

Global Divides and Transnational Media Literacy

Elisabeth Eide

Abstract

The present article explores the challenges of global divides for media researchers through the example of a foreign reporter's blog from an area of intense conflict in Pakistan, where he was threatened by religious students. The event triggering the threats was an MMS containing a Norwegian-made cartoon of the Prophet Mohammed.

The reporter's initial entry to the blog after this event received a large number of responses from a mainly national audience, although the event itself was of a transnational character

The chain of events underlines the need to further explore how, with the help of modern technology, national media events may transcend continents and be reinterpreted in very different circumstances, while the debate mainly remains constrained by national boundaries. Furthermore it demonstrates how such a transnational event may be seen as an inspiration for academics concerned with global journalism and discusses the concept "transnational media literacy" as a tool of interpretation.

Keywords: globalization, transnational, Mohammed cartoons, blog journalism

Embedded with the Taliban

This journey towards an exploration of the concept *transnational media literacy* starts with a special story from the journalistic field.

In early June 2008, a reporter from TV2 – the largest privately owned channel in Norway – went to Afghanistan and Pakistan to do research for a book about the attack at The Serena Hotel in Kabul in January. There he had witnessed how his colleague, Carsten Thomassen, was shot and killed in an attack staged by the Taliban. On 11 June, he wrote a piece from Peshawar in his blog, and received more attention than usual, altogether 200 entries, many critical of his views.

In the following, I will analyse the event in its context suggesting some useful theoretical approaches and also try to summarize the challenges such a media event may pose to journalism researchers and international academic co-operation.

A few days before the reporter, Fredrik Græsvik (one of the most seasoned journalists at TV2), wrote the initial entry in his blog, a caricature of the Prophet Mohammad had been published in a regional newspaper in Norway as a critical response to the suicide attack on the Danish Embassy in Islamabad, Pakistan. The drawing showed a man whose lower body was naked, carrying a suicide belt around his waist and an

inscription across his chest saying: “I am Mohammad, and nobody dares to print me”. The cartoonist afterwards repeatedly said he did not intend to insult any Muslims and underlined that he had been critical of the original 12 caricatures published by *Jyllands-Posten*, in Denmark in September 2005. All the same, the caricature was interpreted as provocative by many Muslims – and some non-Muslims. Nothing much happened in the aftermath of the publication in Norway, probably due to the dialogic tradition and the calm attitude on the part of Muslim leaders.

The reporter visited a *madrasa* – a place of religious learning – where a student is called a *taleb*, Taliban being the plural form. This noun gained new meaning when a group of Taliban appeared as a political-military force in Afghanistan starting in 1994¹. The *madrasas* in Pakistan, and particularly those near the Afghan border have been associated, especially in the new millennium, with institutions for training of religious extremists, some of whom have fought with the Afghan Taliban in the battlefield – and a few of whom have resorted to suicide attacks inside Afghanistan.

The reporter had a long conversation with the students and was invited by the mullahs to stay the night. The madrasa is placed in what is called the Tribal Area close to the Afghan border, where the different Pashtun clans, through their leaders, have mostly ruled themselves for centuries. Recently, the people there had witnessed attacks both by American warplanes and drones and from the East by Pakistani troops, all in their seemingly endless search for Osama bin Laden and his associates.

The discussions were rather heated. According to the reporter, Græsvik, the students (aged 18-25) agreed among themselves that the reporter was a legitimate target for assassination, since he belonged to the electorate of a democracy that in turn was responsible for a government sending soldiers to occupy Afghanistan. Græsvik says he felt the assassination option remained very hypothetical, however².

Did He Deserve a Beating?

From the reporter’s blog, we can read that the situation got more heated the next morning, when one of the students happened to receive a picture of the Norwegian-made caricature on his cell phone via MMS. This happened after he had sent a message to a contact somewhere (location unknown) about a Norwegian reporter staying in their madrasa. The reporter in his blog writes the following, under the headline: “Are Norwegian editors trying to get me killed?”

