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Introduction

The history of relations between the European Union (EU) and Turkey carries interesting path and turning points. Right after the establishment of European Economic Union in 1958, the first formal association was established with the conclusion of the Association Agreement in 1963 through the Ankara Agreement. Through the process of relations, in 1987, Turkey applied for full membership. This was, for sure, the beginnings of a long history of Turkey’s accession process to European Union. For some critics, Turkey’s candidacy was not the end but only the beginning of a long road.

There has been various criticism of Turkey’s accession to EU. For example, in a 2002 interview, the former French president, Giscard d’Estaing declared that admitting Turkey to the EU “would be the end of the European Union”, while Romano Prodi, as the Commission President, in the same period between 1999-2004, described the “New European Order” as embracing “all of us in the EU, the applicant countries and our neighbors in a wider Europe”.

In recent years, while the talks over Turkey’s accession to the EU have progressed, issues over human rights, military involvement in daily life, political developments, Kurdish and minority issues etc. have become more apparent not only in the discourse of EU institutions but also in the media in Europe.

Apparently, besides the issues stated above, Greek and Turkish relations also played an important role in discussions. As a neighboring state of Europe to Turkey, Greece seemed to be in favor of Turkey’s accession to the EU, despite the fact that there has been a long history of disputes on several issues.

In relation to Turkey’s accession to the EU through the developments within the accession process and specific to Greek-Turkish relations, this paper aims to provide a discussion of how Greek media cover and examine Turkey’s accession to the EU and, in return, Turkish media’s reaction to Greek discourse on EU-Turkey relations and the accession process.

European Union and Turkey

For long years, relations between Turkey and the European Union (EU) have been part of the problematic side of international relations and politics. It is a long and ongoing journey that some might liken to the Apollo 13 mission. It is almost inevitable to hear something similar to “Houston, we have a problem.” For both sides, Turkey’s accession to the EU became not only a difficult path and journey but
also a rich script which involved many actors, characters, plots and possibly re-written endings.

Turkey turned its face to westernization and chose the journey of westernizing its economic, political and social structures and institutions especially the during 20th century. Since then, Turkey has established strong relations with western countries and with their institutions. Through its journey of westernization, Turkey has taken part in various international institutions and organizations, in which the country played a wide variety of roles. Turkey has become a founding member of the United Nations, a member of NATO, and of the Council of Europe. Just a few of these examples clearly indicate that Turkey did not only start to align itself with West (specifically with Europe) for economic and social purposes, but also for political and military purposes. Through the existence of all these inter-related issues, Turkey chose to begin close cooperation with the fledgling European Economic Community in 1959 and later on with the European Union as its in new form.

As indicated, through Turkey’s long journey towards becoming a member of the European Union, contesting voices started to appear. Even some critics defined Turkey’s accession to the EU as the ‘question’ of Turkey’s accession to the EU. From the Turkish view-point, that word ‘question’ was almost similar to “Houston, we have a problem”. But, in this case, it was as much a question for Ankara as it was for the EU. The term ‘question’ obviously relates itself to multiple issues. Some of the questions from EU side was and still today is whether ‘Turkey is like Europe’ and if ‘Turkey is a European country’. These hesitations were related and have roots, among others, in economics, culture, religion, social life, politics, human rights.

To underline Turkey’s place in Europe and the EU, many responses are provided to the EU to overcome any hesitation about Turkey’s place and its willingness to be part of the EU. One of the significant examples comes from the president (2001-2004) of TUSIAD (Turkish Industrialists’ and Businessmen’s Association), Tuncay Ozilhan, during his speech of TUSIAD-Bosphorus Prize for European Understanding on January 9, 2004. While he underlines Turkey’s accession to EU as “our society project”, he also indicates Turkey’s place and identity as part of Europe and EU (Turkey in Europe Monitor, 2005: 9), underlining Turkey’s importance in matters of

a.) economic dynamism, entrepreneurial population and the economic opportunities combined with its geopolitical location;
b.) population which is young, well educated and trained and could provide an opportunity for the EU to deal with demographic problems;
c.) its relations with the EU, with its secular, democratic Muslim identity and with its functioning market economy which are of particular importance in a post-September 11 world;
d.) its possibility to extend its zone of peace from the Balkans, the Aegean Sea and the Black Sea to the Middle East, the Caucasus and Central Asia;
According to Ozilhan (ibid.), Turkey works hard to reach EU standards and expects to be treated with the same understanding so generously extended to Central and Eastern European countries. When it is time to decide on starting accession negotiations with Turkey, all the advantages of Turkey’s accession to the EU have to be balanced against the losses that the exclusion of Turkey would incur.

Besides what Ozilhan describes for Turkey’s accession to EU, and common ground and European identity, the threat of hearing ‘Ankara, we have a problem’ has always been valid before and then. One of those examples come almost two years before Ozilhan’s speech from former French president and the man overseeing plans for the future of Europe, Valery Giscard d’Estaing. According to him, Turkey is not a European country and that inviting Turkey to join the elite club would mean “the end of Europe.” As The New York Times quotes the interview with Le Monde, d’Estaing states “its capital is not in Europe; 95 percent of its population live outside Europe; it is not a European country” (The New York Times, November 9, 2002).

As Tuncay Ozilhan asserts the importance of Turkey for the EU in his speech during TUSIAD-Bosphorus Prize for European Understanding on January 9, 2004, Michael Emerson and Nathalie Tocci’s findings can be understood as opposing response to Valery Giscard d’Estaing’s statement in 2002. According to Emerson and Tocci (Emerson and Tocci, 2004), there are some possible assets in relation to Turkey’s membership to the EU, which they categorize as either ‘objective’ or ‘normative’. The following assets they consider objective (Emerson and Tocci 2004, 63):

- Turkey’s accession would lead to an extended reach of the European Neighborhood Policy.
- Turkey’s neighbors would become direct neighbors of the EU. Turkey has the role of geographic hub for regional cooperation.
- Turkey is a secure energy transport hub for Caspian, Middle East and Russian oil and gas.
- Turkey is well situated to become a forward base for the EU’s security and defense policy, for military logistics and the credibility of the EU’s presence in the region.
- Turkey has valuable human resources to complement those of the EU for cooperation programs, ranging from business know-how to language skills.

