

AUTHORITARIAN FEATURES IN EDITORIALS – DIFFERENT TIMES, DIFFERENT STYLES

Sonja Tirkkonen-Condit
University of Joensuu,
Savonlinna School of Translation Studies

This paper aims at identifying authoritarianism in the editorials in terms of how they choose and express (1) addressees, (2) facts and values and (3) programmes of action.

The focus is on those editorials of *Helsingin Sanomat* which take a stand as to whether Finland should apply for membership in the European Community. The study covers the half-year period preceding the decision to apply, i.e. September 1991 to February 1992 for Finland, and April 1991 to September 1991 for Sweden.

Earlier research showed that Finnish editorials were more committed to consensus than Anglo-American editorials. Their argumentation style was cautious, somewhat vague and less explicit. *Helsingin Sanomat*, in particular, was diplomatic and consensus-minded to the extent that it often did not take a distinct stand at all. It was also dialogical in that it discussed alternative positions and viewpoints. This was particularly true of articles dealing with foreign politics and other politically delicate issues.

As there seemed to be a sudden change of style from cautious argumentation to authoritarian preaching – especially in relation to major political issues such as the war at the Persian Gulf, nuclear power, or Finland's relation to the EC – I undertook the task of trying to identify what it was that created the authoritarian impression. The idea of focussing solely on authoritarianism got support from Hannu Nieminen's (1992) research which, among other things, compared one Finnish and one Swedish editorial concerning the war in the Gulf, and found that the Finnish text was marked by an authoritarian and monological style.

The analysis shows that the argumentation style of *Helsingin Sanomat* has indeed changed: It takes a position onesidedly, presents programmes of action in patronizing terms, uses "hard" values such as competitive power as premises for its conclusions, addresses itself to elite audience and patently ignores adversary opinion.

1. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this paper is to identify dimensions of authoritarianism in the editorials of a leading Finnish newspaper in terms of how they choose and express (1) addressees, (2) facts and values and (3) programmes of action.

Earlier research (see Tirkkonen-Condit 1987, 1988, 1989 and 1992; Päckilä 1990; Hemanus 1988, and Teikari 1990) showed that Finnish editorials were more committed to consensus than, e.g., Anglo-American editorials. Their argumentation style was cautious, somewhat vague and less explicit. The leading Finnish newspaper *Helsingin Sanomat*, in particular, was diplomatic and consensus-minded to the extent that it often did not take a distinct stand at all. It was also dialogical in the sense that it presented alternative positions and viewpoints for discussion. This was particularly true of articles dealing with foreign politics and other politically delicate issues. Explanations for this cautious style of argumentation were sought in Finland's precarious geopolitical situation as a next-door neighbour to the Soviet Union, its long period of political and labour-market consensus up to 1990, its relatively short history of editorial-writing, as well as in some culturally determined politeness phenomena.

Finland's political situation, however, has changed radically in the past two years: The foreign political situation has changed because of the disintegration of the Soviet Union, and the internal political situation is presently characterized by sharpening social contrasts caused by economic depression. It would not be surprising if these changes were also shown in the styles of media communication. This seemed indeed to be the case as far as the editorials of *Helsingin Sanomat* were concerned. There seemed to be a sudden change of style from cautious and dialogical argumentation to wellnigh authoritarian preaching – especially in relation to major political issues such as the war in the Persian Gulf, nuclear power, and Finland's relation to the European Community. The present study is designed to identify what it is that creates the authoritarian impression.

The idea of focussing solely on authoritarian features got support from Hannu Nieminen's (1992) research in which, among other things, he compared one Finnish and one Swedish editorial concerning the war in the Gulf. The papers whose editorials were analysed were *Helsingin Sanomat* and

Dagens Nyheter, each of which can be described as a liberal, politically non-committed major national newspaper. One of the conspicuous differences which emerged from Nieminen's analysis was the authoritarian and monological style which characterized the Finnish text.

