

**THE AMERICAN UNIVERSITY OF PARIS
MASTER OF ARTS IN GLOBAL COMMUNICATIONS**

**DISSERTATION SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF
ARTS IN GLOBAL COMMUNICATIONS**

**Provocations of Civilizational Discourse:
The Mohammed Cartoons in the Danish Context**

Charlotte Karen Elliott

- Paris, March 26th, 2010 -

ProQuest Number: 10305720

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 10305720

Published by ProQuest LLC (2017). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

THE AMERICAN UNIVERSITY OF PARIS
MASTER OF ARTS IN GLOBAL COMMUNICATIONS
DISSERTATION

OF

CHARLOTTE KAREN ELLIOTT

APPROVED:

Dissertation Director: 
Mark HAYWARD

Committee member: _____
Darrin HICKS

Program Director: 
Waddick DOYLE

Date: 17 / 05 / 2010.

STATEMENT OF AUTHENTICITY

I have read AUP's policies on plagiarism and certify that the content of this dissertation entitled

PROVOCATIONS OF CIVILIZATIONAL DISCOURSE:
THE MOHAMED CARTOONS IN THE DANISH CONTEXT

is all my own work and does not contain any unacknowledged work from any other sources.

Number of words: 22, 808

Signed: 

Date: 26-05-2010

COPYRIGHT STATEMENT

A printed copy and an electronic version of this dissertation have been given to *The American University of Paris - AUP* for its collection and to grant scholarly access. As of today, I authorize the AUP to archive, perform any needed cataloging, keep records of this dissertation and disseminate them in France and abroad. In addition, I authorize AUP to provide free access to the entire work for on-site consultation, loan, dissemination via Internet/Intranet and for interlibrary loan, for as long as this work exists. The University must acquire my explicit approval before making any additional copies of this dissertation.

L'œuvre ayant le caractère d'un travail universitaire, un exemplaire dans son intégralité sous format papier et sa version électronique ont été déposés à la bibliothèque de *The American University of Paris - AUP*. J'autorise, à partir d'aujourd'hui, la bibliothèque d'AUP à donner un accès gratuit à l'intégralité du texte de mon mémoire, à le citer, à l'archiver, à en faire des résumés, et à sa diffusion, soit en France ou à l'étranger, pendant toute la durée de vie de ce mémoire. Ainsi je donne à AUP l'autorisation pour sa consultation sur place, sa diffusion par Internet/ Intranet ainsi que pour le prêt local entre bibliothèques. *L'Université Américaine de Paris* (AUP) doit obtenir mon accord explicite pour toute reproduction ultérieure.



, 2010

PROVOCATIONS OF CIVILIZATIONAL DISCOURSE: THE MOHAMMED CARTOONS IN THE DANISH CONTEXT

Charlotte Karen Elliott

Dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Global Communications in the year 2010.

ABSTRACT

This thesis examines a particular provocation of civilizational discourse concerning the event of the Mohammed Cartoons controversy in the context of Denmark. It examines the cause-and-effect nature of the Mohammed Cartoons controversy within the advent of “socioeconomic and cultural polarization” of Danish society (Schmidt, 2009). The thesis therefore examines the Mohammed Cartoons controversy in terms of a multi-layered process. There is an examination of a civilizational and cultural conflict, as presented by Samuel Huntington’s *The Clash of Civilizations*. Here, the Cartoons conflict is investigated in regards to “civilizational” identities, which are tied to cultural values and supported by individual identity politics. There is also an examination of free-speech ethics, with arguments regarding the processes of interpretation thereof, and the place of multiculturalism and ethnic diversification in Denmark.

Using relevant works in the field of communication studies, this thesis is approached through a discourse analysis of a plethora of texts, including newspaper articles, academic articles, and theoretical works. It strives to unite different facets of the Mohammed Cartoons controversy to present an actual event which demonstrates a deliberate provocation of civilizational discourse, where the Cartoons were an act of challenging (Danish) Muslims, as well as reflexively asserting a “Danish” national identity through the calling of values of free speech and democracy.

Key Words: Danish Mohammed Cartoons, multiculturalism, *The Clash of Civilizations*, civilizational discourse, freedom of speech.

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my mother, Margit Elliott.

Charlotte K. Elliott, 2010

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Mark Hayward, my thesis advisor, for his continued patience, help, and encouragement during the writing of this thesis.

I would also like to thank my father, David P. Elliott, who provided me the opportunity to pursue my studies at AUP.

A final thanks goes to my family and friends the world over for their support during the production of this work.

Charlotte K. Elliott, 2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPROVAL PAGE.....	II
STATEMENT OF AUTHENTICITY	III
COPYRIGHT STATEMENT	IV
ABSTRACT	V
DEDICATION	VI
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	VII
INTRODUCTION.....	1
SECTION 1: THE MOHAMMED CARTOONS CONTROVERSY: THE ORIGINS	9
1.0. INTRODUCTION.....	9
1.1. HOW THE CARTOONS HAPPENED	9
1.2. THE DEFENSE OF THE CARTOONS.....	11
1.3. THE DEMAND FOR AN APOLOGY	13
1.4. THE REPRINTING OF THE CARTOONS.....	16
1.5. THE FOILED ASSASSINATION ATTEMPT OF A CARTOONIST	19
1.6. THE CARTOONS AS A CRIME.....	21
1.7. REASONING BEHIND THE CARTOONS	24
FIGURES.....	28
FIGURE 1.1. THE "MOHAMMED CARTOONS"	28
FIGURE 1.2. KURT WESTERGAARD'S "BOMB-IN-A-TURBAN" CARTOON.....	29
SECTION 2: APPLIED DISCUSSIONS OF THE CARTOONS	30
2.0. INTRODUCTION.....	30
2.1. HUNTINGTON AND THE "CLASH OF CIVILIZATIONS"	30
2.2. A SHORT CRITIQUE OF HUNTINGTON.....	34
2.3. IN CONTEXT: FREEDOM OF SPEECH.....	37
2.4. IN CONTEXT: RESPONSIBILITY AND JUDGMENT	40
2.5. IN CONTEXT: A QUESTION OF COMMUNICATION	41
2.6. IN CONTEXT: UNDERSTANDING THE CONTROVERSY.....	45
SECTION 3: APPLIED RESEARCH ON MULTICULTURALISM.....	48
3.0. INTRODUCTION.....	48
3.1. IN CONTEXT: IMMIGRATION, DISCRIMINATION, AND MULTICULTURALISM.....	49
3.2. IN CONTEXT: DANISH IDENTITY AS RELATED TO THE CARTOONS.....	52
3.3. CONCLUSION	54
SECTION 4: AN ASSESSMENT OF RESEARCH	55
APPENDIX A: DENMARK.....	58
A.1. BACKGROUND OF NEWSPAPER MEDIA IN DENMARK.....	58
A.2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON DENMARK	60
APPENDIX B: DESCRIPTION OF THE MOHAMMED CARTOONS	63
APPENDIX C: HUNTINGTON	65
C.1. HUNTINGTON'S DEFINITION OF "CIVILIZATION".....	65
C.2. HUNTINGTON'S FIVE FACTORS OF THE ISLAMIC RESURGENCE.....	65
APPENDIX D: DOCUMENTARY: "BLOODY CARTOONS"	67
D.1. BACKGROUND ON THE "BLOODY CARTOONS" DOCUMENTARY.....	67
D.2. DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF THE "BLOODY CARTOONS" DOCUMENTARY	67
D.3. CRITIQUE OF THE "BLOODY CARTOONS" DOCUMENTARY	76
WORKS CITED.....	78

Introduction

The 2005 publication of twelve Danish caricatures of the Prophet Mohammed and the ensuing controversy presents a complex dialogue addressing issues of freedom of speech, self-censorship, nationalism, and multiculturalism, as well as being reflective of the contemporary structure and influence of globalized media networks. The social uprising and conflict after the publication of these cartoons “has not only demonstrated the reach of the media but also the impact of transnational relations between people of the Diaspora and their countries of origin, as well as powerful and complex links holding people of religion and religious communities together across the world” (Eide et al., 2008). Indeed, the controversy would not have led to fruition without “a media publication [,] and its development and consequences would be unthinkable without media coverage and mediated communication.” The significance of media in the controversy is evident on three levels: first, the publication of the Cartoons in a Danish newspaper, second, the international reprinting of the Cartoons as a part of news related to them, and third, the subsequent circulation and discourse of the Cartoons as a part of “mediated statements from many governments, organizations, and individuals issuing their stance on the cartoons or the protests” (Langer, 2008).

This thesis examines the publication of the Cartoons and reads it as a provocation of “civilizational discourse,” a term derived from Samuel Huntington’s work *The Clash of Civilizations* and his critics. This thesis will examine contemporary trends in popular discourses such as that of Benjamin Barber’s work *Jihad versus McWorld* and his discussion of complications in an “imagined political community.” Barber (1996) stipulates that in such a community there is the inter-relationship between “nationalism of the liberal nation-state and the nationalism of *ethnie* of

parochial politics and tribalism,” which in turn create conflicts of interest. The provocation of civilizational discourse is demonstrated in the Cartoons controversy, where there is a conflict of interest in regards to the perpetuation of a “Danish” identity and the changing ethnic diaspora of Denmark, with particular attention given to Muslims. This was perpetuated by values associated with the involved parties, which provided societal and individual ideologies that subsequently conflicted with one another, as demonstrated by the provocation of the Cartoons.

This thesis, however, seeks to move the Cartoons controversy beyond a basic concept of provocation and reaction. Underneath ideas of ethnic conflict, this controversy was actually about the control over the meaning of a “democratic” concept of free speech. To control this meaning entails authority and agency which dictates how a situation can evolve and develop.¹ The beginning of the controversy showed that there was an assumption on the part of the editors behind the Cartoons and the *Muhammed’s Face* article, that their interpretations and presentation of the Cartoons would underscore and enforce common values that the public was assumed to agree with unanimously: that free speech was at stake. Between the lines, however, this thesis argues that the Mohammed Cartoons were a pre-emptive claim that was made in order to bring attention to the issue of a presumed Muslim threat in Danish (and Western) society, ergo, a provocation of civilizational discourse in negotiating the meaning of free speech, within the realm of Danish culture and society.

The Mohammed Cartoons controversy was not simply a matter of editorial caricatures in the cultural section of a Danish newspaper, but a powerful sociological commentary on the place of Muslims in Denmark and the supposed precarious situation of a once-unified Danish identity. There is a positioning in the opinions

¹ Norman Fairclough’s work, *Language and Power* (1989) discusses these ideas further.

surrounding the Mohammed Cartoons where definitions of identity and what is sacred to people are challenged and renegotiated within the most recent decades, particularly concerning immigration regulations. Denmark in the 1980s saw liberal immigration and family reunification policies which changed to where it has arguably the “toughest immigration/asylum-laws, and with strongly conditioned integration policies.” The recent motions towards underscoring Danish identity and cultural belonging, as well as the influence of radical parties such as *The Danish People’s Party*, have fostered a “skepticism of multiculturalism and... the much talked about ‘tone of the integration debate’, [has] been a central catalyst,” to addressing these ideas of identity and integration of “foreigners in Denmark.” The deduction can be made from the “publication of [the] cartoons as a natural extension of the public debate on Muslim integration – a visualisation of an already existing political climate” (Mouritsen et al., 2009).

Jyllands-Posten, the paper that published the Cartoons, sought to utilize such a climate in making a statement in its *Muhammad’s Face* article by pointing out what is an “other” in opposition to a society that defines itself as a “we.” This is important in considering the nature of the caricature, because it is “a form of self-expression by an individual artist, while simultaneously framed within the institutional norms of editorial opinion in the press” (Becker, 2008). What *Jyllands-Posten* initiated by printing the Cartoons as *Muhammed’s Face* was to actually “[touch] a collective nerve among the Muslim community, the sole uniting force among all (Danish) Muslims [which was]... an attack on the sacredness of the prophet Muhammad” (Mouritsen et al., 2009). The issue of the Cartoons is not only an issue of integration, free speech, and ethics in media, but also an attack on the sacredness of a culture and

of the Muslim *Ummah* (nation),² and using religious language to make a commentary on citizenship and belonging to a “Danish” society.

