

PRIDE AND ANGER: ORHAN PAMUK'S NOBEL PRIZE AND DISCOURSES OF NATIONALISM*

Assist. Prof. Dr. Emre GÖKALP**

ABSTRACT

This study argues that Orhan Pamuk's Nobel Prize case provides fertile ground to understand the content of Turkish nationalist discourses from moderate to fanatic/radical. This paper also asserts that Turkish news media contributes both to the feelings of otherness and/or feelings of common identification with Orhan Pamuk through different nationalisms at the same time. This study, in which the representations of the Pamuk case were examined in Turkish press, looks at the way in which discursive strategies are employed to self-glorify Turkness and to construct the forms of otherness.

Keywords: *Orhan Pamuk, Nobel Prize, Nationalism, National Identity, Media*

GURUR VE ÖFKE: ORHAN PAMUK'UN NOBEL ÖDÜLÜ VE MİLLİYETÇİLİK SÖYLEMLERİ

ÖZ

Bu çalışma Orhan Pamuk'un Nobel Edebiyat ödülü örnek olayının -en ılımlısından/makulünden en fanatiğine/radikaline- Türk milliyetçiliği söylemlerini anlamada çok verimli bir zemin oluşturduğunu ileri sürmektedir. Türkiye'de haber medyasının, farklı milliyetçilik söylemleri aracılığıyla, Orhan Pamuk'la hem özdeşleşmeyi hem de onu ötekileştirmeyi eş zamanlı olarak gerçekleştirdiği belirtilmektedir. Pamuk'un Nobel ödülü'nün Türk basınındaki temsillerini irdeleyen bu çalışmada hem farklı ötekilik biçimlerini inşa edici hem de Türklüğü yüceltici söylemsel stratejilerin ne şekilde kullanıldığı ortaya konulmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Orhan Pamuk, Nobel Ödülü, Milliyetçilik, Milli Kimlik, Medya*

* Earlier versions of this study were presented in the 8th European Sociological Association (ESA) Conference, 3-6 September 2007, Glasgow, UK, and in the 12th Annual World Convention of the Association for the Study of Nationalities (ASN), April 12-14, 2007, Columbia University, New York, USA. Author is really grateful to Kerem Öktem (Oxford University), Pille Petersoo (Tallinn University), Ali Ergur (Galatasaray University) and Hakan Ergül (Anadolu University) for their careful reading, editing and commenting on this study. Author also would like to thank to anonymous referees of the article for their very valuable contribution.

** Anadolu University Faculty of Humanities Department of Sociology, e-mail: egokalp@anadolu.edu.tr

1. INTRODUCTION

In 2006, Turkey's best selling and perhaps most famous living novelist, Orhan Pamuk, won the Nobel Prize for Literature. Normally, the first-ever Turkish citizen winning such a prestigious international prize would be cause for jubilation, sanctifying the notion of "Turkishness" and the Turkish nation (like a Turkish soccer team winning a cup abroad). However, the Turkish media and general public reacted with a mix of pride, suspicion, cynicism and anger. As a result, Orhan Pamuk was turned into an object of love and hate in Turkey. On the same day as the Nobel Prize announcement, the French parliament voted to pass a resolution making denial of the 'Armenian genocide' a crime. This caused the majority of Turkish people, including many journalists, to blame Pamuk for stoking an international campaign against Turkey in return for an international award like the Nobel Prize. A damaged image of Orhan Pamuk, who was prosecuted in 2006 for 'insulting Turkishness' on his comments regarding the mass killings of Armenians in the first decades of 20th century and Kurds during the 1990's, remained intact in the memories of many journalists and ordinary people even though he was acquitted. For many, Pamuk won this award for his belittlement of the Turkish nation. On the other hand, many newspapers elated by the Nobel Prize reconstructed a patriotic discourse involving self-glorification of the Turkish national identity. 'This prize is an honour for the Turkish nation and Turkey' was the common expression for the rest of the news media.

In this paper, I will critically examine the representations of the Orhan Pamuk case in ten daily newspapers in two days just after the announcement of Nobel Prize. In doing so, I will analyze how a (Turkish) nationalist discourse has been reconstructed in the news texts in relation to the Pamuk's Nobel case. The newspapers were chosen on the double criteria of political perspectives and circulation numbers. Thus, this study is based on news stories of four highly-circulation daily newspapers and six dailies representing different political views (at least in terms of domestic political allegiances). The newspapers analyzed are: 1) *Posta* 2) *Hürriyet* 3) *Zaman* 4) *Sabah* 5) *Vatan* 6) *Yeni Şafak* 7) *Cumhuriyet* 8) *Yeniçağ* 9) *Tercüman* 10) *Radikal* – which have approximately three million circulation in total, equaling 60 percent of the entire daily circulation of newspapers in Turkey as of 2006.

Table 1.

No	Name of the Paper	Political Affiliations	Circulation in October 2006
1	Posta	Centre/Populist Tabloid	635.000
2	Hürriyet	Centre/Populist	570.000
3	Zaman	Moderate Islamist	528.000
4	Sabah	Centre/Populist	453.000
5	Vatan	Cente/Liberal	202.000
6	Yeni Şafak	Moderate Islamist	111.000
7	Cumhuriyet	Centre-Left	68.000
8	Yeni Çağ	Nationalist	58.000
9	Tercüman	Conservative/Right	41.000
10	Radikal	Liberal/Democrat	37.000
Total circulation			2.985.0000

This study also borrows analytic categories and techniques mainly employed in critical discourse analysis such as Topics and Sub-topics (main events, or subjects of discussion) and Language (lexical choices -verbs, adjectives and phrases) used to describe the Nobel Case and Orhan Pamuk. In this regard, the paper looks at the ways in which discursive strategies are employed to self-glorify Turkish national identity and to construct forms of "otherness".

2. NATIONALISM AND THE PRESS

As numbers of scholars (e.g. Bell, 1998; Fairclough, 1995; van Dijk, 1988) have underlined the profound influence that the news media are key ideological brokers, reproducers and maintainers of the dominant social order(s) of the day. A growing number of studies have already emphasized that mass media can marginalize those who challenge the status quo. In this sense, the mainstream newspapers play a vital role in reaffirmation of the hegemony of national unity, togetherness and homogeneity since their 'ideological power stems from their ability to say the same thing to millions of people simultaneously' (Fowler, 1991, p.122).

Needless to say, there is a clear articulation between the news media and nationalism. Benedict Anderson (1983) has underlined the role of newspapers in the daily reproduction of nationhood. In explaining how a nation is collectively imagined, Anderson (1983, p.35) speaks of newspaper reading as a 'mass ceremony which is repeated by thousands of people at daily intervals.' As Anderson suggests, the national media -along with the national education system- play a vital role in enabling a nation to imagine itself as a coherent, meaningful and homogeneous community.

The role of newspapers in the daily reconstruction of nationalism was also underlined by Billig (1995). For Billig, newspapers flag nationhood in more than one way. For instance, the structure in which they present their news takes the existence of a world composed of different nations for granted. The newspapers contribute to this process of routine-formation in various modes. By organizing their structure along national lines, the newspapers duplicate the division of the world into 'home' and 'foreign' – hence, into 'us' and 'them' – and remind us that 'we' belong to 'our' homeland. The flagging of nationhood is also achieved by 'simultaneously speaking to and for the nation, by evoking a national 'we', by addressing 'us', the nation, and by making it the epicenter of the universe' (Billig, 1995, pp.114–15). The news media also uses stereotypes and negative images designed to dehumanize the 'other.' Since the readers are not passive interpreters but rather active negotiators of mediated messages, we must not, as Pickering (2001, p.22) points out, underestimate the power held by the press. They 'reinforc[e] binary divisions between 'good' and 'bad' that play a significant part in the maintenance and strengthening of obstacles to the formation of a pluralistic social and political map, by the demonization of the 'other' and the restriction of the possibilities of recognizing internal national complexity and plurality.' One should also bear in mind that the reigning nationalistic narrative serves to 'deflect attention elsewhere-to the trivial, to the *other*-and away from key issues' (Burney, 2002, p.1).

