Media Narratives, Politics and the Cyprus Problem

Media, politics and the Cyprus Problem are the main themes of the present study. Through analysis of Greek and Turkish Cypriot television news bulletins and newspaper editorials and leading articles, the study seeks to establish media approaches and positions on important issues so as to better understand their work, role and functions. The study analyses practices and positions related to the Cyprus Problem, the solution, matters of identity, the ‘others’ and the European Union, the authorities and the political forces. This attempt to ascertain the underlying values that guide news selection and content will provide a clearer picture of how the media interacts with or influences society.

The study of sample data from late 2002, 2007 and July 2008 has revealed that, along with some differences, the two communities’ media have common features and practices; these are sustained over time irrespective of the general context. While the media perspectives and positions of the two sides may differ, in many instances they all obey the same or similar principles.

On most issues the media promote the official selection and interpretation of events or those of different elite groups, based on affinities with their own views and positions. High dependency on official news sources, in particular of the Turkish Cypriot media, leads to disseminating the content and structure of the official discourses.

When reporting on core aspects of the Cyprus Problem and the status of the two sides there is little or no differentiation on either side; one-sided legitimacy or status superiority, stereotypical positions of the own side’s good intentions and the other’s wrong doings dominate.

The mediated world is composed of various pairs of ‘us’ and the ‘other’, community or group in the other or the own community; there is an emphasis on dualities, with the ‘other’ being the problem because of its negative attributes. Most often, one side’s or a third party’s acts and decisions will be seen as simply connected to their good or evil nature, thus portraying it as an ally or as foe.

The framing of news and representations shows divergent perceptions of the core of the Cyprus Problem and consequently of how a solution can be reached.

Changes in power or the general atmosphere have limited effect on media coverage and stances. On most issues media practices and positions feature stability and continuity.

The question remains open; can the media articulate a discourse that deviates from the official or dominant discourses sustaining antagonism and conflict, in order to promote peace as a superior good?
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A NOTE ON TERMINOLOGY

The “Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC)” is not recognised by the international community except by Turkey. Cited or other references to the “TRNC”, its institutions or officials is done acknowledging this position of the international community.
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Media, politics and the Cyprus Problem are the main themes of the present study. While each topic on its own occupies an important place in the island’s daily life, the three are very closely interrelated; political actors are, by far, the most prominent if not the almost exclusive group on the media stage, and the Cyprus Problem is the main topic of discourse. All developments and any references, whether significant or minimal, to aspects of the Problem, become news items and give political party leaders and others the opportunity to access the media and present their views and comments. However, issues related to the media in Cyprus have been very little researched.

Our study focuses on the analysis of media content and discourses on television and in newspapers on both sides of the dividing line. The material studied is the main television news bulletin on Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot channels, broadcast in the evening;1 in the case of newspapers, the focus is on editorials and leading news articles in the Turkish and Greek language dailies. We chose to leave out English language newspapers given that they address a public that could hardly compare to the readers of the other dailies.

The aim of this research is to examine how the media cover issues related to aspects of the Cyprus Problem and political actors, the authorities and political parties. The main subjects of interest are the nature of the Cyprus Problem and the envisaged or preferred solution, matters of identity, representations about the other parties engaged in the conflict, positions vis-à-vis the European Union, and the relationship with the authorities and political forces on each side. We sought answers to questions related to the approaches and positions the media adopt, and their views as these are expressed in editorials and comments, or that transpire between the lines as hidden or implied meaning. In addition to describing the main features of media treatment of the respective issues, we felt it was important to delve deeper and attempt to ascertain the underlying values guiding media choices and approaches. We are interested in features indicating continuity or change rather than circumstantial positions or isolated phenomena that may just be influenced by conjuncture.

This research, through a systematic analysis of media content beyond pre-conceived ideas or superficial and stereotypical approaches, will give us a better understanding of the media in Cyprus, revealing its place and role in the society, and especially how it interacts or influences the course of events, whether everyday politics or issues related to the Cyprus Problem. In this respect, everyone, from ordinary citizens to policy makers and researchers, can use this information in a way that enables a more informed, positive and constructive relation with the media. However, we recognize that the above is an optimistic statement since the subject can only be fully addressed through extended and systematic research over many years—not just one study.

Methodology and theoretical background

The object of our study is media content per se, both its direct and implied meaning. This we will accomplish through an attempt to understand and analyse the practices implemented by media professionals in their selection and presentation of news and ideas. Observations and analysis are based solely on the actual material published—with no further research among professionals

1 News bulletins on Greek Cypriot channels start between 20:00 and 20:25 and last from 60 to 75 minutes including sports news, while on Turkish Cypriot channels they start about 30 minutes earlier.
or any other parties. Furthermore, the content is examined to derive its substance and meaning, which could enable us to anticipate or make inferences as to its effects. Thus, our research applied media content analysis to a limited extent, and discourse analysis more thoroughly. This emphasis on discourse rather than content enabled us to seek meaning through interpretation of media texts. Because a given text is open to myriad interpretations, we can provide no definite results here.

We have conducted our analysis in line with Lasswell's well-known definition of news, which stands out as the most illustrative statement2 on this subject: Thus, news is “Who says What, through Which channel, to Whom, with What effect”.

The effects of news content could only be anticipated or inferred in our conclusions, since we took no audience survey nor any related measurement. To Lasswell’s model we also added ‘Why’, in an attempt to explore the reasons for the specific news selection and the choice to present news and ideas in specific ways. Thus, we applied media analysis as a subset of content and discourse analysis and in a qualitative perspective, with particular emphasis on discourse analysis. Following on Berelson’s suggestions, we describe substance and form characteristics of media content; we make inferences to producers and audiences of content, and attempt to deduce the effects of content on audiences and society.3

With the goal of revealing underpinning values, continuity or change, we chose to study texts from different periods in time. The initial plan was to randomly select newspaper and television material from various dates in fall 2002 and in fall 2007. The first period included texts before and after Kofi Annan, the United Nations Secretary General, first presented his blueprint, the Annan Plan I, to the Cypriot leaders and public, in 2002. It proved impossible to find copies of televised news, and so only newspaper content could be studied for this first period. The second period started with the meeting between Tassos Papadopoulos and Mehmet Ali Talat, in early September 2007 and covered news until January 2008. In each period, the study included data from three different sets of dates for a total of 11 days. This choice aimed to examine the eventual impact on the media of significant events, such as the failure of the UN settlement efforts, the relaxation of movement restrictions across the dividing line, and accession of the Republic of Cyprus to the European Union; has the media reacted to these significant changes? If so, in what way? If not, can we explain why?

The change in power on the Greek Cypriot side in February 2008, with the election of Demetris Christofias to the Presidency of the Republic of Cyprus, prompted the inclusion of additional data for four days (30 June – 3 July 2008), that could highlight any effect on the media. This would enable the study of three periods in the very recent history of the island, featuring substantially different political atmospheres regarding intra- and inter-community relations, within a new international context. We aimed to determine in what ways, if any, the handling of the Cyprus Issue by two left-wing leaders and the small positive steps they have made, have changed media practices, positions and orientations. The ultimate issue was about media responses to changes in the political scene: was there any change or did they continue to act in accordance with long-standing values and cultural orientations?

Problems and limitations
One major problem inherent to media text studies relates to the volume of material both in terms of what is available and what should be selected for research purposes. Given the large volume of material that could be included in our analysis, we chose only those discourses and practices that were most repeated. Despite the fact that the media content we studied amounted to hundreds of pages for each newspaper and tens of hours of news for each television channel, this


proved largely insufficient for an in-depth report. On the one hand, there were the many complex issues that we sought to research and, on the other hand, there was the very lengthy period (between 2002 and 2008) we originally wanted to consider. A detailed report would have necessitated data from longer periods of time, and therefore a volume of material many times larger than what we have analyzed, and much more time.

A major handicap is that it proved impossible to secure recorded television material for the entire 2002 period, which limited the study of television news to 2007 and 2008. Thus, a comparative study was possible only for two of the three time periods.

Radio texts are also missing from this research, a deliberate choice for two major reasons: first, there was the question of what kind of material to study (i.e., which news bulletin or current affairs programme) and, second, the impossibility of finding past material combined with the complex technical problems posed by the need to record up to 20 different radio channels for the current study. In addition, the volume and scope of study would have, again, dramatically increased the workload much beyond our resources.

The choice of periods for study and the leap from December 2002 to September 2007 leave a large time period unexamined, including the extremely important 2004 referenda and accession of the Republic of Cyprus to the European Union. This impacted more on the capacity to reveal the processes of eventual shifts and changes, but not on the potential to document continuity or change in media positions and values, which constituted the goal of this research.

Finally, the traditional methods for content and discourse analysis have their limitations, since they are subject to subjective understandings and interpretations; thus any conclusions cannot be definite, while the polysemic nature of texts makes it possible to challenge our reading. Nevertheless, the value of this research lies in the validity of the analysis as one of many possible interpretations of media content.

**Theories on media role and effects**

The role and effects of the media have been extensively researched from many different perspectives. A critical issue for researchers has been that of the power of the media. Much of the public, and many politicians, justices, institutions and others continue to perceive media as a source of evil—or at least as a bad influence—that needs to be controlled. Early research also found the media to be very powerful, even claiming a direct cause-effect relation between media consumption and behaviour, violent or otherwise. Contemporary theory, while dismissing the direct cause-effect argument, nevertheless acknowledges a considerable influence, especially regarding electronic media, but finds the influence more subtle and complex. Three factors form the basis and determine the extent and nature of the influence: (a) the content; (b) the semiotic complexity and efficacy of the medium; and (c) the meaning the reader attributes to the content.5

Many researchers have focused on the role of the reader, even going so far as to talk about ‘the death of the author’ (Roland Barthes), or seeing the reader as an agent of the de-codification process or active producer of meaning. In this respect, John Fiske considers the audience—not the media—as having the most power.7 However, the reader’s ability and will to react depend not only on subjective factors, such as race, gender, education, concerns, etc., but on very objective

---

4 Quite often, politicians blame the media for bringing (undesirable) issues to the public’s attention and prompting debate on them, even though they were the first to open the debate. Justice systems all over the world consider the media as a source of eventual problems in relation to a fair trial. An illustrative example is the following: In an Assizes Court decision in the Republic of Cyprus that caused outrage not only to the public, the acquittal of eleven policemen charged for ill-treating and brutally beating two young students was also founded on grounds related to the coverage of the incident in the media: “...the attribution of criminal responsibility by the media to them in the manner it was done in the present case... is unacceptable in a lawful society. It’s an interference in the work of justice and anticipates the outcome of the trial... it cancels... in particular the carrying out of a fair trial of the accused... This constitute an additional reason for dismissal of the present case.” (Republic of Cyprus, Supreme Court, Republic v. Efstathiou et al., Case 17179/06, decided 19.03.2009). Interestingly, the Court’s concern for a fair trial completely disregarded the critical role of the media in disclosing the real events: The two students were initially charged for assault and injuries to police members, but an amateur video released by the media showed that the two students were brutally beaten for several minutes while handcuffed and immobilised.


factors related to the broader environment and context as well. The context or the social reality is, among other factors, the product of the media, which leads to the question, ‘do the media create or do they reflect social reality?’ Many researchers believe that both are true: media is both a creator and a reflection of what happens in society. This means that the perception of a one-way action, of manipulation or brainwashing, as proposed by Theodor Adorno and Max Horkheimer and others, cannot stand the test since audiences are not passive consumers.

In the framework of political economy and cultural studies views of the media, McCombs introduced his ‘agenda setting theory’, arguing that the media sets the agenda regarding topics for public debate. Through the selection of issues that become news, they ‘suggest’ in a certain way what people should think about and discuss. Furthermore, the choice of a specific perspective, in other words, the ‘framing’ of news, places attention on specific aspects such that the event takes on a specific meaning. This framing can shift attention from fundamental issues to secondary ones. For example, the 2003 USA operation against Iraq was framed in most media largely as an issue of defence and later as a rescue operation, rather than on the basis of ethical questions, such as what was the moral ground for this action.

Beyond its influence, other functions of the media have been considered, such as the use of a specific language and vocabulary; the aggregation of interests; the demands and concerns of certain groups of people, for example, are ways in which the media helps contribute to people’s awareness of belonging to and identification with a national or other entity. When people can recognise themselves in the content they may see the medium as the reflection of a community of all those that share common characteristics. The media can make people aware of their belonging to a wider group. Without pretending any exclusive causal link, it is interesting to note in this respect that the publication of the first newspapers in Cyprus in the late 19th century also marks the beginning of a process of a clear differentiation of the two main communities on the island. Thus, newspapers may have contributed to the consolidation of ethnic differences.

With Cyprus media operating in a society of long-standing differences and conflict between Greek and Turkish Cypriots — put also in the broader perspective of Greece-Turkey relations — our research must take into account theories related to media coverage of conflict. Research on the subject includes issues related to the relations between government and media, and journalists and their professional and broader social environment.

In a comprehensive review of literature on media and war and the more recent theme of peace journalism, Susan Dente Ross asserts that media today are better than ever before, while also noting that they are less (good) than they could be. She looks at research on the role of the media in the dissemination of negative pictures of the ‘other’, suggesting that this might be the result of direct and other pressure by governments and politicians, which becomes stronger in conflict zones, or perhaps it is simply because the media acts as a propaganda vehicle and reinforces the power and positions of the elite. Studies have shown that in reports from conflict areas pain and blood are differently valued, often with a distinction between worthy and unworthy victims. Some argue that this media behaviour results from constraints imposed by internal rules and the context in which the media industry operates, while others contend that media positions are commanded by national identity and political ideology rather than government influences. However, the media is not seen as uncritically disseminating government propaganda;
rather, it simply falls short of becoming a mechanism for the distribution of minority or dissident views and information.15

Beyond arguing for or against the role expected from the media or the need for an ideal media, the critical question that we are attempting to answer in the present report is, ‘what conclusions can one draw about the role of the Cyprus media vis-à-vis the Cyprus Problem and other issues on either side of the dividing line? Can the media contribute to understanding the fears, concerns and pain of the other side and, ultimately, contribute to peace and reconciliation?’

In Cyprus, media research remains very limited; the Greek Cypriot media has been studied by Andreas Kl. Sophocleous, whose sizeable work focused on the history of the press, legal and political aspects and notable figures; some limited-scope research has also been conducted by others.16 Both Servet Dedeçay17 and Cemaletin Ünlü18 studied the history of the Turkish language press in Cyprus. Dedeçay’s work includes the development of broadcast media as well.

The local press was born soon after Cyprus was leased by the Ottoman Empire to the British19 and developed in an environment of antagonism between Greek Cypriot irredentism and the Turkish Cypriot search for securing their own interests. This period was marked by the consolidation of identities across national lines and integration of people into communities.20 The culmination of antagonism came in the 1950s with one community struggling for enosis, union with Greece, and the other for taksim, partition of the island. Throughout the twentieth century and beyond, each community was divided into two main groups, each time on different criteria, but always directly linked to the future of the island and the parameters on which a solution to its problem would be based.21 The core ideas gave precedence to Cyprus or one of the two motherlands and each group made its choices accordingly. The case of the 2004 referenda is a glaring example of the effects of this polarisation, where only two options were available: join the camp of the ‘patriots’ or the ‘surrendering’ ones, labelled by some as ‘traitors’.

What, then, is the place and what are the characteristics of the media, under these conditions? To what extent can the media play a role?

Examining the role of media in Greece and Turkey in Greek-Turkish relations prior to 1999, K. Hadjidimos suggested that negative approaches dominated over the very few positive examples.22 Greek media projected the stereotype of the ‘Barbarian Turk’, while the Turkish media showed Greeks as followers of the ‘Great Idea’.23 Hadjidimos noted the existence of various forms of hate speech and a selection of news that silenced certain views or items or that led to auto-censorship for political or economic reasons.24 The author also noted some positive examples, in particular joint efforts of media professionals aiming at a balanced reporting and cooperation.

In a study on the role and the evolution of the Greek Cypriot press from 1960 to 1985, C. Christophorou concluded that the press did not fulfil its fourth estate functions; it proved dependent on power holders and various pressure and other groups’ interests. The main features of the press in the above period were ‘intolerance, lack of will for dialogue, one-sided interpretations, the intention to annihilate the opponents and, in some cases, intentional calumny’.

15 ibid.
17 S. S. Dedeçay, Kıbrıs ta Enformasyon veya Yazı ve Sözlü Basin [Information or Print and Broadcast Media in Cyprus], Cilt:1,2, LÖTÜ Yayınları, Lefkoşa, Nisan, 1988, 1989.
19 The first newspaper, Κύπρος – Cyprus, was published in Larnaca, in August 1978, some weeks after the start of British rule.
20 For a brief account of Greek and Turkish Cypriot media antagonism and promotion of the positions of their respective communities, see, S. Şahin, The Discursive Construction of National Identity by the Newspapers in North Cyprus, 2008, Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Westminster, pp. 64-70.
23 Megali Idea [Great Idea], an idea aiming at the revival of the Byzantine Empire.
24 A striking recent example of how media treat important issues, including that of Greek-Turkish relations, occurred on 21 June 2009; two newspapers, To Βήμα [To Vima] and Έθνος [Ethnos] reported on a summit meeting that never took place. The Turkish Prime-minister cancelled his visit to Athens and the meeting with the Greek Premier on the occasion of the inauguration of the Acropolis Museum; nevertheless, the papers reported on the ‘cold climate’ and enumerated the subjects that were raised or discussed.
the events of 1963-1967, the Turkish and Turkish Cypriot leadership were labelled in very dark colours, such as terrorists, gangsters and outlaws.25

Focusing on Greek and Turkish Cypriot newspaper headlines, M.Ersoy undertook a content analysis of the coverage of the Cyprus Conflict, in an attempt to examine whether news selection and coverage promoted peace. He concluded that ‘the media structures and the structures of journalism made it probable that peace journalism has a long way to go’. Ersoy noted that, contrary to their Greek Cypriot counterparts, the Turkish Cypriot newspapers depended on news agencies as sources of information. He found that 31% and 25% of their headlines respectively were negatively oriented towards the ‘other’.

M.Bailie and B. Azgin, also examined the role of the press by focusing on reports on a more specific subject, the attempts for the opening of the Ledra street barricade in the heart of Nicosia.27 They argued that Cypriot media over-relied on elite and socially privileged sources, while also suggesting their own agendas through the selection and the perspective in which they present selected official sources. The authors suggested the existence of ‘carefully orchestrated “media wars”’ and the re-presentation of ‘social, cultural, political and economic dynamics in and between the two Cypriot communities in selective and ideological forms: as “win-lose” and “conflict driven”’.

Media in Cyprus today
The press that emerged soon after the island came under British rule, in 1878, developed throughout the 20th century into a pluralistic entity in both communities. Newspapers went through radical changes in the 1980s, prompted, among other things, by phototypesetting and computerisation. The main trends that characterised the press were:

■ The shrinking and disappearance of weeklies following the decision to produce dailies on Mondays, the day traditionally reserved for weeklies, thus displacing them.
■ The decline of the partisan press, without however adopting a clear ideologically neutral editorial line. However, ideology in connection to positions on the Cyprus Problem remains a dominant feature of newspapers. In the Turkish Cypriot community, partisan newspapers continue to exist, all dominated however by the commercial Kıbrıs.
■ The proliferation of specialised press, newspapers, magazines and free-press.
■ The transformation of family press businesses into large all-media enterprises was an ongoing process in 2009, at a more advanced stage for Greek Cypriot than Turkish Cypriot media.

During the 1990s, the lifting of the monopoly on radio frequencies saw the increase in public service radio and television channels and the proliferation of private operators in both communities.

The multiplication of media outlets since the early 1990s led to a huge increase in the demand for professional journalists. Given the rapid increase in the number of journalists, along with an environment dominated by market forces and increased competition instead of traditional cultural values, the question one may raise here is, ‘do journalists function as advocates for the public interest today, and if so, to what extent’?

Ross’s argument that the media – big media also – cannot escape from the system and its competitive values because of political, economic, institutional and other constraints, applies to a much higher degree in Cyprus due to its limited output: The size of the market is small compared to most countries in the world, and this has a direct effect on the size of media audiences and the expected volume of income. Media can generate income which would be insufficient for sustaining an important team of journalists and services, thus increasing dependency on official resources or other mainstream forces.

---

The present study reveals how highly dependent the Turkish Cypriot media is on external sources, primarily the official news agency—which of course carries the risk of journalists being turned into mere news processors and proponents of the government discourse. Their differentiation, mainly through the selection of news and voices, does not stray far beyond the boundaries of the elitist discourse. While most Greek Cypriot media rely more on their own resources, they hardly escape from advocacy journalism, supporting mainstream views. When the media reports on the ‘Cyprus Problem’, there is little or no differentiation on either side; stereotypical phrases, expressions, and the position that ‘our’ side is the good one who strives for a solution, it’s the ‘others’ who are negative, characterise both media.

The selection of news and voices on most issues, i.e., who is given access and whose views are presented, is similar in both the Greek and the Turkish Cypriot media. In addition to their own public — readers and viewers— the media have favoured people and views enjoying a privileged or preferential treatment. This is less accentuated or evident on television.

When comparing the periods studied, one may particularly note a more differentiated landscape and more pluralistic approaches by some newspapers in fall 2002. One such case is the way the Annan Plan was presented by some media, with both its good and bad points. While the dichotomy between ‘us’ and ‘them’ was not new, the Greek Cypriot media targeted Turkey, the Turkish Army, the settlers and Rauf Denktas; the Turkish Cypriots— with the exception of conservative forces, which viewed the Plan as bringing losses and threats emanating from the other side, the ‘enemy with persisting bad intentions’— focused on the prospects the Plan could open for them and for the island.

With the passage of time, intra- and inter-community polarisation appears to have deepened, with a blame-game directed by some not only against the ‘other’ side but also against those with different views as well. Any view diverging from the official line was sometimes seen as damaging and undermining the community’s cause to the benefit of the ‘enemies’; also, responsibility for unfavourable developments in one’s own community was attributed to those with views different from the official view.

The structure of the book
There are a number of ways that we could present our media analysis, each approach with its own advantages and disadvantages. For example, we could present separate analyses for each community’s media, to give an overall picture for each side; in this case, there are still different options, since the press and television analyses could be presented separately for all three periods or alternately for each period. We have decided on a format that will give the reader an overall picture for each of the three periods. To accomplish this, we analyze together the press and television data for each community, which provides a comprehensive view of that community’s media, and enables us to identify similarities and differences, common trends and divergences, before we proceed to comparisons with media on the ‘other side’ of the dividing line.

We examine each timeframe to reveal the basic trends and features of media practices in news selection and presentation; content, or rather, discourse analysis follows, targeting the specific subjects on which this study focuses, i.e., positions on the Cyprus Problem and its solution, stances towards the ‘others’, persons and groups, treatment of the European Union, the political parties and the authorities. Because we study the three periods separately, the analyses and descriptions of trends and features have been repeated. We believe that this approach provides a clearer picture, and at the same time will not pose obstacles to other comparisons that might be made through a non-linear reading of the study.

Section one examines data solely from the newspapers, as there was no/insufficient recorded television data. Synthia Pavlou analyses Greek Cypriot newspaper practices and discourses, derived from 11 days data in October, November and December 2002. She focuses on practices and tactics in the selection of events, views and other topics that are treated as news, as well as of the persons or groups that were given coverage. Then she looks at the discourses related to the Cyprus Problem, aspects of the Problem or its solution, the treatment of the EU, the political
parties and leaders and the authorities, in order to reveal the trends and, most importantly, the values underpinning the analysis. This part concludes with discussion of the main Greek Cypriot newspaper practices and discourses for the 2002 period.

Then Sanem Şahin undertakes analysis of data drawn from the Turkish Cypriot newspapers for the same time period. She also focuses on the main trends relating to journalistic practices and tactics in selecting what becomes news and how it is projected. She notes the trends that are common to all the newspapers, as well as the differences, and concludes with a discussion on traits and features of news-writing and reporting in the Turkish Cypriot dailies.

The second section looks at newspaper and television data, from September 2007 and January 2008, five years after the first period. The same format as section one is followed – Synthia Pavlou first analyses the Greek Cypriot media, beginning with the newspapers, which are examined as in 2002. Next she examines television news selection and content, and analyses TV practices and content in relation to the same issues as in the first section. This analysis is followed by Sanem Şahin’s report on the data for the Turkish Cypriot media drawn from the same period, first from newspapers, followed by television news. She records and compares the main features of news selection for the print media, revealing that despite the large number of dailies, the news content is almost identical. Next she examines television and the extent to which TV is effectively treated as a different medium, regarding both the selection and the presentation of news stories.

The last section focuses on the study of data from four days only, centered around 1 July 2008, the date of an important meeting between the two community leaders. In the same way as in the previous sections, the Greek Cypriot media are examined in the first part by Synthia Pavlou, with newspapers preceding television news analysis; Sanem Şahin then focuses on the study of the Turkish Cypriot media, newspapers and television news.

In the last section the two authors provide an overview and further analysis of both the newspapers and television news of each community, examining the three periods together, from 2002 to 2008. First, Synthia Pavlou, and then Sanem Şahin present commonalities, differences and the main trends characterising the Greek and the Turkish Cypriot media for the whole period studied.

Finally, Christophoros Christophorou presents a synthesis of the results for all media, for both communities, and for the entire period under study. He traces common practices and approaches as well as differences, and the main features of journalistic discourses. The analysis further examines audience understanding and possible interpretations of media content and activity, as well as its effects on the audience. The main issue we are concerned with is whether the media contribute to a better understanding between different groups within a community and, most importantly, between the two communities.

Christophoros Christophorou
The year 2002 marked two major events in the history of Cyprus. The United Nations (UN) presented a plan, labelled the Annan Plan, for the solution of the Cyprus Problem and the European Union decided in Copenhagen to include Cyprus in the forthcoming enlargement.

The UN plan was presented on 11 November 2002, following 60 meetings from January to September 2002 in six rounds of talks between the leaders of the two communities, Glafcos Clerides and Rauf Denktas. The two also held meetings with the UN Secretary-General in New York, in early October, when a health problem kept Mr Denktas in hospital and away from action for several weeks. The Plan was the first ever fully comprehensive proposal for a settlement.

In view of the Copenhagen European Summit of 12-13 December, final and intensive efforts were deployed there aiming to convince the two Cypriot sides to accept the UN Plan as a basis for negotiations. Mr Denktas was at the time still hospitalized in Ankara. With no agreement reached and the UN stating that negotiations had not collapsed, the EU leaders decided for enlargement with ten new countries, including the unconditional access of the Republic of Cyprus.

In early November, the Justice and Development Party (Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi – AKP) won the general elections and a new team of politicians came to power in Turkey. For the first time since 1974 they agreed that a solution should be found, as the Cyprus Problem was ‘not solved in 1974’.

In Cyprus, many formal and informal Turkish Cypriot organizations had been coordinating their actions since 2000, mobilizing the masses for a solution and EU accession. Mobilisation, with massive rallies culminated in January 2003.

In the Greek Cypriot community, political forces were campaigning for the presidential elections of February 2003. The alliance of the Progressive Party of the Working People (Ανορθωτικό Κόμμα Εργαζομένου Λαού - AKEL) and the Democratic Party (Δημοκρατικό Κόμμα - DIKO) that emerged in 2001 was consolidated with the support of the candidacy of Tassos Papadopoulos to the presidency of the Republic of Cyprus. DISY offered support to the candidacy of the Social Democrats Movement (Κίνημα Σοσιαλδημοκρατών - KISOS) leader, in an attempt to avert the party from joining AKEL and DIKO. In view of the ongoing developments and uncertainty about the future, the campaign was mostly on and off until early January.

The sample data examined in this section comes solely from newspapers, from late October to 10 December 2002, just before the Copenhagen summit. Unfortunately it proved impossible to secure recorded television news bulletins for the relevant dates.
The prevailing discourses during the period studied in this section were the document for a ‘Comprehensive Settlement of the Cyprus Problem’, most commonly known as the Annan Plan, and the forthcoming Copenhagen European Summit on EU enlargement. These issues, along with developments related to the Presidential elections of February 2003, were widely covered by the press and seem to have influenced the way the news stories were presented.

The data
Six dailies, Phileleftheros, Politis, Simerini, Machi-Tharros, Haravgi and Alithia, are analyzed in this part of the research. The data were drawn from editions of 28 to 31 October, 20 to 22 November and 7 to 10 December 2002.

The main news story and what it will reveal
The UN Secretary-General’s proposal was the most popular topic reported by the Greek Cypriot newspapers. It was the cover story of the six dailies 59 times out of 66, during only 11 days. Journalists gathered information for this subject mainly from diplomatic sources, personal statements, press conferences and press releases.

This topic and supplementary news stories are studied here to illustrate,

a) How the press works (media practices);

b) Political/ideological stances of the Greek Cypriot newspapers regarding the solution sought, the government, the parties, the European Union and the ‘other side’;

c) The means employed to promote these positions.

Information on the above will reveal whether the Greek Cypriot dailies provided fair coverage or if they attempted to project their own views to the public. Our research will enable those interested to read between the lines and behind the ‘constructed’ information of the newspapers.

Media Practices
To survive, newspapers must attract a loyal readership. To this end, then, newspapers will establish certain practices and professional routines, which will naturally be affected by their financial and personnel resources. Our research revealed several common practices and tactics used in the Greek Cypriot press.

The hidden aces of the commercial newspapers
The dailies with no party or ideological links or affiliations struggled for exclusiveness. They had to add extra information to their cover stories not only to substantiate their views but also to remain competitive. They could not rely on statements from press conferences or press releases alone; they had to offer information and stories that were different from the other dailies in order to ‘sell’ their own beliefs to the public and of course in order to sell more copies. Therefore, Phileleftheros published front-page articles that were based on its editors’ well informed sources,1 ‘cross

---

1 Costas Venizelos, Ιθαγένεια: Μία δια δύο: ΑΠΟΚΑΛΥΠΤΙΚΟ Νέες κι έντονες ανησυχίες της Λευκωσίας από λεπτομέρειες του σχεδίου [Citizenship: One divided by two: REVEALING New and strong concerns of Nicosia deriving from details of the Plan], Phileleftheros, 29.10.2002:1; Costas Venizelos, Σέμι τραπέζας Χάνεϊ: Σύγκρουση σε υψηλούς τόνους του Προέδρου με τον Βρετανό απεσταλμένο [Bald recommendations from Hanney: High tension clash of the President with the British ambassador], Phileleftheros, 22.11.2002:1.
examined or 'valid information'. These expressions were used to highlight the exclusivity of the newspaper’s information. This practice was also noted in Politis. The two dailies employed correspondents around the world, in cities such as New York, Athens, Istanbul and Brussels, which enabled them to avoid the use of copy-paste texts from news agencies and provide extra information.

Furthermore, after the Plan had been officially submitted, Phileleftheros added a new section titled: ‘The Cyprus Problem at a crucial crossroad’, which featured reports on this very important and popular subject. Politis also gave wide coverage to the UN Plan, clearly understanding its readers’ interest in the matter. On 21 November Politis announced that it would publish translated articles about the Annan Plan taken from the Turkish Cypriot press.

The ‘fight’ in the name of a party and the ‘weapon’ used against low circulation numbers

The dailies with party or ideological links and affiliations, or those with low circulation figures and therefore with limited resources, were often forced to depend on press conferences or externally produced texts for their material. Even so, these stories were somehow changed in ways that ‘fit’ a newspaper’s beliefs or served its interests.

Alithia, for example, reproduced a text taken from the Cyprus News Agency (Κυπριακό Πρακτορείο Ειδήσεων - KYPE), but through its headline it highlighted a positive aspect of the Annan Plan: ‘There will be no negative consequences in the labour market from the solution of the Cyprus Problem: Representatives of SEK with D. Kittenis were briefed by the President’. Machi published the same unedited news story, but with its headline negatively portrayed the UN Plan: ‘Some provisions of the Plan are painful: Yesterday’s statements by D. Kittenis after a meeting with the President’.

The press engaged in a number of other practices, promoting specific views and positions. These are outlined in the following sections where the prevailing discourses are also presented.

Different Discourses and Media Practices

The study of the positions of each newspaper in relation to several political issues shows that their views play a very important role in the way a news story is changed, represented and projected.

The form of solution

The newspapers reacted in various ways to the UN Plan, revealing their positions even before the actual Plan was presented to the parties.

- Loud ‘NO’ (Simerini and Machi/Tharros);
- Strong rejection (Phileleftheros);
- Dismissal of the Plan but not of the efforts for rapprochement between the two communities (Politis);
- ‘YES’ but not under pressure and only after certain alterations (Haravgi);
- ‘YES’ (Alithia).

1 Anthos Lykavgis, ‘Νέα «Συμφωνία Κορυφής»: Ολοκληρώνεται και θα τεθεί στα μέρη ως οριστικό πλαίσιο τελικού πάρε δώσε [New “High-Level agreement”: is concluded and will be presented to the parties as a definite framework for the give and take procedure]’, Phileleftheros, 31.10.2002:1.

2 Costas Venizelos. Τελεσιγραφική προειδοποίηση: Οι μεσολαβητές θέτουν την 12/12 ως καταλήκτικη ημερομηνία [A warning in the form of an ultimatum: The mediators set 12 December as the concluding day]’, Phileleftheros, 20.11.2002:1.


5 See an example on 20.11.2002. This theme page was under the editorship of Androula Taramounta.

6 No author, ‘Τι συζητούν στα κατεχόμενα για το σχέδιο [What do they say about the Plan in the occupied areas?]’, Politis, 21.11.2002:1.

7 Cyprus Workers’ Confederation (Συνομοσπονδία Εργατών Κύπρου - SEK).


9 No author, ‘Επιθυμήσεις μερικές πρόνοιες του σχεδίου: Χρεοφόρα δηλώσεις Κίττένη, υπέρ από συνάντηση με τον Πρόεδρο [Some provisions of the Plan are painful: Yesterday’s statements by D. Kittenis after a meeting with the president]’, Machi, 22.11.2002:6.

10 Tharros is the Monday sister edition of Machi.
Simerini and Machi portrayed the Plan as catastrophic. They argued that it was a matter of national interest to reject it, suggesting that if the Plan were endorsed, the Greek Cypriots would soon face extinction. This was clearly put forward in the main news story (To Θέμα) of Simerini on 8 December: ‘Murphy’s Law and the upcoming destruction of Cyprus: How and Why we will not be saved’.11 There were other similarly dramatic scenarios published in Machi, with one of its editorials titled, ‘(Our) main priority is our survival’.12

Phileleftheros was generally objective in its coverage of the UN Plan, although before the first version of the Plan was officially submitted, some of the newspaper’s editorials, headlines or highlighted points stressed aspects of the Plan that could be negatively perceived by the Greek Cypriots. For example, the 29 October cover story headline was, ‘Citizenship: One divided into two: REVEALING Nicosia’s new and intense worries caused by the details of the Plan’. In the bullet points under this headline it was emphasized that the component states would be able to grant citizenship and that Turkish visitors to the island would not need visas. The first two words of the article reveal the paper’s view of these possibilities: ‘Alarming scenarios’.13 Phileleftheros’s dissatisfaction with the Plan, after its release, was primarily revealed in its editorials; one stated that the Plan constituted a violation of reason and principles and that it would lead the Greek Cypriots to extreme compromises.14

Politis, which endorsed rapprochement, tried to remain loyal to its views. Therefore although the newspaper’s editorials reveal that it did not accept the Plan without changes, still, it did not express its strong objection through its news stories. Politis even held an opinion poll in collaboration with a Turkish Cypriot daily regarding the Plan; the results were published in an article by the chief editor of the participating Turkish Cypriot newspaper, Ortam.15

Haravgi, the mouthpiece of the Progressive Party of the Working People (Ανορθωτικό Κόμμα Εργαζόμενου Λαού – AKEL) traditionally supported reunification and rapprochement. It endorsed the idea of a solution that would serve the interests of both Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots. Therefore, it was cautious regarding the way it presented the Plan to its readers, trying not to betray its beliefs with a loud rejection of the UN proposal for peace. It appears that the answer of the newspaper to the Plan was ‘yes’…but not now. It was argued that the Plan had to be modified and that the Greek Cypriot side should assert its demands during negotiations.16 This view was in line with the position of AKEL since Haravgi echoed its views.

Alithia seems to have considered the UN Plan as a compromise, but necessary to end the partition in the country. This daily, through its articles and editorials, attempted to defend the Annan Plan, saying it had ‘many positive points’.17

Thus, it appears that the newspapers promoted, or presented favorably, specific positions in regard to the Annan Plan by engaging in certain practices. We will examine these in more detail below.

Over-representation

Data analysis confirmed that newspapers published more articles that supported their own stance on the Annan Plan than stories with opposite views or irrelevant to the Plan. This practice was most obvious in Machi, Alithia and Simerini. In its 22 November edition, Machi published only negative articles about the UN Plan; there was not even one piece in favor of the proposed settlement. In contrast, all articles on the Annan Plan in Alithia were positive. This strategy of over-representation of specific news stories and, therefore, of certain views is apparent in the various
newspapers’ presentation of a demonstration organized by the ‘No’ camp. All the dailies that were set against the Plan repeatedly covered this topic. Two especially stand out: Simerini, which on 7 December published an article about this subject on its front page and Machi, which covered this same subject from 7-10 December when it was reported as the main story (To Θέμα). Machi even used numbers to show that the rejection of the Annan Plan was a popular demand, stating that over 5000 people would participate in the protest.18 In this case, the numbers not only seem to have been used to make a stronger argument, but to prove that there was harmony of views among the Greek Cypriots regarding this matter. It appears that Machi believed that the unanimity of opinions could substantiate a particular stance. Its cover story on 22 November reveals an attempt to persuade its readers that everybody agreed that the Plan should be rejected: ‘An overwhelming no to the Annan Plan: Public opinion in Cyprus and Greece are set against (the Plan)’.19

The views of important people

Three dailies, Alithia, Machi and Simerini, reported or even highlighted the words of important people, persons of authority, experts or groups who agreed with their positions on the UN Plan.

For example, on 22 November Alithia’s lead story reported the views of a high-ranking church official, the Metropolitan of Kitium. Yet, here we must note that the Holy Synod of Cyprus’s Orthodox Church had rejected the Plan, and the Metropolitan of Kitium was the only bishop out of nine, who supported the proposed settlement.20

Sometimes even the opinions and stances of an international organization, a community or a group were used, a means that could influence the public. Alithia, on 20 November 2002, stated on its front page, ‘The Europeans recommend that we grab the chance’.21 In contrast, Simerini, which was set against the UN Plan, published an article with the title, ‘The Turkish Cypriots also see negative (points): How they view the Annan Plan’.22 Alithia seems to have used the will of this community as an argument in favor of its own view on the Plan: More things unite us (than separate us), let’s go for a solution.23 Since the Turkish Cypriots were the other party of the conflict, their thoughts might shift the Greek Cypriots’ opinion. Moreover, Alithia employed an apparently even stronger persuasion point by reporting that the Turks agreed to negotiate the suggested settlement24 and that Denktaş, who had always been regarded as an intransigent person, was going to discuss the UN proposal.25 On 22 November Simerini declared exactly the opposite on its front page: ‘Denktash will not sign’,26 while Machi’s headline was even harsher: ‘Rauf Denktash rejects the Plan: He does not want the return of the refugees’.27 Machi added statements of the National Organisation of Cypriot Fighters (Εθνική Οργάνωση Κυπρίων Αγωνιστών - EOKA) veterans association that backed and even justified their position on the Plan; the opinion of these people could be expected to move the public and awaken historical memories that would lead to the dismissal of the UN Plan.

18 Ανωτέρω, ‘Παγκύπριο «ΟΧΙ» στο σχέδιο Ανάν: Πέραν των 5000 ατόμων σήμερα στην πλατεία ελευθερίας [Pan-Cypriot “NO” to the Annan Plan: more than 5000 people will be today at Eleftherias square], Machi, 8.12.2002:32.
19 Ανωτέρω, ‘Συντριπτικό όχι στο σχέδιο Ανάν: Η κοινή γνώμη σε Κύπρο και Ελλάδα τάσσεται εναντίον [An overwhelming no to the Annan Plan: Public opinion in Cyprus and Greece is set against (the Plan)], Machi, 22.11.2002:1.
20 Μητροπ. Κιτίου: Δεν μας συμφέρει η απόρριψη του Σχεδίου Ανάν [The metropolitan of Kitium: The rejection of the Annan Plan is not in our best interest], Alithia, 22.11.2002:1.
22 Κομίλος Χαριτονίδης, ‘Βλέπουν αρνητικά και οι Τ/κύπριοι: Πως σχολίαζουν το Σχέδιο Αναν [The T/Cypriots also see negative (points): How they comment on the Annan Plan], Simerini, 20.11.2002:2.
24 Π. Χαραλαμπός, ‘Να στην διαμάχη απαντήσουν κι οι Τούρκοι: Πολιτική και καταλήψεις σε συμφωνία στο Σχέδιο Αναν, μέχρι τις 12 Δεκεμβρίου [The Turks answer yes to negotiations: It is possible to come to agreement on the Annan Plan by 12 December], Alithia, 22.11.2002:1.
25 Ανωτέρω, ‘Ο Ντενκτάς οδηγείται σε συνομιλίες [Denktash is led to talks], Alithia, 8.12.2002:1.
26 Ανωτέρω, ‘Ο Ντενκτάς δεν θα υπογράψει [Denktash will not sign], Simerini, 22.11.2002:1.
27 Ανωτέρω, ‘Απορρίπτεται το σχέδιο ο Ραούφ Ντενκτάς: Δεν θέλει επιστροφή των προσφύγων [Rauf Denktash rejects the Plan: He does not want the return of the refugees], Machi, 22.11.2002:1.
The above examples expose the conflicting ways in which the Annan Plan was presented by several newspapers, especially Alithia, Machi and Simerini, and reveal how this same subject was portrayed differently in order to conform to each daily's views.

The Government and the Parties

The first Annan Plan was presented three months before the presidential elections in 2003. It appears that its representation by three dailies, Haravgi, Machi and Alithia, was directly connected to their view on certain politicians. Articles on the UN Plan as well as some supplementary news stories about other issues enabled us to uncover the trends and the stances of these newspapers regarding the government and the parties.

Wider coverage for a party or the government

Haravgi echoed the views of AKEL and its leader, Demetris Christofias, while it also dedicated more space to articles reporting the views of Tassos Papadopoulos, whose candidacy for the Presidential elections in 2003 was supported by AKEL. Alithia and Machi over-represented the government, the ruling party, Democratic Rally (Δημοκρατικός Συναγερμός - DISY), and their members.

That Haravgi, Alithia and Machi selectively offered more coverage to a particular party or the current government and their members, is revealed by the following practice. Any developments related to the newspaper’s favoured politician or party most often appeared as a separate news story, not as part of an article, which also included extra information such as notions/statements of other people.

On its 21 November front page, Alithia placed two different news stories reporting the opinions of government members. The first reported nothing except the words of the government spokesman, Michalis Papapetrou, who commented on statements made by presidential candidate Tassos Papadopoulos; the second covered solely the view of the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Kasoulides, regarding Turkey’s possible delay in answering whether it would agree to negotiate the Plan. Phileleftheros and Politis did not cover these statements in separate articles, although they did include, in a story on developments regarding the Cyprus Problem, the position of the Minister of Foreign Affairs. Haravgi not only did not publicize these persons’ statements, but also only reported the stance of Papadopoulos. The newspaper frequently published articles reporting solely the views of Christofias or Papadopoulos, while its leading stories were usually connected to either the General Secretary of AKEL or Tassos Papadopoulos.

Machi dedicated a special section to DISY where it reported on the schedule of the party’s leader, Nicos Anastasiades. Additionally, it often covered the views of Yiannakis Omirou, the president of the Movement of Social Democrats (Κίνημα Σοσιαλδημοκρατών - KISOS), whose candidacy was at the time backed by DISY. An example of this is in the 10 December edition which devoted a separate article to Omirou’s statements rather than including them in a piece with other politicians’ views. Moreover, this daily often published news stories about the President, along with articles reporting his views.

28 In 2002 Glafkos Clerides was President of the Republic of Cyprus, and DISY the ruling party with Nicos Anastasiades as Chairman of the party.
31 Costas Venizelos, ‘Στην Κοπεγχάγη το τελικό παζάρι: Η Τουρκία παρελκύει σκόπιμα τις διαδικασίες μέχρι τέλους [In Copenhagen the final bargain: Turkey deliberately defers the procedures until the end].”, Phileleftheros, 21.11.2002:1; No author, ‘Σπρώχνουν τη λύση πιο κοντά στην Κοπεγχάγη: Βους προς Σεζερ: Απαντήστε και θα σας βοηθήσουμε με την ΕΕ [They push the solution closer to Copenhagen: Bush to Sezer: Answer and we will help you with EU].”, Politis, 21.11.2002:3.
33 Examples of this can be found on 22.11.2002, in a piece about Christofias and 9.12.2002, in an article about Papadopoulos.
34 No author, ‘Τί πήραμε στην Κοπεγχάγη: Ομιλία του Προέδρου Κληρίδη [What we got in Copenhagen: Speech by President Clerides].”, Machi, 30.10.2002:5.
35 See an example of this trend: No author, ‘Τί πήραμε στην Κοπεγχάγη: Δηλώσεις του Προέδρου Κληρίδη [Things went really well in Copenhagen: Statements by President Clerides].”, Machi, 30.10.2002:5. This news story was on the first page of Machi.
Negative and positive representation of politicians, parties and the government

The Annan Plan proved to be the perfect vehicle for a few dailies to negatively or positively depict certain politicians, depending on the newspaper’s views.

*Haravgi* often aimed its arrows at DISY, its leader and the government. One example refers to an article reporting on supermarket openings on a national holiday, 28 October, in which it was alleged that the government was once more indifferent to the laws: *‘They break the law with the blessings of the government’*. Another example is the 31 October editorial, which found that the expediences of *‘those who govern clouded their judgment’*. Sometimes the paper targeted the president of the ruling party, DISY, picturing him as a disagreeable person who was often involved in disputes: *‘Anastasiades tangled with de Soto’* and the Hierarchs.* The expression *‘tangled with’* (τα έβαλε) and the fact that the dispute involved highly respected clergy paint a negative picture of the head of DISY. On other occasions, *Haravgi* compared DISY with AKEL in order to highlight the advantages of the left-wing party and at the same time to unflatteringly represent its opponents. On 20 November, the lead story in the paper pointed out that the Annan Plan had led to serious inter-party troubles between DISY and KISOS, while the collaboration of AKEL with the Democratic Party (*Δημοκρατικό Κόμμα - DIKO*) demonstrated a noteworthy coherence and unanimity.

In contrast, *Machi* and *Alithia* positively portrayed the government and the President of the Republic of Cyprus. *Alithia* went even further, through its editorials, to negatively portray AKEL, its leader and the presidential candidate they supported.

In an editorial on 20 October, *Machi* reassured its readers that the President and the government would not consent to a disastrous solution to the Cyprus problem, thus promoting trust in the government's political decisions. Another example of a flattering depiction of Mr. Clerides was the newspaper’s 21 November 2002 cover story. The President was represented as a dynamic as well as a capable negotiator who would not allow Turkey to delay the negotiations after the Copenhagen Summit, therefore risking Cyprus’s accession to the EU. He was often pictured as a determined leader who was ready to resist all pressures in order to protect the interests of his people. *Alithia* also seemed to trust the President and his government to handle the negotiation of the Plan: its 22 October 2002 editorial characterized the ‘tactic’ followed by Nicosia in this matter as *‘methodical’*. In contrast, in its editorial on the previous day, it negatively portrayed Tassos Papadopoulos, accusing him, among other things, of *‘political cowardice’*. On 30 October *Alithia* was set against AKEL and its general secretary, Demetris Christofias, accusing the opposition of having hysterically misbehaved.

The European Union

The first Annan Plan was submitted a month before the Copenhagen Summit, where the negotiations for the Republic of Cyprus’s accession to the EU were finalized. This fact generated scenarios linking the proposed solution with the island’s admission into the EU. The newspapers presented this development in three different ways. *Simerini*, *Machi* and *Haravgi* warned of the danger in linking efforts for the reunification of the country and the Republic of Cyprus’ accession

---

37 Androulla Giourof, ‘Στη θολούρα των σκοπιμοτήτων τους [In the haze of their expediences]’, *Haravgi*, 31.10.2002:1.
38 Alvaro de Soto was the special representative of the UN Secretary-General in Cyprus, up to 2004.
40 No author, ‘ΔΕΝ ΥΠΟΓΡΑΦΗ υπό άλλη μορφή η Πρόταση του Ms HANNAH [We don't sign a solution under pressure]’, *Machi*, 10.12.2002:1.
41 No author, ‘ΔΕΝ ΥΠΟΓΡΑΦΗ υπό άλλη μορφή η Πρόταση του Ms HANNAH [We don't sign a solution under pressure]’, *Machi*, 10.12.2002:1.
42 No author, ‘ΔΕΝ ΥΠΟΓΡΑΦΗ υπό άλλη μορφή η Πρόταση του Ms HANNAH [We don't sign a solution under pressure]’, *Machi*, 10.12.2002:1.
43 Machi, ‘Κύρια προτεραιότητα η επίβιωση μας [Our main priority is our survival]’, *Machi*, 30.10.2002:1.
44 No author, ‘ΔΕΝ ΥΠΟΓΡΑΦΗ υπό άλλη μορφή η Πρόταση του Ms HANNAH [We don't sign a solution under pressure]’, *Machi*, 10.12.2002:1.
to the EU. *Politis* tried to detach the Annan Plan from Cyprus’s admission into the EU but some days before the Copenhagen Summit slightly changed its stance. *Phileleftheros* and *Alithia* pictured the developments positively. It appears that the EU and its officials were perceived by the newspapers either as allies or as enemies according to their stance towards the Plan, which at the time was the most important political issue for the Republic of Cyprus.

**European Union as an enemy who exercised pressure**

Not all newspapers favourably presented the EU and its officials; *Simerini*, *Machi* and *Haravgi* portrayed them negatively because of their position on the Annan Plan.

*Simerini* stressed that the EU was pressuring the Greek Cypriots into accepting a take-it-or-leave-it-Plan. This is evident from an article published on 30 October with the headline, ‘Air of accession from Poos’ and blackmailing scenarios for a solution’. *Simerini’s* editorials show a harsh stance towards the EU, which was variously depicted as an institution that would consent to the extinction of the Republic of Cyprus; a union of states that could not protect the Greek Cypriots; and an international organization that favoured Turkey. *Tharros’s* 9 December 2002 editorial stated that the Greek Cypriots could not survive because of the Annan Plan and that the EU would not be able to save them. This newspaper presented the view that the EU had no real power. *Machi/Tharros* also appears to have promoted the notion that the EU was not on the Greek Cypriot side. On 22 November the title of its cover story was, ‘Verheugen: Solve this on your own! Europe accepts violations of the acquis communautaire’.

*Haravgi* also unflatteringly portrayed the EU, emphasizing that it would try to force the Greek Cypriots to accept the UN proposal during the Copenhagen Summit. One editorial referred to ‘unbearable pressures’, and its cover story on 20 November suggested that EU officials who said that the Annan Plan should be accepted as a solution to the Cyprus problem, hinted at what would follow in the Copenhagen Summit, implying that the Republic of Cyprus would be forced to agree with the proposed settlement in Denmark.

The representation of the EU as a blackmailing community perhaps exposes the Greek Cypriot fears that they might be forced to give their consent to a damaging solution in exchange for the island’s admission into the Union.

**A better image of the European Union**

The above described worries were not detected in *Politis*, whose articles were mainly reassuring and aimed to dissociate the Annan Plan from the country’s admission into the EU. The newspaper argued that although the EU may have applauded the UN Plan it would not use it as a prerequisite for Cyprus’s accession. On 20 November the lead article in *Politis* announced, ‘Europe approves the solution without blocking the accession’. However, two days prior to the Copenhagen Summit in December, the paper somewhat modified its stance by linking Cyprus’s chances for peace to the Summit. On 10 December, its message was even clearer, as it wrote that everything indicated that the decision of the 15 member states on whether they would set a
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46 Jacques Poos was the Rapporteur on Cyprus’s accession to the EU.
48 See this newspaper’s editorials on 30.10, 21 and 22.11.2002.
49 See this daily’s editorial on 21.11.2002.
50 Costakis Constantinou, ‘Πεδίο Μάχης η Ε.Ε : Για την ένταξη της Κύπρου, για το Κυπριακό και για την ημερομηνία της Τουρκίας [The EU is like a battlefield: For the accession of Cyprus, for the Cyprus Problem and for Turkey’s date (for accession)]’, *Haravgi*, 20.11.2002:1.
51 Manolis Kalatzis, ‘Η Ευρώπη εγκρίνει τη λύση, χωρίς να δεσμεύει την ένταξη [Europe approves the solution without blocking the accession]’, *Politis*, 20.11.2002:1, 4, 5.
negotiating date for Turkey would open the door to the solution of the Cyprus Problem. Yet despite its anxiety over this undesirable possibility, Politis never depicted the EU in a negative way. On the contrary, an article on 10 December presented the EU as an organization that could assist Cyprus, since in the case of a solution it would help the ‘occupied areas’ to adjust to the acquis communautaire.

The European Union as an ally
In October, before the submission of the first UN Plan, Phileleftheros seems to have supported the view that the EU would be used to pressure the Greek Cypriots into accepting the proposed Plan. By November, however, it characterized Cyprus’s admission to the EU as a ‘historic chance’, one that would help free the country from being ‘Turkey’s hostage’. This optimism continued, as in an article published on 21 November that stated that the EU enlargement Commissioner appeared to have said that Cyprus would enter into the community regardless of the political developments.

Alithia’s articles were also reassuring. One story reported that according to the Greek government the decision for Cyprus’s accession to the EU had already been taken and therefore it was not linked to the Greek Cypriot position on the Annan Plan.

‘Us’ and the ‘other side’
The expressions ‘our side’ and the ‘other side’ are often used in everyday conversations to describe the Greeks/Greek Cypriots and the Turkish Cypriots/the Turks or Turkey. Below we outline who or which country, according to the various press, was considered ‘us’, and who or which country was described as the ‘others’, in 2002. We also reveal the image promoted for each category. Once again, the examples derive mainly from news coverage of the Annan Plan. The ideologies of the dailies about ‘us’ as well as those concerning the ‘other side’ and the practices used to promote them are also presented.

Each of these two categories is broken into subdivisions for a more thorough examination. ‘Our side’ may be described according to,

a) The position of the newspapers on Greek Cypriot identity;
b) The positions of the newspapers on the Annan Plan.

The ‘other side’ is also divided into several interconnected categories. The various groups that have been depicted as the ‘others’ are the following:
a) The Turkish Cypriot community;
b) The Turkish Cypriot leadership;
c) The settlers;
d) The Turks and Turkey.

‘Us’ and identity issues
Certain newspapers, e.g., Machi and Simerini, emphasized the Greek Cypriot bond with Greece. Machi/Tharros made their position clear on 28 October, the anniversary of ‘ΟΧΙ’ (NO), the day which marks the Greek victory of World War II against Italy. On the front page it was stated, ‘for us, the Greeks’. Another example of this perception of identity can be found in Tharros’s cover
story for 9 December, where the common phrase, ‘the Greek Cypriot side’ (Ελληνοκυπριακή πλευρά) was replaced with, ‘Hellenic Cypriot side’ (Ελληνική Κυπριακή πλευρά). This phrasing suggests that Greek takes precedence over Cypriot. The editorial for the same date leaves no doubt about the paper’s identity views, as we see the island described as ‘a living part of Hellenism’.

Simerini’s December 8 coverage of the Annan Plan reveals that this daily held views similar to those of Machi/Tharros regarding the Cyprus-Greece bond. The paper stated in an article that Kyrenia along with other territories which ‘for centuries have been Greek in every sense’ would be given to Turkey, clearly showing that it considered Cyprus to be part of Greece. The newspaper’s wide coverage of the anniversary of ‘OXI’ (NO) also further supports this claim. Besides articles and a special anniversary section, the next day’s cover story once again reported on the ‘OXI’ (NO) celebrations.

Politis, Alithia and Phileleftheros also referred to the Hellenic identity of the Greek Cypriots, but they did not constantly emphasize this issue. For the 28 October 2002 edition, Politis ran a picture with the caption, ‘then (1940) Hellenism measured its existence with its blood […] then, we could still look ourselves in the mirror.’ The use of the first-person plural reveals that this newspaper considered not only the Greeks but also the Greek Cypriots to have been an integral part of Hellenism. Similarly, an editorial in Phileleftheros regarding the Annan Plan stated that ‘if we, as a Hellenism in its whole, have the necessary unity and will, then we can choose more decisively how to act.’ Alithia, in its 28 October 2002 editorial, also referred to ‘Cypriot Hellenism’.

Haravgi was the only daily that regularly referred to both the Greek Cypriots and the Turkish Cypriots as ‘Cypriot people’. Its signed editorial on 28 October, for example, pointed out that the solution to the country’s political problem should be in the best interest of the ‘Cypriot people’, the ‘G/Cs and the T/Cs’.

All the dailies, however, regardless of their identity views, promoted the idea of a close connection between the Republic of Cyprus and Greece. This can be clearly seen in the regular reports in the Greek Cypriot press on the stances of the Greek government and Greek politicians on political matters. For example, on 31 October, both Politis and Haravgi carried front-page coverage of the Greek Prime Minister’s statements on political developments in Cyprus. The views of Costas Simitis were also the cover stories in Machi and Alithia. On the previous day, Phileleftheros's main story (Το Θέμα) reported the views of the Greek Prime Minister, and Simerini’s cover story on 21 November recorded statements made by Greece’s Minister of Foreign Affairs regarding Cyprus’s accession to the EU.

The Annan Plan divides the Greek Cypriots into two camps

While the ‘others’ usually referred to the Turkish side, two newspapers taking a strong stance on the Annan Plan differentiated Greek Cypriots into ‘our side’—those who followed the paper’s identity views, and those who did not constantly emphasize this issue.
stance, and the ‘others’—those who did not. Simerini and Alithia, more so than other dailies, seem to have considered those who agreed with their own position on the proposed solution as ‘their side’ and those who opposed it as the ‘others’. These two papers viewed the ‘other’ as the enemy. Some politicians from the ‘other’ camp were attacked more regularly than others; the Attorney General of the Republic of Cyprus, Alecos Markides, was one. In its editorial on 10 December 2002, Simerini wrote that Markides ought to apologize to ‘Cypriot Hellenism’ because he ‘played a leading role’ in the ‘destruction’ of the country. Markides was criticised because of statements he made about the need to ‘take on and not to avoid the responsibility’ of a reply to the Plan. His observation that the negotiations had a deadline and that it should be known whether the Cyprus Problem would be solved before the Copenhagen Summit, was projected by Simerini as threatening the public to accept the Plan. The headline read, ‘Scent of blackmail and dilemmas, because of the submission of the solution Plan’. In contrast, Alithia, which did not oppose the proposed settlement and had positively portrayed the government, did not express any dissatisfaction with the Attorney General’s words. It simply quoted what Mr. Markides said.

Additionally, some of its editorials defended the people who were charged as traitors because they did not agree with the dismissal of the Plan while at the same time it ‘attacked’ the opponents of the UN proposal for peace. On 8 December it argued that the international interest regarding the Plan was polluted by ‘hysterical dismissive screams’.

The divisions in the Greek Cypriot community that were related to personal views and different stances towards the Annan Plan did not prevent the press from presenting the Greek Cypriot community as a homogeneous group of people with positive characteristics that were in contrast with those of the Turkish Cypriot leadership, the settlers, and Turkey. The only group of ‘others’ that was not negatively depicted were the Turkish Cypriots.

The ‘other side’ and the image of the Turkish Cypriots

The Turkish Cypriot community was not negatively portrayed by the Greek Cypriot dailies. Our data showed no cases where any paper viewed the Turkish Cypriots as the enemy, although Simerini and Machi hardly referred to them.

The Turkish Cypriots were often depicted as a community oppressed by Denktaş and his regime. Examples of this representation were found in Politis, Phileleftheros and Alithia, all three of which on 20 November published a news story about 25 Turkish Cypriot trade unionists and journalists who were charged simply because they expressed their views. Haravgi’s editorial on 22 November stated that the Turkish Cypriots were living under a regime of terrorism and occupation. This newspaper referred to a solution that would secure the ‘peaceful co-existence’ of both communities and
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74 The former President of the Republic of Cyprus, George Vassiliou, the Republic of Cyprus’s government spokesman Michalis Papapetrou and the leader of DISY Nicos Anastasiades have also been criticized because they had not objected to the Plan. See for example: Simerini, ‘Το μοιραίο λάθος του Προέδρου [President’s fatal mistake]’, Simerini, 9.12.2002:1; Simerini, ‘Κατάντημα… [Wretchedness…]’, Simerini, 29.10.2002:5.


76 Yiannos Charalambides, ‘Άρωμα εκβιασμών και διλημμάτων: Από την υποβολή σχεδίου λύσης [Scent of blackmail and threats because of the submission of the solution Plan]’, Simerini, 29.10.2002:2.

77 No author, ‘Μαρκίδης: Ασήκωτο το ναι ή το όχι [Markides: (either of the answers) yes or no is unbearable]’, Alithia, 29.10.2002:3.


81 This will be further analyzed in the section that describes how Denktaş and his regime have been depicted.

82 Goyo Alexandriou, ‘Σε δίκη Τ/Κ συνδικαλιστές: Υποστήριξη από φορείς και οργανώσεις [In trial T/C trade unionists: They are supported by (various) bodies and organizations]’, Politis, 20.11.2002:29. See the same article in Phileleftheros on top of page 4 and in Alithia on page 3; On the next day Haravgi also reported this development in its editorial on page 3.


projected the notion that the Turkish Cypriots were the Greek Cypriots’ compatriots since it called them ‘Cypriot people’.86

Gloomy portrait of the Turkish Cypriot leadership

The image of Rauf Denktas and his regime was ‘built’ by the press in a completely different way than the portrayal of the Turkish Cypriots. All the Greek Cypriot dailies pictured him in dark colors and named him the ‘occupation leader’.87 The newspapers represented him as a person who placed obstacles in the path to a solution and he was most commonly portrayed as an adamant and dismissive politician.

The following examples show that most Greek Cypriot dailies stressed that the Turkish Cypriot leader had fixed claims. On 7 December, Phileleftheros wrote, ‘Rauf Denktas keeps repeating himself’,88 and on the same day Politis reported, ‘Denktas comes back intransigent: He is not committed to dialogue after Copenhagen’.89 In its cover story, Simerini argued that he ‘repeated his known blackmail’, pointing out that ‘it is impossible for the T/C side to continue with the talks if the G/C administration enters the European Union’.90 Similarly Haravgi’s title for this issue was, ‘Denktas: No91 talks if Cyprus is admitted (into the European Union)’.92 In Alithia’s editorial it was stated that ‘the document given by Denktas as a response to the Annan Plan, basically repeats his intransigent positions’.93

Additionally, on 22 November Machi and Simerini published articles showing that the Turkish Cypriot leader was a dismissive person. A front-page headline in Machi was, ‘Rauf Denktas rejects the Plan: he does not want the return of the refugees’.94 On the same day Simerini ran the headline, ‘Denktas will not sign’.95

The settlers

The people brought by Turkey from Anatolia to the northern part of Cyprus, commonly called the ‘settlers’, were also depicted in dark colors. The Greek Cypriots believed and feared that their influx in big numbers would alter the demographic composition of the island. The newspapers projected this notion. The papers all gave extensive coverage to a report on the settlers written by Jaako Laakso for the Council of Europe’s Parliamentary Assembly. The report was the cover story in Phileleftheros and Simerini and was also mentioned in the cover story of Politis.96

Simerini published this news story using the following pessimistic title: ‘Demographic nightmare from the invasion of tens of thousands of settlers’.97 On Machi’s fifth page, the report was described as ‘dramatic’98 while its front-page headline declared, ‘The Turkish Cypriots have become a minority’.99 Phileleftheros highlighted the alarming numbers: ‘The number of (the settlers) is 115 thousand while the Turkish Cypriots are 87 thousand.100 as did Alithia’s article that

87 See example: No author, ‘Μάλλον «ναι» η απάντηση Ντενκτας [Denktas’s answer will probably be “yes”], Machi, 20.11.2002:20.
89 Michalis Ignatiou, ‘Επιστρέφει αδιάλλακτος ο Ντενκτας: Δεν δεσμεύεται για διάλογο μετά την Κοπεγχάγη [Denktas comes back intransigent: He does not commit to dialogue after Copenhagen], Politis, 7.12.2002:3.
90 Yiannos Charalambides, ‘Φίλμμερ χωρίς ανάσα: Θέλουν αποτέλεσμα σε τέσσερις ημέρες [Breathtaking thriller: They want a result in four days], Simerini, 7.12.2002:1.
91 The Turkish word ‘Yok’ was used instead of ‘No’.
92 No author, ‘Ντενκτας: «Γιοκ» συνομιλίες αν ενταχθεί η Κύπρος [No talks (‘Yok’) if Cyprus is admitted into the EU], Haravgi, 7.12.2002:1.
94 No author, ‘Απορρίπτει το σχέδιο ο Ραούφ Ντενκτάς: Δεν θέλει επιστροφή των προσφύγων [Rauf Denktas rejects the Plan: He does not want the refugees to return], Machi, 22.11.2002:11.
95 No author, ‘Ο Ντενκτας δεν θα υπογράψει [Denktas will not sign], Simerini, 22.11.2002:1.
97 Yiannos Charalambides, ‘Δημογραφικός εφιάλτης: Από την εισβολή δεκάδων χιλιάδων εποίκων [Demographic nightmare from the invasion of tens of thousands of settlers], Simerini, 30.10.2002:1.
98 No author, ‘Οι Τουρκοκύπριοι έγιναν μειονότητα: Δραματική έκθεση του εισηγητή του Συμβουλίου Ευρώπης [The Turkish Cypriots have become a minority: Dramatic report of the Council of Europe Parliament Rapporteur], Politis, 30.10.2002:1.
100 Androula Taramounta, ‘Λύση αποζημιώσεων για τους εποίκους: Εναλλακτικές εισηγήσεις Λάακσο προς το Συμβούλιο της Ευρώπης [Solution based on compensation to the settlers: Alternative suggestions of Laakso to the Council of Europe], Phileleftheros, 30.10.2002:1.
suggested that the T/C community was in danger of becoming a minority.\textsuperscript{101} Haravgi, which included this topic on its front page, stressed this aspect as well.\textsuperscript{102} The reaction by Machi, Phileleftheros, Alithia, and Haravgi to the prospects of the settlers outnumbering the Turkish Cypriot community reveals that settlers were unwelcome.