Article 4 of the Danish constitution mandates that Denmark is a country with a state church, which is related to citizenship and cultural belonging. Anything outside of the *Danish People’s Church* and Lutheran faith is not Danish because, “while the Danish state ensures freedom of religion it does not endorse equality of religion” (Mouritsen et al., 2009). The Cartoons were therefore not about “integrating Muslims” into Danish culture with the use of satire, but with a specific agenda to bring an awareness to the readership of *Jyllands-Posten* and what is not a Danish identity. Given that *Jyllands-Posten* is a newspaper read primarily by the middle-class of mainland Denmark, which generally votes for the *Liberal Party* (Klausen, 2009), and does not have much interaction with minorities and populations of Muslims, the provocation of civilizational discourse comes into play.³ The questions then to be asked are: Who has the right to make statements about religion? Can you make statements and not expect a reaction? Are you an extremist if you react? These questions bring up a “normative idea about *rights to communication* - the right and the power to be heard and not merely to be able to speak one’s mind” (Eide et al., 2008).

This thesis presents the Cartoons controversy as an initiative by *Jyllands-Posten* to ensure the Danish “social capital” of its readership, by stating what is wrong (Muslim intolerance) and what is a right (to mock and ridicule). This is because some of the Cartoons’ depictions of *Muhammed’s Face* were forceful (the bomb-in-a-turban cartoon), while some were gentle (a man walking with a donkey), but all were

² Definition from Klausen (2009).

³ The principle Muslim and minority populations are found in and around Copenhagen, Aarhus, and Odense (Mouritsen et al., 2009).

negotiating a definition of an “other.” By invariably invoking this idea of an “other,” the Cartoons simultaneously made a commentary on citizenship, where the “declaration of liberal sentiments and democratic virtues is in line with conditions of belonging which have a long pedigree in the Danish welfare state community” (Mouritsen et al., 2009). The provoked reaction against the Cartoons created a climate of reflective examination of the involved parties and provided a reaction which was the result of various interpretations of the implications of the Cartoons; those who were a part of a “we” or an “other”, and those who were for or against freedom of speech as outlined by *Jyllands-Posten*.

Hervik et al. (2008) proposes that there are three positions in the discussion over the Cartoons. The first is that the Cartoons were an attempt to prevent “self-censorship in the Danish public sphere.” The second position is that the Cartoons were a provocation to Muslims in general. A third and final position is that the Cartoons provided fodder for “the internal political dispute over immigration in Denmark.” In negotiating this “internal dispute,” Hervik (2008) indicates that “it has become legitimate to treat newly arriving immigrants as different from native Danes.” The issue then is not necessarily a political matter but a cultural matter. Huntington (2002) writes that “culture counts, and cultural identity is what is most meaningful for people.” What people hold most valuable, Huntington provides, is their membership to a culture; yet cultures are borderless. The Cartoons controversy has “illuminated important trends and developments in the current transnationally-mediated world of politics and social values” (Eide et al., 2008), explaining why the reactions to the Cartoons moved beyond the borders of Denmark. This is because the Cartoons “open questions of validity that cannot – without explicit and thus contestable acts of

exclusion – be solved without constructing some sort of embryonic global public sphere moments” (Kunelius & Nossek, 2008).

This thesis utilizes elements of discourse analysis to complement an historical analysis of the research topic. Fairclough, quoted in Langer (2008), writes that “critical discourse aims at ‘systematically [...] explor[ing] often opaque relationships of causality and determination between (a) discursive practices, events and texts, and (b) wider social and cultural structures, relations and processes’.” This is indeed what this thesis seeks to do, with a particular focus on institutional and legal contexts in which the discourses explored were produced. The weakness of this method is that it offers only a partial consideration of the topic, which is unsupported by other types of analysis such as quantitative/qualitative content analysis of the various international and domestic news media surrounding the Cartoons controversy, or an in-depth semiotic analysis of the Cartoons. Given the page limitations of this project, however, it offers the best approach for synthesizing the breadth of empirical information.

What makes this thesis relevant and important to the field of Communications and academia is that it addresses an indirect but important consequence of the Cartoons. This is the questioning, and the positioning through civilizational discourse, of Muslims and Islam in Denmark and how the controversy affected the negotiation of a once-homogenous Danish cultural identity. In all the sources researched for this thesis, no author has addressed this issue of the Cartoons as a provoked incident to arouse a sense of societal identity in the face of a “threat” of a foreign conceptual and religious body. Many of the sources used discuss the provocation of the Cartoons to a Muslim community. Two only touch upon how the Cartoons affect the ethnic Dane majority and they do so with the identification of economic and political complications for the Danish government as well as certain cultural problematics

when sociological groups are divided in a welfare community (Klausen, 2009; Mouritsen et al., 2009). Other dialogues pertaining to the Cartoons are on media discourses in different countries (Hervik & Berg, 2007.1), as well as media discourses as related to the manipulation of news for political motives (Hervik, 2008), and cultural-civilizational conflicts as related to issues on immigration (Hervik et al., 2008). A selection of English-language works on the topic were used for this thesis, as well as many academic articles.⁴

The sources used in this thesis, and others research and not used, relate to other issues such as the broad topics of freedom of speech ethics and the negotiation of self-censorship. Specific topics not investigated, but relevant to the field, include how editorial cartoons are interpreted and negotiated (Corstange, 2007), how the Cartoons controversy is reflective of a political and not a cultural circumstance (Klausen, 2009), the reevaluation of European societies and their minority populations (Phillips & Nossek, 2008), and redefinitions of terms of “tolerance” (Marcuse, 1965).

In the interest of time and relevance, this thesis did not investigate original works on multiculturalism and nationalism. This is because many of the sources used already referred back to such texts, and the original texts do not directly refer to the theme at hand. These texts in question are notably Benedict Anderson’s *Imagined Communities*, Edward Said’s *Orientalism*, and Charles Taylor’s *Multiculturalism: Examining The Politics of Recognition*. Benedict Anderson’s work is considered to be a keystone work in the development of nationalism as a cultural phenomenon, and

⁴ Published works include: the editorial collection *Transnational Media Events: The Mohammed Cartoons and the Imagined Clash of Civilizations* (2009), the working paper series *Reading the Mohammed Cartoons Controversy: An International Analysis of Press Discourses on Free Speech and Political Spin* (2007), and Jytte Klausen’s book *The Cartoons That Shook the World* (2009). Many other works in Danish exist, however, the author did not have a strong enough command of the Danish language to review these texts.

has furthered the study of modern identity formations and cultural flows. Edward Said's work is the founding text on the exoticism of the non-Western "other." Charles Taylor's book is an important text on the development and evolution of multicultural societies, which would complement further research in the area of religion, integration, and Islam in Denmark (Yilmaz, 2006; Mouritsen et al., 2009).

Section 1 of this thesis will outline some of the historical events that occurred during the Cartoons controversy, and serve as a foundation to understanding what were the domestic (Danish) and international reactions to it, as pertaining to the research topic. This presentation of the events will provide an interpretation of them as a "global public sphere moment," leading the reader to Section 2, which will investigate applied discussions of the Cartoons in regards to this concept of a provocation of civilizational discourse. This will be done through an in-context analysis of civilizational and cultural conflict as presented by Samuel Huntington's *The Clash of Civilizations*, free-speech ethics, and processes of interpretation thereof. It will argue that the Mohammed Cartoons demonstrate a fear of how the face of Danish society is changing and what effects this would have on integral Danish civilizational values, such as those of democracy, equality, and free speech ethics. Section 3 will tie the previous sections together through an analysis of the negotiation of Danes and non-ethnic Danes, an examination of immigration policies, and vocabulary of citizenship. A conclusion will summarize the points made in this thesis and elucidate how the Cartoons controversy was exemplary of a provoked civilizational discourse in the Danish context.

Section 1: The Mohammed Cartoons Controversy: The Origins

1.0. Introduction

This section will outline some of the historical events of the Cartoons debate, which provide four fundamental aspects of the controversy and to this thesis. The first is that the reaction to the Cartoons was outside of what *Jyllands-Posten's* (*JP*) expectations were, namely, that because the values of free speech are so intrinsic to a “we” population, a reaction outside of the “we” was unprecedented. This leads to a second fundamental aspect of the controversy and that was how the protests evolved from a local reaction to an international one. The third fundamental aspect was the nature in which the controversy evolved; from newspaper articles, to boycotts orchestrated by text messages, to attacks of non-Danish embassies. The fourth fundamental aspect of the controversy was that *JP's* Cartoons article moved from being supported by other Danish newspaper media in terms of journalistic solidarity, to an issue of principles of democratic values.⁵ The lack of sincere apologies on behalf of *JP* as well as the Danish government also exacerbated the situation and essentially left it unresolved. This brings attention to an issue of cultural conflict, which will be described in the subsequent sections of this project.

1.1. How the Cartoons Happened

What became known as the “Mohammed Cartoons” was the result of a particular dialogue regarding the social and cultural place of Muslims in Denmark (See *Figure 1.1.*). *JP* decided to instigate a conversation of free speech and self-censorship with its “journalistic principle [of]: show, don’t tell” (Rose, 2006). In 2005, Flemming Rose, the *Culture and Arts* Editor for *JP*, wrote to forty-two Danish

⁵ Appendix A. has general information on the Danish newspaper industry (A.1.), and background information on Denmark (A.2.).

cartoonists and illustrators belonging to the *Danish Newspaper Illustrator's Union* that the “daily newspaper *Jyllands-Posten* takes the side of freedom of expression. For that reason we would like to invite you to draw Mohammed as you see him” (Moynihan, 2007; Hansen & Hundevadt, 2008; Klausen, 2009).⁶ He pursued the idea of the project after a Danish children’s book author, Kaare Bluitgen, was having difficulty finding an illustrator for his book on Mohammed’s life, because of fear of violence from Muslim extremists (Bilefski, 2006a). Bluitgen had apparently contacted three artists, one of whom would do the drawings under the condition of anonymity (Hansen & Hundevadt, 2008).⁷

Twelve out of the 42 active members responded to *JP*’s call for participation, and twelve cartoons were printed in its *Culture & Arts* section on Friday, September 30, 2005.⁸ In the middle of this section entitled *Muhammad’s Face*, was an article by Flemming Rose which offered an explanation to accompany the Cartoons (*Figure 1.1*). The following excerpt of the article is one that sources used for this project widely refer to as the thesis behind the article:

Some Muslims reject modern, secular society. They demand a special position, insisting on special consideration of their own religious feelings. It is incompatible with secular democracy and freedom of expression, where [one] has to be ready to put up with scorn, mockery and ridicule.

It is therefore no coincidence that people living in totalitarian societies are sent off to jail for telling jokes or for critical descriptions of dictators. As a

⁶ The Cartoons were originally planned for the *News* section of *JP*, however it was decided that they were more appropriate for the *Culture & Arts* section. Also, there has been an argument that *JP*’s editors did not want to print the Cartoons, but had to since there was an original commitment to the artists (Klausen, 2009).

⁷ What was not made blatantly evident was that the book emphasized the “violent aspects of Mohammed’s life,” so much so that the publisher decided to change its category from a children’s book to a “family book” (Boe & Hervik, 2008).

⁸ A *Danish Union of Journalists* newsletter later “revealed that 15 out of the 42 cartoonists contacted were against” the idea of the Cartoons, with “some referring to it as ‘a campaign [for free speech]’ initiated by *Jyllands-Posten*” (Hervik, 2008). Fifteen responded initially to the invitation, where three members of the *Union* declined the commission. One indicated that the project was unclear, another said that the salary and the assignment were ludicrous, and a third was fearful of participating (Klausen, 2009).

rule, this is done with reference to the fact that it offends people's feelings. In Denmark, we have not yet reached this stage, but the cited examples show that we are on a slippery slope to a place where no one can predict what self-censorship will lead to (Fode, 2006).

1.2. The Defense of the Cartoons

After the publication, Flemming Rose defended the Cartoons by explaining that they were a part of the practice of satire, which is a fundamental aspect of Danish culture. His argument was that the Cartoons were not meant to offend and differentiate Danish Muslims from Danish culture, but to assimilate them into it. By satirizing a component of their lives, the Cartoons were therefore an active effort of integrating them. The Cartoons, he explained, were an analysis of the Prophet Mohammed, and that the Danish press took the position that it needed to "not be tolerant with the intolerant," and to not apologize for the right to publish material (Rose, 2006).