Since 'ethnic prejudices are predominantly acquired and confirmed through various forms of communication' (Van Dijk, 1992, p.6), the 'national' news media, amongst other institutions, plays a crucial role in the reconstruction of national identity and nationalist discourses -whatever the impacts of globalizing trends are.

3. NATIONALIST DISCOURSES IN TURKEY AFTER THE 2000s

There has been a boost in manifestations of nationalist discourses in Turkey especially in the past decade. In fact, nationalism had always been an issue in Turkey since the foundation of the republic¹ ; however nationalist discourse and nationalist movements distinctively increased in 1990's and

1 Since Turkish nationalism was constructed as the official ideology in the initial period of Turkish Republic, (Kemalist) official nationalism has a constitutive effect on the discourses of Turkish nationalism. Therefore all the current discourses of nationalism are rooted in that period. In other words, Kemalist official nationalism is the root language of Turkish nationalism in general. There is a significant 'symbiotic relationship' between Kemalism and Turkish nationalism; moreover, nationalism is one or even the first of the three principles of the Kemalist 'six arrows' (Bora, 2002: p.16).



intensified in a new wave after 2004. Nationalism has become ordinary and popular concurrently with the processes of articulation with liberal, social democratic, and even 'socialist' discourses, and the advent of a discourse sanctifying the state (Kadioğlu, 1997, p.3). Nationalism in Turkey is not a political strategy –specific to the right wing; rather, it has almost become a prerequisite for all political discourses as a common denominator in the public and/or political sphere. Since 1990s in Turkey, nationalist projects have tried to attain a more 'ordinary' and 'normal' identity and started to articulate with liberal and social democratic discourses. Although nationalism is a phenomenon that can bear conflicting themes and include different discourses, articulation of nationalist discourses with all discursive practices by becoming ordinary and continuous is quite note-worthy.

In brief, it is possible to argue that a number of coterminous processes resulted in the strengthening of nationalist sentiment: US policies in the Middle East and particularly the invasion of Iraq; the unresolved Kurdish problem and the PKK threat; Islamophobia in the West and Turcophobia in Europe; the widespread skepticism in Europe with respect to Turkey's EU membership and double-standard of some EU countries in negotiations; the Cyprus issue, the discussions on the 'events of 1915,' and the conflict between the statist nationalist bureaucracy and the Islamic origin AKP (or AK Party) government.² Turkish nationalism reappeared as hegemonic discourse not only in the public and political spheres but also in daily life.³ The Turkish press has been no exception to the operation of this hegemony.⁴ It successfully articulates the news rhetoric into nationalism representing not only the moderate nationalist discourses, but also reconstructing and disseminating parochial and fanatical ones. Previous studies on the Turkish press have also found that the Turkish media in general tend to define the nation via perceived internal and external threats. As Yumul and Özkırımlı (2000, p.795) puts;

The Turkish press warns 'us' against internal enemies, traitors and collaborationists who are engaged in activities that might endanger our national unity. The internal enemies identified by the newspapers vary: sometimes it is the intellectuals, the fundamentalists or human rights advocates; at other times politicians, officials and so on. When reading these and similar news/commentaries, our belief in the validity of the common saying 'the Turk has no friend but the Turk' is reinforced. We feel the need to embrace our national identity more strongly and seek to minimize the impact of external threats by resorting to national isolation.

The "Kurdish problem" and the PKK (the outlawed 'Kurdistan Workers Party') terror have certainly played the most important role in the acceleration of Turkish nationalism with an introverted and chauvinistic dimension. During this period, 'Kurdish people' have been constructed as the 'internal

Six Arrows, is based on Mustafa Kemal Atatürk's, six principles (*Altı Ok*) during the Turkish independence movement. The principles were not defined as an ideology during the life of Atatürk, but formulated later on. Today all discourses of nationalism are trying to 'found, legitimize, and solidify' themselves based on the official Atatürk nationalism (Koçak, 2002: p.37).

- 2 As Günay (2006: p.8) states, secular nationalists and the state elites in Turkey have suspected the ruling AKP (Justice and Development Party) government of having a hidden agenda. 'The AKP's democratization reforms and its drive towards the European Union have been seen as a back door for Islamization and as a danger for the integrity of the Turkish state.'
- 3 According to a recent opinion poll held in 2006, 62 percent of the Turkish society declared itself as 'nationalist,' while 32.3 percent of among them declared themselves as 'fully nationalist' See (Özkırımlı, 2006: p.20).
- 4 Like other forms of nationalism, as a hegemonic discursive formation, Turkish nationalism is not only reproduced in times of crisis either. As Renan (1882) has stated, every day it is necessary for national identity to be presented to public opinion and confirmed quietly so that it is reproduced. In order for Turkish national identity to fulfill its function, citizens should know the meaning of national identity; in other words, national identity should be reminded regularly and continuously, and perpetuated in the future as well as the present. Thus, the categories of Turkish nation and Turkishness do not appear to be ideological constructs within historical process, on the contrary they seem to be perfectly 'natural'.

significant Other.’⁵ Accompanied by the dramatic level of violence/terror, *de facto* foundation of a Kurdish state in North Iraq, and the pressure by European platforms on Turkey related to the Kurdish issue, the intensity of the Kurdish issue has increased to such an extent that it has caused the ‘partitioning/disintegration phobia’ to dominate the political space. This process has led to the radicalization of ethnic and/or discriminatory nationalism, which inflicts an expansion of anti-Western ideas in the public opinion by empowering the anti-Western isolationist tendencies in the collective national memory (Bora, 2003).

Indeed, ‘the paradox of Turkish nationalism which resulted in both hostility and imitation of Western ways have accompanied the modernization process since the turn of the nineteenth century’ (Kadioğlu, 1996, p.185). The historical paradox of Turkish national identity stems from the tension between the emulation of the West/Europe that is regarded as the unique address of civilisation, modernisation, wealth and prosperity, and the hostility towards the same West/Europe that is, at the same time, considered as the cultural/political ‘other’, or at times the ‘enemy.’ In other words, the sentiments for Europe oscillate between two extremes: on the one hand the West/Europe is admired as the ideal or level of contemporary civilization which is in the core of the Republican ideology; on the other hand resentment is nourished against the West/Europe as an insidious political enemy. In this context, following the argument of Petersoo (2007), it might be argued that Europe has been constructed in a dichotomic way both as the ‘external negative Other’ and ‘external positive Other’⁶ of mainstream Turkish nationalism.

5 For Triandafyllidou (1998: p.594), the identity of a nation is defined and/or re-defined through the influence of ‘significant others,’ namely other nations or ethnic groups that are perceived to threaten the authenticity and/or independence of the nation. Significant others might be distinguished between those that belong to the same political entity with the in-group, namely they are ‘internal significant others’ and those that form a separate political unit and, in this sense, are ‘external significant others’ (p.600). More particularly, internal significant others are perceived to erode the unity and/or authenticity of the nation from ‘within,’ while external significant others (are deemed to) challenge the territorial and/or cultural integrity of the nation from without (p.602). ‘In other words, the external significant other is perceived as threatening to ‘wipe out’ the nation, while the internal significant other is viewed as threatening to ‘contaminate’ it (p.603). Significant others also become salient in periods of social, political or economic crisis during which the identity of the nation is put in question. The significant other in these cases serves in overcoming the crisis because it unites the people in front of a common enemy, it reminds them ‘who we are’ and emphasizes that ‘we are different and unique.’ In times of crisis, the significant other serves also as a scapegoat... If the nation undergoes a period of general economic or socio-political crisis, the significant other provides for a ‘distraction’ from the real causes of the crisis. Moreover, it is a means for reasserting the positive identity of the nation against the odds’ (p.603).