The normative ones are:

- Rather than representing values specific to particular cultures or religions, the Turkish case shows that democracy, secularism and human rights are universal values.
- Turkey’s EU accession would demonstrate Europe to be an inclusive concept, with a multicultural values, open to different religions.
- Turkey’s transformation of its security and foreign policy culture, with less reliance on military power and greater emphasis on diplomacy and civilian instruments.
- Turkey’s accession would confirm the contribution of European integration to conflict resolution, with the reconciliation between the Turkish state and
This section does not aim to present a detailed rationale related to the advantages or disadvantages of Turkey’s accession to the EU and the ongoing academic and political discussion. In pursuing our line of research, we focus on the ongoing debate that is portrayed in the selected newspapers, namely Kathimerini and Hürriyet. Our main research offers an overview of how the press in the two countries, Greece and Turkey, approached the topic of Turkey’s accession to the EU. In the following section and before presenting our main research findings, we try to give a comprehensive context of the relations between Greece and Turkey.

**Greece and Turkey**

As the last point of Emerson and Tocci (ibid) indicates, relations between Turkey and Greece within the EU perspective carry a particularly important piece. The long tradition of the problematic Greece and Turkey relations and its reflection on the issue of Cyprus have potential to turn into a more progressive rapprochement process. Especially, the lessons from Earthquake diplomacy and the lessons learned from Kardak/Imia case carried both countries towards a more positive direction and journey, especially within the path of Turkey’s accession to EU.

Besides the positive developments between Greece and Turkey within the first decade of 21st century, their relations maintain a unique part not only for EU-Turkey-Greece relations for also within themselves. As Barry Buzan comments (Buzan 2008), whatever the case is, the background of problems in Greek-Turkish relations may be related to a ‘power struggle’. Issues between these two countries can be considered the artificial face of those which are actually hidden behind those factors of power and domination (Carr 1946). At the same time, both countries, in the times of conflict, reflect their need of security, particularly when it comes to Aegean airspace and illegal immigrant issues. Apparently, these two factors (the struggle over power and security) can be considered to be key factors from Greek side for Turkey’s accession to the EU. In relation to this, media, specifically the newspapers, from both sides usually the ones bringing these power and security issues on their headlines when issues of conflict rise in between Greece and Turkey.

According to former Turkish minister of foreign affairs, Ismail Cem, Greek-Turkish relations play one of the most important factors in EU-Turkey relations. According to his book, *Turkey in the New Century* (2001) underline four factors that are obstacles for Turkey to enter EU. According to Cem (2001), these are religion, Greece, Cyprus and human rights. This can be considered as one of the views of the Turkish side. In contrast, according to Bahar Rumelili (2004), conflict communications in Greek-
Turkish relations have shown a significant de-escalation. Rumelili states that, especially “prior to late 1990s, the EU failed to have a positive impact on Greek-Turkish relations because:

a) until the 1990s, the EU chose to keep out of Greek-Turkish disputes;
b) after the 1990s, Greece was already a member, and the membership carrot for Turkey lacked credibility;
c) Turkey perceived the EU as ‘captured’ by Greece;
d) Greece perceived the EU as an attractive lever to be used against Turkey;
e) the characteristics of Greek and Turkish political cultures impeded Europeanization of policymaking;
f) weakly institutionalized democracy and insufficient civil society development in Turkey and Greece hindered the formulation of alternative perspectives on disputes;
g) problematic identity relations of Greece and Turkey with ‘Europe’ led to imperfect and ambivalent internalization of European identity and norms.

(2004, 25)

Apparently, for both countries, one main element becomes key in triggering tensions in any possible issue of conflict. The ‘nationalist’ ideology of both countries, towards each other, appear as centers for systematic codification, organization and processor, which, in return, affect the beliefs and convictions about the other by nations (Lekkas 1994). The great environment for these practices are usually the newspaper headlines and the media in general. Media acts as the carrier of those feelings and thoughts; or in some incidents, media itself become the source of those feelings and thoughts as it is the source of information while carrying the perspectives and patterns of nationalist set of ideas and its expression.

Nationalist patterns seen in newspapers and in media in general, especially in Greek-Turkish relations, most of the time, appear as –in a subliminal way or in a direct way- ‘we’ (us) the great tradition and heritage and the ‘other’ (them) as from dirty past. Georgios Terzis (2001) reflect this common way of use –especially in media for Greek-Turkish relations- as part of oppositional metaphors. Oppositional metaphors are:

“Us” with the great old civilization vs. “Them” with their historical backwardness;

“Our” tolerance vs. “Their” nationalistic exaltation;

“Us” the modern civilized society vs. “Them” the uncivilized savages;

“Us” the giving/accepting host vs. “Them” the receiving/frightening (Terzis 2001)

These oppositional metaphors only take place when the nationalistic pattern of newspapers and media appear in action. Headlines of newspapers, visuals of media and other related, during the times of conflict between Greece and Turkey, portray
other like ‘crying’, ‘tricking’, ‘feminine’ and especially ‘weak’, while creating the portrayal of ‘strong’, ‘right but unfortunately tricked’, and, for sure, ‘masculine’. As it was indicated earlier, these practices appear in moments of conflict, for example in the moments of conflict between Greece and Turkey. As Brian McNair indicates (1998) they are part of general –mainstream- media production cycle and these oppositional metaphors, unfortunately, are often reproduced because of the media’s role created for itself.

In times of conflict, especially in the case of Greek-Turkish relations, finding or creating ‘an enemy’ or ‘threat’ also becomes an important factor for the discourse of nationalism through newspapers and media. In those times, even if the ‘relation’ is the issue—as in the case of Greek-Turkish relations- ‘we’ as ‘one’ takes place instead of trying to understand what the real element is within that problematic relation.