In order to investigate systematically the impression of authoritarianism in *Helsingin Sanomat*, I have followed up its treatment of one particular topic, namely the issue of whether Finland should apply for membership of the European Community. This issue was chosen, not only because it happened to be the topic of the day, but also because *Helsingin Sanomat* was publicly criticized for having started a campaign in favour of Finland's membership.

The ultimate purpose of the present research will be to find out if Finnish argumentation style at large is more authoritarian than that in other western cultures. In the next stage of the study, the editorials of *Helsingin Sanomat* and *Dagens Nyheter* will be compared as to their respective discussions of whether Finland and Sweden should join the European Community. So far, an analysis has been made of all the editorials of *Helsingin Sanomat* dealing with this issue during the half-year period from September 1991 through February 1992. By the end of February 1992 it became clear that Finland would apply for EC membership, and it consequently submitted its application early March 1992. The corresponding discussion in Sweden took place half a year earlier, as Sweden applied for membership in September 1991. Thus the Swedish material will cover the half-year period from April 1991 to September 1991.

The development of good indicators of authoritarianism was one of the problems to be solved in the early part of the research, and therefore this paper will devote a fair amount of space to methodology. Once the methodology has been tried out on the Finnish material it will be possible to analyze the Swedish material as well and to carry out the comparison. The paper at hand, however, will confine itself (i) to presenting the indicators developed

for the identification of authoritarianism, and (ii) to analyzing the Finnish material in terms of these indicators.

2. MATERIAL

As the present research will focus on how the editorials take a stand on one particular issue, i.e. whether the country should apply for membership of the European Community, the texts will be analyzed only insofar as they cover this issue. Thus if a text discusses other issues as well, the sections devoted to these will be ignored. In addition to editorials themselves, the main feature articles on the editorial page will also be used as supplementary material, as it seems that their choice and timing are relevant to the overall argumentation strategy of the paper.

The number of editorials in *Helsingin Sanomat* dealing with Finland's membership of the EC in the half-year period in question was 39, and the number of main feature articles dealing with this issue was 24. *Helsingin Sanomat* usually publishes two or three editorial articles and one main feature article in each number.

3. METHODOLOGICAL BACKGROUND

A starting point for the present research on authoritarianism was Hannu Nieminen's (1992) study *Emancipation and Modern Publicity*, in which he used a sample analysis of editorials to try out a model which he had developed for the description of power relations in political public dialogue. Nieminen (1992: 227) sees an editorial as a political public speech act in which an "I" puts forward theses and programmes of action concerning some prevailing states of affairs and aims at validating these by appealing to the facts, values and beliefs which he assumes to be shared by his audience. In order to create a community of "us", the "I" introduces a threat from "the other" – a configuration which is more or less directly associated with his political adversaries. Nieminen (1992: 228) argues that when we look at the ways in

which an editorial (or any political text) generates the roles of "I", "us" and "the other" as well as the domain of facts, values and beliefs to which it appeals, we can identify the power relations which the text aims at (re)producing. We can find out who it is that "I" represents and what the facts, values and beliefs are by virtue of which he claims authority in relation to his audience.

Nieminen's sample analysis covered two editorials, i.e. those published in *Helsingin Sanomat* and in *Dagens Nyheter* on 18th January, 1991, and dealing with the war in the Persian Gulf, which the allied forces had started the day before. In these two editorials, Nieminen was able to identify the agents and the vested interests on whose behalf the editorial writers conducted their argumentation, as well as their adversaries. The "I", for example, was identified as the U.S., the allied forces, President George Bush, or America's UN ambassador Thomas Pickering. The "us" was identified as all those who believe in universal justice, or those who want to defend the values of freedom and democracy, whereas "the other" was identified as Iraq, Saddam Hussein, and the PLO and Jasser Arafat as Hussein's allies. In order to find out the facts, values and beliefs to which the editorials appealed in order to justify their programmes of action, Nieminen conducted a macroproposition analysis of the texts.

