

# **Framing Srebrenica: A Comparative Analysis of Dutch, Turkish, and Russian Media Narratives**

## ***Framing Srebrenica: Dutch, Turkish, and Russian Media***

**Jip van SANTEN<sup>1</sup>**

**Abstract.** This study explores how Dutch, Turkish, and Russian media frame the Srebrenica genocide and how these narratives reflect each country's cultural, historical, and political contexts. Drawing on framing theory and qualitative content analysis, the research investigates articles published between 2015 and 2020 in *Algemeen Dagblad* (Netherlands), *Hürriyet* (Turkey), and *Izvestia* (Russia). The objective is threefold: to identify framing techniques, examine the role of national identity and collective memory, and analyze the influence of political context on media narratives. Articles were selected during key moments - the 20th and 25th anniversaries of the genocide and the 2017 ICTY verdict - and coded using Semetko and Valkenburg's framing categories. The findings reveal distinct patterns: Dutch media emphasizes national accountability, Turkish media highlights Muslim solidarity and calls for justice, while Russian media often downplays or reframes the genocide within geopolitical narratives. These

---

<sup>1</sup> BA, Department of Media, Design, and IT, Artesis Plantijn University College, Belgium, [jipvansanten@hotmail.com](mailto:jipvansanten@hotmail.com)



differences underscore how national interests and political alliances shape journalistic framing, ultimately influencing public memory and perceptions of historical responsibility.

**Keywords:** comparative analysis; media framing; narratives; genocide coverage; national identity; political context

## Introduction

The Bosnian War (1992–1995) was a conflict that emerged from the breakup of Yugoslavia, involving Bosnia and Herzegovina's desire for independence. Ethnic tensions among Bosniaks (Muslims), Croats (Catholics), and Serbs (Orthodox Christians) escalated into violent clashes. The war was marked by ethnic cleansing and genocide, particularly against Bosniaks (*Bosnia and Herzegovina, 1992–1995 - United States Holocaust Memorial Museum*, n.d.). As part of the conflict, in 1993, the United Nations declared Srebrenica a "safe area" to protect civilians. However, in July 1995, Bosnian-Serb forces overran the town, and over 8.000 Bosniak boys and men were massacred within a week (United Nations, n.d.).

The media plays a crucial role in shaping public understanding of historical events. Media framing is a method used by news organizations to structure and present a story in a way that influences audience perception and interpretation of key issues (Media-Studies.com, 2023). This framing shapes narratives by highlighting particular values, emotions, or perspectives, often reflecting underlying cultural, historical, and political influences.

For this study, framing theory will be used to examine how Dutch, Turkish, and Russian newspapers reported on the Srebrenica genocide's aftermath from 2015 to 2017 and in 2020. This paper analyzes the coverage in the most popular newspapers from these countries: *Algemeen Dagblad* from the Netherlands, *Hürriyet* from Turkey, and *Izvestia* from Russia. Two articles per year will be selected from each publication, resulting in a total of 18 articles for analysis.

In exploring the newspapers, the focus will be on investigating the underlying cultural, historical, and political factors that influence that shape these narratives. This is because the media coverage of Srebrenica varied significantly across different countries. Dutch journalist Bart Rijs, who reported from Bosnia-Herzegovina during the war, explains that he heavily relied on news reports from other cities for his coverage (Diskurs, 2021).

Russia, Turkey, and the Netherlands were chosen for analysis due to their distinct historical perspectives and political contexts surrounding the Srebrenica genocide, which significantly shape their media narratives. Russia was selected for analysis due to its political and historical ties in the Balkans, particularly its alliance with Serbia, which has influenced its perspective on and denial of the Srebrenica genocide (BBC News, 2015). Turkey emphasizes the genocide as a key issue for the Muslim community, focusing on solidarity and justice for victims, which reflects its historical connections to Bosnia. The Netherlands critically examines the role of the Dutch UN Battalion, Dutchbat, whose failure to protect civilians in the UN-designated "safe area" remains a pivotal part of the country's collective memory and national discourse, raising questions of accountability and consequences (Meester et al., 2020, p. 1). Together, these countries offer diverse narratives that enrich the understanding of media coverage surrounding the Srebrenica tragedy.

The decision to study the Srebrenica genocide is based on its significant impact on international relations and the need to understand how different media narratives shape public perceptions of historical events. By examining how Dutch, Turkish, and Russian newspapers report on the genocide, this research aims to reveal how each country's media influences the understanding of collective memory and national identity.

This study emphasizes the importance of accurate reporting in raising awareness of historical injustices and encourages a deeper understanding of their effects on today's society. By exploring these narratives, the research highlights the role of media in shaping discussions about important historical events like Srebrenica.

