



The Journal of Academic Social Science Studies

JASSS

International Journal of Social Science

Doi number: <http://dx.doi.org/10.9761/JASSS2267>

Number: 24 , p. 251-282, Spring 2014

DAVOS OLAYININ GAZETE KÖŞE YAZILARI BAĞLAMINDA SÖYLEM ÇÖZÜMLEMESİ*

*THE REPRESENTATION OF THE DAVOS EVENT IN TURKISH DAILY
NEWSPAPER EDITORIALS*

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Nazlı BAYKAL

Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Bölümü

Özet

Bu çalışmanın amacı, Başbakan R.T. Erdoğan'ın 2009 yılında İsviçre'nin Davos şehrinde gerçekleştirilen Dünya Ekonomik Forumun'da tanık olunan 'one minute' çıkışının, iki zıt politik görüşte günlük gazetenin köşe yazılarına nasıl yansındığını incelemektir. Köşe yazılarında kullanılan dil tümcelerinin anlam içeriğinin betimlenmesiyle incelenecektir. Bu inceleme dizgeci-işlevsel dilbilgisinin başlıca inceleme yöntemlerinden olan geçişlilik çözümlemesi yoluyla yapılacaktır. Geçişlilik, anlamın tümcede simgelenme şeklidir. Bu inceleme aracılığıyla, ideolojik farklılıkların dilsel seçimler yoluyla gazetelerde okuyucuya nasıl aktarıldığı betimlenmeye çalışılacaktır. Geçişlilik çözümlemesi, ideolojik yönlendirmeli söylemlerde cümle içindeki bazı anlamsal ilişkilerin dilin sözcük-dilbilgisel (lexicogrammatical) yapısından nasıl aktarıldığını irdeleyen bir çözümleme yöntemidir. Geçişlilik çözümlemesinin gerçekleştirilmesi için metinde belli süreç türlerinin ve katılımcıların kullanılıp kullanılmadığı ve bunların metinde nasıl konumlandırıldığı ortaya çıkarılmalıdır. Dilin düşünsel (ideational), bireylerarası (interpersonal), ve metinsel (textual) işlevleri aracılığıyla sözdizimsel öğelerin örüntüleme seçenekleri ortaya çıkar. Bu çalışmada, dilin düşünsel işlevi aracılığıyla ve geçişlilik çözümlemesi yöntemiyle, farklı politik görüşlerde iki gazetede

*Bu makale Crosscheck sistemi tarafından taranmış ve bu sistem sonuçlarına göre orijinal bir makale olduğu tespit edilmiştir.

bulunan köşe yazılarındaki önermesel geçişlilik yapıları ortaya çıkarılacaktır. Geçişlilik çeşitli dilsel seçenekler sağladığı için, metindeki süreç türlerinin ve katılımcıların farklı konumlandırılmaları, politik bakış açısını yansıtan, ideolojik olarak anlamlı dilsel seçim örnekleri köşe yazılarında sergilenmektedir.

Bu çalışmanın veri tabanını oluşturan, Başbakan Erdoğan'ın Davos çıkışını konu alan köşe yazarları, eylemin kendisi ve eyleme dahil olanlara ilişkin anlamsal rolleri düzenlerken ve tümcelerini yapılandırırken, kendi ideolojilerine göre, belli dilsel örüntüleme seçimleri yapmışlar ve bu seçimlerle de eylemin öğelerini farklı biçimde konumlandırmışlardır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Eleştirel Söylem Çözümlemesi, geçişlilik çözümlemesi, medya dili, ideolojik karşıtlık, dizgeci-işlevsel dilbilgisi

Abstract

The aim of this article is to investigate the ideological opposition appeared, as a result of Turkish Prime Minister Erdogan's Davos outburst in 2009, in World Economic forum in Switzerland, in Turkish daily newspaper editorials. The study concentrates on the representations of the Davos event in the editorials of two daily newspapers of opposing political and ideological stance.

The analysis aims to identify, through transitivity analysis from the Systemic Functional Grammar, and explain how ideology is constructed and presented through language use in two ideologically opposing Turkish newspapers' editorial sections. The analysis of transitivity indicates how, through choices from the lexicogrammar, certain semantic roles and relationships are reproduced in the ideologically constructed discursive practices. Through positioning of participants and process choices, and their positioning in the clause, we could reasonably speculate on the ideologies of the news reports. By means of ideational, interpersonal and textual functions of language, aspects of clause grammar which have to do with ideational meanings will be focused on in this study. Emphasis will be placed on the construction of ideological discourse by determining the transitivity patterns expressed with propositions through representational processes in the two Turkish daily newspapers editorials of opposing political stance.

The findings indicate that linguistic choices of transitivity play a fundamental role in propagation of dominant ideologies both implicitly and explicitly in newspaper editorials.

Key Words: Critical discourse analysis, media discourse, systemic functional grammar, transitivity analysis, ideological opposition

The aim of this article is to examine the application of transitivity, from the Sytemic Functional Grammar, as a theoretical tool in the analysis of ideology in the print media. The analysis aims to identify and explain how ideology is constructed and presented through language use in two Turkish newspapers of opposing ideologies, concentrating, specifically, on the Turkish editorial media coverage of the event of Turkish Prime Minister Erdogan's walking out of Davos Economic Forum in Switzerland in January 2009.

The findings indicate that linguistic choices of transitivity play a fundamental role in propagation and perpetuation of implicit and dominant ideologies, and that there are certain ideological differences that are perpetuated either tacitly or overtly in newspaper editorials.

Background to the event

Tensions between Ankara and Jerusalem have escalated since Turkey harshly criticized Israel following its invasion of the Gaza strip in December 2008 (Operation Cast Lead). The operation aimed to halt continuous missile attacks on Israel's civilian population by Hamas. Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdogan's subsequent outburst at Israeli President Shimon Peres during a panel at the World Economic Forum in Davos in January 2009 was indicative of further cooling between the two powers (Aydintasbas, 2009).

The combustion occurred when the moderator of the session on the Middle East, The Washington Post's David Ignatius, refused to allow Erdogan more time to rebut Peres' passionate defense of Israel's recent Gaza offensive. 'President Peres, you are old, and your voice is loud of a guilty conscience,' Erdogan said, red-faced and turning angrily to Peres, 'When it comes to killing, you know very well how to kill. I know well how you hit and kill children on the beaches.' He then finished his remarks and left the podium, saying, 'Davos is over for me'. This reaction of Erdogan has been referred to as '**Doing an Erdogan**' from then on and added as a new entry to the political terminology lists.

At home and across the Middle East, Erdogan's performance saw him feted as a hero. Hundreds took to the streets in Gaza in support, while in İstanbul supporters greeted him at the airport, waving flags and placards that read 'Turkey is proud of you' and 'Erdogan, a new world leader'. On the global stage, Erdogan did not do his prospects of mediating between Israel and the Arab World much good (Turgut, 2009). The incidence has led to a new debate over Turkey's strategic alliance with Israel.

The long-term alliance between Turkey and Israel is not likely to be affected. Peres said there was 'no conflict' with Turkey. Erdogan too appeared to take a step back, saying he did not intend to 'target at all in any way the Israeli people, President Peres or the Jewish people'.

His outburst will not easily be forgotten in Israel nor go unnoticed by Washington, but by expressing the sentiments of the Arab streets, he will, if anything, have boosted Turkey's standing in the Arab world. In this study, discursive representation of 'Doing an Erdogan' in the editorials of two newspapers of opposing ideologies will be investigated.

Turkish-Israeli Relations: A Historical Background

Historically, Turkish foreign policy has been dependent on the structure of the international system and the Western connection of Turkish Republic. The impact of this connection on Turkish foreign policy towards the Middle East region, and Israel in particular, is evident. Within a Cold War context, the fundamental determinant of Turkish foreign policy behaviour towards the Middle East and Israel has been evidently the Western connection of Turkey. The magnitude of Turkey's dedication to its Western connection, however, varied from time to time. It was at its peak in the 1950's. Turkey's recognition of Israel in 1949 accompanied the initiation of relations regarding the military and the intelligence issues in the 1950's. Suspicions were increased, on the Arab side, by Turkey's recognition of Israel in 1949, which was perceived as a stab in the back. (Turan, 2008: 3).

As for Israel, on the other hand, Israel's view of Turkey was conditioned by the fact that Ankara, the capital of Turkey, had for years been the only Muslim country to have recognized Israel. Relations with Turkey have been, thus, of crucial strategic, political, and diplomatic importance.

Due to common perceptions regarding the structure of the international system (e.g. Iraqi invasion of Kuwait –nationally there were also Kurdish and political Islam questions) and the perceived threats from certain Middle Eastern countries, in the 1990's, relations between Turkey and Israel greatly expanded and reached an unprecedented degree of closeness. The peace process that began in Madrid in 1991 freed Turkey from the difficulty of balancing between Arab countries and Israel. The new close cooperation between Ankara and Tel-Aviv began when Turkey decided to upgrade its diplomatic relations with Israel to ambassadorial level. The commercial and economic benefit was an important cause for better relations.

However, in the last decade, spells of correct relations alternated with tensions, in close correlation with Israeli actions in the Middle East (Szymanski, 2010). There was a domestic restraint on developing bilateral relations with Israel due to the rising popularity of the pro-Islamist politics. The first round had been played during the era when Refah Party (Welfare Party) was in power in Turkey, in 1996-1997, and the winner was the ones who supported the strategic partnership, in particular the military. After 2002, however, the military's power has declined in Turkish politics when compared to the 1990's, and political Islam, on the other hand, is in office with a more decisive public support and parliamentary superiority. (Turan, 2008: 96).

