

DPI

Democratic Progress

11 Guilford Street

London WC1N 1DH

United Kingdom

+44(0)203 206 9939

info@democraticprogress.org

www.democraticprogress.org

May 2012



The Role of Media in Conflict

Table of Contents

Forward.....	4
Session One.....	7
Session Two.....	36
Conclusion.....	56
Appendix.....	57
Participants from Turkey.....	57
UK Contributors	59



Foreword

DPI aims to create an atmosphere whereby different parties share knowledge, ideas, concerns, and suggestions facing the development of a democratic solution to key issues in Turkey and the wider region. The work focuses on a combination of research and practical approaches to broaden bases for wider public involvement by providing platforms for discussion in the form of roundtable meetings, seminars, workshops and conferences. This is being carried out in order to support and contribute to existing work on Turkey whilst also extending to the wider region.

DPI's work will incorporate research and discussions on a wide range of strategic and relevant topics including constitutional reform; preparing for constitutional changes in conflicting societies; post conflict societies; freedom of expression and association; cultural and language rights, political participation and representation; women's role in resolving the conflict; access to justice and transitional justice including truth and reconciliation commissions.

DPI aims to facilitate the creation of an atmosphere whereby the different parties are able to meet with experts from Turkey and abroad, to draw on comparative studies, as well as analyse and compare various mechanisms used to achieve positive results in similar cases. The work supports the development of a pluralistic political arena capable of generating consensus and ownership over work on key issues surrounding a democratic solution at both the political and the local level.

This report gives a record of the roundtable meeting entitled ‘The Role of the Media in Conflict’ held in Istanbul on 28 April, 2012. This report details both the speeches given by guest experts in media and journalism, as well as contributions and reflections from the participants during the roundtable discussion. We hope that this report can be utilised as a resource for media professional and civil society members in Turkey, for recognising the challenges that journalism faces as well as recommending a way forward.

Kerim Yildiz

Director, DPI

May 2012

DPI REPORT:

Roundtable: The Role of Media in Conflict

Istanbul, Turkey

28th April 2012



Sezgin Tanrikulu, Donald Macintyre, Bekir Ağırđır, Prof. Dr. Yasemin İnceođlu, Prof. Dr. Mehmet Tekeliođlu, Hilal Kaplan, Ragip Duran, Hasan Cemal, Dr. Peter Busch, Prof. Dr. Sevtap Yokuş, Ali Bayramođlu, Prof. Dr. Mithat Sancar, Mustafa Karaaliođlu, Ergun Babahan, Bejan Matur, Prof. Dr. İhsan Dađı, Yılmaz Ensarođlu, Prof. Dr. Ahmet İnsel, Ayhan Bilgen, Belma Akçura, Belkıs Kılıçkaya, Catriona Vine, Yavuz Baydar, Eleanor Johnson

The Role of Media in Conflict

Saturday 28 April, 2012

Istanbul, Turkey



Catriona Vine, Ergun Babahan, Prof. Dr. Mithat Sancar

Session One

Moderator - Prof. Dr. Mithat Sancar:¹

I would like to welcome you all, on behalf of DPI, and thank each of you for participating in this valuable roundtable discussion. Thanks too, to all of

¹ Prof. Dr. Mithat Sancar is a Professor of Law at the University of Ankara, expert and author on constitutional citizenship and transitional justice, and columnist for Taraf newspaper. He has written extensively on International Human Rights Law and Constitutional issues.

those involved in the organisation of today's meeting. I am sure that the discussions we have here today will prove to be very worthwhile.

Today's roundtable is one of a series of discussions on various themes relating to conflict resolution, which have taken place at Galatasaray University, Istanbul, and King's College London. I look forward to seeing you all at similar DPI activities in future.

Today, we are joined by a number of both academic and practitioner experts on the subject of media and conflict resolution. Prof. Dr. Yasemin İnceoğlu, an expert on the media, who is widely published and is based at Galatasaray University, Istanbul. The title of Yasemin's presentation is *'The role of Media in Conflict Resolution and Peace Journalism'*. Secondly, Donald Macintyre is a British journalist, with the internationally acclaimed *The Independent* newspaper, which is based in London. Mr. Macintyre is renowned for his political commentary and expertise in areas of conflict resolution in a number of regions, ranging from the Middle East to Northern Ireland. The title of Mr. McIntyre's presentation is *'The Media: Allies or Adversaries?'*.

Finally, Dr. Peter Busch of King's College London has both practical and academic experience in the United Kingdom and Germany and is an expert on the media and conflict. Dr. Busch will speak to you on the *subject of 'Fair and Balanced? Mediatized conflicts in the 21st century'*.

Before hearing our speakers share with us, I will first hand over to Catriona Vine, DPI's Director of Programmes, for a brief overview of DPI's work.

Opening Statement: Catriona Vine,² Director of Programmes, DPI

A warm welcome to you all, and on behalf of DPI, I would like to say many thanks for joining us for this roundtable meeting today.

I will start by giving you a very brief overview of DPI. DPI is based in London, United Kingdom and was established in consultation with a group of international and Turkey-based experts. DPI's Turkey Programme seeks to ensure a means of broadening the bases for democracy. This project focuses on a combination of research and practical engagement methods to broaden support and strengthen collaboration between key stakeholders in the conflict including Members of Parliament and politicians, policy-makers and civil society. The work of the project will continue to involve these constituencies in establishing a structured public dialogue on peace and democracy building.

DPI's work incorporates research and discussions on a wide range of strategic and relevant topics including constitutional reform, preparing for constitutional changes in conflicting societies, post conflict societies, freedom of expression and association, cultural and language rights, political participation and representation, women's role in resolving

² Following completion of her LLM in Public International Law at the London School of Economics, Catriona was called to the Bar of England and Wales in 2002. She has practiced in Criminal, Public and Human Rights Law in the UK and internationally. She also has extensive teaching experience in Criminal and International Human Rights Law. She has worked in non-governmental, inter-governmental and government organisations. She is the co-author of three manuals on International Human Rights Law, and has contributed to numerous reports on the implementation of International Human Rights standards.

conflict, access to justice and transitional justice including truth and reconciliation commissions.



*Dr. Peter Busch, Catriona Vine, Ali Bayramoğlu, Sezgin Tanrikulu,
Prof. Dr. Ahmet İnsel, Hasan Cemal*

DPI aims to create an atmosphere whereby the different parties are able to meet with experts from Turkey and abroad, to draw on comparative studies, as well as analyse and compare various mechanisms used to achieve positive results in similar cases. To this end we are planning a comparative study in Wales this summer, focusing on language and identity rights as well as constitutional arrangements and devolution. This will complete the first phase of our UK and Ireland comparative studies. We will follow the comparative study visit to Wales with a roundtable discussion in England, to include expert key speakers on constitutional issues. Future comparative studies we are considering include South Africa, North America, South Asia and Europe.

All of our activity reports are publicly available on our website in English and we are also working on making the relevant texts available publicly in Turkish.



Prof. Dr. İhsan Dağı, Bekir Ağırdır, Mahmut Övür, Bejan Matur



*Bejan Matur, Prof. Dr. Sevtap Yokuş, Belkıs Kılıçkaya, Eleanor Johnson,
Ayhan Bilgen, Belma Akçura, Prof. Dr. Yasemin İnceoğlu*

Prof. Dr. Mithat Sancar: Many thanks Catriona. I now hand over to Yasemin, who will begin this morning's session with a talk on media and conflict resolution and peace journalism. Yasemin's talk will tackle issues including the language of the media; the responsibility of the media for events and agenda setting; hate speech; and freedom of press.



