. The rhymed metaphorical expansion in co-chair –armchair dichotomy backgrounds the direct intervention to the extent of 'active' direct assistance in *co-chair* and non-intervention and non-military assistance in *armchair*. In the context of the failure of the co-chairs represented by many powerful countries like the USA and Japan, this hope on India impinges on this idea since the existing co-chairs can not be expected to provide military assistance intensively ignoring India's regional power status and security. However, India's contemporary adoption of the concepts of global political liberalism and economic globalization has changed its foreign policies substantially towards Sri Lanka in recent years. *The Sri Lankan situation* backgrounds a violent ethnic military conflict respectively. By giving the Sinhala translation, the editorial dominantly addresses its Sinhala readership. It de-topicalizes and de-emphasizes India's non-military assistance at present and military assistance in the past.

(Paragraph 2)

2. *The proposed Joint Defence Cooperation Agreement (PJDCA) between the two countries receives no mention in the joint communiqué issued after President's Rajapakse's visit, whereas in the agreement reached between President Kumaratunga and Prime Minister Manmohan Singh in New Delhi in November 2004, it was stated that the Joint Defence Cooperation Agreement among other issues would involve negotiations on the rehabilitation of the Palaly airfield.*

The EP3 is that there is a proposed Joint Defense Cooperation Agreement (PJDCA) between the two countries. The editorial claims that it should have received mentioning in the joint

communiqué especially the negotiations on the rehabilitation of the Palaly airfield (PA2). The topicalization of the *PJDCA*, passivisation of the transitive verb ‘*receives no mention*’, ‘*would involve*’, and ‘*was stated*’, and pronominalisation of ‘*negotiations on the rehabilitation of the Palaly airfield*’ foreground the *PJDCA* and direct military assistance, not the co-chairing role which assumes a non-military, political and diplomatic intervention. The editorial uses these discourse features as mild forms of expressing seeking military assistance. They *background* that Sri Lanka is also a signatory to this agreement and hide that whether Sri Lanka has fulfilled its responsibilities on its part and the non-military mediation of India. ‘*The joint communiqué*’ as the Agent implicates Sri Lanka as well; the emphasis of the equivalent role of Sri Lanka on the part of the Srilankan President’s side in the *joint communiqué* is excluded; it depicts again Sri Lanka as the victim. Further the verbal expression of the action puts more weight age of the blame on the Indian side for having evaded the inclusion of the statement of implementation of the *PJDCA*.

(Paragraph 5 and Sentence 1-2)

5.1. *It could be said that India has no basic commitment towards Sri Lanka and it is thus perfectly in order to keep its distance.* 5.2. *This, however, is to forget the way in which it embroiled itself in Srilankan affairs in the mid’ 80s to the point of virtually enforcing the Indo-Lanka Agreement and landing their troops here.*

“In the case of suppression, as Theo van Leeuwen (1993) says, there is generally no reference to the social actors in question anywhere in the text. In the case of backgrounding, the exclusion is less radical: the excluded actor may not be mentioned in relation to a given activity, but they are or may be mentioned elsewhere in the text”. The passive expression with verbal process in ‘*It could be said*’ is an example of backgrounding the authoritative evaluation of the editorial tactfully. This text bears an assertive intertextual and interpersonal association between these two countries on historical perspective. The EP4 is that India has basic commitment towards Sri Lanka. Hence India’s keeping its distance is morally wrong (PA3). Again *India* is the agent given in subject position and *Sri Lanka* is the victim referred in the predicate position. Since it is a value-judgment, the sentence beginning with ‘*It could be said*’ is interesting from this point of view. Perhaps its role is a ‘modal’ one, to mitigate and disclaim responsibility for a damning judgment by attributing it to unspecified others. The ‘indirectness and implicitness’ of the critical

stance towards India, according to Fairclough (1995), perhaps shows ‘a tension and a trade off between the evenhandedness of the editorial in its more traditional information-giving in persuasion and defense, authoritative role in criticizing social and political issues, and the more sensationalist demands upon the editorial as entertaining the dominant reading public’, the Sinhala majority community. By questioning the ‘*basic commitment*’ in nominalized form, it foregrounds the non-commitment of the India government regarding military assistance and backgrounds the newspaper editorial judgment by India's commitment of indirect military assistance and non-military assistance in the past and at present. The passive, agent deletion in *It could be said that* suppresses the subjective value judgment of the editorial writers supposed to be representing the Sri Lankan state covering both the Sinhala, and Tamil nations. The relational process in the verbs *has no* and *is* reinforces that the event-like or static nature of India’s present position is as if an already established proposition.