The words used to describe the settlers prove that this matter was highly emotive. No solution was regarded as logical or acceptable if it did not secure the departure of the people who Phileleftheros dubbed as ‘interstitial elements’, who were ‘carried from Anatolia’ and who caused ‘a demographic rape’.\textsuperscript{103} Simerini also portrayed the settlers negatively—in one editorial they were characterized as ‘the third Atilla who ruthlessly assails Cyprus’, while their existence in the country was described as ‘an international crime which turned into gangrene’ and as a ‘demographic bomb’.\textsuperscript{104}

All six dailies agreed on this issue and similarly projected their opinion to the public.

The Turkish side, Turkey and the Turks

Most newspapers portrayed Turkey as the enemy of the Greek Cypriots. Our data show that Machi and Simerini expressed their hostility towards Turkey more clearly and intensely than the other papers. Alithia was the only newspaper that presented Turkey quite neutrally. Phileleftheros, Machi, Simerini and Politis used negative epithets to describe Turkey, stressing that she had invaded and occupied Cyprus. Phileleftheros named Turkey the ‘invader’,\textsuperscript{105} Machi referred to Turkey as ‘Attila’\textsuperscript{106} and ‘immolator’,\textsuperscript{107} and Simerini characterized her as ‘slaughterer’ and ‘Attila conqueror’.\textsuperscript{108} In Politis a picture for the anniversary of ‘OXI’ (NO) carried a caption where Turkey was once more named ‘conqueror’.\textsuperscript{109}

Turkey was often blamed for the deadlock in negotiations, portrayed as unwilling to negotiate and as having fixed positions or avaricious demands. All the newspapers pictured her as a country that placed obstacles in the path to peace. One cover story in Haravgi highlighted that, ‘the Turkish side remains negative and intransigent’,\textsuperscript{110} while an editorial in Machi stated that ‘the Turkish side…never gave the impression that it has been ready to make decisions, to submit proposals and to negotiate for finding a solution’.\textsuperscript{111} One headline in Simerini represented Turkey as inflexible, ‘Turkish ultimatums’,\textsuperscript{112} and another portrayed her as greedy, ‘Turks want everything as a new phase [of meetings] begins’\textsuperscript{113}

Turkey’s unwillingness to negotiate was stressed by Phileleftheros, Politis and Alithia. Phileleftheros headlined one cover story with, ‘The final bargain (will be conducted) in Copenhagen, Turkey deliberately defers the procedures until the end’.\textsuperscript{114} Alithia stated that ‘the other side procrastinates’ to express its opinion on the Annan Plan,\textsuperscript{115} while Politis believed this country would employ Fabian tactics for the solution of the Cyprus Problem.\textsuperscript{116}

Clearly Turkey was negatively portrayed in the press, which promoted the idea that Turkey’s policies hindered peace and reunification.

\textsuperscript{101} No author, ‘Απογραφή των Τ/Κ προτείνει ο Γιάκο Λάκσο: Η τ/κ κοινότητα κινδυνεύει να καταστεί μειονότητα στην περιοχή της [Jaako Laakso proposes a census of T/C: The T/C community is in danger of becoming a minority in its territory]’, Alithia, 30.10.2002:2.

\textsuperscript{102} Maria Fragkou, ‘Μειονότητα οι Τουρκοκύπριοι [The Turkish Cypriots are becoming a minority]’, Haravgi, 30.10.2002:1.

\textsuperscript{103} Phileleftheros, ‘Πρέπει να αναχθεί σε προτεραιότητα [It has to become a priority]’, Phileleftheros, 31.10.2002:3


\textsuperscript{105} Phileleftheros, ‘Μπροστά στην στυγνή αλήθεια [Faced with the cruel truth]’, Phileleftheros, 20.11.2002:3.

\textsuperscript{106} ‘Attila’ was the code name given by Turkey to its military operation in Cyprus in 1974.

\textsuperscript{107} Machi, ‘Να μη του επιτρέψουμε [Not to allow him]’, Machi, 20.11.2002:1.

\textsuperscript{108} Simerini, ‘Στην Ευρώπη χωρίς ασφάλεια [In Europe without security]’, Simerini, 21.11.2002:1.

\textsuperscript{110} Costakis Constantinou, ‘Όχι σε τελεσίγραφα [No to ultimatums]’, Haravgi, 29.10.2002:1.

\textsuperscript{111} Simerini, ‘Τώρα η σειρά τους [Now is their turn]’, Machi, 7.12.2002:1.

\textsuperscript{112} Y. Charalambides, ‘Τουρκικά τελεσίγραφα [Turkish ultimatums]’, Simerini, 20.11.2002:1.

\textsuperscript{113} No author, ‘ Νέα φάση με τους Τούρκους να θέλουν τα πάντα: Συνομιλίες σε Κύπρο- Ν. Υόρκη [Turks want everything as a new phase of meetings begins]’, Machi, 7.12.2002:1.

\textsuperscript{114} Alithia, ‘Η προειδοποίηση Παπανδρέου [The warning of Papandreou]’, Alithia, 22.11.2002:1.

\textsuperscript{115} No author, ‘Κυπριακό και “ημερομηνία” [Cyprus Problem and ‘the date’]’, Politis, 8.12.2002:23.
Confusion of the Turks or Turkey with the Turkish Cypriot leader
At times, the Turkish Cypriot leader and the Turks were represented as being one and the same. This representation, which is perhaps indicative of identity positions of some newspapers, was detected in four dailies, Phileleftheros, Alithia, Machi and Simerini. Phileleftheros ran one headline that read, ‘The Turks attempt to cause confusion’,117 the story though was about the positions of both Recep Tayyip Erdoğan and Denktaş. It seems that the Turkish Cypriot leader was identified simply as a Turk. On 10 December Alithia’s cover story referred to the talks between Alvaro de Soto, the special envoy of the UN Secretary-General on Cyprus and the Greek and Turkish Cypriots concerning changes to the revised Annan Plan. The story declared that besides Denktaş, de Soto had also discussed the UN Plan with other people from the ‘Turkish side’ as well,118 revealing that the Turkish Cypriot leader was viewed as an integral part of the Turkish side. Machi’s editorial argued that the ‘Turkish side’ never gave the impression that it was willing to negotiate, without clarifying whether it was Turkey or Denktaş who did not wish to discuss with ‘our side’.119 On the same day the changes to the Annan Plan requested by Denktaş were noted in Simerini’s cover story, but in the same piece it was reported that ‘the Turks won’t return Morfou and Karpasia’120 to the Greek Cypriots. It seems that the Turkish Cypriot leader was simply identified with the whole Turkish side.

How Greek Cypriots were depicted in relation to the ‘others’
The press always portrayed the Greek Cypriots positively. All the newspapers projected the notion that the Greek Cypriot side was the victim of the conflict or that it was wronged. They also supported that, contrary to the ‘others’, the Greek Cypriots strove for peace in order to find a solution to the political problem of the island. Sometimes the dailies projected the idea that they were too compliant to the demands of the ‘other side’. Indicative examples are given in the following lines.

The portrayal of the Greek Cypriots as victims was detected in Machi, Phileleftheros and Politis. In an editorial about the Annan Plan Machi stated that everyone ‘threatens and blackmails the victim while the immolators are being rewarded’.121 Similarly, Phileleftheros contended that the ‘occupation agent (Denktaş) and some people who back him in Ankara’ demanded everything; therefore, the international community should not exercise pressure on the ‘victims of the depredations’ in order to consent to some of the Plan’s provisions.122 Politis wrote that ominous messages were sent by the ‘other side’ regarding the Plan, explaining this allegation by noting that the ‘Turkish politicians’ claimed that they would fight for more guarantees for Turkish Cypriots’ security, while ‘unquestionably’ it would be the Greek Cypriots who would not be ‘secure’ if the provisions of the Plan remained unchanged.123

Alithia, Machi, Simerini and Haravgi projected the notion that contrary to the ‘others’, the Greek Cypriots wished to negotiate in order to end the deadlock in the country. Simerini even described the Greek Cypriot side as being submissive and ready to say ‘yes’ to whatever was proposed by the ‘others’. It ironically commented that ‘we’ have a ‘record’ of ‘good deeds’ or ‘good will’.124 Alithia wrote that ‘our side has agreed to discuss the Annan Plan’ while ‘the other side procrastinates’.125 Machi argued that ‘our side… demonstrated excessive receptivity to proposals,
submissions, suggestions and “advice” many times (even) at the expense of the essence of the Cyprus problem’, while it declared that ‘the Turkish side…never gave the impression that it was ready to make decisions, to submit proposals and to negotiate to find a solution’.126 Finally, Haravgi represented Denktaş and Ankara as intransigent, in contrast to Greek Cypriots, named ‘our side’ who, ‘proved, despite the odds, to have good will and a readiness to negotiate’.127

The ‘occupied areas’

All the newspapers used similar semantics when they reported on the areas in the north, proclaiming that the ‘others’ had no legitimate power over what was nothing more than a ‘pseudo-state’. Some indicative examples are presented in the following lines.

Haravgi named the territory in the north that covers 37% of the country, ‘the occupied areas’,128 while Politis used the compound word ‘pseudo-state’, meaning non-genuine or false entity.129 The prefix ‘pseudo’ was also attached to other words, indicating that the Republic of Cyprus denounced the legitimacy of the regime in the north. In an article in Machi the word ‘pseudo-Prime-Minister’ was noted,130 and on the next day Phileleftheros ran a story about the editor of a Turkish Cypriot newspaper, headlined, ‘Levent is being dragged into a “court-martial”’ 131 the inverted commas implying that the military court in the north had no real authority. This was also emphasized with the expression ‘so-called’, used in Simerini to characterize Ergun Olgun, the ‘so-called Undersecretary’ to Denktas.132

Not only did Machi employ the above-mentioned semantic tactics, but it also repeatedly emphasized in various ways that the Greek Cypriots were the rightful owners of the areas in the north; for example, in an editorial where it was stated that ‘the survival of Cypriot Hellenism in the land of its ancestors’ should be a matter of high priority.133

We also noted a tendency in some papers to depict the north of Cyprus as a source of troubles for the Republic of Cyprus. Machi ran a front-page news story with the headline, ‘Breakout: Attila is sending us echinococcus’, telling readers that the breakout of echinococcus was caused by animals that were brought ‘from the occupied to the free areas’.134 On the previous day, the same daily contended that ‘thousands of Turks gravitate daily to the free areas for work. Certainly the majority are settlers’.135 In the same period Phileleftheros printed the headline, ‘Illegal immigrants (come to the Republic of Cyprus) through the occupied areas’, and reported that illegal immigrants were coming from Turkey to the ‘occupied areas’ before moving to the ‘free areas’.136

The Press of the ‘other side’

The Greek Cypriot newspapers regularly republished news items from the Turkish Cypriot and the Turkish press. Phileleftheros even had a section where it reported issues that had been covered by the dailies of the ‘other side’.137 Haravgi also dedicated a page in its Sunday edition to news about the Turkish Cypriots, in which it published articles taken from the Turkish Cypriot press.138 Additionally, Politis announced on one of its cover pages that it would translate daily whatever the
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126 Machi, Τώρα η σειρά τους [Now it is their turn], 7.12.2002:1.
129 See for example: Gogo Alexandrinou, ‘Σε δίκη Τ/Κ συνδικαλιστές: Υποστήριξη από φορείς και οργανώσεις [In trial T/C trade unionists: They are supported by public bodies and organizations]’, Politis, 20.11.2002:29.
132 Machi, ‘Κύρια προτεραιότητα η επιβίωση μας [Our first priority is our survival]’, Machi, 30.10.2002:1.
134 Machi, Μαχητικά: Η απασχόληση των Τούρκων [In a fighting spirit: Turks’ employment]’, Machi, 30.10.2002:4.
135 Christakis Yiannakos, ‘Λυμαρομαντίες μέσω κατεχομένων [Illegal immigrants through the occupied areas]’, Phileleftheros, 30.10.2002:28.
Turkish Cypriot press reported regarding the Annan Plan.\(^\text{139}\) Examination of the news stories that the Greek Cypriot dailies selected, and the ways in which they were modified, indicates a systematic negative representation of persons and groups on the ‘other side’.

Machi published an article relating the former Prime Minister of Turkey Bulent Ecevit’s views on the Annan Plan, as expressed in statements previously reported in the Turkish press. However, Machi stressed that Ecevit advised his successor not to assign Karpasia to the Greek Cypriots, further noting that he considered proposals for the return of the Greek Cypriot refugees as ‘unacceptable’.\(^\text{140}\) The same statements were also published by Phileleftheros\(^\text{141}\) and Haravgi.\(^\text{142}\) Negative representations were not limited to the Turks, but also included the Turkish Cypriot leadership or the supporters of Denktas. On its front page Simerini published a news story taken from a Turkish Cypriot daily in which it was emphasized that Denktas would not sign the Annan Plan before the Copenhagen Summit.\(^\text{143}\) This article portrayed the Turkish Cypriot leader as non-compliant. Politis published statements made by Denktas about the UN Plan, unflatteringly portraying the Turkish Cypriot leader, ‘Denktas shouts again: He asks for sovereignty and rejects the maps’.\(^\text{144}\) The supporters of the Turkish Cypriot leader were also negatively represented, ‘Denktas’s welcome was a rave of intransigence: How the TC press covered the return of the TC leader’.\(^\text{145}\)

We also noted a tendency among the Greek Cypriot dailies to change the semantics of the original Turkish/Turkish Cypriot texts, practicing an intertwinement of views and facts. For example, Alithia used inverted commas when it reported what had been written in the Turkish Cypriot newspaper Volkan, yet also enclosed in quotes the title ‘Prime Minister’ when referring to Dervis Eroglu.\(^\text{146}\) The Turkish Cypriot newspaper certainly would not have enclosed the term Prime Minister in quotes. It appears that the quotation was changed in order to ‘fit’ the Greek Cypriot stance that the ‘others’ had no legal or recognized authority over the northern part of the country.

**Conclusion**

The Annan Plan for a settlement in Cyprus was the prevailing newspaper discourse during the eleven days that were examined for this section of our research. Examination of this subject along with supplementary news stories illuminated certain practices employed by the Greek Cypriot newspapers to support their political and ideological stances regarding the solution, the government, the parties, the EU and the ‘other side’.

Our data analysis revealed that the dailies that had no particular party or ideological affiliation did not simply rely on statements from press conferences or press releases; to attract a readership, they instead struggled for exclusiveness. In contrast, the newspapers with party or ideological affiliations or those with low circulation and therefore limited resources, regularly published articles based on press conferences or externally produced texts, often changing this information to serve their interests and views.

Our research revealed other practices employed by the six Greek Cypriot newspapers studied here, to promote or favour specific political or ideological beliefs.

The dailies’ stances on the Annan Plan revealed their positions on the more general issue of a solution to the Cyprus Problem. Simerini and Machi viewed the Annan Plan as catastrophic and...
further argued that it was a matter of national interest to reject it, warning that the Greek Cypriots would face extinction were the Plan to take effect. Phileleftheros did not explicitly reveal its stance on this subject, but we noted that before the Plan was officially submitted, the newspaper had stressed aspects that could be perceived by the Greek Cypriots as negative. Politis argued that to accept the Annan Plan as presented was not possible, but it did not use overly dramatic language to describe the Plan or its possible outcomes. Haravgi argued that the Plan had to be modified and insisted on a settlement that would secure the rights of the Cypriot people, both Greek and Turkish Cypriots. Alithia seems to have been the only newspaper that considered the UN Plan as a compromising but necessary solution to end the deadlock in the country.

To support their positions, Machi, Simerini and Alithia employed two practices: they gave greater coverage to stories that backed their opinion, and they reported or even highlighted the statements of important people, persons of authority, experts or groups who agreed with their stance.

Three dailies, Haravgi, Machi and Alithia appeared to favour certain politicians, political parties or the government. Haravgi offered almost exclusive coverage to AKEL and its leader, as well as to their 2003 presidential candidate Tassos Papadopoulos. Alithia and Machi over-represented the government of Glafcos Clerides, the ruling party and their members. These newspapers also represented negatively or positively specific people, parties or the government. Haravgi often sharply criticized DISY, its leader and the government, while it sometimes compared DISY with AKEL to emphasize the disadvantages of the former party and the advantages of the latter. Machi and Alithia flatteringly portrayed the government and the President of the Republic, and Alithia used its editorials to negatively portray AKEL, its leader and the party’s presidential candidate.

Our examination of the Greek Cypriot press in relation to the EU revealed that the EU and its officials were regarded either as allies or as enemies according to their position on the Annan Plan. Simerini, Machi and Haravgi warned of the danger in connecting reunification efforts with Cyprus’s accession to the EU. Sometimes these three dailies negatively portrayed the EU and pictured it as an international organization that exercised pressure on the Republic of Cyprus to consent to the Annan Plan. Politis tried to separate the UN Plan from Cyprus’s admission into the EU, but several days before the Copenhagen Summit when negotiations for the island’s accession were completed, it slightly changed its stance. Phileleftheros and Alithia pictured the developments positively, and consequently we noted no sense of the EU being portrayed as an enemy.

Data analysis also revealed the way the press viewed and depicted ‘our side’ and the way it perceived and represented the ‘other side’, as well as whom they viewed as our side and the other side. ‘Our side’ was divided according to the dailies’ notions on identity and their beliefs in relation to the UN Plan. The groups of the ‘other side’ were the Turkish Cypriot community, its leadership, the settlers and the Turks or Turkey.

Greek Cypriots and the Greeks were ‘our side’. Some newspapers, especially Machi and Simerini, stressed the bonds with Greece and promoted the idea that Greek Cypriots were an integral part of Hellenism. Politis, Alithia and Phileleftheros also referred to the Hellenic identity of the Greek Cypriots, but they did not emphasize this. Haravgi was the only daily to look at and refer to both Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots as ‘the Cypriot people’. Yet our research revealed that all the newspapers, regardless of their identity views, projected the notion of a connection between the Republic of Cyprus and Greece through their coverage of the Greek government and Greek politicians on important political matters.

This study also showed that two dailies, Simerini and Alithia, separated Greek Cypriots according to their stance on the UN Plan. Those who disagreed with them were considered as the ‘others’ and were severely criticized.

This research revealed no cases where any of the dailies viewed Turkish Cypriots as the enemy. Politis, Phileleftheros, Alithia and Haravgi portrayed this community as oppressed by Denktas and his regime. Moreover, Haravgi stressed that the Turkish Cypriots longed for peace and were the Greek Cypriots’ compatriots. Their leader, however, was pictured in a completely different way, with all naming Rauf Denktas, ‘occupation leader’. They represented him as a person who obstructed the solution and was an intransigent and dismissive politician. The settlers
were also depicted negatively. The dailies proclaimed to the public that the people brought by Turkey from Anatolia were distorting the population balance on the island.

Most newspapers represented Turkey as the enemy of the Republic of Cyprus. Machi and Simerini expressed this in the most negative terms, while Alithia represented Turkey more neutrally. Phileleftheros, Machi, Simerini and Politis used negative epithets to describe this country, stressing that it had invaded and occupied Cyprus, and all the dailies blamed Turkey for the stalemate on the island. They portrayed Turkey as unwilling to negotiate and as having fixed positions or avaricious demands. Sometimes Phileleftheros, Alithia, Machi and Simerini did not clarify whether they referred to Turkey or the Turkish Cypriot leader. It seems that occasionally Turkey and Rauf Denktas were represented as being one and the same.

Our analysis revealed that the Greek Cypriots were always portrayed positively in the press. They were seen as the victim of the conflict or that they were wronged. All the dailies depicted them as the people who— contrary to the ‘others’ —struggled to find a solution to the political problem of the island. Therefore, the Greek Cypriots were represented as the ‘goodies’ while the Turks or Denktas were the ‘baddies’.

The northern part of Cyprus was pictured as a place lacking legitimacy. All the newspapers employed semantics to proclaim that the ‘others’ had no legal power over the territory in the north. Moreover Machi and Phileleftheros depicted the northern area of the island as a source of troubles for the Republic of Cyprus.

Finally, our analysis revealed that when news stories or statements made by politicians of the ‘other side’ were republished from the Turkish Cypriot and the Turkish press they sometimes were used in a way that substantiated or perhaps justified negative representations of the ‘others’. Often, the Greek Cypriot press would change the semantics of the texts taken from the Turkish Cypriot/Turkish dailies, altering the original articles to adapt them to their own stances and perceptions.
THE TURKISH CYPRIOt PRESS IN 2002
Sanem Şahin

Introduction
At the time the UN presented the first version of their Plan (Annan Plan), the nationalist forces of the National Unity Party (Ulusal Birlik Partisi -UBP) and the Democratic Party (Demokrat Parti - DP) were in power in north Cyprus, while the head of the state was Rauf Denktaş who symbolised the nationalist policies and ideology. The dividing line acted as a barrier, not just to crossing but also to communication between the two communities. People on both sides received news about the ‘other’ through the media, which mainly relied on information provided by official sources.

The Data
The data for this analysis consists of the news texts and editorials of seven daily newspapers, namely, Kıbrıs, Halkın Sesi, Yenidüzen, Vatan, Kıbrıslı, Ortam, Volkan, Birlik and Afrika. The periods that will be examined in this part are 28 to 31 October 2002, 20 to 22 November 2002 and 7 to 10 December 2002.

An overall examination of the newspapers showed that the Cyprus issue and the Annan Plan dominated the agenda of the press. Every day, many news texts about the topic appeared in the print media. Even in October 2002, before the Plan was publicly revealed, the newspapers included articles that envisaged such a proposal being presented to both communities.

Analysis of Journalistic Practices
The majority of reporting during the period chosen consisted of public statements, press releases, press conferences and interviews given to the newspapers by the state authorities, political parties and civil organisations. News stories about the Cyprus Problem and the Annan Plan occupied the front pages of the newspapers, pushing other topics to the background.

The newspapers were full of many identical news articles, as they all heavily relied on and benefited from externally produced texts such as news agency dispatches and press releases as their sources. The news articles based on such texts received by newsrooms made up the majority of the news content of the papers. There were hardly any original or exclusive stories in the newspapers, which could be explained by a lack of resources, motivation or effort. The similarity of the news texts indicated that the newspapers mostly copied and published them without much editing. The frequency also suggested that this was a common practice of the Turkish Cypriot press, which again could be explained as a result of shortage of reporters, time or other resources required for news production. Whatever its cause, reproduction of these texts as the news reduced journalists’ role to merely processing the information provided for them by the source rather than them originating the news texts. In a way, the story construction was determined by the sources rather than the journalists, which highlights the dominance of the sources in the production process over any news output prepared by journalistic efforts.

Sometimes the similarities in the texts were not limited to the main body of the article but included even the article headlines. Headlines, which can be generally described as summaries of the news texts,1 in the case of the Turkish Cypriot press indicated the position of the newspaper on that topic. In fact, in some instances headlines offered the only clue to the institutional voice of the newspapers carrying their commentary on the issue. However, during the period analysed there were some examples where similarities in the headlines did not reflect a similarity in the
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different newspapers’ representation of the matter and/or their ideological framework, but their benefiting from the same sources. For example, when both Kıbrıs and Afrika used the headline ‘last 50 metres’, this did not mean a similarity in the representation and discourse of the two newspapers (as they reflected opposite spectrums of opinion) but that both newspapers employed the headline given by the source of the text.

In some cases the newspapers stated no source for the information they reported, while in others the news articles lacked certain crucial information. For example, when Volkan published a survey on the public’s views on the UN Plan, it gave details on how many people were questioned and how many surveyors were employed, but did not reveal for whom or for which organisation the survey was carried out. Reporting on the changes to the Annan Plan suggested by the Greek Cypriot leader Glafcos Clerides, Kıbrıslı failed to state its source of information or where and when Clerides had made the relevant public statement. Without this, the information mediated was unsubstantiated and did not go further than mere claims. In cases where the source of the information was not revealed, passive sentences were used to convey the main argument or event.

Another common practice of the Turkish Cypriot press observed during this period was embedding commentary into the news story. For example, reporting on some parts of the Annan Plan regarding as negative for Turkish Cypriots, Kıbrıslı commented in its summary blurb and at the end of its front-page article that ‘the Annan Plan should not be accepted before “mines underneath” are cleared’. Similarly, Afrika’s headline, ‘after December we will be talking to the EU’, reflected the paper’s interpretation of events rather than communicating a news article composed of facts.

In this headline ‘we’ did not refer to the newspaper itself but to the Turkish Cypriot side. Yenidüzen also published its opinion rather than the facts in the headline for the story on President Denktas’s return to the TRNC: ‘he has no intention of reaching an agreement’.

Publishing articles from the Greek Cypriot press was another common practice in the Turkish Cypriot print media. During the period studied the newspapers benefited from the Greek Cypriot media to report the views of the ‘other’ side on developments related to the Cyprus issue, especially the Annan Plan. The news articles from the Greek Cypriot press appeared in the newspapers either together on one page, under the title ‘News from the South’, or embedded into the main stories to reflect the events and reactions on both sides of the island. In some cases, the news stories that had been published in the Greek Cypriot press received significant coverage in the Turkish Cypriot press. For example, Yenidüzen took a news article that had appeared the previous day in Phileleftheros, a Greek Cypriot daily, and ran it as its main story. This practice showed the lack of competitiveness within the Turkish Cypriot media about being original or exclusive. Generally translated and circulated by the news agency of the state, Turkish News Agency-Cyprus (Türk Ajansı Kıbrıs – TAK also TAK not italics), the same story also appeared in Ortam in detail and on Afrika’s front page with only slight differences. Halkın Sesi and Birlik integrated it into the press summaries from the Greek Cypriot media.

The use of numbers, which generally suggests truthfulness and precision, was employed as a strategy to intensify or weaken the effect of the news. For example, conflicting figures were reported on the number of people who went to the airport to welcome the TRNC President, Rauf Denktas, as he returned to north Cyprus after having spent two months in the USA for health

3 No author, ‘İşte Kıbrıs Türk Halkı [Here is the Turkish Cypriot people]’, Volkan, 9.12. 2002:4.
5 No author, ‘Aralıktan sonra muhatabımız AB [After December we will be talking to the EU]’, Afrika, 28.10.2002:1.
reasons. *Halkın Sesi*, *Volkan* and *Kibrıslı* estimated the number of people to be in their ‘thousands’.12 Contradicting this, *Yenidüzen* gave the figure of the crowd at the airport as ‘900’ rather than ‘thousands’.13 Criticising a report on BRT, the state broadcasting channel, that ‘tens of thousands’ of people met the president, *Afrika* argued that the number was not more than ‘a thousand’.14 While newspapers that were critical of the President limited the number of his sympathisers to not more than a thousand to show a lack of support for him, the ones that backed him gave the number in ‘thousands’ to show it otherwise. These diverging quantities revealed how the numerical information that was supposed to emphasise the precision of the story was actually manipulated to support the conflicting views of the newspapers. Another example was the generalisation of the view of one group to represent a larger one. One such instance was in *Volkan*, which presented the opinion of one economist as ‘economists’, giving the impression that more than one economist backed these assertions.15

The dailies, apart from reporting events and statements regarding the Plan, also included the text of the Annan Plan, either in the main parts of the paper or as a supplement. This allowed readers to find out for themselves about the content of the Plan rather than read accounts of it in the press. Therefore it contributed to efforts to inform the public about the type of settlement that was envisaged in order to help them make an informed decision.

As the press based most of their content on externally produced texts or simply recorded the statements of political figures, sometimes they failed to provide a framework that would help readers understand the issue better. In some cases, there were conflicting reports that created confusion rather than understanding. For example, on 20 November, *Halkın Sesi*, *Yenidüzen* and *Volkan*16 published articles based on the Greek Cypriot press that claimed Greek Cypriots were rejecting the Annan Plan. On the same day, *Birlik*, *Vatan* and *Afrika*, again using articles from the Greek Cypriot press, reported that Greek Cypriots said ‘yes to Annan’.17 Anyone who read this range of newspapers would have been confused about which one to believe.

**Discourse and Representation**

There were differences in discourses and representation of events and issues among the newspapers included in the study. Moreover, their attitudes towards the Plan shifted within the timeframe chosen. In October, it was easy to notice an expectation of some kind of a development in the Cyprus issue in the shape of a settlement plan. The details were not known then. November was dominated by the news texts, which reflected the initial reaction to the Plan. The news articles in December were the reflections of more established reactions to the Plan within Turkish Cypriot society.

**The Cyprus Issue and the Turkish Cypriot Negotiator**

During the period examined, discussions about the Cyprus problem were linked to the Annan Plan. The underlying question was whether or not the Plan could be a basis for negotiations for a settlement in Cyprus. The Turkish Cypriot press was not only a reflection of different, and sometimes conflicting, opinions and interests but also a platform where debates on the issue were carried out. For example, the ill health of President Denktaş, who had been the negotiator of the Turkish Cypriot community for many years, was one of the main concerns related to the future of
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the Cyprus problem. The discussions about whether he would be capable of continuing as the negotiator were not only reported in the press but the debates surrounding it were actually carried out through the press. **Kibris** raised this question about the negotiator on its front page by highlighting a quote from the leader of the Communal Liberation Party (Toplumcu Kurtuluş Partisi - TKP), Hüseyin Angolemli, with whom the newspaper conducted an interview: ‘The negotiator will be a problem’.18 The issue was also the topic of a column written by the editor-in-chief of the newspaper, Başaran Düzgün: ‘Who will it (the negotiator) be’, which was an expression that referred not only to the identity of the representative of the Turkish Cypriot community but also its future leader.19 **Halkın Sesi**, on the other hand, underlined that the Greek Cypriot leader, Glafkos Clerides, had put forward ‘Denktash as a condition’, which meant that ‘he would not accept negotiating with any other Turkish Cypriot authority apart from Denktas’.20 Meanwhile, Akay Cemal, the editor of the newspaper (also covering the same issue in his editorial column) used the Greek Cypriot leader’s statement to support Denktas’s position as the negotiator. Referring to Clerides he wrote ‘in a way he implied that being a negotiator is not child’s play’.21 As Cemal argued, it was not only that it was ‘impossible for the Turkish Cypriot people to accept any negotiator other than Denktas’, but also that ‘Ankara would not approve changing the negotiator’, as Denktas’s duty was not only to protect the rights of Turkish Cypriots but also Turkey’s interests on the island.22

Yet, the same statement was met with suspicion by **Kıbrıslı**. In contrast to **Halkın Sesi**, its interpretation of Clerides’ statement focused on showing the Greek Cypriot side as having ‘lost control’ rather than reinforcing Denktas’s position as the negotiator. According to the newspaper, Clerides’ words signified a new ‘manoeuvre’ on the part of the Greek Cypriots: ‘Denktas staying out of the negotiation process because of ill health has also put Clerides out of the course… the centre of gravity of the peace process has moved to international arenas. Greek Cypriots who have lost control of the process have started political manoeuvres to put its centre of gravity back to a Nicosia axis’.23 It suggested that the sincerity of Clerides in wanting Denktas as the negotiator should be doubted.

**Volkan**, on the other hand, speculated about the underlying reasons for the debate regarding Denktas’s position as the negotiator. The newspaper argued that Karen Fogg, the EU Commission Representative to Turkey, gave some ‘collaborationists – pro-mandate’ groups the instruction to ‘wear Denktas out’. According to the paper, these groups and their press (Yenidüzen, Yeniçağ, Ortam and Afrika) had set out to spread the rumours that as Denktas could not act as the negotiator he should be replaced. But as Denktas’s health improved, the Greek Cypriot Administration, foreign powers and collaborationists could not satisfy their desire to do so.24 To support its claims, the newspaper also published extracts from the Greek Cypriot press, as well as from Yenidüzen and Afrika, that questioned Denktas’s health and his status as the negotiator.

**Ideological and Political determinants**

Even though all the newspapers reported the views of various groups within society, those ideologically close to the newspaper were given advantageous treatment. This was no different in the context of the Annan Plan. Some dailies regarded the Plan as being in the national interest of Turkish Cypriots while the others considered it as the opposite. Therefore, the representation of the Annan Plan changed depending on whether it was reported in the newspapers that favoured it or in the ones that opposed it. The latter papers not only highlighted the negative aspects of the
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22 Ibid, p. 2.
24 No author, ‘Hevesleri kursaklarında kaldı [They were unable to satisfy their desire]’, Volkan, 28.10.2002:1.
Plan but also gave more coverage to the views that were against it. For example, newspapers such as Halkın Sesi, Kıbrıslı, Vatan, Birlik and Volkan were sceptical of the Annan Plan and gave wide coverage to the President’s statements against it, excluding the voices of groups that had proclaimed their support for it. In contrast, the newspapers that were in favour of the Plan, such as Yenidüzen, Afrika and Ortam, portrayed it as a basis for the solution to the Cyprus Problem and were critical of President Denktaş’s attitude towards it. They stressed positive aspects of the Plan and included views that supported it. Denktaş’s public statements and opinions appeared less frequently in these newspapers and, when they did, they were treated with disapproval. For example, the President’s declaration that ‘the plan cannot be a basis for negotiations’ received front-page coverage in Halkın Sesi, Kıbrıslı, Kıbrıs, Vatan and Volkan and was treated within the same framework: ‘Denktaş: the plan cannot be a basis’.25 Denktaş called out to our people from New York: Assert your ownership of the land’ Ortam’s coverage of the issue included the comments of Communal Liberation Party (Toplumcu Kurtuluş Partisi - TKP), which accused Denktaş of gaining time with negative statements and called on him to make up his mind.27 On the same day, Yenidüzen published a different story, which revealed that in 1974 Denktaş had offered a map to the Greek Cypriot side that envisaged less territory to Turkish Cypriots than the one offered in the Annan Plan.28 In contrast to the newspapers that gave wide and positive coverage to Denktaş, Yenidüzen’s story aimed to discredit him.

Another example of the ideological and political determinants influencing news production was observable when the newspapers positioned the political figures they sympathised with, especially the leaders of the political parties they were affiliated with, in the centre of events and highlighted their statements and actions as newsworthy. For example, when the US Special Cyprus Coordinator, Thomas Weston, had a number of meetings with Turkish Cypriot diplomats and party leaders, Ortam carried a front-page report that said: ‘Weston had a meeting with Hüseyin Angolemli, the leader of the opposition party, TKP, and Mehmet Ali Talat, the leader of [Republican Turkish Party, Cumhuriyetçi Türk Partisi] CTP’,29 ignoring the meetings he had with other political figures. Even though the main text of the story inside the paper was the same as in other newspapers, on the front page only Angolemli’s words were reported. Similarly, Birlik highlighted Weston’s meeting with UBP leader, Derviş Erdoğan, without mentioning his get-together with other political party leaders.30

The language in the news texts also proved to be value- and ideology-laden, as it reflected a particular political or ideological orientation. For example, anything state representatives uttered was constructed as if it were the ‘truth’ and verbs such as ‘noted’, ‘stated’, ‘said’, ‘emphasised’ were used to mark it. Affirmative words adopted for official statements also contributed to their being perceived as the ‘authority’. On the other hand, the utterances of opposition groups or internal ‘others’, as well as the Greek Cypriot authorities, were given as ‘claims’, ‘suggestions’ or simply as expressing their opinions rather than pointing at facts. Such use of language not only discredited these groups’ statements but also enforced the power of ‘our’ arguments and cast them as the norm. In summary, while an authoritarian tone for official discourses in news texts was employed to increase the ‘factuality’ of what was being reported, the ‘other’s’ statements were presented as mere suggestions. One such example was in Kıbrıs. The paper reflected the Greek Cypriot government spokesperson’s utterance that ‘Ankara’s attitude is completely different than Denktaş’s’ as a ‘claim’.31 Yet, the day before, a similar story but concerning Greek Cypriots had

29 No author, ‘Çözüm Kaçınılmaz [Solution is Inevitable]’, Ortam, 29.10.2002:1.
a different language structure that implied factuality rather than being a mere insinuation: ‘Vassiliou and the Foreign Affairs Ministry are singing different tunes’. So when it was a statement by ‘us’ it was a fact but when the ‘other’ said a similar thing it was a claim that helped to discredit it. Also when the main opposition party’s women’s group issued a press release saying that the demonstration against the Plan would be unsuccessful, its message was conveyed as a ‘claim’ by Kıbrıs.32 It was not only Kıbrıs that employed this practice, but the press in general.

It is also noticeable that the selection and reproduction of events within the news articles were communicated from a particular political and ideological position and by the discourse supported by the newspapers. These positions were embedded within the choices of raw material that were available as well as in the discourses within the story. For example, a demonstration with the motto of ‘yes to peace, no to this plan’, organised to express opposition to the Annan Plan, was reported in various ways throughout the print media. The newspapers that represented the Plan as a basis for a solution in Cyprus reported the rally as being ‘against peace’, while others that opposed the Plan campaigned to encourage people to attend it. For Ortam, the demonstration was a ‘no to the plan’ demonstration.33 Yenidüzen described the protest rally as a ‘demonstration against peace’34 or as a ‘no to peace demonstration’. Having identified the Plan with a solution in Cyprus, the newspaper depicted the rally as being against a settlement in Cyprus rather than against the Plan. It also criticised the state for giving its support to the demonstration: ‘the state’s shame’.35 In contrast, Kıbrıslı described the protest march with a nationalistic discourse: ‘no to territory concession and migration rally’.36 Vatan gave it a historical aspect by defining it as a ‘historic rally’.37 For Birlik, the demonstration indicated that national struggle, bloodshed and years of suffering had not been wasted.38 It was Kıbrıs and Halkın Sesi that defined the event with its proper title, which was ‘yes to peace, no to this plan demonstration’.39

Another good example of how the newspapers reconstructed their stories in line with their political positions was the news reports of a speech that Prime Minister Derviş Eroğlu delivered during the celebrations of the foundation of the Republic of Turkey. According to the newspapers (all had the same news text which suggested that it was a news agency dispatch) Eroğlu said, ‘We are not against entry into the EU. We are against the EU entering Cyprus against our will’.40

The newspapers selectively quoted from the statement in their headlines. For example, Kıbrıs reported him as saying: ‘We are not against the EU’,41 Kıbrıslı as: ‘We are not against the entry into the EU’,42 and Halkın Sesi as: ‘We are against the EU entering amongst us against our will’.43 Yenidüzen's headline, which was: ‘we are against the EU entering into Cyprus’,44 gave the impression that the Prime Minister opposed the EU's involvement in Cyprus.

*Whose views were reflected?*

Whose views the newspapers reflected was another confusing issue. Many times headlines carried statements of political figures without attributing those statements to the speaker. One
such example was in *Vatan*. Duplicating Denktas’s words in its headline, *Vatan* wrote ‘*there is no sovereignty in the Plan either*’. The headline was taken from a speech the President had delivered, but not employing quotation marks or any other means of attribution made it unclear whose views the newspaper was reflecting, Denktas’s or the newspaper’s. In contrast to the idea that using quotations allows people to distance themselves from participating in the story and lets the facts speak for themselves, the practice reduced the distance between the views expressed by the speaker and the newspaper. In other words, it showed the newspaper’s agreement with Denktas’s statement.

The newspapers’ representation of the Annan Plan was dominated with views of not only Turkish Cypriot government representatives and politicians but also of representatives of the EU, the UN and other states such as Turkey, the USA and the UK. Thus, such reports were comprised mainly of who said what.

Views of civil society were given space in the newspapers but, as discussed above, their treatment depended on whether they were in harmony with the newspaper’s views. For example, *Vatan* published the reactions to the UN Plan of a number of civil society organisations on its first page under the headline, ‘*the debate on the plan is expanding*’. Yet the story covered the views only of the organisations that were against the Plan without mentioning those that supported it.

*Volkan* benefited from the same strategy as well. Some peoples’ opinions on the Plan, which agreed with those of the newspaper, were presented as the opinions of the entire public: ‘*Strong reaction from our people to the Annan Plan is continuing: we won’t give even an inch of our land*’. The phrase not only suggested representing public opinion on the matter but also portrayed it as being homogenous. In the overall coverage of the issue, the ideas of the opposition were included in *Volkan* not to provide a platform where diverse opinions were communicated to readers but as a subject of criticism.

**Nationalist Discourses**

Nationalist discourses dominated the news especially in the right wing newspapers that opposed the Plan. Whether the Plan was in the national interest of Turkish Cypriots was one of the main arguments in the press. The analysis reveals that contrasting versions of national interest were articulated in the print media to mobilize the readers in relation to the Annan Plan.

The newspapers were also involved in drawing boundaries between ‘us’ and ‘them’, which not only established a difference between ‘us’ and the ‘other’ but reinforced the perception of each of these groups as homogenous as well. Yet, there was no fixed categorisation of ‘us’ and ‘them’ groups. Depending on the definition of what was in the national interest of Turkish Cypriots, the inclusion and exclusion process of ‘we’ and the ‘other’ groups changed. While the ‘we’ group was portrayed to represent and defend the interest of the nation, the ‘other’ group was depicted as opposing it.

**National interest**

The concept of national interest played a crucial role in the representation of the Annan Plan. National interest can be simply described as what is believed to be in the interest of nation and how this interest is best served. Far from being a fixed notion, the conceptualisation of the interests of the nation changed depending on the newspaper. For example, the nationalist newspapers that saw the Plan as a threat to the existence of the TRNC state and the Turkish
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45 No author, ‘*Plan’da egemenlik de yok [There is no sovereignty in the Plan either]*’, *Vatan*, 22.11.2002:1. Birlik used the same headline but placed it in quotation marks to attribute the statement to Denktas, 22.11.2002:1.


47 No author, ‘*Plan tartışması giderek büyüyor [The debate on the plan is expanding]*’, *Vatan*, 21.11.2002:1.

48 No author, ‘*Annan Planına halkımızdan yoğun tepkiler devam ediyor “Bir karşılık topрак dahi vermeяз!” [Strong reaction from our people to the Annan Plan is continuing: we won’t give even an inch of our land]*’, *Volkan*, 9.12.2002:5.

Cypriot nation argued against it. Volkan illustrated the UN Plan as the equivalent of an economically destructive proposal in one of its front-page headlines: ‘the UN document=economic destruction’.50 For Vatan, accepting the Plan meant losing the fight for the ‘national cause’.51 Therefore, it depicted one of the protest rallies against the Plan as a national mobilization of Turkish Cypriots to express that ‘they did not want to be subservient to the Greek Cypriots, lose territory, become refugees, lose the security of Turkish military, but they wanted to protect their sovereignty and express their wish for a lasting, fair and honourable peace process’.52

These newspapers construed the Annan Plan not as a solution to the Cyprus Problem but, on the contrary, as a plan for the destruction of the Turkish Cypriot community. Reflecting the President’s assertions that the enemies of the nation were threatening the sovereignty of the country, these newspapers aimed to encourage their readers to a collective action by expressing their rejection of the Annan Plan. Arguing that accepting the Plan would threaten the sovereignty of Turkish Cypriots, Denktas was quoted, ‘we’re not going to pay the price demanded’.53 To prompt its readers to attend the protest rally against the Annan Plan, Vatan implied that the homeland was in danger: ‘Turkish Cypriots are guarding the peace and the homeland’.54 Volkan was one of the newspapers that kept stressing the dangers and threats Turkish Cypriots had to be aware of. According to the newspaper, ‘President Denktas gave a message of resistance to the pressures coming from outside’.55 Equating the solution in Cyprus as suggested in the Annan Plan to the collapse of the state, Volkan repeated Denktas’s words that ‘our state cannot be the price of a solution’.56 For the newspaper, the UN’s proposal was full of traps and dangers to the existence of Turkish Cypriots, and ‘Turkish Cypriots’ houses and lands would be taken away from them which would make them tenants and refugees again’ –but by whom was not revealed.57 Especially Halkın Sesi, Vatan, Bırlik and Volkan quoted Denktas on their front pages in detail, as when he said that ‘the Plan was full of traps’,58 ‘Turkish Cypriots should guard their territory’59 and that the Plan included no sovereignty for Turkish Cypriots.60 Also according to Kıbrıslı, if the Annan Plan were implemented the new state would become a ‘Greek Cypriot Republic again’ in 20 years time.61 In summary, they judged the Plan as being against the national interest of the Turkish Cypriots.

In contrast, the newspapers that favoured the Plan presented it as being in the interest of the nation. They kept characterising the Plan as an ‘opportunity’ for a solution in Cyprus and highlighting its positive aspects. For example, Yenidüzen reported that Turkish Cypriots would gain representation in the European Parliament if a settlement agreement were reached.62 It was especially the newspapers such as Afrika, Ortam and Yenidüzen that integrated the discourse of ‘peace’ and ‘solution’ into their news texts about the Annan Plan, which enhanced the association of the Plan with these concepts. Inclusion of the views that were in favour of the Plan more than

51 No author, ‘Dağ bazıını duman yükü yürüyelim arkadaşlar [The mountain top is smoky let’s walk friends]’, Vatan, 10.12.2002:1 (Author’s note: Lyrics of a youth song).
53 No author, ‘İstenen bedeli ödemeyecekiz [We are not going to pay the price demanded]’, Kıbrıs, 8.12.2002:1.
54 No author, ‘Kıbrıs Türkü Barışa ve vatannına sahip çıkyor [Turkish Cypriots are guarding the peace and the homeland]’, Vatan, 9.12.2002:1.
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the opposition also contributed to these newspapers’ attempts to show the positive side of the settlement proposal. When Ortam started to publish the text of the Annan Plan it explained on its front page that it was to provide objective information so that its readers could make an informed decision about their future. Yet in the same text the newspaper also described the Plan as an ‘opportunity’, which attributed a positive meaning to it. By highlighting the importance of reaching informed decisions but at the same time presenting the Plan as ‘an important opportunity’, Ortam did not act very objectively.

‘Us’ and the ‘Other’

The concept of national interest also determines the discursive construction of ‘us’ and ‘them’. The newspapers supporting different interests for Turkish Cypriots categorised different groups as ‘us’ and the ‘other’. The expression of ‘we’ for self-presentation frequently occurred in the news articles. In many contexts, the ‘we’ group comprised Turkish Cypriots and in some cases it referred to the group expressing an opinion or the newspaper itself. Most of the time ‘we’ meant not only that the paper was speaking to the public, but it was also speaking on behalf of it. By declaring that ‘we won’t be refugees again’, Volkan was speaking on behalf of and to the Turkish Cypriot community. It referred to the migration of Turkish Cypriots to safer areas following the inter-communal conflict in 1960’s. Similarly, speaking on behalf of Turkish Cypriots, Kıbrıslı wrote as its caption for a photo of Jacques Poos, the Rapporteur of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Human Rights, Common Security and Defence Policy of the European Parliament: ‘Poos stressed guaranteeing protection of our cultural heritage and identity. If these guarantees are similar to the ones given to the (American) Indians then we don’t want them. Recognition of our equality and sovereignty is enough for us to protect our cultural heritage and identity’. When Yenidüzen was saying that, ‘our place is ready in the European Parliament’, it also spoke to Turkish Cypriots. By speaking for and to the society, the media not only represent it but also depict what is to be represented. Employing phrases such as ‘our place’, ‘our president’ and ‘us’ was a strategy that emphasised unification among the members of the society to create a ‘national we’. Adopting such a ‘we’ discourse in the news texts also helped to reduce the distance and strengthen the relationship between the media and audience. It helped the media not only symbolize the society but also in some ways reconstruct it.

The concept of ‘we’ also implied consensus among Turkish Cypriots. Actually, the newspapers widely benefited from the ideology of consensus to show their perspective of the events as agreed by the general public and also to depict the society as a homogenous one without any dissidents. During the period studied the newspapers benefited from the language of consensus to portray the society as united around the ideas they had been promoting. For example, Afrika talked about ‘our people’s hope of a solution’, Vatan predicted that Turkish Cypriots would gather in the protest rally against the plan as ‘one voice’, and according to Volkan, ‘the Turkish Cypriot people embraced their leader’.

Another way of depicting Turkish Cypriots as united was to present the opinion of a few people as that of the public. This practice depicted the public as sharing the same views and interests with no dissenters. It also gave an impression of consensus, implying that everyone agreed with the statement, and enhanced the newspapers’ image as the voice of their readers. Halkın Sesi frequently used this strategy, reporting the views of some members of the public on the Plan but

---
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generalising them as everyone’s: ‘People are worried’.70 It headlined another article as ‘the public is apprehensive’— again based on the comments of few people. Claiming that citizens reacted against the maps suggested in the Plan, Halkın Sesi wrote that they found it wrong to give so much territory to the Greek Cypriots and therefore regarded the Plan as unacceptable.71 Volkan also presented a public opinion survey on the Annan Plan as ‘here is the real will of Turkish Cypriots’.72 Claiming that such a survey was conducted for the first time, which strengthened the validity and truthfulness of it, Volkan generalised the results of the survey to all Turkish Cypriots. The same strategy was also used to provide a positive representation of ‘us’. For example, Turkish Cypriots were portrayed as united behind their President or determined not to give any territory to Greek Cypriots by newspapers such as Halkın Sesi, Vatan, Volkan, Kıbrıslı, Kıbrıs.

The ‘other’

The concept of ‘other’ is crucial in the representation of ‘us’. As Hall describes it, it is only through the concept of the ‘other’ that ‘our’ identity is established, because whatever the ‘other’ is ‘we’ are not.73 In other words ‘our’ self-image is dependent on the image of the ‘other’, as it is determined as the opposite. The representation of the ‘other’ group in the press varied depending on the newspaper and the context of its construction. In some cases it was defined on the basis of nationality such as ‘Greek Cypriot’, and in others on political views and ideological positions in relation to the Cyprus Problem or more specifically the Annan Plan. We found that there were more negative depictions of the ‘other’ in the press compared to positive representations of ‘us’.

Greek Cypriots as the ‘other’

Greek Cypriots were cast as the ‘other’ or the ‘enemy’ especially by the nationalist papers that were opposed to the Annan Plan. According to these papers, the Plan meant the surrender of Turkish Cypriots to Greek Cypriots, whose ill-will towards the Turkish Cypriots remained unchanged. Announcing that a protest rally against the Plan would take place, Vatan described it as an action opposing a Plan that, ‘includes the threat of taking the Turkish Cypriot people further back than the 1960 Agreements, proposes to abandon a vital proportion of our territory to Greek Cypriots…’.74

The fear of Greek Cypriots joining ‘us’ was also discernible in Kıbrıslı, which warned its readers that if the Plan were implemented, in 20 years’ time the state would turn into a ‘Greek Cypriot Republic’, and therefore the Plan should not be accepted before certain articles in it were changed.75 According to Volkan, the maps suggested in the UN document infuriated Turkish Cypriots. In one of its features entitled: ‘No to living together with Greek Cypriots again’, which consisted of some people’s view on the issue, the newspaper explained that people believed that Greek Cypriots would attempt to fulfill their dream of enosis at the first opportunity.76

Some newspapers strengthened the perception of Greek Cypriots as the ‘enemy’, especially through reporting on the Turkish Cypriot leader Denktaş’s such statements. By printing Denktaş’s public pronouncements in which he constantly referred to the Plan as ‘full of traps’ and ‘cannot be a basis for a solution’ as well as employing some of his expressions such as ‘they do not want a shared state’,77 ‘return of Greek Cypriots to the north is very dangerous’,78 ‘Turkish Cypriots’
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sovereignty is not included in the plan;79 the newspapers enhanced the notion that Greek Cypriots were still a threat to Turkish Cypriots. Despite the frequent appearance of Denktaş’s anti-Plan statements in the print media, the blame of destroying peace hopes was shifted on to the Greek Cypriot President by Kıbrıslı, when he made some suggestions regarding changes to the Plan: ‘Clerides blew up hopes of peace’.80

The ‘other’ in the image of Greek Cypriots was cast as homogenous and was demonised. It was only Yenidüzen, Afrika and Ortam that highlighted a divergence within them; there were some who backed the Plan and some who didn’t. Reporting the results of a survey that appeared in the Greek Cypriot press, Yenidüzen differentiated those who rejected the Plan from the general population, calling them ‘Greek Cypriot rejectionists’ and so established them as a separate group rather than generalising the tendency to the whole population.81 Ortam also collectivised the Greek Cypriots who joined the protest rally against the Plan as ‘fanatics’ rather than suggesting that the whole community opposed it.82 It called Turkish Cypriots who organised and would attend the anti-Plan demonstration in the north ‘fanatics’ as well. For Afrika it did not matter either whether it was Greek Cypriots or Turkish Cypriots who opposed the Plan, as it collectively named them ‘pro-no’ groups (hayırcılar), which also implied that it did not view Greek Cypriots as the ‘homogenised’ other but all those opposed to the Plan.83

The ‘other’ state was not defined as a ‘republic’ in the news but only as an ‘administration’. Adopting the official discourse, none of the newspapers called that state by its official and internationally recognised name, ‘the Republic of Cyprus’, but simply as ‘the Greek Cypriot Administration’. In contrast ‘our’ state was referred to as a republic, and its name, ‘Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus’ (TRNC), was employed frequently. Inevitably, while the head of ‘our’ state was the ‘President’, the ‘other’s’ was the ‘leader of the administration’. The examples of this discourse were visible in all the newspapers. For example, Kıbrıs reported that ‘the UN is studying the answers of the TRNC President Denktaş and the Greek Cypriot leader Clerides’.84 In Ortam Glafkos Clerides was also identified as ‘the leader of the Greek Cypriot Administration’,85 while in another story Denktaş was described as the ‘TRNC President’.86 The same title was adopted by Afrika and Yenidüzen. It can be argued that these newspapers employed the ‘leader- president’ distinction because it was in the discourses of the texts of the news agency dispatches or the press releases used for the newspaper articles. However, it shows that the papers did not see any problem in using it as they were not edited any differently.

Internal ‘others’: Denktaş and traitors

The concept of the ‘other’ was not limited to Greek Cypriots. Depending on the papers’ support or opposition to the UN Plan, different groups were cast as the ‘other’. For the newspapers that backed the Plan, President Denktaş was in the ‘other’ group. These dailies called him ‘father of no solution [çözümsüz baba]’,87 suggested that he ‘reassured those who say no to the Annan plan’,88 criticised him for ‘giving negative statements to gain time’89 and accused him of ‘provoking the
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“no to the plan” campaign. When territory division in the Plan was on the agenda, Yenidüzen printed a map on its front page that had been accepted by Denktash in 1974. Titled as ‘Denktash’s map’, the story aimed to discredit his arguments on losing territory with the implementation of the Annan Plan, because according to this map, Denktash had agreed to give the Greek Cypriot side some areas that are in the Turkish Cypriot administration now. Yenidüzen’s disapproval of Denktash’s dealing with the Plan was such that it even compared his rejection of the Plan to a murder committed in Lefkoşa: ‘Mr Denktash is opposing the UN plan on the basis of our life safety but murderers are prowling around’.

The news coverage of Denktash’s return to north Cyprus from the USA illuminates the different newspapers’ attitudes towards him. For example, Vatan, Halkın Sesi, Volkan, Kıbrıslı and Kıbrıs reported on their front pages that excited crowds welcomed him at the airport. According to these newspapers, ‘the Turkish Cypriot people embraced their leader’, ‘thousands of people welcomed him with exuberance’, ‘there was a warm welcome for Denktash’, ‘an exuberant crowd of thousands of people greeted him’, and ‘Denktash was welcomed with exuberance’. In contrast, Yenidüzen’s and Afrika’s front-page reports on the President’s return to the country were full of criticism instead of being welcoming. Yenidüzen’s headline was ‘the father of no solution has arrived’. The story continued inside the paper with the headline, ‘Denktash has returned to the island; there is no positive message about a solution and the EU; he has no intention of reaching an agreement’. Meanwhile, Afrika’s front page was ‘Denktash, who has returned home, relieved those who say no to the plan’.

The newspapers that backed the President used the same strategy to portray opposition groups as the ‘other’. To justify Denktash’s rejection of the changes suggested by the Greek Cypriot leader in the Annan Plan, Kıbrıslı employed CTP leader Mehmet Ali Talat’s image as a political figure who favoured a solution with Greek Cypriots. It wrote ‘Not only Denktash but even Talat cannot accept Clerides’ offer of minority status to Turks’. Portraying Talat as the opposition to Denktash, Kıbrıslı suggested that Clerides’ offer was so extreme that even those in opposition to a nationalist leader could not accept it, which enhanced the notion that the President was right in his reaction. For Volkan the ‘other’ among ‘us’ was equivalent to a traitor. Anyone who suggested choosing another negotiator to represent Turkish Cypriots because of Denktash’s ill health was called a ‘collaborationist – pro-mandate’. Furthermore, the newspaper named well-known journalists, newspapers and politicians as some of these traitors. According to Volkan, journalists such as Hasan Hastürer and Hasan Kahvecioğlu and the newspapers Yenidüzen, Yeniçağ, Ortam and Afrika as well as CTP leader Mehmet Ali Talat and TKP leader Hüseyin Angolemli were those who had started a campaign to choose a new negotiator to replace Denktash.

Ortam labelled the groups on both sides and of both nationalities that protested against the Plan as ‘fanatics’. The headlines of two separate stories were positioned one below the other so that both could be read together; ‘yesterday Greek Cypriot fanatics demonstrated against the plan’ and ‘today Turkish Cypriot fanatics are demonstrating against the solution and the UN
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Plan’,103 Yenidüzen used similar expressions: ‘yesterday they shouted in the south of Cyprus and today in the north: No to Peace’.104 It described the protest rally as a joint organisation of ‘the state and military’ and reported that civil servant officers and students were forced to attend the event.105 Similarly, Afrika announced that the ‘no demonstration’ was supported by the state. As well as categorising those backing the rally as ‘the no-group’, Afrika also branded them as ‘reactionary’.106

History and collective memory

Even though many of the news texts about the Annan Plan were oriented towards the future, history and collective memory were also used in the construction of these texts, especially by the nationalist newspapers. History and collective memory not only created continuity between the past and present but also encouraged the interpretation of present events within the framework of the past. For example, reminding the ‘we’ group of ‘our’ suffering in the past, history was reproduced through the negative acts of the ‘other’. This strategy was especially employed by two newspapers, Volkan and Vatan. By publishing two old photos that showed families living in tents and caves, Volkan aimed to evoke the hardship Turkish Cypriots had to endure when they left their homes following the inter-communal conflict.107 Vatan also urged its readers to attend the protest rally by reconstructing the past through the suffering of ‘us’ and the demonisation of the ‘other’: ‘not to return pre -1974 and not to take any Greek Cypriot amongst us…’.108 It also argued that the Plan ‘included the threat of taking the Turkish Cypriot people to the situation before 1960 Agreements’.109 Such portrayals of the ‘other’ also contributed to a boundary drawing process. By using the collective memory, these newspapers reflected arguments that aimed to strengthen bonds among Turkish Cypriots as well as portray the ‘other’ with ‘unchanging evil intentions’.

The EU

Representation of the EU in relation to the Cyprus issue was closely linked to the debates on the Annan Plan and Turkey’s membership negotiations with the organisation. Its portrayal in the news varied not only depending on the newspaper but also on context and time. The news that the EU would get involved in the Cyprus issue along with the UN received mixed treatment in the Turkish Cypriot press. For instance, a caricature that appeared in Kıbrıs gave an indication that the EU’s intervention in the Cyprus problem was not so welcome, as it illustrated the EU as a man not only stirring a pot labelled the ‘Cyprus Problem’ but also using bellows to fan the fire.110 Kıbrıslı, on the other hand, announced that the proposal the UN would put forward was also backed by the EU: ‘The EU support to the UN plan’.111 Yenidüzen’s headline for the story on the US Special Cyprus Coordinator Thomas Weston’s meeting with CTP and TKP leaders was, ‘the Cyprus problem is “the EU problem”’.112 However, the phrase ‘the EU problem’ was in inverted comas and there was an exclamation mark at the end without any indication of why.

The newspapers that supported the Plan saw the EU as an ally, while those who opposed the Plan treated it as a foe. Yenidüzen, having announced that Turkish Cypriots would have seats as observers in the European Parliament when an agreement based on the Annan Plan was
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reached, treated the notion as a positive development. An academic article written by a scholar concerning advantages the Turkish Cypriot community would gain from entering into the EU as united Cyprus appeared in both Yenidüzen and Afrika.

It was Afrika that gave the greatest coverage to the EU in its pages. It started a countdown on the number of days before the Republic of Cyprus joined the EU. It published every day the phrase ‘(number of) days left to Cyprus’s EU membership’ in a box next to its masthead. During the period studied, it also printed a banner at the top of each page that said ‘no to invasion and annexation, yes to the EU and a solution’. Afrika also argued that once the Republic of Cyprus’s membership was confirmed at the Copenhagen Summit, ‘the ones that the Turkish side will have to speak to will be the EU rather than Greek Cypriots’ and that “nationalists” amongst us are already writing that after December North Cyprus’s bordering neighbour will be the EU. It also suggested that ‘Denktaş went to New York as a TRNC citizen but is returning as an EU citizen’: ‘like all other Cypriots, Denktaş will also gain a new citizenship in 5 days: EU citizenship’.

Meanwhile, some newspapers were sceptical about the EU. An opinion column in Halkın Sesi was headlined, ‘Yes to the EU but no to concessions’, in which the author explained that it was unacceptable to make concessions on issues such as sovereignty and territory. It was again Halkın Sesi that pointed out that Jacques Poos, the Rapporteur of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Human Rights, Common Security and Defence Policy of the European Parliament, met with the political party leaders as well as an advisor from the President’s Office but not with the government representatives: ‘The EU ignored the government’.

It was Volkan that characterised the EU with Greek Cypriots as members as the enemy of Turkish Cypriots. In an editorial for the paper, Sabahattin Ismail wrote, ‘Foreign powers, their extensions amongst us, the UN, the EU and the Greek Cypriot and Greek duo should listen to the message the President, united with his people yesterday in Geçitkale, gave.’ The newspaper also argued that the EU was behind the speculations about whether Denktaş as a negotiator should be replaced because of his failing health, reporting that the EU representative in Turkey, Karen Fogg, was the one who instructed and financially supported some journalists and political figures to start a campaign against Denktaş. In another issue, it published an article on the UN Special Cyprus envoy Alvarez de Soto having met in secret with three journalists whom Volkan labelled as ‘Karen Fogg’s journalists’. Furthermore, it described Hasan Hastürer, one of these journalists, as ‘the EU lobbyist’.

**Political Parties**

As Kıbrıs pointed out, the political parties were divided over the Plan: ‘The Plan divided the political parties into two. While UBP expressed its opinion that the Plan does not reflect views of the Turkish side; DP announced that it can be negotiated, but with Turkey and President Denktaş. CTP and TKP stated that the Plan can be negotiated.’ Overall the parties and the politicians received varying coverage and treatment depending on the political position of the newspapers. One such example was the news on the attendance of Mustafa Akıncı, an MP of TKP, at a conference in Greece. While Ortam portrayed his presence at the conference as a positive and
significant event and published it on its front page as its main story, Volkan used it to cast Akıncı in a negative light: ‘TKP’s shadow leader Mustafa Akıncı, who is still very angry for losing his seat, poured his rancour out and told the lie that “Turkish Cypriots greeted the Annan Plan with great joy’”. The newspaper’s depiction of two other politicians, Patriotic Peace Movement (Yurtsever Başçı Hareketi - YBH) leader Alpay Durduran and TKP leader Hüseyin Angołemli was no different: ‘While Turkish Cypriots are going through critical days, Durduran and Angołemli are linked arm-in-arm with Greek Cypriots.

In contrast to its position towards TKP, Volkan openly approved some political parties whose position on the Annan Plan it agreed with: ‘We applaud the decision of UBP, DP and MAP’ (Milliyetçi Adalet Partisi - Nationalist Justice Party).

Conclusion
As our analysis has confirmed, the media’s portrayal of the Cyprus issue in the form of the Annan Plan was determined by the ideological and political positions of the newspapers. While the dailies with a nationalist orientation depicted the Plan as against the interests of the nation, the others viewed it as an opportunity for a peaceful settlement in Cyprus. In some cases, the political affiliations of the press led to a distorted representation of the issue. There were many examples of the newspapers giving advantageous treatment to a political view they favoured while criticising the one they opposed. Therefore, the representation of the Annan Plan was divided; it was either positive or negative depending on the newspaper.

The news primarily consisted of opinions and statements of both national and international political figures. The newspapers prioritised and mediated the views of these individuals and representatives of political bodies, while using the opinion of the public or ordinary people only to enhance the arguments the newspapers had been defending and only if they agreed with the newspapers’ opinion. Adopting the language of consensus, each newspaper represented their arguments as a reflection of general public opinion. Yet, the analysis revealed that the print media did not act as a platform where different ideas and views were communicated but functioned as an instrument of propaganda. The press did little to encourage public participation in the debates about its future.

Nationalist discourses were intertwined with the discourses about the Annan Plan. The newspapers such as Birlik, Volkan, Vatan and Kıbrıslı that held an anti-Plan position argued that the Plan was against the national interest of Turkish Cypriots and was, therefore, unacceptable. Taking the opposite position, Yenidüzen, Afrika and Ortam, having construed the Plan as beneficial to Turkish Cypriots, campaigned for its acceptance and highlighted the advantages it would bring to them. They all adopted the discourse of ‘us’ and ‘them’, which not only depicted each group as ‘united’ but also cast the ‘other’ as different from ‘us’ and not acting in the interest of ‘our’ nation. Therefore, the concepts of the national interest, and the ‘us’ and ‘them’ dichotomy shifted according to the newspaper. Just like the Annan Plan, President Denktas, whose image was identified with the Cyprus issue, received conflicting treatment by the press. The nationalist newspapers featured him as the ultimate leader of the Turkish Cypriot community, while the opposition newspapers portrayed him as one of the reasons for the lack of a solution in Cyprus. Meanwhile, the newspapers that were anti-Annan Plan benefited from history to strengthen the perception of Greek Cypriots as the ‘enemy with unchanging intentions’.

124 No author, ‘Boyun kadar konuş [Speak-out according to your standing]’, Volkan, 20.11.2002:3.
126 Sabahattin Ismail, ‘UBP, DP ve MAP’in kararını alkışlıyoruz [We applaud UBP, DP and MAP’s decision]’, Volkan, 21.11.2002:1.
The image of the EU was also variable. The two most radical newspapers, Volkan and Afrika, treated the EU news topic in completely opposite ways. Afrika considered the Republic of Cyprus’s entry to the EU such a positive step and an important development that it even started counting down the number of days until entry on the front page each day. Volkan, in contrast, was sceptical of the EU’s involvement in the matter and cast it as one of the actors in the scenario of displacing Denktaş as the negotiator.

