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Foreword

This book constitutes a milestone in journalism for both Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot editors and journalists across the island as it offers alternatives to the dominant “war journalism” approach that Cyprus journalism (as part of a global pattern of contemporary journalism), has become habituated to. “Peace Journalism: A Practical Handbook for Journalists in Cyprus” offers an opportunity to journalists who want to escape the blame game, open up opportunities for the resolution to ongoing conflict through serious reporting, and transcend the “them/us” and “we’re right/they’re wrong” dichotomy that has become the hallmark of contemporary journalistic framing. At a time when the profession of journalism is under assault and fresh allegations of “fake news” are daily on the rise, this text offers a momentary reflection on the possibilities inherent in the kind of journalism that reveals complexity rather than simplistic reductionism, includes all stakeholders rather than reduce shareholders to two teams competing in a zero sum game, and opens up questions for dialogue and debate rather than closing down discussion through marginalizing, demonizing and silencing others. We can hopefully look forward to a vibrant dialogue between journalists and editors of both communities about how the press might best serve the interests of democracy and promote an enlightened public that refuses the simplified stereotypes, ethnocentric perspectives, and war-oriented rational of yesterday in favour of a more critical, thoughtful and open minded approach that recognizes and respects the many and varied voices of stakeholders in Cyprus.

Mashoed Bailie
1. The origins of Peace Journalism

The very concept “Peace Journalism” belongs to Norwegian professor Johan Galtung, the founder of “Peace and Conflict Studies” and “Peace Research”. Peace Journalism entered the academic and professional arena during the late 1990s and the theory was championed by former journalists Jake Lynch and Annabel McGoldrick. The idea of Peace Journalism first introduced by Johan Galtung to a group of journalist from a variety of different countries in 1997 at the “Conflict and Peace Journalism Summer School in Taplow Court, UK". A group of academicians and journalists candidly engaged in discussions and debates concerning the strengths and weaknesses of peace journalism during the lectures and workshops held each summer between 1997-99. Jake Lynch wrote a manual from the proceedings of the summer schools, titled “The Peace Journalism Option". Following the summer schools, a web page was created by a group of journalists, including Jake Lynch, called reportingtheworld.net, and it hosts discussions between journalists who are interested in a wide variety of conflicts worldwide and especially in how to report on them. During 2000, Lynch and McGoldrick began teaching peace journalism at the M.A. level at the University of Sydney and followed this with several “peace journalism training workshops” for journalists in several countries including Indonesia, Nepal and Armenia. Lynch claims that both Indonesia and the Philippines are the “two countries where the peace journalism movement gained traction” among journalists through focused training sessions conducted by trainers who had been themselves first trained by he and McGoldrick in Indonesia.

Peace journalism initially received focused attention from the international academic arena following its formal introduction to the academic community at an Oxford conference convened and funded by the Toda Institute for Global Peace and Policy Research in 2002. In 2005 Lynch and McGoldrick published the book “Peace Journalism” which is considered a ground-breaking step in the generation and spread of debates about peace journalism worldwide. Peace Journalism is not only a new way of reporting conflicts and wars but also “a fund of evaluative criteria for media monitoring and content analysis”. During the last two decades, hundreds of peace journalism media analysis research articles and books have been published and several authors including Runne Ottosen, Dov Shinar, Samuel Peleg, Wilhelm Kempf, Ibrahim Seage Shaw, and Robert A. Hacket, have worked on improving the theory of peace journalism.

“I am a pro-peace person and a journalist, doesn’t this make me a peace journalist?”

2. What is Peace Journalism?

Being a pro peace person/journalist does not automatically make one a peace journalist, because peace journalism insists on a specific code or set of rules that are argued to make a conflict more transparent thus opening up possibilities for peaceful solutions.

Lynch and McGoldrick’s most cited definition of peace journalism is: “when editors and reporters make choices – of what to report and how to report it – that create opportunities for society at large to consider and to value non-violent responses to conflict.” Peace Journalism:

- uses the insights of conflict analysis and transformation to update the concepts of balance, fairness and accuracy in reporting
- provides a new route map tracing the connections between

---

journalists, their sources, the stories they cover and the consequences of their journalism – the ethics of journalistic intervention.