One of the differences revealed by Nieminen's research was that the "us" identifications in the Swedish text were more frequently linguistically signalled by means of the first person plural, whereas the Finnish text resorted to passive verb forms or other impersonal formulations. The impersonal style gave the impression that *Helsingin Sanomat* was voicing universal truths without taking personal responsibility. Another difference was that *Dagens Nyheter's* argumentation was more dialogical in that it presented alternative ways of thinking (facts, values and beliefs) which could justify the proposed programme of action, whereas *Helsingin Sanomat*, in contrast, did not present alternative ways of thinking. A third difference was that *Dagens Nyheter* seemed to have two programmes of action in mind, one addressed to the gen-

eral public and the other to an élite audience. *Helsingin Sanomat* addressed its message to an élite audience only, i.e. the decision-makers such as the government, the United Nations and the like.

Nieminen's method as such was not used in the present research. It had to be simplified and operationalized in order to make it suitable for a linguistically oriented analysis of a larger number of texts, mainly for the following reasons: (1) The method is overwhelmingly complex and detailed for the analysis and comparison of about 120 texts, which will be the final number of texts in the present study. (2) The method is based on a fair amount of intuitive interpretation and thus implies a risk of subjectivity. This criticism applies, in particular, to the identification of "I" and "us". (3) A particular linguistic difference, such as the frequency of the first person plural, does not necessarily mean that there is also a cross-cultural difference. The linguistic resources for impersonal expression are larger and more varied in Finnish than in Indo-European languages such as Swedish or English, and "impersonal" style is typical not only of political texts but of factual prose in general (see Hakulinen, Karlsson and Vilkuina 1980). Therefore a frequency count of personal vs. impersonal expressions should not be used as an index of authoritarianism. (4) An entire text need not be analyzed into macropropositions in order to identify its programme of action and the facts, values and beliefs which are used to justify it.

Although Nieminen's method as such could not be used, his analysis provided a theoretical framework for my methodological design. I did not attempt "I" and "us" identifications, but focussed my analysis on programmes of action and their audience, rationale and style of presentation. This analysis seemed relevant when the aim was to identify those phenomena which caused an authoritarian impression. It also yielded inferred information about the interest groups and attitudes cherished by the editorials. Thus my analysis of authoritarianism contains a linguistic and pragmatic description of how the editorials choose and express (i) addressees, (ii) programmes of action, and (iii) facts

and values. These were chosen as the indicators of authoritarianism, and they can be identified on the basis of linguistic signals.

Addressees can be relatively easily identified, as they are often mentioned in the context of the programme of action which the editorial proposes. **Facts and values** consist of those states of affairs which the editorial writer uses as premises for his conclusions, or which he conveys by way of presupposition. The writer expects to share these with the addressees and appeals to them in order to justify his proposals. They are usually easy to detect on account of linguistic signals such as causal conjuncts, connectives and metatext, as well as pragmatic knowledge about argumentative structure. **Programme of action** is a directive speech act which is expressed more or less explicitly. An expression of deontic modality, for instance, is easy to interpret as directive. On the other hand, the variety of speech acts which can be pragmatically inferred as directive is great: admonitions are easy to identify on the basis of linguistic markers, whereas hints must be pragmatically inferred.

Moreover, the indicators of authoritarianism are mutually dependent, so that each indicator conveys implicit information about some other indicator. Thus the choice of addressee conveys information about the proposed programme of action, and vice versa, as each addressee's potential for action is somehow constrained. The choice of facts and values implies information about the addressees – and the analyst can usually deduce which addressees will share those particular “facts” or values. The choice of facts and values also implies information about who is the “I” of the text, i.e. whose mouthpiece the editorial writer is in each case. The implicit information is valuable, as it can be used in support of the information gleaned from linguistic signals. The dimensions chosen for indicators of authoritarianism will be discussed in detail below.

4. ANALYSIS OF TWO SAMPLE TEXTS

I will start by conducting sample analyses of two editorials in terms of the indicators of authoritarianism chosen for the present research. The first editorial was published in *Helsingin Sanomat* on 2nd November, 1991. Its translation is given in Figure 1.

