

Araştırma Makalesi / Research Article

Framing Perception: British Press Coverage of the 1896 Ottoman Bank Raid*

Levent Ürer**

Asuman Kutlu***

Abstract

This study aimed to explore how British newspapers framed the Ottoman Bank Raid in 1896 and how they might have functioned in the political and social reconstruction of Ottoman Empire within the international sphere. A qualitative inductive framing analysis was carried out. The results of textual analysis revealed two main frames: (i) human interest: internal unrest and fracture within the Ottoman Empire and (ii) emphasis on unification: isolation policy within international relations. While the former frame mainly included disinformation regarding the number of Armenians killed or wounded, combined with constant use of negative metaphors for Ottoman Empire and Muslim population, the latter frame focused on national, international support and forceful intervention of Europe rather than diplomatic pressure.

Keywords

The Ottoman Bank Raid, Armenian Attack, British Press, Framing, Perception, Public Opinion.

* Date of Arrival: 24 April 2021 – Date of Acceptance: 09 May 2022

You can refer to this article as follows:

Ürer, Levent, and Asuman Kutlu. "Framing Perception: British Press Coverage of the 1896 Ottoman Bank Raid." *bilig*, no. 105, 2023, pp. 79-97.

** Prof. Dr., Istanbul Aydın University, Department of Public Administration – İstanbul/Türkiye
ORCID:0000-0002-5609-1189
leventurer@aydin.edu.tr

*** Assoc. Prof. Dr., Istanbul Beykent University, Department of Media and Communication – İstanbul/Türkiye
ORCID:0000-0003-2770-3008 asumank@beykent.edu.tr

Introduction

Framing political issues in news has always been a focus of research indicating the significance of media in molding public opinion. Throughout the 19th century, the press was the principal medium of news distribution and had a major impact on shaping public perceptions. It is obviously necessary to take into account the limitation of the concept of “public” in order to interpret the influence of the press on public opinion in a study conducted on a particular period of history. Inadequacy of civilian information and documents to define the distinction between civil and public obliged us to explain the press influence on “public opinion” through a historical fact in the current study. This study taking agenda setting role of media one-step further focused on framing to shape the interpretation of reality in the political realm. Based on framing theory, this research aims to investigate how British newspapers turned the Ottoman Bank Raid¹ into an international conflict through utilizing different frames since media portrayal of the incidents matters to set the public perception towards the political and social reconstruction of Ottoman Empire within the international sphere. Based on theoretical framework and historical background, this research seeks to answer one main question: What are the dominant frames emerged in British media coverage of the Ottoman Bank Raid?

Earlier studies such as that of scholars (Lewy; Georgeon; Uras; Çilesiz; Yavuz) focused on the impacts of Ottoman Bank Raid through drawing attention to the issue from a political perspective or discussing the raid in the Ottoman Armenian Press (Eraslan) but this research would be the first to explore framing of the raid by British print media. In addition, while previous research was mostly descriptive, this study aimed to discuss the framing of the issue based on the reconstruction of the Ottoman Empire and draw attention to the role of media on policy-making.

Theoretical Framework

Framing theory introduced by Goffman within a sociological perspective is a multidisciplinary paradigm has received scholarly attention in media studies over the assumption that news media coverage influences public opinion as many other key theories put forward in mass communication. The basic premise laying behind the concept of framing is that selecting and highlighting

certain aspects of an issue while excluding others, framing can shape public's interpretation of reality including the issues in the political realm. Framing refers to "a central organizing idea for making sense of relevant events and what is at issue" (Gamson 157). News, delivering a reconstruction of public perception of reality, is a window (Tuchman 1) through which some forms of perceived reality is selected and highlighted (Entman, "Framing" 52) and those frames "makes the world beyond direct experience look natural" (Gitlin 6) promoting a specific interpretation of reality for the target audience (Entman, "Framing Bias" 164). Lippmann draws attention to the fact that those pictures inside the heads of people are their public opinion (18). As people form opinions towards different issues of which they lack direct experience, they have to depend on not only mediated information but also analysis provided by mass media to shape public thinking on a variety of subjects including politics (Iyengar and Kinder 2).

The concept of framing is an extension of agenda-setting addressing a correlation between media coverage of particular issues and public agenda. Mass media gatekeeping involving selection of information to display has a significant role in shaping political reality. The amount of coverage and placement of issues inform the public about the importance of news stories (McCombs and Shaw 176). On the other hand, framing, taking the media coverage a step further, is based on the assumption that media influence public perception through providing interpretation frames to consider the issues from a particular point of view. While agenda setting refers to the amount of issue coverage, framing focuses on the production of meanings influencing attitude and behaviour defining public opinion. The process of news production process starts with gatekeeping addressing a selective power and continues with agenda setting in which gatekeepers decide how much salience to give news story. The third step referring to agenda extension indicates the decision to present the story (Kuypers 183-184). The location, repetition and association of information with cultural symbols are some strategies employed to make information in a media text more salient² (Entman, "Framing" 53). For Scheufele and Tewksbury (12), framing is both macro level and micro level construct. As a macro construct, framing addresses presentation of information by media professionals in a way that reduces the complexity of issues for their audience. This should not be considered as a deception strategy but rather

a necessary tool for information processing. Framing also describes how audience form impressions or judgements through mediated information. However considering agenda setting and gatekeeping power of media to shape public opinion, it is necessary to understand how political actors use the this selective power of media to frame public perception through intentional constructions. Therefore, research on framing in communication and political science takes a social constructivism approach and focuses on how frames of political elites influence public opinion and it often takes a negative connotation as elites can manipulate public attitude for their own interests (Chong and Druckman 109, 120) as framing has an important role “in the exertion of political power” (Entman, “Framing” 55) and thus is to be discussed within a political context.