The EP5 is that India interfered in the Sri Lankan affairs both politically and militarily in the mid’ 80s. Hence Sri Lanka thinks that India wants to forget the way in which it embroiled itself in Sri Lankan affairs in the mid’ 80s and India seems to feel that it was a wrong involvement (PA4). The editorial seems neither to endorse nor to oppose the Indian position in this regard overtly. It backgrounds and hides its open judgment on it such as whether it was an intervention with the positive consequences or an interference with the negative consequences due to many factors. The editorial's avoidance of direct attribution to the India's position and leaving it to the India’s way of feeling guiltiness by presenting it in indirect reporting is a subtle attempt on the part of the editorial to escape from being implicated in the criticism of anti-Indo-Lanka relations. However, the lexical choices made and material processes and active voice of the verbs foreground the value judgment that the India’s intervention in the 80s was an unnecessary interference in ‘*Srilankan affairs*’ forcefully and unilaterally implemented without the full approval of Sri Lanka. The verb choices such as *embroiled*, *enforcing* and *landing* vividly demonstrate it. It suppresses the protests organized by many public and political organizations in Sri Lanka during its intervention. The factors contributing to this judgment are as follows: firstly, being a pro-UNP newspaper, it can not accept the India’s ‘unilateral intervention’ in ‘*Srilankan affairs*’ when the UNP was in power at that time. Secondly, being a pro-Sinhala community newspaper wholly owned by the Sinhalese, having the majority readership from the same community as well, it has to be sensitive of the Sinhala sentiments; many prominent Sinhala

dominated parties such as JVP and the Sinhala population as a whole more or less opposed India's intervention as an outright interference in the sovereignty of Sri Lanka. There were many public protests and demonstrations for the eviction of India. Thirdly, the Sinhala community did not accept the Indo-Lanka Agreement made at that time and the formulation of the provincial council system as a solution. Here again, it was the UNP which was a signatory to that Agreement. Fourthly, it was again the UNP which asked India to leave the country. Therefore it backgrounds the 'fault' of India intervening Srilankan affairs in the mid' 80s by not overtly mentioning as it is and indirectly nominalizing India as the agent which released this present non-involvement policy, indirectly thus blaming India's direct intervention in the 80s when the majority Sinhala people did not accept the presence of the IPKF in Sri Lanka and directly blaming its non-involvement when the same accepted it involvement at present.

(Paragraph 8 and Sentence 1-3)

8.1. *The argument is made that India could not respond adequately to Srilankan President Rajapakse's visit because it was ill-timed- the South Indian elections being close at hand and there being pressure from certain quarters of the South Indian political sector on behalf of the LTTE.* 8.2. *While this contention may have some substance it has to be pointed out that this present attitude is consistent with the post-Premadasa Indian policy of keeping aloof and even going back on the proposed Joint Defence Cooperation Agreement made with President Kumaratunga.* 8.3. *India will soon have to face the issue of professing to be a super power but ignoring its global commitments to fight terrorism because of political pressures brought about by a few of its fanatical racist political parties.*

The discourse of international security and Srilankan national security is emphasized at the expense of India's domestic political security realities-India's near achievement of national harmony which is nil in Sri Lanka at present. The EP6 is that India considers the impact of the South Indian elections and politics as serious in making decisions regarding the Sri Lanka's request; it was ill-timed for the visit of the Srilankan president. Hence the PA5 is that India should have responded adequately to Sri Lankan President Rajapakse's visit ignoring the South Indian elections and the pressure from certain quarters of the South Indian political sector. The passivized and nominalized forms '*the argument is made, and it was ill-timed*' background and hide many questions: Who argues? the Sri Lankan or Indian government authorities or the

political analysts of Sri Lanka or of India? Therefore the editorial takes its defense regarding this controversy by hiding the actors who verbalized this controversy and at the same time belittles and backgrounds the significance of the political pressure from Tamil Nadu as if it is not a strong factor but an argument which can be ignored or go wrong. The verbal action of *could not respond* foregrounds the Central Government vulnerability to the intra-state pressure as a sign of weakness.

The EP7 is that India has the post-Premadasa Indian policy of keeping aloof from Srilankan conflict. It foregrounds in repetition of going *back on the PJDCA* and backgrounds India's responsibility and concern for the minority Tamils and hides Premadasa's unjustifiable contribution to the present stand. The nominal form *contention* again tactfully backgrounds the significance of the political pressure from Tamil Nadu by additionally using a relation process verb *may have* with the modality of less probability. However, the foregrounded PA6 in this clause is that *Indian policy of keeping aloof* is not a stable well-defended one; still it is controversial and changeable depending on the situation. This nominal form *this present attitude* foregrounds the existence of a past attitude and a possibility of a future attitude. Thus it persuades a change in attitude in subtle form of expression. The use of the nominal form *the post-Premadasa Indian policy of keeping aloof* deftly hides the implications of anti-Indian and anti-IPKF protests and violence in Sri Lanka causing this present policy.

The EP8 is that it will be very difficult for India to be a super power ignoring its global commitments to fight terrorism because of its internal political pressures. The PA7 is that India aspiring to be a super power should ignore the internal political pressures not its global commitments. The nominalized form '*a few of its fanatical racist political parties*' hides the significance of the pressures for addressing the Tamil's grievances and the impact of fanatical racist politicians in Sri Lanka who refuse to share power with the minorities within the united Sri Lanka. It foregrounds the victimization of '*the issue of professing to be a super power, and its global commitments*' due to India's present stand.