During the times of opposition or conflict between Greece and Turkey, the prime notion that appears—especially through media—in the public sphere, which is hostility. One might argue that it was more apparent during late 1990s. At the same time, some argue that it is still valid through indirect and subliminal forms in following years. The key issue is the ‘us versus them’ pumped by apparent and unapparent bodies and structures. Especially in Greek-Turkish relations, it is the nationalism serviced into public sphere, which Anna Triandafyllidou (1998, 608) defines as the nationalism requires the other, which is constantly reconstructed for current interests, responding to affective needs of its members. For the ‘image’ of other institutions like newspapers and media play a key role. They are the ones for portraying the other’s opposite image, which are totally created through nationalist consciousness against each other. That is why headlines in newspapers usually reflect “Turkish/Greek aggression over Aegean Sea” or “Barbaric/brutal attitude towards immigrants in the sea”.

Unfortunately, Greek-Turkish relations are not only part of newspapers’ and media’s, in general, focus point and place of confrontation, but also for some elites in public. For example, former rector of Istanbul University, Kemal Alemdaroğlu, according to Zaman Daily News, stated in a speech: “We have 25,000 martyrs. We could have 45,000 more, 100,000 more and take Cyprus and Greece.” (Zaman Daily News, 2004). Similar examples can also be seen from Greece to when moments of conflict between countries or interest of internal politics take place.

As it can be understood, Greek-Turkish relations are not only vital for itself and appear as in very fragile characteristic, but it is very essential for Turkey’s accession to EU while factors trigger each other almost automatically in between Greece-Turkey and EU.
Media’s role in the portrayal of Greek-Turkish relations

Media takes part in almost any part of our lives. Economics, politics, health issues, current affairs, international relations are few which may be quickly named. The way media takes part in our lives involve complex patterns and processes involved in the construction of meaning by informing the ways we make sense of the world. According to Roger Silverstone (1999) media influence how we see and live by the way they re-conceptualize, filter and (re)frame everyday realities through their singular and multiple representations, producing touchstones, references, for the conduct of everyday life, for the production and maintenance of common sense. And, that common sense is usually the production of that nationalist pattern which easily locates itself within mainstream sphere.

Newspapers, televisions and other media do not mean much as environments compare to their own content which again shaped by their context and discourse. They serve as an environment for carrying the narratives and attached discourses to the intended target population. According to Bennett and Edelman (1985, 159), the scope of their impact, which is “the narrative shapes people’s views of rationality, of objectivity, of morality, and of their conceptions of themselves and others”.

Meanwhile, in terms of a country’s internal issues, media positions itself immediately, especially during the times of conflict, when an ‘other’ is a possible target. This pattern is one of nationalistic bias which takes place structurally, institutionally and politically within media. During the times of difficulties and conflict between Turkey, and Greece and the EU, media narratives take their role as a defender of the country and the rights of the people. It serves as kind of a reflexive arm of society. That is why, in any context, the terms ‘mediated society’ immediately becomes very significant during the times of disagreement and conflict. Media, while in the process of constructing mediated society, keep sending subliminal or direct messages to society underlining who they are and which ideas to be defended by themselves. Especially, during the times of conflict, as Cohen (1994) refers, media, as a “frontier guard”, signals you the message. “You know who you are, only by knowing who you are not” (1994, 1), simply indicating who the clear ‘other’ (and potentially the enemy) is.

In Cohen’s terms, we might also understand that frontier guarding media do not only play a role in telling what the identities of citizens are and who they are, but also remind them their roots, heroic symbols and their national rituals. For Entman (1991) and Rivenburgh (1999), all these efforts of media intend to underline and (re)emphasize the similarities among citizen groups, against to that potential so called ‘other’.

There is, unfortunately, one apparent consensus among media scholars and professionals that conflict is news, and that news is presented within some kind of conflict framework, which is almost unique to itself. As Botes (1998) indicates, since conflict news is source of such rivalry, it is not only often dramatized or exaggerated,
but frequently abused for commercial purposes. In relation to what Botes defines, Ozgunes and Terzis (2000) state the reasons behind and name them as:

“Professional culture (e.g. absence of journalism code of ethics, professional ideology that sees journalism as a necessary tool to defend the ‘national interests of our country and preserve our cultural autonomy, poor training of the media personnel and absence [or lack of enforcement] of media laws),
Organisational constraints (e.g. deadline pressures that a lot of times do not allow in-depth/balanced reporting),
Technical constraints and possibilities (e.g. lack of equipment, limited and/or biased newsgathering techniques),
Political pressures (e.g. censorship, traitor labelling, intimidation, lobbying, regulation, the interlocking interests of the media, the politicians and the business sector),
Economic pressures (e.g. destroyed market conditions, fierce unregulated commercialisation, market forces that promote sensational journalism),
Source tactics and strategies (e.g. intimidation of the journalist by the government sources, public relations/conflict spin doctors).” (22)

Parallel to what Ozgunes and Terzis defines as hidden and/or open purposes behind the way media appears in mono-style towards nationalistic patterns, Shoemaker and Reese (1996: 32), outline five hierarchical levels similar are:

“Individual level obstacles;
Routine-professional level obstacles;
Organizational level obstacles;
Extramedia level obstacles;
Ideological level obstacles.”

It is almost inescapable to resist to those constraints when the times of conflict appear in international relations and foreign policy. As Nikos Panagiotou states, “media’s significance is underlined by the public’s ‘media-dependency’ for political information, due to the lack of direct personal experience. Mass media especially the press not only reports foreign policy issues but often plays an autonomous role, by determining and “constructing” the framework in which such issues are discussed.” (2006). Panagiotou also defines the role of press, especially during the times of conflict, as “the co-operational, where press discourse is in accordance with the government and political elites ‘definition’ of the events (political certainty)”. Also, with its “protagonist function, in cases of political uncertainty or in the absence of a clear stance from the political elites”, which “media discourse prevails in the public sphere.” (2006, 4).