The newspapers provided an advantageous portrayal of the parties and their representatives with whom they sympathised or were affiliated with, and provided just the opposite treatment for those they disagreed with. Ortam and Birlik, for example, were two newspapers that frequently highlighted their parties’ views on their front pages in the leading stories. Volkan openly gave its approval to some parties they agreed with, but its depiction of those it opposed was close to insulting.

Overall, there were very limited researched news article in the newspapers regarding the Annan Plan and the Cyprus issue. Some articles even lacked such crucial information such as the source, which reduced them to mere claims rather than communications of factual information. Using the press releases in the news text without applying any journalistic transformation helped these publicity and propaganda materials to be disguised as the news.

Sanem Şahin
This section of our research focuses on a period five years after the first study. During these years the country witnessed catalytic developments; and unfortunately, what could have radically changed the course of the island’s history—a solution and reunification—failed. Thus, the EU welcomed Cyprus’s membership with the country still divided after the failed referenda of 24 April 2004 where Greek Cypriots overwhelmingly rejected the UN-proposed Plan while Turkish Cypriots voted in favour.

After the blueprint of November 2002, the Annan Plan was successively amended, until the UN Secretary General exercised arbitration, agreed in February 2004 in New York. Annan Plan V, for a ‘Comprehensive Settlement of the Cyprus Problem’, was the result of a process of negotiations in Nicosia and in Switzerland, sealed by that arbitration on 31 March 2004. Its rejection meant that division was to continue, and that Turkish Cypriots were left out of the EU, although they could individually enjoy some rights as EU citizens.

The ‘day after’ (the 2004 referenda) marked a reversal in the course of relations between the two communities and eventually, as revealed by research, a new era of distrust. The (negative) impact was stronger on Turkish Cypriots, who blamed Greek Cypriots for the collapse of their hopes; their massive mobilisation and rallies in support of EU accession and a solution, which ran counter to the official line and ended with a ‘yes’-to-the-UN-Plan vote, led nowhere.

The situation in the Greek Cypriot community was different. Further to hopes for a solution more favourable to the Greek Cypriots after EU membership, the whole society suffered a serious blow that deeply divided the political forces and the people.

Changes in power took place on both sides of the dividing line: Tassos Papadopoulos won out the presidential elections over the incumbent President of the Republic of Cyprus, Glafcos Clerides in February 2003 and his party DIKO, communist AKEL and Movement of Social Democrats EDEK (Κίνημα Σοσιαλδημοκρατών ΕΔΕΚ – S.K.EDEK) shared power. In the Turkish Cypriot community, the left wing CTP’s dubious win in December 2003 and initial share of power with the DP, at a time when Denktash’s authority was waning, led to complete success in April 2005, when CTP and its leader Mehmet Ali Talat gained full control of power. This change was a reflection of the political and social transformation Turkish Cypriots had been going through.

The most decisive development, however, occurred on 23 April 2003, when a partial lifting of the ban on free movement between the two sides took place. For the first time in 29 years, people from both communities could cross to the ‘other’ side and meet the people they had not been in contact with for nearly 29 years. They could also see for themselves the realities, and the media could now directly access their sources on the other side and inform their public. The results of this experience were mixed, as, for various reasons, a significant number of people, especially Greek Cypriots, chose not to cross the line, while the open news access has not always guaranteed balanced information.

Data studied in this chapter from both the press and television cover three periods in early and late September 2007 and January 2008. They are related to significant events, such as the meeting between the two leaders, Papadopoulos and Talat on 5 September 2007, and the presidential elections in the Republic of Cyprus, but also to other less noticeable developments.
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2 KISOS reverted to its former name EDEK in June 2003, as Movement of Social Democrats EDEK.
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Introduction
The meeting of Tassos Papadopoulos and Mehmet Ali Talat on 5 September and activity related to presidential elections in mid-January 2008 were the most significant events that took place in the period studied. Thus, the analysis of data will allow an insight into how the media cover issues at the heart of our study both in times of significant developments, but also on ordinary days, when no major events monopolise attention.

The Data
We analyze the same dailies as in the earlier period: Phileleftheros, Politis, Simerini, Machi-Tharros, Haravgi and Alithia. The data studied were drawn from these papers’ editions of 4 to 7 and 24 to 26 September 2007 and 17 to 20 January 2008.

The main news stories and what they reveal
Several issues were high on the press agenda during this period of study, with the presidential elections in the Republic of Cyprus, scheduled for February 2008, being a major topic.

In September, the dailies focused on the meeting between the President of the Republic of Cyprus, Tassos Papadopoulos and the Turkish Cypriot leader, Mehmet Ali Talat, their second encounter after the rejection of the Annan Plan. The Greek Cypriots appeared not very optimistic about the talks while some politicians and newspapers suggested that this initiative was simply a tactical move on the part of Papadopoulos to prove, before the presidential elections, that he was willing to reach a settlement.

In the same month all the dailies also included pieces regarding a dreadful fire that broke out in Greece. Several articles reported on Cyprus’s efforts to help.

Other stories included the initiation of a ferry service between the occupied port of Famagusta and Latakia in Syria. Reports of an inaugural trip emerged on 22 and 23 September. This issue alarmed the Greek Cypriot political community since they considered it a matter of indirect recognition of the northern part of the island.

In January, in addition to articles concerning the elections, newspapers wrote about a draft report to the European Parliament Petition Committee on Famagusta. It was suggested by the authors of the report that the reason for the non-return of Famagusta’s inhabitants to the abandoned city was the Greek Cypriot rejection of the Annan Plan. This suggestion caused tumult among Greek Cypriot politicians as did the fact that Mehmet Ali Talat was referred to as the ‘President of the Turkish Cypriot Authorities’ and the invasion as the ‘Turkish intervention’.

As in our earlier analysis, these issues and a series of supplementary news stories are used as examples to reveal, a) the stances of each daily regarding the solution sought, the government / the parties, the European Union and the ‘other side’; b) the means employed to project these positions.

Media Practices
The newspapers appear to have used specific tactics and tools in order to project their views. In this section we describe some of these practices, while other strategies employed by the press are outlined simultaneously with the discourses, especially in the section entitled, the government and the parties.
The aces of the commercial dailies

The newspapers with no party or ideological links or affiliation, and those with low circulation figures, such as Alithia, Haravgi and Machi, were often obliged to rely on externally produced texts and press conferences for their news stories. The information taken from these sources was often published unedited; sometimes the reporters did not even correct the grammatical mistakes or the syntax errors in the original text. For example, an article in both Machi and Alithia, which was probably copied from KYPE, was published with the same error of syntax.6

The above strategies reveal the efforts of Politis and Phileleftheros to increase their circulation figures; it was a tactic aimed at persuading the public that their own journalists knew more about a specific subject than the reporters of the other dailies. Presenting more stories and providing additional or exclusive information, as neutrally as possible, could help the papers establish trustworthiness, which subsequently would help them ‘sell’ their own positions to the public. The newspapers with no party or ideological links or affiliation appear to fight for exclusiveness, as was also noticed in 2002. They could not simply rely on press conferences and press releases for their articles, but had to offer different stories and additional data to earn their readers’ trust and loyalty. Using outside/additional sources would signal their reliability, and subsequently would help them to promote their views, draw more funds, and remain competitive. Therefore, Phileleftheros published articles based on its ‘own information’, ‘diplomatic’ or ‘informed sources’,3 while Politis offered its readers extra details in its news stories.3 This is an indication that the two dailies had sufficient resources to avoid the use of copy-paste texts and publish exclusive news stories.5 Furthermore, and as in the 2002 period, these two newspapers employed correspondents to offer first-hand information to the public.6

The newspapers with low circulation figures and a few advertisements apparently faced limitations in human or other resources. This forced them to frequently republish articles from KYPE, which was published with the same error of syntax.10

The newspapers with low circulation figures and a few advertisements apparently faced limitations in human or other resources. This forced them to frequently republish articles from KYPE.
The pieces about the ‘other side’, for example, were usually copied from this press agency, meaning that the ‘other side’ in these papers was viewed and depicted in the same way.

These dailies rarely published exclusive data or exclusive stories. They often settled for copy-paste information from press conferences and/or politically oriented news stories whose data had been taken from press releases of a particular political party. This could damage their reliability and hinder their efforts to convince readers of their stances.

All the dailies, however, regardless of their distribution figures and links to certain parties, followed various tactics to gain credibility. One of these strategies was the use of numbers.

The use of numbers

The press used numbers to lend plausibility and to substantiate its claims. An example of this is the way the newspapers reported the talks between Papadopoulos and Talat. They stated the exact time of the two leaders’ arrival at their meeting place, and the time frame of their meeting. This practice could have been employed to reassure readers that their journalists were indeed present at the meeting place. Additionally, the dailies’ focus on detail, probably aimed to persuade the public that, whatever their reporters wrote regarding the talks was true and accurate. An article in Phileleftheros stated that, ‘President Papadopoulos reached Moller’s residence first, at 4.01 p.m.…five minutes later Mehmet Ali Talat came as well.’ In Haravgi it was noted that, ‘the two leaders arrived at Moller’s residence 4-5 minutes apart.’

Different Discourses and Media Practices

The form of the solution

The focus in this section is on the ideologies of the newspapers regarding the desirable settlement on the island and not on the journalistic practices. The news stories did not offer enough data that would allow the researcher to categorise the different strategies used by the newspapers to promote their stances.

The editorials provided the key source from which conclusions were drawn about the dailies’ position on the solution to the Cyprus Problem. There were three events where newspapers’ stances on this issue were revealed. The first was the meeting between Republic of Cyprus President Papadopoulos and Turkish Cypriot leader Mehmet Ali Talat. The second was the claim that Karpasia was offered to the Greek Cypriot side during the negotiations for the Annan Plan in Burgenstock. The third was a draft report on Famagusta by the European Parliament Petition Committee. These facts showed that the bi-zonal, bi-communal federal solution and the July 8 agreement, also known as the Gambari agreement, were the poles around which the press agreement was drawn.

For additional information on this matter, see a document posted on the website of the Press and Information Office:
shaped its positions on the type of political settlement. Some of these subjects were presented through the context of the presidential elections, allowing the press to promote its views for, or against a specific candidate.

Supporting the federal solution and the July 8 agreement

Most dailies had an opinion on the bi-zonal bi-communal federal solution, and often times this form of settlement was connected to the July 8 agreement that set the process through which a federal solution could be reached. The newspapers that seemed to support that the bi-zonal bi-communal federal solution was the means to the reunification of the island often stressed that,

a) the Greek Cypriot political community ought to re-affirm its commitment to this type of settlement, given that it was already agreed to it under the July 8 agreement;

b) this was the only type of solution that would quickly lead to peace.

The dailies that did not support this form of settlement, nor expressed a clear-cut opinion for any specific solution, seem to have tried to project that,

a) the Greek Cypriot political community never wanted this kind of settlement and had been forced to give its consent in the high level agreements;

b) there was not much hope of ending the deadlock in the country since the two sides had completely different views on significant matters.

Haravgi, the mouthpiece of AKEL, wrote in an editorial that the party ‘struggles for a proper federal solution’.

Its cover story on 5 September 2007 the paper spoke of the ‘patriotic’ efforts of AKEL general secretary Demetris Christofias to persuade the national council to re-affirm its commitment to a bi-zonal, bi-communal federal solution. It found Christofias’s view justified since it believed that he was aiming to ‘reinforce the negotiating position’ of President Papadopoulos before his meeting with Mehmet Ali Talat. Thus we see that Haravgi echoed AKEL’s position that the stalemate on the island could be brought to an end with a federal solution, and reflected the paper’s traditional pro-settlement stance.

Alithia, in an editorial published on 4 September 2007, came out strongly against Mr. Papadopoulos and his supporters who presented the ‘bi-zonal (federation) as catastrophic’, pointing out that the Greek Cypriot side had already committed itself to this solution. The paper’s criticism of the President indicates its support for the bi-zonal, bi-communal type of settlement. This is also evident in the tone of a headline referring to the Papadopoulos - Talat meeting: ‘Anastasiades: The non re-affirmation of the bi-zonal (bi-communal federal solution) worries me: The meeting is risky with an open agenda.’

The newspapers also took a stance on the Gambari agreement, which has been tied to the bi-zonal bi-communal federal solution. Haravgi was a supporter, and we can read its commitment in the headline and the introduction of its cover story on 7 September: ‘Insistence on the agreement, pressures on Turkey.’

Phileleftheros also explicitly supported the July 8 agreement, writing in an editorial that it was ‘the only way to end the deadlock’ in the country. It also stressed the need for promoting the agreement because this would create ‘the conditions for the beginning of direct negotiations for the solution of the Cyprus problem’.

We note, however, that while the paper supported the July 8
agreement, it avoided any mention that one of its clauses provided for a federal bi-communal and bi-zonal solution. Although the paper did not openly oppose the federal solution, it cast doubt on it, questioning the agreed form of solution in an editorial, and suggesting that the solution should be ‘in line with what the public opinion wishes’. The public’s views, the paper said, could be deducted from opinion polls to be conducted by the government.27

Political did not state explicitly the form of solution it preferred; still, it appeared to support the bi-zonal bi-communal federation. The daily’s headline regarding a national council meeting ironically stated that the political leaders had ‘discovered’ their commitment to this form of federation through the July 8 agreement.28 The way this and other articles covered the matter of the solution showed the paper’s positive stance.

Against the bi-zonal bi-communal federal solution?

It appears that Simerini did not back this type of settlement. The stance of the newspaper is evident in its opinion column and from its coverage of various events. For example, in its cover story on 4 September it stressed that the national council had declared its ‘commitment to the July 8th agreement that provides, however, a solution based on the bi-zonal bi-communal federation’29. The use of the qualifying word ‘however’ indicates the newspaper’s disapproval of this kind of settlement. Furthermore, in its editorials it consistently criticised the Greek Cypriot leadership’s pursuit of a bi-communal federation as a chimeric and illusionary goal. Simerini believed that the ‘other side’ did not want and had abandoned this goal, opting instead for partition of the island.30 Opposition to this form of solution can also be seen in the way another article referring to Makarios’s position on federation in 1977 was presented. This article assured readers that documents ‘confirm that Makarios did not accept the bi-zonal bi-communal federation as the Turks want(ed) it...’31 and even suggested that Makarios had given a ‘warning’ about this kind of agreement: ‘Makarios warning in 1971 about federation: “(With this solution) we would be heading to partition”’.32 The author of the article in Simerini implied that the popular and charismatic ethnarch, who was the person who agreed to this type of solution, was in fact against it. The article continues by listing the problems that would arise under a bi-zonal bi-communal federation: ‘Makarios: the unity of the state would be fragile with the way the Turkish community saw (the federation)’.33 The headline of Simerini’s cover story on 25 September showed that the first President of the Republic of Cyprus was eventually forced to accept this settlement: ‘Foreign office: This is how they pressured Makarios: With a gun (pointed) at his head for the sake of the bi-zonal (federation).’34

Our data reveals no clear stance on the federal solution from Machi. However, there were numerous articles in this daily that highlighted that many issues separated the two sides and that the Greek Cypriots and the Turkish Cypriots had completely different views regarding how they wanted to end the deadlock in the country. Hence, it emphasized the fact that there was little hope for resolving the Cyprus problem. The cover story headline for the leaders’ meeting read, ‘The gap between the two sides was confirmed: Tassos said one thing and Talat another’,35 while in the
introduction of the story, it was pointed out that there was a difference of opinion between the two parties even in the way they wanted to implement the July 8 agreement.

The Government and the Parties
In this part of the report we illuminate journalistic practices, as well as the various newspapers' stances on government and political parties, as these both are evidenced in news stories and editorials. The long pre-election period allows us to see quite clearly the dailies’ positions and practices.

Wider coverage for one party and its candidate
Some newspapers overrepresented certain politicians and specific parties according to their own political beliefs and this preferential coverage was sometimes obvious. In September the title above pages 16-17 of Haravgi was, ‘The activities of the popular movement’. In January the extensive representation of AKEL was connected to the presidential elections: On weekdays, pages 16-17 carried the header, ‘Demetris Christofias. Humane politics. A just solution. A just society’. On the other hand, Machi devoted whole pages to report news stories related to Ioannis Kassoulides, whose candidacy was backed by DISY.

The selective offer of more newspaper space to one party and its members was not always apparent, but it was noticeable. Some dailies highlighted information related to a particular party by placing it in a separate box within an article, occasionally with a bold outline or some other standout feature to catch the reader’s eye. On 17 January, Machi’s cover story was on the European Parliament draft report on Famagusta. This piece was continued on pages 18 and 31 where the efforts by Kassoulides for the withdrawal of the draft were described in a dark gray box beneath the main article. A second example provided by Alithia further illustrates this practice: On 4 September the newspaper reported Anastasiades’ views on the meeting between Papadopoulos and Talat, placing them in a box very conspicuously next to the lead-in to its cover story.

Favouritism for one party and its members was also indicated in the type of coverage a politician received; more specifically, the favoured party or politician’s views often appeared as a separate news story and not as part of a piece, which often included additional information, beyond the stance of that particular individual. This strategy was also noticed in some dailies in the previous period studied, in 2002. Machi, under the column the main story (το Θέμα), outlined the proposals of DISY’s candidate regarding the steps that ought to be taken by the Greek Cypriot side after the Papadopoulos-Talat meeting. On the same day, Haravgi’s lead story covered the proposals of AKEL’s candidate on the same issue. Conversely, Phileleftheros and Politis included the statements of these politicians in a piece with the evaluation of the developments by the political community.

News stories presented favorably or unfavorably towards a candidate or a party
There were also many subjects not directly linked to the presidential elections that the newspapers presented with a bias towards a particular candidate or party. The news story about the President’s thirteen pledges on housing is an example. The newspapers that reported this issue focused on the fact that Papadopoulos had promised refugees that they could sell their
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36 See, for example, Haravgi’s article: ‘Δραστηριότητες του Λαϊκού Κινήματος [The activities of the popular movement]’, Haravgi, 25.9.2007:16, 17.
38 See, for example, in Machi, 18.1.2008:3.
39 A. Alistratlis, ‘«Ζητούμε την απόσυρση της Έκθεσης» [“We ask for the withdrawal of the report”], Machi, 17.1.2008:18, 31.
41 Niki Koulermou, ‘Εμμονή στη Συμφωνία, πιέσεις προς Τουρκία [Insisting on the agreement, pressures on Turkey]’, Haravgi, 7.9.2007:1.
42 See, Andreas Pimpisis, ‘Υπογιάτησα, αχώμες και εισηγήσεις από τα κόμματα [Disappointment, incoherent criticism and suggestions by the parties]’, Phileleftheros, 7.9.2007:4; Katerina Zorpa, Προεκλογική γαργάρα: ΑΚΕΛ και ΔΗΣΥ ζητούν την ανάληψη πρωτοβουλιών [Pre-election... gargling: AKEL and DISY ask for initiatives], Politis 7.9.2007: 5.
occupied building coefficient to others. Haravgi, which naturally favoured AKEL general secretary Demetris Christofias, highlighted a negative aspect of Mr. Papadopoulos’s announcement by stressing that not ‘all’ displaced persons would benefit from this measure.43 Alithia on the same day devoted almost half a page to this topic, minimizing the significance of the presidential promise by pointing out that this pledge might not be applicable. To this end, it published the view of an official body that could be considered expert on this matter: ‘The scientific opinion surpasses the political dispute. ETEK.’44 is puzzled about the building coefficient.45 Phileleftheros remained more neutral, but highlighted the reassuring words of the President regarding the building coefficient: ‘This measure can be applied in 18 months.’46 Politis included the opinions of the entire political community, but chose to emphasize only the negative statements: ‘The coefficient was on fire. AKEL: action that aimed to impress, Kassoulides: not a real gift’.47

Negative and positive representation of politicians and parties

The presidential elections led Haravgi, Alithia, Machi and Politis to depict certain politicians and parties in bright or in dark colors.

Some dailies would include articles and photographs projecting a positive or a negative image of a candidate, and although sometimes these referred to stories that were not really very newsworthy, they were nevertheless run on the front pages. Haravgi, ran a photograph of the AKEL candidate hugging a small girl on the front page, with the caption: ‘Deeply moved and with a tear rolling down his cheek, D. Christofias reassured the people, who were stricken by the tragedy of 1974, of his steady, consistent and constant support’.50 This indicates Haravgi’s portrayal of the specific politician as sensitive and caring. It is further reinforced on pages 11-12 where there were two articles depicting Christofias as a compassionate person who would support parents of large families and who would secure the rights of the handicapped if he were elected.51

On the same day, on the front page of Machi there was a picture of DISY candidate, Kassoulides, at a nursing home holding hands with the elderly,52 confirming that the candidate was an affectionate man. In the paper’s cover story (το Θέμα) about DISY’s Pan-Cypriot Congress for the support of the candidacy of Mr. Kassoulides, there was a separate box within this news story recounting the collapse of an old man and the aftermath: ‘Immediately Kassoulides interrupted his speech and rushed to the stage (to help)’53 illustrating the candidate as merciful. The fainting incident was also mentioned in Alithia’s cover story on DISY’s congress: The journalist wrote that Kassoulides stopped his speech to help the person who passed out, returning to the podium only 43 Neophytos Neophytou, ‘Παραδοχή για αθέτηση δεσμεύσεων του [Admission for a breach of promises]’, Haravgi, 17.1.2008:8.
44 Cyprus Scientific and Technical Chamber (Επιστημονικό Τεχνικό Επιμελητήριο Κύπρου - ΕΤΕΚ).
45 George Kallinikos, ‘Η επιστημονική άποψη υποσκαλεί την πολιτική ανταρτάραθη: ΕΤΕΚ: Πολλοί προβληματίσμοι το το κυβερνητικό δομής’ [The scientific opinion surpasses the political dispute: ETEK: Puzzled for the building coefficient], Alithia, 17.1.2008:5.
46 No author, ‘Θα πάρει αξία χρήσης η περιουσία [In order to add value to the property]’, Phileleftheros, 17.1.2008:4.
47 Antonis Makrides, ‘Πήρε φωτιά ο συντελεστής: ΑΚΕΛ: κίνηση εντυπωσιακού, Κασουλίδης: Νέον δώρων [The coefficient was on fire: AKEL: action that aimed to impress, Kassoulides: not a real gift]’, Politis, 18.1.2008:22.
48 No author, ‘Θα δώσω τη δική μου μάχη κατά τη διάρκεια της πενταετίας [I will give my own battle during the next five years]’, Haravgi, 18.1.2008:6.
49 No author, ‘Η ΕΔΕΚ κατηγορεί το ΑΚΕΛ για παρενοχλήσεις στελεχών του [EDEK blames AKEL for harassing its members]’, Machi, 17.1.2008:11.
50 See picture in Haravgi, 17.1.2008:1.
when he was certain that the elderly man was completely well.\textsuperscript{54} \textit{Alithia}, therefore, also projected a caring image of this politician.

The dailies often portrayed certain people very darkly, and Tassos Papadopoulos was the person on whom most newspapers turned their arrows. The statements and actions of the President were often harshly criticized. On 17 January, \textit{Alithia} devoted page 6 to criticism of the President, with two news stories on his claimed mishandling of the Annan plan negotiations in Burgenstock, which led to Karpasia not being under Greek Cypriot administration in the final version of the proposed settlement. The headline of one of its articles was: ‘\textit{Idleness buried Karpasia}’.\textsuperscript{55} implying that Papadopoulos was not competent enough to solve the Cyprus problem. On the same day \textit{Politis} ran, on page 5, a more neutral version on the issue of Karpasia. However, by highlighting the words of the European Commissioner for Enlargement, we can see that the paper was also negatively portraying the President and his actions: ‘Gunter Verheugen stated that “There were no intensive negotiations for the matter of Karpasia”’.\textsuperscript{56} \textit{Politis}, too, was revealed in this period of study to be against the candidacy of Mr. Papadopoulos, often depicting him as rigidly opposed to the possibility of ending the stalemate on the island. In one editorial it was implied that the President employed strategies of good will not because he wished for a solution but in order to remain in power: ‘We predict that the meeting between Tassos and Talat… only aims to cause sensation (to the public) because of the upcoming elections’.\textsuperscript{57} On 26 September, \textit{Politis} wrote about, ‘\textit{Pre-election games with the Cyprus Problem}’, reporting that the people who worked for the President were trying to create the impression that substantial developments were taking place.\textsuperscript{58}

Not only certain politicians but also specific parties or the government were occasionally portrayed negatively or positively. On 26 September, \textit{Politis} ran on its front page three different stories illustrating how the government had mismanaged several political issues: ‘\textit{The government continues to have three open fronts, despite its efforts to diminish (the significance of these issues)}’.\textsuperscript{59} The headline of an article in \textit{Alithia} about the EP draft report on Famagusta was: ‘\textit{Wherever and whatever this government touches turns into a big mess}’.\textsuperscript{60} Conversely, the headline of an article in Machi painted opposition party DISY as being free of tendentious accounts: ‘\textit{DISY is committed to supporting the local self-government regardless of who will be elected President}’.\textsuperscript{61}

The views of important people

In the fight for the Presidency of the Republic of Cyprus, several newspapers decided to promote their candidate through endorsements of influential persons or those in authority. \textit{Haravgi}, Machi and \textit{Alithia} employed this practice, which was also noted in the previous period of study.

To promote their candidate, \textit{Haravgi} quoted statements of famous Greek artists, such as Mikis Theodorakis and Thanos Mikrouitsikos: ‘\textit{“D. Christofias is a competent leader”: We rarely meet in Europe such an outstanding political leader, says the leading composer Thanos Mikrouitsikos}’.\textsuperscript{62} \textit{Alithia}’s cover story on 20 January published former President of the Republic Glafkos Clerides’ remarks flattering the DISY candidate.. The headline of this article was, ‘\textit{Competent and...}’

\textsuperscript{54} George Kallinikos, ‘Όγιοι της Κλαίρης, το μήνυμα του Β. Μαρτένς, η Νεολαία και η λιποθυμία [Claire’s sons, W. Martens, the youth (organization of DISY) and the collapse]’, \textit{Alithia}, 20.1.2008:5.  
\textsuperscript{55} Panagiotis Tsaggaris, ‘Η αδράνεια έθαψε και την Καρπασία [Inaction buried also Karpasia]’, \textit{Alithia}, 17.1.2008:6.  
\textsuperscript{56} George Kaskanis, ‘Σκοντάψαμε στις δεσμεύσεις [We stumbled over the commitments]’, \textit{Politis}, 17.1.2008:5.  
\textsuperscript{57} Politis, ‘Το εθνικό και η λύση [The national (council) and the solution]’, \textit{Politis}, 4.9.2007:12.  
\textsuperscript{60} Panagiotis Tsagkaris, ‘Όπου και ό,τι αγγίζει αυτή η Κυβέρνηση γίνεται χαμός [Wherever and whatever this government touches turns into a big mess]’, \textit{Alithia}, 17.1.2008:7.  
\textsuperscript{61} No author, ‘Ο ΔΗΣΥ δεσμεύεται να στηρίξει την τοπική αυτοδιοίκηση ανεξάρτητα ποίος θα εκλεγεί πρόεδρος [DISY is committed to supporting the local administration regardless of who will be elected President]’, \textit{Machi}, 18.1.2008:1.  
\textsuperscript{62} No author, ‘Άξιος ηγέτης ο Δ. Χριστόφιας: Σπάνια συναντάμε τέτοιου εξαιρετικού ποιοτικού πείσμα σε Ευρωπαϊκή κλίμακα, δηλώνει ο Θάνος Μικουρτσίκος [“D. Christofias is a competent leader”: We rarely meet in Europe such an outstanding political leader, says the leading composer Thanos Mikrouitsikos]’, \textit{Haravgi}, 17.1.2008:1.
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honest President’.63 On the same day Machi also used a quote from Clerides to promote Kassoulides: ‘Glafkos Clerides: Competent leader for all’.64

Certainty for victory or defeat

Haravgi, Machi and Alithia often gave the impression that their candidate was certain to win. Haravgi ran a cover story on Christofias’s presidential candidacy, with a headline: ‘Candidacy of victory, hope and perspective’.65 Many events, even the cut of a traditional cake, were described in a way to emphasize the notion that the leader of AKEL would be elected: “The cake (Vasilopita66) of Victory was cut in Limassol’.67 Machi reported on a conference organized by DISY to promote its favoured candidate: ‘Victory message by Kassoulides’,68 and Alithia ran a similar headline referring to the same candidate: ‘Conference of victory’.69 In the same way, the newspapers sometimes published reports of a candidate’s certain defeat. Politis suggested that the efforts of the Presidential team to create the impression that substantial developments regarding the Cyprus Problem were indeed taking place would not help Tassos Papadopoulos to remain in power.70 Similarly, in its editorials Alithia insisted on referring to Papadopoulos as the ‘incumbent President’.71

The European Union

News stories related to the EU were published regularly, an indication that the matters of the Union were viewed as important. In addition to reports on Cyprus’s efforts to meet the requirements of the EU acquis communautaire, there was now the new topic of the euro, since the Republic of Cyprus entered the euro zone on 1 January 2008. Although the news was full of articles on the euro, for research purposes here we will focus only on the way the EU was seen in relation to various issues that concerned Cyprus. It appears that the EU and its officials continued to be perceived either as allies or as enemies according to their stance on issues related to the Republic of Cyprus. Five news stories provided the data for this section of the paper:

1. Statements by the vice-president of the European Commission, Jacques Barrot, regarding Turkey’s embargo on ships flying the flag of the Republic of Cyprus.
2. A warning to the Republic of Cyprus, in a European Commission annual report on the Green Line, calling on the authorities to take immediate measures to stop illegal immigration across the buffer zone.
3. The EP draft report on Famagusta prepared by the European Petition Committee.
4. The Slovenian Prime Minister’s view on the role the EU could play in the settlement of the Cyprus Problem, as expressed during a meeting with President Papadopoulos.
5. The view expressed during an informal conference of EU foreign ministers from the Mediterranean states that the Cyprus Problem was not an EU high priority issue.

The European Union as an ally

Jacques Barrot’s comments concerning Turkey’s ban on ships from the Republic of Cyprus led to the EU being depicted as a community that supported the rights of the Greek Cypriots. Machi, Haravgi and Alithia published identical reports on this issue, indicating that they used the same source, possibly KYPE. This reveals the three papers’ intention to suggest that the Commissioner responsible for transport,72 who was thought to represent the stances of the EU, agreed with the

65 Maria Fragkou, ‘Υποψηφιότητα νίκης, ελπίδας και προοπτικής [Candidacy of victory, hope and perspective]’, Haravgi, 19.1.2008:3.
66 Vasilopita is a traditional cake eaten on the first day of the year.
67 Tasos Tsapparellas, ‘Κόπηκε στη Λεμεσό η βασιλόπιτα...της Νίκης [The cake (Vasilopita) of victory was cut in Limassol]’, Haravgi, 18.1.2008:10.
71 See for example, Alithia ‘Δεν είναι τούρκικο η πολιτική [Politics is not a circus]’, Alithia, 20.1.2008:2.
72 Jacques Barrot was not only the Commissioner responsible for transport but also the vice-president of the European Commission.
Republic of Cyprus’s position on this issue. Machi published an article in which it interpreted Barrot’s statement: ‘Turkey’s embargo is also a problem of the EU: Specific and Clear message of Jacques Barrot to Ankara’.73 On the same day, Haravgi ran the following headline on its front page: ‘Firm message from Barrot to Ankara’.74 Alithia’s headline was very similar but not so strong: ‘Barrot’s message to Turkey’.75 On its front page Phileleftheros ran an exclusive interview with Jacques Barrot illustrating that the EU stood ready to assist the Greek Cypriot community: ‘The path of Turkey towards the EU will be closed and 8 (negotiating) chapters will not open until Turkey opens its ports and aerospace to Cyprus’.76 Similar statements by the Commissioner were also used in a Politis headline: ‘Severe recommendations to Turkey: It is obliged to open its ports to Cypriot ships’.77

The European Union as an enemy

Sometimes the EU was pictured negatively, which might indicate a particular newspaper’s perspective, but more likely it signifies the paper’s view that the Greek Cypriot side had just demanded and was the victim and not the villain of the conflict. A news story about the European Commission’s annual report on the Green Line,78 posted on the same day as the previous example, declared that the EU was set against the Republic of Cyprus. This was based on an EU warning to the authorities to act immediately to stop illegal immigration across the buffer zone. The press stressed that the Commission’s request might set up a hard border between the two sides. The headline of Politis regarding this issue was, ‘New slap from the (European) Commission: It raises a “hard border”’.79 Phileleftheros’s title was, ‘Knife in the neck for the Green Line: The Commission calls Nicosia to police it, which creates the image of a hard border’. The representation of the EU as the enemy is evident in this daily’s text: ‘(The EU) instead of turning its face towards [the enemy]... asks the authorities to tighten up the policing of the Green Line, and calls Nicosia “reluctant” to take additional measures’.80

The news story about the EP draft report on Famagusta is another example of the unflattering depiction of the EU. Alithia ran an article in which the secretariat of the EP Petition Committee was accused of ‘manipulations’.81 On the previous day, this subject was the cover story of Machi, with a headline emphasizing that the committee was in agreement with a country perceived by Machi as the enemy: ‘Scandalous report on Famagusta: It adopts Turkey’s rationale on the possibility of the (Greek Cypriots’) return only in the framework of an overall solution’.82 Phileleftheros declared that the draft report was ‘Turkey-friendly’,83 while Haravgi characterized it as ‘unacceptable’.84 These daily papers appeared to have assumed that the EU was not acting in Greek Cypriots’ best interest or, even worse, that this community was their rival.

73 No author, ‘Επιεικώς απαράδεκτο το προσχέδιο για Αμ/το: Προσπάθειες ΑΚΕΛ ν’αποσυρθεί και να συνταχθεί νέο κείμενο [The draft report on Famagusta is at least unacceptable: AKEL tries for its withdrawal and for the writing of a new text], Haravgi, 18.1.2008:6.
74 No author, ‘Μήνυμα προς Τουρκία από Μπαρό [Barrot’s message to Turkey]’, Alithia, 25.9.2007:1.
76 Petros Theoharides, ‘Με τα εμπάργκο η Τουρκία εκτός Ευρώπης [Turkey will be out of Europe because of the embargos]’, Phileleftheros, 25.9.2007:1.
77 Yiannis Kostakopoulos, ‘Αυστηρές υποδείξεις στην Τουρκία: Οφείλει να ανοίξει τα λιμάνια της στα κυπριακά πλοία [Severe recommendations to Turkey: It is obliged to open its ports to Cypriot ships]’, Politis, 25.9.2007:7.
78 The line that divides the Greek and the Turkish quarters of Nicosia, first established in 1963. After the 1974 invasion by Turkey, many use the term ‘Green Line’ to name the impassable cease-fire line between the Turkish Armed Forces and the National Guard of the Republic of Cyprus. Various crossings have been opened along the Green Line since 2003.
80 Yiannis Charalampides, ‘Χαστούκι στο σκάνδαλο...: Όχι σε συζήτηση επί του εγγράφου της Αμμοχώστου [Slap over the scandal…: No discussion of the draft on Famagusta]’, Simerini, 18.1.2008:1.
81 Athanasios Alistratlis, ‘Χαστούκι στο σκάνδαλο...: Όχι σε συζήτηση επί του εγγράφου της Αμμοχώστου [Slap over the scandal…: No discussion of the draft on Famagusta]’, Simerini, 18.1.2008:1.
84 Yiannis Kostakopoulos, ‘Χαστούκι στο σκάνδαλο...: Όχι σε συζήτηση επί του εγγράφου της Αμμοχώστου [Slap over the scandal…: No discussion of the draft on Famagusta]’, Simerini, 18.1.2008:1.
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‘Us’ and the ‘other side’

Here we examine who exactly was considered to be ‘us’ or ‘our side’ in the timeframe studied and who the ‘others’ were. The ideologies of the newspapers and the practices used to promote them are presented simultaneously on the basis of information from several news stories.

‘Us’ and issues of ethnic origin

The dailies appear to have remained loyal to their positions on matters of identity, outlined in the 2002 analysis. As in the previous period, the Greeks and, of course, the Greek Cypriots were viewed by the newspapers as ‘our side’.

Machi and Simerini continued emphasizing a connection between the Greek Cypriots and Greece. This bond was more stressed in the previous period of study, probably because of the Annan plan which must have triggered nationalistic feelings, but it was still obvious in 2007-2008. Machi characterized the Greeks as the Greek Cypriots’ ‘brothers’, while Simerini repeatedly referred to the Greek Cypriot community as the ‘Greek side’. In contrast, Haravgi used the expression the ‘Greek Cypriot side’ and called the two communities ‘Cypriots’.

All dailies however, regardless of their views on identity, highlighted that the Republic of Cyprus had a strong relationship with Greece. Most newspapers even had special sections or whole pages dedicated to news stories referring to Greece.

The way the deadly fires in Greece were reported clearly revealed the bond between the Republic of Cyprus and Greece. This unfortunate event received wide coverage while it projected the notion that Cyprus would always support Greece. The fact that the Republic of Cyprus joined forces with Greece to face the catastrophe was pointed out, while the financial aid Cyprus offered was also emphasized. The headline of Machi’s main story was: ‘Cyprus continues to show solidarity to the fire-stricken Greeks.’ The newspaper also published on its front page an announcement for a fund raising event it was organizing to help the Greeks. Simerini, too, informed its readers of a fundraiser arranged by the publishing house that owned the newspaper.

The determination of the Greek Cypriots to stand by Greece was constantly stressed in extensive reports on the work of a Cypriot team rebuilding Artemida village and the valiant efforts of the Cypriot firemen. Phileleftheros, which sent special correspondents to Greece, stated that the team of Cypriot experts had ‘cast light over the black land (of Artemida) and over despair’. Politis pointed out in one article that 100 houses would be built from scratch under the guidance of the team from Cyprus, while in another it heralded the return of the ‘tired, worn down but filled with pride’ Cypriot firefighters. Alithia also wrote a piece about the Cypriot redcap volunteers, who ‘helped out in the fire extinction in Greece’.

---

86 Simerini, ‘Ποίος θα πιέσει την Τουρκία [Who will pressure Turkey?]’, Simerini, 25.9.2007:3.
87 Niki Koulermou, ‘Πατριωτική η στάση του ΑΚΕΛ: Ενισχύει την ε/κ πλευρά, όταν οι άλλοι την υπονομεύουν [The attitude of AKEL is patriotic: It reinforces the G/C side, when others undermine it]’, Haravgi, 5.9.2007:1.
90 No author, ‘Συνεχίζεται η αλληλεγγύη από την Κύπρο προς τους πυροπληκτούς Έλληνες [Cyprus continues to show solidarity to the fire-stricken Greeks]’, Machi, 4.9.2007:14.
92 Simerini, ‘Έρανος ΔΙΑ και ΣΙΓΜΑ για τους πυροπληκτούς [Fundraising of Dias (publishing house) and Sigma (TV) for the fire stricken (people)]’, Simerini, 2007:1.
93 Frixos Dalitis, ‘Σαν να ανηφορίζεις προς την κόλαση [As if you were climbing towards hell]’, Phileleftheros, 4.9.2007:1.
94 Miranda Lyssandrou, ‘100 σπίτια από την αρχή: Σήμερα η λεπτομερής καταγραφή των ζημιών στην Αρτέμιδα [100 Houses (will be built) from scratch: Today the detailed record of the damages in Artemida]’, Politis, 4.9.2007:3.
96 No author, ‘Επέστρεψαν οι στρατονόμοι [They helped in the fire extinction in Greece]’, Alithia, 5.9.2007:10.
The ‘other side’; Thumbs up for the Turkish Cypriots

The ‘other side’ consisted of many categories, one of which was the Turkish Cypriots. The press was not negative in its views of this community; on the contrary, the dailies that referred to them stressed that nothing separated the two communities.

Haravgi and Politis continued to argue that the peaceful co-existence of Greek and Turkish Cypriots was achievable. Haravgi, promoting the stance of AKEL, put forth the idea that the peaceful reunification of the two communities was possible.97 Politis also remained loyal to its traditional rapprochement policy, and regularly published a column written by a Turkish Cypriot journalist.98 In one editorial it was stated that if Turkey allowed Turkish Cypriots to decide on the solution ‘things would be much better’, suggesting that the two communities had no significant differences regarding the settlement. Simerini also backed this stance in an editorial: ‘Nothing separates us from the Turkish Cypriots and we have only a few things to negotiate’.99 Agreement between the two communities was also mentioned by Alithia, which ascertained that the Greek Cypriots and the Turkish Cypriots agreed on the matter of the settlers.100

Thumbs down for the Turkish Cypriots’ leadership

The newspapers remained consistent with their 2002 positions, and none of them portrayed positively the leadership of the Turkish Cypriots, despite the fact that left wing Mehmet Ali Talat succeeded Rauf Denktaş, viewed as nationalist and intransigent. Simerini and Phileleftheros often named Mehmet Ali Talat ‘the occupation leader’,101 also characterizing him as Turkey’s ‘agent provocateur’102 or this country’s ‘bondservant’.103 Mr. Talat was frequently pictured as someone who followed the wishes of Ankara and obstructed the solution of the Cyprus Problem104 by requesting procedures other than those already agreed. For example, reporting on the meeting between Papadopoulos and Talat, Phileleftheros wrote: ‘Under Ankara’s order he went to kill the July 8th (agreement): Talat suggested a different process and cut off communication’.105 On the same day, the headline of Simerini’s cover story was: ‘Talat “kicked away” the July 8th agreement: Yesterday’s meeting confirmed the dead end’.106 Although Haravgi did not use harsh epithets to describe Mehmet Ali Talat, its lead story nevertheless stated that ‘some analysts interpret Talat’s proposal as an effort of the Turkish Cypriot leadership to disengage from the July 8th agreement with which Ankara was never happy’.107 On the next day in this newspaper’s editorial it was noted that ‘the stance of the Turkish Cypriot leader, who of course acted in the framework of Turkey’s as well as the military’s instructions, shows that he did not leave any room for the continuation (of the talks)’.108

The dailies were set against the settlers

All the newspapers covered events and developments related to the settlers, which is a very sensitive issue for the Greek Cypriot community. They usually pointed out that Turkey or the ‘pseudo-state’ imported them from Anatolia in order to change the demography in Cyprus. Thus, Haravgi ran a lengthy article with the headline: ‘Organized importation of settlers,’ stating that

98 see, for example, Sener Levent’s column in Politis, 17.1.2008:6.
103 See, ‘Πραγματικότητες και ψευδαισθήσεις [Realities and illusions]’, Simerini, 5.9.2007:3.
104 The view that Mehmet Ali Talat is a sensible, realist person who supports the solution was characterised as a myth. See, ‘Η μοναδική διέξοδος [The only way out]’, Phileleftheros, 7.9.2007:6.
105 Costas Venizelos, ‘Με εντολή Άγκυρας πήγε να σκοτώσει την 8η Ιουλίου: Ο Ταλάτ πρότεινε άλλη διαδικασία και έκοπτε τις γέφυρες επικοινωνίας [Under Ankara’s order he went to kill the July 8th (agreement): Talat suggested a different process and cut off communication]’, Phileleftheros, 6.9.2007:4.
106 Marios Mavroudis, ‘Ο Ταλάτ «κλότσησε» τη συμφωνία της 8ης Ιουλίου: Η χέριανθυσή συνάντηση επιβιάστηκε το αδέξαμα [Talat “booted out” the July 8th agreement: Yesterday’s meeting confirmed the dead end]’, Simerini, 6.9.2007:1.
107 Nikos Koutsoumpas, ‘Στο επανειδείν αν και εφόσον: «Εποικοδομητική» συνάντηση Τάσσου-Ταλάτ αλλά δεν συμφώνησαν υπό τους προϋποθέσεις θα ξαναναντιοθηκούν [See you later if…: The meeting of Papadopoulos and Talat was “fruitful” but they did not agree under which circumstances they will meet again]’, Haravgi, 6.9.2007:1.
108 Συλλογικά να συνεκτιμηθεί η κατάσταση [The situation should be evaluated collectively]’, Haravgi, 7.9.2007:5.
Papadopoulos said that the settlers outnumbered the Turkish Cypriots by two to one and that this fact was a consequence of Turkey’s calculated plan. Moreover, some newspapers stressed that the Turkish Cypriot community was also not pleased with the rising numbers of the settlers. This was highlighted in an interview with the Turkish Cypriot, New Cyprus Party (Yeni Kıbrıs Partisi - YKP) leader, Murat Kanatli in Alithia. Simerini ran a cover story purporting that the regime in the north helped the settlers to remain in Cyprus, causing distress to the Turkish Cypriots: ‘They give away “citizenships”’. Below this title, there were several alarming sentences in red type: ‘The Turkish Cypriots estimate that the settlers will reach 1 million within 10 years. 90% of the stores in Kyrenia are controlled by Turks - The T/C worry.’

Turkey as a hostile country

In the press Turkey was never portrayed in positive terms; it did not permit the Turkish Cypriots to decide their own fate; it was following a well-planned strategy to establish a new separatist status quo in Cyprus by altering the demography of the island, among other things. Simerini portrayed Turkey in darker colors than the other papers, calling this country ‘the land of Attila’ or the ‘invader,’ criticizing many of its actions, and arguing that she did not wish to negotiate. Simerini also pictured Turkey as a country with extreme positions, i.e., that she was aiming for Cyprus’s partition, and so was always obstructing a peaceful settlement. This depiction of Turkey was found in the other dailies, which resulted in Turkey being presented as the Greek Cypriots’ enemy, and the one to blame for the deadlock in Cyprus. On 24 and 25 September several dailies reported that Turkey’s Prime Minister, Recep Tayyip Erdogan, said that the Cyprus Problem should be discussed in the framework of two peoples, two democratic regimes, two languages and two religions. The papers added editorials or commentaries related to this statement-in Simerini’s editorial it was stated that Turkey was promoting a velvet divorce solution that would split Cyprus into two states, according to Phileleftheros, Turkey had been moving along the same lines for decades, but with Erdogan’s statement she was officially expressing this policy, the lead story announced: ‘Ankara officially adopts the two states policy.’

Three newspapers argued that Turkey’s objectives collided with those of the Greek Cypriots, making her an enemy. Simerini ran some articles and editorials pointing out that Turkey aimed for the adoption of the Annan plan, while others stressed that she aimed to upgrade the occupied areas and thereby achieve international recognition. In January, Machi published a research report on the Turkish army in Cyprus. This study posited that one reason Turkey wanted its troops to remain on the island was to ‘legalize the illegal regime’in the northern part of Cyprus. Haravgi wrote that Turkish diplomacy tried to persuade the European Council on the issue of ‘direct trade, for the increase of the representation of the Turkish Cypriots (in the EU), for direct flights from and to the occupied areas, for the upgrading and recognition of the illegal universities and for the participation of the pseudo-state’s sports organizations in international athletic organizations’.

---

109 No author, ‘Οργανωμένη εισαγωγή εποίκων: Κατηγορεύει χέρις ο Πρόεδρος, μιλώντας κατά τα διαπαιδευτήρια έξων πρέσβεων [The President reported yesterday during the foreign ambassadors’ acclerations: Organization imported of settlers], Haravgi, 5.9.2007:8.
111 See, ‘Πραγματικότητες και ψευδαισθήσεις [Realities and illusions], Simerini, 5.9.2007:3.
112 See, Simerini, ‘Πούς θα πέσει τη Τουρκία [Where will pressure Turkey?], Simerini, 25.9.2007:3 and Yanhours Charalampides, ‘Χαστούκι στο σκάνδαλο...’ Ως σύμβολο της ενότητας της Αμοιβαιότητας [Slap over the scandal …: Refusal to discuss the draft on Famagusta], Simerini, 18.1.2008:5.
113 Simerini, ‘Το κόστος του ναυαγίου [The cost of the dead end], Simerini, 7.9.2007:9.
114 The split of Czechoslovakia into two countries, the Czech Republic and Slovakia on 1.1.1993 is commonly known as the ‘velvet divorce’.
118 See, for example, Morales Manousopoulos, ‘Μανούσης από τον Ταλάτ: Δεν πείθει η «προθυμία» του για προώθηση της Συμφωνίας [Talat’s maneuvers: His “willingness” for forwarding the agreement is not convincing], Simerini, 5.9.2007:4.
119 No author, ‘Διατηρεί υπεροπλία ο κατοχικός στρατός: Μειωμένες οι δαπάνες για εξοπλισμό της Εθνικής Φρουράς [The occupation army continues to have superior firepower: The expenses for military equipment of the National Guard have been decreased], Machi, 18.1.2008:10.
Turkey was also often depicted as a dangerous country, a practice that would surely heighten Greek Cypriot security concerns. Machi published a piece about the Turkish troops in the north with the headline, ‘The occupation army continues to have superior firepower: The budget for the military equipment of the National Guard has been reduced’, and a subtitle within this news story, ‘The equivalent of one National Guardsman (from the Republic of Cyprus) is three Turkish soldiers’. Machi wrote another article on Turkey’s purchase of new submarines, headlined, ‘Turkey will get six more submarines: It significantly reinforces its navy’. This news story was also posted in Simerini, suggesting that this country posed a threat to the Republic of Cyprus.

**Turkey and the Turkish Cypriot leader, sometimes one and the same**

Turkish Cypriots and Turkey were often represented as being one and the same. Simerini and Machi repeatedly promoted this image, as when they used the expression the ‘Turkish side’ to refer to Turkey, Turkish Cypriots and/or the Turkish Cypriot leadership. This practice reveals their identity views and might also promote the notion that Turkey and the Turkish Cypriots had the same stances and goals, as declared in a Simerini lead story on the Papadopoulos - Talat meeting: ‘The positions expressed by Turkey and the pseudo-state lead to the conclusion that the Turkish side methodically tries to cancel the agreement.’ Machi offers another example of this with a headline reading, ‘Disappointment and judgments against the Turkish Side’, while the text states that the ‘Turkish Cypriot side’ was responsible for the deadlock in the country.

**The ‘others’ in relation to ‘us’**

All the newspapers, for the most part, represented the Greek Cypriots as the ‘goodies’. When the papers compared the actions of the Greek Cypriots with those of Turkey and the Turkish Cypriot leadership, they pictured ‘the others’ as the ‘baddies’.

Phileleftheros and Simerini depicted the Greek Cypriots as willing and ready to resolve the Cyprus problem by adhering both to past agreements and the wishes of the United Nations. For example, in an article on the Papadopoulos - Talat meeting Phileleftheros reported that ‘the occupation leader…basically suggested (that) a new process (should be adopted) abandoning the July 8th agreement,’ which did not concur with the UN position. Another inside headline for this same story was, ‘Under Ankara’s order he went to kill the July 8th (agreement): Talat suggested a different process and cut off communication’, while the text reaffirmed that the President of the Republic of Cyprus aimed solely for implementation of the July 8th agreement, although he also offered ‘several alternative ideas’. In its lead story on the meeting, Simerini pictured Mr. Papadopoulos as someone who went to the talks knowing exactly what he wanted: ‘Tassos goes with specific proposals’. In contrast, the Turkish Cypriot leader was accused of using tricks in order to avoid the July 8 process, since, ‘the Turkish side methodically tries to cancel the agreement’.

There were also news stories promoting the idea that it was Greek Cypriots who deserved the sympathy of the international community. This was accomplished through the recall of bitter

---

121 See note 119.

122 No author, ‘Επιπλέον έξι υποβρύχια θα προμηθευτεί η Τουρκία: Ενισχύει σημαντικά το ναυτικό της [Turkey will get six more submarines: It significantly reinforces its navy], Machi, 25.9.2007:5.

123 Marios Manousopoulos, ‘Μανούβρες από τον Ταλάτ: Δεν πείθει η «προθυμία» του για προώθηση της Συμφωνίας [Talat’s maneuvers: His “willingness” for forwarding the agreement is not convincing], Simerini, 5.9.2007:4.

124 Apostolos Tomaras, ‘Ομόφωνα τα πολιτικά κόμματα: Απογοήτευση και επικρίσεις κατά της Τουρκικής πλευράς [Consensus among the parties: Disappointment and judgments against the Turkish side], Machi, 7.9.2007:14.

125 Costas Venizelos, ‘Η Θάνατος του Ταλάτ: Απογοήτευση και επικρίσεις κατά της Τουρκικής πλευράς [Consensus among the parties: Disappointment and judgments against the Turkish side], Machi, 7.9.2007:14.

126 Costas Venizelos, ‘Η Θάνατος του Ταλάτ: Απογοήτευση και επικρίσεις κατά της Τουρκικής πλευράς [Consensus among the parties: Disappointment and judgments against the Turkish side], Machi, 7.9.2007:14.
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memories, in reports describing the atrocities committed by the ‘other side’ against the Greek Cypriots, who were pictured as the victims of the conflict. In an article in Phileleftheros about the missing persons, the Turkish soldiers were depicted as merciless: ‘One-year-old baby John was bleeding from the ear. He was laying above the head of his father who was killed by the bullets of the Turkish soldiers’.128 The headline of an article in Simerini was, ‘“Three times they put me against the wall…”: The horrifying moments of a priest in the hands of the Turks’.129 In another news story about the release of British documents on Cyprus, the same newspaper wrote that Turkey was the side that constantly broke the cease-fire agreement achieved in Geneva.130 Politis, despite its traditional rapprochement policy, also posted a news story about the missing persons showing that ‘the other side’ mistreated the Greek Cypriots. In the piece, it was reported that a Turkish Cypriot medical student was arrested carrying a Greek Cypriot’s skull. The skull was unearthed by a person who was paid with two trucks of dung for finding one. Part of the sentence which was placed beneath the title of this story was, ‘Skeletons, skulls and other bones belonging to Greek Cypriot missing persons from Ashia and Komi Kebir were found in the hands of medical students and in the offices of T/C doctors’.131

The above examples show that the Greek Cypriots were positively represented in contrast with the ‘other side’ which was depicted as unwilling to reach a solution or responsible for the grievances of the past.

The areas in the north
All the newspapers called the northern part of the island ‘the occupied areas’132 and used the term ‘pseudo-state’ to contest the legitimacy of the territory they consider was taken from the Greek Cypriots by Turkey. The first part of this composite word was frequently attached to other words such as parliament (‘pseudo-parliament’)133 or prime minister (‘pseudo-prime minister’)134 showing that the area in the north of the country was not internationally recognized. Another common practice related to the semantics was quoting in inverted commas the title of a person, a body, an institution or anything that could denote authority to the ‘other side’. For example, Alithia’s cover story on the ferry services between Famagusta and Latakia in Syria refers to Turgay Avcı as ‘The T/C foreign affairs “minister”’.135 Sometimes the inverted commas were replaced by the expression: ‘the so-called’, to stress the lack of international recognition. Simerini, for example, covering the same news story, named Avcı as ‘the so-called Minister of Foreign Affairs’.136 Machi and Simerini not only used the above wording, they also stressed in various ways that the Greek Cypriots were the rightful owners of the ‘occupied areas’. Machi ran a cover story stating that the EU draft report on Famagusta completely adopted Turkey’s rationale that the return of the abandoned city to its ‘rightful owners’ was possible only in the framework of an overall solution.137 This view was also expressed a day later in Simerini’s editorial: ‘Attia… does not allow its rightful owners to return to their lands and to their properties’.138

128 Vassos Vasilou, ‘„Δεν δεχόμαστε να παραλάβουμε ελλιπή οστά”: Άνυπότατη φυγή η Χαρίτα Μάντολες στέκει ολόρθη πριν την ακροτελεία στροφή του δράματος [“We will not accept incomplete bones”: Harita Mantoles is an untamed soul who stands proud just before the last scene of the drama]’, Phileleftheros, 18.1.2008:3.

129 Demetris Manousakis, ‘„Τρείς φορές με έστησαν στον τοίχο…”: Οι εφιάλτικες στιγμές ενός ιερέα στα χέρια των Τούρκων [“Three times they put me against the wall…”: The horrifying moments of a priest in the hands of the Turks]’, Simerini, 19.1.2008:40.


132 See, for example, No author, ‘Διαφορετικές προσεγγίσεις στα κατεχόμενα [Different approaches in the occupied areas]’, Haravgi, 7.9.2007:8.

133 See example, No author, ‘Κάθοδος Γκιουλ: Ποδαρικό με κατεχόμενα [Gul’s descent: First-Footing on the occupied areas]’, Politis, 4.9.2007:5.

134 See example, Spros Athanasiades, ‘Αποχή συνεχές [The abstention is continued]’, Phileleftheros, 7.9.2007:6.

135 See example, No author, ‘Διαφορετικές προσεγγίσεις στα κατεχόμενα [Different approaches in the occupied areas]’, Haravgi, 7.9.2007:8.

136 Panagiota Tsaggaris, ‘Δεν προλάβαμε να παραλάβουμε τις νότες: Προτού απαντήσει το διάβημα μας η Συρία, ξεκινήσαμε προς την Ιταλία [We cannot deliver the memorandums fast enough: Before Syria answers our demarche, we make demarches to Italy]’, Alithia, 25.9.2007:1.

137 Michalis Hadjistylianou, ‘Τούρκος λέγει την αλήθεια; Στα κατεχόμενα πανηγυρίζουν, εμείς διαψεύδουμε [Who tells the truth? In the occupied areas they celebrate while we disprove]’, Simerini, 24.9.2007:6.

138 Athanasiades Alistraitis, ‘Σκανδαλώδης έκθεση για την Αμμόχωστο: Υιοθετεί την επιχειρηματολογία της Τουρκίας για πιθανότητας αποπληθωριώσεις του λιμανιού της Σύρου [Scandalous report on Famagusta: It adopts Turkey’s rationale for the possibility of returning to this abandoned city] only in the frame of an overall solution]’, Machi, 17.1.2008:1.

139 Simerini, ‘Κόκκινο χαλί στον επιδρομέα [Red carpet for the invader]’, Simerini, 18.1.2008:3.
While this stance was not clearly detected in all the dailies, nevertheless each one of them, without exception, widely covered news stories that were related to actions of indirect political recognition of the north. This tendency eventually reflected the Greek Cypriots’ fear of losing forever land that they considered theirs. The issues of ferry services with Latakia in Syria and the meeting of Turgay Avcı with some Italian officials were extensively reported and support this argument. Phileleftheros stated that, ‘Syria under Turkey’s pressure proceeds with actions to upgrade the occupation regime’.139 According to Simerini the ferry services indicated ‘indirect recognition of the pseudo-state’,140 while Machi appears to have considered this issue along with the intention of Turgay Avcı to give ‘TRNC’ passports to two Italian politicians important enough to run them under the title, the ‘main story’ (το Θέμα).141 Alithia reported these developments in its cover story suggesting that the Republic of Cyprus was trying to fend off blows: ‘We cannot deliver the memorandums fast enough: Before Syria answers our demarche, we make demarches to Italy’.142 In inside pages of the paper a related story was headlined: ‘A slap from Italy as well’.143 Politis used a similar headline for the same issue: ‘Slaps from everywhere’,144 while Haravgi stressed that Avcı’s actions were unlawful: ‘They distribute illegal traveling documents’.145 Coverage of matters related to indirect political recognition of the ‘occupied areas’ reveals that such actions were not condoned by the newspapers, while it suggests that the northern part of the island was considered to belong to the Greek Cypriots and that the Turkish Cypriot leadership had no legal authority over the territory.

The north was also very often depicted negatively, with four dailies publishing articles portraying the area as a source of crimes that frequently caused trouble to the Republic of Cyprus. A headline in Simerini reads, ‘Constant flow of illegal immigrants: They travel by ships and fishing boats to the occupied areas and from there to the free areas’.146 The same subject was discussed on the front page of Machi: ‘We have been flooded with… illegal immigrants: forty more (persons) have passed to the free areas’,147 again in Machi, ‘They incessantly sell fake European identification cards: (The illegal immigrants) buy them from the occupied areas for as much as 3000 euros’.148 Politis ran the headline: ‘The occupied areas are (like) a “black hole”: The Green Line issue goes to the Council’149 and an article in Phileleftheros about the arrest of two Romanian suspects was headlined: ‘They were coming from the occupied areas to steal’.150 Stories from the ‘other side’ It is interesting to look at which news stories from the Turkish Cypriot press were selected for republication by the Greek Cypriot newspapers, as well as how these stories were modified. In

141 No author, Το παίζουν «Κινέζοι» στη Δαμασκό: Κανονικό δούλεμα τριών 24ωρων από τη Συρία [In Damascus they pretend to know nothing: Syria played us for 3 days], Machi, 25.9.2007:14, 27.
142 Panagíta Tsangaris, Για τη δίκαιη θέση δεν προκειται το αποτέλεσμα της συνάντησης με τη Συρία, ζευγάρησαν την Ιταλία [It cannot deliver the memorandum fast enough: Before Syria answers our demarche, we make demarches to Italy], Alithia, 25.9.2007:1.
143 Panagíta Tsangaris, Και με Ιταλίδα υπουργό συναντήθηκε ο Ακμός: Χαστούκια και από την Ιταλία- Ο τ/κ «ΥΠΕΞ» συναντήθηκε με Ιταλόγις αξιωματούχος και τελετή στην Ιταλική Βουλή [Avcı also met an Italian minister: A slap from Italy as well-The T/C “Prime Minister” met with Italian officials and (there was a) ceremony in the Italian Parliament], Alithia, 25.9.2007:5.
144 Voggelis Vasilóu, Χαστούκια από παντού [Slaps from everywhere], Politis, 25.9.2007:7.
146 Georgia Ioannidou, Συνεχής ροή λαθρομεταναστών: Με πλοιάρια και ψαρόβαρκες στα κατεχόμενα και απ’ εκεί στα ελεύθερα εδάφη [Constant flow of illegal immigrants: They travel by ships and fishing boats to the occupied areas and from there to the free areas], Simerini, 25.9.2007:3.
147 Sofi Orphanidou, Πλημμύρισαμε...Λαθρομετανάστες: Άλλοι σαράντα πέρασαν στις ελεύθερες περιοχές [We have been flooded with…illegal immigrants: forty more (persons) have passed to the free areas], Machi, 17.1.2008:14.
148 Larnaca Press Agency, Τους πωλούν αβέρτα πλαστές ευρωπαϊκές ταυτότητες: Τις αγοράζουν από τα κατεχόμενα μέχρι και 3000 ευρώ [They incessantly sell fake European identification cards: (The illegal immigrants) buy them from the occupied areas for up to 3000 euros], Machi, 25.9.2007:4.
149 Tetí Sarantopoulou, «Μαύρη τρύπα» τα κατεχόμενα: Στο Συμβούλιο οδεύει το θέμα της πράσινης γραμμής [The occupied areas are (like) a “black hole”: The Green Line issue goes to the Council] 149 and an article in Phileleftheros about the arrest of two Romanian suspects was headlined: ‘They were coming from the occupied areas to steal’.150
149 Phileleftheros, 24.9.2007:40.
the present timeframe, the dailies seem to have focused more on articles and subjects drawn from the newspapers of ‘the other side’ than in 2002. Some dailies even added a special section or a page dedicated to reporting developments in Turkey or in the northern part of Cyprus. On page six, Phileleftheros included a box entitled: Turkey/occupied areas and in its Sunday edition a theme page with articles about the ‘occupied areas’, while it also named its seventeenth page: Turkey. In the 24 September paper, on page nine, Haravgi published the following headline: Turkey: The echo of the current news. Politis usually covered news stories about the Turkish Cypriots or Turkey on page six, where the public could also read the column of the Turkish Cypriot regular columnist, Sener Levent.

The newspapers frequently selected stories referring to efforts of the ‘other side’ to achieve political recognition. They all covered the way that the Turkish Cypriot press reported on the ferry service from Famagusta to Latakia and Turgay Avcı’s visit to Italy. These issues were likely selected because they were considered as matters of de facto recognition of the ‘occupied areas’. Simerini, for example, posted a picture from a Turkish Cypriot daily to prove that Syria accepted ‘TRNC’ passports. The caption below the photo was, “Halkin Sesi”, published in yesterday’s edition (pictures) of the pseudo-state’s passports with Syria’s stamp (on them). Phileleftheros ran an article by Levent Ozadam that had been published in the Turkish Cypriot newspaper, Kibrisli, reporting that ‘Syria’s stance was brave and was sending some messages to the international community. It appears that Avcı’s visit to Syria produced the desirable results and that the Syrian officials have accepted the T/C “passports”’. Machi stated that ‘the Turkish Cypriot media report that the so-called minister of foreign affairs, Turgay Avcıis in Italy to deliver two passports of the (occupation) regime to two Italian politicians’.

It also appears that when the G/C newspapers published pieces from the T/C or Turkish press they changed the semantics of the original texts. This practice of intertwining commentary and facts was employed by all the Greek Cypriot newspapers. Politis republished an article taken from a Turkish daily, saying that it ‘accurately’ reported what was noted in the piece in Cumhuriyet; yet every phrase that suggested authority to the northern part of Cyprus was placed within inverted commas, such as the words ‘opposition’, ‘prime minister’ or ‘parliament’. Phileleftheros posted an article written by Levent Ozadam covering the ferry services from Famagusta to Syria. The piece seems to have been published unedited but the words ‘TRNC’ and ‘passports’ were enclosed within quotation marks, indicating that the piece was tailored to fit the general stance of the Greek Cypriots that the ‘occupied areas’ did not have the status of a state. Machi reported what was published in the Turkish Cypriot press and wrote that, ‘Mr. Toptan mentioned his trip to the occupied areas and said that traditionally the first journey of each President of the Grand National Assembly is in the pseudo-state’. Mr. Toptan, obviously, did not use the words ‘occupied areas’ or ‘pseudo-state’.

151 See example, Spyros Athanasiades, ‘Τουρκία/Κατεχόμενα [Turkey/Occupied areas]’, Phileleftheros, 4.9.2007:6.
155 No author, ‘Παράνομη επίσκεψη στα κατεχόμενα και από τον Τοπτάν [Toptan will also illegally visit the occupied areas]’, Machi, 5.9.2007:9.
156 This practice was also used by the journalists in articles that were not published by the T/C press. See, for example, Michalis Hadjiyiakou, ‘Τι πέφτει τον Τοπτάν για την 8η Ιουλίου: Κανονικό ή Κυπριακό εξαυτηρισμός από το Γ.Γ. του ΟΗΕ Μπαν Κι-Μουν [What Toptan did for the 8th of July: Normal or Cypriot withdrawal of the Secretary-General of the UN to Ban Ki-moon]’, Simerini, 24.9.2007:5. In this article, while the journalist described the meeting of President Papadopoulus with the UN Secretary General, he mixed his opinion with the facts in order to blame Talat for trying to cancel the 8 July agreement.
159 No author, ‘Παράνομη επίσκεψη στα κατεχόμενα και από τον Τοπτάν [Toptan will also illegally visit the occupied areas]’, Machi, 5.9.2007:9.
160 The same words were used in Phileleftheros, which indicates that both newspapers used the same source, probably the Cyprus News Agency.
Conclusion
For the dates researched here, the dailies showed little change from 2002; they appear to have remained bound by their political or ideological beliefs and they also continued to promote specific positions with the same techniques, strategies and tools used in the earlier period. The newspaper stances, their resources and limitations still played a very important role in the way a news story was changed and promoted, but for this period of study it appears that there was a greater effort for objectivity. This attempt at greater impartiality, however, did not stop the dailies from promoting their own positions.

