The Portrayal of Turkey in the British Media: Orientalism Resurfaced

*Yusuf Devran**

The aim of this research is to analyze how Turkey is portrayed by the British media. This study uses discourse analysis to examine Turkey's portrayal in two British daily newspapers, namely the Guardian and Daily Telegraph, and takes a detailed look at news items published between September 2004 and December 2005. The portrayal of Turkey in the western media helps us comprehend the stereotypes and images at work in the types of cognition European countries have about Turkey. Understanding this portrayal contributes to the development of new projects, strategies and tactics to remove negative images and mental obstacles in the minds of Europeans who remain less than enthusiastic about accepting Turkey's inclusion in the European Union. The deeply rooted conceptions and historical concerns held by European societies regarding Turkey – a country which has been trying to join the EU since 1963 – will be the main emphasis of our examination in this paper.

Introduction

There are various definitions of the concept of discourse, such as the use or practice of language, style of speech, arguments, ideology, etc., as well as a process of exchanging power by means of language use.[1] Every discourse is characterized by the standpoint of its speaker; for example the discourses of scientists, politicians, diplomats, etc., are characterized by the use of particular concepts, signs and styles of speech.[2] While actors play crucial roles in giving meaning to a discourse and making it more comprehensible, discourse in turn constructs the identity of its actors. Discourse is also accepted as a construction of reality, as every discourse has its own depiction of reality. Furthermore, the media are neither neutral nor rational mediators of events, but in fact, function to

(*) Associate Professor, Faculty of Communication, Yeditepe University, e-mail: yusufdevran@gmail.com

reproduce pre-formulated ideologies.[3] Despite this fact, the "reality" created by Western discourse, including the discourse of western media, is seen as an absolute reality by others. According to Edward Saïd, whose contribution to the understanding of the importance of discourse cannot be denied, discourse is of particularly great significance because of its depiction of "object" and "subject". Saïd emphasizes that the subject of colonial discourse, which is based on Western values, is the "we", which is presented as being superior to members of eastern cultures, and the object is "you" or "the other", which is mainly passive and negative, as determined by Western values. Such Orientalism is a style of thought based on an epistemological and ontological separation of "East" and "West." It aims to keep the East under the control of the West for economical and cultural reasons.[4]

Orientalism is a style of thought based on an epistemological and ontological separation of "East" and "West."

Our analysis of the Western media, aimed at comprehending the imaginary place of Turkey in the minds of Western people, proposes a critical and competent explanation of the issue at hand by use of the intellectual tools provided by the postcolonial theories of Western discourse. In this respect, rather than acclaiming and re-narrating the depiction of Turkey in Western media, this research will shed light on the invisible reasons, fears and anxieties that appear to be shared by European people. In the analysis that follows, the implicit meaning of the news items will be examined in order to explain the mindset presented by and reflected in the British media. This method of analysis is expected to contribute to an understanding of the difficulties that EU leaders face while making decisions regarding Turkey, and to shed light on the development of EU policies with respect to Turkey's relations with Europe.

Attractive and Effective Headlines

The news items relating to Turkey, published in *the Guardian* and *Daily Telegraph* between September 2004 and December 2005, covered various events. Among them were the relationship between Turkey and the EU, various suicide attacks organized by terrorists, the PKK issue, the Cyprus problem, the Armenian genocide claims, rising nationalism in Turkey, the pipeline project from Russia to Turkey, Mehmet Ali Agca, bird flu, the retrial of Orhan Pamuk, the condition of Turkish prisons, the adoption of new penal codes, educational issues, blood feuds, British tourists killed by bomb attacks while visiting Turkish tourist sites, honor crimes, Gallipoli ceremonies, and Lloyd George's attempt to bribe Enver Pasha.[5] As is evident from a glance at the topics alone, news items likely to create a negative image of Turkey were prevalently covered by the British media during this time.

The main question that should be raised regarding the discourse of the headlines is whether or not they summarize the meaning of the related texts clearly and completely. As seen in these headlines "EU criticizes Turkey on human rights", "Turkish criminal

folly", "EU support for Turkey 'genocide' writer", "France tells Turkey: accept Cyprus or no EU", "Turks need cultural revolution if to join EU", "Chaos at Turkish Journalists' trial", readers can easily comprehend, without reading the entire text, that Turkey is not fulfilling EU requirements. Not only did the headlines explain the news events; they also strikingly emphasized Turkey as a place subject to furious criticism because of its failure to meet EU requirements and, more generally, as an underdeveloped country in regard to its economy, its respect for human rights, and its status as a democracy.

Negative Coverage of Turkey

In the news stories from this period, the background information regarding Turkey is depicted from the viewpoint of countries that may be considered hostile toward Turkey, such as Greece, Austria, and France, from the perspective of people who have negative feelings toward Turkey. Looking specifically at the historical information used by the media regarding the Cyprus issue, the Armenian genocide claims, the PKK issue, etc., it can be seen that European newspapers have tried to instill a negative image of Turkish history in the minds of EU citizens.