- builds an awareness of non-violence and creativity into the practical job of everyday editing and reporting”.
- Lynch, in “a course for Peace Journalism” explains in practical terms what Peace Journalism aims to do:
  - Take an analytical approach to conflict, seeking opportunities to identify parties, goals, needs and interests
  - Project a multiparty conflict model rather than a Manichean ‘tug-of-war’
  - Find room for perspectives from beyond the usual ‘official sources’
  - Seek out peace initiatives as well as ‘pegs’ (opportunities) to report on them.

“Isn’t that peace advocacy?”

The very name “Peace Journalism” may generate multiple understandings about its practices; Peace Journalism is not a peace advocacy approach, instead it is an approach aimed at “giving peace a chance”. As argued by Jake Lynch and Johan Galtung on several occasions, “Peace Journalism is a serious, inquisitive, professional reporting, making conflict more transparent. But it is not peace advocacy. That task is better left to peace workers and activists”. Lynch and McGoldrick, in response to the question: “Peace Journalism? Isn’t that a bit of dodgy label – sounds a bit hippie-ish?” argue that alternative names like “Solutions Journalism, Conflict Analysis Journalism, Constructive Journalism, and Empowerment Journalism” are also possible. They also underline a crucial point related to the defining of Peace Journalism: “If you think of conflict coverage as ‘just reporting the facts’, you have no need to call it War Journalism and no need to define Peace Journalism against it”. The aspect of “just reporting the facts” will be addressed later in more detail below.

It is important to make a distinction between “writing for peace” and “peace journalism”; as Sevda Alankuş argues, writing for peace is not equivalent for peace journalism because most of the journalists who said they write for peace [in terms of supporting peace] are nevertheless trapped in the main characteristics of war journalism¹³.

Johan Galtung, since he first published in the area of Peace Journalism, defines war journalism as “the low road” and peace journalism as “the high road”:

“The low road, dominant in the media, sees a conflict as a battle, as a sports arena or gladiator circus. The parties, usually reduced to two, are combatants in a struggle to impose their goals. The reporting model is that of a military command: who advances, who capitulates short of their goals; losses are counted in terms of numbers killed or wounded and material damage. The zero-sum perspective draws upon sports reporting where “winning is not everything, it is the only thing.” The same perspective is applied to negotiations as verbal battles: who outsmarts the other, who comes out closest to his original position. War journalism has sports journalism, and court journalism, as models. The high road, the road of peace journalism, would focus on conflict transformation. Conflicts would be seen as a challenge to the world… But in conflict there is also a clear opportunity for human progress, using the conflict to find new ways, transforming the conflict creatively so that the opportunities take the upper hand – without violence”¹⁴.

For Galtung, not surprisingly, War Journalism is the dominant/mainstream way of reporting conflicts and wars worldwide. Galtung and Lynch have more recently defined peace journalism as “Being against the mainstream... this is an upstream job, and a very meaningful one”¹⁵.

