

5 Methodology and research design

The following chapter translates the theoretical framework of chapters 3 and 4 into a methodological tool for analyzing journalistic texts. For this, chapter 5.1 introduces critical discourse analysis (CDA) as a theoretical-methodological approach for critically questioning how power relations are (re-)produced, organized and challenged through texts. After these reflections, chapter 5.2 explains how I selected the material for my analysis. Here, I also describe the wider context of media production and reception in Germany and Namibia as well as questions of material availability and accessibility that have shaped and been shaped by my research position. Finally, chapter 5.3 reflects on the challenges and limitations that arose during the research process. Taken together, these chapters outline and reflect the lens through which I view my material, which will be crucial for understanding the ensuing results.

5.1 Critical discourse analysis for analyzing post-colonial silence

The preceding theory chapters have outlined journalism as a discursive authority that negotiates, organizes and structures (post-)colonial power in its production of cultural memory. To deconstruct this process for media coverage of the Herero and Nama genocide, I have chosen to conduct a critical discourse analysis (CDA) of journalistic texts. Chapter 5.1.1 begins by describing CDA and its application in communication studies as a method of textual analysis. It then links my postcolonial theoretical lens to these methodological premises and reflects on my role in perpetuating silence through research. Finally, chapter 5.1.2 outlines the steps I undertook in my analysis.

5.1.1 CDA and critical self-reflection in communication studies

CDA is a method of analyzing texts that draws on the core tenets of discourse analysis according to Foucault (1981). Discourse here is understood as patterns of statements that are formed in similar ways and are articulated in specific historical contexts (Foucault, 1981, p. 170). This method is premised on the idea that language functions as a social practice of meaning-making that is expressed and circulated in texts (Fairclough, 2001,

p. 122), with texts encompassing a wide variety of formats in which language is structured (Wodak, 2001b, p. 6). The way that language is structured and ordered then shapes how power is tangibly enacted, enforced and experienced and which reactions to power are possible. Therefore, discourse analysis seeks to uncover the limits of the un-/sayable in society by analyzing how statements are assembled and organized (M. Jäger, 2019, p. 66). Different arrangements of statements determine how discursive objects, such as the Herero and Nama genocide, are made (in-)visible (Foucault, 1981, p. 67).

CDA builds on the premises of discourse analysis while integrating an explicitly power-critical lens into its analysis and exploration of language. This means CDA seeks not only to describe but also to actively change the power relations that produce social inequalities such as racism (Fairclough, 2001, p. 125; van Dijk, 1991). This aligns with the aims of postcolonial theoretical approaches (cf. chapter 4), making CDA particularly applicable to my research interest. CDA highlights the subversive potential of language, viewing power and resistance as two sides of the same coin that are maintained and challenged through different discursive formations (M. Jäger, 2019, p. 65). In moments of controversy or scandal, the previous boundaries of knowledge and power become visible, as previous discursive structures are no longer sufficient to explain the construction of certain subjects (M. Jäger, 2019, p. 63). Applications of CDA therefore center on controversial issues that are the topic of political and social debate (M. Jäger, 2019, p. 61). This lends itself well to an analysis of the Herero and Nama genocide, especially in the context of controversial negotiations between the German and Namibian governments (cf. chapters 2.2, 4.4).

To analyze these moments of irritation and power negotiation, CDA focuses on linguistic strategies of normalization, specifically collective symbolism (M. Jäger, 2019, p. 68). Through normalization, subjects are shown as natural outcomes of the environment rather than as products of human agency (Gavriely-Nuri, 2020, p. 126). The journalistic practices of objectivity outlined from chapter 3.2 onwards can be understood as strategies of normalization that regulate how subjects can become visible and are shown as “consensus” or “legitimate controversy” (Hallin, 1986, p. 117). Moreover, M. Jäger (2019, p. 69) writes that collective symbols are crucial for implementing strategies of normalization. In the context of my research, I view collective symbolism as both constituted for and constituted by patterns of representation in journalism (M. Jäger, 2019, p. 69; cf. Spivak, 1988).

This methodological emphasis on (post-)colonial collective symbolism necessitates including the wider social and historical context in which journalistic reporting takes place, a point that has particularly been emphasized in the “discourse historical approach” (Reisigl, 2011; Wodak, 2001a, 2014, 2020; Wodak et al., 2008). This approach emphasizes that researchers must include the historical context in which discourses are situated to contextualize the analyzed statements and arguments (Wodak, 2001a, p. 70), which is especially important when considering controversies on racial, national and ethnic issues (cf. van Dijk, 1991; Wodak, 2001a, p. 72). In this way, the researcher can highlight indirect and implicit meanings that remain hidden by strictly viewing the manifest content of the text (Wodak, 2014, p. 403). However, this integration of historical context opens a few questions from a postcolonial theoretical perspective. Chapter 2 has shown that the historical record of the Herero and Nama genocide is filled with gaps and

shaped by colonial power structures. Furthermore, the question of how the researcher selects and uses historical context opens questions of positionality that the discourse historical approach addresses but does not discuss in-depth (Reisigl, 2011, p. 461). There is often an implicit assumption in prior applications of CDA that the researcher is part of the same national community in which the analyzed texts are produced, which is particularly tricky for post-colonial memories that cross national boundaries.

These questions also point to a larger challenge for implementing CDA in communication studies. Even though CDA has frequently been used to analyze media products, it has only hesitantly been adopted in communication studies (Phelan, 2020), despite the growing prevalence of discourse analysis as a method (Wiedemann & Lohmeier, 2019). One explanation for this hesitance could be the explicitly critical lens of CDA, which irritates the quality criteria of neutrality¹ in empirical communications research (Meyen et al., 2019, p. 41). Neutrality is a cornerstone of social scientific qualitative research, which requires the researcher to be “open” when entering the field and to approach the research object with as few preconceptions as possible (Flick, 2017, p. 41). As suggested above, this concept becomes particularly problematic from a postcolonial vantage point. Researchers cannot artificially remove themselves from the discursive production of reality, as they are deeply implicated within it (Foucault, 1978, p. 35; cf. Said, 1978). “Anyone who analyzes discourses takes a position – whether they want to or not.” (M. Jäger, 2019, p. 80, transl. CH) In fact, erasing the position of the researcher furthers (post-)colonial silence by substituting the desires of the researcher with the desires of the researched subjects (cf. Spivak, 2009). However, in prior applications of CDA, this individual position of the researcher is rarely made visible to the reader, exacerbating rather than addressing potential problems of silencing when formulating “emancipatory objectives” for research (Fairclough, 2001, p. 125).

In addition, as Phelan (2020, p. 288) notes, CDA has primarily consisted of “linguists who analyze media rather than media scholars who apply CDA theories and methods.” Previous applications of CDA are rooted in linguistic discursive analysis (Reisigl, 2011, p. 473), meaning they remain largely focused on the semantic and linguistic level of the media text and then expand these linguistic arguments to broader interdiscursive and societal debates on topics such as antisemitism or racism (Phelan, 2020, p. 288). The relationship between journalistic text and societal context is often presupposed but rarely explored in detail (cf. van Dijk, 1991, p. 44). This neglects the discursive practices by which journalism specifically delimits “truth” in its reporting and establishes its position as a site of meaning-making in society.