Contrarily to what has been discussed so far, many scholars and professionals, beside the fact, also consider and suggest the possibility of peace journalism and media’s role in peace. For instance, Wolfsfeld underlines that, “the news media can play a central role in the promotion of peace. They can emphasize the benefits that peace can bring, they can raise the legitimacy of groups or leaders working for
peace, and they can help transform images of the enemy” (2004, 1).

For long years, the practices of media for both Turkish and Greek sides reflect that there are supposedly limited sources and ways to cover relations between these two countries, which result, in almost, most of the time, the same way media address each other. There are limited number of sources cited and referred to in news stories. Especially, in the case of Aegean airspace issues in Turkish media, there are almost no clear sources or most of the time, AA (Anadolu Agency) appears as the source. These practices trigger some kind of an ongoing growing circle or stereotypes and patterned cliches towards the ‘other’. According to Hadjidimos (1999), these kind of practices may be the result of insufficiently trained journalists. As indicated earlier, while Turkey’s accession to EU, in some aspects, may be found similar to Apollo 13 mission, through this journey, Greek-Turkish relations may also remind us the show program from television, ‘Survivor: Turkey vs. Greece’, which transforms the rivalry of these two countries into a television show, with a rich sense of nationalism in itself.

Besides the common practices of newspapers and news media, there are also two other significant examples, too. In the first one, especially, in issues like Greek-Turkish relations, the ‘other’ may not necessarily from the other side. The ‘other’ can also be one of ‘us’. Creating ‘other’ within itself may also target country’s own intellectuals in their home countries. Hadjidimos uses an example of journalist Ricardos Someritis’ letter, directing to the Athens Journalists’ Union (ESIEA):

“...Many Greek journalists, mainly on radio and television, behave like soldiers in the front: they have chosen their camp, their uniform, their flag. If they are columnists, it is their right to do so. Nevertheless, how come that even the Patriarch is censored by many media?... All journalists with a point of view different from the dominant one or who dared offer the information that others refused to give are being threatened or humiliated.” (1999, 6-7)

Secondly, as a common practice, one single event (for example, Kardak/Imia crisis between Greece and Turkey) carries different realities by opposed journalists. Even, while writing this paper, it was interesting and significant to see various versions of analysis not only by two sided media on other ends but also scholars, on Kardak/Imia issue. As Panayotis Yannakogeorgos (2007) reflects in his study; according to Eleftherotypia newspaper’s interview with a member of Turkish team, who landed on Kardak/Imia:

“He was called away from his assignment, and was instructed to go to Kardak/Imia with a team in order to take photographs with the Turkish flag on the islet. The flag was handed to him, and when he inquired as to who gave it to him, he was cryptically told that “names don’t matter. If he hadn’t given the flag, someone else would have.” (20)

The pilot of the helicopter was of great skill who according to Sert managed to land
on Imia in severe weather. Upon landing, Sert describes the actions of his group:

“We nearly landed next to the flagpoles. Like soldiers we jumped out [of the helicopter] with its engine on and propellers roaring. We operated like a military unit, Even today, I wonder why.” (20)

He continues to describe how he tore down the Greek flag, put it in his back pocket, and raised the Turkish flag in its stead. He claims that neither the state nor army ordered him to do so. On the other hand, Bahar Rumelili, in her study, reflect the incident according to the interview conducted with Hürriyet newspaper. In her piece, quoting Panayote Elias Dimitras (1998) with “it was a month after the incident that the Greek media revealed the story and competed with one another in the exaggeration of its significance”. According to Dimitras, the trickling of the story to the Greek press was politically motivated, mainly by the opposition’s desire to challenge the newly elected Simitis government on its ‘soft’ Turkey policy. First, the mayor of the Greek island Kalymnos rushed to plant the Greek flag on the islet. Afterwards, Turkish journalists followed the Greek mayor and went to the islet with TV cameras to remove the flag and replace it with the Turkish flag. The entire expedition was broadcast live on Greek and Turkish TV channels. The next day, the Turkish newspaper Hürriyet ‘explained’ this behavior in the following manner:

‘Our friends photographed the Greek flag on Turkish territory. This was their duty as journalists. Then they planted the flag of the owners of this territory in place of this foreign flag...We believe that people do not lose their civic feelings upon becoming journalists just as they do not lose their human feelings (Hürriyet, 2 February 1996. Quoted in Kentel, 1998.)’ (Rumelili, 2005: 9-10).

Both Yannakogeorgos’ and Rumelili’s analyses are very significant. As covered in Greek newspaper, the story is reflected as misconduct on the part of a Turkish journalist while it appears as almost rationalized by ‘so called’ valid reasons of the journalist(s) in Turkish newspapers. As Ozgunes and Terzis indicate that rationale and reason find their meaning in one journalist’s thoughts:

“I am always thinking of our national interest and the interest of my newspaper when I am reporting Greek-Turkish affairs. At the end of the day, I do not want to criticize my government because my “objective” reporting might be used wrongly by the other side.” (2005, 416)

As it can be seen, both approaches of newspapers are actually far from constructing common understanding. Both sides almost intend to validate their actions by their so called ‘nationalist’ and ‘humanist’ feelings and thoughts.

Besides examples like Kardak/Imia, there were very clear examples for constructive and dialogue journalism between these two countries, which they did not hesitate at all to share very positive messages, especially during the times of disasters. Even there were some still taking place in media, the majority were committing to peace and understanding in those times. Some examples of negative and positive from
newspapers in those times are;

**Positives:**


Taki Berberakis, Athens, “Komşudan İşbirliği Çağrısı” (Cooperation Invitation from the Neighbour), *Milliyet*, August 30, 1999.

Aleksis Iraklidis, “Bu Fırsat Kaçmasın” (This Opportunity Must not be Missed), *To Vima*, September 1, 1999.

N. Marakis, “Türk-Yunan İlişkilerinde İyi Haberler” (Good News on Turkish-Greek Relations), *To Vima*, November 14, 1999.


