

# ‘Throat cutters, fanatics and lap dogs’. Images of the Ottomans in the Dutch leftist press during the First World War

Brigitte van de Pas

Leiden University

Research Master Area Studies:

Asia and the Middle East

MA thesis

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Erik-Jan

Zürcher



Turksche logica

‘Ik heb het altijd gezegd: De Armenische quaestie wordt opgelost, zoodra er geen Armeniërs meer zijn’.

## **Contents**

Introduction	4
Chapter 1: The Dutch left: socialists, Marxists and other rabble	8
Chapter 2: Quantitative content analysis	15
Chapter 3: Qualitative content analysis: the Ottoman non-Muslim policies	37
Chapter 4: Qualitative content analysis: the Triple alliance	58
Conclusion	73
Bibliography	76
Appendix I: Observation schedule 1914	80
Appendix II: Observation schedule 1915	105
Appendix III: Observation schedule 1916	130
Appendix IV: Observation schedule 1917	155
Appendix V: Observation schedule 1918	180

## Introduction

In his revolutionary book *Orientalism*, Edward Said discussed the way the West, and especially Western scholarship, has written about the East. Focusing on the interaction between the Occident (the ‘West’) and the Orient (the Middle and Far East), Said argued that Orientalism, as a theory distinguishing between the Orient and the Occident, created a discourse on the East that had little to do with reality. The West, because of the power it held over the East, constructed an image of the East that said more about the Occident than about the Orient. As the mirror image of the Occident, the Orient was everything the Occident was not: inferior, weak, exotic, passive and alien. In this way, the Occident self-image was defined in contradiction to the Orient.<sup>1</sup>

Said received much applause, but also much critique. Scholars concerned with gender studies for example criticize Said for concentrating on the masculine discourse and argue that within Orientalism there were numerous positions. They claim that alongside the masculine discourse, an alternative feminine discourse developed that did not precisely fit into the Orientalist theory, as it sometimes contradicted and sometimes confirmed the dominant masculine discourse.<sup>2</sup> Although Orientalism may be conceived as a unity it is not monolithic, and alternative discourses do not challenge the hegemony of Orientalism. As Meyda Yeğenoğlu explains: ‘the systematic character of Orientalism is established not only through restoration and confirmation of previous representations, but also by deletion, displacement and even contradiction’.<sup>3</sup>

This thesis further explores the shades of grey within this Orientalist discourse by analyzing the Dutch left and their images of the Ottomans in the First World War period. Engaging with studies on the relations between East and West, I take up the topic in 1914 – the period immediately following the heydays of Western imperialism – just where Said left it. Socialists, and especially radical Marxists, were often anti-imperialists. What did this mean for their image of the Ottomans? Were they anymore sympathetic towards the Ottomans than their liberal and confessional countrymen?

Apart from connecting to the Orientalism debate, with this thesis I also hope to contribute to the knowledge on Dutch-Turkish relationships. Both Turkish and Dutch

---

<sup>1</sup> Edward W. Said, *Orientalism* (London, 2003) 1-15, 40-44.

<sup>2</sup> Reina Lewis, *Rethinking Orientalism: Women, Travel and the Ottoman Harem* (London and New York, 2004); Sara Mills, *Discourses of Difference. An Analysis of Women's Travel Writing and Colonialism* (London and New York, 1991); Meyda Yeğenoğlu, *Colonial Fantasies: Towards a Feminist Reading of Orientalism* (Cambridge, 1998).

<sup>3</sup> Yeğenoğlu, *Colonial Fantasies*, 81.

historians have worked on this topic, especially in the earlier period.<sup>4</sup> The celebration of four hundred years of diplomatic relationships between the Netherlands and Turkey in 2012 furthermore saw the publication of a number of general works on the historical bond between the two countries.<sup>5</sup> These however say little about the First World War period. Whenever a connection between the Ottoman Empire and the Netherlands is made in this period, it is usually only in the form of Indonesia and colonial politics.<sup>6</sup>

Relationships with Constantinople were mainly characterized by self-interest. During the First World War period, maintaining cordial relations was considered more important than ever, as the Dutch colonial authorities feared the influence of Ottoman Pan-Islamist propaganda in the Dutch East Indies. Meddling in Ottoman affairs was avoided during the war, as it might cause unrest among Holland's Muslim subjects. Whereas other neutral countries actively helped the victims of the Armenian persecutions, Armenians asking for help at the Netherlands Embassy in Constantinople were simply sent away.<sup>7</sup> The Dutch press however did not idly stand by, publishing extensive articles about the suffering of Ottoman non-Muslims.

The first modern propaganda war, the First World War elevated the role of the media to a new level. In cooperation with the government and the military, the mass media in the belligerent countries was responsible for ensuring continued support of the war effort on the home front. Censorship was widespread. In the Netherlands censorship also existed, not to keep the spirits high, but to safeguard the Dutch neutrality. Dutch newspapers were allowed to report on war developments, but only in an impartial way. Choosing sides was forbidden, and the government asked newspapers to refrain from publishing rumors or articles that might offend one of the warring parties. Interference however was rare: occasionally the authorities warned editors that articles needed rectification, threatening to ban newspapers if the editors

---

<sup>4</sup> See for example Mehmet Bulut, 'The Ottoman Approach to the Western Europeans in the Levant during the Early Modern Period', *Middle Eastern Studies* 44.2 (2008) 259-274; Alexander de Groot, *The Ottoman Empire and the Dutch Republic: A History of the Earliest Diplomatic Relations, 1610-1630* (Leiden, 1978).

<sup>5</sup> See for example Jan Schmidt, *Nederland in Turkije, Turkije in Nederland: 400 jaar vriendschap* (Leiden, 2012).

<sup>6</sup> See for example Peter-Paul van Vugt, 'De Nederlandse reactie op de panislamitische politiek van Turkije 1876-1922', in Alexander de Groot (ed.), *Het Midden-Oosten en Nederland in historisch perspectief* (Muiderberg, 1989) 123-137; Cees van Dijk, *The Netherlands and the Malay Peninsula, 1890-1918: Pan-Islamism and the Germano-Indian plot* (Leiden, 1997).

<sup>7</sup> Erwin Ruis, 'Nederland en de Armeense kwestie' (2008) via <http://www.armeenegenocide.info/nederland.html> (01-02-2013) 1-3.

did not comply. In most cases though pressure was unnecessary: although many newspapers leaned slightly to the Central Powers, they chose to follow the government's line voluntarily.<sup>8</sup>

Being impartial however was easier said than done. Although some newspapers had correspondents abroad, their main source of information on foreign affairs were foreign newspapers and press agencies. When war broke out, truth was the first victim. Each side tried to win the Dutch for their cause, not only sponsoring existing newspapers to publish positive articles, but also circulating their own posters, leaflets and journals. By 1918, the British and Germans had even set up their own propaganda bureaus in the country. As there was no way of distinguishing lie from fact, the solution most newspapers in the Netherlands chose therefore was to publish articles delivered by both sides.<sup>9</sup>

This thesis focuses on the publications on the Ottoman Empire of two Dutch socialist newspapers during the First World War period. Both *Het Volk* and *De Tribune* were published in and distributed from Amsterdam and read by thousands of working-class people all over the country. *Het Volk* was published from 1900 onwards as the organ of the socialist *Sociaal-Democratische Arbeiderspartij* (SDAP). It had a circulation of 30,000 a day by 1914 and by 1918 that number had increased to 35,000. *De Tribune* was published from 1907 onwards, first as the newspaper of the Marxist opposition within the SDAP, and from 1909, after their removal from the party, as the newspaper of the new Marxist *Sociaal-Democratische Partij* (SDP). *De Tribune* had a considerably smaller reading public of about 1,300 by 1914. Published twice a week in 1914, in April 1916 *De Tribune* became a daily. By 1917, its readership had increased to about 4,000 readers.<sup>10</sup>

To conclude this introduction, a few words about the structure of this thesis. A short introductory chapter on the Dutch left and their views on the Ottoman Empire will provide all necessary background information. To analyze the newspapers mentioned above, I will use a

---

<sup>8</sup> John F. Williams, *Anzacs, the Media and the Great War* (Sydney, 1999) 1-17; Maartje M. Abbenhuis, *The Art of Staying Neutral: the Netherlands in the First World War, 1914-1918* (Amsterdam, 2006) 157-172, 227-228; Joan Hemels, *Een journalistiek geheim ontsluit: de Dubbelmonarchie en een geval van dubbele moraal in de Nederlandse pers tijdens de Eerste Wereldoorlog* (Apeldoorn and Antwerp, 2010) 20-21; Paul Moeyes, *Buitenschot: Nederland tijdens de Eerste Wereldoorlog: 1914-1918* (Amsterdam, 2001) 223-231; Bernadette Kester and Huub Wijffjes, 'Media en oorlog: inleiding', *Tijdschrift voor Mediageschiedenis* 2.2 (1999) 1-15: 7; Stijn Dekker, 'Aan den rand van den ondergang. Pers, politiek en neutraliteit rond de uitbraak van de Eerste Wereldoorlog' (MA thesis, 2010) via <http://igitur-archive.library.uu.nl> (11-02-2013) 2, 57-65; Marcel Boersma, 'Botsende stijlen. De Eerste Wereldoorlog en de Nederlandse journalistieke cultuur', *Tijdschrift voor Mediageschiedenis* 2.2 (1999) 41-68: 42-49.

<sup>9</sup> Boersma, 'Botsende stijlen', 60-61.

<sup>10</sup> Jan van de Plasse, *Kroniek van de Nederlandse dagblad- en opiniepers* (Amsterdam, 2005) 193; Maarten Schneider and Joan Hemels, *De Nederlandse krant 1618-1978. Van 'nieuwstijldinghe' tot dagblad* (Baarn, fourth and revised edition, 1979) 152-156, 162-164; A.C.J. de Vrankrijker, *Het wervende woord. Geschiedenis der socialistische week- en dagbladpers in Nederland* (Amsterdam, 1950) 187; T.H.J. Stoelinga, *Russische revolutie en vredesverwachtingen in de Nederlandse pers maart 1917 – maart 1918* (Bussum, 1967) 216-217; W. van Ravensteyn, *De wording van het communisme in Nederland 1907-1925* (Amsterdam, 1948) 118.

combination of two methods. A quantitative content analysis (chapter two) will determine the major themes of the newspaper articles and the kind of news the newspapers focus on. The qualitative content analysis (chapter three and four) will also focus on subthemes and references, trying to find out which explicit and implicit ideas were presented about the Ottomans in Dutch socialist newspapers. In these chapters, I will use two case studies (the Ottoman non-Muslims and the Ottoman alliance with Germany and Austria-Hungary) to analyze images of the Ottomans more in-depth. In the conclusion, I hope to be able to present a clear view of leftist images of the Ottomans in the First World War period.

## Chapter 1: The Dutch left: socialists, Marxists and other rabble

The political history of socialism in the Netherlands goes back to the 1880s, when the first socialist party, the *Sociaal-Democratische Bond* (SDB) is established and its leader Ferdinand Domela Nieuwenhuis is elected as the first socialist to the House of Representatives. When the SDB splits up in 1894, the *Sociaal-Democratische Arbeiderspartij* (SDAP) is established. Uniting farmers and industrial workers in one party, this new socialist party disapproves of Domela Nieuwenhuis' anti-parliamentarism and instead tries to improve the position of the working class through parliament.<sup>11</sup>

In 1909 the debate over the political course to take is the cause of a new split within the leftist ranks. The younger, radical Marxist wing of the SDAP is expelled from the party. They establish the *Sociaal Democratische Partij* (SDP). Initially limited to a mere two hundred members, they are condemned to the fringes of Dutch party politics. Only during the war the SDP becomes a party of some importance, with a membership just over 1,000 by 1918. The SDAP fares much better. By the outbreak of the war, the party has about 25,000 members and eleven representatives in parliament. In 1913, they even have the opportunity of joining the government, which they eventually decide against.<sup>12</sup>

The division on the Dutch political left is a reflection of international developments. Although the Netherlands is one of the few countries where the split between socialists and communists takes place before the First World War, this does not mean that the international left represents only one school of thought. Next to Marxist groups there are also anarchist and syndicalist groups, for example. Socialism appears in different shapes in different countries too. The Dutch socialists are mainly inspired by German socialism. Bonds between the German and Dutch left are strong, and prominent Dutch socialists and Marxists, such as Herman Gorter and Anton Pannekoek, regularly correspond with German leftists.<sup>13</sup>

Both the SDAP and the SDP have their own newspapers. Indeed, the refusal of the Marxist opposition within the SDAP to stop publishing *De Tribune* is the direct reason for their expulsion. *De Tribune* becomes the party paper of the new SDP, with *Het Volk* again taking its place as the sole party organ of the SDAP. Being party papers, the content of both newspapers differs in some important aspects from regular newspapers. Especially in the early

---

<sup>11</sup> E.H. Kossmann, *The Low Countries 1780-1940* (Oxford, 1978) 508-516, 621.

<sup>12</sup> De Vrankrijker, *Het wervende woord*, 144-154; Kossmann, *The Low Countries*, 508-516, 621; A.A. de Jonge, *Het Communisme in Nederland. De geschiedenis van een politieke partij* (Den Haag, 1972) 9-19.

<sup>13</sup> Henny Buiting, *Richtingen- en partijstrijd in de SDAP: het ontstaan van de Sociaal-Democratische Partij in Nederland (SDP)* (Zeist, 1989) 627-646.



years bringing news is not the main goal of either newspaper, instead they focus on educating the masses. Both *Het Volk* and *De Tribune* make the transition to what we would nowadays recognize as genuine newspapers: *Het Volk* already before the First World War and *De Tribune* during the war. Slowly, the editorial staffs start to include more news. The leftist point of view remains present – especially in *De Tribune* – but becomes less intrusive. As a result, the number of readers rises and both newspapers acquire a larger public than just party members.<sup>14</sup>

No love is lost between the two parties, even though they share many characteristics – indeed, the first three years of its existence, the SDP does not even have an own statement of principles and the party program differs only on one point (education). Despite this, competition is fierce, especially from SDP side. They have no issues working together against the SDAP with parties that are ideologically further distanced. In *De Tribune* too, the SDAP is regularly attacked.<sup>15</sup>

Both parties are internationally oriented. Not surprisingly, they denounce militarism and organize peace marches on the eve of the First World War. Disapproving of the war, they see it as an imperialist war, fought for imperialist reasons – the acquisition of more territory and larger markets in Asia and Africa and the widening of the European sphere of influence. Putting hope on international solidarity, the Dutch left ‘declares war on the war’. When the time for mobilization comes however, the majority of the SDAP – which before 1914 systematically voted against the military budget in parliament – joins the other parties in supporting Dutch neutrality. Although they keep lobbying for peace, trying to unite the socialists from neutral and belligerent countries, they too put the national self-interest first. An attitude strongly criticized by the SDP members, who are disappointed that socialists dismiss international solidarity.<sup>16</sup>

*De Tribune* and *Het Volk* to a large extent follow the line of the SDAP and the SDP respectively. In the case of *Het Volk*, this means a strict adherence to neutrality. There are indications that *Het Volk* is approached by representatives of the Entente, offering money in return for good publicity, but this is rejected out of hand by editor Johan Frederik Ankersmit, even though like most of his colleagues, Ankersmit did somewhat lean to the Entente. From

---

<sup>14</sup> De Vrankrijker, *Het wevende woord*, 126, 166; De Jonge, *Het Communisme in Nederland*, 9-19.

<sup>15</sup> De Jonge, *Het Communisme in Nederland*, 24-30.

<sup>16</sup> Ivo Kuypers, *In de schaduw van de Grote Oorlog. De Nederlandse arbeidersbeweging en de overheid, 1914-1920* (Amsterdam, 2002) 43-53; Theunis Stelling and Ron Blom, *Niet voor God en niet voor het Vaderland: linkse soldaten, matrozen en hun organisaties tijdens de mobilisatie van '14-'18* (Soesterberg, 2004) 13-15; Moeyes, *Buiten Schot*, 243-244; De Jonge, *Het Communisme in Nederland*, 26-27; Stoelinga, *Russische revolutie*, 46-49; P.J. Troelstra, *De wereldoorlog en de sociaaldemokratie* (2nd edition, Amsterdam, 1915) 19-31.

among the editorial staff, only Pieter Jelles Troelstra, Holland's leading socialist at the time, is more sympathetic to the Central Powers. Others, such as Willem Vliegen, Jan Schaper, Frank van der Goes and Henri van Kol, prefer the Entente. The fact that the editorial staff of *Het Volk* is divided among itself is one reason why positive and negative images can appear side by side. Lacking an editor-in-chief, no one has the power to prevent pro-Entente or pro-Central Powers articles from being published. Despite their own preferences however, the editorial staff of *Het Volk* is above all dedicated to the Dutch neutrality.<sup>17</sup>

The editors of *De Tribune* see events in a somewhat different light. Taking into account the goal of world revolution, the larger part of the editorial staff of *De Tribune* hopes for an Entente victory, as they believe this makes progress towards the next stage in history most likely. Of the editors both David Wijnkoop and Willem van Ravensteyn are anti-German, but opponents such as Herman Gorter, Anton Pannekoek and Barend Luteraan are allowed to have their say in *De Tribune* as well. Like in *Het Volk*, conflicting ideas can therefore appear in the same issue of the newspaper.<sup>18</sup>

After this short introduction of leftist currents in the Netherlands and their newspapers, we now turn to their ideas about the outside world, and especially the Ottoman Empire. Determining the most important ideas about the Ottomans is not as straightforward as it may seem, as the Dutch left in this period is mainly interested in the Netherlands and the capitalist (Western) world, leaving the rest of the world aside. In the decennium before 1914 however they start paying attention to the world outside Europe. With regard to the Ottoman Empire, the writings of the German Marxist Rosa Luxemburg are the most extensive. In *Die Akkumulation des Kapitals* (1912) and *Die Krise der Sozialdemokratie* (1915) Luxemburg pays attention to the Ottoman case. As the Dutch left (and especially the radical Dutch left) is profoundly influenced by the German left, we start our examination of leftist ideas on the Ottomans with Luxemburg's works.<sup>19</sup>

In *Die Akkumulation des Kapitals* Luxemburg mainly discusses the Ottomans in the context of international loans. In chapter 30 she describes the capitalist trap young capitalist countries such as the Ottoman Empire fall into. Luxemburg analyzes how unproductive

---

<sup>17</sup> Nienke Geudeker, 'Onafhankelijkheid en neutraliteit. De Nederlandse pers tijdens de Eerste Wereldoorlog. Een vergelijkend onderzoek naar De Telegraaf, de Nieuwe Rotterdamsche Courant en Het Volk' (PhD dissertation, 2004) via <http://igitur-archive.library.uu.nl> (01-09-2013) 101-125; De Vrankrijker, *Het wervende woord*, 174-175.

<sup>18</sup> Joop Morrien, *Indonesië los van Holland. De CPN en de PKI in hun strijd tegen het Nederlands kolonialisme* (Amsterdam, 1982) 18-19; Stoelinga, *Russische revolutie*, 46-49; De Jonge, *Het Communisme in Nederland*, 29-30.

<sup>19</sup> Philippe Bourrinet, *The Dutch and German Communist Left (1900-68)* (2008) via <http://libcom.org/files/dutchleft.pdf> (11-10-2013) 8-9, 52-53.

capital is exported by old capitalist countries to young capitalist countries, continuing to accumulate profit in another setting, for example through the building of railroads. In a seemingly attractive bargain, all the necessary ingredients are provided by the imperialist powers, and the new capitalist countries only have to make use of the projects. Seeing these international loans as a means to emancipate and gain independence, these new capitalist countries fail to see that by providing these loans the old capitalist countries maintain and even strengthen their influence over them. According to Luxemburg though, the real victim is not the Ottoman state, but the Ottoman peasantry. They eventually pay the price for all the grandiose projects, by *corvee*, increased taxation and forced sale of their agricultural products at a low price. The imperial powers are merely helped in their exploitation of the Ottoman peasantry by the Ottoman state, which is dependent on foreign loans.<sup>20</sup>

In *Die Krise der Sozialdemokratie* (1915) Luxemburg takes the argument further. In her eyes, of all the Great Powers Germany is the only one that profits from the continued existence of the Ottoman Empire. The economic interests of Germany however require political intervention in the Ottoman Empire as well, and for the sake of German capital the Ottoman state – the apparatus necessary for exploiting the Ottoman peasant – is turned into a German vassal. The German fulcrum in the Middle East, the Ottoman Empire is entrained in a war not theirs, and no matter the outcome, it will result in further dismemberment or even liquidation of the Ottoman domains.<sup>21</sup>

German influence is particularly seen to be strong in the military. In Luxemburg's eyes, the German interest in the Ottoman military is yet another way of accumulating capital for the German bankers, as interest made on loans for military purposes disappears in their pockets. The German influence on the military is mainly evaluated negatively, as creating a split between the Ottoman officers and soldiers, in the process ruining the trust that had always characterized the Ottoman army.<sup>22</sup>

The Young Turk regime does not escape criticism either. Luxemburg describes that initially hopes for the Young Turk rule are high, but that by 1915 these hopes are smashed. Not unlike Sultan Abdulhamid II (r. 1876-1909), the Young Turks are unable to change the Ottoman state in a modern state. Playing off oppressed peoples and extorting the peasantry, the Young Turks are no better than the despotic sultan himself. Indeed, Luxemburg has lost

---

<sup>20</sup> Rosa Luxemburg, *The Accumulation of Capital* (London, 1951) via <http://archive.org/details/accumulationofca00luxe> (11-09-2013) 419-446.

<sup>21</sup> Rosa Luxemburg, 'De crisis der sociaaldemocratie' (1915) via <http://www.marxists.org/nederlands/luxemburg/1915/junius/index.htm> (11-09-2013) Chapter 4.

<sup>22</sup> Luxemburg, 'De crisis der sociaaldemocratie', Chapter 4.

hope for a true revival of the Ottoman state, as she argues that any attempt to reform the Ottoman state will end in reactionary rule – like the Young Turk regime.<sup>23</sup>

Building on Luxemburg's ideas are the writings of Pannekoek and Gorter – both SDP members. Gorter's writings on the Ottoman Empire are limited to an evaluation of the German-Ottoman alliance, describing the Ottoman Empire as a small power and a junior partner, completely overshadowed by Germany. The German financial and military help is mainly seen in the context of German self-interest: they need the Ottoman help in their battle with the Entente. Nonetheless, this help in developing the country is not disapproved of with so many words.<sup>24</sup>

Pannekoek mainly follows Luxemburg's reasoning in *Die Akkumulation des Kapitals*. The German alliance with the Ottoman Empire is again seen as an outcome of the interests of German capital, and it is only because of the capital that the Ottoman Empire is kept alive by the Germans. Ottoman independence in this respect is nothing but a deception. Again, the war is mainly seen through the imperialist prism, with the 'Driebond der Hongerigen' (powers that have no colonies and want to acquire them) fighting the 'Driebond der Verzagden' (colonial powers).<sup>25</sup>

From the SDAP camp writings on the Ottoman Empire are limited. The work of the colonial specialist, Henri van Kol, however offers some insight into ideas on the Young Turks among SDAP members just before the war. Already before they come to power, the Young Turks are in contact with Van Kol, who helps them organize protests against the Ottoman government in the Netherlands. Van Kol is extremely critical of Sultan Abdulhamid's practices, and therefore he is not welcome in the sultan's domains until the Young Turks take over: a change of power that is welcomed by Van Kol as a new era and a turning point in Ottoman history.<sup>26</sup>

Van Kol is very optimistic about the Ottoman future under the Young Turks, as the constitution and parliament rule out Turkey returning to despotic rule again. Showing his appreciation for Young Turk officials, Van Kol contrasts the Young Turk rule with the despotic rule of Abdulhamid, positively evaluating the soft hand of the Young Turks

---

<sup>23</sup> Luxemburg, 'De crisis der sociaaldemocratie', Chapter 4.

<sup>24</sup> Herman Gorter, 'De wereldrevolutie' (without year) via <http://www.marxists.org/nederlands/gorter/1918/1918wereldrevo.htm#h1> (11-09-2013) Chapter 1; Herman Gorter, *Het imperialisme, de wereldoorlog en de sociaal-democratie* (Amsterdam, 1915) 6-7, 91-96.

<sup>25</sup> Anton Pannekoek, 'De oorlog, zijn oorsprong en zijn bestrijding' (1915) via <http://www.marxists.org/nederlands/pannekoek/1915/1915oorlog.htm> (11-09-2013); Anton Pannekoek, 'Uit de voorgeschiedenis van de wereldoorlog' (1916) via <http://www.marxists.org/nederlands/pannekoek/1916/1916wereldoorlog.htm> (11-09-2013) Chapter 1-2.

<sup>26</sup> H.H. van Kol, *In de kustlanden van Noord-Afrika: het Maghreb* (Rotterdam, 1911) 39, 109-112.

compared to the oppression under Abdulhamid. Indeed he remarks that this has resulted in many positive developments already, with hardly any inhabitant of Tripolitania still talking about independence. The freedom under the Young Turks is exceptional in Van Kol's eyes. Censorship is abolished, bad civil servants are dismissed and people are now able to speak their mind.<sup>27</sup>

While he shows awareness of the difficult task ahead and the limited financial means available, he also shows his appreciation for the changes the Young Turks have already brought about in their short rule, for example pointing out the positive changes in the army, education and health care. Although the population does not always understand or appreciate, progress is very clear.<sup>28</sup>

The war however changes Van Kol's mind. Sometime between 1911 and 1919, his ideas on the Ottoman Empire change profoundly, most likely brought about by the massacres of Ottoman Christian subjects taking place especially in 1915 and the relocation policies applied towards the Ottoman Jewish population. In 1919 Van Kol publishes a pamphlet about the Jewish Question, reflecting upon the position of non-Muslim minorities in the Ottoman Empire for most of the work.

Van Kol describes how the Ottoman non-Muslims had been able to live in exceptional tolerance for centuries, and how the empire was often wrongly labeled barbaric, as it had for example a good legal system. Recently however, he continues, the Ottoman Empire had faced mismanagement, and extortion and pillaging were the order of the day. Hopes were high when the Young Turks overthrew the sultan under the banner of equal rights for all, but Van Kol writes how he lost his respect for them when they had revealed themselves as fanatics without mercy. Indeed, by 1919, he regards them as being worse than Sultan Abdulhamid.<sup>29</sup>

Misery was widespread during the war, as were illness and hunger, but according Van Kol it had hit the non-Muslims particularly hard because of the arbitrariness of the government. Cemal Paşa is seen as the main responsible for the Jewish suffering, and he is described as full of hatred and suspicion. The Ottoman government in Van Kol's eyes is however not without blame either, as they knew what Cemal was doing in Palestine and turned a blind eye to it. The same government is also held responsible for the massacres happening in Armenia, but in a different way. Like all other Christians, the Armenians were treated as less than cattle by the Turks, and even under Abdulhamid attempts were made to

---

<sup>27</sup> Ibidem, 81-112.

<sup>28</sup> Ibidem, 54, 81-112.

<sup>29</sup> H.H. van Kol, *De Joden en de Vrede* (Amsterdam, 1919) 21-24.

exterminate them all. Hated because they were Christians, the massacres started under Abdulhamid were continued by the Young Turks – despite the support the Armenians had shown for the Young Turkish regime. Driven by the ideal of a homogeneous Turkish state, they were killed because they could not be Turkified. While the central Ottoman government is seen as the main responsible for the massacres, the Germans bear at least part of the guilt, for not undertaking any action to stop the massacres.<sup>30</sup>

In his writings, Van Kol shows a remarkable disdain for the Turkish people and culture. Indeed, the Turks are described as the least civilized of the Ottoman people (with even the bedouin elevated above them), combining the wild nature of the nomadic tribes with the aggressive nature of Islam. All that is good about the Ottoman-Muslim culture is said to be of Arab descent, and the Turk himself is characterized by murder and robbery. Respect is only shown for the high culture of the Armenians, the first Christian nation in the world and the most civilized of the Ottoman people, that has survived despite centuries long oppression. A 180 degree turn from his writings in 1911 indeed.<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup> Ibidem, 21-63.

<sup>31</sup> Ibidem, 25-63.

## Chapter 2: Quantitative content analysis

### 2.1 Qualitative content analysis – the theory

Before turning to the discourse analysis, I will first perform a quantitative content analysis. This approach, regularly used in mass media studies, is a useful first step in analyzing images, as it makes transparent the news framework within which a subject is discussed. Important to emphasize is that I am not looking for the truth. The media creates its own reality, which is not an objective representation of reality. Therefore, I focus on the production of frameworks. Filtering events, these interpretive frameworks determine the ideological significance of what was happening in the Ottoman domains.<sup>32</sup>

News frames create order in the world, both for journalists and readers. These determine not only what people should think about a certain topic, these also determine the way people think about that topic in a very subtle way, sometimes without the readers' awareness. Some discussion is possible within frames, but typically the range of ideological positions is limited. Portrayals in the media, including these of the Ottomans, are therefore also limited in their scope. In this chapter, I will go into the coverage of the Ottomans in the Dutch media: how often are the Ottomans the topic of news stories, what events are considered newsworthy, where do the events covered take place, and where does the news come from? Are the Ottomans allowed to speak for themselves, or are they spoken for?<sup>33</sup>

A qualitative content analysis is used to discover the differences in coverage between newspapers. To be able to do this, I have designed observation schedules, based on Elizabeth Poole's research in *Representing Islam*, which was also used by Koen Docter.<sup>34</sup> I will use the same approach to analyze images of the Ottomans. Although the Islamic identity was only one part of the Ottoman identity, it was a defining aspect. The Ottomans had been the most important representative of Islam to the West for centuries. As the Ottoman Empire and Islam were almost automatically linked in the Dutch mind, research on images of Islam and Muslims was particularly useful.

---

<sup>32</sup> Elizabeth Poole, *Reporting Islam. Media Representations of British Muslims* (London and New York, 2002) 23, 55.

<sup>33</sup> Poole, *Reporting Islam*, 55; Nadya Terkildsen and Frauke Schnell, 'How Media Frame Public Opinion: An Analysis of the Women's Movement', *Political Research Quarterly* 50.4 (1997) 879-900: 881-882, 894; William A. Gamson and Andre Modigliani, 'Media Discourse and Public Opinion on Nuclear Power: A Constructionist Approach', *American Journal of Sociology* 95.1 (1989) 1-37: 3.

<sup>34</sup> Poole, *Reporting Islam*, 64-66; Koen Docter, 'Cruel murderers, dangerous fanatics or exotic strangers. The representation of Muslims and Islam in the French and Dutch press in the late nineteenth century' (MA thesis, 2011) via <http://igitur-archive.library.uu.nl> (10-02-2012) 68-76.

Coding newspapers means applying pre-defined categories to a newspaper sample, to measure the frequency with which themes are covered. This signifies the prominence of a subject as well as the importance the editorial staff attaches to a topic. Through examination of the themes and topics covered in the press, I analyze how events are framed and how topics occur in combination with subtopics and references. As will become obvious later, some themes are more common as subtopics or references than main topics. For example, the Ottoman alliance with Germany during the war is not only used as the main topic, it also returns time and again as a subtopic or reference in accounts of campaigns.

Following Poole's example, I determined the categories of the observation schedule in an inductive way, which means that the categories resulted from the primary sources. Since articles are often not limited to one topic, I have for every article established the topic (the most important subject), subtopic (a secondary, but still important subject) as well as the first and second references to other topics. Next, I determined the type of articles that were published about the Ottoman Empire, distinguishing for example between news stories, reports and editorials. Finally, I also listed the geography or the stage of the event, the source of the news and the principle actors.<sup>35</sup>

As the discrepancy between the number of articles analyzed and the numbers in the tables indicating the place of action/origin and the principle actors reveals, this was not always straightforward. For some articles, it was not possible to establish the origin. Others were not about a specific geographical place, or alternatively, were about more than one place. In the former case, no geographical location was entered in the observation schedule. In the latter case, if both locations were equally important, two places were entered. The same applied to the principle actor, which was sometimes either absent or could not be determined. Similarly, it was not always possible to find subtopics or references, as particularly the articles published in *Het Volk* were often short. On the other hand, some articles (especially the longer opinion pieces) contained more than two sub references. The fact that a topic is not included in the observation schedule does therefore not mean that there are no references made to the topic. There are, for example, many more references in *De Tribune* to the Armenian massacres than becomes apparent from the observation schedules. These were left out when other topics were more extensively discussed. With the quantitative analysis, I will only look at the larger picture. The shorter references are however taken into account in the next chapter, as minor references might actually tell the historian more than major ones.

---

<sup>35</sup> Poole, *Reporting Islam*, 63-99.



Before continuing with the analysis, some words on the newspaper sample should be said. I refrained from selecting articles, as researching newspapers has been considerably eased by the National Library digitalization project. I scanned all issues of both newspapers published between July 28, 1914 (Austria-Hungary declares war on Serbia) and November 11, 1918 (the signing of the armistice), using the keywords ‘Turk’ (to find references such as Turkije, Turken, Turks) and ‘Otto’ (Ottomaans, Ottomanen) for articles that are either about the Ottoman Empire or refer to the Ottoman Empire. Relevancy has been the guiding principle. Articles on the Central Powers in which the Ottoman Empire is mentioned only briefly for example have been left out. Merely ‘guilty by association’, these articles generally do not say too much about images of the Ottomans themselves.

As the goal of this thesis is to analyze the images of the Dutch left of the Ottoman Empire, only articles that refer directly to the Ottoman Empire were included in the surveys. The actual number of articles on the Ottoman Empire is even larger, also for example including English telegrams on the campaign in Mesopotamia that merely refer to the Turks as ‘the enemy’. Although other keywords, such as ‘Arme’ (Armeniërs, Armeens, Armenië), were used to check whether I had missed any articles; these articles have not been included when only indirect references were found.

**Example: Inwendige versterking van het nieuwe imperium.**

Naar gemeld wordt, zullen de handels-politieke verdragen tusschen Duitschland en Turkije worden onderteekend. Zoowel door de opheffing der capitulaties als door de nauwe verbinding met Turkije die door den oorlog is ontstaan, was een nieuwe regeling der betrekkingen tot dit land noodig geworden. De verdragen omvatten het geheele gebied der economische betrekkingen, zoodat 20-25 afzonderlijke verdragen moesten worden opgesteld.

Als gemachtigden van Turkije te Berlijn zullen de Turksche gezant Hakki Pacha en de directeur-generaal der politieke afdeeling in het Turksche ministerie van buitenl. zaken Reschid Bey, de verdragen onderteekenen.

Een deel der verdragen zal te Konstantinopel worden onderteekend, alwaar als gemachtigde van Duitsland de gezand Von Kuhmann zal optreden.

De Turksche minister van financiën, Djavid Bey, komt te Berlijn; hij heeft tot taak de onderhandelingen voort te zetten, die tussen de leidende financieele Deutsche kringen en de Turksche regering gevoerd worden.

Author unknown, ‘Inwendige versterking van het nieuwe imperium’, in: *De Tribune* (12-01-1917) 3, via [kranten.kb.nl/](http://kranten.kb.nl/) (18-02-2013)

Before continuing with the complete analysis, I will analyze one article in detail, to make my approach more transparent. The article in the textbox above is about the relationships between the Ottoman Empire and its most important ally, Germany (most important or main topic, the first column of the observation schedule). More specifically, it is about the signing of new treaties (subtopic, the second column of the observation schedule). The first two references are to the capitulations (third column of the observation schedule) and Germany's financial support for the Ottoman Empire (third column of the observation schedule).

The article in the textbox is a news story, which is entered in the second of the observation schedules. To determine the place of action is more difficult: as we see the treaties will be signed in both Berlin and Constantinople. In this case therefore, two places are entered in the observation schedule. It is impossible to determine the source of the news. It is likely that this news came via the Central Powers, most probably Germany, as the Dutch newspapers received many news about the Ottoman Empire via Germany, but is impossible to determine this with certainty, and therefore nothing will be entered in the third observation schedule. To determine the actors is again not very straightforward. As the signatories sign on behalf of the Ottoman and German governments, these two actors will be entered in the observation schedule. In this particular example there is no dominant or most important actor. In many other articles however, the place and actors are easier to determine.

## **2.2 Quantitative content analysis - the analysis<sup>36</sup>**

After the introduction of the method, in the second part of this chapter I will discuss the results of the quantitative analysis. Here I will go into some of the characteristics of the reporting, discussing subjects such as the types of articles published, the place of action, the origin of the news, the principle actors as well as the topics covered. With an appendix numbering over hundred pages, it proved impossible to discuss all details. In this chapter I have merely highlighted some of the most interesting outcomes. For a full overview of the quantitative content analysis, I refer the reader to the appendixes.

---

<sup>36</sup> This analysis is based upon the Observation schedules for *Het Volk* and *De Tribune* (1914-1918), added to the thesis as Appendix I-V.

### 2.2.1. Type of article<sup>37</sup>

Both *Het Volk* and *De Tribune* pay attention to the Ottoman Empire during the First World War, but they do this in varying degrees. This is most apparent in 1914 and 1915. Whereas in 1914 223 articles are published in *Het Volk*, only 11 articles are published in *De Tribune*. To some extent, this is the result of *Het Volk* being published 6 times a week and *De Tribune* only being published only twice a week. Yet, even when this is taken into account, the discrepancy is huge. 20 times as many articles about the Ottomans are published in *Het Volk* in 1914 and 15 times as many articles are published in 1915. From April 1916 onwards, *De Tribune* too is published 6 times a week. As a result of the war the demand for news has grown among its readers.<sup>38</sup> Differences between both newspapers are still substantial (with *Het Volk* publishing 2.5 times as many articles on the Ottomans as *De Tribune*), but they have shrunk considerably. From 1917 onwards, *De Tribune* even takes over, publishing 102 articles on the Ottomans against *Het Volk*'s 86. This trend continues in the final year of the war, but in 1918 the differences between the two newspapers are negligible, with *De Tribune* only publishing four articles more than *Het Volk*.

What is perhaps surprising is that the interest in the Ottomans is not constant. When looking at the numbers for both newspapers, it is clear that there are peaks. The peak of *Het Volk* is reached early in the war in 1915, with almost 400 articles on the Ottoman Empire. The number decreases with almost 40% the next year, and continues to decrease until the end of the war, indicating perhaps either a waning interest in the Ottoman war effort or a lack of news from the Ottoman fronts. The trend for *De Tribune* is somewhat different as a result of the changing nature of the newspaper from 1916 onwards. The number of articles published on the Ottomans continuously increases during the war, and the peak of *De Tribune* is not reached until 1917, two years after *Het Volk*. Decreasing interest in the Ottomans and the Ottoman fronts is only visible in 1918.

What is at least equally interesting is the type of articles the two newspapers publish. *Het Volk*, mouthpiece of a political party supportive of the Dutch neutrality, mainly publishes news stories. Most of these stories are factual reports of war movements or telegrams received from either side. This strict emphasis on facts is especially apparent in the first three years of the war, when about 95% of the articles published are news stories. Although the line is continually descending (96.4% in 1914, 94.6% in 1915, 93.6% in 1916, 90.1% in 1917 and

---

<sup>37</sup> 'Type of Article', Observation schedules 1914-1918, Appendix I-V.

<sup>38</sup> Geudeker, 'Onafhankelijkheid en neutraliteit', 3-4.

87.7% in 1918), when taken over 5 years the decrease is quite limited. Until the end of the war, the editorial staff of *Het Volk* publishes mainly news stories. Opinion pieces are rare, but become more frequent near the end of the war, suggesting that the editorial staff allowed the reins to be loosened somewhat.

The situation is different for *De Tribune*. Published only twice a week until April 1916, the character of the newspaper is completely different at the start of the war. Not a newspaper in the sense we know them today, *De Tribune* initially is more concerned with educating the people than bringing them the latest news – which was probably outdated anyway by the time the newspaper reached the subscriber. Although news stories are also published in *De Tribune*, these are accorded a less prominent place in the communist newspaper in the first two years, with less than half of the articles being news stories. At its lowest point, in 1915, not even 1/3 of the articles are informative. The character of the newspaper however changes considerably after April 1916, when *De Tribune* becomes a daily newspaper. The trend for *De Tribune* is the opposite of the trend for *Het Volk*, with the number of news stories ascending from 1916 onwards (72.2% in 1916, 78.4% in 1917 and 79.2% in 1918) instead of descending. At the end of the war in 1918, *De Tribune* still publishes fewer news stories than *Het Volk*, but the differences between the two newspapers have decreased considerably.

Another category worth mentioning concerns larger feature articles. Especially suitable for a neutral newspaper, it allowed the editorial staff to go more in-depth than is common for a news story, without running the risk of being accused of being partial. Opinion articles too however are not absent from *Het Volk*. Especially in the later years of the war, a number of opinion articles are published every year in *Het Volk* too. In the case of *De Tribune*, these pieces are present almost from the start.

### **2.2.2. The place of action<sup>39</sup>**

Especially during the early years of the war, when *De Tribune* is less concerned with news than with education, not too much attention is paid to particular fronts. Most articles are about the Ottoman Empire in general. This is especially true in the first year, but in later years this somewhat changes, with *De Tribune* also featuring some articles on particular campaigns, such as the Dardanelles campaign.

---

<sup>39</sup> ‘Geography: the place of action’, Observation schedules 1914-1918, Appendix I-V.

From 1916 onwards for both newspapers the main focus is on events taking place at the various Ottoman fronts. The importance of the different fronts changes throughout the war. Big campaigns cause the number of articles on a particular front to increase dramatically. For example, during the Gallipoli campaign (between April 1915 and January 1916) the number of articles on the Dardanelles front skyrockets. Whereas *Het Volk* publishes 13 articles about this (future) front in 1914, the number increases to 137 in 1915 and drops to 8 again in 1916.

Other fronts, such as the Caucasus, retain their importance for a longer period. Reporting on this front both in *Het Volk* and *De Tribune* increases steadily until it reaches its peak in 1916, only to decline afterwards because of the ceasing of hostilities between the Russians and the Ottomans. In 1918 fighting is resumed in the Caucasus, this time with the Armenians and Georgians. Never again reaching the same level of attention as the fighting with the Russians, especially *De Tribune* is interested in this battle of small nations against a large empire.

Apart from the war fronts, some articles are also concerned with Ottoman cities such as Constantinople, focusing for example on government affairs taking place. Some news articles also concern Ottoman foreign relations, and are therefore situated outside the Ottoman Empire. Compared to reporting on the Ottoman theatres of war, these numbers are limited though. As an interesting side note the handful of articles concerning the Dutch Indies, mainly about Pan-Islamism and the support of the Muslims under Dutch colonial rule for the Ottomans, also deserves to be mentioned. Some interest is also shown for India and the Indian Muslims under British rule.

### 2.2.3. The origin of the news<sup>40</sup>

Most news about the Ottomans becomes available to the Dutch press via either the United Kingdom, Russia or Germany. The main source of news for *Het Volk* seems to have been the United Kingdom. In 1914, 1917 and 1918 almost half of the news in *Het Volk* comes via British sources. Although the overall percentage drops in 1915 and 1916, at its lowest point still 1/5 of the news in *Het Volk* comes from British sources. Only in 1916 Great-Britain is not the main place of origin of news on the Ottoman fronts, its place being taken by Russia. The

---

<sup>40</sup> 'Geography: the origin of the news', Observation schedules 1914-1918, Appendix I-V.

large percentage of Russian news that year however is exceptional, as the overall percentage for Russian news in other years never rises above 13%.

That *Het Volk* is not merely copying news from Entente sources becomes clear when we look at the number of articles published from German sources. Germany is a good second in most years, as every year about 15% of the articles in *Het Volk* comes via Germany. This is a sign that the editorial staff of *Het Volk* is serious about representing both perspectives, publishing news coming via the Entente as well as the Central Powers.

Considering the limited amount of articles whose source is clearly indicated, no conclusions should be reached about *De Tribune* for 1914 (0 out of 11 articles) or 1915 (4 out of 26 articles). Later years show a mixed image. *De Tribune* too seems to be relying mainly on British news, with a quarter of the news coming via Britain in 1917 and almost half of the news in 1918. Like in *Het Volk*, most news comes via Russia in 1916. In the case of *De Tribune*, the news sources seem to be more evenly spread throughout the war, with Britain's lead being less obvious in *De Tribune* than in *Het Volk*, with the sole exception of 1918. *Het Volk* on the other hand uses more different sources, for example also publishing some articles received via Greece or France. In 1916, this is most obvious. Whereas *De Tribune* prints news from 10 different sources, *Het Volk* uses 16 different sources, also publishing news from other Central Powers such as Austria-Hungary or Bulgaria or neutral countries.

Both newspapers also publish news that arrives via Constantinople. In most years however, this constitutes less than 20% of the total number of articles. When not taking into account the first two years, the score of *De Tribune* is not particularly bad, with almost 40% of the articles on the Ottomans published coming from the Ottoman Empire itself. At its lowest point in 1918, *De Tribune* still publishes more articles from Ottoman sources (17% of the articles) than *Het Volk* in most other years, the sole exception being 1915 (18.1% of the articles in *Het Volk*). All in all however, the scores are not particularly impressive, especially if it is taken into account that some articles indicating the Ottoman Empire as its place of origin, are not actually coming from Ottoman sources and do therefore not represent the point of view of the Ottomans themselves. Although many articles are sent by the Ottoman government, others come via European sources within the Ottoman Empire. The Ottomans seem indeed to be spoken about more than they contribute to the discourse themselves.

If taken together, a little over half of the news (51.8%) in *Het Volk* comes from the countries of the Triple Entente in 1914. 36.7% of the news comes from the Central Powers, including the Ottoman Empire. In 1915, the share of the Entente countries rises to 56.3%, while the share of the Central Powers decreases to 35.8%. In 1916 and 1917 too, the share of

the Entente countries continues to increase to 66.7%, whereas the share of the Central Powers decreases to 22.2%. In the final year of the war, the shares of the Entente and Central Powers are respectively 51.8% and 38.4%, indicating that the shares have become somewhat more balanced again. This however also shows that *Het Volk* relies mainly on Entente sources for news on the Ottoman Empire.