In this field of linguistically driven media analysis, the work of M. Jäger and Jäger (2007) stands out. Both scholars have predominately worked with newspaper texts and have developed a step-by-step framework for analyzing the various structural and formal aspects of articles in addition to the content of reporting (S. Jäger, 2009, pp. 175–176). For this reason, I have chosen to rely primarily on their suggested steps for a “structural” and “in-depth” analysis. Their “structural” analysis explores the “discursive level” of a medium

1 Meyen et al. (2019, p. 41) describe this as “Werturteilsfreiheit” in German, or refraining from judgment.

in society. This includes the institutional context of journalistic production, the conditions of production and reception as well as the editorial line of specific media (S. Jäger, 2009, p. 175). Next comes an analysis of the “surface” of the journalistic text, which comprises the form, design, genre and topics of each article (S. Jäger, 2009, p. 175). This corresponds with the conceptualization of normalizing strategies in journalism outlined above (cf. chapter 3.2). After ascertaining the formal practices by which journalism limits which statements can be made, S. Jäger (2009, pp. 179–184) suggests an in-depth analysis that explores linguistic-rhetorical strategies in the text. This step echoes many of the approaches above and emphasizes aspects such as pronoun usage or collective symbolism. The analysis of linguistic-rhetorical strategies is followed by an examination of the ideological content of the text, for instance through statements that reflect future visions or imaginations of the community (S. Jäger, 2009, p. 175). Finally, in an interpretive step, the researcher then considers how the text is embedded into hegemonic power structures in society (S. Jäger, 2009, pp. 184–185).

These steps peel back the layers of how journalism produces the boundaries of the un-/sayable in its coverage. Nevertheless, especially for the in-depth analysis, many of the steps that S. Jäger (2009) and M. Jäger (2019) suggest are not always clearly distinguishable from one another and often focus on uncovering the intentions of the journalist in supporting or challenging certain discourses (S. Jäger, 2009, p. 184). Given their disciplinary background as linguists, Jäger and Jäger also do not integrate findings about journalistic practices from communication studies into their analysis of newspaper material, and their steps move from the granular to the societal with rapid speed. Hence, while the work of S. Jäger (2009) and M. Jäger (2019) is a useful starting point, it nevertheless only partially addresses the challenges outlined above. In the following, I now discuss how to explicitly address and integrate positionality into the methodological approaches suggested above through perspectives from communication and postcolonial studies, which offer useful connection points to one another.

Reflecting on the (post-)colonial role of the researcher in CDA

The challenges above hinge on the question: How can the position of the researcher be reflected and made transparent to the reader? From my theoretical background, I understand this self-reflection not merely as a disclaimer but instead as part of an analysis of post-colonial silence.² The conceptualization of silence by Spivak (1996a, p. 207) places the researcher into a “double bind”: While the researcher is called upon to critically uncover hegemonic structures in society, it is simultaneously impossible to analyze subaltern positions from a privileged academic research position. Any “sound” that could reach a researcher’s ear would immediately negate any premise of silence or subalternity (Loomba, 2015, p. 229). Silence, in this perspective, is a systematic effect of the discourse rather than something that can be pinpointed in the discourse. This understanding shifts the focus away from finding “the” silenced to dismantling the hegemonic structures of knowledge production of which the researcher is a part. The researcher thus

2 For a more in-depth discussion on the challenges of analyzing silence in entangled research contexts, see Haritos, C. (2025, forthcoming).

becomes part of the wider power structures that CDA seeks to critique and that are normalized through journalistic coverage. To analyze silence, it is therefore necessary to include reflexivity within the steps of CDA. This can be broken into two interrelated parts: A reflection on the theoretical lens and research literature guiding the analysis as well as the position of the researcher. Both perspectives are connected and shape the process of material selection, collection and analysis, as I will discuss in more detail in this and all ensuing chapters.

Collins and Stockton (2018, p. 4) write that theory provides a perspective of how power and knowledge work by “making implicit assumptions explicit”. The selection of theory indicates the researcher’s normative position within the discourse. In my case, the decision to analyze coverage of the Herero and Nama genocide through a postcolonial lens indicates an interest in the perspectives of formerly colonized individuals who have been silenced in memory production. In qualitative communications research, this theoretical lens is often made transparent through the use of categories to analyze material, which are formed both deductively from previous research and inductively through the material analysis (Löblich, 2015, p. 75). To avoid the risk of reproducing rather than critiquing categories that have predominantly emanated from Western research contexts, I will be drawing on open-ended questions in my methodological approach. Open-ended questions are common to implementations of CDA (cf. S. Jäger, 2009; Wodak, 2001a). However, I will specify these questions inductively and deductively to my research object to make my previous research knowledge visible (cf. chapter 5.1.2). To critically acknowledge gaps in this knowledge, it is also crucial to reflect on the personal position of the researcher, which amplifies the colonial power structures in my theoretical and research literature. For this, I will now briefly consider my own role in perpetuating silence as a first indicator of hegemonic power structures in the discourse.

It is no coincidence that as a researcher located at a German university, I have come to the research questions and interest of this dissertation: As has been reflected in the preceding chapters, much of the theoretical literature on journalism, memory and even postcolonial theory has historically been published at Western institutions, and research on the Herero and Nama genocide continues to often be published in German. In this way, my research position reflects a long history of knowledge production on the Herero and Nama genocide (cf. Bürger, 2017). Moreover, my access to research literature and source material both reflects and privileges my position in post-colonial power structures. This is also reflected in the fact that I do not speak Khoekhoegowab or Otjiherero, the languages of the affected communities in Namibia. My position thereby reflects the very power relations that I wish to critique through the postcolonial theoretical lens described earlier.

Even by making my theoretical perspective transparent, it is impossible to approach German and Namibian material through the same “lens,” which is rife with theoretical and personal blind spots that privilege German centers of knowledge production as an invisible and “normal” position. In my analysis, this means that I am not seeking comparability in my approach to the material and instead try to make this imbalance transparent by reflecting on my position throughout the research process. For instance, my CDA of Namibian material includes background conversations with Namibian journalists for context, as will be described in more detail in chapter 5.2.4. In my results, I also explic-

itly point out moments when I was irritated by my research material (Ploder, 2009), a process more well-known in ethnological media research (cf. Koch, 2021). In addition, I consider and critique academic knowledge structures in the final step of CDA, which asks what the relationship between the text and the hegemonic discourse is (S. Jäger, 2009, pp. 184–185). By viewing academic knowledge production as part of the “hegemonic discourse” that continues to delimit how the Herero and Nama genocide is produced as a discursive object, I can anchor self-reflection in the interpretation and discussion of my results. This can also be seen in the final open-ended question of my analysis in the following chapter.

To keep these reflections from becoming too scattered and far-reaching, the self-reflective steps and postcolonial critiques above are linked to the principles of qualitative research. Textual analysis from a communication studies perspective offers unique potential to orient meaning-making within the performative strategies of the journalistic text (Fürsich, 2009). Self-reflection is therefore not a goal by itself but rather a necessary complement to textual analysis that views the text as the central site of meaning-making.

To briefly summarize, postcolonial studies offer helpful tools to align the critical stance of CDA with the call for transparency in qualitative social science methodology. By pointing towards the danger of research reproducing subjects as autonomous voices, postcolonial studies underline the necessity for research as a circular flow rather than a one-way street between the researcher and the material (Spivak, 2009). The critical stance in CDA not only emanates from but must include the researcher's position as a point of critique. Looking beyond the manifest content of the text requires the researcher to not only describe the context in which statements are made (cf. Wodak, 2014), but also to situate themselves and their research within this context. Therefore, my theoretical background in postcolonial studies (cf. chapter 4) is not just a lens for material analysis but also an intervention that shapes how I make my position in the research process transparent. Given these considerations, I now describe the methodological steps that guided my analysis.