Yorgos Kirtsos, “Önce Türkiye” (First Turkey), *Elefteros Tipos*, November 21, 1999.


Yasemin Çongar, “Yeriniz Avrupa” (Your Place is Europe), *Milliyet*, 21 September, 1999.


“Simitis: ‘Yunanistan ve Türkiye Yakınlaşmalıdır’” (Simitis: ‘Greece and Turkey Have to Get Closer’), To Vima, September 14.

“Yunan Sağlık Bakanı Milliyet’e Konuştu: Türk Kanı da isteriz, Çadiri da” (Greek Minister of Health stated to Milliyet: We ask both Turkish blood and also her tent), Milliyet, September 11, 1999.

“Yunanistan Cumhurbaskani Stefanopoulos: Sizi Unutmayacağiz” (The Greek president Stefanopoulos: We will not forget you”, Milliyet, September 11, 1999.

Negatives:

Utku Çakirözer, “Yunanistan’dan Dostluğa Gölge” (Shadow to the Friendship from Greece), Milliyet, September 16, 1999.

Viron Theodoropoulos, “Sözcükler Savaşı” (War of Words), Kathimerini, August 1, 1999.

“Yardımın Sırrı Anlaşıldı” (The Secret of the Aids is Revealed), Yeni Şafak, August 31, 1999.

Examples collected from newspapers reflect two important factors. The constructive journalism, almost for sure, triggers a positive response from the other side. The efforts on common ground bring more value to journalists’ work into the direction of ‘peace journalism. Probably, it would be also right to say that individual’s efforts really make a difference. During the study, it was very clear and recognizable to observe the efforts of Sami Kohen in building common understanding between Greek-Turkish relations. Journalists’ specialization in certain areas and additional specialized training may further improve the efficacy of these efforts. One of those efforts, especially in the context of Greek-Turkish relation, is peace journalism. So far, possible constraints and obstacles for newspapers, news media and journalists were reflected. In this respect, it is important to realize the value of peace journalism in conflicting issues like Greek-Turkish relations.

According to Galtung (1998), peace journalism is defined as a special mode of socially responsible journalism, which contributes to the peaceful settlement of conflicts. From the peace journalism perspective, journalists are expected to focus on conflict transformation and identify initiatives taken to restore peace and highlight them, instead of rising and creating conflict triggering practices. At the same time, peace journalism defines journalists to be more proactive in order to prevent violence. Galtung underlines the importance of new knowledge compared to previously established ideas and patterns.
Again, for Galtung, conflict prevention through peace journalism between ‘us’ and ‘them’ is possible with the help of creative approaches to reporting conflict. According to him, peace journalism:

Aims to explore the conflict background and investigate deeper roots of the conflict, in structure and culture, in order to make conflicts transparent.

It will have empathy with all parties, focus on suffering on all sides, and give a voice to all.

It will be proactive in its strategies to prevent war/violence.

It will focus and highlight invisible effects of war/violence like psychological trauma and suffering due to long term consequences of violence.

It will depolarize by showing the black and white of all sides by trying to name all wrongdoers.

It will focus on areas of common ground between the parties to the conflict instead of highlighting and strengthening difference between them (1998).

In parallel to Galtung’s perspective on peace journalism to prevent conflicts, the former United Nations Secretary General, Kofi Annan stated:

“By giving voice and visibility to all people – including and especially the poor, the marginalised and members of minorities – the media can help remedy the inequalities, the corruption, the ethnic tensions and the human rights abuses that form the root causes of so many conflicts”. (The Power of the Media, A Handbook for Peacebuilders, 2003)

Clearly, journalists are among the few who are going to look for new knowledge, solutions, progress and development for their own profession. Joann Byrd, the ombudsman for The Washington Post, suggests that in covering conflict journalists should add an 'S' for solutions and a 'C' for common ground to the traditional ‘who, what, when, why and how’ formula of analyzing an issue (Byrd, 1999), which apparently would be necessary to apply in practices of both Greek and Turkish journalists.

Analyses of Greek-Turkish Newspapers:

Turkey’s Accession to EU

On the current level of our study, our research focuses on the articles that appeared around the dipole “Greece-Turkey” within the framework of the EU. More specifically, we examine how two mainstream, high circulation newspapers, namely
Kathimerini and Hürriyet covered the issue of Turkey’s accession process to the EU from the Greek and the Turkish side respectively. Our main research concern is how Kathimerini as Greek newspaper reported and commented on Turkey’s EU journey and how Hürriyet reported back, responding to the Greek newspaper coverage.

We mainly focus on the genres that appear in both Greek and Turkish media, in the way that they impact on

- the construction of EU identity of the country under the accession process (Turkey),
- the presentation of the relations of both countries, taking into consideration the European perspective, as well as
- the promotion of interrelated issues that both countries have to tackle with
- the traces of peace journalism found in the Greek and Turkish newspapers.

Our analysis goes back to December 2004, when the EU discussions about Turkey’s accession started. During this period, European Ministers met to discuss and decide whether the talks with Turkey about its accession should start or not and how could the negotiation procedures be formed. Our research period continues through 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008 and ends in September 2009 when our study was presented in the conference. Actually, during the last months of our study the Greek newspaper started publishing articles regarding the forthcoming discussions in December 2009 when Turkey’s accession procedures to the EU will be reevaluated. The year 2009 is considered as a very important year for Turkey’s accession as the end of this year will be marked by the evaluation of the EU accession procedures for Turkey.

The aim of this research is to study two newspapers’ coverage throughout the last five years, in order to follow the development and the associated climaxes that occurred during these years in the Greek-Turkish relations which are, in their turn, reflected in the mainstream media. The two newspapers chosen for analysis enjoy the highest circulation among morning newspapers, at the time when we started our analysis, whereas they are considered the top mainstream broadsheet newspapers in both countries (for circulation statistics in Greece, ATHENS DAILY NEWSPAPER PUBLISHERS ASSOCIATION, http://www.eihea.gr). In both cases, each news item that featured a discussion, comment or report on Turkey’s POEIA to become a member of the EU is a unit of analysis.