Panel speakers: Prof. Dr. Yasemin İnceođlu, Donald Macintyre, Dr. Peter Busch

Prof. Dr. Yasemin İnceođlu,³ Galatasaray University:

‘The role of Media in Conflict Resolution and Peace Journalism’

Thanks to DPI for organising this roundtable and for bringing us together here today.

The media act as the gatekeepers of information. Journalist and media decision-makers choose what is newsworthy; how the news should be presented, and what type of ‘personality’ the news will take on. The media also makes decisions on the format of the news, including: what will be the title; what pictures should accompany the piece; and whether or not the article will make the front page. Most importantly, the media has a powerful role in calculating the value judgments and personality of the news product. Journalists can select verbs that can either offer support or judgement of a person or event. Using verbs such as ‘said, stated, expressed, or underlined’ connotes support, while choosing verbs such as ‘claimed, alleged, defended, and emphasised’ connotes judgement. Similarly, the terms ‘freedom fighter’, ‘terrorist’, ‘gangs’, and ‘guerrilla fighter’ can all be used to describe a single group, with each term expressing their own value judgments on the group. Terms such as ‘terrorist’ have overwhelmingly negative connotations while terms such as

³ Prof. Dr. Yasemin İnceođlu, Professor at the Faculty of Communications in Galatasaray University, was a visiting scholar at Columbia University (1994) and Salzburg Seminar (2003). Prof. Dr. Inceoglu is one of the founding members of the Media Watch Platform (2008) and Member of Advisor’s Board Disclaimer Centre. Prof. Dr. İnceođlu has participated and presented papers as an expert of the European Council in the 2nd Alliance of Civilisations Conference in Istanbul (2009) and the UNESCO meeting in Paris (2007/2010) on ‘media literacy’ and ‘media ethics’. Recently, she worked in the project ‘Hate Crimes in the Turkish National Press: 10 Years 10 Examples’ as a member the of supervisors’ board. Prof. Dr. İnceođlu has published several books on the subject of media.

'freedom fighter' imply a sense of positive legitimacy. It is through these rhetorical decisions that the media control and promote a single perspective within social discourse.

It is important to recognise how the media places responsibility for an event. Let me give you an example. Research has shown that when a negative act is committed by someone in the privileged class, it is most often ignored. However, when that same act is committed by someone in a lower class, it will make the news. The negative press of the rich is hidden, while the negative press of the poor is not. It is studies like this that highlight the importance of analysing not only what has been said or reported, but what has *not* been reported.



Panel speakers: Prof. Dr. Yasemin Inceoglu and Donald Macintyre

Finally, a news event can and will be published differently in various newspapers. News stories can even contradict each other at times. The basic facts of the event will remain consistent within each article; the differences arise in how the story is framed, what words are chosen and what pieces of information are highlighted or ignored. For instance,

journalists must make the conscious decision of whether or not to replicate, support, or criticise the official discourse.

In this society, the press often make terrorism news. They simplify and frame the incident so that it will fit into a specific narrative. They will symbolise the events and emphasise certain factors, while completely ignoring others. Instead of presenting the whole story, they will present the news in fragmented parts. The media creates sensor maps of events, which result in a fictitious understanding of reality.

News stories often reflect the positions of the dominant discourse. This positive reflection is the result of the media being incident oriented, as well as the media's tendency to reproduce the ideological positions and official discourse of the state. News stories in the mainstream media often reaffirm the dominant discourse and ideology through its choice of language. The media can use rhetorical language not just to support, but also to tear down. It has been used at times to humiliate and demonise certain groups within society, which, in turn, provokes hate speech and prejudice.

The media plays an agenda-setting role. According to Noam Chomsky, political power can be described as the power of an agent to form social public debate, putting certain subjects at the forefront of the agenda while excluding others. Chomsky writes, moreover, that consent is manufactured not by producing information, but by destroying information. As a result, information about political issues is decreasing every day in the mass media. Secrecy remains one of the most powerful tools for states, and states will utilise mass communication tools to maintain that secrecy.

This secrecy can help to instil hope in the masses. Hope remains the most important psychological force within society. Political powers will utilise mass communication tools to promote a social discourse that supports and

instils hope in the status-quo, while simultaneously sidelining alternative discourses and civil disobedience. As such, media and state institutions filter incidents of civil disobedience and protests so that the events are portrayed as belonging to a handful of ‘nefarious people’.



Bejan Matur, Prof. Dr. Sevtap Yokus, Belkıs Kılıçkaya, Eleanor Johnson

What do we mean by hate speech? Hate speech was defined by the European Council of Ministers in 1997, which offers a definition that has become widely recognised. It defines hate speech as the making of verbal or written communication motivated by bias which is negative, humiliating, mocking against a certain victimised group. The scope of bias is wide, as it covers racism, anti-Semitism, xenophobia and other forms of discrimination based on religion, gender, sexual orientation, health and social status. Hate crimes are something else, however. For something to qualify as a hate crime, a crime must have been committed according to the penal code relating to the bias. Turkey has a great many examples of hate discourse and hate speech in its media. Past incidents of hate speech in

newspapers in Turkey include discriminatory phrases such as: ‘cowered Jew’, ‘dirty Gypsy’, and ‘Armenian child’. These phrases may not necessarily be found in newspaper headlines but can be found within the subtext of newspaper articles.

A colleague and I conducted a retrospective study of news in Turkey for the past ten years and found that columnists have utilised certain methodologies that contributed to hate speech, negative symbolisation and stigmatisation. As a result of hate speech and hate crimes, to be Turkish has become limited to people who are protestant, white, and Anglo-Saxon. Turkish has essentially become limited to white Turkish. I am 99% Turkish; I am heterosexual; I stick to my traditions. I have internalised what I have been taught since birth. People who do not fall into these categories are labelled as ‘*the other*’. It is as if we were saying, ‘if you live with me in this society, you must obey these rules; otherwise, you don’t have the right to live’. Through phrases such as ‘we/them’ and ‘strong/weak’, the media denies the human value of certain groups and both justifies and legitimises the violence inflicted upon them.

UNESCO held a conference in Paris in 1983 to identify ethical guidelines for the journalistic profession. The Turkish Association of Journalists created its own national document on ethics in journalism, which states that journalists should serve peace, democracy, human rights and universal values, humanity and pluralism, and the respect for differences in nationalities, societies and religions. This cannot be achieved by journalists alone, however. The Council of Europe’s Committee of Ministers has also published a set of recommendations for journalists for the maintenance and promotion of ethical standards. These ethical guidelines and recommendations that have become ubiquitous in modern-day discourse

surrounding journalism place a large responsibility on journalists. The media, as such, should pay particular attention to whether it is reproducing hate speech.

Controversy has arisen over the argument that limiting hate speech is fundamentally constricting the right of freedom of press. This controversy is most obvious in the on-going debate on freedom of expression in the United States. Within the U.S. Constitution, the First Amendment grants the press freedom of speech; that journalists have the right to criticise. What should be the limits on the freedom of expression, if any?

Let us come to the media's representation of the Kurdish issue. The Kurdish issue is most often portrayed as either an example of terrorism or as a non-issue because of the 'backwardness of the area' and as a problem 'provoked by foreigners'. The media reinforces this discourse through its rhetorical choices, with news articles describing Kurds as 'murderers', 'traitors', and 'the people that come from the mountains'. These stereotypes will not help to resolve the issue. The media is depriving itself of political analysis and instead, resorts to conspiracy theories and volatile headlines to sell newspapers. The news focuses on the pain and violence that has happened in the past rather than focusing on current human rights issues and the future possibilities for democratic reform.