4.2. Discourse of Assistance and Resistance

(Paragraph 3 and 4)

3. *The offers made by India to President Rajapakse such as the establishment of a chair for Indian studies at the Peradeniya University, assist in the improvement of the railway services, etc., is far removed from the crucial issues involved in Indo-Lanka relations.*

The EP9 is that India made some offers. The PA8 is that Sri Lanka views the offers made by India to President Rajapakse related to non-military assistance are not crucial issues involved in Indo-Lanka relations. By subject positioning '*The offers made by India*', and passivizing "*is far removed*", the editorial hides who officially says this and foregrounds the non-significance of the offers and the significance of the military assistance in the pronominal form, '*the crucial issues involved in Indo-Lanka relations*'. The passive verbal action with material process in '*is far removed*' clearly backgrounds many complex issues of Sri Lanka's development and Indo-Lanka relations. It evades the questions such as 'who removes the aforesaid activities far from the crucial issues?', 'what are the crucial issues? Who defies these activities as trivial in the Indo-Lanka relations? Is the direct involvement in the *Srilankan affairs* a crucial issue? Why was it not when the IPKF was here in the past? Who authorizes and defines these crucial issues?

4. *New Delhi has been distancing itself from Srilankan affairs since President Premadasa asked the Indian Peace Keeping Force (IPKF) to leave the country- and not one Indian president, prime minister or minister has visited Sri Lanka other than Prime Minister Narasimha Rao to attend the SAARC Summit Conference in 1990 and Foreign Minister Natwar Singh's arrival to attend the funeral of Lakshman Kadirgamar.*

The EP10 is that New Delhi has been distancing itself from Sri Lankan affairs and no significant Indian political leaders have visited Sri Lanka in the past. However, New Delhi should not distance itself from Srilankan affairs though President Premadasa had asked the Indian Peace Keeping Force (IPKF) to leave the country once (PA9). That means India should involve whenever requested and distance itself whenever requested. That is the way of respecting the sovereignty of Sri Lanka by India; that no significant Indian political leaders have visited Sri Lanka in the past means India is ignoring Sri Lanka. The foregrounding is on distancing while hiding the request of the president Premadasa to the disappointment of India.

(Paragraph 7 and Sentence 1-4)

7.1. *But what are its commitments as regional and now a global power?* 7.2. *US Secretary of State Condoleeza Rice herself assured that it would be a global power soon.* 7.3. *India is knocking on the doors of the UN Security Council to become a permanent member.* 7.4. *Can such a global power turn a blind eye to terrorism which it created just two decades ago?*

The editorial exploits the existing perceptions of the blurred or populist definitions and duties and responsibilities behind the *commitments of a regional and global power* though there are controversies over the ideational functions of these vocabularies; it simply backgrounds these controversies; this time it defends its discourse of national security inter-textually and interpersonally on the contemporary global political and international security framework. The textual and discourse practices are expanded to include the global socio-cultural and political practices as well. This pronominal form and the relational verb process in ‘*are*’ confirm the authoritative defining function of the editorial as if they are taken for granted and already established. The existential presuppositions are that there are certain defined commitments of defined and recognized regional and global powers (EP11). India has commitments towards its neighbours as regional and now a global power (EP12). This expositional question bears the propositional attitude that India’s commitments as a regional and now a global power correlate to its direct involvement in the Sri Lankan affair both militarily and non-militarily (PA10). The intended-readers are the Sinhala community, the officers of the High Commissions in Sri Lanka specifically of India and the politicians and policy-makers of international relations of India. It persuades a policy change on the part of India to intervene in Sri Lankan affairs in line with the expectations of the ‘Sri Lankan government’. Again it foregrounds *its commitments* and at the same time hides Sri Lanka's commitment. The interrogative expressions ironically question the status and affirm the inevitable but at the same time, attribute its short-coming as a global power indirectly comparing and contrasting with the USA particularly in involving in eliminating ‘terrorism’.

The EP13 is that the USA is a real model for a global power if any country aspires to become; if the USA says something, there is a strong possibility. The USA has the power and authority to judge and decide the issues of world politics. Since the US Secretary of State Condoleeza Rice herself assured, Sri Lanka has to accept the fact that India would be a global power soon (PA11).

Thus it foregrounds the USA's role and judgment in world politics while backgrounding India's secondary position.

It foregrounds India's persistent request and its 'obsession' to become a permanent member in the UN Security Council. However, the metaphorical expression ' *is knocking on the doors*' backgrounds the UNSC delays in its considerations and India's unpreparedness or its insufficient show or capability to convince the UNSC of its global political reach or power. In this context, it contemptuously views the India's attempt which symbolizes India's persistent but begging nature to become a permanent member at the same time forgetting 'its regional responsibilities' as expected by Sri Lanka (PA12). In sentences 7.1 and 7.2 India is juxtaposed with the USA and the UN to make India realize the incompatibility of its present policies in par with them to become a full-fledged global power modeled on the USA.

The rhetorical question of metaphorical content carries the existential presupposition that a country which created *terrorism* in the past should not turn a blind eye to it if it aspires for global power at present (EP14). Though a proper definition of *terrorism* is still in grave controversy in international relations, the editorial again makes use of the populist definition, that is, violence carried out for political purposes, as a cover-up for state terrorism and historical injustice meted out on the minority communities in Sri Lanka in terms of their fundamental rights including political and economical. The PA13 is that India created terrorism in Sri Lanka; as a result, Sri Lanka experiences terrorism; ironically even India's military involvement in the Sri Lanka peace process at present is not against the Gandhian principles it preaches. At the same time it hides India's assistance in the past and the minority Tamils' legitimate grievances.