However, we excluded from our analysis news pieces that were reproduced from other foreign newspapers or foreign news agencies, as well as interviews conducted with politicians from other countries (besides Greece and Turkey). The reason for this exclusion is that our primary focus was the attitudes and the approaches of the Greek and the Turkish side.
In terms of methodology, as part of quantitative as well as qualitative approaches, textual analysis is used in relation to content and discourse analysis as the main method of collecting and analyzing data for this study. We have proceeded to the statistical analysis using frequencies and descriptive statistics in SPSS 16.0.

For the collection of the news stories we have used the Advanced Search tool in the online versions of *Kathimerini* and *Hürriyet* using the keywords Greece, Turkey, accession, EU, resulting in 489 articles from *Kathimerini* and 1083 from *Hürriyet*. These articles have been read though and their actual significance and relation to our examined topic ascertained. After this process, we were left with 233 articles from *Kathimerini* and 476 from *Hürriyet*. As a result, we did not select a sample from the news articles that we found, but we have coded all relevant news items.

When *Kathimerini* and *Hürriyet* are compared, the most significant outcome is the number of stories reported in relation to EU and Greece-Turkey. While Turkey is related to Greece and EU in *Hürriyet*, and Greece is related to Turkey and EU in *Kathimerini*; the ratio for the number of news stories in those two newspapers reflect lack of equilibrium. *Hürriyet* covers news stories (1083) about Turkey’s accession to EU in relation to Greece almost two times more often than *Kathimerini*’s news stories of Turkey’s accession to EU and Greece (489). One possible explanation for this imbalance could be that the issue of Turkey’s accession to the EU plays a more significant role in Turkey itself, a role that is highlighted in the coverage of the Turkish press. In other words, the extensive coverage of the Turkish press reflects the ongoing internal debate or dissent in the country. Turkey seems more directly engaged in the debate than Greece, as the latter also focuses on issues related to its own presence in the EU as a member-state.

What should be noted as a further observation is that, actually, besides the year 2009, *Kathimerini* reflects decreasing interest in the issue while the same might be said for *Hürriyet*. For those two newspapers, the period from 2005-2007 can be considered the peak.
The following graph (Graph 2) gives the cumulative total of news articles that were coded in our sample.

**Graph 2: Cumulative total of coded articles**

**Analysis of findings and discussion**

In order to code the different topics that appeared in our selected news stories, we developed a list of issues that were mentioned in the articles. Since multiple references were included in the news articles and different areas were covered, we could not limit our analysis to a one-to-one correspondence, between topic and article. It is usual for newspapers to comprise more than one topic in a news story, so we coded up to three themes per news item in order to reflect the actual content of each news story. Our full list of the coded topics is as follows:

1. Instability in EU relations due to instability in the Aegean Sea
2. The issue of Cyprus
3. Problematic for the overall issue of accession
4. Illegal immigration issue
5. December 2009 discussions
6. Benefits to relations between Greece and Turkey
7. Impact of Turkey’s accession on EU structure
8. Difference between Turkey and EU member-states
9. Relations of Turkey to US/US support towards Turkey’s inclusion
10. Geopolitical importance of Turkey for EU
11. Economic benefits
12. Turkey’s democratic competence
13. Religious issues
14. Other

The tables 1 and 2 demonstrate the full extent of the topics that we have found and coded in the Greek and the Turkish newspaper. At first glance, we see that although *Kathimerini* includes fewer articles than *Hürriyet*, it demonstrates a higher density in multiple references in the news items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TURKISH CASE</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>total (N)</th>
<th>total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instability in Aegean Sea</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue of Cyprus</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>30,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problematic accession</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal immigrants</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3,8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2009</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits to GR-TR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU structure</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>11,1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference TR-EU</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7,4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR-US support</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR geopolitics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic benefits</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4,2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR’s democratic competence</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6,9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious issues</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1: N of topics mentioned in Hürriyet (up to three per news item)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GREEK CASE</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>total (N)</th>
<th>total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instability in Aegean Sea</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7,20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue of Cyprus</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>18,30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problematic accession</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>10,40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The case of Hürriyet, as the Turkish case (see table 1 & graphs 1 and 2), indicates significant outcomes in terms of Turkey’s accession to the European Union in relation to Greece. Firstly, the number of stories related to Greece and the EU show that years 2005 (286) and 2006 (286) contain the highest number of news stories. It may be considered the peak period right after the decision on negotiation talks in late 2004. In the following years, the number of stories related to Greece as connected to Turkey’s accession to the EU reflects a decreasing trend which may also mean there is less tension or relation to Greece in the issue.

Graph 3: Coverage of topics in Hürriyet (N reference)

In terms of news stories categories in Hürriyet, while analyzing the components, in general (through the period of 2004-2009), the Cyprus issue (30,5%) seems the most
important with almost triple the number of occurrences compared to the second category, European Union structure (11,1%). For those two categories, the year 2006 represents the second highest number of news stories (50 and 14). The difference between Turkey and the EU appears to be the third most often mentioned within that six year period, with 7.4% (35). Apparently, in terms of the qualitative aspects of those main three categories, stories mostly carry negative connotations. There is also another very significant observation in terms of news categories within these years, which is illegal immigrants. Throughout the six year period, the issue of illegal immigrants has almost no place in news stories. But, in contrast, just within the nine month period of 2009, stories of illegal immigrants carry the most important value for Turkey’s accession to the EU in relation to Greece as compared to any other year. Also, it finds itself the second place in the same year, 2009, with 16 stories (almost 16%), after issue of Cyprus with 25 stories (almost 25%).

In terms of years, while 2005 and 2006 reflect issue of Cyprus and EU structure as the primary groups; two other categories appear to be taking crucial place in stories: US support to Turkey in 2005 (10) religious issues in 2006 (10). In 2009, the category of religious issues again reflects its use in 2009 (10).