As for *De Tribune*, the trend is more capricious. In 1916 45.6% of the news arrives via the Entente countries, whereas 52.1% of the news arrives via the Central Powers (with the Ottoman Empire being the main source of news). In 1917, the balance is significantly reversed, with 57.5% of the news coming via the Entente countries and 29.7% via the Central Powers. 1918 sees the share of the Entente increasing to 63.8%, with the share of the Central Powers remaining 29.1%. Analyzing the source of news for *De Tribune* shows therefore an interesting trend, with more news from the Central Powers than the Entente being published in 1916, and a reverse of this trend in 1917 and 1918, with the Entente countries being the main source of news.

Concluding, we can say that neither newspaper stands out as particularly pro-Entente or pro-Central Powers. Although the balance might be somewhat in favor of the Entente in either case, it is never completely distorted. The fact that both editorial staffs are divided among themselves is one reason why positive and negative articles can appear side by side. This is characteristic for both newspapers. Both sides are allotted space to have their say in *Het Volk* as well as *De Tribune*. Although much of the news about the Ottomans and the Ottoman fronts comes from non-Ottoman sources, they are not at all left out – although they are spoken about rather than speaking themselves.

#### **2.2.4. The principle actors<sup>41</sup>**

As the main subject of this research is the Ottoman Empire, the Ottomans are expected to form the majority of the actors in the articles too. This is however only true to some extent. Both in 1914 (48.8%) and in 1918 (50.6%) about half of the articles in *Het Volk* has the Ottomans themselves (either the Ottoman government, its representatives abroad, the armed services, etc.) as the principle actors. In the remaining articles the main actors are foreign, most often the Russian and British armies. In 1915, 1916 and 1917 they outnumber the Ottomans as main actors in articles about the Ottoman fronts, indicating that these articles are

---

<sup>41</sup> ‘Actors’, Observation schedules 1914-1918, Appendix I-V.

written from the Ottoman enemy's perspective. In these years the amount of articles in which the Ottomans are the principle actors is around 35% of the total.

Considering the nature of the period under research, it is no surprise that the most important actors between 1914 and 1918 in *Het Volk* are of a military nature. More specifically, they consist primarily of the armies, but also the military authorities, navies and air forces of the warring powers. The armies make up almost half of the actors in the articles in *Het Volk* in 1914 for example, with the fleets making up another 21.2%. A total of 65.2% of all actors this year is of a military nature. This percentage only rises in 1915 and 1916, when diplomatic relations between the two warring camps are terminated for the time being. On its peak in 1916, the military actors make up 82% of the total actors that year. Although the armed forces still make up the majority of the actors in 1917 (67.1%) a decreasing trend is started, reflecting a lesser interest in military affairs. In 1918 the share of the military has declined even further. On its lowest point however, the military actors still make up nearly 40% of the total amount of actors, outnumbering all others.

A secondary set of actors are the political actors, consisting for example of the governments and the diplomatic services. The most important are the various governments, representing for example 17.4% of the actors in 1914. In 1915, the political actors together make up 33.5% of the actors, with the largest group again being the governments. In 1916 with 6.9% their share is at its lowest point, a reverse of the trend visible for the military actors. This includes however a very interesting new category, the foreign social-democrats. Attention is paid to German and Russian socialists in a number of cases. From 1916 onwards, the share of the governmental actors increases again to 15.4% in 1917 and 31.3% in 1918.

A somewhat smaller, but no less interesting category in *Het Volk* are the Ottoman people, and more specifically the Ottoman non-Muslims. Their share is small, but significant. In most cases, it only entails a handful of references every year, but the space allocated to these articles is often much larger than the more frequent telegrams on war movements. In 1914 and 1915 for example, their share amounts to only 0.9% and 0.4% respectively. In 1916, this number has risen. Next to two articles in which the Ottoman people are the main actors, five articles are written about the Ottoman Armenians, numbering 2.1% of the total amount. The Ottoman non-Muslims referred to in these years are only the Armenians. In 1917 for the first time attention is also paid to non-Armenian non-Muslims (Jews). The trend over these years is stable, with 2.1% in 1916, 2.2% in 1917 and 2.6% in 1918 for the combined non-Muslim minorities.



A final interesting category that deserves to be mentioned are the foreign Muslims. Holland being a colonial power, some attention is also paid to the Entente colonies such as Egypt, Sudan and India, and to the Dutch Indies. More specifically, the attitude of the colonial population is monitored out of fear they might have Pan-Islamist sympathies. Starting with Sultan Abdulhamid II, the Ottoman rulers try to acquire the support of foreign Muslims, hoping to counterbalance Great Power interference in their own domains. The fear that Muslims in the Dutch Indies will turn against the Dutch government because of their sympathy for the Ottomans is very real for the colonial governors.<sup>42</sup> Both *De Tribune* and *Het Volk* therefore show an interest in the Muslims in the colonies. On its peak in 1914, these foreign Muslims are the main actors in 2.6% of the articles. After a sharp decrease to 0.4% in 1915 a stable trend numbering around 1.2-1.3% of the total amount of actors becomes visible.

The early years of the war show a somewhat different image for *De Tribune*. Because of the different nature of the newspaper, in the first two years of the war the principle actors of the articles are mainly states, either the Ottoman Empire or other states such as Britain (14.3% each) or groups of allied states, such as the Entente or Central Powers (also 14.3% each). Although attention for larger entities remains more visible in *De Tribune* than *Het Volk*, with the changing nature of the newspaper the share of the different actors also changes. The abstract state or alliances become less important as actors, although for example the Great Powers are still more important as main actors than the Ottoman state or government itself, indicating some sort of ‘pawn status’ for the Ottomans. Their number decreases from 18.1% in 1915 to 10.6% in 1916 and 5.3% in 1917. With the decrease in attention for abstract wholes such as alliances or state, the attention for political actors increases. In 1915 for example, they already amount to 68.3% of the total actors. After this peak their share decreases, stabilizing to between 24-30% of the total.

In the first period especially, the armed forces are less important as actors in *De Tribune*. In 1914 for example, only one article is about an army in particular. In 1915 their share increases to 27.2%: a remarkable increase, yet still way below *Het Volk*’s percentage. In 1916, reflecting the shift in the character of the newspaper, 55.5% of the actors are armies, navies or air forces, mainly the Ottoman (24.5%), followed by the Russian army (17%). In 1917 and 1918 the number decreases to 52.2% and 31.6%, showing that the same trend that is

---

<sup>42</sup> Van Vugt, ‘De Nederlandse reactie op de panislamitische politiek van Turkije’, 123-137.

visible for *Het Volk* also affects *De Tribune*: less attention for the military and more attention for the political towards the end of the war.

From 1915 onwards, *De Tribune* also starts paying attention to Ottoman non-Muslims, mainly the Armenians. The trend here is somewhat more capricious than in *Het Volk*. In 1915, the Ottoman non-Muslims are 4.5% of the main actors in the articles in *De Tribune*. In 1916, their number decreases to 1.1%, only to skyrocket to 15.8% the next year. After this peak, in 1918 the number is still well over 10%, showing a greater concern for Ottoman non-Muslims among the editorial staff of *De Tribune* than among their counterparts at *Het Volk*.

The attention for the foreign Muslims is less obvious in *De Tribune* than in *Het Volk*. In three years (1914, 1915 and 1918) they do not form the main actors of any article. Only in 1916 and 1917 some attention is paid to the subject, both to the Indian Muslims (1.1% in 1916) and the Muslims in the Dutch Indies (2.1% in 1917).

The Ottomans are the main actors in only 18.2% of the articles in 1915. This is a marked decrease from 1914's 42.9% and equals the amount of attention paid to the Germans for example, who did not fight in large numbers at Ottoman fronts, but played important roles as officers and trainers. In 1917 for the first time the Ottomans are the main actor in over half (52.9%) of the articles in either newspaper. This number rises to its peak in 1918 with 65.8%. The attention for foreign, especially British, Russian or German actors, when talking about the Ottoman Empire however is remarkable.

### **2.2.5. Topics, subtopics and references: frequency and percentages of the total<sup>43</sup>**

The topics, subtopics and references used in the observation schedules can be grouped into ten different cohorts. The first group of topics refers to Ottoman relations with the outside world; be they Great Powers or neighbors. This includes topics that have to do with breaking up the Ottoman Empire, such as the annexation of Egypt. The second group of topics has to do with the Ottoman past and includes important events from the recent Ottoman history, such as the Balkan Wars (1912-1913). The third and fourth group are references to the Ottoman government and armed forces/navy. The fifth group contains references to the First World War, both more abstract references to certain theatres of war as well as references to Ottoman victories or defeats. The sixth group contains judgments of the behavior of the different belligerent powers, including determination of truth in telegrams. The seventh group of topics

---

<sup>43</sup> 'Topics, subtopics and references: frequency and percentages of the total', Observation schedules 1914-1918, Appendix I-V.

has to do with the fight for the hearts and minds of the common people, either under Ottoman rule or outside the Ottoman domains. This also includes references to Ottoman non-Muslims. In the eighth group are the references to life in the Ottoman Empire, whereas the ninth group contains references to the Ottoman alliance with Germany and Austria-Hungary. The final group consists of stereotypes about the Ottomans. These groups appear together in the observation schedules, and I have ordered these groups as logically as possible.

Attention for international relations is particularly high at the start and the end of the war. In between, armed confrontation takes the place of diplomatic contact and reporting on fighting between the belligerent powers is more widespread. Especially in the early period, *Het Volk* discusses the Ottomans mainly in the context of international relations, for example focusing on possible alliances. References to relations with other countries form the main topic of the articles. Taking one example, in 1914 the Ottoman relations with the Triple Entente are used as main topic, subtopic and references fifteen times in total. Fourteen times this relationship is the main topic of the article. If exceptions are visible, such as a number of first and second references to the relations with Balkan countries and the Islamic World in 1914, these are still more common as topic and subtopic than as references.

*De Tribune* also pays attention to international relations. To some degree the same trend as in *Het Volk* is visible: many references to relations with the outside world are either main topics or subtopics of articles. The nature of the references is however somewhat different. Especially during the first half of the war, *De Tribune* pays a considerable amount of attention to topics such as the Eastern Question and the foreign designs on Constantinople. This is not surprising, taking into account the Dutch communists' history of anti-imperialist struggle.<sup>44</sup>

When it comes to international relations, *De Tribune* is less subtle than *Het Volk*. Relations with greater blocs, such as the Great Powers, the Triple Entente and the Central Powers, continue to receive more attention than the relationships with specific countries. Diplomatic relations with the USA continue to be discussed separately, but save that, relations with the different Great Powers are usually grouped together under one heading. *Het Volk* continues to devote attention to relations between the Ottomans and the different allies and opponents separately too. References to the Great Powers or the Eastern Question are rare – although *Het Volk* writes extensively about topics as border adjustments.

---

<sup>44</sup> Morrien, *Indonesië los van Holland*, 8-20.

How important the Ottoman international relations are for the editors of both newspapers is clearly visible in the observation schedules. Like the nature of the references, the amount of references to a topic differs from year to year. For example, no fewer than 86 references are found in *Het Volk* in 1914, most of them discussing Ottoman relations with the Triple Entente and the Balkan countries. The same is true for *De Tribune*, with almost 10% of the references in 1914 being to the relations of the Ottomans with the two warring blocks. The continued interest is also visible in later years. At its height in 1915, 17% of the references in *Het Volk* are to international relations and nearly 30% in *De Tribune*. Although both newspapers keep discussing international relations, the percentage of the references declines after 1915. The lowest point is reached in 1916 in *Het Volk* (4.4% of the references) and in 1917 in *De Tribune* (7.8% of the references). The number skyrockets again in the last year of the war, mainly as a result of the peace negotiations.

The topics of the second group, references to the Ottoman past, are not particularly widespread. Based on a limited amount of references (21 over 5 years), they seem to be as common as topics as they are as references in both *Het Volk* and *De Tribune*. In the case of *Het Volk*, these references are limited to the Balkan Wars. Never the main topic of articles, they are used as subtopics about half of the time. References to the Ottoman past are more widespread in *De Tribune*, including the Balkan Wars, the rule of Abdulhamid II, the Russo-Turkish War (1877-1878), the Greek-Turkish War (1897) and the Young Turk Revolution (1908). With the exception of a few references (that can be counted on the fingers of one hand for both newspapers) to the glorious military past of the Ottomans, little attention is paid to the history of the empire. Therefore, we will move on to the next topic.

References to the Ottoman government are equally uncommon. Included in this group are topics such as problems within the Ottoman government, plans to overthrow the government and the formation of new governments. The Ottoman government at the start of the First World War is not a main topic of interest to either newspaper. References are limited again, but are mostly either the main topic or the subtopic of an article, reflecting the concentration on particular events. Both newspapers however also comment on issues such as censorship and the influence of the Young Turks.

The lack of real attention for Ottoman governmental affairs is apparent from the observation schedules too. In 1914 for example, no references are made to the Ottoman government in *De Tribune* and only two references are made in *Het Volk*. And the latter are not particularly positive ones, as they refer to the lack of communication between the Ottoman government and its officials abroad and the practice of censorship. After a peak in

1916 – mainly on account of a number of references to censorship – interest in governmental affairs in 1917 and 1918 returns to same low level as in 1914 and 1915. Not even the Ottoman socialists can spark any interest. With only one reference to their existence in *De Tribune*, their work is largely ignored in the Netherlands.

The lack of interest in Ottoman governmental affairs sometimes is stunning. Indeed, in 1916 *De Tribune* for example does not report on the death of the heir to the Ottoman throne at all. Despite a number of important events happening in 1918 (the fall of the Young Turk government, the formation of a new government and the death of Sultan Mehmet V Reşad and his replacement by Mehmet VI Vahideddin) articles covering these issues are virtually non-existent. Although both newspapers report on the formation of a new government in 1918, *Het Volk* simply forgets to inform its readers about the death of one Ottoman sultan and his replacement by the next.

The Ottoman armed forces and navy are subject of a number of articles as well. In most cases, the subjects form the main topic or subtopic, but in a substantial cases they are used as the first and second references as well. In the latter case, the image is rather contradictory. In one article a newspaper might write that the morale of the Ottoman soldiers is perfect, in the next their morale is very low. Mainly the result of using many conflicting sources as well as different sympathies within the editorial staffs, it cannot be said that either newspaper is thoroughly positive or negative towards the Ottoman army and navy. Instead, abundant and lack of military equipment, high and low morale, well and ill prepared and good and bad leadership continue to alternate. Overall however, the balance is mainly negative.

Both *Het Volk* and *De Tribune* pay attention to the military and the navy, but in different ways. In the first year of the war for example, *De Tribune*'s attention is mainly focused on the Ottoman navy. *Het Volk* on the other hand mainly focuses on the Ottoman army, although some attention is paid to the navy as well. Generally speaking however, the Ottoman land forces receive the bulk of the attention of either newspaper, although a considerable amount of attention is also paid to subjects such as the German cruisers Goeben and Breslau. At first references in *Het Volk* are mainly positive, with the Ottoman army being described as well prepared and ably-led. In later years, *Het Volk* is markedly less positive about the Ottoman armed forces. Although their military toughness and morale is praised on a number of occasions, the balance by 1916 is mainly negative, with references to the lack of equipment and the low morale of the soldiers. In the later years of the war, *Het Volk* refrains from judging the Ottoman armed forces.

The record for *De Tribune* is not very easily established either. In 1915 for example, just like in *Het Volk*, both positive and negative references can be found. Altogether the balance seems to be negative, with more references to low morale than to high morale for example. Both in 1916 and 1917 positive references can still be found. Indeed, in 1916 the only reference is to high morale and in 1917 to abundant military equipment. Only in 1918 a negative reference can be found too.

The next group, references to the First World War, is the most extensive. This includes more general references to the Ottoman ‘theatres of war’ as well as references to clashes between the Ottoman and the Entente troops. In most cases, these subjects are used as main topic or subtopic. In quite a number of cases however, these are also used as first or second references in articles about other fronts. It is for example not uncommon to find references to the war in Egypt or in Mesopotamia in articles about the fighting in the Caucasus. This is especially true in *De Tribune*, but from 1916 onwards this becomes more common in *Het Volk* too.

Which theatres are covered the best differs every year. In 1915 for example reporting in both newspapers is most extensively on the Dardanelles front and the Egyptian front, a reflection of clashes taking place. With the end of the Dardanelles campaign, the editors of *Het Volk* shift attention to the war in Mesopotamia and the Caucasus. The latter is an important topic for the editors of *De Tribune* too, as are the wars in Persia and Egypt. There is a marked difference between both newspapers when it comes to the coverage of the fronts too. *De Tribune* in 1914 for example does not refer to the war in Syria and Palestine at all, whereas this is the theatre best covered by *Het Volk*. *De Tribune* on the other hand devotes most attention to the Persian front and Egypt, which are mentioned respectively only once and not at all in *Het Volk* in the same year.

Which opponent receives the most extensive coverage differs from time to time. In 1914 for example, *Het Volk* mainly reports on clashes between the Ottomans and the Russians, with the British being a good second. Ottoman-Russian clashes come to an end in 1917 with the peace of Brest-Litovsk. 1918 therefore sees hardly any reporting on clashes between Russians and Ottomans. Instead, fighting in the Caucasus continues between the Ottomans and the Armenians and Georgians. Fighting between the British and Ottomans continues right until the end of the war. Both *De Tribune* and *Het Volk* report extensively on British successes against the Ottomans and an occasional Ottoman success against the British.

Generally speaking, the reporting on the war is more extensive in *Het Volk* than in *De Tribune*. In 1914 for example, apart from the Dardanelles and Egypt, references to the war in the Balkans, Syria and Palestine, Mesopotamia, Persian, the Arabian Peninsula, the Caucasus, the Black Sea and North Africa are made, whereas *De Tribune* only refers to the war in Persia once and does not mention the other fronts at all. In other years however references in *De Tribune* are more evenly spread geographically. In 1917 for example, *De Tribune* refers to all fronts apart from the Black Sea front.

The next cohort discusses the behavior of the different belligerent powers towards each other. *De Tribune* largely refrains from judging during the early years of the war, only mentioning Entente unfairness towards the Ottomans once. This is also mentioned a number of times by *Het Volk* in 1914 and 1915, but Ottoman unfairness (12 and 9 references respectively) outnumbers Entente unfairness (5 and 4 references respectively). The next year the balance is somewhat more even, with both the Ottomans and Entente committing one unfair act towards each other according to both newspapers. *De Tribune* reports once more on the mistreatment of citizens of neutral countries by the Ottomans, and there are also three references to the exploitation of the Ottoman Empire by the Great Powers. In 1917 only three references to unfairness can be counted, but all of them are the Ottomans'. The final year of the war the balance is again negative on the side of the Ottomans, with twice as many Ottoman unfairnesses towards the Entente reported as the other way around. As previously, *De Tribune* has a keen eye for Great Power exploitation of the Ottomans, but both newspapers pay more attention to Ottoman unfairness than Entente unfairness throughout the war.

When it comes to the trustworthiness of the belligerent powers, both newspapers are more reluctant to believe Ottoman telegrams than Entente telegrams. In some cases the balance is even, but neither newspaper reports more false Entente telegrams than false Ottoman telegrams in any of the war years. In 1917 for example, the newspapers report three false Ottoman telegrams in total, whereas they only refer to a false Entente telegram once. Just as the above topic, these lying telegrams are never the main topic of articles, instead they function as subtopics or references.

Another important topic is the fight for the hearts and minds of the common people. This includes articles about the Arab Revolt (the subject of a number of articles in 1916 and 1917) and Pan-Islamism, although that topic is often used as subtopic or references as well. In most cases topics in this cohort are more often used as a subtopic or as first or second reference than as main topic. Very few articles for example are written about the support of

the local and foreign Muslims for the Ottomans, rather these function either as subtopic or as references.

Interest is both in Muslims and non-Muslims. When it comes to the Muslims, Pan-Islamism especially is a particularly popular topic, with 17 references in *Het Volk* alone in 1914. Clearly it is a topic that greatly worries the Dutch press, as the attention paid to the topic is constant, although not to the same extent as in the first year of the war. That a fierce fight for the loyalty of the Muslims is going on is visible from other references as well. The same year *Het Volk* for example also refers to the support of foreign Muslims for the Ottomans 9 times. It however also pays attention to subjects such as the loyalty of Muslims under Entente rule and the neutrality of the Muslims. Attention is also paid to the actions of the Ottomans to acquire the support of Muslims abroad.<sup>45</sup> Although the Entente countries go through some trouble to acquire the support of Ottoman subjects<sup>46</sup>, nothing is ever reported on this topic. Although disloyalty among Ottoman subjects (both Muslims and non-Muslims) is mentioned on several occasions, nothing suggests that the Entente Powers might have a hand in this. Not surprisingly, more attention is paid to disloyalty among the Ottoman population than loyalty, although a number of references in each newspaper is also made to the loyalty of the Ottoman subjects. The continued support of foreign Muslims for the Ottomans is also noted by both newspapers, although awareness that many prefer to remain neutral is also shown.

The Ottoman Christian community is an usual focus for newspapers in Christian countries, and the Dutch left is no exception. Indeed, many SDAP as well as SDP-members combine party membership with religious convictions.<sup>47</sup> As the handful of references to the disloyalty of the Ottoman population (and more specifically the non-Muslims) and their activities undermining Ottoman rule suggest, not all are particularly happy within the greater Ottoman family. *Het Volk* shows some interest in their fate, for example discussing the Ottoman policies towards non-Muslims. *De Tribune* is silent on this topic in the first year of the war, paying no particular attention to the Ottoman non-Muslim subjects. News of massacres taking place in the Ottoman domains starts coming in in 1915. Although both newspapers also report on the atrocities committed by the Armenians against the Turkish

---

<sup>45</sup> Stanford J. Shaw, *The Ottoman Empire in World War I: Volume II* (Ankara, 2008). See for example chapter 10, 'Pan-Islamism and Holy War', and chapter 12-14, that discuss Pan-Islamism in the French and British colonies as well as neutral countries such as Afghanistan and Iran.

<sup>46</sup> Shaw, *The Ottoman Empire in World War I*. See for example chapter 8, 'Entente Anti-Ottoman propaganda', chapter 15 'Pan-Islam and Pan Turkism in Russia and the Russian response', and chapter 16, 'The British response to Pan-Islam'.

<sup>47</sup> Stoelinga, *Russische revolutie*, 133.



population, the balance is not in favor of the Turks: many more references to massacres of Christians are made. In both newspapers attention is also paid to larger questions of non-Muslim policies, an interest that will remain constant throughout the years. In the next chapter, I will discuss this topic more in-depth.

Daily life in the Ottoman Empire does not seem to be a prime topic of interest for either newspaper, but some attention is paid to the subject in both newspapers. At its peak in 1915, no less than 15 articles in *Het Volk* report on the daily life of the ordinary Ottomans, most of them negative, mentioning disruption and dissatisfaction. Although the Ottoman daily life is mainly used as a subtopic or as references, it is also the main topic of a handful of articles. Most attention is paid to the topic by *Het Volk*, with reporting mainly focusing on the attitude towards the war within the Ottoman Empire, the dissatisfaction among the Ottoman population and the disruption of their daily lives. After 1916 some attention is paid to these topic by *De Tribune* as well, with both disruption and continuation mentioned several times.

The Ottoman alliance with Austria-Hungary and particularly Germany is a favorite topic for newspaper editors as well. More than once, complete articles are devoted to the Central Alliance. In most cases, these articles are either about the Ottoman alliance with Germany or with the Central Powers in general, for example mentioning problems between the allies. It is clear that Germany is seen as the main partner of the Ottomans, as references to the Austro-Hungarians are rare. In most years at least a handful of articles are published on the alliance, and many more references are made to it. Indeed, next to the main topics and subtopics, the alliance also features in countless references. In chapter four, I will discuss this topic in more detail.

Stereotypes in Dutch newspapers are not as visible as one would perhaps expect. Neither newspaper is extremely outspoken about the Ottomans. Especially in *Het Volk*, the Ottomans are often reported upon in a distant manner, without judging them in every article. Especially in the early days of the war *De Tribune* is kind to the Ottomans, portraying them as nice and simple farmers. *Het Volk* from the start is somewhat less positive. Although they are once referred to as nice in the first year of the war, three more references describe the Ottomans as barbaric and violent. These two references keep coming back during the war, as are negative associations such as pillaging. They are also referred to as stupid, backward and unorganized, which has associations with childishness and under-development rather than cruelty. Neither are particularly positive associations, of which neither newspaper has plenty. References to honesty are considerably rarer than references to violence and cruelty, for example. The change is particularly stunning in the case of *De Tribune*. 1918 is full of

references to backwardness, pillaging, unacceptable behavior of Ottoman soldiers in occupied territory, violence, barbarism, oppression and stupidity. Whereas *De Tribune* seems rather friendly in 1914, it could certainly not be considered friendly anymore in 1918.

References to specific ‘oriental’ subjects are also lacking in most years. Indeed, the inevitable Arabian Nights and the harem only appear for the first time in 1917, when *De Tribune* refers to the Arabian Nights and *Het Volk* reports on the Ottoman harem. These are the only references that surfaced over a period of 1,500 days or 4.5 years. This indicates that neither newspaper really equalized the Ottoman Empire with the medieval Arab world familiar from stories such as the Arabian Nights anymore, as some critics argue. Other references, such as for example to the alliance with Germany, are simply far more important in this period. These stereotypes are used not just as references, but also as main topics and subtopics. In 1918 for example, they are used in *De Tribune* as main topic on three occasions, as subtopic on four occasions and as references on seven occasions. This indicates that stereotypes are more than just a couple of lines in some articles, they form important parts of the articles themselves as main topics and subtopics.

#### **2.2.6. Conclusion**

As expected, reporting of the Dutch press on the Ottoman Empire in the period researched is to a large extent limited to a selected number of topics, mainly the Ottoman government and international relations, and of course, considering the nature of the period, warfare. Most of the ten groups I distinguished above fit one of these broader categories. This does however not mean that no attention is paid to any other topics. Dutch newspapers also show some interest in topics outside these three main categories, for example paying some attention to daily life in the Ottoman Empire, but references to these subjects are relatively rare. It is also important to add that although most of the topics discussed in both *De Tribune* and *Het Volk* can be placed under one of these ten categories, in the end there are still a number of topics that seem to fit in only with difficulty or not at all. What to think for example of the references to women’s rights in the Ottoman Empire? By drawing attention to these larger patterns I therefore do not want to argue that reporting is completely predetermined, rather what I have tried to discover in this chapter are the main interests of the editorial staffs of *Het Volk* and *De Tribune*, and the associations made in their reporting.

Most of the articles in either newspaper are concerned with events taking place in the Ottoman Empire or at the Ottoman fronts. This does not automatically mean that news mainly

reaches the Netherlands via the Ottoman Empire. Indeed, most of the news comes via its most important ally Germany, or via Great Britain and Russia. Neither newspaper can be described as totally pro-Entente or pro-Central Powers, but from the amount of articles published it is clear that the Entente wins the propaganda battle, with many more articles being published from Entente than Central Powers' sources in most years in both newspapers. *De Tribune* and *Het Volk* however both receive news via different sources, to some extent explaining the mixed images found in either newspaper. Although news received via the Ottoman Empire is also printed, this is never more than half of the articles – although it should be emphasized that *De Tribune*'s score is better than *Het Volk*'s throughout the war. The Ottomans are not the most important actors in most of the newspapers, either. Instead, British and Russian actors – primarily armies – also feature prominently.

Considering the war situation, it is perhaps not surprising that reporting on the Ottoman Empire between 1914 and 1918 mainly focuses on international relations first and warfare later. Save the first and last months of the war, reporting on the Ottoman Empire mainly focuses on armed confrontations taking place between the Ottoman armies and their opponents, chiefly the British and the Russians. Whereas in peacetime most attention would probably have been paid to the Ottoman government, in the days of the Great War the Ottoman armed forces and the navy are the main interest of the Dutch press, with only few articles about governmental affairs being published.

Next to these broader topics that mainly function as main topics or subtopics, there are also other topics, that by nature are more suitable as subtopics or references than as main topics. This is for example the case with the references to Ottoman history. Very few articles on the Balkan Wars are published, yet the topic surfaces as a subtopic or reference on a number of occasions. The same is true for moral judgments about the warring powers, such as the unfairness committed by the Ottomans against Entente countries or neutrals, or the discussion about the trustworthiness of telegrams.

Neither newspaper is wholly negative about the Ottomans. Especially *De Tribune* in the early years of the war is relatively friendly towards them, portraying them as nice and simple farmers. Positive portrayals keep appearing throughout the war. On the whole however, the balance is not positive for the Ottomans. Although lying telegrams by either side are identified, false telegrams seem to come more often from the Ottomans than from the Entente Powers. Similarly, unfairness towards their opponents and towards neutral powers seems to be committed more by the Ottomans than by their opponents and their subjects are

more often described as disloyal than loyal – although some attention is also paid to support for the Ottomans abroad.

Similarly, negative connotations are more prevalent than positive associations. Although occasionally the Ottomans are described as nice and honest, on many more occasions they are referred to as violent, barbaric, stupid and backward. There is no real difference in this regard, although the change is more notable on the part of *De Tribune*, as this newspaper is less negative than *Het Volk* at the start of the war. By the end of the war however, they seem to have turned almost 180 degrees, being more negative than *Het Volk*.

At first glance, religion is not a major issue for either newspaper. In many articles no references are made to the different religion of the Ottomans. Indeed, it is only when discussing non-Muslim policies that the reader is confronted with the Islamic nature of the Ottoman state. The absence of references to other Ottoman government policies – save a handful of references to economic policies – reveals however that it is a factor of some importance. As we shall see in the next chapter, both *Het Volk* and *De Tribune* devote a considerable amount of attention to Ottoman non-Muslims and their fate during the war.

Both newspapers have different stands towards the war. *Het Volk*, following the SDAP, supports the Dutch neutrality, whereas *De Tribune*, mouthpiece of the SDP, feels no need to be as neutral as possible in the reporting. To some extent this is reflected in the kind of articles published. Whereas *Het Volk* mainly keeps to news stories, *De Tribune* also publishes a considerable amount of editorials and opinion pieces on the Ottomans. This is especially true in the earlier years of the war, near the end of the war *Het Volk* becomes somewhat more outspoken as well. Despite these differences, the general trends signaled above are true for both newspapers. Although less blunt and outspoken than *De Tribune*, *Het Volk* shares quite a few of their ideas. Real differences in reporting will however only become apparent in the next chapter, when we go into the details of the discourse on the Ottomans.

### **Chapter 3: Qualitative content analysis: the Ottoman non-Muslim policies**

In this chapter and the next, I will analyze two topics more in-depth. For this, I have picked two themes that are quite controversial: the Ottoman policies towards non-Muslims and the Ottoman alliance with the Central Powers. Chosen because these two case studies have traditionally received a lot of attention from scholars in the field of Ottoman Studies, a comparison of the existing secondary literature with the Dutch newspapers allows us to compare between imagination and reality. Was there any link between the Dutch left's imagination and events taking place in the Ottoman Empire, or were the Ottomans not really the uncivilized lot they were portrayed as in the Dutch press? There are no topics relating to the Ottoman Empire on which the Dutch leftist newspapers had more outspoken views, providing us with colourful anecdotes, a wide spectrum of frank opinions and a good insight of the images of the Dutch left on the Ottoman Empire. In this chapter, I will first briefly say something about the non-Muslims in the Ottoman Empire, before continuing with the analysis of the representation of the non-Muslim policies in both newspapers, starting with *Het Volk* and discussing *De Tribune* afterwards. I conclude the chapter with a comparison of images and reality and a conclusion. In the next chapter, I will cover the Triple Alliance in the same order.

#### **3.1 Non-Muslims in the Ottoman Empire**

Life in the Ottoman Empire prior to the World War is relatively peaceful, but interreligious tensions had been brewing throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth century, ending in violence against non-Muslims on multiple occasions. Until the nineteenth century the Ottoman Empire is a traditional Islamic empire, where non-Muslims experience a degree of tolerance, but are still regarded as inferior to Muslims. The Great Powers however regularly interfere in the empire on their behalf. The transformation of the Ottoman Empire into a modern state, based on concepts of liberty and equality, leaves many Muslim subjects dissatisfied: not only do non-Muslims formally acquire a position of equality, they are actually seen to be elevated above the Muslims, because of this foreign protection as well as their relative prosperity. Add to the mix the experience of the Balkan Wars, with major losses

of land and a large influx of suffering Muslim emigrants looking for revenge, and you get a recipe for disaster.<sup>48</sup>

The Armenians – once dubbed the ‘faithful community’ – come to be seen as the ‘enemy within’ in this period. Requesting foreign powers repeatedly for intervention on their behalf, on multiple occasions European sponsored reforms aimed at improving the position of the non-Muslim communities are implemented in the Ottoman Empire. Just before the outbreak of the Great War a new Great Power committee is established to deal with their grievances and to advise about reforms. Regarding this as a forebode of the partition of Anatolia, the Young Turk government takes advantage of the war situation to solve the ‘Armenian problem’ once and for all. Their solution is simple, but radical: without any Armenians left, reforms will be superfluous.<sup>49</sup>

The bulk of the Armenian massacres take place in the period between the spring and the fall of 1915. In a radicalization of pre-war population displacement policies and Turkish assimilation programs, shortly after the disastrous Caucasus campaign and at the height of the Dardanelles campaign, the Ottoman government decides to dislocate several hundred thousand Armenians, allegedly so that they cannot cause any further harm cooperating with the enemy. Transporting so many people within a short period of time over a large distance without adequate transport facilities coupled with lack of sanitation and food means many Armenians do not survive these deportations. Many others are murdered, and by whom still remains a topic of debate. Not the only non-Muslim community suffering during the First World War, in the east the murders extend to the Assyrian community too, resulting in an appalling number of deaths among the Ottoman non-Muslim population during the First World War.<sup>50</sup>

---

<sup>48</sup> Taner Akçam, *A Shameful Act. The Armenian Genocide and the Question of Turkish Responsibility* (New York, 2006) 19-46; Donald Bloxham, ‘The First World War and the Development of the Armenian Genocide’, in: Ronald Grigor Suny, Fatma Müge Göçek and Norman M. Naimark (eds.), *A Question of Genocide: Armenians and Turks at the End of the Ottoman Empire* (New York, 2011) 260-275: 261.

<sup>49</sup> Akçam, *A Shameful Act*, 47-148; Bloxham, ‘The First World War and the Development of the Armenian Genocide’, 261.

<sup>50</sup> Donald Bloxham, *The Great Game of Genocide. Imperialism, Nationalism, and the Destruction of the Ottoman Armenians* (Oxford, 2005) 99-100; Akçam, *A Shameful Act*, 149-204; Bloxham, ‘The First World War and the Development of the Armenian Genocide’, 260-275; David Gount, ‘The Ottoman Treatment of the Assyrians’, in: Ronald Grigor Suny, Fatma Müge Göçek and Norman M. Naimark (eds.), *A Question of Genocide: Armenians and Turks at the End of the Ottoman Empire* (New York, 2011) 244-259.

### 3.2 *Het Volk* – Non-Muslims in the Ottoman Empire

The non-Muslims of the Ottoman Empire, and more specifically the Christians, are a source of great interest to many in Europe, including the editors of *Het Volk* and *De Tribune*. When it comes to reporting in the First World War period, two phases can be distinguished: the period up to the spring of 1915 and the period afterwards, the great dividing event of course being the Armenian massacres.

Before the spring of 1915, reporting on the Ottoman non-Muslims is scarce in *Het Volk*. No particular topic stands out, apart from a couple of reports on the disloyalty of the Ottoman non-Muslim population.<sup>51</sup> One article for example describes the great enthusiasm among the Armenians to serve in the Russian armies,<sup>52</sup> whereas another article reports the refusal of the Patriarch of Constantinople to ask his flock to pray for Ottoman success on the battlefield.<sup>53</sup>

Reports on cruelties committed towards the Armenians in *Het Volk* predate the spring of 1915, the starting point of the killings on a massive scale. The first record of atrocities committed by Ottoman subjects (albeit not within Ottoman borders) dates from mid-January 1915, and is copied from the British *Times*. Atrocities at this point are said to be committed only by wandering Kurdish tribes, that have entered Persia and ‘killed Armenians again’. The first record in *Het Volk* during the war, the article however refers to previous reports on Armenian massacres in the Ottoman Empire, that had ‘popped up almost as soon as war was declared’. Comparing the situation of the Armenians and the Belgians, the author judges the situation of the Armenians to be worse, because their flight takes place in the middle of the winter, leaving many to die of cold and hunger.<sup>54</sup>

News in this period however is not only negative and one-sided. For example in March 1915 *Het Volk* publishes a telegram sent from Teheran saying that in Eastern Turkey Armenians killed 30,000 Muslim prisoners-of-war by ‘beating [them] to death using rifle butts’. Not very angelic either! Indeed, the same hardships that the Armenian women and children were suffering from in the previous article are reported for the Turkish women and children fleeing to the mountains as well.<sup>55</sup>

---

<sup>51</sup> This is not to say only the non-Muslims were disloyal to the Ottoman government. Other articles for example report that Kurdish tribes switch their allegiance to the Entente. See for example ‘Turkije in oorlog’, in: *Het Volk* (17-11-1914) 1.

<sup>52</sup> ‘Rusland en Turkije’, in: *Het Volk* (14-11-1914) 1.

<sup>53</sup> ‘Grieken en Turken’, in: *Het Volk* (25-11-1914) 3.

<sup>54</sup> ‘Turken en Russen’, in: *Het Volk* (15-01-1915) 1.

<sup>55</sup> ‘Een Turks verhaal’, in: *Het Volk* (20-03-1915) 1.

During the course of the war positive articles on the relations between the different communities become less and less common. Indeed, they can be counted on the fingers of one hand. One article, received via the Ottoman Empire and dating from January 1916, describes how Christians joined the celebrations for the victory at Gallipoli, participating in special thank services.<sup>56</sup> Another article, dating from August 1917, reports that 90 Jews travelling from the Ottoman Empire to the USA deny prosecution of Jews by the Ottoman government, and are allegedly very satisfied about their treatment.<sup>57</sup> The final positive article will be discussed in somewhat more detail later on, as an example of how the editors of *Het Volk* deal with neutrality.

From July 1915 onwards reporting is both more widespread and more one-sided. In absolute numbers, reporting is still not very impressive. Only once in a while the Armenian prosecutions are mentioned, but often details are lacking in the early period. It is clear that something is going on in the Ottoman Empire, but it is not yet clear what exactly is happening.<sup>58</sup> Only in the spring of 1916, reports become more detailed. By then it is too late. Hundreds of thousands of Armenians have already died – either because of starvation or maltreatment.

In May 1916, the first detailed reports on the massacres become available. A Russian report on their entrance in Trabzon is the first somewhat detailed report published in *Het Volk*. According to this report, on their arrival in Trabzon the Russians found only 15,000 inhabitants left, all of them Greeks. The Armenian inhabitants of the city as well as the surrounding villages are said to have been mistreated and killed by the Turks. Although cruelties are said to surpass cruelties committed in other parts of Armenia, reports only become really graphic later on. The only detail related about the cruelties at this point is that in the summer of 1915, a couple of hundred young Armenians were arrested, accused of treason, and thrown into the sea.<sup>59</sup>

Misery is not limited to the Armenian population, but prosecution of Greeks seems to be taking place on a different level, as Greek families are not murdered, but ‘merely’ deported to the countryside, leaving around ten percent Greeks in the cities ‘at the mercy of the Muslim population’. It is added that they are turning Greek schools into Turkish, paying for it by pillaging the houses and churches of the Greek population. The victims of ‘annoying

---

<sup>56</sup> ‘De oorlog: Gallipoli ontruimd’, in: *Het Volk* (10-01-1916) 2.

<sup>57</sup> ‘Verspreide berichten’, in: *Het Volk* (29-08-1917) 2

<sup>58</sup> See for example ‘De Doemazitting op 1 Augustus’, in: *Het Volk* (02-08-1915) 2; ‘Om de Dardanellen’, in: *Het Volk* (21-07-1915) 1.

<sup>59</sup> ‘Turkse gruwelen’, in: *Het Volk* (18-05-1916) 1.



measures' rather than outright murder, according to the Greek socialist party there is still a risk that they might disappear because of Turkish oppression.<sup>60</sup>

Perhaps somewhat more surprising, *Het Volk* is interested in the Ottoman Jews as well. We have to wait until April 1917 however for the first reference to the Jews, when their suffering is placed in the context of a more general suffering of Jews throughout Europe and the Middle East. They are not described as suffering more or less than any of the other Jews on this occasion.<sup>61</sup> The first real article on Jewish suffering from the relocation policies dates from May 1917, when *Het Volk* prints a text received from a Jewish worker's association. No extra information is added to this, and no question marks are put here either. The text speaks for itself. As we shall see below, this is a strategy adopted by *Het Volk* on other occasions too.

Addressing the rumors that a policy of extermination towards the Palestinian Jews is adopted by the Ottomans, the communiqué starts by addressing the trustworthiness of the text, saying that despite all possibilities to do so, the Central Powers have never denied this policy. Indeed, the intention is said to be specifically announced by Cemal Paşa, one of the leading Young Turks, who is furthermore reported to be a supporter of slowly exterminating the Jews through hunger and illness. Germany is considered partly responsible for the brutal evictions, because even though the German military has judged the evictions unnecessary from a strategic perspective, the government has not prevented the Ottomans from having their way anyway. Indeed, it is expected that next to the villages evacuated in this area, many more will soon follow.<sup>62</sup> This critique on Germany is not unique. It is repeated in another article the same month, for example. By again copying the words of a Jewish press bureau, it says that foreign consuls – even those from the Central Powers – could not protect the Jews and curb the Turkish excesses.<sup>63</sup>

This translating and publishing of memoranda from Jewish organizations is by no means unique. Indeed, it is an important way of reporting on non-Muslim affairs for *Het Volk*. Several committees, both Jewish and Christian, work to make the general public aware of events happening in the Ottoman realm. For example, the next year a memorandum from the Armenian Committee at The Hague is printed, accompanied by an emotional request to the German, Bulgarian and Austro-Hungarian socialists to call upon their governments 'with all their might' to stop the slaughtering of 'what remains of the deported Armenians'. Not only forcibly converted, it is reported that they are also removed from their homes and forced on

---

<sup>60</sup> 'Griekenland en Turkije', in: *Het Volk* (25-07-1916) 1; 'Turksche verdrukking', in: *Het Volk* (25-04-1918) 3.

<sup>61</sup> 'Joodsche oorlogsliteratuur', in: *Het Volk* (14-04-1917) 6.

<sup>62</sup> 'De Joden door de Turken vervolgd', in: *Het Volk* (18-05-1917) 5.

<sup>63</sup> 'De wreedheden der Turken', in: *Het Volk* (30-05-1917) 2.

endless marches that the weakest do not survive. European eye-witnesses are quoted in the memorandum, and a number of events, such as the forced conversion of 2,700 orphans in Urfa and the disappearance of a great many of them afterwards, are discussed. Quoting from letters, the memorandum relates how once well-to-do people have lost everything, how they are now nothing more than living sacks of bones, how they in their despair eat animal fodder, how many succumb to illness every day, how women are sold as slaves to the Turkish harems, and much more: graphic details that were lacking in reporting in the first years of the war. Language has become more severe too. Indeed, whereas at first reporting takes place on a matter-of-fact basis, by 1918 the horrors are judged ‘unworthy of mankind’ and more.<sup>64</sup>

Switching attention to the Armenians that have escaped deportation and that are facing a new Ottoman occupation, the memorandum continues to discuss the Armenian-formed self-defense groups, that are portrayed in a negative way by the Ottoman government, which accuses them of committing all sorts of cruel deeds while explaining away their own. As the Ottomans do not seem to take prisoners-of-war in the Caucasus, it is feared that these soldiers defending their country will all be killed as soon as the Ottomans reoccupy the Caucasus. The future of Armenia is said to be dark indeed, as the Turks and their Kurdish helpers want to destroy the entire people – both to solve the Armenian Question and to connect with their fellow Turks further east. Germany is again seen as responsible for this, as a German occupation of the Caucasus could have saved the Armenians.<sup>65</sup> The same objection to the Ottoman reoccupation is voiced again a couple of times more. In other articles for example it is said that the annexation is dangerous for the Armenians since the Ottomans have already more or less exterminated the entire Armenian population of the Ottoman borderlands. The remaining 200,000 that could escape the first slaughter are now left at the mercy of the revengeful Ottomans. Again, the peace treaty designed by Germany is blamed, as well as the fact that the Germans allowed the Ottomans to break the treaty.<sup>66</sup>

The first reports on foreign attempts to help the Armenians date from October 1915, when the Americans offer visa and convey messages to the Porte that continuing the massacres will damage the friendly relations between the countries.<sup>67</sup> Their actions are

---

<sup>64</sup> ‘De kruisweg der Armeniërs’, in: *Het Volk* (26-03-1918) 5.

<sup>65</sup> *Ibidem*, 5.

<sup>66</sup> ‘De Rijksdagrede van Ledebour tegen den Vrede van Brest-Litowsk II’, in: *Het Volk* (28-03-1918) 2; ‘De Rede van Haase in den Duitschen Rijksdag I’, in: *Het Volk* (08-07-1918) 2.