6 For Petersoo (2007), there is room for more than one Other at any given time. National identity formation should not be seen as a strictly ‘monogamous’ affair between one nation and one significant Other, but as a complex interplay between the nation and various Others’ (pp.120-121). But there is always the possibility of turning a traditionally opposite Other into a positive Other... For that reason, there is nothing static and stable about Other-images. In other words, the role of any given Other can clearly change during various phases of identity construction and maintenance. An external positive Other is usually a neighboring nation or state perceived not as a threat by the nation in question, but rather as a positive reference point. This positive Other is used as a role model, as a standard to which the nation aspires. An external negative Other may be a neighboring state... The national Self is afraid that the external Other is going to challenge the territorial and/or cultural integrity of the nation from ‘without.’ What’s more is that there is always the possibility of turning a traditionally opposite Other into a positive Other since there is nothing static and stable about Other-images. In other words, the role of any given Other can clearly change during various phases of identity construction and maintenance (pp.121-127).

Since the Republic of Turkey emerged as a nation-state from the ruins of the Ottoman empire after an independence war against the Western powers, there has been not only the reactivation of a so-called 'division anxiety' and the 'Sèvres syndrome' within Turkish nationalist discourse, but also the 'othering' of the West/Europe as the controlling force behind 'hostile plots' against Turkey. The dominant/popular nationalist discourse has coded Europe as one who has always excluded the Turks, supported the PKK, does not accept Turkey's membership to the EU and tries to divide Turkey.

US policies in the Middle East in general and specifically in Iraq have given rise to the establishment of the so-called Kurdish state in North Iraq and the direct reflections of this formation to the Kurdish question in Turkey. In consequence the conflict over Kurdish demands became more sensitive. After the capture of its leader, Abdullah Öcalan, the PKK intensified its attacks against Turkish targets. In 2003, eleven Turkish military officers were arrested by American forces in North Iraq. Hoods were put over their heads during interrogations, an incident that became known in Turkey as the 'hood crisis.' This event, along with the US invasion of Iraq has changed the Turkish public's view towards the US and fortified anti-American sentiment due to the media representations of the event as a humiliating treatment ⁷(Günay, 2006, Grigoriadis, 2006). In 2005 another event occurred in the city of Mersin where two Kurdish children allegedly attempted to burn the Turkish flag in a pro-Kurdish demonstration. Thanks to the populist and sensationalist coverage of the media, this incident caused national(ist) campaigns throughout the country.⁸ Within days, almost all television channels also displayed a Turkish flag at the corner of their screen and nationalist protests were organized with Turkish flags to react the incident across the country.

Some of the European leaders' declarations against Turkey's EU membership and the French Parliament's decision that would make it a crime to deny the so-called 'Armenian Genocide' lead to mistrust among the Turkish public. Moreover, as Grigoriadis (2006, pp.11-12, 19) states, 'the [Turkish] public opinion saw that the European Union did not remain neutral in the Cyprus dispute but took the Greek Cypriot side. While the Greek Cypriots were responsible for the lack of the solution in the Cyprus issue, it was not them but the Turkish Cypriots who were penalised for that...Reaction to Kurdish and Greek Cypriot nationalism was one of the reasons for the recent nationalist upsurge.' All in all, as in the words of Orhan Pamuk, 'fomenting hostility towards Turkey in Europe unfortunately leads to the development of a stifling, anti-European nationalism in Turkey.'⁹ There are a growing number of young and impressionable people 'who are feeling increasingly resentful towards the outside world, Brussels in particular and the West in general. Since the partial suspension of membership talks in December, mounting frustration has in some groups boiled into nationalist fervour' (Davies, 2007, p.1).

It is in this highly charged political atmosphere that Pamuk made his controversial remarks on the suffering of Kurds and Armenians. Pamuk's statement had created extreme reaction. 'In the eyes of many, challenging the statist narrative is equal to betrayal and serves those aiming to separate the territory of the nation. After all, 30.2 percent of the population declared that Pamuk's statement was the current event which annoyed them most (Günay, 2006, p.4).

7 Anti-semitism and anti-Americanism had exceedingly come into the picture in the movie 'Valley of the Wolves: Iraq' in 2006. This movie is still one of the most seen movies in the box office of Turkish cinema history.

8 Considering the state of national mobilization in times of crises, international successes and periodical rituals such as national festivals in which the nation-state sanctifies itself, 'the possibility of popularization of nationalist campaigns decrease, which are not enabled or encouraged in order to create social mobilization according to official policies... For the same reason, the national campaigns which are not encouraged by the great industrial media are not equipped with the possibility of popularization' (Bora and Can, 2004: p.543).

9 Orhan Pamuk, 'Turkey Makes Europe an Offer of Peace,' http://www.qantara.de/webcom/show_article.php/c-654/nr-3/_p-1/i.html?PHPSESSID=5, February 12, 2007

4. THE ORHAN PAMUK CASE

Pamuk, whose novels are literary events and sell hundreds of thousands in their Turkish prints, has been engaged in political activities outside the literary realm for some years. In 1998, The Turkish state offered him the accolade of 'State Artist,' but Pamuk rejected. Although Pamuk has won numerous national and international awards for his books which have been translated into more than 40 languages,¹⁰ he has been in the headlines less for his novels and literary awards but more for his political comments. He voiced his criticism of the Turkish State - for the lack of freedom of expression, democracy and human rights - as well as its policies on the Kurdish issue. In his interviews especially with foreign journalists, he did not refrain from making harsh criticisms on the domestic and international issues.

Pamuk drew the ire of the state in February 2005 when he gave an interview to the Swiss publication *Das Magazin*, a weekly supplement to a number of Swiss daily newspapers. In the interview, among other things, he made remarks on the history of 'others' in Turkey, and especially about Kurds and Armenians 'Thirty-thousand Kurds and 1 million Armenians were killed in these lands, and nobody but me dares to talk about it,' he told the newspaper. His remarks especially on this most controversial episode in Ottoman-Turkish history were widely seen as recognition of the alleged 'Armenian genocide,' a claim Turkey fiercely rejects. The Turkish state officially acknowledges that large numbers of Armenians died, but insists that the overall figure is inflated and that the deaths occurred in the civil unrest during World War I and the collapse of the Ottoman Empire. In accordance with the dominant official ideology, for mainstream media discourse only the 'terrorist organization-PKK' has been held responsible for the loss of 37,000 lives in Turkey. Together with the Kurds, Armenians have been also one of most important internal and/or external negative others of the Turkish national identity in the historical context.¹¹

Although he appeared in an interview on CNN-Turk and said, 'That wasn't what I meant. After all, I didn't say that Turks were the ones who killed those Armenians and Kurds,' the government, nationalist political actors and the news media immediately joined together in attacking Orhan Pamuk. He was accused of 'insulting Turkishness' under Article 301 of Turkish Penal Code. The trial was preceded by

10 Pamuk's books, translated into more than 40 languages, are: 'Cevdet Bey and His Sons' (1982), 'The Silent House' (1983), 'The White Castle' (1985), 'The Black Book' (1990), 'The New Life' (1994), 'My Name Is Red' (1998), 'Snow' (2002) and 'Istanbul' (2003).