¹⁴ Galtung, J. (1998). High Road, Low Road: Charting the course for Peace Journalism Retrieved from: http://journals.co.za/content/track2/7/4/EJC111753
Galtung first introduced Peace Journalism in a “table form” during the “Conflict and Peace Journalism Summer School” in UK.¹⁶ The table, which can be considered a “stand-alone roadmap for journalists”, compares “Peace/Conflict Journalism” with “War/Violence Journalism” across four key themes as shown in Table one below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PEACE/CONFLICT JOURNALISM</th>
<th>WAR/VIOLENCE JOURNALISM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. PEACE/CONFLICT-ORIENTATED</strong></td>
<td><strong>I. WAR/VIOLENCE ORIENTATED</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Explore conflict formation, x parties, y goals, z issues general “win, win” orientation</td>
<td>• Focus on conflict arena, 2 parties, 1 goal (win), war general zero-sum orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Open space, open time; causes and outcomes anywhere, also in history/culture</td>
<td>• Closed space, closed time; causes and exits in arena, who threw the first stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Making conflicts transparent</td>
<td>• Making wars opaque/secret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Giving voice to all parties; empathy, understanding see conflict/war as problem, focus on conflict creativity</td>
<td>• “us-them” journalism, propaganda, voice, for “us”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Humanisation of all sides; more so the worse the weapons</td>
<td>• See “them” as the problem, focus on who prevails in war</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Proactive: prevention before any violence/war occurs</td>
<td>• Dehumanisation of “them”; more so the worse the weapon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Focus on invisible effects of violence (trauma and glory, damage to structure/culture)</td>
<td>• Reactive: waiting for violence before reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Focus only on visible effect of violence (killed, wounded and material damage)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>II. TRUTH-ORIENTATED</strong></th>
<th><strong>II. PROPAGANDA-ORIENTED</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Expose untruths on all sides / uncover all cover-ups</td>
<td>• Expose “their” untruths / help “our” cover-ups/lies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>III. PEOPLE-ORIENTED</strong></th>
<th><strong>III. ELITE ORIENTED</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Focus on suffering all over; on women, aged children, giving voice to voiceless</td>
<td>• Focus on “our” suffering; on able-bodied elite males, being their mouth-piece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Give name to all evil-doers Focus on people peace-makers</td>
<td>• Give name to their evil-doers focus on elite peace-makers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>IV. SOLUTION ORIENTED</strong></th>
<th><strong>IV. VICTORY ORIENTED</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Peace = non-violence + creativity</td>
<td>• Peace = victory + ceasefire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Highlight peace initiatives, also to prevent more war Focus on structure, culture, the peaceful society Aftermath: resolution, reconstruction, reconciliation</td>
<td>• Conceal peace-initiative, before victory is at hand Focus on treaty, institution, the controlled society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Leaving for another war, return if the old flares up again</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“Conflict is inevitable and desirable”

3. Conflict, what is it?

According to Andrew Puddephatt, “Conflict is one of the defining features of the modern world”\textsuperscript{17}. The founders and advocates of Peace Journalism always insist that Peace Journalism focuses on conflict and its peaceful transformation. But what is conflict anyway? It is obvious that there is confusion concerning the definition of conflict and in understanding its characteristics. The main confusion related to conflict is that the term is sometimes used as a subsidiary referring to violence and/or war and/or armed conflict both by academicians, journalists and public in general. Galtung argues that this problem is related to the English language: “there [is] an inability to distinguish between conflict and violence”\textsuperscript{18}.

“Not all conflict is violent”\textsuperscript{19} or leads to violence. Associating all conflicts with violence is “a narrow conceptualization” that prevents us from seeing that there are many different types of conflict\textsuperscript{20}. The term conflict, as used in this book, refers to a definition offered by Max Lucade, “A conflict is a clash between antithetical ideas or interests – within a person or involving two or more persons, groups or states pursuing mutually incompatible goals”\textsuperscript{21}. Here we focus on social aspects of conflict rather than the personal level. According to Louis Kriesberg and Bruce W. Dayton, social conflicts occurs “when two or more persons or groups manifest the belief that they have incompatible objectives”\textsuperscript{22}. In this book, we deal with ethno political conflict as a form of social conflict. Don Ellis defines ethno political conflict as follows: “Conflict

between two or more groups is termed ‘ethno political’ when ethnicity and religion are highly implicated in the ongoing state of hostility”23. Dusan Relic (2004, p.322) argues that ethno political conflict has crucial differences from other types of conflict: “The fundamental distinction is that the conflicting parties often resort to violence because they see this as the only means of resolving their grievances with other ethnic communities”24.

One has to keep in mind that while violence can be prevented, conflict cannot. Max Lucade puts it this way: “Conflict is inevitable, but combat is optional”. Cees Hamelink, also insists that conflict is inevitable and in some cases even desirable – having a positive influence in human life and democracy:

“Conflict is a central part of living with the others… Accepting the inevitability of conflict may help us to discover that conflict can even be desirable… conflict can also be a positive force for change… Without conflict, there no innovations in arts and technology. Without conflict, there can be no science. The basis of scientific investigation is that scientist disagree on almost on everything. Thus, when the scientific community claims to have a consensus, one needs to be suspicious about the quality of the scientific work… Without conflict societies could not be democratically organized. The essence of politics is conflict. Political practice is about the distribution and execution of power and inevitably involves opposite positions. Therefore, disagreement and tension are part of political process. Expressing these frictions is more productive in democracy than seeking consensus, as consensus politics tends to exclude people.”25

Reljic similarly argues that “Conflicts are, after all, part of daily life in a democracy. Subsequently, the absence of reports in the media on conflicts would suggest that democracy itself has been lost”\(^{26}\).