Relations During the Justice and Development Party Era:

From the outset of 2000 and onwards, the fundamental incident that affected the structure of international system has been undoubtedly the 9/11 terrorist attacks on New York and Washington. As a result, the Muslim Middle East turned out to be the target of the allied powers in their campaign against radical Islam. The campaign known as the Greater Middle East Initiative declared that promotion of democratic regimes in the region is considered as the cure for radical Islam. The US has sought support and Turkey had been one of the most enthusiastic proponents of the US-led Greater Middle East Initiative. Almost at the same time, AKP (Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi- Justice and Development Party) won the 2002 general elections in Turkey and became the governing body. AKP government adopted evidently a pro-Western and pro-US foreign policy. The political opposition against AKP, on the other hand, asserted that the US dictated Turkey a 'moderate Islam' role in the region and AKP government was accused of eroding secularism (separation of religious and state affairs in governmental bodies) which is one of the fundamental principles of Turkish Republic. The argument here is that, AKP government mainly tried to use foreign policy and relations as leverage against the legitimacy question that it was facing domestically.

The Israeli elections held in 2001, carried Ariel Sharon to power in Israel. Since he was the one who triggered the Second Intifada, the hopes for halting the violence decreased and had been replaced by the rising tensions and conflicts in the West Bank and Gaza Strip. This inevitably had its ramifications on the countries of the region, in particular on Turkish public. As a result, the opposition against Israel in the Turkish public opinion gained greater ground and the reactions to Israeli attacks against Palestinian civilians increased the sensitivity in ordinary Turkish people.

The tensions between Israel and the newly elected Turkish government emerged and could be explained by the desire of Erdogan government to come closer with the Arab states. Erdogan's statement that described the killing of Sheikh Yassin, the Hamas leader, in May 2004, as 'state terrorism' had negative effects on Turkish-Israeli relations. The rejection of Olmert and Sharon's demand to visit Turkey in order to meet Erdogan and cure relations, without any excuse, further increased the tension. After the election victory of Hamas in January 2006, in Palestinian territories, the first task was to find international recognition, especially because it was designated as a terrorist organization by the United States and EU. The Turkish leadership made an unexpected manoeuvre by inviting Khaled Mashal, the official representative of Hamas in Damascus, to visit Turkey for a meeting with Turkish officials. The goal was to mediate between Israel and Hamas leadership. Nevertheless, this attempt was seen as hostile and deleterious to Turkish-Israeli relations (Turan, 2008: 125).

In the late 2008 and early 2009, a major crisis in bilateral relations was provoked by Israel's offensive in Gaza strip. It was harshly criticized by Turkish authorities, including Prime Minister Erdogan, and in response Israeli politicians signalled the possibility of recognising the 1915-19 killing of Armenians as genocide. Right after this incident, Erdogan left a Davos conference discussion panel after the moderator, David Ignatius, barred him the right of response to earlier pronouncements by Israeli President Shimon Peres (Szymanski,2010).

This reactive response, the walking out of Davos conference, is the main subject of analysis of this study.

In the latter half of 2009, Turkey did not consent to Israel's participation in NATO air manoeuvres, with Turkish TV. channels presenting Israel soldiers and Mosad agents as murderers. This incident directly provoked a diplomatic scandal in January 2010; Israeli Deputy Foreign Minister Daniel Ayalon received Turkish Ambassador, Ahmet Oğuz Çelikkol, in a humiliating manner. Although Israeli authorities apologised and tensions were further reduced by Defence Minister Ehud Barak's visit to Turkey, the crisis in Turkey-Israel relations did not end. Israeli military action to prevent the 'Gaza Flotilla' from breaking the blockade on the Hamas-ruled Strip in June 2010, which ended with nine Turkish Islamists dead on board one of ships, provided Erdogan's government another opportunity to condemn Israel (Inbar, 2011: 132). These actions represent a serious deterioration of the once vibrant strategic relationship between Israel and Turkey.

Turkish government has also been guided by pragmatic considerations, which included tapping Turkish citizens' strong support for the Palestinians as a means of mobilising the electorate prior to the local election of March 2009, diverting attention from problems linked to internal affairs and burnishing the country's image in the Arab world.

It should be clearly noted that Turkish-Israeli relations, especially people-to-people ones, greatly depend on the fate of the Palestinian people and vulnerable to the developments in West Bank and Gaza (Turan, 2008: 132).

The current Turkish government's drive to increase its profile and influence in the Middle East (Davutoğlu,2005:132),coordinated to a considerable extent with the United States and had the overwhelming support of the Turkish people (Aliriza, 2011: 4).

Introduction: Theoretical Background

The media performs a function which is both ideological and political. On the ideological plane, the media constantly process materials thrown up in social life so as to integrate them into consistent ideological systems. This process involves the deletion and classification of events and their restructuring, reclassification, and evaluation in the reports which the media present. Their political effect arises from the fact that the media attempt to make sense of the world for others, in doing so they may cement

readers more firmly in their allegiance to ideological affiliations. The media attempt to shape and influence the ideological structure of the society in which they act (Kress,1983:44). In other words, the media do not passively describe or record news events, but actively reconstruct them, mostly on the basis of their own ideological affiliations. Consequently, the media structure and process events into ideologically unified messages (Kress,1983: 44). In this way, the media expands the scope for the operation of ideology, because they enable the symbolic forms to be transmitted to the extended and potentially vast audiences. If ideology is conceived of as ways in which the meaning conveyed by symbolic forms serves to establish and sustain relations of power and domination, then it is clear that mass communication has enormous consequences for the propagation and diffusion of ideological phenomena (Thompson,1990:226). The media discourse, then, is a site for the production and diffusion of ideology. In this dispute, we are interested in the print media especially, and editorials specifically.

Editorials

Editorials, one of the major discourse genres in newspapers, have been investigated from various perspectives (Boliver, 1994; Fowler, 1991; Morley, 2004; Van Dijk, 1992; Westin, 2002). Since editorials are mainly used to convey the value positions of the newspaper, power and ideology in these kinds of discourse will be of great importance (Liu, 2009: 59-60). Thus, editorials will be of much relevance in releasing the ideological opposition present in our data.

An editorial is the place where the processes of selection and assimilation, of rewriting and transformation are most dense. It is here that the paper's ideology is clarified and re-established, reasserted in relation to troublesome events. It is also the place where the paper speaks most directly to its readership, presenting its perception of reality in the form which it regards as most suitable for its readership (Hodge and Kress, 1993: 17).

The language of the editorial claims a characteristic style, it not only marks a group but also embodies a characteristic representation of experience. Vocabulary patterns map out the typical concerns of a register and its users, syntax analyzes actions and states, casting people into roles and assigning responsibility to persons mentioned; recurrent themes and generalizations are stated or implied (Fowler, 1991: 40-41).

Essential in our analysis of editorials, as well as for the study of discourse in general, is the assumption that language users construct models of events they talk about. Such models are called context models (van Dijk, 1997). Such models represent the knowledge and opinions speakers and writers have about the setting, circumstances, intentions, goals, purposes, and other properties of the context influencing the style, rhetoric and the surface structures of text and talk.

When expressed in editorials, opinions and ideologies play a role in the formation and change of public opinion, in setting the political agenda, and in influencing social debate, decision making and other forms of social and political action. Opinions and ideologies are being produced by journalists and other writers who have such personally or socially biased models about the same or similar events, they also have participatory roles in the complex processes of institutional reproduction.

Precisely because editors (like all language users) may be a member of different groups, some of which have conflicting interests, and hence conflicting ideologies, we may also expect their opinions to reflect such contradictions (van Dijk, 1995: 2-13). For our analysis, especially these conflicting social identities will be relevant in a critical study of editorials.

The Notion of Representation

As used in discourse analysis, representation refers to the language used in a text or talk to assign meaning to groups and their social practices, to events, and to social and ecological conditions and objects (Fairclough, 1989, 1995; van Dijk, 2002). Meaning is not embedded in the reality that is perceived but rather that it is construed by linguistic representation (Fairclough, 1992; Goatly, 2000; Halliday, 1990; Hodge and Kress, 1993; Mehan and Wills, 1998; Muntigl, 2002; Shapiro, 1988; van Dijk, 2002; Wenden and Schaffner, 1999; Wodak, 2002). Moreover, linguistic representations determine the way in which we think about particular objects, events, situations and as such, function as a principle of action influencing actual social practice (Shapiro, 1988; Fairclough, 1989; Hodge and Kress, 1993; Wodak, 2002; Karlsberg, 2005). Ideology will also influence the manner in which groups represent matters (Wenden, 2005: 90). There will be competition among groups over what is to be taken as the correct, appropriate, or preferred representation (Holquist, 1983; Fairclough, 1992; Wodak, 2001).

News (a key material for the processing of editorials) is a representation of the world in language (Fowler, 1991: 4-5). The structure of a news text embodies values and beliefs; that representation of experience, of events and concepts, is patterned by the structure of the medium, so inevitably that the very notion of 'representation' carries within it the qualification of representation from a specific ideological point of view, that values, or ideology, differ systematically in different forms of expression (Fowler, 1991: 66). The ideological work of media language includes particular ways of representing the world, particular constructions of social identities and social relations. The focus is, then, upon how events, situations and people are represented in media texts. The main idea behind this is that media texts constitute versions of reality through choices made in representational processes at various levels in the production of texts. This suggests that the analysis of representational processes have a common concern with critical discourse analysis with choices that are made in the texts in the representation, signification, and construction of reality and social motivations for these choices (Fairclough, 1995: 105).

