









rather than foster war and violence. For this reason, in the 1970's he introduced the concept of "peace journalism". Because, according to Galtung (2013, p.97), there is no debate on whether negative events should be communicated. However, the first victim in a war is not the reality, but peace. With the concept of peace journalism, Galtung points out that the media is at a level where it can play an active role in world peace.

### **Pro-peace Journalism as an Alternative to Pro-war Journalism**

Galtung does not define the concept of "peace" simply as "non-violence". He also adds the "creativity" in the concept of peace (2006, p.1). That is because the radical solution to violence and problems, requires a set of creative dialogue and empathy. Peace journalism creates an opportunity to give non-violent developmental reactions by encouraging society to think in general (Lynch, 2007, p.2). Instead of escalating, exaggerating or neglecting conflicts, it suggests ways to alternative conflict reportings that could contribute to peace building and reconciliation processes (Blasi, 2004, p.2). According to Goldrick and Lynch (2000), peace journalism (p.5) expresses the renewal of the concepts of rightness, objectivity and equilibrium in a way correspondent with the modern age by using conflict and its transformation in the writing of news.

In describing the concept of peace journalism, Galtung focuses on the concepts of "conflict" and "violence". According to Galtung (2013, p.96), there are two different viewpoints on conflict. These two roads are called "high road" and "low road". The high road emphasizes conflict and its peaceful transformation. The low road, however, following the main conflict which war and violence have created, attaches importance to the meta-conflict in which, the question of who is winning prevails.

When we are back to the dynamics of journalism these two roads offer, the low road which dominates the media sees the conflict as a war, a sporting arena, a gladiatorial arena. The sides which are reduced to two, are warriors who are struggling to impose their own goals. This model moves with military logic. In other words, it is important to emphasize who is in progress, who has surrendered, the number of dead and wounded, and the material damage. In this model, the dominant approach is one where one of the two sides in the news is the winner while the other one is the loser (zero-sum perspective). Peace journalism, on the other hand, has an analytical approach and is a third party to reduce tensions between the parties (Peleg, 2006, p.2; 2007, p.4; Lynch, 2007, p.2).

The high road, which is the way of peace journalism, focuses on the transformation of the conflict (Galtung, 2013, p.96). The concept of conflict here is described as a useful way to start the debate, with an approach that invites them to separate the negative aspect of the violence (Lynch, 2007, p.9). According to Galtung (2013, p.96-97), as the peoples of the world take a stand against each other, violence turns into a clear threat. In conflict, however, there is a clear opportunity for human development. This opportunity is accomplished by using conflict, by finding new ways and being creative without resorting to violence. Galtung assesses war journalism as an opposite concept to better explain peace journalism and interprets the point of view of both on the issue.

### **War/violence-oriented vs. Peace/conflict oriented Approaches**

War/violence-oriented journalism approach focuses on the arena where the conflict is experienced, as explained before. There are two sides, the only purpose is to win. There is only one winner. The real situation of war is tried to be hidden and the "us vs. them" approach of journalism is always dominant. It makes wars clandestine and incomprehensible. It only hears and conveys the voice of "us." It sees "them" as a problem. It emphasizes the concrete effects which the war has brought about. The peace-conflict-oriented viewpoint against it, explores the formation of the conflict, rather than the arena of conflict. There can be more than one party, one goal and one problem. As a result, there is an option in which both sides win. Conflicts are made more visible and it takes into account the voice of all parties. The main thing is the creativity of the conflict. The challenge is to find a creative solution that will destroy the war and problem from their root. Peace/conflict-oriented approach focuses on the invisible effects of war (Galtung, 2006, p.1).

### **Propaganda/Reality-Oriented**

In the propaganda-oriented approach, the negative aspects of the others are conveyed. It generally tries to reveal the lies of others while helping "us" in the lies and faults (Galtung, 2006, p.1). However, in the reality-oriented peace journalism approach, they try to help them understand each other by approaching both sides from the same human distance, instead of considering the other side as a source of all problems (Alankuş, 2016, p.34).

### **People/Elite Individual-Oriented**

Elite individual-oriented war journalism focuses on the difficulties and hardships "we" face. It brings forth the names of the evil-doers. It emphasizes only the elite people who strive

for a solution. However, the people-oriented peace journalism strives to be the voice of all the suffering parties. It reveals all the evildoers on both sides. It focuses on all people who provide solutions (Galtung, 2013, p.98).

### **Solution/Victory-Oriented**

Victory-oriented approach sees victory and ceasefire as peace which one of the two sides in the war will win. When a war is over, it opens door for another war. However, if the old war is flared again, it will return to it. In the solution-oriented approach, peace is non-violence and creativity. Following the war, it focuses on reconciliation, on embracing the healing of the wounds of war, and on the restoration of social order (Galtung, 2013, p.98).

Peace journalism with these characteristics seems to be equivalent to the quality of health journalism. Because in health journalism, a patient's battle with cancer, the causes of cancer, all treatment processes and cancer prevention measures are communicated to readers (Lee and Maslog, 2005, p.312). Pro-peace journalism is also a supportive act to find new ways of peace and to ensure peace.

The approaches of both the Turkish and Russian media in the event of downing the Russian attack aircraft on the Syrian border of Turkey which will be analyzed in this study, was investigated Galtung's peace journalism perspective. Diplomatic relations between Turkey and Russia following this incident became quite tense and it turned into a psychological war. Studying the viewpoints of media in two countries in a tense environment between Turkey and Russia, and their effects on this environment is very important in terms of pro-peace journalism.