## Literature review

In an age where media plays a crucial role in informing public discourse, the framing of conflicts can significantly influence societal understanding and memory of historical events. As de Vreese (2005, p. 51) notes, “framing involves a communication source presenting and defining an issue,” making it essential for examining how conflicts are reported and understood. This concept is particularly relevant when analyzing media narratives of ethnic conflicts and genocides, which are often shaped by opposing frames, such as ‘ethnic war’ versus ‘genocide’ (Hammond, 2018).

De Vreese (2005) emphasizes the dynamic nature of framing, which functions through two processes: frame-building, referring to how frames are shaped within newsrooms, and frame-setting, which involves the interaction between these frames and audience perceptions. Entman’s (1993) model emphasizes how frames “define problems, diagnose causes, make moral judgments, and suggest remedies,” underscoring their central role in shaping narratives and influencing responses to conflict (de Vreese, 2005, p. 53).

While framing theory outlines how media constructs narratives, the processes of frame-building and setting are deeply influenced by the journalistic norms and constraints within conflict reporting. Aldridge and Evetts (2003) and Santos (2009) explain that traditional journalism expects reporters to show both sides of a story and keep their emotions separate from the events they cover. However, war journalists face unique challenges, including restricted access to conflict zones and the emotional toll of covering violence. For example, limited media presence during the Rwandan genocide meant fewer Western journalists could report on the atrocities, highlighting how geography and international interest shape coverage (Knight, 2023). In contrast, the Bosnian War saw more accessible media coverage due to its European location, although journalists were barred from areas like Srebrenica following its fall, leaving significant gaps in reporting.

The framing of the Bosnian War offers a clear example of how media narratives evolve. Early Western coverage often framed the conflict as an ‘ethnic war,’ portraying it as a result of deep-rooted hatreds and downplaying the role of targeted aggression. As Hammond (2018) explains, this framing

suggested the conflict was intractable, calling for minimal intervention. However, journalists like Allan Little (2001) reframed the violence, emphasizing its genocidal aspects, particularly the targeted aggression by Serbian forces against Bosnian Muslims (Hammond, 2018, p. 3). Hammond (2018) argues that this shift in framing, reinforced by media outlets like *The Guardian*, *The Independent*, and *The Times*, played a crucial role in prompting greater international intervention and legal accountability through the ICTY.

Frames serve broader functions within journalism, shaping how events are reported and understood. Semetko and Valkenburg (2000) identify generic frames such as conflict, human interest, attribution of responsibility, morality, and economic consequences (de Vreese, 2005, p. 56). Among these, responsibility and morality are particularly relevant for analyzing portrayals of the Srebrenica genocide, where media narratives often center on accountability and ethical judgment. Hammond's (2018) analysis of Western coverage during the Bosnian War underscores the profound impact of the 'genocide' frame, which carried significant moral and legal weight, influencing political responses and calls for justice.

By using framing theory, this study will analyze how Dutch, Turkish, and Russian newspapers constructed narratives surrounding the Srebrenica genocide. The framework outlined by de Vreese (2005) provides a lens for understanding how frames, such as attribution of responsibility and morality, might differ between these countries based on their unique historical, political, and cultural contexts. Comparing the framing across media outlets in these nations will uncover how the genocide is portrayed in ways that reflect national interests, geopolitical alliances, and broader societal narratives.

## Research Design

This chapter presents the objectives and research questions of the study, which focuses on how Dutch, Turkish, and Russian newspapers frame the Srebrenica genocide. The study investigates how each country's media reflects and amplify specific narratives about the genocide, examining the impact of cultural, historical, and political factors on media coverage.

The main aim is to explore how these newspapers have framed the aftermath of the Srebrenica genocide from 2015 onwards focusing on the cultural, historical, and political narratives present in media reports. By analyzing the period after 2015, the research explores how national identity and collective memory are reflected in media narratives, uncovering the ways historical events are presented and interpreted differently in each country's media landscape. The study aims to provide insights into how these narratives shape public understanding and contribute to interpretations of responsibility and accountability regarding the Srebrenica genocide.

## **Objectives and Research Questions**

### ***Objective 1: identifying framing techniques***

Previous research on media framing suggests that the way events are reported can shape public understanding by emphasizing specific aspects while downplaying others (Chong & Druckman, 2007). This objective aims to identify and compare the framing techniques reflected in Dutch, Turkish, and Russian newspapers' coverage of the Srebrenica genocide. Drawing on Kellner's (1995) framing theory, the study will examine how narratives within the media content shape discourse around the event. Specifically, it will analyze the use of language, tone, and the assignment of blame, investigating how these elements manifest framing techniques in the news coverage.