With this connection, within the framework of critical discourse analysis, a transitivity analysis adapted from Halliday's Systemic Functional Theory(1994) of language was carried out on the newspaper editorials composing the data to find out the representational processes in the presentation of pro-government/Erdogan and anti-government/Erdogan discourses.

Critical Discourse Analysis and Transitivity Analysis

Critical discourse analysis is discourse analysis 'with an attitude'. It focuses on social problems, and especially on the role of discourse in the production and reproduction of power abuse or domination. Whereever possible, it does so from a perspective that is consistent with the best interests of dominated groups (van Dijk, 2001: 96). CDA, make choices, and select those structures for closer analysis that are relevant for the study of a social issue. This would tell us which properties of discourse may vary as a function of which social structures. Discourse is seen as 'a field of both ideological processes and linguistic processes', and there is a determinate relation between these two kinds of processes' (Trew, 1979).

CDA also needs a solid 'linguistic' basis, where 'linguistic' is understood in a broad 'structural-functional' sense. It always needs to account for at least some of the detailed structures, strategies and functions of text and talk (van Dijk, 2001: 97). The use of language as discourse implies that language is a socially and historically situated mode of action, in a dialectal relationship with other facets of the social practice. It is socially shaped, but is also socially shaping. Critical discourse analysis explores the tension between these two sides of language use (Fairclough, 1995: 54-55).

Critical linguistics is based upon 'systemic' linguistic theory (Halliday, 1978, 1985). It brings to analysis of media discourse systemicist views of the text. Halliday's systemic -functional grammar is a lexico-grammatical theory based on the notion of choice by which language users are enabled to produce texts in order to communicate meaning (Halliday, 1994). Systemic functional grammar aims to study the selection, categorization and ordering of meaning at the clausal level and its functional view focuses on studying the relationship between grammatical structures and their social contexts. In this sense, it provides the necessary background for critical discourse analysis to uncover and interpret systematically the underlying motivations, intentions and goals of language users along together with the attitudes, perceptions and prejudices that manipulate them (Teo, 2000:24).

To refer to how meaning is represented in the clause, systemic functional grammar uses 'transitivity' to show how language users encode in language their mental picture of reality and how they account for their experience of the world around them (Halliday,1994:106). Linguistically, transitivity is concerned with propositional meanings and functions of syntactic elements. The representations that can be attested within a transitivity model are said to signal bias, manipulation and

ideology in discourse. The ideas expressed by a clause is considered as a proposition about the world in which an event, situation, relation or attribute and they are predicated of some participant(s). This is based on the claim that syntax provides for alternative phrasings and that wherever in language alternative phrasings are permitted, different values came to be associated with different variants which can be ideologically significant (Fowler, 1991:77). The analysis of transitivity indicates how, through choices from the lexicogrammar, certain semantic roles and relationships are reproduced in the ideologically constructed discursive practices. Through positioning of participants and process choices, and their positioning in the clause, we could reasonably speculate on the ideologies of the news reports (Thetela, 2001: 12).

Thus, the transitivity model provides the means for investigating how readers' perception of mening of a text is pushed in a particular direction and how linguistic structures of a text effectively encode a particular world-view, i.e. particular ideology (Simpson, 1993:104).

In this system, meaning is realized mainly through the ideational, interpersonal and textual functions embodied in the grammatical choices made by language users. All three main types of meaning (action, representation, identification) are simultaneously at issue in clauses, and each gives a particular perspective on the clause, and particular analytical categories. From the representational perspective, clauses can be seen as having three main types of element: Processes, Participants, and Circumstances. Processes are generally realized as verbs, participants as Subjects, Objects, or indirect objects of verbs, circumstances as various types of adverbial elements, such as time or place etc. (Fairclough, 2003:134). In transitivity different processes are distinguished according to whether they represent actions, speech, states of mind or states of being (Halliday,1994), interalia, material processes(processes of doing), relational processes(processes of being), verbalization processes(processes of saying), and mental processes(processes of sensing). So, the transitivity system mainly distinguishes two types of representational processes; these are actionals (material, mental and verbal processes), and relationals (processes of being).

In general terms, actionals refer to actions, events and situations that involve people and objects as participants of a process. Relationals, on the other hand, do not involve an action, but establish a relation between two entities or between an entity and a quality. Relationals signify the act of classification and judgement. They display the results of the activities of mind, making judgements and commenting (Oktar, 2001: 325). Transitivity in general, relational and actional processes in particular, seem to be useful analytic tools that foreground the agency, more specifically the attribution of agency and process to the various participants in the text by the writer(Teo,2000: 25). Relational processes encode the meaning of 'being'- something is said to be something else: either something has a certain quality ascribed to it (attributive) or something has an identity assigned to it (identifying).

Information About Two Newspapers

In uncovering ideological orientations in print media through transitivity analysis, two influential Turkish newspapers, Cumhuriyet (The Republic) and Zaman (The Time), are chosen for data analysis.

Following Kemalist ideology, 'Cumhuriyet' is an adherent of the Turkish Republic based on a democratic and secular system of government. In this sense, 'Cumhuriyet' identifies itself with the secularist side of Turkish society, which favours the values of nation state, democracy, freedom, equality, rule of law, human rights, peace, and so forth; drawing a clear line between ruling AKP government political views and practices and its' ideological standing. 'Zaman', on the other hand, positions itself on the side of the Islamic views. It follows the ideology of politicized Islam which opposes the democratic and secular system of the Turkish Republic. Thus, it seems explicit that these two newspapers lend themselves to presenting the ideological conflict and to investigating the articulation of such a conflict in their discourses.

Method

I analysed the editorials that appeared in Cumhuriyet (secularist) and Zaman (Islamist) newspapers, 44 editorial in total; 22 editorials from each, between 31 January 2009 and 7 February 2009, when the evaluations of the Davos event was at its peak. The main motivation behind the choice editorials as the object of analysis is that editorials generally include detailed information about events, situations, people and places enabling mental representative capacity of ideological conflicts more detectable. Giving details about events, situations, people and places may lead to argumentative, rhetorical and possibly ideological implications (van dijk, 1995:275). In this sense, editorials can be considered as the expression of ideologies, attitudes, beliefs, values and other social representations. Therefore, this characteristic of the editorials provides the grounds for investigating the conflicts between social groups with oppositional ideologies (Oktar,2001: 321).

This study uses critical discourse analysis as a methodology which claims that using certain linguistic forms systematically carries ideological messages. In unraveling this, critical discourse analysis pays attention to the grammar and vocabulary of texts. Three dimensions of the clause grammar are differentiated in Halliday's systemic functional grammar: transitivity, modality and theme. These correspond to ideational, interpersonal and textual functions of language. In this study, aspects of clause grammar which have to do with ideational meanings will be focused on. Emphasis will be placed on the construction of ideological discourse by determining the transitivity patterns expressed with propositions through representational processes in the two Turkish daily newspapers editorials of opposing political stance. Transitivity has the facility to analyze the same event in different ways. Since transitivity makes options available, the choice the writer makes or the choice made by the discourse indicates the

writer's ideological point of view. Newspapers provide abundant examples of the ideological significance of transitivity.

In transitivity different processes are distinguished according to whether they represent actions, speech, states of mind or states of being, that is; material processes (processes of doing), relational processes (processes of being), verbalization processes (processes of saying), and mental processes (processes of sensing).

Analysis

Cumhuriyet Newspaper

The examples of relational processes are very few in number in Cumhuriyet. The editorials' inclination is towards encoding meaning through actionals (who did what to whom) on the reality of the Davos event.

Relationals in Cumhuriyet

(1) *Davos'ta birkaç dakika süren gösteri..tamamen medyatik ve Mart seçimlerine yöneliktir.*

'A few minute show-off in Davos **is** truly mediatic and intended for the (municipal) elections in March'.

(2) *Türkiye'nin bu anlamda bıraktığı izlenim... 'uluslararası nezaket kurallarını hiçe sayma', 'protesto için ortamı terk etme' gibi en üst düzeyde tepkisel davranıştır.*

'Turkey gave the impression that this (leaving the panel room and announcing 'Davos is over for me') **is** a reactional response at the uppermost degree which meant ignoring rules of courtesy and leave the stage so as to protest'.

(3) *...asıl hata ...bir ekonomik forumda...Arap Birliği temsilcisi....BM Genel Sekreteri...(beceriksiz) bir moderatör...dinci bir parti liderinin tartışma masasında bir araya getirilmesidir.*

'The actual failure **is** to gather together a representative from the Arab League.. Secretary General of the United Nations, an ineffective moderator, and a religious party leader for a discussion in an economic forum'.

(4) *Erdoğan'ın moderatöre tepki vermesi normaldi.*

'For Erdogan to react to the moderator **was** normal'.