### **Research Method**

The study aims to examine the reflections of the crisis between the two countries in the Turkish and Russian media following the incident of downing the Russian Air Forces' Sukhoi Su-24 warplane by the jets of the Turkish Armed Forces on November 24<sup>th</sup>, 2015. The aim of the study is to examine whether the news on the incident in the Turkish and Russian media after the crisis is shaped according to the attitude of the two countries regarding the incident.

The basic assumptions in the study is that newspapers selected from the Turkish and Russian media re-shaped the incident of downing the Russian plane on the Syrian border of

Turkey on November 24<sup>th</sup>, 2015 through a war rhetoric in parallel with their ideologies, in line with the attitudes of their respective countries' governments and political stances.

In this incident, which led to a crisis between the two countries, the press in the two countries also released news against each other according to the position of their country's governments and the interests of their countries. These news releases have made relations between the two countries' governments and society more negative. Hence, the fact that the media in both countries make things more tense, and put forward a rhetoric of pro-war journalism, rather than pro-peace journalism, forms the main question in this study.

Different reflections of these events which, affect the society in national and international sense, need to be examined in every aspect. Because the interests of the countries to which media organizations belong and changing their rhetoric according to their ideologies are issues which need to be examined. Examining the interests of the country in the news texts and the relationship between ideologies and the war rhetoric has great importance in terms of a healthy and accurate reading of the media industry.

In this study, the internet pages of Hürriyet and Komsomolskaya Pravda published on November 24<sup>th</sup>, 25<sup>th</sup>, 26<sup>th</sup> 2015 were examined. The newspapers selected for the study were designated by their ideology, their political position and the audience they addressed. Both newspapers are in the position of being the top circulated/clicked in their own country and follow a liberal pattern.

### **Method**

It is necessary to touch on the concept of discourse before proceeding to the critical discourse analysis. Discourse is a message to be given in a sentence or a phrase. According to Sözen (1999, p.20), discourse is simply a language and a practice of language. However, the use of language in society is not only used in the light of linguistic principles. Discourse is also related to the social, political, economic and cultural spheres of life. According to Fairclough (1989, p.26), seeing language as a national discourse and social practice does not only mean committing to analyze texts and processes of production and interpretation, but also making the relationship between texts, processes and their social conditions.

There is a deep connection with ideology, as well as with language. Because if discourse is a message, ideology is a code camouflaged in it, and language is a medium in which discourse and ideology are conveyed. According to Van Dijk (2015, p.41; 1998a, p.192), the discourse plays a major role in the expression and reproduction of ideologies.



Van Dijk (2015, p.52) says that discourse has a very complex structure and that ideologies can be expressed in various forms, and there is a need for a *finder*. This finder points to a method of finding ideology in text and speech, namely, discourse analysis.

Van Dijk, who introduced a critical analysis method peculiar to himself, has used this method on news texts. According to Van Dijk, the important element is what is not said in news texts, rather than what is said. Hidden ideological structures in news texts must be uncovered. Critical discourse analysis, which examines news texts, is usually concerned with the examination of ideologically biased discourses and the way they polarize our (in-group) and their (out-group) representation. At both global and local levels of meaning analysis, we encounter the strategy of "positive self-representation and negative representation of others" in which our good things and their bad things are emphasized, or their good things and our bad ones are de-emphasized (Van Dijk, 2001, p.104). Actually, here in the expression "presentation of our good things and presentation of their negative things" the definition of pro-war journalism by Galtung can be seen.

Van Dijk is separated from some of the other discourse analysts. The most important distinction is the way news is handled. Dijk thinks that news is not just text (Ülkü, 2004, p.374). In the critical discourse analysis, attention is drawn to a number of measures, from the sources used, to the news headlines, from the long or short structure of the sentences, to the fact that they are active or passive. These criteria used in the news have a single goal – to ensure the reestablishment of power and ideology. This method examines texts from the micro-structure to the choice of words, in order to reveal the might and power relations which are taking place in the society in the news text analysis (Ertan Keskin, 2004, p.392). Critical discourse analysis aims to investigate the social inequality created and legitimized by using language or discourse (Wodak, 2001, p.2; Van Dijk, 2001: p.96). Critical discourse analysis reveal the discourses by decoding the ideologies in news texts. For critical discourse analysis, language alone is not enough, using the dominant individuals that language makes the discourse stronger. Thus, critical discourse analysis is in support of the suffering and weak people, and is critical of those people responsible for inequality (Wodak, 2001, p.10).

Van Dijk distinguishes the critical discourse analysis into two different structures. These are the macro and micro-structures. In the study, the headlines in the macro-structure and the interpretations made by the parties, and choices of word in the micro structure have been examined (Özer, 2011, p.83).

## Research Findings

### Macro-structure

The headlines, draw a general framework for the news, summarize the subject covered by the news, and represent the main theme. The Komsomolskaya Pravda newspaper (KP) has revealed its point of view on the examined incident. In defense of Russia, it has made a grave criticism of the Turkish side which downed the Russian attack aircraft.