Additionally, the concept of "conflict framing" is crucial, as it reveals how journalists' choices reflect national ideologies and historical context (Hammond, 2018). Framing, however, is not always a deliberate process. As de Vreese (2005, p. 52) explains,

*Frame-building* refers to the factors that influence the structural qualities of news frames. Factors internal to journalism determine how journalists and news organizations frame issues (Shoemaker & Reese, 1996). The frame-building process takes place in a continuous interaction between journalists and elites (Gans, 1979; Tuchman, 1978) and social movements (e.g., Cooper, 2002; Snow & Benford, 1992). The outcomes of the frame-building process are the frames manifest in the text.

This emphasizes that frames can emerge naturally due to journalistic norms and external influences.

By examining how newspapers from different countries frame the same historical event, the study will reveal how media can either promote or mitigate narratives of moral responsibility, blame, and victimhood, thus influencing collective memory.

**Research Question (RQ1):**

How do Dutch, Turkish, and Russian newspapers frame the Srebrenica genocide?

***Objective 2: exploring the role of national identity in framing the Srebrenica genocide***

National identity plays a crucial role in shaping how countries remember historical events. As Keskin (2021) suggests, the media's coverage of Srebrenica is influenced by national memory, which often reflects a country's political priorities and cultural narratives. This objective aims to explore how national identity and collective memory shape media coverage of the Srebrenica genocide in Dutch, Turkish, and Russian newspapers. Dutch media, for example, initially focused on the safety of Dutch peacekeepers, reflecting a national identity that prioritized internal responsibility over addressing the broader tragedy (Keskin, 2021). On the other hand, Turkish media, with its cultural and religious ties to Bosniaks, framed the genocide as a humanitarian crisis impacting fellow Muslims. Russian media, influenced by political alliances with Serbia, often downplayed the genocide, reflecting national interests and political strategies (Keskin, 2021).

This objective will help reveal how national identity and collective memory shape the portrayal of the Srebrenica genocide in these countries and provide insights into how cultural and political factors influence media narratives.

**Research Question (RQ2):**

How do national identity and collective memory shape the news frames employed in Dutch, Turkish, and Russian coverage of the Srebrenica genocide?

***Objective 3: analyzing the influence of political context on media coverage***

Political context is another key factor that influences media framing. As Hume (1997) argued, 'journalism of attachment compromises objectivity by ignoring the historical and political contexts of violence,' which is particularly evident in the case of the Srebrenica genocide (Gilboa, 2006, p.598). The relationship between the media and political power can shape how historical events are remembered and reported. In the case of the Srebrenica genocide, political interests in each country have affected the narrative presented by the media. For example, Russia's political alliance with Serbia led to its media downplaying the genocide, and its vote against recognizing it as genocide at the UN in 2015 further reflects this stance (Keskin, 2021). Similarly, the Turkish media's portrayal of the genocide was influenced by the country's historical and religious ties to Bosniaks, while Dutch media coverage often focused on the responsibilities of Dutch peacekeepers, framing the event in the context of national guilt and moral responsibility.

By examining the political context in which media outlets operate, this objective will explore how the political priorities and alliances of each country shape media narratives and the collective memory of the Srebrenica genocide.

**Research Question (RQ3):**

How do political context and national identity shape the news frames used in Dutch, Turkish, and Russian newspaper coverage of the Srebrenica genocide?

***Data collection and Methodology***

This research examines how Dutch, Turkish, and Russian newspapers frame the Srebrenica genocide. The genocide, which led to the deaths of over 8,000 Bosniak men and boys in July 1995 (United Nations, n.d.), remains one of the darkest chapters of modern European history (*Borrell and Varhelyi: Srebrenica Genocide Is One of the Darkest Moments in Modern European History*. -



*Free Online Library*, n.d.). Despite its significance, the genocide is still omitted from some history curricula, particularly in Republika Srpska, where the political narrative denies its occurrence and textbooks avoid mentioning it (Synovitz & Obradovic, 2019). Efforts to integrate the genocide into broader educational systems have faced challenges, including resistance from educators and inadequate resources (DetektorBa, 2024). This gap in education underscores the need to analyze how the genocide is represented in public discourse, especially in the media, which plays a key role in shaping collective memory and national identity (*National Identity: Formation & Media Themes* / Vaia, n.d.).

This study aims to address these gaps by examining how Dutch, Turkish, and Russian newspapers frame the genocide. By focusing on these nations' most widely read newspapers, the research highlights the dominant narratives that inform public understanding of the Srebrenica genocide.