5.1.2 Analytical steps

With the considerations above, I adapted the steps of CDA proposed by S. Jäger (2009) to my research interest and theoretical lens. I began with a structural analysis of my media material that considered the discursive position of individual German and Namibian media, their production and reception conditions as well as their role in society. This structural analysis took place in two steps: First, I described the institutional framework of media production in Germany and Namibia (cf. chapter 5.2). Here, I also reflected on the colonial power structures that have shaped both my media material as well as my access to these materials. Then, my analysis continued in the description of the “surface” of the text (S. Jäger, 2009, p. 175) in chapter 6. In this step, I analyzed formal discursive strategies that shape how statements can be made in journalism, described in chapter 3.2, as well as the authors and the “discursive strands,” or topics, of my newspaper articles (S. Jäger, 2009, p. 160). Following this descriptive analysis, I chose typical articles for analysis that reflected the range of statements that could be made about the Herero and Nama genocide in newspapers between 2015 and 2021 (S. Jäger, 2015, p. 82).

The selected typical articles then became part of my in-depth analysis. Here, I combined S. Jäger's (2009) dimensions of linguistic-rhetorical strategies and content-ideological strategies to fit my research object and interest. Building on the theoretical framework elaborated in chapter 4.5, I broke this section into mnemonic practices of tropology (re-presentation, speaking *about* the past) and mnemonic practices of persuasion (representation, speaking *for* present interests through the past). These practices are not mutually exclusive but rather overlap in various ways. However, looking at each constituent part provided me with a framework for structuring and organizing my analysis and results. Each section contained open-ended questions that build on the analytical questions posed in chapter 4.5 and that were expanded as I worked with my material. The final open-ended question considers how my academic position is de-/legitimized through my results, which will be a point of reflection in the discussion section. Table 1 shows the steps that guide my analysis as well as the ensuing chapters.

Table 1: Utilized steps of CDA

Structural analysis	
Institutional framework	- Discursive level: Historical and cultural position of each medium in society - Discursive position of medium: Ownership, editorial line, production and reception
Formal text "surface" <i>How does journalism formally produce the Herero and Nama genocide as a non-/commemorative topic of reporting?</i>	- Date of publication - Length of piece (word count/minutes) - Page number - Headline/teaser/subheadings - Imagery and image caption, if used - Rubric (e.g., politics) - Genre (e.g., interview) - Discursive events: Occasions of reporting - Discursive strand: Topics and topical connections - Discursive position of (guest) authors: Personal, professional and political

Continued Table 1: Utilized steps of CDA

In-depth analysis	
Re-presentation: Mnemonic strategies of tropology (cf. Spivak, 1988, p. 276) <i>What can be said about the past?</i>	- What sources does journalism reference in its coverage, including its previous reporting? (Bijl, 2016; Zelizer, 1993) - What collective symbols and terms does journalism use in its description of the genocide? (Erll & Rigney, 2009) - How does journalism describe the causes of the 1904–1908 genocide? - How does journalism describe historical participants of the 1904–1908 genocide? - Which connections to other memories does journalism make in its coverage? (Erll, 2011; Zelizer, 2011) - How do these connections function to dis-/connect past and present in the article? (Edy, 1999)
Representation: Mnemonic strategies of persuasion (cf. Spivak, 1988, p. 276) <i>Who can legitimately connect the past with (whose) present?</i>	- Which temporal and locational markers does journalism use to dis-/connect the events of 1904–1908 to the present audience? (Chouliaraki, 2008; Neiger & Tenenboim-Weinblatt, 2016) - How does journalism connect to prior memorial events in its coverage? - Which reactions to the past are thereby shown as in-/appropriate in journalism? (Kitch, 2005; McConville et al., 2016) - How are present groups described in journalistic reporting? - What relationships does the article thus show between current groups? - Which speakers are connected to the events of 1904–1908, and how does this shape their ability to speak for certain groups and individuals in the article? - What pronouns are used in the article to connect the journalist/speaker to the audience? - Given this construction of speakership, which prospective visions and demands for the genocide are (de-)legitimized in journalism? (Tenenboim-Weinblatt, 2014) - Which demands are placed in the sphere of consensus, controversy or deviance? (Hallin, 1986, p. 117) - Based on these prospective appeals, which (academic) institutions are de-/legitimized in journalistic reporting?

Source: Own depiction

5.2 Material selection, collection and availability

This chapter describes my selection of various German and Namibian newspapers, one German news magazine as well as one Namibian radio station for my CDA. Chapter 5.2.1 begins by outlining my selection criteria. Then, chapters 5.2.2 and 5.2.3 describe the selected material in Germany and Namibia. This aligns with the first step of the structural analysis described above and provides insights into the discursive level of each medium in German and Namibian society. Finally, chapter 5.2.4 describes the background conversations with Namibian journalists that helped to inform my structural analysis.

5.2.1 Selection criteria and time frame of analysis

I selected my material according to three criteria: centrality, diversity and feasibility (Meyen, 2013, p. 54). The first of my selection criteria, centrality, refers to the fact that it is impossible to outline every single potential statement within the discourse. To overcome this problem, centrality enables the researcher to focus on media that play an outsized role in shaping discourse in society (Meyen et al., 2019, p. 157). This includes sources whose reporting is often repeated in other journalistic sources and discursive levels (cf. chapter 3.2.2). Thus, centrality requires an understanding of the relationship to power positions in society that certain media have, for instance by being consumed by elite decision-makers in society or producing discourses that elite decision-makers must respond to (Schudson, 2018, p. 15).

As the analysis of centrality is dependent on the specific construction of power and knowledge, different types of media are considered “central” in Germany and Namibia, depending on how they reflect or challenge power structures (cf. Meyen, 2013, p. 54). Therefore, to determine centrality, I relied on previous research literature on the Herero and Nama genocide to ascertain which media had previously played an important role in shaping the memory discourse. I also relied on prior research on the German and Namibian media systems, as will be described in more detail below.

In addition to centrality, diversity ensures that the material reflects as many effective discursive positions as possible (Meyen, 2013, p. 55). This aspect is especially important for grasping the complexity of producing cultural memory from a variety of local and national positions. To ascertain positions of diversity in my material, I relied on prior research literature as well as experiences from my master’s thesis (Haritos, 2019), which gave me preliminary insights into German and Namibian media coverage and enabled me to see which positions were quoted or critiqued within the coverage.

The final selection criterion is feasibility. In keeping with the postcolonial considerations of chapter 5.1.1, feasibility provides an opportunity for reflecting on the (post-)colonial power positions that shape my research position. My selection of material indicates my personal constraints: I only speak German and English. This limits the material that I can view, even as it also reflects persistent power structures in Namibia, as I discuss in more detail in chapter 5.2.2. Since I live in Germany, my collection of research material had to be completed during a six-week research stay in Namibia. In contrast to German newspapers, I could not access digital archives that show the entire news page for Namibian newspapers or provide show schedules for radio and television stations.

Thus, my material collection had to happen almost completely through the sighting of physical material in archives. This material was not necessarily complete. In a way, this reflects dual structures of silence that were produced both through my limited research position as well as financial structures that make it easier to access digital archives of German material rather than Namibian material. Finally, my material selection also reflects economic constraints: I was financed for three and a half years and had to finish my research in this time.

These considerations also shaped the time frame of my analysis, which was limited to the period between 2015 and 2021. This six-year span roughly covers the initial period of negotiations between the German and Namibian governments on the Herero and Nama genocide, which began in 2014 but was officially announced and reported beginning in 2015 (Rausch, 2023b, p. 183). 2015 also marks the first time that the events of 1904–1908 were officially recognized as genocide by the German government, both in response to a question at a press conference and through an opinion piece published in *Die Zeit* by Norbert Lammert (*Zeit*, 09.07.15; cf. Wolff, 2021, pp. 294–297). In 2016, the Herero and Nama sued the German government for reparations in the New York District Court, which was tossed out in 2019 (Wolff, 2021, p. 349). In May 2021, the German and Namibian governments announced that they had reached an agreement on the genocide, promising 1.1 billion euros in development aid along with an apology that the German president would provide in the Namibian National Assembly. In September 2021, there were contentious debates around the agreement, which has to date not been signed (Melber, 2022).