This does not change the fact that facets of Islam prohibit illustrations of this most esteemed Prophet and deem such illustrations blasphemous because of fear that they could lead to idolatry (Belien, 2005; Bilefsky, 2006a); a fact with which Rose, as a newspaper Culture editor, was undoubtedly familiar. Cartoonist Kurt Westergaard's contribution to the Mohammed Cartoons is widely thought in sources used for this project to be the most inflammatory of them all, and has been the main focus of the general debate surrounding the Cartoons in the media and academia. It depicts the face of Mohammed with a turban; and the turban is shaped like a bomb with a lit fuse (*Figure 1.2.*). What is provocative about this cartoon is its use of the "testimony of faith," known as the *shahadah*, which is inscribed on the turban in the cartoon

(Hussain, 2007).⁹ It is a declaration that comprises one of five pillars in Islam, which are considered the foundation of the religion. It is also “an exclamatory statement that Muslims invoke whenever they are confronted with a crisis situation,” and “the preferred last testament that a Muslim recites before death” (Alhassan, 2008).

The use of Arabic text in this cartoon can be seen as a “strategic function of establishing what Stuart Hall... would probably have called ‘magnetic lines of tendency’ or ‘lines of tangential force’ in guiding one to read the bomb as being Muslim” (Alhassan, 2008). In assessing the cartoon with this information, it is no wonder that it elicits a strong reaction from viewers; and particularly a Muslim audience. Westergaard invoked language that was not native to him to provoke two reactions: The first is in non-Muslims, who could read the cartoon as an illustration liaising “Islam” and “Terrorism.” The second is in Muslims, where the use of language poses a direct and challenging question of what it is to be a Muslim and how declarations of faith are made. Given the sensitive nature of these Cartoons and how they are interpreted, particularly Westergaard’s, can offense be defended on the basis that they were satirical illustrations?

According to Hansen (2006), *JP* is construed to be operating under a particular agenda, with “ties to the [former] Prime Minister of Denmark, Anders Fogh Rasmussen, whose coalition includes the far-right Danish People’s party [... and its] core demographic is made of farmers and the provincial middle class [...where] it has never published anything that would offend their religious sensibilities.” This was demonstrated with the fact that *JP* once refused to publish a caricature of Jesus, which subsequently invoked criticisms of hypocrisy by those opposing the printing of the

⁹ The *shahadah* is where a person recites, “‘there is no god but God and Muhammad is the messenger of God.’ It is the declaration that, when recited orally and sincerely, marks the moment of one’s belief in and conversion to Islam” (Hussain, 2007).

Cartoons (Keane, 2009). It is also important when examining what were the particular motives of *JP* printing the Cartoons, beyond the utilization of satire.

Bonde (2007) critiques *JP*'s interpretation of satire by underscoring the article's argument that, "freedom of expression is in jeopardy if the Christian and secular majority of the Danish population does not freely disdain, mock and ridicule Muslims in the country." To him, *JP* was making the statement that "Christians in contrast to Muslims are modern, secular, and do not ask for respect for their religious belief." In this regard the Christian "we" invoked, "implies Denmark, Danes, and the Western world against an Other composed of the Muslim world."¹⁰ What *JP* was doing was spinning the politics of the article by stating that "good countries" have free speech, while "bad ones" do not, and this was hidden underneath ideas of self-censorship and freedom of speech (Hervik, 2008). The loaded act of the article backfired and created an unprecedented global reaction, beginning in Denmark.

1.3. The Demand for an Apology

Many Danish Muslim convenience storeowners refused to sell the September 30th edition of *JP*, and in the same afternoon death threats were already being made to the employees at the paper. On October 7, the issue was discussed in Friday prayers and the Muslim community was encouraged to protest the actions of the paper. The following day, "Christian communities" were questioning the intentions of the article (Bonde, 2007),¹¹ and a "coalition of imams and mosque activists from four Danish mosques" was formed to address the issue of the Cartoons. These coalitions were later referred to by the *Danish People's Party* and "some newspapers... as the 'enemy

¹⁰ Appendix D. investigates an example of this "we" in the documentary, *Bloody Cartoons*.

¹¹ This source cites October 8 as the date of discussion of the Cartoons at Friday prayers, however, this is an error because it was a Saturday. Also, a detailed description of "Christian communities" was not offered by Bonde (2007).

within” (Klausen, 2009). Within six months of the original printing of the twelve Cartoons, there was a wide range of responses, gradually subsiding by March 2006 (Devji, 2006).

Reactions and outrage at the Cartoons began with mass demonstrations. These included the burning of Danish diplomatic offices in Damascus and Beirut, as well as deaths in mobs in Libya, Nigeria, and Pakistan (“Danish cartoon ‘plotters’ held”). There were demonstrations in cities such as Dubai and Nairobi, and in countries such as Iran, Iraq, Malaysia and Turkey (Bilefsky, 2006a; Brinkley & Fisher, 2006; Fattah, 2006; “In Pictures: Cartoon outrage”; Hansen, 2006); as well as flag-burnings of the Danish flag in places such as Baghdad, and in the West Bank (Bilefsky, 2006a). More than two hundred people died during the global rioting (Klausen, 2009), with fatalities in Afghanistan and Somalia (Hines, 2008). There was even violence directed towards other diplomatic missions, where firebombs were thrown at the French Embassy in Tehran (Bilefsky, 2006a). Government officials protested, including Egypt’s Speaker of Parliament, who claimed that Danes had violated the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (Kimmelman, 2008). Ministers representing eleven different nations demanded that the Danish government punish *JP* and called the Cartoons a “provocation” (Belien, 2005).

In Denmark, mobilized Danish Muslims against the Cartoons were predominantly members of a “fundamentalist organization,” Equality and Brotherhood, and The Islamic Society of Denmark (“About Jyllands-Posten”).¹² The Islamic Society of Denmark demanded “an apology and the withdrawal [of] the

¹² “Fundamentalist organization” is a description provided by *JP* on its website, an interpretation of which would be that those opposing *JP* were considered radicals against *JP*’s values of free speech. Others involved included “a host of organizations, including the outlawed Muslim Brotherhood, the Federation of Arab Journalists, [and] the International Union of Muslim Clergy” (Saleh, 2008).

cartoons” on October 9, 2005. A mass-demonstration numbering 5,000 protested peacefully at *JP*’s headquarters in Copenhagen on October 14, 2005.¹³ On October 19, 2005, the above-mentioned eleven ambassadors requested a meeting with the Danish Prime Minister (Hansen, 2006; “Muhammad cartoon row intensifies”).

On December 7, the Organization of Islamic Countries (OIC) discussed the matter of the Cartoons in a meeting. The OIC then made a formal complaint to the United Nations, “criticizing the Danish government for refusing to meet with the... ambassadors and for failing to correct *Jyllands-Posten*.”¹⁴ In late December, ministers at the Arab League “expressed their ‘surprise and indignation at the reaction of the Danish government, which was disappointing despite its political, economic and cultural ties with the Muslim world’” (Schmidt & Rynning, 2006). “Danish Muslim activists” had obtained 16,000 signatures of people opposing the Cartoons (Klausen, 2009), yet still no apology or retribution was offered.

On December 17 a group of Danish imams organized a delegation to Lebanon and Syria, equipped with a 43-page document, “Dossier about championing the Prophet Muhammad peace be upon him,” in protest of the original printing of the Cartoons (Klausen, 2009).¹⁵ Included in the files were copies of the twelve original Cartoons, as well as “images from another Danish newspaper, anti-Muslim hate mail [...and] three additional images.” The dossier also included fabricated cartoons, which aided in inciting outrage in the Muslim world. Some of these were

¹³ The imams reacting to the Cartoons were primarily Muslims of the Sunni faith, hailing from Egypt, Palestine, and Saudi Arabia (Schmidt & Rynning, 2006).

¹⁴ Interestingly, twenty-two “former Danish ambassadors disapproved of the government’s lack of sensitivity to the issue.” Former civil servants “rarely criticize the government” (Klausen, 2009).

¹⁵ Another name for the dossier is the Akkari-Laban Dossier, “named after the delegation spokesman Imam Akhmad Akkari and after Imam Ahmad Abu Laban, well known in Denmark” (Hahn, 2008). A first delegation had been invited in December to Cairo, with the speculation by Klausen (2009) that Egypt demonstrated interest in the Cartoons as a part of a religious race with Saudi Arabia as “the nation that represents and protects Islam.”

“illustrations that depicted Muhammad as a pig and engaged in bestiality” (Nizza, 2008).¹⁶

A letter accompanying the Dossier stated that the delegation’s intention was to contact those, “who [want] to support our fight to defend and support the holy prophet and with all legal means fight for the passing of a general law, which ensures respect for all things sacred, particularly the Muslim, in a time, which allows attacks on Muslim sanctuaries using ‘war against terror’ as an excuse” (Bonde, 2007). The actions of the delegation are construed to be the “first wave of Muslim mobilization,” in regards to the Cartoons, with outraged individuals seeking to lambast *JP* and the government, eventually giving way to a “second wave” of moderate individuals seeking a solution to the problem of the Cartoons. These individuals included members of a newly created organization, the *Democratic Muslims*, to provide a Danish Muslim “counter-mobilization” to the efforts of the Islamic Society of Denmark (Mouritsen et al., 2009).

1.4. The Reprinting of the Cartoons

The first paper to reprint some of the Cartoons as news was Egypt’s *Al-Fagr* on October 17, 2005 (Klausen, 2009). On January 10, 2006, a Norwegian newspaper reprinted the Cartoons as a reaction to the media events surrounding them. A Danish website on journalism news, *Ejour* “found that by the end of February 2006 one or more of the Cartoons had been reprinted in at least 143 newspapers in fifty-six countries” (Klausen, 2009). The reprinting of the Cartoons created another global reaction. *Reporters Without Borders* described this reaction, which was predominantly in the Middle East, as one which “[betrayed] a lack of understanding”

¹⁶ It is interesting to note that an illustration of “Muhammad as a pig,” was later discovered to be a caricature of a French man who had won a pig-squealing contest (Hansen, 2006).

of the freedom of the press as, “an essential accomplishment of democracy” (“Muhammad cartoon row intensifies”). Such ideas of democracy, however, did not curb diplomatic repercussions: Saudi Arabia, and Syria expressed their desire to close their Danish embassies, Libya closed its Danish embassy, and Saudi Arabia recalled its ambassador to Denmark (Hansen, 2006; “Muhammad cartoon row intensifies”). Denmark also withdrew its ambassadors to Indonesia, Iran, and Syria (Bilefsky, 2006b).

The global consequences were not only diplomatic in nature. Mobilized people in the Arab world encouraged massive boycotts. These were orchestrated via mobile text messages in countries including Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, and the United Arab Emirates. There were boycotts of Danish products in Egypt and Yemen. Supermarkets in Saudi Arabia discouraged customers from buying Danish products. The Danish-Swedish Dairy company, Arla Foods, reported sales in the Middle East as plummeting to zero, where it was previously selling “\$1.5 million worth of dairy products a day” (Fattah, 2006; “In Pictures: Cartoon outrage”; “Muhammad cartoon row intensifies”). The boycotts of Danish goods had reduced the country’s total “exports by 15.5% between February and June” due to a 50% decline in exports to the Middle East. This cost Danish businesses roughly 134 million euros (Hervik, 2008). A Dubai national explained to a journalist why he was boycotting Danish products, “‘I will cut them off 100 percent because there is no respect,’ he said, ‘It’s no longer an issue of apologizing. Now, they have to learn a lesson’” (Fattah, 2006). Given “lessons” such as these, a hundred employees were laid off because of the boycotts, and two Saudi Arabian employees were reported to have been “beaten by angry customers,” because of their professional relationship with the company (Buchanan, 2006).

On the 29th of January, 2006, Flemming Rose spoke on Al-Jazeera to apologize “for the fact that the publication of the drawings inadvertently hurt and insulted Muslims,” and on the 30th of January, *JP* “[published] a declaration in Danish, English and Arabic in which it [apologized] for these inadvertent effects.”¹⁷ However, there was never an apology for the Cartoons directly, and none was considered needed until the Danish judicial system ruled otherwise, which provoked further antagonism and violence (Schmidt & Rynning, 2006). This issue of an apology (or lack thereof) is important when analyzing the negotiation of “dialogues” surrounding the Cartoons; which will be explored further in this thesis.