Especially in 2009, the category of instability in the Aegean sea stands as the second. Meanwhile, while one might think that controversy surrounding the December 2009 report from the EU for Turkey’s accession carries a significant role, it surprisingly has no significant value. One might claim that Hürriyet has almost no projection and oversight on December report for accession to EU; the study reflects no data till mid-September period.

Graph 4: Coverage of topics in Kathimerini (N reference)
In the Greek case, our first impression is that the Greek articles include multiple references in a greater density than the Turkish newspaper. The issue of Cyprus takes the first and higher place in the news stories, indicating the importance of the issue for the Greek side. We see that throughout the years, this particular issue is constantly apparent in the Greek newspaper. It is notable also that it is the most discussed issue in the Turkish newspaper too, highlighting the importance that both the Greek and the Turkish side give to the Cyprus conflict. Interestingly, Cyprus related stories are mostly covered in winter period while illegal immigrants related stories are covered in spring and summer.

Moreover, the issue of the problematic accession of Turkey to the EU plays a vital role in the coverage of the Greek newspaper (N=49), an issue that is closely related to the consequences that Turkey’s accession will have on the structure of the European Union (N=48). The impact on EU’s structure is apparent in the case of the Turkish paper too, though a more detailed analysis is needed in order to crosscheck the form of the approach to this problematic from both the Turkish and the Greek perspective.

The tables 3 and 4 show the extent to which newspapers construct similar ways of looking at the topics. They do not follow the same ranking, but it is definitely apparent that the top 5 topics are common to both. These topics, however, should be further analyzed and examined in the context of other data and, more importantly, other data relating to how the press reported the reasons for promoting these topics over others in each country. We could argue that this would be a platform to examine and evaluate the extent to which these newspapers have put forward attitudes and opinions that stress differences or similarities between EU and Turkey and between Turkey and Greece.

Turkey’s democratic competence is ranked 4th for the Turkish case and 5th for the Greek case, enhancing the ongoing dialogue about human rights and minorities issues that are related with Turkey’s possibility to become an EU member-state. Religion also plays an important role, as it is mentioned 36 times in Kathimerini and 31 in Hürriyet. We note, though, that the selected press of the two countries emphasized variations on the same themes, reflecting the agenda of their national politics.

A special note should be made regarding the topic of illegal immigrants which is closely connected to the instability caused in the Greek-Turkish relations due to frequent airspace violations on the part of both countries. ‘Aegean’ is common for airspace disputes and trafficking of illegal immigrants. In terms of disputes over Aegean and GR-TR relations, flights over the Aegean Sea have their own category. Related to the frequent airspace violations, the Greek Minister of Foreign Affairs (of the previous government), Dora Bakoyanni has her very critical speech over TR and EU, for sure, once a month, to warn Turkey.
### TURKISH CASE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>TR or %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Issue of Cyprus</td>
<td>30,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU structure</td>
<td>11,1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference TR-EU</td>
<td>7,4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR's democratic competence</td>
<td>6,9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits to GR-TR</td>
<td>6,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious issues</td>
<td>6,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instability in Aegean Sea</td>
<td>6,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR geopolitics</td>
<td>6,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problematic accession</td>
<td>5,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR-US support</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic benefits</td>
<td>4,2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal immigrants</td>
<td>3,8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2009</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 3: News topics ranked in Hürriyet according to their frequency of appearance*

### GREEK CASE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Issue of Cyprus</td>
<td>18,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problematic accession</td>
<td>10,4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU structure</td>
<td>10,2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits to GR-TR</td>
<td>8,1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR's democratic competence</td>
<td>7,9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious issues</td>
<td>7,7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference TR-EU</td>
<td>7,4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instability in Aegean Sea</td>
<td>7,2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal immigrants</td>
<td>6,8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR geopolitics</td>
<td>5,1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR-US support</td>
<td>4,9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic benefits</td>
<td>3,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2009</td>
<td>1,7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1,3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4: News topics in Kathimerini ranked according to their frequency of appearance*

---

**2009 as a case study for peace journalism**

In examining the perspective of promoting and strengthening peace journalism on behalf of both countries, we used the articles that appeared in the selected newspapers for 2009 as a case study. We have followed the criteria constructed by Robert Manoff from the NYU Institute for War, Peace and News Media in exploring the Potential Media Roles in the Prevention and Management of Conflict, namely:

1. **Channeling communication between parties:** The media not infrequently
play this role *ad hoc* in domestic and international politics; the point would be to heighten the appreciation and systematic performance of this dialogical role in the ethno-political context.

2. *Educating:* Simply changing the information environment in which the parties operate can have a marked impact on the dynamics of conflict; it is particularly useful to promote appreciation of the complex factors impinging on the conflict situation, and to create appreciation of and tolerance for the negotiation process itself.

3. *Confidence building:* Lack of trust between parties is a major factor contributing to conflict. The media can help to reduce suspicion through their reporting of contested issues, and increase trust through reporting of stories that suggest or illustrate that accommodation is possible.

4. *Counteracting misperceptions:* Related to the confidence-building role above, journalists can come to see the misconceptions of the parties as a story in and of itself, and by reporting this story they can encourage the parties to revise such views, moving closer to the prevention or resolution of a conflict in the process.

5. *Analyzing conflict:* This differs from conventional conflict reporting in that the media would self-consciously apply analytical frameworks derived from conflict resolution and related fields to systematically enhance the public's understanding of key aspects of the situation, as well as the dynamics of the efforts to manage it.

6. *De-objectifying the protagonists for each other:* Sophisticated journalism, by revealing people's complexity, can already do this, but the question is whether some of what journalists already do *ad hoc* can be developed into a systematic repertory which they will be able to employ by virtue of an enhanced conception of journalism influenced by conflict-prevention considerations.