Some news coverage dealt with stories about how Turkish people live in appalling housing, and how Turkish children study in primitive schools which have no separate lavatories, a condition used as an excuse by fathers to prevent their children from continuing their education. Quoting from a statement made by the education minister, one news item mainly focuses on the numbers of schools without toilets in the eastern part of Turkey, using numerical information to persuade the readers of Turkey's backwardness.[6]

The British media has also claimed that the Turkish government pays money to families in order to encourage them to send their girls to school. As seen in this paragraph from the *Guardian*, education in Turkey is described as being highly authoritarian and ideological: "Turkish textbooks, like the country's national curriculum, are viewed as among the most authoritarian and ideological in the world. Recently, schoolchildren began being "taught" democracy in an effort to promote critical thinking in a system that has long favoured learning by rote."[7] Using very detailed quotations from the qualitative surveys conducted by the UN, the British media avoids naming its sources by using passive sentences which shadow the objectiveness of the journalism and which could be interpreted as a sign of bias and prejudice.

Regarding the allegations of Armenian genocide, the British media uses dramatic and striking phrases and terms, such as "slaughter," "massacre," etc. and asserts that there was an international consensus regarding the accuracy of the claims. Proceeding as if all countries in the world have accepted the Armenian allegations, Turkey is advised to recognize the massacre of more than one million Armenians as genocide during the First World War in 1915. The phrase "slaughtering people" contributes to the construction of an intensely negative meaning for the country, implying that the Turkish people employ

this kind of killing method. Whoever reads this kind of news item, which portrays Turkish history prejudicially, will most likely have a very negative image of the country as being one full of barbarians.[8] While exaggerating the Armenian allegations, the British media omitted publication of Turkey's point of view. Its use of the phrase "Christian Armenian Community" clarifies the reason; this discourse attracts the attention of all Christians to the news event. Furthermore, statements made by Orhan Pamuk, a Turkish novelist, who was sentenced due to his baseless press declaration that "one million Armenians and 30,000 Kurds were killed in Turkey", were used in particular by the British media to back up their own rehashing of such allegations.[9]

Whoever reads the British newspapers will face various descriptions of Turkey as a poor, predominantly Muslim, culturally alien, over-crowded country with a population of 72 million; a country with a shaky democracy and economy that lies geographically outside the boundaries of Europe.[10]

According to the comments in the news items, Turkey has not proved that it had absorbed the core principles of Western democracy, including civil liberties, human rights, secularism, etc., even though there have been obvious developments. As the *Daily Telegraph* opines, "Absorbing a poor country of some 70 million will not be easy. But the negotiations and the transition period thereafter are expected to be protracted, giving Turkey ample time to pass further reforms and European leaders to prepare their electorates for the integration of a vibrant democracy that straddles the great cultural divide of our age."[11] It is highly difficult for the EU to absorb a country which is claimed to be poor and over-crowded with a population of 70 million. For this reason, according to the media, enough time should be given for Turkey to pass further reforms and make fundamental changes in its system.

The other phrase commonly used to describe Turkey is "Muslim democracy". In fact, the British media emphasizes the separation, rather than the affinity, between democratic Muslims and Christians by using the phrase "*Muslim* Democracy". This approach shows that the British media is rearticulating the discourse of the Orientalist approach, namely the distinction between "us" and the "others", as far as the West and East are concerned. Moreover, the media's "positive" presentation of the fact that there are some Europeans who want Turkey to be given a chance — within at least 10 to 15 — years to be a member of what has been called "the modern world" is, in fact, hardly positive. The reason why the media mentions the time duration of the democratization process at all is to point out that even those who are open to Turkey's membership share, at least in part, the opinion of those who are skeptical about Turkey's entrance to the EU.[12]

The British media emphasizes the separation, rather than the affinity, between democratic Muslims and Christians by using the phrase "*Muslim* Democracy"

Emphasizing that the EU is a union of civilizations based on Christianity, some journalists do not avoid describing

Turkey as a predominantly Muslim country, as observed in this statement: "The decision ended a week of crisis with Brussels over Turkey's efforts to become the EU's first predominantly Muslim member."[13] European attitudes toward Turkey's Muslim majority seem to explain why Turkey has been subjected to the toughest terms ever imposed on any EU applicant.

The other interesting point is that in the quotations from Abdullah Gul, the foreign minister of Turkey, the phrase "inşallah" –meaning God willing - is always placed in the sentences with inverted commas to indicate that Gul and his government are highly pro-Islamic. Even though the Turkish foreign minister does use the term "inşallah", the journalist could have translated it into English as "hopefully", which is essentially what it has come to mean in Turkey today. But they preferred not to use the term 'hopefully'. Such journalistic choices reinforce the discourse constructed by the British media which depicts Turkey as a predominantly Muslim country with a religious government.