In February 2006, violence and antagonism continued. *JP*'s office in Copenhagen received “104 threats... [and had to be] evacuated several times” (Rose, 2006). Threats were made to *JP*'s satellite office in Denmark's second-largest city, Aarhus (“Aarhus”). Danish citizens living and working in Palestine and Saudi Arabia received death threats and were forced to leave (Buchanan, 2006). The Danish Embassy in Kuwait was besieged with protesters. Gunmen raided EU's Gaza office to “demand an apology,” though no one was injured (“In Pictures: Cartoon outrage”).¹⁸ Hackers managed to “shut down 450 Danish web sites, including several government sites and that of *Jyllands-Posten*,” and hacked two thousand computers in Denmark (Klausen, 2009).

Danish Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen “welcomed the apology, but defended the freedom of the press” (“Muhammad cartoon row intensifies”). There

¹⁷ This was a revision of a previous open letter written two days before, which was also posted online. Interestingly, in “late January 2006, the Confederation of Danish Industries” had “demanded that *Jyllands-Posten* explain itself and address the consequences of its actions” (Klausen, 2009).

¹⁸ In a separate instance, “diplomats from Denmark and Norway began pulling out of their missions in Gaza as gunmen searched hotels for Europeans from countries where newspapers had printed the pictures, declaring them legitimate targets” (McGrory & Sabbagh, 2003).

was thus the sentiment that not much was being done for the offence of Muslims (“Danish Muslims despair at portrayal”). Not only this but there was the forcing of several issues. The first was the dichotomy of either saying “‘yes’ or ‘no’ to free speech.” The second is that Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen made it a point to personally oppose the Cartoons yet only offering an apology for the offense, not the act, of the Cartoons. This in turn was viewed as insincere. The third issue was that there was a trend of blaming the Danish imams for inciting trouble (Hervik, 2008).¹⁹ A sinister point here is that Pia Kjaersgaard, the leader of *The Danish People’s Party* “told Fogh Rasmussen that if he conceded to Muslim pressure, she would withdraw her support for his government” (Klausen, 2009).²⁰ The debate continued and the Danish media supporting the Cartoons maintained that their journalistic motivations were protected under the laws. Even so, they were accused of exacerbating the situation rather than seeking to calm it (Harrison, 2008). “‘It’s just getting worse and worse because the daily spoken language about immigrants and the portrayals of Muslims specifically are getting worse worldwide,’” a Danish Muslim said, “‘so of course that’s had an effect in Denmark as well’” (“Danish Muslims despair at portrayal”). A consequence was also felt by one of the cartoonists.

1.5. The Foiled Assassination Attempt of a Cartoonist

In the early hours of February 12, 2008, three men were arrested when it was discovered that they were in the preliminary stages of planning to kill cartoonist Kurt Westergaard, creator of the bomb-in-a-turban caricature. One of the men arrested was a Danish national of Moroccan origin and two were foreign nationals of Tunisian

¹⁹ An interesting side note is that the *Danish People’s Party* announced on February 2, 2006 that it would start an “investigation into the possibility of removing citizenship of the protesting imams,” which the Prime Minister’s party supported (Klausen, 2009).

²⁰ Klausen (2009) argues that without the *Danish People’s Party*’s support of Fogh Rasmussen, he would not have been able to obtain his current position as Secretary-General of NATO, which in turn explains his lackluster involvement in the controversy.

origin. The Tunisians were later expelled to Tunisia without a trial in Denmark. The Dane was later released, “pending investigation” (“Danish cartoon ‘plotters’ held”; McLaughlin & Sulugiuc, 2008; “Danish Muhammad cartoon reprinted”; Harrison, 2008).²¹ The plot and the arrests shocked many Danes and Europeans. Others were not so sympathetic. Salah Suleiman, an activist and member of a Danish mosque that helped incite responses from the Muslim world after the original Cartoons were published, was reported to have been content with Mr. Westergaard’s threat on his life (Higgins, 2008; Kimmelman, 2008).

On February 13, 2008, after Mr. Westergaard’s failed murder plot, seventeen Danish newspapers and one Swedish paper reprinted his cartoon out of solidarity for his and *JP*’s journalistic expression (McLaughlin & Sulugiuc, 2008; Higgins, 2008). One of Denmark’s leading newspapers, left-leaning *Politiken*, which also decided to reprint the cartoon, wrote the following statement along with it: “‘Regardless of whether *Jyllands-Posten* at the time used freedom of speech unwisely and with damaging consequences, the paper deserves unconditional solidarity when it is threatened with terror’” (McLaughlin & Sulugiuc, 2008; Nizza, 2008).

This did not go unnoticed. Osama Bin Laden threatened retribution in his first address to the world that year; “‘Publishing these insulting drawings,’ Mr. bin Laden [said], ‘is the greatest misfortune and the most dangerous’” (AP, 2008).²² Iran demanded an apology (Higgins, 2008). A mob in Karachi, Pakistan, burned a coffin painted with the Danish flag. There was a “fresh round of protests from Gaza to Indonesia.” There were demands in Afghanistan for immediate “withdrawal of Danish

²¹ All three individuals are said to be followers of Hyalel, one of the imams involved in the Danish protest (Klausen, 2009), and who is interviewed in the documentary *Bloody Cartoons* (Appendix D.).

²² The source does not indicate if Mr. bin Laden was referring to the printing of the Cartoons overall, or if his words were a reaction to the reprinting of the Cartoons.

troops under NATO's command and the severing of all diplomatic ties with Denmark." Denmark's foreign minister, Per Stig Moeller, was forced to react by stating that it was "becoming difficult for him 'to put Danish soldiers' lives in danger to support a country 'where one is at risk to be condemned to death for values that we believe to be an inseparable part of democracy and the modern world'" (Kimmelman, 2008).

It is likely that Kurt Westergaard understands that his cartoon has caused conflict. He explained that his intention was to "mock extremists who push a deformed reading of their faith," and he described his cartoon as a "symbol of democracy and freedom of expression." Mr. Rose has described it as a "great cultural icon of the 20th century." Ironically, Mr. Westergaard received only about \$150 for the drawing, then \$800 in reprinting fees. Also, both Mr. Westergaard and Mr. Rose had bounties on their heads for their beliefs and "blasphemous" work (Higgins, 2008; Kimmelman, 2008).

1.6. The Cartoons as a Crime

The opportunity to prove that the Cartoons were blasphemous was never realized because, "the Director of Public Prosecution under the Minister of Justice ruled that none of the complaints over the Cartoons raised by Muslims and ethnic Danes would lead to verdicts against *Jyllands-Posten*." This decision could have been overruled by the *Minister of Justice*, though such an initiative was not made (Bonde, 2007). The *Director of Public Prosecution* (DPP) deemed that the Cartoons' offense was not criminal in terms of Denmark's blasphemy laws, by breaking down the Cartoons according to Sections 140 and 266b of the *Danish Criminal Code* (Klausen, 2009).

The DPP wrote that the Danish Constitution (Section 77) states, “Any person shall be at liberty to publish his ideas in print, in writing, and in speech, subject to his being held responsible in a court of law.” The DPP also ascribes to The European Court of Human Rights’ position that “freedom of expression is the foundation of a democratic society.” This means that there must be:

[Avoidance of] expressions that are gratuitously offensive to others and thus an infringement of their rights, and which therefore do not contribute in any form of public debate capable of furthering progress in human affairs... [however] persons who exercise the freedom to manifest their religion, irrespective of whether they do so as members of a religious majority or minority, cannot reasonably expect to be exempt from all criticism. (Fode, 2006).

With this to consider, the Cartoons must be seen in light of the negotiation of freedom of speech and the practice of religion. The DPP began this process by identifying that “religious writings of Islam cannot be said to contain a general and absolute prohibition against drawing the Prophet Muhammed.” This said, a “caricature of such a central figure in Islam as the Prophet Muhammad may imply ridicule of or be considered an expression of contempt of Islamic religious doctrines and acts of worship,” whereby the whole article of *Muhammad’s Face* needed to be evaluated (Fode, 2006).

Most of drawings were considered by the DPP as the following: they were impartial and without contempt, observant of societal issues, and commentative. It was the bomb-in-a-turban cartoon that was most heavily considered out of all of the drawings. This was because of, a) a certain historical depiction of Muhammad as an advocate of violence in the name of religion against those of differing beliefs, and b) the interpretation of the bomb portion of the cartoon allowing for an understating of Islam as linked to terrorism. These considerations did not go against the laws in which

the Cartoons were being tried under; namely, Section 140 of the Criminal Code. According to the DPP, the bomb-in-a-turban cartoon was not deemed to be an “expression of mockery or ridicule, and hardly scorn within the meaning of section 140 of the Danish Criminal Code.” This was because the “concept of scorn covers contempt and debasement, which in the usual meaning would not comprise situations depicting a figure as shown in [the bomb-in-a-turban cartoon], regardless of how it is illustratively to be understood or interpreted” (Fode, 2006). It is interesting to note that how images are “understood and interpreted” carry important weight sociologically and culturally in regards to the expression, interpretation, and reception of images and words, but this is not evident in this language of these Codes.²³

The DPP determined that the Cartoons could not be considered criminal under Section 266b of the Danish Criminal Code, which provides a legal safeguard for any “group of people – belonging to a majority or a minority – who are scorned or degraded e.g. on account of their religion.” Although the DPP acknowledges that the article made a public proclamation of an issue, it ruled that because the original article referred to “some Muslims” as the target of its thesis, and the collection of the Cartoons provide no “basis to assume that the drawings make statements referring to Muslims in general” (Fode, 2006). This then meant that an individual response could not be considered a reaction to a criminal act against that individual.

A remarkable point that the DPP made in the concluding remarks addresses a premise behind the article that accompanied the Cartoons. This was notably that in regards to Sections 140 and 266b of the Danish Criminal Code, there is no “free and unrestricted right to express opinions about religious subjects,” as claimed in *JP*’s

²³ Ferdinand de Saussure’s *The Course in General Linguistics* (1913) investigates these interpretations of semiotics further.

original article. The DPP wrote that, “it is not a correct description of existing law when the article in *Jyllands-Posten* states that it is incompatible with the right to freedom of expression to demand special consideration for religious feelings and that one has to be ready to put up with ‘scorn, mockery and ridicule’” (Frode, 2006). This brings to question whether or not the readership of *JP* could be aware of this and how an authority such as a newspaper can construct bias within a mutually understood “code symmetry” (Hahn, 2008). A second remarkable point was presented by Hervik (2008), who determined through media analysis that the Danish media coverage never disputed the newspaper’s “*constitutional right* to publish the cartoons.” This then brings the issue of the Cartoons to a more profound level of commentary on multiculturalism, beginning with superficial arguments on free speech; bearing in mind that, “free speech is never only philosophy: it always [involves] claims of supremacy” (Peters, 2008). This interpretation is not in line with Mr. Rose’s.

1.7. Reasoning Behind the Cartoons

In 2006, Flemming Rose, the *Culture and Arts* Editor for *JP*, explained in *The Washington Post* that Western people are “not fundamentalists for our freedom of expression.” He had commissioned the Cartoons as a reaction to a handful of “incidents of self-censorship in Europe caused by widening fears and feelings of intimidation in dealing with issues related to Islam.” His belief was that this was an issue that Europeans needed to address, and to challenge “moderate Muslims to speak out.” The intention, he noted, was not to provoke or to cause violence but to challenge self-censorship (Rose, 2006). Mr. Westergaard, who is an atheist, was quoted with a differing opinion: “Cartoons always concentrate and simplify an idea and allow a quick impression that arouses some strong feeling... but the same clash would

eventually have occurred over some book or a play. It was waiting to happen” (Kimmelman, 2008).

The consequences of this clash were widespread. The United States and the European Union did not approve of how the Danish government handled the controversy (Klausen, 2009). Conducting Internet searches of the Cartoons was dangerous for individuals in Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Saudi Arabia.²⁴ In France and Jordan, editors were fired or sent to prison for reprinting the Cartoons (Hervik et al., 2008). Most major newspapers in the United States did not reprint them; the *Philadelphia Enquirer* was the only American paper to do so (Craft & Waisbord, 2008). Tensions were felt up to the United Nations, where former Secretary General Kofi Anan stated, “I am distressed and concerned by this whole affair. I share the distress of the Muslim friends, who feel that the cartoon offends their religion. I also respect the right to freedom of speech. But of course freedom of speech is never absolute. It entails responsibility and judgment” (Hervik et al., 2008).