*Sergei Rutsi, Chief of General Staff of Russian Defense Ministry: Turkey did not attempt to communicate with the pilots before downing the SU-24. (November 25<sup>th</sup>, 2015)*

*Defense Ministry of Russia: the Russian downed airplane in Syria, had not violated the Turkish airspace. (November 24<sup>th</sup>, 2015)*

*Victor Baranyets, the military expert at KP: Turkey will wear herself out to prove that her airspace has been violated. (November 24<sup>th</sup>, 2015)*

The KP has stressed with 4 reports about the aircraft on November 24<sup>th</sup> and one report November 25<sup>th</sup> that the Russian SU-24 aircraft had never violated the Turkish airspace. By expressing that Turkey downed the plane without any violation of airspace, the KP has demonstrated the positive sides of Russia, and put forward the negative and aggressive sides of Turkey. Adopting a propaganda-oriented approach, the KP has voiced the rhetoric of the Russian government and has not been equally distant to both sides.

*Former Russian war pilot Valery Burkov: Downing the SU-24 plane was a planned action. (November 24<sup>th</sup>, 2015)*

*Komsomolskaya Pravda had warned Erdogan that they would down our plane. (November 24<sup>th</sup>, 2015)*

With its headlines, the KP continues to accuse the Turkish government of downing the plane. It has emphasized on the two news on November 24<sup>th</sup> that downing the plane was not the result of an airspace violation, but an action premeditated beforehand. The “us vs. them” theme of pro-war journalism, as Galtung put it, showed itself in this news. By the expression "our airplane", they viewed the Russian side as their side, acted as a spokesperson, and strived to show "us" innocent and good by stating that the plane was downed as part of a planned action. The Turkish side who downed the plane was viewed as "them", and despite a lack of a violation, it saw the Turkish government as the other in this incident, and pushed Turkey into

a negative position in a hostile manner. Exposing the mistakes of the Turkish government according to its point of view, presented a propaganda-oriented war journalism.

*Safarov, Russian Minister of Tourism: Turkey was earning approximately \$10 billion on our holidaymakers. (November 26<sup>th</sup>, 2015)*

*Russian Foreign Minister and Tourism Minister: Russian citizens were called to avoid holidays in Turkey. (November 24<sup>th</sup>, 2015)*

*Expert: Russia's economic sanctions on Turkey could lead to a military coup in Turkey. (November 26<sup>th</sup>, 2015)*

When we look at the way the news is presented, it can be seen in the headlines that Russia is escalating the situation by punishing Turkey with economic sanctions to such an extent that it is reported that sanctions would lead to a military coup in Turkey. With such an important foresight, the Russian side turned the downing of the plane into a game of war, and it was clearly stated that with such an action Russia would do the Turkish government a great harm. Here, too, is an understanding of "victory" exemplified with two sides, which war journalism focuses on – one is a winning and the other is losing. The amount of earnings on tourists and the emphasis placed on the concrete effects of war journalism is clearly seen. Only the economic aspect of this decision taken by the Russian government is demonstrated, while the intangible effects are omitted. Only material losses have been mentioned, disregarding how two countries treat each other's citizens – tourists who cannot go to Turkey or the problems the employees in the tourism industry in Turkey will face.

*"All inclusive" in Turkey in : Both Jihad and tourism (November 25<sup>th</sup>, 2015)*

*According to Aleksandr Fralov, Vice President at the National Energy Institute, Turkey earns hundreds of millions of dollars by selling oil they buy from ISIS. (November 24<sup>th</sup>, 2015)*

The idea that the Turkish government is in cooperation with the ISIS is an attempt to discredit Turkey in the eyes of all countries fighting against ISIS. An ironic case is in question in the headlines where jihad and tourism are put together. Combining the jihadist understanding of ISIS and Turkey who hosts Russian vacationers with the "all inclusive" slogan of the tourism industry is quite noteworthy. Because according to Russia, Turkey has come to the fore in Russia with its support to ISIS as well as its tourism industry serving the Russian citizens. By alleging Turkey's support to ISIS, it is aimed that Turkey experiences a loss in the international arena. Thus it has been tried to give the impression that Turkey is against Russia and the coalition forces fighting against ISIS. It has been aimed to create an

animosity against Turkey at international level, and Turkey has been pushed to be marginalized. These accents are based on the "all inclusive" metaphor in tourism.

*Vladimir Putin: We expect an apology from Turkey. (November 26<sup>th</sup>, 2015)*

Here the KP, assuming the spokesperson position of the Russian side, has shown the Russian side as good and innocent, and has tried to expose Turkey's mistake as a country which should apologize. In a sense, the KP has drawn attention to the pains and difficulties of their own lives, bringing forth the names of the evil-doing others. This is a reflection of the elite/individual-oriented war journalism.

*Downed SU-24, a Turkish cinema classic (November 25<sup>th</sup>, 2015)*

In the headlines of a news story published on November 25<sup>th</sup>, the KP stated that Turks did not like Russians since ancient times and that they felt a hostility against Russians. According to the headlines, Turkey featured demolition of Russian temple even in the ever-first film in its history<sup>2</sup>. The KP regarded the Turkish side as the "other" in its headlines, taking on the side of the Russian government and assuming a spokesperson position. This historical attitude of Turkey had never been raised before the incident. By presenting this case as a pretext for the Russian government's approach against Turkey, it has undertaken the propaganda function of the Russian government. The tension between the two countries was presented as normal, and only the voice of the Russian side was heard.