### ***Data collection***

The Netherlands has a unique and direct connection to the Srebrenica genocide. As the United Nations-designated "safe area" was under the protection of the Dutch UN Battalion, Dutchbat, its failure to prevent the massacre remains a critical part of the country's collective memory and national discourse (Meester et al., 2020, p. 1). This is reflected in the ongoing struggles of Dutch Bosnians, former Dutchbat soldiers, and political leaders to come to terms with the consequences of these events. Furthermore, the genocide's recognition by international courts underscores its historical significance, making the Dutch perspective crucial to understanding how national accountability is framed in public discourse (ibid., 2020, p. 2).

Turkey's inclusion in this study is due to its unique role as a historical ally and a contemporary advocate for justice for Bosniak victims of the Srebrenica genocide. President Recep Tayyip Erdoğan has publicly reiterated Turkey's unwavering support, stating, "We will always stand by our Bosnian brothers in their search for justice. The Srebrenica Genocide will never be forgotten," during memorial events marking the genocide's 25th anniversary

(*Turkey Stands by Bosnia in Fight for Justice for Srebrenica Genocide*, 2020). Additionally, Turkey's evolving foreign policy, marked by its mediation efforts in the Balkans and increased regional influence, further highlights its strategic and cultural ties to Bosnia. Turkish initiatives, such as conflict mediation and regional stabilization, have reflected its solidarity with the Bosniak Muslim community while showcasing its growing geopolitical clout (Hussein, 2022; Yaqeen Institute, 2024).

Russia's involvement in Srebrenica denial is rooted in its political alliance with Serbia, which has shaped its stance on the massacre. In 2015, Russia vetoed a United Nations Security Council resolution that would have labeled the Srebrenica massacre as genocide, citing political motivations and an anti-Serb bias in the wording of the resolution (BBC News, 2015). This action was part of a broader effort by Russian-backed Bosnian Serb leader Milorad Dodik to reject international recognition of the genocide and to strengthen ties between Serbia, Republika Srpska, and Russia. Media in both Serbia and Republika Srpska, influenced by this alliance, have propagated denial and revisionist narratives about the event, reflecting a rejection of Western values and a preference for Russian support in the region (Turčalo, 2024).

For this study, articles will be collected from two widely read online quality newspapers from each country: the Netherlands, Turkey, and Russia. "Widely read" is determined based on circulation and web traffic, while "quality newspaper" is defined as "a newspaper that deals seriously with issues and has a high standard of editing and comment" (Quality Newspaper Noun, n.d.).

In the Netherlands, the selected newspaper is *Algemeen Dagblad* (AD), with 347,000 (Dutch Newspapers – What Do the Dutch Read?, 2024). For Turkey, the chosen outlets are *Hürriyet*, with 212,000 readers (*Hürriyet*, n.d.). According to Reuters Institute et al. (2017), these are the most widely read printed and online newspapers in Turkey. In Russia, *Izvestia* (431,000) is selected based on their significant circulation and readership (Russia, n.d.).

Instead of collecting articles from every year, the focus will be on key years that correspond to significant events. These events are the ICTY verdicts (notably the 2017 conviction of Ratko Mladić) and the 20th and 25th anniversaries of the Srebrenica genocide (2015 and 2020).

In the final Trial Judgement of the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY), Trial Chamber I convicted Ratko Mladić, former Commander of the Main Staff of the Bosnian Serb Army (VRS) of genocide, crimes against humanity and violations of the laws or customs of war. (McCloskey et al., n.d.)

To ensure a manageable dataset while capturing key shifts in media framing, two articles per year from each quality newspaper will be selected. As noted by Fraser et al. (2021), focusing on specific timeframes allows researchers to narrow their analysis to significant moments, thus capturing essential changes without overwhelming the study with excessive data. This approach ensures the study concentrates on pivotal moments in the history of the Srebrenica genocide. The selected articles will be retrieved using keywords like "Srebrenica genocide," "Srebrenica massacre," and "Bosnian genocide." This approach will allow the study to focus on important shifts in media framing without the need to cover every single year.