All the newspapers maintained their 2002 stances with regard to the solution to the Cyprus Problem. *Simerini* and *Machi* continued pointing out the divergence of opinion between the two communities, and they still blamed Turkey and the Turkish Cypriot leadership for placing obstacles in the path to a solution. *Phileleftheros*, which was always careful not to oppose the official stance of the Greek Cypriot side, backed the July 8 agreement but also supported positions that could lead away from the agreed form of the solution. *Politis* and *Haravgi*, following a policy of rapprochement, stressed the need for a prompt settlement that would reunify the island.

In this period the press focused less on the solution, as attention was turned towards the presidential elections. Analysis of the news stories revealed that most newspapers offered favorable coverage to specific parties or politicians. This trend, also observed in 2002, was manifested through several practices, including overrepresentation of a party and/or a politician; reporting specific subjects favorably and/or unfavorably in relation to a candidate or a party; portrayal of certain parties or candidates positively and/or negatively; use of flattering statements made by an influential individual in favor of a candidate; and, last but not least, the projection of the notion that the presidential hopeful, backed by the party to which a daily offered favorable coverage, would win the presidential elections.

The depiction of the EU was inconsistent, as media positions changed frequently. The EU would be perceived either as an ally or as an enemy according to its stance on several issues that were related to the Republic of Cyprus. This was also noted in the 2002 press analysis.

The press considered certain groups to be ‘us’ or ‘our side’ and other groups as the ‘others’, each characterized by a specific image. The Greek Cypriots and the Greeks were viewed as ‘our side’. *Machi* and *Simerini* especially, as in the previous period of study, emphasized the bond between the Greek Cypriots and Greece. *Haravgi* continued to consider the two communities as one people. All newspapers however, seemed to feel there was a close connection between the Republic of Cyprus and Greece.

The ‘other side’ comprised several categories. The Turkish Cypriots were depicted favourably, although their leadership was pictured negatively. The portrayal of the settlers in even darker colors shows that they were considered to be part of Turkey’s well-planned strategy to alter the demography in Cyprus and achieve a new status quo. Turkey was always pictured as a country that wanted partition and hindered peace. It was projected as the Greek Cypriots’ enemy, aiming for a settlement unfavourable to the Republic of Cyprus, and for the political recognition of the ‘occupied areas’. Some dailies even depicted it as dangerous, increasing perhaps the security concerns of the Greek Cypriots.

Regardless of their political persuasions or identity beliefs, the newspapers portrayed the Greek Cypriots as the good guys who were willing to end the deadlock on the island. Conversely, *Simerini* and *Phileleftheros* projected the idea that Turkey and the Turkish Cypriot leadership blocked the process of solution. These contradicting images became more obvious in reportages about the past. The use of memories by *Simerini*, *Phileleftheros* and *Politis* put forth the view that Greek Cypriots were the victims of the conflict and the ones who deserved the sympathy of the international community.

The northern part of the island under Turkish control was characterized as the ‘occupied areas’ and depicted negatively. All the newspapers repeatedly reported news stories that were linked to the matter of indirect recognition of this part. This perhaps reflected the Greek Cypriots’ fear of losing forever a territory which they considered as their own. Moreover, that area of the island was often depicted as a source of problems for the Republic of Cyprus.
The news stories from Turkish Cypriot dailies were changed before being republished by Greek Cypriot newspapers. Many of the articles selected for publication referred to the efforts of the ‘other side’ to achieve political recognition. Furthermore, in this section of the report it appeared that the newspapers systematically tailored the semantics used in the original texts to their own stances. This practice of intertwinement between views and facts was employed by all dailies.

Synthia Pavlou
GREEK CYPRIOIT TELEVISION IN 2007-2008
Synthia Pavlou

The different reality of television
It has been said that a news report is ‘only a passing parade of specific events, a “context of no context”’.1 Our research, however, reveals that a newscast not only reports on the big news of the moment, but also carries its own implicit messages.

Here we examine the roles of the presenters, the headlines, the subtitles, and the voice-overs.2 Yet a broadcasting team uses much more than words to describe an event, to convey information or certain views to the public. Therefore, besides the story content, we must also examine the order of news items, their length, accompanying images, statements of the people included in the news and natural ambient sound.

The Data
The five national free-to-air television channels, the public service Cyprus Broadcasting Corporation (Ραδιοφωνικό Ίδρυμα Κύπρου - RIK), and the commercial Mega, ANT1, Sigma and Plus TV3 are examined in this part of the research. The data studied were drawn from the main evening news bulletins, for the same dates as for newspapers, i.e., from 4 to 7 September, 24 to 26 September 2007 and 17 to 20 January 2008.

The main news stories and what they reveal
At the beginning of September 2007, the meeting between President Tassos Papadopoulos and the Turkish Cypriot leader Mehmet Ali Talat was widely covered in all the media. In the same month all channels also covered the forest fires in Greece and emphasized the Cypriot contribution. Additionally, the initiation of a ferry service between the occupied port of Famagusta and Latakia in Syria was extensively reported. In January 2008, the presidential elections and the candidates’ campaigns dominated the eight o’clock news bulletins.

These top news stories, which were repeatedly covered, along with a series of supplementary reportages are examined to reveal the following:

a) Trends/practices of television stations;
b) The stances of each TV channel regarding the solution, the government, the political parties, the European Union and the ‘other side’;

The strategies followed to promote these positions.

Media Practices
The study reveals the main practices that the stations used to draw viewers to their newscast while trying to remain competitive and inform the audience of significant events as objectively as possible.

---

3 This channel was launched on 28 July 2006 and it was called CNC (Cyprus New Channel) Plus TV.
News offerings and competitiveness

Some argue that television reporting is nothing more than a “section” of a commercial business. This might explain the various strategies and practices that the stations employed to increase the competitiveness of their product, which in this case was the eight o’clock news report.

A more fulfilling viewing experience

Television channels aim to keep the public tuned to their newscast; they have to remain competitive to stay in business, and so they ‘invent’ ways to maintain viewers’ interest. To this end, most stations offer a mix of visual and verbal information aiming to ‘sensationalize and glamorize’ the news. Such means were the use of special effects such as the split screen technique, the video wall, images and words that gradually appeared on the screen, shots which succeeded each other giving the impression of turning pages and graphics seamlessly mixed with live action. The assumed goal is to astonish the audience, engage viewers in a fulfilling viewing experience and become the market leader in news production. Electronic images, which are considered vital in today’s news bulletins that ‘blend’ information with entertainment (infotainment), seem to have helped the channels titillate the viewers.

In addition to computer-generated graphics, sound was also manipulated for maximum effect. Music, for example, was used to create a dramatic backdrop, possibly resulting in the amusement of the public or simply emphasizing the significance of a story. As background to their reportage, the TV stations played different types of melodies that could lead to eliciting audience responses such as laughter, tears or a rapid heartbeat. Ambient sound as an accompaniment to news stories could make the reportages more vibrant and appealing; e.g., the applause heard during news stories about the submissions of candidacy for the Republic of Cyprus presidency is an example of this media practice.

Wide coverage and timely report of the news

The TV stations were quite competitive; two tactics that could garner large audiences were wide coverage and timely reporting of the news. These features enabled TV channels not only to keep their audience up-to-date about an important development, but also to improve the quality of their nightly newscast.

A practice in the effort to give extensive coverage was to air different reportages for the same news story. One example was coverage of the submission of presidential candidacies, for which all the channels offered several different reports.

7 See, for example, the split screen technique on Plus TV, item 5, 20.1.2008; Mega, item 11, 20.1.2008. See also, the effects used by RIK and Mega in their news stories about the submissions of candidacy for the Republic of Cyprus presidency: RIK, item 1, 18.1.2008; Mega, item 4, 18.1.2008; Sigma, item 9, 19.1.2008; ANT1, item 4, 6.9.2007. The researcher separated the news report into different items by counting the news stories that were introduced by the presenter. The stories that are linked to certain reportage were classified by the number of the relevant news story and a letter, for example 1a, 1b, 1c, etc.
9 Mega broadcast a news story about a team of MPs from the Republic of Cyprus sent to the European Parliament to sandbag the spread of negative impressions that might have been created by the positions of MEP, Marios Matsakis, regarding a solution based on two separate states. A music that implied danger was heard at the beginning of this reportage; Mega, item 3, 5.9.2007.
10 A news story about a concert organized for the support of Demetris Christofias’s candidacy was aired by Plus TV. It passed its own political messages but it was also related to entertainment issues. This is why it was accompanied by the music pieces of those who would participate in this event: Plus TV, item 4, 20.1.2008.
11 See, for example, ANT1, item 5, 17.1.2008. This reportage was about the submissions of candidacy for the Republic of Cyprus presidency. See also, RIK, item 7, 26.9.2007. This news story was about a poll regarding the Presidential elections.
12 ANT1 aired a story about funny instances that occurred during the submissions of candidacy for the Republic of Cyprus presidency. A cheerful tune was heard at the beginning of this reportage to cultivate the appropriate mood in the audience. See, ANT1, item 4, 18.1.2008.
13 A news story about the fires that broke out in Greece began with a sad melody. See Mega, item 6, 5.9.2007.
14 Mega, items 4a and 4b, 18.1.2008; RIK, items 2, 3 and 4, 18.1.2008; Sigma, item 4, 18.1.2008; Plus TV, item 1, 18.1.2008.
15 Plus TV, items 1-7, 18.1.2008; RIK, items 1-5, 18.1.2008; ANT1, items 2-5, 18.1.2008; Mega, items 4, 4a-4c, 5-6, 6a-6b and 7, 18.1.2008; Sigma, items 4-6, 18.1.2008.
Live broadcasting was a practice the stations employed in order to instantly report on newsworthy issues, which could attract the attention of the audience and eventually help them win the viewing race. All five television stations tried to offer wide coverage of significant events while simultaneously attempting to broadcast breaking news in real time. They used live links, studio interviews, live telephone reports and last-minute information delivered by a journalist to the newsroom. The meeting between Papadopoulos and Talat was one of the news stories broadcast live, proving that the stations were constantly present and ready to report a significant development. The display of different windows on the screen was another live broadcasting-related tool that helped the channels remain competitive; it was likely used to dazzle the viewers and persuade them that they were not only being provided with very thorough coverage but also with a valuable commodity. This technique was employed in the news stories on the ferry service from the port of Famagusta to Latakia and the visit of several EU officials to Cyprus upon the country’s adoption of the euro.

The channels’ attempt to broadcast developments as quickly as possible and their wish to reach the top-rated spot were perhaps the reasons behind their decision to employ international correspondents or to send their local journalists abroad to cover specific events. This practice confirmed the stations’ efforts for providing extra and timely information on a variety of issues.

**Scoops and extra information**

TV channels tried to provide exclusive coverage of events or developments. This was most often in the form of offering additional information about a widely reported event. This perhaps contributed to their reliability, and helped them gain a larger audience as they earned the trust of the viewers. This, in turn, could subsequently help them to promote their views, draw more funds and remain competitive. ANT1 aired ‘a well-documented (ντοκουμέντο)’ video and Plus TV offered ‘an exclusive’ video highlighting the fact that they broadcast unique images, which no other channel had filmed, attesting to the importance of extra information.

If a station scooped all the others by airing a news story first, then it made sure to point it out. This was achieved by placing the word ‘exclusive’ on the screen, or more commonly, by emphasizing in the introductory headlines or reports that a piece of information or a statement would be only broadcast by that specific station.

**Impartiality and truthfulness**

‘The power of television is partly attributed to its completeness: it entertains, comments and informs.’ In this part of the report we will examine whether the stations tried to objectively inform the public. This issue is crucial since television news is the most important source of information for the majority of people in western societies.

It appears that most channels attempted to cover some news as neutrally as possible. The stations tried to objectively report various events not only to serve their duty as news providers but also to gain credibility and ensure the public’s trust. This tactic seems to have subsequently...
helped the stations to ‘sell’ their own perceptions and opinions about other significant political
issues. The way the campaigns for the presidential elections were presented can support this
view. Most channels repeatedly attempted to include the opinions or actions of the three main
candidates in the same news bulletin. 27

The stations followed several strategies to gain credibility. One was the use of numbers, which
were perhaps included to substantiate their claims, but probably also to persuade the public that
whatever was reported was true and accurate. The meeting between Papadopoulos and Talat can
once again be used as an example to support this argument. The channels informed the viewers
of the exact time the two leaders arrived at the residence of the United Nation’s special envoy,
and they also specified the time frame of the meeting. 28

Financial Support
While most stations appear to have tried to cover some news as neutrally as possible, still, this
research found that many times their depiction of events was affected by certain views and
political aspirations. Sponsorship appears to have partly influenced the stations’ representations.
RIK, for example, which is a state-funded public service station, appears to have offered favorable
coverage to the government. Mega, on the other hand, which is owned by the Church of Cyprus
and Teletypos S.A., sometimes offered coverage to activities and the views of the Church.
Furthermore, this channel occasionally highlighted the role of the Church in several matters while
in many cases it backed the Church’s stance. 29

Discourses and Media Practices

The form of the solution
The news stories covered during the timeframe of this research did not offer enough material for
categorising the various strategies used by the media to project their stances. Therefore, the focus
here is on the channels’ ideologies related to the settlement of the Cyprus Problem and not the
journalistic practices used to promote their views on this subject.

Our analysis reveals that no channel explicitly opposed the official stance of the government
regarding the way forward for a solution. They all appear to have considered the Gambari
agreement as an acceptable arrangement to reach a solution of the Cyprus Problem.

Mega invited prominent DIKO, DISY and AKEL officials to their studio to share their opinions
on the upcoming meeting between Tassos Papadopoulos and Mehmet Ali Talat. The presenter
initiated the discussion using the following words: ‘Our side aims...to begin the July 8 process’. 30 On
the next day’s news bulletin, it was stressed that ‘the Greek Cypriot side correctly insists on the
agreement reached a year ago’. 31 The use of the possessive determiner of the personal pronoun
‘we’ in the first example and use of the adverb ‘justly’ in the second sentence reveal that Mega
adopted the official position of the government on the solution sought. RIK also appears to have
projected the idea that the Gambari process could end the deadlock in the country. One of the
journalists who covered the leaders’ meeting said that the July 8 agreement was ‘the beginning
of a substantial effort for the solution of the Cyprus problem’. 32 Plus TV also seems to have
supported this process; during a report on the Papadopoulos-Talat meeting it said that ‘AKEL
expresses its satisfaction with the National Council’s… reassurance that we will honor the July 8

27 RIK, item 21, 20.1.2008; Mega Cyprus, items 15-17, 20.1.2007; ANT1, items 9, 9a, 9b, 20.1.2008; Sigma, item 7 and 13, 20.1.2008; Sigma
did not broadcast a campaign-related reportage about Papadopoulos, but, it did air a news story in which Tassos Papadopoulos’s positions on
the water problem were positively described. Sigma, item 6, 20.1.2008.
28 Sigma, item 1, 5.9.2007; RIK, item 1, 5.9.2007; ANT1, item 1, 5.9.2007; Plus TV, item 1, 5.9.2007. Mega used numerical data to convey that
the Turkish-Cypriot leader did not actually wish to re-affirm his commitment to the Gambari agreement. In one of this channel’s news stories it
was said that ‘fifty meetings’ between President Papadopoulos and Mehmet Ali Talat reveal that the latter politician did not want to implement
the July 8 agreement: Mega, item 1, 5.9.2007.
30 Mega, item 6, 4.9.2007.
31 Mega, item 1, 5.9.2007.
32 RIK, item 1, 5.9.2007.
agreement which, in its first paragraph, commits the two sides to work for a bi-zonal bi-communal federal solution. This was also stressed during another Plus TV news story about the United Democratic Youth Union’s (Ενιαία Δημοκρατική Οργάνωση Νεολαίας – EDON) views on the settlement. Plus TV, which always offered favorable coverage to AKEL and often took the line of this party’s stances, favored the implementation of the Gambari agreement and a solution based on the bi-zonal bi-communal federation.

ANT1’s and Sigma’s views on this subject were not clearly revealed. However, the fact that both channels criticized the Turkish Cypriot leader for not wanting to implement the July 8 process might imply that they supported this agreement, meaning that their notions about this issue were aligned with those of the government.

The fact that all five Greek Cypriot stations enthusiastically pointed out that the UN Secretary-General, Ban Ki Moon, backed the Gambari process during his meeting in New York with President Papadopoulos, reinforces the argument that they were not against the arrangement. This matter united the channels against the ‘other side’ which was considered to be Turkey and the Turkish Cypriot leadership. This unanimity was less evident when the channels reported news stories that were not related to the solution.

The Government and the Parties

Our analysis attempted to trace the channels’ stances on the government and the political parties by examining the journalistic practices and the ways that certain views received favorable treatment.

Any news or events linked to the presidential elections were widely covered by the stations and revealed their stances, representations and practices. RIK appears to have been the channel that dedicated the most broadcast time to this issue, with Plus TV and Mega not far behind. ANT1 and Sigma included reports in their news bulletins that were related to this political matter, but they did not focus on this subject. The analysis of the news stories revealed that most television stations had preferences and offered more favorable coverage to certain people or parties. This trend was also noticed in reports that were not linked to the issue of the elections.

Wider coverage for one party and its candidate

Most channels seem to have overrepresented certain politicians or parties. Sometimes this was evidenced by the fact that a particular person’s or party’s actions and/or views were the only subject of a news story. The examples given below substantiate this claim.

This research revealed that ANT1 and RIK offered more favorable coverage to Papadopoulos during the pre-election period. On one day both channels emphasized the stances of this politician in reports that focused solely on the President’s views on the solution of the Cyprus Problem. On the other hand, Sigma, which appears to have remained neutral during the elections, and Plus TV, which seems to have offered favorable coverage to Christofias, included Papadopoulos’s statements in a report on another development, the official encounter of the US Under-Secretary

33 Plus TV, item 2, 4.9.2007.
34 Plus TV, item 8, 17.1.2008.
35 ANT1, item 1, 5.9.2007; Sigma, item 1, 5.9.2007.
36 RIK, item 1, 24.9.2007; Sigma, item 2, 24.9.2007; Mega, item 3, 24.9.2007; ANT1, item 10, 24.9.2007.
37 RIK aired in total seven news stories related to the Presidential elections in two days. See, RIK, item 1-5 and 19-20, 18.1.2008; RIK, items 1-2, 9-10, 14 and 18-20, 19.1.2008. The next day, it broadcast six reportages on election issues. See, RIK, items 2, 4-5, 14-15 and 21, 20.1.2008.
38 Plus TV included seven news stories related to the submissions of candidacy for the Republic of Cyprus Presidency, in one news bulletin. See, Plus TV, items 1-7, 18.1.2008. Five reportages directly or indirectly connected to the presidential elections were broadcast on each of the following two days. See, Plus TV, items 1-3, 6 and 9, 19.1.2008; Plus TV, items 1-5, 19.1.2008.
39 Mega also aired 11 news stories connected to the Presidential elections in three days. See, Mega, items 4, 4a-4c, 5-6, 6a-6b and 7, 18.1.2008. It broadcast five reportages in each of the following two days and included a speakage linked to the Presidential elections. See, Mega, items 3, 3a-5, 15-16, 19.1.2008 and items 11-12 and 15-17, 20.1.2008.
40 ANT1 broadcast in total eleven reportages about the elections over three days. See, ANT1, items 2-5, 18.1.2008, items 5, 6, 16 and 21, 19.1.2008 and 9-9a and 10, 20.1.2008.
41 Sigma also aired 11 news reports connected to the Presidential elections in three days. See, Sigma, items 4-7, 18.1.2008, items 4-5 and 8-9, 19.1.2008 and items 5, 7 and 13, 20.1.2008.
42 See, ANT1, item 17, 25.9.2007; RIK, item 3, 25.9.2007.
for Political Affairs with the Greek Foreign Minister. Another example of overrepresentation can be found in RIK’s reports on the Papadopoulos-Talat meeting, in which the only views covered were those of the representatives of DIKO, EDEK and the European Party (Ευρωπαϊκό Κόμμα- EVROKO) which supported the candidacy of Papadopoulos. Sigma and Plus TV did not report the opinions of these three parties in a different news story; instead, they broadcast them in the same report where they covered the reactions of the parties’ leaders to the official encounter of the President with Mehmet Ali Talat.

Another example of the extensive reporting of a certain party was the Plus TV broadcast that focused solely on Christofias’s mother and her wishes for her son. This event was possibly televised in an effort to give wider coverage to the general secretary of AKEL. The other channels that broadcast Mrs. Christofias’s statements included them in the report on her son’s submission of candidacy or in the news story on the other candidates’ submissions.

**Minimum coverage of the independent candidates**

Coverage of the independent candidates, in terms of broadcasting time, was not equal to that of politicians with party backing. Not only were the views of the independent candidates not widely covered, they were even ridiculed. These observations also support the argument that the channels served their own political persuasions and preferences.

We can take one newscast of Plus TV to illustrate the unequal allocation of time for independent versus party-backed candidates. The coverage of Christofias’s candidacy lasted approximately six minutes and thirty seconds; for Papadopoulos, two minutes and thirty-six seconds and for Kassoulides, two minutes and fifteen seconds. There was only one news story on the six remaining candidates and it lasted only two minutes and nineteen seconds. ANT1 offers another example, as all submissions were reported in a single story, with Papadopoulos given one minute and twenty seconds, Christofias one minute and sixteen seconds, and Kassoulides one minute and nineteen seconds; among independents, Costas Themistocleous was allotted thirty-two seconds, and Marios Matsakis, thirty-one seconds. No more than ten seconds were dedicated to the three remaining independent candidates.

One day, all the stations broadcast several humorous incidences that had occurred during the submissions. These amusing stories, however, which were also sometimes embarrassing, concerned only the independent candidates. One report of Mega for example, recounted unexpected events and funny incidents related to minor candidates. The subsequent story was dedicated solely to an independent candidate, highlighting his amusing statements.

**Government-centered or party-centered news stories**

A popular means for stations to show their support to a particular party, the government or candidate was to lead with a news item related to their favourite. They might also highlight the
views of their preferred party, politician or the government by reporting them in the captions or in an introductory announcement prior to the main news bulletin. The practice of highlighting government-centered or party-centered news stories was most often used by RIK and Plus TV.

For example, in one newscast, RIK began with statements of the President and the Minister of Foreign Affairs regarding the ferry service from the occupied port of Famagusta to Latakia; the second story was a sound bite from the Minister of Internal Affairs on his meeting with the Syrian attaché; the third item reported on Papadopoulos’s meeting with the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, Sergey Lavrov.\(^57\) Plus TV, in contrast to RIK’s government-centered report, focused on AKEL and Christofias. The first news item covered the meeting of the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Erato Kozakou-Markoulli, with her Syrian counterpart,\(^58\) but the introduction of the second focused solely on Christofias’s stance on the ferry issue.\(^59\) The fourth news story was about the government’s decision to reduce the heating oil tax, but during the cue and in the voice-over of this report, AKEL’s position on this matter was heard.\(^60\)

While the above-described practices resulted in promoting a certain party or a person, when it came to the presidential elections, we will see that much more powerful weapons that would ‘coerce’ the viewers to follow a particular political line, were required.

Positive representation of politicians and parties

RIK and Plus TV, especially, gave flattering coverage to the candidates and politicians they supported. For example, Plus TV aired a news story highlighting AKEL’s efforts to help out in the face of high commodity prices: ‘AKEL increases pressure on the government to give generous social benefits through a new package’.\(^61\) In another story reporting on a music concert, this same station noted in the cue that the performers, which were well-known Greek musicians, considered the general secretary of AKEL ‘an outstanding leader, a positive and firm politician who [would] unite the people and lead Cyprus toward a fair solution that would set the foundations for a just society’.\(^62\) Conversely, RIK often stressed the virtues of the government and the President by pointing out that they could handle all kinds of challenges and successfully tackle the deadlock in the country. In a lead story it noted that although Papadopoulos was in New York, he remained ‘fully informed’ on the Syria issue.\(^63\) In a different news story the following words were heard: ‘he personally gives instructions for the operations and the demarches’…’\(^64\)

Negative representation of a ‘rival’ candidate or a party

On occasion most channels presented news stories in an unfavorable manner towards a certain candidate or party that did not share the channel’s views or opposed the person or political group to which they offered favorable coverage.

ANT1, for example, in the cue to a news item on President Papadopoulos’s meeting with the UN Secretary General, wrote: ‘Ioannis Kassoulides and Costas Themistocleous… had a negative attitude and clearly reduced [the meeting’s] importance’.\(^65\) Similarly, Mega aired a story on the refugees’ building coefficient, stating, ‘AKEL insists on considering that the proposed measure was to no avail…while it was also aggressively opposed to the other benefits announced by the President’.\(^66\) Plus TV was often critical of the government, e.g., ‘The issue of the ferry service between the occupied areas and Latakia caught the [government] diplomatic services by surprise.

---

\(^57\) RIK, item 1-3, 26.9.2007.
\(^58\) Plus TV, item 1, 26.9.2007.
\(^59\) Plus TV, item 2, 26.9.2007.
\(^60\) Plus TV, item 4, 26.9.2007.
\(^61\) Plus TV, item 5, 24.9.2007.
\(^63\) RIK, item 1, 25.9.2007.
\(^64\) RIK, item 4, 25.9.2007.
\(^65\) ANT1, item 10, 24.9.2007.
\(^66\) Mega, item 8, 17.1.2008.
They are trying to catch up before things get worse...; and, on another occasion; ‘The government’s decision to reduce the heating oil tax, five months prior to the presidential elections, caused turmoil,’ implying that Papadopoulos announced this measure simply to win more votes.

The European Union

Developments related to the EU and the Republic of Cyprus were widely covered by all the stations except Plus TV. The European Union would be illustrated either as an ally or as an enemy according to its stance on issues that concerned the island.

The EU as an ally

During the timeframe of this research, a story that received wide coverage concerned the view of the EU vice-president and Commissioner responsible for transport, Jacques Barrot, on Turkey’s embargo on ships sailing under the flag of the Republic of Cyprus. Because of his stance the EU was pictured as a community that supported the rights of the Greek Cypriots. RIK wrote in a caption: ‘A firm message to Turkey’, while the journalist’s voice-over began, ‘The vice-president of the European Commission...harshly warned Turkey for its responsibilities for a second time within twenty-four hours’. Mega’s caption was almost identical; its presenter said that Jacques Barrot ‘condemned Turkey’; the voice-over noted that the Commissioner responsible for transport was ‘explicit’. Sigma announced that the vice-president of the European Commission gave a ‘clear message’ to Turkey: ‘Jacques Barrot warns Turkey that the embargo is also its own problem: Firm message’. These three stations used the same sharp words to describe this event in an effort perhaps to project that the vice-president of the European Commission, who was thought to represent the position of the EU, took the side of the Greek Cypriots.

The European Union as an enemy

Sometimes the Union was pictured negatively, as noted in the case of two stations which depicted the EU as being in favor of the ‘other side’. This representation might reveal the stations’ stance, but it could also imply the position that the Greek Cypriots had justified demands and expected EU support.

The view of the European Commission that the Republic of Cyprus ought to take immediate measures in order to stem illegal immigration across the buffer zone, which was included in its annual report on the Green Line, was read by the media as pro-Turkey. Regarding the report, ANT1 correspondent in Brussels said, ‘the commission attempts to lead Nicosia to a tragic dilemma, asking the Cypriot government to substantially reinforce the policing of the Green Line, something that in reality will create the image of a hard border between the free areas and occupied Cyprus’, adding, ‘one would expect that the commission would turn [its recommendations towards] Ankara and not towards Nicosia’. Plus TV provided another example of the negative depiction of the EU, with a news story on the visit of the ‘so-called Minister of Foreign Affairs of the occupied areas to Rome’, which alerted the Greek Cypriots. The report it was said that the EU was ‘blissfully unaware of the issue’, thus promoting the notion that the Union was not helping the Republic of Cyprus in the face of a challenging situation.

68 Plus TV, item 4, 26.9.2007.
69 Jacques Barrot’s statement: “Cyprus’s shipping in particular has to cope with the handicap of the [denied] access to the Turkish ports. Please be sure that I will work hard to solve this issue. It is not only a problem for Cyprus; it is a problem for Europe and also a problem for Turkey.”
70 RIK, item 6, 24.9.2007.
71 Mega, item 16, 24.9.2007.
72 Sigma, item 16, 24.9.2007.
73 The fact that the channels used the same words to describe this occurrence might also mean that they were all influenced by a piece originating from the same source.
75 ANT1, item 14, 24.9.2007.
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‘Us’ and the ‘other side’

The channels’ views about who were considered to be ‘us’ and who were the ‘others’, and the image promoted for each category, are examined next. The way they viewed and represented the occupied areas is also revealed, along with the channels’ ideologies and the practices with which these ideologies were put forward.

A bond with Greece, collaboration with Greek channels

All Greek Cypriot TV stations collaborated with Greek TV stations and re-broadcast specific news stories from these channels. RIK often presented reports taken from the news bulletins of ERT and Alpha, while Mega aired news from ‘Mega Greece’. ANT1 re-broadcast reportages from ANT1 Greece, Plus TV collaborated with Alter and Sigma had an affiliation agreement with Star Channel. The reports taken from the Greek television stations were either about news from other countries or about the current affairs of Greece. This clearly indicates a connection between Cyprus and Greece, and the following examples reveal that the Greek Cypriot channels considered Greece as part of ‘our side’.

‘Us’, bonds and identity issues

All TV channels highlighted a connection between Cyprus and Greece by widely covering important developments in Greece. A clear example of this is the way in which the Greek Cypriot stations reported the elections in Greece. For an election debate, Sigma connected to its studio in Athens where its correspondent informed the public about the debate, which would be conducted that same evening, between the Greek Prime Minister and the party leaders. ANT1 aired a report on the debate and at the end of its newscast connected with ANT1 Greece which ran a live broadcast of the beginning of the debate. RIK aired a news story about this subject, which included a telephone report delivered by its correspondent in Athens. Plus TV announced early in its broadcast that it would carry the debate live. Plus TV aired a broadcast with the caption: ‘Expedition: Plus TV’s pilgrimage to Artemida: “A Cypriot” hope.’ The choice of words reveals that this station wanted not only to emphasize that it would deliver reports from where the tragedy occurred but also that the Greek Cypriots boosted the morale of the Greek victims. Sigma broadcast a news story that included a sound bite from the on-site reporter in which he described the gratitude of a Greek man towards the Cypriots who battled to save his

---

77 ERT is the state channel in Greece. See, for example, RIK, items 7 and 8, 4.9.2007.
78 See for example, RIK, item 5, 5.9.2007.
79 See for example, Mega, item 11, 5.9.2007.
80 See for example, ANT1, items 10, 20 and 23, 6.9.2007.
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83 Sigma, item 17, 6.9.2007.
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86 ANT1, item 8, 6.9.2007.
87 Plus TV, item 3, 6.9.2007.
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house. Cyprus’s effort to help Greece was highlighted by all the channels, strengthening the perception that the two countries were closely bound.

On one day alone, ANT1 and Mega included in their newscasts’ top ten news stories, three reportages on how much Cyprus had helped Greece face the catastrophe—the Cypriot experts who made a study for the reconstruction of a burned Greek village,96 the return of the redcap firefighters,97 Cypriot financial assistance to victims of the fires.98 RIK, too, ran three stories in one day on how Cyprus stood by Greece,99 one story reporting on the Cyprus Red Cross donations said that Cypriots had sent ‘in good faith what ever they had’;100 while another on the reconstruction of Arthemida reported that Cyprus would ‘substantially contribute’ to bringing the village back to life.101

Another indication of the perception of close ties with Greece was the fact that some stations initiated their own efforts to aid the Greek victims. For example, Sigma organized a telethon to raise money to send to victims, and aired a news story covering this event the next day.102 Reporting on the Cypriot donations, Sigma characterized the Greeks as ‘brothers’ of the Greek Cypriots,103 the noun ‘brother’ highlighting the close bonds between Cypriots and Greeks. ANT1 also mounted a fundraiser; and in reporting on its success said, ‘the Cypriot people showed their solidarity towards their fire-stricken Greek brothers’.104

The other side

The conception of the ‘others’ was not as clear-cut as that of ‘us’. In fact, we identified three separate categories of the ‘other’, which will be analysed separately:

a) The Turkish Cypriot community;

b) The Turkish Cypriot leadership;

c) Turkey and its troops.

The Turkish Cypriots

During this period of study most channels stressed that Greek Cypriots did not consider Turkish Cypriots as the enemy.105 Even when not stated outright, we can infer this from the wording of reports. For example in a news story about Turkey’s goals to increase the number of the settlers in the north, Sigma stressed that this action would be at the Turkish Cypriots’ expense.106 ANT1’s coverage of the same story—by a Turkish Cypriot who collaborated with the channel—included a statement made by the government’s spokesman who pointed out that the Turkish Cypriots and the Greek Cypriots were compatriots.107 The very fact that this station cooperated with a Turkish Cypriot reporter and aired that specific sound bite could be an indication that it valued the quality of relations with the ‘other’ side. Another lead story on ANT1 reported the findings of a survey of Greek Cypriots’ stances towards the Turkish Cypriots, stressing in the cue that ‘six out of ten Greek Cypriots [were] … in favor of living with the Turkish Cypriots’.108 Reporting on an incident where the Cypriot athlete Marcos Baghdatis chanted the slogan ‘Turks out of Cyprus’ at a

96 Sigma, item 6, 6.9.2007.
97 ANT1, item 3, 4.9.2004; Mega, item 7, 4.9.2007.
98 ANT1, item 6, 4.9.2007; Mega, item 9, 4.9.2007.
99 ANT1, item 8, 4.9.2007; Mega, item 8, 4.9.2007.
100 See one of them: RIK, item 19, 7.9.2007.
101 RIK, item 20, 7.9.2007.
102 RIK, item 21, 7.9.2007.
103 Sigma, item 6, 6.9.2007.
104 Sigma, item 22, 7.9.2007; Sigma, item 7, 5.9.2007.
105 ANT1, item 7, 6.9.2007.
106 Safe conclusions could not be drawn about the way RIK viewed the Turkish-Cypriots. Therefore this channel is excluded from the examples which are given in order to show the stances of the stations regarding this community.
107 Sigma, item 10, 17.1.2008.
108 ANT1, item 15, 17.1.2008.
109 ANT1, item 4, 17.1.2008.
gathering in Australia,\footnote{Mega, item 1, 18.1.2008.} Mega defended him, pointing out that ‘it is clear that when we say Turks we refer to the Turkish occupation forces’ and not to the Turkish Cypriots.\footnote{Mega, item 1b, 18.1.2008.} Plus TV generally took the stance of AKEL, and so appeared to endorse rapprochement. It ran a news story on the youth sections of a Greek Cypriot and a Turkish Cypriot party who declared that partition was catastrophic ‘for Cyprus and for its people, the Greek Cypriots and the Turkish Cypriots’.\footnote{Plus TV, item 8, 17.1.2008.} Another story emphasized the need for re-unification and promoted the idea of amity between the two communities; this report described a Turkish Cypriot, who supported Christofias, embracing a Greek Cypriot priest,\footnote{Plus TV, item 6, 18.1.2008.} a scene suggesting also that the two communities tolerated each other’s religious views.

A gloomy portrait of the Turkish Cypriot leadership

No station offered a positive portrayal of the Turkish Cypriot leadership. Most channels called Mehmet Ali Talat ‘the occupation leader’.\footnote{Sigma, item 3, 4.9.2007; ANT1 Cyprus, item 4, 6.9.2007; Plus TV, item 1, 4.9.2007; Mega, item 4, 24.9.2007.} He was frequently illustrated as following Ankara’s policies and obstructing a solution to the Cyprus Problem by requesting procedures different than those already agreed. Coverage of the Papadopoulos-Talat meeting clearly reveals this.\footnote{Plus TV was the only station that did not negatively depict Mr. Papadopoulos in this news story.} RIK’s introductory headlines said: ‘Talat fought to kill the July 8 [agreement]’,\footnote{RIK, first introductory headline, 6.9.2007.} while on the same day Mega’s lead story reiterated, ‘Mehmet Ali Talat’s refusal to comply with what was agreed on the July 8 and his insistence on changing the talks’ procedure, which he himself had agreed to 14 months earlier, led…[the] meeting into a deadlock.’\footnote{RIK, item 1, 6.9.2007.} ANT1 announced that the ‘occupation leader torpedoed the July 8 process’, and portrayed Talat as an adamant and a revengeful person who refused a second meeting with Papadopoulos when he realized that his plans would not materialize.\footnote{ANT1, item 4, 6.9.2007.} A similar representation was observed on Sigma: ‘Mehmet Ali Talat was negative and dismissive. He said no to Tassos [who proposed] a new meeting on Monday’.\footnote{Sigma, newscast’s introduction, 6.9.2007.}

Moreover, the same three channels depicted Talat as Turkey’s dutiful servant. RIK claimed that ‘obviously following Turkey’s instructions’, Mehmet Ali Talat pursued different goals than Papadopoulos during their meeting.\footnote{RIK, item 4, 6.9.2007.} Reporting on the Turkish government’s intention to increase the number of settlers in the north, Sigma said that ‘this dramatic development occurred after Talat’s recent visit to Turkey’,\footnote{Sigma, item 10, 17.1.2008.} implying that the Turkish Cypriot leader was following Turkey’s orders. The first sentence of ANT1’s cue was: ‘[The will] of Turkey prevailed regarding the assignment of so-called citizenship in the pseudo-state to thousands of settlers’.\footnote{ANT1, item 15, 17.1.2008.} The choice of words reveals that according to ANT1 the Turkish Cypriot leadership did not wish for this action, but still obeyed Turkey’s demands.

Turkey and its troops as the villain

The stations also depicted Turkey and its troops very negatively. This was revealed in several news stories in which the choice of words repeatedly highlighted that this country was the Republic of Cyprus’ foe.

ANT1’s and Sigma’s portrayal of Turkey seemed slightly darker than the other channels. These stations projected the view that the Turkish troops, which they called ‘Attila’ (\'Αττίλα),\footnote{See, ANT1, item 6, 5.9.2007; Sigma, item 3, 17.1.2008.} posed a grave threat. ANT1 aired a news story with the caption: ‘New provocations: The Turks opened fire...
at Kokkina against Greek Cypriot flocks'. Sigma ran a newscast recalling events in the village of Mia Milia in the summer of 1974: ‘The occupied village was at the center of the invasion troops’ attack… the inhabitants and several [Greek Cypriot soldiers] found themselves exposed. They were surrounded and many of them were killed on the spot. Others were captured and transferred to Turkey’.125

Furthermore, three channels highlighted Turkey’s link to illegal activities. Sigma broadcast the news that police found a weapon that they identified as originating from Turkey. It used a caption reading: ‘Turkish pistol’;126 while Mega’s headline for the same story was: ‘A pistol of Turkish origin’.127 ANT1 stressed the same in its cue reporting the incident,128 and in another story, aired the same day, blamed Turkey for problems in the Republic of Cyprus concerning illegal immigration. In its coverage of the annual report of the European Commission on the Green Line, it said that ‘one would expect that the commission would direct [its recommendations] to Ankara and not Nicosia, since 36.4% of the 3778 immigrants picked up in Cyprus had a Turkish visa on their passports’.129

All the channels accused Turkey of importing people from Anatolia, as part of a well-planned strategy to change the demography of Cyprus and ensure Turkish dominance in the north and establish her authority on the island. They often reported news stories related to the settlers—a very sensitive issue for the Greek Cypriot community. In Sigma’s reports harsh epithets were used, not only to describe these people, but also to depict Turkey, considered responsible for their rising numbers: ‘Turkey makes a new provocative gesture in the occupied areas. She increases the number of settlers by tens of thousands negating the population balance’. This action was characterized as Ankara’s transgression.130 In ANT1’s cue the presenter announced that Turkey intended to transfer 50,000 people to Cyprus,131 while Plus TV reported that ‘according to Ankara’s demands, the number of applicants for so-called Turkish Cypriot citizenship will gradually reach 50,000’.132 Mega referred to ‘the pseudo-state’s intention of giving…so-called citizenship to thousands of Turkish citizens’, and although Mega did not name Turkey as the instigator of this plan, this country was thought to control the decisions of the Turkish Cypriot leadership and the ‘occupation regime’. Two days later RIK broadcast a report on Papadopoulos’s statements about Turkey, and used a caption reading: ‘Turkish plan for colonialism’, with no indication that they were actually quoting the President. This phrase also projected the idea that Turkey was responsible for the alteration of the demography in the north.134

One last notion related to Turkey that four channels highlighted was that she fought to legalize the regime in the northern part of Cyprus. Reporting on the Papadopoulos-Talat meeting, RIK said that according to government sources, the Turkish goal was to upgrade the pseudo-state. In its lead story on the ferry service to Syria, Plus TV announced that ‘Turkey [had] laid a specific plan to convince the Republic of Cyprus [to recognize the northern areas of the country as a different state]’, while Sigma stressed that the ferry service served the interests of Turkey.139 Mega claimed that ‘Ankara [had] also approached Jordan asking to open its ports to ferry services, from and to, the occupied areas’.139
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The Turkish side
Sometimes the Turkish Cypriots and Turkey were perceived as being one and the same. Sigma repeatedly promoted this image but all the stations, except Plus TV, at least once did not clarify whether their news stories referred to Turkey or the Turkish Cypriot leadership. They highlighted the Turkish identity of the ‘others’ who were always depicted unflatteringly. Sigma aired a broadcast for which the headline was: ‘New Turkish plot’, while the caption was: ‘T/Cs sell their properties in the free areas with sham contracts’.\(^{140}\) Mega, RIK and ANT1 used the expression ‘the Turkish side’ while referring to Talat in the news story about his meeting with Papadopoulos. This phrase perhaps reveals that these channels considered that Turkey and the Turkish Cypriot leadership shared the same stances and goals. Mega ran a story arguing that the ‘Turkish side’ showed that it was against implementation of the Gambari process,\(^{141}\) and RIK reported that ‘the Turkish side systematically aimed for the cancellation of the agreement’.\(^{142}\) ANT1 on the same meeting said: ‘The mood on the Turkish side: They ask for a complete negotiation process’.\(^{143}\)

Our analysis shows that most stations had a tendency to identify Turkey and the Turkish Cypriot leadership as one and the same, and sometimes the Turkish Cypriots too. Moreover, they did not represent the ‘Turkish side’ positively.

The ‘others’ in relation to ‘us’
The TV news channels projected the idea that the Greek Cypriots were in the right regarding important political matters and that they deserved the sympathy of the international community because they were the victims of the conflict. The ‘others’ were portrayed in a completely different way. To substantiate their positive representation of Greek Cypriots, the stations would include in their broadcasts the notion that important people, organizations or even countries agreed with the Republic of Cyprus. The use of memories was another strategy used to support the view that the Greek Cypriots were in the right and were victims.

Coverage of the Papadopoulos-Talat meeting exemplifies how the stations projected the notion that the Greek Cypriot leadership was willing to end the deadlock in the country while the ‘other side’ placed obstacles in the path to a solution. Mega said that the Greek Cypriot side ‘justly’ insisted on implementation of the agreement reached a year before, while claiming that Talat wanted to change the procedure.\(^{144}\) A RIK journalist covering the meeting reported that ‘obviously’ the Turkish Cypriot leader ‘as we had all expected, attempted…to break the July 8 agreement [while] of course the President of the Republic insisted on its implementation’;\(^{145}\) ANT1 reported that ‘when Talat saw that his plan was not working he refused [to have] a second meeting as proposed by President Papadopoulos to avoid a stalemate’.\(^{146}\) Sigma made a similar statement in one of its cues,\(^{147}\) and Plus TV in a positive representation of the Greek Cypriots, said that at least ‘our side’ had hoped that the meeting would produce encouraging results regarding the Cyprus problem.\(^{148}\)

To back up their depiction of the justness of the Greek Cypriots’ aims and stances, the stations would highlight the opinions or statements of persons in authority who represented the EU, the UN or the USA. For example, all the channels emphasized that the UN Secretary General, who had a meeting with President Papadopoulos in New York, was in favor of the Gambari process—an arrangement accepted by the Greek Cypriots but allegedly opposed by the ‘others’. In the cue of Sigma’s reportage it was said that, ‘Ban Ki-moon asks for the implementation of the July 8

---
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\(^{147}\) Sigma, item 1, 6.9.2007.
\(^{148}\) Plus TV, item 3, 4.9.2007.
agreement’,149 while Mega announced that, ‘the Secretary General of the United Nations expressed his support for the Gambari process and the complete implementation of the July 8 agreement’.150 ANT1 suggested that the Gambari process won the trust vote from Ban Ki-moon;151 Plus TV’s news story caption was, ‘UN Secretary General: In support of the July 8 [agreement]’;152 RIK ran the headline, ‘The United Nations insist on the July 8 agreement’. Yet none of the stations covered the meeting, so there was no proof that Ban Ki-moon had actually expressed the declared view.

Moreover, RIK and Sigma often stressed that the EU backed the Greek Cypriots’ views. It is likely that they emphasized EU backing to confirm that the demands of the Republic of Cyprus were fair, since important personages, who were thought to represent the Union, supported them.

Two indicative examples are given in the next few lines. RIK aired a story beginning with the following cue: ‘The President of the EU Council and the Foreign Minister of Slovenia, Dimitri Rupel, stated that the only valid procedure for the Cyprus problem is the Gambari agreement’.154 Another example, mentioned earlier,155 is the broadcast by Sigma, Mega and RIK of the statements of Jacques Barrot concerning Turkey’s embargo on ships flying the flag of the Republic of Cyprus. The three stations implied that the European Commission vice-president and the EU were on the Greek Cypriot side. Sigma’s caption can illustrate this argument: ‘Jacques Barrot warns Turkey that the embargo is also its own problem: Firm message’.156

Sigma, Mega and RIK also pointed out that United States’ officials backed the Greek Cypriots. Sigma introduced a report related to the Gambari process using the following words: ‘The US Under Secretary for political affairs, Nicholas Burns…spoke about an inspiring United Nation’s procedure for the [resolution of the] Cyprus Problem’.157 Mega’s New York correspondent said that an official of the State Department expressed his hope that the July 8 agreement would be implemented,158 and RIK headlined a news story, ‘US and UN point towards the July 8 [agreement]’.159 These would appear to be attempts to substantiate the view that the Republic of Cyprus had reasonable diplomatic positions and that these stances were favored by the international community.

The use of memories and recall of 1974 events was another practice occasionally employed by the stations to justify Greek Cypriots’ views and feelings regarding the ‘other side’. This promoted the notion that the Greek Cypriots were the victims of the conflict while the ‘others’ were the villains who committed atrocities.

Sigma was the station that most frequently employed this practice. It broadcast a follow-up report on the events that occurred in the ‘occupied village’ Mia Milia in 1974, using a sound-bite from a priest, who said that the Turkish soldiers bound his hands and carried him to the ship that would take him as prisoner to Turkey.160 The report describing the past abuse of a man of God projected the idea that the ‘others’ were the ‘baddies’ and the Greek Cypriots the victims.

The ‘occupied areas’

All TV stations characterized the north of the island as ‘the occupied areas’161 and used the term pseudo-state162 to describe it, proclaiming that Turkey and the Turkish Cypriot leadership had no

149 Sigma, item 3, 24.9.2007.
150 Mega, item 3, 24.9.2007.
151 ANT1, item 10, 24.9.2007.
152 Plus TV, item 3, 24.9.2007.
153 RIK, beginning headline 1, 24.9.2007.
154 RIK, item 11, 18 January 2008.
155 Plus TV and ANT1 did not point out that the vice-president of the EU was on our side.
156 Sigma, item 16, 24.9.2007.
157 Sigma, item 13, 25.9.2007.
158 Mega, item 1, 5.9.2007.
159 RIK, item 2, 7.9.2007.
160 Sigma, item 8, 18.1.2008.
161 See, for example, ANT1, item 6, 24.9.2007.
162 See, for example, a news story in which the term pseudo-state was used: Sigma, item 12, 25.9.2007.
legitimate power over the territory, which according to them, was taken from the Greek Cypriots. Another semantics practice employed by the stations for the same reason was the use of inverted commas in captions, such as in this Plus TV broadcast: ‘18,000 more Turks will receive “T/C citizenship”’.\textsuperscript{163} A sound equivalent of inverted commas was the expression ‘the so-called’, which was used to stress that the north was not internationally recognized, so it could not, for example, have ‘real’ officials: RIK, reporting on Turgay Avcı’s meeting with Italian officials, called Avcı ‘the so-called Minister of Foreign Affairs’.\textsuperscript{164}

These practices demonstrate that the channels believed and projected the view that the northern part of the island was ruled illegally by the ‘occupation regime’,\textsuperscript{165} and led to wide coverage and sometimes negative representation of efforts made by Turkey and the Turkish Cypriot leadership to achieve political recognition. This reveals Greek Cypriots’ fear of losing forever a territory they considered as their own. The numerous stories on the newly launched ferry services to Latakia in Syria\textsuperscript{166} and Turgay Avcı’s intention of giving ‘TRNC’ passports to two Italian politicians are indicative of this fear. Mega’s caption on the passport issue was, ‘More tricks: The pseudo-state now also “enfranchises” Italian politicians,’\textsuperscript{167} while in Plus TV’s cue, the newscaster announced that the occupation regime ‘gave a performance of recognition’.\textsuperscript{168}

Some channels, i.e., RIK, ANT1, Sigma, depicted the north as a criminal or a trouble source. One could interpret this as an attempt to show that as long as the north was controlled by the ‘others’, there would be problems that would subsequently affect the Republic of Cyprus. For example, Sigma aired a report in which it was said that the police investigated the possibility that a Turkish pistol was ‘illegally transported from the occupied areas’, as this specific type of gun was not used by any security service in the ‘free areas’.\textsuperscript{169} ANT1 broadcast a story on an infamous criminal, it which it was stressed that he was able to escape to the north. The newscaster’s first sentence was: ‘C........ M..... is hiding in the occupied areas’ and the caption of this report was: ‘Ecevit is in…the occupied areas’.\textsuperscript{170} RIK also used this caption in the introduction of its own report.\textsuperscript{171} In another story, RIK said that illegal immigrants used the north to reach the southern part of the country: ‘Illegal immigrants (are coming) from the buffer zone’.\textsuperscript{172}

**Stereotyped images and sounds**

The stations used stereotyped images when they aired news stories related to the ‘pseudo-state’, the settlers or the occupied areas; this was most often shots with the Turkish and TRNC flags. This emblem of identity defined the ‘other’\textsuperscript{173} or the areas in the north, reaffirming the notion that a flag is a strong symbol that can evoke emotions and transmit underlying messages. For example, a shot that shows a flag situated in a disputed area and where it is clearly visible to people who believe that the land belongs to them, can provoke emotional responses since some people might consider that this emblem was placed there to provoke or threaten them.

The frequent use of particular shots of the flags can also awaken memories. ANT1 and Mega broadcast reports during which this symbol, which has been recognized as creating ‘a detrimental

\textsuperscript{163} Plus TV, item 6, 17.1.2008.

\textsuperscript{164} RIK, item 4, 25.9.2007.

\textsuperscript{165} This expression was used by RIK and Plus TV. It sometimes replaced the word ‘pseudo-state’. See examples: RIK, item 4, 24.9.2007; Plus TV, item 12, 19.1.2008.

\textsuperscript{166} During the dates that were analyzed for this research, RIK and Mega each aired four news reports on this issue. ANT1, Sigma and Plus TV each broadcast three. Some stations also included live reports on this subject.

\textsuperscript{167} Mega, item 2, 24.9.2007.

\textsuperscript{168} Plus TV, item 1, 24.9.2004.

\textsuperscript{169} Sigma, item 14, 24.9.2007.

\textsuperscript{170} This person’s nickname was Ecevit. ANT1, item 17, 26.9.2007.

\textsuperscript{171} RIK, item 21, 26.9.2007.

\textsuperscript{172} RIK, item 19, 26.9.2007.

\textsuperscript{173} During the dates that were examined in this part of our research, ANT1 aired five reportages in which these stereotyped images were used. In three of these news stories there were shots of the Turkish flag and in the remaining two, the Turkish and the ‘TRNC’ flag appeared. Mega also broadcast five reportages where the flags were seen. In three of them both flags were shown. Sigma aired five news stories where the images of the flags were used. Solely in one of them, the viewer could see only the ‘TRNC’ flag. Plus TV broadcast four reportages in which the flags appeared, and again in three of them there were shots of the two flags flying next to each other. RIK aired only one news story in which several Turkish and ‘TRNC’ flags appeared.
effect on community relations,'174 appeared at a place where it was viewed as a ‘constant reminder that the neighboring ‘other’ hasn’t gone away.’175 The news story of a Greek Cypriot shepherd, whose animals were shot by Turkish soldiers, was aired by ANT1 together with images of the Turkish and the ‘TRNC’ flags in a village that defines the limits of a territory which was once controlled by the Republic of Cyprus. Also, Mega repeatedly aired a shot of a huge ‘TRNC’ flag at the occupied Pentadaktilos Mountains, a visible reminder to the Greek Cypriots of their lost land.176

The use of the flags, a symbol considered as ‘an important element in the ongoing tensions’ and ‘which can give and take offence’,177 was not the only practice that might arouse feelings concerning the ‘other side”; music and sound were also employed with similar effects.

RIK broadcast a report on a highly emotive issue, that of the missing persons. This news story began and ended with images from a funeral which were accompanied by the sound of a death bell.178 The shots of people crying, together with the sound of the death knell, could induce feelings of resentment towards those who were thought to be responsible for the deaths of these Greek Cypriots. ANT1 aired a piece about a Turkish commando unit in the north, showing images of this camp with dramatically suspenseful music as the backdrop-music that was slightly threatening, and could lead viewers to feel that Greek Cypriots’ security was in danger. Mega also used a dramatic sound beat during the news story about Turgay Avcı’s visit to Rome,179 perhaps to emphasize the potential danger of political recognition of the ‘so-called authorities of the pseudo-state’.

Conclusion
Our research revealed that the television channels not only reported the news, but they also ‘sensationalized and glamorized’ it. They achieved this mainly through the use of flashy special effects and computer-generated graphics, while sometimes they used music. The stations were likely sensationalizing the news or—in more positive terms—transforming the news into a more interesting viewing experience, in an effort to eventually attract a wider audience and so remain commercially viable.

Thus with the dual objective of informing the audience of the day’s significant events, and achieving market dominance, or at least surviving, the stations offered wide coverage and timely report of the news. They accomplished these aims by covering an event with several different news stories or from several angles, and they included live broadcasting to inform the public about important events in real time. This immediate reporting of the news was occasionally delivered through different windows on the screen (split-screens), and the timeliness of news coverage was assured by employing permanent correspondents abroad and/or by sending reporters abroad to cover significant events. All the stations also aimed at producing news ‘exclusives’.

The channels appeared to make an effort to cover the news as neutrally as possible; this would be a way to gain and maintain the viewers’ trust. This strategy may have had the added benefit of subsequently helping the stations to ‘sell’ their own positions to the audience. Another means of convincing audiences of their truthfulness, engaged in by all the channels, was the use of numbers. Numbers would appear to lend accuracy and reliability to news reports. However, in the final analysis, the stations were shown to be not completely impartial, as there were many instances where the stations were biased towards certain views and political aspirations. Party or ideological links and affiliations appear to have greatly influenced representations of events, people, etc., on all channels.

176 Mega, item 4, 25.9.2007.
178 RIK, item 12, 6.9.2007.
179 Mega, item 2, 24.9.2007.
Regarding the settlement of the Cyprus Problem, all the stations appeared to follow the official (government) stance that supported the Gambari agreement. This matter united the channels against the ‘other side’, Turkey and the Turkish Cypriot leadership. There was a greater divergence of views, however, when the channels reported on other issues.

Most channels offered favorable coverage to specific people or parties. This was accomplished through several media tactics, including overrepresentation, leading with reports linked to a specific political group or individual, highlighting a particular party’s or person’s view, positive representation of a certain person or party and the negative depiction of ‘rival’ candidates and parties.

Positions on the EU were inconsistent; the EU was pictured either as an ally or as an enemy of the Republic of Cyprus depending on its stance on several issues that concerned the island.

On the issue of identity and representation of the others, it appeared that the Greek Cypriots and the Greeks were considered to be ‘us’ while the Turkish Cypriots, their leadership, Turkey and its troops were the ‘others’.

The collaboration with Greek television stations, the rebroadcast of some of their news stories and the extensive reports on important developments that occurred in Greece, revealed identity views. The way the channels emphasized Greek Cypriot help to Greece during the severe fires in 2007 and the stations’ fundraising to aid the victims clearly revealed the belief that Cyprus was strongly connected to Greece. The bond between the two countries was even more evident when two channels characterized the Greeks, as the Greek Cypriots’ ‘brothers’.

The ‘other’ was not always viewed as the enemy. No cases were noted where Turkish Cypriots were considered the Greek Cypriots’ enemy. But while the channels positively portrayed this community, they did not do the same for the Turkish Cypriot leadership. Negatively depicted by all, Mehmet Ali Talat was frequently illustrated as someone who followed Ankara’s instructions and placed obstacles in the path to a solution of the Cyprus Problem.

Turkey and its troops were also pictured in dark colors. Some stations promoted the idea that the Turkish soldiers posed a threat to the Greek Cypriots’ safety, and they all projected Turkey as a hostile county and a source of problems for the Republic of Cyprus. Most stations represented Turkey as a state that claimed territory that belonged to the Greek Cypriots.

Sometimes, images of the ‘other’ were amalgamated, as most of the channels used the expression ‘the Turkish side’ without clarifying whether they referred to the Turkish Cypriots, their leadership or Turkey. It appeared as if these entities were occasionally viewed as being one and the same. The ‘Turkish side’ was always pictured unflatteringly.

The negative depiction of the Turkish Cypriot leadership and Turkey was also clear in their comparison with the Greek Cypriot side. It was often stressed that the Greek Cypriots were in the right regarding important political matters and that they deserved the sympathy of the international community. The exact opposite image was promoted about the ‘others’. The channels projected that the positions of the Greek Cypriots were fair, as important people, organizations or even countries agreed with the stances of the Republic of Cyprus. The contrast between the Greek Cypriots and the ‘others’ was also transmitted through the use of memories where the Greek Cypriot community was portrayed as the victim of the conflict and the ‘other side’ was the villain who committed atrocities.

The negative illustration of the ‘others’ was also put forward through the repetition of the notion that the Turkish Cypriot leadership, Turkey and its army had no authority over the land in the north and that as long as they ruled it, this territory would be a source of troubles for the Republic of Cyprus.

In the last part of this section it was revealed that not only words, but also stereotyped images, music and sounds were employed in a way to reinforce negative pictures and eventually feelings and fear related to the other side.

Synthia Pavlou
THE TURKISH CYPRIOt PRESS IN 2007-2008
Sanem Şahin

Introduction
A completely different situation prevailed in the present period compared to the end of 2002. There was a new team in power handling the fate of the Turkish Cypriots, following the victory of the CTP and Mehmet Ali Talat over the conservative forces. The Cyprus Problem was in a stalemate. After the Turkish Cypriot media briefly turned their attention to the meeting between the two leaders in early September, they shifted their focus back to internal affairs and politics.

The Data
This part of the research will analyse the 12 daily newspapers that were publishing at the time of this study: Kıbrıs, Halkın Sesi, Yenidüzen, Vatan, Kıbrıslı, Ortam, Volkan, Afrika, Güneş, Demokrat Bakış, Sözcü and Kıbrıs Star. The data covers the periods 4 to 7 September 2007, 24 to 26 September 2007 and 17 to 20 January 2008, and will be examined as was the data for the previous time period. In other words, we will analyse the media portrayal of themes such as the Cyprus Issue, the representation of the EU, the reflection of internal politics and Turkish Cypriot self-perception in relation to the ‘others’.

The Journalistic Practices and the Structure of the News
Regarding the timeframe of this part of our research, the news reporting did not show much change in terms of style, source or treatment from the 2002 period. The newspapers continued to rely heavily on externally produced texts such as news agency dispatches and press statements, as well as covering press conferences and public announcements of political figures and civil society organisations. Yet there was little attempt to offer exclusive coverage, and most stories that appeared in the newspapers were identical, such that the content of the 12 newspapers was also almost identical. For example, all 12 newspapers ran articles reporting on the meeting of the two leaders, Mehmet Ali Talat and Tassos Papadopoulos. The articles were all the same, as all newspapers had used the same TAK dispatch. Although the news articles covering this meeting stated that many journalists had attended the event, no different accounts of it appeared in the papers. Only one paper, Yenidüzen, reported the event differently: it presented highlights of the day in bullet points under the by-lines of the two journalists who covered the event, and it even included the journalists’ opinions and expectations.1 Kıbrıs Star was the only other paper that sought the views of the public and the political leaders on this event.2

Another example of the print media sharing the same reports was their coverage of the DP MPs’ resignation from the parliament. All the newspapers published the same reports on, the party assembly in which the members decided on resignation; the parliamentary session in which the MPs handed in their resignations; and the views of other political party leaders on these developments. Because these reports were identical, it was difficult to isolate the individual newspaper’s institutional voice. Again, although some newspapers sent reporters to cover these events, they generally used the news agency dispatches for the main story, using their journalists’

---

1 Çağılı Günalp and Fayka Arseven, ‘Görüümü tarihi yok [There is no date for negotiation]’, Yenidüzen, 6.9.2007: 8,9.
2 Elif İyidoğan and Volkan Karaca, ‘Vatandaş da barış istiyor [Citizens want peace, too]’, Kıbrıs Star, 4.9.2007: 7; No author, ‘Ben olsam derdim ki [If it was me I would have said]’, Kıbrıs Star, 5.9.2007:1.
reports in separate sections as ‘observations’ or ‘notes’. For example, despite having its reporter and photographer at a DP party meeting, *Yenidüzen* still published the same text as the other papers, a TAK news dispatch. It printed its reporter’s observations in short paragraphs with some photos rather than presenting them as a whole text.³ It followed the same format to report on the parliamentary meeting in which the DP MPs presented their resignations to the assembly.⁴ *Kibris*’s account of the parliamentary session was no different: while TAK’s story was used to report the event, its correspondent’s observations were published as ‘notes from the parliament’⁵ in short paragraphs instead of a long news article. ‘Notes’ aimed to provide insights for what had been said or done during the assembly gathering. Often times, these sections written by the correspondents as well as the newspapers’ headlines were the only evidence of a newspaper’s attitude towards the events.

Compared to the number of articles that derived from news agencies, the news items produced by journalists were minimal, even including the front-page stories. The role of the journalist was reduced to merely editing the source text; and even in cases where journalists compiled reports themselves, they usually did little more than write up statements or comments from the relevant individuals or groups. Journalistic processes of news production rarely involved any research or investigation, which raised the question about the role of research in newsgathering practices of journalists working for the Turkish Cypriot media. Instead (of research) there were cases in which rumours were disguised as news, or unconfirmed information was turned into a factual text. For example, *Yenidüzen* claimed that UBP would meet with the Turkish government representatives in Ankara, but did not state its source.⁶

Use of numbers in the news is generally a sign of precision and truthfulness.⁷ In the news reports on the Talat - Papadopoulos meeting, the only numbers that appeared were the arrival time of each leader and the start and finishing times of the meeting. Apart from *Yenidüzen*, all the newspapers used the same text, a TAK dispatch. According to *Kibris*, *Haikin Sesi*, *Vatan*, *Kibrisli*, *Kibris Star*, *Ortam*, *Volkan*, *Güneş* and *Afrika*, the Greek Cypriot leader arrived at 16:03 while the Turkish Cypriot leader arrived at 16:08 and at that time the meeting started. Such precision regarding the arrival time was applied to the finishing time as well, 19:20. On the other hand, in *Yenidüzen*’s article these times were slightly different: 16:02 and 16:06.⁸ The length of the meeting also varied according to the different newspapers. Generally they all stated that the leaders’ talk lasted three hours, but some were more specific: *Yenidüzen* reported that it was ‘3 hours 20 minutes’,⁹ *Kibrisli* noted ‘3.5 hours’¹⁰ and *Ortam* ‘3 hours 15 minutes’.¹¹ *Vatan* and *Yenidüzen* found the length of the meeting worthy of their front pages. *Vatan* stressed in its main headline that ‘(the meeting) lasted 3 hours’¹² while *Yenidüzen*’s headline was ‘3-hour-long summit’.¹³ Overall, time was regarded an important factor to be included in reports.

Intertwining commentary with facts was common in the Turkish Cypriot newspapers; *Kibrisli*, especially, treated its front-page stories like editorials. For instance, on the day of the leaders’ meeting its front-page story was more like a commentary than communication of information.¹⁴ The following day’s issue was no different, as its front-page story again appeared more like an editorial commentary rather than a news text.¹⁵ Yet, it was not only *Kibrisli* that used this practice;

---

⁵ Dilek Çetereisi, ‘DP Tavukluğu Seçti Horozluğu CTP’ye Bırkatı [DP Chose to be a Chicken and Left it to CTP to be a Rooster]’, *Kibris*, 18.1.2008:14, 15.
⁹ Ibid.
most of the other newspapers also did. Yenidüzen's main story two days after the meeting had as its headline 'the hidden side of the matter,'16 which was actually a summary of an opinion column by a journalist, Sami Özuslu. Reporting on the discussions that took place in the meeting, Yenidüzen did not even attempt to attribute them to any source; moreover, the article did nothing more than present some unconfirmed information—yet it appeared on the front page.

Headlines were another place where the newspapers' views on an issue could be discerned. For example, Ortam defined the leaders’ meeting as 'they are meeting only to have met,'17 Afrika summarised the outcome as 'they got nowhere'18 and Kıbrıslı claimed that it was a 'forced meeting'.19

To increase the persuasiveness and enhance the truthfulness of their stories, the newspapers claimed that the information came from 'observers', 'experts', 'some reliable sources' or 'diplomatic sources'. For example, Kıbrıslı defined some of its sources simply as 'observers', 'diplomatic sources who follow the Cyprus Problem closely', and 'authoritative sources'.20 Ortam employed the same strategy when it attributed some information it reported on its front page to 'reliable sources'.21 In some cases stories lacked other crucial information. For example, Afrika, running a story on how some influential people were exempt from paying their electricity bills claimed that 'citizens' reacted to this news, yet its article did not include any citizens' views.