When the courts banned the pro-Kurdish Democratic Society Party (DTP) for 'activities against the indivisible unity of the state', the media portrayed it as a natural and legitimate political development, especially on the television networks. The media showed images of citizens celebrating on the streets, and interviews with individuals expressing their support of the DTP's banning. The banning of the DTP was not universally applauded, however. In fact, many writers, academics and civil society organisations

criticised and condemned the decision to ban the party. That the DTP was banned was also criticised internationally. This dissention was ignored by the mainstream media, however.

Furthermore, when the Peace and Democracy Party (BDP) was opened, the mainstream media described it as a continuation of the DTP. The mainstream media blackened Kurdish politics by failing to represent the BDP and DTP as legitimate political parties representing the Kurdish issue. Journalist should refrain from representing a conflict in such black and white terms. If a journalist demonstrates a conflict as being between two sides, he or she is deeming one side as the threat or enemy. The parties should be recognised as different from their opponents and violence should not be depicted. Possible future results and connections between different conflicts should be pursued. The long-term effects and possible psychological trauma should also be taken into consideration.

Words such as ‘victims’, ‘murder victims’, ‘assassinations’, and ‘genocide’ should only be used economically, if ever. Do not liberally use the word terrorist. Put in a broader context, if these words are used too liberally, when the actual event occurs, there may no longer be an appropriate word to describe the action.

Prof. Dr. Ahmet İnel:⁴

Many thanks Yasemin. I will now introduce you to Mr. Donald Macintyre, our second speaker of the day. Mr. Macintyre is a British journalist with *The*

⁴ Prof. Dr. Ahmet İnel Ahmet İnel is Head of the Economics Department at Galatasaray University, Istanbul. He was previously Vice President of Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne University, France. He is widely published, and a Managing Editor of the İletisim publishing house.

Independent newspaper. He will continue our discussion of the role of media in conflict with a presentation, entitled *'The Media: Allies or Adversaries?'*, focusing in particular on the context of Northern Ireland, and on the role the media played in the peace process there, and his experience as a reporter on Northern Ireland at that time.

Donald Macintyre,⁵ journalist, The Independent newspaper, United Kingdom:

'The Media: Allies or Adversaries?'

Many thanks to DPI for inviting me to participate at this valuable roundtable.

I am going to speak to you today about my experiences as a commentator and journalist covering the Northern Ireland peace process, from the early 1990's up to the Good Friday Agreement. Northern Ireland remains a poignant example because, while it had serious imperfections, it is a peace process that has appeared to have succeeded.

I began to visit Northern Ireland with increasing frequency from the early stages of 'The Troubles' in the early 1970's. The conflict was between the

⁵ Donald Macintyre, British journalist with the internationally acclaimed *The Independent* newspaper. The journalist studied at Oxford University and obtained a post-graduate degree from the Cardiff School of Journalism. Macintyre was previously *The Independent* newspaper's Chief Political Commentator for eight years and before that, Political Editor of *The Independent* and *The Independent on Sunday*. He has written for a number of British newspapers including the *Daily Express*, *Sunday Times*, *The Times* and *Sunday Telegraph*. Macintyre is renowned for his political commentary and expertise in areas of conflict resolution in a number of regions, ranging from the Middle East to Northern Ireland. In 2011, Macintyre was awarded the Next Century Foundation's Peace through Media Award.

Nationalists, who were mostly from Northern Ireland and saw themselves as belonging to a united Ireland, and the Loyalists or Unionists, who maintained that Ireland should remain part of Great Britain. It is from my initial trips in the seventies, that I came to understand the grievances of the Nationalists. By the mid-eighties, the specific grievances that served as the genesis for 'The Troubles' had, for the most part, been addressed. One example was the passing of the Employment Act that allowed for the employment of Catholics. The specific grievances and ideas of the Nationalist minority were never adequately addressed, however.



Belma Akçura, Prof. Dr. Yasemin İnceoğlu and Donald Macintyre

Before I go further, it is important to remember that the media scene was very different then than it is now. There was no blogging or fast-moving news websites. Television, as a result, was very influential. For instance, when famous correspondent Kate Adie gave television coverage of the Orange marches⁶ in Northern Ireland, which was an annual march of hard-

⁶The 'Orange marches' see members of the Orange Order parade in ceremonial dress. The Order says it constitutes a celebration of the Protestant culture and communities of Northern Ireland. Many nationalists see the Orange marches differently. When the Orange marches take place in Catholic areas, the parades are often seen as intimidatory and designed to raise tensions. The marching season is historical and ritualistic, but as a result of the divisions in Northern Ireland, many regard the Orange marches as a sign of sectarianism.

line Unionists against the Nationalists, the violence would increase markedly. This type of reporting predated what we call twenty-four hours news, like Sky News in Britain. Morning newspapers were still widely popular, with a circulation around fourteen million, a number which has dropped dramatically since then.

The issues in Northern Ireland did not galvanise the British public, other than when there were particularly violent episodes, especially if that violent episode had hit the mainland. The Birmingham pub bombings in the 1970s serve as an example of a highly publicised violent episode; and, indeed, it remained a tremendous story for a long period of time. But beside these violent episodes, even among the liberal intelligentsia, there was very little interest.



Bejan Matur, Catriona Vine, Hilal Kaplan

And so, while the people in Northern Ireland, both North and South, were heavily preoccupied with the issue, and all of the main newspapers had continued news correspondence, the public remained largely indifferent. The word 'terrorist' was used widely in this period, but without distinction.

I remember one such headline that read, ‘They are all Irish; they are all hell; they should sink into the sea’.

Some of us at this time were conscious of two points. The first was that Northern Ireland still remained a dark corner of the British Scene. William Gladstone during the 1880s when the world was ruled by two large empires, the British and the Ottoman, referred to Ireland as a ‘sad exception to the glory of our country’. The second point was that, despite a long-standing commitment to unionism, something quite big had changed within the current British government. The government started to realise that a peaceful outcome could not be achieved by military means alone. This admission gave some space for politicians, such as John Major, who had previously expressed interest in the political process, which had been a radical idea up until this point.



Dr. Peter Busch, Catriona Vine, Ergun Babahan, Yavuz Baydar, Prof. Dr. Mithat Sancar, Hilal Kaplan, Prof. Dr. Mehmet Tekelioğlu, Sezgin Tanrikulu

The widespread sentiment was that very little would be accomplished, however. I was more optimistic than some of my colleagues, but this is

probably attributable to my naïveté. I was less conscious of the potential pitfalls than some of my more seasoned colleagues. More than just doubt, there were others, on both sides of the Irish Channel, who regarded any peace as a concession for Republican terrorism. When Thatcher was still in power in the late 1980s, I wrote an article about how impressed I was by Dick Spring. I was then fairly strongly attacked in the *Irish Independent*, in a column by Eamon Dumphry, who proceeded to call me a naïve Brit. I met him recently and he said that he was much greener now. Like the majority of people, he had come to accept in recent years the idea of Republicans, who had been formerly linked to the IRA, playing a full part in political life.

I suppose, part of the coverage from a political view was to stick to the three successor secretaries, Patrick Mayhew, Mo Mowlam, and Peter Mandelson. We at *The Independent* tried to report more sympathetically on Northern Ireland than we did on other issues. We made an effort to both report and commentate sympathetically on what we at the paper saw as a serious attempt to bring peace to Northern Ireland. We were not alone in our sympathetic reporting, but there were other papers that were very strongly critical of the peace process.

One of the major problems in reporting during the Northern Ireland peace process was the succession of three big incidents, where unofficial information was passed to press, that threatened to jeopardize the entire process. I am not referring to intentional, manipulative leaks committed by the government. I am referring to specific documents, in whole, or part, that were given to newspapers. All of these unofficial documents which were given to the press were hostile in character and endangered the peace process. The last of these documents, which was published in *The Times*, was a one-sided view of the draft peace resolution. At the time, I was

uncertain whether a newspaper presented with this information should publish it. Now I realise, that the passing on of this information was not the disaster we thought it was at the time, however. I often wonder if secrecy was really as valuable to the peace process as politicians and journalists thought it was. The Oslo Process that led up to the Oslo Accords in 1993 were secret, and it is often said that its secrecy was what made it successful. But could it have worked better if it had been open for discussion? If there had been more public debate about the peace process during the time it was being conducted?