This time frame provides an opportunity to explore how the boundaries of the un-/sayable surrounding the Herero and Nama are potentially shifting and how power is being negotiated within and between both nations in the production of cultural memory. The negotiations are a discursive event that is shaping how discursive objects are brought forward and produced (S. Jäger, 2015, p. 82). Analyzing newspaper coverage between 2015 and 2021 also adds a more recent perspective to the previous research literature (cf. chapter 4.4).

To briefly summarize, the selection criteria of centrality, diversity and feasibility reflect a variety of factors that are highly context dependent (Meyen, 2013, p. 54). They reflect prior research, inductive experiences with the material and personal decisions that reveal the researcher's role in the research field. Given these selection criteria as well as the proposed time frame of analysis, I have selected the following material for my CDA:

- The daily newspapers *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* (FAZ), *Süddeutsche Zeitung* (SZ), *die tageszeitung* (taz) as well as the weekly newspaper *Die Zeit* and the news magazine *Der Spiegel* in Germany
- The daily English-language newspapers *The Namibian*, *New Era*, *Namibian Sun* and the German-language newspaper *Allgemeine Zeitung* (AZ) as well as transcripts of the English-language radio station National FM from NBC in Namibia

These sources all reflect central and diverse discursive positions in terms of circulation, ownership, editorial line and the (historical) relationship to discursive power within society. These individual positions will be explored in more detail in the following chapters,

as they are crucial for understanding the role of each medium in shaping cultural memory of the Herero and Nama genocide.

5.2.2 German material: Daily newspapers and news magazine

To understand how power structures are (re-)produced through journalistic coverage on the Herero and Nama genocide, I analyzed German daily and weekly newspapers and one news magazine. Previous research shows that leading German newspapers have often been at the forefront of thematizing the Herero and Nama genocide (Kößler & Melber, 2015, p. 14), including in more recent debates such as the so-called “*Historikerstreit 2.0*,” where historians in Germany debated whether German colonialism could or should be compared to the Holocaust in the cultural sections of German newspapers (Rausch, 2022, p. 430). To gather as many journalistic statements as possible, newspaper coverage also proved to be a feasible medium for the purposes of material collection and analysis. Despite losses in general readership, which have compounded over the past decades (Kupferschmitt & Müller, 2023, p. 17), the newspaper remains a medium read by elite decision-makers in German society (Arnold, 2009, p. 249). All papers in my sample were founded after the Second World War (Pürer & Raabe, 2007, p. 113). While many of these newspapers were initially relatively local in scope (Pürer & Raabe, 2007, p. 104), they have since become national newspapers, even as they still retain some of their local focus through regional inserts and through topic selection, as will be discussed below. The following newspapers have been selected for their continued and sustained coverage of the Herero and Nama genocide as well as their discursive position in the German media landscape (cf. Boehme, 2020, p. 239).

Süddeutsche Zeitung

The daily newspaper *Süddeutsche Zeitung* (SZ) was founded in 1945 in the German city of Munich (Pürer & Raabe, 2007, p. 109). To this day, the newspaper is owned by the *Süddeutscher Verlag* (Pürer & Raabe, 2007, p. 148). In the second quarter of 2021, which is the end of my analysis time, the SZ had 311,390 sold copies³ and a circulation of 318,093 (IVW, 2024c). This includes both the daily edition as well as the weekend edition, which is published on Saturdays. These numbers make the SZ the second most-read German daily newspaper after the tabloid newspaper *Bild* (IVW, 2024c). At the same time, the SZ maintains a regional connection to southern Germany in its reporting and readership (Wolff, 2021, p. 221). Pürer and Raabe (2007, p. 152) note that two-thirds of the paper's printed edition are purchased in Munich and the surrounding areas. Its editorial stance is described as “liberal” and slightly left of center (Pürer & Raabe, 2007, p. 152).

In my sample, the SZ is useful for the role it plays in shaping the reporting of other newspapers in Germany, as it has been noted in surveys as the most read newspaper by other journalists in Germany (Meyen & Riesmeyer, 2009, p. 111; Weischenberg et al., 2006, p. 134). Moreover, the SZ provides an interesting discursive position on my research topic for the prominent emphasis it gives to its culture section, or *Feuilleton*, which is

3 E-papers are included in all following sums from the *Informationsgemeinschaft zur Feststellung der Verbreitung von Werbeträgern e.V.* (IVW).

placed right after the politics section or after the features section “second book” (“*Zweites Buch*”) in weekend editions. This is important given the debates in the cultural sections of German newspapers described above, as well as the growing importance of topics such as cultural restitution in the German discourse.

Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung

In addition to the SZ, the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* (FAZ) stands out as a leading newspaper that is often read by other German journalists as well as elite decision-makers in society (Weischenberg et al., 2006, p. 134). Founded in 1949 and located in Frankfurt am Main, the newspaper built its national prominence in the 1970s and 1980s as a newspaper with a strong economic focus that envisioned its target audience as societal elites with political and economic decision-making power (Kutzner, 2021, p. 416). To this day, the newspaper maintains a focus on economic topics (Pürer & Raabe, 2007, p. 152), making it especially useful for an analysis of the German-Namibian negotiations on reparations. Moreover, the FAZ places a strong emphasis on international reporting (Pürer & Raabe, 2007, p. 152), which is important for my research interest. The editorial line of the FAZ is center-right (Pürer & Raabe, 2007, pp. 152–153). It has been owned by the FAZIT Stiftung, a non-profit publishing foundation, since 1959 (Pürer & Raabe, 2007, p. 149). In addition to its daily newspaper, which appears from Monday to Saturday, the FAZ also maintains a Sunday edition (*Frankfurter Allgemeine Sonntagszeitung*) that has its own editorial team and that provides more space for background research and reviews. In the second quarter of 2021, the daily edition (Monday to Friday) sold 199,398 copies and had a circulation of 208,579, and the weekend edition (Saturday to Sunday) sold 275,677 copies and had a circulation of 284,880 (IVW, 2024a). In my sample, I will view both daily and weekend editions to gather as many statements on the Herero and Nama genocide as possible.

Die tageszeitung

The final daily newspaper in my sample is *die tageszeitung* (taz), which appears from Monday to Saturday. While much smaller than the previous newspapers – 46,127 sold daily copies and a circulation of 48,035 in the second quarter of 2021 (IVW, 2024d) – it nevertheless represents a unique discursive position in my sample. The taz was founded by multiple initiative groups in 1979 as an explicitly alternative left newspaper (Pürer & Raabe, 2007, p. 154). This came amid a wave of alternative newspapers that were founded at the same time. The taz is the sole surviving newspaper from this time. Today, the taz is owned by the cooperative TAZ Verlagsgenossenschaft (Pürer & Raabe, 2007, p. 154). What makes the taz particularly interesting for my sample, though, is not merely its critical, left-leaning perspective but also its explicit focus on topics from the Global South (Pürer & Raabe, 2007, p. 154). Finally, the taz is a useful medium for my sample since a journalist from the taz also reports in Namibian newspapers during my analysis time. This will be explored in more detail in chapter 6.2.