11 During the construction of Turkish nation and the Turkish national identity, 'the Armenians became the first 'others,' whose claims over eastern Anatolia were perceived as a real threat to Turkish territoriality and identity (Göl, 2005: p.121). The Armenian question, 'although ninety years have passed by, is the hottest issue in Turkey at the moment. In fact, it has grown more flagrant than it used to be before the 1970's, because generations have grown up without having the least information about it, unless they were told about Armenian atrocities against Turks. The assassinations conducted by *Asala* from the 1970s onwards contributed to this feeling of victimization and being the object of an international campaign of slander

death threats and a provincial official ordered the destruction of Pamuk's books. Although Pamuk was acquitted by the court, he won the reputation of a 'traitor' mainly because of the representation of the mainstream news media.¹² As Murat Belge (2005, pp.1-2) maintains;

When this interview was translated and published in Turkey, and the Turkish media helped create a clamour against the speaker of these blasphemies, Turkish prosecutors probably felt that their career demanded them to intervene...With the help of support by the media (mainstream included) the reaction turned into mass hysteria, with groups organizing noisy demonstrations to rant and rail against Pamuk.

A recent research (İri and Arcan, 2006) based on a content analysis on the news coverage of Pamuk's controversial remarks clearly shows that how his point of view is framed and how he is labelled as 'traitor' by the mainstream Turkish press. This research on four biggest selling dailies uncovers the fact that the news media used stereotypes and negative images designed to dehumanize Pamuk.

Table 2. Negative Depictions of Orhan Pamuk in News

Negative Depictions	Repeat Number
Insults Turkishness	57
Claims Armenian Genocide	55
Controversy/Conflict Maker	25
Traitor	22
Slanderer	18
Collaborator of West/Upper Class/ Enemy	14
Unread Writer	14
Anti-patriotic	14
Virtual/ Western Hero	10
So-called Writer	7
Self-interested (award-money)	6
Coward	6
Ethnic racist	5
Terror accessory	5
Ignorant	3
Forger	3
Jewish	2
Marginal	2
Homosexual	1
Unbeloved	1

¹² At this point, it is noteworthy that Orhan Pamuk was not portrayed as one of the leading authors of Turkey in a recent official publication. With the contributions of official Turkish Promotion Fund, Directorate General of Press and Information of the Prime Ministry published a promotional book, named 'Turkey' for foreign audience in 2005. In this 528 pages of book, although there is a special part on Turkish literature and a reader can find the name of over hundreds of Turkish poets and authors from the early ages of Turkish history to 2005, there does not exist the name of Orhan Pamuk in this eleven pages on Turkish literature (See, *Turkey*, The Directorate General of Press and Information of the Prime Ministry, 2005). In addition to this, a day after the Nobel Prize ceremony, in a documentary shown by Turkey's state broadcaster, TRT (Turkish Radio and Television Corporation), 'Pamuk was awarded a Nobel Prize because he denied his own identity,' said film-maker Banu Avar, daily *Milliyet* reported on December 13, 2006.

Table 3. Positive Depictions of Orhan Pamuk in News

Positive Depictions	Repeat Number
Admired-great writer	11
Human rights activist	9
Mistreated	9
Intellectual	5
Celebrity-famous	5
Most translated writer	3
Most selling writer	2
Virtual	1

As seen in tables 2 and 3, 20 negative -most of which are emotional- and 8 positive depictions are diagnosed in the news texts. 270 repeats for negative ones, 45 repeats for positives show the dominant tone of the news discourse. The four biggest selling dailies in Turkey have reconstructed the exclusionist nationalism with the depictions like genocide claimer, traitor, slanderer, anti-patriotic and ethnic racist. By doing this as a signifier, the mainstream media signifies Orhan Pamuk as illegitimate, marginal and a demon character. Despite Orhan Pamuk's international positive reputation in the news, he is demonized, marginalized because of his remarks. With this process mainstream media have contributed to the growing lynching process in Turkey. Because of their ties to the power structure, the mainstream media framed Pamuk's case from the perspective of dominant official ideology (İri and Arcan, 2006, pp.4-5).

5. ANALYSIS AND THE RESEARCH FINDINGS

In the sections to come, I will use three main categories to explore and analyze how different news discourses have been articulated and how a (Turkish) nationalist discourse have been reconstructed in the news texts in relation to the Pamuk's Nobel case. These categories are: 1- Representation of Pamuk as 'Other' and/or 'enemy' 2- 'Yes, but...' Self-Glorification with the Nobel and Othering Pamuk, and 3- Nobel Pride.

5.1. Representation of Pamuk as 'Other' and/or 'Enemy'

In the first category, there is a highly unfavourable and negative representation of Pamuk and the Nobel Prize. One part of the Turkish press seems to have successfully manipulated the Nobel event so as to construct what can be termed chauvinism and/or exclusionist nationalism. As can easily be predicted, the news discourse of rightist and/or nationalist press has been articulated into a parochial and fanatic nationalist discourse. These dailies openly voiced the hatred felt towards Pamuk since the beginning. For them, there is a huge conspiracy afoot, and that Pamuk only received the prize due to his statements on the Armenian and Kurdish issues, mainly his comments over the Armenian genocide allegations. They claimed that the prize was not given because of his literary skills, it was given because he belittled 'our national values' by recognizing the Armenian thesis. The author is seen as nothing but an enthusiastic denigrator of his own country. He was criticized for 'selling out' his country to clinch the Nobel. This is why he should not be praised.

These dailies presented the Nobel case in such a syntactic and lexical order as to humiliate and depreciate Pamuk by employing the rude jargon. As a 41,000-circulation newspaper, the rightist daily



Tercüman represented Pamuk in a highly derogatory way. Beneath its headline saying, ‘not a coincidence but merely a vulgar plot,’ the paper gave inclusion to the following words in the spot: ‘France adopts her immoral genocide law at the same time with their granting the Nobel Prize to Pamuk, a writer wannabe. The Swiss Academy awards the writer – traitor Orhan Pamuk for saying “1 million Armenians were killed in Turkey” with the Nobel Prize in Literature’. As shown, Pamuk is not only humiliated by reference as a ‘writer wannabe’ but also declared as a ‘traitor’. This meaning is also reinforced in other headlines of the same paper, which reads as follows: ‘Treason over and over again. Nobel Prize goes to fellow speakers of Genocide, while prison waits for deniers’ and ‘The Prize is for Hostility against Turks’ (October 14, 2006).

The use of derogatory language to ‘other’ and demonize Pamuk is more widespread in the first category. The mass-selling nationalist daily *Yeniçağ* with a 58,000-circulation, said in its headline: ‘His mouth bubbled, spilling saliva’ and proceeds with the following statement in the spot: ‘Driven as mad as rabid with the tremendous joy of having obtained the glamorous Nobel Prize in Literature, as an award of his vulgar slanders against the Turkish nation, Orhan Pamuk’s mouth bubbled, spilling saliva.’ (October 13, 2006). It is possible for even the most untrained eye to easily come to the conclusion that Pamuk is resembled with a ‘dog’ though these lexical choices. In the leads of the news text, Pamuk is characterized for exhibiting ‘spastic attitudes’, while accused of being a convert. The following subheadings employed in the news text are also nothing but a reflection of the hidden efforts to secure a totally negative posture of Pamuk in the minds of readers: ‘He insults his own country,’ or ‘Nobody likes him’ and ‘He attracts furious reactions from all social groups’.

Moreover, it is obvious that the columnists also reinforce this fanatic nationalist discourse that predominates the news texts in general. Columnists indirectly encode Pamuk and another author Elif Şafak as ‘bastard’ and ‘traitor.’ A columnist did not hesitate to use such words as ‘like a fly disturbing the eye’ (Sırrı Yüksel Cebeci, *Tercüman*, October 13, 2006) when referring to Pamuk. To give a few examples from this category which contains not even a single column favoring Pamuk, Altemur Kılıç writes,

‘Pamuk took the Prize as a reward of his behaving so brave to dare to insult the very nation and history of the Turkish people. The reward was precisely given for consecrating a challenge against the Turkish nationalists and to give a lesson to Turkey. I am not proud of him since I am a Turk but I am ashamed of him’ (October 14, 2006-*Yeniçağ*).