The media is always there. You cannot simply wish it away in a democracy. It is bound to play a role. Even when a government is engaged in delicate tasks, it should be open with what they are doing. The Major and Brown governments recognised the importance of freedom of press, but also, put responsibility on the press not to be cynical to the point where it would jeopardise their genuine efforts for peace.

Prof. Dr. Ahmet Insel:

Many thanks Donald. I now hand over to Dr. Peter Busch, a Professor at the War Studies Department of King's College, London. DPI has worked closely with Kings College London over the last year or so, and it is with pleasure that we welcome Peter to this roundtable. He will talk with us today on the subject of mediatised conflicts in the 21st century, and will deal with issues including objectivity of the media and the media and state policy.



Panel speakers: Donald Macintyre and Dr. Peter Busch

Dr. Peter Busch,⁷ Professor, War Studies Department at King's College, London:

'Fair and Balanced? Mediatised conflicts in the 21st century'.

Many thanks to DPI for organising this roundtable and for inviting me to speak to you today. King's College London and DPI have consistently worked together, both in activities at Galatasaray University and in London, and it is my pleasure to take part in DPI's roundtable today.

⁷ Dr. Peter Busch is a Senior Lecturer in the Department of War Studies, King's College London. He completed his PhD at London School of Economics in 2003. Before joining the Department in 2004, he was Senior Broadcast Journalist in the news and current affairs department of Germany's biggest television station, ZDF. He also taught seminars in History at the Free University of Berlin, the University of Erfurt and the London School of Economics, as well as International Journalism at the University of Hanover. Dr. Busch's current book project is a study of the media coverage of new wars. He is also working on GDR propaganda against West Germany's Bundeswehr in the 1960s, and on photographers as cultural brokers.

I would like to open with a book, titled *Media Spectacle and the Crisis in Democracy*. In the book, Douglas Kellner laments the political situation in the United States during the Bush administration. Those who supported the Bush administration were seemingly impervious to reasoning and argumentation. Liberals only watched liberal media; conservatives only conservative media, like *Fox News*. These separate media camps illustrate the deep divisions within US society. If the US; the supposed pillar of democracy, is unable to achieve balanced and unified reporting, how can democratic representation within the media be achievable in conflict zones and other complex cases? Kellner proposes a liberal solution:

“This process will involve sustained critique of the corporate media; calls for re-regulation; and the revitalization of public television, cultivation of community and public radio, improved public access television, an expansion of investigative and public service journalism, and full democratic utilization of the Internet. Since corporations control the mainstream press, broadcasting, and other major institutions of culture and communication, there is little hope that the corporate media will be democratized without major pressure or increased government regulation of a sort that is not on the horizon in the present moment in most parts of the world.”

What Kellner fails to acknowledge is that many Americans have lost their willingness to listen, which is an essential skill, especially in post-conflict societies. Objective and educational reporting will be of no effect if no one is willing to listen.

Today I would like to make a few remarks about mediatisation and the concept of objective, unbiased reporting in media today. I contend that the journalistic profession as it currently stands, particularly in Western countries, is firmly attached to labels such as 'objective' and 'balanced', but these labels are seriously problematic. That is not to say, however, that media journalists have actually achieved objectivity. I continue to be taken aback at the different discourses for the same issues that I encounter. For example, the 'Global Media on the "War on Terror" Conference' at the University of Westminster, which I attended in 2010, was dominated with the discussion of the journalistic failures to hold the powerful to account; how journalists failed to take on the 'watchdog' responsibility in face of the government's news spins and larger press strategies. The conference participants with a military background characterised journalists as irresponsible and intrusive; as having undermined the military's interest and endangered both civilians and soldiers lives. This negative discourse served in the military's interests.

The lesson found here is that often the military and state establishments are better exploiting the new media environment than their counterparts, the peacemakers. The elite paradigms and military controls imposed on the media, predicated upon corporate interests, help to manufacture a consent paradigm. The decline of journalists acting as the watchdogs of democracy only reaffirms this consent paradigm. The military understands the challenges presented by the new media ecology; policy makers understand the necessity of public support operations. The fact that the United States military is producing Hollywood-style operation films on the Iraq War for mass consumption illustrates the government and military's awareness of the importance of manufacturing public consent. This is where the presumed influence of the media comes into play. Because policy elites

recognise the media's importance, they carefully craft both the content and format of the information they present to the public.

Simon Cottell writes how conflicts have now become mediatised; that conflict is represented and mediated through the press and media spaces. How the conflict is mediated, in turn, has a defining role in not only the politics of recognition and redistribution but, more generally, our ideology and ways of life. This is what is termed a 'defused war'. A defused war is the intermediation of war; a war that immersed in and produced through a new media ecology. We are inundated with information from a multitude of sources, such as online news, plays, podcasts, videogames, Facebook, and even architecture. Each person is now becoming a 'monitorial citizen', constantly monitoring for news information that affect us personally.

That there is such an overabundance of sources of information, is rapidly changing communications and journalism. Journalism is now liquid in a sense. Journalism faced with unparalleled user control must become fluid, embracing its uncertainty and complexity. This fluidity plays out differently depending on how you conceive of the role of journalism. There are two schools of thought when determining that role:

- (1) The first school of thought for defining the role of journalism is predicated upon the idea that media is a mirror of society; that the media should only fulfil an observer role.
- (2) The second school of thought, which I believe is more applicable to our current media ecology, expands the role of journalism to the making of critical decisions of what news is important, what the consumer ought to know and even what they ought to believe. This school of thought gives the media a considerable amount of agency.

Within the first school of thought for media, journalists take on the role of 'watchdogs'. They regard themselves as truth seekers, although truth is a complicated topic. They aim to verify information in sometimes stark contrast to the unreliable information on the Internet and the propaganda distributed in other media forms.

Societies do not necessarily want balance, truth and objectivity from the media. With the rise of informal media, especially with the advent of the Internet, news stories rarely undergo an as rigorous filtering and vetting processes as they once did. News has become subjective rather than objective. Conscious of this change, monitorial citizens have adapted a healthy scepticism of the media, and actively seek out multiple sources for information. Journalists should become one of those sources. Journalists should adopt an existentialist approach to reporting war and take the professional risks by adopting an individual perspective. Go against the functionaries of the media institutions; rebel against conformism.

This approach is controversial. Whether someone accepts or dismisses this approach, the question remains whether or not the audience wants objective or subjective reporting. Most media consumers want the news to confirm their views of the world. News information that upset or challenges their preconceptions of the world will be unwelcomed. Some might argue that the audience might not be prepared to consume information outside the status quo because it is too discomfoting. This is inaccurate. A recent study of the news programmes: BBC, CNN, and al-Jazeera, found that al-Jazeera viewers, as they watched the programme for an extended period of time, became less dogmatic, more tolerant, and more open to different ways of reporting.

Raw, unmediated information is regarded as more authentic, as containing more truth. I contest that there is an unarticulated frustration of objectivist, mainstream reporting. The subjectivity of the informal space is sought, cherished and understood. By adopting a more subjective approach, it might provide to the audience what it is looking for: news information in all of its complexity.

Prof. Dr. Ahmet İnel:

Many thanks indeed, Peter. I now close this first session, and look forward to further discussion and to hearing your thoughts on the morning's talks during the afternoon session, which will be moderated by Mr. Ali Bayramođlu. In the meantime, let us break for lunch at Cezayir Restaurant, and continue our discussion there.