Yesterday they quarrelled over sleeping next to the Norwegian journalist, this morning they quarrelled over who would get close enough to give me a solid beating. A little more than two years ago a Palestinian group at the Gaza strip tried to assassinate me due to the Mohammad caricatures printed by V.S. in his Christian magazine [January 2006]. I had a narrow escape from that attempt. This time I escaped with some pushing, since I swore at them and since the Mullah came to my rescue after a while. (Græsvik 11.6.2008)³

He told his readers how he felt that editors and cartoonists sitting safely back home while putting others’ lives, including his own, in danger ought to venture out into the Islamic world and face the anger. He questioned the wisdom of printing such caricatures in an increasingly globalized media world, and the entry concluded with a question:

Do YOU think the editors are cowards who put others' lives in danger? Or do you think it is right to print cartoons to provoke – regardless of the costs? Please write a comment. (And – yes, I know that there are many among you who may think I deserved a solid beating, that might be right, but you do not need to write this.) (ibid.)

A short version of this event – focussing on the threats against the reporter and his reactions – was broadcast on TV2's news-around-the-clock channel. The blog harvested comments for approximately two weeks, but only very intensively during the first 24 hours.

A Polarized Blog

The event demonstrates how a newspaper with a mostly regional readership (not unlike the situation for the Danish *Jyllands-Posten* before it turned national) can generate, with a visual image, unforeseen feelings and actions in another corner of the world. In this case it happened in what is considered a remote and dangerous area for journalists, an area that might easily be considered as one end of the Huntingtonian “Clash of Civilizations” (Huntington 1993, 1996, Lewis 1990). It also demonstrates how media output can be circulated by a combination of modern technology and private initiatives – for reinterpretation far outside a medium's regular audience, if we may still apply such terms. How this MMS travelled is one obvious research question. The reporter says he does not know, but one route may have been from Norwegian-Pakistanis, living either in Norway or (visiting) in Pakistan, to this student contact at the Madrasa. The route may also have been much more complicated.

Among the app. 200 entries to the blog⁴, I found a few participants who contributed more than once, one of them 24 times. But otherwise there was a great variety. With all reservations taken for the many uncertainties of interpreting such material⁵, a quantitative overview indicates that close to two thirds of the responses were critical – some even hateful – of the reporter for allegedly betraying the principles of freedom of expression. Some accused him of being a closet Muslim lover (not an uncommon derogatory concept in the blogworld of Norway), and others accused him of being much too self-centred. More men than women participated, and among the women a majority more or less supported the reporter's views.

Judging from the entries (and the nicknames), only a handful of participants with a Muslim background took part in the discussion. One of the participants appeared to be Danish. The fact that the Norwegian language is primarily only understood by a Scandinavian audience prevented a larger transnational discussion; but we do not know how many of the participants actually live in Norway. Still we may conclude that the blog was mainly localized to one country, while the debate contained transnational elements and arguments.

Table 1. Views Expressed in the Blog (11.06–12.07⁶)

	Sympathetic with the reporter's views	Critical of the reporter's views	Ambiguous attitude towards the reporter's views	Total
Male entries	35	81	9	125
Female entries	17	14	1	32
Gender unknown	12	23	2	37
Total	64	118	12	194 ⁷

Among the most frequent discourses in the debate were the following ones critical of his views (several participants expressed more than one discourse in their entries, therefore it does not make sense to quantify these results):

- *The reporter disregards/betrays the value of freedom of expression.* (“There is no doubt that the Islamists will win this struggle. When even experienced journalists in fear of their own life turn against freedom of expression, which has been the foundation of the equal rights and religious freedom we have in Norway today, yes then the Islamists are going to win”; Marius 11.6.2008)
- *The reporter is a closet Muslim lover* (“I no longer consider Græsvik to be a good journalist. A good journalist defends freedom of expression as something absolute; and he evidently does not do so. When he also reveals clear sympathies for the Taliban and is extremely one-sided in his defence of Islam’s people and critical of the U.S., Israel and the West ...”; Anti-socialist 11.6.2008)
- *The self-centred reporter* (“The only thing that provokes me here is F. Græsvik’s ability to put one man, himself, in focus over Adresseavisen’s publication. I don’t think the cartoonist had you in mind ...”; Lars Erik, 11.6.2008)

In addition, some people explicitly accused the reporter of bad judgement or uttered more general and moral disgust.