<sup>67</sup> ‘Armeniërs naar de Vereenigde Staten’, in: *Het Volk* (02-10-1915) 1; ‘Verspreide berichten’, in: *Het Volk* (05-10-1915) 3.

followed by representatives of Greece and the Vatican.<sup>68</sup> Individuals too try to raise awareness of the suffering of the Armenians, for example the former German correspondent in Constantinople, who writes with horror about the cold indifference of the German government, that allows its dependent Ottoman vassal to exterminate the poor Armenians. Relating how his wife suffered a nervous breakdown after witnessing the Ottomans slaughter the Armenians like animals, this correspondent writes that an unscrupulous German government knows what is happening with the Armenians in the Ottoman Empire, but chooses not to take action.<sup>69</sup>

Another interesting example is the well-known socialist Karl Liebknecht. Reproducing an interpellation in the Reichstag, a government representative is quoted arguing that the Porte was forced to remove the Armenians from some parts of the empire, putting the blame on allied propaganda. ‘Because of certain results of this measure’ the Ottoman and German governments are said to have exchanged opinions. Although Liebknecht asks for details on several occasions he receives none, and instead he is treated with contempt by the president. No judgment is made by the editors of *Het Volk* themselves on this occasion, they merely reproduce the interpellation.<sup>70</sup>

Keeping this in mind, it is interesting to look at how *Het Volk* deals with telegrams arriving from the Central Powers. An interesting case is a telegram sent from Jerusalem by a ‘prominent Jewish individual’ in June 1917. Contradicting Entente telegrams, he states that the evacuations are not unnecessarily violent, not directed towards the Jewish population alone and that no one died. Instead, he writes that the entire population is evacuated and that the Jewish-led evacuation takes place without chaos and excesses. Showing awareness of the contradictory nature of telegrams published in *Het Volk*, the editors express hope that this news is true, but add that this particular telegram contradicts information from reliable sources as well as news published in Germany and Austria-Hungary. They furthermore argue that the lack of care by the Ottoman government is shown by the inadequate provision of carriages and food – adding that this was admitted in German newspapers as well. They also argue that the evacuation of German and Arabic villages is not reported, contradicting the statement that everyone is evacuated. To prove this point, an article from an Austro-Hungarian journal is cited. The military necessity of the evacuations is disputed by the editors of *Het Volk*, quoting the German military staff. They also argue that deportations are taking

---

<sup>68</sup> ‘Griekenland en Turkije’, in: *Het Volk* (23-08-1916) 1; ‘De wreedheden der Turken’, in: *Het Volk* (30-05-1917) 1.

<sup>69</sup> ‘Duitschers tegen Duitschland’, in: *Het Volk* (27-04-1918) 6.

<sup>70</sup> ‘Karl Liebknecht in den Reichstag’, in: *Het Volk* (12-01-1916) 2.

place in villages far from the firing lines, whereas others, closer to the front, are left in peace. Indeed, the sudden care for the well-being of the population by the Ottoman government is commented upon sarcastically, saying it only brought new misery to a population that has been under fire for years. Finally, a comparison with Armenia is made, where events were hidden from the public for months.<sup>71</sup>

One of the few telegrams published with comments, this is a particularly interesting case. Liebknecht's interpellation is printed in full, leaving no details out. In this way news about the Armenian massacres is related to the Dutch public, but not through the pen of the editorial staff of *Het Volk*. They cannot be blamed for anything, as they are merely quoting Liebknecht. When a couple of months later a telegram arrives that contradicts common sense, it is commented upon by quoting the German military and journals from both Germany and Austria-Hungary. Using Central Powers' sources, again the editors cannot be accused of being impartial, as they are merely using the Central Powers' own stick to hit them with.

Near the end of the war, the editors of *Het Volk* are a lot more outspoken than at the start of the war. When it comes to the arrangements after the war, *Het Volk* plainly states to support self-determination and oppose annexations. Indeed, the editors question the morality of *not* supporting the demands for independence of Arabia and Armenia, considering the fact that the inhabitants of the areas – not only Armenia, but also Syria and Palestine – are regularly abused by the Turks.<sup>72</sup> Not only that, the rule of a minority of Turks over a majority of others as well as the Pan-Turkish policies of the government are criticized. In fact, with the sole exception of the Kurds, the other people (Armenians, Greeks, Jews, but also Arabs) are judged to have a civilization that is elevated far above the Turkish. The blame for the extermination of a million Armenians is put on the Young Turks, as are the repression of the Arab movement in Syria and the banishment and expulsion of the Jews from Palestine. A pretty bad record indeed.<sup>73</sup>

### **3.3 *De Tribune* – Non-Muslims in the Ottoman Empire**

Before the Armenian massacres take place *De Tribune* shows no particular interest in the Ottoman non-Muslim community. Indeed, unlike in *Het Volk*, no articles on the Ottoman non-Muslims can be found until well after the start of the massacres. The Ottoman non-Muslims

---

<sup>71</sup> 'De gruwelen in Palestina', in: *Het Volk* (04-06-1917) 2.

<sup>72</sup> 'Socialisten in het Engelsche Lagerhuis', in: *Het Volk* (19-05-1917) 2.

<sup>73</sup> 'De Bevrijding van Jeruzalem en de Zionisten', in: *Het Volk* (17-12-1917) 2.

are mentioned in *De Tribune* for the first time only in August 1915, when the Ottoman government hangs twenty socialists, who happen to be of Armenian origin. They are said to be a Young Turk example to the provincial governments, showing those governments how to deal with ‘the revolts that had been going on in all of Armenia from April onwards’. The first reference to events happening in Armenia, it is neither extensive, nor does *De Tribune* focus on the non-Muslim nature of the rebels. Instead, their socialist identity is emphasized. They are not hung because they are Armenians, they are hung because they are socialists.<sup>74</sup>

By October 1915 *De Tribune* acknowledges that something more is going on in the Ottoman Empire, and the first of many articles on the Armenian massacres is published. Calling it a renewed attempt to exterminate the Armenian people, the massacres are put in context by referring to the 1890s. Back then, according to *De Tribune*, the Armenian people were sacrificed because of Great Power interests in spheres of influence and concessions. Hundreds of thousands of civilized people were clubbed down like animals, experiencing horrible torture and humiliation. And now again entire provinces are said to be drowned in blood, on this occasion on the order of the ‘enlightened’ Young Turks.<sup>75</sup>

After this initial recognition of massacres taking place in the Ottoman Empire a period of silence occurs. It is not until February 1916 that the next article on the massacres is published. Again, the connection to the politics of Sultan Abdulhamid II and his determination to exterminate the Armenians within the Ottoman domains is made. In the eyes of *De Tribune*’s editors, the only chance for the Armenians to survive is not to return them to Ottoman rule anymore. Civilization is seen as returning to the pre-capitalist age. Not even current imperialism was trying, like Abdulhamid and the Young Turks, to get rid of an entire nation: men, women and children.<sup>76</sup>

The bulk of the reporting on the massacres is only published after they had officially come to an end. *De Tribune* features only one more article on the Armenian community in the spring of 1916. Comparing the massacres under Abdulhamid II and the Young Turks, in this article the Armenians are said to almost long back to the 1890s, when the massacres were well organized (in other words, in contradiction to the chaos of 1915-1916). An allegedly modern and civilized government ordered the recent massacres out of national hatred. The Young Turks are said to have betrayed the comradeship that had existed between them and the Armenians and that had bound them together in opposing Abdulhamid, because of their own

---

<sup>74</sup> ‘Twintig socialisten opgehangen’, in: *De Tribune* (18-8-1915) 2.

<sup>75</sup> ‘De uitmoording van een volk’, in: *De Tribune* (16-10-1915) 3.

<sup>76</sup> ‘De oorlog’, in: *De Tribune* (26-02-1916) 3.

intellectual bankruptcy, their economic unsuitability and their cultural inferiority. In the eyes of *De Tribune* Abdulhamid's reign is indeed to be preferred to the Young Turk Era: Abulhamid at least used the qualities of the Armenians, and although they also suffered from his fury once in a while, they were as loyal to the Ottoman Empire as the Turks themselves. Now they are rationally exterminated because the Young Turks hope to balance the races and create a state in which the Turks are the majority.<sup>77</sup>

As in *Het Volk*, details about the massacres start coming in relatively late. The same Russian report that is quoted in *Het Volk* in May 1916 is also published in *De Tribune* only a day later, with exactly the same facts and figures.<sup>78</sup> This again is the first really detailed account of events happening in the Ottoman Empire.<sup>79</sup> During the second half of the war details about the massacres however become increasingly abundant. In January 1917 for example, Kurds are said to sell Armenian women and children in the markets in exchange for some pennies.<sup>80</sup> In another article (copied from *De Telegraaf*) the same month it is related how flocks of Armenians are left to die of hunger and thirst by the Ottomans, how Europeans are forbidden to help them, how the highest ranking Ottoman officials are standing idly by, and how educated and civilized Turks and Arabs watch Ottoman soldiers mistreat pregnant Armenian women, silently disapproving. Indeed, soldiers are quoted telling how women and children begged for mercy, how mothers killed their own children, how the soldiers chased Armenians who had escaped the massacres, how they killed children who hid themselves and how thousands of Armenians were thrown into the Euphrates.<sup>81</sup>

Indeed, articles become more and more graphical and detailed when more information becomes available to the Dutch press. For example, quite a number of articles are published describing how out of a group of a certain number of women and children travelling from this to that location, no one is alive anymore, and how on this and that day a certain number of people were deported from this and that *vilyatet* and how many of these people reached their final destination. Similarly, the graphical details are not lacking. It is not merely said that Armenians were thrown into the Euphrates – rather, it is related how they were put in boats, how their money and clothing was taken from them in the middle of the river (and later sold

---

<sup>77</sup> 'Het lot van Armenië', in: *De Tribune* (18-04-1918) 3.

<sup>78</sup> Both newspapers using the same sources is not an exception either. For example an open letter, written by a number of Germans who had lived in Syria, similarly is also published both in *Het Volk* and in *De Tribune* in August 1916. See 'De uitmoording der Armeniërs', in: *De Tribune* (22-08-1916) 2.

<sup>79</sup> 'Het stervend Armenië', in: *De Tribune* (19-05-1916) 3.

<sup>80</sup> 'De strijd aan het oostfront', in: *De Tribune* (25-01-1917) 3.

<sup>81</sup> 'De hel in Armenië', 1.

on the market), and how they were thrown overboard while soldiers were shooting at them from the river bank.<sup>82</sup>

As the above reveals, *De Tribune*'s sympathy from the beginning is with the Armenians, with whom the Dutch feel more closely related than the Turks, both because of their culture and their religion. The Armenians are considered as peaceful, hard-working and free of fanatic thoughts.<sup>83</sup> It is emphasized that the Armenians are no savages or barbarians, no 'Zulus or Kirghiz', but a civilized nation of peaceful farmers, traders and civilians. Their Indo-Germanic descent is emphasized, as is their similarity to the Dutch and Germans.<sup>84</sup> They are described as men and women of high civilization, from old and prominent elite families, with honorable professions such as doctor, engineer and lawyer. They are said to be of European culture and lifestyle, thinking along European lines, and they are considered as easily adaptable and hospitable, deserving everyone's respect because of their intellectual capacities. Lacking chauvinism and fanaticism, they are seen as the best possible counterweight to the nationalistic Young Turks. They certainly do not deserve to be deported like animals, and allegations that Armenians are also murdering Muslim fellow countrymen are considered lies to justify Ottoman massacres of Armenians.<sup>85</sup>

Contrasting this, *De Tribune* is less positive about the Turks. Not all Turks are considered bad, and it is acknowledged that some civil servants and governors resisted the measures – only to be replaced by more willing tools.<sup>86</sup> Many other articles are however negative. Quoting pro-Armenian sources, the Turks are described as defying civilization and not striving towards improvement. The Turk is portrayed as a good soldier, who likes to give orders, and who tries to raise his salary in all possible ways – hinting at corruption, although this is not said with so many words. He is considered uninterested in modern ideology, or ideas in general: his interest does not go beyond material affairs, and even the intellectual elite is only interested in enriching itself through the civil service. Trying to spread modern (socialist) ideas among these people is therefore considered useless. The Turkish socialists indeed have their own way of interpreting Marx and Lasalle, and their interpretation can hardly be called socialism at all, the *De Tribune* editors judge. Indeed, their defense of the

---

<sup>82</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>83</sup> 'Het vermoorde Armeensche volk', in: *De Tribune* (05-10-1917) 1.

<sup>84</sup> 'De hel in Armenië', 1.

<sup>85</sup> 'De Turksche moordenaarsbende II', in: *De Tribune* (29-07-1918) 2; 'De Turksche moordenaarsbende', in: *De Tribune* (10-04-1918) 3; 'Het vermoorde Armeensche volk', 1.

<sup>86</sup> 'De ineenstorting van Turkije', in: *De Tribune* (10-10-1918) 1; 'Het vermoorde Armeensche volk', 1.

Ottoman government is considered stunning, as is their justification of the Armenian massacres.<sup>87</sup>

As indicated above, *De Tribune* uses sources from both the pro-Armenian and pro-Turkish camp. It is interesting to have a closer look at how both sources are used. A telling example is an article published in October 1917. The extensive reply of a committee trying to help the Armenian people to an announcement of the Ottoman Legation to the Dutch press is published. The actual announcement itself however is nowhere to be found in *De Tribune*. Instead, its content is summarized in a couple of lines. Apparently, according to the editors of *De Tribune*, the pro-Armenian reply to the announcement is more interesting than the announcement of the Ottoman representatives itself.<sup>88</sup>

The pro-Armenian stance of *De Tribune* is even more clear when we look at the sources used. In August 1917 for example, an Armenian source is quoted. When referring to the Armenian witness quoted in the article, it is emphasized how civilized he is (for example pointing out that he is a great poet), indicating that his opinion deserves to be taken into account. In pro-Armenian sources German witnesses too are used to make certain facts appear more trustworthy. For example, a March 1918 article quotes German doctors and employees of the Baghdad railway in arguing that Entente sources are not exaggerating. Similarly, a German correspondent – described as both trustworthy and honest – who had lived in the Ottoman domains for a long time is quoted, as is information provided by Turkish civilians with contacts with the police forces.<sup>89</sup>

Comparing the various ways in which *De Tribune* deals with Ottoman telegrams shows plenty about their stand on the Armenian Question. The first attempt to represent the Ottoman government's point of view dates from May 1916, a full year after the Armenian massacres started. In a printed declaration, Talaat Paşa argues that the deportations were a military necessity, as the Armenians had the means to rise up against the government. He admits that extravagances took place during these deportations, that many suffered and some were killed, but he puts the blame on Ottoman officials and Kurdish tribes. This declaration is reprinted from a German magazine without comment.<sup>90</sup>

This is however hardly the case with other Ottoman government sources. For example, in July 1917 an Ottoman telegram arguing the necessity of the deportations is distributed.

---

<sup>87</sup> 'Waartoe Stockholm al niet dient', in: *De Tribune* (27-08-1917) 3.

<sup>88</sup> 'Het vermoorde Armeensche volk', 1.

<sup>89</sup> 'De Turksche moordenaarsbende', in: *De Tribune* (22-03-1918) 3; 'De Turksche moordenaarsbende' (10-04-1918) 3.

<sup>90</sup> 'De Armeensche gruwelen erkend', in: *De Tribune* (06-05-1916) 3.



According to this telegram Armenians living in Sivas were moved to Urfa and therefore the reported massacres on Armenians in Sivas could not have taken place, as there had not been any Armenians in Sivas anymore at the time. *De Tribune*'s comment is telling. Arguing that this telegram needed not to be commented upon, the editor writes that 'thousands of Armenians lived in Sivas, and none are to be found there anymore. Their bones lay already bleached on mountain passes and ravines. The Ottoman executioner sniggers and says: "you will never find them anymore"'.<sup>91</sup>

Similarly, in October 1917 Talaat 'following European governments' sends around a long piece 'giving himself and his fellow rascals' what *De Tribune* calls 'a license of goodness'. The accompanying comment relates how, after having slaughtered hundreds of thousands of innocent women and children in a way Abdulhamid could learn from, the Young Turks 'dare to signal the following message', followed by the telegram itself. The *NRC* apparently published the same telegram without commentary, and this is immoral in the eyes of *De Tribune*.<sup>92</sup>

This criticism on the Ottoman government policies is repeated time and again. Two more examples will suffice. In March 1918, when the Ottoman armies again enter the formerly Armenian inhabited areas in the east after the Peace of Brest-Litwosk, according to *De Tribune* they 'had the imprudence of sending telegrams into the world saying that they were forced to do this because of Armenian gangs'.<sup>93</sup> Similarly, in April 1918 an Ottoman telegram about the retreat of Armenian gangs is published saying 'the killers of Armenia have the insolence to slander their victims as follows...'<sup>94</sup>

Indeed, when it comes to the Armenian massacres *De Tribune* is anything but quiet. The Armenian massacres are portrayed not only as 'unequaled by all other cruel acts committed by the Central Powers',<sup>95</sup> but also as 'surpassing any of the other horrors happening during an already gruesome world war'<sup>96</sup> and 'the most horrible slaughtering that ever happened in the history of the regions Syria and Armenia',<sup>97</sup> with the tactics used 'not applied since the days of Tamerlane'.<sup>98</sup> Indeed, they 'make Dante's hell look like a game'.<sup>99</sup> The horror is seen to be especially in the methodic and cold-blooded nature of the

---

<sup>91</sup> 'De Turksche worgers', in: *De Tribune* (07-07-1917) 3.

<sup>92</sup> 'Een toppunt van driestheid der Turksche worgers', in: *De Tribune* (02-10-1917) 1.

<sup>93</sup> 'De Turksche moordenaarsbende' (22-03-1918) 3.

<sup>94</sup> 'De uitmoorders van Armenië', in: *De Tribune* (23-04-1918) 2.

<sup>95</sup> 'Open brief', in: *De Tribune* (02-06-1917) 1.

<sup>96</sup> 'De uitmoording der Armeniërs', in: *De Tribune* (22-08-1916) 2.

<sup>97</sup> 'De opinie van Balfour', in: *De Tribune* (19-01-1917) 3.

<sup>98</sup> 'De oorlog', in: *De Tribune* (11-03-1918) 2.

<sup>99</sup> 'Laatste oorlogsnieuws', in: *De Tribune* (03-01-1918) 1.

deportations, taking place over a time span of 1.5 years, with daily quota of Armenians that need to be deported.<sup>100</sup>

Summing up what happens to the Ottoman Armenians *De Tribune* in March 1918 graphically describes their fate:

‘Murders, violence against women, throwing in sea of children, dragging the most beautiful girls to brothels, violent conversion to Islam, the dragging of all young, female creatures to the harems, the crude expelling from their homes of civilized, elite families by animal-like police, robberies during the marching by thugs ordered by the government, internment in notorious malaria-spots and in deserts where no food can be found, the surrender to the barbaric lusts of wandering Kurds and Bedouins, shortly, the animal-like, cruel and rational extermination measures’.<sup>101</sup>

The editors of *De Tribune* are much more outspoken than the editorial staff of *Het Volk*, even on their own account. For example, Van Ravensteyn, both *De Tribune* editor and one of the most prominent SDP leaders, does not shy from giving his opinion in a number of letters written in June 1917 in reply to those of a certain Mr Reesema. The two cannot agree whether the Serbian horrors come anywhere near the Armenian. Van Ravensteyn argues in his letters that in magnitude and gruesomeness the Armenian massacres surpasses anything happening to non-combatants in the current war, only rivaled by Abdulhamid’s massacres of the 1890s.<sup>102</sup>

This is repeated time and again. Although it is admitted that Armenians have committed punishable acts, the deportation and killing of 1.5 million men, women and children is considered disproportional. Measures against civilians in wartime might be acceptable, but this – against one particular nation, with the consequence that not even a quarter of the pre-war population is still alive – is seen as far, far beyond that. The Armenian massacres are considered as bad as horrors happening in the war zones.<sup>103</sup>

Who exactly is to blame for the Armenian massacres is a topic of dispute. The Ottoman government’s point of view is not totally disallowed by *De Tribune*. Indeed, on more than one occasion the Armenians are said to be exterminated by unorganized hordes, mainly Kurds and other wild nomadic peoples, who are compared to the negroes from black Africa in their barbarism. They are not alone in their blame however. A German source claims that although Kurdish tribes raided a certain caravan, the last Armenians surviving the massacre were killed by the regular Ottoman troops sent out to punish the Kurds. In other instances too the Ottoman army is shown as being involved in the massacres. Ultimately, the responsibility

---

<sup>100</sup> ‘De Turksche moordenaarsbende’ (10-04-1918) 3.

<sup>101</sup> ‘De Turksche moordenaarsbende’ (22-03-1918) 3.

<sup>102</sup> ‘Open brief’, 1; ‘Armenië-Servië’, in: *De Tribune* (05-06-1917) 3; ‘Van Reesema en de feiten’, in: *De Tribune* (08-06-1917) 1; ‘Armenië-Servië’, in: *De Tribune* (22-06-1917) 2.

<sup>103</sup> ‘Het vermoorde Armeensche volk’, 1.

however is seen as the Young Turks', and not only because they could not protect the Armenians against these mountainous people – as Talaat argues. The Ottoman government is directly accountable in the eyes of *De Tribune* because the orders to systematically slaughter the Armenians originated from Constantinople and were theirs. Their blame is however shared with the German government, as the Ottoman bloodlust is seen to be without limitations because of German protection.<sup>104</sup>

Mainly because of Young Turk responsibility for the massacres, *De Tribune* is a supporter of Armenian self-determination. According to *De Tribune*, the return of Armenia to Ottoman rule is not only not in accordance with the wish of the Armenian people, it is also not in accordance with the progress of humanity.<sup>105</sup> Indeed, according to *De Tribune* the Armenians have earned the right to self-determination because of 'twenty-five centuries of civilization work' as well as their 'battle for freedom through natural gifts, a democratic mind and a passionate love for Western civilization'.<sup>106</sup> Considered as the perfect bridge between East and West, in the eyes of *De Tribune* editors this ancient people has served civilization in many ways by providing the foundation for progress.<sup>107</sup>

The idea that the question of nationalities can be solved within the Ottoman Empire in their eyes is absurd, considering the events of the last few years. As they cynically comment, Enver and his friends have very easy solutions for the problem, namely the extermination of all Armenians, Arabs and Jews.<sup>108</sup> Indeed, the Ottomans are said to be dissatisfied with only exterminating the Armenians within the Ottoman domains: their ultimate goal is to do the same with all non-Turkish people. The Armenians are merely the most hated and therefore the first.<sup>109</sup>

Attention is not only paid to the Armenians. Albeit on a less extensive scale, some articles are also devoted to other non-Muslim communities. In August 1917 for example, the prosecution of Greeks is reported on by *De Tribune*. The article relates how Greeks are forced into the Ottoman army, how the revenues of Greek schools are used for Ottoman hospitals,

---

<sup>104</sup> 'De oorlog', in: *De Tribune* (18-08-1916) 2; 'De hel in Armenië', in: *De Tribune* (30-01-1917) 1; 'Open brief', 1; 'Armenië-Servië' (05-06-1917) 3; 'Van Reesema en de feiten', 1; 'Armenië-Servië' (22-06-1917) 2; 'De internationale positie der Russische Revolutie', in: *De Tribune* (04-06-1918) 1.

<sup>105</sup> 'Drie jaren wereldoorlog', in: *De Tribune* (21-08-1917) 3.

<sup>106</sup> 'Beroep ter gunste der Armeniërs', in: *De Tribune* (03-07-1918) 3.

<sup>107</sup> 'De uitroeiing der Armeniërs voortgezet', in: *De Tribune* (23-05-1918) 3; 'Een oproep van Armeniërs', in: *De Tribune* (27-04-1918) 3.

<sup>108</sup> 'De oorlog', in: *De Tribune* (23-02-1918) 2.

<sup>109</sup> 'De oorlog' (11-03-1918) 2.

how businesses are forced to close down, and how Greeks are forced to convert. According to this article Greeks are arrested on a daily basis for working with the enemy.<sup>110</sup>

Lebanon and Syria, and especially the Catholic population, also receive some attention, mainly in the form of Western Powers trying to help the local population suffering from famine. In July 1916 for example, the Pope is said to have protested the prosecutions of the ecclesiastical authorities as well as the Lebanese population. The USA, in cooperation with the Vatican, is also said to have asked on a number of occasions for permission to help the Syrian Christians coping with the famine. This permission is withheld in July 1916, and in January 1917 the USA and the Vatican are still said to be waiting for permission, while between 50,000 and 80,000 Syrians are reported to have died already, both because of the famine and the Ottoman military authorities' stripping Syria of anything of worth.<sup>111</sup>

The Americans are not only involved in trying to ease the suffering of the Syrian and Lebanese population. They are also occupied with the possible sale of Palestine, with the purpose of establishing a Jewish colony there. The Ottomans are reported as not unwilling to sell, as the country needs the Jews to replace the Armenians it had 'lost'. Although a later article claims evidence exists that the Ottomans had agreed to the sale of this land to both Jews and Christians after the war, the Young Turks deny this.<sup>112</sup>

The tragedy of the Jews in Palestine is completely overshadowed by the Armenian massacres. Nonetheless, the Jewish population also suffers, allegedly because of their 'resistance to assimilation'. In May 1917, *De Tribune* features the first articles on their fate, describing how all inhabitants of Jaffa are driven from their homes and how they flee northbound. The Ottoman authorities reputedly allow the non-Jewish population to destroy and plunder their homes, with resistance punished by hanging. Thousands of Jews are said to be wandering around helplessly, experiencing hunger and illness.<sup>113</sup> When in December 1917 new measures against the Jews are taken, a Jewish press bureau circulates an article that describes how thousands of Jews are homeless, suffering from illness and misery. Quoting from an Austro-Hungarian magazine, it states that 1/3 of the Jews in Palestine have already

---

<sup>110</sup> 'Grieken-vervolgingen in Turkije', in: *De Tribune* (04-08-1917) 3.

<sup>111</sup> 'Verhongerend Syrië', in: *De Tribune* (10-07-1916) 3; 'De hongersnood in Syrië', in: *De Tribune* (29-01-1917) 3.

<sup>112</sup> 'Het Heilige Land te koop?', in: *De Tribune* (27-07-1916) 3; 'Palestina te koop', in: *De Tribune* (05-09-1916) 3.

<sup>113</sup> 'De Turken verdrijven de Joden uit Jaffa', in: *De Tribune* (15-05-1917) 3; The same ingredients are repeated in an article published two months later. 'De vervolging der Joden in Palestina', in: *De Tribune* (17-07-1917) 3.

died.<sup>114</sup> However tragic, reporting on the Jewish suffering never reaches the same heights in *De Tribune* as the Armenians’.

Responsibility for the Jewish suffering is again seen as the Young Turks’, and more specifically Cemal’s, as he is the one designing the measures. Indeed, he is said to have announced an Armenian-style extermination policy in Palestine. He is also portrayed as an opponent of pogroms, preferring slow extermination instead. Contrary to their role in the Armenian massacres, the Germans are not considered directly responsible for the Jewish suffering, as the German Chief of the General Staff had advised Cemal against it.<sup>115</sup>

Although more reports on Western attempts to help the Ottoman Christians are published, the Ottoman Jews are not without help either. The Spanish government for example is active on their behalf, albeit without too much success – as is reported in late July 1917.<sup>116</sup> Jewish organizations too help their brothers and sisters in the Ottoman domains, ‘to save them from doom’,<sup>117</sup> for example through the publication and circulation of news articles. Although *De Tribune* mainly publishes news received from Jewish associations, the Ottomans are not left completely without a voice. In May 1917 for example, an article representing the Ottoman point of view is published. This communication, received from the Turkish Delegation in The Hague, disputes that horrors took place during the evacuation of Jaffa. In contrast to *Het Volk* however, *De Tribune* does not give any further details.<sup>118</sup>

### 3.4 Reality check

Reporting on the non-Muslim massacres taking places in the Ottoman Empire starts relatively late. Most articles, both in *Het Volk* and in *De Tribune*, appear after the spring of 1916, when the bulk of the massacres has already taken place. After that period, reporting however is quite accurate. To be sure, the Armenians serving with the Russians are only a handful and reporting on large numbers of Turkish Muslims killed by the Armenians is mainly a result of Young Turk propaganda, but unfortunately the atrocities reported upon are real. Armenians are converted by force, sold into slavery and killed in their thousands. *De Tribune* does also

---

<sup>114</sup> ‘De wapens neder!’, in: *De Tribune* (06-12-1917) 3.

<sup>115</sup> ‘Armeniërs en Joden’, in: *De Tribune* (23-05-1917) 3.

<sup>116</sup> ‘De wegvoeringen der Joden uit Palestina’, in: *De Tribune* (31-07-1917) 3.

<sup>117</sup> ‘De wapens neder!’, 3.

<sup>118</sup> ‘Laatste oorlogsnieuws’, in: *De Tribune* (24-05-1917) 3.

very accurately pinpoint the issue at stake: the balance of the races and the creation of a Turkish majority state.<sup>119</sup>

The question of the German guilt will be dealt with more in-depth below. What is perhaps striking is that in both newspapers a lot of attention is devoted to the role of the ‘wandering Kurdish tribes’. We now know that a large part of the guilt is the Young Turk’s, and especially the *Teşkilât-ı Mahsusa*’s (Special Organization), but this organization was secret, and therefore did not make it into the Dutch newspapers. Although the guilt is put clearly with the Young Turk government by both newspapers, their focus on the Kurds sometimes underplays the central government’s role, which in some cases is directly responsible for their actions, as some are on the government payroll. *De Tribune* also reports on the resistance by some provincial governors and civil servants and the limited role of the Ottoman regular army (as opposed to the Ottoman irregular troops, which included some of the so called unorganized Kurdish hordes), which we also know to be true. The same goes for their reporting on international offers of help, which unfortunately are rejected by the Porte, as *De Tribune* reports.<sup>120</sup>

Interestingly, both *De Tribune* and *Het Volk* pay attention to non-Armenian (Greeks, Jews) groups in the Ottoman Empire, perhaps even more than is the case in today’s academic literature about the Ottoman Empire during the First World War, which mainly focuses on the Armenian suffering. Although some work has been done on the non-Armenian non-Muslims in recent years, the general public today is not sufficiently aware of the other groups involved.

### 3.5 Conclusion

Both *Het Volk* and *De Tribune* devote a considerable amount of attention to non-Muslims, especially Armenians. As this chapter shows, similarities as well as differences can be found in their reporting. Before the start of the massacres in the spring of 1915, reporting is most extensive in *Het Volk*. Indeed, whereas *De Tribune* does not feature a single article about non-

---

<sup>119</sup> Bloxham, ‘The First World War and the Development of the Armenian Genocide’, 260-275; Uğur Ümit Üngör, ‘“Turkey for the Turks”: Demographic Engineering in Eastern Anatolia, 1914-1945’, in: Ronald Grigor Suny, Fatma Müge Göçek and Norman M. Naimark (eds.), *A Question of Genocide: Armenians and Turks at the End of the Ottoman Empire* (New York, 2011) 287-305; Peter Holquist, ‘The Politics and Practice of the Russian Occupation of Armenia, 1915-February 1917’, in: Ronald Grigor Suny, Fatma Müge Göçek and Norman M. Naimark (eds.), *A Question of Genocide: Armenians and Turks at the End of the Ottoman Empire* (New York, 2011) 151-174: 154.

<sup>120</sup> Bloxham, ‘The First World War and the Development of the Armenian Genocide’, 260-275; Hans-Lukas Kieser, ‘From “Patriotism” to Mass Murder: Dr. Mehmed Reşid (1873-1919)’, in: Ronald Grigor Suny, Fatma Müge Göçek and Norman M. Naimark (eds.), *A Question of Genocide: Armenians and Turks at the End of the Ottoman Empire* (New York, 2011) 126-150.

Muslims before August 1915, *Het Volk* includes at least a handful – most of them focusing on non-Muslim disloyalty. In this early period somewhat more positive articles can be found too, in which for example the non-Muslims claim that the Ottoman authorities treat them well. These articles are however limited to the early phase of the war, and none appear anymore after 1916. Such articles are lacking throughout the entire 4.5-year period under research in *De Tribune*, which is considerably more negative about the effects of Ottoman rule on non-Muslim minorities than *Het Volk*.

In both cases it is true that in absolute numbers the articles on the suffering of the Ottoman non-Muslim population during the First World War are limited. Especially in the early period of the war these articles appear only once every two months on average. They become more plentiful during the second half of the war, with often at least one article a month being published on the subject. Their importance however does not lie in their quantity, but in their quality. These are the most extensive and outspoken articles published on the Ottomans during the war.

The first articles about killings of Armenians taking place in the Ottoman domains appear in the Dutch leftist newspapers in 1915. Reporting starts particularly early in *Het Volk*. When *Het Volk* publishes the first report on Armenians being murdered in the Ottoman Empire in January 1915, the mass murders have yet to start. When *De Tribune* publishes its first article on the massacres in August 1915, the track record of *Het Volk* already shows one other article on the prosecutions and a number of references in more general articles.

Although the reality check determined that reporting on the non-Muslims was pretty accurate, both newspapers in the early period have difficulties interpreting the events. Whereas the first articles in *Het Volk* mention the involvement of the Kurdish tribes in the massacres, *De Tribune* initially sees anti-socialist conspiracies. By the autumn of 1915 they are aware that something more far-reaching is going on in the Ottoman domains, but details are long lacking. Both *Het Volk* and *De Tribune* have difficulties obtaining facts about the massacres. Only after the bulk of the massacres have come to an end more detailed reports start coming in. To what extent the Dutch newspapers rely on sources provided by others becomes clear only then. Both *Het Volk* and *De Tribune* publish the same Russian rapport as their first somewhat detailed source in May 1916. Afterwards, more and more details become available to the Dutch public. Whereas the first report only mentions a number of Armenians thrown into sea, subsequent reports are more detailed and more graphical, with stories about suffering women and children, reduced to begging living skeletons and left to perish of hunger and illness. The language of the reports also becomes more severe in the course of the

war. Whereas the first reporting takes place on a matter-of-fact basis, by 1918 the horrors are judged 'unworthy of mankind' and much more.

Differences are mainly in the details. *De Tribune* for example devotes more attention to the historical context, referring to the relations between the Young Turks and the Armenians and the massacres of the 1890s a couple of times. Similarly, they are more outspoken about the difference between Turks and Armenians. Although *Het Volk* also sympathizes with the Armenians, it is not repeatedly mentioned that they are more civilized than the Turks, as is the case in *De Tribune*. Generally speaking, *Het Volk* is more balanced in its reporting, for example also reporting on the suffering of the Turkish population. Whereas *Het Volk* also publishes Turkish counterclaims that Armenians are also killing Muslims, *De Tribune* dismisses the idea as a lie straightaway.

The suffering of other non-Armenian non-Muslims is reported upon as well, but less extensively. Both newspapers also devote a considerable amount of attention to the Jews of Palestine from the spring of 1917 onwards, although a topic such as the sale of Palestine is only discussed a number of times in *De Tribune*, and not in *Het Volk*. Next to that, *Het Volk* shows some interest in the Greek case, while *De Tribune* reports on the suffering in the Levant, first only on the Christians, and later also including the Muslim population. Although their fate is unenviable, both *Het Volk* and *De Tribune* are aware that their suffering is taking place at a different level. Although Greeks, Maronites and Jews also suffer and die of hunger and illness, they are not the victims of an extermination policy, as are the Armenians. Although both newspapers to some extent blame the Kurdish tribes, Ottoman officials as well as Germany, main responsibility is put on the Ottoman government.

Both *Het Volk* and *De Tribune* publish sources from 'pro-Ottoman' as well as 'anti-Ottoman' groups, but especially in the case of reporting on the Jewish Ottoman population, many sources become available through the minority groups themselves. To a lesser extent this is true for the Armenians as well, as both newspapers are keen on publishing Armenian memoranda. Witnesses cited in these articles are without exception pro-Armenian, and often Turkish or Germany/Austro-Hungarian too, which makes the articles look more reliable, as of course Central Power citizens cannot be accused of spreading war propaganda. Pro-Ottoman witnesses are rarely cited in newspaper articles. Pro-Ottoman sources are limited to government telegrams, and the opinions represented are the government's. Few people speak out on their behalf.

In many cases, these articles are reprinted without comments. Especially *Het Volk's* strategy in the early period of the war seems to be to reproduce news, not to give its own



opinions on these matters. Unfortunately it is impossible to find out hundred years after the start of the war whether any selection was performed by the editors. Whether publishing more pro-Armenian than pro-Ottoman sources says something about the attitude of the editors or the PR activities by both sides is therefore difficult to determine. On a limited number of occasions however, clues to the position of the editors of *Het Volk* can be found. In June 1917 for example, *Het Volk* publishes an Ottoman telegram, commenting that they hope the news is true, but that it contradicts information from reliable sources – some of them Central Powers’. During the final stages, they too argue for self-determination for the non-Turkish peoples.

*De Tribune* is more outspoken than *Het Volk*. Ottoman government sources are printed, but with a lot of added commentary, effectively disqualifying the telegrams. *De Tribune* does not claim neutrality. That would not have been very convincing either, considering the comments accompanying Ottoman telegrams. *De Tribune* editor Van Ravensteyn too is very vocal in defending the Armenian cause in a series of letters written in the summer of 1917, showing the sympathy of *De Tribune* was indeed only with one side.

## Chapter 4: Qualitative content analysis: the Triple Alliance

### 4.1 The Triple Alliance

Before 1914 German influence in the Ottoman Empire is mainly felt on the economic and military terrains. German investment in the Ottoman Empire (mainly in transport, mining and agriculture) skyrockets after 1880, as does trade between the two countries. The German influence in the Ottoman Empire however is by no means absolute. It is counterbalanced by British and French influence, which is equally important – if not more important. The Germans might have their military mission, the British have a naval mission of equal size present in the Ottoman capital and the leading Ottoman bank is still the French-British *Banque Impériale Ottomane*. That the Ottomans would join the Central Powers during the First World War is no forgone conclusion, and the alliance only comes into existence after extensive Ottoman lobbying and several rejections from both power blocs.<sup>121</sup>

During the war, the Ottoman leadership seeks to revert the unequal relationship between the Ottoman Empire and the European Powers that has come into existence especially since the late eighteenth century. Far from being a German lapdog, as Ulrich Trumpener and Mustafa Aksakal show, the Ottomans during the First World War are masters in their own house, and skillfully play the German leadership to obtain more and more concessions. With gritted teeth, the Germans allocate a substantial amount of the war budget to supporting the Ottomans in their war efforts, but they receive very little in return. The Ottomans delay their declaration of war for months in 1914, hiding behind cabinet problems and military unreadiness for war, to the extent that the Ottoman alliance with the Central Powers almost breaks down. They also refuse to give any written guarantees that Germany will have a preferential position after the war with regard to the valuable Ottoman raw materials, and constantly keep the door open for doing business with the Entente again in the post-war period. Far from exploiting Ottoman resources, Germany has to support the Ottoman Empire throughout the war, to the extent that supposedly profitable businesses – such as the Baghdad railroad – turn into near bankruptcies.<sup>122</sup>

Germany's attempt to dominate the Ottoman Empire militarily fails equally. The number of Germans in Ottoman service never amounts to a large number, and they never

---

<sup>121</sup> Ulrich Trumpener, *Germany and the Ottoman Empire 1914-1918* (Princeton, 1968) 7-20; Mustafa Aksakal, *The Ottoman Road to War. The Ottoman Empire and the First World War* (Cambridge, 2008) 75-104.

<sup>122</sup> Trumpener, *Germany and the Ottoman Empire*, 271-351; Aksakal, *The Ottoman Road to War*, 75-187.

acquire positions of tremendous influence. To be sure, some Germans (such as General Otto Liman von Sanders) command armies, but with regard to imperial policy making they are always merely advisors, and not decision makers in their own right. Decisions continue to be made by the Ottoman leadership, and especially Enver Paşa, who would not allow himself to be easily manipulated.<sup>123</sup> But, as we shall discover in this chapter, the Dutch left interprets events in the Ottoman Empire in a somewhat different manner.

#### 4.2 *Het Volk* – Triple Alliance

The relationship between the Central Powers is a topic of some interest to the editors of *Het Volk*, but for this category the same disclaimer as for the non-Muslim minorities applies: in absolute terms the number of articles dealing with this relationship is not particularly impressive. Indeed, most articles that mention any of the Ottoman allies merely mention German officers accompanying or commanding the Turkish forces,<sup>124</sup> German victims among the fallen at the Ottoman fronts,<sup>125</sup> or German officers captured among the prisoners-of-war in engagements at Ottoman theaters of war.<sup>126</sup> Nonetheless, there are enough articles left to say something meaningful on the portrayal of the Ottoman relations with Germany and Austria-Hungary in *Het Volk*. In this analysis, Bulgaria is left out, as the Ottoman relationship with Bulgaria is of a completely different nature.

Within the Triple Alliance Germany is clearly the dominating partner. Relations with Austria-Hungary receive very little attention in the socialist press, in striking contrast with the attention paid to the Ottoman alliance with Germany. Emphasis is put on the German dominance over the Ottomans, as is literally expressed on several occasions: ‘Germany rules the Ottoman Empire’.<sup>127</sup> Suggestions of the German government are portrayed to regularly find a listening ear in Constantinople. For example, the Ottoman offer to cede some territory to Bulgaria in exchange for Bulgaria’s benevolent neutrality is not seen as an Ottoman, but as a German proposal.<sup>128</sup> Special attention is also paid to the German reorganization of the army, the navy and the bureaucracy, and the public works commissioned by German capitalists.<sup>129</sup>

---

<sup>123</sup> Trumpener, *Germany and the Ottoman Empire*, 21-107.

<sup>124</sup> See for example ‘Turken en Russen’, in: *Het Volk* (14-11-1914) 1.

<sup>125</sup> See for example ‘Turkije in de oorlog’, in: *Het Volk* (17-11-1914) 1.

<sup>126</sup> See for example ‘De Turksche nederlaag’, in: *Het Volk* (11-01-1915) 2.

<sup>127</sup> See for example ‘De stand van het vredesvraagstuk’, in: *Het Volk* (13-01-1917) 2.

<sup>128</sup> ‘Verspreide berichten’, in: *Het Volk* (17-06-1915) 2.

<sup>129</sup> See for example ‘De stand van het vredesvraagstuk’; ‘De Weener “Arbeiter-Zeitung” in Duitsland verboden’.

That the Ottomans are regarded as no more than a junior partner in the alliance becomes clear all the better when *Het Volk* reports on Central Powers' diplomacy. For example, when the Central Powers send an ultimatum to Romania about the transit of ammunition, the ultimatum is said to be sent by Germany and Austria-Hungary alone, leaving the Ottoman Empire out – despite the fact that the goods transported through Romania are meant for Ottoman use.<sup>130</sup> In the same way, the Ottomans are not mentioned when the demands of the Central Powers towards Russia are discussed in the context of the Treaty of Brest-Litowsk. Again only the German and Austro-Hungarian demands are cited.<sup>131</sup>

Similarly, the Ottoman actions during the war are portrayed as dictated by Germany. This already starts in November 1914, with the clashes in the Black Sea that ultimately draw the Ottomans into the war. Admitting there is a real possibility that the Germans have hastened the crisis because of their defeat at the Weischel, it is judged that the German influences in Constantinople have predominated in the end.<sup>132</sup> Likewise, in April 1915 a committee of Young Turks is reported incapable of deciding upon what to do if the Entente Powers succeed in forcing the Dardanelles, instead settling on waiting for instructions from Berlin.<sup>133</sup>

German dominance in the Ottoman Empire is however never seen as absolute, despite the above. On some occasions, the Germans are merely referred to as the Ottomans' helpers.<sup>134</sup> On other occasions, German and Ottoman officers are described as leading operations together, as is for example the case at the Dardanelles front, when Enver and the German General Liman von Sanders direct the Ottoman forces together.<sup>135</sup> Politically, too, the Ottomans are still capable of making their own decisions. When the Germans advise the sultan to leave Constantinople during the attack on the Dardanelles for example, the sultan is disinclined and proposes to send his heir away instead, suggesting that he might listen to what the Germans have to say and is willing to accommodate them too to some extent, but that he does not comply with their advice if it is against his own will.<sup>136</sup>

Clearly from the outset relations between the countries are mainly characterized by self-interest. This is very obvious in the German case, as the Germans are accused of waging

---

<sup>130</sup> 'De Balkan-krisis', in: *Het Volk* (03-09-1915) 2.

<sup>131</sup> 'De voorwaarden van den wapenstilstand tusschen de Centrale Mogendheden en Rusland', in: *Het Volk* (18-12-1917) 1.

<sup>132</sup> 'In de Zwarte Zee', in: *Het Volk* (31-10-1914) 2; 'Turkije's ingrijpen', in: *Het Volk* (02-11-1914) 2.

<sup>133</sup> 'Uit Turkije', in: *Het Volk* (14-04-1915) 1.

<sup>134</sup> See for example 'Turken en Engelschen', in: *Het Volk* (23-11-1914) 2.

<sup>135</sup> 'Aan de Dardanellen', in: *Het Volk* (03-05-1915) 1.

<sup>136</sup> 'Aan de Dardanellen', in: *Het Volk* (09-06-1915) 2.

an imperial war to secure the connection with Persia in the East.<sup>137</sup> To a large extent the Ottoman Empire (like Bulgaria) is seen as a victim of German imperialism.<sup>138</sup> This is however only part of the story. Indeed, to some extent Ottoman moves are also seen as characterized by self-interest. This is already apparent in September 1914, when the Ottoman government is waiting for ‘the opportune moment’ to engage in the war.<sup>139</sup> Indeed, they are not beyond working against the other Central Powers either if it suits them better. In July 1915 for example, the Young Turks are reported to consider using the German difficulties to transport ammunition through Romania and Bulgaria to negotiate a separate peace with the Entente.<sup>140</sup>

As this suggests, the Triple Alliance is never more than a marriage of convenience for either side, be it the Germans/Austro-Hungarians or the Ottomans, although the papers go to some length to show that this was not the case. They for example report on pro-Ottoman marches in Germany to show the existence of great sympathy between the two countries,<sup>141</sup> and quote General Colmar von der Goltz, influential in reforming the Ottoman army, saying that it is a pleasure for the Germans to render the Ottomans this favor and commenting upon the close nature of the military bonds between the two countries.<sup>142</sup> Similarly, the surrender of Russian territory in favor of the Ottomans is allegedly received with sympathy in Austria-Hungary.<sup>143</sup>

From the beginning, little attempt is made by the editors of *Het Volk* to understand the Ottoman perspective. Instead, the Ottomans are portrayed as naive fools, easily misled by German advice and fighting only for the benefit of Germany and Austria-Hungary.<sup>144</sup> Indeed, when writing about the campaign against Egypt in 1915, it is clearly stated that the Germans do not fight in Egypt to gain victories for the Ottomans, but rather to divert Britain’s attention from the Western Front. The Ottomans – and more specifically the Young Turks – are described merely as the tool to implement German plans.<sup>145</sup>

The prime instruments in this respect are the Ottoman army and navy, which are both seen as completely under German influence. Indeed, the Ottoman fleet is often called the ‘German-Turkish fleet’, or sometimes even ‘the German fleet under Turkish flag’.<sup>146</sup> An

---

<sup>137</sup> ‘Wil Turkije vrede?’, in: *Het Volk* (23-07-1915) 1.