4.3. Discourse of Non-violence and Friendship

(Paragraph 6 and Sentence 1-3)

6.1. *For a country that preaches Gandhian principles to the world, it does seem highly immoral in having created the raksha- nurtured, funded and helped internationally- it could now sit on a mountain top and watch with supreme detachment Sri Lanka stew in their own juice.* 6.2. *India we are aware has ditched the Gandhian principles despite their ritualistic incantations to it.* 6.3. *The humble spinning wheel and nuclear power do not go together.*

This cultural allusion of intertextuality posits its judgment of its discourse of international relations and global political security in the Indian socio-cultural practices. Interestingly and most tactfully the editorial evokes a popular, powerful religious and epic-oriented metaphoric allusion which can appeal the feelings of both Hindus and Buddhists living in both India and Sri Lanka: the Hinduist and Buddhist asceticism and renunciation. Earlier India was the culprit for '*having created the raksha*'- the epical characters of destruction (which refers the Tamil armed resistance movements) but now it plays the role of a Hindu sage or ascetic in meditation-the *sanyasi* who has denounced the worldly pleasures or engagements sit on a mountain top and meditate on spiritual matters. The EP15 is that for a country that preaches any principles to the world, it should practice them on the whole. The Gandhian principles are against any violent methods (EP16). Hence India should not have created the *raksha* because of its preaching on the Gandhian principles and international societies should not have nurtured, funded and helped it (PA14). Since Sri Lanka is the victim of the India's actions, it is hypocritical on the part of India keeping away from the Srilankan peace process. India is a pseudo-sanyasi! Further the well-established semantic dichotomy of the vocabulary 'preaching and practice' is evoked to impose the editorial's ideological attitude towards India, representing Sri Lanka. The word 'preaching' has gradually attained a possessive proposition with a negative attribute that those who preach never practice. The passivized verbal expression of evaluative judgement in '*it does seem highly immoral*' foregrounds India's and other international community's duplicity, complicity and the resulted Sri Lanka's present crisis. However, amidst all these 'presences', there are 'absences' of Sri Lanka's ethnic discrimination and violent suppression of human rights and human security which are the real causes of the creation of *the raksha*. Here the editorial tries to foreground the secondary factors as the primary ones while hiding the primary factors at all. The globalization of the Sri Lankan conflict is made in terms of putting all the blames on India and other countries of international community and seeking mainly military assistance from these global political forces. It is to suit the intention of the editorial and to justify the disappointment of the Srilankan Sinhala nation over the India's original reaction regarding the suffering of the ethnic Tamil minority in Sri Lanka. This verbal use exposes the question of authorization of the statement.

The simplistic, nominalized metaphorical statement in Sentence 6.3 backgrounds the editorial's hidden or latent ideologies of international relations with India and its confused illogical ideational functions. The EP17 is that the country preaching the Gandhian principles should not

aspire for nuclear power. Did Gandhi propagate for a weaponless non-violent security forces for the future independent India? Is it practicable? Hence India aspiring for nuclear power is wrong in this regard (PA15). It tacitly foregrounds India's contradicting unjustifiable policies of national security and becoming a global power and the historically deeply entrenched cultural ethos propagated by Mahatma, the great soul. Whereas, the editorial column hides its or Sri Lanka's moral capacity to judge India's as a model nation practicing the Gandhian principles. Its logic can go to the level that since Sri Lanka is neither the originator of the principles nor an aspirant for becoming a global power and not worried for practicing the principles. This reference of ideational content of the Gandhian principles is quite ironical when compared with Sri Lanka's equivalent Buddhist's principals professed by the dominant majority community while violently repressing the Tamil grievances. Is this statement directly relevant to the main topic: the request for direct involvement of India? The emotional outburst reveals their frustration over the India's stand on this and this frustration expands to severe criticism of India's evolvment as a nuclear power state which is not truly liked or appreciated by the editors belonging to Sri Lanka, one of the neighboring countries of India.

(Paragraph 9 and Sentence 1-4)

9.1. *The low priority given to the Sethusamudram project in the joint communiqué indicates that Sri Lanka has virtually surrendered its rights in the Palk Strait.* 9.2. *No doubt Sri Lanka has not been Simon Pure in its dealings with India.* 9.3. *But a country which aspires to great power status has to be more generous to its faltering little neighbours.* 9.4. *In the words of former Indian Prime Minister, Inder Kumar Gujiral, "India should do more for its neighbours than what the neighbours could do for India."*

The EP18 is that the low priority was given to the Sethusamudram project in the joint communiqué. The PA16 is that India is the aggressor and master and Sri Lanka is the aggressed and servant. The low priority given is wrong. The subject positioning of this nominalized and passivized expression *the low priority given to the Sethusamudram project in the joint communiqué* foregrounds Sri Lanka's interests in the SSP and the India's domination and unilateral decision on the SSP while backgrounding the Srilanka's irresponsibility in not asserting its voice in this matter though it was *the joint communiqué*. The editorial's fear of the impact of this project to the future of the Colombo harbor and its consequent economic disaster

to the southern Sri Lanka is understandable here. Surprisingly, there is little resistance to it from the minority communities from the Northern Sri Lanka which is geographically proximate to the Palk Strait. Perhaps there may be a chance of economic development in upgrading the harbors of the Northern Sri Lanka in future because of this massive development project of India which benefits mostly Tamil Nadu concretely. Even though this project immensely contributes to economic globalization which may have the strong potential to support the development of the Northern Sri Lanka in future, the Southern Srilankans' obsession with this project underlies the ethno and regional nationalistic foreign policies.