Methodology

We carried out a qualitative inductive framing analysis in which frames emerged during research process. In order to identify the frames, we employed constant comparative technique for qualitative analysis consisting of 4 steps; “(i) comparative assignment of incidents into categories, (ii) elaboration and refinement of categories, (iii) searching for relationships and themes among categories, (iv) simplifying and integrating data into a coherent theoretical structure” (Wimmer and Dominick 120). Researchers read the articles several times and took notes to identify frames based on the steps and in order to explore how the incidents framed, they used textual analysis which allowed them to deeply explore what the frames represented in the broader political context. They took notes about the use of language (including figurative language and the tone to reveal ideology) and identified the frames through interpreting body texts of the articles as well as headlines as a headline is considered “the most salient cue to activate certain semantically related concepts in readers’ minds” (Pan and Kosicki 59).

Sampling and Data Collection

The sample was assembled by using a newspaper archive database (British Newspaper Archive) to retrieve news articles between the dates of August 27 and Sept. 17, 1896 covering the Ottoman Bank Raid. By using key term “ottoman bank” in the initial advanced search, a total of 213 news items and 21 newspapers were retrieved in May, 2020. We only searched for articles

so excluded advertisements or family notices, which did not specifically refer to the event. Duplicate articles and one Welsh language newspaper were not included, either. We selected at least one article for each day from all newspapers. We also used another archive database (*The Times*) and retrieved news articles between the sampled days. The final sample included 22 newspapers.

Results

Human Interest: Internal unrest and fracture within the Ottoman Empire

The most common frame utilized by British newspapers was the human interest emphasizing “plight” of Armenians. This frame focused on the number of “victims” by the Armenian side and press censorship in the Ottoman Empire that would be used to justify disinformation flow by British newspapers. The main news sources consisted of Consular reports and reports by English residents and “well-informed” inhabitants. Early coverage of the raid on August 27th and 28th included brief description of the event and the attack on the bank premises. It was predominantly focused on provocation by the Armenian side and seriousness of event (“Rioting in Constantinople”, *The Times* 3; “Revolutionary Outbreak”, *South Wales Echo* 3). For instance, Times dated August 28, highlighted the disorder in the city caused by Armenians citing, “Owing to the insensate proceedings of some few Armenians, many hundreds of lives have been sacrificed in Constantinople” (“The Rioting in Constantinople” 3). However, some were accusing the Ottoman Government to lay all the burden of other recent raids on Armenian shoulders (“The Riot”, *The Aberdeen Journal* 4).

News stories of August 28 and following days were more descriptive giving the details of the entire incident. The articles covered the number of people killed or wounded people much on the following days and were dominated by violence-oriented reporting through sensationalizing the number of victims using a fear-driven language. The newspapers gave a wide coverage on Armenians’ entrance to the bank, the raid, the events occurred in different parts of Istanbul following the raid and the arrangement to convey Armenians holding the bank on board Sir Edgar Vincent’s Yacht to convey them from Turkish territory by The Powers. However, the tone of the coverage remarkably changed highlighting anarchy at Constantinople (“The

New Armenian”, *Graphic* 8; “The Riots”, *Liverpool Mercury* 5). For instance, some newspapers reported about a refuse cart of the Municipality piled with the corpses of Armenians porters and on the top, there was a dying man. Many killed had fractured skulls (“The Constantinople Horrors”, *Lloyd’s Weekly Newspaper* 1; “The Armenian Emeute”, *South Wales Daily News* 5).

While they were reporting a difficulty in calculating the number of victims as many people were reported to be disappeared and many bodies were thrown to the sea, they were reporting quite different and rounding numbers in various articles although Turkish authorities denied the figures declaring that they were grossly exaggerated (“The Reign of Terror”, *The Daily News* 5). For instance, newspapers of August 30th and 31st reported the number of victims to reach several thousands (“Massacre at Constantinople”, *Reynolds’s Newspaper* 8; “The Armenian Emeute”, *South Wales Daily News* 5). On the following day the number would reach more than ten thousand (“Constantinople”, *South Wales Daily News* 4). However, the newspapers dated Sept. 2 and 9 reported that 5000 people massacred last week (“Constantinople Riots”, *The Bristol Mercury* 5; *The Derby Mercury* 4). It is important to note that British newspapers did not agree with the data offered by Turkish authorities. One newspaper reported Sublime - Porte to admit the number reached 2000 (“Armenian Horrors”, *South Wales Daily News* 5). However, this number contradicted the official Ottoman reports on the victims. According to Turkish official circles, the number of Armenian victims is about eleven hundred and it is alleged that many Turks were killed and buried by mistake with the Armenians (“The Turkish Atrocities”, *The Belfast Newsletter* 5). There was also a difference between the numbers reported by Embassies and official reports but also amongst the Western Powers. They failed to agree on the number of Armenians who were killed. According to reports of Embassies, the number of the people who were killed is between 5000 and 6000. Russian officials estimated the number of deaths at 6000 and it was the lowest estimate (“Armenian Horrors”, *South Wales Daily News* 5; “Further Details”, *The Glasgow Herald* 8). In order to combat international disinformation flow, Turkish official circles had to deliver telegrams to Reuters accusing British press. The Daily News gave a wide coverage to the report headlined as: “The “blind rage” of the press’. The report was accusing some London writers of forgetting two facts which were the murders committed by the Armenians were crimes