<sup>138</sup> ‘De socialisten in de Doema’.

<sup>139</sup> ‘Verspreide berichten’, in: *Het Volk* (29-09-1914) 2.

<sup>140</sup> ‘Wil Turkije vrede?’.

<sup>141</sup> ‘Een pro-Turksche betooging’, in: *Het Volk* (31-10-1914) 3.

<sup>142</sup> ‘Ongerustheid in Italië’, in: *Het Volk* (04-01-1915) 1.

<sup>143</sup> ‘Annexionisten-vreugde’, in: *Het Volk* (06-03-1918) 4.

<sup>144</sup> ‘Uit Turkije’, in: *Het Volk* (02-11-1914) 2; ‘Het optreden van Turkije’, in: *Het Volk* (30-10-1914) 3.

<sup>145</sup> ‘Turken en Engelschen’, in: *Het Volk* (14-01-1915) 2; ‘De aanval op Egypte’, in: *Het Volk* (14-01-1915) 3.

<sup>146</sup> ‘In de Zwarte Zee’, in: *Het Volk* (31-10-1914) 2.

interesting case is the alleged sale of the German cruisers Goeben and Breslau to the Turkish navy just after the conclusion of the alliance. Sometimes described as Turkish, sometimes as German, when for example the description of the action of ‘the Turkish squadron existing of the Goeben and Breslau’ in ‘*Russen en Turken*’ is analyzed in more detail one is struck by the absence of Turks. The report of the engagement with a Russian squadron is very detailed, but Turks are not mentioned once. Instead, the Germans are giving the Russians a tough time.<sup>147</sup>

Not only reorganizing the navy, German officers are at least equally important for training the Ottoman army. Indeed, this applies to such an extent that Ottoman defeats are seen as impacting the German military prestige rather than the Ottoman.<sup>148</sup> The Ottomans are not at all bad soldiers; they are portrayed as fierce, dedicated and fanatical soldiers. They however need Europeans to help them develop their qualities. It is the training of the competent German officers that is seen as instrumental in their success, as these are able to use these qualities and make the most of them.<sup>149</sup>

As hinted at before, the cooperation between the two allies is not always as idyllic as portrayed above. First of all, the alliance does not have the full backing of everyone in either country. Already in November 1915 the German press is skeptical about the added value of the Ottomans to the German-Austro-Hungarian alliance.<sup>150</sup> Public opinion in the Ottoman Empire is reported divided as well. The editors of *Het Volk* show awareness of the many different opinions on the alliance within the Ottoman domains, for example quoting *The Times* in saying that the alliance is the result of a very small pro-German wing in Constantinople.<sup>151</sup> Adding their own opinion, they report that not everyone in the Ottoman Empire is equally satisfied with the prevalence of the German advisors, for example naming the crown prince anti-German.<sup>152</sup>

Tensions too arise periodically between the allies. In November 1914 for example, a military revolt in Adrianople is reported by the British. Allegedly, the military is angry because of the subordination of Ottoman officers to German officers, and because all the high ranking posts are occupied by Germans.<sup>153</sup> The next year, Enver is reported to host a dinner for all Ottoman statesmen, not inviting any Germans. It is in this context that Enver’s issues

---

<sup>147</sup> ‘*Russen en Turken*’, in: *Het Volk* (23-11-1914) 2.

<sup>148</sup> ‘*Verspreide berichten*’, in: *Het Volk* (24-10-1914) 2.

<sup>149</sup> ‘*De Turksche nederlaag*’, in: *Het Volk* (08-01-1915) 1.

<sup>150</sup> ‘*In de Zwarte Zee*’, in: *Het Volk* (31-10-1914) 2.

<sup>151</sup> ‘*Turkije’s ingrijpen*’, in: *Het Volk* (02-11-1914) 1.

<sup>152</sup> ‘*Turkije en de oorlog*’, in: *Het Volk* (03-11-1914) 2; ‘*De Turksche troonopvolger*’, in: *Het Volk* (04-02-1916) 1.

<sup>153</sup> ‘*Woelingen in Turkije*’, in: *Het Volk* (13-11-1914) 1.

with Liman von Sanders, whose return Enver had already asked for, are discussed as well.<sup>154</sup> Similarly, relations with another member of the Triumvirate, Cemal, are not at all friendly either. In January 1916 a furious Cemal is reported to have left for Syria, angry over the issue of German officers on his staff.<sup>155</sup> In August 1917 he refuses to hand over command of the troops in Syria to General Erich von Falkenhayn, despite Enver's insistence.<sup>156</sup>

In other cases, cooperation seems to be somewhat better. The Germans and Ottomans are for example reported to work together to divide arms among the Bedouins of the Arabian Peninsula<sup>157</sup> and the Germans also spread Ottoman propaganda in the British colonies as well as the Dutch Indies.<sup>158</sup> The Austro-Hungarians are not often involved in this, although there are one or two reports on Ottoman-Austro-Hungarian cooperation in this field too, for example working together to incite Balkan rebels.<sup>159</sup>

The relation between Germany and 'its dependent vassal', subject to tension throughout the war, worsens towards the end of the war, especially after the Treaty of Brest-Litwosk. According to reports the Ottomans are not only dissatisfied with some of the clauses of the agreement, they also disapprove of German actions in the Caucasus that counteract their own.<sup>160</sup> Similarly, the German attempt to settle the Ottoman-Bulgarian dispute about the territory bordering the river Maritsa leaves the Ottomans disappointed. Adding to that are the German import- and export practices, that leave the Ottomans with barely enough to survive themselves.<sup>161</sup> The other way around, the Ottoman intention to conclude a separate peace is not well received in Germany either.<sup>162</sup>

Indeed, the Ottomans prove to be a bit of a liability for the Germans. As discussed in the previous section, when the Ottomans commit excesses the Germans are at least considered partly – if not wholly – responsible, as they are expected to restrain their ally. Having influence in Constantinople, the outside world expects them to use that influence.<sup>163</sup> That this is not particularly easy is admitted when it is reported that even the consuls of the Central Powers are unable to protect their countrymen, despite their attempts.<sup>164</sup> Similarly, the

---

<sup>154</sup> 'Deutschland en Turkije', in: *Het Volk* (04-08-1915) 3.

<sup>155</sup> 'Verspreide berichten', in: *Het Volk* (18-01-1916) 2.

<sup>156</sup> 'In Mesopotamië', in: *Het Volk* (07-08-1917) 1.

<sup>157</sup> 'Uit Afrika', in: *Het Volk* (03-12-1914) 1.

<sup>158</sup> 'Een Duitse poging', in: *Het Volk* (24-11-1915) 1; 'Duitse aktie in Indië', in: *Het Volk* (11-04-1917) 1.

<sup>159</sup> 'Van den Balkan', in: *Het Volk* (08-01-1915) 1.

<sup>160</sup> 'De Oostenrijksche regeering en de vredesonderhandelingen', in: *Het Volk* (05-10-1918) 1.

<sup>161</sup> 'Turkije en Duitschland', in: *Het Volk* (10-10-1918) 2.

<sup>162</sup> 'Na Bulgarije Turkije', in: *Het Volk* (04-10-1918) 3.

<sup>163</sup> 'Turkije en de Vereenigde Staten'; 'De Joden door de Turken vervolgd'; 'De Rijksdagrede van Ledebour tegen den vrede van Brest-Litowsk'.

<sup>164</sup> 'De wreedheden der Turken'; 'De gruwelen in Palestina'; 'Duitschers tegen Duitschland'.

Germany-designed peace treaty of Brest-Litovsk is criticized, as through this treaty Germany allows the Ottomans to reconquer these provinces inhabited by non-Muslims.<sup>165</sup> But although the role played by Germany is not a particularly favorable, we have also seen in this section that the agency of the Ottomans themselves cannot be underestimated.

### 4.3 *De Tribune* – Triple Alliance

The editors of *De Tribune* mainly see the First World War as an imperialist war, and the dispute between Germany and Great Britain over the wealthy oil fields in Mesopotamia and the concessions to build the Baghdad railway is regarded as one of the main reasons for the outbreak of the war.<sup>166</sup> Not surprisingly therefore, the alliance between Germany, Austria-Hungary, Bulgaria and the Ottoman Empire is mainly seen through the prism of imperialism. This alliance is considered part of Germany's master plan to rule the East (and more specifically the Ottoman Empire), and all other war goals are subordinate to that.<sup>167</sup>

Within this master plan each area has its own function. The Balkans for example are seen as the filament to provide the Ottoman Empire with German energy. Reporting on the Balkan states is therefore often framed in reference to relations between the Central Powers, and more specifically the transport of war material from Germany to the Ottoman Empire and food the other way around.<sup>168</sup> The Ottoman Empire plays a crucial role in this master plan, as it is considered the missing link in Germany's Empire. The fate of the Ottoman Empire is tied to the fate of the Balkans: if the Ottoman Empire is removed from the German sphere of influence, so will the Balkans.<sup>169</sup>

Following this, events during the war too are analyzed from an imperialist perspective. During the Dardanelles campaign, it is for example stated that Constantinople cannot fall, as this would be a blow to Germany's imperialist designs in the Near East.<sup>170</sup> Similarly, the Arab Revolt and the fall of Baghdad are said to be destroying the German imperialist dreams.<sup>171</sup> The uprisings in Persia are seen as attempts to open Germany's road to India with Ottoman

---

<sup>165</sup> 'De kruisweg der Armeniërs'; 'De Rede van Haase in den Duitschen Rijksdag I'.

<sup>166</sup> 'De strijd om de petroleum', in: *De Tribune* (08-04-1916) 5

<sup>167</sup> 'Algemeen overzicht', in: *De Tribune* (16-05-1916) 2; 'Algemeen overzicht', in: *De Tribune* (07-08-1916) 2.

<sup>168</sup> 'De oorlog', in: *De Tribune* (22-01-1916) 3; 'De oorlog', in: *De Tribune* (18-12-1915) 3; 'De oorlog: algemeen overzicht', in: *De Tribune* (18-09-1916) 2.

<sup>169</sup> 'Algemeen overzicht' (07-08-1916) 2; 'De verbinding over land tusschen Centralen en Turkije reeds verbroken?', in: *De Tribune* (02-10-1918) 3.

<sup>170</sup> 'De oorlog', in: *De Tribune* (02-10-1915) 2.

<sup>171</sup> 'De oorlog: algemeen overzicht', in: *De Tribune* (03-07-1916) 3; 'De beteekenis van den val van Bagdad', in: *De Tribune* (13-03-1917) 2.



help, and the Ottoman attack on Egypt is meant to hit the centre of the British Empire, and has little to do with Ottoman ambitions in the region.<sup>172</sup>

Not all German actions are however seen as in accordance with this plan. The editors of *De Tribune* for example question the nature of the help provided by the Germans. In their eyes, the Ottomans are not provided with enough German officers or ammunition to hold on to the Armenian provinces.<sup>173</sup> This criticism is repeated by a German officer, who wonders why Erzurum could fall so easily when a German officer was leading the defense. In his opinion, the Germans have neglected to strengthen the weak spots of their Ottoman ally.<sup>174</sup> The *De Tribune* editors are not sure what to make of this: does this mean the Russian advance suits the German plans, or that the Germans have no troops left to send to the Ottoman fronts, or perhaps that the Ottomans are so weak that even German help could not save them?<sup>175</sup>

Indeed, according to quite a few articles, German expectations of the alliance are much higher than *De Tribune*'s editors deem justified. The Ottoman Empire is judged as poor and underdeveloped, causing all sorts of problems for the Germans in their attempt to come to the Ottoman rescue. For example, after the British and Russian push into Asia Minor the Germans cannot easily win back the territory because of the difficulty of transporting troops in an area lacking railroads.<sup>176</sup> Similarly, Germany is portrayed as lying about the pros of the Ottoman alliance, because 'everybody knows that scarcity reigns in Turkey', and certainly no foodstuff should be expected from that corner, according to the editors of *De Tribune*.<sup>177</sup>

The exact nature of the relationships between the Central Powers and the Ottoman Empire is not always very straightforward. This is especially true when it comes to Austria-Hungary. In some articles, Austria-Hungary is seen as protecting the Ottoman Empire together with Germany. In others however, Austria-Hungary is portrayed as a fellow victim of German autocracy: a German vassal, not unlike the Ottoman Empire and Bulgaria.<sup>178</sup> This seems to be the opinion of some Ottoman deserters too. In an incident just before the armistice, Ottoman deserters abuse and kill a number of German officers, whereas the Austro-Hungarian officers are not only left alone, but also treated very well, as they are regarded as

---

<sup>172</sup> 'De oorlog', in: *De Tribune* (11-03-1916) 3.

<sup>173</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>174</sup> 'De oorlog', in: *De Tribune* (26-02-1916) 3.

<sup>175</sup> 'De oorlog' (11-03-1916) 3.

<sup>176</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>177</sup> 'Honger!!', in: *De Tribune* (15-07-1916) 3.

<sup>178</sup> See for example 'De oorlog' (02-10-1915) 2; 'Liebknecht', in: *De Tribune* (19-01-1916) 2; 'De oorlog', in: *De Tribune* (14-12-1917) 1.

fellow victims.<sup>179</sup> The Ottomans and Austro-Hungarians (together with the Germans) are also reported to plot together in Persia and Afghanistan and spread propaganda in Indonesia.<sup>180</sup>

The Ottoman relationship with Germany, although not without its issues, is much more clear-cut. As the right wing of German imperialism, the Ottoman Empire is seen as independent in name only: in reality it is part of the German Empire in Asia, a German vassal at most.<sup>181</sup> The Ottoman Empire is portrayed as a long-time object of German imperialism, and saying that Germany fights this war for Ottoman independence is nothing but a delusion, as according to the editors of *De Tribune* everyone knows that Germany's real goal is a submissive Ottoman state, and not an independent one.<sup>182</sup> A tool of conquest in German hands, the Ottoman government and army are seen as under German control.<sup>183</sup> The Ottoman military is supplied not only with German generals, army corpses and ammunition, but even with German ships. Consequently, the Germans are very proud of Ottoman victories, as for example at Kut al-Amara, as this is considered as a German victory for the important role played by the German general Von der Goltz.<sup>184</sup>

Especially the bonds between Germany and the Young Turk government are strong. Although some officials are less influenced by the Germans than others, the Young Turk regime is pro-German.<sup>185</sup> In the eyes of *De Tribune*, the Young Turks have, in their blindness, bound their fate to Central Power imperialism.<sup>186</sup> Indeed, the Young Turks are judged to be foolish enough to succumb to the incitement of German imperialism, instead of following the clever neutrality politics of Abdulhamid II.<sup>187</sup> This cooperation continues right until the end of the war, even after the fall of the Young Turk regime, as prominent Young Turks such as Talat and Enver are still influential behind the screens. Only with their flight the German influence in the capital comes to an end, argues *De Tribune*.<sup>188</sup>

---

<sup>179</sup> 'Gespannen toestand tusschen Turken en Duitschers', in: *De Tribune* (04-11-1918) 3.

<sup>180</sup> 'Perzië', in: *De Tribune* (27-11-1915) 2-3; 'De val van Bagdad', in: *De Tribune* (15-03-1917) 1; 'De "heilige oorlog" van den Islam', in: *De Tribune* (12-04-1917) 4.

<sup>181</sup> 'De wereldoorlog', in: *De Tribune* (08-08-1914) 2; 'Het Duitse Oorlogsdoel en de Sociaaldemocratie', in: *De Tribune* (21-08-1915) 2; 'De oorlog', in: *De Tribune* (25-09-1915) 2.

<sup>182</sup> 'De val van Bagdad', 1.

<sup>183</sup> 'De opinie van Balfour', in: *De Tribune* (19-01-1917) 3.

<sup>184</sup> 'De oorlog', in: *De Tribune* (25-12-1915) 3; 'De wereldoorlog', 2; 'Oorlogskroniek', in: *De Tribune* (26-08-1914) 1; 'Nieuwe toebereidselen in Turkije', in: *De Tribune* (23-05-1916) 3; 'De capitulatie van het Engelsch legertje aan den Tigris', in: *De Tribune* (04-05-1916) 2.

<sup>185</sup> 'De ineenstorting van Turkije', in: *De Tribune* (10-10-1918) 1.

<sup>186</sup> 'De Midden-Europese revolutie', in: *De Tribune* (06-11-1918) 1.

<sup>187</sup> 'Honger!!', 3

<sup>188</sup> 'De Duitse invloed in Turkije is nog groot', in: *De Tribune* (01-11-1918) 3; 'Gespannen toestand tusschen Turken en Duitschers', in: *De Tribune* (04-11-1918) 3.

The Young Turk regime is seen as financially and militarily dependent on Berlin.<sup>189</sup> It is for this reason for example that Ottoman troops fight at the European fronts. Ottoman forces are not offered by the Ottoman government, instead they are unable to turn down a German request.<sup>190</sup> These troops are needed for the defense of Asia Minor after the fall of Baghdad, but only *after* German agreement Ottoman troops can be withdrawn from the other fronts, showing whose opinion matters most.<sup>191</sup> Similarly, representatives of the Ottoman Empire are described as having no influence at all on German decisions.<sup>192</sup>

Indeed, an element of control is not absent. The Germans are regarded as responsible for the behavior of the Ottomans, not only when it comes to non-Muslim policies, but also for example regarding the upholding of treaties. In 1918 for instance, the Russians blame the Germans for the Ottoman breaking of the Treaty of Brest Litowsk.<sup>193</sup>

Only on very few occasions, the Ottomans are seen as having a will of their own. In the early days of the war, *De Tribune* editor Van Ravensteyn questions whether the Ottoman interference in the war was really Berlin's doing, showing understanding of the Ottoman position, and even defending Ottoman actions against the Entente.<sup>194</sup> Similarly, evacuations in Palestine are reported to go ahead, despite the German Chief of the General Staff's opinion that they are not necessary from a military perspective.<sup>195</sup> In August 1917, Cemal refuses to hand over the command of the troops in Syria to a German general.<sup>196</sup> These are rare occurrences though. In most cases, the Young Turks are said to follow German orders with gritted teeth, but without protest.<sup>197</sup>

Most of the time relations between the Germans and the Ottomans are pretty tense, with a lot of suspicion on both sides.<sup>198</sup> They are reported quarrelling about all sorts of things, from the intended rise of the Ottoman import tariffs<sup>199</sup> – ultimately done without Germany's consent – to the Ottoman policies towards non-Muslims (discussed above and below in more detail). Both sides seem to look down on each other. The Ottomans are said to mock the Germans for their cowardly behavior with regard to the Armenian question.<sup>200</sup> Similarly, it is

---

<sup>189</sup> 'De opinie van Balfour', 3.

<sup>190</sup> 'De oorlog: algemeen overzicht', in: *De Tribune* (18-08-1916) 2.

<sup>191</sup> 'Na den val van Bagdad', in: *De Tribune* (23-03-1917) 2.

<sup>192</sup> 'Belangenverschil bij de Centralen', in: *De Tribune* (08-01-1918) 3.

<sup>193</sup> 'De inneming van Bakoe', in: *De Tribune* (24-09-1918) 3.

<sup>194</sup> 'De oorlog', in: *De Tribune* (07-11-1914) 2.

<sup>195</sup> 'Armeniërs en Joden', in: *De Tribune* (23-05-1917) 3.

<sup>196</sup> 'Een offensief tegen Bagdad', in: *De Tribune* (09-08-1917) 1.

<sup>197</sup> 'De Turksche moordenaarsbende I', in: *De Tribune* (27-07-1918) 3.

<sup>198</sup> 'Uit Duitschland', in: *De Tribune* (05-08-1916) 2.

<sup>199</sup> 'Oneenigheden tusschen Duitschland en Turkije', in: *De Tribune* (02-10-1916) 2.

<sup>200</sup> 'De Turksche moordenaarsbende', 3.

reported that Germans – even the highest ranking officers – are treated with contempt and rudeness in the Ottoman domains, to the extent that many people who have been there never want to return again. Allegedly it even takes ‘fraternization’ Turks fighting with the Germans at the European fronts to improve the image of the Ottomans.<sup>201</sup> As this shows, the Germans are not particularly impressed with the Ottomans either. Both the Bulgarians and the Ottomans are treated like children who still believe in fairy tales.<sup>202</sup> German officers also treat Ottoman soldiers poorly. The incident mentioned before, in which Ottoman deserters murder German officers, and where German officers have to turn to their POWs for protection does not come out of nowhere. German troops are looked upon both with hate and suspicion.<sup>203</sup>

Tensions are particularly high when it comes to Ottoman policies towards non-Muslims. The responsibility for the massacres of non-Muslims is seen by the editors of *De Tribune* to be Germany’s – either partially or wholly – as the German government knew what was happening to the non-Muslims in the Ottoman Empire and did not object to that, thereby implicitly giving permission.<sup>204</sup> Similarly, it is considered as too passive in the case of the hanging (‘murder’) of twenty Armenian socialists.<sup>205</sup> In either case, the protests made are considered only as formal, and too weak to make a real impression, whereas Germany had been in the position to interfere energetically. Whether it was out of ‘weakness, cowardice or unscrupulousness’, the German diplomats are portrayed as more concerned with Germany’s prestige and the staining of the German reputation through association with the Ottomans than with the suffering of the Armenians.<sup>206</sup> Individuals trying to change the conditions of the Armenians, such as the German Consul Wolff-Metternich, are prevented from doing so by the German government itself.<sup>207</sup>

The German government does not shy away from using cowardly tools to reach its objective, judges *De Tribune*. Although the Ottoman government is dependent on Germany in military, financial and political matters, no mercy towards the Armenians is shown. Although the German government intervened in Ottoman affairs a thousand times when the German interests were at stake, the Armenians were sacrificed for the interests of the Great Powers.

---

<sup>201</sup> ‘Uit Duitschland’, 2.

<sup>202</sup> ‘De jongste redevoering van den Duitse rijkskanselier’, in: *De Tribune* (08-06-1916) 2.

<sup>203</sup> ‘Uit Duitschland’, 2; ‘Gespannen toestand tusschen Turken en Duitschers’, 3.

<sup>204</sup> ‘De gruwelen in Palestina’, in: *De Tribune* (22-05-1917) 4; ‘Armeniërs en Joden’, 3; ‘De groote vervolgingen der Armeniërs’, in: *De Tribune* (22-03-1918) 3.

<sup>205</sup> ‘Twintig socialisten opgehangen’, in: *De Tribune* (18-8-1915) 2.

<sup>206</sup> ‘De uitmoording van een volk’, in: *De Tribune* (16-10-1915) 3; ‘Liebknecht’, 1; ‘De oorlog’, in: *De Tribune* (26-02-1916) 3; ‘De Turksche moordenaarsbende’, 3; ‘De uitmoording der Armeniërs’, in: *De Tribune* (22-08-1916) 2.

<sup>207</sup> ‘De Turksche moordenaarsbende’, 3.

Although several people reported the massacres the government did nothing, using ‘excuses’ that they need the Ottomans. The concessions for the Baghdad railway apparently are more important than the lives of the Armenian people. Indeed, the Germans in 1918 are seen as purposely handing over the rest of the Armenian people to the Ottomans through the Treaty of Brest-Litowsk, so that these too can be exterminated.<sup>208</sup>

Protected by the Germans, the bloodlust of the Ottomans knows no limits.<sup>209</sup> The Germans are however more than just passive bystanders. They actively take part in the extermination of the Armenians, as does for example the German commander who bombed Urfa when the Armenians did not want to leave the city.<sup>210</sup> Indeed, on some occasions German officers are portrayed as even more enthusiastic than the Ottomans. *De Tribune* for example features a story about two German officers travelling in the Ottoman domains who, without any orders, ‘made a sport of showing their shooting qualities’. No Ottoman soldier had had the courage to shoot at the women and children, but the Germans had no problems with that.<sup>211</sup> German legal advisers too advise the Ottoman Minister of Finances about measures to seize the belongings of the Ottoman Greeks.<sup>212</sup> In this respect, it is indeed a little more than just the association with the Ottomans that stains the German reputation.

#### 4.4 Reality check

It is true that the Ottoman Empire is a junior member of the Central Powers Alliance and that the Ottomans are financially dependent on Germany, but, as historians Ulrich Trumpener and Mustafa Aksakal have shown, the Germans do not rule the Ottoman Empire and it is surely no German vassal state, as *Het Volk* and *De Tribune* claim. It is true that the German military mission is of some importance and that some German proposals are accepted by the Ottoman leadership, but this is never without extensive negotiations and many concessions by the Germans. That the Germans control the Ottoman government financially and militarily and that the Ottomans have no influence on Germany is far from the truth.<sup>213</sup>

It is true that the Ottoman interference in the World War in November 1914 is a result of enormous German pressure, but what *Het Volk* does not mention is that the Ottomans have

---

<sup>208</sup> ‘De oorlog’, in: *De Tribune* (11-03-1918) 2; ‘De Turksche moordenaarsbende’, in: *De Tribune* (10-04-1918) 3.

<sup>209</sup> ‘De hel in Armenië’, in: *De Tribune* (30-01-1917) 1.

<sup>210</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>211</sup> ‘De Turksche moordenaarsbende’, 3.

<sup>212</sup> ‘In de wacht gesleept’, in: *De Tribune* (02-10-1917) 3.

<sup>213</sup> Trumpener, *Germany and the Ottoman Empire*, 62-107, 271-284; Aksakal, *The Ottoman Road to War*.

resisted this pressure during the previous three months, skillfully delaying their declaration of war, hoping that the war is over before they have undertaken any military action. That the Germans hasten the Ottoman entrance is certainly a valid judgment, but more than this, it is surprising that it takes them three months to persuade the Ottomans to allow the naval maneuvers that finally involved the Ottomans in the war. Considering the stubbornness to German wishes shown by the Ottoman leadership on many occasions, the idea that the Ottomans passively wait for instructions from Berlin in case things go wrong is unlikely. On some occasions awareness that the German dominance in the Ottoman Empire is not absolute is shown by *Het Volk*, but this is only in a limited number of the articles.<sup>214</sup>

*Het Volk* is right in characterizing the relations between the two countries as motivated by self-interest. It is however misleading to judge the Ottomans merely as a victim of German imperialism, as both they and *De Tribune* do. To be sure, the Germans do have imperialist designs on the Ottoman Empire, but it is the Ottomans, and not the Germans, who push for the alliance. It is not a foolish choice by a blinded Ottoman leadership, as *De Tribune* portrays the alliance with Germany, but a well-calculated move on the part of the Ottomans. Convinced that the empire needs time to reform without foreign interference, the Young Turk leadership sees the alliance with Germany as the instrument for emancipation. Both *Het Volk* and *De Tribune* miss out the fact that the Ottomans are more than Germany's tool to implement a German master plan in the Middle East. Germany is also an Ottoman tool for *their* master plan. In this sense, the war as an imperialist war holds for the Ottoman fronts, with the only side note that it is imperialism that influenced both German *and* Ottoman decisions.<sup>215</sup>

That the cooperation between the two allies is far from perfect and that the alliance is not backed by everyone in the Ottoman Empire is also true, but that the alliance is only the wish of a small pro-German clique in Constantinople is not true. The alliance is backed by a much larger circle in the Ottoman leadership than is presumed both in Dutch leftist newspapers at the time and early post-war academic literature. *Het Volk* captures the tensions between the Ottoman and German military leadership very well, although a bit more attention for the problems in the Caucasus might have been justified.<sup>216</sup>

The German responsibility for Ottoman actions, for example with regard to treaties signed, but also especially with regard to the Armenian massacres, remains a topic of

---

<sup>214</sup> Trumpener, *Germany and the Ottoman Empire*, 21-60; Aksakal, *The Ottoman Road to War*, 93-187.

<sup>215</sup> Trumpener, *Germany and the Ottoman Empire*, 317-351; Aksakal, *The Ottoman Road to War*, 93-118.

<sup>216</sup> Trumpener, *Germany and the Ottoman Empire*, 108-270, 352-365; Aksakal, *The Ottoman Road to War*, 19-41.

discussion today. That they bear full responsibility for Ottoman behavior seems too harsh a judgment, considering their limited influence on the Ottoman leadership. In *Het Volk* too these limitations can be read between the lines, for example when reporting that the consuls of the Central Powers in Constantinople are powerless in the face of the murder of the Ottoman Armenian community. That the German diplomatic personnel does not idly stand by, but that they regard the German reputation more important than Armenian lives rings a bell of truth. Above all however, it is the fear of breaking up the alliance that leaves them toothless. Nonetheless, their final verdict, that the Germans are at least partially responsible, still holds today.<sup>217</sup>

#### 4.5 Conclusion

The Ottoman relationship with the Central Powers is a topic of interest to both *Het Volk* and *De Tribune*, but again – as was the case with Ottoman non-Muslims – in absolute numbers the amount of articles dealing with the subject is limited. Most articles referring to the Ottoman allies merely mention their presence at the battlefield, without discussing the alliance at all. Nonetheless, a considerable number of articles is published on the alliance. Reporting in *Het Volk* and *De Tribune* mainly differs in detail, and not so much in content. Whereas ordinary news reports in the first half of the war are more likely to be found in *Het Volk*, *De Tribune* focuses more on larger background stories. In the second part of the war, when *De Tribune* becomes a daily newspaper, this changes.

True to their socialist nature, both *De Tribune* and *Het Volk* mainly view the war through the prism of imperialism and see the war as part of Germany's master plan to dominate the East. The Ottomans are considered the victims of imperialism, only fighting for the benefit of Germany. This is even more outspoken in *De Tribune* than in *Het Volk*. To some extent, *Het Volk* gives the Ottomans some agency as well, with some of their actions portrayed as motivated by self-interest only. This is almost entirely absent in *De Tribune*. Neither of the two newspapers makes a lot of effort to understand the Ottoman point of view, with the exception of Van Ravensteyn in one of his articles. Instead they are mainly portrayed as naive fools, easily misled by Germany. The reality check showed how distorted these images really are.

---

<sup>217</sup> Trumpener, *Germany and the Ottoman Empire*, 167-270.

In neither *Het Volk* nor *De Tribune* do relations with Austria-Hungary receive much attention. In *De Tribune* Austria-Hungary is sometimes even portrayed as a secondary power and fellow victim like the Ottoman Empire itself, dominated by Germany in a similar way. This theme does not occur in *Het Volk*. Both newspapers however see Germany as the dominating partner within the alliance, and many Ottoman actions during the war are portrayed as dictated by Germany. *De Tribune* goes to the extent to claim that the Ottomans are independent in name only, in reality being part of the German Empire. Because they are seen as controlling the Ottomans, excesses committed by the Ottomans such as the Armenian massacres are considered Germany's responsibility. Protected by the Germans, the bloodlust of the Ottomans knows no limits. Again, this has little to do with reality: although the Germans have some influence in Constantinople, they cannot completely control their ally, let alone prevent the Armenian massacres, because they need the Ottoman alliance too.

Especially the bonds between Germany and the Young Turk government are seen as strong, and the Young Turks are judged foolish for teaming up with Germany. The Young Turk regime is portrayed as financially and militarily dependent on Berlin, with both the Ottoman army and navy completely under German influence. Although Ottomans are not bad soldiers, the influence of the German officers is instrumental in making the most of their qualities. Their contribution to the alliance is however not considered very important, and the Ottoman Empire is judged as poor and underdeveloped, being something of a liability to the German war effort too. A partial presentation of reality again: yes, financially and military the Ottomans need the Germans, but they are not in control of the military and the Ottomans carefully weighted the pros and cons of the alliance with the Central Powers before joining.



## Conclusion

Coming back to Edward Said's *Orientalism*, what does this thesis teach us about images of the Ottomans held by Dutch socialists and Marxists? What strikes perhaps most is the lack of interest in Middle Eastern affairs initially. Marxist and socialist writings on the Ottomans proved very difficult to find, and perhaps with the exception of Rosa Luxemburg's writings, no real theories on the Ottoman Empire are developed by the Dutch-German leftist movements. The SDAP colonial expert Van Kol travels the world and publishes a number of books on his journeys, but he seems to be the only one who takes a real interest in non-European affairs in the Netherlands. Apparently, before the war, the Dutch left is not particularly concerned with events taking place in the Middle East. The radical left is somewhat more internationally oriented, but especially the socialists are too occupied with improving the position of the Dutch working class to really pay a lot of attention to changes taking place in the Ottoman domains.

The First World War to some extent changes the orientation of the Dutch left. With the entire globe on fire, the world outside the Netherlands becomes more important than ever before, and the growing demand for international news even makes *De Tribune* into a daily by 1916. Considering the nature of the period, it is not surprising that reporting is limited in its coverage. International relations and especially the war movements are the main topics of interest between 1914 and 1918. Indeed, as we have seen in the second chapter, the focus of both newspapers is mainly on the armed conflict holding the world in its grip, and reporting on the Ottomans is no different from this. Most articles in either *De Tribune* (especially after April 1916) or *Het Volk* are concerned with developments at the Ottoman fronts. Attention for Ottoman politics, economy or people is limited, to say the least. Despite the transition to a modern style newspaper both *De Tribune* and *Het Volk* go through, some seemingly important events in the Ottoman political sphere are not covered at all. Consequently, the topics discussed in the third and fourth chapter were chosen not because of quantitative reasons, but because of qualitative reasons. Although limited in absolute numbers, the articles on Ottoman non-Muslims and the Ottoman alliance with Germany are the most outspoken articles to be found in either newspaper.

Socialists and Marxists share an interest in the position of non-Muslim minorities in the Ottoman Empire with other Europeans. Similarly, they are interested in the semi-colonial relationships between the Ottoman Empire and Germany. Especially the latter is framed through the prism of imperialism, a distinctively leftist way of looking at things. Taking this

into account, their lack of attention for some other topics is difficult to explain. The abolishing of the capitulations for example, which one would expect to cause quite a bit of enthusiasm in the Netherlands, passes almost without notice in either newspaper. Similarly, the Ottoman socialists are a topic of little concern to the Dutch left. If they are commented upon at all, it is only with disdain.

What is perhaps surprising are the few references to specific ‘Orientalist’ topics, such as the harem and the Arabian Nights. With only two references over the entire period, these do not really seem to be associated with the Ottomans. References to cruelty, barbarism and aggression are more widespread, especially when talking about the massacres of Armenians. Although positive characteristics can be found in either newspaper, the Ottomans are described in a negative manner on many more occasions. Especially when discussing the alliance with the Central Powers, the Ottomans are regarded as passive and as victims, who need Western guidance. Although *De Tribune* every now and then tries to view events from an Ottoman perspective, this does not mean that they are awarded agency too. This is more frequent in *Het Volk* instead, although in neither case the Ottomans are really seen as determining their own path. Instead, agency is with others, mainly Austria-Hungary and Germany. Academic literature on the topic analyses how wrong this image was.

Initially perhaps the Dutch left might have had some sympathy for the Ottomans, and more specifically the Young Turk government. In his pre-war writings Van Kol praises them extensively, and especially *De Tribune* in the early part of the war publishes a number of articles that are quite sympathetic towards the Ottomans. Events in the spring of 1915 all change this. The more details about the Armenian massacres become available, the more negative the Dutch press becomes. This is especially true in the case of *De Tribune*, which does not abide by the same level of self-censorship as *Het Volk*. In the latter case too however, it is quite clear whose side they are on – and that side is not the Turkish. Both *Het Volk* and *De Tribune* are more sympathetic towards the Armenians, with whom they feel more related culturally and religiously. Their respect for the Armenian culture stands in stark contrast with their disdain for the Turkish, so visible during the latter part of the war in *De Tribune* especially. But although this is not stated equally often in *Het Volk*, the editors nonetheless to a large extent share the basic ideas of *De Tribune*’s editors.

How can these images of the Ottomans be linked to Edward Said’s *Orientalism*? Although anti-imperialist and critical about Great Power exploitation of non-European people, any sympathy the Dutch left had for the Young Turks disappeared early in the war, when news of the Ottoman massacres of the non-Muslim population of the empire reached the

Netherlands. Discussing the Ottoman policies towards non-Muslims and the Ottoman alliance with Germany, it turns out that the Dutch left was not completely immune to stereotypes. Indeed, stereotypes about Ottoman cruelty towards non-Muslims, described in the chapter on Ottoman non-Muslims, as well as stereotypes about Ottoman weakness and passiveness in their relationships with the other Central Powers (chiefly Germany) and their need of Western guidance, analyzed in the chapter about the Ottoman alliance with the Central Powers, can be explicitly linked to Said's analysis of Orientalism. Whether portrayed as pillaging, barbaric and uncivilized (especially in comparison with the Western looking Armenians) or weak, passive and foolish in relationships with Germany, these are really two sides of the same Orientalist coin.

Whether the Dutch leftists were any more sympathetic towards the Ottomans than their liberal or confessional counterparts is a topic that remains to be researched, but based on the findings of this thesis, it is doubtful. Confessionals for example might emphasize different aspects, such as the Islamic nature of the Ottoman Empire, a bit more than the Dutch communists and socialists, but this is mainly a matter of detail, and not of substance. The same Orientalist stereotypes, so familiar from Said's work, turned out to dominate the leftist discourse in the Netherlands too. In that respect, the Dutch socialists and communists were not so different from the mainstream thinking as they perhaps would have liked to be.

## Bibliography

The front page cartoon is Pasquino, 'Turksche logica' (03-07-1904) via <http://www.agindepers.nl/cartoons> (01-02-2013)

### Primary sources

*De Tribune* (1914-1918) via <http://kranten.kb.nl> (02-2013 – 03-2013)

*Het Volk* (1914-1918) via <http://kranten.kb.nl> (10-2012)

Gorter, Herman, 'De wereldrevolutie' (without year) via <http://www.marxists.org/nederlands/gorter/1918/1918wereldrevo.htm#h1> (11-09-2013)

Gorter, Herman, *Het imperialisme, de wereldoorlog en de sociaal-democratie* (Amsterdam, 1915)

Kol, H.H. van, *De Joden en de Vrede* (Amsterdam, 1919)

Kol, H.H. van, *In de kustlanden van Noord-Afrika: het Maghreb* (Rotterdam, 1911)

Luxemburg, Rosa, *The Accumulation of Capital* (London, 1951) via <http://archive.org/details/accumulationofca00luxe> (11-09-2013)

Luxemburg, Rosa, 'De crisis der sociaaldemocratie' (1915) via <http://www.marxists.org/nederlands/luxemburg/1915/junius/index.htm> (11-09-2013)

Pannekoek, Anton, 'De oorlog, zijn oorsprong en zijn bestrijding' (1915) via <http://www.marxists.org/nederlands/pannekoek/1915/1915oorlog.htm> (11-09-2013)

Pannekoek, Anton, 'Uit de voorgeschiedenis van de wereldoorlog' (1916) via <http://www.marxists.org/nederlands/pannekoek/1916/1916wereldoorlog.htm> (11-09-2013)

Troelstra, P.J., *De wereldoorlog en de sociaaldemokratie* (2nd edition, Amsterdam, 1915)

### Secondary sources

Abbenhuis, Maartje M., *The Art of Staying Neutral: the Netherlands in the First World War, 1914-1918* (Amsterdam, 2006)

Akçam, Taner, *A Shameful Act. The Armenian Genocide and the Question of Turkish Responsibility* (New York, 2006)

Aksakal, Mustafa, *The Ottoman Road to War. The Ottoman Empire and the First World War* (Cambridge, 2008)

Bloxham, Donald, 'The First World War and the Development of the Armenian Genocide', in: Ronald Grigor Suny, Fatma Müge Göçek and Norman M. Naimark (eds.), *A Question of Genocide: Armenians and Turks at the End of the Ottoman Empire* (New York, 2011) 260-275.

Bloxham, Donald, *The Great Game of Genocide. Imperialism, Nationalism, and the Destruction of the Ottoman Armenians* (Oxford, 2005)

Boersma, Marcel, 'Botsende stijlen. De Eerste Wereldoorlog en de Nederlandse journalistieke cultuur', *Tijdschrift voor Mediageschiedenis* 2.2 (1999) 41-68.

Bourrinet, Philippe, *The Dutch and German Communist Left (1900–68)* (2008) via <http://libcom.org/files/dutchleft.pdf> (11-10-2013)

Buiting, Henny, *Richtingen- en partijstrijd in de SDAP: het ontstaan van de Sociaal-Democratische Partij in Nederland (SDP)* (Zeist, 1989)

Dekker, Stijn, 'Aan den rand van den ondergang. Pers, politiek en neutraliteit rond de uitbraak van de Eerste Wereldoorlog' (MA thesis, 2010) via <http://igitur-archive.library.uu.nl> (11-02-2013)

Docter, Koen, 'Cruel murderers, dangerous fanatics or exotic strangers. The representation of Muslims and Islam in the French and Dutch press in the late nineteenth century' (MA thesis, 2011) via <http://igitur-archive.library.uu.nl> (10-02-2012)

Gamson, William A., and Andre Modigliani, 'Media Discourse and Public Opinion on Nuclear Power: A Constructionist Approach', *American Journal of Sociology* 95.1 (1989) 1-37.

Geudeker, Nienke, 'Onafhankelijkheid en neutraliteit. De Nederlandse pers tijdens de Eerste Wereldoorlog. Een vergelijkend onderzoek naar De Telegraaf, de Nieuwe Rotterdamsche Courant en Het Volk' (PhD dissertation, 2004) via <http://igitur-archive.library.uu.nl> (01-09-2013)

Gount, David, 'The Ottoman Treatment of the Assyrians', in: Ronald Grigor Suny, Fatma Müge Göçek and Norman M. Naimark (eds.), *A Question of Genocide: Armenians and Turks at the End of the Ottoman Empire* (New York, 2011) 244-259.

Hemels, Joan, *Een journalistiek geheim ontsluit: de Dubbelmonarchie en een geval van dubbele moraal in de Nederlandse pers tijdens de Eerste Wereldoorlog* (Apeldoorn and Antwerp, 2010)

Holquist, Peter, 'The Politics and Practice of the Russian Occupation of Armenia, 1915-February 1917', in: Ronald Grigor Suny, Fatma Müge Göçek and Norman M. Naimark (eds.), *A Question of Genocide: Armenians and Turks at the End of the Ottoman Empire* (New York, 2011) 151-174.

Jonge, A.A. de, *Het Communisme in Nederland. De geschiedenis van een politieke partij* (Den Haag, 1972)

Kester, Bernadette, and Huub Wijffjes, 'Media en oorlog: inleiding', *Tijdschrift voor Mediageschiedenis* 2.2 (1999) 1-15.

Kieser, Hans-Lukas, 'From "Patriotism" to Mass Murder: Dr. Mehmed Reşid (1873-1919)', in: Ronald Grigor Suny, Fatma Müge Göçek and Norman M. Naimark (eds.), *A Question of*

- Genocide: Armenians and Turks at the End of the Ottoman Empire* (New York, 2011) 126-150.
- Kossmann, E.H., *The Low Countries 1780-1940* (Oxford, 1978)
- Kuypers, Ivo, *In de schaduw van de Grote Oorlog. De Nederlandse arbeidersbeweging en de overheid, 1914-1920* (Amsterdam, 2002)
- Lewis, Reina, *Rethinking Orientalism: Women, Travel and the Ottoman Harem* (London and New York, 2004)
- Mills, Sara, *Discourses of Difference. An Analysis of Women's Travel Writing and Colonialism* (London and New York, 1991)
- Moeyes, Paul, *Buiten schot: Nederland tijdens de Eerste Wereldoorlog: 1914-1918* (Amsterdam, 2001)
- Morrien, Joop, *Indonesië los van Holland. De CPN en de PKI in hun strijd tegen het Nederlands kolonialisme* (Amsterdam, 1982)
- Plasse, Jan van de, *Kroniek van de Nederlandse dagblad- en opiniepers* (Amsterdam, 2005)
- Poole, Elizabeth, *Reporting Islam. Media Representations of British Muslims* (London and New York, 2002)
- Ravensteyn, W. van, *De wording van het communisme in Nederland 1907-1925* (Amsterdam, 1948)
- Ruis, Erwin, 'Nederland en de Armeense kwestie' (2008) via <http://www.armeensegenocide.info/nederland.html> (01-02-2013)
- Said, Edward W., *Orientalism* (London, 2003)
- Schneider, Maarten, and Joan Hemels, *De Nederlandse krant 1618-1978. Van 'nieuwstyldinghe' tot dagblad* (Baarn, fourth and revised edition, 1979)
- Shaw, Stanford J., *The Ottoman Empire in World War I: Volume II* (Ankara, 2008)
- Stelling, Theunis, and Ron Blom, *Niet voor God en niet voor het Vaderland: linkse soldaten, matrozen en hun organisaties tijdens de mobilisatie van '14-'18* (Soesterberg, 2004)
- Stoelinga, T.H.J., *Russische revolutie en vredesverwachtingen in de Nederlandse pers maart 1917 – maart 1918* (Bussum, 1967)
- Terkildsen, Nadya, and Frauke Schnell, 'How Media Frame Public Opinion: An Analysis of the Women's Movement', *Political Research Quarterly* 50.4 (1997) 879-900.
- Trumpener, Ulrich, *Germany and the Ottoman Empire 1914-1918* (Princeton, 1968)

Üngör, Uğur Ümit, “‘Turkey for the Turks’: Demographic Engineering in Eastern Anatolia, 1914-1945’, in: Ronald Grigor Suny, Fatma Müge Göçek and Norman M. Naimark (eds.), *A Question of Genocide: Armenians and Turks at the End of the Ottoman Empire* (New York, 2011) 287-305.

Vrankrijker, A.C.J. de, *Het wervende woord. Geschiedenis der socialistische week- en dagbladpers in Nederland* (Amsterdam, 1950)

Vugt, Peter-Paul van, ‘De Nederlandse reactie op de panislamitische politiek van Turkije 1876-1922’, in Alexander de Groot (ed.), *Het Midden-Oosten en Nederland in historisch perspectief* (Muiderberg, 1989) 123-137.