Another common characteristic of the newspapers was to raise questions on their front pages. Asking questions within the news reports rather than researching and reporting them can be seen as an easy way to obtain information. That is to say, rather than investigating and mediating the outcome for their readers, the newspapers actually published questions on their front pages in the hope that they would provoke a reaction from the authorities. This practice likely developed as a result of lack of sources, time and journalists. Throughout the period studied, there were many such examples: Vatan: 'Everyone's asking about the Democrat Party MP's resignation: what is going to happen now?'22 Afrika: 'Who is protecting the ones who don’t pay (their electricity bills).JWT';23 Yenidüzen asked UBP and DP whether they would end their boycott of the parliament and rejoin the assembly, 'in or out?';24 Halkın Sesi: 'What happened to the minimum wage?';25 Kıbrıslı: 'Who's the target' in a car bomb incident.26 Güneş asked if the DP would really resign27 and Demokrat Bakış used its front page to answer and also ask questions on behalf of the DP, the party affiliated with it.28

The newspapers sometimes used photographs to express their views as well. Publishing a photograph on its front page that showed both Turkish Cypriot and Greek Cypriot leaders looking at Michael Moller, the UN Secretary General’s Special Envoy in Cyprus, Afrika wrote: 'look at this photograph carefully. Here is the latest photograph of our situation'.29 The explanation for the headline came in the editorial: 'Here is our latest photograph. This is our state of thinking of ourselves as clever and others as stupid... Two little lambs... Looking into Moller’s mouth'.30 The paper further clarified what it meant by 'our situation' in its next issue in one of its commentary sections, 'Tunnel': 'Moller is standing the most relaxed, Talat and Papadopoulos look like students in the photograph'.31

17 No author, 'Görüşmek için görüşecekler [They are meeting only to have met]', Ortam, 5.9.2007:1.
18 No author, 'Havanda su dövdüler [They pounded water in a mortar]', Afrika, 6.9.2007:1.
21 No author, ‘İngiliz üssü olduk [We have become a British base]', Ortam, 4.9.2007:1.
23 No author, 'İçeri mi dışarı mı [In or out?]', Yenidüzen, 25.9.2007:1.
26 No author, 'DP sine-i millete dönecek mi [Will DP return to the nation?]?', Güneş, 17.1.2008:1 (Author’s note: Meaning, will DP resign?).
28 No author, ‘İşte Kıbrıs’taki halimizin son fotoğrafı [Here is the latest photograph of our situation]', Afrika, 6.9.2007:1.
29 No author, 'Kıbrıslı taki halimizin son fotoğrafı [The latest photograph of our situation]', Afrika, 6.9.2007:3.
Yenidüzen also focused on a photograph in a front-page story. Reporting that the Greek Cypriot leader was meeting with the UN General Secretary Ban Ki-moon, it published a photograph of Papadopoulos which showed him holding his hand on his front just below his waistline. The headline was ‘fena sıkıştı’. Fena means badly but the tricky word was ‘sıkıştı’ in this phrase. ‘Sıkıştı’ in Turkish means either ‘to get caught in or become tightly wedged’ or ‘to need to go to the toilet’. The photograph clearly referred to the latter meaning of the word, but the article did not correspond to the photo as it was about Papadopoulos’s meeting with the UN General Secretary. The headline must have raised some questions among its readers as the editor-in-chief, Cenk Mutluyakalı, later republished the photograph in his column with a circle around Papadopoulos’s hand to highlight it, and also an explanatory text: ‘Here is the harmony between the headline and the photograph’. However, even if the headline matched the photograph, it was not in harmony with the article. Therefore it can be assumed that it was used to humiliate the Greek Cypriot leader.

Discourse and Representation

The Cyprus Issue
The Cyprus Issue dominated the media agenda in relation to the Talat-Papadopoulos meeting, but rarely made the front page of the newspapers in the other two timeframes selected (24 to 26 September, 2007 and 17 to 20 January 2008). Therefore, this part of the research will focus on the accounts of the leaders’ meeting to study how the press depicted the Cyprus Issue.

How Diverse is the Press?
The two leaders’ meeting was called by various names: summit (zirve), meeting (buluşma) and negotiation (göçüme). Rejecting the notion that the meeting was a summit or a negotiation, Kıbrıslı argued that it was a ‘meeting’. Doğan Harman, the editor-in-chief of the paper, explained that ‘summits’ are organised ‘sometimes to initiate big changes and sometimes to end big changes and such summits are prepared by working together for a long period’, which was not the case in this situation. Negotiation, on the other hand, Harman said, occurs if ‘the political leaders come together to solve a common problem or problems and exchange ideas and may involve bargaining’, which again was not the case. Therefore, he argued, it could only be described as ‘meeting’, as the leaders did not come together to solve common problems but were working for their own benefit. Meanwhile, Kıbrıs Star called the leaders’ meeting a ‘critical rendez-vous’.

The Turkish Cypriot press did not depict the leaders’ meeting optimistically. Having stated that the leaders were ‘meeting for the sake of meeting’, and that it was a ‘forced meeting’, most newspapers expressed their scepticism at a positive outcome. Kıbrıs even ran a news feature entitled ‘no expectations from the 5th of September’ (the date of the meeting), with the subheading ‘neither community is hopeful’. The main story was accompanied by two political parties’ announcements that expressed their cynicism about the meeting. The coverage in the other
newspapers was no different, as they also stressed that the reason behind the talk was the elections in south Cyprus in February 2008 and that the Turkish Cypriot side took part ‘not to be the side avoiding negotiations again’ and ‘to start the negotiation process’. Kıbrıslı articulated strong doubts on its front page: ‘Everyone knows that this forced meeting is taking place because of the Greek Cypriot elections. While Papadopoulos tries to manipulate voters, Talat will stress that the UN is the place to seek a solution’. Güneş felt the meeting was ‘an election helping hand for Tassos’. Only Yenidüzen expressed optimism: Having underlined some encouraging aspects about the meeting, it headlined its main story as ‘positive atmosphere’ and its front-page story as ‘life buoy’ meaning that a good outcome would help the country economically.

According to the Turkish Cypriot press, the meeting ended with no concrete result. The newspapers found unconvincing the UN’s Special Envoy to Cyprus Michael Moller’s announcement that both sides agreed to start the process that would lead to a comprehensive settlement. Some papers expressed their lack of faith quite colloquially. For example, Ortam ran the headline: ‘The mountain gave birth to a mouse’ meaning that ‘our expectations were built up only to be let down in a big way’. Afrika also defined the summit as ‘pounding water in a mortar’ which suggested that the meeting led nowhere.

The newspapers also conveyed the Greek Cypriot politicians’ views on the meeting, again using a news story that originated from TAK: ‘The Greek Cypriot politicians don’t have great expectations’. Halkin Sesi’s slight transformation in the headline to ‘the Greek Cypriot politicians don’t have great expectations either’ or Kıbrıs Star’s version, ‘the neighbour is also without hope’ subtly changed its meaning to generalise the lack of hope to include the Turkish Cypriots.

Press coverage of the meeting was dominated by the official discourse. Having benefited from the same official sources, the depiction of the meeting was the same throughout the Turkish Cypriot press: The Turkish Cypriot leader’s proposal of launching comprehensive talks and reaching a solution by the end of 2008 was refused by the Greek Cypriot leader, Papadopoulos, simply because Greek Cypriots did not want a solution. All the newspapers copied the text in which Talat was quoted justifying the Turkish Cypriot attempt to transform the 8 July process to make it more productive, and accused the Greek Cypriot side of not being mentally prepared to reach a comprehensive settlement in Cyprus. Use of the same text by the press contributed to the reproduction and dissemination of the official opinion. None of the dailies looked critically at Talat’s statement or questioned why there was a need to change the 8 July agreement. They also reported that Papadopoulos insisted on application of the 8 July agreement with no changes.

A newspaper’s position was relayed not only through news reports but also through the page layouts and distribution of the stories. Kıbrıs’s page design was one such example: On page 4 of the September 7 issue a big headline read: ‘Talat: we’re committed to a solution’, and next to it on page 5 was an account of a statement given by the Presidential spokesperson: ‘Papadopoulos

46 No author, ‘40’nci yla doğru [Towards the 40th year]’, Yenidüzen, 5.9.2007:1.
50 Meltem Sonay ‘Olumlu have [ Positive atmosphere]’, Yenidüzen, 4.9.2007:8 & 9.
54 Meltem Sonay ‘Olumlu have [ Positive atmosphere]’, Yenidüzen, 4.9.2007:8 & 9.
56 No author, ‘Dağ fare doğurdu [The mountain gave birth to a mouse]’, Ortam, 6.9.2007:1.
58 No author, ‘Sonрусır zine [Summit with no result]’, Halkin Sesi, 7.9.2007:1.
60 No author, ‘Rum siyasilerin fazla bekientes yok [The Greek Cypriot politicians don’t have great expectations]’, Ortam, 5.9.2007:16; Afrika, 5.9.2007:11; Vatan, 5.9.2007:11; Yenidüzen, 5.9.2007:8.
61 No author, ‘Rum siyasiler de görüşmendem umutsuz [The Greek Cypriot politicians don’t have expectations from the meeting either]’, Halkin Sesi, 5.9.2007:3; No author, ‘Komşu da umutsuz [Our neighbour is also without hope]’, Kıbrıs Star, 5.9.2007:9.
does not want to start negotiations for a comprehensive settlement’. Turning to page 7, the Prime Minister was quoted in the headline: ‘Papadopoulos wants to crash bi-zonal federation’. Similarly, Yenidüzen positioned statements of the President and the Prime Minister next to each other in a way that blamed the Greek Cypriot leader. A headline on page 6, which carried only that story, quoted Prime Minister Soyer: ‘Papadopoulos is unproductive’; next to it on page 7 was an account of Talat’s press conference in which he had evaluated the summit: ‘Talat: the Greek Cypriot side is against negotiations for a comprehensive settlement’. Volkan, Kıbrıslı, and Halkın Sesi also employed similar headlines for the same stories that pointed the finger at the Greek Cypriot leader for obstructing the efforts for a solution on the island. These examples reveal how the Turkish Cypriot print media became instrumental in mediating the official representation of the events as they accepted and followed it. It is important to highlight that in the absence of any challenges, the domination of the official discourses in the newspapers can serve to establish them as the norm and shape the framework in which events are understood.

Despite the pessimism regarding its outcome, the meeting was depicted as historically important. Kıbrıs defined it as a ‘historical summit’ while Kıbrıs Star stressed that it had been 14 months since both leaders last met. Yenidüzen and Vatan reminded their readers that the negotiations to solve the Cyprus Problem had been going on for 40 years. The day the leaders met Yenidüzen’s main headline was ‘towards the 40th year’, referring to June 1968 when the negotiations first started in Beirut. Vatan’s editorial by Kasımoğlu also positioned the Talat - Papadopoulos meeting in a historical context of 40 years. Such historical references not only established continuity between the past and present by creating a temporal link, but also enhanced the perception of the problem as hard to solve, as it had lasted for 40 years.

Nationalistic Representations and Discourses: ‘Us’ and ‘them’

Among the many expressions of nationalistic discourses, the most obvious is the distinction between the positive self and negative ‘other’. This binary division of ‘us’ and ‘them’ not only acts as a unification process within ‘us’ by producing a sense of distinctiveness from the ‘other’, but also reinforces conflict rather than reconciliation. In the 12 newspapers studied the representation of ‘us’ was based on differentiation from the ‘other’ and a negative portrayal of it. Yet, the categorisations of ‘us’ and ‘them’ were fluid rather than fixed, and changed depending on the newspaper and context.

Positive Self-representation of ‘us’

In all the newspapers the Turkish Cypriot side was depicted as the side that wanted peace, while the Greek Cypriot administration was portrayed as the opposite: The Turkish Cypriots were attending this meeting to restart the process for a solution, while the Greek Cypriot leader was participating as part of a propaganda act for the coming general elections in the south.
Otherwise, asked Özuslu from Yenidüzen and Harman from Kıbrıslı, why was Papadopoulos, ‘who would not even agree to have coffee with Talat‘ now meeting with him? According to Kıbrıslı, the main challenge of the meeting was opposing views: ‘The main contradiction of the meeting that took place yesterday was that the Turkish side acted with the idea of a solution and the Greek Cypriot side are chasing sovereignty’. Kıbrıslı likened the process to ‘political chess’, further stating that Papadopoulos angered the international community with his attitude while Talat gained an advantage in the negotiations.

Identifying the leaders with their communities, the newspapers attributed positive characteristics for ‘us’ and cast the ‘other’ in a negative light. For example, Talat was portrayed as the one who started a new process by saying ‘stop’ to the ‘delaying tactics’ of Papadopoulos, and who accepted the offer of meeting so as not to be the side avoiding negotiations for a solution. On the front page of Kıbrıslı, he was reported as saying: ‘We are committed to the aim of solution’, where the ‘we’ refers not to Talat alone but to Turkish Cypriots in general. The day before, nearly all the newspapers had printed a photograph of Talat tying a piece of cloth on a wishing tree on a visit in Turkey, with headlines describing him as a person and leader committed to peace: ‘Talat tied (a piece of) cloth to the wishing tree for peace (or a solution)’ or ‘Talat wished for peace’.

Turkey as part of ‘us’

Sometimes the newspapers treated Turkey as part of ‘us’; this was especially true for Vatan, Volkan and Kıbrıslı. For example, when it was revealed that Turkey would not appear on the new Euro coins as part of the European map, Vatan reacted angrily and accused the EU of being a hypocrite: ‘Two-faced EU’.

In order to portray the Greek Cypriots as the ‘enemy’, Volkan frequently used news stories from the Greek Cypriot press where their state officials and politicians criticised the presence of the Turkish army in the north. The newspaper announced that according to AKEL leader Demetris Christophias, a bi-zonal and bi-communal federation was ‘a federation without the Turkish army’. The paper was also very critical of Tassos Papadopoulos for making derogatory comments about ‘motherland Turkey’.

Greek Cypriots as the ‘other’

In contrast to Talat, Papadopoulos was cast as the one who ‘refused everything’, ‘running away’ from negotiations, ‘refused Talat’s offers of launching a comprehensive negotiation process that would lead to a solution in a determined way’, and whose attitude was ‘uncompromising’. Kıbrıslı even illustrated Papadopoulos’s rejection as a trait: ‘As expected, Papadopoulos avoided taking a step towards solution’. The expression ‘as expected’ made it seem as though this was Papadopoulos’s natural behaviour. Interestingly, nearly all the newspapers used the strategy of
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70 No author, ‘BM bayrağı altında göüşme değil buluşma [Meeting not negotiation under the UN flag]’, Kıbrıslı, 6.9.2007.1.
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73 No author, ‘8 Temmuz’un sonu [The end of 8th July]’, Halkın Sesi, 6.9.2007.1.
74 No author, ‘BM bayrağı altında göüşme değil buluşma [Meeting not negotiation under the UN flag]’, Kıbrıslı, 6.9.2007.1.
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77 The newspapers that used this headline are Afrika, 4.9.2007:3; Yenidüzen, 4.9.2007:1, 6,10; Volkan, 4.9.2007:8; Halkın Sesi, 4.9.2007:3; Vatan, 4.9.2007:3; Güneş, 4.9.2007.1.
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79 No author, ‘İşte iki yüzlü AB [Here is the two-faced EU]’, Vatan, 26.9.2007.1.
80 No author, ‘Türk askerinin olmadığı federasyon [A federation without the Turkish army]’, Volkan, 4.9.2007.1.
81 No author, ‘Çözüm hedefine bağımız [Talat: we’re committed to the aim of solution]’, Kıbrıs, 7.9.2007.1.
82 The expression ‘as expected’ made it seem as though this was Papadopoulos’s natural behaviour. Interestingly, nearly all the newspapers used the strategy of
shifting the blame to the Greek Cypriot leader and found nothing to criticise in ‘our’ leader. Such reproduction of the events not only gave the impression of a harmonious ‘we’ but also encouraged the negative perceptions of the ‘other’. This can be attributed to the wide use of the official sources. The Turkish Cypriot newspapers were not alone in employing the strategy of shifting responsibility. According to the Greek Cypriot press summaries that appeared in nearly all the Turkish Cypriot newspapers it was Talat to blame: ‘Talat kicked 8th of July’. The article was given a full page in Vatan, Ortam, Kibris Star and Yenidüzen. But Yenidüzen’s reported the expression as ‘comments’ and Kibris called it ‘claims’ of the Greek Cypriot press, which means they saw them as mere suggestions in contrast to the authoritarian tone they normally assigned to the Turkish Cypriot authorities.

It was not just the President of the Republic of Cyprus Tassos Papadopoulos who was cast as the ‘other’ but Greek Cypriots in general. For example, when the Presidential spokesperson Hasan Erçakıca issued a press statement in which he pointed the finger at Greek Cypriots as the cause of the isolation Turkish Cypriots were experiencing, Halkın Sesi, Vatan, Yenidüzen, Güneş, Bakış and Kibris published the announcement in its entirety. While the similarity of the texts may not reveal the institutional voice of the newspapers, it shows that they all found it acceptable to publish the statement and they all reproduced the official discourse in the form of news. It confirmed the tendency of the press to treat the official sources as valid news and to integrate the official ideologies and policies into their stories disguised as news. In other words, as these examples reveal, they simply reproduced official discursive acts rather than putting them through a journalistic process.

Halkın Sesi, on the same day it published Erçakıca’s statement blaming Greek Cypriots for Turkish Cypriots’ isolation, also reported that Greek Cypriots were objecting to Foreign Minister Turgay Avci’s visit to Italy: ‘Now they are protesting against Italy’. Just the day before, Halkın Sesi had published on its front page (exactly where the story on protesting against Italy had appeared) that the Greek Cypriot government disapproved the start of ferry services from Famagusta to the Syrian port Latakia: ‘They will ask for an explanation from Syria’. The coverage strengthened the notion that Greek Cypriots were continuously obstructing Turkish Cypriots from developing any relations with other countries and keeping them in international isolation.

The newspapers used articles from the Greek Cypriot press whenever they criticised their own government or wrote any negative portrayal of their society. One such example was an article published in the Greek Cypriot daily, Haravgi, about an increase in the use of illegal drugs in south Cyprus. The story was on the front pages of Vatan and Kıbrıslı and appeared in the inner pages of Volkan and Kıbrıs Star. The similarity in the stories not only suggested that they originated from the same source but also confirmed a tendency in these newspapers to consider anything that was negative about the ‘other’ side as newsworthy. Volkan, taking this a step further, transformed the original phrase ‘around 50,000 Greek Cypriots have tried marijuana at least once in their life’ to ‘50,000 Greek Cypriots are using drugs’. Vatan and Kıbrıslı used the same headline: ‘The drug use in the South’ while Kibris Star’s title was ‘50 thousand Greek Cypriots have used drugs’. The story did not appear in any other Turkish Cypriot newspaper.
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It was again these three newspapers, Kıbrıs Star, Vatan and Kıbrıslı, that reacted to a video film on an internet site showing the Greek Cypriot tennis player Marcos Baghdatis shouting slogans against the presence of Turks in Cyprus. Calling him ‘racist’, Vatan’s front page said ‘just look what the racist Greek Cypriot tennis player said’.

In Kıbrıslı, the event was reported in the sports page with a headline, ‘(he’s) turned out to be racist’. Kıbrıs Star wrote that the footage on the internet led him to be labelled as ‘racist’.

Volkan generalised this anti-Turk action to all Greek Cypriots. Even though the event had taken place a year before, the newspaper chose to combine it with recent reports of other similar incidents in the south which was a strategy to enhance the perception that all Greek Cypriots are anti-Turk. Marcos Baghdatis’s public announcement that he was protesting only against the presence of the Turkish army on the island and not Turkish Cypriots did not mean much for these newspapers as they considered the existence of the Turkish army on the island as crucial to the security of Turkish Cypriots. It was also an indication that the paper did not differentiate between Turkish Cypriots and Turks as two separate nations.

The official national discourse of defining the Republic of Cyprus as the ‘Greek Cypriot Administration’ was adopted by all the newspapers. As part of this discourse, Mehmet Ali Talat was described as the ‘TRNC President’, while the President of the Republic of Cyprus, Tassos Papadopoulos, was referred to as the ‘Greek Cypriot leader’, the ‘Greek Cypriot community leader’ or the ‘leader of the Greek Cypriot Administration’. None of the newspapers described him as the ‘President of the Republic of Cyprus’. For example, all news reports on the leaders’ meeting referred to Talat as the ‘TRNC President’ and Tassos Papadopoulos as ‘the leader of the Greek Cypriot administration’ or ‘the Greek Cypriot leader’. It was only Afrika that pointed out this distinction in an editorial: ‘According to our news agencies, ours is President… the other is only the leader of the Greek Cypriot Administration’.

The European Union (EU)

There were not many stories related to the EU for the dates examined in this part of the research. When a story on the EU appeared, it portrayed the EU as either positive or negative depending on the context. For example, it was pictured positively as a source of funding for the improvements needed in the country, while for its role in negotiating a settlement the picture was more negative, although its policies towards Cyprus were still considered important. In either case, most news articles about the EU were identical, suggesting that the original texts were either press statements or news agency dispatches. The only difference in the stories was their headlines, but sometimes even those were identical. For example, to convey what the European Commission President Jose Barroso said about the Cyprus Issue, Halkın Sesi, Yenidüzen, Kıbrıs and Vatan used the headline ‘Barroso: Cyprus can be effective in the EU only after a solution’, while Volkan and Kıbrıslı noted that ‘the EU would not react if the TRNC adopted the Euro’.

The European Union (EU)

There were not many stories related to the EU for the dates examined in this part of the research. When a story on the EU appeared, it portrayed the EU as either positive or negative depending on the context. For example, it was pictured positively as a source of funding for the improvements needed in the country, while for its role in negotiating a settlement the picture was more negative, although its policies towards Cyprus were still considered important. In either case, most news articles about the EU were identical, suggesting that the original texts were either press statements or news agency dispatches. The only difference in the stories was their headlines, but sometimes even those were identical. For example, to convey what the European Commission President Jose Barroso said about the Cyprus Issue, Halkın Sesi, Yenidüzen, Kıbrıs and Vatan used the headline ‘Barroso: Cyprus can be effective in the EU only after a solution’, while Volkan and Kıbrıslı noted that ‘the EU would not react if the TRNC adopted the Euro’.
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A Source of Funding

The analysis revealed that one of the main perceptions about the EU was that it was a source of funding. For example, Kıbrıs reported that the EU had drawn up and funded a project that would help solve the country’s traffic problem: ‘3 million Euro from the EU for traffic’.104 The article portrayed the EU as a funding source; however, the story was based solely on information from a single source, the Chairman of the Road Traffic Accident Prevention Association Mehmet Avcı, with no additional researched information to back up the newspaper’s representation of the issue.

That the EU was perceived as a source of funding was also evident in an article in Kıbrıslı. Reporting that Nicosia Mayor Cemal Bulutoğlulanan showed the new municipality building to Italy’s Ambassador to Cyprus, the newspaper quoted the mayor saying, ‘the construction of the building was carried out without any funds from the government or the EU’,105 implying that the EU usually funded such projects in the country. The EU was also depicted as a measurement of comparison for standards, as a headline in Kıbrıslı illustrates: ‘Such a magnificent municipality palace does not exist even in the EU’.106 Only when the main text was read does it become clear that the headline was quoting the Italian ambassador during his visit to this new municipality building.

Is it just or not?

It can be argued that the stories about a group of Turkish Cypriots applying to the European Court of Human Rights for a case107 might have reinforced the association of Europe with justice, which indirectly may also have influenced the perception of the EU in a similar way. But Vatan was not very convinced that the EU was a fair union as it accused it of being ‘two-faced’ for not including Turkey in the map of Europe on new Euro coins.108

The EU vs the UN

The official discourse that a Cyprus solution had to occur under UN auspices and not with the EU was also integrated into the news discourse. For example, Halkın Sesiquoted Talat as saying that ‘the EU cannot solve the Cyprus Problem’ on its front page.109 Kıbrıslı also stressed the importance of the leaders’ meeting being ‘under the UN flag’.110 Explaining this phrase further in his column, Doğan Harman, editor-in-chief of the paper, wrote ‘Papadopoulos, who has taken the Cyprus Problem out of the UN umbrella and put it under the EU’s framework, eventually agreed to meet under the UN framework’.111 Some regarded EU involvement in the Cyprus Issue as a cause of concern, as they believed that the EU backed the Greek Cypriots. Ertem Kasımoğlu, the owner of Vatan, wrote ‘…for years by turning their back to the realities of Cyprus and by backing Greek Cypriots in the international platforms they have made them the EU’s spoilt child’,112 and, ‘whatever the EU and Greek Cypriots and Greeks’ other western relatives say, two separate states have been in existence for 30 years…’.113 Meanwhile, most of the newspapers published Prime Minister Ferdi Sabit Soyer’s statements in which he remarked that the leaders’ negotiation had confirmed once more that the UN was the basis for a solution to the Cyprus Problem. Reproduction of the statement enhanced the official discourse that the Cyprus Issue should be dealt with under UN auspices rather than being an issue of the EU.
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Internal Politics
Newspaper affiliation with a political party is common in north Cyprus. Although this connection is not always stated on the newspaper masthead, the public will be aware of it as their content reflects the specific party politics.

Criticism of the Government
The government was a main source of news for the dailies. All the newspapers reported statements given by the government representatives or sought out their comments on an issue. Dependence on TAK’s reports meant actions and policies of government and state officials found wide and positive coverage in the print media.

The newspapers’ affiliations with political parties played a large role in the level of criticism directed at the government. That is to say, while stories with a critical tone appeared in the dailies that sympathised with the opposition, pro-government newspapers reported them in a positive light. For example, Yenidüzen’s close links with the Republican Turkish Party-United Forces (Cumhuriyetçi Türk Partisi Birleşik Güçler - CTP-BG), the larger party in the coalition government, influenced its coverage of events that were critical of the government. One such example was when the government attracted public criticism for its decision to extend the power supply to the end of Karpaz peninsula. The protest rally organised by some civil society organisations received wide coverage in the newspapers. While Kıbrıs, Vatan, Ortam, Bakış, Kıbrıs Star and Halkın Sesi put the story on their front pages together with the Talat - Papadopoulos meeting, in Yenidüzen it appeared on the inner pages.114 Apart from the leaders’ meeting Yenidüzen chose to publish a story on the conflict between two opposition parties, UBP and DP.115

Another such example was on 26 September 2007, a randomly chosen date to test the claim. While most dailies published news on actions critical of the government policies or decisions, this was not the case for Yenidüzen. Halkın Sesi and Kıbrıs informed their readers on the front page that the Cyprus Turkish Civil Servants Trade Union ( Kıbrıs Türk Amme Memurları Sendikası - KTAMS) had filed a court case against the government for the changes it made in the public examination regulation, and also that the price of fuel increased.116 On the same day, Afrika’s main headline was ‘who’s protecting the ones who don’t pay (their electricity bills)?’ which argued that the authorities allowed some influential people exemptions from paying their bills even though they amounted to billions of Turkish liras.117 Kıbrıslı invited the Education Minister to intervene in the administration of a high school on whose premises some condoms and empty beer bottles were found.118 Volkan summarised the reaction of some trade unions to government actions on its front page as ‘CTP-ÖRP government is falling apart’.119 Güneş pointed at the problems in schools and blamed the government.120 In contrast, Yenidüzen published no such news but announced positive policies of the government, e.g., a special credit would be awarded to businesses in Morphou to help their development, and that two new power stations would be built to meet the electricity needs of the country.121

Similarly, when the union of electricity board workers protested the Finance Minister Ahmet Uzun’s accusations directed at the board, the story was reported on the front pages of all the newspapers except Yenidüzen.

117 No author, ‘Ödemeyenleri kim koruyor [Who is protecting the ones who don’t pay (their electricity bills)]’, Afrika, 26.9.2007:1.
120 No author, ‘70 MW’lık santrale ilave 2 yeni santral daha [2 new power station added to the power station of 70 MW]’, Yenidüzen, 26.9.2007:1.
Political Biases

The newspapers’ sympathies or links with political parties influenced both their news selection as well as their representation of events. For example, Yenidüzen, with close ties to CTP-BG, was critical of two main opposition parties, UBP and DP, for not attending parliamentary meetings. UBP and DP had skipped meetings to protest the formation of a coalition government with the Freedom and Justice Party (Özgürlük ve Reform Partisi - ÖRP), since, they argued, the party did not reflect Turkish Cypriots’ political will. Yenidüzen reported that the two parties ‘had become aware that the “parliament boycott” has been damaging to them and therefore were looking for ways to return to Parliament’.[122] Its headline directed a question to them: ‘in or out’.[123] Reporting on the meetings of the three main parties, CTP-BG, UBP and DP, regarding some constitutional changes, Yenidüzen was especially critical of UBP: ‘CTP-BG have discussed the suggestions in their party assembly, DP is meeting today..(sic) UBP is indecisive’.[124] The newspaper not only portrayed UBP as indecisive but also as incapable of making a decision on its own and needing to seek advice of ‘Ankara’ i.e. the Turkish government: ‘UBP will consult Ankara again’,[125] the ‘again’ suggesting that consulting Ankara was characteristic of UBP.

It was not only Yenidüzen that reflected its political orientation in its pages. Kıbrıslı and Güneş disapproved ÖRP, and continually referred to it sarcastically as ‘ÖP’ (which means kiss in Turkish) rather than using its proper name. For example, in one front-page story, Kıbrıslı claimed that ‘DP would use force to throw ÖP MPs out of the parliament’ and that they would protest ‘the coalition with ÖP’. The newspaper also quoted some unnamed DP authorities saying that ÖP emerged as a political formation comprised of people formerly belonging to UBP.[126] Demokrat Bakış, the publication of DP, frequently published cartoons on its front page that made fun of the party as ‘ÖP’.

Political affiliations were also influential in the selection of the news. Newspapers would favourably report actions of the political parties and other organisations that it sympathised with or was linked to. For example, press statements released by the Communal Democracy Party (Toplumcu Demokrasi Partisi – TDP) leader Mehmet Çakıcı were regarded as very important and were given wide coverage in Ortam,[127] while in other newspapers he received no such advantageous treatment.

Providing Information?

The resignation of the DP MPs from parliament was an unusual event, which meant that the public relied on the media to help them understand. The newspapers, however, covered the event in a way that reflected their views, as we stated earlier—a common journalistic practice in the Turkish Cypriot press.

Reporting the developments, some newspapers used the same term that DP used to describe its action of resigning: ‘Return to nation’ (sine-i millet), accompanied by an explanation that it meant withdrawal from the parliament.[128] According to Kıbrıslı, the DP withdrawal from parliament meant ‘the ropes have snapped’ (ipler koptu- the relationship has been severed). However, the newspaper did not provide any further information or explanation.[129] Afrika was the only newspaper that highlighted the action as ‘a first in our political history’,[130] maybe because it was the first time that
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127 No author, ‘Gidilen yol çıkmaz yoldur [The road taken is a dead-end]’, Ortam, 7.9.2007:1; No author, ‘Çakıcı maskeli balo devam ediyor [Çakıcı: Costume ball is continuing]’, Ortam, 18.1.2008:5.
129 Mutlu Esendemir, ‘İpler koptu [The relationship has been severed]’, Kıbrıs, 17.1.2008:1.
there was confusion\textsuperscript{131} and ‘everyone kept asking: what’s going to happen now’.\textsuperscript{132} According to the papers, the uncertainty led everyone to ‘turn their eyes to parliament’,\textsuperscript{133} where a decision on the resignation of the MPs would be taken. Halkın Sesi tried to guess what might happen next, suggesting that the resignations might be rejected by CTP-BG and UBP, but if they were accepted, there would likely be either a by-election or a general election.\textsuperscript{134} Similar information appeared in an opinion column in Yenidüzen.\textsuperscript{135} Güneş was the only newspaper that reported the development very briefly and did not elaborate on it. It described the parliamentary session as a ‘UBP-CTP duel’ on its front page without highlighting the DP MPs resignation, which appeared only on its inner pages.\textsuperscript{136}

None of the newspapers clearly explained the reason for the MPs’ resignation. They all reminded their readers that the party had been boycotting the parliament for nearly a year and a half to protest ÖRP’s establishment and participation in the coalition government. They noted that the party said this happened because of AKP’s —the governing party in Turkey—intervention, against Turkish Cypriots’ political will. The newspapers took quotes from the resigning MPs’ speech in the assembly that ‘they did not want to be political extras’ and ‘they did not want to be part of political pollution’. Even though in the news texts, the resignations were depicted as an action the party had taken in protest, in many opinion columns it was also linked to UBP’s giving up boycotting the parliament and returning to the assembly. Many construed this as a move that left DP in political isolation.

Because the newspapers used TAK’s coverage of the developments, certain discourses and treatment were repeated in all the dailies. For example, they all stressed the underlying reason for the resignation as ‘the intervention’ and reported that DP leader Serdar Denktaş apologised for not reacting against similar ‘interventions’ in the past. Yet, none of the newspapers provided their readers with any background information on these previous interventions, probably assuming that they all knew. They all limited their coverage of the issue to quoting Denktaş without offering any further information to their readers. Even Ortam, whose headline was ‘Apology and Confession: DP leader Serdar Denktaş confessed that there had been intervention in the past and apologised for not taking action’,\textsuperscript{137} and Afrika, who wrote ‘Denktaş apologised for not reacting against such interventions’,\textsuperscript{138} did not explain what ‘intervention’ they referred to.

Another discourse that appeared in all the newspapers simply because it was in the texts TAK provided to them was that DP had ‘left the reconciliation door (or path)’ open. Yet, apart from Halkın Sesi, none indicated clearly how the party did that. Unlike the other newspapers, Halkın Sesi did not use the agency text but produced its own story that consisted of interviews with the political party leaders, including those of DP. It linked the expression of ‘leaving the reconciliation path open’ with a quote from Serdar Denktaş: ‘We have made a decision. If CTP comes with an offer that will remove the consequences of what occurred 16 months ago, then we’re open to dialog’.\textsuperscript{139}

Although some newspapers were critical of the resignations, this was not evident in their coverage, again because they used externally prepared texts that did not include such understandings. In these cases, interpretations were limited to headlines. For Vatan the resignation was not that convincing; it wrote, ‘resignation but!!(sic)’.\textsuperscript{140} Kıbrıs Star described it as a ‘resignation show from DP’.\textsuperscript{141} Yenidüzen also kept writing the word resignation in inverted commas as if it
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carried a different meaning than it suggested. Güneş was also sceptical: ‘Will DP return to the nation?’. Otherwise, any interpretation of events was limited to the newspapers’ opinion columns. While Sami Özuslu from Yenidüzen described it as ‘DP’s decision: “Half resignation...”’, Ali Tekman from Vatan raised questions about it: ‘Is it resignation or benefiting?’[istifa mı istifade mı]. Dilek Çetereisi from Kıbrıs also named the action as ‘not complete [yarı buçuk]’. However, such criticisms or interpretations were not included in the news articles.

*Whose Views are Reflected?*

The media can offer a picture of a given society. By articulating cultural values and mediating symbols embedded in typical social routines, the media reflect a symbolic form of society. The language of the media contributes to the definition of who ‘we’ are. The usage of ‘we’ in media discourse creates a bond between the media and the audience and enhances the sense of unity. The press offered numerous examples of the deictic use of ‘we’ in that sense: ‘Iskele youth makes us proud’, ‘We gave 9 million Cyprus Pounds to Greek Cypriots’, ‘we have become a British base or else what is meaning of bas?’, ‘we are defeated by cancer’, ‘We have become a bridge to the Middle East’, etc. The use of ‘we’, as in these examples, helped to portray a society in consensus, a society in which everyone has common interests and therefore is united. It also gave the impression that besides speaking to the public the newspapers were also speaking on behalf of it.

For the dates examined in this part of the research, only certain groups’ views and comments were integrated in the texts. On the Cyprus Issue, it was essentially the views of the president and government that were mediated by the newspapers. Official representation of the two community leaders’ meeting dominated the coverage of the event in the print media as the stories were mostly based on official statements. Coverage of public opinion was mainly limited to the views of some politicians, a few trade union representatives and journalists. For example, just before the leaders’ meeting Yenidüzen published a feature describing the opinions of representatives of the four major political parties. The only time members of the public were given a chance to express their opinion was in Kıbrıs, when it reported on both Turkish and Greek Cypriots’ expectations of this meeting. Kıbrıslı also wrote about the hopes of some shopkeepers in the area known as Arasta in Lefkoşa that a decision to open the Lokmacı barricade or the Ledra Street crossing might come out of the leaders’ meeting.

Yenidüzen was partial to the opinions and analysis of journalists and trade union representatives. Having reported comments of journalists from both communities who had attended the leaders’ summit, the newspaper also integrated their views on the outcome in a feature article. Interestingly, the feature included the views of some trade union representatives as well. Yenidüzen ran a similar article, comprised of the comments of some journalists and trade union representatives.
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representatives on the DP MPs’ resignation. As journalists have been those shaping and defining the news, the trade union perspective was the only voice to reflect the opinion of the society. Otherwise, with articles focused on the views of political parties, the reports ignored what the rest of the society thought on the issue.

The coverage of political news was no different and political party leaders, especially, were given opportunities to express their opinions. For example, when the DP assembly decided on resignation, CTP-BG General Secretary Ömer Kalyoncu’s comment on the issue was included in the TAK story (which meant that it appeared in all the newspapers that based their stories on it), with no explanation as to why only his views were reported. The newspapers decided to record mainly the views of CTP-BG and UBP, for the most part ignoring the small partner of the coalition that was at the centre of the debate.

During the period included in the study women were invisible in the press. It was only when UBP MP Şerife Ünverdi issued a press release critical of Fatma Ekenoğlu, the Speaker of the Parliament, that women appeared in the papers. Kıbrıslı’s report of these statements carried a belittling tone as it referred to both female politicians by their first names rather than their surnames as it would do to male politicians: ‘A strong reaction from Şerife to Fatma’.

The journalistic practice of publishing statements without contextualizing them led to some views, ideas and discourses being reproduced in the newspapers disguised as news. For example, sometimes political party statements that were basically propaganda material rather than informational were integrated into news articles. News articles reporting on the speech DP leader Serdar Denktaş delivered at his party assembly were one such example: Both Kıbrıslı and Ortam published most of the speech text instead of an account of it, which helped the dissemination of a text prepared specifically for the party members as it included the beliefs and ideology of the political party. By publishing it the newspapers communicated them to a wider audience, as mentioned before, hidden in the form of news.

Conclusion
Research for this time period also confirmed that the print media rely heavily on externally prepared texts, especially news agency dispatches, rather than produce their own news items. Reworked or edited in some cases, but copied with minimal change most times, these texts from the same sources comprised the majority of the newspapers’ news content. News articles were practically identical in all the newspapers even when reporters attended a news event and could have written up their own accounts. Thus, it is difficult to talk about a diverse media landscape as generally only one version of events was ever presented. In the absence of challenging discourses and representation, such reproduction of issues and events reinforces perception of that version as the ‘truth’ as well as providing a hegemonic frame to understand and construct a particular social reality. This was the case in the news reports on the Cyprus Issue. As the majority of the press employed TAK dispatches, which can be described as officially approved, the print media’s depiction of developments regarding the leaders’ meeting was not only dominated by the official framework but also strengthened and justified their arguments on the matter. The official discourse that portrayed the Turkish Cypriot side as wanting a peaceful solution, while casting the Greek Cypriot side as the opposite, was integrated into the news. As a result, it reinforced a
common public perception that Greek Cypriots do not want a peaceful solution with Turkish Cypriots.

Intertwining commentary with information was common in the Turkish Cypriot newspapers examined. They frequently presented their opinions in the form of the news or factual information which was far from providing a clear understanding of the issue. Any remarks that implied a newspaper’s views were usually embedded in the headlines. Because so often the news agency reports were copied verbatim and published as the newspaper story, headlines and subheads were the only place to hear— and so to analyse—the institutional voice of a newspaper.

Nationalistic representations and discourses were obvious especially in the stories focused on the Cyprus Issue. Reports depicting the Turkish Cypriots as united against the Greek Cypriots confirmed that when the topic was a national issue such as the Cyprus Problem, the media employed the image of a homogenous nation. Meanwhile, accounts of the talks between the Turkish Cypriot and Greek Cypriot leaders used the discourse of ‘us’ and ‘them’. Such dichotomy not only acted as a unifying force within ‘us’ by producing a sense of distinctiveness from the ‘other’, but also enhanced the conflict between the two sides. On the other hand, the relationship with the ‘other’ did not show much variation: Generally, it was Greek Cypriots in the position of the ‘other’ while there was no reference to Greeks; and Turkey and Turks did not appear in the position of the ‘other’, but on the contrary, featured as part of ‘us’. The construction of oppositional positions of ‘us’ and ‘them’ and the positive representation of ‘us’ and the negative portrayal of the ‘other’ were discernible throughout the dates included in the study.

There were political biases inherent in the representations of the newspapers. In some cases subtle and in others openly, these biases were reflected in the news. For example, the coverage in the newspapers of the DP withdrawal from parliament reflected intra-national differences and political orientations. Our study confirmed that the affiliations the Turkish Cypriot press had with some political parties were influential in the construction of the news. Even though usage of stories prepared by the news agency might have helped the newspapers insulate themselves from political bias, their headlines still mirrored their political agreements with and oppositions to the issue discussed.

The EU did not feature much in the press during the dates analysed here, indicating a lack of interest in the institution. There were no stories reporting actions and policies of the EU in the Turkish Cypriot press, but only events that had a direct influence on the country such as providing funding or its role in the Cyprus Problem. When the EU featured in a story related to the Cyprus Problem, it was in some cases portrayed as an ally and in others as a foe.

Sanem Şahin
Introduction

Analysis of television news requires a different approach since both the production and the reception processes of broadcast news are different. News on television, a visual- and audio-based medium, is considered to be more impartial and trustworthy than the newspapers. The process of constructing television news, from information gathering to selection and writing, is also different than print news because of the nature of television. Unlike print journalists, broadcast journalists have to be present at the event and record it in audio and video form. Clarity, brevity and the narrative based on audio and visuals shape the way the story is told on television.

John Hartley, in his study of the news, asserts that television news tells us about certain aspects of society as well as about television news production itself. That is because social relations in a society are reflected onto the news production and are also influential in shaping news discourses. Therefore, this part of the research aims to discover the representation of the Cyprus Issue, the EU, internal politics and self-perception in relation to the ‘others’ in the Turkish Cypriot television news. It also investigates common routines and practices in the broadcast journalism in north Cyprus.

The Data

The context of the research is similar to that of the newspaper analysis in 2007. The data covers the period of 4 to 7 September 2007, 24 to 26 September 2007 and 17 to 20 January 2008, and includes the main evening news bulletins of five television channels, Bayrak Radio Television (BRT), Kıbris TV, Genç TV, Kanal T and Avrasya TV (ART). Around 40 hours of news were analysed for the research.

For the analysis we studied the visual and verbal structures of the news narratives and investigated the relationship between images and texts. News selection, accessed voices, construction and presentation of stories are examined to compare treatment and discourse on the different television channels. As with the newspapers, this kind of comparison is made in order to reveal the shared values and common practices within the Turkish Cypriot media as well as establish their differences.

The Journalistic Practices and the Structure of the News

The television news programmes that were included in the study consisted of presentation of a topic by a newsreader who set the frame and discourse of the story and in some cases provided links with other topics in the programme. The filmed portion included a voice report and presented images related to the story. Correspondents, whose role is to offer further details and explain the importance of the issue, rarely appeared on the news bulletins. During the period examined, Kanal T, Genç TV and BRT journalists reported live from the location of the leaders’ meeting to give the latest developments. Apart from this event, it was mainly Kanal T that had items showing
a reporter involved in the story; that is to say, doing a stand-up piece to camera at the end or in the middle of a story or appearing on screen while carrying out interviews.

Film reports mainly consisted of the newsreader’s voice over video images and, in some cases, sound-bites from a speaking source. Nearly all television news programmes benefited from graphics in the form of captions appearing at the bottom of the screen; to an extent, these summarised the story. Otherwise, it was only ART that used full-frame text graphics that not only indicated the gist of the news topic but also conveyed some commentary. In some cases a news item had several such graphics highlighting certain aspects of the report.

Like newspaper reports, television news programmes were very similar to each other and far from being exclusive. Again, having used the same sources, such as TAK, the content of news bulletins was alike and similar to the print media’s stories as well. For example, reporting on the views of TRNC Prime Minister Ferdi Sabit Soyer, the Speaker of the Assembly and the political party representatives concerning the meeting between the Turkish Cypriot leader Mehmet Ali Talat and the Greek Cypriot counterpart Tassos Papadopoulos, all the television channels aired the same news with slightly different images. Either because of lack of resources or reporters, exclusive reports rarely appeared on the television news. While Kanal T’s exclusively stories were mainly human-interest ones, BRT’s consisted of comments of politicians, especially on issues related to the Cyprus Problem.

Although television is a visual medium, the quantity and quality of images were far from satisfying. Shaky and badly lit video pictures were common. Probably caused by not having enough images for news scripts, the same visuals were used in a loop—meaning that audience kept seeing the same pictures over and over and not only in the same report but in several reports within the same news bulletin. For example, on BRT two separate stories that concerned the European Court of Human Rights (ECHR) were presented one after the other and showed the same archive footage of the ECHR building.5 Similarly, any reference to the Talat-Papadopoulos meeting in the news used the same or similar footage of the two leaders with Michael Moller, the UN Secretary General’s Special Envoy in Cyprus, giving an after-meeting press statement. This image appeared in the video part of the stories concerning the leaders’ meeting on nearly all television channels.

Lack of recent or new pictures also led to frequent use of archive footage, most of the time without acknowledging this fact. Images from picture libraries were used especially when written press statements were reported. In some cases, even when the script specified that it was a written press release, pictures showed the source as speaking. Use of still photography was also common when there was no video footage. Genç TV’s film report on the opening of a new branch of the Red Crescent6 and tree planting activity organised by the Turkish army forces comprised only photographs, with no video.7 Kıbrıs TV also employed this method when it had no footage for a meeting between the Minister of Labour and Social Security, Sonay Adem, and a trade union.8 Stills also appeared in another news item on Kıbrıs TV, reporting on an announcement of the Agriculture Minister; but this time the report combined photographs with some video shots of the ministry building.9 Kanal T also chose to broadcast a story about Turkey’s first lady, Emine Erdoğan, even though it had no video footage for the item. It simply compiled the report with some stills.10

One of the main rules of television news writing is that the pictures and the script (or voice report) should complement each other. Certainly, the basic theme of pictures should highlight the main topic of a script. On Turkish Cypriot television, the news stories based mainly on who said what showed the image of the person who issued the statement. Therefore, pictures in the television news predominantly demonstrated one person speaking, and matching picture and
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5 BRT, items 7 and 8, 6.9.2007.
7 Genç TV, item 7, 20.1.2008.
8 Kıbrıs TV, item 9, 18.1.2008.
10 Kanal T, item 16, 25.9.2007.
script did not seem to create a big problem. But in stories where the pictures and the script came from different sources, for example, if pictures were recorded by the channel’s camerapersons and the script was taken from a news agency, then reports and pictures did not have direct correspondence. One such example was the media account of a protest demonstration by environmentalist groups against the government’s decision to transfer electricity to the end of Karpaz peninsula. Reports of the event on Kanal T, Kıbrıs TV and Genç TV’s utilised different pictures to illustrate the same script—probably a news agency dispatch, as the same text appeared in most of the newspapers as well.\footnote{Kanal T, item 4, 5.9.2007; Kıbrıs TV, item 6, 5.9.2007; Genç TV, item 3, 5.9.2007.} In this example, it is hard to talk about a picture-script harmony.

Representation of certain issues and institutions with the same pictures helped to establish a symbolic relationship between them. Shots of flags were one means employed, especially by ART, to identify one or the other side of the island as the focus of the news topic. That is to say, whenever there was an issue concerning south Cyprus or Greek Cypriots in general, the flag of the Republic of Cyprus, and in some cases of Greece, were shown. In one news items ART described the Greek Cypriot side as being ‘prestigious in fiasco and illegal events’ and showed a Republic of Cyprus flag to identify the place in the pictures as the Greek Cypriot side.\footnote{ART, item 9, 18.1.2008.} It also integrated pictures of huge Turkish and Turkish Cypriot flags drawn on the mountain in the north into its film report immediately after the full-screen text that said ‘Greek Cypriots are anxious’.\footnote{Art, item 2, 20.1.2008.} In a report on shopkeepers’ expectations from the Tatlı-Papadopoulos meeting, the Kanal T journalist began by showing both Greek and Republic of Cyprus flags first and then zooming out towards Turkish Cypriot and Turkish flags to indicate his position at the border and to illustrate the separation.\footnote{Kanal T, item 3, 4.9.2007.}

Apart from national symbols such as flags, wide-ranging street shots were the other pictures used for topics that referred to the people in general. For stories related to the Greek Cypriot side, shots of shopping streets or traffic in the south were used. Reporting that the Greek Cypriot Administration rejected the Turkish Cypriot side’s offer of cooperation to prevent illegal immigration and human trafficking to Cyprus, Kanal T, BRT and ART showed pictures of people walking in the streets in south Nicosia.\footnote{Kanal T, item 5, 17.1.2008; BRT, item 7, 17.1.2008; ART, item 3, 17.1.2008.} Kıbrıs TV did not use street shots for that story, but did use them for another story reported in the same bulletin concerning a survey carried out about the presidential elections in the south.\footnote{Kıbrıs TV, item 3, 17.1.2008.} When south Cyprus was the topic of the news most pictures were usually from Ledra Street, a major shopping street in south Nicosia. Yet, unless stated in the voice report, there was no indication that would help audience to identify it as such or even as the Greek Cypriot side.

The practice of showing general view shots was not limited to the stories about the Greek Cypriot side. When the news reported on events in the north, such as campaigns, developments, research findings, general street shots or views from the rooftop of the well-known Saray Hotel in north Nicosia were used. For example, Genç TV used the picture of the view from Saray Hotel for two separate stories in the same bulletin, one reporting on a seminar organised by the Chamber of Commerce and the other on a joint meeting of youth organisations of two political parties from both sides.\footnote{Genç TV, items 11 and 13, 18.1.2008.} Similar pictures were used by Kıbrıs TV for a news report on the start of a campaign called ‘end slavery’,\footnote{Kıbrıs TV, item 9, 19.1.2008.} while Kanal T used general street shots for the same report.\footnote{Kanal T, item 11, 19.1.2008.} ART and Genç TV also showed general pictures of Nicosia their report on research findings related to illegal drug usage amongst primary school students.\footnote{ART, item 5, 20.1.2008; Genç TV, item 10, 20.1.2008.} And BRT used similar pictures for a story.
on the Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe meeting where human rights abuse and injustices against Turkish Cypriots were among the issues to be discussed.\textsuperscript{21}

Images for foreign news came either from news agencies such as \textit{IHA}, a Turkish news agency, or were recorded from news channels such as \textit{Euronews}. These types of pictures required no editing and, combined with text received from a news agency, were ready to broadcast with little or no transformation. Recordings from Turkish television channels were another source for such visuals.

In television news, sound-bites or clips where a source is heard speaking are considered useful not only to convey information but also to communicate feelings, ideas and emotions.\textsuperscript{22} For these reasons they are frequently used in broadcast news to attract audience attention. Common practice is to keep them short, not more than 20-30 seconds; however, our research revealed that the average length of a sound-bite in the Turkish Cypriot television news is around a minute or more. Moreover, some news bulletins included parts from discussion programmes aired earlier on the same channel. In such cases sound-bites were much longer. For example, BRT’s first news item the day after the Talat–Papadopoulos meeting was based on another news programme aired on BRT in which Talat had been a guest. The sound-bite employed in this approximately five minute-long report was nearly three minutes long.\textsuperscript{23} Similarly, one leading story on \textit{Kanal T}, which was an account of a heated argument between two guests on another news programme shown earlier on the channel, included a sound-bite around five minutes long.\textsuperscript{24} \textit{Genç TV} had a similar news item that again consisted of lengthy sound-bites from a television programme that had been broadcast earlier on the channel.\textsuperscript{25}

Clarity is crucial in broadcast news as the audience hears the information only once. Yet the news analysed here cannot always be described as ‘clear’, mainly, it seems, because they used stories written for the press without editing them for broadcast. As a result, long and complex sentences in scripts made it difficult to follow and understand the presentation. There were also many instances in which the identity of a source seen speaking on screen was vague, as no clear indication was given either in captions or a verbal introduction. There were also times when the wrong image was used for the person mentioned in the text. This practice was noted especially on \textit{Genç TV}. Reporting on the British Foreign Secretary Peter Miliband’s visit to Turkey and his statements about Talat and Papadopoulos’ meeting, the channel showed the wrong image for the British diplomat.\textsuperscript{26} It made the same mistake in another report on the DP MPs’ resignations; showing the party assembly in which the resignation decision was taken, \textit{Genç TV} quoted Mustafa Adaoglu, one of the party authorities, but showed someone else’s picture.\textsuperscript{27}

Time is accepted as an important factor that distinguishes broadcast news from print media. It plays a role in shaping the presentation and style of the news bulletins as broadcast news has to be given at a specific time and has a fixed duration.\textsuperscript{28} In broadcast news it is always ‘today’s’ developments that are reported rather than the events of the past. Yet, in the Turkish Cypriot broadcast culture, time is not so important a factor. Even though many channels showed a clock to indicate the start time of their news bulletins and highlight their timeliness, most failed to start their news programme on time. Events that took place a day earlier also appeared in bulletins of all the television channels. For example, Prime Minister Soyer’s public meeting in a village was on the next day’s evening main news bulletins of BRT, \textit{Kanal T} and \textit{Genç TV}.\textsuperscript{29} Also the attendance of President Talat to an event organised by the Union of Journalists was reported in the next day’s main evening news bulletins on all the television channels.\textsuperscript{30}
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Discourse Analysis

The Cyprus Issue

There are a variety of ways that the news can be arranged within a bulletin, for example, by importance or categories of topics. The Turkish Cypriot television channels generally order stories according to their topics and usually start with any issue related to the Cyprus Problem. That is not to say that if any extraordinary and unexpected event happened they would not report it first, but to note that when there is no such news, then priority is given to the news about the Cyprus Issue. Accounts of announcements made by state or government figures or foreign diplomats on the Cyprus Problem are always in the first part of the news bulletin. The Cyprus Issue is regarded as so newsworthy that even in the events not related to the Cyprus Problem any mention of the issue is highlighted as the most important aspect. In other words, if any official made a statement during an event and referred to the Cyprus Problem, then this part is reported before the event itself. For example, when Talat gave a speech at a Union of Journalists event, the television channels led with his remarks on the Cyprus Issue, highlighting this as more significant than the event itself.  

Domination of the Official Discourses

The depiction the leaders’ meeting on the television news was no different from the official representation, which set itself as the dominant discourse and established a framework for interpretation of the events. According to the official story, the Turkish Cypriot side had made an offer that would help both sides to progress in finding a settlement to the Cyprus Problem, but the Greek Cypriot side, by rejecting it, showed its unwillingness for a peaceful solution on the island. As the television channels benefited from the same sources of information, they not only contributed to presenting these viewpoints as uniform but the fact that most of these sources were official ones, justified and strengthened their discourses as well.

The television channels treated the Talat-Papadopoulos meeting as the most important development in their news bulletins, even the day before it took place. Like the press, the television channels reminded their audience ahead of the meeting that the two leaders would get together the following day, and provided them with some details such as where and what time they would meet and who would accompany them. The content of these stories was the same as that of the newspapers, which meant that they originated from the same source. The channels also gave an account of Talat’s spokesperson, Hasan Erçakıca’s, press briefing on the issue. The script used in the reports was again the same as the texts that appeared in the newspapers (except the sound-bites) and consisted of repeating what the official spokesperson said.

Most of the television channels expressed the same pessimism as the newspapers about the outcome of the leaders’ meeting. Kıbrıs TV, highlighting the opinion of the main opposition party UBP, as expressed in a press conference, reported that ‘UBP does not seem very optimistic about the summit’. The next item on the same bulletin continued with the story, but gave also citizens’ views on the issue, which apart from one were all negative. Carried out in vox-pop style, audiences heard the interviewee say ‘I don’t have much hope’. In sections where the interviewee gave an explanation for his pessimism then the blame was mostly put on the Greek Cypriot side for not wanting a solution. As mentioned in the previous chapter, Kıbrıs newspaper also had a similar feature reporting on the public’s view on the topic. In the same way, Kanal T asked members of the public for their opinions on the meeting, but they were more specific and interviewed retailers in the shopping area known as ‘Arasta’ in Lefkoşa (north Nicosia). While all
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the interviews revealed that the shopkeepers did not expect a positive outcome from the meeting, they also voiced their wish for an opening of the Lokmacı/Ledra checkpoint. The same story also appeared in the next day’s issue of Kıbrıslı newspaper. Compiled by the same reporter who worked for both Kanal T and Kıbrıslı, the photos of the interviewees showed the same people as those who had appeared on the screen, but their words were slightly transformed. Genç TV, on the other hand, reported on the Greek Cypriot political figures only. Basing its story on a news agency report that was derived from the Greek Cypriot press on the issue (it also appeared in the newspapers the next day), the newsreader remarked that ‘Greek Cypriot political leaders have little expectation from the meeting that will take place between TRNC President Mehmet Ali Talat and the leader of the Greek Cypriot Administration Tassos Papadopoulos’.39

The leaders’ press conferences that occurred after their meeting received different levels of coverage, with the Turkish Cypriot leader being treated much more favourably. The press conferences took place too late to be covered in any of the television main evening news bulletins, but were reported the next day. Kıbrıs TV summarised the main points of the statements made by both leaders in its lead story, while it had a news package that included some sound-bites from Talat’s press conference, the Greek Cypriot leader’s comments were reported only as a voice-over report without any actual sound from him. The reason for this difference in treatment could be lack of relevant footage from Papadopoulos’s press conference. Genç TV also first showed Talat’s press conference, including sections with Talat’s voice, and then Papadopoulos’s but only as a voice report. The script was the same as the articles in the newspapers. BRT, on the other hand, probably having reported both press conferences in its daytime news bulletins, chose not to repeat the same stories in its main evening bulletin. Instead it reported on an interview Talat had given to the channel earlier that day as well as the comments of the Greek Cypriot government spokesperson and political party leaders on the meeting. The channel reported that Talat did not expect any advancement in the Cyprus Issue prior to the presidential elections in south Cyprus, which again put the responsibility on the Greek Cypriots.

Adopting the official discourse, all the news reports represented the Turkish Cypriots as making positive suggestions that would aid in solution of the Problem, and the Greek Cypriots as rejecting it. According to the television news, the Turkish Cypriot offer was to launch comprehensive talks in 2008 following a rapid preparation period and to target a solution by the end of the same year, but the Greek Cypriot leader did not accept it. While the reports on the Turkish Cypriot leader attributed him a positive attitude and underlined his concern for finding a settlement, the reports on the Greek Cypriot leader Papadopoulos did the opposite.

The state and government representatives who blamed the Greek Cypriot leader were also given preference. For instance, the Speaker of Assembly Fatma Ekenoğlu’s views on the leaders’ meeting were reported on every news channel. BRT and Genç TV showed exactly the same sound-bite from Ekenoğlu where she accused Papadopoulos of ‘avoiding meeting our president. But now conditions forced him to attend this meeting’. Prime Minister Soyer was also reported to have pointed a finger at the Greek Cypriot leader for not being sincere. Kıbrıs TV used a quote from Soyer as one of the captions in the film report that said, ‘the whole world saw the real intention of Papadopoulos’, the quote that BRT used was, ‘Papadopoulos sent Talat a letter (of invitation) when he was cornered’.
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Balanced reporting? The views from the Greek Cypriot side

Reportage of the leaders’ meeting within the Greek Cypriot political community received limited coverage in the Turkish Cypriot television news. BRT broadcast a story concerning the opinions of the Greek Cypriot government spokesperson as well as political party representatives as a voice report over a mixture of images of the people quoted. The story appeared after a news item that included views of the Turkish Cypriot party representatives.46 In the story the Greek Cypriot government spokesperson was reported to be accusing Turkish Cypriot leader Talat of looking for ways to violate the 8 July agreement. The caption of the story was, ‘the Greek Cypriot side puts the blame on the Turkish side’.47 Genç TV also included news items from the Greek Cypriot side, which provided an insight to the representation of the topic in south Cyprus. For instance, it broadcast stories consisting of press coverage of the meeting in the Greek Cypriot press. Using one such story, Genç TV announced that the representation of the meeting was different there and that it was Talat who was blamed for not honouring the 8 July agreement. It summarised the Greek Cypriot press’s attitude in the caption of its story as ‘Talat kicked the 8th July’.48 Within the television news broadcasting, these were the only indications that the Greek Cypriot side viewed the issue in a different and contrasting way than the Turkish Cypriot side. There was no other story in the Turkish Cypriot television news that included Greek Cypriots’ comments on the outcome of the meeting.

Greek Cypriots as the ‘other’

Discursive construction of a dichotomy based on ‘us’ and ‘them’ with negative attributes enforces the binary position and may contribute to the enforcement of conflict rather than reconciliation. Creation of the ‘other’ as the ‘enemy’ encourages ethnocentric and nationalist perceptions among people. The Turkish Cypriot television channels reinforced the perception of the Greek Cypriot side as the ‘other’ either by repeating official discourses that showed them as such or in their interpretation of the events. Throughout the period in which the television news was analysed, the Greek Cypriot side was frequently portrayed as working against the interests of Turkish Cypriots and a settlement in Cyprus. Referring to a letter the Greek Cypriot administration sent to the UN Secretary General blaming the Turkish Cypriot leader Talat for not following the 8 July procedure, Kanal T and BRT reported that, ‘the side that refused the Turkish side’s suggestion of starting the procedure has immediately started political manoeuvres’.50 In this expression, having cast a positive light on the Turkish Cypriot side, they attributed a negative attitude to the Greek Cypriot side.

News broadcasts frequently included repetition of official proclamations, which shifted the responsibility for lack of progress in the meeting to the Greek Cypriots and helped to strengthen the perception of Greek Cypriots as the ‘other’. Foreign Minister Turgay Avcı’s statement accusing the Greek Cypriot authorities of using Turkish animosity in their election propaganda appeared on BRT and Genç TV.51 The discourse the President’s spokesperson used in a press briefing in which he blamed the Greek Cypriots for the isolation imposed on Turkish Cypriots was repeated on all the television channels.52 Another example of such reports was on prevention of human trafficking on the island. The reports again repeated the accusation of the presidential spokesperson that the Greek Cypriot side, ‘as it usually did on every issue’ refused to cooperate on the sensitive issue of illegal immigration. By suggesting that the Greek Cypriot side ‘usually'
took this attitude the news discourse helped to set its behaviour as a trait and strengthened the stereotypical representation of it. Furthermore, some television channels enhanced such stereotyping by not only repeating the official discourse but by integrating their interpretation of the subject into the news discourse. Kanal T, in describing the Turkish Cypriot side’s offer as ‘a humane move’, effectively portrayed the Greek Cypriot side as the opposite for refusing it.\(^53\) ART went a step further, and described the Greek Cypriot administration as ‘being so blinded with rage it even refuses to cooperate with the TRNC in vitally important matters’.\(^54\)

Treatment of the Greek Cypriot side as the ‘other’ or as the enemy with unchanging evil intentions was more frequent on channels with a nationalistic stance, such as ART. One such example was the report that Greek Cypriot leader Tassos Papadopoulos had sent a letter to the UN Secretary General, in which he accused the TRNC and Turkey of not working for a settlement but for the recognition of the TRNC. ART first announced that the Greek Cypriot administration, which did not want Turkish Cypriots to live peacefully in the state they established, was making attempts to stop it and then mentioned Papadopoulos’s letter as an example. Its film report stated that ‘the Greek Cypriot administration, which cannot stand the existence of the TRNC, is continuing to take negative steps’ over the pictures of both Greek Cypriot and Greek flags. The caption that stayed on throughout the report defined Papadopoulos as ‘the Greek Cypriot leader who denies the existence of the TRNC’.

The diplomatic note the Greek Cypriot government gave to Syria for allowing ferry services from Famagusta to Syria’s port Latakia was regarded as another example of the Greek Cypriot administration efforts against Turkish Cypriots. Kanal T, in its report on the issue used a caption that said ‘isolation for the TRNC’,\(^55\) while ART stated that the Greek Cypriot administration, which tried to suffocate the TRNC through embargos, could not stand the TRNC establishing relations with the outside world.\(^56\) BRT and Kıbrıs TV also ran stories on the issue, announcing that the Greek Cypriot administration disapproved the start of the ferry services and had expressed that to the Syrian authorities.\(^57\)

Despite being cast as the ‘other’, there was an interest in the coming presidential elections in the south. Both, Genç TV and ART informed their audience of the application process for presidential candidates in the Republic of Cyprus.\(^58\) Accounts of surveys about the elections also found their way into the Turkish Cypriot television news bulletins. Basing one of its news items on a survey carried out in south Cyprus, ART announced that the difference in estimated support between two candidates, Papadopoulos and Christofias, was diminishing.\(^59\) Kıbrıs TV, also using a survey that had appeared in a Greek Cypriot daily, highlighted that the number of Greek Cypriots who were willing to live together with Turkish Cypriots was on the increase.\(^60\) Kanal Twas the only channel that produced an exclusive news item on the presidential elections in the south. Their report, which was based on interviews with some Greek Cypriots, stressed that ‘even though Greek Cypriots wish DISY leader Ioannis Kassoulides to win the elections, they believe Papadopoulos will’. The caption that ran throughout the film said ‘Kassoulides’ name is in hearts but Papadopoulos’ name spills from mouths.’\(^61\) However, as the report did not refer to or quote any research or survey, the claim raised in the story did not go further than mere speculation.

**Turkey**

In general, the broadcast news representation and related discourse on Turkey were no different than the official ones. During the period included in the study, Turkey appeared on television news
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bullets mostly when Turkish state authorities made statements concerning the Cyprus Issue and when the state representatives from the two countries visited each other. The TRNC Foreign Minister’s visit to Turkey was one such example of an official visit from one state to the other. It received wide coverage in the Turkish Cypriot media, which apart from being regarded as newsworthy, could be explained by the newsrooms being provided with the relevant press releases and necessary visual materials, as in most cases the news material was very similar.