which had indirect impacts on Europe especially England and origin of the organization as more than 438 killed or wounded Ottoman soldiers showed the strongest evidence of its deliberate implementation by the Armenians against the Imperial Government (“The Blind Rage”, *The Daily News* 5).

Press censorship in the Ottoman Empire was among the most highlighted issues by the British newspapers at the time (“The Reign of Terror”, *The Daily News* 5). Continuing the policy of expanding the sovereignty of the state in the 1890s, Abdul Hamid II strived to take the border and peripheral lands of the empire under tighter political control and this resulted in oppressive censorship policies during his reign (Georgeon 306). Poor information flow caused by censorship was mainly used to reinforce the plight occurring within the borders of the Empire. For instance on Sept. 1, a Wales-based newspaper, reported that until the letters arrived from English residents living in Istanbul, they would not learn the truth expected to give details of “murderous doings of the Sultan and his dehumanised butchers” as the telegrams that have been revised by Turkish censorship are untrustworthy. Turkish Government was accused of not telling the “fearful truth” (“Constantinople”, *South Wales Daily News* 4).

The tone of the much coverage towards Turks is negative and accusatory and that accusation was reinforced with figurative language through the main use of metaphors as semiotic tools to create a direct comparison instead of similes. Direct metaphors were deemed to play a significant role to shape public attitude and behaviour towards issues as they highlight certain aspects. Throughout the news texts, we observed that metaphors were mainly used for the Empire, the Sultan and Muslim population. For instance, Istanbul was mainly depicted as a city “converted into a slaughter house” in which “dehumanised butchers” (“Constantinople”, *South Wales Daily News* 4) who are “blood thirsty” Muslims (The Armenain Emeute”, *South Wales Daily News* 5) were killing innocent Armenians who are described as “only righteous men in this modern Gomorrah” (“The Reign”, *The Daily News* 5) and The Times would report on August 29, they were making the streets in the lower part of Galata wet with Armenian blood (“The Rioting in Constantinople”, *The Times* 3). The newspapers heavily used “sick man” metaphor to address the Empire which was ruled by “an inhuman bigot” (“Constantinople”, *South Wales Daily News* 5), “tiger in human form” (“The Constantinople Riot”, *The*

Bristol Mercury 5), and “bloodthirsty despot” (“Constantinople Riots: 5000 People Massacred”, *The Bristol Mercury* 5) whose “purpose is to exterminate the Armenians” (“The Riots in Constantinople”, *The Times* 3). When there was an account accusing Armenians, it was reported to be discredited. For instance, upon the notification of an occurrence in which soldiers killed two Armenians, Tevfik Pasha, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the period, replied that the Armenians had threatened the soldiers with their revolver. However, according to the newspaper it was not probable because in the other account the soldiers tried to arrest Armenians without any apparent motive and when they *probably* resisted the attempt, Armenians were killed (“The Armenain Emeute”, *South Wales Daily News* 5). The identification of what is being probable or not indicates opinionated reporting rather than factual one. The situation was highly polarized. The Turkish version put forth by the Ottoman government argued that their response was necessary to a terrorist attack carried out by Armenians. However, the British version maintained that the Armenians were the innocent victims by the Ottoman government.

Emphasis on Unification: Isolation Policy within International Relations

The other major frame focused on the unification of Great Powers in Europe against the Ottoman Empire. This policy would isolate the Empire in the world stage. For instance a newspaper of the Sept. 1st would mention growing hostility towards Turks in Germany (the country reported to be the last country to expect hostility (“Deeds of Fiendish Bestiality”, *Cardiff Times* and *South Wales Weekly News* 5)) due to Austrian and Russian negotiations (“Constantinople”, *South Wales Daily News* 4) and another newspaper referring dull anniversary of the Sultan Abdul Hamid II’s accession in Paris highlighted French changing attitude towards Ottoman Empire citing that “it is a sign of the times that Frenchmen of position are becoming ashamed to be seen at Turkish functions” (“The Reign”, *The Daily News* 5). For Abdul Hamid II, the most negative aspect of the crisis between 1894 and 1896, is his image. All his attempts to regain his and his regime’s reputation was being destroyed. The Western public, horrified by the scale of the incidents, turned all their anger towards the sultan (Georgeon 355).