The ones who were largely sympathetic to Græsvik’s reasoning may be grouped under the following discourses:

- *Respecting the culture of the Other* (... “I wonder about these people who just throw out their words on print just to exercise their right to freedom of expression. All countries are not like Norway and these people demonstrate precisely that they do not understand the totality of this problem.”; Bjarte 11.6.2008)
- *Provocation is negative and counterproductive* (“There are so many just out there to provoke and harass. Their sensibility is as low as that of the terrorists. They act without thinking of the consequences”; Adrian 11.6.2008)
- *Wrong to mock religion* (“One should not defend freedom of expression by ridiculing others’ religions or beliefs”; Tork 11.6.2008)

Some of these entries also mentioned how freedom of expression was never totally unlimited, and that some of the ‘original’ cartoons of the Prophet Mohammed were examples of how this right could be misused.

The reporter responded to parts of the critique and tried to clarify his position as a defender of the freedom to print both cartoons and of other forms of expression, but felt free to criticize some of the ways in which this right is being exercised in contemporary Norway.

Connections between Locals

He did this by referring to cartoons turning into global media events, when telling how he encountered the rage both in Gaza and in Pakistan, a point not considered by many of his critics who seemed to “domesticate” the debate.

Anthropologist Jonathan Friedman sees the global as a set of processes that connect localities (2008). This seems to fit well with the event described above, as we here find a case in which a cartoon from a Norwegian newspaper is suddenly represented among madrasa students in Pakistan’s North West Frontier Province, bordering on an Afghanistan at war. But the connection is limited, and the discourses following the event in Norway do not come across to the *madrasa* and its community of interpretation.

In the course of globalization, writes Martin Löffelholz, transnational cultures are developing that increasingly shape the production of media content (2008: 23). We may debate to what degree this is true, as many media seem to still retain a very national focus. But it remains true that we are living at a time in which one does not yet know the full impact on journalism of media mergers and the (no longer so) new technology; and in which journalism is undergoing a very rapid development. Löffelholz therefore does not endorse a very fixed theoretical approach to global journalism research, but writes that “a *multi-perspective approach* – not always with a clear focus, may be a necessary answer to the many challenges of a social scientific description of journalism” (op. cit.: 26).

Modernities?

Judging from the complexity of the situation inspiring the present article, Löffelholz’s view seems relevant. One approach might be to discuss modernity. Yudishtir Raj Isar mentions how asymmetric relationships that implicitly favour the universalization of Western paradigms stifle local production of culture, language, and memory, and thereby create considerable conflict potential⁸. The conflict potential was obviously realized during the caricature crisis in 2006 (Kunelius, Eide et al. 2007, Eide, Kunelius & Phillips 2008). But does “stifle” mean freezing local cultural production and interpretation in pre-modernity, or thinking of this production of meaning as static?

Modernity is often defined as having to do with individualism, division between the public and the private, enlightenment philosophy and critical rationality, capitalism, global economy, development and evolutionism (Friedman 2008), i.e., values that a Western *we* is supposed to embrace. It may be worth discussing, however, whether this *we* cannot also see other expressions of modernity, or whether one might do as Friedman has and speak of *modernities* in the plural (ibid.). The communication between the individual *Taleb* and his contacts (somewhere in the world) may then be seen as part of modernity and of the global processes connecting localities. And the response of the angry group of students, traditionally interpreted as an echo of medieval thought and

fanaticism, might be looked upon as a result of modern religious revivalism, and as an expression of believers feeling humiliated, plus a heated political reaction against Western military intervention and double standards.

Ethical Responsibility

Raj Isar also asks when a conflict is cultural, and whether encounters with the West are increasingly interpreted in religious terms. This relates to the trend towards culturalization of the way in which conflicts are explained – a move away from previous racially inspired discourses. On the other hand this trend seems to ignore more social or political explanations of present-day phenomena in multicultural societies. The question arises, then, of whether an increasingly religious interpretation (by the media) may be a way of de-politicizing current conflicts. In the case described above, such an approach offers a rather narrow interpretation of the event.