Yeğenoğlu, Meyda, *Colonial Fantasies: Towards a Feminist Reading of Orientalism* (Cambridge, 1998)

Williams, John F., *Anzacs, the Media and the Great War* (Sydney, 1999)

## Appendix I: Observation schedule 1914

Topics, subtopics and references: frequency and percentages of the total

	<i>Het Volk</i>		<i>De Tribune</i>	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
<b>References to Ottoman relations with the outside world</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>21.8%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>25.1%</b>
Relations with the Great Powers	3	0.8%	0	0%
Relations with the Triple Entente	15	4%	2	6.3%
Relations with the Central Powers	4	1.1%	1	3.1%
Relations with Great-Britain	9	2.4%	0	0%
Relations with France	2	0.5%	0	0%
Relations with Russia	5	1.3%	0	0%
Relations with Germany	7	1.9%	0	0%
Relations with Austria-Hungary	1	0.3%	0	0%
Relations with Italy	3	0.8%	0	0%
Relations with the USA	2	0.5%	0	0%
Relations with neighboring countries (Balkans)	19	5%	0	0%
Relations with the Islamic world	9	2.4%	0	0%
Alliances against the Ottoman Empire	0	0%	0	0%
Eastern question	0	0%	0	0%
Border adjustments	0	0%	0	0%
Foreign designs on Constantinople	0	0%	0	0%
Ottoman actions to disturb Balkan relations	0	0%	0	0%
Capitulations/concessions	2	0.5%	2	6.3%
Annexation Egypt	0	0%	2	6.3%
Annexation Cyprus	1	0.3%	1	3.1%
<b>References to the Ottoman alliance with Germany and Austria-Hungary</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>8.1%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>12.5%</b>
German-Ottoman alliance	8	2.2%	2	6.25%
The Ottoman Empire as Germany's puppet	6	1.6%	0	0%
German influence on the Ottoman army and navy	9	2.4%	1	3.1%
German military and financial support	3	0.8%	0	0%
Ottoman support for	0	0%	0	0%



Germany and Austria-Hungary				
German responsibility for Ottoman crimes	1	0.3%	0	0%
The Ottoman Empire is only fighting for the benefit of Germany and Austria-Hungary	1	0.3%	1	3.1%
Connection Germany-Ottoman Empire (transport)	0	0%	0	0%
Problems between the Ottoman Empire and Germany	0	0%	0	0%
Pro-German group in the Ottoman Empire is a minority	2	0.5%	0	0%
Attempted murder on German general	0	0%	0	0%
Decorations for German officers	0	0%	0	0%
<b>References to the Ottoman past</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>2.2%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6.25%</b>
Rule Abdulhamid II	0	0%	0	0%
Bulgarian revolt	0	0%	0	0%
Russo-Turkish war 1877-1878	0	0%	1	3.1%
Greek-Turkish war 1897	0	0%	1	3.1%
Young Turk revolution	0	0%	0	0%
Balkan wars	8	2.2%	0	0%
<b>References to the Ottoman government</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2.8%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>
Ottoman neutrality	7	1.9%	0	0%
Censorship	1	0.3%	0	0%
Influence Young Turks	0	0%	0	0%
Failure of the Young Turk reforms	0	0%	0	0%
Dissatisfaction with Young Turks	1	0.3%	0	0%
Disapproval government	0	0%	0	0%
Plans to overthrow the government	0	0%	0	0%
Formation new government	0	0%	0	0%
Problems within the Ottoman government	0	0%	0	0%
Rumors about the government leaving Constantinople	0	0%	0	0%
Rumors about the sultan leaving Constantinople	0	0%	0	0%

Death Ottoman heir to the throne	0	0%	0	0%
New sultan	0	0%	0	0%
Lack of communication between the Ottoman government and its officials	1	0.3%	0	0%
<b>References to the Ottoman armed forces</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>5.3%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>12.6%</b>
Ottoman army	6	1.6%	0	0%
Military service	1	0.3%	0	0%
Ottoman mobilization for war	5	1.3%	2	6.3%
Ottoman army well prepared	1	0.3%	0	0%
Ottoman army ill prepared	0	0%	0	0%
Lack of military equipment	0	0%	0	0%
Abundance military equipment	0	0%	0	0%
Good leadership Ottoman army	2	0.5%	0	0%
Change in command army	0	0%	0	0%
Low morale Ottomans	0	0%	0	0%
High morale Ottomans	0	0%	0	0%
Soldiers disobeying orders	0	0%	0	0%
Prisoners of war	0	0%	0	0%
Execution Ottoman officers	0	0%	0	0%
Glorious military past	0	0%	0	0%
Ottoman fleet	1	0.3%	1	3.1%
Goeben/Breslau	5	1.3%	1	3.1%
<b>References to the Ottoman theaters of war and battles</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>38.6%</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>34.6%</b>
Dardanelles war	7	1.9%	1	3.1%
War on the Balkans	1	0.3%	0	0%
War in Egypt	0	0%	2	6.3%
War in Syria and Palestine	12	3.2%	0	0%
War in Mesopotamia	4	1.1%	2	6.3%
War in Persia	1	0.3%	3	9.4%
War on the Arabian peninsula	0	0%	0	0%
War in the Caucasus	0	0%	0	0%
War on the Black Sea	0	0%	1	3.1%
War in North Africa	1	0.3%	0	0%
Central Powers' success against the Entente	0	0%	0	0%
Entente success against the Central Powers	0	0%	0	0%
A Central Powers-Entente clash without a winner	0	0%	0	0%
Ottoman success against the Entente	0	0%	0	0%

Entente success against the Ottomans	0	0%	0	0%
An Ottoman-Entente clash without a winner	2	0.5%	0	0%
Ottoman success against the British	10	2.7%	0	0%
British success against the Ottomans	0	0%	0	0%
An Ottoman-British clash without a winner	7	1.9%	0	0%
Ottoman success against the French	0	0%	0	0%
French success against the Ottomans	0	0%	0	0%
An Ottoman-French clash without a winner	2	0.5%	0	0%
Ottoman success against the Russians	44	11.9%	0	0%
Russian success against the Ottomans	33	8.9%	0	0%
An Ottoman-Russian clash without a winner	15	4%	2	6.3%
Ottoman success against the British/French	0	0%	0	0%
British/French success against the Ottomans	0	0%	0	0%
An Ottoman-British/French clash without a winner	4	1.1%	0	0%
Ottoman success against the Armenians/Georgians	0	0%	0	0%
An Ottoman-Armenian/Georgian clash without a winner	0	0%	0	0%
Ottoman success against the Italians	0	0%	0	0%
Italian success against the Ottomans	0	0%	0	0%
An Ottoman-Italian clash without a winner	0	0%	0	0%
Peace with the Ottoman Empire	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Judgments on the behavior of the belligerent powers</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>5.6%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3.1%</b>
Unfairness Entente towards the Ottoman Empire	5	1.3%	1	3.1%
Ottoman unfairness towards the Entente	8	2.2%	0	0%
Ottoman unfairness towards neutral countries	3	0.8%	0	0%

Unfairness Entente towards neutral countries	0	0%	0	0%
Mistreatment Entente nationals by the Ottomans	1	0.3%	0	0%
Mistreatment citizens of neutral countries by the Ottomans	0	0%	0	0%
Exploitation of the Ottoman Empire by the Great Powers	1	0.3%	0	0%
Ottoman telegrams are lying	1	0.3%	0	0%
Entente telegrams are lying	1	0.3%	0	0%
<b>References to the fight for the hearts and minds of the people</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>23.9%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3.1%</b>
Pan-Islamism/Holy War	17	4.6%	1	3.1%
Pan-Turkism	0	0%	0	0%
Oppression Islam/Islamic peoples	3	0.8%	0	0%
Support foreign Muslims for the Ottomans	9	2.4%	1	3.1%
Loyalty Muslims under Entente rule	6	1.6%	0	0%
Support local Muslims for Ottoman rule	4	1.1%	0	0%
Support local non-Muslims for Ottoman rule	0	0%	0	0%
Disloyalty Ottoman Muslims	1	0.3%	0	0%
Arabian Revolt	0	0%	0	0%
Neutrality Muslims	4	1.1%	0	0%
Ottoman actions to acquire support Entente Muslims	0	0%	0	0%
Ottoman actions to acquire support neutral Muslims	0	0%	0	0%
Entente actions to acquire support Ottoman subjects	0	0%	0	0%
Yezidis helping Russians	1	0.3%	0	0%
Armenians helping Russians	1	0.3%	0	0%
Ottoman non-Muslim policies	2	0.5%	0	0%
Liberation of non-Turks from Ottoman rule	0	0%	0	0%
Attitude of the Ottoman non-Muslim population	0	0%	0	0%
Massacres of non-Muslims	0	0%	0	0%
Armenian massacres	0	0%	0	0%
Greek massacres	0	0%	0	0%
Catholic massacres	0	0%	0	0%
Jewish massacres	0	0%	0	0%
Other atrocities towards non-	0	0%	0	0%

Muslims				
Atrocities Armenians towards the Turks	0	0%	0	0%
Jewish colony in Palestine	0	0%	0	0%
<b>References to life in the Ottoman Empire</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0.3%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>
Attitude Ottoman population	1	0.3%	0	0%
Celebrations in Constantinople	0	0%	0	0%
Daily life continuing in the Ottoman Empire	0	0%	0	0%
Daily life disrupted	0	0%	0	0%
<b>References to Ottoman stereotypes</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2.7%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>9.3%</b>
Military toughness	5	1.3%	0	0%
Violent Ottomans	2	0.5%	0	0%
Barbaric Ottomans	1	0.3%	0	0%
Oppressive Ottomans	0	0%	0	0%
Pillaging Ottomans	0	0%	0	0%
Stupid Ottomans	0	0%	0	0%
Unorganized Ottomans	0	0%	0	0%
Backwardness Ottomans	0	0%	0	0%
Behavior Ottoman soldiers in occupied territories	0	0%	0	0%
Nice Ottomans	1	0.3%	1	3.1%
Honesty Ottomans	0	0%	0	0%
Ottoman harem	0	0%	0	0%
'Lustful Turk' stereotype is not true	0	0%	1	3.1%
Arabian Nights	0	0%	0	0%
The Ottoman Empire does not belong in Europe	1	0.3%	0	0%
Turk as simple farmer	0	0%	1	3.1%
<b>Others</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>
Women's rights	0	0%	0	0%
Socialism in the Ottoman Empire	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>372</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>100%</b>

Observation schedule *Het Volk* 1914

Topic	Frequency topic	Frequency subtopic	Frequency reference 1	Frequency reference 2	Total	Percent
<b>References to Ottoman relations with the outside world</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>21.8%</b>
Relations with the Great	2	1			3	0.8%

Powers						
Relations with the Triple Entente	14			1	15	4%
Relations with the Central Powers	3		1		4	1.1%
Relations with Great-Britain	7	2			9	2.4%
Relations with France	1	1			2	0.5%
Relations with Russia	4	1			5	1.3%
Relations with Germany	4	2	1		7	1.9%
Relations with Austria-Hungary	1				1	0.3%
Relations with Italy	2	1			3	0.8%
Relations with the USA	2				2	0.5%
Relations with neighboring countries (Balkans)	15	1	2	1	19	5%
Relations with the Islamic world	4	2	2	1	9	2.4%
Alliances against the Ottoman Empire					0	0%
Eastern question					0	0%
Border adjustments					0	0%
Foreign designs on Constantinople					0	0%
Ottoman actions to disturb Balkan relations					0	0%
Capitulations/concessions	2				2	0.5%
Annexation Egypt					0	0%
Annexation Cyprus			1		1	0.3%
<b>References to the Ottoman alliance with Germany and Austria-Hungary</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>8.1%</b>
German-Ottoman alliance	1	5	2		8	2.2%
The Ottoman Empire as Germany's puppet		4	1	1	6	1.6%
German influence on the Ottoman army and navy		7	1	1	9	2.4%
German military and financial support		3			3	0.8%
Ottoman support for Germany and Austria					0	0%
German responsibility for Ottoman crimes			1		1	0.3%
The Ottoman Empire is only fighting for the benefit of Germany and			1		1	0.3%

Austria-Hungary						
Connection Germany-Ottoman Empire (transport)					0	0%
Problems between the Ottoman Empire and Germany					0	0%
Pro-German group in the Ottoman Empire is a minority			2		2	0.5%
Attempted murder on German general					0	0%
Decorations for German officers					0	0%
<b>References to the Ottoman past</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>2.2%</b>
Rule Abdulhamid II					0	0%
Bulgarian revolt					0	0%
Russo-Turkish war 1877-1878					0%	0%
Greek-Turkish war 1897					0	0%
Young Turk revolution					0	0%
Balkan wars		4	1	3	8	2.2%
<b>References to the Ottoman government</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2.8%</b>
Ottoman neutrality	2	3	1	1	7	1.9%
Censorship			1		1	0.3%
Influence Young Turks					0	0%
Failure of the Young Turk reforms					0	0%
Dissatisfaction with Young Turks	1				1	0.3%
Disapproval government					0	0%
Plans to overthrow the government					0	0%
Formation new government					0	0%
Problems within the Ottoman government					0	0%
Rumors about the government leaving Constantinople					0	0%
Rumors about the sultan leaving Constantinople					0	0%
Death Ottoman heir to the throne					0	0%
New sultan					0	0%
Lack of communication between the Ottoman		1			1	0.3%

government and its officials						
<b>References to the Ottoman armed forces</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>5.3%</b>
Ottoman army	3	3			6	1.6%
Military service		1			1	0.3%
Ottoman mobilization for war	4	1			5	1.3%
Ottoman army well prepared	1				1	0.3%
Ottoman army ill prepared					0	0%
Lack of military equipment					0	0%
The Ottoman Empire has abundant military equipment					0	0%
Good leadership Ottoman army		1		1	2	0.5%
Change in command army					0	0%
Low morale Ottomans					0	0%
High morale Ottomans					0	0%
Soldiers disobeying orders					0	0%
Prisoners of war					0	0%
Execution Ottoman officers					0	0%
Glorious military past					0	0%
Ottoman fleet	4	1			5	1.3%
Goeben/Breslau	1	5	2		7	1.9%
<b>References to the Ottoman theaters of war and battles</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>38.6%</b>
Dardanelles war	1				1	0.3%
War on the Balkans					0	0%
War in Egypt	11		1		12	3.2%
War in Syria and Palestine	2	2			4	1.1%
War in Mesopotamia		1			1	0.3%
War in Persia					0	0%
War on the Arabian peninsula					0	0%
War in the Caucasus					0	0%
War on the Black Sea	1				1	0.3%
War in North Africa					0	0%
Central Powers' success against the Entente					0	0%
Entente success against					0	0%



the Central Powers						
A Central Powers-Entente clash without a winner					0	0%
Ottoman success against the Entente					0	0%
Entente success against the Ottomans					0	0%
An Ottoman-Entente clash without a winner	2				2	0.5%
Ottoman success against the British	9	1			10	2.7%
British success against the Ottomans					0	0%
An Ottoman-British clash without a winner	6	1			7	1.9%
Ottoman success against the French					0	0%
French success against the Ottomans					0	0%
An Ottoman-French clash without a winner	1	1			2	0.5%
Ottoman success against the Russians	38	5	1		44	11.9%
Russian success against the Ottomans	30	2	1		33	8.9%
An Ottoman-Russian clash without a winner	13	2			15	4%
Ottoman success against the British/French					0	0%
British/French success against the Ottomans					0	0%
An Ottoman - British/French clash without a winner	4				4	1.1%
Ottoman success against the Armenians/Georgians					0	0%
An Ottoman-Armenian/Georgian clash without a winner					0	0%
Ottoman success against the Italians					0	0%
Italian success against the Ottomans					0	0%
An Ottoman-Italian clash without a winner					0	0%
Peace with the Ottoman Empire					0	0%
<b>Judgments on the</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>5.6%</b>

<b>behavior of the belligerent powers</b>						
Unfairness Entente towards the Ottoman Empire		3	2		5	1.3%
Ottoman unfairness towards the Entente	1	4	3		8	2.2%
Ottoman unfairness towards neutral countries	2	1			3	0.8%
Unfairness Entente towards neutral countries					0	0%
Mistreatment Entente nationals by the Ottomans		1			1	0.3%
Mistreatment citizens of neutral countries by the Ottomans					0	0%
Exploitation of the Ottoman Empire by the Great Powers		1			1	0.3%
Ottoman telegrams are lying			1		1	0.3%
Entente telegrams are lying		1			1	0.3%
<b>References to the fight for the hearts and minds of the people</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>23.9%</b>
Pan-Islamism/Holy War	13	4			17	4.6%
Pan-Turkism					0	0%
Oppression Islam/Islamic peoples		1	1	1	3	0.8%
Support foreign Muslims for the Ottomans		6	2	1	9	2.4%
Loyalty Islamic people under Entente rule		4	1	1	6	1.6%
Support local Muslims for Ottoman rule		4			4	1.1%
Support local non-Muslims for Ottoman rule					0	0%
Disloyalty Ottoman Muslims		1			1	0.3%
Arabian Revolt					0	0%
Neutrality Muslims		4			4	1.1%
Ottoman actions to acquire support Entente Muslims					0	0%
Ottoman actions to acquire support neutral					0	0%

Muslims						
Entente actions to acquire support Ottoman subjects					0	0%
Yezidis helping Russians		1			1	0.3%
Armenians helping Russians			1		1	0.3%
Ottoman policies towards minorities	1	1			2	0.5%
Liberation of non-Turks from Ottoman rule					0	0%
Attitude of the Ottoman non-Muslim population					0	0%
Massacres of non-Muslims					0	0%
Armenian massacres					0	0%
Greek massacres					0	0%
Catholic massacres					0	0%
Jewish massacres					0	0%
Other atrocities towards non-Muslims					0	0%
Atrocities Armenians towards the Turks					0	0%
Jewish colony in Palestine					0	0%
<b>References to life in the Ottoman Empire</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0.3%</b>
Attitude Ottoman population	1				1	0.3%
Celebrations in Constantinople					0	0%
Daily life continuing in the Ottoman Empire					0	0%
Daily life disrupted					0	0%
<b>References to Ottoman stereotypes</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2.7%</b>
Military toughness		3	1	1	5	1.3%
Violent Ottomans		1	1		2	0.5%
Barbaric Ottomans				1	1	0.3%
Oppressive Ottomans					0	0%
Pillaging Ottomans					0	0%
Stupid Ottomans					0	0%
Unorganized Ottomans					0	0%
Backwardness Ottomans					0	0%
Behavior Ottoman soldiers in occupied territories					0	0%
Nice Ottomans		1			1	0.3%
Honesty Ottomans					0	0%
Ottoman harem					0	0%

'Lustful Turk' stereotype is not true					0	0%
Arabian Nights					0	0%
The Ottoman Empire does not belong in Europe			1		1	0.3%
Turk as simple farmer					0	0%
<b>Other</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>
Women's rights					0	0%
Socialism in the Ottoman Empire					0	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>214</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>372</b>	<b>100%</b>

Observation schedule *De Tribune* 1914

Topic	Frequency topic	Frequency subtopic	Frequency reference 1	Frequency reference 2	Total	Percent
<b>References to Ottoman relations with the outside world</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>25.1%</b>
Relations with the Great Powers					0	0%
Relations with the Triple Entente	2				2	6.3%
Relations with the Central Powers			1		1	3.1%
Relations with Great-Britain					0	0%
Relations with France					0	0%
Relations with Russia					0	0%
Relations with Germany					0	0%
Relations with Austria-Hungary					0	0%
Relations with Italy					0	0%
Relations with the USA					0	0%
Relations with neighboring countries (Balkans)					0	0%
Relations with the Islamic world					0	0%
Alliances against the Ottoman Empire					0	0%
Eastern question					0	0%
Border adjustments					0	0%
Foreign designs on Constantinople					0	0%
Ottoman actions to					0	0%

disturb Balkan relations						
Capitulations/concessions			1	1	2	6.3%
Annexation Egypt		1		1	2	6.3%
Annexation Cyprus	1				1	3.1%
<b>References to the Ottoman alliance with Germany and Austria-Hungary</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>12.5%</b>
German-Ottoman alliance				2	2	6.25%
The Ottoman Empire as Germany's puppet					0	0%
German influence on the Ottoman army and navy		1			1	3.1%
German military and financial support					0	0%
Ottoman support for Germany and Austria					0	0%
German responsibility for Ottoman crimes					0	0%
The Ottoman Empire is only fighting for the benefit of Germany and Austria-Hungary			1		1	3.1%
Connection Germany-Ottoman Empire (transport)					0	0%
Problems between the Ottoman Empire and Germany					0	0%
Pro-German group in the Ottoman Empire is a minority					0	0%
Attempted murder on German general					0	0%
Decorations for German officers					0	0%
<b>References to the Ottoman past</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6.25%</b>
Rule Abdulhamid II					0	0%
Bulgarian revolt					0	0%
Russo-Turkish war 1877-1878			1		1	3.1%
Greek-Turkish war 1897	1				1	3.1%
Young Turk revolution					0	0%
Balkan wars					0	0%
<b>References to the Ottoman government</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>
Ottoman neutrality					0	0%

Censorship					0	0%
Influence Young Turks					0	0%
Failure of the Young Turk reforms					0	0%
Dissatisfaction with Young Turks					0	0%
Disapproval government					0	0%
Plans to overthrow the government					0	0%
Formation new government					0	0%
Problems within the Ottoman government					0	0%
Rumors about the government leaving Constantinople					0	0%
Rumors about the sultan leaving Constantinople					0	0%
Death Ottoman heir to the throne					0	0%
New sultan					0	0%
Lack of communication between the Ottoman government and its officials					0	0%
<b>References to the Ottoman armed forces</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>12.6%</b>
Ottoman army					0	0%
Military service					0	0%
Ottoman mobilization for war	1	1			2	6.3%
Ottoman army well prepared					0	0%
Ottoman army ill prepared					0	0%
Lack of military equipment					0	0%
The Ottoman Empire has abundant military equipment					0	0%
Good leadership Ottoman army					0	0%
Change in command army					0	0%
Low morale Ottomans					0	0%
High morale Ottomans					0	0%
Soldiers disobeying orders					0	0%
Prisoners of war					0	0%

Execution Ottoman officers					0	0%
Glorious military past					0	0%
Ottoman fleet	1				1	3.1%
Goeben/Breslau	1				1	3.1%
<b>References to the Ottoman theaters of war and battles</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>34.6%</b>
Dardanelles war		1			1	3.1%
War on the Balkans					0	0%
War in Egypt	1		1		2	6.3%
War in Syria and Palestine					0	0%
War in Mesopotamia		2			2	6.3%
War in Persia			2	1	3	9.4%
War on the Arabian peninsula					0	0%
War in the Caucasus					0	0%
War on the Black Sea	1				1	3.1%
War in North Africa					0	0%
Central Powers' success against the Entente					0	0%
Entente success against the Central Powers					0	0%
A Central Powers-Entente clash without a winner					0	0%
Ottoman success against the Entente					0	0%
Entente success against the Ottomans					0	0%
An Ottoman-Entente clash without a winner					0	0%
Ottoman success against the British					0	0%
British success against the Ottomans	1				0	0%
An Ottoman-British clash without a winner					0	0%
Ottoman success against the French					0	0%
French success against the Ottomans					0	0%
An Ottoman-French clash without a winner					0	0%
Ottoman success against the Russians					0	0%
Russian success against the Ottomans					0	0%

An Ottoman-Russian clash without a winner	1	1			2	6.3%
Ottoman success against the British/French					0	0%
British/French success against the Ottomans					0	0%
An Ottoman - British/French clash without a winner					0	0%
Ottoman success against the Armenians/Georgians					0	0%
An Ottoman-Armenian/Georgian clash without a winner					0	0%
Ottoman success against the Italians					0	0%
Italian success against the Ottomans					0	0%
An Ottoman-Italian clash without a winner					0	0%
Peace with the Ottoman Empire					0	0%
<b>Judgments on the behavior of the belligerent powers</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3.1%</b>
Unfairness Entente towards the Ottoman Empire		1			1	3.1%
Ottoman unfairness towards the Entente					0	0%
Ottoman unfairness towards neutral countries					0	0%
Unfairness Entente towards neutral countries					0	0%
Mistreatment Entente nationals by the Ottomans					0	0%
Mistreatment citizens of neutral countries by the Ottomans					0	0%
Exploitation of the Ottoman Empire by the Great Powers					0	0%
Ottoman telegrams are lying					0	0%
Entente telegrams are lying					0	0%
<b>References to the fight for the hearts and</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3.1%</b>



<b>minds of the people</b>						
Pan-Islamism/Holy War			1		1	3.1%
Pan-Turkism					0	0%
Oppression Islam/Islamic peoples					0	0%
Support foreign Muslims for the Ottomans				1	1	3.1%
Loyalty Islamic people under Entente rule					0	0%
Support local Muslims for Ottoman rule					0	0%
Support local non-Muslims for Ottoman rule					0	0%
Disloyalty Ottoman Muslims					0	0%
Arabian Revolt					0	0%
Neutrality Muslims					0	0%
Ottoman actions to acquire support Entente Muslims					0	0%
Ottoman actions to acquire support neutral Muslims					0	0%
Entente actions to acquire support Ottoman subjects					0	0%
Yezidis helping Russians					0	0%
Armenians helping Russians					0	0%
Ottoman policies towards minorities					0	0%
Liberation of non-Turks from Ottoman rule					0	0%
Attitude of the Ottoman non-Muslim population					0	0%
Massacres of non-Muslims					0	0%
Armenian massacres					0	0%
Greek massacres					0	0%
Catholic massacres					0	0%
Jewish massacres					0	0%
Other atrocities towards non-Muslims					0	0%
Atrocities Armenians towards the Turks					0	0%
Jewish colony in Palestine					0	0%
<b>References to life in the Ottoman Empire</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>

Attitude Ottoman population					0	0%
Celebrations in Constantinople					0	0%
Daily life continuing in the Ottoman Empire					0	0%
Daily life disrupted					0	0%
<b>References to Ottoman stereotypes</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>9.3%</b>
Military toughness					0	0%
Violent Ottomans					0	0%
Barbaric Ottomans					0	0%
Oppressive Ottomans					0	0%
Pillaging Ottomans					0	0%
Stupid Ottomans					0	0%
Unorganized Ottomans					0	0%
Backwardness Ottomans					0	0%
Behavior Ottoman soldiers in occupied territories					0	0%
Nice Ottomans		1			1	3.1%
Honesty Ottomans					0	0%
Ottoman harem					0	0%
‘Lustful Turk’ stereotype is not true			1		1	3.1%
Arabian Nights					0	0%
The Ottoman Empire does not belong in Europe					0	0%
Turk as simple farmer				1	1	3.1%
<b>Other</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>
Women’s rights					0	0%
Socialism in the Ottoman Empire					0	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>100%</b>

Type of article

	<i>Het Volk</i>		<i>De Tribune</i>	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
News story	215	96.4%	5	45.5%
Editorial	4	1.8%	5	45.5%
Letter	1	0.4%	0	0%
Report	0	0%	1	9.1%
Feature	2	0.9%	0	0%
Opinion piece	1	0.4%	0	0%
Speech	0	0%	0	0%
Poetry	0	0%	0	0%
Leaflet	0	0%	0	0%

Other	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>223</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100%</b>

Geography: the place of action

	<i>Het Volk</i>		<i>De Tribune</i>	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
The Ottoman Empire				
- The Ottoman Empire	10	4.8%	5	83.3%
- Constantinople	10	4.8%	0	0%
- Smyrna	0	0%	0	0%
- Dardanelles & Sea of Marmara	13	6.2%	0	0%
- Balkan front	0	0%	0	0%
- Egypt	30	14.4%	0	0%
- Syria & Palestine	7	3.3%	0	0%
- Mesopotamia	15	7.2%	0	0%
- Border with Iran	5	2.4%	0	0%
- Caucasus	32	15.3%	0	0%
- Black Sea	25	12%	0	0%
- Russian front	29	13.9%	0	0%
- Arabian Peninsula	0	0%	0	0%
Triple Entente				
- United Kingdom	6	2.9%	1	16.7%
- France	2	1.0%	0	0%
- Russia	3	1.4%	0	0%
- Belgium	0	0%	0	0%
- Serbia	0	0%	0	0%
Central Powers				
- Germany	1	0.5%	0	0%
- Austria-Hungary	0	0%	0	0%
Neutral countries				
- The Netherlands	1	0.5%	0	0%
- Sweden	0	0%	0	0%
- Switzerland	0	0%	0	0%
- Italy	2	1.0%	0	0%
- Vatican	0	0%	0	0%
- Bulgaria	3	1.4%	0	0%
- Greece	1	0.5%	0	0%
- Romania	3	1.4%	0	0%
- Albania	0	0%	0	0%
- Persia	1	0.5%	0	0%
- Afghanistan	1	0.5%	0	0%
- USA	0	0%	0	0%
Colonies				
- Malta	0	0%	0	0%
- India	2	1.0%	0	0%
- Sudan	0	0%	0	0%
- Dutch Indies	2	1.0%	0	0%

- North Africa	2	1.0%	0	0%
Others				
- Mediterranean	2	1.0%	0	0%
- Atlantic Ocean	0	0%	0	0%
- Balkans	1	0.5%	0	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>209</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>100%</b>

#### Geography: the origin of the news

	<i>Het Volk</i>		<i>De Tribune</i>	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
The Ottoman Empire	10	16.7%	0	0%
Triple Entente				
- United Kingdom	25	41.7%	0	0%
- France	1	1.7%	0	0%
- Russia	3	5%	0	0%
- USA	1	1.7%	0	0%
- Italy	0	0%	0	0%
- Romania	0	0%	0	0%
- Greece	1	1.7%	0	0%
- Belgium	0	0%	0	0%
- Serbia	0	0%	0	0%
Central Powers				
- Germany	9	15%	0	0%
- Austria-Hungary	3	5%	0	0%
- Bulgaria	1	1.7%	0	0%
Neutral countries				
- The Netherlands	5	8.3%	0	0%
- Denmark	0	0%	0	0%
- Sweden	0	0%	0	0%
- Switzerland	0	0%	0	0%
- Vatican	0	0%	0	0%
- Persia	0	0%	0	0%
- Afghanistan	0	0%	0	0%
Colonies				
- Malta	0	0%	0	0%
- India	0	0%	0	0%
- Sudan	0	0%	0	0%
- Dutch Indies	1	1.7%	0	0%
- North Africa	0	0%	0	0%
- Egypt	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>

#### Actors

	<i>Het Volk</i>		<i>De Tribune</i>	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
The Ottoman Empire				
- Ottoman Empire (state)	0	0%	1	14.3%

- Ottoman government	24	10.6%	2	28.6%
- Ottoman sultan	0	0%	0	0%
- Ottoman heir to the throne	0	0%	0	0%
- Ottoman grand vizier	0	0%	0	0%
- Ottoman governors	0	0%	0	0%
- Ottoman representatives abroad	6	2.7%	0	0%
- Ottoman delegation The Hague	1	0.4%	0	0%
- Opponents of the Ottoman government abroad	0	0%	0	0%
- Ottoman military authorities	1	0.4%	0	0%
- Ottoman army	56	24.8%	0	0%
- Ottoman fleet	22	9.7%	0	0%
- Ottoman gangs	1	0.4%	0	0%
- Ottoman irregular troops	0	0%	0	0%
- Ottoman prisoners of war	0	0%	0	0%
- Ottoman airforce	0	0%	0	0%
- Ottoman press	3	1.3%	0	0%
- Ottoman people	1	0.4%	0	0%
- Patriarch of Constantinople	1	0.4%	0	0%
- Non-Ottoman minorities	0	0%	0	0%
- Ottoman Christians	0	0%	0	0%
- Ottoman Greeks	2	0.9%	0	0%
- Ottoman Armenians	0	0%	0	0%
- Ottoman Jews	0	0%	0	0%
- Ottoman socialists	0	0%	0	0%
- Ottoman factories	0	0%	0	0%
- Ottoman universities	0	0%	0	0%
Great Powers	0	0%	0	0%
Triple Entente				
- Entente Powers	1	0.4%	1	14.3%
- Entente representatives in the Ottoman Empire	4	1.8%	0	0%
- Entente representatives abroad	1	0.4%	0	0%
- Entente armies	0	0%	0	0%
- Entente fleet	1	0.4%	0	0%
- Entente airforce	0	0%	0	0%
- UK/French armies	0	0%	0	0%
- UK/French fleet	7	3.1%	0	0%
- Entente colonies	2	0.9%	0	0%
- Entente Muslims	0	0%	0	0%
Central Powers				
- Central Powers	0	0%	1	14.3%
- Central Powers armies	0	0%	0	0%
- German/Austrian military	0	0%	0	0%
United Kingdom				
- United Kingdom (state)	0	0%	1	14.3%
- British government	4	1.8%	0	0%
- British ministers	0	0%	0	0%
- British rulers Egypt	1	0.4%	0	0%

- British army	14	6.2%	0	0%
- British fleet	7	3.1%	0	0%
- British airforce	0	0%	0	0%
France				
- France (state)	0	0%	0	0%
- French government	1	0.4%	0	0%
- French representatives in The Hague	1	0.4%	0	0%
- French army	0	0%	0	0%
- French fleet	0	0%	0	0%
Russia				
- Russia (state)	0	0%	0	0%
- Russian government	1	0.4%	0	0%
- Russian representatives in the Ottoman Empire	1	0.4%	0	0%
- Russian army	28	12.4%	0	0%
- Russian fleet	9	4%	0	0%
- Russian Muslims	1	0.4%	0	0%
- Russian socialists	0	0%	0	0%
- Armenians/Georgians	0	0%	0	0%
- German companies in Russia	0	0%	0	0%
Germany				
- Germany (state)	0	0%	0	0%
- German government	1	0.4%	0	0%
- German fleet	0	0%	0	0%
- German people	1	0.4%	0	0%
- German social-democrats	0	0%	0	0%
- Germans in the Ottoman Empire	1	0.4%	0	0%
- German companies	0	0%	0	0%
Austria-Hungary				
- Austria-Hungary (state)	0	0%	0	0%
- Austro-Hungarian government	1	0.4%	0	0%
- Austro-Hungarian press	0	0%	0	0%
The Netherlands				
- The Netherlands (state)	0	0%	0	0%
- Ottoman representation The Hague	0	0%	0	0%
Sweden				
- Swedish socialists	0	0%	0	0%
Italy				
- Italy (state)	0	0%	0	0%
- Italian government	1	0.4%	0	0%
- Italian representatives in the Ottoman Empire	0	0%	0	0%
- Italian army	0	0%	0	0%
- Italian fleet	2	0.9%	0	0%
- Italian press	0	0%	0	0%
Vatican				
- The Pope	0	0%	0	0%

<b>Balkans</b>				
- Balkan states	0	0%	0	0%
- Balkan rebels	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Bulgaria</b>				
- Bulgaria (state)	0	0%	0	0%
- Bulgarian government	1	0.4%	0	0%
- Bulgarian army	0	0%	0	0%
- Bulgarian press	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Greece</b>				
- Greece (state)	0	0%	0	0%
- Greek government	1	0.4%	0	0%
- Greek representative in the Ottoman Empire	1	0.4%	0	0%
- Greek socialists	0	0%	0	0%
- Greek army	0	0%	1	14.3%
<b>Serbia</b>				
- Serbian government	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Romania</b>				
- Romania (state)	0	0%	0	0%
- Romanian government	2	0.9%	0	0%
- Romanian representative in the Ottoman Empire	0	0%	0	0%
- Romanian army	0	0%	0	0%
- Romanin customs	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Persia</b>				
- Persia (state)	0	0%	0	0%
- Persian government	1	0.4%	0	0%
<b>Afghanistan</b>				
- Afghanistan (state)	0	0%	0	0%
- Afghani government	0	0%	0	0%
- Afghani emir	1	0.4%	0	0%
<b>USA</b>				
- USA (state)	0	0%	0	0%
- American government	2	0.9%	0	0%
- American representative in the Ottoman Empire	0	0%	0	0%
- American press	1	0.4%	0	0%
<b>India</b>				
- Indian Muslims	1	0.4%	0	0%
<b>Sudan</b>				
- Sudanese Muslims	1	0.4%	0	0%
<b>Dutch Indies</b>				
- Muslims Dutch Indies	3	1.3%	0	0%
- Press Dutch Indies	0	0%	0	0%
<b>North Africa</b>				
- Toearegs	1	0.4%	0	0%
- Senussi	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Egypt</b>				
- Egyptian sultan	1	0.4%	0	0%

- Bedouins	0	0%	0	0%
Arabian Peninsula				
- Bedouins	0	0%	0	0%
Jews	0	0%	0	0%
International socialist organizations	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>226</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>100%</b>



## Appendix II: Observation schedule 1915

Topics, subtopics and references: frequency and percentages of the total

	<i>Het Volk</i>		<i>De Tribune</i>	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
<b>References to Ottoman relations with the outside world</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>28.8%</b>
Relations with the Great Powers	1	0.2%	0	0%
Relations with the Triple Entente	0	0%	0	0%
Relations with the Central Powers	0	0%	0	0%
Relations with Great-Britain	0	0%	0	0%
Relations with France	0	0%	0	0%
Relations with Russia	1	0.2%	0	0%
Relations with Germany	2	0.3%	0	0%
Relations with Austria-Hungary	0	0%	0	0%
Relations with Italy	22	3.7%	1	1.3%
Relations with the USA	2	0.3%	0	0%
Relations with neighboring countries (Balkans)	42	7.1%	2	2.6%
Relations with the Islamic world	3	0.5%	1	1.3%
Alliances against the Ottoman Empire	4	0.7%	0	0%
Eastern question	0	0%	7	9.2%
Border adjustments	21	3.6%	3	3.9%
Foreign designs on Constantinople	1	0.2%	8	10.5%
Ottoman actions to disturb Balkan relations	1	0.2%	0	0%
Capitulations/concessions	0	0%	0	0%
Annexation Egypt	0	0%	0	0%
Annexation Cyprus	0	0%	0	0%
<b>References to the Ottoman alliance with Germany and Austria-Hungary</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>9.3%</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>18.4%</b>
German-Ottoman alliance	13	2.2%	1	1.3%
The Ottoman Empire as Germany's puppet	6	1.0%	5	6.6%
German influence on the Ottoman army and navy	11	1.7%	0	0%
German military and financial support	9	1.5%	1	1.3%
Ottoman support for	0	0%	0	0%

Germany and Austria-Hungary				
German responsibility for Ottoman crimes	0	0%	2	2.6%
The Ottoman Empire is only fighting for the benefit of Germany and Austria-Hungary	2	0.3%	1	1.3%
Connection Germany-Ottoman Empire (transport)	5	0.8%	4	5.3%
Problems between the Ottoman Empire and Germany	1	0.2%	0	0%
Pro-German group in the Ottoman Empire is a minority	0	0%	0	0%
Attempted murder on German general	1	0.2%	0	0%
Decorations for German officers	3	0.5%	0	0%
<b>References to the Ottoman past</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0.2%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7.9%</b>
Rule Abdulhamid II	0	0%	0	0%
Bulgarian revolt	0	0%	0	0%
Russo-Turkish war 1877-1878	0	0%	0	0%
Greek-Turkish war 1897	0	0%	0	0%
Young Turk revolution	0	0%	0	0%
Balkan wars	1	0.2%	6	7.9%
<b>References to the Ottoman government</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0.5%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5.2%</b>
Ottoman neutrality	0	0%	1	1.3%
Censorship	0	0%	0	0%
Influence Young Turks	0	0%	0	0%
Failure of the Young Turk reforms	0	0%	0	0%
Dissatisfaction with Young Turks	0	0%	0	0%
Disapproval government	0	0%	3	3.9%
Plans to overthrow the government	0	0%	0	0%
Formation new government	0	0%	0	0%
Problems within the Ottoman government	3	0.5%	0	0%
Rumors about the government leaving Constantinople	0	0%	0	0%
Rumors about the sultan leaving Constantinople	0	0%	0	0%

Death Ottoman heir to the throne	0	0%	0	0%
New sultan	0	0%	0	0%
Lack of communication between the Ottoman government and its officials	0	0%	0	0%
<b>References to the Ottoman armed forces</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>8.9%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>
Ottoman army	21	3.6%	0	0%
Military service	0	0%	0	0%
Ottoman mobilization for war	0	0%	0	0%
Ottoman army well prepared	2	0.3%	0	0%
Ottoman army ill prepared	1	0.2%	0	0%
Lack of military equipment	3	0.5%	0	0%
Abundance military equipment	1	0.2%	0	0%
Good leadership Ottoman army	0	0%	0	0%
Change in command army	2	0.3%	0	0%
Low morale Ottomans	10	1.7%	0	0%
High morale Ottomans	2	0.3%	0	0%
Soldiers disobeying orders	1	0.2%	0	0%
Prisoners of war	1	0.2%	0	0%
Execution Ottoman officers	2	0.3%	0	0%
Glorious military past	1	0.2%	0	0%
Ottoman fleet	4	0.7%	0	0%
Goeben/Breslau	1	0.2%	0	0%
<b>References to the Ottoman theaters of war and battles</b>	<b>308</b>	<b>54%</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>27.6%</b>
Dardanelles war	45	7.6%	12	15.8%
War on the Balkans	2	0.3%	0	0%
War in Egypt	13	2.2%	4	5.3%
War in Syria and Palestine	1	0.2%	0	0%
War in Mesopotamia	2	0.3%	2	2.6%
War in Persia	4	0.7%	1	1.3%
War on the Arabian peninsula	1	0.2%	0	0%
War in the Caucasus	7	1.2%	0	0%
War on the Black Sea	3	0.5%	0	0%
War in North Africa	2	0.3%	0	0%
Central Powers' success against the Entente	0	0%	0	0%
Entente success against the Central Powers	0	0%	0	0%
A Central Powers-Entente clash without a winner	0	0%	0	0%
Ottoman success against the Entente	0	0%	0	0%

Entente success against the Ottomans	0	0%	0	0%
An Ottoman-Entente clash without a winner	1	0.2%	0	0%
Ottoman success against the British	21	3.6%	0	0%
British success against the Ottomans	27	4.6%	0	0%
An Ottoman-British clash without a winner	7	1.2%	0	0%
Ottoman success against the French	3	0.5%	0	0%
French success against the Ottomans	1	0.2%	0	0%
An Ottoman-French clash without a winner	0	0%	0	0%
Ottoman success against the Russians	19	3.2%	0	0%
Russian success against the Ottomans	51	10.4%	0	0%
An Ottoman-Russian clash without a winner	9	1.5%	0	0%
Ottoman success against the British/French	30	5.1%	0	0%
British/French success against the Ottomans	32	5.4%	1	1.3%
An Ottoman-British/French clash without a winner	19	3.2%	1	1.3%
Ottoman success against the Armenians/Georgians	0	0%	0	0%
An Ottoman-Armenian/Georgian clash without a winner	0	0%	0	0%
Ottoman success against the Italians	0	0%	0	0%
Italian success against the Ottomans	0	0%	0	0%
An Ottoman-Italian clash without a winner	0	0%	0	0%
Peace with the Ottoman Empire	8	1.4%	0	0%
<b>Judgments on the behavior of the belligerent powers</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>3.5%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.3%</b>
Unfairness Entente towards the Ottoman Empire	1	0.2%	0	0%
Ottoman unfairness towards the Entente	0	0%	0	0%
Ottoman unfairness towards neutral countries	4	0.7%	0	0%

Unfairness Entente towards neutral countries	3	0.5%	0	0%
Mistreatment Entente nationals by the Ottomans	1	0.2%	0	0%
Mistreatment citizens of neutral countries by the Ottomans	4	0.7%	0	0%
Exploitation of the Ottoman Empire by the Great Powers	0	0%	0	0%
Ottoman telegrams are lying	4	0.7%	1	1.3%
Entente telegrams are lying	3	0.5%	0	0%
<b>References to the fight for the hearts and minds of the people</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>6.6%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7.8%</b>
Pan-Islamism/Holy War	6	1.0%	2	2.6%
Pan-Turkism	0	0%	0	0%
Oppression Islam/Islamic peoples	0	0%	0	0%
Support foreign Muslims for the Ottomans	8	1.4%	0	0%
Loyalty Muslims under Entente rule	0	0%	0	0%
Support local Muslims for Ottoman rule	1	0.2%	0	0%
Support local non-Muslims for Ottoman rule	0	0%	0	0%
Disloyalty Ottoman Muslims	3	0.5%	0	0%
Arabian Revolt	0	0%	0	0%
Neutrality Muslims	1	0.2%	0	0%
Ottoman actions to acquire support Entente Muslims	4	0.7%	0	0%
Ottoman actions to acquire support neutral Muslims	3	0.5%	1	1.3%
Entente actions to acquire support Ottoman subjects	0	0%	0	0%
Yezidis helping Russians	0	0%	0	0%
Armenians helping Russians	0	0%	0	0%
Ottoman non-Muslim policies	3	0.5%	0	0%
Liberation of non-Turks from Ottoman rule	1	0.2%	0	0%
Attitude of the Ottoman non-Muslim population	1	0.2%	0	0%
Massacres of non-Muslims	0	0	0	0%
Armenian massacres	4	0.7%	2	2.6%
Greek massacres	2	0.3%	0	0%
Catholic massacres	0	0%	0	0%
Jewish massacres	0	0%	0	0%
Other atrocities towards non-	0	0%	0	0%