The textual analysis of the reports indicated the growing anxiety and stress on the lack of European diplomatic pressure. Stressing the rivalry between the

powerful countries, most newspapers argued that the reign of Abdul Hamid II and all the “massacres” are the result of the jealousies of the Christian Powers (“The Massacres”, *The Daily News* 5; “London Correspondence”, *The Freeman’s Journal* 4; “Constantinople”, *South Wales Daily News* 4; *The Leeds Mercury* 4). Christianity, which was the largest religion in Europe was portrayed as a unifying power and it is thus could be regarded as the emergence of religion as an early media framing instrument. “Turkey is secure in the European jealousy and suspicion of England causing extraordinary indifference to the sufferings of the Armenians and this has disgraced Christian Europe.” (“Lost Armenia”, *The Freeman’s Journal* 4) The sympathy for the Armenians gained a religious dimension and European Christianity was united against the Sultan. British press was demanding action.

British newspapers, covering dozens of news on the raid until August 31st, started to include correspondents’ reports on conspiracy theories about the origin of the raid onwards. The newspapers included accounts to prove that The Turkish Government carried out an attack to justify a general massacre on Armenians and a newspaper on 3 September, reported that the accounts were based on “well-informed inhabitants” rather than official sources viewed as untrustworthy by British newspapers (“The Situation in Constantinople”, *The Belfast News-Letter* 7). The article in an Irish nationalist newspaper started asking whether the anarchy at Constantinople was the beginning of the end with the Turk in Europe or it was only another intentionally organized plot for the extermination of the Armenians and argued that it was a put up job. The article’s evidence was the escape of chief performers and the passivity of the troops. (“London Correspondence”, *The Freeman’s Journal* 4) *The Bristol Mercury* indicated Turks organizing the attack on the bank as it provided justification for onslaught on Armenians. Everybody knew the conditions one faced when one rebelled and Constantinople is about the last city where Christian people chose to rebel. However, those agents were allowed to leave the country (“The Presidential Campaign”, *The Bristol Mercury* 5). In similar vein, another newspaper article on September 3, based on the accounts supplied by eye-witnesses as they were more valuable “for the better guidance of public opinion of Europe with regard to the supreme question of what to do with the Turk..”, argued that the attack was planned and carried out not by Armenians but by the Turkish Government as an excuse for the massacre so the Government permitted the massacre of

five thousand innocent and defenceless people (“Occasional Notes”, *Pall Mall Gazette* 2). The attack on the bank was reported to be executed by the Palace mainly argued to be “well earned, just as any other Armenian attack on the Turkish authorities has been well earned” (“Constantinople Riots”, *The Bristol Mercury* 5).

British newspapers also gave much coverage on collective note sent to the Sublime-Porte by representatives of European Powers stressing the organised character of the mob and demanding an inquiry to punish the guilty parties. (“The Situation in Constantinople”, *The Times* 3; “Crisis”, *The Leeds Mercury* 5; “The Turkish Atrocities”, *The Belfast Newsletter* 5; “The Reign of Terror”, *The Daily News* 5; “The Note”, *Lloyd’s Weekly Newspaper* 1) In proof of their contention as to the organised attack on the Armenians, the Powers pointed to the fact that bands of fanatics appeared simultaneously at different parts of the city and that they were led by Softas, soldiers and police officers (“The Armenian Atrocities”, *The Freeman’s Journal* 5) One newspaper mocked with Sultan’s imaginary reply: “Of course he will swear upon the Koran and by the Prophet that he knew nothing of the outbreak, and could not prevent it.” (“Constantinople”, *South Wales Daily News* 4) Besides, the collective note and rejecting to illuminate the Embassies on the anniversary of Sultan’s accession would be regarded as little courage shown by Ambassadors (“At Home”, *The Hampshire Telegram* 4) but British newspapers mostly stressed going beyond diplomatic pressure.³ The Sultan has sent a reply the communication of the Powers and the Sultan gives a denial to their charges. His reply was regarded as a defiance of Europe. (“The Turkish Atrocities”, *The Belfast Newsletter* 5; “From Week”, *Newcastle Courant* 4). The Sultan was reported to show his contempt for the Powers, “the ruler of the rottenest Empire in the world flouts the mighty Powers of Europe treating their representatives as men whose word is not to be believed.” (*The Leeds Mercury* 5). The report also drew a comparison between the plan of Armenians and The Fenian Rising of 1867 against British Rule in Ireland. However, they were not assisted unlike Armenian Revolutionary Committee with the direct and indirect support of international politics. It was a protest against the European interference in Ottoman affairs. European powers used the Armenian problem as an ostensible reason in order to weaken the Empire. (Lewy 14) While this document was reported to be “a defiance and insult” and a statement to increase rage in Great

Britain against Türkiye, it was also observed that some newspapers included the coverage of European Press blaming England for the unrest to weaken the opponent of her interests in Asia and concluded that Lord Salisbury had to choose acting alone or not acting, although it was obvious that he would prefer the latter alternative (Lost Armenia, *The Freeman's Journal* 4). Furthermore, another newspaper blamed the Sultan and his ministers for attributing the whole unrest to English intrigue through circulating that the bombs were provided by England to the Armenians ("The Turkish Atrocities", *The Belfast Newsletter* 5).