The promised land of lobbies

"Political power in Finland belongs to the people, which is represented by Parliament in the National Assembly." Do not the constitutionally elected Members of Parliament and the Government enjoy the full confidence of their electors any longer, as tens of thousands of irritated wage-earners, farm producers and pensioners have protested in the Senate Square and outside the Parliament Building within a matter of a week?

These people did not gather in the street parliament spontaneously but encouraged by unions and political organizations. These events made the organization leaders happy but they also made them restless, because some of the criticism voiced by the members was clearly directed at the leaders themselves.

It is high time for the republic of Finland, which has drifted into an economic depression, to openly admit that conglomerating and expensive lobbying has turned against itself.

Single examples will speak for themselves: many quarters look after their interests extremely ruthlessly. The unions show incredibly little solidarity towards the poor and the unemployed. They stick to their own interests to the bitter end, even when they endanger the entire national economy. This is the nature of things, they say.

The organizations of agriculture and trade have looked after their interests exceptionally well; consumers get concrete evidence of this in the prices of food every day. Housing is absurdly expensive, and again somewhere in the background are the conglomerations of lobbies. Every attempt to lower the prices of these basic commodities is doomed to fail. Why?

Industry certainly has the best oiled machinery for lobbying. It has the associations of the private sector as its safeguard, and, in addition, the joint organs representing the whole range of economic life. Only the weakening of the economy has forced industry to ask how it could manage with less expensive but not necessarily less effective lobbying.

The virus of lobbying is particularly deeply rooted in public administration, where the party machinery has its key posts and cover jobs which cause inefficiency and overmanning. The same feudal system extends to the local authorities and their or-

ganizations. When bureaucracy also defends its positions, it is virtually impossible to create sensible cooperation.

Ideological organizations must also face the fact that lobbying tends to turn against itself. Sports clubs, as well as local, regional and national sports organizations are all looking after their own interests and, as a sideline, the interests of the individual and the Pools Corporation; they do it so vigorously that enormous sums of money are wasted, while at the same time staff motivation suffers.

Excessive lobbying undermines the moral of society. As the decision-makers are intertwined and ignore their biased status, society is run by small factions, and national interest is sacrificed to a narrow lobby interest even in legislation. In a nutshell: democracy is not working.

The struggle for freedom, away from the grip of lobbies, must not take place at the expense of some but for the benefit of all. An excessively rigid and controlled system means a clear advantage for competitors. Finland is like a party of prisoners tied together, staggering on the brink of an abyss.

What is needed now is new ideas, inventions and development efforts of all kinds. Otherwise wealth will not grow. The psychological climate must also change into a stimulating and challenging one; the key to its creation will be in the hands of critical research and the media. Luckily the integration process, like a glacier, forces the lobbying machinery into a new mould.

FIGURE 1. Editorial published on 2nd November, 1991.

This article is a typical "Euro condition" article. It points out circumstances which Finland must change in order to become an eligible member of integrated Europe. The article criticizes lobbies, and contains the following passages which reveal its programme of action and are classified as directive:

- (1) It is high time for the republic of Finland ... to openly admit that conglomerating and expensive lobbying has turned against itself.
- (2) The struggle for freedom, away from the grip of lobbies, must not take place at the expense of some but for the benefit of all.
- (3) What is needed now is new ideas, inventions as well as development efforts of all kinds.
- (4) The psychological climate must change into a stimulating and challenging one; the key to its creation will be in the hands of critical research and the media.

There is a clearly marked addressee in (1), namely **the republic of Finland**. The programmes of action in (2), (3) and (4) are expressed imper-

sonally so that the addressee, i.e. the potential agent of action, is not singled out.

The directive nature of the above passages is conveyed by expressions of deontic modality (**it is high time, must not take place, is needed, must change**) such that (1), (3) and (4) are classified as advice, whereas (2) is classified as a warning.

The quarters criticized in the article are many: the unions, agricultural organizations, trade and industry, organizations of economic life, public administration, local authorities, and ideological organizations. These are the addressees of criticism.