Die Zeit

*Die Zeit*⁴ is the most-read weekly newspaper in Germany (Pürer & Raabe, 2007, p. 163), including among other German journalists (Weischenberg et al., 2006, p. 134). The newspaper appears every Thursday with sales of 587,582 copies and a circulation of 610,667 in the second quarter of 2021 (IVW, 2024e). The newspaper was founded in 1946 in Hamburg and quickly became a prominent “liberal” newspaper in Germany with a variety of political leanings in its pages (Pürer & Raabe, 2007, pp. 163–164). It is owned by the *Holtzbrinck* publishing group. What makes the *Zeit* particularly useful for my analysis is not only its role as a prominent weekly newspaper but also the connection to Hamburg that is also visible in its reporting. Hamburg, due to its prominent role as a city in German colonialism, faced a variety of protests, exhibitions, research projects as well as visits by Namibian delegations between 2015 and 2021. As became clear in an inductive viewing of the material, the *Zeit* is important because these events in Hamburg became part of the newspaper’s reporting and helped to grasp even more effective statements on the Herero and Nama genocide.

Der Spiegel

The final medium in my sample is the Hamburg-based weekly news journal *Der Spiegel*⁵. While in the format of a news magazine, Pürer and Raabe (2007, p. 164) note that the *Spiegel* effectively functions as a weekly newspaper in terms of its editorial content and reception. The magazine appears weekly on Saturdays with 675,870 copies sold and a circulation of 681,567, as per the second quarter of 2021, and is owned by the *Spiegel-Verlag* (IVW, 2024b). Its editorial line is slightly left of center (Pürer & Raabe, 2007, p. 165). As with many of the newspapers above, the *Spiegel* views its readership as economic elites that are in decision-making positions in society (Pürer & Raabe, 2007, p. 167). In addition to being the most-read German news magazine, the *Spiegel* is one of the top three journalistic sources read by other journalists, along with the *SZ* and the *FAZ*, making it a leading medium in Germany (Meyen & Riesmeyer, 2009, p. 111). The magazine was founded in 1947 and has played an important role in initiating political scandals throughout (West) German history (Pürer & Raabe, 2007, p. 166). Previous research also shows that the *Spiegel* is at the heart of a scandal on the Herero and Nama genocide when its former Africa correspondent, Bartholomäus Grill, wrote a piece in 2016 questioning whether the events of 1904–1908 constituted genocide (Wolff, 2021, pp. 308–309). The *Spiegel* was thus included as the final news source in my sample.

Process of material collection

Given the sample above, I analyzed news articles that were published in the print editions of the newspaper. In this way, it was possible to ensure feasibility and comparability with my Namibian material, which was gathered in haptic newspapers. This choice also ensured that my structural analysis could remain focused on the formal construction of

4 For ease of reading, I will be referring to the *Zeit* without its constituent article *Der* from this point onwards.

5 For ease of reading, I will be referring to the *Spiegel* without its constituent article *Der* from this point onwards.

journalistic articles in newspapers and magazines without also having to consider the structural aspects of websites.

The material described above was largely gathered through online databases as well as in the Berlin State Library. To find articles, I used the keywords “Herero,” “Nama,” “German South-West Africa,” “Namibia,” “genocide,” “reparations” and “colonialism.” Once I had ascertained a few discursive events, such as the announcement of the 2021 German-Namibian joint declaration, I was also able to search for coverage around these dates (cf. chapter 6.2.1). For the *FAZ* and *SZ*, I was able to view all full-page articles in the internal databases of the newspapers *FAZ Biblionet* and *SZ Archiv*. For the *taz*, *Zeit* and *Spiegel*, I relied on the online database Nexis Uni as well as WISO. I had access to these databases through the Free University of Berlin as well as the Berlin State Library. However, for the *Spiegel* and editions of the *taz* prior to 2016, I was only able to see text and not the full page of coverage on these databases. Therefore, for the typical articles in my in-depth analysis, I also viewed physical or microfiche copies of the papers in the Berlin State Library. To select the “discursive fragments,” or texts, that comprised my CDA (M. Jäger, 2019, p. 74), I again relied on the selection criteria of centrality, diversity and feasibility. I chose articles that had the Herero and Nama genocide as a primary topic of reporting and did not include reprints from news agencies. These articles formed the basis of the research process described in chapter 5.3. Given this material, I will now introduce my Namibian material and show which positions it takes in the discursive construction of the Herero and Nama genocide.

5.2.3 Namibian material: Daily newspapers and broadcaster

To understand the discursive position of the Namibian media in my sample, it is necessary to first discuss the contours of the Namibian media system. As has already been briefly discussed in chapter 2, the first recorded newspapers in Namibia arose in the German-speaking settler community (Rothe, 2010, p. 12). Many of these papers continued to exist after the end of German colonialism, speaking to and constructing a German-speaking community united by a shared language and customs (Nahmen, 2001, p. i). In addition to these early newspapers, multiple mass media were founded during South African colonialism, typically crystallizing around positions of support or opposition to the colonial regime. This included the public broadcasting corporation South West African Broadcasting Corporation (SWABC), which was founded in 1979 and based on the South African Broadcasting Corporation (Rothe, 2010, p. 13). While the service gradually introduced indigenous language programs, the broadcaster limited information about the anti-colonial struggle and criticism against the colonial administration (Ibelema & Bosch, 2009, p. 296). Conversely, various alternative publications, often party- or church-affiliated, were founded as part of the anti-colonial struggle (Heuva, 2001, p. 27). Many of these publications were discontinued after Namibian independence in 1990 – with a few exceptions that will be discussed in more detail below.

To this day, media production and consumption is highly urbanized in Namibia, a country with a population of roughly three million, and is centered on the capital of Windhoek (Ibelema & Bosch, 2009, p. 321). Given this urbanization, newspapers are both produced and consumed by economic and political elites (Rothe, 2010, p. 15). “It therefore

follows that newspaper businesses in Africa often cater for a much smaller and wealthier segment of the population.” (Remmert, 2019, p. 13) Nevertheless, “despite being a small and sparsely populated nation, [Namibia] has a fairly diverse and pluralistic media environment” with five daily newspapers and a variety of weekly newspapers (Remmert, 2019, p. 10). Namibia continues to rank highly in international press freedom scores (African Media Barometer, 2022, p. 17), although there are signs that politicians are becoming increasingly intolerant of media criticism, for instance by refusing to give interviews to certain media or attempting to withhold information (African Media Barometer, 2022, pp. 5, 28; Lister, 2018, p. 230).

The urban bias of Namibian journalism is also reflected in the weakness of local media: “Local radio stations are few and not very local in their broadcasting, and community papers are almost non-existent.” (Kivikuru, 2005, p. 328). The primary languages of newspaper reporting are English and, to a much smaller degree, Afrikaans and German (Kivikuru, 2005, p. 328). English-language newspapers often include a weekly or daily newspaper insert in indigenous languages, typically in Oshiwambo (Rothe, 2010, p. 23). Television, in turn, is primarily broadcast in English (Kivikuru, 2005, p. 329). The successor to SWABC, the government-owned public broadcaster NBC, continued to expand its indigenous language programming after independence, currently offering nine indigenous language services in addition to national programming in English and reaching 95% of the Namibian population (African Media Barometer, 2022, p. 33). However, NBC is “notably biased in favor of the government” and often reflects this perspective in its coverage (Remmert, 2019, p. 18).