Prof. Dr. Mithat Sancar, Ergun Babahan, Belma Akçura, Sezgin Tanrıkulu, Prof. Dr. Mehmet Tekeliođlu, Hasan Cemal and Yavuz Baydar during lunch at Cezayir Restaurant, Istanbul



Mahmut Övür, Prof. Dr. Sevtap Yokuş, Bekir Ağırđır, Cengiz Çandar, Ragip Duran



Prof. Dr. İhsan Dağı, Ayhan Bilgen, Yılmaz Ensarođlu



Cengiz Candar, Prof. Dr. Mithat Sancar, Ragip Duran



Prof. Dr. Mehmet Tekelioğlu and Prof. Dr. Sevtap Yokuş



Hilal Kaplan and Belkıs Kılıçkaya



Prof. Dr. Yasemin İnceođlu, Prof. Dr. Mithat Sancar, Cengiz andar



Belkıs Kılıçkaya, Prof. Dr. Sevtap Yokuş, Mustafa Karaaliođlu, Prof. Dr. Mithat Sancar



Bejan Matur and Prof. Dr. Mehmet Tekeliođlu

Session Two: Discussion and questions

Moderator - Mr. Ali Bayramoğlu:⁸

Welcome back. This morning's session provided some very valuable insight into and analysis of the role of media in conflict; the theme of today's discussion. The talks given by our three speakers have all demonstrated the complexity of the issues at play. Of course, we are limited in how much ground we are able to cover in today's roundtable, given time restrictions, however this is DPI's first initiative in the area of media, and I'm sure there will be similar activities in future, with a focus on this area. I now open the afternoon's session, in which you will have the opportunity to discuss this morning's topics in further detail, and pose any questions you may have to our speakers. I open the floor for comments.

Participant:

The media is capable of manufacturing fear and using it as a method of social control. I am currently conducting a study in which I have been searching for the frequency of occurrence of five specific words: 'apocalypse', 'disaster', 'reaction' and two others, in a total of six newspapers, for the period of the last ten years. There is an incredible correlation between social and political events and the frequency with

⁸ Ali Bayramoğlu is a writer and political commentator. He is a columnist with the daily newspaper *Yeni Safak* and a presenter with Turkey's '24 TV' television channel. Mr. Bayramoğlu is widely published in the area of social and political analysis.

which these words are used. The frequency of these words and verbs does not necessarily correlate to the seriousness of the event, however.

Another study I conducted further illustrates this point. I compared the news coverage of the Bird Flu pandemic and the actual number of Bird Flu cases. Less than fifty people were infected with Bird Flu in 2008 but, nevertheless, there was huge inundation of articles and commentary surrounding the Bird Flu during that year. If an ordinary citizen were to read these articles and take them at face value, they could easily overestimate the level of the threat that Bird Flu represented. The media exists as a community of power; the media leaders fulfil the role of a priest or imam, with the consumers its believers. As such, the media has the heady power of instilling fear or desperation through its reporting and rhetorical choices, whether or not it consciously intended to do so.

Now to an observation: when a journalist conducts a survey or a study, he or she is generally demonstrating a fault in reporting and expecting the responsible media actors to be ashamed of what they have done. We should hope that this problematic reporting is being done unconsciously, which would allow for a space for reform. If there were an editorial group of journalists and media leaders who could identify bad journalism, they could offer sensitive reporting training to those responsible. It is important to not only discuss these ethical issues, but to act against them as a collective group.

Participant:

I would like to make two points, one about technical media and another about the role of the media. First, let me discuss technical media. When we discuss the potential roles of media in conflict, one negative example that immediately comes to mind is Rwanda's *Télévision Libre des Milles Collines*.

This Rwandan radio station propagated hate speech and incited violence during the genocide, to the extent that the managers of the radio station were later found legally culpable in a trial at The Hague. A positive example of the role of the media during conflict, however, was the *Sarajevo Newspaper* during the Bosnian War, which made sincere efforts to pacify the violence. What is illustrated is that the media can play either an instigating, or a resolving role. Now to my other point: the burden of peacebuilding should not rely just on the media. It should also include academics, government representatives, and civil society members, for instance. We as journalists are not conflicting parties but observers, trying to understand the information presented to us.

Participant:

I wanted to qualify something that has been discussed earlier during this roundtable. While media sources such as newspapers and television stations are numerically increasing, the media's potential capacity for manipulation has remained the same. While the sound and volume of media are increasing, and while we have new and competing newspapers and television stations cropping up, the roles and capabilities of the media remain unchanged. Moreover, we need to be more realistic in our expectations for the role of media in conflict resolution. If we are expecting the media to pioneer peace, we need to discuss the current situation in which the security bureaucracy is very influential on the content choices within newspapers, as well as the reality that this bureaucracy is in favour of conflict as opposed to peace.

Participant:

I think the media has only represented the Kurdish issue as belonging to Kurds, rather than showing it to be an issue belonging to all of Turkey's

society. Moreover, the media can play a negative role and make society pity themselves. This was the case in Turkey with regards to the Armenian issue. The television communicates what has been said by politicians, and so the media says 'Armenians stabbed you in the back'; they are killing you'. This must be prevented.

Participant:

In Turkey, perhaps more so than in other countries, the media is very dependent on the state. Historically, Turkish media was dependent on both the government and the military. But now the Turkish media is solely dependent on the state. When a bombing occurred sometime back, in which thirty-seven people died, we heard it first from internet websites and Twitter rather than the news. In fact, the bombing, which had occurred in the morning, did not make news headlines until that evening. If this trend of media acquiescence continues, Turkish media will fail to play a constructive role in building peace.

Participant:

When I look to the past, I recognise that we have made positive developments in the way in which the Turkish media portrays the Kurdish issue. The media can play an even larger role in changing the public discourse surrounding the Kurdish issue. The journalist, correspondents, and television presenters in attendance today are in a formidable position to help push us towards peace.

After World War II, there was a lot of public discussion within Germany on the scope of criminal responsibility for the crimes committed. If it was decided that everyone was guilty in German society, for either crimes of commission or omission, it would be fundamentally problematic.



*Dr. Peter Busch, Catriona Vine, Prof. Dr. Mithat Sancar, Prof. Dr. Mehmet Tekeliođlu,
Prof. Dr. Ahmet İnsel, Hasan Cemal*

It is not possible to place blame on everyone equally. There must be a categorisation, a stratification of levels of criminal culpability. The first and highest level would be that of criminal offence, which would be a legal crime carrying a minimum and maximum sanction or penalty. The second level would be a political crime. What we mean here by political crime is crimes committed by state officers, using their authority from the state. The third level would be a moral offense, where the defence of obeying orders is not sufficient to acquit someone from that crime. The fourth level of responsibility is metaphysical. It is a crime of omission; if you can do something to stop the violence but fail to act, you should be held responsible. But how far does the scope extend for this fourth level of culpability? What should be the appropriate sanction for a crime of omission? What authority would assess and give judgments on these crimes? Would the media's incitement to violence and failure to reveal the calculated killing on behalf of the state fall within this fourth level of responsibility? The media was responsible for promulgating hate speech and inciting hate crimes. This post-war Germany example is relevant to our

situation in Turkey. If an editor chooses to use hate speech in the titles of our newspapers, and we recognise this as unethical, what should be our response? It seems as though many journalists adhere to the belief that, although they write for the newspaper, they are not responsible for what it publishes, clearing oneself of responsibility. This has to stop. If we do not make an assessment before it is published, we will ourselves begin to lose doubt in the media as a peace-making force.

Participant:

Donald Macintyre, can you offer some examples of when journalists have negatively or positively impact peace processes? And then, could you offer some examples of how the passing of unofficial information to the press has specifically impacted, either positively, or negatively, a peace process?