The relationals in Cumhuriyet are of attributive type. With the attributive relationals, the options are more open, and the activity is one of judgement, specifying qualities of whatever it is that is being judged or commented on (Hodge and Kress, 1993:103). The attributive relationals assign negative attributes to the sudden abandonment of the Davos panel by Prime Minister Erdogan. In example 1, the writer(editor) identifies the Davos event as 'a show' (gösteri) and attributes qualities of being 'mediatic'(medyatik) and 'pre-propaganda for the coming municipal elections' (Mart seçimlerine yönelik) and regards the attitude of Erdogan a 'reactional' (tepkisel)

one(2). Erdogan, the Davos event, and Turkey are positioned as agents interchangeably either as single nouns in subject positions or in noun phrases; Erdogan(4), Türkiye (2), Davos'ta... gösteri (1). The participants are Turkish citizens and Turkey indirectly being affected from the repercussions of the misconducted panel. In all the examples containing relational processes, the process is expressed by the verb 'is'. Since relationals signify the act of classification and judgement, the examples in Cumhuriyet classify, in general, the Davos event as a 'diplomatic failure' and assigns negative values except for the fact that the way the panel is organized and handled by the moderator is open to criticisms (3,4). This is an occasional agreement between two opposing newspapers on the representation of the Davos event. Whatever happens, the attitude of the moderator (David Ignatius) during the panel (not allowing Erdogan as much time to speak as Shimon Peres) to Prime Minister Erdogan, seems to be categorized as 'downgrading' by both pro and anti Erdogan fronts. That is why Erdogan's reaction is attributed 'normal' (4). This may be because of the perception that the moderator's attitude is regarded as an insult at a national level.

Turkey, as a proper noun, functions both as a subject and an object (indirectly affected from the negative outcomes of the event) as far as its structural positioning is concerned. Turkey as the participant is assigned the image that her Prime Minister 'have no intention of obeying international (political) rules of negotiation' and 'have a misfitting style of protest (2- uluslar arası nezaket kurallarını hiçe sayma, protesto için ortamı terk etme).

The actional processes outnumber the relational processes in Cumhuriyet.

Actionals in Cumhuriyet

Verbalization processes

(1) 9. Cumhurbaşkanı ... Demirel, olayla ilgili açıklamasında, 'Bu toplantı adeta hadise çıkarmak için yapılmıştır diyerek (dedi).

'Demirel, the 9th President of Turkey, in a press conference on the Davos event, said that this panel is intentionally designed to lead to a dispute'.

(2) Gazetenin deneyimli Ortadoğu muhabiri Antonio Ferrari tarafından kaleme alınan yazı 'Erdoğan'ın uluslararası inandırıcılığını birkaç dakikada heba ettiğini, kredibilitesinin buharlaştığını' söylüyor.

'The article by an expert Middle East correspondent Antonio Ferrari says that Erdogan has lost his trustworthiness in a couple of minutes and his credibility has evaporated'.

(3) Davos'taki dik duruşun aslında daha önceden hem dışarıya hem de içeriye dönük kimi hesaplara göre planlandığını gösteren somut işaretlerden söz ediliyor.

'It has been said that there are concrete signs pointing out that the Davos event is particularly designed the way it is with some domestic and international benefits in mind'.

The sayer role in the newspaper is occupied by proper nouns except for one. One of these proper nouns refers to Demirel, the 9th President of Turkish Republic-ex.1), the choice of speech verb is 'say' characterizing a person of power criticizing the outburst of Erdogan in Davos (a meeting held up especially to create a problem). The criticism might especially be worded by a former President to increase the truth value, believability and magnitude of the criticism from an anti-Erdogan perspective. The verb 'say' is used in both active (2) and passive (3) present tense constructions.

In example 2, the sayer role is occupied by a defining noun phrase (an expert Middle East reporter), again criticizing the Davos outburst by the speech verb 'say', reflecting a mutual opinion of the foreign press (Erdogan has lost his credibility in international arena). In other words, the verbalization processes in Cumhuriyet presents Erdogan as the participant who is said to be active in the way the Davos event turned out to be the way it has been.

In example 3, the sayer role is hidden. The clause has a passive structure, with a passive verb 'to be spoken of'. The message is a criticism; what is spoken of by the authorities is the intentionally-designed character of Davos panel to bring out the intended outcomes.

Material Processes

(1) *Bizimki Davos'ta dik duruşunun sonucunu aldı.*

'Literally: He got the results of standing upright'.

'Metaphorically: He did not give in but for what price'.

(There is a cynical use of the term 'bizimki' in a subject position referring to Erdogan himself.)

(2) *Bu işaretler panelin, RTE'nin, Gazze nedeniyle dış politikada yeni bir döneme girdiğini duyurmak için düzenlendiğini gösteriyor.*

'These signs indicate that this panel has been organized by Recep Tayyip Erdogan (RTE) to announce the beginning of a new period in international politics on the Gaza issue'.

(3) *Davos'ta Erdoğan kazandı, Türkiye kaybetti.*

'In Davos, Erdogan won Turkey lost'.

(4) *2002'den beri yürüttüğü(Erdoğan'ın) 'İsrail'e destek politikası' Davos gösterisi ile, birkaç dakikada silinebilir mi?*

' Could (Erdogan's) ' support for Israel' campaign since 2002 be erased by the Davos show in a couple of minutes'?

(5) *İsrail Cumhurbaşkanı ile atışırken Hamas savunuculuğunu üstlenmesi Türkiye Başbakanı'na iç politikada destek sağladı. Ancak... uzun diplomatik kazanımlar, yanlış bir zamanlamayla geriledi.*

'While arguing with Israeli President, defending Hamas gained support to Turkish Prime Minister in domestic politics. However, long standing gains are losing ground with a wrong timing'.

(6) *Yahudilere Tevrat'ı öğretiyor, suçluyor, aşağılıyor, bütün salonu suçluyor, sonra da kalkıp gidiyor.*

'He is teaching the Torah to Jewish, blaming, insulting, and leaving the panel'.

(7) *Orada bulunan herkesi suçluyor ve 'dikkate almaya değmez kişiler' muamelesi yapıyor. Böylece de haklı konumunu kaybediyor.*

'He blames everybody present in the panel, treats them as unworthy, thus loses his legitimate stance'.

(8) *Amacını aşan bir öfke patlaması da orantısız güç kullanmaktır.*

'An angry outburst equals to using disproportionate force'.

(9) *Son gelen haberlere bakılırsa toplantıyı AKP lideri istemiş. Bu doğruysa, olayın önceden tasarlandığı kuşkularını daha da arttırmaktadır.*

'According to the latest news, AKP leader(Erdogan) wanted the panel to be organized. If this is true, it is highly suspicious that this meeting has been pre-arranged'.

The majority of transitivity structures are constructed as material processes. The semantic definition of a material process is that some entity is doing something, or undertakes some action. In other words, people, events, actions, and situations are portrayed as either arising directly as the result of an actor's action and with a direct effect on a goal; or by intransitive structures, arising without such an action, that is either as a self-caused action or an action that happens in some unspecified way.

In the examples quoted from the Cumhuriyet editorials, Prime Minister Erdogan is explicitly referred to as the actor, and the Davos event, Turkish nation and people are positioned as goal- as people or things that are acted upon. In other words, Erdogan is presented as an active participant who is involved in the activity of destroying Turkey's reputation in the diplomatic arena (3,5) and endangering its previously earned status(4) by his wrong timing in displaying a fierce reaction to the participants of the panel (6,5). The foregrounded agentive position of Erdogan is

favoured in order to emphasize/ express information that is negative about them (him-Erdogan), thus criticize his conduct all through the Davos event. This makes Erdogan the only responsible person (agent) for the unstable diplomatic relations in the international arena (4). He is also responsible for manipulating the show-off in Davos to the benefit of his political party's propaganda (5,9). The action undertaken has sometimes a reporting (heresay) character (9- according to the latest coming news); a strategy putting the agent Erdogan into the central position to pre-arrange the panel in Davos and the reporting structure puts all the responsibility to the agent. It is also worth pointing out that some verbal processes are coded in the present tense (7), thereby adding the quality of urgency and relevance to the event.

Mental Processes

(1) ...(*Erdogan*) *yerel seçimlerde daha düşük oy alma olasılığını bertaraf etmek istemiştir.*

'Erdogan) might have wanted to eliminate the risk of getting poor poll in coming municipal elections'.

(2) *Bir bilen uyarıyor (S. Demirel): 'Uluslararası meselelerde birtakım faturalar çıkar. Bu faturaların nerede, ne zaman, nasıl çıktığının çok farkına varamazsınız.*

'A wise man (S. Demirel- former President)warns: You may have to pay prices in international relations but you never know where, when, and how you shall pay it'.

(3) *Erdoğan bundan böyle bölgede hala arabuluculuk rolü oynamayı düşünüyorsa... hayal görüyor.*

'Erdogan is dreaming if he is stil thinking of playing the mediator in the region'.

(4) *Pek çok kişi bunu (davos çıkışı) Başbakan'ın ruhsal dengesine veya aşırı yorgunluğuna bağlıyor...ama ben...Başbakan'ın işi bu noktaya taşıyan tutum ve davranışlarının, izlediği politikanın temel özelliklerinden kaynaklandığını ve rastlantısal olmadığını düşünüyorum.*

'A lot of people relates Davos outburst to Prime Minister's psychological state and excessive tiredness but I think Prime Minister carried the occasion this far precisely because of the fundamental qualities of his political style and the whole event is not coincidental'.