Studies on Namibian youths’ media use have found that radio, including public, private and community broadcasters, is mainly used to listen to music (Kivikuru, 2005, p. 327; Shihomeka, 2019, p. 68). In addition, “television is less accessible to young people than radio and [...] printed newspapers get looked at mainly for job opportunities and for relaxation” (Shihomeka, 2019, p. 68). In this study, the author also finds that citizens are “still heavily reliant on both print and online media, so that the two support each other” (Shihomeka, 2019, p. 65). Another poll of youth media use found that “while the same group of youth openly admitted to being skeptical about the high volumes of disinformation and propaganda which proliferate online, they confirmed that newspapers continued to enjoy the highest levels of trust, followed by radio and television.” (Lister, 2018, p. 230) While these studies are based on self-reported behavior, they nevertheless point to an interesting dynamic in the Namibian media system. In 2022, only 51% of the country had internet access – again, often concentrated in urban areas (African Media Barometer, 2022, p. 55). Interviews with media practitioners in 2019 suggested that they were not very concerned with the digital transformation (Remmert, 2019, pp. 24–25), even though this has led to a lack of guidelines on how to ethically handle digital news-making in Namibian journalism (Zviyita & Mare, 2024).

All in all, the Namibian media system remains highly urbanized in a sparsely populated country, despite the wide selection of daily newspapers. Newspapers are primarily consumed by elite audiences, providing a unique insight into the construction of power and knowledge, even though this selection also has some drawbacks by remaining so focused on urban populations. In the following, I will discuss how the various media I selected for my analysis fit into this broader context.

The Namibian

Remmert (2019, p. 24) writes that “an estimated 243,000 people read *The Namibian* on a daily basis,” making it the largest-selling newspaper in Namibia (Shihomeka, 2019, p. 66). The newspaper appears daily from Monday to Friday. The *Namibian*⁶ was founded in 1985 by the journalist Gwen Lister during the liberation struggle, and the newspaper advocated for independence and openly thematized human rights violations by the apartheid regime (Heuva, 2001, p. 83). Hence, the *Namibian* became a target of repeated political suppression and violence by supporters of apartheid, including a bombing at the newspaper’s offices and a planned assassination attempt of the editor (Rothe, 2010, p. 29). After independence, the *Namibian* again came under fire for its critical coverage of the new Namibian government (Links, 2006, pp. 8–11). In 2000, the Namibian government banned government institutions from purchasing the newspaper, and from 2001 onwards, the government refused to place any more advertisements in the *Namibian* (Rothe, 2010, pp. 29–32). This ban was only lifted in 2011 following internal criticism in the ruling party, SWAPO (Rothe, 2010, p. 32). To this day, the *Namibian* “boasts a strong and recognizable brand” that is shaped by this history (Remmert, 2019, p. 23).

The *Namibian*’s unique position in the Namibian media landscape is also underscored by its independent ownership structures. “The majority of print publications [in Namibia] are operated as commercial businesses, while the government owns three newspapers [...]. An outlier in this collection of predominantly commercially- and government-owned local newspapers is the daily *The Namibian*, which is owned by the Namibia Media Trust.” (Remmert, 2019, p. 11) Finally, the *Namibian* also stands out through its introduction of a daily SMS feature called “*What you’re saying!*”, which enables readers to send text messages that are printed on a specific page in the newspaper. In interviews, these pages “were highlighted as spaces for people to express themselves freely, provided they don’t insult others.” (African Media Barometer, 2022, p. 11) Finally, the *Namibian* is also especially relevant for an analysis of the Herero and Nama genocide because its coverage is frequently quoted in German newspaper reporting (cf. Mükke, 2009, p. 119), making it an interesting leading medium in describing the Herero and Nama genocide, as will be discussed in more detail in the results chapter. The *Namibian* is also, by far, the Namibian newspaper with the most academic literature, as this section exemplifies, pointing to an overlap in the academic and journalistic discursive production of knowledge.⁷ While this testifies to the *Namibian*’s position of discursive centrality, it also highlights the fact that there is little research comparing this newspaper’s coverage with other papers in Namibia.

New Era

New Era arose during the liberation struggle as a medium of the resistance organization and later ruling party SWAPO. To this day, the paper is owned by the Namibian government (Remmert, 2019, p. 11). According to Remmert (2019, p. 24), *New Era* is the second most-read newspaper in Namibia, reaching a circulation of approximately 107,000. The

6 For ease of reading, *The Namibian*’s official title will be referred to as *Namibian* from here forward.

7 The *Namibian* was also the only English-language Namibian newspaper analyzed in my master’s thesis. See Haritos (2019) for this analysis, which additionally only focused on online articles.

newspaper appears daily from Mondays to Fridays. The financial proximity to the government often translates into content, with the government privileging *New Era* with exclusive access to information or interviews with government officials (African Media Barometer, 2022, p. 18). This is especially important for an analysis of journalistic reporting on the German-Namibian government negotiations. Moreover, *New Era* stands out for the fact that it is the only newspaper that has historically placed a large emphasis on indigenous languages in its reporting. Every day, the newspaper offers pages in a different indigenous language, including Otjiherero and Khoekhoegowab (Rothe, 2010, p. 23). As became clear in inductive sightings of the paper, journalists from the Herero/Mbanderu community often wrote pieces in this newspaper not found elsewhere in my sample, as I will discuss in more detail in my results. The combination of government proximity with a simultaneous emphasis on indigenous perspectives provided a unique discursive position on the Herero and Nama genocide that was important to include.

Namibian Sun

The *Namibian Sun* is the final large daily English-language Namibian newspaper in my sample. It appears daily from Mondays to Fridays. The paper was founded in 2007 in the vein of the popular South African newspaper *Daily Sun* (Rothe, 2010, p. 37). As such, the newspaper specifically aims to reach a younger audience and engage reader participation (Rothe, 2010, p. 37). As with the *Namibian*, its paper includes an SMS write-in column (“SayIt!”) as well as an occasional page with selected Facebook and Twitter comments that the newspaper received on its online articles (Remmert, 2019, p. 6). The *Namibian Sun* is commercially owned by the Network Media Hub (formerly Namibia Media Holdings), the same media organization that owns the German-language daily newspaper *AZ* and the Afrikaans-language daily newspaper *Republikein* (Remmert, 2019, p. 25), and all three newsrooms are in the same building (Nahmen, 2001, p. 138). There is no reliable circulation data for the *Namibian Sun*, even as it is widely accepted as one of the large daily newspapers behind the *Namibian* and *New Era* (Remmert, 2019, p. 11). The inclusion of a tabloid newspaper geared towards young readers is especially important given Shihomeka’s (2019, p. 68) assertion that many young Namibian recipients read the newspaper “for relaxation.”

In a study on the South African *Daily Sun*, Wasserman (2010, p. 179) has pointed out that tabloids often play the role of public interest journalism in South Africa, pointing out corruption or criticizing existing power structures in humorous or salacious terms. These findings suggested that the *Namibian Sun* could provide a unique discursive position. This position appeared to be partially fulfilled through the individual position of the investigative journalist Jemima Beukes, who is known in Namibia for critical questions she has posed to former President Hage Geingob and for being “manhandled” along with her colleague from the *Namibian*, Charmaine Ngatjiheue, by the president’s security staff during the public opening of a Covid-19 isolation facility (Media Institute of Southern Africa, 2021, p. 53). Taken together, the *Namibian Sun* thus represents a commercially owned newspaper with a discursive position that provides a variety of statements on the Herero and Nama genocide not found elsewhere in my sample.