The Hürriyet newspaper has revealed its point of view on the airplane crisis with its headlines. Hürriyet could not avoid impartiality to both sides and adopted the "us vs. them" notion of the pro-war journalism, by defending the Turkish side and using headlines which emphasized the justification of the downing.

*Shocking statements from Putin on the Russian plane downed on the Syrian border (November 24<sup>th</sup>, 2015)*

*Harsh messages from Russian Prime Minister Medvedev (November 25<sup>th</sup>, 2015)*

*Russia claims 'Airplane has not violated Turkish airspace' (November 24<sup>th</sup>, 2015)*

*Tourism Industry in Shock by Russian Minister's Call: 'Do not go to Turkey' (November 24<sup>th</sup>, 2015)*

---

<sup>2</sup> See for details. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4hDEcNUpoBc>

In the Hürriyet newspaper's headlines published on the 24th and 25th of November, the Russian administration has been presented in a negative light. Pointing out that the statements of the Russian administration on the incident are harsh and shocking, Hürriyet reveals how out of place and unexpected these statements are. This, according to Hürriyet's point of view, has revealed the negative and problematic sides of the Russian government, which is seen as "them". This point of view, while setting aside the incident of downing the aircraft, has highlighted Russia's negative attitude. Besides, it tried to decrease the degree of truth by calling Russia's statement on the absence of airspace violation a "claim".

*Turkey warned Russian pilots (November 25<sup>th</sup>, 2015)*  
*Russian war plane shot down at the second violation (November 25<sup>th</sup>, 2015)*  
*Soldiers also warned in person (November 24<sup>th</sup>, 2015)*

In the news headlines on the 24<sup>th</sup> and -25<sup>th</sup> of November, it was reported that the Russian pilots were warned in person and via radio many times by the Turkish side. Resorting to such headlines aims to justify the downing of the aircraft. The Hürriyet newspaper has undertaken the spokesperson position for the Turkish government by displaying a propaganda-oriented war journalism. It regarded the violation of the Russian pilots as a problem of the "other", and the Turkish side was placed in a positive position, merely responding to a violation.

*Obama: Turkey has the right to protect her airspace (November 24<sup>th</sup>, 2015)*  
*Davutoğlu: It is our international right (November 24<sup>th</sup>, 2015)*

In these headlines it appears that downing the airplane is presented as a right. Here, Hürriyet paid attention to the voice of the Turkish Government, which he regarded as "us", and revealed that such a situation was experienced as a result of Russia's violation, whose aircraft has been downed. The pilots of the downed aircraft and the financial or emotional loss that Russia suffered were never mentioned, however only the views of the Turkish side were expressed. One of the interesting points here is the effort to prove that downing the plane is defended on an international level, by highlighting the US President Barack Obama's comment in Turkey's favor.

*Trade Figures between Russia and Turkey (November 25<sup>th</sup>, 2015)*

Stating the trade figures between the two countries in the headlines is an indication of war journalism. The importance given only to tangible and material elements in war journalism is also noted in this headline. The social dimension of the incident has not been put

forward, the health conditions and fate of the Russian pilots have been pushed aside, the situation of the Turks living in Russia has been ignored, and only the analysis on the material situation in trade has been portrayed. In fact, a peaceful rhetoric can be made considering the economic difficulties that societies will face. But; rather than thinking about the economic difficulties governments and press focus on the economic damage given to the other party.

*Outrageous attack on the Turkish Embassy in Moscow (November 25<sup>th</sup>, 2015)*

Evaluating the demonstrations of the Russian citizens in Moscow on November 25<sup>th</sup> in a negative perspective, Hürriyet framed attention to the protests as attacks rather than demonstrations. The newspaper communicated the bad aspects of the Russian citizens, supported by visual images. Photographs of the damaged embassy building and the angry manners of the demonstrators were presented to the readers.

### **Comments from Both Sides on the Incident**

Another element of the macro-structure is that when comments by the sides of the incident were examined as part of the incident, the KP presented Putin, the pilots of the downed aircraft, Russian Chief of General Staff Sergey Rutski, former Russian fighter pilot Valery Burkov, Daria Aslamova (expert correspondent), Russian Tourism Minister Safarov, Vice Executive President of the National Energy Institute of Russia Aleksander Fralov, and the KP's military expert Victor Baranyets, and on the Turkish side it presented Turkish General Staff, President Erdoğan and the Turkish government. So the number of people from both sides whose views were presented on KP was unsurprisingly unequal. Furthermore, they didn't let Turks in Russia and Russians in Turkey to express their views, who would be one of the keys to building peace. Especially mixed families and Turkish-Russian friendship associations would have conveyed more humane messages.

The KP acted with the "us vs. them" approach of pro-war journalism with the news they published on the incident. In the news, the KP chose a pro-Russian side, presenting comments by the Russian officials about the incident where they regard themselves as innocent, and their negative statements about the Turkish side. The KP designated the sides to the incident and then appointed its own side, also presented the actions to be taken following the incident as a rightful war and struggle with its rhetoric in the news. In the comments made by the parties, Putin's statement that the Russian aircraft did not violate the Turkish airspace has been put forward. In addition, with Putin's statement that "We were stabbed in the back" (November 26<sup>th</sup>, 2015) it was implied that the Turkish side thus acted treacherously. It has

been observed that downing the aircraft being a planned action by the military, and the rhetoric that Turkey supports ISIS by selling its oil are presentation of the bad sides of the “other” in pro-war journalism. This rhetoric has the meaning for normalization of the tension between the two countries, and that the war rhetoric would be bolstered gradually by pushing Turkey's actions in a quite negative position.