In summarizing this section, the Cartoons were indeed about a lack of attention to “responsibility” and “judgment.” It is evident that they were “a deliberate provocation of Danish Muslims in order to test their reactions.” The research presented thus far shows how the issue of the Cartoons presented a lack of conflict resolution efforts, and that the controversy was “framed in terms of discrimination, tolerance/respect and integration. Essentially, the situation was never directly resolved because there was no dialogue” (Mouritsen et al., 2009). This is because “presenting visual information without accompanying discourses leads to different decoding by recipients who have different linguistic and cultural backgrounds” (Hahn, 2008).

²⁴ The danger was not explained by the source; however, the risk is likely due to prohibitions on viewing illicit material, religious or Western.

Even more specifically, there was no dialogue on identity and the place of Muslims in Denmark, nor the acknowledgement of “socioeconomic and cultural polarization between ethnic minorities and the majority population” that fueled the protests (Schmidt, 2009). In the situation of the Mohammed Cartoons, the argument was that satire and integration equals to neutrality or equality. This is based on the idea that neutrality is established by a majority culture and its values (Mouritsen et al., 2009).²⁵

There is, however, the matter of global communications and transnational flows, as they occur in these recent times. Upon publishing the Cartoons, *JP* failed to recognize that “it makes very little sense to see freedom of expression as practiced in Denmark as an absolute without looking at it in an international context,” and without acknowledging that others may not share the same view on freedom of speech (Bonde, 2007). This means that there cannot be an examination of a domestic issue without regarding the effects internationally or how domestic residents (who are marginalized and therefore not entirely a part of the “domestic”) could reach out for international sympathies. Therefore, “a *no-context-no-comment-policy* actually encourages intercultural frictions in global media communication” (Hahn, 2008).

What makes the case of the Mohammed Cartoons controversy fascinating is the nature of the conflict. It provides an example of an over-simplified illustration of a complex domestic and international issue, which caused it to be a “transformative” and “radicalizing” event (Mouritsen et al., 2009).²⁶ In examining the Cartoons as a media event, it is important to also look at them in a theoretical light. This section sought to outline the events surrounding the Cartoons controversy and what sorts of

²⁵ See Appendix D., for an investigation of these notions found in the documentary, *Bloody Cartoons*.

²⁶ This was indicated in the attempted murder of Kurt Westergaard, as well as two other cases of “planned terrorist attacks inside Denmark, one from Odense and one from Copenhagen,” where the Cartoons were the sources of inspiration for these actions (Mouritsen et al., 2009).

implications and effects they may have in identifying a marginalized group in a society which is supposedly threatening a majority group. The following section will examine how such complications of civilizational discourse are very much alive and valid in such an event as the Mohammed Cartoons controversy.

[Image omitted due to copyright concerns. Image available for viewing in print copy at the AUP library.]

[Image omitted due to copyright concerns. Image available for viewing in print copy at the AUP library.]

Section 2: Applied Discussions of the Cartoons

2.0. Introduction

In the case of the Mohammed Cartoons controversy, the issue of “taking sides” was prevalent. The position was to be either in favor of free speech or against blasphemy; in favor of religiosity or valuing democracy above religion. The controversy shifted a complex domestic issue to another complex transnational and emotional one. Peters (2008) writes, “the tension of the sacred and the secular is not simply geopolitical or cultural: it also runs through individual people’s hearts and heads.” In reviewing the case of the Mohammed Cartoons, this conversation about religiosity and the sacred also addresses the issue of multiculturalism. Kunelius and Alhassan (2008) write that, “tendencies of dialogic multiculturalism can be read from texts produced in a number of contexts. Thus a more religiously inclined version would claim that it is important to retain a sense of the sacred and an ability to respect the sacredness of others in society.” As was shown in the previous chapter, the position taken by *JP* in the controversy was that the right to communication is synonymous with democracy. According to *JP*, to threaten free speech is to threaten all that is implicated within free speech and go against “Western,” “democratic” and “modern” civilizational values.²⁷ This section will investigate applied discussions of discourses on civilizations and freedom of speech as modes of understanding the communicative aspects of the Mohammed Cartoons controversy.

2.1. Huntington and the “Clash of Civilizations”

Concepts in Samuel Huntington’s *The Clash of Civilizations* are useful when examining the civilizational aspects of the Mohammed Cartoons controversy and freedom of speech as a marker of Danish identity. “In the politics of civilizations,” he

²⁷ Appendix C. (C.I.) has a brief Huntingtonian definition of “civilization.”

writes in his original article, *The Clash of Civilizations?*, “the people and governments of non-Western civilizations no longer remain the objects of history as targets of Western colonialism but join the West as movers and shapers of history.”

To begin with, the Mohammed Cartoons are indeed about “pulls of tribalism and globalism” (Huntington, 1993). As mentioned above, there is, on the one hand a discussion of free speech, and on the other hand a discussion of religious integrity and lack of reverence of a religion; underneath which is a commentary on issues related to multiculturalism. These highly volatile topics are embedded in cultures and their societal values. The Mohammed Cartoons controversy offers two levels of discussion in this context. On one level there is the discussion of values of Euro-Danish free speech ethics contrasting with Islamic doctrine held by a specific group of vocal individuals. On another level there is a discussion of the place of Muslims in Denmark, who represent some 60 different countries (Schmidt, 2009). Where is there a resolution? How can two sides find a common ground and view each other as equals? Perhaps conflict is inevitable.

Huntington’s core argument is centered around the idea that, “current and future conflicts take place not between ideologies, but between ‘civilisations’, that are related to cultures...” where:

People define themselves in terms of ancestry, religion, language, history, values, customs, and institutions. They identify with cultural groups: tribes, ethnic groups, religious communities, nations, and at the broadest level, civilizations. People use politics not just to advance their interests but also to define their identity. We know who we are only when we know who we are not and often only when we know who we are against. (Huntington, 2002)

This quote offers an encompassing definition of identity politics. Here, an individual is described not only as an individual in society but also as an individual

interacting with society and reflexively reinforcing identity through this interaction. Finally, there is the understanding of definition in terms of contrast.

Huntington (2002) also correlates to the case of the Mohammed Cartoons controversy, with his theory of a “global religious revival.” This revival is “‘the return to the sacred’,” and is “a response to people’s perception of the world as a ‘single place’,” a consequence of which has created the phenomenon of an “Islamic Resurgence.” He writes that this resurgence is where, “Muslims in massive numbers were simultaneously turning toward Islam as a source of identity, meaning, stability, legitimacy, development, power, and hope, hope epitomized in the slogan ‘Islam is the solution’.”²⁸ This creates conflict not only between identity groups but also economically and politically oriented groups, and arguably, socio-cultural events.

Another consequence to this perception of a “single space” which Huntington (2002) describes is that, “Westerners increasingly fear ‘that they are now being invaded not by armies and tanks but by migrants who speak other languages, worship other gods, belong to other cultures, and, they fear, will take their jobs, occupy their land, live off the welfare system, and threaten their way of life’.” With this in mind when considering the Mohammed Cartoons, how does one negotiate a way of life and culture, in neo-modern Western societies, which may or may not embrace traditional notions of *Western-ness*? Interaction and intermingling “exacerbate differences over the rights of members of one civilization in a country dominated by members of the other civilization” (Huntington, 2002).

Huntington concludes *The Clash of Civilizations* by stating that the “security of the world requires acceptance of global multiculturalism” (Huntington, 2002). This is a highly charged phrase, particularly in light of the Mohammed Cartoons. How can

²⁸ Appendix C. (C.2.) has more information on the “Islamic Resurgence”.

“acceptance” be created when parties are deeply invested in the ideological and emotional convictions of their beliefs? How can acceptance supercede the desire for defense and debate? Here is an event that has undertones of religious conflict and disagreement, which in turn is a challenging faction to notions of identities and civilizations. Although the Cartoons could not be said to have major consequences for humanity as a whole, the event itself demonstrates its confrontational nature.

The problem in the case of Denmark and the Mohammed Cartoons controversy is that people were divided within a civilization over this topic. Huntington writes that, “when civilizations lack core states the problems of creating order within civilizations or negotiating order between civilizations become more difficult.” Although Denmark is its own social, economic, and political entity, the fact that there are cultural bodies and peoples adhering to a different set of beliefs within this entity means that there is a lacking of a standard, or what Huntington calls a “core state.” A dividing factor is the implementation and call to respect “freedom of speech” as a democratic concept of a free state. Huntington (2002) writes that there is the “[promotion of] Western political values and institutions by pressing other societies to respect human rights as conceived in the West and to adopt democracy on Western lines.” The problem here is again the identification of what it means to be *Modern* and *Western*, and the lack of recognition of a new cultural and religious modernism, which is changing societies and is catalyzed by globalization.

Regarding the “us and them” aspect of these conflicts in Huntington’s work, the “differences in intra- and extracivilizational behavior stem from,” among other things, the “difficulty of communication with them as a result of differences in language and what is considered civil behavior.” The “ubiquity of conflict” as described in *The Clash of Civilizations* and how “it is human to hate” show that

members of civilizations “naturally distrust and see as threats those who are different and have the capability to harm them” (Huntington, 2002). Those opposing the Cartoons, *JP* seems to argue in the previous section, are those to whom Islam is “the true faith, based on God’s final revelation, [which] must be protected from insult and abuse; other faiths, being either false or incomplete, have no right to any such protection” (Lewis, 1990). Reversely, the Cartoons can be seen as an act of islamophobia, inciting a progenation of islamophobic sentiments. In a poll conducted in early 2008, 79% of Danes expressed concern that “more interaction with the Muslim world would increase its threat” (“Islamophobia is rife claims study”). In synthesized form, the Cartoons controversy was perpetuated by a declining tolerance of the other; narrowed down simplistically to *JP* versus Danish Muslims.²⁹

2.2. *A Short Critique of Huntington*

Huntington’s work, although conceptually viable, is not without flaws. As the above analysis has described, *The Clash of Civilizations* is based on the idea that there is first conflict between states, then between people and ideologies, then between cultures. The principal critique here, and it is one that is echoed in other texts researched in this project, is that Huntington assumed that his theories are researchable. A solution offered by Bolks and Stoll (2003), is to review Huntington’s theories in terms of their ability to create war in the post Cold-War period, i.e. in most recent times. In short, if wars are created, then the theories are valid. This of course does not leave room for flows of cultural and sociological phenomenon that do not necessarily lead to war.

²⁹ A complicating factor to this is that the Danish imams engaged in the uproar accused Muslims who accepted or refused to dispute the issue of the Cartoons as being “disloyal” to their religion (Hansen & Hundevadt, 2008).

Another critique offered by Chiozza (2002), breaks down Huntington's theories into five principal points. The first is the clear distinction that Huntington's theories are a "*hypothesis* of the nature of world politics." The second is that global civil society often changes questions of identity to questions of responsibility to others. The third point is that modernization does not only create the separation of identities as Huntington writes, but also empowers a collective and fertilizes identity consciousness across borders. Along with this point, Chiozza explains that Huntington's ideas of civilizations are no different than Benedict Anderson's concepts of an "imagined community," which to him is theorizing nationalism. The advent of the flows of media and globalization shows us this as inevitable and not as a phenomenon with an agenda. A fourth critique is that Huntington does not provide enough analysis of cultural convergence. An addition to this critique would be that Huntington could not foresee how the Internet, which was a few short years away from becoming mainstream, would change the way people communicate in cyberspace; as well as how advanced wireless communication networks allow individuals to rapidly contact one another. A final and important critique is that the West is not unique in the world. This is because the West has had its history of clashes within itself and against other civilizations, where events such as colonialism and fascism do not make Western ideologies any different than the supposed perils of the "Islamic Resurgence".

Chiozza's critiques were with the intention to encourage the reader to think about why *The Clash of Civilizations* has elicited such strong reactions and responses from the academic community, and why the book is relatable to its readers. Perhaps this was because the book elicited readings of the sacred systems of people versus the profane systems of culture, and how these interact with each other in those modern

times.³⁰ Chiozza found that the book promoted negative readings of world politics, where it demonizes people and sought to create fixed alliances of peoples. He writes that the book proposes a “pessimistic conception of the possibility of human community,” where people are controlled by “violence and the threat of violence.”