Muslims				
Atrocities Armenians towards the Turks	1	0.2%	1	1.3%
Jewish colony in Palestine	0	0%	0	0%
<b>References to life in the Ottoman Empire</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>2.5%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.3%</b>
Attitude Ottoman population	9	1.5%	0	0%
Celebrations in Constantinople	0	0%	0	0%
Daily life continuing in the Ottoman Empire	2	0.3%	0	0%
Daily life disrupted	4	0.7%	1	1.3%
<b>References to Ottoman stereotypes</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>1.8%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.5%</b>
Military toughness	6	1.0%	0	0%
Violent Ottomans	1	0.2%	0	0%
Barbaric Ottomans	1	0.2%	1	1.3%
Oppressive Ottomans	0	0%	0	0%
Pillaging Ottomans	1	0.2%	0	0%
Stupid Ottomans	0	0%	0	0%
Unorganized Ottomans	0	0%	0	0%
Backwardness Ottomans	0	0%	0	0%
Behavior Ottoman soldiers in occupied territories	1	0.2%	0	0%
Nice Ottomans	0	0%	0	0%
Honesty Ottomans	0	0%	0	0%
Ottoman harem	0	0%	0	0%
'Lustful Turk' stereotype is not true	0	0%	0	0%
Arabian Nights	0	0%	0	0%
The Ottoman Empire does not belong in Europe	0	0%	0	0%
Turk as simple farmer	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Others</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>
Women's rights	0	0%	0	0%
Socialism in the Ottoman Empire	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>591</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>100%</b>

Observation schedule *Het Volk* 1915

Topic	Frequency topic	Frequency subtopic	Frequency reference 1	Frequency reference 2	Total	Percent
<b>References to Ottoman relations with the outside world</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>17%</b>
Relations with the Great	1				1	0.2%

Powers						
Relations with the Triple Entente					0	0%
Relations with the Central Powers					0	0%
Relations with Great-Britain					0	0%
Relations with France					0	0%
Relations with Russia		1			1	0.2%
Relations with Germany	2				2	0.3%
Relations with Austria-Hungary					0	0%
Relations with Italy	20	1	1		22	3.7%
Relations with the USA	1	1			2	0.3%
Relations with neighboring countries (Balkans)	39	2	1		42	7.1%
Relations with the Islamic world	2			1	3	0.5%
Alliances against the Ottoman Empire		3	1		4	0.7%
Eastern question					0	0%
Border adjustments	1	20			21	3.6%
Foreign designs on Constantinople			1		1	0.2%
Ottoman actions to disturb Balkan relations		1			1	0.2%
Capitulations/concessions					0	0%
Annexation Egypt					0	0%
Annexation Cyprus					0	0%
<b>References to the Ottoman alliance with Germany and Austria-Hungary</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>9.3%</b>
German-Ottoman alliance	1	7	4	1	13	2.2%
The Ottoman Empire as Germany's puppet	1	3	1	1	6	1.0%
German influence on the Ottoman army and navy		8	2	1	11	1.7%
German military and financial support	1	4	4		9	1.5%
Ottoman support for Germany and Austria					0	0%
German responsibility for Ottoman crimes					0	0%
The Ottoman Empire is only fighting for the benefit of Germany and	1		1		2	0.3%

Austria-Hungary						
Connection Germany-Ottoman Empire (transport)	2	2	1		5	0.8%
Problems between the Ottoman Empire and Germany		1			1	0.2%
Pro-German group in the Ottoman Empire is a minority					0	0%
Attempted murder on German general		1			1	0.2%
Decorations for German officers	2			1	3	0.5%
<b>References to the Ottoman past</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0.2%</b>
Rule Abdulhamid II					0	0%
Bulgarian revolt					0	0%
Russo-Turkish war 1877-1878					0	0%
Greek-Turkish war 1897					0	0%
Young Turk revolution					0	0%
Balkan wars				1	1	0.2%
<b>References to the Ottoman government</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0.5%</b>
Ottoman neutrality					0	0%
Censorship					0	0%
Influence Young Turks						
Failure of the Young Turk reforms					0	0%
Dissatisfaction with Young Turks					0	0%
Disapproval government					0	0%
Plans to overthrow the government					0	0%
Formation new government					0	0%
Problems within the Ottoman government	1		2		3	0.5%
Rumors about the government leaving Constantinople					0	0%
Rumors about the sultan leaving Constantinople					0	0%
Death Ottoman heir to the throne					0	0%
New sultan					0	0%
Lack of communication between the Ottoman					0	0%



government and its officials						
<b>References to the Ottoman armed forces</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>8.9%</b>
Ottoman army	15	6			21	3.6%
Military service					0	0%
Ottoman mobilization for war					0	0%
Ottoman army well prepared		2			2	0.3%
Ottoman army ill prepared		1			1	0.2%
Lack of military equipment	1	1	1		3	0.5%
The Ottoman Empire has abundant military equipment	1				1	0.2%
Good leadership Ottoman army					0	0%
Change in command army		2			2	0.3%
Low morale Ottomans	4	3	3		10	1.7%
High morale Ottomans		2			2	0.3%
Soldiers disobeying orders		1			1	0.2%
Prisoners of war		1			1	0.2%
Execution Ottoman officers		1	1		2	0.3%
Glorious military past		1			1	0.2%
Ottoman fleet	3	1			4	0.7%
Goeben/Breslau		1			1	0.2%
<b>References to the Ottoman theaters of war and battles</b>	<b>271</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>308</b>	<b>54%</b>
Dardanelles war	38	6		1	45	7.6%
War on the Balkans	2				2	0.3%
War in Egypt	13				13	2.2%
War in Syria and Palestine	1				1	0.2%
War in Mesopotamia	1	1			2	0.3%
War in Persia	2	1	1		4	0.7%
War on the Arabian peninsula	1				1	0.2%
War in the Caucasus	7				7	1.2%
War on the Black Sea	3				3	0.5%
War in North Africa	1	1			2	0.3%
Central Powers' success against the Entente					0	0%
Entente success against					0	0%

the Central Powers						
A Central Powers-Entente clash without a winner					0	0%
Ottoman success against the Entente					0	0%
Entente success against the Ottomans					0	0%
An Ottoman-Entente clash without a winner	1				1	0.2%
Ottoman success against the British	21				21	3.6%
British success against the Ottomans	26	1			27	4.6%
An Ottoman-British clash without a winner	6	1			7	1.2%
Ottoman success against the French	3				3	0.5%
French success against the Ottomans	1				1	0.2%
An Ottoman-French clash without a winner					0	0%
Ottoman success against the Russians	19				19	3.2%
Russian success against the Ottomans	48	3			51	10.4%
An Ottoman-Russian clash without a winner	7	2			9	1.5%
Ottoman success against the British/French	26	3	1		30	5.1%
British/French success against the Ottomans	31	1			32	5.4%
An Ottoman - British/French clash without a winner	17	2			19	3.2%
Ottoman success against the Armenians/Georgians					0	0%
An Ottoman-Armenian/Georgian clash without a winner					0	0%
Ottoman success against the Italians					0	0%
Italian success against the Ottomans					0	0%
An Ottoman-Italian clash without a winner					0	0%
Peace with the Ottoman Empire	4	1	2	1	8	1.4%
<b>Judgments on the</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>3.5%</b>

<b>behavior of the belligerent powers</b>						
Unfairness Entente towards the Ottoman Empire		1			1	0.2%
Ottoman unfairness towards the Entente					0	0%
Ottoman unfairness towards neutral countries		4			4	0.7%
Unfairness Entente towards neutral countries		1	2		3	0.5%
Mistreatment Entente nationals by the Ottomans			1		1	0.2%
Mistreatment citizens of neutral countries by the Ottomans		3	1		4	0.7%
Exploitation of the Ottoman Empire by the Great Powers					0	0%
Ottoman telegrams are lying		2	2		4	0.7%
Entente telegrams are lying		3			3	0.5%
<b>References to the fight for the hearts and minds of the people</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>6.6%</b>
Pan-Islamism/Holy War	1	3		2	6	1.0%
Pan-Turkism					0	0%
Oppression Islam/Islamic peoples					0	0%
Support foreign Muslims for the Ottomans	1	5	3		8	1.4%
Loyalty Islamic people under Entente rule					0	0%
Support local Muslims for Ottoman rule		1			1	0.2%
Support local non-Muslims for Ottoman rule					0	0%
Disloyalty Ottoman Muslims		2	1		3	0.5%
Arabian Revolt					0	0%
Neutrality Muslims			1		1	0.2%
Ottoman actions to acquire support Entente Muslims	1	1	1	1	4	0.7%
Ottoman actions to acquire support neutral		2	1		3	0.5%

Muslims						
Entente actions to acquire support Ottoman subjects					0	0%
Yezidis helping Russians					0	0%
Armenians helping Russians					0	0%
Ottoman policies towards minorities	1	1	1		3	0.5%
Liberation of non-Turks from Ottoman rule	1				1	0.2%
Attitude of the Ottoman non-Muslim population	1				1	0.2%
Massacres of non-Muslims					0	0%
Armenian massacres	1	3			4	0.7%
Greek massacres	1	1			2	0.3%
Catholic massacres					0	0%
Jewish massacres					0	0%
Other atrocities towards non-Muslims					0	0%
Atrocities Armenians towards the Turks	1				1	0.2%
Jewish colony in Palestine					0	0%
<b>References to life in the Ottoman Empire</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>2.5%</b>
Attitude Ottoman population	7	1	1		9	1.5%
Celebrations in Constantinople					0	0%
Daily life continuing in the Ottoman Empire		1	1		2	0.3%
Daily life disrupted	4				4	0.7%
<b>References to Ottoman stereotypes</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>1.8%</b>
Military toughness		4	2		6	1.0%
Violent Ottomans		1			1	0.2%
Barbaric Ottomans	1				1	0.2%
Oppressive Ottomans					0	0%
Pillaging Ottomans			1		1	0.2%
Stupid Ottomans					0	0%
Unorganized Ottomans					0	0%
Backwardness Ottomans					0	0%
Behavior Ottoman soldiers in occupied territories		1			1	0.2%
Nice Ottomans					0	0%
Honesty Ottomans					0	0%
Ottoman harem					0	0%

'Lustful Turk' stereotype is not true					0	0%
Arabian Nights					0	0%
The Ottoman Empire does not belong in Europe					0	0%
Turk as simple farmer					0	0%
<b>Other</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>
Women's rights					0	0%
Socialism in the Ottoman Empire					0	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>391</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>11</b>	591	100%

Observation schedule *De Tribune* 1915

Topic	Frequency topic	Frequency subtopic	Frequency reference 1	Frequency reference 2	Total	Percent
<b>References to Ottoman relations with the outside world</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>28.8%</b>
Relations with the Great Powers					0	0%
Relations with the Triple Entente					0	0%
Relations with the Central Powers					0	0%
Relations with Great-Britain					0	0%
Relations with France					0	0%
Relations with Russia					0	0%
Relations with Germany					0	0%
Relations with Austria-Hungary					0	0%
Relations with Italy	1				1	1.3%
Relations with the USA					0	0%
Relations with neighboring countries (Balkans)		1	1		2	2.6%
Relations with the Islamic world		1			1	1.3%
Alliances against the Ottoman Empire					0	0%
Eastern question	5		1	1	7	9.2%
Border adjustments				3	3	3.9%
Foreign designs on Constantinople	1	4	2	1	8	10.5%
Ottoman actions to					0	0%

disturb Balkan relations						
Capitulations/concessions					0	0%
Annexation Egypt					0	0%
Annexation Cyprus					0	0%
<b>References to the Ottoman alliance with Germany and Austria-Hungary</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>18.4%</b>
German-Ottoman alliance				1	1	1.3%
The Ottoman Empire as Germany's puppet		2	3		5	6.6%
German influence on the Ottoman army and navy					0	0%
German military and financial support			1		1	1.3%
Ottoman support for Germany and Austria					0	0%
German responsibility for Ottoman crimes		1	1		2	2.6%
The Ottoman Empire is only fighting for the benefit of Germany and Austria-Hungary		1			1	1.3%
Connection Germany-Ottoman Empire (transport)	2	1	1		4	5.3%
Problems between the Ottoman Empire and Germany					0	0%
Pro-German group in the Ottoman Empire is a minority					0	0%
Attempted murder on German general					0	0%
Decorations for German officers					0	0%
<b>References to the Ottoman past</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7.9%</b>
Rule Abdulhamid II					0	0%
Bulgarian revolt					0	0%
Russo-Turkish war 1877-1878					0	0%
Greek-Turkish war 1897					0	0%
Young Turk revolution					0	0%
Balkan wars	1	2	2	1	6	7.9%
<b>References to the Ottoman government</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5.2%</b>
Ottoman neutrality	1				1	1.3%

Censorship					0	0%
Influence Young Turks					0	0%
Failure of the Young Turk reforms					0	0%
Dissatisfaction with Young Turks					0	0%
Disapproval government	1			2	3	3.9%
Plans to overthrow the government					0	0%
Formation new government					0	0%
Problems within the Ottoman government					0	0%
Rumors about the government leaving Constantinople					0	0%
Rumors about the sultan leaving Constantinople					0	0%
Death Ottoman heir to the throne					0	0%
New sultan					0	0%
Lack of communication between the Ottoman government and its officials					0	0%
<b>References to the Ottoman armed forces</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>
Ottoman army					0	0%
Military service					0	0%
Ottoman mobilization for war					0	0%
Ottoman army well prepared					0	0%
Ottoman army ill prepared					0	0%
Lack of military equipment					0	0%
The Ottoman Empire has abundant military equipment					0	0%
Good leadership Ottoman army					0	0%
Change in command army					0	0%
Low morale Ottomans					0	0%
High morale Ottomans					0	0%
Soldiers disobeying orders					0	0%
Prisoners of war					0	0%

Execution Ottoman officers					0	0%
Glorious military past					0	0%
Ottoman fleet					0	0%
Goeben/Breslau					0	0%
<b>References to the Ottoman theaters of war and battles</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>27.6%</b>
Dardanelles war	7	2	1	2	12	15.8%
War on the Balkans					0	0%
War in Egypt	1	2	1		4	5.3%
War in Syria and Palestine					0	0%
War in Mesopotamia		1		1	2	2.6%
War in Persia	1				1	1.3%
War on the Arabian peninsula					0	0%
War in the Caucasus					0	0%
War on the Black Sea					0	0%
War in North Africa					0	0%
Central Powers' success against the Entente					0	0%
Entente success against the Central Powers					0	0%
A Central Powers-Entente clash without a winner					0	0%
Ottoman success against the Entente					0	0%
Entente success against the Ottomans					0	0%
An Ottoman-Entente clash without a winner					0	0%
Ottoman success against the British					0	0%
British success against the Ottomans					0	0%
An Ottoman-British clash without a winner					0	0%
Ottoman success against the French					0	0%
French success against the Ottomans					0	0%
An Ottoman-French clash without a winner					0	0%
Ottoman success against the Russians	1				0	0%
Russian success against the Ottomans	2				0	0%



An Ottoman-Russian clash without a winner					0	0%
Ottoman success against the British/French					0	0%
British/French success against the Ottomans	1				1	1.3%
An Ottoman - British/French clash without a winner		1			1	1.3%
Ottoman success against the Armenians/Georgians					0	0%
An Ottoman-Armenian/Georgian clash without a winner					0	0%
Ottoman success against the Italians					0	0%
Italian success against the Ottomans					0	0%
An Ottoman-Italian clash without a winner					0	0%
Peace with the Ottoman Empire					0	0%
<b>Judgments on the behavior of the belligerent powers</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.3%</b>
Unfairness Entente towards the Ottoman Empire					0	0%
Ottoman unfairness towards the Entente					0	0%
Ottoman unfairness towards neutral countries					0	0%
Unfairness Entente towards neutral countries					0	0%
Mistreatment Entente nationals by the Ottomans					0	0%
Mistreatment citizens of neutral countries by the Ottomans					0	0%
Exploitation of the Ottoman Empire by the Great Powers					0	0%
Ottoman telegrams are lying		1			1	1.3%
Entente telegrams are lying					0	0%
<b>References to the fight for the hearts and</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7.8%</b>

<b>minds of the people</b>						
Pan-Islamism/Holy War		2			2	2.6%
Pan-Turkism					0	0%
Oppression Islam/Islamic peoples					0	0%
Support foreign Muslims for the Ottomans					0	0%
Loyalty Islamic people under Entente rule					0	0%
Support local Muslims for Ottoman rule					0	0%
Support local non-Muslims for Ottoman rule					0	0%
Disloyalty Ottoman Muslims					0	0%
Arabian Revolt					0	0%
Neutrality Muslims					0	0%
Ottoman actions to acquire support Entente Muslims					0	0%
Ottoman actions to acquire support neutral Muslims			1		1	1.3%
Entente actions to acquire support Ottoman subjects					0	0%
Yezidis helping Russians					0	0%
Armenians helping Russians					0	0%
Ottoman policies towards minorities					0	0%
Liberation of non-Turks from Ottoman rule					0	0%
Attitude of the Ottoman non-Muslim population					0	0%
Massacres of non-Muslims					0	0%
Armenian massacres	2				2	2.6%
Greek massacres					0	0%
Catholic massacres					0	0%
Jewish massacres					0	0%
Other atrocities towards non-Muslims					0	0%
Atrocities Armenians towards the Turks		1			1	1.3%
Jewish colony in Palestine					0	0%
<b>References to life in the Ottoman Empire</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.3%</b>

Attitude Ottoman population					0	0%
Celebrations in Constantinople					0	0%
Daily life continuing in the Ottoman Empire					0	0%
Daily life disrupted				1	1	1.3%
<b>References to Ottoman stereotypes</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.5%</b>
Military toughness					0	0%
Violent Ottomans					0	0%
Barbaric Ottomans		1			1	1.3%
Oppressive Ottomans					0	0%
Pillaging Ottomans					0	0%
Stupid Ottomans					0	0%
Unorganized Ottomans					0	0%
Backwardness Ottomans					0	0%
Behavior Ottoman soldiers in occupied territories					0	0%
Nice Ottomans					0	0%
Honesty Ottomans					0	0%
Ottoman harem					0	0%
'Lustful Turk' stereotype is not true					0	0%
Arabian Nights					0	0%
The Ottoman Empire does not belong in Europe					0	0%
Turk as simple farmer					0	0%
<b>Other</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>
Women's rights					0	0%
Socialism in the Ottoman Empire					0	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>100%</b>

#### Type of article

	<i>Het Volk</i>		<i>De Tribune</i>	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
News story	369	94.6%	7	26.9%
Editorial	3	0.8%	8	30.8%
Letter	0	0%	0	0%
Report	7	1.8%	0	0%
Feature	10	2.6%	5	19.2%
Opinion piece	0	0%	5	19.2%
Speech	1	0.3%	0	0%
Poetry	0	0%	0	0%

Leaflet	0	0%	1	3.8%
Other	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>390</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>100%</b>

Geography: the place of action

	<i>Het Volk</i>		<i>De Tribune</i>	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
<b>The Ottoman Empire</b>				
- The Ottoman Empire	28	7.1%	7	29.2%
- Constantinople	20	5.1%	0	0%
- Smyrna	2	0.5%	0	0%
- Dardanelles & Sea of Marmara	137	34.8%	5	20.8%
- Balkan front	2	0.5%	0	0%
- Egypt	26	6.6%	2	8.3%
- Syria & Palestine	7	1.8%	0	0%
- Mesopotamia	18	4.6%	1	4.2%
- Border with Iran	8	2%	1	4.2%
- Caucasus	53	13.5%	3	12.5%
- Black Sea	21	5.3%	0	0%
- Russian front	6	1.5%	0	0%
- Arabian Peninsula	5	1.3%	0	0%
<b>Triple Entente</b>				
- United Kingdom	1	0.3%	1	4.2%
- France	0	0%	0	0%
- Russia	0	0%	0	0%
- Italy	10	2.5%	1	4.2%
- Belgium	2	0.5%	0	0%
- Serbia	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Central Powers</b>				
- Germany	2	0.5%	1	4.2%
- Austria-Hungary	0	0%	0	0%
- Bulgaria	21	5.3%	0	0%
<b>Neutral countries</b>				
- The Netherlands	1	0.3%	0	0%
- Switzerland	0	0%	0	0%
- Sweden	0	0%	0	0%
- Vatican	1	0.3%	0	0%
- Greece	4	1.0%	0	0%
- Romania	6	1.5%	0	0%
- Albania	1	0.3%	0	0%
- Persia	5	1.3%	1	4.2%
- Afghanistan	0	0%	0	0%
- USA	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Colonies</b>				
- Malta	1	0.3%	0	0%
- India	1	0.3%	0	0%
- Sudan	0	0%	0	0%

- Dutch Indies	1	0.3%	0	0%
Others				
- Mediterranean	0	0%	0	0%
- Atlantic Ocean	1	0.3%	0	0%
- Balkans	3	0.8%	1	4.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>394</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>100%</b>

#### Geography: the origin of the news

	<i>Het Volk</i>		<i>De Tribune</i>	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
The Ottoman Empire	69	18.1%	0	0%
Triple Entente				
- United Kingdom	111	29.1%	0	0%
- France	24	6.3%	0	0%
- Russia	49	12.7%	1	25%
- Italy	23	6.0%	0	0%
- Belgium	1	0.3%	0	0%
- Serbia	0	0%	0	0%
Central Powers				
- Germany	60	15.7%	2	50%
- Austria-Hungary	4	1.0%	0	0%
- Bulgaria	4	1.0%	0	0%
Neutral countries				
- The Netherlands	3	0.8%	0	0%
- Denmark	2	0.5%	0	0%
- Sweden	0	0%	0	0%
- Switzerland	6	1.6%	0	0%
- Vatican	1	0.3%	0	0%
- Greece	13	1.4%	0	0%
- Romania	2	0.5%	0	0%
- Persia	0	0%	0	0%
- Afghanistan	0	0%	0	0%
- USA	2	0.5%	0	0%
Colonies				
- Malta	1	0.3%	0	0%
- India	0	0%	0	0%
- Sudan	0	0%	0	0%
- Dutch Indies	0	0%	0	0%
- North Africa	0	0%	0	0%
- Egypt	6	1.6%	1	25%
<b>Total</b>	<b>381</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100%</b>

#### Actors

	<i>Het Volk</i>		<i>De Tribune</i>	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
The Ottoman Empire				
- Ottoman Empire (state)	4	1%	0	0%

- Ottoman government	16	4%	1	4.5%
- Ottoman sultan	2	0.5%	0	0%
- Ottoman heir to the throne	0	0%	0	0%
- Ottoman grand vizier	0	0%	0	0%
- Ottoman governors	0	0%	0	0%
- Ottoman representatives abroad	0	0%	0	0%
- Ottoman delegation The Hague	0	0%	0	0%
- Opponents of the Ottoman government abroad	0	0%	0	0%
- Ottoman military authorities	1	0.2%	0	0%
- Ottoman army	103	25.6%	2	9.1%
- Ottoman fleet	9	2.2%	0	0%
- Ottoman gangs	2	0.5%	0	0%
- Ottoman irregular troops	1	0.2%	0	0%
- Ottoman prisoners of war	0	0%	0	0%
- Ottoman airforce	0	0%	0	0%
- Ottoman press	1	0.2%	0	0%
- Ottoman people	9	2.2%	0	0%
- Patriarch of Constantinople	0	0%	0	0%
- Non-Ottoman minorities	0	0%	0	0%
- Ottoman Christians	0	0%	0	0%
- Ottoman Greeks	0	0%	0	0%
- Ottoman Armenians	1	0.2%	1	4.5%
- Ottoman Jews	0	0%	0	0%
- Ottoman socialists	0	0%	0	0%
- Ottoman factories	1	0.2%	0	0%
- Ottoman universities	0	0%	0	0%
Great Powers	0	0%	3	13.6%
Triple Entente				
- Entente Powers	5	1.2%	1	4.5%
- Entente representatives in the Ottoman Empire	0	0%	0	0%
- Entente representatives abroad	0	0%	0	0%
- Entente armies	0	0%	0	0%
- Entente fleet	1	0.2%	0	0%
- Entente airforce	2	0.5%	0	0%
- UK/French armies	39	9.7%	1	4.5%
- UK/French fleet	26	6.5%	2	9.1%
- Entente colonies	0	0%	0	0%
Central Powers				
- Central Powers	5	1.2%	0	0%
- Central Powers armies	0	0%	1	4.5%
- German/Austrian military	1	0.2%	0	0%
United Kingdom				
- United Kingdom (state)	0	0%	0	0%
- British government	1	0.2%	1	4.5%
- British ministers	3	0.7%	1	4.5%
- British rulers Egypt	0	0%	0	0%
- British army	28	7%	0	0%

- British fleet	16	4%	0	0%
- British airforce	0%	0	0	0%
France				
- France (state)	0	0%	0	0%
- French government	0	0%	0	0%
- French representatives in The Hague	0	0%	0	0%
- French army	0	0%	0	0%
- French fleet	1	0.2%	0	0%
Russia				
- Russia (state)	0	0%	0	0%
- Russian government	0	0%	0	0%
- Russian representatives in the Ottoman Empire	0	0%	0	0%
- Russian army	42	10.4%	2	9.1%
- Russian fleet	18	4.8%	0	0%
- Russian Muslims	0	0%	0	0%
- Russian socialists	0	0%	0	0%
- Armenians/Georgians	0	0%	0	0%
- German companies in Russia	1	0.2%	0	0%
Italy				
- Italy (state)	0	0%	0	0%
- Italian government	10	2.5%	1	4.5%
- Italian representatives in the Ottoman Empire	2	0.5%	0	0%
- Italian army	7	1.7%	0	0%
- Italian fleet	2	0.5%	0	0%
Germany				
- Germany (state)	0	0%	0	0%
- German fleet	1	0.2%	0	0%
- German government	0	0%	4	18.2%
- German people	0	0%	0	0%
- German social-democrats	0	0%	0	0%
- Germans in the Ottoman Empire	1	0.2%	0	0%
- German companies	1	0.2%	0	0%
Austria-Hungary				
- Austria-Hungary (state)	0	0%	0	0%
- Austro-Hungarian government	0	0%	0	0%
- Austro-Hungarian press	0	0%	0	0%
The Netherlands				
- The Netherlands (state)	0	0%	0	0%
- Ottoman representation The Hague	1	0.2%	0	0%
Sweden	0	0%	0	0%
- Swedish socialists	0	0%	0	0%
Vatican				
- The Pope	1	0.2%	0	0%
Balkans				
- Balkan states	1	0.2%	0	0%

- Balkan rebels	2	0.5%	0	0%
Bulgaria				
- Bulgaria (state)	1	0.2%	0	0%
- Bulgarian government	13	3.2%	0	0%
- Bulgarian army	3	0.7%	0	0%
- Bulgarian press	1	0.2%	0	0%
Greece				
- Greece (state)	1	0.2%	0	0%
- Greek government	1	0.2%	0	0%
- Greek representative in the Ottoman Empire	0	0%	0	0%
- Greek socialists	0	0%	0	0%
- Greek army	0	0%	0	0%
Serbia				
- Serbian government	0	0%	0	0%
Romania				
- Romania (state)	0	0%	0	0%
- Romanian government	4	1%	0	0%
- Romanian representative in the Ottoman Empire	1	0.2%	0	0%
- Romanian army	0	0%	0	0%
- Romanian customs	1	0.2%	0	0%
Persia				
- Persia (state)	0	0%	0	0%
- Persian government	2	0.5%	1	4.5%
Afghanistan				
- Afghanistan (state)	0	0%	0	0%
- Afghani government	0	0%	0	0%
- Afghani emir	0	0%	0	0%
USA				
- USA (state)	0	0%	0	0%
- American government	0	0%	0	0%
- American representative in the Ottoman Empire	2	0.5%	0	0%
- American press	0	0%	0	0%
India				
- Indian Muslims	1	0.2%	0	0%
Sudan				
- Sudanese Muslims	0	0%	0	0%
Dutch Indies				
- Muslims Dutch Indies	0	0%	0	0%
- Press Dutch Indies	1	0.2%	0	0%
North Africa				
- Toearegs	0	0%	0	0%
- Senussi	1	0.2%	0	0%
Egypt				
- Egyptian sultan	1	0.2%	0	0%
- Bedouins	0	0%	0	0%
Arabian Peninsula	0	0%	0	0%



- Bedouins	0	0%	0	0%
Jews	0	0%	0	0%
International socialist organizations	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>402</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Appendix III: Observation schedule 1916

Topics, subtopics and references: frequency and percentages of the total

	<i>Het Volk</i>		<i>De Tribune</i>	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
<b>References to Ottoman relations with the outside world</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>4.4%</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>13.2%</b>
Relations with the Great Powers	0	0%	6	2.7%
Relations with the Triple Entente	0	0%	1	0.4%
Relations with the Central Powers	2	0.6%	4	1.8%
Relations with Great-Britain	0	0%	0	0%
Relations with France	0	0%	0	0%
Relations with Russia	0	0%	0	0%
Relations with Germany	1	0.3%	1	0.4%
Relations with Austria-Hungary	0	0%	0	0%
Relations with Italy	0	0%	1	0.4%
Relations with the USA	1	0.3%	3	1.3%
Relations with neighboring countries (Balkans)	4	1.1%	4	1.8%
Relations with the Islamic world	2	0.6%	0	0%
Alliances against the Ottoman Empire	0	0%	0	0%
Eastern question	0	0%	2	0.9%
Border adjustments	1	0.3%	1	0.4%
Foreign designs on Constantinople	2	0.6%	4	1.8%
Ottoman actions to disturb Balkan relations	0	0%	0	0%
Capitulations/concessions	0	0%	1	0.4%
Annexation Egypt	0	0%	0	0%
Annexation Cyprus	2	0.6%	2	0.9%
<b>References to the Ottoman alliance with Germany and Austria-Hungary</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>7.2%</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>6.7%</b>
German-Ottoman alliance	1	0.3%	2	0.9%
The Ottoman Empire as Germany's puppet	16	4.5%	2	0.9%
German influence on the Ottoman army and navy	3	0.9%	4	1.8%
German military and financial support	0	0%	0	0%
Ottoman support for	1	0.3%	2	0.9%

Germany and Austria-Hungary				
German responsibility for Ottoman crimes	1	0.3%	2	0.9%
The Ottoman Empire is only fighting for the benefit of Germany and Austria-Hungary	0	0%	2	0.9%
Connection Germany-Ottoman Empire (transport)	1	0.3%	1	0.4%
Problems between the Ottoman Empire and Germany	1	0.3%	0	0%
Pro-German group in the Ottoman Empire is a minority	0	0%	0	0%
Attempted murder on German general	1	0.3%	0	0%
Decorations for German officers	0	0%	0	0%
<b>References to the Ottoman past</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0.4%</b>
Rule Abdulhamid II	0	0%	0	0%
Bulgarian revolt	0	0%	0	0%
Russo-Turkish war 1877-1878	0	0%	1	0.4%
Greek-Turkish war 1897	0	0%	0	0%
Young Turk revolution	0	0%	0	0%
Balkan wars	0	0%	0	0%
<b>References to the Ottoman government</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>3.7%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2.6%</b>
Ottoman neutrality	0	0%	0	0%
Censorship	10	2.8%	5	2.2%
Influence Young Turks	0	0%	0	0%
Failure of the Young Turk reforms	0	0%	0	0%
Dissatisfaction with Young Turks	0	0%	0	0%
Disapproval government	0	0%	1	0.4%
Plans to overthrow the government	0	0%	0	0%
Formation new government	0	0%	0	0%
Problems within the Ottoman government	0	0%	0	0%
Rumors about the government leaving Constantinople	1	0.3%	0	0%
Rumors about the sultan leaving Constantinople	0	0%	0	0%

Death Ottoman heir to the throne	2	0.6%	0	0%
New sultan	0	0%	0	0%
Lack of communication between the Ottoman government and its officials	0	0%	0	0%
<b>References to the Ottoman armed forces</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>8.7%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>3.5%</b>
Ottoman army	10	2.8%	5	2.2%
Military service	4	1.1%	0	0%
Ottoman mobilization for war	0	0%	0	0%
Ottoman army well prepared	1	0.3%	0	0%
Ottoman army ill prepared	1	0.3%	0	0%
Lack of military equipment	2	0.6%	0	0%
Abundance military equipment	0	0%	0	0%
Good leadership Ottoman army	3	0.9%	0	0%
Change in command army	2	0.6%	0	0%
Low morale Ottomans	0	0%	0	0%
High morale Ottomans	1	0.3%	0	0%
Soldiers disobeying orders	0	0%	1	0.4%
Prisoners of war	0	0%	0	0%
Execution Ottoman officers	3	0.9%	2	0.9%
Glorious military past	2	0.6%	0	0%
Ottoman fleet	1	0.3%	0	0%
Goeben/Breslau	0	0%	0	0%
<b>References to the Ottoman theaters of war and battles</b>	<b>226</b>	<b>64.3%</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>51.9%</b>
Dardanelles war	6	1.7%	6	2.7%
War on the Balkans	1	0.3%	6	2.7%
War in Egypt	5	1.4%	12	5.3%
War in Syria and Palestine	0	0%	0	0%
War in Mesopotamia	16	4.5%	5	2.2%
War in Persia	1	0.3%	11	4.9%
War on the Arabian peninsula	2	0.6%	6	2.7%
War in the Caucasus	19	5.4%	11	4.9%
War on the Black Sea	1	0.3%	1	0.4%
War in North Africa	0	0%	0	0%
Central Powers' success against the Entente	6	1.7%	4	1.8%
Entente success against the Central Powers	2	0.6%	1	0.4%
A Central Powers-Entente clash without a winner	11	3.1%	0	0%
Ottoman success against the Entente	0	0%	0	0%

Entente success against the Ottomans	1	0.3%	1	0.4%
An Ottoman-Entente clash without a winner	1	0.3%	0	0%
Ottoman success against the British	10	2.8%	11	4.9%
British success against the Ottomans	14	4%	3	1.3%
An Ottoman-British clash without a winner	2	0.6%	5	2.2%
Ottoman success against the French	0	0%	0	0%
French success against the Ottomans	0	0%	0	0%
An Ottoman-French clash without a winner	0	0%	0	0%
Ottoman success against the Russians	21	6%	8	3.6%
Russian success against the Ottomans	96	27.3%	21	9.3%
An Ottoman-Russian clash without a winner	11	3.1%	4	1.8%
Ottoman success against the British/French	0	0%	1	0.4%
British/French success against the Ottomans	0	0%	0	0%
An Ottoman-British/French clash without a winner	0	0%	0	0%
Ottoman success against the Armenians/Georgians	0	0%	0	0%
An Ottoman-Armenian/Georgian clash without a winner	0	0%	0	0%
Ottoman success against the Italians	0	0%	0	0%
Italian success against the Ottomans	0	0%	0	0%
An Ottoman-Italian clash without a winner	0	0%	0	0%
Peace with the Ottoman Empire	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Judgments on the behavior of the belligerent powers</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0.9%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>2.9%</b>
Unfairness Entente towards the Ottoman Empire	0	0%	1	0.4%
Ottoman unfairness towards the Entente	1	0.3%	1	0.4%
Ottoman unfairness towards neutral countries	1	0.3%	0	0%

Unfairness Entente towards neutral countries	0	0%	0	0%
Mistreatment Entente nationals by the Ottomans	0	0%	0	0%
Mistreatment citizens of neutral countries by the Ottomans	0	0%	1	0.4%
Exploitation of the Ottoman Empire by the Great Powers	0	0%	3	1.3%
Ottoman telegrams are lying	0	0%	1	0.4%
Entente telegrams are lying	1	0.3%	0	0%
<b>References to the fight for the hearts and minds of the people</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>9.6%</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>16.2%</b>
Pan-Islamism/Holy War	0	0%	0	0%
Pan-Turkism	0	0%	0	0%
Oppression Islam/Islamic peoples	2	0.6%	1	0.4%
Support foreign Muslims for the Ottomans	4	1.1%	1	0.4%
Loyalty Muslims under Entente rule	2	0.6%	2	0.9%
Support local Muslims for Ottoman rule	1	0.3%	0	0%
Support local non-Muslims for Ottoman rule	1	0.3%	0	0%
Disloyalty Ottoman Muslims	5	1.4%	6	2.7%
Arabian Revolt	0	0%	0	0%
Neutrality Muslims	1	0.3%	0	0%
Ottoman actions to acquire support Entente Muslims	0	0%	0	0%
Ottoman actions to acquire support neutral Muslims	1	0.3%	2	0.9%
Entente actions to acquire support Ottoman subjects	0	0%	0	0%
Yezidis helping Russians	0	0%	1	0.4%
Armenians helping Russians	2	0.6%	0	0%
Ottoman non-Muslim policies	1	0.3%	0	0%
Liberation of non-Turks from Ottoman rule	0	0%	0	0%
Attitude of the Ottoman non-Muslim population	0	0%	0	0%
Massacres of non-Muslims	7	2%	9	4%
Armenian massacres	3	0.9%	0	0%
Greek massacres	1	0.3%	1	0.4%
Catholic massacres	0	0%	0	0%
Jewish massacres	0	0%	5	2.2%
Other atrocities towards non-	0	0%	0	0%

Muslims				
Atrocities Armenians towards the Turks	0	0%	2	0.9%
Jewish colony in Palestine	2	0.6%	1	0.4%
<b>References to life in the Ottoman Empire</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1.2%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2.6%</b>
Attitude Ottoman population	1	0.3%	1	0.4%
Celebrations in Constantinople	0	0%	0	0%
Daily life continuing in the Ottoman Empire	3	0.9%	3	1.3%
Daily life disrupted	0	0%	2	0.9%
<b>References to Ottoman stereotypes</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1.2%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1.8%</b>
Military toughness	0	0%	0	0%
Violent Ottomans	1	0.3%	2	0.9%
Barbaric Ottomans	0	0%	0	0%
Oppressive Ottomans	1	0.3%	0	0%
Pillaging Ottomans	1	0.3%	0	0%
Stupid Ottomans	0	0%	1	0.4%
Unorganized Ottomans	0	0%	1	0.4%
Backwardness Ottomans	0	0%	0	0%
Behavior Ottoman soldiers in occupied territories	0	0%	0	0%
Nice Ottomans	0	0%	0	0%
Honesty Ottomans	0	0%	0	0%
Ottoman harem	0	0%	0	0%
'Lustful Turk' stereotype is not true	0	0%	0	0%
Arabian Nights	0	0%	0	0%
The Ottoman Empire does not belong in Europe	1	0.3%	0	0%
Turk as simple farmer	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Others</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2.8%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>
Women's rights	10	2.8%	0	0%
Socialism in the Ottoman Empire	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>352</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>225</b>	<b>100%</b>

Observation schedule *Het Volk* 1916

Topic	Frequency topic	Frequency subtopic	Frequency reference 1	Frequency reference 2	Total	Percent
<b>References to Ottoman relations with the outside world</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>4.4%</b>
Relations with the Great					0	0%

Powers						
Relations with the Triple Entente					0	0%
Relations with the Central Powers	1	1			2	0.6%
Relations with Great-Britain					0	0%
Relations with France					0	0%
Relations with Russia					0	0%
Relations with Germany		1			1	0.3%
Relations with Austria-Hungary					0	0%
Relations with Italy					0	0%
Relations with the USA	1				1	0.3%
Relations with neighboring countries (Balkans)	4				4	1.1%
Relations with the Islamic world		1		1	2	0.6%
Alliances against the Ottoman Empire					0	0%
Eastern question					0	0%
Border adjustments		1			1	0.3%
Foreign designs on Constantinople	1		1		2	0.6%
Ottoman actions to disturb Balkan relations					0	0%
Capitulations/concessions					0	0%
Annexation Egypt					0	0%
Annexation Cyprus		1		1	2	0.6%
<b>References to the Ottoman alliance with Germany and Austria-Hungary</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>7.2%</b>
German-Ottoman alliance	1				1	0.3%
The Ottoman Empire as Germany's puppet	1	10	4	1	16	4.5%
German influence on the Ottoman army and navy			2	1	3	0.9%
German military and financial support					0	0%
Ottoman support for Germany and Austria	1				1	0.3%
German responsibility for Ottoman crimes		1			1	0.3%
The Ottoman Empire is only fighting for the benefit of Germany and					0	0%



Austria-Hungary						
Connection Germany-Ottoman Empire (transport)	1				1	0.3%
Problems between the Ottoman Empire and Germany	1				1	0.3%
Pro-German group in the Ottoman Empire is a minority					0	0%
Attempted murder on German general		1			1	0.3%
Decorations for German officers					0	0%
<b>References to the Ottoman past</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>
Rule Abdulhamid II					0	0%
Bulgarian revolt					0	0%
Russo-Turkish war 1877-1878					0	0%
Greek-Turkish war 1897					0	0%
Young Turk revolution					0	0%
Balkan wars					0	0%
<b>References to the Ottoman government</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>3.7%</b>
Ottoman neutrality					0	0%
Censorship		8	1	1	10	2.8%
Influence Young Turks					0	0%
Failure of the Young Turk reforms					0	0%
Dissatisfaction with Young Turks					0	0%
Disapproval government					0	0%
Plans to overthrow the government					0	0%
Formation new government					0	0%
Problems within the Ottoman government					0	0%
Rumors about the government leaving Constantinople			1		1	0.3%
Rumors about the sultan leaving Constantinople					0	0%
Death Ottoman heir to the throne	1				1	0.3%
New sultan					0	0%
Lack of communication between the Ottoman	2				2	0.6%

government and its officials						
<b>References to the Ottoman armed forces</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>8.7%</b>
Ottoman army	8	1	1		10	2.8%
Military service		4			4	1.1%
Ottoman mobilization for war					0	0%
Ottoman army well prepared			1		1	0.3%
Ottoman army ill prepared			2		2	0.6%
Lack of military equipment					0	0%
The Ottoman Empire has abundant military equipment		2	1		3	0.9%
Good leadership Ottoman army					0	0%
Change in command army	1	1			2	0.6%
Low morale Ottomans		1			1	0.3%
High morale Ottomans					0	0%
Soldiers disobeying orders					0	0%
Prisoners of war	1	1	1		3	0.9%
Execution Ottoman officers		2			2	0.6%
Glorious military past					0	0%
Ottoman fleet		1			1	0.3%
Goeben/Breslau					0	0%
<b>References to the Ottoman theaters of war and battles</b>	<b>178</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>226</b>	<b>64.3%</b>
Dardanelles war	6				6	1.7%
War on the Balkans	1				1	0.3%
War in Egypt	3		1	1	5	1.4%
War in Syria and Palestine					0	0%
War in Mesopotamia	4	8	3	1	16	4.5%
War in Persia		1		1	1	0.3%
War on the Arabian peninsula	1		1		2	0.6%
War in the Caucasus	13	5	1		19	5.4%
War on the Black Sea	1				1	0.3%
War in North Africa					0	0%
Central Powers' success against the Entente	6				6	1.7%
Entente success against	2				2	0.6%

the Central Powers						
A Central Powers-Entente clash without a winner	11				11	3.1%
Ottoman success against the Entente					0	0%
Entente success against the Ottomans	1				1	0.3%
An Ottoman-Entente clash without a winner	1				1	0.3%
Ottoman success against the British	9	1			10	2.8%
British success against the Ottomans	12	2			14	4%
An Ottoman-British clash without a winner	2				2	0.6%
Ottoman success against the French					0	0%
French success against the Ottomans					0	0%
An Ottoman-French clash without a winner					0	0%
Ottoman success against the Russians	18	3			21	6%
Russian success against the Ottomans	91	5			96	27.3%
An Ottoman-Russian clash without a winner	11				11	3.1%
Ottoman success against the British/French					0	0%
British/French success against the Ottomans					0	0%
An Ottoman - British/French clash without a winner					0	0%
Ottoman success against the Armenians/Georgians					0	0%
An Ottoman-Armenian/Georgian clash without a winner					0	0%
Ottoman success against the Italians					0	0%
Italian success against the Ottomans					0	0%
An Ottoman-Italian clash without a winner					0	0%
Peace with the Ottoman Empire					0	0%
<b>Judgments on the</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0.9%</b>

<b>behavior of the belligerent powers</b>						
Unfairness Entente towards the Ottoman Empire					0	0%
Ottoman unfairness towards the Entente		1			1	0.3%
Ottoman unfairness towards neutral countries	1				1	0.3%
Unfairness Entente towards neutral countries					0	0%
Mistreatment Entente nationals by the Ottomans					0	0%
Mistreatment citizens of neutral countries by the Ottomans					0	0%
Exploitation of the Ottoman Empire by the Great Powers					0	0%
Ottoman telegrams are lying					0	0%
Entente telegrams are lying				1	1	0.3%
<b>References to the fight for the hearts and minds of the people</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>9.6%</b>
Pan-Islamism/Holy War					0	0%
Pan-Turkism					0	0%
Oppression Islam/Islamic peoples	2				2	0.6%
Support foreign Muslims for the Ottomans		2	2		4	1.1%
Loyalty Islamic people under Entente rule	1	1			2	0.6%
Support local Muslims for Ottoman rule				1	1	0.3%
Support local non-Muslims for Ottoman rule			1		1	0.3%
Disloyalty Ottoman Muslims	3	2			5	1.4%
Arabian Revolt					0	0%
Neutrality Muslims			1		1	0.3%
Ottoman actions to acquire support Entente Muslims					0	0%
Ottoman actions to acquire support neutral			1		1	0.3%

Muslims						
Entente actions to acquire support Ottoman subjects					0	0%
Yezidis helping Russians					0	0%
Armenians helping Russians	2				2	0.6%
Ottoman policies towards minorities					0	0%
Liberation of non-Turks from Ottoman rule					0	0%
Attitude of the Ottoman non-Muslim population	5	1	1		7	2%
Massacres of non-Muslims	3				3	0.9%
Armenian massacres		1			1	0.3%
Greek massacres					0	0%
Catholic massacres					0	0%
Jewish massacres					0	0%
Other atrocities towards non-Muslims					0	0%
Atrocities Armenians towards the Turks	1	1			2	0.6%
Jewish colony in Palestine					0	0%
<b>References to life in the Ottoman Empire</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1.2%</b>
Attitude Ottoman population			1		1	0.3%
Celebrations in Constantinople					0	0%
Daily life continuing in the Ottoman Empire	1	2			3	0.9%
Daily life disrupted					0	0%
<b>References to Ottoman stereotypes</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1.2%</b>
Military toughness		1			1	0.3%
Violent Ottomans					0	0%
Barbaric Ottomans		1			1	0.3%
Oppressive Ottomans			1		1	0.3%
Pillaging Ottomans					0	0%
Stupid Ottomans					0	0%
Unorganized Ottomans					0	0%
Backwardness Ottomans					0	0%
Behavior Ottoman soldiers in occupied territories					0	0%
Nice Ottomans					0	0%
Honesty Ottomans					0	0%
Ottoman harem					0	0%