The Hürriyet newspaper presented as sides to the incident Turkish President Erdoğan, Prime Minister Ahmet Davutoğlu, Chief of General Staff, F-16 pilots, Foreign Minister Mevlüt Çavuşoğlu and Türofed President Osman Ayık on the Turkish side, while presenting Putin, Medvedev, Foreign Minister Lavrov and the SU-24 pilots on the Russian side. The Hürriyet newspaper, just like the KP, assumed the position of spokesperson for the Turkish Government by appointing its own side.

As for the comments from both sides, Erdoğan and Davutoğlu dwelled on the fact that such a response was given as a result of the Russian pilot's violation, and about downing the aircraft Turkey only did what was required, and Russia was at fault. They also published the radar tracks from the Chief of General Staff, showing the airspace violation. About the radar tracks, the Hürriyet newspaper used the expression "*in the analysis it shows how the violation of the Turkish airspace of the aircraft downed took place.*" (November 24<sup>th</sup>, 2015). Regarding the violation, with statements like "It has violated the Turkish airspace despite repeated warnings (10 times in five minutes)", "Whoever violates our air and land borders, it is both our international right and our national duty to take all necessary measures." (November 24<sup>th</sup>, 2015), it chose its side on a two-sided war, as pro-war journalism required, and strived for its victory. There are unfavorable statements made by the Russian side on downing the aircraft. These statements are reflected in Hürriyet using expressions like “harsh remarks” and “shocking messages”. These descriptions have touched on “our” good sides and their problems in pro-war journalism, by presenting Russia's comments in a negative light and giving them bad and unexpected features. In a news stressing NATO's negative reception of Russia's airspace violations, the Hürriyet newspaper used statements like “Condemning the violations in that period, NATO had warned Russia that such irresponsible behavior is extremely dangerous”. NATO Secretary General Jens Stoltenberg said “NATO is ready to defend its allies against any threat. Turkey is also one of these countries.” (November 24<sup>th</sup>, 2015). When reviewing these statements, it is seen that NATO describes these violations as Russia's irresponsibility and NATO will defend its ally Turkey as NATO is on Turkey's side.

## **Micro-Structure**

### **Choices of Words**

Choice of words, one of the micro-structure elements, is one of the most important items where ideology and rhetoric show themselves in news texts. That is because usage of words reveal the attitudes of the newspaper in the given incident. When examining the choices of words in the KP, good and innocent words are used for Russia while critical and negative words are preferred against the Turkish government. The KP put forward the SU-24's non-violation of the Turkish airspace with the phrase "documented with objective inspection tools" (November 24th, 2015). Mentioning an impartial observer with the use of the term "objective" and stating that it was proven with the word "documented" aim to indicate that the Russian side was right while the Turkish side was faulty. Presenting the downing of the aircraft as "a planned action" and the Russian planes and aircrafts being "watched as by a guard" (November 24th, 2015) pointed to the negative side of Turkey – the equivalent of the "other" in the KP's pro-war journalism. The interpretation that it was a "tragic mistake" on the Turkish side, emphasized the pathetic and negative aspects of the incident. In the "stabbing us in the back" part of Putin's "We cannot make sense of Turkey's stabbing us in the back. We expect an apology from Turkey" (November 26th, 2015) in the news text, the Turkish side was heavily criticized, and was presented as a treacherous aggressor. Subsequently, it is stated that he expects an apology for this action. Resorting to use these words, the KP has also undertaken the Russian government's propaganda-oriented war journalism. An antithesis was put forward against Turkey with Putin's statement such as "Some [people] are making millions of dollars by hiding the terrorists's involvement in human trafficking, illegal trade of oil, drugs, and weapons." (26 November 2015) and it was indicated that Turkey supported ISIS, and it was tried to make Turkey an enemy of the forces in the international arena fighting against ISIS. Such accusations of the Russian government, with no prior accusations like this up until this incident, aims to disparage Turkey, being seen as "them".

The Hürriyet newspaper has taken an attitude, showing Russia as negative and unfair with its choices of words. On the part of Turkey, however, indicated that it was its natural right resulting from violations to down the aircraft. In its news about the violations, Hürriyet said that "the warnings were ignored", and that "it was shot because the violation in the first tour continued to the second tour". Here in this incident, the dominating opinion is that the