On a brighter note, while the statement which portrays Turkey as a Muslim country with a population of 70 million is accepted as a negative discourse by France, Austria and the Netherlands, which are strongly opposed to Turkey, Britain appreciates Turkey's diversity as a form of cultural richness and an advantage for a multicultural Europe. For this reason, Tony Blair and his ministers stress that Turkey's presence will help relations with millions of Muslims in today's EU, and accentuate the point that accepting a country which has very different religious understandings, democratic traditions and points of view would serve to indicatie that the EU is a place of a harmony of differences.

It has been claimed in some news items that the European people are worried about the Euro-Turks who have emigrated to Europe from the underdeveloped regions of Anatolia and are therefore concerned about Turkey's presence in the EU. Because the Turkish immigrants in question came from underdeveloped areas, these undereducated people faced serious difficulties in learning the language of the countries in which they settled. Consequently, Turko-Swedes or Turko-German dialects are emerging which are linguistic reflections of identity.[14] In addition to such media claims regarding the detrimental effects of Turkish presence in Europe, the immigration of Turkish people into Europe is described using the term "pour", which connotes that Turkish people are steadily streaming into Europe in undifferentiated crowds. Emphasizing the unpredictable results of Turkish migration, this metaphor implies that these uneducated and peasant Turks experienced serious difficulties in adapting to Western values and integrating into a foreign civilization. Taking these concerns to an extreme, it has been claimed, with a quotation from Bernard Lewis, the pre-eminent British scholar of Islam, that with the immigration of millions of Muslims from abroad, causing an increase in the Muslim population, Europe will become dominated by Muslims.[15]

In contrast to what the Western media claims, Jack Straw, the former British foreign minister, described Turkey in the following statement "I'm in absolutely no doubt that the benefits will follow from this enlargement and bring a strong secular state, which happens to have a Muslim majority, into the European Union" to an attempt to rid negative opinions and fears promulgated by the media all over the EU.[16]

The Media Coverage of EU-Turkey Relations

Since relations between the EU and Turkey had the most coverage during the period under analysis, news items regarding Turkey's entry into the EU will now be examined in detail to reveal the main reasons why some EU leaders have fears and anxieties regarding Turkey. Not only are the sources used in the texts important, but the connotative meanings of the terms used also play a very significant role in disclosing the intention of the journalists and the media.

The Long Duration of the EU Membership Process

As seen in the changing discourse of the paragraphs regarding the membership process, which started with the Ankara treaty in 1963, the duration of Turkey's membership process to the EU has been depicted in different manners. With phrases like, "No country other than Turkey has had to wait 42 years at Europe's door. With each new condition the European Union places on Turkey's joining the EU, anger has raised and now the country is engulfed by anti-EU feelings"[17] the situation of Turkey is emphasized in order to show that Turkey has faced different and exceptional conditions and procedures since 1963. The phrase "Europe's door" is a very clear metaphor depicting Turkey's position vis-à-vis the European Union. Keeping someone waiting at the door of an office connotes that the outsider has a demand which the person in the office is reluctant to meet.

Similar to the phrase "Europe's door", the phrase "the waiting room of Europe" in the following sentence, "After 42 years in the waiting room of Europe, Turkey generated one last day of tension and brinksmanship"[18] shows how Turkey has been kept waiting in front of the EU and how it has been humiliated with unequal treatment during the membership process. Keeping someone in the waiting room implies that the person who is keeping people waiting has power, superiority, authority and the initiative to accept or reject the person waiting to see him. In addition to expressing of a power differential, the word order in particular sentences clarifies the tedium of membership talks, as in the case of the phrase, "After 42 years of waiting", which is positioned at the beginning of the sentence. Furthermore, Turkey's lengthy EU journey has also been depicted with the phrase, "Knocking on the door of the European Union for 40 years", again emphasizing the long lasting process of membership and depicting Turkey's relative weakness.[19]

According to the discourse of the news items, the EU is so skeptical about Turkey that it will "scrutinize" every aspect of Turkey's adoption of its regulations, regarding, in particular, its track record in respect to human rights and civil liberties. The reason why the word "scrutinize" is preferred in news texts has to do with the EU's anxiety about the judiciary system in Turkey. Additionally, this word implies that the EU has the absolute power and moral superiority with which to question and correct the system of a candidate country which has an unsuitable or improper administrative system.[20]

Unlike the *Daily Telegraph*, *The Guardian* depicted Turkey's application process as a 40-year 'dream' of joining the European Union, and described the EU as a 'family' which

Turkey is portrayed as a country that has no power or initiative to resist EU regulations which are further presented as unalterable, and as an ultimate series of rules

shares the same values and has a very strong relationship among its members. Additionally, the Guardian preferred not to use metaphors or phrases like "waiting room", and "knocking on Europe's door", etc. to exaggerate the fact that Turkey has been kept away from the negotiation table deliberately or to emphasize that Turkey has been placed in a humiliating position in the process.[21] While the *Daily Telegraph* describes the EU as a club, *The Guardian* defines it as a family. The difference between these two sociological concepts is that while the members of clubs are tied to each other by official rules, the relationships between family members are based mainly on unofficial and highly intimate principles.[22] Furthermore, the phrase "European family" is important in terms of emphasizing blood ties and kinship among the members of the EU nations, nations that are highly compatible with each other; it implies that Turkey should be in perfect harmony with the other members if it wants to join the EU without raising serious doubts.