A critique by Hadar (1993) addressed the issue of Islam. His main point was that governments construct ideas of threat for political motives. He addresses the Muslim issue from a different angle, by stating that this religion is “less a transnational political force and more a vital religion that provides spiritual support for a broad spectrum of people, some liberal, some orthodox.... It is also not spreading but battling to stay alive and present in communities all over the world.” The “Islamic Resurgence” that Huntington writes about is not a phenomenon of the creation of conflict, but a “response to the confusion and anxiety of modernity and a challenge to repressive and corrupt regimes.” An interpretation of this argument is that the “Islamic Resurgence” is an active effort to enforce cultural law over political law.

Henderson and Tucker (2001), further the previous arguments by addressing the issue of cultural life and the role that it plays in societies. Their argument is that the theories behind *The Clash of Civilizations* are obvious and inevitable because of global demographic and economic flows between nations, which “increased salience of civilization membership in global politics. Since civilizational characteristics are basic and essential, civilizational differences are increasingly likely to generate conflict. The result is that cultural factors have replaced ideological ones as the major source of conflict in world politics.” An argument to update this statement to current events would be to acknowledge that the lines between culture and ideology have

³⁰ Emil Durkheim’s *Elementary Forms of Religious Life* (1912) describes sacred and profane systems of belief in societies.

blurred and make them difficult to identify independent of one another, as was the case with the Mohammed Cartoons controversy.

Perhaps the most poignant article reviewed here is that of Abrahamian (2003), where Huntington is critiqued for not having enough knowledge about Islam. To make statements about Islamic culture, or culture alone is using definitions that are too broad. There is the point made that Huntington does not acknowledge the mixing of ethnicities and heritages. *The Clash of Civilizations* is in short, “international relations with the politics taken out.” Abrahamian writes that, “what is disturbing about Huntington's triumph is that it has taken place in a pluralistic society with apparently open and free media-- but one that has implicitly drawn a taboo line on what can and can not be said.” This is also the ironic nature of the Mohammed Cartoons, as well as the ensuing academic debate about the matter. What is the meaning of debate if each party is convinced he or she is right?

2.3. In Context: Freedom of Speech

It cannot be contested that the issue of freedom of speech is integral to the discussion of the Cartoons controversy. After the printing of the Cartoons, some argue that free speech is a vital component of democracy. Others state that freedom of speech is indeed necessary, however, within limitations. The development of “toleration,” or the non-interference of governments over religions, determines where these limitations lie. Even with freedom of speech, the issue is multi-faceted to the point that it no longer concerns a group of people, but a group of individuals who collectively and individually relate to the offended system of beliefs (Laegaard, 2007).

Devji (2006) writes that the Mohammed Cartoons controversy was the “second great manifestation of Islam’s globalisation.” Here Devji identifies the

Muslim protest of the Cartoons as a phenomenon that “moved so far beyond the bounds of state and citizenship.” Most importantly, Devji makes the claim that freedom of speech is conceptually challenging to negotiate because, “at the global level there is no common citizenship and no government to make freedom of expression meaningful even as an expression... Tolerance therefore becomes a process of exclusion in which it is always the other person who is being judged.” This “other person” is a member of a Muslim minority, where “it is impossible to target [these] minorities inside liberal states without by the same token targeting liberalism itself, and impossible seriously to target Muslim majorities outside these states without at the same time targeting their own wealth and security. So whereas global Islam has a number of options open to it, liberal democracy has only compromise and suicide to choose from.”

Another facet of this discussion on free speech are concepts of the “moral narrative of modernity,” and how this narrative is constructed by the press. Keane (2009) introduces this term where he places a transnational comparison in the context of the Mohammed Cartoons, which “manifested a form of European ethnonationalism, increasingly defined against an Islamic other, crystallized around a purported opposition between secular freedoms and religious sensibilities.” Keane invokes the idea of the “moral authority of the press,” and the “social power of the idea of freedom.” Notions of freedom and democracy have been negotiated by the press and presented particular problems to those penning published works. Keane provides that the case of the Mohammed Cartoons presents such a problem. “Not only does semiotic ideology mediate moral judgments,” he writes, “but it can also obscure the nature of the social action from its protagonists and make it hard for the actors themselves to understand the consequences.” The reaction of the Danes showed that

they were not equipped to moderate this issue beyond its creation. Keane underscores this with his description that, “Their initial action was self-contained and that any response to that action was supplementary or extraneous to it.”

In then-Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen’s 2006 televised New Year Address, there was the condemnation of the act of printing the Cartoons, but not the act of free speech:

I condemn any expression, action or indication that [attempts] to demonise groups of people on the basis of their religion or ethnic background. It is the sort of thing that does not belong in a society based on respect for the individual human being.-- We have a long history of extensive freedom of speech in Denmark. We are to speak freely and present our views to each other in a straightforward manner. However, it must be done in mutual respect and understanding. And in a civilized tone of voice.-- And fortunately, the tone of the Danish debate is in general both civilized and fair. (Bonde, 2007)

This quote shows the extent of bias that a politician can advertently or inadvertently present to a public. There is the deliberate avoidance of addressing the feelings of Danish Muslims. There is the implication in the words, “mutual respect and understanding,” that the aggressed cannot challenge the aggressor. This is emphasized with the invocation of a “civilized tone of voice,” which is referred to by the “tone of Danish debate [which] is in general both civilized and fair.” The former Prime Minister’s words here leave no room for commentary because to do so would be to challenge Danish civilizational values and way of life.³¹ Such “universal rationality” that was employed, “is only possible in particular contexts that favour (by virtue of exclusion) certain symbolic capitals. Thus, dialogue and rationality in communication are always framed by a ‘way of life’” (Kunelius & Alhassan, 2008).

³¹ This tone of dictating values is similar in a Danish-led campaign called “The Arab Initiative,” which “[aims] to promote reform and democracy in Muslim countries.” It was an initiative that began in 2003 with the goal of “[promoting] collaboration between Danish organizations and institutions and partners in the Arab world and Iran” (Klausen, 2009).

With this in mind, how can “ways of life” be negotiated when discussing free speech ethics?

2.4. *In Context: Responsibility and Judgment*

The Mohammed Cartoons brings up a unique facet of the freedom of speech. “Responsibility and judgment,” are key in determining the weight of the message of something as semiotically effervescent as editorial cartoons. Keane’s (2009) notion of a “moral narrative of modernity” and its context in free speech is found in the Cartoons because they “[affirm] certain fundamental assumptions about the place of signs in the world, the nature of truth, and their relationship to action.” These (Danish) assumptions operate on the basis that the “moral evaluation of Muslims’ nonmodernity centers here on the notion that they simply do not understand reality,” and impose an “*external* threat to freedom.”³²

Keane’s thesis applied here is derived from the fact that *JP* apologized for the offense cause by the Cartoons, and not for the Cartoons in and of themselves. *JP* erred in its publication of the Cartoons because it failed to acknowledge that other publics would not view the Cartoons as each cartoonist’s depiction of Mohammed “as they [saw] him,” but as representative of all Danish views with “concepts of agency and truth that rest on distinct semiotic ideologies” (Keane, 2009). Had the Cartoons never left Denmark, as Keane (2009) mentions, there would never have been a problem. Or at least, the disagreement would have arisen, then dissipated over time. The reality of the controversy was that it was greatly supported by “chat rooms, text messaging, and the Internet [which] proved an unmanageable source of political mobilization and rapid radicalization” (Klausen, 2009), and the efforts of mobilized individuals who create a borderless nation through communication.

³² Appendix D. investigates this in its analysis of the documentary, *Bloody Cartoons*.

2.5. In Context: A Question of Communication

Hussain (2007) presents an interesting proposal regarding the communication and assessment of the events of the Mohammed Cartoons controversy. "There exist elements in both worlds," he writes, "with a keen interest in nurturing these and other misconceptions to support the notion, articulated by Huntington (1996) and repopularized in recent years, of a global clash of apparently incompatible civilizations." The problem of the Mohammed Cartoons controversy, he identifies, is a problem of misconception. The mistake is that Muslims think (wrongly) that Christians wouldn't insult their own religion. The second misconception is the "currently widespread notion among many Muslims that the West is engaged in a renewed Crusade against Islam, [which] is the result of relatively recent political trends." This is supported by two phenomenon. The first is the notion that different parties involved are operating under the idea of different gods, where there is Allah for the Muslims, God for the Christians. The media, Hussain argues, has false perceptions on Mohammed, Islam, and Mohammed's relationship to God, where Mohammed is seen as directly related to God, whereas Jesus was a messenger of God.

As for the Mohammed Cartoons controversy, there is a particular problem with the drawing of the Prophet Mohammed. "The existence of such depictions of Muhammad throughout Islamic history," Hussain writes, "proves that the notion that the Muslim protests resulted from the mere fact that cartoonists drew images of Muhammad is, at the very least, questionable and, at most, ludicrous." He explains this further by writing that, "there is a readiness, and sometimes even eagerness, in the media to attribute the characteristics and actions of Muslim fundamentalists to Muhammad himself." The Cartoons were slanderous for Hussain, because they are reasserting the idea that they represent misconceptions of Islam. What went wrong in

the communication process was the assumption that the Danish (and Western) culture of satire would be interpreted similarly across borders, and to Hussain, this was discrimination.

The argument of agents in the Cartoons controversy and issues of discrimination supports the research of this thesis. What is important is the underlying motivation of these agents, and how the controversy is exemplary of a case where agents feel wronged, either by exercising their rights, or by not having their rights respected. Phillips (2008) proposed, “the question of who speaks, who is heard, and how they are validated, both reflects the power structures as they exist and helps to confirm them.” This juxtaposition of power is demonstrative of complications of civilizational discourse in Denmark.

The Cartoons controversy has shown that there are more profound conflicts occurring than that of freedom of speech. Given that there is a “discursive situation” in Europe, where minority loyalty to governments is questioned, there has to be a discussion of multiculturalism and the place of Muslims in Denmark (Eide et al., 2008). This “loyalty” of minorities, and notably the Danish Muslim minority, can be negotiated according to how said minority group is received and integrated into a host country. In the case of the Cartoons controversy in Denmark, there have been several pre-existing stereotypes and issues related to immigrant populations, particularly as pertaining to an issue of “moral panic” in society (Bonde, 2007).³³ The following sections will provide an analysis of issues of immigration and discrimination, and how changing policies have fostered a climate which lead up to an event such as the Mohammed Cartoons controversy.

³³ This “moral panic,” is defined as the quantified reaction “against threats to common values, public concern, responses from experts in fields even beyond the original story and finally leading to social change and change of policies” (Boe & Hervik, 2008).

A noteworthy quote from Flemming Rose reflects back to these issues; ““The furor over the Cartoons has been a wake-up call for Danes. We are used to seeing ourselves as a permissive and open society on the side of the good, and it is shocking to see Danes as objects of hate... People are no longer willing to pay taxes to help support someone called Ali who comes from a country with a different language and culture that is 5,000 miles away”” (Bilefsky, 2006b). This quote emphasizes the difficult situation of non-ethnic Danes in Denmark. Already there are socio-cultural mechanisms of differentiation based on ethnicity, and socio-economic differences that can create separate qualities of life in a country that strives to have a commitment to the equal welfare of all in a society. It evidently speaks to a population that wishes to differentiate between people in a cultural community, and thus appropriate welfare to the “we” with merit.

A relevant fact here is that the “boundaries of permissible language had shifted,” Klausen (2009) writes, “What once would have been offensive speech about ‘other people’ was now justified as standing up to piety or simply as speaking one’s mind.” Conflict in this regard is evident in a Danish radio station, Radio Holger, which in mid-2005 suggested “the preventive extermination of Muslims.”³⁴ In the 2007 Danish elections, the *Danish People’s Party* “used the cartoon protests and the ‘Muslim threat’ as a campaign effort.” Events such as these provide the advent where, Klausen (2009) writes, “hardly a day goes by without someone saying or writing that a believing Muslim cannot be ‘fully’ Danish.”