(5) *AKP liderinin iç politikada yıllardır inatla sürdürdüğü düzeyi kuşkulu üslubunu yakından bilenler için sürpriz olmamıştır.*

'This outburst has not come as a surprise to those who know AKP leader's questionable political style in domestic affairs which he pursues insistently'.

A mental process involves a participant (senser)(the person who experiences or undergoes the mental process) and phenomenon (what impinges on consciousness). There are mental processes of cognition, perception and affection.

Examples 5 and 1 are examples of mental processes of cognition. Given the previous performance of the senser Erdogan in diplomatic arena and being well aware of the his political strategies, through analogy and guessing, Erdogan has shown this performance in Davos, to gain votes in municipal elections (1). The verb 'want' (istemek) in example 1 has a reference to Erdogan(senser) with a tint of guessing- 'istemıştır' (highly likely that he wanted, we guess that he wanted).

In example 5, the senser (Erdogan) has performed what is expected of him (considering his questionable style in diplomatic negotiations). The mental picture this has created in the minds of patients (people/citizens who know Erdogan's style) is not surprising. This mental process is given in a series of cause-effect propositions.

Erdogan is the active agent, the only responsible person for the action; his actions are explicitly stated. Turkey, as a state/national body and Turkish citizens on the whole are the recipient of Erdogan's actions in a negative way. Erdogan has the governing power and uses it to manipulate this international event to gain more power in the domestic arena. Cumhuriyet newspaper, by making Erdogan the active agent in all types of processes (relational, material, mental, verbal), is actually criticizing and questioning Erdogan's leadership qualities, thus his ideological stand. Putting his citizens at a disadvantaged position for his own personal and political benefits is a negative representation of Erdogan through transitivity patterns. Erdogan is accused of manipulating national and international agenda. He is put in the foreground in an explicit way, in active syntactic constructions rather than passive ones to be blamed for what happened in Davos.

Thus, Cumhuriyet newspaper's representational strategy of criticizing (being negative) pro-government/pro-Erdogan politics and ideologies is to place Prime Minister Erdogan right at the center of all negative outcomes of the Davos event, both domestically and internationally, and hold him responsible for those outcomes through actional processes. It is not surprising at all to observe very few relational processes in the data because the editorial writers' aim is not to be negative by being judgemental and commenting on the matter by means of relational type transitivity patterns, rather, they display sound evidence, through actional processes, of the wrongdoings of Prime Minister Erdogan in relation to the Davos event which made him popular both in and out Turkey in a negative sense. He is represented to be taking active part (an agent foregrounded in almost all material processes in transactive structures) in activities, mainly his political and ideological conduct, that are contrary to his citizens' benefits.

Zaman Newspaper

Relational and actional processes are equally represented in this newspaper as opposed to the scarcity of relational processes in Cumhuriyet. As far as actional processes are concerned, material processes are more frequently observed with respect to verbalization and mental processes in this newspaper. The active agent is Erdogan

as in Cumhuriyet newspaper but the recipients vary ranging from the Muslim people in Gaza (2,9), to Turkish citizens (8,13,15), and to Israeli President Simon Peres (3).

Erdogan performs all his actions for the benefit of humanity in general, Muslim people in Gaza and Turkish citizens in particular. Alternative agents to Erdogan differ in newspapers in question. Cumhuriyet considers foreign and domestic experts, and newspaper reporters involved in international affairs for the act of evaluating the Davos event and its ramifications, whereas Zaman's alternative agents are Turkish newspaper reporters and the Muslim world who give negative (Turkish newspapers) and positive (Muslim world) support to what happened in Davos.

Relationals in Zaman

(1) *..bütün bunlar karşısında Erdoğan'ın paneli terk etmesini de yerinde, haklı ve doğru bulmuştuk.*

'As a response to what happened, we thought Erdogan was right in leaving the panel room'.

(2) *Erdogan saldırıyı sert eleştirdi ama söylediklerinde uygar olmayan bir şey yoktu.*

'Erdogan criticized the attack harshly but there was nothing uncivilized in his speech'.

(3) *..toplantıdaki gerçek, ne Peres'in olgunluğunu işaretliyor ne de Erdoğan'ın bilgi eksikliğini.*

'The reality of the panel is neither the maturity of Shimon Peres nor Erdogan's lack of knowledge'.

(4) *..bizim medyadaki bazı arkadaşların derdi Türkiye'nin dünya siyasetindeki yeri, önemi, onuru, gururu değil.*

'What some members of our media worry is not Turkey's place, importance, honour, and pride in world politics'.

(5) *..bu çıkışın önceden planlanmış olabileceğinden kuşkuları var.*

'There are suspicions on this protest being arranged before'.

(6) *Davos'tan ilk gelen ham tercümelerde Erdoğan'ın sözleri ABD Dışişleri'ndekilere çok daha sert görünmüş.*

'Erdogan's speech seemed quite adamant to U.S. Foreign Affairs'.

(7) *ABD hükümeti mensupları,... Amerikan Musevi Cemaatinin Davos sonrası büsbütün kaybedebileceğinden endişeli.*

'Members of American government are worried about losing the support of American Jewish Society after the Davos incident'.

(8) *Washington'da olaylara reelpolitik zaviyeden bakan aktif dış politika oyuncularını, Türkiye'nin kendisine zarar verdiği kanaatinde.*

‘Active foreign affairs actors based in Washington and observing the event from a realpolitic angle is of the opinion that Turkey is destroying herself’.

(9) *Davos'ta insanlığın namusunu kurtaran adam Erdogan olmuştur.*

‘Erdogan is the man who saved the honour/decency of humanity in Davos’.

(10) *Davos racon gördü.*

‘Davos witnessed Erdogan’s swagger’.

(11) *Davos'taki yeni ruh, diriliş ruhudur.*

‘The spirit in Davos is one of resurrection’.

(12) *Davos'taki Erdogan semboldür. Bundan sonraki çağ, silahların değil toplu vuran yüreklerin çağıdır.*

‘Erdogan in Davos is a symbol. The coming era will not be an era of wars but of people act for each other’.

(13) *Türkiye, Ortadoğu'da yegane oyun kurucu güç haline geliyor.*

‘Turkey is becoming the only constitutive power in the Middle East’.

(14) *Başbakanımızın Davos'taki tepkisi diplomatik bir tepki değildi; ama çok sağlam bir sağduyuya ve önsezilere dayalı çok isabetli bir hamleydi.*

‘Our Prime Minister’s reaction was not a diplomatic one yet it was a very fitting/ appropriate move based on strong commonsense and foresight’.

(15) *Türkiye bundan böyle bölgeye müdahil bir güç olarak sahneye çıkmaktadır. Bu devletin politikasıdır.*

‘Turkey steps on the stage as the intervening power in the region from now on. This is the state policy’.

Relational processes encode the meaning of being- something is said to be something else, either certain qualities ascribed or an identity assigned to it. In most of the relational processes, Erdogan is positioned as a major participant and assigned positive attributes or identifying qualities- the person who acted just to save the honour of humanity (9), the person who displayed a decent reaction to Simon Peres (1,2); the person who pointed out the unjust treatment (14), Erdogan is a symbol of an era in which people act collaboratively for the benefit of each other (12).

The relational processes explain the evaluations of Davos event, the event itself, the reactions displayed afterwards with the aim of praising Erdogan’s attitude during the panel, and his abrupt decision of leaving the panel and criticizing oppositions’ reactions to what Erdogan did. Assigning Erdogan the active agent role serves the purpose of praising Erdogan in this newspaper in line with its ideological standing.

Erdogan gets the major participant roles either explicitly (referred by his name) or implicitly (without mentioning his name). One can infer that he is the sole responsible person during the event (1,2,10). The major participant role is mostly referred to by a proper noun Erdogan, sometimes these are replaced by an identifying noun 'Başbakan' (the Prime Minister)(14), or an identifying noun phrase 'Başbakan Erdogan' (Prime Minister Erdogan)/ 'Davos'taki Erdogan (Erdogan in Davos)(12).

Besides the major participant Erdogan, the Davos event itself gets positive attributes as well (isabetli bir hamleydi- it was a well targeted reaction (14); (13,15)- Türkiye bölgeye müdahil bir güçtür artık Davos olayıyla- Turkey has become an intervening factor in the (Middle East) area after the Davos event.

What is worth mentioning is the fact that Davos event also gets negative attributes and identifying qualities (5,6,7,8,) mainly attributing the negativeness to mishandling the whole event and as a result suffering the consequences (7- Turkey may lose American Jewish Society's support,8- Turkey has given harm to herself). Attributes and other qualities are ascribed in structures other than the verb 'is'. Examples of these verbs are 'planned' (5), 'seemed' (6), 'is worried' (7), 'is of the opinion' (8) with one example of passive structure (7).

There is a deliberate attempt by the writers of the editorials not to express opinions with certainty instead using verbs suggesting vagueness like 'seem' or 'with the opinion of'. They try to hint their criticisms, placing the prominence of the message not on the agent but on the consequences of the action(process). Thus, relationals in Zaman do not portray as solid a front as in Cumhuriyet in fulfilling their ideological supporting role.

There is clearly observable manoeuvre to direct the readers' attention away from Erdogan's performance in Davos panel to other side issues that may not have close connections to the main event like the comments of foreign diplomats or Erdogan being announced as the hero of Muslim people in Gaza and all over the Muslim world (refer to no.18 in material processes).