Some ethno political conflicts are not resolvable and these kinds of conflicts are called “intractable conflicts”. Coleman clarifies that “When destructive conflicts persist for long periods of time and resist every attempt to resolve them constructively, they can appear to take on a life of their own. We label them as intractable conflicts”\(^{27}\). Thus, one of the main characteristics of intractable conflicts is that, “they appear impossible to resolve”\(^{28}\). Israeli academic Daniel Bar-Tal, known for his research on intractable conflicts, argues that what makes conflicts intractable, is the “culture of conflict”:

> These conflicts last for a long time because the real disagreements over goals and interests are fuelled by the socio-psychological repertoire that is well grounded in the culture of the engaged societies – that is, in longstanding, violent, and vicious intractable conflicts, societies evolve a culture of conflict that has a tremendous influence on the way these conflicts are managed, because it provides important foundations for their continuation and it thwarts their peaceful resolution\(^{29}\).

Bar-Tal, elsewhere, also outlines the characteristics of a culture of conflict as follows:

> It justifies the outbreak of the conflict and the course of its development, delegitimizes the rival, glorifies one’s own group and presents it as the victim of the conflict, encourages mobilization for the conflict, and sets security and patriotism as highly desirable values\(^{30}\).

---


\(^{28}\) Ibid, p.544


According to Bar-Tal a culture of conflict in a society is something shared by the majority and is a dominant and hegemonic way to approach conflict.

One can consider Cyprus as a complex and divided society of intractable ethno political conflict between Turkish Cypriots and Greek Cypriots – a conflict that has fuelled inter-ethnic violence on several occasions.

4. Peace, in a positive sense

Peace, on the other hand, “is often defined or determined negatively. Peace is ‘the absence of war’. Peace is ‘nonviolence’. Etc. We know peace by its absence”\(^{31}\). However, peace “is something more than absence of war”\(^{32}\) or violent conflict. In his seminal work on “Negative and Positive Peace”, Galtung argues that absence of direct violence/war is not enough to achieve what he calls “positive peace”. Galtung introduced the concepts of “positive peace” and “negative peace” in the very first issue of the “Journal Of Peace Research” in 1964 as follows: “…negative peace which is the absence of violence, absence of war - and positive peace which is the integration of human society”\(^{33}\). In a subsequent article published in 1969, Galtung updates his definition of positive peace by arguing that, “‘positive peace’ is constantly changing . . . I would now identify ‘positive peace’ mainly with ‘social justice’”\(^{34}\). More recently, Galtung defines positive peace as the: “presence of cooperation . . . presence of equity, equality . . . presence of a culture of peace, and dialogue”\(^{35}\). It is definitely difficult to achieve a positive peace described by Galtung. Charles Webel considers the difficulty in achieving peace as follows:

---

“Perhaps ‘peace’ is like ‘happiness’, ‘justice’, ‘health’ and other human ideals, something every person and culture claims to desire and venerate, but which few if any achieve, at least on an enduring basis… Peace is a linchpin of social harmony, economic equity and political justice, but peace is also constantly ruptured by wars and other forms of violent conflict. Like happiness, peace remains so near . . . and yet, like enduring love, so far…”

“Can journalists really make a difference?”

5. News media’s role in ethnic conflict and war/violence

The news media play a central role in democratic life as key sources of information for citizens of contemporary societies. News is central to daily life because, “One of the first places that people go to find out what is happening in the world is the media”37. Wilson Lowrey, for example, considers reading news a “ritual rather than utility” because it is “…as natural and taken-for-granted as turning on a faucet”38. In everyday life we need news because, “…news tells us what we do not experience directly and thus renders otherwise remote happenings observable and meaningful”39. As Michael Parenti, once argued: “For many people, an issue does not exist, until it appears in the news media”40.

Seeing the media as a key source of information in the everyday life of the citizen, underlines just how important it is to bring the media under scrutiny and to examine how the media reports ethno-political conflicts, wars and peace negotiations. The media’s role in ethno-political conflict, war and peacebuilding has been a popular topic among communication scholars

worldwide since the 1990s where discussions concerning media and conflict/war/peace reporting tend to accentuate the negative contributions of media in their reporting of conflict.