While Arslan Bulut writes,

‘The writer chooses to author novels humiliating the culture into which he was born and that is what it is all about! Subsequently, granting such an internationally renowned, prestigious award as the Noble Prize in Literature to such a person shows how gratefully an action taken toward humiliating the Turkish people can be rewarded. However, it is a well known fact, which is exclusively testified thus demonstrable by the history itself at various spots on the timeline of civilizations that Turks, thanks to their superior mental qualities and heightened level of intelligence, have always found a way to provide the best response against and swiftly eliminate all sorts of dishonorable, mean attacks like the most recent one and so will be, in the future, without doubt’ (October 13, 2006-*Yeniçağ*).

It is obvious that the news discourse of these dailies is well articulated into a fanatic and parochial nationalist discourse, which adopts a very exclusionist and reactive stance. This nationalist discourse which totally ‘other’ Pamuk, and do not recognize him within the category of ‘us’ as a nation. On the contrary, it excludes him from the Turkish National identity and constructs his identity as the ‘other’ and/or ‘enemy.’ In other words, those dailies examined in this category try to construct the Pamuk’s

image as internal negative other, and consolidates exclusionist and anti-democratic conception of national identity. In this sense, I argue that, in the news discourse, Pamuk is represented as a 'significant other' reified/symbolized around Kurdish and Armenian questions that have been constructed as the 'internal and/or external negative others' of Turkish nationalism.

5.2. 'Yes, but...' Self-Glorification with the Nobel and Othering Pamuk

It should first of all be noted that the newspapers analyzed in this category do not present a homogenous appearance. This category presents a large segment involving six newspapers, including four top circulated dailies (*Posta*, *Hürriyet*, *Zaman* and *Sabah*) and two others, namely liberal daily *Vatan* with 200,000 circulation and centre-left daily *Cumhuriyet* with 68,000 circulation. With two million-circulation in total, this is not only the most representative category but also the most striking category in this study since the strategy of 'Yes, but...' functions in a dual way: in the news discourse of these papers, despite the general elation over the Nobel Prize, they welcomed the prize by noting their reservations on Orhan Pamuk. In other words, they self-glorified with the Nobel and othered Pamuk at the same time.

It is also quite clear that majority of the news texts did not welcome the Pamuk's Nobel Prize with enthusiasm. There is still hitherto not any particular paper that directly takes a protective and positive stance in favor of Pamuk on the level of headlines. On the contrary, they welcomed and self-glorified the Nobel Prize on the grounds of national origin of the winner. To put it more precisely, they imply that being a Turk is the key for having an 'essence' to provide this success since instead of 'Pamuk wins the award' or 'Orhan Pamuk wins the Prize,' the phrase of 'A Turk wins the Nobel' or 'Nobel goes to a Turk' is preferred. These lexical choices in the level of headlines apparently demonstrate the articulation of essentialist Turkish nationalism into the news discourse. This news discourse is toward welcoming the Nobel as if Orhan Pamuk was not the rewarded this prestigious prize but just an anonymous Turk. For the dominant view in the news discourse, Pamuk was rewarded not for his literary skills but for his vocal criticism of his country. For that reason, Pamuk is not appreciated as a respected and renowned author winning the Prize but is criticized and excluded from the dominant 'we' identity. In short, they praise the Nobel Prize, not its winner. However, it is possible to argue that the majority of the Turkish press half-heartedly celebrated Pamuk's Nobel award. One can clearly observe the bitter sweetness present in the news discourse.

Turkey's biggest selling centre-populist tabloid, *Posta*, draws notice on Pamuk's winning the Nobel Prize, a short while after French Parliament's decision: 'A Historical Coincidence' (October 13, 2006). Reminding the Pamuk's controversial remarks to the reader, the newspaper seems to have recourse to an indirect manipulation through an article it preferably inserts with the title 'Armenian authors are pleased (at Nobel prize for Pamuk).' In other words, there clearly exists a deliberate intent in giving such news that suggests 'Armenian authors got happy' while there exists tens of Turkish authors who also seemed to be joyous about this prize. This headline profoundly intends nothing but to marginalize Pamuk.

The next day, *Posta* uses the phrase 'Even Pamuk gets angry' in the headline and 'Mr. Pamuk even curses this' in the lead, which mentions Pamuk's discordance with the latest act of the French parliament, the term 'even' being used apparently as part of this paper's lexical choice toward perpetuating its misbehavior of scorning and further othering Pamuk, implicitly. Additionally, the chief columnist of Turkey's best selling tabloid, Rauf Tamer congratulates Pamuk and expresses how proud he feels about this achievement while on the other hand, blaming him of lying:



'I cannot agree with Pamuk on this issue. We have not murdered 1 million Armenians. We are not killers. My point is Mr. Pamuk lies. Nobel is a world-renowned prestigious institution based on established principles. It never minds if a prosperous author would also be a master of lies' (October 13, 2006-*Posta*).

The headline of *Hürriyet*, Turkey's second biggest-selling newspaper with 570.000 circulation, reads, 'Nobel Prize goes to a Turk,' rhetorically lays the impetus on the very fact that the Nobel Prize has been won by a Turkish writer, opting to not name Pamuk (October 13, 2006). The top story on the *Hürriyet*, reads 'Armenian Shadow over the Nobel Prize.' In the publication's assessment, Pamuk is merely an average novelist in the global scheme of things. According to *Hürriyet*, the author would not have been awarded the most prestigious prize in the world of literature if it weren't for his political statements on the mass killings of Armenians. 'Undoubtedly, the award is a source of pride for the whole nation... but the stunts Pamuk performed to win it are not forgotten,' Oktay Eksi, the chief columnist of this paper, said on the same day. 'Unfortunately, Pamuk abided by the rule of the Western world that in order to win a literary prize, you should go against your country whether you are right or wrong,' he added. He also blamed him of showing 'moral infirmity' and went on to say that 'He'd better be also winning some sort of certificate or award for moral infirmity along with the Noble Prize there.' We can trace the concise expression of this nationalistic discourse in the following lines by the editor-in-chief of the newspaper, which preaches why we should take proud in a Turk's, (rather than Orhan Pamuk's) obtaining the Nobel Prize, and why, as Turkish people, we should get angry at Orhan Pamuk:

Overwhelmed by the Turkish part of our identity, some of us are sincerely angry at Orhan Pamuk. Yet still, again under the overwhelming influence of this Turkish part, we take pleasure and pride in seeing him get the greatest award of literature (Ertuğrul Özkök, October 13, 2006-*Hürriyet*).

Zaman, the top circulated Islamist daily newspaper in Turkey, stated 'Genocide shadow cast over Pamuk's Nobel' adding that the date on which the Nobel Prize was awarded on the very same day of French parliament's act of passing the aforesaid bill. 'Assertions of Politicization of Nobel Prizes in place', reads the spot. *Zaman*, in its coverage of Pamuk's Nobel Prize for Literature in 2006 expressed his success overshadowed by the French bill and the writer's previous statements. Recalling that Pamuk was brought before a court for words to be humiliating for Turkey and its history, *Zaman* said Turks have mixed feelings towards the Turkish writer, with some lingering resentment of his remarks about the alleged genocide. *Zaman* said the controversial prize has also divided Turkish literary circles. While some authors expressed pride, others said the Nobel was a humiliation because it was awarded to Pamuk for his controversial statements about the alleged genocide.