The facts and values which the editorial writer uses to justify the programmes of action pointed out above are as follows:

- (i) The harmful moral and economic consequences of the "conglomerating" lobbies are discussed at length in support of the advice in (1).
- (ii) "An excessively rigid and controlled system means a clear advantage to competitors" is presented as a justification of the warning in (2).
- (iii) "Otherwise wealth will not grow" is presented in support of (3).

In sum, we get the following picture of authoritarianism as it appears in the editorial in Figure 1: The programme of action is that Finland should get rid of lobbies. It is expressed in terms of advice and warning, and addressed either to the republic of Finland or impersonally. The facts and values which are appealed to are moral and economic viability, competitiveness, and the growth of wealth. In addition, the unions, trade and industry, public administration and ideological organizations are criticised for lobbying. The addressees of this article are elite audiences rather than the general public; the type of directives chosen, i.e. advice and warning, can be described as patronizing in tone; the values belong to those in whose interest it is to aspire to international competitiveness and economic growth.

The second article to be analyzed was published in *Helsingin Sanomat* on 12th December, 1991. Its translation is given in Figure 2.

Finland will have to hurry

Maastricht did not give Finland presents, but it did not heap unsurmountable obstacles to its road to the EC either. It is clear, however, that we are running short of time in our efforts to catch the so-called first train to membership together with Sweden and Austria. The Community, on the other hand, has tied the starting point of the actual membership negotiations to the success of its own internal and somewhat problematic arrangements, which may put off the negotiations till 1993.

The influential EC Commission has already given its opinion about Austria's membership application and it will prepare an opinion about Sweden's application by the summer. This process, too, is long, and if Finland is to join the round together with Austria and Sweden, a decision about the application must be made clearly and fairly soon, without months of hesitation. It is good to remember the marching order: Finland needs the Economic Community, but the Community does not need Finland.

It is encouraging to notice that Prime Minister Esko Aho corrected his rather unfortunate first statement by saying that to his knowledge all the facts relating to the integration decision were known and that the next few months would be crucial. The Minister for Foreign Trade Pertti Salolainen for his part did not hesitate to voice the opinion that a decision about the application must be made in February at the latest.

Hopefully Aho's and Salolainen's opinions are compatible. Aho's cautiously formulated opinion may be intended to pacify the controversies within the Centre Party itself, whereas Salolainen's timetable shows realism in relation to the EC.

If Finland becomes a member, we will commit ourselves to the very strict economic and monetary policy discipline which was agreed upon at Maastricht. There is no way of joining Europe free of charge, but the door seems to be open for those who have the courage.

FIGURE 2. Editorial published on 12th December, 1991

This article argues for the view that Finland should submit its application for membership in the European Community without delay, so that the application could be considered in the same "round" as the applications of Austria and Sweden. This programme of action is expressed in the second paragraph by means of clearly marked deontic modality, so that the passage is easy to identify as advice or admonition:

“... if Finland is to join the round together with Austria and Sweden, a decision about the application **must be made** clearly and fairly soon, without months of hesitation. **It is good to remember** the marching order: Finland needs the Economic Community, but the Community does not need Finland.”

The addressee here is Finland, and the facts and values appealed to are that (1) Finland should keep up with Austria and Sweden (expressed in the if-sentence) and (2) that Finland is the vulnerable party of the deal, as it needs the EC but is not needed by it.

The article also contains passages which can be described as praise: the prime minister as well as the minister of foreign trade are praised for opinions which the editorial writer considers favourable for Finland's application. In addition, the first paragraph contains the presuppositions that Finland has a “road to EC” and that we are making “efforts to catch the first train to membership together with Sweden and Austria.”

The picture which emerges from this analysis is that the programme of action is addressed to an élite audience rather than to the general public; that the tone of the directives is patronizing and even irritable (as shown by the advice that the application must be made “clearly” and “without months of hesitation”), and that the editorial writer speaks only for those whose interests lie in international competitiveness and thus membership of the Community.