*Table 1: Summary of Data Collection*

Country	Newspapers	Circulation	Key Years	Total Articles	Keywords for Search
Netherlands	Algemeen Dagblad (AD)	347.000	2015 (20th Anniversary), 2017 (ICTY Verdict), 2020 (25th Anniversary)	2 per year	"Srebrenica genocide", "Srebrenica massacre", "Bosnian genocide"
Turkey	Hürriyet	212.000	2015 (20th Anniversary), 2017 (ICTY Verdict), 2020 (25th Anniversary)	2 per year	"Srebrenica genocide", "Srebrenica massacre", "Bosnian genocide"
Russia	Izvestia	431.000	2015 (20th Anniversary), 2017 (ICTY Verdict), 2020 (25th Anniversary)	2 per year	"Srebrenica genocide", "Srebrenica massacre", "Bosnian genocide"

## **Analysis Method**

The analysis of the collected articles will employ qualitative content analysis, focusing specifically on the framing of the Srebrenica genocide in Dutch, Turkish, and Russian newspapers. This approach will allow for an in-depth understanding of how media outlets in these countries represent the genocide and its key events. The analysis will be guided by second-level agenda-setting theory (Melkote, 2009), which suggests that media not only influences the public on what to think about, but how to think about the issues presented. Additionally, the study will focus on framing strategies identified by Semetko and Valkenburg (2000), which help examine how media outlets construct the narrative around significant events like the Srebrenica genocide.

### ***Categorization and Coding***

The analysis will categorize the content into three types of sentences, following Melkote's framework. First, based on Hayakawa's (1972) classification, the sentences were categorized according to their type: report, inference, or judgment (Melkote, 2009, p. 552).

Reports are factual statements that can be verified or disproven. A sentence was coded as a report if, according to Hayakawa's definition, it could be confirmed or refuted. For example, "A chief United Nations weapons inspector demanded today that Iraq start destroying all its Al Samoud 2 missiles" is a report, as it presents a verifiable fact (ibid, 2009, p. 552).

Inferences, on the other hand, are statements that draw conclusions or interpretations from known facts. According to Hayakawa (1972), an inference is a statement about the unknown, made based on the known. An example would be: "Going to war without allied backing or United Nations sanction could isolate Mr. Blair at home," as it suggests a potential consequence derived from existing knowledge (Melkote, 2009, p. 552).

Judgments are statements that express approval or disapproval of actions or actors. In this study, sentences that contained strong adverbs, adjectives, or verbs, or those that clearly reflected the writer's feelings toward a

subject, were categorized as judgments. This type of sentence is often characterized by the emotional tone or evaluative language it contains. For example, "The UN's failure to intervene during the massacre was an utter betrayal of its mission and international obligations," reflects a strong disapproval and a subjective evaluation of the event.

As Melkote (2009) notes, examining sentence types offers "a unique way to examine news coverage by looking at the structure of the newspaper's language" (p. 551). Each article will also be assessed for tone, categorized as positive, negative, or neutral. A sentence was coded as favorable if it conveyed a positive meaning toward the attitude object (AO) or would likely cause the reader to form a positive opinion about it. Conversely, a sentence was coded as unfavorable if it conveyed a negative meaning toward the AO or would probably lead the reader to form a negative opinion. Neutral sentences, as expected, would neither elicit strong positive nor negative opinions.

Additionally, the analysis will focus on framing strategies identified by Semetko and Valkenburg (2000), such as attribution of responsibility, human interest, and morality, to identify how these frames shape the portrayal of the Srebrenica genocide (p. 100). The attribution of responsibility frame examines whether the story suggests that some level of government or specific individuals are responsible for the issue. Key questions here include whether the story implies a governmental responsibility for alleviating or solving the problem, or if it attributes blame to a group of individuals, such as the Serb forces or the UN, for causing the issue (*ibid.*, 2000, p. 100). It will also explore whether the story conveys a sense of urgency surrounding the problem.

The human interest frame focuses on providing a "human face" to the issue (Semetko & Valkenburg, 2000, p. 100). This frame will be explored by identifying whether the story uses personal vignettes or emotional language to generate feelings of outrage, empathy, sympathy, or compassion toward the victims of the genocide. It will also examine if visual elements are included to evoke similar emotional responses, and how the personal lives of the actors are featured within the narrative.

The morality frame interprets the events through a moral or ethical lens, often bringing up themes related to justice, morality, or religious tenets (Semetko & Valkenburg, 2000, p. 100). It will be assessed whether the story

includes moral messages, references to religious elements, or prescriptive advice about how people should behave in response to the events. This frame will help analyze the ethical dimension of media coverage and how it influences public perception of the Srebrenica genocide.

By analyzing these frames and their associated factors, the study will uncover patterns in how Dutch, Turkish, and Russian newspapers depict the Srebrenica genocide and its surrounding issues, highlighting the diverse ways in which the media frames responsibility, victimization, and morality.

### ***Tool for Analysis***

To collect the articles for this study, a manual selection approach was used instead of automated scraping tools like Octoparse. The selection focused on the most widely read and relevant articles from the years analyzed. The primary search term used was "*Srebrenica genocide*", and when necessary, additional related terms were employed to ensure a representative sample. This method ensured that the study was based on widely circulated and influential media sources.