Based on exhausting and interminable discussions, the EU's decision about launching the process of talks with Turkey was described as a historic decision for Europe and for the international community as a whole by some European authorities, in particular, Tony Blair, the British prime minister, and his foreign secretary, Jack Straw. This discourse projects two significant meanings, one of which emphasizes the importance of the decision as a turning point for both sides, with the other one emphasizing the difficulty of reaching a consensus.[23]

Turkey as a Country Warned and Criticized by the EU

When the media's output is analyzed in detail, it becomes clear that Turkey is constantly under scrutiny by the European Union, which warns, criticizes and threatens Turkish practices so that they meet its requirements, which amount to eighty thousands pages of regulations. Additionally, EU authorities make it clear that if Turkey does not obey its EU obligations and instead violates Europe's core values, the membership process will face a very serious threat and may be halted.[24] Being chastised with what has been called a "blunt warning" from Brussels, Turkey is portrayed as a country that has no power or initiative to resist EU regulations which are further presented as unalterable, and as an ultimate series of rules. Moreover, the word 'warn" is mainly used as a response when a person or institution resists the tasks it has to implement.[25] As seen in this statement "…EU leaders warned [R. Tayyip Erdogan] against the proposal, saying it suggested that he was seeking to lead Turkey towards Islamic rule. Mr. Erdogan then withdrew the proposal"[26], it seems that Turkey is so strictly under the control of the EU authorities that it is impossible for a law to be passed in the Turkish National Assembly without their consent. Thus, it is made clear that the EU regulations should be taken as a measure before adopting new codes; otherwise, warnings from Brussels will reach Ankara as soon as the newspapers cover the event. Not

only do the EU authorities send a message of warning to Ankara but they have also accused the Turkish Government, and sometimes the prime minister, of not meeting its EU commitments and of diverting Turkey towards the Islamic side. In other words, passing over the EU boundaries is perceived as moving towards Islam, which is described as the opposite or wrong direction.

The intention of the Turkish government in putting Europe's requests into practice is emphasized with the word "bow" which has a negative association and depicts the pressure of the European Union and the inability of Turkey to stand firm. Being a term which is mainly used in religious texts, "bow" indicates the weakness of a man in front of an unbearable power, such as, God. Use of the term "bow" in such news briefs as the following, "Turkey's parliament last night bowed to European Union demands and passed a liberalizing penal code which should open the way to talks with Ankara on EU membership"[27] implies that the authority of the EU is superior to that of the Turkish National Assembly, which is the highest institution representing the sovereignty of Turkish society.

The rhetorical dimensions of the news items that cover the warnings by EU ministers are so strong that readers can easily be convinced that Turkey deserves such treatment

The rhetorical dimensions of the news items that cover the warnings by EU ministers are so strong that readers can easily be convinced that Turkey deserves such treatment. Since Turkey signed agreements with the EU, it has promised full cooperation and obedience to EU regulations, without any exception. For instance, Turkey is expected to apply the Ankara protocol, signed by Turkey and EU members, which allows all 25 EU countries - including the Greek Cypriots - to trade with Turkey in 2005, and now it is expected that Turkey will lift the embargo it had applied to Greek Cypriots.

Conditional Clauses and the Atmosphere of Fear and Anxiety

The statements of authorized people from the European Union include various conjunctions, such as "if," "unless," "although," "even though," "even if," etc., to imply that Turkey's entrance to the 'European family' is bound by certain regulations which have to be obeyed without exception, as implied in this paragraph: "Turkey's hard line stance is destabilizing lengthy membership talks. Mr. Rehn made clear last week Turkey could be in trouble unless it changes its ways by the time the commission publishes its annual progress report in the autumn. 'We may face a period of political tension in EU-Turkey relations,' he told Reuters. 'The commission is working to avoid a train crash at the end of the year' The European Commission fears the membership talks could unravel unless Turkey abides by its commitments."[28] Instead of confirming that Turkey will be a member of the EU if it meets the requirements, the sentences stress the negative side of the membership process by focusing on improbable, negative developments and emphasizes

Turkey is described as a country that is not only economically but also culturally different and underdeveloped; that is, it is seen as the 'other' in Europe

that Turkey will face serious obstacles causing the loss of its chance to be part of the European family. Thus, fear and anxiety is spread not only among the members of the EU but also in the realm of Turkish public opinion, planting the idea that Turkey will not be subjected to an objective evaluation process by EU authorities.