A Greek and a Turkish scholar in their joint article, argue that, “Media… cannot be blamed for creation of ethnic/national conflicts but play an important role in their conduct”\(^{41}\). Similarly, Israeli professor Gadi Wolfsfeld reminds us, “the media do not initiate the violence, but they can often play an important role in intensifying such conflicts. Perhaps the most apt metaphor is that of the wind: The media can be a major catalyst turning a small fire into a raging inferno”\(^{42}\). There are several cases where media played a crucial role in the conduct of violent conflicts and according to Vladimir Bratic one example was when “The Rwandian Radio Television Libre des Milles Colines played a crucial role in initiating the slaughter of more than half a million people in less than 100 hundred days”\(^{43}\).

Of course, media also play an important role in “sustaining” conflict. According to Elbaz and Bar-Tal, “…the media, especially in times of intractable conflict, become the main transmitter of the culture of conflict, promoting national narratives, values, and security concerns in a hegemonic way.”\(^{44}\) Elbaz and Bal-Tar, call these narratives “conflict supporting narratives” and argue that: “These narratives are selective, biased, and distortive, but play an important role in satisfying the basic sociopsychological needs of the society members involved”\(^{45}\). Furthermore, they claim that “…journalists often serve as agents in the formulation and dissemination of these conflict-supporting narratives”\(^{46}\). For what reasons might journalists willingly, or unwillingly, promote conflict supportive narratives? We deal with this in the following section.

\(^{45}\) Ibid, p.1
\(^{46}\) Ibid, p.1
“Is it that easy?”

6. Visible and invisible barriers in front of peace journalism

When the issue is about reporting a violent or cold ethno-political conflict, there are 4 interconnected issues that can be considered as barriers in front of peace journalism. First, media institutions are primarily commercial institutions having mainly economical but also political and ideological\(^{47}\) interests. According to a well-known political economist Robert W. McChesney media is a “…businesses no less than any other profit-maximizing firms\(^{48}\).” Second, journalists are not free-floating professionals reporting whatever they want in whatever way they prefer. They are working for media institutions that have their own interests.

Third, what we call news is always about negative things. “The bad news comes first” says Pamela J. Shoemaker and adds “If developments are negative, they are more likely to become news”\(^{49}\). According to Gadi Wolfsfeld, “All other things being equal, journalists prefer to tell stories about conflict. News is first and foremost, about conflict and disorder. Protests, violence, crime, wars, and disasters provide the most natural material for news reports. Journalists become famous and win awards for covering such stories.”\(^{50}\)

Fourth, domestic media usually adopts nationalistic/ethnocentric views worldwide. Former American journalist Jack Fuller puts it this way: “newspapers are nationalistic institutions. They must organize around a coherent set of interests – one of which is geographic –to create an audience

\(^{47}\) “Ideology can be understood as the attempt to fix meaning for specific purposes. Ideologies are discourses that give meaning to material objects and social practices; they define and produce the acceptable and intelligible way of understanding the world while excluding other ways of reasoning as unintelligible and unjustifiable” (Barker, C. (2002). Making sense of cultural studies central problems and critical debates. London: SAGE. p.56-57).


and this defines the basic choices of what to report and how to report it"\textsuperscript{51}. According to Fuller, “Newspapers grow out of the soil of community. They have always been a kind of Daily We”\textsuperscript{52}. The ethnocentric/nationalistic characteristics of news and news media also recalls another discussion about “journalism in service to” a country/state/nation/community during times of conflict/war/possibility of war/national security.

Tamar Liebes, argues that the difficulty for journalists in representing the ‘other side’s views stems from the fact that “…conflict makes it physically and psychologically difficult to get to the other side, that journalists have to tell stories which are relevant and familiar to their public, and thus that journalists, willy-nilly, are servants of their culture”\textsuperscript{53}. Journalists being servants of their culture or nation/community causes a dilemma, well described by Zandberg and Negier in this way: “…journalists are members of two communities simultaneously: the professional community and the national one. Each community’s ideology contradicts the other; one might say that the journalists are caught between Nation and Profession”\textsuperscript{54}. Why can journalists not be critical of wars declared or fought by their country? Simply because being critical in those times, puts journalists in positions where their “patriotism”\textsuperscript{55} or “loyalty”\textsuperscript{56} to their country is questioned.