Another route of exploration of the event may be through editorial ethics and responsibility. The reporter revealed that the TV2 blogs are edited. Entries expressing outright racism or hate speech are deleted. In the case of TV2, such moderation has been outsourced to a company in Sweden, a fact that does not seem to be entirely in accordance with a media institution's editorial responsibility. This may indicate the low status of blogs compared to TV programmes, and the need for researchers to think in terms of the political economy of outsourcing. One might imagine more such outsourcing and multiple borders being crossed if it were not for the particularities of the Scandinavian languages⁹.

Seeing the World with Different Lenses

My background in journalism studies and journalistic practice has given me experience of how certain media events may be received in communities of interpretation that differ substantially from each other. Awareness of this fact has to do with what Edward Said labels “contrapuntal reading” (Said 1994). I have also witnessed how internal differences in a nation may at times be more decisive for media output and interpretation than are regional or global divides. Being based at a university in Pakistan during the full duration of the caricature crisis the spring semester of 2006 was a learning experience. Most people there probably did not see the actual cartoons, but had strong opinions about them as blasphemous and provocative. Political leaders used them for their own purposes. Voices were raised suggesting that they were a result of a deliberately planned action to prove Huntington right in his “Clash of Civilizations” prophesy. But there were also other voices, even a few who defended the initial publication of the cartoons, and Western voices of various political shades were given space in Pakistani newspapers. The anger expressed was often an amalgamation of frustration with the government's closeness to the U.S., the soaring food prices – and outrage against the Mohammed cartoons (Eide 2007).

The images conveyed to the so-called Western world about Pakistan (and other countries where Islam is a dominant religion) during this conflict seem mostly to have been the angry side of the picture (Kunelius, Eide et al. 2007), demonstrating the collective conventions or doxa of journalism at work: focusing on extremes and conflict (Bourdieu

1999, Benson & Neveu 2005). In this case, it implied the flag- and effigy-burning fanatics in the streets; the unruly rampages, representing a tiny minority of the 170 million people living in the country. Similar pictures would be found in the Pakistani press, which may indicate some universality when it comes to news values (Eide 2007). But while the pictures of violence at home (in Pakistan) seem after a while to have been shown as a warning to the citizens (“see how destructive this turns out”), in Europe the connotations may have been simpler and more outright: Here is the violent Other; this is the way “they” are. This indicates how images travel – but unaccompanied by the discourses in the societies in which they originally occur, as also happened in Græsvik’s case (see also Hahn 2008).

Transnational Media Commons?

In search of some common ground for global journalism research, the concept of “transnational commons” might be useful. Ulf Hannerz defines it as resources that are somehow shared by humanity, and not directly under the control of any government. His examples range from collective resources such as the (polluted) sea and water to the shared potential of biodiversity¹⁰ and common threatening realities in the shape of global warming. He also writes about the public spaces of larger cities as “transnational *cultural commons*”. The latter do not risk being depleted, as meanings are floating without getting lost (Hannerz 1996).

Despite the risk that Hannerz may be projecting an idealized world, it is clear that, combined with other aspects of globalization (such as diasporic connections), the Internet (though access to it is limited by government censorship and gross social inequality) may today, twelve years after Hannerz wrote his piece, be seen as an important element in a contemporary *transnational media commons*. In addition, today’s electronic connections transcend the borders of the large cities, as seen in the MMS transmittance of a Norwegian caricature. Thinking along the same lines, due to the development of the Internet, Stephen Reese recently found it meaningful to speak of a “global news arena” and a “new social geography”, despite the fact that most traditional media are local or national:

When I refer to global journalism I do not mean to suggest that it has replaced the local and national. In a broad sense, no media practice has escaped the transformations of globalization. Even the smallest Third World news agency with access to the Internet has changed the way it works [...] So we can see aspects of the global embedded in many settings, which makes theorizing more challenging. (Reese 2008: 241)

Reese emphasizes global media ownership as one important factor and suggests three related propositions in this social geography: [1] an evolving media system that he calls the “global news arena”; [2] a journalism adapting to this arena, in need of navigating “between its traditional ‘vertical’ orientation within whatever nation-state it is carried out and a ‘horizontal’ perspective that transcends national frameworks”; and [3] cultural as well as professional identification among those involved in this global dimension, not least within journalism, which “increasingly shares common norms and values adapted to the needs of a more globalized system” (ibid.).