Additionally, as clearly stated in the following sentence, "Turkey must undergo a 'major cultural revolution' if it is ever to join the European Union, France's President Jacques Chirac insisted yesterday"[29], Turkey either must experience a major cultural revolution or its membership process will be cancelled automatically. In fact, this is the way in which the leaders of some European countries, such as France or Austria, attempt to douse the aspirations of opposition leaders regarding Turkey in their countries. As seen in the quotation above, Jacques Chirac, the French president, insists that Turkey bring about a cultural revolution by using phrases like "must", "insistent" and "ever", which emphasize the authority of his determination of the subject. Needles to say, Turkey is described as a country that is not only economically but also culturally different and underdeveloped; that is, it is seen as the 'other' in Europe. In other words, Turkey, being culturally the other, can be a member country only if it transforms its eastern culture to 'the' Western one.

The reason why some EU officials prefer to use conditional sentences with ifs, even ifs, etc. is because they are trying to stress that the latest decision will be made by taking the public opinion of the EU countries into consideration; this is done in order not to lose political support and also because they want to hint that Turkey will never join the EU family as a Muslim country. As stated by Ursula Plassnik, the Austrian foreign minister, "... entry would depend on the EU's ability to "absorb" new nations."[30] As Turkey's membership bid continues, EU authorities repeatedly put forward new concepts that are unfamiliar, and which are subject to discussions and debate. So, Turkey is compared to a marathon runner who is struggling to reach an end point which is continuously extended by the authorities, preventing him from finishing the race.

Turkey as an Obedient Country before the EU

Discourse is defined as the exchange of ideas between those who communicate with each other, and implies which party is relatively more powerful. In Turkey the phrase *müzakere* is used most often to describe the talks between the Turkey and the EU. With an Arabic root, the word *müzakere* denotes that two equal sides are exchanging views about related issues. The term denotes respect and common understanding and the idea that neither side has the right to get the other to do something without his/her consent. Contrary to this, EU officials prefer to use various phrases such as "talks" or "discussions", which do not carry the same positive meaning as *müzakere*.

It can be clearly observed that Turkey's statements towards the EU have been depicted in the westerm media through the use of various words such as "pleas," or "talks," etc., all of which connote that Turkey is powerless and asking for the mercy of the EU. Contrary to this, Europe's explanations are expressed in terms like "request," "putting pressure," "pressing," "warning," etc., which connote that the EU has superiority and a right over Turkey to keep it on track during the membership process. As can be seen clearly in this sentence, "Turkey's plea splits Brussels hierarchy,"[31] Turkey has no power of initiative, but the EU is in a position to do it a favor. Furthermore, with the above-mentioned phrases, like press, warn or push, it is implied that Turkey does not want to do its homework, so the EU is forcing it to do whatever is needed by means of blackmail or threats. The phrase "push" implies that someone is not willingly moving, but rather is being forced. The discourse regarding the position of Turkey depicts the approaches of an upper class country towards a lower class one. This is how the West describes its culture and identity, because, as Derrida states, an identity's constitution is always based on excluding something and establishing a violent hierarchy between the two resultant poles – man/woman, etc.[32]

> Turkey is compared to a marathon runner who is struggling to reach an end point which is continuously extended by the authorities, preventing him from finishing the race

Unlike the discourse of the British media and the EU officials, the discourse of R. Tayyip Erdogan, the Turkish prime minister, implies that Turkey has equal rights similar to other EU candidate countries and should be treated fairly. Even though the discourse of the EU officials connotes that the EU's is the superior side, Erdogan insists on emphasizing that Turkey has some sort of power to accept or reject its requests. Similar phrases and terms which indicate that Turkey is able to correct the errors of the EU are used in this statement by R. Tayyip Erdogan "Mr Erdogan warned yesterday that the EU would have passed up an opportunity to bridge a "clash of civilizations" between the Christian and Muslim worlds if it scuppered Turkey's dream of joining the European mainstream... "Either [the EU] will show political maturity and become a global power, or it will end up a Christian club,"[33] this is to say, Erdogan is struggling to locate Turkey on an equal footing with the EU at the level of discourse. While *The Guardian* gives place to the discourse of the Turkish prime minister, the *Daily Telegraph* often constructs the news items regarding Turkey from the viewpoint and discourse of the EU authorities. For instance, it prefers not to use phrases like "request" or "warn" when delivering the statement of the Turkish authorities; instead, the most frequent phrases are "Turkey told the EU" or "Turkey said to the EU"[34]

How Can an Enemy be Transformed into a Family Member?

The relationships between Turkey and the European countries are depicted in various ways. While Greece, Greek Cyprus and Austria are depicted as enemies of Turkey, other countries, including France and the Netherlands, are portrayed as opposing countries.