Actionals in Zaman

Material Processes

(1) *Davos'taki performansının...Mart 2009'da yapılacak yerel seçimlerde kendisine yardımcı olması beklenebilir.*

'It might be expected that Erdogan's performance in Davos should serve him in municipal elections in March,2009'.

(2) *Başbakan, İsrail Cumhurbaşkanı'na karşı onurlu bir duruş sergilemiş oldu.*

'Prime Minister displayed an honourable stance to Israeli President'.

(3) *Başbakan bu onurlu duruşu ile kendi kamuoyunun tepkisini yalın biçimde temsil etmiş oluyor.*

'With this honourable stance, Prime Minister is simply representing the reaction of his supporters'.

(4) *Erdogan'ın niyeti İsrail yönetimi ile kavga etmek değil, orada yaşanan insanlık dramına karşı çıkmak.*

'Erdogan's intention is not to argue with Israeli government but to protest the human tragedy over there'.

(5) *Başbakan'ın Davos'ta onur mücadelesi verdiği gün.*

'The day when Prime Minister stood for the honour of humanity'.

(6) *(başbakan) ...oradaki haksızlığa işaret ediyor ve toplantıyı terk ederek protestosunu gösteriyor.*

' (Prime Minister) points out the injustice, and walking out of the panel room, demonstrates his protest'.

(7) *Aslında panelin seyrini İsrail Cumhurbaşkanı Simon Peres değiştirmiştir.*

'In fact, it was Israeli President Shimon Peres who changed the course of the panel'.

(8) *Bu densizliğe Başbakan Erdogan kayıtsız kalmadı ve Peres'e hak ettiği cevabı verdi.*

'Prime Minister Erdogan did not remain indifferent to this tactlessness and gave the answer Peres deserved'

(9) *ABD hükümetindekiler her iki liderinde paneldeki davranışlarını pek tasvip etmiyor.*

'USA government do not endorse the attitude of both leaders at the panel'

(10) *Baykal, Erdogan'ın haksızlığa tepkisini doğru bulurken (buluyor).*

' Baykal (the leader of the opposition party) approves of Erdogan's reaction to injustice'.

(11) *Erdoğan, diplomasiye ve siyasete yitirdikleri bir değeri iade etmiştir.*

' Erdogan returned a longlost value to diplomacy and politics'.

(12) *Başbakan Tayyip Erdoğan... Davos zirvesindeki şahsiyetli çıkışından sonra (şahsiyetli bir çıkış yapmıştır).*

'Prime Minister Tayyip Erdogan has demonstrated a protest which possessed a style'.

(13) *Erdoğan, mazlum Filistin halkını içtenlikle ve ustalıkla savunan konuşmasıyla ve toplantı başkanına yönelik çarpıcı jestiyle dünya gündemine oturdu.*

' Erdogan became a current (political) issue by his speech, defending the oppressed Palestine people wholeheartedly and proficiently, and by his impressive reaction to the chairman'.

(14) *Türkiye diplomasiyi aşan bir tepki ortaya koyuyor. Türkiye diplomatik hesapların dışında bütünüyle insani bir tutum sergiliyor.*

'Turkey reacts beyond diplomacy. Turkey exhibits a very humanitarian attitude, leaving diplomatic benefits aside'.

(15) *Başbakan Tayyip Erdoğan'ın sözleri tam olarak Gazzelilerin başkaldırısına dönüşüyor.*

'The words of Prime Minister Tayyip Erdoğan become the uprising of Gaza people'.

(16) *Bu ülkenin Başbakanı ...bütün uluslararası camianın nefretle kınadığı katliamın sahibi bir devletin yetkilisine hak ettiği dersi veriyor.*

'The Prime Minister of this country gives what he deserves to a statesman who was condemned vehemently worldwide due to his share in the massacre'.

(17) *..onurlu bir şekilde ortamı terk ediyor.*

'Erdogan makes an honourable exit'.

(18) *Davos'taki Erdoğan, Arap aleminin ve İslam dünyasının gönlünü fethetti. Türkiye'ye duyulan sempati zirvelere çıktı.*

'Erdogan in Davos conquered the hearts in Arab and Muslim world. The sympathy for Turkey peaked'.

(19) *Onurumuzu ve şerefimizi Erdoğan kurtardı.*

'Erdogan saved our honour and dignity'.

Erdogan occupies the main agent position in all the material processes except in four examples. He is referred to by his surname Erdogan (4, 11, 13), in other agentive constructions, he is portrayed in terms of his unique identity- Başbakan (President)(2,3,5); Başbakan Erdoğan/Başbakan Tayyip Erdoğan (President Erdoğan/President Tayyip Erdoğan (8,12,15) which according to van Leeuwen (1996) gives the participant elite status. He is also in agentive position in circumstantial structures- Bu ülkenin Başbakanı (the President of this country) (16), Davos'taki Erdoğan (Erdogan in Davos) (18).

The patients who receive the after effects of Erdoğan's actions are Israeli President Simon Peres (2), officials in American government (9), oppressed Palestinians (13,15), Arab and Islamic World (18), politicians (11), and the whole humanity (14). Erdoğan is explicitly put in the agent position in transactive(active) structures, this places Erdoğan in a controlling position to what happened during the Davos panel and

afterwards. This coincides with his previously mentioned elite status; being the leader/President of a country, this is what he is expected to do.

The agent is in subject position in all the examples in the data which further supports the proposition that elite statesmen take all the responsibility and control in issues concerning their country. This is the image of Prime Minister Erdogan and message Zaman newspaper wants to relay to its readers. The actions the main agent performs originally carries humanitarian values, and they are given as a list of actions in cause-effect relationship. The agent (Erdogan) points out the inhumanitarian attitude of Israelis to Palestinians (4,6), his reaction is in the form of a protest (6), the protest is to leave the panel room (6), and this reaction is what Israeli President deserves (16,8). Example 10 further supports this style of protest, the support comes from the leader of the opposition party, a valuable support gaining strong foundations for the ideological stance of the newspaper in question.

This ordering of events from the perspective of this newspaper is an attempt to portray the agent Erdogan in a controlling position, on top of all the authorities coinciding with his elite status as the Prime Minister of Turkey. The message given is that Erdogan is right in what he did, cannot be criticized, and his actions (reaction) cannot be questioned. They (Israeli authorities, Turkish press who criticize him, the nations who stayed indifferent to the unjust treatment of Palestinians) are the ones to be criticized, got what they deserved politically (16).

The attributions Erdogan assigned as the active agent during the event carry positive values; he is respectable (as he displayed an honourable protest against Israeli President-2, 3, 5, 17,19), knowledgeable and initiator (14,13,12- as he takes risks and has the necessary capacity to initiate non-diplomatic manouvres to solve problems), carries humanitarian values and his protest is for the unjust and biased treatment of Palestinians by Israelis and the Western World- 4,6, 11,13,14,16).

The material processes mostly include active (action) verbs (karşı çıkmak- to stand against (4); mücadele etmek- to struggle (5); terk etmek- to walk out (6); protestosunu göstermek- to protest (6); hak ettiği cevabı vermek- to reply by what someone deserves (8); insani bir tutum sergilemek- to display a humanitarian attitude (14); başkaldırıya dönüşmek- to display a rebellion (15). The actions Erdogan actively takes part in are compatible with the active, controlling, authoritative role he has been assigned to and his elite status as a statesman.

Verbal Processes

(1) *bazıları hala bu tavır ve çıkışın doğru olup olmadığını soruyorlar.*

'Some still ask if this attitude and outburst were proper'.

(2) *Demek ki bazılarının iddia ettiği gibi T.C. Başbakanı sadece İsrail'i eleştirmemiş.*

'So, as some argued, Prime Minister of Turkey did not only criticize Israel'.

(3) *(Erdoğan) arabuluculuk ve barışa katkının hakkını vererek gerçekleri söyleyecekti(söyledi).*

'(Erdogan) told the truth by doing justice to peacemaking and mediatorship'.

(4) *Başbakan, bir daha Davos'a gelmeyeceğini söylüyor.*

'Prime Minister says he won't visit (come to) Davos any more'.

(5) *..bazısı bunun bir faturası var diyor.*

' Some say there is a price to pay'.

(6) *... bir Amerikalı düşünce kuruluşu uzmanı, 'duygusal liderliğin' bir kenara bırakılıp daha farklı bir üslup kullanılması gerektiğini söylüyor.*

' A specialist in an American think-tank organization says 'emotional leadership' style should be left aside'.

(7) *Başbakan Erdoğan'ın, Davos'ta İsrail Cumhurbaşkanı Simon Peres'e rest çekerek paneli terk etmesinin seçimlere etkisinin hiç olmayacağı söylenemez.*

' It can not be said that Prime Minister Erdogan's protest of Israeli President Shimon Peres in Davos has no effect on municipal elections'.

(8) *(Bahçeli) Irak gibi, AB gibi diğer dış politika konularında aynı duruşu niye tekrarlamadığını sordu.*

'(Bahçeli (an opposition leader), while regarding Erdogan's protest acceptable and to the point, asked why he did not displayed the same style of protest in controversial issues concerning Iraq and European Union'.

(9) *Yine denilebilir ki, Türkiye bu çıkışıyla Arap-İsrail savaşına müdahil olmuş değildir, insanlık ve canilik çatışmasında taraf olmuştur.*

'It could again be said that with this protest Turkey has been on the side of protecting human rights not be a part of Arab-Israel conflict'.