The cartoon controversy, in its many incarnations, has demonstrated the existence of a “global news arena” with its horizontal perspective, but it also emphasizes how streams of journalism do not necessarily and easily adapt to this. The TV2 reporter’s experience and the blog response that followed emphasize the need to combine local and global perspectives in journalism.

Author, journalist and professor at Vassar College, Amitava Kumar wrote in his powerful book on India-Pakistan relations that “The most challenging space of scrutiny that one can occupy is the place where one is both oneself and the enemy” (Kumar 2004). Reporters like Fredrik Græsvik may have felt that challenge, and in his particular case may have thought that the traditional news conventions were too narrow to allow him to express his experiences, explaining his desire to enter his views on the blog, and to invite response.

The Reporter as a Human Being

Another line of exploration of the case of Græsvik’s blog from Pakistan may be the particular ways in which reporters and participants express themselves in this medium. There are examples of entries that could have been published in traditional print media, but this probably does not apply to most of them. Some are very personal letters to the reporter, while others are rather hateful without arguments underlining the aggression. Some are far from the point, as when a famous Norwegian blogger gives her view on Græsvik’s initial entry, and another person comments on her good looks.

Susan Robinson explores what she calls the “j-blog”, where journalists from conventional media have an extra outlet (Robinson 2006). In her study, she argues that the blog is a place where reporters may “display short-form reporting, short-form analysis and short-form writing”; and it is also a way for mainstream publications to “recapture journalism authority. Thus, blogs represent reconstituted journalism [...]” (ibid. 65).

With Græsvik, being a TV reporter, the case may be slightly different, because traditional TV reports are very short and do not offer space for in-depth reasoning. But the reporter’s blog as a means of attracting (bonding) the audience to a particular medium in competition with more independent blogs may be highly relevant. Another dimension has to do with the blog atmosphere being more informal and personal. Robinson points out that blogs are popular because they “allow the reader to see the journalist as a human being, connecting with them without the stiff, imperial voice that turns so many young people off” (Robinson, 2006:68, quoting Pohlig, 2003: 25). She also questions whether journalists, when engaging in this new (post-modern) journalism, “are crafting something completely alternative to ‘normal’ journalism” (ibid. 69), but concludes that the j-blogs “by mainstream publications remain very much framed in tradition” (ibid. 81).

Comment and Confessional Diary

Furthermore, Robinson suggests a general categorization of her sample of blogs in seven forms¹¹. Græsvik’s initial entry may pass as a cross between a “confessional diary written about the reporter about his or her beat” and a “straight column of opinion for the Web”, as it is indeed a personal account, but simultaneously comments on an actual event: the publication of another Mohammed cartoon in his home country. It lets the

readers see the reporter with his frustrations as a (temporarily misplaced) human being, spontaneously writing after having experienced a stressful and threatening situation. His entry carries several of the characteristics traditionally more associated with blogs than with mainstream (news) journalism: usage of first person, questions without answers, etc. Based on these observations, the entry may be more inviting to ordinary (young) citizens than are the rather hierarchic news items transmitted on the TV screen – thus generating a more active response¹².

Melissa Wall shows how independent blogs have emerged during times of war as a “new genre of journalism – offering news that features a narrative style characterized by personalization and an emphasis on non-institutional status; audience participation in content creation; and story forms that are fragmented and interdependent with other websites” (Wall 2005: 154). Græsvik’s blog, being linked to a major medium, shares only a few of these characteristics: personalization and audience participation in creating a debate. As such, it does not constitute an entirely new and post-modern journalism (an expression used by several blog researchers), but may be said to be a textual re-expression in between the institutionalized and the informal.

It is beyond the scope of the present article to elaborate on the particularities of the blog, but judging precisely from the *responses* to Græsvik’s blog, one may safely suggest that a larger degree of informality, intimization and aggression (and subsequently polarization) characterizes many, but far from all of the audience entries. On the other hand, this is clearly an outlet for voices that would (otherwise) not have been registered in the mainstream media.