**It will be unfair to scrutinize journalists without contextualizing their behaviour within the media institutions they work for.** The media themselves exude feelings of patriotism during times of war, as Hammond and Herman argue, “The mainstream media of most countries have regularly jumped aboard a patriotic bandwagon when their governments have gone to

\textsuperscript{52} Ibid, p.228
war, and have very commonly helped stoke war fever”\textsuperscript{57}. Wolfsfeld argues that domestic media always employs an “ethnocentric view of the world” which makes it easier for the politicians to promote wars. Wolfsfeld adds that: “Journalists who do not exhibit sufficient ‘patriotism’ during such conflicts are likely to become extremely unpopular”\textsuperscript{58}. Journalists who oppose the hegemonic ethnocentric views in their culture not only become unpopular but are also more likely to be putting their lives at risk.

Journalists do not only experience the risks associate with social and political pressure making them more likely to adopt patriotic tones; they are also members of their societies and have been socialized into those patriotic views, norms and tones. This socialization into particular ways of thinking about the world partly explains how writing about conflict from the point of view of the journalist’s own community/society/state/nation seems reasonable and rational – leading inevitably to a rarely questioned “ethnocentric view of the world”.

The other key reason for media and journalists to adopt and represent “ethnocentric views of the world” is their heavy reliance on official sources during crisis, war or the possibility of war – in other words issues related to national security. John Zaller and Dennis Chiu (1996, p.385), who call the media the “government’s little helper” argue that:

“…journalists find it difficult to report critically on government activity during foreign policy crises. They must contend not only with officials who strain to control the news, but with fear that tough reporting will undermine the government’s ability to deal with the crisis. As a result, journalists often simply ‘rally round the flag’ and whatever policy the government favours”\textsuperscript{59}

Summarizing research conducted worldwide, Gadi Wolfsfeld reports that, “…the news media generally tend to “rally ’round the flag” in support of their governments, especially during the early stages of such [international] conflicts.”\(^{60}\) Yoram Peri similarly argues that, “In education, economy, sports, and culture, journalists enjoy access to a variety of sources, but when it comes national security, the sources of information are few and access to them controlled.”\(^{61}\) Furthermore, Rubin reiterates this position when explaining the media’s support for the state when national security issues are at stake:

In the national security area, the press has taken the statist view. Newsmakers are almost exclusively top government officials with access to secrets; they define what is news by selectively manipulating information. We rarely hear the voice of civil society in national security stories.\(^{62}\)

These factors mitigate against journalists engaging in peace journalism precisely when it is needed the most. Nevertheless, for those who work through these issues, what are the steps needed in the process of becoming a peace journalist?

**Peace Journalism... How to do it?**

**7. What to keep in mind while reporting conflict**

All journalism is representation – no less is peace journalism. As Majid Tehranian\(^{63}\) has insisted, journalists have to consider whether their work will be part of the problem or part of the solution – opening up possibilities for non-violent solutions to conflict:


“Reporting is representation and your representation of conflict problems can become part of the problem if it exacerbates dualisms and hatreds”; therefore; “Always exercise the professional media ethics of accuracy, veracity, fairness, and respect for human rights and dignity”\textsuperscript{64}

“Bias is endemic to human conditions. You, your media organization, and your sources are not exceptions”… So “develop a good sense of skepticism” and; “Transcend your own ethnic, national, or ideological biases to see and represent the parties to human conflicts fairly and accurately”\textsuperscript{65}

Furthermore; be aware that; “Your representation of conflict problems can become part of the solution if it employs the creative tensions in any human conflict to seek common ground and nonviolent solutions”\textsuperscript{66}

\textit{How to approach conflicting parties...}

1) Peace journalists have to avoid simplification; they have to avoid \textbf{reducing a conflict to two parties or two stakeholders – simplifying a process to “us and them” or “bad versus good”}. Defining one side as “good” encourages us to see the other party as “bad” which can be used to justify violence or war against them\textsuperscript{67}. “Peace Journalism is proactive, examining the causes of conflict, and leading discussions about solutions”\textsuperscript{68}, long before tension raises or violence erupt.