5. METHOD OF ANALYSIS

As the sample analyses show, attention is paid to the following dimensions of the text:

- (1) Whether and how the text takes a stand to Finland's EC membership: the speech act types which were identified above were advice, warning, admonition, criticism and praise. Other types of stand-taking that appear in the material are hint, hypothetical or neutral statement and presupposition.
- (2) Whether there is a passage related to the issue of EC membership which is identifiable as a directive. A directive passage is coded as a programme of action.

- (3) Whether the directive passage can be described as patronizing or egalitarian. Attention is paid not only to the types of speech act but also to the stylistic choices in their expression.
- (4) Whether there is an addressee for whom the programme of action seems to be designed. Attention is paid to whether there are more than one addressee and whether the addressees represent the general public or an élite audience.
- (5) What are the facts and values to which the editorial writer appeals in order to justify his programme of action. Judgements are also made as to whose values are represented.

In addition to describing the editorials in terms of the above considerations, the analysis also covers the main feature articles found on the editorial pages during the half-year period in question. The number of these articles in *Helsingin Sanomat* was 24, and they fell into the following broad categories: (1) "Euro-condition" articles, i.e. texts which seemed to presuppose that Finland would join the EC and discussed the changes that would be needed in Finland's economic and legislative structures in order to make it eligible for the EC. (2) Articles which took a positive or encouraging stand to Finland's membership. (3) Articles which took a negative or critical stand to Finland's membership. (4) Articles which were neutral in respect of Finland's membership.

Attention was also paid to the timing of the various types of main feature articles. Moreover, the statements made in some editorials themselves about the prerequisites of public dialogue were subjected to critical review.

6. RESULTS

I will begin with some statistics about the editorials themselves. The quantitative analysis made it quite clear that *Helsingin Sanomat* took the stand that Finland should apply for membership, and that it should apply without delay. Only six editorials out of the 39 were neutral and "dialogical" in relation to whether Finland should apply for membership, and one of these was moderately critical as well. The rest of the editorials, i.e. 33 texts, took a clear stand in favour of Finland's application. They either contained a programme

of action expressed by means of a directive speech act – this was the case in 25 texts – or expressed their position by means of praise, criticism, or hint. I will now look at the programmes of action in some detail: What is their content; who are their addressees, and how are they expressed?

6.1. The content and the addressees of the programmes of action

Table 1 shows the distribution of the programmes of action according to content. Among the 25 texts which had a programme of action, there were 10 texts which advocated particular changes in Finland's economy, industry, agriculture or legislation etc. which would be necessary in order to groom Finland so that it would be eligible for the European Community. I call these Euro-condition articles. Five texts conveyed the message that Finland should apply without delay; two texts admonished Finland to seek membership, and the rest of the texts took a stand to the various political measures which would be necessary for the application to materialize.

The programmes were addressed to Finland, or to those in power, i.e. the government, the prime minister, the president, or other élite audiences such as the unions or the political parties.

There were also eight instances in which the addressee was not singled out and in which the programme of action was expressed impersonally. As was pointed out above, the Finnish language has a greater inventory of linguistic devices for impersonal expression than Indo-European languages, and also a greater propensity to use these devices. In two instances only, the programme of action was addressed to "us".

TABLE 1. Programmes of action: content matter

Euro-condition articles	10
Finland should apply without delay	5
Finland should seek membership	2
Finland should decide without delay	1
Government should persuade Parliament and citizens that membership is better than non-membership	1
Government and prime minister should encourage discussion	1
Prime minister should seek a widespread consensus on application	1
Centre Party should make its position clear	1
Social Democrats and the unions should keep the national interest in mind	1
President and Government must make a decision on application	1
Centre Party ministers should remember the national interest	1
Total	25

6.2. The expression of the programmes of action

The programmes of action are expressed in such a way that the speech act is recognizable as advice, admonition or warning, as shown by the following examples:

- (1) In its bilateral agreements Finland must not rush to define the content of its foreign policy in a way which would give the other party a kind of veto in relation to Finland's policy of neutrality. (September 24, 1991.)
- (2) Now that even Switzerland, which has more than any other country guarded its independence and neutrality, is applying for membership, Finland, like Norway, has hardly any other option but to follow suit. (October 23, 1991.)
- (3) Public authorities are there to create legislation which forces the companies to compete. They must also see to it that competition functions all the time. Against this background it is now necessary to tighten Finland's competition laws. (October 27, 1991.)
- (4) It would be sensible for Finland to give the EC as soon as possible a sufficiently clear signal about its wish to submit a membership application to be discussed simultaneously with those of Sweden and Austria. (December 13, 1991.)