“According to Appadurai,” Boe and Hervik (2008) write, “the identification of minorities as carriers of difference within a nation state reminds the majority, that it is not a ‘whole’, homogenous nation. Therefore, even small numbers destabilize the

³⁴ The station has since been shut down and privatized (Klausen, 2009).

majority, creating an ‘anxiety of incompleteness’.” Given such anxieties in modernity, Giddens (1991) theorizes that people in modernity are constantly in a cyclical battle of anxiety, risk, fear, guilt, basic trust and trust, which are all monitored and controlled by routines and regimes of the self. These elements enable or disable a person’s “colonization of the future.” A modern person, according to Giddens, is always in a battle of controlling his or her future and wanting security from knowing what the future can bring. An application of these theories to Flemming Rose’s quote above would show that non-ethnic Danes pose a threat and cause anxieties within a population of Danes because their future community is at risk of changing with the faces of new populations. One half of Muslims “are recent immigrants to Denmark or have been born to immigrant parents since 1980” (Klausen, 2009), making this phenomenon of a changing society a real and actual event occurring within recent decades.

Regardless of social, cultural, and economic hardships, Muslims in Denmark have been able to establish their faith and community. Islam is considered to be the second most practiced religion in Denmark. There are currently 155 mosques, the first of which was built in 1967 (Klausen, 2009; Schmidt, 2009). About 20 schools have been established by parents of Muslim origin, the first of which was founded in 1978 (Mouritsen et al., 2009).³⁵ Muslim communities are also supported by businesses such as Islamic banks, halal butchers, travel agencies arranging attractive fares for pilgrimages to Mecca, and specialized driving schools for Muslim women (Fair, 2003). Due to these socio-economic factors certain concentrated urban areas, as well as welfare housing, have become ghettos and ethnic neighborhoods (Tansey, 2009).

³⁵ Children of Muslim origin who attend Muslim schools perform better academically than their peers in public schools (Mouritsen et al., 2009).

What these communities then create is a significant presence in an otherwise quite homogenous culture, which in turn challenges notions of Danish identity and heritage. In Danish culture, it is important for “immigrants to seamlessly integrate into society so that there is only a Danish identity, and Danish values predominate” (Tansey, 2009). What the above demonstrates, however, is a concerted effort and resistance to retain non-Danish notions of community and identity, not only within consequences of the events of the Cartoons controversy but also leading up to it.

2.6. *In Context: Understanding the Controversy*

Without understanding some of the events that occurred before the controversy, a proper analysis of the implications of the Cartoons cannot be made. Danish newspaper *Politiken* published the following statements made in June 2005 by *The Danish People’s Party* leader, Pia Kjaersgaard, in her party’s newsletter three months prior to the printing of the Cartoons:

Nobody in 1900 would have been able to imagine that by 2005 human beings at a lower level of civilisation would populate big parts of Copenhagen and other major Danish cities with their foreign primitive, cruel habits -- such as honour murders, arranged marriages, Halal slaughtering and blood revenge. This is exactly what has happened. Ten thousands upon ten thousands of people have come to a country, which left the Middle Ages centuries ago, while their own apparent state of civilisation, culturally and spiritually, is in 1005. (Bonde, 2007)³⁶

Although *The Danish People’s Party* does not have majority rule, it has significant control over cultural matters in Denmark. This is because “in Denmark a government can be formed if there is not a majority against it” (Klausen, 2009). In light of this project, Kjaersgaard’s quote shows an active effort to prioritize “civilizations.” It demonstrates a “hatred of a religion,” and is an exemplary effort to

³⁶ From *Politiken*, January 20, 2006 - Tillykke Pia Kjaersgaard [Congratulations, Pia Kjaersgaard].

spin politics and social values to promote a definition of democracy, and the idea of culture as a vital component of daily life.³⁷

Similar language was used by the then-Minister of Culture, Brian Mikkelsen, when speaking at the annual meeting of the *Conservative Party* in 2005 shortly before the printing of the Cartoons (Klausen, 2009):

There are still many battles to fight. One of the most important ones is the confrontation we experience when immigrants from Muslim countries refuse to accept Danish culture and European norms. In the midst of our country - our own country - parallel societies develop in which minorities practice their medieval norms and un-democratic ways of thinking. This we cannot accept. This is the new front of the cultural battle. (Bonde, 2007)

Such a statement made by a representative of “culture” is objectionable. Rather than embracing a multicultural society, the Minister chose to invoke language of “us” and “them.” Although views of politicians cannot be said to represent all constituents of a country, the two above quotes offer some insight into the rhetoric of two major political parties, *The Danish People’s Party* and the *Conservative Party* in the months leading up to the Cartoons controversy. So how could equal rights and freedom of speech be implemented in an environment that may not have been ideal for such negotiations?

To conclude this section would be to think about Huntington’s theories and the dialogues of academics in light of liberalism today. Liberalism, Peters (2008) writes, “needs to risk rigorous self-criticism of its own assumptions – especially its love for monopolizing the virtues and its distrust of nonsecular forms of reasoning. If it does not, it risks being the ideological arm of a geopolitical struggle that will only further polarize the twenty-first century into warring factions.” Mouritsen et al. (2009)

³⁷ This is also reflected in Appendix D., within the analysis of the documentary, *Bloody Cartoons*.

takes this a step further by stating that, “the Danish case highlights a certain ambiguity in the idea of repressive liberalism (deep autonomy, self-discipline) as a neo-liberal welfare-statist functionalism that colours official integration ideologies and programs.” In this context, freedom of speech is a form of religiosity, where ideas of democracy and equality are embedded in issues of multiculturalism.

Section 3: Applied Research on Multiculturalism

3.0. Introduction

Issues of citizenship and minority populations are also important to consider in this thesis. They are important because discourses on immigration and integration play a role in protecting a society and a “way of life.” By examining issues related to immigration and citizenship, the Mohammed Cartoons can be read as a protectionist reaction within a population that views an “other” as a threat to a way of life and a struggle to protect civilizational values. Democracy, equality, and liberal free speech regulations are all a part of a Danish identity which is jeopardized, *JP* presented, by a “non-we” population which could conceivably change the way people live in a Danish democracy. This is regarded in two points. The first point is that there is a concentration in Denmark on “ethnic and national distinctiveness that is tied to citizenship,” and the second point is the “focus on citizenship as a reward which should incite foreigners to become integrated in order to obtain it.” This invariably will cause discord in Danish society because there is a differentiation between types of citizens, rather than all citizens being equal and validated members of society. These stringent citizenship regulations are also a “a test case for social rights being tied to period of residence rather than legal citizenship.” Once someone has acquired citizenship, his or her citizenship is not only based on inherent “rights and obligations” to a state,” but also a duty to obtaining a new national identity, where integration is key (Mouritsen et al., 2009).³⁸

³⁸ There is delineation between kinds of citizenships. Research for this project has shown that people are not simply citizens of Denmark. They are either *medboger* (“citizens with us”) or *statsboger* (“citizens of the state”) with *indføedelsesret* (“rights of the native born”) (Mouritsen et al., 2009). Naturalized citizenship is voted upon by parliament, where a list of applicants is presented twice a year (Klausen, 2009).

A study from 1999 investigated integration in Denmark, where non-ethnic Danes “who [felt] more integrated in Danish society also [felt] more discriminated against” (Mouritsen et al., 2009). The logic of this is that these individuals have more contact with Danish culture, as opposed to other non-ethnic Danes who reside in communities that support their lifestyles and provide acculturated goods and services. In 2006, the *Ministry of Integration* made an opposite conclusion with the statement that, “It is a clear tendency that those people who feel least integrated, experience most discrimination. It is difficult to tell whether it is the experience of discrimination that leads to the feeling of not being integrated or whether it is a low degree of integration which is the cause of the experience of discrimination” (Mouritsen et al., 2009). This, clearly, is a weak statement because it is obvious that the Ministry is appropriating agency to the “discriminated,” i.e., that it is the responsibility of the non-ethnic Dane to integrate. If a person is integrated, they would not feel discriminated against. This premise could be made, of course, if there is no prejudice towards non-ethnic Danes in general. The last two decades saw much debate on the issue of discrimination where many political parties used the issue in shaping their political positions, and problems have arisen when implementing European and international regulations into Danish ones (Mouritsen et al., 2009). These convictions contribute to a creation of a national identity with the advent of multiculturalism.

3.1. In Context: Immigration, Discrimination, and Multiculturalism

Denmark has historically been considered a tolerant country. It has been lauded for protecting Jews during its occupation by the Nazis in the Second World War. In the 1960s, it was socially acceptable for unmarried heterosexual couples to live together, and homosexual marriage was legalized in the 1970s. In 2003, Denmark provided the highest “per capita aid to developing countries,” globally. Also in that

year there was an acceptance rate of 43% for asylum-seekers, and “on a per capita basis, Denmark was third on a list of [numbers] of refugees accepted by industrialized countries.” Contradicting these notions of “tolerance and openness” are documented issues related to racism and prejudice. Reporting by the European Commission Against Racism and Intolerance provided a criticism of Denmark, “stating that ‘problems of xenophobia and discrimination persist and concern particularly non-EU citizens – notably immigrants, asylum seekers and refugees, but also Danish nationals of foreign background’ (Fair, 2003). In reflecting this, Denmark has strong “‘multicultural optimism’ (that is, regarding presence of minorities as ‘enriching’),” however, “it hits an EU low... on measures of personal feelings of ‘disturbance in daily life’ by the presence of other nationalities, other races, and *particularly other religions*.” This is due, in large part, to the “academic notion of cultural homogeneity as a precondition of social capital, trust, and solidarity” (Mouritsen et al., 2009).

From 1967 to 1973 groups of “third country nationals” immigrated to Denmark as guest workers.³⁹ In the mid-1970s, these groups as well as incoming refugees were labeled in the “news media as ‘uncontrolled floods of large, anonymous groups of immigrants’.” The groups were originally Turks and Yugoslavs; however, in the 1980s they were also from non-European countries such as Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, and Palestine. The 1980s also saw an increase of refugees and asylum-seekers due to relaxed regulations (Fair, 2003); and the right of all immigrants to vote in local elections was given in 1982 (Mouritsen et al., 2009). By 1993, these populations had doubled in a decade (Fair, 2003), and the news media widely propagated that

³⁹ “Third country nationals” refers to individuals who are not citizens of Scandinavia, Europe, or North America (Fair, 2003).

criminality and social deviance was a part of minority culture (Bonde, 2007).⁴⁰

Currently, immigrants live “under socially more vulnerable conditions than Ethnic Danes.” This is largely due to low income and high unemployment rates in these groups, low education and insufficient Danish language levels. This therefore gives rise to higher crime rates, which include abused women and gang activity. Due to these factors and the visibility of veiled women, the “media often present these facts as connected to Muslims and Islam as a religion.” Therefore, the only attention paid to Muslims was negative attention (Tansey, 2009). In a recent article on gang activity in Copenhagen, one ethnic youth stated, “We are constantly a target for police discrimination and harassment. The police stop us just because of the way we look. If you have black hair you stick out. You are automatically a criminal.” In response to acts of criminality, there are new efforts to create legislation which would allow the removal of people of “‘non-Danish’ descent and to strip ‘New Danes’ of their citizenship” (Joumaa, 2009). This is one example of a “hostile rhetoric” against “visible foreigners and Muslims” (Mouritsen et al., 2009).

Muslims have a tendency to be “grouped under one category because of their non-ethnic Dane “otherness,” even though they hail from different nations and have varying degrees of practicing their faith.” Minorities also have a proven risk of being discriminated against in the workplace (Mouritsen et al., 2009). A perpetuation of the guest/host nature of non-ethnic Danes in Denmark is that the media landscape does not provide the development of minority media. Broadcast media “do not provide

⁴⁰ This was promoted by imagery of Muslim women as “oppressed and battered, and Muslim men as hypersexual threats to women” (Bonde, 2007).

multicultural programming (Bonde, 2007).⁴¹ Immigration and multiculturalism are thus current and active issues in Denmark's socio-economic environment.

3.2. *In Context: Danish Identity as Related to the Cartoons*

The event of multiculturalism in Denmark has created an increase in "Danish nationalism and a renewed interest in Danish culture (Fair, 2003). This is because, "the underlying problem is really one of perceptions, images, and imaginings around Danes' own identity" (Nielsen, 2009).⁴² To ascribe to values of "Danishness," there has to be an adherence to values associated with Denmark and Danish society. The first is the issue of language and shared language. The second is the small size of Denmark, and the way that people interact with one another, with traditional concepts of intimacy and "coziness." The last values are the most important ones, and these are concepts of democracy and equality, which are the keystones to Danish identity and philosophies of life and run with the idea that everyone must "work *and pay taxes*, and hence to contribute to the reciprocity and mutuality of the welfare state" (Mouritsen et al., 2009).