Donald Macintyre:

First, as a quick follow-up to the previous comment, there is no protection for journalists who publish false information. Working in the Middle East for the last several years, I have been amazed at how common it is for liberal journalists to regard military or intelligence information as absolute truth. This can easily backfire for journalists, who will then be blamed for the false news. In Great Britain, the same holds true, but in a more subtle way.

With regards to the question posed, we must realise that the Northern Ireland peace process constituted a rare case wherein the government and the media worked together as allies, rather than as adversaries. In the summer of 1997, when the Blair government came into power, there was a sincere hope that the annual Orange marches would not go ahead. The Chief Constable advised the Blair government (none of whom had been in

government prior to the elections), that the march would have to go ahead. During this time, I had the opportunity to conduct an off-the-record interview with Northern Ireland's Minister, Mo Mowlam, about her predictions for the Orange marches. Mowlam seemed badly shaken and nervous of the major nationalist backlash that would inevitably follow from the Orange march by Unionists members. I wrote a short piece on what she had told me, including the security advice that she had given me. I had to accept her theory that, if the Orange march did not take place, fewer murders would have been committed. In retrospect, I wonder how solidly based the information was.

Another example of the media and government acting as allies occurred around the time of the collapse of the Northern Ireland executive at the turn of 1999 into 2000, which was the result of the IRA not disarming at a quick enough pace. I wrote in an article that this breakdown did not signify the end; that there was a way forward, but progress could not be made until the IRA gave up its arms. I was trying to contribute to a positive discourse of the peace talks. The media can either contribute to the discourse of crisis or the discourse of hope. That being said, I do not want to exaggerate the role of the media. I do agree that the media is self-aggrandising at times; that the media overestimates its power to make changes. Media alone cannot successfully push a peace process forward. In some instances, however, the media has helped to nudge it along, and in other cases, the media has impeded the peace process.

Now, let me shortly give you some historical examples regarding the passing of unofficial information to the press. The two, perhaps, worth talking about occurred in November 1993. The first one dealt with the discussed possibility of joint authority over Northern Ireland; the second

example of information being passed to the press involved the secret talks between the British government and the IRA. With regards to the second example, the government treated the public scandal quite sensibly; the government admitted that they had spoken to delegates of the IRA a total of fourteen times. Both of these examples were thought to be huge setbacks, and created much panic among those policy makers trying to negotiate a peaceful settlement. In retrospect, however, they were not as undermining as we had once thought they once were.

Participant:

I agree with Macintyre's earlier contention, that the media does not create peace but, through its commentary, can impact the outcome in either a positive or negative way. The media chooses the rhetoric it reproduces in its articles or news segments. This language is then replicated in daily life and becomes more than what was meant in its initial use. For example, the word 'deployment' was originally a military term, but now has entered into ordinary social and political rhetoric. Seventeen years ago, when an Islamic administration came into power, there was widespread panic and the armed forces wanted to destroy this Islamic party. They did so not with weapons, however, but with political interventions and media propaganda campaigns. They would have been less successful if it were not for the press. The press helped to degrade, exploit, target and otherwise portray that part of society as extremist and not belonging to Turkey. This, in turn, helped to convince its consumers of the legitimacy of military intervention. The society then expanded this fear of Islamism, saying 'Sharia is coming'. Only after the media had primed society could the military have the legitimacy to act.

Now, on the Kurdish issue: six months ago, after the head of the PKK published a letter in a Turkish newspaper, many of the newspaper bosses and policy makers demanded that the journalists take a position against the letter. Hasan Cemal and Cengiz Çandar both refused. As a result, Cengiz was excluded from television shows for an extended period of time. This example illustrates how decision-makers within the media can sanction or punish journalists who do not adhere to the status-quo.

Dr. Busch, do you think the problems faced by journalists are different, depending on which country they are from?

Dr. Peter Busch:

The way in which media is formulated is different in every society, and Turkey is no exception. However, journalists face similar problems no matter what country they are from, or how the media is formulated. The question that arises is how to keep one's critical distance, to maintain objectivity and reliability in the face of rising financial and audience expectations. Achieving critical distance has become even more challenging with the increase in competition within the media industry and with the unrealistic expectations of the immediacy of news reporting, both of which limit the time and resource dedicated to fact-checking and ensuring a balance of opinions.

Fear: fear is a huge force within media. We cannot deny this. The audience wants small amounts of fear; fear sells. This is one reason that there is so much news coverage of conflicts; because it sells. We as journalists should try to manage this particular aspect. Moreover, the media should reassess its focal strategies from state security to human security. A refocusing on human beings and situations of their distress would help generate interest

and empathy for the situation. The people of Turkey want peace and I believe that they would welcome more humanistic news coverage.

Participant:

In what ways do media produce hate?

Prof. Dr. Yasemin İnceoğlu:

Media does not produce hate. The media communicates and replicates existing hate crimes and hate speech. I recently published a book on hate speech in collaboration with a colleague. We identified media institutions that used hate speech between the years of 2004 and 2007. Some of the headlines that we encountered included: 'the Turk's blood is poisoning us'; 'the barking of rants, in Turkish is similar'; and 'runts, collect your bags and go away.'



Ragip Duran

This sort of hate speech can create a culture of passivity, so that no one becomes particularly upset when members of the victim groups are murdered. It amounts to a cultural lynch.

Participant:

I believe the passing of unofficial information to press to be a vital issue for journalists. I wish this happened more. The dilemma is that as countries become more democratic and transparent, there is more functioning control over the passing of information to the press. In Turkey, passing information to the press has an important function as we transition into a more democratic state. For instance, the information obtained by the press regarding the talks between the PKK and the intelligence agency: we cannot stop this but we can conceptualise it; we can offer commentary and background information for it.



Prof. Dr. İhsan Dağı and Bekir Ağırdir

Participant:

The passing of unofficial information to the press is essentially the result of conflicting interests between different participating and state bodies. Moreover, the intelligence services may find it convenient to pass information to journalists they have a good working relationship with. This happens often in Turkish media. Today DPI has been the victim of such

an occurrence. DPI's existence is to observe and communicate examples of conflict resolution for the promotion of a peaceful, negotiated resolution. In Turkey the intelligence services have conducted a blackening campaign in the newspapers. As we have seen, the passing of unofficial information to the press can sometimes help to advance transparency and democracy, but in cases like this, can be unhelpful.



Catriona Vine, Ergun Babahan, Prof. Dr. Mithat Sancar, Ali Bayramođlu

Participant:

The media had an important role in the demilitarisation process that was initiated in 2004, following a scandal surrounding the passing of military and government documents to the press. The audience perceives the information found in the unofficial document as both being unadulterated truth and having great significance. When a reader purchases a newspaper that has this document, they will perceive the issue or event through the lens of only that document, which is fundamentally one-sided. Each of these documents is the result of a great many political considerations, but these are not necessarily portrayed. This document will be taken more seriously,

however incomplete and one-sided it may be, than other documents. This is an issue in journalism.

Participant:

As has been said earlier, intelligence organisations manipulate the media to advance their interests. If there were an investigation into the passing of the information, someone would be held responsible. If this was done by security officers, it would be a crime. The press agencies of the state and intelligence give newspapers information in the format very similar to a news article. This article is then published in a newspaper. Two days later, another article is published. This is active manipulation, a provocation.