Turkish "enemies" Greece and Austria have undergone unforgettable historical experiences with Turkey, which can be found in textbooks; this helps to create stereotypes in the minds of their citizens against Turkey. For instance, for Austrian society, the siege of Vienna has a symbolic meaning that creates indelible negative stereotypes about Turkey. Greece has similar memories dating back to the Ottoman Empire and both the Turks and Greeks have negative images about each other dating from this time. Now, the most difficult question is how these stereotypes can be cleansed from the memory in the West and replaced with another one, creating a positive image of Turkey.[35]

Because of its combination of modern-day fears about Muslim immigration and historical suspicion, Austria comes to the fore in the matter of Turkey's EU accession, unlike the other 25 members of the EU. The subconscious attitude of the Austrian voters determines the main policies of the political parties regarding Turkey. Schussel, the Austrian prime minister, runs two-faced policies giving two different messages about Turkey, one of which is given behind closed doors at the EU and the other delivered in front of public opinion. Furthermore, Austria abuses Turkish membership for the sake of Croatia, which is described as a fellow Christian country, in its bid to become a member of the European family. The following quotations clarify the inconsistent position of the Austrian prime minister: "Mr Schussel, whose fragile conservative coalition faces tricky provincial elections on Sunday, said he was only listening to public opinion. EU diplomats expressed deep cynicism, noting that he had personally endorsed the existing wording of Turkey's accession agreement, not once but twice, at successive summits of all 25 EU heads of state and government."[36] "Turkey will today face a new setback to its EU ambition when Austria declares that it is wrong to open membership talks with Ankara while blocking Austria's near neighbor - and fellow Christian country - Croatia."[37] The difference between the *Daily Telegraph* and *The Guardian* in terms of covering Austria's two-faced attitude towards Turkey is that while the Guardian defines it as hostility, the *Daily Telegraph* prefers to explain the situation by using the phrase "Turko-phobic"[38]

Looking beyond contemporary media coverage, there is a great deal of material that creates negative images and stereotypes against the Turks in history books, plays, movies, etc. in Western countries

The policies executed by France, another opposing country, are depicted as an "Asterix complex" by the German ambassador to Paris. Like Austrian Prime Minister Schussels, French President Jacques Chirac always follows a hypocritical policy regarding Turkey, giving positive messages to the Turkish authorities and the opposite to the French public opinion, owing to fears of losing public support.

In fact, looking beyond contemporary media coverage, there is a great deal of material that creates negative images and stereotypes against the Turks in history books, plays, movies, etc. in Western countries. For example, some parts of Shakespeare's *Othello* are very good examples of a Western source depicting a negative Turkish image.

Othello presents a colonial picture of the "Moor" lost in a superior culture. Othello is admirably proud, but also not that bright. The same implication that a potential invader combines danger with amusement value is there in the explicitly Turkish sexual politics of Mozart's *Entführung* and particularly in its central character Osmin, a comical figure, but also a menacing presence.[39]

Rhetorical Devices Used in News Items

News rhetoric is a term that encompasses the persuasive dimensions of texts by focusing on the devices used to convince readers; there are many devices, such as alliteration, encomium, exemplification, showing evidence, comparison, using attribution and numerical information, etc. that can be used to persuade readers in the course of constructing a news story. Various rhetorical devices are used in the Turkish news items published in the British media. The narrative dimensions of the texts are very strong and, in addition, it appears as if they are structured specifically to create a negative image of Turkey. In particular, numerical information, attributions from credible sources, historical information, quotations from various opinion polls, comparisons, etc. are among those devices which are applied most. For instance, the following quotation cites public opinion research: "France and Austria have both promised their citizens referendums on Turkish entry. A recent European Commission opinion poll showed 70 per cent of French voters opposed to Turkish entry, and 80 per cent of Austrians."[40] Taking advantage of quotations from various leaders of EU countries is another tactic of constructing more persuasive texts. For instance, Silvio Berlusconi's statement is quoted to emphasize Turkey's possible position if the EU refuses to launch talks with it. According to Berlusconi, the former Italian prime minister, if rejected Turkey would feel like a spurned lover and if love is rejected, it can turn to hate.[41]

Regarding the EU, reputable sources are EU officials, European leaders, ministers, the EU commission, EU experts, etc., and journalists very often quote from them to strengthen the rhetorical dimension of their news texts. Furthermore, they prefer statements from sources that are consistent with what they really believe, and they do not avoid giving more coverage to radical politicians who are furious about accepting a Muslim country as a member of what they call the "Christian club".

Exemplifying is one of the most frequently used rhetorical devices in news items. It is preferred in particular to support and justify the policies of leaders who oppose Turkey's entry. This is why opinion polls are the most frequent type of examples applied in this regard. As seen in the following quotation there are many examples quoted from surveys conducted by various institution in order to measure opinions regarding the enlargement policies of the EU. As in the case of the following quotation, emphasizing a poll that indicates 40% of EU citizens want Turkey to be a member of the EU family, with the figure falling to 20% and 10% in France and Austria, the news items aims to deliver a message to the EU authorities who have promised that the citizens will have the last say, letting them know