The paper intensifies this attitude of its next day issue, by putting the headline that reads: 'The Nobel Prize separates the literary circles into two halves' (October 14, 2006). *Zaman* indicates that certain authors, poets and art critics advocate that this Prize should be seen as a major step contributing to internationalization of Turkish literature, while others suggest that it was not the literary practices but personality of Orhan Pamuk revealed by his political statements, led him to the Nobel Prize's award, according to unfavourable criticisms. The opinions of three figures, as evident to anyone capable of reasoning, should not be enough to give rise to such an exacerbated and contorted statement as aforesaid that is 'The Nobel Prize separates the literary circles into two halves.' It is again evident that the columnists of the paper also strengthened this negative discourse on Orhan Pamuk which predominate the news texts in general. Columnists briefly coded the Nobel Prize award of Pamuk simply as 'Western conspiracy.' To give a few examples from this paper which contains just a single column favoring Pamuk, Mehmet Kamış writes,

'I think that the words of Mr. Pamuk, a great novelist and talented writer spent in relation to Armenians and Kurds are highly opportunistic. The main point to discuss here is the hypocrisy of the Western world. They almost dictate a heavy speech meant to insult the values of the native society that an Eastern writer or thinker belongs as prerequisite and condition for this writer or thinker's acceptance in their society... Therefore one should consider those words of Pamuk just as an attempt toward seeming cute to the issuers of the Prize in order to become qualified for it. It is highly probable for one to consider the weird statement in France right after the disclosure of the Winner of this year's Nobel Prize, totally as a Western conspiracy' (October 14, 2006-*Zaman*).

On similar lines, another columnist note:

'He and his kind are and will be rewarded with the Nobel Prize in Literature, because they call upon the very interests of Western subconscious, pick a method of narration that simply deciphers the psychology of being 'underdeveloped' allegedly dominant among Eastern and Islamic Cultures of the world and of course, verbally affirm that '1 million Armenian souls were victimized to genocide' (Ali Bulaç, October 14, 2006-*Zaman*).

In its coverage of the Nobel Prize awarded to Turkish author Orhan Pamuk, one of the most selling daily Sabah concentrated on the joy of the author, who told the newspaper: 'I called my daughter first when I heard about the news.' Pamuk also told Sabah that 'winning the Nobel is a proud moment for Turkish culture.' However, in the headline of 'Should we be happy or sad?,' Sabah's Editor-in-Chief Fatih Altaylı recalled he had stated not long ago that Pamuk was this year's favourite for the Nobel Prize in Literature.

'That has happened; he has received the award. Ironically, he -- who uttered words supporting Armenian claims of genocide -- was awarded the Nobel on the day when the French parliament passed a bill making denial of the alleged genocide a crime. When Pamuk had uttered those words, it had been stated in this column that 'he said those things to grab the Nobel,' because that is what the Nobel is all about; an opposing political stance, being an outcast in one's own country and being unwanted are all plusses for the Nobel. In fact, we should be glad. A young Turkish author getting the Nobel is a great honour for Turkish literature that will open the doors of world literature for many of our writers. However, we can't be happy. *We can't really be elated because we can't bring ourselves to see Pamuk as 'one of ours.'* *On the contrary, we see him as someone who 'sold out' on us, as someone who 'accused his nation with lies' to get the Nobel.* At the same time, we can't view him as a man who would stand up for his ideas, who would defend what he said no matter what. Instead, he twisted his own stance when he was cornered. Many great writers and Nobel winners had significant personal shortcomings; however, the prizes they won moved their countries up a notch.' (October 13, 2006-*Sabah*)

Next day, *Sabah* featured an interview with Şekure Basman, mother of Nobel Prize winner Orhan Pamuk. Basman spoke for the first time about her son's controversial comments. Referring to his mother, 'Orhan said something wrong' says *Sabah* in its headline. However, when one who read the news text in inner pages can obviously realize the manipulation in the headline of the interview. 'Orhan told a tiny European newspaper something wrong; however, the Turkish press made a big deal out of this. It would not let go of the incident. Although the government wanted to downplay that interview, the press really pushed it,' Sekure Basman told *Sabah*. While his mother was actually blaming the Turkish press for making a big deal out of Pamuk's remarks, the paper preferred to marginalize Pamuk by distorting statements of his mother.

On the liberal wing, daily *Vatan* with a 210.000 circulation, prefers to raise the question 'For his words, or his pen?' in its headlines, after reporting that Nobel Prize in Literature goes to Pamuk. The paper surprisingly derives the conclusion that Pamuk's winning the prize did not yield the joy and excitement it rightfully deserved among the community for two reasons, among the lines of the spot of this article,



although 24 hours have hardly passed since the announcement of the prize. According to the paper, the award associated with the decision-making process in France that resulted in favor of Armenian assertions of genocide in combination with the statement of Orhan Pamuk that says ‘1 million Armenians and 30 thousand Kurds were killed on these lands,’ which he spoke a short while before winning the Prize. Carefully abstaining from developing a discursive strategy that attends to Pamuk and the Nobel Prize he brought in, this daily appears to take a contrary stance of adopting a discursive strategy that is destined to ‘other’ Pamuk. Since *Vatan* includes the following phrase in the spot: ‘Pamuk’s Prize facing great public protest saying ‘Screw your country up by calling her Guilty of Genocide, all to grab an award,’ to ‘other’ Pamuk.

‘Bitter Joy’ says *Vatan* in the headline of its inner page detailing of this article, showing persistence, as part of its discursive strategy, to allege as if Pamuk has won the Nobel Prize in Literature thanks to a few words he spent through his mouth, rather than his deeds using his pen. The lead – ‘While people were striving to lift off the shock of the French Decision, Pamuk got the Nobel Prize by saying ‘1 million Armenians and 30 thousand Kurds were killed on these lands’’ –reinforces this observation.

Vatan’s popular columnist Necati Doğru underlined the announcement by Nobel committee that Pamuk was this year’s winner for the literature prize coincided with the French parliament’s decision to adopt the genocide denial bill.

Results of the voting and the Nobel announcement came around the same hours, even minutes; it was a painful coincidence, a coincidence that proves right those who say, ‘Whoever was born and bred in Turkey but attacked the Turks later will be crowned, even awarded with the Nobel.’ It is a coincidence that bears testimony to doubts that he was awarded with the Nobel not for his work but for his slanderous statements against his own nation regarding the alleged genocide of Armenians. At the same time, it is a suspicious coincidence. They added him to the list of the world’s greatest writers. This world-class author aided those calumnious circles trying to corner Turkey and Turkish nation in front of the civilized world. He made statements as if he were a prominent member of the Tashnak [a socialist Armenian political party founded in 1886 that operated clandestine and armed groups]. Just like the Taşnaks, he was unable to provide any solid evidence and sufficed it to leave his accusations as unfounded claims. And he got the Nobel. A very sad coincidence. (October 13, 2006-*Vatan*)

As evident seen in this quotation, Pamuk is tried to be identified as an ‘Armenian.’ The ‘us’ and ‘other’ distinction has been a basis of much representation in the Turkish press in its coverage of Pamuk’s Nobel case through discursive strategies that reinforce fanatic/radical nationalism and narratives that demonize the *other*, here Orhan Pamuk.

Putting the phrase ‘Pamuk wins the Nobel’ on its headline in a neutral way, centre-left leaning daily *Cumhuriyet* with a 68,000 copies of circulation switched it to ‘Politics determined the Nobel’s award,’ on the second page. Justifying this statement with stories published by international press, *Cumhuriyet* gave inclusion to the following statement in spot: ‘The international press by majority considers Pamuk winning the Prize as an outcome of political will and influence’. However, a thorough reading of the story by context reveals nothing but short quotations of the news/comments of 10 rated international papers only one of which, that is *Financial Times* of the UK, seems to affirm this conclusion by one of its columnists saying ‘it is true that this election has a political dimension’. What this newspaper dares to do is to disclose to the general public the idea that ‘Nobel has been compromised by political will’, relying solely upon the commentary of a single writer in a single newspaper circulated abroad.