The EP19 is that a country which aspires to have great power status has to be more generous and Sri Lanka is one of its faltering little neighbours. The former Indian Prime Minister, Inder Kumar Gujral has confirmed it. The modifying simple generalized expressions *more generous* and *faltering* hide many implicated contextual meanings. Their meanings related to what sense, when, where, by whom, to whom, why, and how will further distort the editorial meaning of this statement and its justification for expecting this generosity. That's why the statement has been presented as a generalized one. The PA17 is that the present Indian government should not ignore the words of its former Indian Prime Minister and India is not doing well in this regard. The pronominal form *faltering little neighbours* brings out an illustration of 'a successful State' and a failed State' to India and Sri Lanka relationship. The lexical choice of *neighbours* reveals the use of discourse of familial neighborhood and charity mingling with the discourse of international political relations.

(Paragraph 10 and Sentence 1-6)

10.1. *All theses experiences are a positive indication that we can not have all the eggs in the Indian basket.* 10.2. *President Mahinda Rajapakse has a daunting challenge before him.* 10.3. *There are the big Western powers now involved in the Srilankan issue along with Japan.* 10.5. *Rajapakse has to work out a strategy to defeat terrorism in his country with or without the assistance of foreign powers.* 10.6. *Firstly, he has to put his own house in order.*

The subject positioning of the nominal form *All theses experiences*, and the nominal form of complement *a positive indication* lead to the EP20 that India has many a time ignored and acted against 'our' concerns. The editorial continues with the use of discourse of deception, familial

neighborhood and charity reinforce the already established attributions towards India- a deceiving –deceived situation. The use of the metaphorical expression *all the eggs in the Indian basket* further reinforces this discourse of familial neighborhood, charity and household care. The PA18 is that all theses (negative) experiences are a positive indication that we can not rely on India for everything. The editorial foregrounds seeking assistance from other countries in case India fails to deliver the goods and Sri Lanka's state of dependence.

The nominal use of '*a daunting challenge*' reveals the EP21 of the Editorial hidden realization that the President has many serious problems to address the Srilankan issue without the help from India. Its PA19 reveals that without the help from India, solving the crisis or maintaining the relationship with India will be a daunting challenge while backgrounding the solution of the ethnic crisis even militarily. However, the editorial tries to provide another solution with the EP22 that the big Western powers can be a substitute in the Sri Lankan issue along with Japan. Further its PA20 is that never mind India, there are the big Western powers to help while backgrounding Sri Lankan's continuous state of dependence.

Again the editorial tries to provide another solution with the EP23 that Sri Lankan President does not have a strategy at present to defeat terrorism in his country with or without the assistance of foreign powers. However its PA21 reveals Sri Lanka's frustrating realization of the importance of being self reliant in this aspect. The expression *with or without the assistance of foreign powers* foregrounds the importance of independence and disappointment at the inability of the government to make use of the opportunity of the US initiated war against terrorism and the New World Order behind this globalized framework, and self-reliance backgrounding the assistance within the contemporary global political and economic security framework if the assistance is not viable or vulnerable to the Srilankan government's manipulation. The nominal form *a strategy to defeat terrorism in his country* and the discourse of war backgrounds the Indian recommendation of a federal solution by political means and foregrounds an imposed unilateral solution by military means. Further it reveals its disappointment that his house is not in order now and frames its PA22 that disorderliness of his house is one of the reasons for not utilizing the assistance within the contemporary global political and economic security. The idiomatic illustration of *to put his own house in order* again reminds the discourse of household care which is a pre-requisite for getting the intended benefit from the present global order.

The existential presuppositions derived are that his election alliance was wrong approach against the present global political liberalism (EP24); the JVP and JHU, the local Sinhala Nationalist parties, are seen as anti-forces of the Sri Lankan peace process by all the interested countries in general. (EP25); Here again, the editorial hides the justifiable real causes of the India's approach. Further the repeated use of the discourse of power politics, not the discourse of democratic politics brings out the editorial's focus on political power.

This approach, according to Jackson, R. and Sorensen, G. (2003), signifies "the foreign-oriented policies, decisions, and activities of states people who act on behalf of territory-based political systems...." Blaming the diplomats and states people for the failure, the editorial seems to justify that 'international politics is a realm of human experience' (Wight 1991: 1). Simply speaking, it is a matter of language game, more appropriately, a game of political discourse and rhetoric.

(Paragraph 11 and 12)

12.1. *Meanwhile, he should appoint competent diplomats, academics and others to consider whether the main thrust of Srilankan foreign policy during the past decade: friendship with India has reached a dead end.*

The discourse of friendship and neighborhood is again used to reconstruct the necessity of mutual assistance between the countries. The existential presuppositions that he has not appointed competent diplomats and academics (EP26); and the present India's position is not conducive to the existing Srilankan foreign policy on friendship with India (EP27) could be derivable. Its propositional attitude reveals that Srilankan foreign policy should have been revised to make India respond to the Sri Lankan situation (PA23). The subject positioning of the nominalized form *Bold and innovative thinking to be put into practice* (12.2) again hides the type of foreign policies in line with the latent ideologies without specifying them. The nominal forms *The Srilankan foreign policy* and *friendship with India* within this global security and international framework implicitly embodies the unilateral ethno-nationalistic foreign policy and the unilateral ethno-nationalistic friendship with India.