'Lustful Turk' stereotype is not true					0	0%
Arabian Nights					0	0%
The Ottoman Empire does not belong in Europe	1				1	0.3%
Turk as simple farmer					0	0%
<b>Other</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>2</b>		<b>1</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2.8%</b>
Women's rights	7	2		1	10	2.8%
Socialism in the Ottoman Empire					0	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>228</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>352</b>	<b>100%</b>

Observation schedule *De Tribune* 1916

Topic	Frequency topic	Frequency subtopic	Frequency reference 1	Frequency reference 2	Total	Percent
<b>References to Ottoman relations with the outside world</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>13.2%</b>
Relations with the Great Powers	4	2			6	2.7%
Relations with the Triple Entente	1				1	0.4%
Relations with the Central Powers	2	2			4	1.8%
Relations with Great-Britain					0	0%
Relations with France					0	0%
Relations with Russia					0	0%
Relations with Germany	1				1	0.4%
Relations with Austria-Hungary					0	0%
Relations with Italy	1				1	0.4%
Relations with the USA	2	1			3	1.3%
Relations with neighboring countries (Balkans)	2	1		1	4	1.8%
Relations with the Islamic world					0	0%
Alliances against the Ottoman Empire					0	0%
Eastern question	2				2	0.9%
Border adjustments		1			1	0.4%
Foreign designs on Constantinople		1	3		4	1.8%
Ottoman actions to					0	0%

disturb Balkan relations						
Capitulations/concessions			1		1	0.4%
Annexation Egypt					0	0%
Annexation Cyprus		1	1		2	0.9%
<b>References to the Ottoman alliance with Germany and Austria-Hungary</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>6.7%</b>
German-Ottoman alliance	2				2	0.9%
The Ottoman Empire as Germany's puppet		1		1	2	0.9%
German influence on the Ottoman army and navy	1	3			4	1.8%
German military and financial support					0	0%
Ottoman support for Germany and Austria		1	1		2	0.9%
German responsibility for Ottoman crimes	1	1			2	0.9%
The Ottoman Empire is only fighting for the benefit of Germany and Austria-Hungary	1	1			2	0.9%
Connection Germany-Ottoman Empire (transport)		1			1	0.4%
Problems between the Ottoman Empire and Germany					0	0%
Pro-German group in the Ottoman Empire is a minority					0	0%
Attempted murder on German general					0	0%
Decorations for German officers					0	0%
<b>References to the Ottoman past</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0.4%</b>
Rule Abdulhamid II					0	0%
Bulgarian revolt					0	0%
Russo-Turkish war 1877-1878		1			1	0.4%
Greek-Turkish war 1897					0	0%
Young Turk revolution					0	0%
Balkan wars					0	0%
<b>References to the Ottoman government</b>					<b>6</b>	<b>2.6%</b>
Ottoman neutrality					0	0%

Censorship		3	2		5	2.2%
Influence Young Turks		1			1	0.4%
Failure of the Young Turk reforms					0	0%
Dissatisfaction with Young Turks					0	0%
Disapproval government					0	0%
Plans to overthrow the government					0	0%
Formation new government					0	0%
Problems within the Ottoman government					0	0%
Rumors about the government leaving Constantinople					0	0%
Rumors about the sultan leaving Constantinople					0	0%
Death Ottoman heir to the throne					0	0%
New sultan					0	0%
Lack of communication between the Ottoman government and its officials					0	0%
<b>References to the Ottoman armed forces</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>3.5%</b>
Ottoman army	1	3		1	5	2.2%
Military service					0	0%
Ottoman mobilization for war					0	0%
Ottoman army well prepared					0	0%
Ottoman army ill prepared					0	0%
Lack of military equipment					0	0%
The Ottoman Empire has abundant military equipment					0	0%
Good leadership Ottoman army					0	0%
Change in command army					0	0%
Low morale Ottomans					0	0%
High morale Ottomans	1				1	0.4%
Soldiers disobeying orders					0	0%
Prisoners of war	1	1			2	0.9%



Execution Ottoman officers					0	0%
Glorious military past					0	0%
Ottoman fleet					0	0%
Goeben/Breslau					0	0%
<b>References to the Ottoman theaters of war and battles</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>51.9%</b>
Dardanelles war		2	2	2	6	2.7%
War on the Balkans	4	1		1	6	2.7%
War in Egypt	5	1	6		12	5.3%
War in Syria and Palestine					0	0%
War in Mesopotamia		3	2		5	2.2%
War in Persia	2	5	1	3	11	4.9%
War on the Arabian peninsula	3	2		1	6	2.7%
War in the Caucasus	7	1	1	2	11	4.9%
War on the Black Sea			1		1	0.4%
War in North Africa					0	0%
Central Powers' success against the Entente	3			1	4	1.8%
Entente success against the Central Powers	1				1	0.4%
A Central Powers-Entente clash without a winner					0	0%
Ottoman success against the Entente					0	0%
Entente success against the Ottomans				1	1	0.4%
An Ottoman-Entente clash without a winner					0	0%
Ottoman success against the British	5	4	1	1	11	4.9%
British success against the Ottomans	1	1		1	3	1.3%
An Ottoman-British clash without a winner	4		1		5	2.2%
Ottoman success against the French					0	0%
French success against the Ottomans					0	0%
An Ottoman-French clash without a winner					0	0%
Ottoman success against the Russians	6	1	1		8	3.6%
Russian success against the Ottomans	17	2	1	1	21	9.3%

An Ottoman-Russian clash without a winner	1	2		1	4	1.8%
Ottoman success against the British/French	1				1	0.4%
British/French success against the Ottomans					0	0%
An Ottoman - British/French clash without a winner					0	0%
Ottoman success against the Armenians/Georgians					0	0%
An Ottoman-Armenian/Georgian clash without a winner					0	0%
Ottoman success against the Italians					0	0%
Italian success against the Ottomans					0	0%
An Ottoman-Italian clash without a winner					0	0%
Peace with the Ottoman Empire					0	0%
<b>Judgments on the behavior of the belligerent powers</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2.9%</b>
Unfairness Entente towards the Ottoman Empire	1				1	0.4%
Ottoman unfairness towards the Entente			1		1	0.4%
Ottoman unfairness towards neutral countries					0	0%
Unfairness Entente towards neutral countries					0	0%
Mistreatment Entente nationals by the Ottomans					0	0%
Mistreatment citizens of neutral countries by the Ottomans			1		1	0.4%
Exploitation of the Ottoman Empire by the Great Powers	2			1	3	1.3%
Ottoman telegrams are lying					0	0%
Entente telegrams are lying					0	0%
<b>References to the fight for the hearts and</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>16.2%</b>

<b>minds of the people</b>						
Pan-Islamism/Holy War					0	0%
Pan-Turkism					0	0%
Oppression Islam/Islamic peoples	1				1	0.4%
Support foreign Muslims for the Ottomans			1		1	0.4%
Loyalty Islamic people under Entente rule		1	1		2	0.9%
Support local Muslims for Ottoman rule					0	0%
Support local non-Muslims for Ottoman rule					0	0%
Disloyalty Ottoman Muslims	6				6	2.7%
Arabian Revolt					0	0%
Neutrality Muslims					0	0%
Ottoman actions to acquire support Entente Muslims					0	0%
Ottoman actions to acquire support neutral Muslims	1	1			2	0.9%
Entente actions to acquire support Ottoman subjects					0	0%
Yezidis helping Russians		1			1	0.4%
Armenians helping Russians					0	0%
Ottoman policies towards minorities					0	0%
Liberation of non-Turks from Ottoman rule					0	0%
Attitude of the Ottoman non-Muslim population	6		2	1	9	4%
Massacres of non-Muslims					0	0%
Armenian massacres		1			1	0.4%
Greek massacres					0	0%
Catholic massacres	1	3		1	5	2.2%
Jewish massacres					0	0%
Other atrocities towards non-Muslims	2				2	0.9%
Atrocities Armenians towards the Turks				1	1	0.4%
Jewish colony in Palestine			1		1	0.4%
<b>References to life in the Ottoman Empire</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2.6%</b>

Attitude Ottoman population			1		1	0.4%
Celebrations in Constantinople					0	0%
Daily life continuing in the Ottoman Empire		1	2		3	1.3%
Daily life disrupted			1	1	2	0.9%
<b>References to Ottoman stereotypes</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1.8%</b>
Military toughness		1		1	2	0.9%
Violent Ottomans					0	0%
Barbaric Ottomans					0	0%
Oppressive Ottomans					0	0%
Pillaging Ottomans				1	1	0.4%
Stupid Ottomans				1	1	0.4%
Unorganized Ottomans					0	0%
Backwardness Ottomans					0	0%
Behavior Ottoman soldiers in occupied territories					0	0%
Nice Ottomans					0	0%
Honesty Ottomans					0	0%
Ottoman harem					0	0%
‘Lustful Turk’ stereotype is not true					0	0%
Arabian Nights					0	0%
The Ottoman Empire does not belong in Europe					0	0%
Turk as simple farmer					0	0%
<b>Other</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>
Women’s rights					0	0%
Socialism in the Ottoman Empire					0	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>225</b>	<b>100%</b>

#### Type of article

	<i>Het Volk</i>		<i>De Tribune</i>	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
News story	220	93.6%	70	72.2%
Editorial	2	0.9%	12	12.4%
Letter	0	0%	0	0%
Report	2	0.9%	1	1%
Feature	6	2.6%	11	11.3%
Opinion piece	3	1.3%	3	3.1%
Speech	1	0.4%	0	0%
Poetry	1	0.4%	0	0%

Leaflet	0	0%	0	0%
Other	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>235</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>100%</b>

Geography: the place of action

	<i>Het Volk</i>		<i>De Tribune</i>	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
<b>The Ottoman Empire</b>				
- The Ottoman Empire	15	6%	16	16.3%
- Constantinople	3	1.2%	3	3.1%
- Smyrna	4	1.6%	0	0%
- Dardanelles & Sea of Marmara	8	3.2%	1	1%
- Balkan front	21	8.4%	10	10.2%
- Egypt	5	2%	4	4.1%
- Syria & Palestine	1	0.4%	6	6.1%
- Mesopotamia	30	12%	10	10.2%
- Border with Iran	2	0.8%	6	6.1%
- Caucasus & Asia Minor	126	50.6%	21	21.4%
- Black Sea	3	1.2%	0	0%
- Russian front	2	0.8%	0	0%
- Arabian Peninsula	6	2.4%	9	9.2%
<b>Triple Entente</b>				
- United Kingdom	3	1.2%	1	1%
- France	0	0%	0	0%
- Russia	1	0.4%	1	1%
- Italy	1	0.4%	1	1%
- Romania	2	0.8%	1	1%
- Belgium	0	0%	0	0%
- Serbia	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Central Powers</b>				
- Germany	3	1.2%	2	2%
- Austria-Hungary	0	0%	0	0%
- Bulgaria	1	0.4%	0	0%
- Albania	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Neutral countries</b>				
- The Netherlands	0	0%	0	0%
- Switzerland	3	1.2%	0	0%
- Sweden	0	0%	0	0%
- Vatican	0	0%	0	0%
- Greece	3	1.2%	0	0%
- Persia	3	1.2%	1	1%
- Afghanistan	0	0%	0	0%
- USA	1	0.4%	2	2%
<b>Colonies</b>				
- Malta	0	0%	0	0%
- India	0	0%	0	0%

- Sudan	0	0%	0	0%
- Dutch Indies	2	0.8%	1	1%
- North Africa	0	0%	0	0%
Others				
- Mediterranean	1	0.4%	1	1%
- Atlantic Ocean	0	0%	0	0%
- Balkans	0	0%	1	1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>249</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>100%</b>

Geography: the origin of the news

	<i>Het Volk</i>		<i>De Tribune</i>	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
The Ottoman Empire	26	11.7%	18	39.1%
Triple Entente				
- United Kingdom	44	19.7%	5	10.9%
- France	9	4%	0	0%
- Russia	77	34.5%	10	21.7%
- Italy	4	1.8%	2	4.3%
- Romania	2	0.9%	1	2.2%
- Belgium	0	0%	0	0%
- Serbia	0	0%	0	0%
Central Powers				
- Germany	27	12.1%	6	13%
- Austria-Hungary	3	1.3%	0	0%
- Bulgaria	1	0.4%	0	0%
Neutral countries				
- The Netherlands	4	1.8%	0	0%
- Denmark	9	4%	0	0%
- Sweden	0	0%	0	0%
- Switzerland	8	3.6%	1	2.2%
- Vatican	0	0%	0	0%
- Greece	2	0.9%	0	0%
- Persia	0	0%	0	0%
- Afghanistan	0	0%	0	0%
- USA	1	0.4%	0	0%
Colonies				
- Malta	0	0%	0	0%
- India	0	0%	1	2.2%
- Sudan	0	0%	0	0%
- Dutch Indies	1	0.4%	0	0%
- North Africa	0	0%	0	0%
- Egypt	5	2.2%	2	4.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>223</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>100%</b>

## Actors

	<i>Het Volk</i>		<i>De Tribune</i>	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
<b>The Ottoman Empire</b>				
- Ottoman Empire (state)	1	0.4%	0	0%
- Ottoman government	5	2.1%	10	10.6%
- Ottoman sultan	0	0%	0	0%
- Ottoman heir to the throne	2	0.8%	0	0%
- Ottoman grand vizier	0	0%	0	0%
- Ottoman governors	0	0%	0	0%
- Ottoman representatives abroad	2	0.8%	0	0%
- Ottoman delegation The Hague	1	0.4%	0	0%
- Opponents of the Ottoman government abroad	0	0%	0	0%
- Ottoman military authorities	1	0.4%	1	1.1%
- Ottoman army	62	26.1%	23	24.5%
- Ottoman fleet	0	0%	0	0%
- Ottoman gangs	1	0.4%	1	1.1%
- Ottoman irregular troops	0	0%	0	0%
- Ottoman prisoners of war	1	0.4%	0	0%
- Ottoman airforce	1	0.4%	2	2.1%
- Ottoman press	0	0%	0	0%
- Ottoman people	2	0.8%	0	0%
- Patriarch of Constantinople	0	0%	0	0%
- Non-Ottoman minorities	0	0%	0	0%
- Ottoman Christians	0	0%	0	0%
- Ottoman Greeks	0	0%	0	0%
- Ottoman Armenians	5	2.1%	1	1.1%
- Ottoman Jews	0	0%	0	0%
- Ottoman socialists	0	0%	0	0%
- Ottoman factories	0	0%	0	0%
- Ottoman universities	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Great Powers</b>	0	0%	3	3.2%
<b>Triple Entente</b>				
- Entente Powers	1	0.4%	2	2.1%
- Entente representatives in the Ottoman Empire	0	0%	0	0%
- Entente representatives abroad	0	0%	0	0%
- Entente armies	3	1.3%	4	4.3%
- Entente fleet	3	1.3%	0	0%
- Entente airforce	0	0%	1	1.1%
- UK/French armies	3	1.3%	1	1.1%
- UK/French fleet	0	0%	0	0%
- Entente colonies	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Central Powers</b>				
- Central Powers	0	0%	2	2.1%
- Central Powers armies	12	5%	2	2.1%
- German/Austrian military	0	0%	0	0%

United Kingdom				
- United Kingdom (state)	0	0%	0	0%
- British government	0	0%	5	5.3%
- British ministers	2	0.8%	0	0%
- British rulers Egypt	0	0%	0	0%
- British army	13	5.5%	2	2.1%
- British fleet	1	0.4%	1	1.1%
- British airforce	0	0%	0	0%
France				
- France (state)	0	0%	0	0%
- French government	0	0%	0	0%
- French representatives in The Hague	0	0%	0	0%
- French army	0	0%	0	0%
- French fleet	0	0%	0	0%
Russia				
- Russia (state)	0	0%	1	1.1%
- Russian government	2	0.8%	2	2.1%
- Russian representatives in the Ottoman Empire	0	0%	0	0%
- Russian army	90	37.8%	16	17%
- Russian fleet	3	1.3%	0	0%
- Russian Muslims	0	0%	0	0%
- Russian socialists	1	0.4%	0	0%
- Armenians/Georgians	0	0%	0	0%
- German companies in Russia	0	0%	0	0%
Italy				
- Italy (state)	0	0%	0	0%
- Italian government	0	0%	1	1.1%
- Italian representatives in the Ottoman Empire	0	0%	0	0%
- Italian army	0	0%	0	0%
- Italian fleet	0	0%	0	0%
Romania				
- Romania (state)	0	0%	1	1.1%
- Romanian government	0	0%	1	1.1%
- Romanian representative in the Ottoman Empire	0	0%	0	0%
- Romanian army	2	0.8%	0	0%
- Romanian customs	0	0%	0	0%
Germany				
- Germany (state)	0	0%	1	1.1%
- German fleet	0	0%	0	0%
- German government	1	0.4%	2	2.1%
- German people	0	0%	0	0%
- German social-democrats	2	0.8%	1	1.1%
- Germans in the Ottoman Empire	5	2.1%	0	0%
- German companies	0	0%	0	0%
Austria-Hungary				



- Austria-Hungary (state)	0	0%	0	0%
- Austro-Hungarian government	0	0%	0	0%
- Austro-Hungarian press	0	0%	0	0%
The Netherlands	0	0%	0	0%
- The Netherlands (state)	0	0%	0	0%
- Ottoman representation The Hague	0	0%	0	0%
Sweden				
- Swedish socialists	0	0%	0	0%
Vatican				
- The Pope	0	0%	1	1.1%
Balkans				
- Balkan states	0	0%	0	0%
- Balkan rebels	0	0%	0	0%
Bulgaria				
- Bulgaria (state)	0	0%	0	0%
- Bulgarian government	0	0%	0	0%
- Bulgarian army	2	0.8%	0	0%
- Bulgarian press	0	0%	0	0%
Greece				
- Greece (state)	0	0%	0	0%
- Greek government	1	0.4%	0	0%
- Greek representative in the Ottoman Empire	1	0.4%	0	0%
- Greek socialists	0	0%	0	0%
- Greek army	0	0%	0	0%
Serbia				
- Serbian government	0	0%	0	0%
Persia				
- Persia (state)	0	0%	0	0%
- Persian government	0	0%	0	0%
Afghanistan				
- Afghanistan (state)	0	0%	0	0%
- Afghani government	0	0%	0	0%
- Afghani emir	0	0%	0	0%
USA				
- USA (state)	0	0%	0	0%
- American government	1	0.4%	3	3.2%
- American representative in the Ottoman Empire	0	0%	2	2.1%
- American press	0	0%	0	0%
India				
- Indian Muslims	0	0%	0	0%
Sudan				
- Sudanese Muslims	0	0%	0	0%
Dutch Indies				
- Muslims Dutch Indies	2	0.8%	1	1.1%
- Press Dutch Indies	0	0%	0	0%
North Africa				

- Toearegs	0	0%	0	0%
- Senussi	0	0%	0	0%
Egypt				
- Egyptian sultan	0	0%	0	0%
- Bedouins	0	0%	0	0%
Arabian Peninsula				
- Bedouins	3	1.3%	0	0%
Jews	0	0%	0	0%
International socialist organizations	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>238</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>100%</b>

## Appendix IV: Observation schedule 1917

Topics, subtopics and references: frequency and percentages of the total

	<i>Het Volk</i>		<i>De Tribune</i>	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
<b>References to Ottoman relations with the outside world</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>7.8%</b>
Relations with the Great Powers	1	0.6%	2	1%
Relations with the Triple Entente	0	0%	1	0.5%
Relations with the Central Powers	1	0.6%	5	2.4%
Relations with Great-Britain	0	0%	0	0%
Relations with France	0	0%	0	0%
Relations with Russia	0	0%	1	0.5%
Relations with Germany	0	0%	0	0%
Relations with Austria-Hungary	0	0%	0	0%
Relations with Italy	0	0%	0	0%
Relations with the USA	2	1.2%	2	1%
Relations with neighboring countries (Balkans)	1	0.6%	0	0%
Relations with the Islamic world	2	1.2%	1	0.5%
Alliances against the Ottoman Empire	0	0%	0	0%
Eastern question	1	0.6%	0	0%
Border adjustments	0	0%	0	0%
Foreign designs on Constantinople	2	1.2%	0	0%
Ottoman actions to disturb Balkan relations	0	0%	0	0%
Capitulations/concessions	0	0%	4	1.9%
Annexation Egypt	0	0%	0	0%
Annexation Cyprus	0	0%	0	0%
<b>References to the Ottoman alliance with Germany and Austria-Hungary</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>6.6%</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>10.1%</b>
German-Ottoman alliance	2	1.2%	6	2.9%
The Ottoman Empire as Germany's puppet	3	1.8%	2	1%
German influence on the Ottoman army and navy	1	0.6%	3	1.4%
German military and financial support	1	0.6%	1	0.5%
Ottoman support for	0	0%	1	0.5%

Germany and Austria-Hungary				
German responsibility for Ottoman crimes	2	1.2%	7	3.3%
The Ottoman Empire is only fighting for the benefit of Germany and Austria-Hungary	2	1.2%	0	0%
Connection Germany-Ottoman Empire (transport)	0	0%	1	0.5%
Problems between the Ottoman Empire and Germany	0	0%	0	0%
Pro-German group in the Ottoman Empire is a minority	0	0%	0	0%
Attempted murder on German general	0	0%	0	0%
Decorations for German officers	0	0%	0	0%
<b>References to the Ottoman past</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1.5%</b>
Rule Abdulhamid II	0	0%	2	1%
Bulgarian revolt	0	0%	0	0%
Russo-Turkish war 1877-1878	0	0%	0	0%
Greek-Turkish war 1897	0	0%	0	0%
Young Turk revolution	0	0%	1	0.5%
Balkan wars	0	0%	0	0%
<b>References to the Ottoman government</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1%</b>
Ottoman neutrality	0	0%	0	0%
Censorship	0	0%	0	0%
Influence Young Turks	0	0%	0	0%
Failure of the Young Turk reforms	0	0%	1	0.5%
Dissatisfaction with Young Turks	0	0%	1	0.5%
Disapproval government	0	0%	0	0%
Plans to overthrow the government	0	0%	0	0%
Formation new government	0	0%	0	0%
Problems within the Ottoman government	0	0%	0	0%
Rumors about the government leaving Constantinople	0	0%	0	0%
Rumors about the sultan leaving Constantinople	0	0%	0	0%

Death Ottoman heir to the throne	0	0%	0	0%
New sultan	0	0%	0	0%
Lack of communication between the Ottoman government and its officials	0	0%	0	0%
<b>References to the Ottoman armed forces</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1.2%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>4.3%</b>
Ottoman army	2	1.2%	4	1.9%
Military service	0	0%	3	1.4%
Ottoman mobilization for war	0	0%	0	0%
Ottoman army well prepared	0	0%	1	0.5%
Ottoman army ill prepared	0	0%	0	0%
Lack of military equipment	0	0%	0	0%
Abundance military equipment	0	0%	0	0%
Good leadership Ottoman army	0	0%	0	0%
Change in command army	0	0%	0	0%
Low morale Ottomans	0	0%	0	0%
High morale Ottomans	0	0%	0	0%
Soldiers disobeying orders	0	0%	0	0%
Prisoners of war	0	0%	0	0%
Execution Ottoman officers	0	0%	0	0%
Glorious military past	0	0%	0	0%
Ottoman fleet	0	0%	1	0.5%
Goeben/Breslau	0	0%	0	0%
<b>References to the Ottoman theaters of war and battles</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>61.1%</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>31.3%</b>
Dardanelles war	1	0.6%	2	1%
War on the Balkans	2	1.2%	1	0.5%
War in Egypt	4	2.5%	4	1.9%
War in Syria and Palestine	3	1.8%	1	0.5%
War in Mesopotamia	15	9.2%	10	4.8%
War in Persia	2	1.2%	1	0.5%
War on the Arabian peninsula	1	0.6%	2	1%
War in the Caucasus	3	1.8%	1	0.5%
War on the Black Sea	1	0.6%	0	0%
War in North Africa	1	0.6%	2	1%
Central Powers' success against the Entente	0	0%	0	0%
Entente success against the Central Powers	0	0%	0	0%
A Central Powers-Entente clash without a winner	0	0%	0	0%
Ottoman success against the Entente	0	0%	0	0%

Entente success against the Ottomans	2	1.2%	0	0%
An Ottoman-Entente clash without a winner	0	0%	0	0%
Ottoman success against the British	7	4.3%	3	1.4%
British success against the Ottomans	33	20.2%	25	11.9%
An Ottoman-British clash without a winner	2	1.2%	4	1.9%
Ottoman success against the French	0	0%	0	0%
French success against the Ottomans	0	0%	0	0%
An Ottoman-French clash without a winner	0	0%	0	0%
Ottoman success against the Russians	4	2.5%	2	1%
Russian success against the Ottomans	10	6.1%	5	2.4%
An Ottoman-Russian clash without a winner	2	1.2%	0	0%
Ottoman success against the British/French	0	0%	0	0%
British/French success against the Ottomans	0	0%	0	0%
An Ottoman-British/French clash without a winner	0	0%	0	0%
Ottoman success against the Armenians/Georgians	0	0%	0	0%
An Ottoman-Armenian/Georgian clash without a winner	0	0%	0	0%
Ottoman success against the Italians	0	0%	0	0%
Italian success against the Ottomans	1	0.6%	0	0%
An Ottoman-Italian clash without a winner	0	0%	0	0%
Peace with the Ottoman Empire	6	3.7%	2	1%
<b>Judgments on the behavior of the belligerent powers</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1.8%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2%</b>
Unfairness Entente towards the Ottoman Empire	0	0%	0	0%
Ottoman unfairness towards the Entente	1	0.6%	1	0.5%
Ottoman unfairness towards neutral countries	0	0%	0	0%

Unfairness Entente towards neutral countries	0	0%	0	0%
Mistreatment Entente nationals by the Ottomans	0	0%	0	0%
Mistreatment citizens of neutral countries by the Ottomans	1	0.6%	0	0%
Exploitation of the Ottoman Empire by the Great Powers	0	0%	0	0%
Ottoman telegrams are lying	1	0.6%	2	1%
Entente telegrams are lying	0	0%	1	0.5%
<b>References to the fight for the hearts and minds of the people</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>18.9%</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>28.1%</b>
Pan-Islamism/Holy War	1	0.6%	3	1.4%
Pan-Turkism	1	0.6%	0	0%
Oppression Islam/Islamic peoples	0	0%	0	0%
Support foreign Muslims for the Ottomans	0	0%	2	1%
Loyalty Muslims under Entente rule	1	0.6%	0	0%
Support local Muslims for Ottoman rule	1	0.6%	1	0.5%
Support local non-Muslims for Ottoman rule	1	0.6%	0	0%
Disloyalty Ottoman Muslims	1	0.6%	3	1.4%
Arabian Revolt	1	0.6%	4	1.9%
Neutrality Muslims	0	0%	0	0%
Ottoman actions to acquire support Entente Muslims	0	0%	1	0.5%
Ottoman actions to acquire support neutral Muslims	1	0.6%	0	0%
Entente actions to acquire support Ottoman subjects	1	0.6%	0	0%
Yezidis helping Russians	0	0%	0	0%
Armenians helping Russians	0	0%	3	1.4%
Ottoman non-Muslim policies	3	1.8%	8	3.8%
Liberation of non-Turks from Ottoman rule	4	2.5%	2	1%
Attitude of the Ottoman non-Muslim population	1	0.6%	0	0%
Massacres of non-Muslims	0	0%	1	0.5%
Armenian massacres	5	3.1%	16	7.6%
Greek massacres	0	0%	0	0%
Catholic massacres	0	0%	0	0%
Jewish massacres	3	1.8%	3	1.4%
Other atrocities towards non-	6	3.7%	12	5.7%

Muslims				
Atrocities Armenians towards the Turks	0	0%	0	0%
Jewish colony in Palestine	0	0%	0	0%
<b>References to life in the Ottoman Empire</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4.8%</b>
Attitude Ottoman population	0	0%	1	0.5%
Celebrations in Constantinople	0	0%	0	0%
Daily life continuing in the Ottoman Empire	0	0%	0	0%
Daily life disrupted	0	0%	9	4.3%
<b>References to Ottoman stereotypes</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3.6%</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>10.2%</b>
Military toughness	0	0%	1	0.5%
Violent Ottomans	2	1.2%	4	1.9%
Barbaric Ottomans	1	0.6%	4	1.9%
Oppressive Ottomans	1	0.6%	5	2.4%
Pillaging Ottomans	0	0%	0	0%
Stupid Ottomans	0	0%	0	0%
Unorganized Ottomans	0	0%	0	0%
Backwardness Ottomans	0	0%	2	1%
Behavior Ottoman soldiers in occupied territories	0	0%	0	0%
Nice Ottomans	0	0%	0	0%
Honesty Ottomans	0	0%	1	0.5%
Ottoman harem	1	0.6%	1	0.5%
'Lustful Turk' stereotype is not true	0	0%	0	0%
Arabian Nights	0	0%	1	0.5%
The Ottoman Empire does not belong in Europe	1	0.6%	2	1%
Turk as simple farmer	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Others</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0.5%</b>
Women's rights	0	0%	1	0.5%
Socialism in the Ottoman Empire	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>100%</b>

Observation schedule *Het Volk* 1917

Topic	Frequency topic	Frequency subtopic	Frequency reference 1	Frequency reference 2	Total	Percent
<b>References to Ottoman relations with the outside world</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6%</b>
Relations with the Great				1	1	0.6%



Powers						
Relations with the Triple Entente					0	0%
Relations with the Central Powers		1			1	0.6%
Relations with Great-Britain					0	0%
Relations with France					0	0%
Relations with Russia					0	0%
Relations with Germany					0	0%
Relations with Austria-Hungary					0	0%
Relations with Italy					0	0%
Relations with the USA	1		1		2	1.2%
Relations with neighboring countries (Balkans)	1				1	0.6%
Relations with the Islamic world	2				2	1.2%
Alliances against the Ottoman Empire					0	0%
Eastern question	1				1	0.6%
Border adjustments					0	0%
Foreign designs on Constantinople		2			2	1.2%
Ottoman actions to disturb Balkan relations					0	0%
Capitulations/concessions					0	0%
Annexation Egypt					0	0%
Annexation Cyprus					0	0%
<b>References to the Ottoman alliance with Germany and Austria-Hungary</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>6.6%</b>
German-Ottoman alliance		1	1		2	1.2%
The Ottoman Empire as Germany's puppet		1	2		3	1.8%
German influence on the Ottoman army and navy				1	1	0.6%
German military and financial support		1			1	0.6%
Ottoman support for Germany and Austria					0	0%
German responsibility for Ottoman crimes			2		2	1.2%
The Ottoman Empire is only fighting for the benefit of Germany and			2		2	1.2%

Austria-Hungary						
Connection Germany-Ottoman Empire (transport)					0	0%
Problems between the Ottoman Empire and Germany					0	0%
Pro-German group in the Ottoman Empire is a minority					0	0%
Attempted murder on German general					0	0%
Decorations for German officers					0	0%
<b>References to the Ottoman past</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>
Rule Abdulhamid II					0	0%
Bulgarian revolt					0	0%
Russo-Turkish war 1877-1878					0	0%
Greek-Turkish war 1897					0	0%
Young Turk revolution					0	0%
Balkan wars					0	0%
<b>References to the Ottoman government</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>
Ottoman neutrality					0	0%
Censorship					0	0%
Influence Young Turks					0	0%
Failure of the Young Turk reforms					0	0%
Dissatisfaction with Young Turks					0	0%
Disapproval government					0	0%
Plans to overthrow the government					0	0%
Formation new government					0	0%
Problems within the Ottoman government					0	0%
Rumors about the government leaving Constantinople					0	0%
Rumors about the sultan leaving Constantinople					0	0%
Death Ottoman heir to the throne					0	0%
New sultan					0	0%
Lack of communication between the Ottoman					0	0%

government and its officials						
<b>References to the Ottoman armed forces</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1.2%</b>
Ottoman army	1	1			2	1.2%
Military service					0	0%
Ottoman mobilization for war					0	0%
Ottoman army well prepared					0	0%
Ottoman army ill prepared					0	0%
Lack of military equipment					0	0%
The Ottoman Empire has abundant military equipment					0	0%
Good leadership Ottoman army					0	0%
Change in command army					0	0%
Low morale Ottomans					0	0%
High morale Ottomans					0	0%
Soldiers disobeying orders					0	0%
Prisoners of war					0	0%
Execution Ottoman officers					0	0%
Glorious military past					0	0%
Ottoman fleet					0	0%
Goeben/Breslau					0	0%
<b>References to the Ottoman theaters of war and battles</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>61.1%</b>
Dardanelles war		1			1	0.6%
War on the Balkans	1		1		2	1.2%
War in Egypt		4			4	2.5%
War in Syria and Palestine	3				3	1.8%
War in Mesopotamia	12	2	1		15	9.2%
War in Persia			1	1	2	1.2%
War on the Arabian peninsula				1	1	0.6%
War in the Caucasus	2	1			3	1.8%
War on the Black Sea			1		1	0.6%
War in North Africa	1				1	0.6%
Central Powers' success against the Entente					0	0%
Entente success against					0	0%

the Central Powers						
A Central Powers-Entente clash without a winner					0	0%
Ottoman success against the Entente					0	0%
Entente success against the Ottomans		2			2	1.2%
An Ottoman-Entente clash without a winner					0	0%
Ottoman success against the British	4	3			7	4.3%
British success against the Ottomans	29	4			33	20.2%
An Ottoman-British clash without a winner	2				2	1.2%
Ottoman success against the French					0	0%
French success against the Ottomans					0	0%
An Ottoman-French clash without a winner					0	0%
Ottoman success against the Russians	3		1		4	2.5%
Russian success against the Ottomans	6	2		2	10	6.1%
An Ottoman-Russian clash without a winner	2				2	1.2%
Ottoman success against the British/French					0	0%
British/French success against the Ottomans					0	0%
An Ottoman - British/French clash without a winner					0	0%
Ottoman success against the Armenians/Georgians					0	0%
An Ottoman-Armenian/Georgian clash without a winner					0	0%
Ottoman success against the Italians					0	0%
Italian success against the Ottomans	1				1	0.6%
An Ottoman-Italian clash without a winner					0	0%
Peace with the Ottoman Empire	5	1			6	3.7%
<b>Judgments on the</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1.8%</b>

<b>behavior of the belligerent powers</b>						
Unfairness Entente towards the Ottoman Empire					0	0%
Ottoman unfairness towards the Entente		1			1	0.6%
Ottoman unfairness towards neutral countries					0	0%
Unfairness Entente towards neutral countries					0	0%
Mistreatment Entente nationals by the Ottomans					0	0%
Mistreatment citizens of neutral countries by the Ottomans	1				1	0.6%
Exploitation of the Ottoman Empire by the Great Powers					0	0%
Ottoman telegrams are lying				1	1	0.6%
Entente telegrams are lying					0	0%
<b>References to the fight for the hearts and minds of the people</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>18.9%</b>
Pan-Islamism/Holy War			1		1	0.6%
Pan-Turkism			1		1	0.6%
Oppression Islam/Islamic peoples					0	0%
Support foreign Muslims for the Ottomans					0	0%
Loyalty Islamic people under Entente rule			1		1	0.6%
Support local Muslims for Ottoman rule		1			1	0.6%
Support local non-Muslims for Ottoman rule		1			1	0.6%
Disloyalty Ottoman Muslims		1			1	0.6%
Arabian Revolt	1				1	0.6%
Neutrality Muslims					0	0%
Ottoman actions to acquire support Entente Muslims					0	0%
Ottoman actions to acquire support neutral		1			1	0.6%

Muslims						
Entente actions to acquire support Ottoman subjects		1			1	0.6%
Yezidis helping Russians					0	0%
Armenians helping Russians					0	0%
Ottoman policies towards minorities	3				3	1.8%
Liberation of non-Turks from Ottoman rule	1	1	2		4	2.5%
Attitude of the Ottoman non-Muslim population	1				1	0.6%
Massacres of non-Muslims					0	0%
Armenian massacres		2	2	1	5	3.1%
Greek massacres					0	0%
Catholic massacres					0	0%
Jewish massacres	2	1			3	1.8%
Other atrocities towards non-Muslims	3	2	1		6	3.7%
Atrocities Armenians towards the Turks					0	0%
Jewish colony in Palestine					0	0%
<b>References to life in the Ottoman Empire</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>
Attitude Ottoman population					0	0%
Celebrations in Constantinople					0	0%
Daily life continuing in the Ottoman Empire					0	0%
Daily life disrupted					0	0%
<b>References to Ottoman stereotypes</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3.6%</b>
Military toughness					0	0%
Violent Ottomans	1		1		2	1.2%
Barbaric Ottomans		1			1	0.6%
Oppressive Ottomans			1		1	0.6%
Pillaging Ottomans					0	0%
Stupid Ottomans					0	0%
Unorganized Ottomans					0	0%
Backwardness Ottomans					0	0%
Behavior Ottoman soldiers in occupied territories					0	0%
Nice Ottomans					0	0%
Honesty Ottomans					0	0%
Ottoman harem	1				1	0.6%

'Lustful Turk' stereotype is not true					0	0%
Arabian Nights					0	0%
The Ottoman Empire does not belong in Europe	1				1	0.6%
Turk as simple farmer					0	0%
<b>Other</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>
Women's rights					0	0%
Socialism in the Ottoman Empire					0	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>100%</b>

Observation schedule *De Tribune* 1917

Topic	Frequency topic	Frequency subtopic	Frequency reference 1	Frequency reference 2	Total	Percent
<b>References to Ottoman relations with the outside world</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>7.8%</b>
Relations with the Great Powers	1	1			2	1%
Relations with the Triple Entente	1				1	0.5%
Relations with the Central Powers	5				5	2.4%
Relations with Great-Britain					0	0%
Relations with France					0	0%
Relations with Russia	1				1	0.5%
Relations with Germany					0	0%
Relations with Austria-Hungary					0	0%
Relations with Italy					0	0%
Relations with the USA	2				2	1%
Relations with neighboring countries (Balkans)					0	0%
Relations with the Islamic world		1			1	0.5%
Alliances against the Ottoman Empire					0	0%
Eastern question					0	0%
Border adjustments						
Foreign designs on Constantinople					0	0%
Ottoman actions to					0	0%

disturb Balkan relations						
Capitulations/concessions	1	3			4	1.9%
Annexation Egypt					0	0%
Annexation Cyprus					0	0%
<b>References to the Ottoman alliance with Germany and Austria-Hungary</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>10.1%</b>
German-Ottoman alliance		3	2	1	6	2.9%
The Ottoman Empire as Germany's puppet			2		2	1%
German influence on the Ottoman army and navy			2	1	3	1.4%
German military and financial support				1	1	0.5%
Ottoman support for Germany and Austria		1			1	0.5%
German responsibility for Ottoman crimes	1	4	2		7	3.3%
The Ottoman Empire is only fighting for the benefit of Germany and Austria-Hungary					0	0%
Connection Germany-Ottoman Empire (transport)			1		1	0.5%
Problems between the Ottoman Empire and Germany					0	0%
Pro-German group in the Ottoman Empire is a minority					0	0%
Attempted murder on German general					0	0%
Decorations for German officers					0	0%
<b>References to the Ottoman past</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1.5%</b>
Rule Abdulhamid II			1	1	2	1%
Bulgarian revolt					0	0%
Russo-Turkish war 1877-1878					0	0%
Greek-Turkish war 1897					0	0%
Young Turk revolution	1				1	0.5%
Balkan wars					0	0%
<b>References to the Ottoman government</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1%</b>
Ottoman neutrality					0	0%



Censorship					0	0%
Influence Young Turks					0	0%
Failure of the Young Turk reforms		1			1	0.5%
Dissatisfaction with Young Turks	1				1	0.5%
Disapproval government					0	0%
Plans to overthrow the government		1			1	0.5%
Formation new government					0	0%
Problems within the Ottoman government					0	0%
Rumors about the government leaving Constantinople					0	0%
Rumors about the sultan leaving Constantinople					0	0%
Death Ottoman heir to the throne					0	0%
New sultan					0	0%
Lack of communication between the Ottoman government and its officials					0	0%
<b>References to the Ottoman armed forces</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>4.3%</b>
Ottoman army	1	2		1	4	1.9%
Military service		1	1	1	3	1.4%
Ottoman mobilization for war					0	0%
Ottoman army well prepared		1			1	0.5%
Ottoman army ill prepared					0	0%
Lack of military equipment					0	0%
The Ottoman Empire has abundant military equipment					0	0%
Good leadership Ottoman army					0	0%
Change in command army					0	0%
Low morale Ottomans					0	0%
High morale Ottomans					0	0%
Soldiers disobeying orders					0	0%
Prisoners of war					0	0%

Execution Ottoman officers					0	0%
Glorious military past					0	0%
Ottoman fleet		1			1	0.5%
Goeben/Breslau					0	0%
<b>References to the Ottoman theaters of war and battles</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>31.3%</b>
Dardanelles war		1		1	2	1%
War on the Balkans		1			1	0.5%
War in Egypt		2	1	1	4	1.9%
War in Syria and Palestine	1				1	0.5%
War in Mesopotamia	5	1	3	1	10	4.8%
War in Persia	1				1	0.5%
War on the Arabian peninsula		1	1		2	1%
War in the Caucasus		1			1	0.5%
War on the Black Sea					0	0%
War in North Africa	2				2	1%
Central Powers' success against the Entente					0	0%
Entente success against the Central Powers					0	0%
A Central Powers-Entente clash without a winner					0	0%
Ottoman success against the Entente					0	0%
Entente success against the Ottomans					0	0%
An Ottoman-Entente clash without a winner					0	0%
Ottoman success against the British	2	1			3	1.4%
British success against the Ottomans	22	2	1		25	11.9%
An Ottoman-British clash without a winner	4				4	1.9%
Ottoman success against the French					0	0%
French success against the Ottomans					0	0%
An Ottoman-French clash without a winner					0	0%
Ottoman success against the Russians	2				2	1%
Russian success against the Ottomans	5				5	2.4%

An Ottoman-Russian clash without a winner					0	0%
Ottoman success against the British/French					0	0%
British/French success against the Ottomans					0	0%
An Ottoman - British/French clash without a winner					0	0%
Ottoman success against the Armenians/Georgians					0	0%
An Ottoman-Armenian/Georgian clash without a winner					0	0%
Ottoman success against the Italians					0	0%
Italian success against the Ottomans					0	0%
An Ottoman-Italian clash without a winner					0	0%
Peace with the Ottoman Empire	1	1			2	1%
<b>Judgments on the behavior of the belligerent powers</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2%</b>
Unfairness Entente towards the Ottoman Empire					0	0%
Ottoman unfairness towards the Entente	1				1	0.5%
Ottoman unfairness towards neutral countries					0	0%
Unfairness Entente towards neutral countries					0	0%
Mistreatment Entente nationals by the Ottomans					0	0%
Mistreatment citizens of neutral countries by the Ottomans					0	0%
Exploitation of the Ottoman Empire by the Great Powers					0	0%
Ottoman telegrams are lying		1		1	2	1%
Entente telegrams are lying			1		1	0.5%
<b>References to the fight for the hearts and</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>28.1%</b>

<b>minds of the people</b>						
Pan-Islamism/Holy War	2			1	3	1.4%
Pan-Turkism					0	0%
Oppression Islam/Islamic peoples					0	0%
Support foreign Muslims for the Ottomans		2			2	1%
Loyalty Islamic people under Entente rule					0	0%
Support local Muslims for Ottoman rule		1			1	0.5%
Support local non-Muslims for Ottoman rule					0	0%
Disloyalty Ottoman Muslims		2	1		3	1.4%
Arabian Revolt	3		1		4	1.9%
Neutrality Muslims					0	0%
Ottoman actions to acquire support Entente Muslims				1	1	0.5%
Ottoman actions to acquire support neutral Muslims					0	0%
Entente actions to acquire support Ottoman subjects					0	0%
Yezidis helping Russians					0	0%
Armenians helping Russians	1	1	1		3	1.4%
Ottoman policies towards minorities	5	1	1	1	8	3.8%
Liberation of non-Turks from Ottoman rule	2				2	1%
Attitude of the Ottoman non-Muslim population					0	0%
Massacres of non-Muslims	1				1	0.5%
Armenian massacres	9	5	1	1	16	7.6%
Greek massacres					0	0%
Catholic massacres					0	0%
Jewish massacres	2	1			3	1.4%
Other atrocities towards non-Muslims	3	5	3	1	12	5.7%
Atrocities Armenians towards the Turks					0	0%
Jewish colony in Palestine					0	0%
<b>References to life in the Ottoman Empire</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4.8%</b>

Attitude Ottoman population			1		1	0.5%
Celebrations in Constantinople					0	0%
Daily life continuing in the Ottoman Empire					0	0%
Daily life disrupted	4	1	2	2	9	4.3%
<b>References to Ottoman stereotypes</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>10.2%</b>
Military toughness		1			1	0.5%
Violent Ottomans		3		1	4	1.9%
Barbaric Ottomans	2	1	1		4	1.9%
Oppressive Ottomans	1	2	1	1	5	2.4%
Pillaging Ottomans					0	0%
Stupid Ottomans					0	0%
Unorganized Ottomans					0	0%
Backwardness Ottomans	1		1		2	1%
Behavior Ottoman soldiers in occupied territories					0	0%
Nice Ottomans					0	0%
Honesty Ottomans	1				1	0.5%
Ottoman harem	1				1	0.5%
'Lustful Turk' stereotype is not true					0	0%
Arabian Nights			1		1	0.5%
The Ottoman Empire does not belong in Europe	1		1		2	1%
Turk as simple farmer					0	0%
<b>Other</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0.5%</b>
Women's rights	1				1	0.5%
Socialism in the Ottoman Empire					0	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>100%</b>

#### Type of article

	<i>Het Volk</i>		<i>De Tribune</i>	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
News story	78	90.1%	80	78.4%
Editorial	0	0%	4	3.9%
Letter	0	0%	4	3.9%
Report	0	0%	2	2%
Feature	2	2.3%	4	3.9%
Opinion piece	5	5.8%	6	5.9%
Speech	0	0%	1	1%
Poetry	0	0%	0	0%