### ***Comparative Analysis of Media Framing in *Algemeen Dagblad*, *Hürriyet*, and *Izvestia****

This section examines how *Algemeen Dagblad* (Netherlands), *Hürriyet* (Turkey), and *Izvestia* (Russia) frame the Srebrenica genocide using five framing categories—Attribution of Responsibility, Human Interest, Conflict, Morality, and Economic Consequences—as well as Hayakawa's classification of language. This combined approach allows for a more in-depth understanding of how facts, implications, and judgments are communicated within each article. The analysis highlights key differences in reporting based on national perspectives.

### ***Attribution of Responsibility***

*Algemeen Dagblad* emphasizes Dutch accountability, citing the UN peacekeepers' failure to protect Bosnian Muslims. It references court rulings that hold the Netherlands partially responsible for some deaths. Example:

*"The Dutch Supreme Court ruled that the Netherlands bears partial responsibility for the deaths of 300 men handed over to Bosnian Serb forces."* This factual statement represents a report as per Hayakawa's classification.

*Hürriyet* focuses on justice for Bosniaks but does not extensively discuss Dutch responsibility. Instead, it quotes UN officials stressing global accountability. Example: *"UN Secretary-General Antonio Guterres reiterated the importance of acknowledging the genocide to prevent future atrocities."* This is an inference, as it suggests a broader conclusion based on past events.

*Izvestia* downplays Serbian responsibility, instead framing the genocide as part of a geopolitical struggle, stating that *"Western narratives ignore crimes committed by Bosnian forces."* This reflects a judgment, as it expresses an evaluative stance on media portrayals.

### ***Human Interest***

*Algemeen Dagblad* includes survivor testimonies, such as a woman who lost her family: *"I never saw them again after the soldiers took them away."* This emotional account serves as a report, as it presents a firsthand statement without interpretation.

*Hürriyet* highlights Turkish solidarity, stating: *"The pain of Srebrenica is our pain. We will never forget our Bosnian brothers."* This judgment reflects an emotive and collective stance on the tragedy.

*Izvestia* provides limited victim narratives, focusing instead on Serbian grievances, mentioning *"Serbian civilians ignored by the West suffer from continued misrepresentation."* This inference shifts the framing away from Bosniak victims and toward an alternative political narrative.

### ***Conflict***

*Algemeen Dagblad* discusses Serbian genocide denial, quoting leaders calling it a *"myth perpetuated by the West."* This quote represents a report, as it directly presents a claim made by a public figure.

*Hürriyet* stresses European integration and historical recognition as vital for peace. Example: *"European leaders must ensure that past atrocities are recognized as part of the continent's history to prevent future violence."* This is an inference, as it draws a conclusion from historical events.

*Izvestia* claims the genocide narrative serves a political agenda against Serbia, arguing that "*labeling it genocide dismisses the war's complexity.*" This judgment conveys skepticism toward the established historical consensus.

### ***Morality***

*Algemeen Dagblad* and *Hürriyet* strongly condemn the genocide, with Dutch officials emphasizing that "*Srebrenica must never happen again.*" This statement serves as both a judgment (moral evaluation) and a report (direct quote from officials).

Turkish leaders call for "*ensuring accountability.*" This judgment aligns with Turkey's advocacy for justice.

*Izvestia*, however, questions whether the term "genocide" is politically motivated. Example: "*The events of Srebrenica remain a subject of historical debate.*" This is an inference, suggesting ambiguity about established facts.

### ***Economic Consequences***

Economic aspects are minimally discussed. *Hürriyet* briefly mentions Bosnia's post-war struggles, stating: "*Bosnia continues to face economic hardship as it rebuilds from the war.*" This is a report, as it presents a verifiable fact.

Meanwhile, *Algemeen Dagblad* and *Izvestia* focus primarily on political discourse, avoiding economic analysis altogether.

***Summary Table of Media Framing***

<b>Framing Category</b>	<b>Algemeen Dagblad</b>	<b>Hürriyet</b>	<b>Izvestia</b>
<b>Attribution of Responsibility</b>	Emphasizes Dutch accountability, UN failure ( <i>report</i> )	Highlights justice for Bosniaks, global accountability ( <i>inference</i> )	Downplays Serbian responsibility, geopolitical framing ( <i>judgment</i> )
<b>Human Interest</b>	Survivor testimonies, personal trauma ( <i>report</i> )	Turkish solidarity, shared pain ( <i>judgment</i> )	Limited victim narratives, Serbian grievances ( <i>inference</i> )