5. Findings

A variety of discursive structures and strategies such as discourses of international relations; international security, international terrorism, friendship, neighborhood, and household care have been used to express the editorial's covert as well as overt ideological beliefs in relation to the countries, the governments, and the communities. The overall strategy of all the ideologies, as revealed in this editorial, appears to be a positive self-presentation and a negative 'other-presentation'. This also implies various moves to hide or deny Sri Lanka's negative acts or attributes, and India's good ones. Thus the editorial board, the Sinhala community, the Srilankan government, and Sri Lanka as a whole represented by *we* are associated with positive norms and values while hiding the grievances of the Srilankan Tamils, whereas, the Indian government and India as a whole represented by *they*, violate such basic principles of globalized political security framework targeting the elimination of 'terrorism'. The negative acts of the *Other*, India, the Tamil militants, the fanatical parties of Tamil Nadu, are further emphasized by hyperboles, topicalization, concrete detailed descriptions, threatening and frightening future scenarios and warnings.

The editorial text serves to legitimize and persuade India's intervention at the present context and at the same time, delegitimize the same political practice of India in the past contexts because it went against its discourse of ethno-nationalism and hegemonic power politics of the dominant community in Sri Lanka. It excludes mentioning the mostly-affected victims, the Tamil people in Sri Lanka in the whole body of the text, who have been left to be identified with the '*raksha*', the Tamil armed resistance movements as the cause or the agents of the 'terrorism' in Sri Lanka. It excludes or backgrounds many of 'fanatical racist political parties' in Sri Lanka and includes and foregrounds those of Tamil Nadu. Representations include or exclude political actors to suit their interests in relation to the readers for whom they are intended.

If the activities of the government or Sinhala politicians or Sinhala people carry negative impact on the peace process or in maintaining cordial relationship with India, the agents are excluded from the sentences mainly by choosing passive structures. This helps "to promote the roles of these agents positive to the representational process, to social and political progress". (Trew, 1979: 106). The pronominalized forms background the Indian military assistance for the ethno-nationalized State security prominently as it is in the first sentence 'Sri Lankan *peace process*' (2) while foregrounding Sri Lanka's hope on the India as its regional superpower and close

neighbor with its responsibility towards protecting one of *'its faltering little neighbours'* which has global political recognition and legitimacy as a sovereign state. However, it hides at this juncture the events such as India's continuous non-military assistance on the basis of the globalized political economic liberalistic security framework and military assistance by means of non-direct intervention methods such as giving military training and equipments and so on. Further it avoids mentioning the India's direct military intervention in the past. The pronominalized forms *'Srilankan affairs'* (3) *the 'Srilankan issue'*, *'the Srilankan situation'* background three-decade intensive violent ethnic military conflict in which the minority Tamil community have many grievances, and experienced discriminations and fundamental human security and human right violations. It has well-acknowledged by the international or global communities mainly by India, the USA, the EU and Japan.

Naturalized ideological existing propositions and propositional attitudes allow the editorial to choose the concrete events and persons historically in terms of the functions of intertextuality and inter-personality to formulate more persuasive statements about the intervention of India in the Sri Lankan affair under the international and global security framework against the 'terrorism' of the non-state actors while suppressing the 'terrorism' of the state, ethno-nationalistic discrimination within the national politics especially between the Sinhala and Tamil communities. Comparisons with the Evil, such as the LTTE and separatism, or extremism of Tamil politicians in Sri Lanka and Tamil Nadu, are another efficient rhetorical ploy to emphasize how bad the *Others* are. Here are the ideologies expressed through this discourse of the editorial:

1: Discourse of political liberalism and globalization originated from the theory of International Political Economy: it can be an undercover for pursuing Sri Lanka's unilateral ethno-nationalist governance in Sri Lanka and its lopsided foreign policy interests in Realist International Relations. Both India and Sri Lanka should ignore the resistant but resilient voices of Tamils from Sri Lanka and India at the intra-state level though the voices may or may not have justifiable claims. The internationalized and globalized diplomatic discussions and decisions between two countries should be purely political in realist's terms, not cultural or moral.

2: Discourse of Economic globalization: *it can be a strategy to implicate India, the EU, the North American countries, and Japan in the already collapsed state of security and stability at the intra-state level in the name of safeguarding their investment interests.*

3: Discourse of 'political globalization': *the political governance and sovereignty of Sri Lanka can be 'insured' in these states of power blocs functioning as 'insurance companies' selling short term insurance of governable stability and territorial integrity for the countries which have opened up their frontiers for economic globalization. Globalization can be a cover-up for discrimination and state terrorism at the intra-state level.*

4: Discourse of National Security: *Sri Lanka is primarily concerned about its national security and national economy on the basis of the theories of political realism and neo-realism of international relations even at the expense of disregarding ethnic harmony and equal distribution of resources of economic and human development*