Russian side “disregarded” the warnings, and "continued violation" which caused the shootdown of the aircraft, emphasizing the legitimacy of Turkey's action. Hürriyet, doing pro-war journalism, created two sides as good vs. bad, us vs. them, and taking Turkey's side, emphasized the best sides of Turkey and only the negative sides of Russia. The Hürriyet newspaper, repeatedly used the word “claims” while presenting the Russian authorities' statements that it was not violation and that Turkey was in cooperation with ISIS. Putin, militants those in Syria to Turkey was alleged that a large amount of oil coming (November 24, 2015). Putin also claims that a large amount of oil is brought by the militants coming to Turkey from Syria (November 24th, 2015). Putin claims: "Our plane was shot by a missile thrown by a Turkish F-16. It fell down 4 kilometers away from the border with Turkey, on the Syrian soil." (November 24th, 2015). Russia claims “Aircraft has not violated Turkish airspace”. (November 24th, 2015) Russian Minister claims: "It's no secret that terrorists use Turkey's territory" (November 25th, 2015). In such statements, it was attempted to reduce the credibility of the Russian side by saying that nothing said by the Russian said can be taken to be true, that it is merely an assertion, and that this is only the Russian side's interpretation. In order to demonstrate the legitimacy of Turkey on this issue, the Hürriyet newspaper also resort to the opinions of NATO and the United States. “On the other hand, Fox News's national security correspondent Jennifer Griffin has tweeted that "American military sources said that US pilots have heard Turks repeatedly warn the Russian pilots on the emergency radio-frequency conversations" (November 24th, 2015). “NATO condemned the violations in that period and warned Russia that "such irresponsible behavior is extremely dangerous" (November 24th, 2015). It stated that US pilots have said that the Turks have repeatedly warned the Russian pilots. By using the words "repeatedly warned" by the Turks, it presented an international support for Turkey being right with the US witnessing the violation. NATO's warning that Russia is acting "irresponsibly" has also been reported. With the term "irresponsible", Russia's role in this situation have been brought into the foreground.

### **Conclusion and Discussion**

In this study, reflections of the aircraft downing crisis on November 24<sup>th</sup>, 2015 on the Turkish-Syrian border in the Turkish and Russian media have been examined within the scope of pro-peace journalism. In the study, reports from the Hürriyet newspaper in Turkey and the Komsomolskaya Pravda newspaper in Russia on the 24<sup>th</sup>, 25<sup>th</sup>, and 26<sup>th</sup> of November regarding the aircraft crisis were analyzed with Van Dijk's critical discourse analysis method. The headlines, choices of word and interpretations used in the news by each newspaper on the

incident differ. As a result of the critical discourse analysis, it has been observed that both newspapers define the incident in their own perspective with their ideological attitudes. In the study, it was detected that the events that took place were communicated by the newspapers with different realities, in a language peculiar to pro-war journalism. In the theoretical part of the study, the results of the analysis part show parallelism with the idea that the media, as Galtung suggested, makes propaganda for war by ignoring pro-peace journalism. The newspapers has chosen in the study, as pointed out by Galtung, preferred to make war journalism, instead of applying the peace journalism criteria. Both governments have made the propaganda of their country's interests and official rhetorics. The newspapers, analyzed for both countries, considered the side on which their governments had tension with as the “other” side, and made a presentation of the negative and bad aspects of that side, and put forward the positive and right aspects of its own side. By conveying a certain rhetoric to their readers in order for their party to win and to justify them, the newspapers have taken a stance against the principle of peace journalism which promotes the win-win approach, being detached from both sides, and paying attention to the voices of both sides (Galtung, 2013).

Looking at the newspapers' attitudes, the Komsomolskaya Pravda, being on the side of Russia, stated that the violation was only a claim by the Turkish government, that the plane did not cross the Turkish airspace, and that this was proved by the analysis of objective control tools. Therefore it has put forward the negative and unfair aspects of the Turkish side, by stating that downing the aircraft was part of a plan and provocation. However, the Hürriyet newspaper has taken the side of Turkey, and published the radar traces, stating that it was a violation. It has stated that the aircraft was shot down as a result of Russia's continuing the airspace violation despite all warnings. The Hürriyet newspaper emphasized that the violation of Russia has caused it, and that the Turkish government is innocent and right, while the Russian government is at fault. In this context, the newspapers examined here have been seen as having a propaganda-based journalism approach (Lynch, 2006) in which the media are involved in any of the parties in the propaganda-focused conception of war journalism. In light of all these results, the thesis of the study that “the selected newspapers from Turkish and Russian media reshaped the November 24<sup>th</sup>, 2015 aircraft shootdown incident with a certain war rhetoric in parallel with their ideologies, as opposed to pro-peace journalism, in line with the attitudes and political stance of their respective governments” has been proved. The Komsomolskaya Pravda tried to legitimize the material and moral warfare rhetoric and actions that Russia will perform in the eyes of the Russian society and in the international arena by

substantiating that the aircraft shutdown crisis occurred without any airspace violation. The *Hürriyet* Newspaper, however, aims to justify the incident in the eyes of the Turkish society and in the international arena. The newspapers published positive news for the ideology they support, negative news for the opposite ideologies and discourses (Van Dijk, 1998b; 2001).

Since it is worth examining that news publications change their rhetoric according to their countries' interests and ideologies, analyzing the relations between these interests and ideologies and the war rhetoric, has great importance in the sense that the media industry can be read in a healthy and just manner, and new solution proposal can be offered. The attitudes of the newspapers toward the incident proved that war journalism was done by violating the principles of pro-peace journalism. In negative situations between countries, the newspapers need to find some solutions to prevent the existing war, attaching importance to the "creativity" (2006; 2013) function which Galtung points out in peace journalism. It is essential for the media to form a culture of peace before pro-peace journalism. A peaceful culture is a precondition for peace journalism (Hanitzsch: 2007, p.7).