To sum up it is apparent that majority of the news texts in the front pages did not welcome the Nobel Prize and the awardee with enthusiasm. There is not any particular paper that directly takes a protective and positive stance in favor of Pamuk in the level of headlines. Nevertheless, another thing to be noted

here is that the headlines, story leads and columnists' expressions included in papers of this category are not in one to one correspondence with those of the first category. On the contrary, some of the columnists of the papers in concern appear to have adopted a very positive stance and expressions favoring Pamuk and the Prize he brought in, at a great extent. There are more positive editorials than the negative ones, especially in *Hürriyet* and *Sabah*.

However, it is notable that this positive attitude in the columns does not show itself in the headlines and news stories concerning the Nobel Prize of these highly circulated mainstream newspapers who presents themselves as in the 'centre' or 'liberal.' More importantly, as mentioned before, the editors in chief or head columnists of the aforementioned papers seem to have adopted highly criticizing and unfavorable expressions against Pamuk. Or, in the best possible form, the rest of the columnists, while sharing the prideful moment of obtaining a Nobel Prize on one hand, try to marginalize and 'other' Pamuk, on the other.

Moreover, it is evident that majority of the news headlines and editorials focused on the Pamuk's Nobel case by forming a correlation between the 'genocide' debate and the prize. For that reason, emotional language is used to describe Pamuk and the lexical choices used to describe him are inflammatory. Except for the emotional language, they try to manipulate the possible reception of the audience by employing deictic language in such statements: 'Turkish people will never be able to wholeheartedly embrace this prize of Pamuk' or 'We can't really be elated because we can't bring ourselves to see Pamuk as 'one of us'.' Rather than grand memorable phrases, 'small words offer constant, but rarely conscious, reminders of the homeland, making 'our' national identity unforgettable' (Billig, 1995, p.93). The small word with the biggest deictic punch is, as Billig observed, 'we.' If 'nationalism is an ideology of the first person plural, which tells 'us' who 'we' are, then it is also an ideology of the third person' (p.78). As in the words of Bauman (1992, p.678), 'nationalism can be thought of as a specimen of the big family of we-talks; that is, of discourses in which identities and counter-identities are conceived and through which they are sustained...They tend to promote ego-centred binary divisions, divide the world into friends and enemies.' In other words, one might observe the hegemonic and state-oriented manufacturing of Turkish nationalism in news discourses of the press. Thus, it might be underlined that the mainstream Turkish press tempts the readers to support the national cause by reproducing official nationalist discourse.

5.3. Nobel Pride

Last but no means least, one can observe a third category as for the representational strategies of the Turkish press over the Pamuk's Nobel case. This category again should not be considered as homogenous unit since it includes liberal *Radikal* and conservative *Yeni Şafak*. In other words, although there is a political and ideological difference, two intellectual dailies of the country covered the Nobel Prize of Pamuk in a highly positive manner. Besides, these dailies made little mention of the author's previous statements that had caused resentment thanks to the mainstream news media. In a similar vein, Pamuk is depicted as an intellectual who has a peaceful stance on issues like the Armenian and Kurdish questions. At this point, dailies in this category underlined that there are many authors who won the award have made critical political statements on their countries and the world in the long history of the Nobel Literature prize.

Under the headline of 'Genocide of thought, Nobel pride,' *Yeni Şafak* referred to the French genocide denial bill as a disgrace for democracy. In its coverage of Nobel, 'Orhan Pamuk, author of *Cevdet Bey and His Sons*, *The Black Book*, *Snow*, *The White Castle* and *My Name is Red*, won the Nobel Prize with his years of hard work,' said the daily, proudly adding that Pamuk outperformed prominent authors nominated for the Nobel for 2006 including Philip Roth.

In the news discourse of these papers, Pamuk's literature and his Nobel Prize is entirely applauded. Almost all commentators believe that he fully deserves this Prize for his literary skills. Here are some examples of statements in these dailies on the Nobel Prize and Pamuk.

- 'We are honored. We are proud.'
- 'It's such a great honor, such a great pleasure'
- 'The world honors Orhan Pamuk.'
- 'Congratulations again, Orhan Pamuk!'
- 'Turkey is proud of Pamuk'
- 'Pamuk won the award as a novelist'

Furthermore, for these newspapers, 'we should enjoy Pamuk's success' since 'Pamuk's Nobel is an honor both for Turkey and for the Turkish language and literature.' 'Now Turkey also has a writer who has won the Nobel Prize' and 'This Prize will play an important role in the promotion of both Turkey and Turkish literature.' This discourse is in accordance with the discourse of Orhan Pamuk:

'I think that this is first of all an honor bestowed upon the Turkish language, Turkish culture, Turkey and also recognition of my labors ... my humble devotion to that great art of the novel... The prize is not to me but to Turkey' (Quoted in dailies, October 13, 2006)

'Pamuk is our pride,' says Liberal daily *Radikal* on its front page. *Radikal* may be seen the most positive paper over the event and it devoted three special pages inside to the coverage of the Prize.

According to the main point in the news discourse, those who don't know the importance of the Nobel Prize may not grasp the historic nature of this event. One should not evaluate this in the current political atmosphere but take a look at the long-term perspective. Most certainly, a Turkish author winning the Nobel for the first time is a source of (national) pride. As in the words of *Radikal* Columnist, Murat Yetkin:

For now, don't pay heed to those who are infuriated with the blow dealt by France and those who are angry with Orhan Pamuk's prize on the grounds that 'he took up the Armenian issue, that's why they gave him the award.' Time passes, skies remain. When this controversy dies down, the only remaining record will be that a Turkish author won the Nobel Prize for literature. I don't think Orhan Pamuk needed a Nobel to prove that he is a great writer. For politicization of the Nobel Prize is not a new phenomenon. Pamuk was just a great writer without the Nobel, read by the entire world. Now, he has entered into consciousness of literary history. Yesterday, Pamuk comforted our hearts upset by France (October 13, 2006-*Radikal*)

6. CONCLUSION

In this paper three main categories are used to explore how different news discourses have been articulated and analyze how a (Turkish) nationalist discourse has been reconstructed in the news texts in relation to the Pamuk's Nobel case. Those conservative and nationalist dailies examined in the first category of 'Representation of Pamuk as 'Other' and/or 'Enemy,' tries to construct Pamuk's image as internal negative other, or 'traitor' and consolidates exclusionist and anti-democratic conception of national identity. In this regard, I argued that, in the news discourse, Pamuk is represented as a 'internal negative other' reified/symbolized around Kurdish and Armenian questions that have been constructed as the 'significant internal and/ or external others' of Turkish nationalism.