5: Discourse of Development: *On realist's terms, Sri Lanka is obsessed with the perceived threat of India's growing global power status at the political front and with its development projects such as the SSP in the South India specifically in Tamil Nadu at the economical front. Sri Lanka fears that this dual development trend will bring far-reaching benefits to India but will bring far-reaching consequences and threats to Sri Lanka at both political and economic fronts.*

6: Discourse of Neighborhood Politics: *India is the sole creator of the emergence of the Tamil militants as a powerful force equivalent to the Srilankan security forces and hence its impact on Sri Lanka's sovereignty and unitary character. It should accept full responsibility for it and should take a prominent role in liquidating the establishment of the power base and strength of them. India should be ashamed of its past acts in the present circumstances of its much praised cloak 'the world's largest democracy' pursuing globalized liberal path. Under the pretext of the global commitments of India, Sri Lanka can implicate India in the intra-state ethnic conflict in Sri Lanka according to the unilateral ethno-nationalist agenda.*

7: Discourse of Peace and Diplomacy: *Using the discourse of peace process, diplomatic negotiation, and international intervention, the still pervasive and inherent ethno-nationalist extremism of the dominant majority and its intransigence in denial of devolving power with other communities can be backgrounded. Using the discourse of diplomatic assistance and Indian intervention underscores Sri Lanka's ultimate aim of soliciting Indian military assistance. The efficient discourse and rhetoric of international diplomacy and global political governance is*

more important than the efficient empirical implementation of addressing the grievances of the affected communities at the intra-state level.

8: Discourse of Non-violence: *The criticism of the non-observance of the Gandhian principles by India while having acquired the nuclear power can be a distraction from the criticism of the non-observance of the Buddhist's principles by Sri Lanka in resolving the conflict and exposes the fact that Sri Lanka can still follow the double standards.*

This also allows a smooth attribution of the Sri Lankan government's war against terrorism while suppressing the fundamental political rights of the Tamil communities as part and parcel of the global war on terrorism. According to the discourse of war, both India and Sri Lanka still have a Common Enemy, who has the potential threat for both countries as well as for global security and the implication and recommendation of the editorial is therefore usually that both Indian and Sri Lankan governments and politicians should act vigorously to contain that threat.

Thus, the morally defensible critique of terrorism gets an ideologically much more general and political scope, viz., that relating to the interests and the (leadership) position of India in the globalized security framework. Since various forms of terrorism sponsored by the Sri Lankan governments in succession and majority Sinhala parties, the issues such as violation of human and political rights of the Tamils, Sinhala Buddhist fundamentalism and intolerance, the role of the security forces in the North-East conflict and the forcible occupation of Tamils' villages are ignored or de-emphasized in this writing. The self-serving partisan nature, the nationalism and ethnocentrism of the editorial is clearly ideological, and articulated along the fundamental ideological divide between the Sinhalese and the Tamils at the community level. All levels and dimensions of the discursive structures of the article express, with some variations, this basic fundamental ethnic divide.

The contemporary media discourse gloating on the illusive terms of globalization, political globalization, global political security, intentionally or unintentionally has become addicted to these terms of universal nature tends to bury their attention on human security and human rights in terms of individual human being and social and political organizations at the national level within this amazing, ideal yearning for globalization and global political security.

6. Conclusions

The Ideological Discourse Analysis of newspaper editorials helps to reveal the ideologies of the newspaper institution, and their attitudes in their adherence to their political parties, race, religion, language and culture both at national and international levels. The IDA exposes the representation of these ideologies at the national level as a whole, where, there is a diversity of ethnic communities whose aspirations and needs are excluded by choosing the intended discursive structures at the discourse level. Thus, this power-based representation media discourse applied in wider processes of social and cultural aspects and signifying wider power relations and ideological processes in society continues to sustain or transform the already established unequal social structures to retain the status of elitism in the society. It preserves the ideological agenda of the biased media in the regional and global political scenarios. This IDA demonstrates that the voices of marginalized nations and communities within are suppressed or not properly represented in the editorial or media discourse. However, there are newspapers and articles which could be resistant to marginalization and social discrimination if a proper IDA is carried out of them.

References:

Appeltshauer, L. Discourse, Counter-Discourse and Silence: the Need for a Sociological Approach to IR Discourse Analysis. The first Graduate Conference on Why Discourse Matters? at Frankfurt am Main, The University of Goethe. 2014.

<https://daconference2014.wordpress.com/panel-discourses-in-international-relations/>

Bell, A. *The Language of News Media*, Oxford: Black-well 1991.

Bakhtin, M. Speech genres and other late essays, ed. Emerson, C. and Holquist, M. University of Texas Press. 1986

Bourdieu, P. *Outline of a theory of a practice*, trans. Nice, R., Cambridge University Press. 1977.

Bullion, A. J. *India, Sri Lanka and the Tamil Crisis, 1976-1994: An International Perspective*. London; Pinter. 1995:

LSE,. International Relations: overview. 2016

http://www.lse.ac.uk/study/undergraduate/DegreeProgrammes2017/internationalRelations/overview_and_features.aspx | Page updated 1 Mar 2016 and accessed on 25th January 2017.

Eagly, A.H. and Chaiken, S. *The Psychology of Attitudes*. Orlando: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich quoted by Van Dijk, T.A. in Ideological Discourse Analysis, University of Amsterdam Project on Discourse and Ideology since 1993.