The newspapers also gave much coverage on the fear of European residents, claims from British residents whose property had been destroyed during the incidents and assurance of their safety calling for the intervention of Europe ("The Armenain Emeute", *South Wales Daily News* 5). However, it should have been beyond diplomatic pressure. The need for immediate and direct force was mainly emphasized ("Armenian Horrors", *South Wales Daily News* 4) although the Powers remained passive. That media perspective from which the attitude of European Powers towards the issue was told could be regarded as an effort leading them to act together. The passive treatment of Eastern questions by European countries was indicated to be the reason of events ("The Constantinople Massacres", *The Ipswich Journal* 2). The only solution would be the deposition of Abdul Hamid II ("The Presidential Campaign", *The Bristol Mercury* 5) which was "under the serious consideration of the Powers" (*The Leeds Mercury* 4; "The Crisis", *The Derby Mercury* 3) and a newspaper on September 1 cited "the days of the Ottoman Empire are numbered" ("The Situation in Constantinople", *The Belfast News-Letter* 7). Any delay might prevent the European unity and could allow Abdul Hamid II to escape punishment ("Armenian Massacres", *South Wales Echo* 3). The European press everywhere blamed Abdul Hamid II for the massacres "an autocratic ruler known for giving minute attention to the internal affairs of his empire." (Lewy 30).

Employing religion in their arguments for both national and international support ("Constantinople Riots", *The Bristol Mercury* 5), a newspaper of Sept. 15 reported that British people were ready for a war.

“The Constantinople myth is dead and buried. The integrity of the Ottoman Empire-that miserable figment of cowardly imagination which has cost so much blood and treasure- no longer deceives anyone in this country at least. Let any civilised Power in Europe partition Turkey as it pleases...” (“Why Cry Peace”, *The Northern Echo* 3).

Another newspaper highlighted the need for national protests to direct public opinion citing, “Public opinion in this county is powerful enough to demand the sacrifice of Abdul Hamid II as the first step towards the reform- or the partition- of the Ottoman Empire.” (*The Glasgow Herald* 4).

Although Armenian efforts got international support as they achieved to create crisis and demonstrated to “arm chair politicians” and so Eastern question was reported to be a sign of hope, (“The Assassin Ruler”, *Reynolds’s Newspaper* 4) for some newspapers it causes almost total failure. A newspaper on August 27 reported that they seemed more in keeping with Bashi-Bazouks rather than Armenians. “If the rebels had gone for the Yıldız and given the Sultan an unceremonious fusillade, we might have called them patriots. But an attack on a bank-more particularly the Ottoman Bank- is nothing more or less than a brigandage.” (“Occasional Notes”, *Pall Mall Gazette* 2). Nine years later, The Dashnak-Armenian Revolutionary Federation would make a failed attempt⁴ to assassinate the Sultan (“The Attempt”, *Pall Mall Gazette* 2).

Conclusion

The construction of news frames and its impact on audience as way of forming public perception has been a focus of research in communication studies since media portrayal of issues influences the distribution of public opinion and policy decisions. This study is an attempt to assess the image of Ottoman Empire in international relations adopted a qualitative news frame analysis of the Ottoman Bank Raid in British newspapers under study. It is thus the research aimed to reveal how the facts were reported through different frames rather than finding out *truth*. The study has some limitations. We have not taken the impact of ideological stances of newspapers into account as this would extend the scope of the research. In addition, we used a database to reach news articles in a limited time span. The results led to several conclusions.

The textual analysis of news items revealed two main frames. Human interest frame focusing internal unrest and fracture within the Ottoman Empire included sub-frames of disinformation regarding the number of Armenians killed or wounded as well as press censorship in the Ottoman Empire. The second frame that emphasized unification of European Powers indicated an isolation policy within international relations. Furthermore, the incident involved many countries so the research provided an assessment of how media could construct a sphere for political debate. The raid would be discussed within ethnic and cultural diversities so the distinction between Muslim and non-Muslim populations would turn into a Turkish Armenian question establishing a direct interest with the Sultanate. Therefore, the attention of European Powers would be drawn on the Empire. The discussion by British newspapers on unification of the Powers through the use of religion for both national and international support, deposition of the Sultan as well as forceful intervention of Europe rather than diplomatic pressure demonstrated how media could set the public perception towards the political and social reconstruction of Ottoman Empire within the international sphere. Third, the tone of the coverage of newspapers towards Turks was highly accusatory. It was reinforced with constant use of negative metaphors to describe the Empire, the Sultan and Muslim population. Those were considered as important to shape perception towards Turks as they highlighted certain aspects. In conclusion, we have presented in this paper the dominant frames emerged in British media coverage of Ottoman Bank Raid and highlighted the contribution of media to construction of perception to support certain interpretations of the Empire.

Contribution Rate Statement

The authors' contribution rates in this study are equal.