Allgemeine Zeitung

In addition to the English-language newspapers above, the German-language AZ has a unique discursive position in the construction of the Herero and Nama genocide. This newspaper is the oldest newspaper in my sample and the only German settler newspaper still in print on the African continent. Nahmen (2001, p. 69) traces the history of the newspaper back to the *Südwestbote* from the year 1912, which turned into the *Kriegsbote* in 1915 during the First World War, then was renamed the *Allgemeine Zeitung* after the war. The AZ was briefly renamed again as the *Deutscher Beobachter* in 1939 during the Second World War, returning to the name AZ after the war (Nahmen, 2001, p. 69). From its inception, the AZ has historically focused on a German-speaking readership, and “[t]he paper had close ties to the colonial and apartheid establishment throughout its history in pre-independence Namibia.” (Links, 2006, p. 14). Chapter 2 has already discussed the role that the AZ has played in shaping commemorations of the genocide after the end of German colonialism (Förster, 2010).

Throughout its history, the AZ has also maintained ties to Germany and conservative German politics. For instance, in the late 1980s, the German publicist Diether Lauenstein purchased the AZ with funds from the conservative Hanns-Seidl-Stiftung (Nahmen, 2001, p. 113). Today, as with the *Namibian Sun*, the AZ is owned by the Network Media Hub. However, the paper continues to report in German and often covers topics that are not found in any other Namibian newspapers. In addition to reporting on events in Namibia, the paper also focuses to a lesser degree on events in Germany. Due to its German language, some of the readership of the AZ also consists of Germans, primarily former or prospective tourists. Rothe (2010, p. 19) notes that “[s]ince most readers in Namibia buy the print edition, the online edition rather targets the German-speaking readers abroad. Some 87 percent of the page views can be traced back to German-speaking Europe, whereas, on average, only 5 percent of the page views can be traced back to Namibia.” While these percentages have undoubtedly changed in the past 15 years, they nevertheless point to an interesting phenomenon that was later confirmed in the analysis: The AZ also has a readership of German-speaking individuals in Europe. Thus, despite being a newspaper read by a small, albeit economically elite, audience⁸, the AZ is nevertheless useful for capturing the breadth of statements that can be made about the Herero and Nama genocide today. The AZ appears daily from Mondays to Fridays; particularly notable is its Friday insert “WAZon” (*Wochenende Allgemeine Zeitung*), which often provides space for more in-depth cultural reviews as well as a page of letters to the editor, which has previously been an interesting space for relativizing comments or even denial of the 1904–1908 genocide (Haritos, 2019, p. 54).

Excursus: NBC, National FM

Finally, given the role of radio as the most-received medium in Namibia, I also included transcripts and audio snippets from NBC’s English-language service, National FM. As

8 Statistics of circulation could not be ascertained. See Haritos (2019, Appendix p. 20) for an interview where the editor-in-chief Frank Streffen mentioned that approximately 6,000 copies were printed a day. However, given the fact that the AZ reduced its print run because of Covid-19, it is very likely that this number is no longer accurate.

with *New Era*, NBC is owned by the Namibian government, which provides 70% of the broadcaster's running costs (African Media Barometer, 2022, p. 13). This has often translated into a bias towards portraying the government favorably, even though the latest African Media Barometer (2022, p. 13) points out that "NBC staff have begun adopting a more editorially independent stance, although this was not the case a few years ago." Förster (2010) noted that the Otjiherero language stations of NBC often played a role in the commemoration of the Herero and Nama genocide in Herero communities. Even though I could not analyze the Otjiherero language service (Omurari FM) or the Khoekhoegowab language service (Kaisames) due to language constraints, NBC's National FM provided me with an opportunity to view potentially diverging statements on the genocide that could not be found in the newspaper coverage. Moreover, as the name "National FM" already points out, this English-language program has historically had the duty to promote the use and understanding of the English language as part of a nation-building project (Rothe, 2010, p. 42). National FM thus was useful for considering how various positions of belonging are constructed through the media.

Process of material collection

For my Namibian material, I relied on a two-step process of material collection and analysis. First, I used the database Nexis to view the text of Namibian articles from the *Namibian*, *Namibian Sun* and *New Era*. This gave me an overview of events that had garnered reporting on the Herero and Nama genocide. Then, I used these texts as a guideline to identify important time frames for my second step of material collection, which involved sighting and scanning articles from printed newspapers during a two-week research trip to Basel as well as a six-week research trip to Namibia. I was able to view copies of *The Namibian* at the Basler Afrika Bibliographien, a private archive in Basel, as well as at The Namibian Resource Center, an archive maintained by the *Namibian* at its offices in Windhoek. Copies of *New Era* and the *Namibian Sun* were viewed at the National Library of Namibia in Windhoek. The dates and events acquired over Nexis gave me an idea of which months of newspaper coverage to order from the library. Then, I went through the newspaper, looking for articles that had the Herero and Nama genocide or German colonialism as a primary topic of coverage. I also focused on articles that had the Herero and Nama communities, the German-speaking Namibian community or Germany as a topic. This process helped me to find numerous articles that were not on Nexis. As I found out through this process of material collection, Nexis archived articles on the front pages of the Namibian newspapers, only saving politics and not including opinions sections, which were typically where the most in-depth articles on the Herero and Nama genocide were located. This points to interesting patterns of knowledge hierarchization in the digital archiving of Namibian newspaper material. Going through the physical copies of the newspaper thus helped me to identify new events and debates. It is important to note that the archives I found in both Basel and Windhoek also had a few gaps, and sometimes a few issues or even a month would be missing, especially during the time of the Covid-19 lockdown. The articles that I had access to and that focused on the Herero and Nama genocide became part of my structural analysis. Then, I was able to locate the typical articles for my in-depth analysis, which highlighted central and diverse statements on the Herero and Nama genocide.

For the *AZ*, which was not available online, I viewed physical newspaper copies in the Berlin State Library. Here, I went through every issue from 2015 until 2020. Regrettably, despite prior reassurances, the Berlin State Library did not have any issues from the *AZ* in 2021, likely due to disruptions during the Covid-19 pandemic. Regrettably, since I had already returned from Namibia at this time, it was not possible to view these issues. For this reason, as will be discussed in chapter 6, I was only able to include coverage from the *AZ* up to 2021. However, as I discuss there, this still gave me a variety of material to work with.

Finally, episodes from NBC's National FM were formally requested from the NBC's Archive Services in Windhoek. The process of receiving this material was a substantial challenge. Given my formal request, the archivists selected shows that had the Herero and Nama genocide as a topic and gave me printed transcript overviews. However, I was not permitted to purchase or save audio material and could only listen and take handwritten notes in the archive's offices. Given these limitations, the NBC material below will be viewed primarily as an excursus that helps to underline, contextualize or contrast some of the material I find in the newspapers. The selected shows will be discussed in more detail in chapter 6.

The process of material collection described above differs considerably from the process of German material collection, requiring me to focus much more on my sightings of printed material. Moreover, as the chapter above has indicated, the literature on the Namibian media system is still relatively sparse. Even though there is literature available about the Namibian media system, there is still very little literature on the content of Namibian journalism or the working conditions of Namibian journalists. Thus, despite knowing the available literature, there were still large gaps in knowledge – knowledge that ran the risk of being further compounded by yet another German-based researcher looking at Namibian material. This was a particular problem for my structural analysis, where I aimed to look at the entirety of collected German and Namibian material to ascertain typical articles for my ensuing in-depth analysis. To reflect on and confront this blind spot in my research position, I decided to also conduct background conversations with Namibian journalists.