-
- (5) The government must persuade parliament and a distinct majority of citizens that EC membership is better than staying outside the EC. (January 4, 1992.)
 - (6) No distinct public opinion will become apparent about the EC application at this stage. Therefore the president and the government must now make the decision. (February 8, 1992.)

6.3. Praise, criticism and hint

The editorials also used indirect means of expression to convey their position. These were praise, criticism and hint. These were addressed to the same élite audiences as the programmes of action discussed above. The following examples show what kind of expressions were coded under this heading.

- (7) The issue of Finland's possible membership in the EC was handled by (prime minister) Aho so diplomatically that the doors are open in all directions. (September 4, 1991.)
- (8) How on earth can such a thing (public opinion) be suddenly created, as the president himself does not want to take a stand yet. (January 2, 1992.)
- (9) The (government's) report also exposes popular fallacies, such as the fear that there will be a dump sale of social security. (January 10, 1992.)
- (10) (Sweden's prime minister) Bildt is right that Nordic cooperation can be strengthened in the future only "in a wider European context," or in practice within the EC. (October 9, 1991.)
- (11) Now that the prime minister and the foreign minister have taken their stand (on Finland's application), it is permissible to expect President Mauno Koivisto to take a stand as well. There is a good opportunity to do this at the opening of the National Assembly on Friday. (February 4, 1992.)

6.4. Facts and values appealed to

An analysis of the facts and values which the editorials use to justify their programmes of action turns out a rather homogeneous picture. The Euro-condition articles presuppose the necessity of seeking membership, and they appeal to such values as competitiveness and flexibility in the face of the

challenges which the membership will present. The sample text in Figure 1 will serve as an example of a Euro-condition article.

Those articles which advise Finland to seek membership appeal to values such as keeping pace with Sweden, Austria and Switzerland, and to such "ultimate" values as economic growth, wealth, our future, and Finland's image as a western country, as illustrated by the excerpt in example (12), which reveals the programme of action of an editorial entitled "Time is ripe for EC application."

- (12) Europe is no more what it used to be. Therefore we cannot stick to the old. We must try to see what has changed and will change. We must think about our priorities in a changing Europe. ... Finland must see its position in a new light. Neutrality must not be made into a straitjacket but it must be adjusted to the new European reality. It is not politically wise to stay alone, neighbored by Russia, outside the EC, if Sweden becomes a member and the Baltic countries look for political allies in the west. Our economic wellbeing and future on the periphery of Europe will look anything but optimistic if we, accompanied only by the former socialist countries, stay outside the EC. In such company our image would not be as European as we would like to think. (November 10, 1991.)

Competitiveness, economic growth and wealth are the ultimate values which are taken for granted and never challenged.

The editorial whose programme of action was quoted above in (12) also contains a passage which reveals contempt towards those who are opposed to Finland's application. This passage is quoted below in example (13).

- (13) Staying outside the EC will not secure a "Finnish way of life" or "the right to decide about our own affairs", as those who fantasize about a cocoon of safety imagine. We will have to adjust to the reality which is decided within the EC and in other international forums.

In the next section I will discuss the choice of the main feature articles during the same six-month period from which the editorials themselves originate.

6.5. Main feature articles: content and timing

The number of the main feature articles was 24, and they were categorized as shown in Table 2. The analysis of the main feature articles shows that they are in line with the editorials themselves. More than half of the articles are Euro-condition articles written by experts in various fields such as agriculture, industry, history and culture, regional policies, local government and law, and timed so that they cover the entire half-year period. There were only five critical articles, and four of these were published early in the period, whereas the articles advocating membership were published close to the time of the final decision.