Conclusions: Transnational Media Literacy

A caricature aimed at a Norwegian regional audience becomes a transnational media event via cell phone connections – and generates a blog with a largely national response, but still a debate with international ingredients. The future is likely to bring similar challenges in a world where people are increasingly interdependent, not least due to the climate crisis. If one as a researcher in the field of journalism feels the need to understand a variety of perspectives in a globalized world, it makes more sense than ever to build academic networks across countries and continents. In this case, a valuable connection would be researchers at Peshawar University – colleagues who, provided with a translation of the blog, might be co-workers in a project including the Pakistani side of the story. Thus, they would be able to suggest their questions to the Norwegian reporter and other actors – and I mine to the Pakistani actors. How did the cartoon travel to the *madrasa*? What did the students do afterwards? What Internet connections do they use to inform themselves? Do they also contribute to blogs or other debates about the Mohammed cartoon conflict? What would the answers tell about their niche of modernity and their media literacy, even if limited?

Some researchers’ networks of this nature (i.e., across the imagined clashes or divides) do exist. In spite of immigration restrictions and deep economic divides, more media and journalism researchers need to broaden such connections to achieve a deeper understanding of the role of media globalization. The interpretation of such media events as the caricature issue may require a degree of what Gayatri Spivak calls “transnational literacy”, which she explains in this way:

[...] the ability to read the world in its differences even when required categories such as 'literature' or 'decolonization' impose a uniformity [...] It allows us to sense that the other is not just a 'voice' but that others produce articulate texts, even as they, like us, are written in and by a text not of our own making. It is through transnational literacy that we can invent grounds for an interruptive praxis from within our disavowed hope in justice under capitalism. (Spivak/Sanders 2006:2)

Spivak – primarily a literature scholar – is concerned with the interpretation of fiction, but her words have inspired me to suggest *transnational media literacy* as an increasingly important perspective in journalism research. Among the properties of such literacy, these points are suggested:

- An awareness of the ways in which initially local and national media events may obtain a more global character, not least helped by modern technology, and thus generate a plurality of readings and interpretations (and non-intended actions) in communities of interpretation across the world.
- An ability to see events with the eyes of the distant other too, helped by an exchange of lenses – between academics across continents, and between media and journalism educators and practitioners in particular.
- A recognition that transnational media literacy also operates and is required within a nation's borders, as was demonstrated in many nations when the caricature crisis was at its peak in 2006 – and as is constantly demonstrated in all societies in which diaspora plays an increasingly important role.
- A growing and shared in-depth knowledge of the various media systems of the world and of how the struggle for media freedom and human dignity takes various forms owing to the variety of national and local circumstances.

More cooperation is needed between media researchers and educators, a cooperation that transcends continental barriers and strict visa policies. Many networks do exist; one of them was formed while working with the newspaper coverage of the caricature crisis, where researchers from many corners of the world contributed. In November 2007, the group actually sat together and commented upon each of the twelve original drawings of the Prophet Mohammed from *Jyllands-Posten* (Alhassan 2008). Such experiences and future related endeavours may contribute to making Said's contrapuntal reading (1994) a more accepted and fruitful practice in transnational media research.

Notes

1. In 1996 they took Kabul, and when the US and its allies invaded Afghanistan 7.10.2001, they controlled approx. 90 percent of the country.
2. In a telephone interview with this researcher, 12.07.2008.
3. <http://fredrik.tv2blogg.no/article17092.ece>. All translations from the blog are made by this researcher.
4. The reporter himself has five entries in addition to his initial one.
5. I have interpreted male nicknames and pseudonyms as representing male participants, and vice versa. A small group of people non-identifiable as gendered does exist (12)
6. Only 19 entries were made after the first date (11.6), which demonstrates the intensity of such a medium.
7. This number excludes the reporter's own entries, which were either supportive or ambiguous.