Conflict of Interest Statement

There is no conflict of interest with any institution or person within the scope of this study. There is no conflict of interest between the authors.

Notes

- 1 Armenians living in the Ottoman Empire were encouraged by the successes of oppressed nationalities such as Greeks and Bulgarians and different secret Armenian societies began to organize armed struggle during the early 1880s (Lewy 16-17). In 1896, a group of Armenian Dashnak members, attacked and seized the Ottoman Bank in İstanbul, the capital of the Ottoman Empire and threatened to explode the bank if their demands for reforms in Armenia were not met (Lewy 28; Georgeon 346). Since they attempted to raise awareness by European powers whose intervention was considered necessary due to the weakness of the Armenia side, they attacked the Ottoman Bank which was in partnership with *French* and *British* financiers at the time (Georgeon 272). For further historical background information see Esat Uras, *Tarihçe Ermeniler ve Ermeni Meselesi*. 1976, Belge Yayınları; Guenter Lewy, *The Armenian Massacres in Ottoman Turkey: A Disputed Genocide*. 2005, The University of Utah Press; François Georgeon, *Sultan Abdülhamid*, Translated by: Ali Berktaş. 2006, Homer Kitabevi. For information on Armenian revolutionary committees see Chapter 1 in Edward J. Erickson, *Osmanlılar ve Ermeniler: Bir İsyanın ve Karşı Harekatın Tarihi*, Translated by: İbrahim Türkmen. 2015, Timaş Yayınları. Also for more information about the coverage of the raid in the foreign media see Fikrettin Yavuz, *Osmanlı Devleti Dış Politikasında Ermeni Sorunu: 1896 Osmanlı Bankası Baskını Örneği*. 2009, Sakarya U., PhD dissertation, pp: 207-259.
- 2 Entman defines salience as “making a piece of information more noticeable, meaningful, or memorable to audiences” (“Framing” 53).
- 3 For information on the transformation of public symbols related to sultanate, see Selim Deringil. *İktidarın Sembolleri ve İdeoloji II. Abdülhamit Dönemi* (1876-1909). (G.Ç. Güven, Trans.), Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2002, pp. 35-56.
- 4 The assassination attempts carried out by the Armenians against the Turkish statesmen were first started with the attempt against Sultan Abdul Hamid II. In 1905, a failed assassination attempt took place at Yıldız Mosque. They parked a carriage containing explosives to be exploded when Sultan Abdul Hamid II would leave the mosque. However, the Sultan arrived later than planned and the bomb exploded in the middle of the crowd, killing 26 people. The Great Powers also played a role in the assassination attempts against Abdul Hamid II as his reign prevented the collapse of the Ottoman Empire and the Great Powers from achieving their goals in the Ottoman geography. The murder of Abdul Hamid II would have allowed both the Armenians and the Powers to achieve their goals. (Karakoç 107-117)

References

- “Armenian Horrors.” *South Wales Daily News*, 4 Sept. 1896, p. 5.
- “Armenian Massacres: Wholesale Shipment of Armenians.” *South Wales Echo*, 10 Sept. 1896.
- “At Home and Abroad.” *The Hampshire Telegram*, 5 Sept., 1896, p. 4.
- Chong, Dennis, and Druckman, James N. “Framing Theory.” *Annual Review of Political Science*, vol. 10, 2007, pp. 103-126.
- “Constantinople and Its Horrors.” *South Wales Daily News*, 1 Sept. 1896, p. 4.
- “Constantinople Riots: 5000 People Massacred.” *The Bristol Mercury*, 2 Sept. 1896, p. 5.
- Çilesiz, Gürcan. *26 Ağustos 1896 Osmanlı Bankası ve Etkileri*. Master thesis. İstanbul University, 2014.
- “Crisis at Constantinople.” *The Leeds Mercury*. 7 Sept. 1896, p. 7.
- “Deeds of Fiendish Bestiality: Hundreds of Girls Outraged and Killed.” *Cardiff Times and South Wales Weekly News*, 5 Sept. 1896, p. 5.
- Deringil, Selim. *İktidarın Sembolleri ve İdeoloji II. Abdülhamit Dönemi (1876-1909)*. Trans. Gül Çağalı Güven, Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2002.
- Entman, Robert M. “Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm.” *Journal of Communication*, vol. 43, no: 4, 1993, pp. 51-58.
- Entman, Robert M. “Framing Bias: Media in the Distribution of Power.” *Journal of Communication*, vol. 57, no. 1, 2007, pp. 163-173.
- Eraslan, Hülya. *Osmanlı Bankası Baskını'nın (1896) Osmanlı Ermeni Basınında Ele Alınışı*. PhD dissertation. Gazi University, 2016.
- Erickson, Edward J. *Osmanlılar ve Ermeniler: Bir İsyanın ve Karşı Harekatın Tarihi*. Trans. İbrahim Türkmen, Timaş Yayınları, 2015.
- “From Week to Week.” *Newcastle Courant*. 12 Sept. 1896, p. 4.
- “Further Details of the Massacres: Bodies Thrown into the Sea.” *The Glasgow Herald*, 9 Sept., 1896, p. 8.
- Gamson, William. “A. News as Framing: Comments on Graber.” *American Behavioral Scientist*, 33(2), 1989, pp. 157-161.
- Georgeon, François. *Sultan Abdülhamid*. Translated by: Ali Berktray. Homer Kitabevi, 2006.
- Gitlin, Todd. *The whole world is watching*. University of California, 2003.
- Goffman, Erving. *Frame Analysis; An Essay on the Organization of Experience*. Harper & Row, 1974.
- Iyengar, Shanto, and Kinder, Donald. R. *News That Matter: Television and Public Opinion*. The University of Chicago Press, 2010.