2) Peace journalists are \textbf{non-partisan}… When reporting about a conflict, they “look to unite parties, rather than divide them”\textsuperscript{69}. What does this mean in practice? Well, “avoid concentrating always on what divides the parties, the differences between what they say they want. Instead try asking questions...
which may reveal areas of common ground and leading your report with answers which suggest that some goals may be shared or at least compatible, after all.”

3) Try “to identify the views and interests of all parties to human conflicts. **There is no single truth;** there are many truths.”

4) Be critical/sceptical about texts/announcements/narratives coming from different parties;

   “-The texts/narratives of conflict parties must be reported together with the *countertexts* of other parties;
   - There are usually *subtexts* where other intentions are hidden, embedded: try to get at them through investigative journalism;
   - The open text may be a *pretext* or only a (very) partial truth;
   - There is always a *context*, the broader conflict formation of parties and goals and issues: try to identify all of them!
   - There are *deeper texts*, in the collective subconscious/deep cultures of the parties: study gender, class, national myths!”

5) “Avoid focusing exclusively on the human rights abuses, misdemeanours and wrongdoings of only one side. Instead try to **name all wrongdoers** and treat equally seriously allegations made by all sides in a conflict.”

6) “Avoid blaming someone for ‘starting it’. Instead try looking at how shared problems and issues are leading to consequences which all the parties say they never intended.”

74 Ibid.
7) Avoid seeing a conflict like a football match or a zero-sum game. Instead try to employ a win-win approach to explore what sides will gain from a peaceful solution.

_Sources... why it is so important whose stories journalists give voice to?_

Political elites and official sources have consistently gained privileged access to journalists who are reporting conflicts. Peace journalists have to follow a different path when it comes to using sources to speak about a conflict.

8) Instead of having an “elite oriented” story, peace journalists have to be more **“people oriented”**. What does this mean in practice? Well, a peace journalist “gives voice to the voiceless, instead of just reporting for and about elites and those in power”.

9) **Let ordinary people, speak**... “Give voice to the oppressed and peacemakers to represent and empower them”.

10) Simply; “Do not be hostage to one source, particularly those of governments that control sources of information.” In other words, “**Reject official propaganda, and instead seek facts from all sources.**”

11) **“Avoid letting parties define themselves by simply quoting their leaders’ restatements of familiar demands or positions.** Instead enquire deeper into goals: How are people on the ground affected by the conflict in everyday life? What do they want changed? Is the position stated by their leaders the only way or the best way to achieve the changes they want? This may help to empower parties to clarify and articulate their goals and make creative outcomes more likely.”

---
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12) Avoid waiting for leaders on ‘our’ side to suggest or offer solutions. Instead pick up and explore peace initiatives wherever they come from. 

13) “Look out for and report peace proposals, there are more of them around than may be expected. Do not fall for the idea that peace has to come from governments; governments matter but their decisions are empty unless backed by public sentiments and civil society. Use questions to invite people to propose, suggest; peace belongs to everybody, not only to the political class”

14) Explore what ordinary members of other communities/parties faced during this conflict; that will help to create a sympathy/empathy towards the other communities. Peace Journalism can build a bridge for people to understand that it is not only “us” who suffered from conflict.

Language... Every word matters...

15) “Peace journalists carefully choose and analyse the words they use, understanding that carelessly selected words are often inflammatory.”

16) Avoid using emotive words, victimising language, demonizing adjectives! AVOID hate speech and blaming the other side(s)!

17) “Do not exaggerate situations by using strong wording. Reserve the strongest language only for the gravest situation”

18) “Quote parties correctly; do not use “claims” for one party and “explanations” for the other”

---
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19) “Avoid making an opinion or claim seem like an established fact. Instead tell your readers or your audience who said what.”

20) Avoid, using quotes/headlines that can escalate tension among conflicting parties.

21) Refuse to take part in the political elite’s blame game... Make sure your audience understands the contexts of the disagreements.

22) Peace journalists provide depth and context, rather than merely superficial and sensational “blow by blow” accounts of violence and conflict.