Participant:

Sometimes it can be hard to decide whether or not to publish a document that has been passed unofficially to the press. For example, in the beginning of the eighties I had a columnist friend who held documents stamped by the national intelligence agency that implicated a newspaper owner in drug smuggling. He and I had a discussion on whether or not he should publish the information, and I believed that he shouldn't; that not every document of intelligence is factual. My colleague did end up publishing the document and the press fight in the newspaper lasted for years. There are different types of leaks in our profession. In the end of 1979, when I was a correspondent in Ankara, I opened the newspaper one morning to find the headline, 'The Army is Warned'. The article referenced a document that had been passed to the press, signed by the Army General, and I am fairly sure that the document was intentionally passed by a military staff member. Even though it was unofficial information, if I had been the one to receive the document, I would have published it in my newspaper as well.

Another issue is finding a balance between national security and the right of freedom of press. The question becomes: what are the limits for what constitutes an issue of national security? Finding what qualifies as national security is not an easy task, and it is something that not just Turkey, but also the UK and the US, is still struggling to define.

One example is in the US during the 1960s when President Kennedy chose to embargo Cuba. *The New York Times* obtained this unofficial information, but because the editor at the time, James Reston, was friends with Kennedy, they never published the information. Later, when the disaster of the Bay of Pigs invasion made headlines worldwide, it was widely believed that if the *New York Times* had published the unofficial information, the US administration would have never got to this point. Journalists should do their homework and let statesmen govern the state.

Participant:

I think there is a general acceptance that we need to commit to peace journalism in a conflict environment. That being said, to what extent is peace journalism possible? What effect can peace journalism have? How can we perform peace journalism without discussing the political and sociological problems that are at the root cause of the conflict? The social environment can be affected by media, but the positive differences it can make can easily be undone by political events. Take February 28th, the day of Habur, for instance. The media showed scenes of celebration when the members of the PKK came from across the border from Iraq into Turkey to turn themselves in as part of a political compromise with the Turkish government, only to find themselves arrested after a huge social backlash. Turkey has not fulfilled the necessary requirements for peace to be achieved. Even if we do peace journalism in Turkey, while media can have

an effect on the outcome of the process, we need to look deeper into the sociological, causative factors to be able to truly resolve the conflict.

Participant:

I think the history of the media in Turkey should be further examined. Take for instance the open letter that threatened to initiate a coup, which later forced the Prime Minister to resign. The media could have used its power for peace, and not have published it.



Bekir Ağırdır and Mustafa Karaalioğlu

The media was psychologically preparing society for a coup-d'état. The media worked together with the military, but then, in 2004, the military was replaced with the police and intelligentsia. Now the security services are exerting control not through democratic channels, but through the media.

Participant:

All opposition parties want to be represented within the media. If you are an editor and anyone can send you a document, it is your job to filter

through them. You have to double and triple check the information given to you, otherwise people can send you real or fake documents to be published and distributed.

And let me clarify an earlier point I made. I did not say that media is unimportant, but that its importance should not be exaggerated. Media does not have power in of itself. It is reliant on its audience. But it can promote peace, if not manufacture it. My newspaper put two families together: one family of a recently deceased Turkish soldier and the other a family of a recently deceased guerrilla fighter, to get them to discuss their common experiences. At first it worked and they met a few times. But then the father of the Turkish soldier called the PKK 'dogs', and as Chief Editor of the newspaper, I had to remind him that no one could be called a dog. This family did not accept my judgment, which had to be applied. A willingness in society for peace is essential in order to achieve it.

Participant:

Yasemin İnceoğlu, what is your view on how to increase self-regulation within the media?

Prof. Dr. Yasemin İnceoğlu:

I was in a Balkan country last year to attend a conference about self-regulation and auto-control mechanisms within the media. The problem that can arise is the result of a lack of self-regulation in the media.

While we have press councils that take on the role of the watchdog, similar to those in Europe, our press councils do not function as they should. If we could reassess and rearrange our Turkish Media Councils, it would contribute to the peace process.



Dr. Peter Busch, Catriona Vine, Ergun Babahan, Prof. Dr. Mithat Sancar, Prof. Dr. Tekeliođlu, Prof. Dr. Ahmet İnsel, Hasan Cemal



Prof. Dr. İhsan Dađı

Participant:

I do prefer to listen rather than talk during these meetings, but I would like to say at least a few things. In Turkey, we do not have a strong tradition of good media and press. Since the beginning of Turkish media, it has pursued an ideology. Turkey does not have independent media, which is the source of our current problems. In a developing Turkey, we will question ourselves and, hopefully, take important steps based on those self-assessments. While we have had some positive developments, the managers of Turkish mass media are only motivated by money and from alliances with the government in power. This has been the same trend for the last eighty years.

Participant:

Hate speech is very unpleasant and we should find an end to it. Ending hate speech is not going to be the result of legal arrangements. It cannot be done in this way. There are many laws that are not effectively implemented in Turkey. We need to individually fight against hate speech in our columns, and in this way we can ensure that the mentality of society will change.

Ali Bayramoğlu:

I now give the floor to Ahmet Insel, who would like to say a few words, before handing back to Mithat Sancar, who will close today's roundtable.

Prof. Dr. Ahmet Insel:

I have prepared an explanatory statement for why we have changed our venue that I would like to share with you. DPI's roundtable on the media's role in conflict resolution was initially intended to take place at Galatasaray University, as part of a series of DPI roundtables, which as you know, have

taken place at Galatasaray University, Istanbul. However, following some unfortunate disruptions to DPI's plans, the organisers of the conference decided to move it to a different environment, and instead, to hold it at this venue. As per DPI's usual practice, records of the meeting will be published on the DPI website at a later date.



*Dr. Peter Busch, Catriona Vine, Ergun Babahan, Prof. Dr. Mehmet Tekelioğlu,
Prof. Dr. Ahmet İnsel, Hasan Cemal*

In this roundtable, the role of the media in deepening or resolving conflict has been discussed at length. The activity as a whole has been fruitful and productive, as with previous DPI roundtable events. We do not, in any way, take seriously, the marginal press that has attempted to undermine this event, and stress the importance of bringing participants together, to contribute to such an important discussion.

Prof. Dr. Mithat Sancar:

Thank you Ahmet, and thank you to all of you for participating in today's roundtable, and for your valuable contributions. A full report on today's discussions will be made publicly available on DPI's website in due course,

and will also be published in hard copy. I look forward to seeing you at future DPI activities.

Conclusion

DPI's roundtable meeting in Istanbul on the subject of 'The Role of Media in Conflict' proved to be highly valuable. The day was extremely productive, and included in-depth analysis and discussion of the key factors to be considered in the context of conflict resolution and the media. Discussion centred on the language of the media, the political elements of media, and the responsibilities of the media in the context of conflict. The activity succeeded in bringing to the table all of Turkey's major media representatives, as well as academics, Members of Parliament and civil society representatives, to take part in discussion.

DPI will continue to organise similar roundtable discussions, both in Turkey and abroad.

Once again, DPI thanks all participants and contributors for their much appreciated participation in this activity.

Appendix

DPI Roundtable: 'The Role of Media in Conflict'

28th April 2012, Istanbul

Participants from Turkey

- Prof. Dr. Ahmet İnel: Professor, Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne University; Professor, Head of Department of Economics, Galatasaray University. Editor, writer for monthly journal, *Birikim*. Writer for *Radikal Newspaper*.
- Ali Bayramoğlu: Journalist, writer, political commentator; columnist with *Yeni Şafak Daily Newspaper*.
- Ayhan Bilgen: Journalist, columnist and Editor-in-Chief, *Günlük Daily Newspaper*.
- Bejan Matur: Writer, poet, and columnist.
- Bekir Ağırđır: Founder of Democratic Republican Programme; first coordinator, then Director-General of the History Foundation of Turkey.
- Belkıs Kılıçkaya: Correspondent, *Habertürk Newspaper*.
- Cengiz Çandar: Journalist, writer, columnist for *Radikal Newspaper*.
- Ergun Babahan: Journalist with *Star Daily*; member of the Advisory Board of Corporate and Public Strategy Advisory Group. Former Editor-in-Chief of *Sabah Daily Newspaper*.
- Hasan Cemal: Journalist, reporter and correspondent with *Milliyet Daily Newspaper*.
- Hilal Kaplan: Journalist, television presenter and columnist with *Yeni Şafak Daily Newspaper*.