- Karakoç, Ercan. *Geçmişten Günümüze Ermeni Komiteleri ve Terörü*. IQ Kültür Sanat Yayıncılık, 2009.
- Kuypers, Jim A. "Framing Analysis." *Rhetorical Criticism: Perspectives in Action*, edited by Jim A. Kuypers, Lexington Books, 2009, pp. 181-204.
- Lewy, Guenter. *The Armenian Massacres in Ottoman Turkey: A Disputed Genocide*. The University of Utah Press, 2005.
- Lippmann, Walter. *Public Opinion*. Free Press, 1997.
- "London Correspondence." *The Freeman's Journal*, 31 Aug. 1896, p. 4.
- "Lost Armenia." *The Freeman's Journal*, 17 Sept. 1896, p. 4.
- "Massacre at Constantinople: Hundreds Butchered: Shops Plundered." *Reynolds's Newspaper*, 30 Aug. 1896, p. 8.
- McCombs, Maxwell E. and Shaw, Donald L. "The Agenda Setting Function of Mass Media." *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, vol. 36, no. 2, 1972, pp. 176-187.
- "Occasional Notes." *Pall Mall Gazette*, 27 Aug. 1896, p. 2.
- "Occasional Notes." *Pall Mall Gazette*, 3 Sept. 1896, p. 2.
- Pan, Zhongdang, and Kosicki, Gerald M. "Framing Analysis: An Approach to News Discourse." *Political Communication*, vol. 10, no. 1, 1993, pp. 55-75.
- "Revolutionary Outbreak at Constantinople." *South Wales Echo*, 27 Aug. 1896, p. 3.
- "Rioting in Constantinople." *The Times*, 27 Aug. 1896, p. 3.
- "Riots in Constantinople." *Liverpool Mercury*, 28 Aug. 1896, p. 5.
- Scheufele, Dietram A. and Tewksbury, David. "Framing, Agenda Setting, and Priming: The Evolution of Three Media Effects Models." *Journal of Communication*, vol. 57, no. 1, 2007, pp. 9-20.
- "The Armenian Atrocities." *The Freeman's Journal*, 14 Sept. 1896, p. 5.
- "The Armenain Emeute: Bloodshed and Carnage." *South Wales Daily News*, 31 Aug. 1896, p. 5.
- "The Assassin Ruler." *Reynolds's Newspaper*, 6 Sept. 1896, p. 4.
- "The Attempt on The Sultan." *Pall Mall Gazette*, 22 July 1905, p. 2.
- "The Blind Rage of The Press." *The Daily News*, 17 Sept. 1896, p. 5.
- The British Newspaper Archive*, <https://www.britishnewspaperarchive.co.uk/>. (Accessed May 2020).
- "The Constantinople Horrors: Butchery of Armenians." *Lloyd's Weekly Newspaper*, 30 Aug. 1896, p. 1.
- "The Constantinople Massacres: Where the Real Responsibility Lies." *The Ipswich Journal*, 12 Sept. 1896, p. 2.
- "The Constantinople Riot." *The Bristol Mercury*, 29 Aug. 1896, p. 5.
- "The Crisis in Turkey." *The Derby Mercury*, 16 Sept. 1896, p. 3.
- The Derby Mercury*. 9 Sept. 1896, p. 4.

- The Glasgow Herald*. 8 Sept. 1896, p. 4.
The Leeds Mercury. 4 Sept. 1896, p. 4.
The Leeds Mercury. 11 Sept. 1896, p. 4.
The Leeds Mercury. 14 Sept. 1896, p. 5.
“The Massacres in Constantinople.” *The Daily News*, 29 Aug. 1896, p. 5.
“The New Armenian Riots.” *Graphic*, 5 Sept. 1896, p. 8.
“The Note to The Sultan.” *Lloyd’s Weekly Newspaper*, 13 Sept. 1896, p. 1.
“The Presidential Campaign.” *The Bristol Mercury*, 3 Sept. 1896, p. 5.
“The Reign of Terror in Constantinople.” *The Daily News*, 1 Sept. 1896, p. 5.
“The Riot in Constantinople.” *The Aberdeen Journal*, 28 Aug. 1896, p. 4.
“The Rioting in Constantinople.” *The Times*, 28 Aug, p. 3.
“The Rioting in Constantinople.” *The Times*, 29 Aug, p. 3.
“The Riots in Constantinople.” *The Times*, 31 Aug. 1896, p. 3.
“The Situation in Constantinople.” *The Belfast News-Letter*, 1 Sept. 1896, p. 7.
“The Situation in Constantinople.” *The Belfast News-Letter*, 3 Sept. 1896, p. 7.
“The Situation in Constantinople.” *The Times*, 7 Sept. 1896, p. 3.
The Times, <https://www.thetimes.co.uk/>. (Accessed May 2020).
“The Turkish Atrocities.” *The Belfast Newsletter*, 14 Sept. 1896, p. 5.
Tuchman, Gaye. *Making News: A Study in the Construction of Reality*. Free Press, 1978.
Uras, Esat. *Tarihte Ermeniler ve Ermeni Meselesi*. Belge Yayınları, 1976.
“Why Cry Peace Where There is No Peace.” *The Northern Echo*, 15 Sept. 1896, p. 3.
Wimmer, Roger D. and Dominick, Joseph R. *Mass Media Research: An Introduction*. Wadsworth, 2011.
Yavuz, Fikrettin. *Osmanlı Devleti Dış Politikasında Ermeni Sorunu: 1896 Osmanlı Bankası Baskını Örneği*. PhD dissertation. Sakarya University, 2009.