TABLE 2. Content and timing of main feature articles

Type	Number	Time of publication
Euro-condition articles	14	Evenly spread between September 91 and February 92
Articles taking a positive stand	4	One in October 91; three in January/February 92
Articles taking a negative or critical stand	5	Four in September/October 91; one in January 92
Neutral	1	February 92
Total	24	

7. CONCLUSION

The analysis of the editorials and the feature articles would suggest that the argumentation style in the editorial pages of *Helsingin Sanomat* has indeed changed: instead of being diplomatic, cautious and dialogical, the paper is now monological and authoritarian, at least in its treatment of an issue which it considers important: (1) It takes a position onesidedly instead of presenting alternative viewpoints. (2) It presents its programmes of action in a patronizing tone of voice as advice, admonition and warning. (3) It addresses itself to élite audiences rather than the general public. (4) It virtually ignores adversary opinions: its editorials do not conduct a dialogue with those who challenge the basic values of competition and economic growth. (5) It even goes so far as to label its opponents as “those who fantasize about Finland as a cocoon of safety”, as appears from the editorial published 10th November 1991. (6) Authoritarian lines of thought are also voiced clearly and explicitly by some editorials under review, as illustrated by the passages quoted in examples (5), (8), and (13). Here the editorial writers express the view that the general public cannot form an opinion before the father figures, i.e. the president and the prime minister, have expressed their opinion and that it is the task of the government to persuade parliament and the citizens that EC membership is better than staying outside the EC. They also show contempt towards their adversaries by labelling them unrealistic “fantasizers”.

In conclusion this analysis suggests that Finland may be heading towards an era of hard and authoritarian values, in which lip service is paid to international exchange and understanding but in which there is even less tolerance of diversity than before. Should we teach ourselves and our students strategies to communicate successfully with the representatives of this new culture?

REFERENCES

- Hakulinen, Auli, Fred Karlsson & Maria Vilkuna 1980. *Suomen tekstilauseiden piirteitä. Kvantitatiivinen tutkimus*. Helsinki: Department of General Linguistics, University of Helsinki.
- Hemanus, Pertti 1988. Suomen sanomalehdistö tänään ja huomenna. In: *Suomen lehdistön historia 3*. Jyväskylä.
- Nieminen, Hannu 1992. "Emansipaatio ja moderni julkisuus". Unpublished Licentiate Thesis. University of Tampere.
- Päkkilä, Markku 1989. "Comparing the Editorials of Finnish and British Popular Tabloids". Unpublished M.A. Thesis. University of Joensuu, Savonlinna School of Translation Studies.
- Teikari, Erkki 1990. Suomalainen sanomalehti, varovainen kannanottaja, *Tiedotustutkimus* 3, 56–63.
- Tirkkonen-Condit, Sonja 1987. Argumentation in English and Finnish Editorials. In: Frans H. van Eemeren, Rob Grootendorst, J. Anthony Blair & Charles A. Willard (eds.) *Argumentation: Across the Lines of Discipline*. Dordrecht: Foris, 373–378.
- Tirkkonen-Condit, Sonja 1988. Editorials as Argumentative Dialogues: Explicit vs. Implicit Expression of Disagreement in Finnish, English and American Newspaper Editorials. In: *Erikoiskielet ja käännösteoria. VAKKI-seminaari VIII*, Vöyri 13.–14.2.1988. Vaasa: University of Vaasa, Department of Languages, 168–175.
- Tirkkonen-Condit, Sonja 1989. Topic and Structure in Argumentation. In: Jussi Niemi (ed.) *Papers from the Eleventh Scandinavian Conference of Linguistics*. Volume 2. Studies in Languages No. 15. Joensuu: University of Joensuu, Faculty of Arts, 416–433.
- Tirkkonen-Condit, Sonja 1992. How do Readers Infer Relational Propositions in an Argumentative Text: An Experimental Study. In: Frans H. van Eemeren and Rob Grootendorst (eds.) *Argumentation Illuminated*. Amsterdam: SICSAT – International Centre for the Study of Argumentation.