(10) *Eğer ben orada diplomatik davranmamış olsaydım, benim daha farklı bir şey yapmam gerekirdi diyor Başbakanımız. ...Başbakan tam olarak vereceği daha sert bir tepkiyi, diplomatik endişelerle frenlediğini söylüyor. ..Kısaca bize 'ben efendiliğimi bozmadım' demiş oluyor.*

'Our Prime Minister says that if I did not react the way I did, I would do something else. I restrained myself from displaying a stronger reaction'.

(11) *Arap Birliği Genel Sekreteri Amr Musa.. şöyle konuştu: Sayın Erdoğan söylemek istediğini söyledi ve gitti. Hepsi bu. Haklıydı.*

'Amr Musa, the secretary General of the Arab League, told (us) that Erdogan said what he wanted and left. That's it. He was right'.

(12) *Başbakan, ABD ile ilişkileri risk altına sokma pahasına mı bunları yaptı? .. bu soruya da 'hayır' cevabı vermek lazım.*

'Did Prime Minister want to risk relations with USA with this protest? One should answer this question with a 'no'.

The sayer role is assigned either to Prime Minister Erdogan or to a group of people without definite identities (bazıları- some people) or other authorities (bir Amerikalı düşünce kuruluşu uzmanı- an expert from an American think-tank organization).

The process verb is, most of the times, 'say' (4,5,6,7,9,10,11)- used to stand for the Turkish verbs- 'söylemek' and 'demek' in either positive (4,5,6,10,11) and negative (7) forms, and different tense markings. Other Turkish verbs used in verbal processes are 'sormak'- to ask (1,8), 'konuşmak'- to speak (11), '(birine) söylemek'- to tell (someone) (11), 'cevap vermek'- to answer (12), 'eleştirmek'- to criticize (2), 'gerçekleri söylemek'- to tell the truth (3). The verbal processes use active and passive structures equally. Passive constructions refer either to criticisms (6) or to statements open to interpretations (7,9,10).

The sayer role is given to people other than Erdogan when the newspaper does not agree with the political outcomes of the Davos event (5). These outcomes question the attitude of Erdogan during the panel discussion (his angry outburst to Simon Peres (1)) and his emotional leadership style (6). When criticisms are directed, the sayer role changes so as to pass the responsibility of disagreeing with the dominant ideology to other people. Another point to be noticed is that the newspaper vocalizes criticisms coming from Western political sources and praises from the Arab World. Thus, overall, main comments on Davos event are reflected from the perspective of an outer source. This may indicate an intention to move away from being the focus of attention and establish a ground to reply to the criticisms vocalized in the newspaper of the opposite ideology.

Mental processes will not be subject to investigation as there are not enough samples present in the data.

Discussion

In the editorials that make up the data for analysis it has emerged that the ideological orientations of the newspapers in question are quite diverse to the point that the same issue (Davos conflict) can be subject to both criticisms and praises. In international and national circles, what happened in Davos in World Economic Forum in 2009, has been termed a 'conflict' yet it led the way to two diverse interpretations of the same issue. In both groups of editorials, no serious attempt could be observed to see the issue from the others' eyes. The language that is used to argue the main themes in a conflict and to present characterizations of key events, players and concepts is, in

fact, the construction itself of how these are understood. Careful comparative study of texts emblematic of the issues in crisis can reveal how differently those issues are perceived and explained to the constituents involved (Vaughan, 1995:73). This perception of Vaughan explains well the diverse (ideological) interpretations of the Davos conflict in the data.

Both newspaper give ample space to the arguments that appeared in the foreign press related to the Davos conflict with adverse ideological intentions resulting in adverse messages to their readers. Cumhuriyet newspaper refers to these arguments by foreign writers to amplify 'support' to the points criticized concerning Erdogan's attitude in the Davos issue whereas Zaman newspaper uses the arguments as a defence mechanism in explaining why Erdogan behaved the way he did, and how well-fitted his reaction was. The opinions of Arab newspapers, mostly, take place in the editorials of Zaman newspaper to legitimize Prime Minister's reactive attitude since Erdogan is announced the 'hero of the Middle East', 'the new leader of the Muslim World', and praised for being the saviour of people who are living in Gaza under life-threatening conditions. The acceptance of Prime Minister's attitude gets further reference from outer circles; fortifies Zaman editorials' standing on the issue and their pro-Erdogan publication policies. A noticeable detail in Cumhuriyet editorials is their preference to give space to views from Western Press, especially American Press as those include criticisms about Erdogan's attitude repeatedly. Zaman's strategy of giving reference to foreign press is repeated in Cumhuriyet strengthening their ideological positioning on the Davos issue.

Zaman newspaper editors are also observed to find themselves in a position where they continuously nullify criticisms to Erdogan himself and his overreaction during the panel; trying to delegitimize the grounds for any kind of opposition coming from anti-Erdogan front. The message is 'there is nothing to criticise about' and 'if you are criticising then you are against the authority, the governing power; which makes you 'a traitor'. The editors are positioning their readers as true citizens by questioning the genuineness of the opposition's citizenship thus reinforcing the binary opposition us vs.them. They are, in a way, serving the Islamist ideology as well, by praising what Erdogan did, accepting his Islamic leadership, obeying his governing strategies that are in line with Islamic doctrines. This is a clear indication of powerful effect of media on the readers.

Compared to Cumhuriyet newspaper editorials, Zaman editorials carry emotional overtones, especially in their representation of Prime Minister Erdogan using adjectives of strong emotional reactive force like stunning, fantastic etc. This suggests a more involved reporting stance. Cumhuriyet, on the other hand, characteristically embodies strong overtones of criticism for the representation of Erdogan and the Davos issue.

Comparison of editorials stylistically brings about another worth mentioning detail which is the observation that in Zaman editorials, answers or justifications

(legitimizations) can be found to the points raised against Erdogan and his attitude in Davos conflict in Cumhuriyet editorials. This is just like a reaction-response session between two newspapers.

Two newspapers use transitivity processes to bring to the fore their own perspective to the representation of Davos event while at the same time placing more emphasis on the negative attributes of opposing group/ideology (anti-Erdogan vs. pro-Erdogan). Transitivity processes also assisted in the realization of contrasting discourses. Material, verbal and relational processes of transitivity indicate the newspapers' political stances or ideologies. The actionals (material, verbal, mental processes) have a role to play in constructing a version of reality that is out of proportion to the number of times they occur in the editorials. The actionals are more in Cumhuriyet in comparison with relationals (processes of being) to emphasize Erdogan's share in Davos to turn out a failure. However, in Zaman, the reason we observe more actionals is because this newspaper's version of reality proposes that Erdogan's active role in Davos has made the event a complete success, earning him the status of a hero, saving the rights of oppressed people. The participants (as goal – the people and things affected by the action) of the processes have diverse ideological foundations; in Cumhuriyet the participants as goals are Turkish citizens suffering or will be suffering the ill consequences of this, in this newspapers' terms, unprofessionally held diplomatic event. In Zaman, however, the affected people are those who suffer from the inhumanitarian treatment of people in Gaza by the Israeli government, Davos event is presented as a strategy to save lives of the people who are living in a different geography. Thus, the Davos event is represented once 'a betrayal'(Cumhuriyet) and 'a humanitarian act' in another (Zaman) through attributions attached in each case along the newspapers' ideologies. The rhetorical strategy employed is generalization; Cumhuriyet generalizes the non-leader like/non-citizen friendly qualities of Prime Minister Erdogan (Cumhuriyet newspaper mental processes section, examples 1,4 and 5). Again, by saving the rights of people in Gaza, by means of generalization, Prime Minister is saving the rights of all humanity in Zaman. The high number of verbal processes in Zaman newspaper compared to Cumhuriyet newspaper serves the authoritarian leadership style Prime Minister Erdogan displays in the editorials of the newspaper in question. Whatever ideological message this newspaper wants to relay to its readers is verbalized directly from the mouth of the Prime Minister so that the newspaper would not be in any responsible position while defending pro-Erdogan policies.

The proportionately high number of actionals in both newspapers go hand in hand with the sole, active agent role of Prime Minister Erdogan. He is the only responsible person for the good and bad results of processes (actions) that directly or indirectly effect the participants of these processes.

There is structural evidence of positive representation of the event in Zaman and negative one in Cumhuriyet. Thus, the transitivity analysis makes it possible to relate the structural organizations at the clausal level with the underlying motivations and ideologies behind the production of the editorials under investigation. Representational practices and processes such as transitivity have ideological effects and can assist in the realization of contrasting discourses through actional and relational processes.