Algının Çerçevenmesi: İngiliz Basınında 1896 Osmanlı Bankası Baskını *

Levent Ürer**

Asuman Kutlu***

Öz

Bu çalışma, İngiliz gazetelerinin 1896 yılındaki Osmanlı Bankası Baskını'nı nasıl çerçevelediğini ve Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun uluslararası alandaki siyasi ve sosyal yeniden inşasında bu çerçevelerin rolünü incelemeyi amaçlamıştır. Nitel bir tümevarımsal çerçeveleme analizi gerçekleştirilmiştir. Metin analizinin sonuçları iki ana çerçeve ortaya çıkarmıştır: (i) insani ilgi: Osmanlı İmparatorluğu içinde iç çekişme ve bölünme ile (ii) birleşme vurgusu: uluslararası ilişkilerde izolasyon politikası. Birinci çerçeve, Osmanlı İmparatorluğu ve Müslüman nüfusa yönelik olumsuz metaforların kullanılmasıyla birlikte, öldürülen veya yaralanan Ermenilerin sayısına ilişkin dezenformasyonu içerirken, ikinci çerçeve, diplomatik baskıdan ziyade Avrupa'nın ulusal, uluslararası desteğine ve güçlü müdahalesine vurgu yapmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler

Osmanlı Bankası Baskını, Ermeni Saldırısı, İngiliz Basını, Çerçeveleme, Algı, Kamuoyu.

* Geliş Tarihi: 24 Nisan 2021 – Kabul Tarihi: 09 Mayıs 2022

Bu makaleyi şu şekilde kaynak gösterebilirsiniz:

Ürer, Levent, ve Asuman Kutlu. "Framing Perception: British Press Coverage of the 1896 Ottoman Bank Raid." *bilig*, no. 105, 2023, ss. 79-97.

** Prof. Dr., İstanbul Aydın Üniversitesi, Kamu Yönetimi Bölümü – İstanbul/Türkiye
ORCID:0000-0002-5609-1189

leventurer@aydin.edu.tr

***Doç. Dr., İstanbul Beykent Üniversitesi, Medya ve İletişim Bölümü – İstanbul/Türkiye
ORCID:0000-0003-2770-3008

asumank@beykent.edu.tr

Формирование восприятия: освещение в британской прессе рейда на османский банк в 1896 г.*

Левент Урер**

Асуман Кутлу***

Аннотация

Это исследование было направлено на изучение того, как британские газеты преподнесли захват Османского банка в 1896 году, и какую роль этот фрейминг сыграл в политической и социальной реконструкции Османской империи в международной сфере. Был проведен качественный индуктивный анализ фрейминга. Результаты текстового анализа выявили два основных фрейма: (i) человеческий интерес: внутренние беспорядки и раскол в Османской империи и (ii) акцент на объединении: политика изоляции в международных отношениях. В то время как первый фрейм в основном включал дезинформацию о количестве убитых или раненых армян в сочетании с постоянным использованием негативных метафор в отношении Османской империи и мусульманского населения, последний фрейм был сосредоточен на национальной, международной поддержке и силовом вмешательстве Европы, а не на дипломатическом давлении.

Ключевые слова

Захват Османского банка, нападение армян, британская пресса, фрейминг, восприятие, общественное мнение.

* Поступило в редакцию: 24 апреля 2021 г. – Принято в номер: 09 мая 2022 г.

Ссылка на статью:

Ürer, Levent, and Asuman Kutlu. "Framing Perception: British Press Coverage of the 1896 Ottoman Bank Raid." *bilig*, no. 105, 2023, pp. 79-97.

** Проф., д-р, Стамбульский Университет Айдын, кафедра общественного управления – Стамбул / Турция

ORCID:0000-0002-5609-1189

leventurer@aydin.edu.tr

*** Доц., д-р, Стамбульский университет Бейкент, кафедра СМИ и коммуникаций – Стамбул / Турция

ORCID:0000-0003-2770-3008 asumank@beykent.edu.tr