Framing Category	Algemeen Dagblad	Hürriyet	Izvestia
<b>Conflict</b>	Highlights genocide denial, historical tensions ( <i>report</i> )	Advocates European integration and recognition ( <i>inference</i> )	Frames genocide narrative as Western political agenda ( <i>judgment</i> )
<b>Morality</b>	Strong condemnation, justice emphasis ( <i>judgment, report</i> )	Ensuring accountability ( <i>judgment</i> )	Questions genocide term, political skepticism ( <i>inference</i> )
<b>Economic Consequences</b>	Minimal discussion, focus on political discourse	Brief mention of Bosnia's post-war struggles ( <i>report</i> )	No economic focus, political discussion instead

This analysis shows how different national perspectives shape media framing of the Srebrenica genocide. *Algemeen Dagblad* emphasizes Dutch accountability, *Hürriyet* highlights justice for Bosniaks, and *Izvestia* challenges the genocide classification by focusing on Serbian grievances. These framing differences reflect broader political and historical narratives, influencing public perception and collective memory. By integrating Hayakawa's classification of report, inference, and judgment, this analysis offers a clearer perspective on how language constructs historical narratives in the media.

## Conclusions

This study aimed to explore how Dutch, Turkish, and Russian media frame the Srebrenica genocide and what underlying factors shape these narratives. The results reveal that national political contexts, historical relationships, and international alignments significantly impact how media outlets construct their reports.

*Algemeen Dagblad* aligns with the Netherlands' introspective stance, acknowledging its role and emphasizing responsibility. *Hürriyet* frames the genocide as a historical injustice, reinforcing Turkey's diplomatic and

cultural solidarity with Bosnia. Meanwhile, *Izvestia* presents a revisionist perspective, portraying Serbia as a victim of Western political narratives.

These findings demonstrate the broader implications of media framing in shaping historical memory and public discourse. The differences in how each newspaper presents the events reflect not only political biases but also deeper ideological and cultural perspectives. Recognizing these framing strategies is essential in understanding how media shape historical consciousness and influence contemporary international relations.

Future research could expand this analysis by incorporating additional media sources, public reactions, or interviews with journalists to further examine the interplay between politics, media narratives, and historical truth.

## References

- BBC News. (2015, July 8). *Russia vetoes UN move to call Srebrenica "genocide."*  
<https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-33445772>
- Borrell and Varhelyi: *Srebrenica genocide is one of the darkest moments in modern European history.* - Free Online Library. (n.d.).  
<https://www.thefreelibrary.com/Borrell+and+Varhelyi%3a+Srebrenica+genocide+is+one+of+the+darkest...-a0800900706>
- Bosnia and Herzegovina, 1992–1995 - United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. (n.d.).  
<https://www.ushmm.org/genocide-prevention/countries/bosnia-herzegovina/1992-1995>
- Chong, D., & Druckman, J. N. (2007). Framing theory. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 10(1), 103–126.  
<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.polisci.10.072805.103054>
- Daalder, I. H. (1998, December 1). Decision to intervene: How the war in Bosnia ended. *Brookings*.  
<https://www.brookings.edu/articles/decision-to-intervene-how-the-war-in-bosnia-ended/>
- DetektorBa, N. S. (2024, September 28). *Teaching Srebrenica Genocide in Swiss and French schools: A mission to preserve memory* - N1. N1.  
<https://n1info.ba/english/news/teaching-srebrenica-genocide-in-swiss-and-french-schools-a-mission-to-preserve-memory/>