23) “Peace journalists offer counter-narratives that debunk media-created or perpetuated stereotypes, myths, and misperceptions. Put a step forward and “challenge yourself, and your audience... go beyond the easy narrative.”

24) Last but not least; journalists who claim to “only report facts” have to keep in mind What Johan Galtung argues:
   - Facts are always selected: hence, also select peace issues!
   - Facts are often distorted from event to print, be watchful!
   - Facts are often repressed: to be avoided also when those facts run counter to peaceful outcomes and processes!

8. Cyprus media and their approach to the conflict between two communities

The introduction of print media to Cyprus caused confrontation between the elites of two communities. The first Greek Cypriot newspaper titled ΚΥΠΡΟΣ...

---

(CYPRUS) was published in 1878 immediately after the start of British rule on the island. Nationalistic ideas like *enosis* [union with Greece] that were represented in the first Greek Cypriot newspapers generated responses in the Turkish Cypriot community as they responded by publishing the first Turkish Cypriot newspapers. Papademetris and Sophokleous, similarly state that “[t]he publication of the first Greek Cypriot papers, their nationalistic articles and the sustained promotion of the demand for Union with Greece, naturally provoked the anxiety and reaction of the Turkish Cypriots, who also sought to publish papers so as to oppose the Greek Cypriots’ demands and protect their own interests.”

The Turkish Cypriot press and the Greek Cypriot press have had different functions throughout their histories. However, being instruments of ‘national struggle’ is a shared characteristic. As Bekir Azgin argues, ‘the Turkish Cypriot press has a traditional “national struggle” approach. A journalist is like a politician as well; he takes sides and aims to protect and save his country and community.” The previous head of the Turkish Cypriot Journalist Association, Cenk Mutluyakalı, mentions in the preface of a recently published book that the Turkish Cypriot Press’ mission is not limited to journalism; it is also sometimes a ‘struggle tool’ used to oppose British colonial administration and at other times provides motivational support during inter-ethnic clashes. Papademetris and Sophokleous describe the role of the Greek Cypriot press during 1955-59 in similar terms, arguing that ‘[m]any Greek Cypriot reporters were at the same time freedom fighters [against British colonial administration].’

After independence, both the Turkish Cypriot and Greek Cypriot press, following the footsteps of the elites of their communities, continued to function as vehicles for the “national struggle” as they do to this day. Several

---

Cyprus media scholars including Bekir Azgin, Mashoed Bailie, Sanem Şahin, Metin Ersoy and Christophoros Christophorou, have argued that the media in Cyprus escalates conflict between the two communities. The first academic research about peace journalism in Cyprus, conducted by Metin Ersoy, as a MA thesis, under the supervision of Süleyman İrvan in 2003.

The Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot media, much like media institutions throughout the world, are more interested in producing conflict-oriented news stories. The Turkish Cypriot and Greek Cypriot media usually construct their stories from the points of view or dominant ideologies of their respective communities and this commonly produces a one sided – perspective, with accusations being hurled onto the “other side”. Such practices are what Galtung has defined as the ‘war journalism approach’.

Although a questionnaire-based survey concluded that 76.6 % of Turkish Cypriot journalists support peace journalism\textsuperscript{97}, there are several other studies showing the conflict orientation among Turkish Cypriot and Greek Cypriot journalists and the media of both communities\textsuperscript{98}. Ersoy’s recent study (2010) concluded that ‘news coverage in Cyprus does not contribute to peace building’.

\textbf{9. Towards peace journalism in Cyprus}

Cyprus, as a post conflict country, having had an intractable conflict for almost half a century, definitely needs a conflict transformation in peaceful terms. This can be facilitated through the practice of peace journalism where non-violent options to the resolution of conflict are revealed.

It is time for journalists in Cyprus to “go beyond the easy narrative”\(^99\) by challenging themselves and their readers. The easy narrative in Cyprus, on both sides, is to blame, and demonize the “other side”, and focus on “our” rightfulness on all issues. It is time for the Turkish Cypriot and Greek Cypriot media/journalists to go beyond the easy narrative.

In order to achieve this goal, there must be trainings and educational programs about Peace Journalism addressing media workers and journalists on both sides of the division. Furthermore, the media and communication faculties of universities in Cyprus, can increase the number of peace journalism courses in their curriculums.

---
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