In the discourse of the British media, Turkey is portrayed as an invader in Cyprus and a country that is keeping its soldiers illegally on the island

that they should not make any decisions without taking public opinion into consideration: "Surveys suggest less than 40% of EU citizens want Turkey to join, with the figure falling to around 20% and 10% in France and Austria respectively. Both countries have said they intend to hold referendums on whether Turkey should be allowed to join the EU"[42]

Irony is another rhetorical device that is used in news items. In this sentence, "Turkey, which in its earlier, Ottoman form occupied much of the Balkans, and therefore cut them off from what was then the Christian club of Europe, is now the European door-opener for its former colonies."[43] One of the probable missions of Turkey in the EU is ironically delivered by means of a comparison with what the Ottoman Empire did, conquering the Balkans up to Austria and cutting them off from Europe. Appealing to emotions, namely using pathos is also an effective way of convincing and motivating readers. Even though it is rarely the preferred way of delivering a message, pathos is used when mothers' feelings regarding EU enlargement are expressed.[69]

The Cyprus Issue and the Portrayal of Turkey

In the discourse of the British media, Turkey is portrayed as an invader in Cyprus and a country that is keeping its soldiers illegally on the island. Regarding the Republic of Northern Cyprus, which is mainly depicted as "Turkish-controlled North Cyprus," or "the breakaway Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus," or Turkish Cypress, etc., the discourse used by both newspapers is similarly negative.[44] Since Turkey is portrayed as an invader on the island, with its army being kept there illegally, according to this discourse the invaded island belongs to another country, namely Greek Cyprus, rather than Turkey. Turkey is also portrayed as doing something wrong in rejecting the recognition of Greek Cyprus, which is recognized internationally. So, in keeping with international consensus, Turkey should withdraw its soldiers from the island. In short, the discourse of the British newspapers is parallel to that constructed by Western countries against Turkey.

There is a bombardment of information by the newspapers that contradicts the thesis put forward by Turkey. As can be clearly understood from the following comments made by the journalist at the end of news items from both papers, readers may justify the demands of the Greek side: "Turkey has steadfastly refused to have diplomatic relations with Greek-dominated Cyprus since Turkey invaded the island in the wake of an Athens-inspired coup in 1974. Ankara claims recognition can only come when the two feuding sides agree to sign a UN peace settlement."[45] "Turkish troops invaded the Turkish-controlled north of the island in 1974 after Greek-Cypriot nationalists sought to join Cyprus with Greece. Turkey's refusal to co-operate with United Nations efforts to reunite the island, and its record on

human rights, were long cited by the EU as the chief reasons for refusing to give it membership."[46] To state this more clearly, in every comment the phrase "invasion" is used by the newspapers to emphasize that the 1974 operation by the Turkish army was illegal and unjustifiable. Furthermore, the name Turkey is particularly emphasized with active sentences when a negative event is attributed to it. As in the case of these two sentences: "Turkey has steadily refused ... or Turkish troops invaded..."[47] In both papers, Turkey is characterized as a country which steadily makes negative steps and which does not cooperate with the United Nations. In short, the perception of both the *Daily Telegraph* and the *Guardian*, regarding the Cyprus issue is so similar that sentence patterns, phrases and background information are almost identical.

The name Turkey is particularly emphasized with active sentences when a negative event is attributed to it

Portrayal of the PKK

The PKK is one of the issues that takes up the most coverage in the British media. Although the organization is responsible for killing more than thirty thousand soldiers and innocent citizens in Turkey, it is depicted as a Kurdish separatist and freedom organization. The leader of the PKK, Abdullah Öcalan, is portrayed as a guerilla leader and its members are defined as insurgent Kurdish people, paramilitary groups, guerilla groups, separatists or freedom fighters. Even though the PKK has been officially recognized as a terrorist organization by the EU, British newspapers avoid using the same attribution. Giving very detailed information about the PKK problem in Turkey, these newspapers somehow never mention how Turkey, and particularly the army, has suffered heavy losses because of its terrorist attacks since 1984.[48]

Describing the PKK assaults and massacres that took place in the 1980's and the 1990's as "insurrections," the newspapers, as can be seen in the quotation below, criticize the Turkish army for its brutal reprisals to PKK actions: "Across the country's troubled south-east, which bore the brunt of the Kurdish insurrection of the Eighties and Nineties and the state's brutal response to it, security forces are on high alert. Kongra-Gel, the Kurdish paramilitary group once called the PKK, has renounced its five-year ceasefire. Human rights groups say more than 400 people have died since the summer".[49]

It should be pointed out that this kind of discourse is so problematic that the agent of the event is not mentioned in the news items and consequently the reason why the people lost their lives is unknown. The following quotation is similarly misleading: "Guerrillas of the Kurdistan Workers' Party, or PKK, have battled government forces in a conflict that has killed more than 37,000 people in south eastern Turkey since 1984."[50] It has been claimed that the reason why people lost their lives is because of the conflict between the armed forces and what are called the Kurdish guerillas. The *Guardian* puts it thus: "Last year, rebels of the Kurdistan Workers' Party (PKK) resumed a long armed insurrection, which

The discourse of the British media regarding Turkey is not the reason for, but rather the result of, a deep-rooted Orientalist discourse

had petered out five years earlier. More than 35,000 people were killed in the first bout of bloodshed, and at least 100 Turkish soldiers have died in the past year."[51] Describing the Kurdish people as a minority, Diyarbakır as a Kurdish rather than a Turkish city, and terrorist attacks as a freedom struggle, the British media uses passive sentences in order not to create a negative image of the PKK, thus disguising its roles and responsibilities.