This study has tried to provide a qualitative contribution to the topic of pro-peace journalism discussed in the field of media. In the study, news reports of the Russian and Turkish press about the dropped plane show that pro-peace journalism did not observed in this particular event. While the Russian press reflected the hard and hostile stance of the Russian government following the incident, the Turkish press made the discourse of Turkish government clear to the readers that the plane had been dropped because of violations of airspace. It has been seen that the media is not neutral, sedative, or rational mediator to social events, but helps to reproduce preformatted ideologies (Van Dijk, 1988, p.11).

There are lots of studies on peace journalism (Galtung, 1986, 1998, 2000, 2006, 2013; Loyn, 2007; Lee and Maslog 2005; Goldrick and Lynch, 2000; Lynch, 2007; Blasi, 2004; Peleg, 2006; Yıldız, 2012; Alankuş, 2016). There are also descriptive studies (Galtung, 2000, 2006, 2013; Loyn, 2007; Peleg, 2007; Mc Goldrick and Lynch, 2000; Lynch, 2007; Peleg, 2006; Shinar, 2004, 2007; Alankuş, 2016; Yıldız, 2012) focusing on the news production process (Blasi, 2004) in peace journalism which are written to reveal the barriers and steps to overcome the barriers (Shinar, 2007; İrvan, 2006) of the peace journalism. For example in a study by Lee and Maslog (2005), in which pro-peace journalism was discussed through a case study, news made in four countries in Asia during conflicts in Asia were measured in terms of pro-peace journalism. This study made quantitative contributions to the field. In addition,

Lynch (2006) examined the peace journalism by British newspapers on the Iranian Nuclear Crisis.

In this study, the news in the press of the two countries about dropping the aircraft that caused the crisis between Russia and Turkey have examined. The news in this study were analyzed by critical discourse analysis. As a result of the analysis, the newspapers examined were not found to have news discourses that would set an example for peace journalism. Instead, the newspapers present hate, and hostile attitudes to the reader through the news discourse. The titles used, the evaluations of the event parties and the word choices have been examined to reveal the tendency and the dominance of contemporary media to pro-war journalism. In addition, the discourses of the newspapers of two countries, which are the subject of the study, were revealed by the discourse analysis. Both sides are evaluating the same event in different ways and it has been revealed that these events reflect their own ideology. Instead of conveying to the voice of all parties about the news of the crisis, it was observed that discourses in favor of their own interests found a place in the press of their own country (Galtung, 1986). In this case (Galtung, 1986), the media became one of the agents of the conflict by sympathizing with one side. The combination of qualitative and quantitative analysis in subsequent studies may make the study more striking, contributing more to the field in the name of the spread of pro-peace journalism.

The fact that newspapers should give up this ideological stance and play an active role in contributing to peace by focusing on the positive side of both parties that are clashing, which are required by pro-peace journalism. So they can play more effective role in the win-win game. States can follow strategies that are appropriate for the conditions of the period in accordance with national interests. However, the change of discourse according to the states in which the press operates damages the role of the press in building peace in society. It is necessary for the media to think about the benefit of the society rather than being the voice of the present rulings. It polarizes societies and separates them into good or bad, feeding others, hating and hating. The task of press here is to develop a discourse that will develop peace by avoiding polarizing world in national or international context. As a matter of fact, the pro-peace language used by the press will be effective in changing the relations between individuals within a society and with other societies positively.

## References

- Alankuş, S. (2016). *Barış Gazeteciliği Elkitabı*. İstanbul: IPS İletişim Vakfı Yayınları.
- Blasi, B. (2004). Peace journalism and news production process. *Conflict and Communication online*, 3(1/2). 1-12 Retrieved February 17th 2018 from [http://www.cco.regener-online.de/2004\\_pdf\\_2004/blaesi.pdf](http://www.cco.regener-online.de/2004_pdf_2004/blaesi.pdf)
- Dursun, Ç. (2003). Haber ve Habercilik/Gazetecilik Üzerine Düşünmek. (ed.). S. Alankuş. *Gazetecilik ve Habercilik* (pp. 63-85). İstanbul: IPS İletişim Vakfı Yayınları
- Ertan Keskin, Z. (2004). Türkiye’de Haber İncelemelerinde Van Dijk Yöntemi. (ed.). Ç. Dursun. *Haber, Hakikat ve İktidar İlişkisi* (pp. 391- 407) Ankara: Elips Kitap
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and Power*. London: Pearson Education.
- Galtung, J. and Ruge, M. H. (1965). The Structure of Foreign News. *Journal of Peace Research*, 2 (1), 64-91. Oslo.
- Galtung, J. (1986). On the role of the media in worldwide security and peace. In (Ed.). T. Varis. *Peace and communication*. (pp.249–266) San Jose, Costa Rica: Universidad para La Paz.
- Galtung, J. (1998). Peace journalism: What, why, who, how, when, where. Paper presented in the workshop, “What are journalists for?” TRANSCEND, Taplow Court, UK.
- Galtung, J. (2000). The Task of Peace Journalism. *Ethical Perspective* 7. 2 (3). 162-167.
- Galtung, J. (2006). Peace Journalism as an Ethical Challenge. *Global Media Journal: Mediterranean Edition*. 1 (2) Fall. 1-5.
- Galtung, J. (2013). High Road, Low Road: Charting the Course for Peace Journalism. J. Galtung and D. Fischer (ed.). *Springer Briefs on Pioneers in Science and Practice* 5. (pp.95-102). Heidelberg: Springer
- Güngör, N. (2013). *İletişim: Kuramlar ve Yaklaşımlar*. Ankara: Siyasal Kitabevi
- Hanitzsch, T. (2007). Situating peace journalism in Journalism Studies: A critical appraisal. *Conflict and Communication online*. 6 (2). 1-9. Retrieved February 2nd 2018 from [http://www.cco.regener-online.de/2007\\_2/pdf/hanitzsch.pdf](http://www.cco.regener-online.de/2007_2/pdf/hanitzsch.pdf)
- İnal, A. (1996). *Haberi Okumak*. İstanbul: Temuçin Yayınları
- İrvan, S. (2006). Peace Journalism as a Normative Theory: Premises and Obstacles. *GMJ: Mediterranean Edition* 1(2) Fall. 34-39.
- Lee, S. T. and Maslog, C. C. (2005). War or Peace Journalism? Asian Newspaper Coverage of Conflicts. *Journal of Communication*. 311-329.
- Loyn, D. (2007). Good journalism or peace journalism? *Conflict and Communication online*, 6(2). 1-10 Retrieved March 1st 2018 from [http://www.cco.regener-online.de/2007\\_2/pdf/loyn.pdf](http://www.cco.regener-online.de/2007_2/pdf/loyn.pdf)
- Lynch, J. (2006). What’s so great about Peace Journalism? *GMJ: Mediterranean Edition* 1(1) Spring. 74-87.
- Lynch, J. (2007). A course in peeece journalism. *Conflict and Communication online*, 6(1). 1-20. Retrieved February 15th 2018 from [http://www.cco.regener-online.de/2007\\_1/pdf/lynch.pdf](http://www.cco.regener-online.de/2007_1/pdf/lynch.pdf)