Overall, we might possibly conclude that a subjective assessment is presented as an integral part of the objective content with the use of transitivity analysis in ideologically opposing newspaper editorials

REFERENCES

- ALİRİZA, Bülent (2011). The Turkish-Israeli Crisis and U.S. –Turkish relations. Center for Strategic and International Studies. Retrieved from: <http://csis.org/publication/turkish-israeli-crisis-and-us-turkish-relations>
- AYDINTAŞBAŞ, Aslı (2009). Erdogan's Davos Outburst Is Nothing New. Forbes. Retrieved from: http://www.forbes.com/2009/01/30/erdogan-turkey-davos-opinions-contributors_0130_asli_aydintasbas.html
- BLOOMEART, Jan and Jef VERSCHUEREN (1998). *Debating Diversity: Analysing the Discourse of Tolerance*. London: Routledge.
- BOLIVAR, Adriana (1994). "The Structure of Newspaper Editorials". In *Advances in Written Text Analysis*, ed. by Malcolm Coulthard, 276-294. London: Routledge.
- DAVUTOĞLU, Ahmet (2005). *Stratejik Derinlik: Türkiye'nin Uluslararası Konumu*. Küre Yayınları: İstanbul.
- FAIRCLOUGH, Norman (1989). *Language and Power*. London: Longman.
- FAIRCLOUGH, Norman (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- FAIRCLOUGH, Norman (1995). *Media Discourse*. London: Edward Arnold.
- FAIRCLOUGH, Norman (2003). *Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research*. London: Routledge.
- FOWLER, Roger (1991). *Language in the News: Discourse and Ideology in the Press*. London: Routledge.
- GOATLY, Peter A (2000). *Critical Reading and Writing*. London: Routledge.
- HALLIDAY, Michael A. K. (1978). *Language as Social Semiotic - the interpretation of language and meaning*. London: Edward Arnold, Ltd.

- HALLIDAY, Michael A. K. (1985). *A Short Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold, Ltd.
- HALLIDAY, Michael A.K. (1990). "New Ways of Meaning: A Challenge to Applied Linguistics." Plenary address presented at the Ninth World Congress of Applied Linguistics, Thessaloniki, Greece. Also published in the *Journal of Applied Linguistics* 6: 7-36.
- HALLIDAY, Michael A.K. (1994). *Introduction to Functional Grammar*. 2nd. edn. London: Arnold.
- HODGE, Robert and Günther KRESS (2nd ed).(1993). *Language as Ideology*. London: Routledge.
- HOLQUIST, Michael (1983). "The Politics of Representation". *The Quarterly Newsletter of the Laboratory of Comparative Human Cognition* 5: 2-9.
- INBAR, Efraim (2011). "Israeli-Turkish Tensions and their International Ramifications". *Orbis* 55(1): 132-146.
- KARLSBERG, Michael (2005). "The Power of Discourse and the Discourse of Power: Pursuing Peace through Discourse Intervention". *International Journal of Peace Studies* 10(1): 1-25.
- KRESS, Günther (1983). "Linguistic Processes and The Mediation of 'reality': The Politics of Newspaper Language". *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 40: 43-58.
- LIHUA, Liu (2009). " Discourse Construction of Social Power: interpersonal rhetoric in editorials of the China Daily". *Discourse Studies* 11(1): 59-78.
- MEHAN, Hugh and John WILLS (1988). "MEND: A Nurturing Voice in the Nuclear Arms Debate". *Social Problems* 35(4): 363-383.
- MUNTIGL, Peter (2002). "Politicization and Depoliticization: Employment Policy in the European Union". In *Politics as Talk and Text*, ed by Paul A. Chilton, and Christina Schäffner , 45- 79. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- MORLEY, John (2004). "Modals in Persuasive Journalism: An example from the Economist". In *English Modality in Perspective. Genre Analysis and Contrastive Studies*. ed. by Roberta Facchetti, and Frank Palmer , 67-82 . Frankfurt/Main: Peter Lang.
- OKTAR, Lütfiye (2001). "The Ideological Organization of Representational Processes in the Presentation of us and them". *Discourse and Society* 12 (3): 313-346.
- SHAPIRO, Michael (1988). *The Politics of Representation*. Madison WI: University of Wisconsin Press.

- SZYMANSKI, Adam (2010). "Crisis in Turkey–Israel Relations". *Bulletin. The Polish Institute of International Affairs* 18 (94): 182 – 183.
- SIMPSON, Paul (1993). *Language, Ideology and Point of View*. London: Routledge.
- TEO, Peter (2000). "Racism in the News: A Critical Discourse Analysis of News Reporting in Two Australian Newspapers". *Discourse and Society* 11 (1): 7-49.
- THETELA, Puleng (2001). "Critique Discourses and Ideology in Newspaper Reports: A Discourse Analysis of the South African Press Reports on the 1998 SADC'S Military Intervention in Lesotho". *Discourse and Society* 12 (3): 347-370.
- THOMPSON, John B. (1990). *Ideology and Modern Society*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- TURAN, Tolga (2008). "Turkish Foreign Policy Towards Israel: The Implications of Turkey's Relations with the West". MA Thesis, Middle East Technical University: Turkey.
- TURGUT, Pelin (2009). Behind the Turkish Prime Minister's Outburst at Davos. *Time World*. Available at <http://www.time.com/time/world/article/0,8599,1875981,00.html>.
- TREW, Tony (1979). "What Papers Say: Linguistic Variation and Ideological Difference". In *Language and Control* ed. by Roger Fowler, Robert Hodge, and Günther Kress, 117-157. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- VAN DIJK, Teun A. (1980). *Macrostructures. An interdisciplinary study of global structures in discourse, interaction, and cognition*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- VAN DIJK, Teun A., and Walter Kintsch (1983). *Strategies of Discourse Comprehension*. New York: Academic Press.
- VAN DIJK, Teun A. (1984). *Prejudice in discourse*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- VAN DIJK, Teun A. (1987). *Communicating racism: Ethnic prejudice in thought and talk*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- VAN DIJK, Teun A. (1991). *Racism and the press*. London: Routledge.
- VAN DIJK, Teun A. (1992). "Racism and Argumentation: Race Riot Rhetoric in Tabloid Editorials". In *Argumentation Illuminated* ed. by Frans H. van Eemeren et.al, 242-259. Dordrecht:Foris.
- VAN DIJK, Teun A. (1993). *Elite discourse and racism*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- VAN DIJK, Teun A. (1995). "Discourse Semantics and Ideology". *Discourse and Society* 6(2): 243-89.
- VAN DIJK, Teun A. (1995). Opinions and Ideologies in Editorials. In *Paper for the 4th International Symposium of Critical Discourse Analysis, Language, Social Life and Critical Thought*, Athens, 14-16 December. Available at:

- <http://www.discourses.org/UnpublishedArticles/Opinions%20and%20ideologies%20in%20editorials.htm>
- VAN DIJK, Teun A. (1996). "Opinions and Ideologies in Editorials". Available at <http://www.hum.uva.nl/teun/editoria.htm>.
- VAN DIJK, Teun A. (1997). "Context models and text processing". In *Cognition and Consciousness*, ed. by Maxim I. Stamenow, 189-226). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- VAN DIJK, Teun A. (1998). "Opinions and ideologies in the press". In *Approaches to Media Discourse*, ed. by Allan Bell, and Peter Garrett , 21-63. Oxford: Blackwell.
- VAN DIJK, Teun A. (1999). "Media, Racism and Monitoring". In *International Media Monitoring*, ed. by Kaarle Nordenstreng, and Michael S. Griffin, 307-316. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- VAN DIJK, Teun A. (2001). "Multidisciplinary CDA: A Plea for Diversity". In *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* , ed. by Ruth Wodak, and Michael Meyer, 95 – 120. London: SAGE.
- VAN DIJK, Teun A. (2002). "Political Discourse and Political Cognition". In *Politics as Text and Talk: Analytic Approaches to Political Discourse*, ed. by Paul Chilton, and Christina Schaffner, 204 – 236. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- VAN DIJK, Teun A. (2005a). "Politics, ideology and discourse". In *Elsevier Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics, Volume on Politics and Language*, ed. by Ruth Wodak, 728-740. Oxford:Elsevier.
- VAN DIJK, Teun A. (2005b). "War rhetoric of a little ally. Political implicatures of Aznar's Legitimization of the War in Iraq". *Journal of Language and Politics* 4(1): 65-92.
- VAN DIJK, Teun A. (2006). "Ideology and discourse analysis". *Journal of Political Ideologies* 11: 115–40.
- VAN DIJK, Teun A. (2009). "Critical Discourse Studies: A Sociocognitive Approach". In *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* , ed. by Ruth Wodak, and Michael Meyer, 62-86. London: Sage.
- VAUGHAN, Caroline H. (1995). "A Comparative Discourse Analysis of Editorials on the Lebanon 1982 Crisis". In *Language and Peace* , ed. by Christina Schaffner, and Anita L. Wenden, 61- 74. England: Dartmouth.
- WENDEN, Anita L., and Christina SCHAFFNER(1999). "Introduction". In *Language and Peace* , ed. by Christina Schaffner, and Anita L. Wenden, xi – xxi. Amsterdam: Harwood Academic Press.

-
- WENDEN, Anita L. (2003). "Achieving a Comprehensive Peace: The Linguistic Factor". *Peace and Change: A Journal of Peace Research* 18(2): 169-201.
- WENDEN, Anita L. (2005). "The Politics of Representation: A Critical Discourse Analysis of an Aljazeera Special Report". *International Journal of Peace Studies* 10(2): 89-112.
- WESTIN, Ingrid (2002). "Language Change in Newspaper Editorials". In *Language and Computers: Studies in Practical Linguistics*, No.44. Amsterdam:Rodopi.
- WODAK, Ruth (2001). "What CDA is About – a Summary of Its History, Important Concepts and Developments". In *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* , ed. by Ruth Wodak, and Michael Meyer, 1 – 13. London: Sage Publications.
- WODAK, Ruth (2002). "Fragmented Identities: Redefining and Recontextualizing National Identity". In *Politics as Text and Talk: Analytic Approaches to Political Discourse* , ed. by Paul Chilton, and Christina Schaffner , 143 – 169. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.