- Prof. Dr. İhsan Dağı: Professor, Middle East Technical University; member of the Board of Directors of the Turkish Fulbright Commission. Former Editor-in-Chief of *Insight Turkey*.
- Mahmut Övür, Columnist with *Sabah Daily Newspaper*.
- Prof. Dr. Mehmet Tekelioğlu: Member of Parliament, Izmir, Justice, and Development Party (AKP); Chairman of the European Union Harmonisation Commission of the Turkish Grand National Assembly.
- Prof. Dr. Mithat Sancar: Professor, Ankara University; columnist with *Taraf Daily Newspaper*.
- Mustafa Karaalioglu: Columnist, Chairman, Publication Director of *Star Gazetesi*. Co-founder, Editor, writer with *Yeni Safak Gaztesi*.
- Ragip Duran: Journalist and political activist.
- Prof. Dr. Sevtap Yokuş: Professor; Head of the Department of Public Law, Kocaeli University.
- Sezgin Tanrikulu: Member of Parliament, Istanbul, Republican People's Party (CHP). Vice President, CHP. Member of Central Executive Board, CHP.
- Prof. Dr. Yasemin İnceoğlu: Author; Professor, Galatasaray University; and founding member of the Media Watch Platform.
- Yavuz Baydar: Columnist, *Today's Zaman*. News ombudsman with *Daily Sabah*; and presenter of the weekly current-affairs programme, *ACIK GORUS (Open View)* on *Channel 24* in Turkey.
- Yılmaz Ensaroğlu: Director of Law and Human Rights, SETA (Foundation for Political, Economic and Social Research); Member of the Executive Board for the Joint Platform for Human Rights and İHGD; Chief Editor of the *Journal of the Human Rights Dialogue*.

UK Contributors

- Donald Macintyre: Journalist, *The Independent* newspaper, United Kingdom.
- Dr. Peter Busch: Journalist; Professor, Department of War Studies, King's College London, United Kingdom.
- Catriona Vine: DPI, London, United Kingdom.
- Eleanor Johnson: DPI, London, United Kingdom.
- Chelsea Rice: DPI, London, United Kingdom.



Director:

Kerim Yildiz

Kerim Yildiz is Director of DPI. He is an expert in International Human Rights Law and minority rights, and has written extensively on international Human Rights mechanisms and International Humanitarian Law. Kerim is the recipient of a number of awards, including from the Lawyers Committee for Human Rights for his services to protect human rights and promote the rule of law in 1996, the Sigrid Rausing Trust's Human Rights award for Leadership in Indigenous and Minority Rights in 2005, and the Gruber Prize for Justice in 2011.

Board Members:

Nick Stewart QC (*Chair*)

Barrister and Deputy High Court Judge (Chancery and Queen's Bench Divisions), United Kingdom. Former Chair of the Bar Human Rights Committee of England and Wales and Former President of Union Internationale des Avocats.

Prof. Penny Green (*Secretary*)

Head of Research and Director of the School of Law's Research Programme at King's College London and Director of the International State Crime Initiative (ICSI), United Kingdom (a collaborative enterprise with the Harvard Humanitarian Initiative and the University of Hull, led by King's College London).

Priscilla Hayner

Author on Truth Commissions and Transitional Justice initiatives. Co-founder of the International Center for Transitional Justice (ICTJ). Global expert and previous consultant to the Ford Foundation and to the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. Widely published on the subject of truth-seeking.

Arild Humlen

Lawyer and Director of the Norwegian Bar Association's Legal Committee, Norway. Widely published within a number of jurisdictions, with emphasis on international civil law and human rights. Has lectured at law faculties of several universities in Norway. Awarded the Honor Prize of the Bar Association for Oslo for his work as Chairman of the Bar Association's Litigation Group for Asylum and Immigration law.

Jacki Muirhead

Practice Director, Cleveland Law Firm. Previously Barristers' Clerk at Counsels' Chambers Limited and Marketing Manager at the Faculty of Advocates. Undertook an International Secondment at New South Wales Bar Association.

Prof. David Petrasek

Professor of International Political Affairs at the University of Ottawa, Canada. Expert and author on human rights, humanitarian law and conflict resolution issues, former Special Adviser to the Secretary-General of Amnesty International, consultant to United Nations.

Antonia Potter

Expert in humanitarian, development, peacemaking and peacebuilding issues. Consultant on women, peace and security; and strategic issues to clients including the Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue, the European Peacebuilding Liaison Office, the Global Network of Women Peacemakers, MediatEUR, and Terre des Hommes.

Council of Experts:

Christine Bell

Professor at the University of Ulster; expert on Transitional Justice, peace negotiations, Constitutional Law and Human Rights Law. Trainer for diplomats and lawyers.

Cengiz Çandar

Senior Journalist and columnist specialising in areas such as The Kurdish Question. Former war correspondent. Served as special adviser to Turkish President Turgut Ozal.

Yilmaz Ensaroğlu

Director of Law and Human Rights at SETA (Foundation for Political, Economic and Social Research), Member of the Executive Board of the Joint Platform for Human Rights and İHGD, Chief Editor of the Journal of the Human Rights Dialogue.

Prof. Mervyn Frost

Head of the Department of War Studies, King's College London. Former President of the South African Political Studies Association. Expert in the field of Human Rights politics, International Relations and Justice.

Martin Griffiths

Founding member of the Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue, Served in the British Diplomatic Service, and held numerous humanitarian posts in the United Nations.

Dr. Edel Hughes

Lecturer at the School of Law, University of East London. Previously Lecturer at the School of Law, University of Limerick. Prior to this, was a researcher at the Irish Centre for Human Rights, NUI Galway, where she completed her PhD in 2009. Author of numerous publications, including on International Criminal Law.

Dr. Salomón Lerner Febres

Former President of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Perú; Executive President of the Center for Democracy and Human Rights of the Pontifical Catholic University of Perú.

Prof. Ram Manikkalingam

Professor at University of Amsterdam. Served as Senior Advisor on the Peace Process to President of Sri Lanka; author on conflict, multiculturalism and democracy.

Bejan Matur

Renowned Turkey based author, poet and columnist. Formerly Director of the Diyarbakır Cultural Art Foundation (DKSV).

Jonathan Powell

British diplomat, former Downing Street Chief of Staff under Prime Minister Tony Blair between 1997 and 2007. Chief negotiator in the Northern Ireland peace talks, leading to the Good Friday Agreement in 1998. Currently runs Inter Mediate, a UK-based non-state mediation organisation.

Sir Kieran Prendergast

Served in the British Foreign Office; Diplomat; former UN Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs. Now engaged in peacemaking efforts.

Prof. Naomi Roht Arriaza

Professor at University of Berkeley, United States; expert and author on transitional justice, human rights, international criminal law and global environmental issues.

Prof. Dr. Mithat Sancar

Professor of Law at the University of Ankara, expert and author on Constitutional Citizenship, Transitional Justice, and International Human Rights Law. Columnist for Taraf newspaper.

Prof. Dr. Sevtap Yokuş

Professor of Law University of Kocaeli, expert on constitutional law and Human Rights Law, practitioner in European Court of Human Rights. Author of numerous publications on the European Convention on Human Rights.



11 Guilford Street

London WC1N 1DH

United Kingdom

+44(0)203 206 9939

info@democraticprogress.org

www.democraticprogress.org