Turkey was also the topic of the news when its membership in the EU was an item, especially if the issue also involved Cyprus. One such issue was the meeting between Tayyip Erdogan and Angela Merkel, in which, according to coverage on BRT, Kibris TV and Kanal T, Merkel was expected to bring up the issue of Turkey opening its ports to the Republic of Cyprus. These channels also repeated claims that the Greek Cypriot administration, using the religious institutions in Cyprus and Europe, was pressuring political parties and governments in Europe to force Turkey to open its ports to the Republic of Cyprus. Though the three channels used nearly the same text, BRT gave its source as an internet news portal, ‘AP’, while the other two gave no source.

The decision by EU member states not to put Turkey on the map of Europe that appeared on the new Euro coins was also regarded as newsworthy by Kanal T and Kibris TV. The latter reported on the statement of the spokesperson for EU Commissioner on Economic and Monetary Affairs, Joaquin Almunia. Kanal T, on the other hand, with the addition of background music, dramatized the issue. Referring to the new design for the Euro coins, the channel highlighted that ‘on the map, in which Turkey doesn’t appear, Cyprus is brought closer to Greece’.

Reports of video footage on the internet showing famous Greek Cypriot tennis player Marcos Baghdatis taking part in an anti-Turk demonstration was another topic that was well covered in the press. The broadcast footage showed Baghdatis shouting, while some channels added the caption, ‘Turks out of Cyprus’. ART and Kibris TV aired the story using similar captions: ‘The racist behaviour of the Greek Cypriot tennis player’. Both channels treated Baghdatis’s behaviour as an insult to ‘us’. Later the tennis player explained in a press conference that by ‘Turks’ he meant the Turkish army on the island not Turkish Cypriots. Yet the Turkish Cypriot media’s presentation of the story reveals that separation of Turkish Cypriots and Turks as two nations was irrelevant when the ‘us’ group was constructed in relation to Greek Cypriots.

The European Union

The EU was treated in the television news just the same as in the print media, i.e., positively or negatively depending on the issue. Its role as a source of financial aid for project development was welcomed, while its interference in the Cyprus Problem was not. Overall, the EU was covered only if the story involved Cyprus, otherwise interest in it was minimal. One such example was a report on Slovenia, which had the rotating presidency of the EU Council, issuing Greece and the Republic of Cyprus a warning concerning their political attitude towards the independence of Kosovo. According to the television channels that broadcast the story these two countries feared that the recognition of Kosovo might encourage recognition of the TRNC.

The EU as a Source of Financial Aid

One of the main representations of the EU was as a source of financial aid. In the period included in the study, the EU was reported to have prepared and presented its report on the financial aid
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regulation to north Cyprus to advance the social-economic conditions in the country. Related stories were included in BRT and Kanal T’s main evening news bulletins.\(^{69}\) Using a similar text, both channels highlighted in their lead stories that success of the regulation was linked to both an improvement in the relations between two communities and the progress in talks for a settlement within the framework of the UN. Kanal T, in the introduction to the story, stressed that 9.5 million Euro of the aid would be used to bring Turkish Cypriots closer to the EU, which enhanced the perception of the organisation as a positive one. The film reports on both channels showed some buildings with European flags in front of them, which the audience could only guess as being the EU offices.

The EU also had a project to improve traffic safety in the country, as announced by ART and Kıbrıs TV. This was a problem that Kıbrıs TV described as ‘a bleeding wound of our country’,\(^{70}\) and ART as ‘ruining families’.\(^{71}\) In this context, the news discourse related to the EU was positive: The newsreader on Kıbrıs TV announced the project was expected to bring EU norms to the country while the caption on ART pointed at the EU’s role in the process; ‘the EU’s solution to the traffic problem’.

**The EU’s Involvement in the Cyprus Solution**

Unlike the newspapers, the television news did not comment on the EU’s involvement in the Cyprus Problem, but instead repeated statements of political figures on the issue. The analysis of the news bulletins showed various EU representatives stressing the importance of a solution in Cyprus and stating that the EU was ready to help with the solution. The EU related stories appeared more frequently on BRT than any other channel. For example, a statement of support by Slovenia, the EU’s rotating presidency at the time, to the UN-initiated process known as the Gambari agreement, and the President of the European Commission, Jose Manuel Barroso’s, statement that the EU was ready to help negotiate a solution to the Cyprus Problem were reported on BRT.\(^{72}\) The same statement, whose source was an article in a Greek Cypriot daily, Politis, also appeared on Genç TV as ‘Cyprus could be effective in the EU only after a solution’.\(^{73}\)

In addition to EU representatives’ interest in the solution of the Cyprus Problem receiving negative reports, not so positive views of Turkish Cypriot politicians on the issue were also reported. A statement by Prime Minister Ferdi Sabit Soyer, emphasizing that the Talat- Papadopoulos meeting once again confirmed that a solution could be found within the umbrella of the UN, was broadcast on some television channels.\(^{74}\) At a later date, ART and BRT reported TRNC Minister Avcı’s criticisms of the UN and the EU for not keeping their promises to Turkish Cypriots, while at the same time they quoted the Turkish Minister Ali Babacan’s remark that a framework for a solution in Cyprus would be found with the UN.\(^{75}\) On ART, Turkish Minister Babacan’s words that ‘the place for the solution will be the UN’, were given in a sound-bite and repeated as a full-screen text graphic.

**Internal Politics: Political Parties and the Government**

Policies and actions of the government and political parties were the subject of many news items on television bulletins. The government was one of the main sources of information for the news media, which not only helped to regulate the information environment but also served to promote its policies and actions. At the same time, many news items that reflected civil society organisations’ criticisms of the government were also included in the television news.
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The Government

The government received wide coverage in the television news, with all channels informing their audiences of the cabinet’s new decisions, actions of various ministers, and criticisms directed at them. The activities and announcements of government ministers were seen as especially newsworthy. For example, a joint press conference between the Finance Minister, Ahmet Uzun, and the Agriculture Minister, Önder Sennaroğlu, was covered on all the channels in great detail.76 Also deemed newsworthy were ministers’ visits—whether to a school, road building sites, etc.

Even visits of various civil society organisations to government ministers were treated as newsworthy. Such stories, which most of the time have no news value, are a common feature of the Turkish Cypriot news media. Turning such an incident into a news story not only gives these groups a way to publicise a problem or an important issue but also gives government representatives the opportunity to promote their policies or views. For instance, when representatives of the Black Sea Culture Association (Karadeniz Kültür Derneği) visited Prime Minister Soyer in his office to invite him to their festival, it was reported on both BRT and Kanal T, even though the story had no public interest.77 Labour and Social Security Minister Sonay Adem’s meeting with the representatives of the Union of Employers (İşverenler Sendikası) was also covered by Kıbrıs TV and Genç TV,78 essentially allowing the minister to publicise his proposal—an amnesty in social security payments, which was probably discussed or would be discussed during the meeting.

Opposition to the Government

Despite the government being the main source of news, criticism directed at it was also frequently reported on the television news. Popular news topics included disapproval of the trade unions concerning the minimum wage, education and price increases. All channels included the criticisms that the civil organisations directed at the government and broadcast such stories together with stories that promoted their actions. For example, the news programmes included on the same day both a positive and a negative news items. The first was a report on two ministers promoting the actions and policies of their ministries, while the second was about a trade union, Cyprus Turkish Civil Servants Trade Union (Kıbrıs Türk Amme Memurları Sendikası - KTAMS), taking the government to court for not consulting the union on a matter that by law it was required to.79 Interestingly in BRT, the state-owned broadcasting corporation, the KTAMS story preceded the ministers’ aforementioned press conference.80 The news of the trade union filing a court case against the government was the second item in the bulletin whereas the ministers’ press conference appeared as the fourth and fifth items. On all other channels, the court case followed the ministers’ public announcements.

Demonstrations against government decisions were also reported. The Electric Workers Union (Kıbrıs Türk Elektrik Kurumu Çalışanları Sendikası - El-Sen) and the Cyprus Turkish Unions Federation (Türk-Sen) organised a rally to protest Finance Minister Ahmet Uzun’s accusatory statements directed at the electricity board workers, and this event received wide coverage on the television channels. Most reports used sound-bites that showed the union representatives first and then the minister—as it actually happened. But Genç TV changed the order and aired the minister’s pronouncement before the trade unions’, thus prioritising the official voice.81 Unlike the other channels, ART prepared an exclusive story to reflect the public’s reaction. Using eight vox pops that consisted of only men, the channel reproduced ‘citizens’ views’ that called this practice ‘discriminating and unfair’.82
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Political Parties

The colourful language that came with political biases of the newspapers was not so common in the television news. The TV news language was mostly limited to who said what and did not include journalist observations as in the print media. Nevertheless, political biases were still observable in the news selection. For example, within the period the analysis was carried out, there were more news items reflecting the views of the National Unity Party (Ulusal Birlik Partisi - UBP) on Kanal T than any other channel. Only Kanal T covered the UBP representatives’ visit to Turkey or UBP’s criticism of the government for high price increases or the dinner party UBP organised for its supporters. Similarly, news items concerning the activities of the Freedom and Justice Party ( Özgürlük ve Reform Partisi - ÖRP) received more coverage on Genç TV, e.g., the opening of ÖRP’s new party offices in various villages and ÖRP’s women’s group launching a blood donation campaign. In contrast, the story of the People’s Party ( Halk Partisi - HP) establishing a branch office in a village several months later did not appear on Genç TV. Overall, UBP appeared more frequently on TV screens than any other party, whether expressing its opinion on the day’s issues or because of its activities, while TDP was the least visible. CTP-BG, on the other hand, featured less in the news, and was mainly covered when their opinions were sought on a certain topic such as the leaders’ meeting. Like UBP, ÖRP was the other political party that regularly benefited from television news to announce its activities to the public.

Both the amount and the type of coverage the various political parties received in the broadcast media were different. For instance, the four parties represented in the assembly appeared in the news more frequently than those that were not, and of those represented, the larger parties were more visible. For example, while BRT reported on the views of the four party representatives on the Talat-Papadopoulos meeting, Kıbrıs TV chose to report only the views of CTP and UBP, the larger party of the coalition government and the main opposition party. On Kanal T, on the other hand, only UBP’s views were included in the news.

The DP party was given the widest media coverage when its six MPs resigned from their seats in the assembly. Apart from Kanal T, all channels used this event as their lead story. Kanal T, instead, chose to broadcast a heated debate between the CTP-BG General Secretary Ömer Kalyoncu and Nicosia Turkish Mayor Cemal Bulutoğlulan, which had taken place in one of its television programmes broadcast earlier in the day. Unlike the other channels, there was no mention of the DP MPs’ resignation in the main evening news of Kanal T, which could be explained by its close ties with UBP. ART and Genç TV highlighted the impact of the resignations on local politics: ‘Political arena shook with the resignation of DP MPs’, and ‘….DP MPs decided to resign from the assembly; the politics is mixed up (became confusing)’. The choice and sequence of news items on these two channels reveal how little importance was assigned to the time factor; both led off with events of the day, before, rather than that day’s news. That is to say, they first informed their audience of the events in the DP party assembly meeting that had happened a day before the transmission and then reported that day’s events. Kıbrıs TV and BRT, on the other hand, began their bulletins with the story of the MPs submitting their letters of resignation. It is possible that they did this because they had both already covered the issue in their late night news bulletins the previous day. Both highlighted ‘political interference’ in the
introduction of their stories as the cause of the MPs’ resignation, but they gave no further information, on either the ‘interference’ or where was it coming from.\textsuperscript{93} Like the print media, they also assumed their audience had background knowledge of the issue.

\textit{ART’s} report on the DP MPs’ resignation resembled its coverage in \textit{Kıbrıslı} newspaper. \textit{ART’s} caption reminded one of \textit{Kıbrıslı}’s headline on the topic: ‘\textit{DP severed the ties [DP ipleri kopardı]}’.\textsuperscript{94} A claim made by Cemal Bulutoğluları, Turkish mayor of Nicosia and a member of DP, during his speech in the party assembly that ÖRP had offered him some money to transfer to that party, also appeared only in \textit{Kıbrıslı} and \textit{ART}.\textsuperscript{95}

\textbf{Conclusion}

The television news examined here showed many similarities to the news in the press, indicating that the processes of information gathering and writing were not so different from print journalism even though the medium of television would require different processes. Many times both media shared the same news texts that were externally produced, such as a news agency dispatch or a press release. Adopting these texts without editing them for television not only led to pictures clashing with scripts but also to the use of long and complex sentences unsuitable for television. Both resulted in loss of clarity, so that the television news was often difficult to follow or understand. Picture quality was likewise unsatisfactory; many film reports in the bulletins consisted of shaky, badly lit or poorly composed shots. In some stories audiences kept seeing the same shots over and over, which gave the impression that the pictures were not always used to complement the script but to fulfil the requirements of the medium.

All five television channels included in the study used graphics, these mainly in the form of captions. Only \textit{ART} integrated full-screen text graphics into its film reports that not only summarised the main points but in some cases also communicated its commentary. Music was mainly used by \textit{Kanal T}, and specifically by one reporter probably to dramatise the issues he was covering.

Television news items concerning the Cyprus Issue were mainly dominated by the official discourse. That was partly because it was accepted as the norm and partly because, apart from live reporting, most of the information in the news concerning the leaders’ meeting originated from the statements of state and government representatives such as the Speaker of the Assembly, the President, the Prime Minister, etc. As a result of the common journalistic practice of reporting who said what, the discourse of these institutions was integrated in the news. Therefore, there were no challenging views or views different to the official line. Criticism was mostly within the framework of internal politics or was directed at the ‘other’ rather than ‘us’. The blame for lack of achievement in the talks was shifted to the ‘other’, that is to say, to the Greek Cypriot side. On other issues, the news was framed to show that Greek Cypriots were working against the interests of Turkish Cypriots. Meanwhile, there was very limited news from the Greek Cypriot community. For example, the reaction to the leaders’ meeting within the Greek Cypriot community was limited to its reflection in the Greek Cypriot media.

Most news coverage of Turkey was in relation to Cyprus. That is not to say that important developments in Turkey were not reported, for they were. For example, all the Turkish Cypriot channels reported on the confidence vote the new Turkish government received from the Turkish assembly. The framing of Turkey stressed good relations, cooperation and a shared interest between two states. Furthermore, when an incident that was against Turkey’s interest took place, the television channels reacted in disapproval as if it had been directed at ‘us’.

Looking at the Turkish Cypriot television news one would assume that the EU did not interest the audience (or the media), as it rarely appeared in the news. Only its involvement in issues
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about Cyprus was reported, such as financial aid it offered to improve social and economic standards in the country or its interest in a solution to the Cyprus Problem.

Overall, the government received more advantageous treatment than any other institution. Coverage of some activities of the government and its ministers that lacked any newsworthiness indicated a certain amount of bias towards this political power. On the other hand, while the government’s policies and actions were frequently reported, criticisms directed at it were also included in news coverage.

Like the newspapers, the television channels’ political alliances were obvious. Headlines, which can reflect the opinion of a newspaper and give an indication of its political position, in the broadcast media were in the form of captions accompanying the filmed reports. However, ART integrated a commentary into the story introduction and displayed this in the form of full-screen text graphics. Apart from language, biases were observable in story selection and treatment of the news concerning political parties; certain parties were favoured more in some channels while others were ignored.

The overall analysis of television news revealed a journalistic culture of reporting who said what to be the dominant approach. This was also true for the print media. Most news items derived from organised media events, news agency dispatches or press releases. There were no examples of investigative journalism. In some cases, the news fell short of informing audience as they lacked crucial information or background information that was required to understand the issue better.
NEW EFFORTS – CAUTIOUS HOPES FOR A SOLUTION
(30 June – 3 July 2008)

With the election of Demetris Christofias to the Presidency of the Republic of Cyprus in February 2008, the two communities were now headed by leaders that many considered as sharing similar values and ideas. The leaders’ first positive steps, the opening of the Ledra street barricade and the setting up of technical committees, as well as an agreed course that would lead to direct negotiations, revived hopes for a solution that would end the division of the island. Their meeting on 1 July 2008 attracted media and the public’s attention; ahead of the meeting the Turkish Cypriot side had expressed the hope that a date to begin direct talks could be set during that encounter; the Greek Cypriot side felt that more work needed to be done by the technical committees before full-fledged direct talks could start.

The difficulties the two leaders have faced from the beginning clearly demonstrate that a solution to the protracted Cyprus Problem needs more than good will and intensive efforts. Along with the leaders’ commitment, citizens and the media have a role, too. Thus, an examination of media coverage of issues related to the meeting should reveal, to some extent, the role they play.

The decision to include a data analysis from the period after Christofias’s election enabled a comparison of three largely different periods related to the latest efforts for a solution of the Cyprus Problem. Extensive coverage of the leaders’ meeting provided a considerable volume of data, relatively sufficient for analysis. However, the short data collection period—four days only—limited the range and depth of issues that could be studied in comparison to the previous periods. Nonetheless, useful conclusions derive from this study.
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Introduction
Technical and expert committees began working in April 2008, with the task of preparing the ground for talks between the two community leaders, Demetris Christofias and Mehmet Ali Talat. Full-fledged talks were to start after sufficient progress had been recorded. The Greek Cypriot side did not anticipate that a date for the beginning of talks would be set at the meeting of 1 July 2008.

The Data
We continue with the analysis of six newspapers, Phileleftheros, Politis, Simerini, Machi/Tharros, Haravgi and Alithia, based on data drawn from 30 June to 3 July 2008.

The main news story
The 1 July 2008 meeting between President Demetris Christofias and the Turkish Cypriot leader Mehmet Ali Talat, at the residence of the UN Secretary General’s Special Representative in Cyprus, was widely covered by the media. The study of the relevant material revealed the dailies’ views and representations; it also enabled us to see any changes in attitudes, views, and representations from the earlier periods analysed.

Media Practices
The practices recorded in the previous part on the Greek Cypriot press under Media Practices seem to have remained unchanged in the present period. Phileleftheros and Politis continued their effort to provide exclusive data; both papers published pieces with extra information derived either from their employees in Cyprus or their correspondents. They also appeared to have been consistent in attempting to avoid the use of copy-paste texts. Conversely, the dailies with party or ideological affiliations or links, as well as those with low circulation relied on externally produced texts. This material frequently originated from KYPE, press conferences and press releases and it was often published exactly as provided, with no editing, a trend also noticed in the past.

One more similarity with the previous period of study is the attempt at objectivity. All newspapers, even those with party or ideological links, tried to present several events as neutrally as possible, or at least they gave this impression. Another practice which all the dailies continued to employ was the use of numbers.

Different Discourses and Media Practices
The Form of Solution
In this part of the research, the focus is on the ideologies of the press regarding the acceptable settlement of the Cyprus Problem and not on the journalistic practices. The information available was not sufficient to reveal the different strategies used by the media to project their stances.

The meeting between President Christofias and the Turkish Cypriot leader, Mehmet Ali Talat, triggered the exposure of the varying opinions on the solution. Coverage of this news story revealed whether the newspapers promoted the official, government position or whether they projected their own views on the issue. It also shows whether they hoped for and supported an end to the deadlock. The editorials provided the key source from which conclusions were drawn concerning both the solution of the Cyprus Problem and the prospects to achieve it.
In 2002, the Annan Plan was the main discourse concerning the settlement sought. For the period we examined in 2007-2008, there were the bi-zonal, bi-communal federal solution, the July 8 process also known as the Gambari agreement, and the Annan Plan around which the press shaped its positions regarding the form of solution. Over the four days analyzed in this section, the matter of single sovereignty and citizenship in a united Cyprus was at the heart of public debate. This subject was often referred to as the basis of the solution, the settlement or the negotiations. The President of the Republic of Cyprus wished to confirm that the Turkish Cypriot leader agreed on this issue and none of the dailies opposed his goal. The level of optimism, however, as to the possibility of ending the stalemate in the country was not the same in every newspaper. The fact that most were hopeful that in the future the two leaders might find the path towards peace perhaps shows that there was a slight shift in the way some saw the subject of the settlement. Nevertheless, it must be noted that this change might have been incidental and could be attributed to the fact that the specific meeting was fruitful.

Supporting single sovereignty and citizenship

Phileleftheros's editorial on 30 June stated that ‘we aim for a solution which will be based on the federal model, one state, a single sovereignty, and one citizenship and international representation’.1 Simerini appears to have backed the same form of settlement: On 2 July its editorial argued that the basis of the solution was one of the essential matters left unclarified during the meeting between Christofias and Talat.2 The fact that this subject was viewed as important perhaps indicates that this newspaper was not set against it. On the same day the cover story of Haravgi revealed that this daily continued to support AKEL on this issue. Its headline was, ‘An important step’, while one of the points stressed under the title was that the two leaders agreed on the principle of single sovereignty and citizenship.3 Reporting the outcome as a success signals the newspaper’s support for these principles. In the main story (το Θέμα) of Machi the notions of single sovereignty and citizenship were characterized as basic and the fact that Christofias and Talat discussed these issues was described as a positive step.4 Consequently, it appears that this daily also supported this arrangement. This preference can perhaps be attributed to the fact that DISY, the party favored by Machi, also backed this form of settlement. Similarly, Alithia appeared to adopt the stance of DISY regarding the key features of an acceptable settlement. In its editorial on 1 July it suggested that during the meeting the Turkish Cypriot side would be required to answer with a simple yes or no to a ‘preconditioned adjustment’, this being the acceptance of ‘a single sovereignty, a single international representation, a single citizenship…’.5 Politis was the only daily that did not reveal its views on the matter, contenting itself to simply reporting the results of the meeting. Nevertheless, nothing indicated that this newspaper followed a different line from the rest of the dailies, as it did not object to the official position.6 Therefore, our analysis indicates that none of the newspapers opposed the idea of a single sovereignty and citizenship by projecting another form of arrangement.

While the newspapers seemed to be unanimous in their opinion regarding the form of a solution, this was not the case for their views on the likelihood of a settlement. There appears to have been a change in attitude since the last period of study, for although some newspapers remained pessimistic about the two sides reaching an agreement, there were a number that now appeared hopeful over such an outcome. In the previous period of study, all

1 Να ξεκαθαρίσει στη συνάντηση [To be made clear in the meeting], Phileleftheros, 30.6.2008:4; see also, Έχει εξαρτηθεί στοιχείων [A lot will depend on (the meeting)], Phileleftheros, 1.7.2008:6.
2 Πάρε-δώσε υπό αίρεση [Give-and-take under revision], Simerini, 2.7.2008:3.
3 Niki Koulermou, Σημαντικό βήμα [An important step], Haravgi, 2.7.2008:1.
4 Athanasios Abstratis, Ένα προβλήμα για τη χώρα [A problem for the country], Alithia, 1.7.2008:2.
5 Η κοινή βάση για κοινή δράση [The common basis for a common action], Alithia, 1.7.2008:2.
6 Lefteris Adilinis, Πρεμιέρα απειλής παρουσία Downer: Χριστόφιας και Ταλάτ συμφώνησαν για συνομιλίες στο Σεπτέμβριο [Premiere for the direct (negotiations) in the presence of Downer: Christofias and Talat agreed for talks in September], Politis, 2.7.2008:1.
the dailies concluded that the results of the meeting between Papadopoulos and Talat were unsatisfactory; four even suggested that the official encounter had reached a dead end.

On 2 July, Machi positively reported the outcome of the meeting and stressed that for the first time the Turkish Cypriots agreed to discuss the matter of sovereignty and citizenship.7 Under the title, ‘Important step for the framework of the solution’, Haravgi also highlighted in its cover story that the meeting produced results that would be beneficial for the resolution of the conflict. Similarly, Politis was hopeful that a settlement could be reached in the future, stating in its editorial that the two leaders were proceeding with the aim of finding a solution to the Cyprus Problem.8 Alithia reported that ‘Everything shows that the path to direct negotiations has opened’,9 noting that there were signs of progress towards a political settlement. The following day its editorial titled, ‘A positive result’,10 repeated this view and also stressed that a new positive approach on the subject of the solution was possible.

Simerini and Phileleftheros, in contrast, ran editorials that described the outcome of the meeting in gloomy colors. Subsequently, as in the past, they promoted the idea that the future of the solution was not bright. For example, Simerini on 2 July reported that the official encounter ‘did not give answers to substantial matters. The basis was not clarified, and a common language was not found,’12 and the next day highlighted that there was ‘no convergence of views’ between the involved parties.13 Phileleftheros reported that the meeting between the two leaders confirmed that there were still differences on basic issues between the two sides,14 repeating this notion the following day in its cover story headlined, ‘The gap is still large’.15

The Government and the Parties

Journalistic practices and the newspapers’ views and positions on the government and political parties are examined in this section, looking at and analysing various news stories.

The newspapers seem to have continued giving favorable coverage to the political parties they supported or had affiliations with, as noted in previous periods of study. Haravgi continued to favor AKEL, while Alithia and Machi supported DISY. This was evidenced in the fact that these dailies overrepresented the party of their preference and emphasized its opinions—practices that had also been noted in the past.

Wider coverage and highlighting

Alithia, Machi and Haravgi appear to have dedicated more space to a certain party and also to have emphasized its views. These ends were achieved by means of four different methods. The most frequently used tactic of overrepresentation was to report only the comments or opinions of the favored party. On 2 July, both Alithia and Machi published a news story about inflation. In both reports the only opinion included was that of the DISY deputy, Averof Neophytou.16

[脚注列表]
7 Athanasios Alistratlis, ‘Ικανοποιημένος δηλώνει ο Δ. Χριστόφιας, ενημερώνει σήμερα το Εθνικό Συμβούλιο: Στο τραπέζι των απευθείας διαπραγματεύσεων το θέμα της κυριαρχίας και της ιθαγένειας [D. Christofias declares that he is content, he briefs the National Council today: The subject of a single sovereignty and citizenship is on the table of the direct negotiations], Machi, 2.7.2008:18.
9 Politis, ‘Ας σκεφτούμε επιτέλους για το Κυπριακό [Let’s finally think about the Cyprus Problem]’, Politis, 2.7.2008:12.
10 Nikos Prokomenos, ‘Ζητούν εσωτερική ιθαγένεια: Ο Ταλάτ έθεσε θέμα στη συνάντηση του με το Χριστόφια [They ask for internal citizenship: Talat mooted this question during his meeting with Christofias]’, Alithia, 2.7.2008:1.
11 Alithia, ‘Θετική κατάληξη [A positive result], Alithia, 3.7.2008:2.
13 Kornilios Hadjicostas, ‘Ζητούν εσωτερική ιθαγένεια: Ο Ταλάτ έθεσε θέμα στη συνάντηση του με το Χριστόφια [They ask for internal citizenship: Talat mooted this question during his meeting with Christofias]’, Simerini, 2.7.2008:3.
15 Costas Venizelos, ‘Παραμένει 80% υπό οικονομική κρίση η Κύπρος: Πρόκληση για την εμπιστοσύνη [80% of the Cyprus remains in economic crisis: Challenge for the confidence]’, Phileleftheros, 2.7.2008:1.
16 No author, ‘Τεράστια απειλή η εκτίναξη του πληθωρισμού: Αβέρωφ Νεοφύτου [The inflation blow is a huge threat: Averof Neophytou]’, Alithia, 2.7.2008:23; No author, ‘Πανί με Πανί ελέω πληθωρισμός: Για απάθεια και απραξία κατηγορεί ο ΔΗΣΥ την κυβέρνηση [Flat-broke due to inflation: DISY blames the government for apathy and idleness]’, Machi, 2.7.2008:42.
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Another strategy indicating a paper’s favoritism towards a party was to report its positions on a matter first, followed afterwards with the other parties’ views. Thus, Alithia and Machi led with DISY’s reaction to the meeting outcome, while Haravgi began with statements of the governing party, AKEL. There was another technique employed by these three dailies to promote a specific political group and of course to project their own positions—to highlight information about this party in a news story. Reporting on the political parties’ statements regarding the leaders’ meeting, Alithia wrote that DISY awaited the National Council’s briefing. Just below Haravgi’s cover headline on the meeting was the following sentence: ‘President Christofias and AKEL expressed their satisfaction.’ On 3 July Machi published an article on the rent benefit given by the government, highlighting the stance of a DISY deputy: ‘The rent benefit is “peanuts”: DISY’s deputy, Lefteris Christophorou points out that the displaced persons are not beggars.’ The first and the third examples reveal that DISY was favoured by Alithia and Machi, while the second shows Haravgi’s bonds with AKEL.

A final means of offering favourable coverage to a party was to highlight the remarks of its members. At times, these statements were put in a box with a sharp outline, a lead-grey background or even a bold type headline, as to catch the eye of the reader. In a report on Greece’s assistance to Cyprus during the drought-induced water shortage, Alithia highlighted DISY’s position by placing their views in a separate frame with bold outline. An article in Haravgi reporting on the Christofias-Talat meeting included a grey-colored box headlined, ‘The President is satisfied.’ In the past this newspaper had never pointed out the statements of the then-President; rather, it had consistently stressed the positions of AKEL.

This analysis reveals that Haravgi’s stance towards the government changed with the election of the leader of AKEL, Demetris Christofias, as President of the Republic of Cyprus. Contrary to the previous period of study, now Haravgi promoted the views of the government while it also positively represented it. The distinctive placement in an article of statements by members of the government was just one trend reflecting the shift in this daily’s coverage of the government. Highlighting the positions of the members of the government, including those of the President, was another trend noted in Haravgi during the period analyzed in this section. Their stances and actions made the headlines, while sometimes they were even placed as a highlighted sentence above or under the main title of an article or within a piece. Beneath the headline of its cover story on 2 July, it was stated that, ‘President Christofias and AKEL expressed their satisfaction.’

Positive and negative representations of the government, the parties and their members
Just as Haravgi no longer negatively described the actions and statements of the government, we also noted a new practice of positive representation. On 30 June, the paper headlined an article, ‘The President’s solutions for the water (shortage) are effective.’ Alithia did not cover this topic in the same way; it appeared unhappy with the government’s handling of the water shortage and it was the only daily to suggest that Christofias’s government should take responsibility in this matter. In its front page headline, a former Minister of Agriculture, Costas Themistocleous, was
quoted reacting to the government celebrations at the arrival of the first water shipment from Greece: ‘They should all be in jail’.26 In an interview for the newspaper, Mr. Themistocleous blamed the government for the ‘tragic’ position in which the Republic of Cyprus was placed because of its failure to address the water problem. This piece, however, was the only case in which the government was, even indirectly,27 criticized by the newspaper. Machi published an article in which it stated that the government’s increased rent benefit for displaced persons was ‘pathetic’.28 Haravgi, on the contrary, presented this news positively: ‘Satisfaction with the benefit increase for those who suffer’. Below this headline, which was written in large, bold font, was a second sentence, in smaller typeface, stating, ‘Dissatisfaction with the rent benefits for displaced persons’.29 So although it did note some dissatisfaction with the government actions, Haravgi strongly pointed out the positive aspects of this news story, and flatteringly depicted Christofias’s government.

We noted the negative representation of DIKO and Tassos Papadouloulos, the former President of the Republic of Cyprus, in two newspapers, Alithia and Politis, which both portrayed him as the ‘other’. On its cover page Alithia blamed DIKO for not allowing Christofias’s government to give permanent jobs to temporary employees, stating, ‘They find everything unconstitutional regarding the non-permanent employees: The revenge of DIKO’.30 Additionally, the former President was held responsible for not dealing effectively with the Cyprus Problem, and Alithia stated clearly in an editorial that it was a happy day when the presidency of Papadopoulos ended. This sentence clarified, beyond any doubt, this newspaper’s stance towards Papadopoulos. Politis, in its own editorial on the meeting between Christofias and Talat, stressed that those who support the policy of the former President wish for the ‘continuation of the existing status quo’.31

The European Union
News stories related to the EU were regularly published by the press, an indication that developments regarding the Union were still viewed as important. Phileleftheros and Politis even employed correspondents in Brussels in order to keep their readers up to date on European issues. Contrary to the previous phase of study, we found no news stories in which the EU appeared as either an ally or an enemy of the Greek Cypriots.

The dailies were not set against the EU. Politis, for example, published an article about the EU’s renewed social agenda, stressing that one of its most interesting points was a directive proposing cross-border healthcare.32 This same development was also positively represented by Machi,33 Haravgi,34 Simerini35 and Phileleftheros.36 Haravgi was the only newspaper that published a news story related to the EU that can be considered negative. In an article published on 3 July, this daily unflatteringly described the efforts of DISY’s leader to defend the Treaty of Lisbon.37

26 Anna Maria Ethinou, ‘Θα έπρεπε να έχανε όλοι φυλακή: Ο Κώστας Θεμιστοκλέους για το υδατικό πρόβλημα’ [They should all be in jail: Costas Themistocleous on the water problem], Alithia, 30.6.2008:1.
27 The word ‘indirectly’ is used because the government was criticized by Costas Themistocleous and not by Alithia. The fact, however, that this newspaper published this interview and ran it at the top of its front page, might indicate that this daily also judged the government on this issue.
28 Eleftherios Charalambous, ‘Ψάχνοντας το επίδομα ενοικίου: Δεν είναι επάρκεις οι πρόσφορες τονίζει ο βουλευτής ΔΗΣΥ Λευτέρης Χριστοφόρου’ [The rent benefit is ‘peanuts’: DISY’s deputy Letteris Christophorou points out that the displaced persons are not beggars], Machi, 3.7.2008:10.
29 Neophytos Neophytou, ‘Ικανοποίηση για τις αυξήσεις σε παθόντες: Δυσφορία για τα επιδόματα ενοικίου σε πρόσφυγες’ [Satisfaction with the benefit increase for those who suffer: Dissatisfaction with the rent benefits for displaced persons], Haravgi, 3.7.2008:8.
30 Takis Agathocleous, ‘Για τους εκτάκτους τα βρίσκουν όλα αντισυνταγματικά: Η εκδίκηση του ΔΗΚΟ’ [They find everything unconstitutional regarding the non-permanent employees: The revenge of DIKO], Politis, 1.7.2008:12.
31 Politis, ‘Η Συνάντηση Χριστόφια – Ταλάτ’ [Christofias – Talat meeting], Politis, 1.7.2008:1.
33 Athanasios Alistratlis, ‘Με την “Ανανεωμένη Κοινωνική Ατζέντα” της ΕΕ: Υλοποιούνται οι στόχοι για διασυνοριακή υγειονομική περίθαλψη και καταπολέμηση της φτώχιας’ [With the “Renewed Social Agenda” of the EU: The aims for cross-border healthcare and poverty elimination are spelled out], Machi, 3.7.2008:10.
34 No author, ‘Περισσότερες επιλογές για τους ασθενείς: Πρόταση-Οδηγία του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου για την εφαρμογή των δικαιωμάτων των ασθενών στη διασυνοριακή υγειονομική περίθαλψη και καταπολέμηση της φτώχιας’ [More choices for patients: European Parliament’s directive proposal for the implementation of the patients’ rights on cross-border healthcare], Haravgi, 3.7.2008:13.
35 No author, ‘Βλημάζεται η διασυνοριακή περίθαλψη; Πρόταση οδηγίας της Ε. Επιτροπής [The cross-border healthcare is being improved: The European Commission’s directive proposal]’, Simerini, 3.7.2008:31.
37 No author, ‘Καθώς οι πολιτικές γένεσις δεν γνωρίζουν τη Συνθήκη [Political leaderships are also ignorant about the treaty]’, Haravgi, 3.7.2008:9.
Alithia also ran an article on AKEL and DISY’s disagreement on this issue, but it did not reveal its own stance.38

ʻUs’ and the ‘other side’

This part of the research reveals who the press considered to be ‘us’ or ‘our side’ and who they saw as the ‘others’, as well as the image projected for each category. The ideologies of the dailies and the practices used to promote them are presented together.

A bond between Cyprus and Greece

Greeks or the Greek Cypriots continued to be viewed as ‘our side’. Machi Tharros seems to have continued emphasizing the connection between the Greek Cypriots and Greece. On the cover page of Tharros on 30 June, a bold headline under a big picture of a Greek ship that had struck a reef while traveling to Chios read, ‘Terror at sea in Greece: The 478 passengers (of the ship) were saved’.39 While this incident was not given such wide or important coverage in the other dailies, it appears that Tharros still considered this event in Greece to be newsworthy. There was also evidence that both Alithia and Phileleftheros took for granted the existence of nationality bonds between Cyprus and Greece. They re-published a report taken from the high-profile Greek newspaper ‘Το Βήμα’ [Το Βήμα] in which a person from Cyprus was characterized as Greek.40 Neither Alithia nor Phileleftheros changed the wording of this piece, which probably means that they adopted this idea. If they did not agree with this notion, probably they would have edited this sentence as they did with many taken from the Turkish Cypriot press. Phileleftheros, in one of its editorials, even used the expression the ‘Hellenic Cypriot side’ instead of the Greek Cypriot side, indicating in this way Cyprus’s connection with Greece.41

The above three newspapers continued having special sections or whole pages dedicated to news stories from Greece, while the others published some articles about this country. This shows that, as in the previous period of study, the dailies continued highlighting that the Republic of Cyprus had strong bonds with Greece.

The ‘other side’

The ‘other side’ is divided into sub-categories that are interconnected in order to be thoroughly examined.

Once more, thumbs up for the Turkish Cypriots

Several newspapers, Alithia, Politis and Haravgi, which covered matters related to the Turkish Cypriots, published articles and news stories focused on issues of rapprochement and reunification. For example, Alithia published the views of a young man who believed that the workers could help in the reunification of Cyprus,42 and also reported on the renovation of a building to host events aiming to encourage ‘the cooperation between the G/Cs and the T/Cs’.43 Politis, maintaining its loyalty to the Turkish Cypriot community, more than any other newspaper highlighted that the Turkish Cypriots were not the enemy. In fact, in an editorial it characterized as Cypriots those who

38 Costas Constantinou, ‘Στη φόρα η διαφωνία ΔΗΣΥ-ΑΚΕΛ για τη Λισαβόνα: Ανοικτή συζήτηση του ΟΠΕΚ για τη μεταρρυθμιστική συνθήκη [The disagreement of DISY-AKEL on the (Treaty of) Lisbon was given away: Open discussion (organized by) the Association for Social Reform (ΟΠΕΚ) on the Reform Treaty]’, Alithia, 3.7.2008:7.
39 No author, ‘Τρόμος εν πλω στην Ελλάδα: Σώοι οι 478 επιβάτες [Terror at sea in Greece: The 478 passengers (of the ship) were saved]’, Tharros, 30.6.2008:1.
40 See, N. Hasapopoulos, ‘Πέντε Κύπριοι πίσω από τον Ομπάμα: Είτε θα τον φέρουν στην Κύπρο είτε θα στέλνουν τον Χριστοφία στο Λευκό Οίκο [Five Cypriots behind Obama: They will either bring him to Cyprus or they will send Christofias to the White House]’, Alithia, 30.6.2008:6.
41 Phileleftheros, ‘Να ξεκαθαρίσει στη συνάντηση [To be clarified in the meeting]’, Phileleftheros, 30.6.2008:4.
42 P. Hadjidimitriou, ‘Μουσταφάς: Πατρίδα μου είναι η Ελλάδα: Νεαρός, μέλος της μειονότητας από την Κομοτηνή, υποστηρίζει: Αγώνα για την επανένωση της Κύπρου με πρωταγωνιστές τους εργάτες [Moustafa: My country is Greece: A young man, a member of the minority group in Komotini, suggests: The workers could play the leading role in the struggle for reunification]’, Alithia, 30.6.2008:16.
lived on both sides of the barricade.44 It also continued publishing a regular column by a Turkish Cypriot journalist.45 In a show of support for a united Cyprus, both Politis and Haravgi positively covered a news story about a bi-communal camp.46

The Turkish Cypriot leadership

The leadership of the Turkish Cypriots was negatively characterized by some dailies. Mehmet Ali Talat was repeatedly called ‘the occupation leader’ by Phileleftheros,47 and this same negative epithet was repeated in an editorial in Simerini.48 Machi called Talat a ‘pseudo-leader’.49

These two newspapers remained consistent in their views about Mehmet Ali Talat, as they frequently pictured him as someone who obstructed the solution of the Cyprus Problem. In their coverage of the two leaders’ meeting, both papers were much more vocal in expressing their disapproval of Talat than any other paper. Phileleftheros stressed that the Turkish Cypriot leader was dismissive and uncooperative during the meeting. Its cover story headline on 1 July read: ‘Talat is offside again: He rejected the formula of the UN, he does not want any reference to (the matter of) a single sovereignty’.50 Simerini pointed out that the Turkish Cypriot leader was trying to block the path to a settlement, while in an editorial it argued that, ‘The discussion of the details about the implementation of a single sovereignty and a single citizenship gives Talat endless opportunities to lead the subject to a dead-end and endless talks’.51 Additionally, Simerini pictured the Turkish Cypriot leader as Turkey’s bond, as the ‘willingness and flexibility of Mehmet Ali Talat…depends on Ankara’s plans and intentions’.52 In its own editorial, Alithia considered that the Turkish Cypriot leadership was responsible for the continuation of the conflict, since the demands of the ‘Turkish Cypriot side…broaden the chasm’ separating the two communities.53

Nevertheless, in the same news story Talat was characterized as a ‘pseudo-leader’. Haravgi was the only newspaper that did not reveal any particular stance toward Talat in the period studied.

44 Ας σκεφτούμε επιτέλους για το Κυπριακό [Let’s finally think about the Cyprus Problem], Politis, 2.7.2008:12.
45 See an example of Sener Levent’s column in Politis, 30.6.2008:6.
46 Costas Nanos, ʻΜαζί όλη είναι πιθανόν: Δικοινοτική κατασκήνωση [“Together everything is possible”: Bi-communal camp], Politis, 1.7.2008:65; Argyro Tittoni, ʻΜαζί όλη είναι πιθανόν: Ελληνοκύπριοι και Τουρκοκύπριοι φοιτητές ξανά μαζί σε δικοινοτική κατασκήνωση στην Πάφο [“Together everything is possible: Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot students together again at a bi-communal camp in Pafos’], Haravgi, 1.7.2008:40.
47 Phileleftheros, ʻΘα εξαρτηθούν πολλά [A lot will depend on (the meeting)], Phileleftheros, 1.7.2008:6.
48 Simerini, ʻΠάρε – δώσε υπό αίρεση [Give and take under revision], Simerini, 2.7.2008:3.
49 Athanasios Alistratlis, ʻΙκανοποιημένος δηλώνει ο Δ. Χριστόφιας, ενημερώνει σήμερα το Εθνικό Συμβούλιο: Στο τραπέζι των απ’ ευθείας διαπραγματεύσεων το θέμα της κυριαρχίας και της ιθαγένειας [D. Christofias declares that he is content, he briefs the National Council today: The subject of a single sovereignty and citizenship is on the table of the direct negotiations], Machi, 1.7.2008:18.
50 Costas Venizelos, ʻΟφσάιντ πάλι οΤαλάτ: Απέρριψε φόρμουλα του ΟΗΕ, δεν θέλει αναφορά σε μια κυριαρχία [Talat is off-side again: He rejected the UN formula, he does not want a reference to a single sovereignty], Phileleftheros, 1.7.2008:1.
51 Simerini, ʻΠάρε – δώσε υπό αίρεση [Give and take under revision], Simerini, 2.7.2008:3.
52 Marios Manousopoulos, ʻΧαμηλές προσδοκίες: Ενώπιος ενωπίω σήμερα Χριστόφιας-Ταλατ [Low expectations: Today Christofias-Talat (will meet) face to face], Simerini, 1.7.2008:5; See also: Simerini, ʻΥπό την σκιά της τουρκικής κρίσης [Under the shadow of the Turkish crisis], Simerini, 3.7.2008:3.
53 Athanasios Alistratlis, ʻΕλληνοκύπριοι και Τουρκοκύπριοι φοιτητές ξανά μαζί σε δικοινοτική κατασκήνωση [“Together everything is possible: Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot students together again at a bi-communal camp in Pafos’], Haravgi, 1.7.2008:40.
54 No author, ʻΟι απευθείας θα συζητηθούν στη σημερινή συνάντηση: Επιμένουν οι Τ/Κ [The Turkish Cypriots insist (that): The direct negotiations will be discussed during today’s meeting], Politis, 2.7.2008:4.
55 No author, ʻΟι απευθείας θα συζητηθούν στη σημερινή συνάντηση: Επιμένουν οι Τ/Κ [The Turkish Cypriots insist (that): The direct negotiations will be discussed during today’s meeting], Politis, 2.7.2008:4.
56 No author, ʻΟι απευθείας θα συζητηθούν στη σημερινή συνάντηση: Επιμένουν οι Τ/Κ [The Turkish Cypriots insist (that): The direct negotiations will be discussed during today’s meeting], Politis, 2.7.2008:4.
Overall, apart from Machi, the dailies did not represent the Turkish Cypriot leader any differently than they had in the past. Most still pointed out that he had fixed positions and that somehow he was responsible for the deadlock on the island.

Turkey still pictured as a hostile country

The newspapers continued to negatively represent Turkey, with some projecting the view that this country’s objectives collided with those of the Greek Cypriots. Simerini, whose portrayal of Turkey was the darkest, depicted Turkey as the Greek Cypriots’ enemy. In an editorial it claimed that ‘the Turks steadily declare their unchangeable positions aiming: First, to the destruction of the Republic of Cyprus, second, to the subordination...of Cyprus...to the Turkish army’. Furthermore, Simerini characterized the Turkish policy as ‘relentlessly offensive’, and argued in an editorial that it was Ankara that had the ‘key to the solution of the Cyprus Problem’. This was a sensitive subject for Greek Cypriots, who believed that if the areas in the northern part of the island were recognized, then Cyprus would be separated in two different states.

Turkey was negatively portrayed not only because of its stance on the Cyprus Problem, but also as an undemocratic country. Phileleftheros highlighted in bold letters the words of persons working for the President of France, who maintained that Turkey ‘has never been a democratic country’. On the previous day, Polis published an article detailing how a member of Turkey’s Justice and Development Party (Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi - AKP) interrupted the speech of a writer who was criticizing AKP. The sentence above the headline of this piece was, ‘They forced her into silence because she criticized AKP’. In the present period of study, neither Machi nor Haravgi ran any stories that projected Turkey as the enemy.

Turkey and the Turkish Cypriots sometimes viewed as one and the same

Occasionally, some dailies used the expression the ‘Turkish side’ to refer not only to Turkey, but to the Turkish Cypriots or the Turkish Cypriot leadership as well. In the past, Machi and Simerini repeatedly presented the Turkish Cypriots and Turkey as being one and the same, while in this period of analysis Simerini and Phileleftheros were found to make use of this identification. This perhaps reveals their notion of identity, but also that the idea that Turkey and the Turkish Cypriots had the same stances and goals.

Simerini published the statements of the ‘so-called Minister of Foreign Affairs’, Turgay Avcı, about a ‘two-state solution’, and characterized this ‘approach’ as ‘Turkish’. In the following day’s editorial, Mr. Talat and the officials of the ‘occupied pseudo-state’ were named ‘the Turkish side’. On the same day, Phileleftheros pointed out in its editorial that the procedure for the settlement should be decided by the two communities. In the next sentence, however, the Turkish Cypriot side was referred to as the ‘Turkish side’. One cover story in Phileleftheros stated, ‘the G/C side
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57 Simerini, Συνομιλίες με νέες εκπτώσεις [Talks with new concessions], Simerini, 1.7.2008:3.
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59 No author, Θέμα εμπιστοσύνης λένε στην Τουρκία [It is a matter of trust, they say in Turkey], Alihtia, 1.July 2008:4.
60 No author, Δίπλωμα από ΟΗΕ για αναγνώριση Δυναμική παρέμβαση Μπαμπατζάν στη σύνοδο της Ισλαμικής Διάσκεψης [Steps of recognition by the OIC: Dynamic intervention by Babacan in the meeting of the (Organization) of the Islamic Conference], Phileleftheros, 30.6.2008:4.
62 Anna Andreou, «Να, πάρε ελευθερία!» Την ανάγκασαν να σωπάσει γιατί άσκησε κριτική [“So much for freedom (of speech)”]: They forced her into silence for being critical], Polis, 1.7.2008:11.
63 Michalis Hadjistylianou, Γιόγια πάνω τη Τουρκία: Ύπνος της γαλλικής Προεδρίας υποστηρίζει ότι «απομακρύνεται η προοπτική ένταξης» [Greek President’s sources back the prospect of Turkey’s exclusion], Phileleftheros, 2.7.2008:6.
64 Anna Andreou, Η Τουρκία αγγίζει το έδαφος της Ανατολικής Κύπρου [Turkey approaches the territory of East Cyprus], Polis, 1.7.2008:11.
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considers that the basis of the negotiations is clarified by yesterday’s statement...while the Turkish (side), interprets the matters of the sovereignty and citizenship based on the relevant provisions of the Annan Plan’. In the same article the expression the ‘Turkish Cypriot side’ was also used.66

The ‘others’ in relation to ‘us’

Two dailies, Phileleftheros and Simerini, emphasized that the Greek Cypriot leadership held the correct positions on the solution sought and had acted appropriately before the meeting of Christofias with Talat. Conversely, they implied or projected the notion that the ‘other side’, which was thought to be Turkey and the Turkish Cypriot leadership, obstructed the course of settlement. Phileleftheros maintained that the President of the Republic of Cyprus ‘rightfully’ insisted that the procedure of the settlement could be advanced and carried out only with the reconfirmation of a common basis for the negotiations.67 The use of the word ‘rightfully’ indicates that Phileleftheros believed that the Greek Cypriots had just demands. On the next day, however, it pointed out that Talat rejected the formula suggested by the UN and that he furthermore did not want any reference to the subject of a single sovereignty, which, according to the Greek Cypriots, was the basis of the negotiations. The Greek Cypriot leadership was therefore pictured positively while the Turkish Cypriot leadership was portrayed in a negative light. This was also evident in Simerini, which reported that Christofias would attend the official meeting in order to clarify the nebulous situation concerning the basis of the solution of the Cyprus Problem, although the Turkish Cypriot side ‘did not allow for any progress’ to be achieved.68 On the following day, once again the Greek Cypriots were flatteringly portrayed, while the ‘others’ were pictured as the villain. Another article in Simerini related to the two leaders’ meeting argued that Nicosia followed ‘a low-profile tactic, avoiding internal debates as far as possible, and reaction[s] to the Turkish provocations.’ The article continued, however, to say that ‘the games of tension and dispute are a known tactic of the Turkish side, used when it tries to impose its own rules’.69

As validation that the Greek Cypriots’ aims and stances were just, all the newspapers pointed out that the G/C positions were backed by important organizations such as the PARIS MoU (Memorandum of Understanding)70 and the British House of Commons. This practice was also used to show that the Greek Cypriot side had just demands while the ‘others’ were simply wrong, as in the following example. Two different news stories, originally from KYPE, were published in Phileleftheros and Haravgi. Phileleftheros’s headline was, ‘The accession [of Turkey to the EU] is impossible because of the Cyprus Problem: [This] is stressed in a report of the Committee of the British House of Commons’;71 Haravgi used an identical title.72 In the same report it was mentioned that the PARIS MoU rejected Turkey’s application for EU membership because of Ankara’s refusal to accept ships sailing under the Cypriot flag in its ports. It introduced this development with the following headline: ‘Discriminations…cost to Turkey’.73 The headline in Simerini referring to this same issue was, ‘Another “NO” to Turkey: From the PARIS MoU for

66 Costas Venizelos, ‘Ο κύβος ερρίφθη: Αρχίζουν απευθείας, ξεκαθάρισμα βάσης διαπραγμάτευσης βλέπει η Λευκωσία [The die is cast: The direct (negotiations) begin, Nicosia sees clarification of the basis of the negotiation]’, Phileleftheros, 2.7.2008:1.
67 Ibid.
68 Michalis Hadjistylianou, ‘Ενώπιον των ασαφειών: Ξεκαθάρισμα της μορφής της λύσης του Κυπριακού θα επιδιώξει ο Χριστόφιας [Before the obscurities: Christofias will aim to clarify the form of the solution of the Cyprus Problem]’, Simerini, 30.6.2008:4.
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70 This is an official document “in which the 27 participating Maritime Authorities agree to implement a harmonized system of Port control. See, Paris Memorandum of Understanding on Port State Control (No date), The Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) [online]. Available from: http://www.parismou.org/ParisMoU/Organization/Memorandum+of+Understanding/Menu/3945/default.aspx [Accessed 15 October 2008].
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73 No author, ‘Αδύνατη η ένταξη λόγω Κυπριακού: Τονίζεται σε έκθεση της Επιτροπής της βρετανικής Βουλής των Κοινοτήτων [The accession (of Turkey to the EU) is impossible because of the Cyprus Problem: (This) is stressed in a report of the Committee of the British House of Commons]’, Haravgi, 1.7.2008:5.
ships'].74 Machi ran a similar headline: 'No to Turkey from the PARIS MoU: Because of the embargo on the ships [that sail] under the Cypriot flag'.75 Politis reported that, 'PARIS MoU “closes the door” on Turkey: It cannot join the MoU for ship control because of the discriminations against Cyprus'.76

The title of Alithia was similar: ‘Turkey in front of a “closed door”: PARIS MoU for ship control.’77

The above-noted examples lead to the conclusion that Turkey was punished because it wrongfully banned from its ports ships sailing under the flag of the Republic of Cyprus.

The areas in the north

All the dailies continued to proclaim that they did not accept the legitimacy of the territory in the north of the island, and used the same semantical tactics as in the previous period of study. They repeatedly referred to the north as the ‘occupied areas’,78 attached the word ‘pseudo’79 to many words such as state, prime minister, etc., placed inverted commas80 around any word or phrase that could denote authority to the ‘other side’ and used the expression ‘the so-called’81 to show that the ‘others’ illegally ruled the territory in the north.

A vivid example of this is found in Alithia, which stated in an editorial that the northern part of Cyprus belonged to the Greek Cypriots, who could no longer be tortured by ‘the view of their occupied properties and territory’.82

This belief in the Greek Cypriot rights to the land was not so outrightly stated in all the newspapers; yet they all still widely covered news stories that were related to actions of indirect political recognition of the areas ruled by Talat, or published reports on the efforts of the ‘others’ to develop the northern part of the island. This tendency might reflect the Greek Cypriots’ fear of losing forever a territory they considered as their own.

An article in Machi reporting on land development in the north reveals its stance on ownership of the land: ‘They will build a new huge hotel in occupied Karavas: The aim is to draw tourists from the free areas.’83 On the following day, Politis published an article related to the efforts of the Republican Turkish Party (Cumhuriyetci Turk Partisi - CTP) to change from an observer to a member in Socialist International.84 This news story85 also appeared in Haravgi, Phileleftheros and Simerini, which might have thought that if the status of this political party in the north were upgraded, then this would constitute indirect recognition of the regime.
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The Greek Cypriot Press in June-July 2008

Information drawn from the press of the ‘other side’
The newspapers continued to show an interest in news stories related to the ‘other side’, and often these were still taken from the Turkish Cypriot or the Turkish press. The most common subject of these reports was the attempts of the ‘others’ at indirect recognition of the northern part of the island, a trend also noticed in the previous period of study.

Alithia, Politis and Phileleftheros concentrated on this issue via one main news item, ferry services from Famagusta to Latakia (in Syria), and the subsequent potential tourist flow to the north. An article on this subject was published in the Turkish Cypriot daily Kibris, and the above-noted three newspapers re-reported on these matters in their first few pages.86

Another similarity with the previous period of study was that some dailies published pieces from the Turkish Cypriot or the Turkish press, after making some semantical changes to the original statements or texts. Phileleftheros, for example, reported on statements by ‘the so-called Minister of Foreign Affairs, Turgay Avcı’. It quoted him as having ‘stated’ that the procedures for the opening of the office which would accommodate the ‘pseudo-state’s delegation’, were being completed.87 Avcı would not have used the phrase ‘pseudo-state’, so we can assume that Phileleftheros made the change. Alithia quoted the Turkish newspaper Hürriyet as having reported that the Greek Cypriots had rejected a proposal made by the “TRNC”.88 The inverted commas around the word “TRNC” were clearly added by Alithia, indicating that it did not accept the authority of that entity. In another example, Simerini reported that the TMT association ‘mentioned’ in an announcement that it was impossible for Turkey to abandon the ‘pseudo-state’89 where clearly the term ‘pseudo-state’ had replaced the original wording used in the Turkish language text.

Conclusion
Our analysis of the material in this period reveals that the tactics used by the Greek Cypriot press in the previous part of our research and described under the heading, Media Practices, have remained unchanged. There were, however, a few differences; most notably that four dailies, Machi, Haravgi, Politis and Alithia, appeared to believe that the two leaders could reach an agreement. This optimism, which was not evident in the past, can be attributed to the fact that the meeting between Christofias and Talat was fruitful, contrary to that of Papadopoulos with Talat in 2007. We made one more observation, related to the solution sought: None of the newspapers opposed the official stance that any settlement must be based on a single sovereignty and citizenship.

Haravgi, Alithia and Machi continued to offer favorable coverage to specific parties. They did this by dedicating more space to AKEL (Haravgi) or DISY (Machi and Alithia) and by highlighting the respective party’s views. These practices were also employed by Haravgi in order to project the stances of the government, which it represented positively. In the previous period of study, the newspaper hardly referred to Papadopoulos’s government unless it was to criticize its members for their opinions or actions. Its position towards the government changed after the leader of AKEL, Demetris Christofias, became the new President of the Republic of Cyprus. In general, there were not many news stories opposing Christofias’s government as was the case during Papadopoulos’s presidency. Alithia and Politis continued criticizing the former President and his supporters.

News stories published about the EU offered no evidence of the EU being viewed either as an ally or as an enemy of the Greek Cypriots.

86 No author, ‘Επανήρχισαν τα δρομολόγια με τη Συρία [The (ferry) services with Syria have started again]’, Alithia, 1.7.2008:1; No author, ‘Και τώρα τουρίστες [And now tourists]’, Politis, 1.7.2008:6; Spyros Athanasiades, ‘Επανήρχισαν τα δρομολόγια Αμμοχώστου και Λατάκειας: Στόχος η μεταφορά 2.000 Σύρων τουριστών [The (ferry) services between Famagusta and Latakia have started again: The target is to transport 2.000 Syrian tourists]’, Phileleftheros, 1.7.2008:6.
88 No author, ‘Χουριέτ: Πεθαίνω αλλά δεν πίνω τουρκικό νερό [Hurriyet: I prefer to die than drink water from Turkey]’, Alithia, 2.7.2008:11.
89 George Michailides, ‘Απαράδεκτος ο Μπαμπατζάν [Babacan is unacceptable]’, Simerini, 3.7.2008:3.
With reference to Greece, Machi/Tharros continued to point out a connection between the Greek Cypriots and Greece. Additionally, Alithia and Phileleftheros projected a bond of ethnic origin between Cyprus and Greece.

Alithia, Politis and Haravgi, the only papers that referred to the Turkish Cypriots, did not view them as the enemy. Conversely, their leadership was negatively depicted, with Phileleftheros and Simerini naming Mehmet Ali Talat, ‘occupation leader’, while Machi characterized him as a ‘pseudo-leader’. Most newspapers emphasized that he had fixed positions and that he was responsible for the deadlock on the island. Haravgi’s stances toward Talat could not be ascertained, while Machi published one report claiming that the Turkish Cypriots (meaning their leadership) showed positive behaviour with regards to the solution sought.

Turkey was still portrayed as a hostile country and, as in the past, Simerini painted a darker picture of this country than the other papers. This newspaper, along with Alithia and Phileleftheros, projected a negative image of Turkey by stressing that her objectives collided with those of the Greek Cypriots. Additionally, Phileleftheros and Politis published articles in which Turkey appeared undemocratic.

Simerini and Phileleftheros occasionally used the expression the ‘Turkish side’ when they referred not only to Turkey, but also to the Turkish Cypriots or the Turkish Cypriot leadership. This indicates their views on identity and reveals that the two papers considered Turkey and the Turkish Cypriots to have the same stances and goals. They also projected the view that the Greek Cypriot leadership had the correct position on the solution to the Cyprus Problem and stressed that it acted appropriately before the meeting between Christofias and Talat. In contrast, they implied or even emphasized that the ‘other side’—Turkey and the Turkish Cypriot leadership—obstructed the course of the settlement.

All the newspapers validated the correctness of the Greek Cypriot aims and opinions on political matters by pointing out that these were also backed by important organizations. This practice showed that the Greek Cypriot side had just demands while the goals of the ‘others’ were unfair and unfounded.

All the dailies continued to proclaim that they did not accept the legitimacy of the territory in the north, employing the same semantic practices used in the previous period of study. The newspapers widely covered stories related to indirect political recognition of the northern areas and/or the development of the land in the north. This trend indicates the Greek Cypriots’ fear of losing forever a territory they considered as their own. The subject of de facto recognition was also the most common subject of Turkish Cypriot or Turkish press reports republished by Alithia, Politis and Phileleftheros. This practice was also observed in the previous period of study. Another trend was the change in the wording of articles reproducing texts or statements from Turkish sources. Three dailies, Phileleftheros, Alithia and Simerini, engaged in this tactic to match what was said or written with their own beliefs and stances.

Synthia Pavlou
The Data
As before, the five national free-to-air television channels are studied in this part of the paper. The data from RIK, Mega, ANT1, Sigma and Plus TV were drawn from their main evening news bulletins of 30 June to 3 July 2008.

The main news story and what it will reveal
The 1 July 2008 meeting between President Demetris Christofias and the Turkish Cypriot leader Mehmet Ali Talat and their subsequent joint statement were widely covered by the stations. The television coverage of this story as well as other issues provided the material for our analysis, which aimed to clarify:

a) The stances of each TV channel regarding the solution sought, the government / the parties, the European Union and the ‘other side’;
b) The means employed to put forward these positions.

Media Practices
The television stations, by and large, used the same methods as in the previous period of analysis, both to inform their audiences as objectively as possible and to remain competitive. Additionally, their resources and party or ideological links and affiliations continued to affect the way some stations represented certain news items.

Different Discourses and Media Practices
The Form of Solution
The leaders’ meeting is used as a reference point to reveal the stations’ ideologies related to the settlement of the Cyprus Problem. A station’s coverage of this event reveals whether it promoted the official government position, or instead projected its own stance; more importantly, it shows if the station still hoped that the deadlock in the country would end. The stations’ positions regarding the settlement are outlined in relation to their positions in the previous period of study and in comparison to their coverage of the Papadopoulos—Talat meeting on 5 September 2007.

The main similarity in the stations’ coverage of the meetings of Mr. Papadopoulos and Mr. Christofias with Mehmet Ali Talat was that all stations appeared to have adopted the official stance on the parameters of the desired solution. During the meeting between Christofias and Talat, the President of the Republic of Cyprus sought agreement on the issue of single sovereignty and citizenship. This seems to have also been the position adopted by the stations and was viewed by the Greek Cypriots as the basis for negotiations.

ANT1 reported that the matter of ‘the basis of the negotiations is, at least in principle, closed’.1 The use of the phrase ‘at least’ probably indicates that the station was relieved that there had been agreement between the two leaders. Mega broadcast a news story in which the outcome of
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1 ANT1, item 1, 1.7.2008.
the meeting was positively described, and followed the report with a live debate on the subject between the station’s presenter and two journalists. Mega’s newscaster said that ‘one could claim that the common basis [for the negotiations] has been found, this being a single sovereignty and citizenship’. The optimistic way of reporting this event could quite possibly indicate approval of this feature of the solution. Plus TV’s presenter said that the fact that the single sovereignty and citizenship were discussed during the meeting was positive, which signals a position in favour of this arrangement. RIK’s cue read, ‘President Christofias and Mehmet Ali Talat discussed… the issue of single sovereignty and citizenship and agreed in principle on these subjects’. RIK appears to have found the specific development to be significant since these words were heard during the introduction to RIK’s top news story. On 3 July a Sigma journalist reported that Talat’s reference to a single sovereignty and citizenship was a step forward.

The stations appeared to have remained consistent in their support of the government position on the settlement. Their degree of optimism at the possibility of a solution to the Cyprus Problem, however, increased since the previous period of study, as the hopes for an agreement between the two leaders were raised. The stations appeared to believe that in time Christofias and Talat might actually find the path to peace, in contrast to the way the meeting of Tassos Papadopoulos with the Turkish Cypriot leader was reported.

However, pessimistic messages were spotted in many news stories on the eve of the 1 July meeting, with all stations, excluding Plus TV, making gloomy predictions about the forthcoming meeting.

In RIK’s cue on this subject, it was stressed that the two leaders set different priorities for their meeting. This matter was also pointed out in Mega’s report, which used the caption, ‘Christofias-Talat: They go to tomorrow’s meeting with different agendas’. The same words were used by Sigma, whose negativity regarding the results of the following day was also projected by a survey, presented with the caption, ‘The people are pessimistic regarding developments on the Cyprus Problem’. Sigma’s next report, on a meeting between the Presidential commissioner, George Iacovou, and Talat’s advisor, Ozdíl Nami, carried the headline, ‘They did not manage to speak the same language’. This distrust of a positive outcome was also projected by ANT1, which broadcast an opinion poll about the meeting, highlighting that, ‘The majority does not expect that important decisions will be taken’.

The next day’s reports revealed that the dire predictions had not occurred, and moreover, they even expressed some optimism about the future. On 1 July, ANT1 introduced its news bulletin with the words, ‘We go straight ahead to direct negotiations between Christofias and Talat for the settlement of the Cyprus Problem. Today’s meeting…opened the door to the second phase of developments’. Mega stated, ‘the meeting was particularly important for the overall future of the new effort’, while RIK mentioned that a ‘few steps forward’ were made. Plus TV, meanwhile, commented on the results of the meeting between the two leaders and recapitulated by saying, ‘we are now in a good position’. Sigma was the only station that presented the meeting outcome with caution: while during the cue it stressed that there was agreement on the issue of single sovereignty

---

2 Mega, item 2, 1.7.2008.
3 Plus TV, item 1d, 1.7.2008.
4 RIK, item 1, 1.7.2008.
5 Sigma, item 10, 3.7.2008.
6 RIK, item 2, 30.6.2008.
7 Mega, item 4, 30.6.2008.
8 Sigma, item 3, 30.6.2008.
9 Sigma, item 4, 30.6.2008.
10 Sigma, item 5, 30.6.2008.
11 ANT1 item 3, 30.6.2008.
12 ANT1, news bulletin’s introduction, 1.7.2008.
13 Mega, item 1.7.2008.
14 RIK, item 1, 1.7.2008.
15 Plus TV, item 1d, 1.7.2008.
and citizenship, which was reported in the joint statement, it added that, nevertheless, the details for the implementation of these issues would be deferred to the direct phase of the negotiations.\textsuperscript{16}

**The Government and the Parties**

The examples given below derive solely from two stations, *RIK* and *Plus TV*, because these were the only stations for which we could safely draw conclusions based on the material available for this section. Besides, the other channels revealed no noteworthy change in their depiction of the Christofias government in relation to the Papadopoulos government.