8. This refers to his presentation in the same plenary in Stockholm, also published in this volume.
9. Occasionally, misunderstandings between people in the Nordic countries occur, which may also happen in the course of the mentioned outsourcing.
10. As Dr. Vandana Shiva mentioned in her keynote on the opening night of the IAMCR conference in Stockholm.
11. The seven forms suggested are: "a reporter's notebook of news tidbits and incidentals; a straight column of opinion for the Web; a question-and-answer format by editors; a readership forum; a confessional diary written by the reporter about his or her beat; a round-up of news summaries that promote the print publication; and a rumor-mill blog that the reporter uses as an off-the-record account" (ibid. 70).
12. The massive response may also have to do with the fact that the Mohammed cartoons conflict was a hot political topic in Norway – and indeed elsewhere.

Literature

- Ahassan, A. (2008) 'The Twelve Cartoons: A Discursive Inquiry', in Eide, E., Kunelius, R., & Phillips, A. (eds. 2008) *Transnational Media Events. The Mohammed Cartoons and the Imagined Clash of Civilizations*. Göteborg: Nordicom.
- Benson, R. & Neveu, E. (2005) *Bourdieu and the Journalistic Field*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1999) *Om fjernsynet*. Oslo: Gyldendal.
- Eide, E. (2007) 'Pakistan – Critique, Anger and Understanding', in Kunelius, R. & Eide, E. (eds.) (2007) *Reading the Mohammed Cartoons Controversy. An International Analysis of Press Discourses on Free Speech and Political Spin*. Bochum/Freiburg: Projekt Verlag.
- Eide, E., Kunelius, R., & Phillips, A. (eds.) (2008) *Transnational Media Events. The Mohammed Cartoons and the Imagined Clash of Civilizations*. Göteborg: Nordicom.
- Fairclough, N. (1995) *Media Discourse*. London: Arnold.
- Friedman, J. (2008) 'Modernities, Class and the Contradictions of Globalization', in K.E. Friedman & J. Friedman (eds.) *The Anthropology of Global Systems*. Lanham: Altamira Press.
- Hahn, O. (2008) 'Pictures Travel, Discourses do not', in Eide, E., Kunelius, R., & Phillips, A. (eds.) (2008) *Transnational Media Events. The Mohammed Cartoons and the Imagined Clash of Civilizations*. Göteborg: Nordicom.
- Hanitzsch, T. (2008) 'Comparing Journalism across Cultural Boundaries: State of the Art, Strategies, Problems, and Solutions', in Martin Löffelholz & David Weaver: *Global Journalism Research*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Hannerz, U. (1996) *Transnational Connections: Culture, People, Places*. London/NYC: Routledge.
- Huntington, S.P. (1993) 'The Clash of Civilizations?', *Foreign Affairs* Vol 72 Issue No 3
- Huntington, S.P. (1996) *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. London: Touchstone Books.
- Kunelius, R. & Eide, E. (eds.) (2007) *Reading the Mohammed Cartoons Controversy. An International Analysis of Press Discourses on Free Speech and Political Spin*. Bochum/Freiburg: Projekt Verlag.
- Lewis, B. (1990) 'The Roots of Muslim Rage', *The Atlantic Monthly*, September 1990, <http://www.theatlantic.com/doc/199009/muslim-rage>
- Löffelholz, M. (2008) 'Heterogeneous – Multidimensional – Competing: Theoretical Approaches to Journalism – an Overview', in Löffelholz & Weaver (eds.), op. cit.
- Löffelholz, M. & Weaver, D. (eds.) (2008) *Global Journalism Research, Theories, Methods, Findings, Future*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing
- Reese, S.B. (2008) 'Theorizing a Globalized Journalism', in Löffelholz & Weaver, op. cit.
- Robinson, S. (2006) 'The Mission of the J-blog: Recapturing Journalistic Authority Online', *Journalism*, Vol 7 (1): 65-83. London: Sage.
- Said, E.W. (1994) *Culture and Imperialism*. London: Vintage.
- Spivak, G. & Sanders, M. (2006) *Live Theory*. London/NYC: Continuum.
- Wall, M. (2005) "'Blogs of War' Weblogs as news', *Journalism*, Vol 6 (2) 153-172. London: Sage.