Leaflet	0	0%	1	1%
Other	1	1.2%	0	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>100%</b>

Geography: the place of action

	<i>Het Volk</i>		<i>De Tribune</i>	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
<b>The Ottoman Empire</b>				
- The Ottoman Empire	10	11%	29	30%
- Constantinople	1	1.1%	1	1%
- Smyrna	0	0%	0	0%
- Dardanelles & Sea of Marmara	0	0%	1	1%
- Balkan front	5	5.5%	2	2.1%
- Egypt	1	1.1%	1	1%
- Syria & Palestine	15	16.5%	17	17.5%
- Mesopotamia	38	41.8%	22	22.7%
- Border with Iran	2	2.2%	0	0%
- Caucasus & Asia Minor	3	3.3%	5	5.2%
- Black Sea	0	0%	1	1%
- Russian front	1	1.1%	1	1%
- Arabian Peninsula	1	1.1%	2	2.1%
<b>Triple Entente</b>				
- United Kingdom	2	2.2%	2	2.1%
- France	0	0%	0	0%
- Russia	2	2.2%	0	0%
- Italy	0	0%	0	0%
- Romania	0	0%	0	0%
- Greece	0	0%	1	1%
- Belgium	0	0%	0	0%
- Serbia	1	1.1%	2	2.1%
<b>Central Powers</b>				
- Germany	0	0%	4	4.1%
- Austria-Hungary	0	0%	0	0%
- Bulgaria	0	0%	0	0%
- Albania	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Neutral countries</b>				
- The Netherlands	0	0%	2	2.1%
- Switzerland	2	2.2%	1	1%
- Sweden	2	2.2%	0	0%
- Vatican	0	0%	0	0%
- Persia	2	2.2%	0	0%
- Afghanistan	0	0%	0	0%
- USA	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Colonies</b>				
- Malta	0	0%	0	0%
- India	0	0%	0	0%

- Sudan	0	0%	0	0%
- Dutch Indies	1	1.1%	2	2.1%
- North Africa	2	2.2%	1	1%
Others				
- Mediterranean	0	0%	0	0%
- Atlantic Ocean	0	0%	0	0%
- Balkans	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>100%</b>

Geography: the origin of the news

	<i>Het Volk</i>		<i>De Tribune</i>	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
The Ottoman Empire	7	9.7%	12	22.2%
Triple Entente				
- United Kingdom	34	47.2%	14	25.9%
- France	1	1.4%	6	11.1%
- Russia	8	11.1%	5	9.3%
- Italy	4	5.6%	3	5.6%
- Romania	0	0%	0	0%
- Greece	0	0%	2	3.7%
- Belgium	0	0%	0	0%
- Serbia	1	1.4%	1	1.9%
Central Powers				
- Germany	9	12.5%	3	5.6%
- Austria-Hungary	0	0%	1	1.9%
- Bulgaria	0	0%	0	0%
Neutral countries				
- The Netherlands	4	5.6%	4	7.4%
- Denmark	0	0%	0	0%
- Sweden	1	1.4%	0	0%
- Switzerland	2	2.8%	2	3.7%
- Vatican	0	0%	0	0%
- Persia	0	0%	0	0%
- Afghanistan	0	0%	0	0%
- USA	1	1.4%	0	0%
Colonies				
- Malta	0	0%	0	0%
- India	0	0%	0	0%
- Sudan	0	0%	0	0%
- Dutch Indies	0	0%	1	1.9%
- North Africa	0	0%	0	0%
- Egypt	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>100%</b>

## Actors

	<i>Het Volk</i>		<i>De Tribune</i>	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
<b>The Ottoman Empire</b>				
- Ottoman Empire (state)	0	0%	2	2.1%
- Ottoman government	6	7.1%	13	13.7%
- Ottoman sultan	0	0%	0	0%
- Ottoman heir to the throne	0	0%	0	0%
- Ottoman grand vizier	0	0%	0	0%
- Ottoman governors	0	0%	0	0%
- Ottoman representatives abroad	0	0%	0	0%
- Ottoman delegation The Hague	0	0%	0	0%
- Opponents of the Ottoman government abroad	0	0%	1	1.1%
- Ottoman military authorities	0	0%	0	0%
- Ottoman army	9	10.6%	11	11.6%
- Ottoman fleet	1	1.2%	0	0%
- Ottoman gangs	0	0%	0	0%
- Ottoman irregular troops	0	0%	0	0%
- Ottoman prisoners of war	0	0%	0	0%
- Ottoman airforce	0	0%	0	0%
- Ottoman press	0	0%	0	0%
- Ottoman people	1	1.2%	3	3.2%
- Patriarch of Constantinople	0	0%	0	0%
- Non-Ottoman minorities	0	0%	0	0%
- Ottoman Christians	0	0%	1	1.1%
- Ottoman Greeks	0	0%	1	1.1%
- Ottoman Armenians	1	1.2%	8	8.4%
- Ottoman Jews	1	1.2%	7	7.4%
- Ottoman socialists	0	0%	0	0%
- Ottoman factories	0	0%	0	0%
- Ottoman universities	1	1.2%	0	0%
<b>Great Powers</b>	0	0%	3	3.2%
<b>Triple Entente</b>				
- Entente Powers	2	2.4%	1	1.1%
- Entente representatives in the Ottoman Empire	0	0%	0	0%
- Entente representatives abroad	0	0%	0	0%
- Entente armies	4	4.7%	1	1.1%
- Entente fleet	0	0%	0	0%
- Entente airforce	0	0%	0	0%
- UK/French armies	0	0%	0	0%
- UK/French fleet	0	0%	0	0%
- Entente colonies	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Central Powers</b>				
- Central Powers	3	3.5%	1	1.1%
- Central Powers armies	0	0%	0	0%
- German/Austrian military	0	0%	0	0%



United Kingdom				
- United Kingdom (state)	1	1.2%	0	0%
- British government	2	2.4%	1	1.1%
- British ministers	0	0%	2	2.1%
- British rulers Egypt	0	0%	0	0%
- British army	31	36.5%	19	20%
- British fleet	0	0%	0	0%
- British airforce	0	0%	1	1.1%
France				
- France (state)	0	0%	0	0%
- French government	0	0%	0	0%
- French representatives in The Hague	0	0%	0	0%
- French army	0	0%	0	0%
- French fleet	0	0%	0	0%
Russia				
- Russia (state)	0	0%	0	0%
- Russian government	3	3.5%	1	1.1%
- Russian representatives in the Ottoman Empire	0	0%	0	0%
- Russian army	11	12.9%	4	4.2%
- Russian fleet	0	0%	1	1.1%
- Russian Muslims	0	0%	0	0%
- Russian socialists	0	0%	0	0%
- Armenians/Georgians	0	0%	1	1.1%
- German companies in Russia	0	0%	0	0%
Italy				
- Italy (state)	0	0%	0	0%
- Italian government	0	0%	0	0%
- Italian representatives in the Ottoman Empire	0	0%	0	0%
- Italian army	1	1.2%	0	0%
- Italian fleet	0	0%	0	0%
Romania				
- Romania (state)	0	0%	0	0%
- Romanian government	0	0%	0	0%
- Romanian representative in the Ottoman Empire	0	0%	0	0%
- Romanian army	0	0%	0	0%
- Romanian customs	0	0%	0	0%
Greece				
- Greece (state)	0	0%	0	0%
- Greek government	1	1.2%	0	0%
- Greek representative in the Ottoman Empire	0	0%	0	0%
- Greek socialists	0	0%	0	0%
- Greek army	0	0%	0	0%
Serbia				
- Serbian government	0	0%	1	1.1%

Germany				
- Germany (state)	0	0%	1	1.1%
- German fleet	0	0%	0	0%
- German government	0	0%	2	2.1%
- German people	0	0%	1	1.1%
- German social-democrats	0	0%	0	0%
- Germans in the Ottoman Empire	0	0%	0	0%
- German companies	0	0%	1	1.1%
Austria-Hungary				
- Austria-Hungary (state)	0	0%	0	0%
- Austro-Hungarian government	0	0%	0	0%
- Austro-Hungarian press	0	0%	0	0%
The Netherlands				
- The Netherlands (state)	0	0%	0	0%
- Ottoman representation The Hague	0	0%	1	1.1%
Sweden				
- Swedish socialists	1	1.2%	0	0%
Vatican				
- The Pope	1	1.2%	0	0%
Balkans				
- Balkan states	0	0%	0	0%
- Balkan rebels	0	0%	0	0%
Bulgaria				
- Bulgaria (state)	0	0%	0	0%
- Bulgarian government	0	0%	0	0%
- Bulgarian army	0	0%	0	0%
- Bulgarian press	0	0%	0	0%
Persia				
- Persia (state)	0	0%	0	0%
- Persian government	0	0%	0	0%
Afghanistan				
- Afghanistan (state)	0	0%	0	0%
- Afghani government	0	0%	0	0%
- Afghani emir	0	0%	0	0%
USA				
- USA (state)	0	0%	0	0%
- American government	0	0%	1	1.1%
- American representative in the Ottoman Empire	0	0%	0	0%
- American press	0	0%	0	0%
India				
- Indian Muslims	1	1.2%	0	0%
Sudan				
- Sudanese Muslims	0	0%	0	0%
Dutch Indies				
- Muslims Dutch Indies	0	0%	2	2.1%
- Press Dutch Indies	0	0%	0	0%
North Africa				

- Toearegs	0	0%	0	0%
- Senussi	0	0%	0	0%
Egypt				
- Egyptian sultan	0	0%	0	0%
- Bedouins	0	0%	0	0%
Arabian Peninsula				
- Bedouins	0	0%	2	2.1%
Jews	1	1.2%	0	0%
International socialist organizations	2	2.4%	0	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>100%</b>

## Appendix V: Observation schedule 1918

Topics, subtopics and references: frequency and percentages of the total

	<i>Het Volk</i>		<i>De Tribune</i>	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
<b>References to Ottoman relations with the outside world</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>15.4%</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>14.7%</b>
Relations with the Great Powers	1	0.7%	1	0.6%
Relations with the Triple Entente	8	5.3%	4	2.6%
Relations with the Central Powers	5	3.3%	6	3.9%
Relations with Great-Britain	0	0%	0	0%
Relations with France	0	0%	0	0%
Relations with Russia	1	0.7%	1	0.6%
Relations with Germany	0	0%	0	0%
Relations with Austria-Hungary	0	0%	0	0%
Relations with Italy	0	0%	0	0%
Relations with the USA	1	0.7%	0	0%
Relations with neighboring countries (Balkans)	4	2.7%	0	0%
Relations with the Islamic world	0	0%	0	0%
Alliances against the Ottoman Empire	0	0%	0	0%
Eastern question	0	0%	0	0%
Border adjustments	12	8%	9	5.8%
Foreign designs on Constantinople	0	0%	1	0.6%
Ottoman actions to disturb Balkan relations	0	0%	0	0%
Capitulations/concessions	0	0%	0	0%
Annexation Egypt	0	0%	1	0.6%
Annexation Cyprus	0	0%	0	0%
<b>References to the Ottoman alliance with Germany and Austria-Hungary</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>11.4%</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>12.8%</b>
German-Ottoman alliance	7	4.7%	2	1.3%
The Ottoman Empire as Germany's puppet	2	1.3%	4	2.6%
German influence on the Ottoman army and navy	1	0.7%	0	0%
German military and financial support	0	0%	5	3.2%
Ottoman support for	0	0%	1	0.6%

Germany and Austria-Hungary				
German responsibility for Ottoman crimes	3	2%	2	1.3%
The Ottoman Empire is only fighting for the benefit of Germany and Austria-Hungary	1	0.7%	0	0%
Connection Germany-Ottoman Empire (transport)	0	0%	1	0.6%
Problems between the Ottoman Empire and Germany	2	1.3%	3	1.9%
Pro-German group in the Ottoman Empire is a minority	0	0%	0	0%
Attempted murder on German general	0	0%	0	0%
Decorations for German officers	1	0.7%	2	1.3%
<b>References to the Ottoman past</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1.2%</b>
Rule Abdulhamid II	0	0%	0	0%
Bulgarian revolt	0	0%	0	0%
Russo-Turkish war 1877-1878	0	0%	1	0.6%
Greek-Turkish war 1897	0	0%	0	0%
Young Turk revolution	0	0%	1	0.6%
Balkan wars	0	0%	0	0%
<b>References to the Ottoman government</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2.1%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3.8%</b>
Ottoman neutrality	0	0%	0	0%
Censorship	0	0%	0	0%
Influence Young Turks	1	0.7%	4	2.6%
Failure of the Young Turk reforms	0	0%	0	0%
Dissatisfaction with Young Turks	0	0%	0	0%
Disapproval government	0	0%	0	0%
Plans to overthrow the government	0	0%	0	0%
Formation new government	1	0.7%	1	0.6%
Problems within the Ottoman government	0	0%	0	0%
Rumors about the government leaving Constantinople	0	0%	0	0%
Rumors about the sultan leaving Constantinople	1	0.7%	0	0%

Death Ottoman heir to the throne	0	0%	0	0%
New sultan	0	0%	1	0.6%
Lack of communication between the Ottoman government and its officials	0	0%	0	0%
<b>References to the Ottoman armed forces</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5.3%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5%</b>
Ottoman army	2	1.3%	3	1.9%
Military service	0	0%	0	0%
Ottoman mobilization for war	0	0%	0	0%
Ottoman army well prepared	0	0%	0	0%
Ottoman army ill prepared	0	0%	0	0%
Lack of military equipment	0	0%	0	0%
Abundance military equipment	0	0%	0	0%
Good leadership Ottoman army	0	0%	0	0%
Change in command army	0	0%	0	0%
Low morale Ottomans	1	0.7%	0	0%
High morale Ottomans	0	0%	0	0%
Soldiers disobeying orders	0	0%	1	0.6%
Prisoners of war	0	0%	0	0%
Execution Ottoman officers	0	0%	1	0.6%
Glorious military past	1	0.7%	3	1.9%
Ottoman fleet	2	1.3%	0	0%
Goeben/Breslau	2	1.3%	0	0%
<b>References to the Ottoman theaters of war and battles</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>39.9%</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>34%</b>
Dardanelles war	0	0%	1	0.6%
War on the Balkans	0	0%	0	0%
War in Egypt	0	0%	0	0%
War in Syria and Palestine	2	1.3%	1	0.6%
War in Mesopotamia	2	1.3%	2	1.3%
War in Persia	0	0%	0	0%
War on the Arabian peninsula	0	0%	0	0%
War in the Caucasus	6	4%	5	3.2%
War on the Black Sea	0	0%	0	0%
War in North Africa	0	0%	0	0%
Central Powers' success against the Entente	0	0%	0	0%
Entente success against the Central Powers	0	0%	0	0%
A Central Powers-Entente clash without a winner	0	0%	0	0%
Ottoman success against the Entente	0	0%	0	0%

Entente success against the Ottomans	0	0%	1	0.6%
An Ottoman-Entente clash without a winner	0	0%	0	0%
Ottoman success against the British	4	2.7%	3	1.9%
British success against the Ottomans	14	9.3%	10	6.5%
An Ottoman-British clash without a winner	1	0.7%	2	1.3%
Ottoman success against the French	0	0%	0	0%
French success against the Ottomans	1	0.7%	0	0%
An Ottoman-French clash without a winner	0	0%	0	0%
Ottoman success against the Russians	3	2%	1	0.6%
Russian success against the Ottomans	0	0%	1	0.6%
An Ottoman-Russian clash without a winner	0	0%	0	0%
Ottoman success against the British/French	0	0%	0	0%
British/French success against the Ottomans	0	0%	0	0%
An Ottoman-British/French clash without a winner	0	0%	0	0%
Ottoman success against the Armenians/Georgians	2	1.3%	5	3.2%
An Ottoman-Armenian/Georgian clash without a winner	0	0%	2	1.3%
Ottoman success against the Italians	0	0%	0	0%
Italian success against the Ottomans	0	0%	0	0%
An Ottoman-Italian clash without a winner	0	0%	0	0%
Peace with the Ottoman Empire	25	16.7%	19	12.3%
<b>Judgments on the behavior of the belligerent powers</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4.6%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5%</b>
Unfairness Entente towards the Ottoman Empire	2	1.3%	1	0.6%
Ottoman unfairness towards the Entente	5	3.3%	3	1.9%
Ottoman unfairness towards neutral countries	0	0%	0	0%

Unfairness Entente towards neutral countries	0	0%	0	0%
Mistreatment Entente nationals by the Ottomans	0	0%	0	0%
Mistreatment citizens of neutral countries by the Ottomans	0	0%	0	0%
Exploitation of the Ottoman Empire by the Great Powers	0	0%	1	0.6%
Ottoman telegrams are lying	0	0%	3	1.9%
Entente telegrams are lying	0	0%	0	0%
<b>References to the fight for the hearts and minds of the people</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>10.8%</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>21%</b>
Pan-Islamism/Holy War	0	0%	0	0%
Pan-Turkism	0	0%	0	0%
Oppression Islam/Islamic peoples	0	0%	0	0%
Support foreign Muslims for the Ottomans	0	0%	0	0%
Loyalty Muslims under Entente rule	0	0%	0	0%
Support local Muslims for Ottoman rule	0	0%	0	0%
Support local non-Muslims for Ottoman rule	0	0%	0	0%
Disloyalty Ottoman Muslims	0	0%	0	0%
Arabian Revolt	3	2%	0	0%
Neutrality Muslims	1	0.7%	0	0%
Ottoman actions to acquire support Entente Muslims	0	0%	0	0%
Ottoman actions to acquire support neutral Muslims	0	0%	3	1.9%
Entente actions to acquire support Ottoman subjects	0	0%	0	0%
Yezidis helping Russians	0	0%	0	0%
Armenians helping Russians	1	0.7%	0	0%
Ottoman non-Muslim policies	1	0.7%	7	4.5%
Liberation of non-Turks from Ottoman rule	1	0.7%	3	1.9%
Attitude of the Ottoman non-Muslim population	1	0.7%	1	0.6%
Massacres of non-Muslims	0	0%	1	0.6%
Armenian massacres	4	2.6%	13	8.4%
Greek massacres	0	0%	0	0%
Catholic massacres	0	0%	0	0%
Jewish massacres	0	0%	0	0%
Other atrocities towards non-	3	2%	1	0.6%



Muslims				
Atrocities Armenians towards the Turks	0	0%	3	1.9%
Jewish colony in Palestine	1	0.7%	1	0.6%
<b>References to life in the Ottoman Empire</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4.1%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5.1%</b>
Attitude Ottoman population	4	2.7%	4	2.6%
Celebrations in Constantinople	1	0.7%	2	1.3%
Daily life continuing in the Ottoman Empire	0	0%	1	0.6%
Daily life disrupted	1	0.7%	1	0.6%
<b>References to Ottoman stereotypes</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.7%</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>6.9%</b>
Military toughness	0	0%	0	0%
Violent Ottomans	1	0.7%	1	0.6%
Barbaric Ottomans	0	0%	1	0.6%
Oppressive Ottomans	0	0%	1	0.6%
Pillaging Ottomans	0	0%	2	1.3%
Stupid Ottomans	0	0%	1	0.6%
Unorganized Ottomans	0	0%	0	0%
Backwardness Ottomans	0	0%	2	1.3%
Behavior Ottoman soldiers in occupied territories	0	0%	2	1.3%
Nice Ottomans	0	0%	0	0%
Honesty Ottomans	0	0%	1	0.6%
Ottoman harem	0	0%	0	0%
'Lustful Turk' stereotype is not true	0	0%	0	0%
Arabian Nights	0	0%	0	0%
The Ottoman Empire does not belong in Europe	0	0%	0	0%
Turk as simple farmer	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Others</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1.2%</b>
Women's rights	0	0%	1	0.6%
Socialism in the Ottoman Empire	0	0%	1	0.6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>100%</b>

Observation schedule *Het Volk* 1918

Topic	Frequency topic	Frequency subtopic	Frequency reference 1	Frequency reference 2	Total	Percent
<b>References to Ottoman relations with the outside world</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>15.4%</b>
Relations with the Great			1		1	0.7%

Powers						
Relations with the Triple Entente	1	3	4		8	5.3%
Relations with the Central Powers	3	1		1	5	3.3%
Relations with Great-Britain					0	0%
Relations with France					0	0%
Relations with Russia	1		1		1	0.7%
Relations with Germany					0	0%
Relations with Austria-Hungary					0	0%
Relations with Italy					0	0%
Relations with the USA	1				1	0.7%
Relations with neighboring countries (Balkans)	1	2		1	4	2.7%
Relations with the Islamic world					0	0%
Alliances against the Ottoman Empire					0	0%
Eastern question					0	0%
Border adjustments	6	4	1	1	12	8%
Foreign designs on Constantinople					0	0%
Ottoman actions to disturb Balkan relations					0	0%
Capitulations/concessions					0	0%
Annexation Egypt					0	0%
Annexation Cyprus					0	0%
<b>References to the Ottoman alliance with Germany and Austria-Hungary</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>11.4%</b>
German-Ottoman alliance	1	3	2	1	7	4.7%
The Ottoman Empire as Germany's puppet	1		1		2	1.3%
German influence on the Ottoman army and navy		1			1	0.7%
German military and financial support					0	0%
Ottoman support for Germany and Austria					0	0%
German responsibility for Ottoman crimes		1	2		3	2%
The Ottoman Empire is only fighting for the benefit of Germany and				1	1	0.7%

Austria-Hungary						
Connection Germany-Ottoman Empire (transport)					0	0%
Problems between the Ottoman Empire and Germany	2				2	1.3%
Pro-German group in the Ottoman Empire is a minority					0	0%
Attempted murder on German general					0	0%
Decorations for German officers	1				1	0.7%
<b>References to the Ottoman past</b>					<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>
Rule Abdulhamid II					0	0%
Bulgarian revolt					0	0%
Russo-Turkish war 1877-1878					0	0%
Greek-Turkish war 1897					0	0%
Young Turk revolution					0	0%
Balkan wars					0	0%
<b>References to the Ottoman government</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2.1%</b>
Ottoman neutrality					0	0%
Censorship					0	0%
Influence Young Turks		1			1	0.7%
Failure of the Young Turk reforms					0	0%
Dissatisfaction with Young Turks					0	0%
Disapproval government					0	0%
Plans to overthrow the government					0	0%
Formation new government	1				1	0.7%
Problems within the Ottoman government					0	0%
Rumors about the government leaving Constantinople					0	0%
Rumors about the sultan leaving Constantinople	1				1	0.7%
Death Ottoman heir to the throne					0	0%
New sultan					0	0%
Lack of communication between the Ottoman					0	0%

government and its officials						
<b>References to the Ottoman armed forces</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5.3%</b>
Ottoman army			2		2	1.3%
Military service					0	0%
Ottoman mobilization for war					0	0%
Ottoman army well prepared					0	0%
Ottoman army ill prepared					0	0%
Lack of military equipment					0	0%
The Ottoman Empire has abundant military equipment					0	0%
Good leadership Ottoman army					0	0%
Change in command army					0	0%
Low morale Ottomans			1		1	0.7%
High morale Ottomans					0	0%
Soldiers disobeying orders					0	0%
Prisoners of war					0	0%
Execution Ottoman officers					0	0%
Glorious military past		1			1	0.7%
Ottoman fleet		1	1		2	1.3%
Goeben/Breslau	2				2	1.3%
<b>References to the Ottoman theaters of war and battles</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>39.9%</b>
Dardanelles war					0	0%
War on the Balkans					0	0%
War in Egypt					0	0%
War in Syria and Palestine		2			2	1.3%
War in Mesopotamia		1		1	2	1.3%
War in Persia					0	0%
War on the Arabian peninsula					0	0%
War in the Caucasus	4	1	1		6	4%
War on the Black Sea					0	0%
War in North Africa					0	0%
Central Powers' success against the Entente					0	0%
Entente success against					0	0%

the Central Powers						
A Central Powers-Entente clash without a winner					0	0%
Ottoman success against the Entente					0	0%
Entente success against the Ottomans					0	0%
An Ottoman-Entente clash without a winner					0	0%
Ottoman success against the British	4				4	2.7%
British success against the Ottomans	12	2			14	9.3%
An Ottoman-British clash without a winner	1				1	0.7%
Ottoman success against the French					0	0%
French success against the Ottomans	1				1	0.7%
An Ottoman-French clash without a winner					0	0%
Ottoman success against the Russians	1	1	1		3	2%
Russian success against the Ottomans					0	0%
An Ottoman-Russian clash without a winner					0	0%
Ottoman success against the British/French					0	0%
British/French success against the Ottomans					0	0%
An Ottoman - British/French clash without a winner					0	0%
Ottoman success against the Armenians/Georgians	2				2	1.3%
An Ottoman-Armenian/Georgian clash without a winner					0	0%
Ottoman success against the Italians					0	0%
Italian success against the Ottomans					0	0%
An Ottoman-Italian clash without a winner					0	0%
Peace with the Ottoman Empire	19	5	1		25	16.7%
<b>Judgments on the</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4.6%</b>

<b>behavior of the belligerent powers</b>						
Unfairness Entente towards the Ottoman Empire			1	1	2	1.3%
Ottoman unfairness towards the Entente	1	1	3		5	3.3%
Ottoman unfairness towards neutral countries					0	0%
Unfairness Entente towards neutral countries					0	0%
Mistreatment Entente nationals by the Ottomans					0	0%
Mistreatment citizens of neutral countries by the Ottomans					0	0%
Exploitation of the Ottoman Empire by the Great Powers					0	0%
Ottoman telegrams are lying					0	0%
Entente telegrams are lying					0	0%
<b>References to the fight for the hearts and minds of the people</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>10.8%</b>
Pan-Islamism/Holy War					0	0%
Pan-Turkism					0	0%
Oppression Islam/Islamic peoples					0	0%
Support foreign Muslims for the Ottomans					0	0%
Loyalty Islamic people under Entente rule					0	0%
Support local Muslims for Ottoman rule					0	0%
Support local non-Muslims for Ottoman rule					0	0%
Disloyalty Ottoman Muslims					0	0%
Arabian Revolt		3			3	2%
Neutrality Muslims	1				1	0.7%
Ottoman actions to acquire support Entente Muslims					0	0%
Ottoman actions to acquire support neutral					0	0%

Muslims						
Entente actions to acquire support Ottoman subjects					0	0%
Yezidis helping Russians					0	0%
Armenians helping Russians				1	1	0.7%
Ottoman policies towards minorities	1				1	0.7%
Liberation of non-Turks from Ottoman rule		1			1	0.7%
Attitude of the Ottoman non-Muslim population			1		1	0.7%
Massacres of non-Muslims					0	0%
Armenian massacres	2	2			4	2.6%
Greek massacres					0	0%
Catholic massacres					0	0%
Jewish massacres					0	0%
Other atrocities towards non-Muslims	1	2			3	2%
Atrocities Armenians towards the Turks					0	0%
Jewish colony in Palestine	1				1	0.7%
<b>References to life in the Ottoman Empire</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4.1%</b>
Attitude Ottoman population		3	1		4	2.7%
Celebrations in Constantinople		1			1	0.7%
Daily life continuing in the Ottoman Empire					0	0%
Daily life disrupted	1				1	0.7%
<b>References to Ottoman stereotypes</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.7%</b>
Military toughness					0	0%
Violent Ottomans			1		1	0.7%
Barbaric Ottomans					0	0%
Oppressive Ottomans					0	0%
Pillaging Ottomans					0	0%
Stupid Ottomans					0	0%
Unorganized Ottomans					0	0%
Backwardness Ottomans					0	0%
Behavior Ottoman soldiers in occupied territories					0	0%
Nice Ottomans					0	0%
Honesty Ottomans					0	0%
Ottoman harem					0	0%

'Lustful Turk' stereotype is not true					0	0%
Arabian Nights					0	0%
The Ottoman Empire does not belong in Europe					0	0%
Turk as simple farmer					0	0%
<b>Other</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>
Women's rights					0	0%
Socialism in the Ottoman Empire					0	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>100%</b>

Observation schedule *De Tribune* 1918

Topic	Frequency topic	Frequency subtopic	Frequency reference 1	Frequency reference 2	Total	Percent
<b>References to Ottoman relations with the outside world</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>14.7%</b>
Relations with the Great Powers	1				1	0.6%
Relations with the Triple Entente	4				4	2.6%
Relations with the Central Powers	3	2		1	6	3.9%
Relations with Great-Britain					0	0%
Relations with France					0	0%
Relations with Russia	1				1	0.6%
Relations with Germany					0	0%
Relations with Austria-Hungary					0	0%
Relations with Italy					0	0%
Relations with the USA					0	0%
Relations with neighboring countries (Balkans)					0	0%
Relations with the Islamic world					0	0%
Alliances against the Ottoman Empire					0	0%
Eastern question					0	0%
Border adjustments	5	3	1		9	5.8%
Foreign designs on Constantinople		1			1	0.6%
Ottoman actions to					0	0%



disturb Balkan relations						
Capitulations/concessions					0	0%
Annexation Egypt				1	1	0.6%
Annexation Cyprus					0	0%
<b>References to the Ottoman alliance with Germany and Austria-Hungary</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>12.8%</b>
German-Ottoman alliance		1		1	2	1.3%
The Ottoman Empire as Germany's puppet		1	1	2	4	2.6%
German influence on the Ottoman army and navy					0	0%
German military and financial support		1	4		5	3.2%
Ottoman support for Germany and Austria		1			1	0.6%
German responsibility for Ottoman crimes			1	1	2	1.3%
The Ottoman Empire is only fighting for the benefit of Germany and Austria-Hungary					0	0%
Connection Germany-Ottoman Empire (transport)			1		1	0.6%
Problems between the Ottoman Empire and Germany		2		1	3	1.9%
Pro-German group in the Ottoman Empire is a minority					0	0%
Attempted murder on German general					0	0%
Decorations for German officers	2				2	1.3%
<b>References to the Ottoman past</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1.2%</b>
Rule Abdulhamid II					0	0%
Bulgarian revolt					0	0%
Russo-Turkish war 1877-1878			1		1	0.6%
Greek-Turkish war 1897					0	0%
Young Turk revolution		1			1	0.6%
Balkan wars					0	0%
<b>References to the Ottoman government</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3.8%</b>
Ottoman neutrality					0	0%

Censorship					0	0%
Influence Young Turks		1	3		4	2.6%
Failure of the Young Turk reforms					0	0%
Dissatisfaction with Young Turks					0	0%
Disapproval government					0	0%
Plans to overthrow the government					0	0%
Formation new government	1				1	0.6%
Problems within the Ottoman government					0	0%
Rumors about the government leaving Constantinople					0	0%
Rumors about the sultan leaving Constantinople					0	0%
Death Ottoman heir to the throne					0	0%
New sultan	1				1	0.6%
Lack of communication between the Ottoman government and its officials					0	0%
<b>References to the Ottoman armed forces</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5%</b>
Ottoman army		2	1		3	1.9%
Military service					0	0%
Ottoman mobilization for war					0	0%
Ottoman army well prepared					0	0%
Ottoman army ill prepared					0	0%
Lack of military equipment					0	0%
The Ottoman Empire has abundant military equipment					0	0%
Good leadership Ottoman army					0	0%
Change in command army					0	0%
Low morale Ottomans					0	0%
High morale Ottomans					0	0%
Soldiers disobeying orders	1				1	0.6%
Prisoners of war					0	0%

Execution Ottoman officers	1				1	0.6%
Glorious military past	2		1		3	1.9%
Ottoman fleet					0	0%
Goeben/Breslau					0	0%
<b>References to the Ottoman theaters of war and battles</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>34%</b>
Dardanelles war			1		1	0.6%
War on the Balkans					0	0%
War in Egypt					0	0%
War in Syria and Palestine	1				1	0.6%
War in Mesopotamia		1	1		2	1.3%
War in Persia					0	0%
War on the Arabian peninsula					0	0%
War in the Caucasus	3	1	1		5	3.2%
War on the Black Sea					0	0%
War in North Africa					0	0%
Central Powers' success against the Entente					0	0%
Entente success against the Central Powers					0	0%
A Central Powers-Entente clash without a winner					0	0%
Ottoman success against the Entente					0	0%
Entente success against the Ottomans		1			1	0.6%
An Ottoman-Entente clash without a winner					0	0%
Ottoman success against the British	2	1			3	1.9%
British success against the Ottomans	9	1			10	6.5%
An Ottoman-British clash without a winner	2				2	1.3%
Ottoman success against the French					0	0%
French success against the Ottomans					0	0%
An Ottoman-French clash without a winner					0	0%
Ottoman success against the Russians		1			1	0.6%
Russian success against the Ottomans				1	1	0.6%

An Ottoman-Russian clash without a winner					0	0%
Ottoman success against the British/French					0	0%
British/French success against the Ottomans					0	0%
An Ottoman - British/French clash without a winner					0	0%
Ottoman success against the Armenians/Georgians	4	1			5	3.2%
An Ottoman-Armenian/Georgian clash without a winner	1	1			2	1.3%
Ottoman success against the Italians					0	0%
Italian success against the Ottomans					0	0%
An Ottoman-Italian clash without a winner					0	0%
Peace with the Ottoman Empire	11	8			19	12.3%
<b>Judgments on the behavior of the belligerent powers</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5%</b>
Unfairness Entente towards the Ottoman Empire	1				1	0.6%
Ottoman unfairness towards the Entente		1	2		3	1.9%
Ottoman unfairness towards neutral countries					0	0%
Unfairness Entente towards neutral countries					0	0%
Mistreatment Entente nationals by the Ottomans					0	0%
Mistreatment citizens of neutral countries by the Ottomans					0	0%
Exploitation of the Ottoman Empire by the Great Powers		1			1	0.6%
Ottoman telegrams are lying		1	1	1	3	1.9%
Entente telegrams are lying					0	0%
<b>References to the fight for the hearts and</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>21%</b>

<b>minds of the people</b>						
Pan-Islamism/Holy War					0	0%
Pan-Turkism					0	0%
Oppression Islam/Islamic peoples					0	0%
Support foreign Muslims for the Ottomans					0	0%
Loyalty Islamic people under Entente rule					0	0%
Support local Muslims for Ottoman rule					0	0%
Support local non-Muslims for Ottoman rule					0	0%
Disloyalty Ottoman Muslims					0	0%
Arabian Revolt					0	0%
Neutrality Muslims					0	0%
Ottoman actions to acquire support Entente Muslims					0	0%
Ottoman actions to acquire support neutral Muslims	1		1	1	3	1.9%
Entente actions to acquire support Ottoman subjects					0	0%
Yezidis helping Russians					0	0%
Armenians helping Russians					0	0%
Ottoman policies towards minorities	3	2		2	7	4.5%
Liberation of non-Turks from Ottoman rule	1	2			3	1.9%
Attitude of the Ottoman non-Muslim population		1			1	0.6%
Massacres of non-Muslims	1				1	0.6%
Armenian massacres	9	1	2	1	13	8.4%
Greek massacres					0	0%
Catholic massacres					0	0%
Jewish massacres					0	0%
Other atrocities towards non-Muslims				1	1	0.6%
Atrocities Armenians towards the Turks	1	1		1	3	1.9%
Jewish colony in Palestine		1			1	0.6%
<b>References to life in the Ottoman Empire</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5.1%</b>

Attitude Ottoman population	2	1	1		4	2.6%
Celebrations in Constantinople		1		1	2	1.3%
Daily life continuing in the Ottoman Empire		1			1	0.6%
Daily life disrupted			1		1	0.6%
<b>References to Ottoman stereotypes</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>6.9%</b>
Military toughness					0	0%
Violent Ottomans				1	1	0.6%
Barbaric Ottomans		1			1	0.6%
Oppressive Ottomans			1		1	0.6%
Pillaging Ottomans			1	1	2	1.3%
Stupid Ottomans			1		1	0.6%
Unorganized Ottomans					0	0%
Backwardness Ottomans		1	1		2	1.3%
Behavior Ottoman soldiers in occupied territories		2			2	1.3%
Nice Ottomans					0	0%
Honesty Ottomans	1				1	0.6%
Ottoman harem					0	0%
'Lustful Turk' stereotype is not true					0	0%
Arabian Nights					0	0%
The Ottoman Empire does not belong in Europe					0	0%
Turk as simple farmer					0	0%
<b>Other</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1.2%</b>
Women's rights	1				1	0.6%
Socialism in the Ottoman Empire	1				1	0.6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>100%</b>

#### Type of article

	<i>Het Volk</i>		<i>De Tribune</i>	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
News story	64	87.7%	61	79.2%
Editorial	0	0%	0	0%
Letter	1	1.7%	1	1.3%
Report	0	0%	2	2.6%
Feature	3	4.1%	7	9.1%
Opinion piece	5	6.8%	6	7.8%
Speech	0	0%	0	0%
Poetry	0	0%	0	0%

Leaflet	0	0%	0	0%
Other	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>100%</b>

Geography: the place of action

	<i>Het Volk</i>		<i>De Tribune</i>	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
The Ottoman Empire				
- The Ottoman Empire	15	22.4%	24	32.4%
- Constantinople	4	6%	7	9.5%
- Smyrna	0	0%	1	1.4%
- Dardanelles & Sea of Marmara	4	6%	0	0%
- Balkan front	1	1.5%	0	0%
- Egypt	0	0%	0	0%
- Syria & Palestine	13	19.4%	10	13.5%
- Mesopotamia	4	6%	7	9.5%
- Border with Iran	0	0%	0	0%
- Caucasus & Asia Minor	13	19.4%	17	22.1%
- Black Sea	1	1.5%	0	0%
- Russian front	0	0%	2	2.7%
- Arabian Peninsula	0	0%	0	0%
Triple Entente				
- United Kingdom	0	0%	1	1.4%
- France	0	0%	0	0%
- Russia	3	4.5%	2	2.7%
- USA	2	2.9%	0	0%
- Italy	0	0%	0	0%
- Romania	0	0%	0	0%
- Greece	1	1.5%	0	0%
- Belgium	0	0%	0	0%
- Serbia	0	0%	0	0%
Central Powers				
- Germany	0	0%	0	0%
- Austria-Hungary	1	1.5%	1	1.4%
- Bulgaria	1	1.5%	1	1.4%
- Albania	0	0%	0	0%
Neutral countries				
- The Netherlands	0	0%	0	0%
- Switzerland	3	4.5%	1	1.4%
- Sweden	0	0%	0	0%
- Vatican	0	0%	0	0%
- Persia	0	0%	0	0%
- Afghanistan	0	0%	0	0%
Colonies				
- Malta	0	0%	0	0%
- India	0	0%	0	0%

- Sudan	0	0%	0	0%
- Dutch Indies	1	1.5%	0	0%
- North Africa	0	0%	0	0%
Others				
- Mediterranean	0	0%	0	0%
- Atlantic Ocean	0	0%	0	0%
- Balkans	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>100%</b>

Geography: the origin of the news

	<i>Het Volk</i>		<i>De Tribune</i>	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
The Ottoman Empire	10	16.7%	8	17%
Triple Entente				
- United Kingdom	25	41.7%	22	46.8%
- France	1	1.7%	1	2.1%
- Russia	3	5%	6	12.8%
- USA	1	1.7%	0	0%
- Italy	0	0%	1	2.1%
- Romania	0	0%	0	0%
- Greece	1	1.7%	0	0%
- Belgium	0	0%	0	0%
- Serbia	0	0%	0	0%
Central Powers				
- Germany	9	15%	4	8.5%
- Austria-Hungary	3	5%	1	2.1%
- Bulgaria	1	1.7%	1	2.1%
Neutral countries				
- The Netherlands	5	8.3%	2	4.3%
- Denmark	0	0%	0	0%
- Sweden	0	0%	0	0%
- Switzerland	0	0%	1	2.1%
- Vatican	0	0%	0	0%
- Persia	0	0%	0	0%
- Afghanistan	0	0%	0	0%
Colonies				
- Malta	0	0%	0	0%
- India	0	0%	0	0%
- Sudan	0	0%	0	0%
- Dutch Indies	1	1.7%	0	0%
- North Africa	0	0%	0	0%
- Egypt	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>100%</b>



## Actors

	<i>Het Volk</i>		<i>De Tribune</i>	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
The Ottoman Empire				
- Ottoman Empire (state)	4	5.1%	2	2.5%
- Ottoman government	14	17.7%	18	22.8%
- Ottoman sultan	1	1.3%	2	2.5%
- Ottoman heir to the throne	0	0%	0	0%
- Ottoman grand vizier	1	1.3%	1	1.3%
- Ottoman governors	1	1.3%	1	1.3%
- Ottoman representatives abroad	2	2.5%	1	1.3%
- Ottoman delegation The Hague	0	0%	0	0%
- Opponents of the Ottoman government abroad	0	0%	0	0%
- Ottoman military authorities	0	0%	0	0%
- Ottoman army	8	10.1%	8	10.1%
- Ottoman fleet	3	3.8%	0	0%
- Ottoman gangs	0	0%	0	0%
- Ottoman irregular troops	0	0%	1	1.3%
- Ottoman prisoners of war	0	0%	0	0%
- Ottoman airforce	0	0%	0	0%
- Ottoman press	2	2.5%	2	2.5%
- Ottoman people	2	2.5%	4	5.1%
- Patriarch of Constantinople	0	0%	0	0%
- Non-Ottoman minorities	0	0%	1	1.3%
- Ottoman Christians	0	0%	1	1.3%
- Ottoman Greeks	0	0%	0	0%
- Ottoman Armenians	1	1.3%	7	8.9%
- Ottoman Jews	1	1.3%	0	0%
- Ottoman socialists	0	0%	1	1.3%
- Ottoman factories	0	0%	0	0%
- Ottoman universities	0	0%	1	1.3%
Great Powers	0	0%	1	1.3%
Triple Entente				
- Entente Powers	2	2.5%	3	3.8%
- Entente representatives in the Ottoman Empire	0	0%	0	0%
- Entente representatives abroad	0	0%	0	0%
- Entente armies	0	0%	0	0%
- Entente fleet	0	0%	0	0%
- Entente airforce	0	0%	0	0%
- UK/French armies	0	0%	0	0%
- UK/French fleet	0	0%	0	0%
- Entente colonies	0	0%	0	0%
Central Powers				
- Central Powers	2	2.5%	3	3.8%
- Central Powers armies	0	0%	0	0%
- German/Austrian military	0	0%	1	1.3%

United Kingdom				
- United Kingdom (state)	0	0%	0	0%
- British government	1	1.3%	0	0%
- British ministers	0	0%	0	0%
- British rulers Egypt	0	0%	0	0%
- British army	16	20.3%	15	19%
- British fleet	2	2.5%	0	0%
- British airforce	0	0%	0	0%
France				
- France (state)	0	0%	0	0%
- French government	0	0%	0	0%
- French representatives in The Hague	0	0%	0	0%
- French army	1	1.3%	0	0%
- French fleet	0	0%	0	0%
Russia				
- Russia (state)	1	1.3%	0	0%
- Russian government	3	3.8%	0	0%
- Russian representatives in the Ottoman Empire	0	0%	0	0%
- Russian army	1	1.3%	0	0%
- Russian fleet	0	0%	0	0%
- Russian Muslims	0	0%	0	0%
- Russian socialists	0	0%	0	0%
- Armenians/Georgians	3	3.8%	3	3.8%
- German companies in Russia	0	0%	0	0%
USA				
- USA (state)	0	0%	0	0%
- American government	0	0%	0	0%
- American representative in the Ottoman Empire	0	0%	0	0%
- American press	0	0%	0	0%
Italy				
- Italy (state)	0	0%	0	0%
- Italian government	0	0%	0	0%
- Italian representatives in the Ottoman Empire	0	0%	0	0%
- Italian army	0	0%	0	0%
- Italian fleet	0	0%	0	0%
Romania				
- Romania (state)	0	0%	0	0%
- Romanian government	0	0%	0	0%
- Romanian representative in the Ottoman Empire	0	0%	0	0%
- Romanian army	0	0%	0	0%
- Romanian customs	0	0%	0	0%
Greece				
- Greece (state)	0	0%	0	0%
- Greek government	0	0%	0	0%

- Greek representative in the Ottoman Empire	0	0%	0	0%
- Greek socialists	1	1.3%	0	0%
- Greek army	0	0%	0	0%
Serbia				
- Serbian government	0	0%	0	0%
Germany				
- Germany (state)	0	0%	0	0%
- German fleet	0	0%	0	0%
- German government	1	1.3%	1	1.3%
- German people	1	1.3%	0	0%
- German social-democrats	0	0%	0	0%
- Germans in the Ottoman Empire	0	0%	0	0%
- German companies	0	0%	0	0%
Austria-Hungary				
- Austria-Hungary (state)	0	0%	0	0%
- Austro-Hungarian government	0	0%	0	0%
- Austro-Hungarian press	1	1.3%	0	0%
The Netherlands				
- The Netherlands (state)	0	0%	0	0%
- Ottoman representation The Hague	0	0%	0	0%
Sweden				
- Swedish socialists	0	0%	0	0%
Vatican				
- The Pope	0	0%	0	0%
Balkans				
- Balkan states	0	0%	0	0%
- Balkan rebels	0	0%	0	0%
Bulgaria				
- Bulgaria (state)	0	0%	0	0%
- Bulgarian government	1	1.3%	0	0%
- Bulgarian army	0	0%	0	0%
- Bulgarian press	0	0%	0	0%
Persia				
- Persia (state)	0	0%	0	0%
- Persian government	0	0%	0	0%
Afghanistan				
- Afghanistan (state)	0	0%	0	0%
- Afghani government	0	0%	0	0%
- Afghani emir	0	0%	0	0%
India				
- Indian Muslims	0	0%	0	0%
Sudan				
- Sudanese Muslims	0	0%	0	0%
Dutch Indies				
- Muslims Dutch Indies	1	1.3%	0	0%
- Press Dutch Indies	0	0%	0	0%
North Africa				

- Toearegs	0	0%	0	0%
- Senussi	0	0%	0	0%
Egypt				
- Egyptian sultan	0	0%	0	0%
- Bedouins	0	0%	0	0%
Arabian Peninsula				
- Bedouins	0	0%	0	0%
Jews	1	1.3%	1	1.3%
International socialist organizations	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>100%</b>