*RIK* appeared to continue providing favorable coverage to the government. However, because the government had changed, it would appear that *RIK* highlights and positively represents issues related to the government, regardless of the government stance or which party or parties form the government.

*Plus TV*, on the other hand, appeared to have completely shifted its position towards the government from the moment the leader of AKEL was elected President of the Republic of Cyprus.

**Still wider coverage for one party**

Sometimes a station’s broadcast focused solely on the actions or views of one particular person or party.

*Plus TV* most frequently overrepresented a specific party, since it often broadcast news stories, which no other station aired, related exclusively to AKEL.

For example, for three days in July *Plus TV* reported on events related to two concerts organized by EDON, the youth section of AKEL.\textsuperscript{17} No other channel broadcast these stories, which indicates *Plus TV*’s favouritism toward AKEL. The station widely covered the positions of AKEL. On 1 July it aired a live telephone conversation between the presenter of *Plus TV* and the Press Spokesman of AKEL, Andros Kyprianou, in which the politician was asked his opinion of the Christofias—Talat meeting.\textsuperscript{18} The view of no other party representative was heard with regard to this matter, a practice also noted during the previous period of study.

**The views and actions of the government**

*Plus TV* not only overrepresented the positions of AKEL, it also emphasized the stances of the Christofias government using other methods, some of which are illustrated below. *RIK*, too, promoted the government’s views, and often used similar methods.

It appears that favorable coverage to the government was offered by highlighting the views, actions, or stances of an individual representing the government. This was often achieved by describing these views or actions in the cue of a news story as well as in one of the introductory themes which were announced by the newscaster before the beginning of a news bulletin. This promotion technique was also detected during the previous period of study and was most often used by *RIK* and *Plus TV*.

For example, in this period of analysis *Plus TV* aired a piece on the increasing number of fires in Cyprus, stating in the cue, ‘In the following report the measures taken by the government will be presented’.\textsuperscript{19} In the previous period of study, when the Papadopoulos government was in power, this station rarely included any reference to the government in its cues unless these were negative statements.

Similarly, in the present timeframe, *RIK* broadcast a news story about the rising inflation in the Eurozone and the measures proposed by labour union SEK to face this challenge; at the end of the cue the presenter said, ‘In the following report, how the Minister of Finance answers [will be presented]’.\textsuperscript{20} As in the earlier period analysed, *RIK* referred to the government stance during the cue. So now, although a shift in power had occurred, *RIK* continued to favour the government.

\textsuperscript{16} Sigma, item 1, 1.7.2008.

\textsuperscript{17} Plus TV, item 14, 1 and 2.7.2008; Plus TV, item 16, 3.7.2008.

\textsuperscript{18} Plus TV, item 1d, 1.7.2008.

\textsuperscript{19} Plus TV, item 11, 1.7.2008.

\textsuperscript{20} RIK, item 11, 30.6.2008.
Positive representation of the government

RIK and Plus TV not only seemed to highlight the views and actions of the government, but they have also depicted it in a flattering way.

Plus TV, on 6 July, aired a news story about the rising price of oil, and stated in the cue, ‘The Minister of Finance stressed that they will continue offering economic benefits [to the people],’ clearly emphasizing the positive efforts of the government to protect the public.

RIK, also on 6 July, noted in its cue that the government would protect the public from record-high fuel prices: ‘the Ministry of Commerce attempts to protect the Cypriot consumer.’

Moreover, these two channels tended to highlight the positive aspects of any government-related topic with little or no mention of the negative points. In a story reporting on the rent benefit increase, Plus TV noted first that the refugee parliamentary committee was content with the increase; not until later in the story was the audience informed that the President of the committee was not pleased with the rent benefit. RIK, on the other hand, did refer to this fact in its cue and at the beginning of its coverage of the event, but still chose to begin with the positive reactions. The presenter said, ‘Satisfaction with the increase in the benefits [given to] those who suffered and dissatisfaction at the proposed increase in the refugees’ rent benefit.’ In this way, the bright side of the developments was stressed, and perhaps indirectly the actions of the government were praised.

During the previous dates studied, with Papadopoulos in power, Plus TV did not offer favorable coverage to the government; instead, it overrepresented and flatteringly depicted AKEL and its leader. Conversely, in both periods of study, RIK stressed the view of the government, while it positively described its actions and its representatives. The fact that a new government had been formed appears to have been irrelevant.

The analysis of the data offered no evidence that the rest of the stations clearly positioned themselves in favor of or against a specific party or the government.

The European Union

EU issues continued to be viewed by the channels as significant, and Mega and ANT1 employed correspondents in Brussels to report on any EU developments. RIK broadcast the most news stories related to the EU and Plus TV aired the fewest.

In the collected data we found no evidence that the EU was depicted either as an ally or as an enemy of the Republic of Cyprus. Two channels, however ANT1 and Sigma, aired alarming stories about the efforts of the European Central Bank to curb inflation by raising its benchmark interest rate to 4.25%. In these reports it was stressed that this measure might slow down the Eurozone economy and adversely affect both households and borrowers. It seems that both stations were not only worried about the EU’s decision but also did not fully approve it.

Us and the ‘other side’

The issue of who exactly was considered to be ‘us’ and who was considered as the ‘other’, as well as the image projected for each category, are discussed next. The ideologies of the stations regarding these two groups and the practices they used to put them forward are presented simultaneously.

22 RIK, item 12, 30.6.2008.
23 Plus TV, item 9, 2.7.2008.
24 RIK, item 19, 2.7.2008.
25 One of the news stories covered by Mega’s correspondent was related to the fact that from 1.7.2008 France would hold the rotating EU presidency. See, Mega, item 11, 30.6.2008. On the same day, the correspondent of ANT1 informed the public about the inflation rate in the Eurozone. See, ANT1, item 12, 30.6.2008.
26 RIK aired eight reports related to the EU and a journalist reported live on events related to the Treaty of Lisbon. See, RIK, item 11, 30.6.2008; items 4 and 15, 1.7.2008; items 5-7, 2.7.2008 and items 1, 2 and 6, 3.7.2008. Plus TV aired only two EU-linked stories and included in its newscast a telephone communication with a journalist who reported on the ratification of the Lisbon Treaty by the parliament of the Republic of Cyprus. See, Plus TV, item 16, 1.7.2008 and items 12 and 13, 3.7.2008. ANT1 broadcast seven news stories linked to the EU, while events related to the ratification of the Lisbon Treaty were broadcast live. See, ANT1, item 12, 30.6.2008; items 12-13, 1.7.2008; item 15, 2.7.2008 and items 1-2, 5 and 10, 3.7.2008. Sigma also aired seven reports referring to the EU, while one of its journalists in the news room reported the developments on the Lisbon Treaty. See, Sigma, item 13, 30.6.2008; items 18-19, 1.7.2008; item 13, 2.7.2008 and items 3-4, 6 and 8, 3.7.2008. Although Mega employed a correspondent to cover EU-related issues, the station only broadcast three reports concerning the EU during this period of analysis. See, Mega, item 11, 30.6.2008; item 12, 1.7.2008 and item 2, 3.7.2008.
27 Sigma, item 8, 3.7.2008; ANT1, item 5, 3.7.2008.
Is Greece still viewed as part of ‘us’?

All the television channels maintained their relationship with Greece through their continued collaboration with certain Greek television stations. They also continued re-broadcasting various reports from Greek channels. The re-broadcasts referred either to news from other countries or to the current affairs of Greece. Four stations aired news stories on a Greek politician’s visit to Cyprus and/or the comments of the spokesperson from the Greek Ministry of Foreign Affairs on the Cyprus Problem.

Two stations appeared to project special bonds between Cyprus and Greece. RIK, for example, re-broadcast a report from Greece’s ERT, but added that the leader of PASOK sent a ‘message of hope and support to the President of the Republic, Demetris Christofias, and the Turkish Cypriot leader, Mehmet Ali Talat.’ Similar examples were noted in the previous period of study. On another occasion, RIK broadcast a report on the visit to Cyprus by the leader of the Greek party, ‘Synaspismos’, and used the caption, ‘Synaspismos stands with Cyprus’. In this period, therefore, we can see that RIK remained consistent in promoting the view that Greece cared about the island and that there was a strong connection between the two countries.

Sigma, too, projected this same idea, as it had also done in the previous period studied. In a report on a statement made by the spokesperson of the Greek Ministry of Foreign Affairs regarding Cyprus, Sigma’s caption read, ‘Koumoutsakos, The crisis in Turkey should not affect the [settlement of the] Cyprus Problem’. Sigma also aired a report on a huge Greek flag that Cypriot youngsters had made out of stones. No other station broadcast this story and the fact that Sigma aired a news story about a strong symbol of identity could indicate its ideology with regard to the bond between Cyprus and Greece.

The other side

In this part of the analysis we will again divide the ‘other’ into sub-categories for a more thorough examination. These groups, which were depicted by the stations as the ‘other’, were,

a) The Turkish Cypriot community;

b) The Turkish Cypriot leadership;

c) Turkey.

The Turkish Cypriots are not the enemy

The analysis for this period did not reveal any significant change in the way the Turkish Cypriots were pictured in relation to the previous period of study. The stations continued to air news stories about this community, indicating that the Turkish Cypriots’ views and current affairs were still viewed as important.

Both Sigma and Plus TV broadcast reports on a music event related to reunification, and the cue of the latter began with the following words: ‘The continuation of the rapprochement efforts …was observed during a multicultural event held last night at the Ledra Palace’. The choice of the word ‘continuation’ shows that Plus TV projected the event as part of an ongoing effort for rapprochement.

ANT1 aired an opinion poll that included the views of both communities on the Christofias-Talat meeting. The fact that the views of the Turkish Cypriots were not excluded could mean that this group was perceived as a community whose stance was valued.

28 See for example, RIK, item 16, 30.6.2008; Plus TV, items 9, 17, 19 and 21, 30.6.2008; Mega, items 9, 14, 17, 30.6.2008; ANT1 items 13, 23, 30.6.2008; Sigma, item 26, 30.6.2008.
29 Plus TV, items 6-7, 3.7.2008; ANT1, item 18, 3.7.2008; Sigma, items 10 and 15, 3.7.2008; RIK, item 18, 3.7.2008.
30 RIK, item 16, 30.6.2008.
31 RIK, item 18, 3.7.2008.
32 Sigma, item 10, 3.7.2008.
33 Sigma, item 11, 2.7.2008.
34 Sigma, item 21, 30.6.2008.
35 Plus TV, item 18, 30.6.2008.
36 ANT1, item 2, 2.7.2008.
On the same day, RIK broadcast a news story about a Turkish Cypriot reporter who won an award in journalism. The first sentence of the voice-over showed Turkish Cypriots not as the ‘other’ but simply as Cypriots: ‘For the first time Cyprus gets the prize of courage in journalism…’.37

Only Mega did not air any reports linked to the Turkish Cypriot community in the period examined, so it cannot be determined whether this station remained loyal to its past stance on this community.

How the Turkish Cypriot leadership was portrayed

Compared to the previous period of study, there was a slight change in the way Mehmet Ali Talat was represented by some channels. On some occasions, and on some channels, he was no longer depicted as a person who hindered the solution of the Cyprus Problem. For example, Plus TV, reporting on the meeting between the two leaders, stated that they ‘agreed in principle on the issues of single sovereignty and citizenship’.38 Several days later it reported that diplomats characterized this development as an important step for the elucidation of the basis of the solution of the Cyprus Problem.39 These reports painted Talat in a positive light. We also found that RIK had changed its portrayal, as when it declared that ‘the important thing is that the two leaders meet and that they at least find some solutions and some points to report in the joint statements’,40 perhaps indicating that the station believed that Talat did not object to Christofias’s objectives. In Mega’s story on the leaders’ meeting, the reporter announced that the two men had found the ‘golden mean’,41 revealing that the station felt Talat was a person who compromised.

ANT1’s coverage was slightly different than that of RIK, Plus TV and Mega. Its report intimated that both leaders appeared to have made concessions,42 but the next day’s story reported that Talat wanted internal citizenship, a point that was highlighted in a caption.43 The station also presented Talat’s compliance during the meeting as unexpected, as the irony behind the following words cannot be concealed: ‘Suddenly, Talat appeared as the defender of a unified state with single sovereignty and citizenship’. The first sentence of this news story reveals a lack of trust in the Turkish Cypriot leader: ‘Bluff or clarification?’.44 Thus, although ANT1 did not portray Talat in gloomy colors, nor did they depict him positively or as someone to be trusted.

Sigma was also doubtful whether the Turkish Cypriot leader was in agreement with the Greek Cypriot positions. A Sigma journalist commenting on Talat’s statements about the ‘sovereignty of the new state’ said that these were ‘subject to multiple interpretations’. Nonetheless, the reporter concluded by stressing that the Turkish Cypriot leader’s reference to single sovereignty and citizenship was ‘a step forward’.45 Another report, however, presented Talat as an opportunist, because despite being a political friend of Tayip Erdoğan, he had no problem in allying with the Turkish Prime-Minister’s political rivals.46

The above examples reveal that Talat was depicted by some channels in a more positive way than in the past, at least regarding his efforts for the solution to the Cyprus Problem.

Was Turkey still the villain?

Some developments in Turkey in the period studied here were covered by all the channels, as for example, the crisis from a lawsuit that challenged the legitimacy of the governing party.47

---

37 RIK, item 20, 2.7.2008.
38 Plus TV, item 1, 1.7.2008.
39 Plus TV, item 1, 3.7.2008.
40 RIK, item 1, 1.7.2008.
41 Mega, item 1, 1.7.2008.
42 ANT1, item 1, 1.7.2008.
43 ANT1, item 1, 2.7.2008.
44 ANT1, item 3, 3.7.2008.
45 Sigma, item 10, 3.7.2008.
46 Sigma, item 13, 30.6.2008.
47 See, Mega, item 10, 30.6.2008; item 3, 1.7.2008; item 11, 2.7.2008 and item 11, 3.7.2008; RIK, item 3, 1.7.2008; item 4, 2.7.2008 and item 13, 3.7.2008; Plus TV, item 15, 1.7.2008; item 3, 2.7.2008 and Plus TV, item 19, 3.7.2008; ANFT1, item 3, 1.7.2008 and item 4, 2.7.2008; Sigma, item 13, 30.6.2008; item 17, 1.7.2008 and item 9, 3.7.2008.
Sometimes these reports were broadcast at the beginning of the stations’ newscasts, and this reveals that the stations believed that the political situation in Turkey could subsequently affect Cyprus. Sigma aired a caption quoting the spokesperson of the Greek Ministry of Foreign Affairs that supports this hypothesis: ‘Koumoutsakos, The crisis in Turkey should not affect the [settlement of the] Cyprus Problem’. Sigma also reported certain events and developments in Turkey to show that this country did not belong in the EU: ‘Nationalist zealots were preparing a coup d’état. They were planning acts of terrorism and murders’. After reading these sentences, we can see that the caption for this news story was quite sarcastic: ‘In the European Turkey’.

ANT1 also broadcast a news story in which it was implied that Turkey was not fit to become an EU member state. The beginning of this report’s cue was: ‘Today, diplomatic circles have expressed doubts about Turkey’s ability to accede to the EU’. This is not new, as pointing out Turkey’s deficiencies was found regularly in the previous period of analysis.

The Turkish Cypriots and Turkey were not called the Turkish side
In this part of the research it appeared that a clear distinction was made between Turkish Cypriots, their leadership and Turkey. There were no occurrences where Turkish Cypriots and Turks or Turkey were presented as one and the same, an indication that the common Turkish identity of the ‘others’, occasionally called, ‘the Turkish side’, was not emphasized.

The ‘other’ in relation to ‘us’
Two stations, ANT1 and Plus TV, validated the correctness of the Greek Cypriot aims and stances by pointing out that these were supported by important organizations, including the United Nations and the PARIS MoU (Memorandum of Understanding). Each channel broadcast a news story in which it was implied that the Republic of Cyprus, unlike the ‘other side’, had justified demands. ANT1’s story referred to the Paris MoU’s criticism of Turkey: ‘Ankara was once more criticized because of its refusal to accept in its ports, ships [sailing] under the Cypriot flag. The PARIS MoU has rejected its application to become a member of the organization’. Plus TV’s story insinuated that the Greek Cypriots had the right on their side when Christofias would meet Talat ‘armed with the agreed principles for the solution of the Cyprus Problem, as these are defined in the resolutions of the United Nations and the high level agreements’. Here we see the position of the President of the Republic of Cyprus backed by the UN. In their emphasis on the Greek Cypriots having right on their side, both stations substantiated their view by pointing out that they were supported by recognized organizations. This was also noted on all channels in the previous period of study.

In the present period, the notion that only the Greek Cypriots were willing to end the stalemate in the country was not put forward. Only Sigma aired a story where it was stressed that, ‘Turkish Cypriot organizations and parties’ were infuriated with Talat for accepting single sovereignty and citizenship. It also reported that they featured Talat as ‘incapable of handling the Cyprus Problem while the fascist TMT threaten[ed] to rouse the Turkish Cypriots to revolt if he dare[d] sign the demise of the pseudo-state’. None of the other stations broadcast reactions to the outcome of the meeting so negatively, emphasizing that many people living in the northern part of the country did not wish a settlement as desired by the Greek Cypriots.
The ‘occupied areas’

The north was represented in the same way as in the previous period of study. The same semantics were used to refer to the northern territory of the island, as we see in a Sigma news story that used the term ‘pseudo-state’. In another Sigma report the northern part of the island was characterized as, ‘the occupied areas’. Two days later, the same term was used by ANT1, as was also the case on Mega, Plus TV and RIK on 3 July. Thus, the stations continued to use the adjective ‘occupied’ in order to proclaim that Turkey and the Turkish Cypriot leadership had no legitimate power over the northern part of the country.

In addition to the above, the expression ‘so-called’ was also used to preface anything that could assign authority to the north. In the material analysed, we noted ANT1 using this expression when a report described Ferdi Sabit Soyer as the ‘so-called Prime-Minister of the occupation regime’.

The notion that the ‘other’ had no lawful rights over the northern part of the island was also emphasized in another ANT1 report, which stated in the cue that the ‘illegal’ ferry services between the port of Famagusta and Latakia had re-started. The term ‘illegal’ indicates the lack of international recognition of those who undertook the specific activity.

While ANT1 and Sigma appeared consistent in the use of this phraseology when they referred to the northern areas of the island, the limited amount of data studied did not reveal the practices by the other channels.

The images

In addition to words, images also carried their own underlying messages. Reporting on the Turkish Cypriot journalist who had been awarded a journalism prize, RIK broadcast black and white shots of women who were running to save their lives. These images could have awakened the viewers’ memories about the tragic events of 1974 and perhaps even caused resentful feelings towards the country the Greek Cypriots view as responsible for the catastrophic occurrences of the past. Negative reactions to the ‘other side’ could have also arisen from the final image of this news story—a shot of the Turkish and the ‘TRNC’ flags on the occupied Pentadaktylos Mountains. A similar shot was seen in one of ANT1’s news stories covering the meeting between Christofias and Talat. This can be viewed as a constant reminder that the ‘other’ still remains in a territory that the Greek Cypriots consider as their own, while at the same time, the position of the flag is thought to be provocative.

Sigma also showed images of the Turkish and/or the ‘TRNC’ flags in a report on the meeting of the two leaders. During references to the positions of the ‘Turkish Cypriot side’, three out of four images of the northern part of the island showed the two flags. The Turkish and the ‘TRNC’ flags also appeared on Plus TV in a news story about the meeting, while referring to the ‘occupied areas’. In the previous period of study the Turkish and the TRNC flags were the most common shot included in reports about the ‘other side’. In the present period, Mega was the only channel that did not use any images of the flags.

55 Sigma, item 11, 3.7.2008.
56 Sigma, item 13, 30.6.2008.
57 ANT1, item 3, 2.7.2008.
58 Mega, item 4, 3.7.2008.
59 Plus TV, item 1, 3.7.2008.
60 RIK, item 2, 3.7.2008.
61 This practice was also employed in the past.
62 ANT1, item 3, 2.7.2008.
63 ANT1, item 16, 30.6.2008.
64 RIK, item 20, 2.7.2008.
65 ANT1, item 3, 3.7.2008.
66 Plus TV, item 1, 3.7.2008.
Conclusion

Our analysis for this time period indicates that the TV channels remained consistent - since the earlier time period studied - in terms of the practices they employed to remain competitive, achieve market dominance and project their stances to their viewers. The stations’ practices in news selection and content, as well as their ideological framework also remained consistent.

All the stations projected the Republic of Cyprus government stance on the basic parameters of the solution sought, independent of their personal politics. It also appeared that, in both the previous and the present timeframe, they all approved a settlement based on single sovereignty and citizenship. This finding was consistent for the two time periods analysed. There were also some differences—primarily, that the stations were positive about the prospects of progress towards a resolution of the conflict; pessimistic stances were evident only prior to the meeting of Christofias with Talat. Sigma was the only station that used caution in reporting the outcome of the official encounter; all the other channels suggested that in time the two politicians might find the path towards peace.

The data analysis indicated that two stations underwent noteworthy changes in their depiction and coverage of the government. RIK continued to offer the government favorable coverage, even though there was a shift in power since the previous period of study. On the other hand, Plus TV completely altered its stance and offered full support to the government from the moment the leader of AKEL was elected President of the Republic of Cyprus.

Issues related to the EU were still considered important. In contrast to the previous period of study, no evidence was found to suggest that the EU was depicted either as an ally or as an enemy of the Republic of Cyprus.

All television stations continued their collaboration with Greek channels. While there was no evidence of any change in the other channels’ stance, only RIK and Sigma broadcast news stories attesting to their belief in a strong bond between Greece and Cyprus. This was evident in the previous timeframe on all channels.

The representation of Turkish Cypriots was also consistent with the other two periods of study. Throughout the various timeframes, all stations projected the idea that this community was not the Greek Cypriots’ enemy. A slight difference was however noted in the way Mehmet Ali Talat was represented by most of the channels. Unlike in the previous period, Plus TV and RIK did not portray the Turkish Cypriot leader as someone who hindered the solution of the Cyprus Problem. Only ANT1 and Sigma continued picturing Talat in gloomy colors. These two channels also continued to illustrate Turkey negatively, even insinuating that the country was not fit to enter into the EU.

This time there was no data that presented the Turks as being one and the same as the Turkish Cypriots or their leadership, as had occurred in the past. The term, ‘the Turkish side’, used in the previous set of data, which emphasized the Turkish identity of the ‘other side’, was not present in the latest time period. However, this does not mean that this practice was abandoned.

In examining the image of the ‘other’ we found that ANT1 and Plus TV promoted the idea that, in contrast to the Turkish Cypriot leadership and Turkey, the Greek Cypriots had reasonable demands and justified goals. This was achieved by pointing out that their views and aims were supported by important organizations, a practice noted also in the previous periods of study. However, most stations did not promote the notion that only the Greek Cypriots were willing to end the stalemate in the country.

The north was represented much as it had been in the earlier period. The channels continued using the same semantics when they referred to the northern territory of the island, with ANT1 and Sigma being more consistent in their phraseology. Through the use of specific terms, they pointed out that the ‘others’ had no lawful rights over the north of the island.

The examination of the images revealed their hidden messages and eventual impact. RIK seems to have capitalized on the power of memories in its picture selection; certain images that were used could provoke negative feelings toward the ‘others’. Similarly, all stations except Mega used images of the ‘TRNC’ and the Turkish flags, which could also easily arouse resentment against those who, according to the Greek Cypriots, were illegally occupying the northern part of the island.

Synthia Pavlou
THE TURKISH CYPRiot PRESS
IN JUNE-JULY 2008
Sanem Şahin

Introduction
Unlike the two previous sections of our research, which examined media on randomly chosen dates, this section focuses on a specific time period—the dates just surrounding the Talat-Christofias meeting on 1 July 2008. Focusing on this event will not only provide a comparison of the media presentation of the Talat-Papadopoulos and Talat-Christofias meetings, it will also allow us to observe any shifts in the representation of the issues studied in the previous periods.

The Data
The methodology adopted in this part of the research is no different than that used in the previous sections. Twelve daily newspapers, Kıbrıs, Halkın Sesi, Yenidüzen, Vatan, Kıbrıslı, Ortam, Güneş, Demokrat Bakış, Sözçü, Kıbrıs Star, Yeni Volkan and Afrika have been examined for their coverage of the Cyprus Problem, the image of the EU, internal politics, the representation of ‘us’ and the ‘other’ (in other words, Greek Cypriots), and also the portrayal of Turkey. The only difference in this part of the research is the length of the examined timeframe, which here is only four days, 30 June to 3 July 2008, shorter than any other periods covered in the research.

The Journalistic Practices and the Structure of the News
Neither journalistic practices nor the structure of the news showed much dissimilarity to those observed in the previous research. Because most newspapers relied heavily on externally produced texts such as news agency dispatches and press releases, the content of newspapers was very similar. Interestingly, this time it was not only texts that were alike, but photographs as well. Pictures that accompanied the news article on a trade union demonstration against the government’s proposal to amend the Sliding Scale System were the same in nearly all the newspapers. The newspapers chose to publish the same four shots that showed demonstrators carrying placards, or making speeches with a loudspeaker in their hands.¹ There were numerous other examples of this practice all throughout the period studied. This can perhaps be explained by the lack of resources (even journalists) or interest, which led the newspapers to use the material provided by the TAK agency.

Some newspapers chose an interesting way to express their criticism or opposition to a political figure or party, playing on words in names. Ortam changed the first name of the Prime Minister Ferdi Sabit Soyer to ‘Freddie’ to evoke Freddie Krueger, a character in the horror film, ‘A Nightmare on Elm Street’, and to therefore make people think of the similarity between their actions. Its claim was that ‘Ferdi’s government has turned people’s lives into a nightmare: Freddie’s nightmare’.² Güneş, the publication of UBP also did the same and changed the name of ÖRP to ‘ÖP’ which means ‘kiss’ in Turkish. The constant use of ‘ÖP’ instead of ÖRP was an indication that this spelling was not a simple typing mistake but an intentional use to insult the party.³

¹ It was only Demokrat Bakış that did not use any photograph for the story. Demokrat Bakış, 1.7.2008:10. Yenidüzen used different photographs from the other newspapers. Yenidüzen, 1.7.2008:15.
² No author, ‘Fredi’nin kabusu [Fredie’s nightmare]’, Ortam, 30.6.2008:1, 6.
Certain techniques of reporting were also evident in some newspapers during this part of the analysis. As before, Yenidüzen reported some events in ‘notes’, the title heading these features, which consisted of reporters’ observations presented either as short texts in bullet points or photos with captions.\(^4\) There is a similar example in Kibris Star, where the journalist’s observations were titled as ‘notes from the meeting’.\(^5\)

Presenting the news as questions rather than reporting it as objective facts is another common practice within the Turkish Cypriot press. Journalists pose questions to a specific individual or group through newspapers rather than contacting them directly to find out the answer and report it. Within the period investigated, the practice was employed especially by Yeni Volkan, which, for example, directed four questions to the Economy and Tourism Minister about the launch of an advertising campaign promoting tourism in the TRNC.\(^6\) Claiming that it had not received any response to its enquiry, the newspaper repeated the same questions the following day.\(^7\) The Tourism Minister was not the only target of such questioning, as the headline of the main story on 30 June was also a question directed to President Mehmet Ali Talat. Stating that the Cyprus Mail had quoted Christofias saying that Talat had accepted the concept of ‘single sovereignty and citizenship’, Yeni Volkan enquired: ‘Is it true?’\(^8\)

Kıbrıs Star even made a story out of the two leaders’ body language as they emerged from the meeting hall. Based on one of its journalist’s observation, the story recounted how, as they came out of the meeting, Christofias rubbed his hands while Talat gulped. According to the journalist these gestures were signs of how the meeting went. The photo caption of the story was ‘Talat was thoughtful, Christofias was happy.’\(^9\) The newspaper regarded these body gestures as so important that the editor of the paper and another columnist also wrote about this issue in their columns: ‘Why did Christofias rub his hands.’\(^10\)

**Discourse and Representation**

**The Cyprus Issue**

The main topic related to the Cyprus Issue within the timeframe studied was the two leaders’ meeting. In general, the Turkish Cypriot press reflected an expectation that a date for the launch of negotiations could be decided at the meeting. On the day of the meeting the newspapers simply announced that the leaders were getting together but did not elaborate on the issue further. The same brief text detailing that the leaders were meeting under the 21 March accord, with the aim of launching comprehensive talks, appeared in Kıbrıs, Yenidüzen, Vatan, Kıbrıslı, Afrika, Yeni Volkan, Ortam, Güneş and Demokrat Bakış.\(^11\) Yet, each newspaper ran different headlines, which highlighted an aspect that the specific newspaper deemed important. Yenidüzen noted on its front page that the two leaders would discuss the ‘future of the Cyprus Problem and the work done until today’. Therefore, it was ‘a critical day’.\(^12\) Halkın Sesi voiced an expectation in its headline with a question: ‘Will the talks start?’\(^13\) According to the paper, ‘eyes are on the decision that will come

\(^4\) Meltem Sonay, ‘Eylemden notlar [Notes from the demonstration]’, Yenidüzen, 1.7.2008:15; Meryem Ekinci, ‘Görüşmeden notlar [Notes from the meeting]’, Yenidüzen, 2.7.2008:9.


\(^6\) No author, ‘Şanlıdağ susmaya devam ediyor [Şanlıdağ is continuing to keep quiet]’, Yeni Volkan, 30.6.2008:1.

\(^7\) No author, ‘Şanlıdağ susmaya devam ediyor [Şanlıdağ is continuing to keep quiet]’, Yeni Volkan, 1.7.2008:1.

\(^8\) No author, ‘Hristofyas’ın elleri [Christofias’s hands]’, Kıbrıs Star, 3.7.2008:7.


\(^10\) No author, ‘Talat ile Hristofyas zemini görüşecek [Talat and Christofias will discuss the basis]’, Kıbrıs, 1.7.2008:1; No author, ‘İmaj savaş devam ediyor: Büyük yenenid [Image war continues: Once again today]’, Vatan, 1.7.2008:1; No author, ‘Ya taman ya devam (I’ll walk the narrow line)’, Afrika, 1.7.2008:1; No author, ‘Süper partikülar [Super parties]’, Ortam, 1.7.2008:1; No author, ‘Hristofyasın eline çift eli [Just an ordinary meeting]’, Güneş, 1.7.2008:1, 7; No author, ‘Talat –Hristofyas görüşmesi bugün [Talat-Christofias meeting is today]’, Demokrat Bakış, 1.7.2008:1.


\(^12\) No author, ‘Görüşmeler başlayacak mı [Will the talks start?]’, Halkın Sesi, 1.7.2008:1.
out of the leaders' summit whether talks will start or not'. Although the newspaper did not specify whose 'eyes' or attention it was referring to, it can be guessed that it was talking on behalf of the general public. Kıbrıslı viewed the two men's meeting as a step that would determine the future of the negotiation process: 'It either ends or continues', was its headline. It announced that the leaders would try to overcome the tension that had emerged after 23 May, and also noted that finding a common language would determine the future of the talks. Offering no explanation of what it meant by 'tension', the newspaper relied on whatever background information its readers might have on the issue. The situation was no different in Vatan, which described the meeting as an 'image war': 'Image war continues. Once again today'. Yet, like Kıbrıslı, it provided no clarification as to why it described the leaders' meeting as an 'image war'. It left the interpretation to its readers. Vatan's coverage of the event leads one to assume that the paper did not believe that the meeting would produce any serious outcome apart from working for improvement of the images of the two community leaders.

Despite the headlines, which revealed diverse opinions of the meeting, the content of majority of the texts on the topic were either the same or very similar. All the newspapers informed their readers that after the approximately four and a half hour long meeting, both community leaders had agreed in principle on the concept of single sovereignty and single citizenship. They included the joint statement of the two leaders, announced the date of the next meeting as 25 July and provided the readers with the details of the meeting such as the leaders' arrival time and length of the meeting. While the headlines of Kıbrıs, Yenidüzen and Afrika focused on the issue of 'single sovereignty and single citizenship', those of Yeni Volkan, Ortam, Kıbrıslı, Halkın Sesi and Güneş reflected their dissatisfaction and disappointment with the outcome of the meeting.

The widest coverage on the topic was in Yenidüzen, whose front page was devoted exclusively to the talks. As well as publishing the text of the joint statement issued by the two leaders on its front page, the newspaper also included a statement by the Turkish Foreign Minister Ali Babacan expressing how Turkey wished for the start of the comprehensive negotiations with the aim of finding a solution in Cyprus. The third story on its front page was that CTP-BG did not find the meeting satisfactory, as a date for the start of full-fledged talks was not set.

Some papers' reaction to the outcome of the summit was mainly dissatisfaction: Kıbrıslı dismissed the agreement on single citizenship and sovereignty, saying that 'not reaching an agreement on every issue meant there was no agreement on any issue'. It also reported that a crisis had been postponed. According to the paper, 'after a 4.5 hour long meeting the leaders' only achievement was to postpone a crisis'. Kıbrıslı blamed Christofias for a failed meeting and reported that it was due solely to Talat's efforts that a 'crisis' was avoided. However, what kind of 'crisis' it meant, the newspaper did not explain. Ortam also defined the meeting as resulting in nothing: 'Add zero to zero, it is zero', which meant 'all this work has been for nothing'. In Ortam's view the leaders could go no further than the issue of single sovereignty and citizenship. Güneş was also dissatisfied with the result and described the process as 'just a meeting'. Halkın Sesi voiced dissatisfaction that no specific date was set for the start of the leaders' talks: 'No date for

14 No author, 'Ya tamam ya devam [It either ends or continues]’, Kıbrıslı, 1.7.2008: 1, 4.
15 No author, 'İmaj savaysav devam ediyor: Bugün yeriden [Image war continues: Once again today]', Vatan, 1.7.2008:1.
16 No author, 'Vatandaşlık ve egemenlik pazarlığı [Bargaining on citizenship and sovereignty]', Kıbrıs, 2.7.2008:1; No author, 'Tek vatan adı değişik tek egemenlik [Single citizenship single sovereignty]', Yenidüzen, 2.7.2008:1; No author, 'Sıfıra sıfır elde var "0" [Add zero to zero, it is zero]', Ortam, 2.7.2008:1; No author, 'Kriz ertelendi [The crisis has been averted]', Halkın Sesi, 2.7.2008:1.
17 No author, 'Tek vatandaşlık tek egemenlik [Single citizenship single sovereignty]', Yenidüzen, 2.7.2008:1; No author, 'Bu zilleti reddediyoruz [We are rejecting this humiliation]', Yeni Volkan, 2.7.2008:1; No author, 'Sıfıra sıfır elde var "0" [Add zero to zero, it is zero]', Ortam, 2.7.2008:1; No author, 'Krız ertelendi [The crisis has been averted]', Kıbrıs, 2.7.2008:1; No author, 'Görüşme tarihi yine yok [No date for the talks once again]', Halkın Sesi, 2.7.2008:1.
18 Doğan Harman, Her konuda anlaşmaya varılmadıkça hiçbir konuda anlaşmaya varılmaz [Not reaching an agreement on every issue meant there was no agreement on any issue]', Kıbrıs, 2.7.2008:1.
19 No author, 'Kriz ertelendi [The crisis has been averted]', Kıbrıs, 2.7.2008:1.
20 No author, 'Sıfıra sıfır elde var "0" [Add zero to zero, it is zero]', Ortam, 2.7.2008:1.
21 No author, 'Yölesine bir görüşme [Just a meeting]', Güneş, 2.7.2008:1.
Among all the newspapers, Yeni Volkan was the one to react most strongly to the outcome of the meeting. Unlike the others that criticised both leaders for failing to produce a fruitful result, it directed its condemnation at Talat: ‘Talat succumbed to Christofias and accepted single sovereignty and single citizenship under the roof of the “Republic of Cyprus”: we reject this humiliation’.23 Continuing with its angry tone, Yeni Volkan wrote: ‘Talat has violated his oath and the constitution. Therefore he is not representing the Turkish Cypriot people. The things he accepted do not bind our people. We reject this humiliation’.

The newspapers also reported politicians’ reactions to the outcome of the meeting. Halkın Sesi, as well as highlighting the opposition’s protest in its main headline, also reported that the Prime Minister blamed the Greek Cypriot leader for the result: ‘Christofias has become a slave of DIKO and EDEK’.25 Kıbrıs Star’s headline also quoted the Prime Minister accusing the Greek Cypriot leader of running away.26 For Kıbrıslı responses were ‘diverse’,27 while for Yeni Volkan they were united: ‘The people rebelled’.28 Güneş, Demokrat Bakış and Ortam—newspapers affiliated with political parties—reported the party views on their front pages. Both Güneş and Demokrat Bakış used the same headline that communicated UBP and DP’s views: ‘Osmosis’.

In all these texts the newspapers frequently referred to both Talat and Christofias with their status as ‘the leaders’ rather than emphasizing their titles as Turkish Cypriot and Greek Cypriot. Yet, whenever they did use their titles and names, all the newspapers described Christofias as the ‘leader of the Greek Cypriot Administration’ rather than the ‘President of the Republic of Cyprus’, and they called Talat ‘TRNC President’.

‘Us’ and ‘Them’

Distinction based on positive self-representation and negative ‘other’ portrayal was clearly visible in some newspapers, e.g., Halkın Sesi, Kıbrıslı and Yeni Volkan. For example, while the Turkish Cypriot side was portrayed as keen to find a solution, the Greek Cypriot side was shown as the side dragging its feet before the leaders’ meeting. The day before the meeting three out of six headlines in Halkın Sesi showed the Greek Cypriot side in a negative way: ‘More than 30 kg cocaine seized on the Greek Cypriot side’; ‘Greek Cypriots are far from direct talks’; and ‘the Greek Cypriot side is trying to impose its will’.29 On the day of the meeting, the paper quoted an unidentified source saying that Greek Cypriots were laying down conditions that implied hindrance. According to the paper, the negotiations that were supposed to commence on 21 June could not because the Greek Cypriot side delayed the process. Reporting that ‘Greek Cypriots are dragging their feet’,31 Halkın Sesi also commented that ‘before the summit the Greek Cypriot side has adopted a negative manner’.32 Highlighting contradictory statements of both Turkish Cypriot and Greek Cypriot representatives, the paper cast the latter with a negative attitude but portrayed the Turkish Cypriot as being constructive: ‘While the Greek Cypriot Foreign Minister Marcos Kyprianou spoke in a pessimistic way about the direct talks, Talat’s spokesperson Hasan Erçakıca noted that “they (Turkish Cypriot side) want to start full negotiations”’.33 It integrated a short account of Kyprianou’s statement into its main story under a sub-headline that said, ‘he showed
Turkey as the target.34 Yeni Volkan, on the other hand, stressed a different aspect of his words: ‘Two separate states cannot be acceptable’.35

Presidential spokesperson Hasan Erçakıca’s statement accusing the Greek Cypriot Administration of damaging the negotiations by trying to impose its will through the Greek Cypriot press received coverage in the papers. Halkın Sesi quoted the spokesperson in the headline saying, ‘Greek Cypriot side is trying to impose its will’.36 While Vatan wrote, ‘reaction against Greek Cypriot imposition’.37 Kıbrıslı repeated Presidential spokesperson Erçakıca’s remarks that ‘the process is being damaged’.38 Kıbrıslı’s report on the spokesperson’s accusations reflected its agreement with his statement: ‘The President’s spokesperson Erçakıca reacted to the Greek Cypriot Administration who tried to impose its will using the Greek Cypriot press’.39 Rather than quoting the spokesperson, the newspaper implied that it was a fact that the Greek Cypriot Administration had really tried to do that.

Following the meeting, the negative portrayal of the Greek Cypriot side continued in the newspapers that were already critical of it. In particular, Kıbrıslı reported on its front page that Christofias continued to show reluctance for comprehensive talks and tried to gain time by postponing the meetings indeterminately.40 In Kıbrıslı’s view, it was clear from Christofias’s attitude that the Greek Cypriot leader had ‘tendencies against the 21 March Agreement’. According to the paper, some observers, who were unidentified in the text, stated that Christofias had a similar unwillingness as Papadopoulos to reach an agreement. Reporting the details of the meeting, Kıbrıslı also wrote, ‘Greek Cypriot stubbornness could not be overcome’.41

Representation of the Turkish Cypriot side in these papers was the opposite. Kıbrıslı wrote that when the meeting came to a breaking point it was with Talat’s efforts that the crisis was overcome.42 It also reported that when Christofias wanted to delay the negotiations until September, Talat rejected the idea.43 Halkın Sesi announced that there was no date for the launch of negotiations but also reminded its readers that the Turkish Cypriot side had aimed to initiate the start of the comprehensive talks in this meeting.44 In a way, it indirectly shifted the responsibility for lack of success in the meeting to the Greek Cypriot side.

Turkey in the News

Discourse and representation of Turkey were no different than during the other timeframes studied. In the short period analysed, news coverage of Turkey focused mainly on three topics: The first was about the ongoing Ergenekon investigation in Turkey; the second was when Turkish Foreign Minister Ali Babacan expressed his support for Talat in the negotiations; the third was when the Prime Minister and the Finance Minister announced that there would be no more financial aid from Turkey. The news discourse in these reports was similar in all the newspapers. For the first incident the newspapers used expressions such as ‘shocking arrests’,45 ‘arrests that shook Turkey’,46 ‘Arrests that shocked Turkey’,47 ‘Ergenekon earthquake’48 and ‘Ergenekon arrest
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earthquake’.49 News accounts of Babacan’s statement were also very similar in the newspapers: ‘Ankara trusts Talat’,50 ‘Support for the TRNC and Talat from the Turkish Foreign Ministry’,51 ‘Babacan: our trust in Talat is total’,52 ‘Full support for a solution and Talat’,53 ‘we’re behind him’54 and ‘Babacan: our wish is the start of full-fledged negotiations with the aim of finding a solution’.55 These headlines indicated Turkey’s support for the Turkish Cypriot leader Talat during the negotiations and that Turkey wanted a solution in Cyprus.

Turkey also appeared in the headlines in relation to Prime Minister Soyer’s and Financial Minister Uzun’s joint press conference on the latest measures taken to tackle economic difficulties in the country. The papers that reported the ministers’ conference highlighted that Turkey would not give any more financial aid to north Cyprus: ‘Turkey gave whatever it can’,56 ‘no more money from Turkey’57 were some of the headlines.

Invisible EU

It was difficult to evaluate if there was any shift in the attitude towards the EU as there was little coverage of the EU in the Turkish Cypriot newspapers during the period analysed. The name of the EU was only mentioned when Jean Asselborn, the Luxembourg Deputy Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs and Immigration, was reported in Kıbrıs saying that ‘everyone in the EU must help in the solution of the Cyprus Problem’ following his meeting with Turkish Foreign Minister Ali Babacan.58 Even though the text mostly focused on the relations between Luxembourg and Turkey, the newspaper chose to highlight the part that was about Cyprus. The title of the same article in Ortam was, ‘full support from Luxembourg for the EU’, while the text explained that the Turkish Foreign Minister thanked Luxembourg’s Minister for supporting Turkey’s attempts to join the EU.59 It was again only these two newspapers, Kıbrıs and Ortam, that reported a change in the rotating presidency of the EU Council from Slovenia to France.60

The second time the EU was a news topic was the coverage of a meeting organised to announce the changes that would affect the welfare of EU citizens. The newspapers that included this story used the same text and photo to report it.61 Overall, the coverage of these events did not provide sufficient data to examine if there was any shift in the media towards the EU.

The Government

The stories involving the government showed very little divergence in the press. For example, a trade union protest against the government’s attempt to amend the bi-monthly system of linking public workers’ salaries to the cost of living index, which is called the Sliding Scale System (esel mobil in Turkish), was reported with identical texts and titles. All the newspapers stated that the unions were going to protest against the government for its latest decision on the Sliding Scale System: ‘Trade unions are taking to the streets’,62 ‘sliding scale demonstration by the trade

51 No author, ‘TC Dışişleri’nden KKTC ve Talat’a tam destek [Full support for the TRNC and Talat from the Turkish Foreign Ministry]’, Vatan, 2.7.2008:7.
53 No author, ‘Çözüme ve Talat’a tam destek [Full support for a solution and Talat]’, Kıbrıslı, 2.7.2008:1.
54 No author, ‘Arkasındayız [We’re behind him]’, Sözcü, 2.7.2008:1.
55 No author, ‘Babacan: Kapsamlı müzakerelemiz çözüme ulaşmak amacıyla en kısa zamanda başlamasını istiyoruz [Babacan: We want the start of the comprehensive negotiations with the aim of finding a solution]’, Yenidüzen, 2.7.2008:1.
56 No author, ‘Kendi kendimizi yüzgeçme zamanı [It’s face ourselves]’, Yenidüzen, 3.7.2008:1; No author, ‘Türkiye vereceğini verdi [Turkey gave whatever it can]’, Kıbrıs, 3.7.2008:1; No author, ‘“Türkiye vereceğini verdim” dedi [Turkey said “I gave whatever I can”]’, Halkın Sesi, 3.7.2008:1.
57 No author, ‘Kıbrıs da başka para yok [No more money from Turkey]’, Afrika, 3.7.2008:1.
59 No author, ‘Lüksemburg’dan AB için tam destek [Full support from Luxembourg for the EU (membership)]’, Ortam, 1.7.2008:12.
60 No author, ‘AB’nin yeni dönem başkanı Fransa [The EU’s new president is France]’, Kıbrıs, 2.7.2008:1; 40; No author, ‘AB’nin yeni dönem başkanı Fransa [The EU’s new president is France]’, Ortam, 1.7.2008:14.
expressed his opinion in scathing terms. Yenidüzen, on the other hand, published the statements of both Prime Minister Soyer and a representative of the trade unions. Even the headlines were similar: Halkın Sesi’s ‘Warning to the government’, Ortam’s ‘Warning from the unions to Soyer: Resign’, Yenidüzen and Kıbrıslı treated the story differently, as unlike the other newspapers that gave priority to the unions, these two newspapers treated the Prime Minister’s response to it with equal weight. According to Kıbrıslı, the Prime Minister expressed his opinion in scathing terms. Yenidüzen, on the other hand, published the statements of the unions and the Prime Ministers separately but next to each other rather than combining them in one article as did all the other newspapers.

Stories on this demonstration offer good examples of how the discourse of a source, in this case the trade unions, was adopted and integrated into reports. Many newspapers quoted the slogans of the demonstrators in their headlines, thus echoing their anger: Kıbrıs wrote ‘Sliding Scale frustration’; Halkın Sesi, ‘there is no fear, but resistance’; Kıbrıslı and Yeni Volkan, ‘break the hands that will touch on the Sliding Scale’; and Yenidüzen and Güneş, ‘continue our struggle until the end’. The other papers also ran stories announcing that trade unions had staged a protest demonstration against the government’s decision on the Sliding Scale System.

All the newspapers reported the warning that a group of trade unions gave to the government against certain policies, and most put the story on their front page. All employed the same text, which consisted of the statements of both Prime Minister Soyer and a representative of the unions. Even the headlines were similar: Halkın Sesi’s ‘Warning to the government’, Ortam’s ‘warning like a slap in the face’, Güneş’s ‘warning to the CTP-ÖP government’ and Afrıka’s ‘Warning from the unions to Soyer: Resign’. Yenidüzen and Kıbrıslı treated the story differently, as unlike the other newspapers that gave priority to the unions, these two newspapers treated the Prime Minister’s response to it with equal weight. According to Kıbrıslı, the Prime Minister expressed his opinion in scathing terms. Yenidüzen, on the other hand, published the statements of the unions and the Prime Ministers separately but next to each other rather than combining them in one article as did all the other newspapers.
Political Parties

Within the studied timeframe, political parties were the focus of news articles on two main issues: The Talat-Christofias meeting and CTP’s80 application to Socialist International. The practice of giving priority to the news concerning the party with which the newspaper was affiliated or sympathised was noticeable again. For example, CTP-BG’s press release expressing its dissatisfaction with the leaders’ meeting appeared on the front page of Yenidüzen.81 In the same way, articles involving TDP received front-page coverage in Ortam; UBP was favoured in Vatan, and DP was featured in Demokrat Bakış.82 In most cases, the opposition parties’ statements that were critical of government actions and policies were given advantageous treatment in the newspapers that sympathised with them.

Political parties’ reactions to the two leaders’ meeting were reflected as a forewarning to President Talat. Especially noticeable were UBP leader Tahsin Ertuğruloğlu’s press announcements, in which he was reported to have warned Talat. According to the newspapers ‘UBP leader asked Talat to be careful once more before the 1 July meeting: the situation is not good’,83 there were ‘Pre-summit warnings from UBP to Talat’;83 UBP invited Talat to ‘behave like the TRNC President’84 and ‘take UBP’s realistic thoughts on a solution into consideration’85 as well as expressing the party’s concern for the 1 July meeting.86 Kıbrıslı’s headline, ‘Call from Tahsin to Talat’ had a belittling tone towards the UBP leader as it referred to him by his first name in contrast to using Talat’s last name.87 UBP was not the only party to issue a warning to the President, as Halk Party (People’s Party) leader Raşit Pertev was reported as giving advice to Talat to change his tactic in the negotiations.88

There were differences in the media coverage of parties’ reactions. CTP-BG’s dissatisfaction that a date for the launch of negotiations had not been set found space in most of the newspapers,89 while DP’s protest against the ‘single sovereignty and single citizenship’ decision and Politics for the People Party’s (Halk İçin Siyaset - HIS) demand for an explanation from the President about whether he made a secret agreement with Christofias did not. Only two newspapers, Halkın Sesi and Yeni Volkan, found these last two statements newsworthy.90

Views of the political parties attracted the media’s attention following a meeting they had with President Talat to discuss the latest developments in the Cyprus Issue. Reporting the event, the papers used a TAK article, but some papers transformed it by changing the order of the statements of the party leaders in the text. According to Kıbrıslı, the UBP leader was the first to make a statement followed by the leaders of DP, CTP-BG, ÖRP and TDP,91 while in Kıbrıs and Yenidüzen, the order was CTP-BG, ÖRP, TDP, UBP and DP.92 Yeni Volkan and Demokrat Bakış
reported only the UBP and DP leaders’ comments93 while Gunes covered only those of the UBP leader.94 Halkin Sesi gave each leader’s statement separately,95 while Afrika and Kibris Star did not include the story at all.

CTP’s application to Socialist International (SI) was another topic that nearly all the newspapers reported. However, their coverage of the story was more confusing than informative. Initially, Kibris, Yeniduzen, Kibrisl, Vatan, Halkin Sesi and Afrika informed readers that ‘CTP’s membership in Socialist International has been approved’.96 Basing its report on a Greek Cypriot daily, Ortam was the only paper to report that EDEK, a Greek Cypriot political party, voted against CTP becoming a consultative member of the organisation.97 The next day contradicting reports appeared in the print media. According to some newspapers, CTP’s membership was accepted but needed the approval of George Papandreou, President of SI and Louis Ayala, the General Secretary. These newspapers based their information on a statement given by the CTP-BG Representative Kutlay Erk to TAK and repeated his claims that the party’s membership was accepted but needed endorsement.98 In contrast, other newspapers using the information they received from the CTP press announced that CTP’s application for membership was rejected and that the party could only be a member if it recognised the Republic of Cyprus.99 Vatan and Afrika published these two contradictory articles100 but, rather than merging or positioning them together, they put them on separate pages which probably confused their readers more. On the other hand, it was only Afrika, pointing a finger at CTP, that raised questions about the existence of conflicting information on the issue: ‘Why did CTP deceive society?’ and ‘they deceived the people saying that CTP’s membership was accepted’.101 The following day only Kibris Star, Kibris and Afrika published articles based on the Greek Cypriot press.102

Conclusion

The analysis reveals that since the previous timeframe there has not been much change in the Turkish Cypriot press in terms of journalistic culture. Reliance on other sources for information, and propaganda disguised in the form of news still dominated the content of the print media. Maybe because of lack of resources or the existing journalistic culture, neither newsgathering nor journalistic processing of information was very evident within the Turkish Cypriot media. Therefore, the content of the majority of the newspapers was generally the same and sources were powerful actors in determining the shape and style of texts that appear in them.

---

96 No author, ‘CTP’nin Sosyalist Enternasyonal üeliği onayandi [CTP’s membership in Socialist International has been approved]’, Vatan, 1.7.2008:18; No author, ‘CTP Sosyalist Enternasyonal’e üye oldu [CTP becomes a member of Socialist International]’, Halkin Sesi, 1.7.2008:5; No author, ‘CTP Sosyalist Enternasyonal’a üye oldu [CTP becomes a member of Socialist International]’, Kibris, 1.7.2008:1; No author, ‘Afrika’, 1.7.2008; No author, ‘CTP’nin Sosyalist Enternasyonal üeliği onayandi [CTP’s membership in Socialist International has been approved]’, Yeniduzen, 1.7.2008:5.
97 No author, ‘EDEK’ten CTP’ye itiraz [Objection from EDEK to CTP]’, Ortam, 1.7.2008.
98 No author, ‘CTP’nin Sosyalist Enternasyonal üeliği onayandi [CTP’s membership in Socialist International has been approved]’, Vatan, 1.7.2008:18; No author, ‘CTP’nin Sosyalist Enternasyonal üeliği onayandi [CTP’s membership in Socialist International has been approved]’, Yeniduzen, 1.7.2008:5.
100 No author, ‘CTP’nin üeliğine oray gerekıyor [CTP’s membership needs approval]’, Halkin Sesi, 2.7.2008:7; No author, ‘Üyelik bugün kesinlik kazanacak [the membership to be confirmed today]’, Kibris, 2.7.2008:5; No author, ‘Erk: Üyelik kabul gördü ancak Başkan ve Genel Sekreter’in onayı gerekıyor [Erk: Membership has been accepted but needs the approval of the President and the General Secretary]’, Yeniduzen, 2.7.2008:11; No author, ‘CTP’nin üeliği Papandreu’nun elinde [CTP’s membership is in Papandreu’s hands]’, Kibris, 2.7.2008:3.
101 No author, ‘CTP’nin Sosyalist Enternasyonal üeliğini re [Objection to CTP’s Socialist International membership]’, Ortam, 2.7.2008:8; No author, ‘EDEK’ten CTP’ye şemek [EDEK tips-up CTP]’, Kibris Star, 2.7.2008:1; No author, ‘CTP Rum yönetimini tamyacısak mi [Will CTP recognize the Greek Cypriot administration]’, Yeni Volkan, 2.7.2008:4; No author, ‘CTP’nin Sosyalist Enternasyonal üeliğini red [Objection to CTP’s Socialist International membership]’, Gunes, 2.7.2008:11.
102 No author, ‘CTP’nin Sosyalist Enternasyonal üeliğini re [Objection to CTP’s Socialist International membership]’, Vatan, 2.7.2008:13; No author, ‘Erk: Üyelik kabul gördü ancak Başkan ve Genel Sekreter’in onayı gerekıyor [Erk: Membership has been accepted but needs the approval of the President and the General Secretary]’, Vatan, 2.7.2008:19; No author, ‘CTP’nin üeliği kabul edildi diyerek toplumu yanıltabilir [They deceived the people by saying that CTP’s membership was accepted]’, Kibris, 2.7.2008:9; No author, ‘CTP’nin Sosyalist Enternasyonal üeliğini re [Objection to CTP’s Socialist International membership]’, Kibris, 2.7.2008:11.
103 Ibid. Also see, Niyazi Oktén, ‘Sosyalist Enternasyonal yalanı [Socialist International Lie]’, Afrika, 2.7.2008:9.
The representation of the Cyprus Issue, which was reflected in the Talat-Christofias meeting, was slightly different in comparison to the meeting between Talat and Papadopoulos. The majority of the newspapers simply reported on the process of the Talat-Christofias meeting and its outcome rather than speculating and combining their comments with the facts, as they did with the Talat-Papadopoulos meeting. In a way, they kept the same distance from both leaders and treated them equally. Yet, they still referred to Demetris Christofias as ‘the Greek Cypriot Administration leader’ and Talat as the ‘TRNC President’. Another difference was the expectation of a result from the Talat-Christofias meeting in terms of a date for the launch of negotiations. Therefore, when the outcome was not as they had hoped, the print media communicated their dissatisfaction. The newspapers had expressed no such expectation from the Talat-Papadopoulos meeting; on the contrary, even before the leaders’ summit took place they had published articles that reflected their lack of faith in the process.

Only a few of the newspapers adopted an ‘us’ and ‘them’ discourse in their reports on the Talat-Christofias meeting and pinned the responsibility for lack of an outcome in the form of a negotiation date on the Greek Cypriot side. Accusations directed at the Greek Cypriot leader—such as unwillingness, dragging his feet, delaying the process—were noticeable especially in Kıbrıslı, Halkın Sesi and Yeni Volkan. These newspapers not only criticised the Greek Cypriot administration for not being sincere but also portrayed the Turkish Cypriot side as the one being genuine in its attempts. Other newspapers focused their reports on the outcome of the meeting rather than blaming the ‘other’.

Unlike the earlier parts of this research, any representation of Turkey and the EU was very limited. This could be because of the length of the timeframe for this part of the research rather than an indication of lack of interest. Turkey’s appearance in the media was in the form of its Foreign Minister expressing his country’s belief in and support for solution attempts in Cyprus; in other words, it was positive. The ongoing Ergenekon investigation, which occupied the media in Turkey, was also reported as an important event by the Turkish Cypriot press. Meanwhile, the representation of the EU in the print media was even less than Turkey’s. In other words, the EU was invisible for the Turkish Cypriot audience during this period.

Criticisms and protests against the government appeared frequently in the press. The newspapers gave especially wide coverage to a trade union demonstration protesting the government’s decision to amend the Sliding Scale System—even the papers that sympathised with the government such as Yenidüzen, the newspaper linked to CTP-BG, the main party in the government. However, it balanced the appearance of such stories on its front page with articles that reflected the government actions and policies in a positive way.

Newspapers continued to give advantageous treatment to events involving the political party representatives they sympathised with. Statements or events related to the big parties such as CTP-BG and UBP were considered important and were reported by most newspapers; in contrast, smaller parties received very limited coverage, and only in the newspapers that sympathised with them. CTP’s application for membership to SI was found newsworthy by most of the print media. Yet, apart from one newspaper, Afrika, none questioned the conflicting information about it and published only one side of the development. In that sense, the newspapers failed to provide accurate and balanced information to their readers.

Sanem Şahin
TURKISH CYPRiot TELEVISION
IN JUNE-JULY 2008
Sanem Şahin

Introduction
The study of the main evening news bulletins of five television channels, BRT, Kıbrıs TV, Genç TV, Kanal T and ART focused — as in the case of the press — on 30 June to 3 July 2008. The TV coverage of the Talat-Christofias meeting was not very different from that of the press. Analysis of material on the leaders’ meeting revealed that all channels used the same stories and even the same texts as the print media. The idea that television news requires different processes of construction and reception, as a visual- and audio-based medium, does not seem to have applied. Although this part of the research mainly focused on the presentation of the leaders’ meeting in the television news, it also examines the representation of other topics such as the government, political parties, Turkey and the EU, as was done for the two previous chapters.

Journalistic Practices and the Structure of the News
The structure of the news during this period was the same as in the previous period; that is, the news mainly consisted of the presentation of an issue by a newsreader, followed by a film part that included a voice report and images on the topic. Sound-bites in some of these news items allowed the audience to see and hear a source speaking, but otherwise what was said was mostly paraphrased and integrated into a script that was read over related pictures. In some cases the reporter of a story was identified by the newsreader, but generally reporters remained anonymous.1 The images of journalists were limited to showing them holding sound recording instruments to their interviewees. Like the news structure, bulletins were also very similar to those of the previous timeframes, consisting of similar topics with almost no exclusive news items.

The quality of images that accompanied reports was poor, as problems such as lighting, framing and camera movement continued to occur. Some visuals were used over and over, which meant that audiences saw the same sequence of pictures not only in the same report but also in the same bulletin for different stories. Images from the Talat-Christofias meeting were one such example, as they were utilised in any news story that referred to the leaders’ summit. Use of still photography instead of video footage continued, and thus became established as a common practice.2 Apart from captions highlighting the important aspects of stories, like headlines in the press, graphics were limited. Again, it was only ART that used full-frame graphics to reflect the gist of a story as well as the channel’s commentary on it.

Scripts of television news that were based on news agency dispatches were more suitable to the print media news. Despite this, they were used without being adapted to television, which only reduced the effectiveness and clarity of the news. As text and pictures did not always match, in many instances the identity of the person or the place shown on screen was not clear, which meant that the audience had to rely on its own background knowledge to understand the issue. For example, Genç TV, in its account of the Nationalist Justice Party’s (Milliyetçi Adalet Partisi - MAP) views on the leaders’ meeting, showed a photo of the party’s leader without naming him in the script.3

1 During the period studied, only on Genç TV did the reporter present a piece before the camera and was seen interviewing people; Genç TV, item 13, 3.7.2008.
2 For example, Kıbrıs TV used photographs for two stories in its bulletin; Kıbrıs TV items 7, 9, 3.7.2008.
3 Genç TV, item 5, 3.7.2008.
Some accounts of events were far from informative. One such example was the reports on the Fishermen Union’s protest rally at Kyrenia harbour. The film part of the news on Kanal T consisted of a video recording during the rally which showed unidentified people getting involved in a heated debate but included no script to give further information. On Kıbrıs TV and ART the images that accompanied the same report were general shots of Kyrenia harbour and fishermen, and did not include any pictures from the event. All these reports lacked the most crucial information, i.e., what was the reason for the protest. Only BRT informed its audience that the demonstrators ended their protest on the same day after discussing their problems with the Public Works and Transportation Minister, who had gone down to the harbour and promised to solve their problems.

Discourse Analysis

The Cyprus Issue

News bulletins were arranged according to topic, which meant that all the television channels gave priority to the Cyprus Issue. The day before the leaders’ meeting and the day it took place, the leading stories were about this summit and relevant statements by political figures. Other stories, such as a trade union protest rally against the government, followed the items on the Cyprus Issue in the programme.

Facts given in the reports on the leaders’ meeting were a repetition of official information. For example, the day before the meeting, all the channels highlighted that the aim of Talat’s and Christofias’s meeting was to launch full-fledged negotiations. This was based on the information Presidential spokesperson Hasan Erçakıca had given the day before.

The day the meeting took place, all the channels focused on the outcome of the meeting. Intros of their leading stories informed their audience that after four and a half hours of negotiation both leaders had agreed in principle on the idea of single sovereignty and citizenship and to meet again on 25 July to review the work of the technical committees and working groups. The news scripts also repeated the content of the joint statement read by the UN Special Representative Taye Brooke Zerihoun at the end of the meeting on behalf of both presidents. The film reports showed the leaders arriving at the meeting place, which was Zerihoun’s residence in the UN-controlled buffer zone, and shaking hands after the summit. Overall, reports on the event were all similar and this similarity was also noted in stories related to the topic. For example, the bulletins on both Kıbrıs TV and BRT included a statement by the Turkish Foreign Minister Ali Babacan expressing Turkey’s wish to start full-fledged negotiations to find a solution to the Cyprus Problem. ART and Genç TV, on the other hand, aired an announcement by Christofias that the end of 2008 was not a deadline for the Greek Cypriot side.

It was the next day’s news that communicated opinions of various groups on the issue. According to these reports many political figures, such as the Prime Minister, the Speaker of the Parliament and political party representatives, found the meeting unsatisfying and unfruitful. While some explained this dissatisfaction was with the slow progress and specifically with lack of a start date for the negotiations, others expressed their disagreement with the agreed issues such as single sovereignty and citizenship. BRT reflected the widest range of opinions on the topic as it reported the views of the Speaker of the Parliament, political party representatives and groups such as the Turkish Defence Organisation (Türk Mukavemet Teşkilatı - TMT) and the Cyprus Turkish National Council. In contrast, ART reported the least, limiting its coverage to the statements of the Prime Minister, CTP-BG, DP and the Cyprus Turkish National Council.

---

4 Kanal T, item 7, 30.6.2008.  
5 Kıbrıs TV, item 5, 30.6.2008; ART, item 7, 30.6.2008.  
6 BRT, item 7, 30.6.2008.  
7 Kıbrıs TV, item 3, 1.7.2008; BRT, item 2, 1.7.2008.  
8 ART, item 2, 1.7.2008 and Genç TV, item 2, 1.7.2008.  
9 BRT, items 1, 2, 3 and 4, 2.7.2008.  
10 ART, items 1, 2 and 3, 2.7.2008.
Talat’s statement two days after the summit that ‘if a united Cyprus is going to be established, it is definite that there is going to be single sovereignty and single citizenship’ became the leading story on all the channels apart from ART. His remarks on the issue of single sovereignty and citizenship received similar treatment on all channels; this involved repeating his words and using some sound-bites. On ART the story was not only the fifth item in the bulletin but its discourse was a sign of its disapproval of the leader: ‘Talat once more proved that he has not given up the dream of a united Cyprus’ and ‘he has not given up his insistence on single sovereignty and citizenship’. ART’s previous four items consisted of stories critical of his decision.

Reporting the Greek Cypriot Side
Interest in the Greek Cypriot side was no different than in the previous periods studied and the news from the south continued to be included in the bulletins. Information for such stories came mainly from the news agency that compiled them from the Greek Cypriot media. Reflections of the leaders’ meeting on the Greek Cypriot side, the statement issued by the Greek Cypriot government spokesman Stefanos Stefanou and Christofias’ meeting with National Council were instances of such stories. Apart from political issues, the water shortage, which also affects the north, was found newsworthy, and the delivery of water from Greece with tanker boats to overcome the water shortage was reported on four channels— Kıbrıs TV, Genç TV, ART and Kanal T. It was only ART that linked the story to the north. But rather than drawing attention to the similarities, their coverage enhanced stereotyping the Greek Cypriot side as opposing everything the Turkish Cypriot side offered: ‘The Greek Cypriot side continues to oppose any joint initiative despite the TRNC’s good intentions’. In this statement the word ‘continues’ implies that this negative behaviour is a trait of the Greek Cypriot side. It also cast the Turkish Cypriot side as acting with ‘good intentions’, the opposite of the Greek Cypriot side.