McGoldrick, A. and Lynch, J. (2000). Peace Journalism: What is it? How to do it? (Retrieved 17th May 2017 from [https://www.transcend.org/tri/downloads/McGoldrick\\_Lynch\\_Peace-Journalism.pdf](https://www.transcend.org/tri/downloads/McGoldrick_Lynch_Peace-Journalism.pdf))

Mora, N. (2011). *Medya Çalışmaları Medya Pedagojisi ve Küresel İletişim*. Ankara: Nobel Yayıncılık

Özer, Ö. (2011). *Haber Söylem İdeoloji: Eleştirel Haber Çözümlemeleri*. Konya: Literatürk Yayınları

Poyraz, B. (2002). *Haber ve Haber Programlarında İdeoloji ve Gerçeklik*. Ankara: Ütopya Yayınevi

Sözen, E. (1999). *Söylem: Belirsizlik, Mücadele, Bilgi/Güç ve Refleksivite*. İstanbul: Paradigma Yayınları

Ülkü, G. (2004). Söylem Çözümlemesinde Yöntem Sorunu ve Van Dijk Yöntemi. In. (ed.). Ç. Dursun. *Haber, Hakikat ve İktidar İlişkisi* (pp. 371–391). Ankara: Elips Kitap

Peleg, S. (2006). Peace Journalism and through the Lense of Conflict Theory: Analysis and Practice. *Conflict and Communication online*. 5(2). 1-17 Retrieved January 1st 2018 from [http://www.cco.regener-online.de/2006\\_2/pdf/peleg.pdf](http://www.cco.regener-online.de/2006_2/pdf/peleg.pdf)

Peleg, S. (2007). In defence of peace journalism: A rejoinder. *Conflict and Communication online*. 6 (2). 1-9. Retrieved February 2nd from [http://www.cco.regener-online.de/2007\\_2/pdf/peleg.pdf](http://www.cco.regener-online.de/2007_2/pdf/peleg.pdf)

Shinar, D. (2007). Peace Journalism: The State of the Art. *Conflict and Communication online*. 6(1). 1-9. Retrieved January 19th 2018 from [http://www.cco.regener-online.de/2007\\_1/pdf/shinar\\_2007.pdf](http://www.cco.regener-online.de/2007_1/pdf/shinar_2007.pdf)

Wodak, R. (2001). What CDA is about - a summary of its history, important concepts and its developments. In. (Eds.). Ruth Wodak and Michael Meyer. *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* ( pp.1-14). London: Sage Publicaitons, Van Dijk, T. (1998a). *İdeology: A Multidisciplinary Approach*. London: . Sage Publications.

Van Dijk, T. (1988). *News As Discourse*. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Van Dijk, T. (1998b). Opinion and Ideologies in the Press, In. (Eds.). Allan Bell and Peter Garrett. *Approaches to Media Discourse* (pp.21-62). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Van Dijk, T. (2015). Söylem ve İdeoloji: Çok Alanlı Bir Yaklaşım. In. (Ed.). B. Çoban, Z. Özarslan. *Söylem ve İdeoloji* (pp. 15 – 100). İstanbul: Su Yayınları.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1997). The study of discourse. In. (Ed.). Van Dijk. *Discourse as Structure and Process* (Vol. 1). (pp. 1-35) London: Sage, Publication.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2001). Multidisciplinary CDA: A Plea for Diversity., In. (Eds.). Ruth Wodak and Michael Meyer. *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. (pp.95-121) London, UK: Sage Publicaitons.

Yıldız, G. (2012). *Dünyada ve Türkiye’de Barış Gazeteciliği*. Sosyal Yayınları. İstanbul.