- Diskurs, B. (2021, January 23). *Dutch Media and the Srebrenica Genocide: Coverage or Cover&#x2d;up?* | *Balkan Diskurs*. Balkan Diskurs.  
<https://balkandiskurs.com/en/2018/07/11/dutch-media-srebrenica/>
- Dutch newspapers – what do the Dutch read?* (2024). Next Expat.  
<https://www.nextexpat.com/en/dutch-newspapers-what-do-the-dutch-read/>
- From Srebrenica to Gaza - How systematic dehumanization leads to genocide.* (2024, July 8). Yaqeen Institute for Islamic Research. <https://yaqeeninstitute.org/omar-suleiman/from-srebrenica-to-gaza-how-systematic-dehumanization-leads-to-genocide>
- Gilboa, E. (2006). Media and international conflict. In *SAGE Publications, Inc. eBooks* (pp. 595–626). <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412976176.n22>
- Hammond, P. (2018). When frames collide: ‘Ethnic war’ and ‘genocide.’ *Media War & Conflict*, 11(4), 434–445. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1750635218776994>
- Hürriyet*. (n.d.). eurotopics.net. <https://www.eurotopics.net/en/148569/huerriyet>
- Hussein, M. (2022, January 31). To prevent a second Bosnian genocide, Turkey may finally militarily intervene. *Middle East Monitor*.  
<https://www.middleeastmonitor.com/20220131-to-prevent-a-second-bosnian-genocide-turkey-may-finally-militarily-intervene/>
- Keskin, H. N. (2021). *The Srebrenica genocide and the denial narrative*. TRT WORLD RESEARCH CENTRE. [https://researchcentre.trtworld.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/Serebrenica\\_Genocide.pdf](https://researchcentre.trtworld.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/Serebrenica_Genocide.pdf)
- Knight, C. (2023). ‘They blame the messenger’: Re-examining the critique of journalists reporting on genocide in Rwanda and Srebrenica. *Journalism*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14648849231192790>
- McCloskey, P., Tieger, A., Groome, D., Lukić, B., Ivetić, D., & Stojanović, M. (n.d.). Case Information Sheet (IT-09-92) Ratko Mladić. In A. Orie, B. J. Moloto, & C. Flügge, *Not an Official Document - Document Prepared By The Communications Service of the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia*.  
[https://www.icty.org/x/cases/mladic/cis/en/cis\\_mladic\\_en.pdf](https://www.icty.org/x/cases/mladic/cis/en/cis_mladic_en.pdf)
- McCombs, M. (2005). A Look at Agenda-setting: past, present and future. *Journalism Studies*, 6(4), 543–557. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616700500250438>
- Media-Studies.com. (2023, April 12). *What is Media Framing?* Media Studies.  
<https://media-studies.com/media-framing-theory/>
- Meester, F., Simon, C., & Simon(e) van Saarloos. (2020). SREBRENICA IS DUTCH HISTORY. *Srebrenica Is Dutch History*.  
[https://srebrenicaisdutchhistory.com/content/uploads/2020/07/SrebrenicaIsDutchhistory\\_manifest.pdf](https://srebrenicaisdutchhistory.com/content/uploads/2020/07/SrebrenicaIsDutchhistory_manifest.pdf)

- Melkote, S. R. (2009). News framing during a time of impending war. *International Communication Gazette*, 71(7), 547–559.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1748048509341887>
- National Identity: Formation & Media Themes | Vaia. (n.d.). Vaia.  
<https://www.vaia.com/en-us/explanations/media-studies/media-and-cultural-studies/national-identity/>
- Quality newspaper noun. (n.d.). Oxford Learner's Dictionary.  
<https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/us/definition/english/quality-newspaper>
- Reuters Institute, Yanatma, S., & Finkel, A. (2017). Digital News Report 2017 Turkey Supplementary Report. In D. Levy & R. Fletcher (Eds.), *Reuters Institute Digital News Report*. <https://reutersinstitute.politics.ox.ac.uk/sites/default/files/2017-11/Turkey%20Digital%20News%20Report.pdf>
- Russia. (n.d.). Media Landscapes.  
<https://medialandscapes.org/country/russia/media/print>
- Semetko, H. A., & Valkenburg, P. M. V. (2000). Framing European politics: A Content Analysis of Press and Television News. *Journal of Communication*, 50(2), 93–109. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2000.tb02843.x>
- Synovitz, R., & Obradovic, A. (2019, August 31). On Srebrenica Massacre Road, school won't teach of tragedy. *RadioFreeEurope/RadioLiberty*.  
<https://www.rferl.org/a/on-srebrenica-massacre-road-school-won-t-teach-of-tragedy/30139243.html>
- Turčalo, S. (2024, June 3). *The Kremlin's Hand: How Russia Fuels Srebrenica Genocide Denial and Balkan Instability*. Just Security.  
<https://www.justsecurity.org/95283/the-kremlins-hand-how-russia-fuels-srebrenica-genocide-denial-and-balkan-instability/>
- Turkey stands by Bosnia in fight for justice for Srebrenica genocide. (2020, July 11). EchoTurkey. <https://www.echoturkey.com/diplomacy/turkey-stands-by-bosnia-in-fight-for-justice-for-srebrenica-genocide/>
- United Nations. (n.d.). *Remembering Genocide: The Mothers of Srebrenica* | United Nations.  
<https://www.un.org/en/video/remembering-genocide-mothers-srebrenica>
- Van Der Vegt, J. H., MPM & College voor Toetsen en Examens. (2023). GESCHIEDENIS VWO. In *SYLLABUS CENTRAAL EXAMEN 2025* (pp. 4–5). College voor Toetsen en Examens.  
<https://www.examenblad.nl/system/files/exam-document/2023-09/Syllabus%20geschiedenis%20vwo%202025%20versie%202.pdf>
- Vreese, C. H. (2005). News framing. *Information Design Journal*, 13(1), 51–62.  
<https://doi.org/10.1075/idjdd.13.1.06vre>