It was very noticeable that ART frequently employed a strategy of positive representation of Turkish Cypriots and negative portrayal of Greek Cypriots, highlighting an ‘us’ versus ‘them’ discourse. Pointing to an agreement between the UK and the ROC, ART claimed that Turkish Cypriot side’s trust towards the latter diminished. To reinforce its claim it included a day-old report on TRNC Presidential spokesperson Hasan Erçakıca’s statement accusing the Greek Cypriot administration of damaging the negotiation process. The caption in the film, ‘President’s Office: Greek Cypriots are damaging the negotiation process’, supported the script’s message that the spokesperson reacted angrily to the Greek Cypriot side. It was again ART that described the Greek Cypriot leader Christofias’s assertion that the end of 2008 was not a deadline for the negotiations as ‘insolent’. The channel repeated the same accusation in its lead story in the following day’s bulletin: ‘Prime Minister Ferdi Sabit Soyer commented on Christofias’s insolent statements in the press prior to the meeting’.

Turkey in the TV News
Just like in the press, Turkey was in the TV news mainly regarding developments in the Ergenekon investigation. Nearly all the channels included reports on detentions of well-known military and political figures in Turkey. Some regarded the Turkish Military Chief of Staff’s statement concerning

11 ART, item 5, 3.7.2008.
12 Genç TV, item 7, 2.7.2008.
14 Kıbrıs TV, item 2, 3.7.2008; Genç TV, item 7, 3.7.2008 and BRT, item 2, 3.7.2008.
15 Kıbrıs TV, item 12, 1.7.2008; Genç TV, item 17, 1.7.2008; Kanal T, item 11, 1.7.2008; ART, item 4, 1.7.2008.
16 ART, item 1, 3.7.2008.
17 ART, item 2, 3.7.2008.
18 ART, item 4, 1.7.2008.
19 ART, item 1, 30.6.2008.
20 ART, item 1, 2.7.2008.
the arrests and house search of some high-ranking military officers as newsworthy.\(^ {21} \) In these reports it was only *Kanal T* that described Turkey as the ‘motherland’;\(^ {22} \)

Turkey’s expression of support for a solution in Cyprus was also a news topic. *BRT* and *Kibris TV* reported on Turkey’s Foreign Minister Ali Babacan statements stressing Turkey’s support for Talat in the negotiations.\(^ {23} \) Another example was in a speech the Turkish Ambassador to Lefkoşa Türkcekul Kurttekin delivered during the annual gratitude events organised by various veteran organisations. According to *BRT* (similar reports appeared on other channels as well), Kurttekin said that the solution supported by the Turkish Cypriot people and backed by Turkey was the one that would protect political equality and consist of two equal constituent states.\(^ {24} \)

**The EU**

The EU was invisible from the television news during this period. The only time it became an issue was when there was a change in the rotating presidency of the EU Council from Slovenia to France. Four channels, *Kanal T, BRT, Kibris TV* and *Genç TV*, reported the occasion.\(^ {25} \) The news stories mainly consisted of French President Nicolas Sarkozy expressing his view on France’s role in the EU presidency. Other than this, no topic related to the EU was included in the TV bulletins.

**The Government**

During the four-day period examined the government was frequently a topic in the news— not only with accounts of its actions and policies, but also with reports of protests staged against it. In fact, while criticisms or demonstrations against the government were reported on all the television news channels, stories reflecting its decisions and activities were not. For example, a trade union protest rally against the government’s decision to amend the Sliding Scale System\(^ {26} \) was covered by all the channels. Later, when 13 trade unions jointly warned the government about the amendments\(^ {27} \) and threatened a general strike,\(^ {28} \) it was again reported on all stations. All the channels also considered the Fishermen’s Union demonstration in Kyrenia harbour as important.\(^ {29} \) In contrast, a joint press conference organised by the Prime Minister and the Finance Minister to announce measures taken to tackle the economic crisis in the country was not reported on *ART*.

All the stations reported stories concerning the government in a very similar way and also framed issues in the same way, especially when their scripts derived from TAK texts. For example, reports on the union demonstration against the government were one such example, with similarities extending to pictures and sound-bites. Even the views included— in this case, those of a UBP representative, then the main opposition party— were very similar.\(^ {30} \) In a way, using TAK, the state-owned news agency, set the framework for a story. As a result the government’s representation in the news, whether it was to promote its actions or report on a protest against it, was fairly standard and offered little diversity of opinion.

Government announcements and actions were also frequently reported. For example, the joint press conference organised by Prime Minister Soyer and Finance Minister Uzun received coverage on *Kibris TV*, *Genç TV*, *Kanal T* and *BRT*. Yet, the importance the channels attributed to it differed: While *Kibris TV* broadcast it as the second item in its bulletin, *BRT* ran it as the sixth; on *Genç TV* and *Kanal T* the story appeared in the middle of the bulletins.\(^ {31} \) The visits of various

\(^ {21} \) *Kıbrıs TV*, item 12, 2.7.2008; *Genç TV*, item 10, 1.7.2008; *Kanal T*, item 13, 2.7.2008.

\(^ {22} \) *Kanal T*, item 2, 1.7.2008.

\(^ {23} \) *Kıbrıs TV*, item 3, 1.7.2008; *BRT*, item 2, 1.7.2008.

\(^ {24} \) *BRT*, item 11, 2.7.2008.

\(^ {25} \) *Kanal T, BRT, Kıbrıs TV and Genç TV*, 1.7.2008.

\(^ {26} \) *Kıbrıs TV*, item 4, 30.6.2008; *Genç TV*, item 8, 30.6.2008; *Kanal T*, item 6, 30.6.2008; *ART*, item 5, 30.6.2008; *BRT*, item 5, 30.6.2008.

\(^ {27} \) *Kıbrıs TV*, item 1, 2.7.2008; *Genç TV*, item 1, 2.7.2008; *Kanal T*, item 11, 2.7.2008; *ART*, item 5, 2.7.2008; *BRT*, item 5, 2.7.2008.

\(^ {28} \) *Kıbrıs TV*, item 6, 3.7.2008; *Genç TV*, item 9, 3.7.2008; *Kanal T*, item 10, 3.7.2008; *ART*, item 6, 3.7.2008; *BRT*, item 4, 3.7.2008.


\(^ {31} \) *Kıbrıs TV*, item 2, 2.7.2008; *Genç TV*, item 11, 2.7.2008; *Kanal T*, item 9, 2.7.2008, 10 and *BRT*, item 6, 2.7.2008.
groups and organisations to state officials and government ministers were also treated as newsworthy. This type of story was most prevalent on BRT and Genç TV.

Political Parties
As seen in the press and the previous television analysis, political parties were the topic of many news items. Their activities and views, especially on the Talat-Christofias meeting, were reported on all the television bulletins. For example, on several occasions Turkish Cypriot leader Talat met the political parties represented in the assembly to inform them of the latest developments on the Cyprus Issue; all the channels covered at least one of these meetings. A close study of their television coverage reveals how political biases — or lack of journalistic norms of being balanced, fair and accurate — played a role in the construction of stories. For example, although all the reports on the second meeting looked similar — party leaders talking to journalists following their meeting with Talat — in fact the order of appearance of each party leader changed according to the channel. While on BRT the leaders appeared according to the political hierarchy, that is to say, first the Prime Minister, who is also the leader of CTP-BG, the main party in the coalition government; then the deputy prime minister, who is also the leader of ÖRP, the small partner of the coalition government; then followed the larger opposition party, UBP, and the smaller ones, DP and TDP. In contrast, on Kanal T, the UBP leader was shown first followed by the DP and TDP and then the ÖRP and CTP-BG leaders. As there was no script that went with the pictures, there was no indication why Kanal T chose to show the leaders in that order. Genç TV, on the other hand, included only CTP-BG leader Soyer, ÖRP leader Avcı and TDP leader Çakıcı in its report. ART gave priority to the views of the UBP leader Tahsin Ertuğruloğlu and then reported the views of CTP-BG and ÖRP.

Having shown the party leaders talking to their cameras and giving their views on the leaders' meeting, the television channels also chose to broadcast statements issued by CTP-BG, DP and TDP separately. Among them, CTP-BG's was deemed the most newsworthy as it appeared on all television bulletins; this can perhaps be explained by its being the main party in the coalition government.

Another example of political bias being apparent in story selection and treatment was Kanal T's reports on UBP. This was the only channel that reported UBP leader Tahsin Ertuğruloğlu's call to Talat to act like the TRNC President. Kanal T also reported on the party's criticism of the government concerning the Sliding Scale System, as did BRT. On the other hand, BRT was the only channel to air statements of parties such as ÖRP and BKP regarding the leaders' summit. Meanwhile, more news related to DP was reported on ART than any other channel. ART broadcast DP's protest of the leaders' decisions on single sovereignty and citizenship as the second item in one of its news bulletins, and then covered CTP-BG's statement of dissatisfaction.

Unlike the press, CTP-BG's membership in Socialist International did not receive much coverage on the television news. BRT, Kıbrıs TV and Kanal T reported that the membership application to the organization was approved and, apart from the Greek Cypriot party EDEK, everyone had voted in favour of it. Kıbrıs TV also broadcast CTP-BG Representative Kutlay Erk's statement.

32 The meeting of political parties with Talat before the leaders' summit was reported by Kıbrıs TV, Genç TV, Kanal T and BRT, 30.6.2008 but not by ART. When the parties met the president after the leaders' meeting it was only BRT and Kanal T that reported the incident on the actual day while ART and Genç TV included it in their next day's bulletin. BRT, item 1, 2.7.2008 and Kanal T, item 2, 2.7.2008.
33 BRT, item 8, 30.6.2008.
34 For ÖRP, see BRT, item 2, 30.6.2008; for BKP see BRT, item 3, 2.7.2008.
35 BRT, item 8, 30.6.2008; Kıbrıs TV, item 8, 30.6.2008. Kanal T reported the story a day later, in item 3, 1.7.2008.
on the issue. Otherwise no information, even contradictory as appeared in the press, was provided on the television news. As a result, television audiences were not informed that CTP-BG’s membership was actually not approved.

Conclusion
The Cyprus Issue or, in this case, the Talat-Christofias meeting, was the most important topic and generally led the television bulletins. Framing of the issue did not show much variance among the five television channels. That is to say, they all adopted and repeated the official discourse in their news coverage.

In the television news, attitudes towards this meeting were slightly different than for the Talat-Papadopoulos meeting. First of all, there was the expectation of a positive result in the Talat-Christofias meeting. The September 2007 meeting lacked any optimism for a positive outcome and was viewed as nothing more than a propaganda move on the part of the Greek Cypriot leader. In the Talat-Christofias meeting, on the other hand, the media reflected an expectation that a start date for negotiations could be established.

Reaction to the outcome of these two meetings was also different. While it surprised no one that the Talat-Papadopoulos meeting failed to produce any positive outcome, there was a clear dissatisfaction that no decision to pursue negotiations was reached in the Talat-Christofias meeting. This meeting resulted in disappointment either because of a lack of a start date for peace negotiations or because of the agreement on single sovereignty and citizenship.

The television coverage also reflected different attitudes towards the leaders. The advantageous treatment given to the Turkish Cypriot leader in the Talat-Papadopoulos meeting was still apparent in the coverage of the latest summit, but was not stressed as strongly. However, rather than pointing to an attitude change it could be because of the difference in the outcome and the way of announcing the outcome to the media. Talat and Papadopoulos had organised separate press conferences to give information on the meeting. In these conferences, giving their versions of the event, each put the blame to the other. Communicating these events, the media integrated nationalistic discourses into their reports and generally held the ‘other’ side responsible for the failure. Talat and Christofias, on the other hand, announced the outcome of their meeting with a joint declaration. This limited the media’s coverage to this statement. The divergence of ‘us’ and ‘them’ was still there but not emphasised. The ‘us’ and ‘them’ discourse was most obvious on ART, which usually cast the Greek Cypriots as the ‘other’. They were represented as continually rejecting Turkish Cypriots’ offers of cooperation and their leaders were accused of making ‘insolent’ announcements. In contrast, Turkish Cypriots were portrayed as the side with ‘good intentions’.

Turkey’s representation did not show much change either. Important developments in Turkey as well as remarks on Turkey’s policy on Cyprus were found newsworthy by the Turkish Cypriot channels. While the interest in Turkey’s internal and Cyprus affairs continued, it seems that there was a lack of interest in the developments in the EU as there was rarely any story about it in this part of the study. This could also be attributed to the fact that the data chosen for this part of the study was insufficient to evaluate the media attitude towards the institution.

Government-related news continued to feature prominently in the news bulletins. Its ministers’ actions and decisions as well as government visits of various individuals and groups were treated as newsworthy. Coverage of such activities of the government ministers that lacked any news value indicated an advantageous treatment towards them. Yet criticisms and protests staged against the government were also reported. In fact, all the channels reported the news on demonstrations in opposition to the government. The only difference between reports on the protest rallies and those on government announcements was that the reports on the latter included more information as they benefited from the news agency texts. In some television reports the coverage of the demonstrations was confusing and lacked certain crucial information.

43 Kıbrıs TV, item 3, 1.7.2008.
The television channels’ bias in relation to political parties did not show much divergence from the previous times examined. Although the political biases of the television channels were not as clear as in the press, the frequency and the length of the stories favouring a specific party indicated certain political partialities. The treatment of news stories, and especially in terms of using comments of party leaders, was also an indication of such biases.

Sanem Şahin
The Annan Plan was the most popular topic reported by the media in 2002. The Papadopoulos-Talat meeting and the presidential elections in the Republic of Cyprus were the most widely covered subjects in the time period 2007-2008. The meeting between President Demetris Christofias and the Turkish Cypriot leader Mehmet Ali Talat on 1 July was the prevailing discourse during the four days studied in 2008. These news stories, along with others, revealed certain trends that cannot be considered coincidental. The study of the daily newspapers and TV channels showed that many of their practices and discourses remained constant throughout the time periods examined for this report.

There were two practices of the press that remained unchanged over the three time periods; these concerned the amount of information offered to the readers and the sources from which the dailies drew their information. It seems that Politis and Phileleftheros fought for exclusivity by publishing front-page stories based on their own sources and by employing correspondents both in Cyprus and abroad. Conversely, the newspapers that were affiliated with political parties, and those facing the challenges of low circulation figures and limited funds re-published material which originated mainly from KYPE. Even so, they often changed the headlines of these externally produced texts to harmonize them with their own views and beliefs. These trends appear to have remained constant over the three time periods although during the last two there was a slight divergence from this trend as a stronger effort for objectivity was observed.

The analysis of the press also revealed that, in 2002, the Annan Plan was at the heart of the public debate and the main news discourse concerned the form of solution to the Cyprus Problem. In 2007-2008, the bi-zonal, bi-communal federal solution, the July 8 process also known as the Gambari agreement and, once again, the Annan Plan, were the key news topics. In 2008, the newspapers widely covered the matter of single sovereignty and citizenship.

In 2002 the dailies expressed, more profoundly than other time period studied, their stance on the issue of the proposed settlement. All the dailies, apart from Alithia, projected directly or indirectly that it was against the national interest to accept the Annan Plan. Machi and Simerini rejected it ‘more loudly’ than the others. Machi, Simerini and Alithia employed two practices that promoted their political positions: they devoted more space to news stories that backed their own opinions; they emphasised the viewpoints of important people, persons of authority, experts or groups who agreed with their stance on the UN Plan. In the remaining two time periods, Haravgi, Alithia and Phileleftheros seemed to link their stance on the solution to their support of a specific party or the government. Therefore, in the 2007-2008 time period, Haravgi echoed AKEL’s position that the federal solution could bring an end to the Cyprus Problem and supported the Gambari agreement which had been linked to the bi-zonal, bi-communal federal solution; during the four days analyzed in 2008 it continued backing AKEL’s view and backed the single sovereignty and citizenship. In 2007-2008, Alithia aligned itself with DISY’s opinions on the bi-zonal, bi-communal type of settlement, promoting the view that it was a suitable form of solution, while in 2008 it too backed single sovereignty and citizenship. Phileleftheros, which was always careful not to oppose the positions of the government, also supported a solution based on the federal model, a single sovereignty and citizenship as well as the July 8 although in 2007-2008 it did not explicitly state its pro-Gambari agreement stance and in an editorial appeared suspicious of the federal solution. Over the two time periods, Politis did not openly reveal its position on the
above mentioned forms of settlement; it was clear, though, that it did not oppose them. In the 2007-2008 time period, Machi did not expose its stance on the federal solution but it did point out that the Greek Cypriots and the Turkish Cypriots disagreed on many topics related to the settlement. In 2008, however, it too supported the single sovereignty and citizenship following the views of DISY, which was the party it favored the most; thus Machi did not oppose the official position of the government. In 2007-2008 Simerini did not back the bi-zonal, bi-communal federal solution, but in 2008 took up the official stance of the government by supporting single sovereignty and citizenship.

The study of the press landscape during the two first time periods revealed that the newspapers had little hope for a resolution of the Cyprus problem; this was not the case in 2008. Over this last time period analyzed most newspapers showed some optimism about the two sides reaching an agreement. Simerini and Phileleftheros were the only dailies that remained constant throughout the three time periods in their gloomy predictions for the future of the solution.

The dailies were consistent in their positions vis a vis the settlement as well as in their uneven coverage of certain politicians, parties and the government. Over the three time periods, Haravgi consistently served as the mouthpiece of AKEL, Machi and Alithia seemed to support DISY, Phileleftheros was cautious in its depiction of the government and its positions, while Politis during the two final time periods appeared set against Tassos Papadopoulos. It was primarily two practices that revealed these views— the wider coverage and/or the highlighting of the stances of a certain party/the government and the negative or positive representation of a particular party/the government. In this latter case the party/the government was represented as ‘the other’, and pictured almost as the ‘enemy’. Before the presidential elections in the 2007-2008 time period the dailies implemented more elaborate strategies for promoting specific candidates to their readers, for example, they quoted flattering statements that influential people made about their preferred candidate.

Over the three periods analyzed, none of the dailies, apart from Haravgi, maintained consistent views regarding the EU. However, there was one continuous practice among all the dailies with regard to the EU, this being that each newspaper altered its representation according to its stance on matters related to political issues that concerned the Republic of Cyprus. Thus, in the same time period we find newspapers depicting the EU as the foe of the Greek-Cypriots or their savior/ally, depending on the way the Greek Cypriots perceived its specific position or decision. In 2007-2008 there were numerous examples of this phenomenon; within a few months, Phileleftheros, Alithia, Machi and Haravgi depicted the European Union as first being on the Greek-Cypriots’ side and then against them. Phileleftheros even ran two different news stories on the same day, where in one story the EU was presented as Cyprus’s ally and in the other as an enemy of the Republic of Cyprus.

This report also examined the discourses and practices the newspapers used to picture what they considered to be ‘our side’ or the ‘others’. The study of these representations revealed that throughout the three time periods there were many unaltered elements.

In 2002 there was a duality in the concept of ‘our side’. While all the dailies appeared to view the Greek Cypriots and Greece as ‘their side’, in 2002, Simerini and Alithia also seemed to consider members of their ‘own’ team all those like-minded people who objected or accepted the Annan plan according to the paper’s stance. Simerini and Machi were the newspapers that most emphasized an identity connection between the Greek Cypriots and Greece. They seemed to regard the Greek Cypriots as an integral part of Hellenism, and so characterized the Greeks as their ‘brothers’. These notions were expressed more emphatically in 2002 although they were observed throughout the three time periods of this report; in 2008 however, there were no data to reveal Simerini’s representations. Haravgi was the only daily that never referred to the Hellenic identity of the Greek Cypriots, and never used the expression the ‘Greek side’; instead, it repeatedly stressed the bond between the Greek Cypriots and the Turkish Cypriots. Nevertheless, all the newspapers seem to have felt that there was a strong tie between Cyprus and Greece. This was apparent in the choice of certain
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news stories or in the fact that they often included in their reports the statements of Greek politicians. Over the last two time periods most newspapers even had sections or whole pages where they only published stories related to Greece.

The dailies did not regard the Turkish Cypriot community as the ‘other’ or the enemy. Haravgi, Politis and Alithia seem to have a more positive stance than other newspapers, with Haravgi and Politis appearing as stronger supporters of rapprochement than Alithia. Apart from their choice of news stories, Haravgi repeatedly stressed that the Turkish Cypriots and the Greek Cypriots were one people, while Politis collaborated regularly with a Turkish Cypriot journalist. The Turkish Cypriots were not seen as the foe of the Greek Cypriots, whose enemy ‘other’, was always Turkey and those who executed its orders such as its troops or the Turkish Cypriot leadership. None of the newspapers portrayed Rauf Denktaş and, later, Mehmet Ali Talat positively, often describing them with unflattering epithets. For the time periods we analyzed, Phileleftheros and Simerini, for example, referred to them as the ‘occupation leader’. In 2002, all the dailies emphasized that Denktaş had fixed claims, while during the two other time periods they also projected Talat as Turkey’s bondservant and responsible for the deadlock on the island, since his unjust demands obstructed the solution. Haravgi was the only newspaper that, over the four days studied in 2008, did not take a position on Talat although the analysis of the news stories did not indicate that there was any change in the way he was regarded.

The settlers, another group of ‘others’, were consistently depicted in dark colors. Turkey was blamed for bringing them from Anatolia in order to change the demographic composition of Cyprus. Over the four days studied in 2008 there were no news stories about them but during the first two time periods, all the dailies stressed this idea; in 2002, Simerini more than any other newspaper expressed disapproval of this group, describing it as the ‘third Attila’ or referring to it as the ‘gangrene’ of the Republic of Cyprus.

Turkey was the main category of the ‘other’ that was negatively represented. Not only was Turkey held responsible for bringing the settlers into the Republic of Cyprus but, throughout the time periods examined, she was depicted by several dailies as their ultimate enemy, since by her unwillingness to negotiate she had led the country into a deadlock. Simerini used strong language to portray Turkey as a wrong doer and a threat to the safety of Greek Cypriots. Machi, which over the two first time periods was also strongly set against Turkey, concurred in this portrayal.

There were occasions in 2002 when Phileleftheros, Alithia, Machi and Simerini fused together the Turkish Cypriot leadership or the Turkish Cypriots with the Turks, referring to them simply as the ‘Turkish side’, perhaps revealing their stance on identity. Simerini identified Turkish Cypriots with Turkey throughout the three time periods, while it was observed that Machi did so during the first two periods and Phileleftheros over the first and last. The ‘Turkish side’ was always depicted negatively while ‘our side’ was seen positively and although, as mentioned above, the Turkish Cypriots were not regarded as the foe of the Greek Cypriots, in this case, if they were indeed considered as part of the ‘Turkish side’, they were represented unflatteringly.

The ‘we’ and ‘they’ dichotomy with ‘our side’ being the goodies and the ‘other side’ the baddies was most stressed by Phileleftheros and Simerini. Nevertheless, all the dailies portrayed the Greek Cypriots as those in the right and the victims of the conflict. In 2002 the newspapers presented the situation as one where the Greek Cypriots wished and strived for a settlement while ‘the others’ placed obstacles in the path to peace; over the last two time periods Phileleftheros and Simerini continued putting forward this notion. In 2008 all the newspapers reported that important organisations supported the Greek Cypriot positions on various issues, in a way emphasizing that their demands were just ones. One of these positions was related to the land in the north of the island. Throughout the three time periods, all the papers used the same semantical tactics to proclaim that ‘the other side’ did not have legitimate power over the northern part of the island. They repeatedly referred to it as the ‘occupied areas’, attached the word ‘pseudo’ to other words, placed inverted commas around phrases or words that could denote authority to ‘the others’ or replaced them with the expression the ‘so called’. In 2002 Machi clearly stated that ‘the others’ illegally ruled the northern part of the country and that the land belonged
to the Greek Cypriots. The concept of the ‘rightful ownership’ was also stressed by Simerini during the following time period; throughout 2007-2008 and during the four days analyzed in 2008, all newspapers indirectly put forward the same notion as they repeatedly reported the efforts of ‘the other side’ for the indirect recognition of the north. Additionally, in 2002 Machi and Phileleftheros, followed by Haravgi and Simerini in the next time period, seemed to have personified the land as one of their foes since they depicted the northern territory of the island as a source of crime or troubles for the Greek Cypriots. It seems that the latter daily was the one that pictured ‘the other side’, Turkey, the settlers and the Turkish Cypriot leadership, in gloomier colors than the rest.

The way the newspapers viewed ‘the others’ was also revealed by studying which news stories from the Turkish Cypriot press were selected for re-publication and by examining how these were modified. In 2002, all the dailies apart from Alithia, seem to have chosen stories that were suitable for negatively representing ‘the other side’. During the last two time periods of our analysis, Phileleftheros, Haravgi and Politis focused more on subjects drawn from the Turkish or Turkish Cypriot press than they had in 2002, by adding new sections that reported developments in Turkey or the northern part of Cyprus. Throughout these time periods the newspapers also chose news stories where the efforts of ‘the others’ to achieve political recognition were described. One more practice which remained constant over the three time periods was the change in the semantics used in the original Turkish or Turkish Cypriot texts. The dailies intertwined commentary and facts, employing the same semantical tactics described above; thus, the words and expressions of the original texts were tailored to ‘fit’ the newspapers’ own beliefs.

This report was not confined to the analysis of the press, but also included analysis of the TV channels. As with the press, we aimed to reveal the practices, stances, representations and strategies the stations followed to put forward their views.

We could only examine the TV media for the last two time periods due to availability of data. Our analysis shows that, by and large, all the channels employed the same methods/strategies to remain competitive, draw the attention of large audiences and inform the public. Moreover, it appeared that their sources of income as well as their party or ideological affiliations affected the selection of news items and the way these were represented to the viewers.

Throughout the two last time periods the channels vied for audience loyalty with computer-generated effects and music. They also tried to keep their audience informed on the latest developments by offering wide coverage of important events and by the timely reporting of these events; thus, they aired different reports for the same news story and used live broadcasting and correspondents for ‘on the spot’ coverage. The stations strived to get ‘scoops’ and extra information, and most covered several topics as neutrally and accurately as possible by airing opposing opinions or different actions in the same news story and by using numbers. These methods helped them to earn the trust of the viewers. Nevertheless, there were channels such as Mega and RIK whose news reports were influenced by their funding resources.

Examination of the television news coverage revealed the stations’ views on the solution. In 2007-2008 the channels appeared to consider the Gambari agreement as an acceptable form of settlement, and so they did not explicitly oppose the official government stance. This was true for the following time period, too, as they did not object to the government position on single sovereignty and citizenship. The main difference between the two time periods was the level of optimism at the possibility of a settlement; during the four days studied in 2008 hopes were revived for a settlement.

While they did not have noticeable differences on the above issue, the stations took different positions vis-a-vis the politicians and the political parties; this was especially noticeable in the 2007-2008 time period, where data show that ANT1 and RIK offered favorable coverage to Tassos Papadopoulos while Plus TV favoured Demetris Christofias. It seems that Sigma remained neutral while Mega did not flatteringly depict AKEL. Over the four days examined in 2008 only Plus TV and RIK clearly revealed their stances. They both used similar practices to offer favorable coverage to the party or politicians they supported: these were over-representation, positive depiction or highlighting of the views/actions of that party, its supporters, or of the government.
In 2007-2008, issues related to the European Union were widely covered by all the channels except Plus TV; furthermore, for the four days examined in 2008, Plus TV reported the fewest EU-related stories. In 2007-2008 the channels reported on the EU in relation to its stance on political issues concerning the Republic of Cyprus; thus, not only the press but also the TV channels depicted the Union either as an ally or as an enemy of the Greek Cypriots. While this was not observed in 2008, it does not necessarily mean that there was a change in the way the EU was regarded: over the four days studied there were no news stories that would reveal whether this practice was still used.

Similar to the press, the TV stations seem to have had close ties with Greece; they collaborated with Greek TV channels and often re-broadcast stories carried by Greek stations. A connection and the existence of an identity bond between the two countries were highlighted by widely covering topics that concerned Greece. The deadly fires that broke out in Greece revealed the effort of the Greek Cypriot stations to emphasize that Cyprus stood by Greece in troubled times. In 2008, RIK and Sigma, more than any other channel, presented the notion that there was a close relationship between Cyprus and Greece, which was regarded as being part of ‘our side’. The Turkish Cypriots seemed to be somewhere in between ‘our side’ and ‘the other side’ in the news stories reporting this community’s views and current affairs. The Turkish Cypriots were depicted positively by all channels, especially by Plus TV, which followed the stance of AKEL and endorsed rapprochement. In 2008 only Mega’s representations were not revealed, but in general, all stations treated this community favourably, even if they did not explicitly declare that the Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots were one people. During the 2007-2008 time period, however, the channels sometimes identified the Turkish Cypriots with the Turks and the Turkish Cypriot leadership; in this case they regarded them as ‘the others’ or as part of the ‘Turkish side’ and depicted them unflatteringly. Sigma TV, more than any other channel did not clarify to which group it referred when reporting on ‘the others’, giving the impression that it perceived Turkish Cypriots and Turks as being one and the same. Yet all the stations, except Plus TV, did this mix up at least once. In July 2008 this did not occur, perhaps as a result of the hopeful outcome of the Christofias-Talat meeting.

As was the case in the press, the Turkish Cypriot leader was clearly considered as part of ‘the others’. In 2008 he was pictured negatively, characterized by most channels as the ‘occupation leader’ who followed Ankara’s policies and hindered the solution. RIK, ANT1 and Sigma were the stations that projected this the most strongly, while sometimes they also represented him as obediently following Turkey’s orders. In 2008, however, there was a slight change: Plus TV, Mega and RIK did not depict him as a person who obstructed settlement, possibly because of his positive meeting with Christofias. ANT1 and Sigma remained doubtful whether the positions or attitude of the Turkish Cypriot leader had actually changed, while they also portrayed Turkey more negatively than the rest. Over the 2007-2008 time period, all channels represented Turkey and its soldiers as their primary enemies. They held Turkey responsible for bringing settlers from Anatolia in order to change the demography of Cyprus and thus ensuring her dominance in the north. Additionally, RIK, Plus TV, Sigma and Mega put forward the notion that Turkey fought to legalize the regime in the northern part of Cyprus. ANT1 and Sigma reported that Turkish troops posed a grave threat to the Greek Cypriots’ safety, and along with Mega associated Turkey with danger by often connecting her with illegal activities. In 2008 once again, ANT1 and Sigma reported news stories which implied that Turkey was not fit to become a member of the European Union. It seems that the latter station pictured ‘the others’, Turkey, the Turkish Cypriot leadership and the settlers, in gloomier colors than the rest, followed by ANT1 and RIK.

In 2007-2008 the TV channels used the same practices as the press to project that the Greek Cypriots had justified demands while ‘the others’ were wrong concerning important political matters. The stations validated the correctness of the Greek Cypriots’ aims and wishes by emphasizing that significant people, organizations or counties agreed with them. In 2008, ANT1 and Plus TV continued to uphold this claim. Additionally, the use of memories helped in the representation of the Greek Cypriots as the victims of the conflict, reinforcing the image of the ‘the
others’ as the instigators. Although Sigma TV was the channel that most used this representation, nevertheless, all the stations claimed that the Greek Cypriots were in the right and longed for a solution while Turkey, the Turkish Cypriot leadership and generally the ‘other side’ tried to obstruct it. These notions were not spotted over the four days analyzed in 2008. It seems that during the last time period the channels represented the ‘other side’ as being more willing to compromise.

In both the 2007-2008 and 2008 time periods, the stations used the same semantical practices as the press to proclaim that Turkey and the Turkish Cypriot leadership had no legitimate power over the land in the north. In 2007-2008, this was also stressed by reporting the efforts of ‘the others’ to achieve political recognition. In 2008, ANT1 and Sigma continued projecting that Turkey and the Turkish Cypriot leadership had no right to rule the northern part of the country. In 2007-2008, like some newspapers during the same time period, RIK, ANT1 and Sigma depicted the north as a source of troubles for the Republic of Cyprus. The territory in the north, the settlers and the ‘pseudo-state’, over the two last time periods, were often defined by the image of the Turkish and the ‘TRNC’ flags. This symbol, which can carry underlying messages, had the power to evoke strong emotions in the viewers. Music could have the same effect, depending on the selection, and this tactic was most often used in 2007-2008 by RIK and ANT1.

Our analysis of the media landscape reveals that there were no noticeable differences between the press and the TV channels with regard to the discourses and practices. The only deviation was perhaps in the way they represented ‘the others’. It appears that in 2008, the Turkish Cypriot leadership and sometimes even Turkey were described in a milder way than before, as the Christofias-Talat meeting shed a ray of hope over the possibility for a solution. The optimism for a brighter future appears to have led a few stations and newspapers to avoid representing ‘the others’ as those who did not want reunification or peace.

Synthia Pavlou
Our analysis of the Turkish Cypriot dailies and television has revealed the existing journalistic culture that determines the news output. Repetitive occurrence of certain journalistic practices and discourses over the selected periods in this research indicates that they are features of the Turkish Cypriot media rather than coincidental.

The Turkish Cypriot media relied heavily—almost exclusively, even—on articles originating from news agency dispatches and press releases. Thus, an almost identical news output prevented presentation of diverse views and frameworks on the topic reported. The practice also raised questions on the role of journalists in news production. If news reports sourced from news agencies and the information provided in press releases are used word-for-word without being edited, then what are journalists for? The contradiction in the number of media organisations and lack of diversity in news reports strengthened the idea that the main purpose of the media was to propagate political opinion rather than inform the public. Yet for the media to function as it should, it is important that media organizations benefit from their reporters and encourage them to produce news items instead of using readily provided texts. Or even if they do use such sources, that they approach them critically rather than taking them for granted. This would provide the public with a diversity of information and enable them to make more informed decisions. It would also limit the power of the sources in manipulating the content of the news.

Another widespread practice in the Turkish Cypriot media was to give advantageous treatment to political figures and groups that a media organization sympathized with. Representation of events was mostly shaped in line with opinion and policies of these political parties, sometimes resulting in distortion. For the media (TV stations and/or newspapers) affiliated with political parties this was not surprising, but this phenomenon also applied to those that had no such affiliation. In either case, professional norms of journalism, being fair, accurate and balanced, tended to be sacrificed for political gains, turning the media into an instrument of propaganda rather than a platform for debate and dissemination of information.

Nationalist discourses were another common feature of the Turkish Cypriot media, especially on issues related to the Cyprus Problem. Based on an ‘us’ and ‘them’ dichotomy, which was not fixed but changed depending on topic and the media, these discourses were integrated into the news. For example, while some media outlets represented the Annan Plan as being against the national interest, others represented it as the opposite; however, they all presented their arguments in terms of ‘our’ national interest. A comparison of news coverage of the Annan Plan and the two community leaders’ meetings revealed how the ‘us’ and ‘them’ groups were differentiated and how these groups included and excluded different actors in their reflection of events concerning the Cyprus Problem. Reports on the Annan Plan were influenced by intra-national differences and political orientations and, therefore, categorisation of the ‘others’ varied depending on whether the media institution supported the plan or not. In the leaders’ meetings, the ‘us’ and ‘them’ differentiation was clearer as the news reports were constructed as the Turkish Cypriot vs the Greek Cypriot side. The stories, employing the image of a homogenous nation, also depicted the Turkish Cypriot side as united against the Greek Cypriots. These stories were also dominated by official discourses. Integrating the official announcements into the news reports not only presented them as reality but, in the absence of any challenge, set themselves as the norm and the framework in which to understand the events.

In the periods analysed, there was rarely a report that gave voice to members of the Greek Cypriot community. Even though events in the south were reported by the media in the north,
these reports were generally colored by northern viewpoints—journalists in the north very rarely included any Greek Cypriots’ views in their reports. In general, Greek Cypriots were portrayed as the ‘other’, and the actions and statements of their state representatives and politicians concerning Turkish Cypriots were generalised to the whole community.

The image of the EU did not change much throughout the periods studied. It became a news topic only when it concerned Cyprus or Turkish Cypriots. That is to say, as a source of funding to improve social and economic standards its interest in the country was welcomed but its involvement in the Cyprus Problem was not. The EU’s image was utilised in the news reports frequently during the time when the Annan Plan was debated. While its depiction was positive in the pro-Plan media, it was the opposite in the others. However, stories concerning the EU nearly disappeared in the other periods studied as if not being a member had also diminished the interest in it. As a result, the EU became nearly invisible for the Turkish Cypriot audience.

The research focused on representation of Turkey as a country, excluding other stories on Turkish origin citizens, immigrants, students, etc. Turkey’s image in the media did not show variation. In some cases it was referred to it as a separate state with good relations with the TRNC and in others it was portrayed as part of ‘us’. For example, if the story concerned Greek Cypriots as well then Turkey and the TRNC were depicted as united. However, if the story was on official relations between these two countries then they were regarded as separate. There were few news articles critical of Turkey and its affairs with Cyprus. Its representation did not show much divergence from the official version and was similar throughout the media.

The media’s coverage of politics did not alter much over the years either. The only change was in the media organizations that supported the political power, but the strategy they used in reporting the political power stayed the same. That is to say, when a party the media institution sympathized with was in power it was cast in a positive light, but when that party became the opposition, then a high level of criticism was directed towards the new power holders. Therefore, the media can be criticized of not fulfilling their duties to the public because of their partisanship.

Sanem Şahin
DISCUSSION AND FINAL CONCLUSIONS

Christophoros Christophorou

The study of Greek and Turkish Cypriot media content from three different periods has revealed a number of standard features and values sustained over time independent of their respective general context. It is not an exaggeration to say that when they are examined in parallel, each community’s media resemble the other’s in many ways, as they largely follow similar practices and apply the same rules in their approaches and construction of their respective mediated reality; the perspectives and positions may differ or oppose each other, but each side’s media obey the same principles. The media in Cyprus have more similarities than differences as revealed by the analysis offered in this study, which was an opportunity to better assess and understand the way they work, their role and functions and the possible impact of their activity. However, one should be very cautious not to generalise because broader and more in-depth research is required to reach more accurate conclusions. In addition, interpretation of, and inferences based on, media content may vary according to one’s point of view.

The critical concepts that determine the role and the functions of the media, as well as their impact, are those related to ‘agenda-setting’ and ‘framing’ theories. As McCombs suggests,1 the power to set a nation’s agenda and focus the public’s attention on a few issues ‘is an immense and well documented influence’ of the news media. In our case, the Cyprus problem was the key issue on the agenda set by the media; this was so when it was central in developments or when it became the focal point of news through media choice. The main event might have had no significant relationship to the Cyprus Problem, but any reference to it sufficed to shift attention from the event itself and turn the focus to the Problem alone. Thus the agenda was influenced in two ways: Significant issues were completely ignored or relegated to secondary positions; conversely, events with the slightest reference or relation to the Cyprus Issue were upgraded and turned into important news. Ultimately, the agenda in the island’s daily life had one major object, its Problem.

The mediated reality brought to the attention of the public consisted of both real and ‘staged’ events,2 with authorities, political and other actors playing primary, almost exclusive, roles. Given that objects with a connection to the Cyprus Issue were highly rated in news selection, the dominant discourse of all actors forcibly responded to this ‘requirement’. This was done repeatedly and with focus on specific aspects of the Problem.

In the present study, the main axes of discourse were the Annan Plan in the first period; the September 2007 leaders’ meeting, the Presidential elections in the Republic of Cyprus and political friction and disputes between Turkish Cypriot political parties in the second period; and for the third period, the new leaders’ meeting in July 2008. Other events mediated in the news, also referring and connected to the authorities, political and other actors or institutions were also examined.

A crucial question is, who set the media agenda and how? It has been shown very clearly that the shortage of resources, but also convenience and the search for easy solutions, led the media to simply reproducing news items provided by external sources. Our research showed that the Turkish Cypriot media set an agenda which was largely a subset of the agenda set by the official news agency, TAK, while they also reproduced the structure and perspective already embedded

---

1 McCombs, 2001:1.
2 Staged events are comments, statements, news conferences and other organised activities aimed at attracting media attention.
in these external news items. In the Greek Cypriot case, the search for exclusivity by some media
having at their disposal more resources created a more diversified agenda and differentiated
news structure and perspectives. More important, however, was the fact that in both cases the
selection of the news and the focus on specific aspects conformed to the official and elite
perspectives. It was through ‘information subsidies’\(^3\) from the authorities that the media set the
agenda and reproduced their news items. Some media adopted or promoted the official selection
and interpretation of events; others chose those of different groups on the basis of affinities with
their own vision and beliefs. News agencies mediated the information provided by authorities as
well as by various sources (political and other actors); the latter might have also sent or delivered
their information subsidies directly to the media offices or to journalists. However, as already
processed information, news agency dispatches needed no additional work, as might have been
the case for press releases or statements, which prompted their publication unchanged.

The impact of the above processes meant that the ‘pictures’ of mediated reality that reached
the minds of the public were largely constructed on the basis of the authorities’ or elites’ agendas. Thus, to some audiences, this mediated reality could be perceived as the truth and the only
existing reality.

Similarly, the media tended to promote those aspects or those topics that were raised by
authorities and other actors. This led to the projection of only partial views, covering limited and
specific aspects of a subject, and not necessarily discussing its substance. This research
distinguished two levels in the work of the media: On the first level there is the effect of favouring
specific people, institutions and views in the selection of sources and items-to-become-news; this
was enhanced by second-level actions through the use of tools and practices, such as the choice
of headlines, the use of language-specific verbs in reporting, embedding one media’s views or
comments, overrepresentation, discrediting opponents, providing the media’s own interpretations
and focus. Thus, in the first period, the mediated reality on the United Nations proposed Plan and
by extension the Cyprus Problem was a partial one, which reduced reactions to the Plan to one
or more specific angles. These aspects referred to the national interest, the eventual desire of the
two sides for a solution, the dangers perceived to come from the ‘other’, the assumed
repercussions that a solution could have, the survival / extinction of the community or perceived
negative points of the Plan. It was difficult to find an overall picture or a passionless analysis of
the proposal and the challenges posed by either its acceptance or rejection. The main aspects
projected in the second period constrained the issue to the will or readiness of the sides to talk
and solve the Problem and to their approach and positions on the 8 July agreement. Thus, the
substance, e.g., the role and the reach of the agreement, the reasons for which the Problem
should be solved, as well as the aspects that needed to be addressed by the leaders, were not in
the picture. As a result, the need to resort to blame became a central point.

The change in the general climate following the election of Demetris Christofias and the
positive steps made by the two community leaders had some limited effect on media coverage
and stances. The focus of attention on the eve of the leaders’ meeting on 1 July was mostly on
their differences; after the meeting it shifted to the ‘positive outcome’ and glimpses of optimism for
some Greek Cypriot media and disappointment for the Turkish Cypriot media; suspicions
regarding the intentions of the other side, but also questioning of the outcome were also noted.
Most approaches lacked the perspective needed for an overall view of the Problem, as there was
no discussion of the steps required from each side in order to arrive at a solution. Moreover, the
treatment of the other side by some media showed some positive or not so negative signs;
however, this might be due to circumstances rather than a change of behaviour.

---

3 “An information subsidy is an attempt to produce influence over the actions of others by controlling their access to and use of information
relevant to those actions”, Gandy, 1982:81.
‘Us’ and the ‘Other(s)’

A very important aspect of the topics selected as news items by the media was that of defining the ‘actors’, those involved in any way in the news reports, and their attributes. With the media engaged in acts of identification with, and differentiation from, certain people and groups, a number of dichotomies and binary oppositions were formed; this led to various pairs of ‘us’ and the ‘other’, with each party portrayed in relation to specific aspects and attributes. In this process of inclusion / exclusion, ‘self-proclamation’ was a frequent phenomenon. By ‘self-proclamation’ we mean the claim by journalists and media of the role or status of the mouthpiece or representative of the nation, the people, a group, an organisation or an official. The media spoke on behalf of, or as if they represented, these large groups. This was done in opposition or separation from the ‘other(s)’, and with each party bearing specific characteristics; the attribution of exclusively positive features to one’s own group and negative features to the ‘other’ had a decisive effect: The mediated reality promoted the idea that the real problem was the ‘other’, since this ‘other’ had specific negative attributes. Thus, portraying the ‘other’ as the enemy, a threat, a wrong-doer with inherently bad or evil intentions meant that no change in behaviour or positions could take place and the problems would remain unsolved forever.

In some cases what was portrayed as the ‘other’ was not the other community, but a specific group within the own and/or the other community, or a country or a leadership. Thus, some media identified those who promoted rejection of the Annan Plan not in connection to their community, but as belonging to one group, the one negating the solution of the Problem. This group was composed of members from both communities. Conversely, one group could be identified with the whole ‘other’ community independently of the group’s size, where its (positive or negative) characteristics were also extended to the community. A most interesting position with regard to perceptions about the ‘other’ was that of Greek Cypriot media not considering the other community as an adversary. Indeed, they argued further that the Turkish Cypriots were also victims of the situation. Instead, it was their leader or leaders, Turkey, the settlers and extremists who posed a threat to Greek Cypriots. This might have two effects; it could broaden the group of ‘us’ – they suffered like ‘we’ suffered, so we all belong to one and the same group; it could also remove any suspicion of Greek Cypriot wrong-doing to them or any bad intentions, thus confirming the widespread view that the Problem was caused by foreign powers.

In many cases the media made no attempt to try to understand a person’s position or behaviour; nor did it engage in any kind of dialogue on a given subject. A common media tactic was to label one side or group as good or evil, according to how it appeared in the opposition of ‘us’ to the ‘others’. Reactions related to the EU clearly illustrate this view; when funds were approved or the decisions were favourable to one’s side, the Union was labelled as a nice institution; should the opposite occur it was portrayed as unjust. The object of the argument was displaced from the specific event, position or decision to the personality or nature of the institution itself. The judgement, based on one, single fact, became a criterion of a general and absolute value, determining the (good or evil) character or nature of the institution. Similarly, statements or moves by the Turkish Cypriot leaders or Turkey were interpreted by the Greek Cypriot media in connection with a perception depicting them as bad or untrustworthy by nature.

Framing the Problem

The media presented the basic issues and their specific aspects to the public in ways that put them in a specific perspective that also determined the basis of the debate. The framing of issues and their aspects not only determined how and from what angle they were viewed or should have been viewed, it had also further repercussions. It defined the terms in which the public would discuss the news subjects, be it the issues presented, the problems, the solutions sought, the protagonists or all the actors involved. In this way, framing had an impact both on the overall picture and on each of its component elements. Examples of framing that eventually had an impact on the public at different levels related to the presentation of news stories, perceptions about the Cyprus Issue and the way the media envisaged the solution.
A peculiarity of the framing in the case of out-sourced news items was that of the coexistence of two different frames, one in the main body of the news item that was externally produced, and one in the headlines that was internally produced. This contradiction offered a solution to the media, which produced headlines that accommodated their framing needs when necessity forced them to use external texts. Since shortages in resources limited their capacity to produce news texts of their own, they eagerly used the officially produced news and embedded framing and changed the headings of news so as to offer their own framing.

With reference to key issues, the Greek Cypriot media perception of the Cyprus Problem was consistently framed in terms of a bad neighbour – Turkey, which had invaded and occupied part of the island, colonised this part and followed a policy that formed an obstacle to any solution. The framing in the Turkish Cypriot media, in particular in the nationalist newspapers and television stations, focused on the Greek Cypriots’ past wrong-doings and their persistent ill-will towards Turkish Cypriots.

These diverging perceptions influenced efforts to find a commonly accepted definition of the core of the Problem, since the Greek Cypriots saw no problem between them and the Turkish Cypriots and they viewed Turkey as the real problem; yet Turkish Cypriots saw Turkey as their protector from the Greek Cypriots, whose intentions constituted the core of the problem.

Passing to a different level, each side’s media envisaged a solution on different terms. Echoing the views of a majority of Turkish Cypriots, some Turkish Cypriot media saw it as a means for opening to the world, becoming masters of their own fate and for gaining other benefits, including joining the European Union; in contrast, for conservatives this was an eventuality to avoid as it would lead to the disbanding of their state, their subjugation to Greek Cypriot oppression and their eventual extinction. Greek Cypriots spelled solution either as a necessity, albeit for some with many negative points, or a dangerous development that would lead to their extinction. Interestingly some subjects were seen in exactly the same perspective but from opposing directions; those opposing the Plan in either community saw it as the product of a conspiracy and a threat to the survival of their own community or political entity, serving only the interests of the enemy.

The above perceptions shaped the answer to the question: What kind of a solution and on what terms? The fact that the media viewed or interpreted issues related, for example, directly or indirectly to sovereignty and citizenship from opposing directions is another indication of the lack of common ground, or, in other words, of each side’s different frame. The way the outcome of the 1 July meeting was received on each side illustrated these different perspectives. The Greek Cypriots viewed it as a positive step, while Turkish Cypriots expressed their disappointment.

The portrayal of the two sides in terms of several dualities, namely ‘victim vs perpetrator’, ‘intransigent vs flexible’, ‘wrong vs right’, etc., meant that the real problem was the other and it was the ‘other’s’ obligation to conform to principles, international or other law, and make a move to re-establish justice. This was deducted not only from the framing of news objects; it was also explicitly projected by the media.

More importantly, this also framed the key problem as an issue of determining which party bore responsibility, and so led to the need to resort to blame. Thus, blame has consistently been a major feature of discourse in and by the media.

The phenomena just described in relation to the Cyprus Problem and the two communities were also observed in connection to other issues, in the relations with authorities, between political parties, different groups and political forces. The outcome of such approaches was the denial of others, of their right to exist, not only of their views and beliefs. Their opponents were symbolically eliminated from the mediated reality or they were annihilated through the kind of (negative) portrayal reserved to them by the media.

---

4 See, Christophorou, 2005.
The role of the media in the road to peace

A crucial question in relation to the media agenda and their framing of the news was whether this turned them into propaganda tools of the authorities and elite groups; therefore questions about their role in general, as well as questions about how journalists did their job and influenced perceptions and opinions also emerged. Because our interest centered on issues related to the Cyprus Problem we will examine the questions above as they relate to the Cyprus Problem.

The fact that the dominant picture of reality mediated to the public largely originated in constructions by the authorities and elite groups made this picture a reflection to some extent of dominant political views and positions. Along with mediated pictures on specific aspects of the Problem that appeared identical to the official ones or to those of parties or ideological trends, there were also significant differentiations. The main ideas and features are summarized below in a way that can help us assess the role and impact of these pictures.

Parts of the mediated reality might have created a negative influence and strengthened the idea that no solution could be found and that conflict was not only inevitable, but also natural. This related to the representation of the leaders’ contacts and talks as a game, or to the prediction that no possibility existed for a breakthrough; some went as far as to say or confirm that the exercise was just a futile one and it was only a matter of time before it was necessary to accept this ‘reality’. These approaches, along with the portrayal of leaders as not believing in the efficiency of their efforts or the procedure, could have an impact on the general atmosphere. It could result in the public’s disengagement, which could be of crucial importance for the success of the whole enterprise for reaching a solution.

Similarly, the tendency to add drama, to focus on or even exaggerate differences left out or underrated common points of convergence on some issues. In any case, this meant that the audience was not given a complete picture of the situation, and so it was impossible to assess it accurately.

Focusing on one’s own side’s (noble) intentions and good will, and on the other side’s (bad) actions and the harm they caused, a characteristic noted in literature on the subject in similar situations,5 has a number of side effects. The focus on one’s own side’s intentions meant that there was silence regarding its bad acts or that their positive aspect was shown or promoted. When reference to one’s own side’s wrong doings was unavoidable, these were underrated or attributed to marginal extremists. Conversely, when referring to the other’s acts and their effects, their intentions were depicted or implied in a negative way. Thus, stereotypically positive and negative pictures, generalised to include all members of the group, were disseminated, perpetuating the gap, real and virtual, between people.

We have also seen cases where the media did not follow the dominant line and views of their respective community or as promoted through official channels. They defied negative portrayals and avoided the blaming game, or, even better, they promoted common features or vision. However, even in the case where the media promoted or supported views that one might consider negative, this also had a positive effect since it prompted debate and could eventually help elucidate questions.

There were issues on which all media were unanimous through their support of the official stance, even in cases where the expressed positions of a media were different. Thus, the subject of status was considered of ultimate importance for each community and consequently the institutions and officials of the other side were consistently placed below the status of own ones; while for one’s own side the terms ‘government’ or ‘President’ were used, for the other side, ‘administration’, ‘leader’ or whatever was inferior was chosen. On the basis of legitimating foundations, the use by Greek Cypriot media of denominations such as ‘pseudo-’, ‘so-called’ and others, focused on the other side’s lack of international recognition. This pushed its conceptualisation to a complete denial or refusal of existence in any way. Conversely, all Turkish Cypriot media

5 Cited in Ross, 2006.
referred to the ‘Greek Cypriot Administration’ and ‘the Greek Cypriot leader’, to show that they do not recognise the authority of the Republic of Cyprus and its officials.

Views and positions on other decisive issues caused intra-community divisions, in some cases, into more than two groups: One example was the issue of national identity on either side of the dividing line, and relations with the perceived mother countries; to some the ‘motherland countries’ had precedence over Cyprus, to others local identity was prioritized, while a third group made local identity an exclusive one, integrating both communities.

The fact that specific media projected a reality that reflected to a large degree the official or a party’s or a group’s views raises the question of the influence of authorities or other institutions. We saw that changes in power also led to changes in the relations between the media and office holders or specific institutions. On most issues, however, orientations did not change and stability and continuity seemed in force. National identity appeared to be the decisive factor determining ideologies and orientations, as well as the dividing lines between groups. On specific issues, identification with a group or institution might mean the dominance of the latter over the media, such as the case of numerous newspapers which are party mouthpieces in the Turkish Cypriot community. It appeared also that other media chose their line in response to the perceived needs and expectations of specific groups.

All the above considerations raise the question, ‘could the media escape from this logic and transform reality beyond dominant perceptions and frameworks’? In other, simpler words—since the reality of news was constructed on the basis of what was provided by agents in a specific context, in which authorities and elite groups set the parameters, what was the margin for media to go beyond this context? For example, since the official discourse was one that sustained antagonism and conflict, could the media articulate a discourse that promoted peace as a superior good?

As is the case for other countries, Cyprus media are also subject to the constraints and limitations set by political, financial, industry and other factors. Their size, selling figures and resources that determine the extent to which they can sustain themselves and keep their independence—all of which are directly connected to the size of the market—could make them more dependent on official sources than their counterparts in bigger countries. The above, however, did not prohibit them from having dissident or their own ideological and editorial line on some issues, at least. The crucial question is whether this freedom of choice could extend to matters fundamental for the community, in particular, the core of the Cyprus Problem. Researchers have noted the role of a phenomenon described as ‘urge toward conformity’ when there are issues that are crucial for one group, which exerts pressure on persons and institutions, allowing little margin for deviating positions. This might be stronger in small societies like Cyprus, where social pressure can be felt more intensely than in larger societies.

Additional features, such as those related to history, language and the subsequent role of the media in each community might have further implications. Since Greek and Turkish language newspapers developed on the island in tandem with respective national consciences, their role as implements of cohesion and consolidation for each community across ethnic lines cannot be seriously contested. The language factor also has implications at various levels, as a criterion of distinction and identity on the basis of ethnicity. This was a major point creating the dichotomy across origin. Furthermore, language determined the public of the media, and conditioned their content. The media became the forum of expression of the respective group speaking that language; they aggregated and promoted the readers’ and viewers’ interests. The most significant effect of the above was that members of one community could learn about the other only through their respective media, since contacts were limited and most people cannot read the other’s language.

Under the above conditions, the almost exclusive role of the media to inform about the ‘other’ became decisive; the mediated reality had the potential to determine the picture of the other since little or no possibility of alternative or supplementary information sources existed. Thus the tendencies and phenomena reviewed in the previous paragraphs, where political and other

See Blanchard, 1992, cited in Ross, 2006:10
187 Discussion and Final Conclusions

Differences between the communities were reported by the media on the basis of mainly official, external sources, contributed to the maintenance of the gap. The positions of the two sides were reproduced and the official line transcended each community. Along with this, perceptions about the role of language seemed to limit its use to the expression of dominant views; a Greek or Turkish language media could only express and support the respective community’s views and concerns. An illustrative example of linking language and the views ‘allowed’ to be expressed was that of the treatment of media and politicians after 2004, when Greek Cypriot politicians were condemned for spelling out Ankara’s positions in the Greek language; such a reaction means that the accusers believed that the Greek language is incompatible with the expression of certain views, especially those deviating from official ones. On another occasion, a newspaper was labeled ‘a Greek language Turkish newspaper’, meaning that although the paper’s language was Greek, it behaved like a Turkish newspaper, promoting the arguments and interests of the enemy. Deviation from the official line was considered in connection to language and not the logic of the arguments.

In some cases the media even seemed as if they were part of the solution process, that they were at the negotiation table, and negotiating on behalf of the community. As a result of such an approach, they had to abide by the rules of the community; no views or opinions should weaken the community positions.

How can things change? Can one expect journalists to assume the role of advocates for peace, as some suggest, or is there another way to improve understanding and pave the road to peace? The question could be formulated in a different way, which brings the issue back to the fundamentals of the role of the media and of journalists; how can the media best respond to their role of providing complete and unbiased information while allowing their audiences to shape their own views on the basis of this information? A first and crucial step would be to separate facts from comments. Then, we should proceed to more specific actions related to the selection of news and the construction of a mediated reality that aims to be fair with people, facts, opinions and situations.

Such steps include reporting not only about the good intentions of one’s own community, but also on the less good, or the violent acts and the harm that these acts caused to the ‘other’. This can gradually lead to the realisation that the stereotypical good-intentioned ‘us’ and the wrong acts of the ‘other’ are not supported by reality. It could show that good and evil are not standard attributes of any group of people defined by national, religious or other attributes. The human aspect that transcends the above could make all of us aware of simple truths that we need to accept. Journalists and people in general should treat all other people first and above all as humans and not according to national, religious or other identity. This applies to journalists themselves as well: The treatment they deserve and their rights, in particular freedom of expression, must be safeguarded on the basis of universality, which extends these rights to all human beings, independently of any other identity. Media and journalists have an obligation, by defending human rights for all, to build bridges between people and link them together for a common future in peace and prosperity.

Christopheros Christophorou

7 Politis, 20.8.2007.
APPENDIX I
BRIEF NOTES ON GREEK CYPRIOT MEDIA
Christophoros Christophorou

Newspapers

- **Alithia, Αλήθεια [Truth]**, belongs to Alithia Publishing Company, which also owns Alpha TV (pay TV) and Sports Super FM radio channel. Founded in 1952 as a weekly newspaper, Alithia became a daily in 1982, two years after it was acquired by its present owners. It is ideologically linked to right wing party DISY. Web portal: http://eu.alitheiaportal.com.

- **Machi, Μάχη [Battle]**, was first published in 1960 by Nicos Sampson and ceased publication in 1980. In 1994 its publication was revived, with Tharros, Θάρρος [Courage] as a weekly edition. Sampson's son and owner is a DISY MP.

- **Politis, Πολίτης [The Citizen]**, is the youngest Greek Cypriot daily, first published in 1999. Politis is a commercial newspaper with no party or ideological links. Website: www.politis.com.cy.

- **Simerini, Σημερινή [Today]** was founded in 1976 by a group of journalists and later it was taken over by the DIAS Publishing Company, also owners of SIGMA TV, Radio Proto and other radio stations. The company owns or it is affiliated with free of charge publications and several magazines. In 2009 the DIAS Group started up a Web portal, www.sigmalive.com. Simerini is a conservative right wing newspaper.

- **Phileleftheros, Φιλελεύθερος [The Liberal]** was founded in December 1955. Phileleftheros Public Company also owns the Cyprus Weekly and four magazines, SFERA FM and other radio channels. The Company is also affiliated with several specialised magazines. Web portal: www.philenews.com. Phileleftherosis a commercial daily with by far the largest circulation figures.

- **Haravgi, Χαραυγή [Dawn]** started circulation in 1956. It is the mouthpiece of left wing party AKEL. Website: www.haravgi.com.cy.

Television Channels

- **The Cyprus Broadcasting Corporation (Ραδιοφωνικό Ίδρυμα Κύπρου, - RIK)** is the public service broadcaster, created by the British in 1953 when the first radio channel went on air, with a television channel starting in 1957. Its monopoly lasted until 1990 and 1992 when the first commercial radio and television stations started operation. The Corporation has two television channels, RIK1, RIK2 and three radio channels.

- **MEGA**, first started as Λόγος, Logos [The Word]. It is owned and operated by the Church of Cyprus. It was the first commercial television channel to go on the air, on 25 April 1992. Financial difficulties led its owners to lease it to Mega TV – Greece, in September 1999. Following a court decision, control returned later to the owners, with Mega TV participating in the channel's capital. Since 1999 it has broadcast as MEGA.

- **Sigma started operation in 1995.** It also has two cable channels, Sigma Sports 1 and 2. It belongs to the DIAS Publishing House Ltd..

- **ANT1** started operation in June 1993. Antenna LTD also owns ANT1 FM radio (1998). Since it first started operations the channel has cooperated with ANT1 in Greece.

- **Plus TV** went on the air in July 2006 as CNC (Cyprus New Channel) Plus TV. It is linked to left wing party AKEL.
APPENDIX II
BRIEF NOTES ON TURKISH CYPRiot MEDIA
Sanem Şahin

Newspapers

- **Kıbrıs** started publication in 1989. It is part of the Kıbrıs Media Group owned by Asil Nadir. Its policies have changed over the years with the government.
- Website: [http://www.kibrisgazetesi.com](http://www.kibrisgazetesi.com).
- **Yenidüzen** was established in 1975 as the publication of CTP. In December 2008 it formed United Media Group with Sim FM (radio), Kanal Sim (TV).
  Website: [http://www.yeniduzen.com](http://www.yeniduzen.com).
- **Halkın Sesi** is the longest surviving Turkish Cypriot newspaper, having begun publication in 1942. It has a nationalist stance and supports conservative policies.
  Website: [http://www.yeniduzen.com](http://www.yeniduzen.com).
- **Vatan** started its publication in 1991. Owned by Erten Kasımoğlu, the paper is managed and directed by his sons, Ahmet and Mehmet Kasımoğlu. It backs nationalist views.
  Website: [http://www.vatangazetesi.com](http://www.vatangazetesi.com/).
- **Kıbrıslı** has been published by Doğan Harman since 1999. It has changed its policy from a very nationalistic stance to supporting the Annan Plan.
  Website: [http://www.kibrisligazetesi.net](http://www.kibrisligazetesi.net).
- **Ortam**, established in 1980, was the publication of TKP and later of TDP, when the party joined with BDH to form TDP. It mainly propagates the party’s views and actions.
  Website: [http://www.ortamgazetesi.com](http://www.ortamgazetesi.com).
- **Volkan**, established in 2001, later changed to Yeni Volkan, following a legal action. It is an ultra nationalist newspaper, supportive of former president Denktas’s views.
  Website: [http://www.volkangazetesi.net](http://www.volkangazetesi.net).
- **Birlik**, founded in 1980, was the publication of UBP. It propagated the policies of UBP and had a nationalist stance. It closed down in 2004.
- **Afrika** started as **Avrupa** but changed its name to **Afrika** in 2001, following a court case. It is a radical left-wing paper supportive of the reunification of Cyprus.
  Website: [http://www.afrikagazetesi.net](http://www.afrikagazetesi.net).
- **Güneş** started publication after **Birlik** closed down in 2004. It’s the organ of UBP and publishes in line with UBP’s policies.
  Website: [http://www.gunesgazete.com](http://www.gunesgazete.com).
- **Demokrat Bakış** has been the newspaper of the DP since 2007. It promotes DP’s policies and actions.
  Website: [http://www.demokratbakis.net](http://www.demokratbakis.net).
- **Sözcü** is ÖRP’s publication, launched in 2007. Like other party newspapers, it publishes in line with the party’s policies and actions.
- **Kıbrıs Star** started publication in 2007 and is part of Star Media Group owned by Ali Özmen Safa. It is a commercial tabloid newspaper. Website: [http://www.starkibris.net](http://www.starkibris.net).

Television Channels

- **Bayrak Radio Television Corporation** (BRTK)’s foundation dates back to 1963. It is the official broadcasting corporation of the TRNC and follows government policies.
- **Kanal T**, owned by Ersin Tatar (the Finance Minister in the UBP government in 2009), has been on the air since 1997. It has a nationalist position in relation to the Cyprus Issue.
- **Genç TV** is part of Birinci Media Group and has been operating since 1997. It can be described as left of centre.
- **Avrasya TV** (ART), owned by Mustafa Özbek, has been broadcasting since 2003. Some of its programmes are produced in Turkey. It is supportive of nationalist policies.
- **Kıbrıs TV** is part of Asil Nadir’s Kıbrıs Media Group, which also owns **Kıbrıs** newspaper.
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Media Narratives, Politics and the Cyprus Problem

Media, politics and the Cyprus Problem are the main themes of the present study. Through analysis of Greek and Turkish Cypriot television news bulletins and newspaper editorials and leading articles, the study seeks to establish media approaches and positions on important issues so as to better understand their work, role and functions. The study analyses practices and positions related to the Cyprus Problem, the solution, matters of identity, the ‘others’ and the European Union, the authorities and the political forces. This attempt to ascertain the underlying values that guide news selection and content will provide a clearer picture of how the media interacts with or influences society.

The study of sample data from late 2002, 2007 and July 2008 has revealed that, along with some differences, the two communities’ media have common features and practices; these are sustained over time irrespective of the general context. While the media perspectives and positions of the two sides may differ, in many instances they all obey the same or similar principles.

On most issues the media promote the official selection and interpretation of events or those of different elite groups, based on affinities with their own views and positions. High dependency on official news sources, in particular of the Turkish Cypriot media, leads to disseminating the content and structure of the official discourses.

When reporting on core aspects of the Cyprus Problem and the status of the two sides there is little or no differentiation on either side; one-sided legitimacy or status superiority, stereotypical positions of the own side’s good intentions and the other’s wrong doings dominate.

The mediated world is composed of various pairs of ‘us’ and the ‘other’, community or group in the other or the own community; there is an emphasis on dualities, with the ‘other’ being the problem because of its negative attributes. Most often, one side’s or a third party’s acts and decisions will be seen as simply connected to their good or evil nature, thus portraying it as an ally or as foe.

The framing of news and representations shows divergent perceptions of the core of the Cyprus Problem and consequently of how a solution can be reached.

Changes in power or the general atmosphere have limited effect on media coverage and stances. On most issues media practices and positions feature stability and continuity.

The question remains open; can the media articulate a discourse that deviates from the official or dominant discourses sustaining antagonism and conflict, in order to promote peace as a superior good?
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