Taking an active role in international politics, the British media claimed that international public opinion was not convinced that Öcalan was judged in an objective way according to the laws. Consequently, the Court of Human Rights requested that Turkey retry him. The main question, which should be raised at this moment, is how the newspapers can be so sure about a worldwide opinion that Ocalan was not judged according to legitimate principles.[52]

Conclusions

It has been observed that the relationship between Turkey and Europe dates back to the period of the Ottoman Empire, and that the conflicts experienced then have created stereotypes and images of Turkey in the memory of European nations. The discourse of the British media regarding Turkey is not the reason for, but rather the result of, a deep-rooted Orientalist discourse and it is clear evidence that this discourse is still very effective in shaping texts about Turkey. For this reason, Turkey should find a way to change the stereotypes that the European nations hold about it. The EU media should abandon their habits of covering events from a negative approach which create and sustain a negative image of Turkey in the European mind. European public opinion regarding Turkey will not change unless the media abandons its biases and prejudices. Therefore, the European media must be aware of their responsibilities before determining how to cover and construct news events regarding a country which has strong and historical ties with European countries. In short, the reason why Turkey's entry to the EU is relatively more remote is due to the effects of an Orientalist discourse that describes Turkey as the 'other' in terms of cultural differences.

Endnotes:

1. Regarding the research methodology see; Bell, A. & Garret, P. (Eds.). (1998). *Approaches to Media Discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell and van Dijk, T. A. (1985). *Discourse and Communication: New Approaches to the Analysis of Mass Media Discourse and Communication*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
2. Sözen, E. (1999). Söylem: belirsizlik, mübadele, bilgi/güç ve refleksivite. İstanbul: Paradigma Yayınları.
3. Hall, S., Hobson, D., Lowe, A.,&Willis, P. (Eds.). (1980). *Culture, media, language*. London: Hutchinson.

4. Said, E. (1982). *Oryantalism*. İstanbul: Pınar yayınları.
5. According to the files released by MI6 at the National Achieves at Kew, Lloyd George was prepared to pay $25 million in bribes through a secret agent to persuade Turkey to pull out of the First World War.
6. The Daily Telegraph, July 19, 2004.
7. The Guardian, February 22, 2005
8. The Guardian, April 23, 2005.
9. *Ibid*.
10. The Guardian, July 05, 2005 and The Daily Telegraph, October 02, 2005.
11. The Daily Telegraph, October 04, 2005.
12. The Daily Telegraph, December 18, 2004.
13. The Daily Telegraph, September 27, 2004.
14. The Daily Telegraph, December 19, 2004.
15. *Ibid*.
16. The Guardian, October 4, 2005.
17. The Daily Telegraph, September 02, 2005.
18. The Daily Telegraph, October 10, 2005.
19. The Daily Telegraph, December 18, 2004.
20. The Daily Telegraph, October 04, 2005.
21. The Guardian, August 27, 2005.
22. The Daily Telegraph, October 07, 2004.
23. The Guardian, October 3, 2005.
24. The Daily Telegraph, October 10, 2005.
25. The Guardian, April 26, 2006.
26. The Daily Telegraph, September 27, 2004.
27. *Ibid*.
28. The Guardian, April 26, 2006.
29. The Daily Telegraph, October 05, 2005.
30. The Daily Telegraph, October 04, 2005.
31. The Daily Telegraph, June 30, 2005.
32. Hall, S. (1996) '*Introduction: Who Needs Cultural Identity*?" in S. Hall and P. Du Gay (eds.) *Questions of Cultural Identity*. London: Sage. p. 4-5.
33. The Guardian, October 3, 2005.
34. The Daily Telegraph, September 18, 2004.
35. The Guardian, October 3, 2005.
36. The Daily Telegraph, September 30, 2005.
37. The Guardian, September 14, 2005.
38. The Guardian, October 3, 2005.
39. The Guardian, February 11, 2005.
40. The Daily Telegraph, October 05, 2005.
41. *Ibid*.
42. The Guardian, October 4, 2005.
43. The Guardian, October 6, 2005.
44. The Daily Telegraph, June 28, 2005.
45. The Guardian, August 5, 2005.
46. The Daily Telegraph, December 16, 2004.
47. *Ibid*.
48. The Guardian, November 26, 2005.
49. The Guardian, December 19, 2004.
50. The Guardian, November 26, 2005
51. The Guardian, August 13, 2005.
52. The Guardian, May 13, 2005.