With two million-circulation in total, as for the second and the most representative category in this study, it can be argued that there is a self-glorification with the Nobel Prize as well as representation of Pamuk as the Other. It is quite clear that majority of the news texts even in the four top circulated mainstream dailies did not welcome the Nobel Prize and its winner with huge enthusiasm. Although there is not any particular paper that directly takes a protective and positive stance in favor of Pamuk in the level of headlines, at most, they welcomed and self-glorified the Nobel Prize on the grounds of Turkish origin of the laureate. In other words, it was observed that being a Turk is the key for having an 'essence' to provide this success since instead of 'Pamuk wins the award' or 'Orhan Pamuk wins the Prize,' the phrase of 'A Turk wins the Nobel' or 'Nobel goes to a Turk' is widely preferred in the news texts. These lexical choices in the level of headlines apparently demonstrated the articulation of ethnicist and essentialist Turkish nationalism into the news discourse. In a sense, this news discourse is toward welcoming the Nobel as if Orhan Pamuk was not rewarded this prestigious prize but just an anonymous Turk. For the dominant discourse in this category, Pamuk was rewarded not for his literary skills but for only his statements belittled the Turkish nation. For that reason, he was not appreciated in the news discourse as a respected author winning the Prize but is criticized and excluded from the dominant 'we' identity. To put it more succinctly, the Nobel Prize was partially praised, but not its winner. However, the headlines, story leads and columnists' expressions are not in one to one correspondence. On the contrary, some of the columnists of the papers in concern appear to have adopted a very positive stance and expressions favoring Pamuk and the Prize he brought in, at a great extent. Nonetheless, it is quite clear that this positive attitude in the columns does not show itself in the headlines and news stories concerning the Nobel Prize of these highly circulated mainstream newspapers which present themselves as in the 'centre' or 'liberal.' Further, it is evident that majority of the news headlines and editorials focused on the Pamuk's Nobel case by forming a correlation between the 'genocide' debate and the prize.

Although there is a political and ideological difference, two intellectual dailies of the country covered the Nobel Prize of Pamuk in a highly positive manner. They simply signified the event as Nobel Pride and underlined: 'We are proud of Orhan Pamuk. We are very happy about the Prize.' Additionally, these dailies made little mention of the author's previous statements that had caused resentment thanks to the mainstream news media. Pamuk was also depicted as an intellectual who has a peaceful stance on issues like the Armenian and Kurdish questions.

In the coverage of Pamuk's Nobel Prize, the mainstream press also consolidated the 'complicated dialectics of remembering and forgetting' as Billig (1996) also stated. In this respect, in order to refresh the collective memory on the one hand, the 'glorious past' of the Turkish nation is commemorated, while on the other a collective forgetting takes place. 'Remembering/reminding' the 'glorious past' is performed by means of a 'selectivity' which excludes/ignores or denies certain events and moments in the past so that some parts of the 'past' are totally erased from the collective memory or forgotten. Moreover, 'willing collective oblivion or denial [of a particular period] is an important psychic characteristic of Turkish national identity' (Yörük, 2002: p.310). In this sense, there is almost provided no background information and discussion on Armenian and Kurdish issue and evidence on why Pamuk hurts the feelings of the Turkish nation. Besides, the papers never quote Pamuk's other statements, except the one on the mass killings of Kurds and Armenians. It is clear that the discourse used by the Turkish press is crammed with the constituent elements of the nationalist ideology. The Turkish press does not question the naturalness of the nationalist propositions, like the nation is the source of all political and social power, and loyalty to the nation overrides all other allegiances. On the contrary, it takes them for granted.

Under the light of this discussion, it might be argued that the 'us' and 'other' distinction has been a basis of news discourse of the Turkish press in its coverage of the Pamuk's Nobel case through by marginalizing and illegitimizing the very personality and intellectual identity of Orhan Pamuk.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, Benedict (1983).** *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Bauman, Zygmunt (1992).** Soil, Blood and Identity, *Sociological Review*, 40(4): 675-701.
- Bell, Allan (1998)** The discourse structure of news stories, in Allan Bell and Peter Garrett (eds),. *Approaches to Media Discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, pp. 64-104.
- Billig, Michael (1995).** *Banal Nationalism*, London: Sage, 1997.
- Bora, Tanıl (2003).** Nationalist Discourses in Turkey, *The South Atlantic Quarterly*, 102:2/3: 433-451.
- Bora, Tanıl (2002).** Sunuş [Preface], in T.Bora (ed) *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce: Milliyetçilik* [Political Thinking in Modern Turkey: Nationalism]. Vol.:4, İstanbul: İletişim, pp.15-22.
- Bora, Tanıl and Can, Kemal (2004).** *Devlet ve Kuzgun. 1990'lardan 2000'lere MHP* (Milliyetçi Hareket Partisi) [State and Raven. The NAP (Nationalist Action Party) from the 1990s to the 2000s], İstanbul: İletişim.
- Burney, Shehla (2002).** Manufacturing Nationalism: Post-September 11 Discourse in United States Media, *Studies in Media & Information Literacy Education*, Volume 2, Issue 2, Article Number: 21.
- Fairclough, Norman (1995)** *Media Discourse*, London: Arnold
- Fowler, Roger (1991).** *Language in the News. Discourse and Ideology in the Press*. London: Routledge.
- Göl, Ayla (2005).** Imagining the Turkish Nation Through ‘Othering’ Armenians, *Nations and Nationalism* 11 (1), 2005, 121–139.
- Grigoriadis, Ioannis N (2006).** Upsurge Amidst Uncertainty, Nationalism in post-2004 Turkey’, *SWP Research Paper*, Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik, German Institute for International and Security Affairs (Berlin: RP 11, October 2006).
- Iri, Murat and Arcan, H. Esra. (2005).** The Orhan Pamuk Case: How mainstream Turkish media framed his freedom of speech, Paper presented in the International Crossroads Conference, 2-23 July 2006, İstanbul.
- Kadioğlu, Ayşe (1996).** ‘The Paradox of Turkish Nationalism and the Construction of Official Identity,’ in S. Kedourie (ed.) *Turkey: Identity, Democracy, Politics*. London: Frank Cass, pp. 177-93.
- Kadioğlu, Ayşe (1997).** Sıradan Milliyetçilik: Sürekli Milliyetçilik, *Varlık* (1097), 2-5.
- Koçak, Cemil (2002).** Kemalist Milliyetçiliğin Bulanık Suları, pp. 37-43 in T. Bora (ed.) *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce: Milliyetçilik*, [Political Thinking in Modern Turkey: Nationalism] Vol.:4, İstanbul: İletişim.
- Pickering, Michael (2001).** *Stereotyping: The Politics of Representation*. Basingstoke and London: Palgrave.

-
- Petersoo, Pille (2007).** Reconsidering Otherness: Constructing Estonian identity, Nations and Nationalism 13 (1), 2007, pp.117–133.
- Özkırmıh, Umut (2006).** ‘Milliyetçilik Araştırması’ [A Survey of Nationalism] *Tempo* , April 6, 2006.
- Renan, Ernest (1882).** What is a Nation? in H. K. Bhabba (ed.) *Nation and Narration*. London: Routledge, 1990, pp. 8-22.
- Triandafyllidou, Anna (1998).** National Identity and the ‘Other,’ *Ethnic and Racial Studies* Vol. 21: 593-612.
- Van Dijk, Teun (1988).** *News as Discourse*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Yörük, Zafer (2002),** “Politik Psişe Olarak Türk Kimliđi,” T.Bora (der.) *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce: Milliyetçilik*, [Political Thinking in Modern Turkey: Nationalism] Vol.:4, İstanbul: İletişim, pp. 309-324.
- Yumul, Arus and Özkırmıh, Umut (2000).** ‘Reproducing the Nation: ‘Banal Nationalism’ in the Turkish Press,’ *Media, Culture & Society* Vol. 22, pp.787–804.

INTERNET RESOURCES

- Belge, Murat (2005).** Love Me, or Leave me? The Strange Case of Orhan Pamuk,’ <http://www.opendemocracy.net/content/articles/PDF/2935.pdf>, October 18, 2005.
- Davies, Elizabeth (2007).** Silenced: The Nationalist War on Turkey’s Intellectuals, *The Independent*, March 7, 2007, <http://news.independent.co.uk/europe/article2334920.ece>
- Günay, Cengiz (2006).** Flags Against Fears and Uncertainties, January 12, 2007 http://www.esiweb.org/pdf/esi_turkey_tpq_id_82.pdf