Fairclough, N. *Language and Power*, Longman. 1989:

Fairclough, N. Discourse and social change, Polity Press. 1992a:

Fairclough, N. Critical Discourse Analysis and the Marketization of Public Discourse: the Universities. *Discourse and Society*, 4 (2): 1993: 133-68.

Fairclough, N. Ideology and identity Change in political television. In Fairclough, N., CDA, Longman. 1995:

Fairclough, N.L. *Media Discourse*. Edward Arnold, London .1995.

Faucault, M. *The Archeology of Knowledge*, trans. Sheridan-Smith, A.M., Tavistock Publications. 1972:

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

Fowler, R., Hodge, R., Kress, G. and Trew, T. *Language and Control*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul. 1979

Fraser, N. 1989: *Unruly Practice: power, discourse and gender in contemporary social theory*, Polity Press.

Galtung, J. and Ruge, M. 'Structuring and Selecting news', in Cohen, S. and Young, J. (eds.) *The Manufacture of News: Social Problems, Deviance and the Mass Media*, London: Constable. 1973.

Goatly, A. 'Critical Reading and Writing' London: Routledge. 2000.

Gunaratna, R. *International & Regional Security Implications of the Sri Lankan Tamil Insurgency*. Sri Lanka: Bandaranaike Centre for International Studies. 1997.

Halliday, M.A.K. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*, London: Edward Arnold. 1985

Jackson, R. and Sorensen, G. *Introduction to International Relations-theories and approaches*. New York: OUP. 2003

Kadian, R. *India's Sri Lanka Fiasco*. New Delhi: Vision. 1990

Kristeva, J. Word, dialogue and novel. In Moi, T. (ed.), *The Kristeva Reader*, Basil Blackwell. 1986

Lau, R.R. and Sears, D.O. (eds). *Political Cognition*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum quoted by Van Dijk, T.A. in *Ideological Discourse Analysis*, University of Amsterdam Project on Discourse and Ideology. 1986.

Muni, S. D. *Pangs of Proximity : India and Sri Lanka's Ethnic Crisis*. New Delhi ; London: Sage. 1993

Nash, W. *Designs in Prose*, Harlow: Longman. 1980

Nawaz , S., Ahmad Bilal, H., Kalsoom, M., Fayyaz, Z. and Nayyar, H. *Media Discourse and their Implicit Ideologies: Asian Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities*. Leena and Luna International, Oyama, Japan. Vol. 2 No. 2 2013. accessed on 25th January 2017 at [http://www.ajssh.leena-luna.co.jp/AJSSHPDFs/Vol.2\(2\)/AJSSH2013\(2.2-36\).pdf](http://www.ajssh.leena-luna.co.jp/AJSSHPDFs/Vol.2(2)/AJSSH2013(2.2-36).pdf)

O'Keeffe, A. *Investigating Media Discourse*. London: Routledge. 2006.

Roychoudhury, S.M, *Securitization Theory and Internal Ethnic Conflicts: Interrogating Select Cases from India and Sri Lanka*. Working Draft To be presented in ISA Asia-Pacific Conference 2016, Hong Kong Organized by the International Studies Association, 2016.

Stubbs, M. *Discourse analysis*, Basil Blackwell. 1983:

Thompson, J.B. *Studies in the theories of Ideologies*, London: Polity Press. 1984

Trew, T. " 'What the papers say': linguistic variation and ideological difference', in Fowler et al. (eds) *Language and Control*, London: Routledge, 1979. pp. 117-56.

- Van Dijk, T. (ed.) Handbook of discourse analysis, 4 vols, Academic Press. 1985
- Van Dijk, T.A. 'News schemata', in Cooper, C.R. and Greenbaum, S., *Studying Writing; Linguistic Approaches*, London: Routledge, 1986. pp.117-56.
- Van Dijk, T.A. Discourse analysis as ideology analysis. In Wenden, A. and Schaffner, C. (eds) *Language and Peace* (in press) quoted by Van Dijk, T.A. in *Ideological Discourse Analysis*, University of Amsterdam Project on Discourse and Ideology. 1995.
- Van Dijk, T.A. Discourse semantics and ideology. *Discourse & Society* 6: 2. 243-289 quoted by Van Dijk, T.A. in *Ideological Discourse Analysis*, University of Amsterdam Project on Discourse and Ideology. 1995b.
- Van Leeuwen, T. 'Language and representation: the recontextualization of participants, activities and reactions', unpub. PhD, University of Sydney. 1993.
- Venugopal, Rajesh The Global Dimensions of Conflict in Sri Lanka- *Paper presented to the conference on "Globalization and Self-Determination Movements": Pomona College, 21st – 22nd January 2003*, Queen Elizabeth House, Univ.Oxford 2003.
- Volosinov, V.N. *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*: trans. Ladislav Matejka and Titunik, I.R: Harvard UP. 1973.
- Wetherell, M. Themes in Discourse Research: the case of Diana. In Wetherell et al (eds) *Discourse Theory and Practice* London: Sage Comprehensive and clear. 2001.
- Whorf, B. L. *Language, Thought and Reality*, Carroll, J.B. (ed) Cambridge MA: MIT Press. 1953.
- Wight, M. *International Theory: The Three Traditions*, ed. G. Wight and B. Porter. Leicester: Leicester University Press. 1991.