7. *Identifying the interests underlying the issues:* This is standard conflict resolution practice, but it is surprising how infrequently journalists address this question in stories. As media scholar James W. Carey has remarked, U.S. journalism generally forgoes sophisticated analysis of underlying group interests: "Explanation in American journalism is a kind of long-distance mind reading in which the journalist elucidates the motives, intentions, purposes and hidden agendas which guide individuals in their actions."
8. **Providing an emotional outlet**: Conflicts may escalate or explode in part because the parties have no adequate outlets for expression of their grievances. Conflict can be fought out in the media rather than in the streets. Journalists, already prone to report conflict, could better serve their readers and viewers, as well as the cause of preventive diplomacy, by more fully understanding this role and perhaps pursuing it self-consciously.

9. **Encouraging a balance of power**: This helps get parties to the negotiating table. A media report can weaken a stronger party or strengthen a weaker party in the eyes of publics, thereby encouraging parties to negotiate when they otherwise might not have out of concern for the perception of their relative positions.

10. **Framing and defining the conflict**: This is nothing but good journalism practiced on the right occasions. The media can help frame the issues and interests in such a way that they become more susceptible to management. The media can be particularly attentive to the concessions made by the parties, the common ground that exists between them, the solutions they have considered and so on.

11. **Face saving and consensus building**: Similarly, when in the course of negotiations parties take steps toward resolving a conflict, they risk being attacked by more intransigent members of their own constituencies. The media can greatly facilitate the process of compromise by making it possible for negotiators to address their own publics through the media in order to explain their negotiating positions and build support for them.

12. **Solution building**: Conflicts get prevented or managed when the parties table and consider possible solutions to grievances. Journalists can play a role in this process by pressing the parties for their proffered solutions. Although this seems self-evident, many third-party negotiators have noted that parties are often so invested in their grievances that they do not develop or consider options for potential agreement with adversaries. The simple act of eliciting ideas and reporting them could assist the dynamic of the more formal mediation process itself. It should also be noted that the process of formal mediation can fail if there is not a parallel process of what might be called 'social mediation', by which the constituents and publics of the formal negotiating parties are brought into the process and prepared to accept its outcome.

In order to proceed with our analysis, we developed four clusters of analysis,
grouping these 12 criteria into four main categories, identifying four different roles for the media, as it is indicated: media acting as mediators, appearing as analyzers, behaving as educators and, finally, promoting themselves as ‘rescuers’ (see our cluster of analysis in graphs 4-7).

**Graph 4: Media as mediators**

- Role as mediator
  - Channeling communication between parties
  - Confidence building
  - Counteracting misperceptions

**Graph 5: Media as analyzers**

- Role as analyzer
  - Analysing conflict
  - Deobjectifying the protagonists for each other
  - Framing and defining the conflict
As far as the Turkish newspaper is concerned, our research shows that the analyzed stories are intended to 'analyze' either to a deeper extent (21) or somehow (21). The secondary group is made of 'mediator role' (4) and 'rescuer' role (4). Of the 76 stories, 51 have a role (or somehow); the rest 25 stories (almost 33%) has totally 'negative' attitude. Columnists' stories carry most of the mediator-rescuer and educator roles. Finally, stories without 'author name' are either mostly analyzer or 'negative'. 

Graph 6: Media as educators

Graph 7: Media as 'rescuers'
Moving on to our analysis of the Greek side, we see that conflict in Aegean Sea, the Cyprus issue and the illegal immigrants’ problem are highlighted in the Greek press. The Greek sample follows a negative way of reporting, especially when it comes to commentaries. Only news stories related to culture show some traces of peace-promoting journalism.

Concentrating on both cases, negative connotations are clearly seen in stories related to conflicts and problems. There are very few instances of using 'positive approaches’ in those conflict and problem related stories. We may say that there is almost very little use 'peace journalism’ tools. When analyzed from the perspective of peace journalism, the most common for both is the analyzer role. Unfortunately, as can be seen from the collected data, the other roles for samples from both sides are almost impossible because of their ‘negative' construction of stories. For both sides, negative constructions appear in three common categories: Aegean issues, the Cyprus issue and illegal immigrants. Literature also reflects very few studies made on media’s role in shaping perceptions and understandings of relations between the EU and Turkey since early 2000 (Kardak/Imia & Earthquakes) showing that media wait for a crisis to deal with the issue in-depth.

**Conclusion**

The study clearly reflects that both cases (Kathimerini and Hürriyet) from Greece and Turkey carry a significant number of stories in relation to Turkey’s accession to the European Union. Besides the number of stories, qualitative aspect of the study also underlines particular categorizations of those news stories appear in those newspapers.

As indicated in the study, the issue of Cyprus and Turkey’s place in the European Union structure appear to be the highly used stories within six year period. Besides its use, the issue of Cyprus is actually the common problematic in between those two countries. Accordingly, it is significant that an issue, in terms of its unique stand point apart from European Union issues, actually fills the most important place. In parallel, issue of illegal immigrants in year 2009 also reflects its importance for those countries. Both issues are actually unique with regard to their treatment of issues directly related with the European Union, such as Turkey’s competence to EU, EU structure or even differences between EU and Turkey. From this point, study may relatively underline that historically problematic issues between these two countries actually establish the bridge between Turkey’s accession to EU and both countries’ reactions on each other. Separate issues from the original point (accession to EU) apparently keep the agenda full and busy.

The outcome stated above also constructs the rationale and background for the lack of use of peace journalism. Clearly, both newspapers selectively use problematic
stories compare to their potential services, as indicated in peace journalism, such as constructive, informative, mediator or educative purposes. Study also indicates that there are also some other surrounding story types, which are not related to accession to EU, but appear to be effecting the whole process, such as regular stories on flights over Aegean sea by both sides.

The study, in conclusion, clearly expresses the need for the integration of peace journalism practices in both sides’ media organizations. The review of the literature, and all the data gathered and analyzed in the study can also be understood and used for the rationale for the need of peace journalism practices in unique times and under unique conditions, as it appears in the case of Turkey’s accession to EU and the coverage from both sensitive sides. Peace journalism can be maintained as one of the key tools and practices for media coverage of conflicts and problematics. Especially specialized training (EU & Turkey) and peace journalism training as a tool can be considered for future opportunities for more positive and constructive media practices.
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