5.2.4 Background conversations with Namibian journalists

As has been described in chapter 5.1, CDA requires the researcher to consider not only the manifest but also the latent context in which certain statements are made in each medium. To do justice to this goal, and in accordance with the blind spots in my research position, I also conducted background conversations with Namibian journalists during my six-week research stay in Namibia to help orient my CDA of Namibian material. In the process of material collection in Windhoek, I found that certain figures in my analysis period often wrote continuously about the Herero and Nama genocide throughout my analysis period. Additionally, in my master's thesis, I had already gathered experiences with interviews with the journalist Ndanki Kahiurika of the *Namibian* and the editor-in-chief Frank Steffen of the *AZ* (Haritos, 2019). In these qualitative interviews, I had asked questions about the self-image of journalists in Namibia as well as their day-to-day job. For this dissertation, I decided to conduct background conver-

sations that focused specifically on the topic of the genocide and the role of journalists in writing these articles. Background conversations enabled me to speak to journalists without having to officially record conversations, which was deemed important to talk about a “hot potato topic” such as the Herero and Nama genocide freely (African Media Barometer, 2022, p. 74). Thus, rather than recording and transcribing my conversations, I instead took notes during the conversation, enabling journalists to tell me when they wanted something written about or not.

The goal of these background conversations was to learn more about the position of the newspapers and how the topic of the Herero and Nama genocide is integrated into the reporting of the paper. This was especially important since there was very little available information about individual Namibian journalists to contextualize their position within the medium. In contrast with German newspapers, where information about journalists was readily available online or even in memoirs, this was not the case for the Namibian journalists in my sample. Moreover, in these conversations, I was also able to directly ask journalists about outdated research results and to discuss findings. Whereas there is previous research literature on German newspaper reporting on the genocide (Rausch, 2023a; Robel, 2013; Wolff, 2021), there was nothing similar for Namibian journalism. Finally, these conversations were vital given my own blind spots in the discourse. For instance, during my analysis, I began to think that newspapers were not reporting on the Herero and Nama genocide as much as in the beginning of my sample. However, I was not sure if this was merely a question of material access, especially given the archival gaps during the Covid-19 pandemic. Speaking to journalists gave me a way to reflect on these thoughts in the absence of research literature.

The conversational partners I spoke to are all prominent journalists from English-language newspapers who wrote about the Herero and Nama genocide throughout my sample and clearly held an important discursive position in the journalistic construction of this event. They included:

- Charmaine Ngatjiheue from the *Namibian*
- Kuzeeko Tjitemisa from *New Era*
- Kae Maṭunḍu-Tjiparuro from *New Era*
- Jemima Beukes from the *Namibian Sun*

All journalists above were contacted via e-mail or, in one case, via WhatsApp and agreed to meet me at cafés or at their offices in Windhoek. The journalists were told that the conversations would not be quoted verbatim but would serve as necessary background to understand the newspaper reporting that I was seeing. English-language journalists were selected since they wrote at newspapers, especially in the case of *New Era* and the *Namibian Sun*, for which there is little prior research. While I considered speaking to someone at the *AZ*, it was difficult to get in touch with the newspaper, and since I had already conducted an expert interview with the editor-in-chief for my master's thesis (Haritos, 2019), I decided to rely on the previous research literature, especially against the backdrop of time constraints while in Namibia.

The background conversations I had with these journalists helped to inform the structural analysis of my CDA to determine the position of the journalists writing about

the genocide as well as the topics and events that would help to define my in-depth analysis. As these conversations were not transcribed, I will not explicitly quote from them in the following results chapters. However, for purposes of transparency, I will mention when information that I am referring to comes from a conversation with one of the journalists above. Before moving to my results, I will now very briefly describe and reflect on my research process.

5.3 Reflections on the research process

This chapter describes how I applied the steps of CDA described in chapter 5.1 to the material described in chapter 5.2. During and after my process of material collection, I documented all “discursive fragments” (M. Jäger, 2019, p. 74), or articles, that contained the Herero and Nama genocide as a topic in an Excel file. Here, I also conducted the formal analysis and listed the date, length, rubric, page number, title, teaser, author and imagery (if applicable) of each article. I also provided a content summary and noted the topics and subtopics in the article. In total, I completed this process for 917 Namibian and 404 German articles. The following chapter 6 will look at these articles in more detail. This extensive overview was necessary for understanding how the discourse on the genocide emerged as a subject in journalism between 2015 and 2021 and was especially important given the lack of previous research. This part of the analysis was also where my background conversations with Namibian journalists helped to contextualize the discursive position of each medium and journalist.

Following the structural analysis, I used MAXQDA to conduct an in-depth analysis of 177 typical articles that represented key discursive events in my sample. MAXQDA provided me with the opportunity of easily collecting statements and arguments across papers and national contexts in my sample. In MAXQDA, I followed an open-ended and iterative process of coding. The questions articulated in chapter 5.1.2 functioned as a guideline for lead codes that helped me to outline aspects of memory construction that I wanted to look at. Underneath these lead codes, I then used an inductive process of coding to identify various sub-codes that referred to statements and arguments that I found within the text (cf. Appendix B: MAXQDA code system). In an iterative process, I went through multiple revisions and additions of my sub-codes, combining or producing new codes and sub-codes as I worked with my material. My goal was not to group as many statements under as few codes as possible but to capture the breadth of effective statements on the Herero and Nama genocide. The sub-codes I collected in MAXQDA were the basis for my in-depth analysis, which viewed all sub-codes and underlying statements together to consider which themes arose across the material and to answer my research questions. The results of this in-depth analysis are presented in the following chapters 7 and 8.

The research process described above came with quite a few limitations. An inductive and open coding process runs the risk of (re-)producing a German research perspective in the analysis of Namibian material, as I reflect above. Methodological applications of CDA often presuppose that the researcher, journalist and audience all come from the same discursive context. Even though I conducted background conversations with Namibian

journalists and am a native English speaker, it is certain that I missed some nuance in my analysis of Namibian material, since I am not located in a Namibian discursive context. Hence, future research by Namibian scholars on Namibian media content is crucially needed, as I reflect in the discussion.

It is also important to note that the state of material archivization also had an impact on my CDA: Handmade scans of Namibian newspapers, which had often been stapled and sometimes taped in the National Library, were a particular challenge for scanning and later coding in MAXQDA. This meant that I often spent more time with my Namibian material, transcribing textual content in the memos of my sub-codes when the OCR was not able to grasp the entire statement or only provide me with a list of symbols and numbers.

In addition to these archival challenges, the newspaper material in my analysis also differed in length, as I reflect in more detail in my formal analysis. Whereas German newspaper articles included long quotes with figurative language, Namibian newspapers relied on shorter articles with less figurative language. The longest articles with the most information on the Herero and Nama genocide in Namibian journalism were often written by non-Namibian guest authors or were reprints from Western newspapers. This reflects the different contexts of knowledge production described in chapter 5.2. In my selection of articles for the in-depth analysis, I thus not only determined which articles covered the Herero and Nama genocide in the most depth, but also which were typical for the arguments and speakers found in my sample. While this included shorter articles compared with my German sample, it also helped me to grasp the effective statements that were made in Namibian journalism. This is why the formal analysis in chapter 6 was crucial as a precursor for my in-depth analysis. Chapters 6.1 and 6.3 will describe this process in more depth and explain how these differences shaped my selection of articles for the in-depth analysis.

Finally, these differences also meant that in my in-depth analysis, I found myself both trying to show overlap between German and Namibian material and simultaneously often grouping material together to do justice to the different contexts of meaning-making. This was a challenge that shaped my analysis and shows the need for future methodological work for potentially bringing different contexts of meaning-making together more seamlessly, especially if the goal is an entangled analysis that goes beyond merely comparing and thereby further essentializing the differences between both contexts. Nevertheless, I also was able to find numerous points of overlap, which will be highlighted below. By looking at journalistic material in both contexts, I could trace speakers and arguments that frequently traversed boundaries, thereby playing a unique role in shaping the un-/sayable on the events of 1904–1908. With this background, I will now present the results that arose from my CDA of German and Namibian journalism.