These values, however, run the risk of "[fostering] limited perspectives of other views on liberal lifestyles, as well as cultural difference." All of these forms of identification have been instigated in large part because of the Mohammed Cartoons, which "fed into a process of new national assertiveness, stressing an uncompromising stance on 'our democratic values', by a large part of the electorate and the present government." There is an attitude that "the responsibility (and duty) lies entirely with

⁴¹ Broadcast media "do not provide multicultural programming; Denmark's Radio has closed down all its news programmes in foreign languages, and only a few community media targeting a local audience provide programming aimed for minorities" (Bonde, 2007).

⁴² The "renewed interest" in Danish identity is reinforced with the presence of the Danish flag in daily life as well as special occasions. This type of demarcation is "closely tied with the concepts of home... hospitality, and comfort, all key symbols of 'Danishness'" (Fair, 2003). Another demarcation of being a part of the Danish entity is that everyone must have a *CPR* number (Personal Registration Number), in order to live in Denmark legally.

individual immigrants who must assimilate to the majority and prove themselves worthy of becoming members of Danish society,” because the majority reserves the “right to dominate the national public space and institutions” (Mouritsen et al., 2009). The option is to conform or otherwise be represented as an other, within “distinct [lines] of demarcation” (Eide, 2008).

In this dialogue of “Danishness,” it is important to look at the vocabulary surrounding citizenship in Denmark. Technically, to be a Dane one parent must be a Danish national who was born in Denmark. An immigrant who has been born abroad, and any children born to him or her are considered foreigners in Denmark (Tansey, 2008). Upon receiving a residency permit, an immigrant must complete a program as dictated by the “Integration Act” and pass a Danish language test. In 2005 the “Declaration on integration and active citizenship in Danish society” was placed into action. Here an immigrant is required to declare that “he or she can ‘understand and accept’ a number of [aspects of] Danish legislation and society, for example that it is expected [that] all persons should become self-supporting, that Danish society is built on gender equality, and that it is illegal to beat spouses and children and (!) to carry out acts of terrorism” (Mouritsen et al., 2009). With the placement of the radical *Danish People’s Party* into power in 2006, the regulations became even more demanding. In addition to the previous requirements, there is an “integration exam and a requirement for 2½ years of full time employment” (Tansey, 2009). There are also changes to immigration and asylum-seeker policies, which have been created to discourage “newcomers to the country.” There exists, however, a hazing of the definition of immigrant, because even those who have acquired citizenship are still considered statistically as immigrants (Mouritsen et al., 2009).

3.3. Conclusion

The positioning of *JP* in the controversy was that the right to communication is synonymous to democracy; however, the examination of multiculturalism in Denmark complicates this positioning. The problem, Huntington (2002) would interject, is the control of the “flows of ideas, technology, goods, and people,” and the interaction of the “forces of integration in the world [that] are real and are precisely what are generating counterforces of cultural assertion and civilizational consciousness,” which can question and renegotiate the arguments presented by *JP*; that is, to threaten free speech is to threaten all that is implicated within free speech and go against “Western,” “democratic” and “modern” civilizational values.

Modernization as we know it today, however, has been twisted in a unique manner in that it “strengthens those cultures and reduces the relative power of the West[;] In fundamental ways, the world is becoming more modern and less Western” (Huntington, 2002). To be non-Western and modern, therefore, means that there is a blurring of Christian values while there is an integration of other systems of beliefs, as well as cultures and practices not traditionally “European.” To play the devil’s advocate in the case of the Mohammed Cartoons controversy would be to say that in order to embrace one’s society as a “modern” society, one must remember that the origins of modernity and “civilization” have changed.

Section 4: An Assessment of Research

In researching this thesis, the deduction can be made that the Danish Mohammed Cartoons were an over-simplified illustration of a complex domestic and international issue. In investigating the complications of civilizational discourse provoked by the Mohammed Cartoons, this thesis has shown the different facets of the controversy: certain dialogues on free speech, reviewing certain civilizational aspects of people and culture, and presenting a sociological environment of Denmark and certain issues concerning immigration and multiculturalism. All of these facets are important in regarding the controversy and its after-effects; particularly in the recent past.

In September 2009, Yale University Press prevented the printing of the Cartoons in a book written by a Brandeis University professor (and a Dane), Jytte Klausen. In November 2009, a Duke University professor published a book on banned images of Mohammed (Ham, 2009). In early November 2009, the *Danish Illustrators Association* created “caricature.dk” with funds acquired from the “sale and use” of the Mohammed Cartoons. The site was created as a forum for caricatures of the COP climate conference, which was held in Copenhagen in December 2009; with changing themes thereafter. “Instead of giving 10-15,000 kroner to each of the 12 cartoonists,” the chairman of the association, Claus Seidel, is quoted to have said, “we decided from the beginning to put the money into a fund that could carry Danish illustration into the future” (“Mohammed drawings fund satirical website”).⁴³

The resonance of the issue is not only within mediated spheres, but also violent ones. The controversy gave license to some who “accept the use of political violence in a Danish context as legitimate” (Mouritsen et al., 2009). In October 2009, two men were arrested after their plan, the “Mickey Mouse Project,” to attack *Jyllands-Posten*’s offices

⁴³ Klausen (2009) indicated that two cartoonists declined the commission for the cartoons. No other source researched has shown that the cartoonists chose not to profit from their work.

was uncovered (“US charges two for ‘Denmark plot’”). In January 2010, a Somali man attacked Kurt Westergaard’s home and will now be charged with terrorism (“Denmark adds terrorism charge to cartoonist attack”). In response to this attack a group was created on the social-networking website, Facebook, encouraging members to write “I am Kurt Westergaard” on their pages the first Friday after the attack (January 8, 2010). The group was created as a mode of supporting the cartoonist as an individual who was exercising his rights to freedom of speech. (“[Facebook demonstration supports freedom of speech]”).⁴⁴ This production of discourse demonstrates that there is a continued tug-of-war about how to handle the issue of freedom of the speech when it concerns religion. How the academic books on Mohammed caricatures, or the website funded by the Cartoons will be received is to be determined in future study and reflection, and it will continue to be an emotional one.

The ability of this controversy to arouse emotions in those that engage in a debate over the issue demonstrate just how important certain elements are to people’s lives: namely sharing a system of similar values and beliefs within a conceptual “civilization.” What the Cartoons controversy showed was that “Diasporic communities are a testimony of globalization. Given the intensity and diversity of transnational media and communication flows, they are situated in a new way” (Eide et al., 2008). The internal/external nature of the Cartoons shifted the controversy within the “global village,” from the streets of Nairobi to the desks of North American professors.⁴⁵ *JP*’s attempt to assert notions of Danish identity as a “collective we” and the focusing on the “other” to assimilate, backfired because in today’s mediated world, certain words and images cannot be projected without consequence. Marginalizing a people, even within a

⁴⁴ There is an undeniable link between the Facebook protest and Friday being a day of prayer for Muslims, however the source does not mention this.

⁴⁵ The idea of a “global village” originates with Marshall McLuhan’s original work, *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man* (1964); Modood (2007) provides an article of several North American professors in dialogue over the Cartoons.

specific readership, is a futile effort when a provoked reaction is inevitable. Interestingly, in March 2009, the United Nations Human Rights Council “passed a resolution proposed by the OIC citing the cartoons as an example of a human rights violation” (Klausen, 2009), thus officially negating the unquestioned rights in Denmark to free speech.

This brings the issue of the Cartoons and the resulting effects back to “responsibility and judgment” that Koffi Anan called upon. The Cartoons controversy was an event that showed the power of the media and communications, which inspired people to mobilize and engage with one another; through actions and words, which in turn affected Danish discourses on society. If civilizational discourse on multiculturalism in Denmark is not addressed, “there is a high latent risk that new cultural conflicts will appear again due to the efficiency and uncontrollability of the present patterns of communication” (Bonde, 2007).

The process of writing this thesis has been a long and complex one. There is a vast quantity of material to choose from in addressing questions and reasons for this thesis, namely, the provocation of civilizational discourse in the context of the Mohammed Cartoons in Denmark. This thesis sought to present the Mohammed Cartoons controversy in a different light; one that will raise further questions to be considered and investigated. Questions should always be brought up when addressing a controversial topic, in order to provide further understanding of how global citizens interact with one another and how civilizational discourses are understood.

Appendix A: Denmark

A.1. Background of Newspaper Media in Denmark

In the early 20th century, Danish newspapers “began to break free from political parties.” This evolution did not leave the newspapers unbiased, and “Danish journalists have become participants in setting the political agenda through the choice of the news and views that are presented.” Not only this, but newspapers “also make use of their political statements and affiliations to brand their newspapers and to attract a certain readership.” Almost 50% of the Danish population reads newspapers daily, although newspapers targeted towards an immigrant audience or Muslim readership are not available in Denmark (Hervik, 2008). The following is a breakdown of the different major Danish newspapers:

First is the newspaper that published the so-called Mohammed Cartoons, *Morgenavisen Jyllands-Posten* (also known as simply *Jyllands-Posten*). This newspaper was established in 1871 on mainland Denmark, and was not circulated nationally until the 1960s. In 2007, it had a weekday circulation of 128,920 and a Sunday circulation of 173,503. It was the first Danish newspaper to print color photographs in 1954, and the first to go online in 1995. It has “declared itself an independent liberal newspaper,” and its website claims that it is “Denmark’s most widely read newspaper – and the country’s outstanding newspaper success of recent years” (“The press in Denmark”; “About Jyllands-Posten”; Hervik, 2008).

The next major newspaper is *Politiken*, or “policy” in Danish. *Politiken* was established in 1884 in Copenhagen, and is known to have allegiances to the *Labor Party (Socialdemokratiet)* and the *Social Liberals (Venstre)*. It has a circulation of

134,000. Another large newspaper is the *Berlingske Tidende*, which was established in 1749, and is one of the world's oldest newspapers. It is considered to be a conservative paper with a circulation of 124,550. A paper with a smaller circulation of 110,880 is *Ekstra Bladet* or "the extra paper." *Ekstra Bladet* was founded in 1904 and became a tabloid newspaper in 1964. It is "known for its provocative journalistic research," with "plenty of sex, crime, and sport." It also had a symbolic relationship with the radical *Danish People's Party* in 1997, which had just recently been created (Hervik, 2008). A second tabloid newspaper, *B.T.*, was established in 1916 has a circulation of 93,942. *B.T.* is more family-oriented. Two newspaper conglomerates own "the 'big five.' Copenhagen-based media group Berlingske Oficin owns *Berlingske Tidende* and *B.T.* [, and the free newspaper *Urban*], while JP/Politikens Hus A/S... owns *Jyllands-Posten*, *Politiken*, and *Ekstra Bladet*." ("The press in Denmark")

Another newspaper is the *Kristeligt Dagblad*, or the "Christian daily paper," which was established in 1896 and has a circulation of 17,000. It is the "only paper with special sections devoted to church and faith, aiming to 'publish a daily newspaper managed and written in a Christian spirit'." Finally there is *Information*, which is a liberal newspaper with a circulation of 20,235. *Information* was an "illegal news agency during Nazi occupation in 1943, becoming a legitimate daily... after the country was liberated in May 1945." It was the first Danish broadsheet format newspaper to switch to compact form in late 2004, and it is casually known as the newspaper of intellectuals and academics. There are also two major free newspapers, often read by commuters, *Urban* with a distribution of 227,000 and *metroXpress*,

which publishes 241,000 copies in Copenhagen. (“The press in Denmark”; Hervik, 2008).

A.2. Background Information on Denmark

As a peninsula in northern Europe, the Kingdom of Denmark has oceanic borders to the Baltic and the North Sea and a geographic border with Germany. Denmark has two self-governing entities, the Faeroe Islands and Greenland, both of which have seats in Denmark’s parliament, *Folketinget* (*People’s Assembly*). Denmark has the oldest known kingdom in the world, and is considered to be a modern and wealthy nation, involved with the “general political and economic integration of Europe.” It became a member of NATO in 1949, and the European Union (then the EEC) in 1973. (“Films > 10...”; “Europe: Denmark”; “The Kingdom of Denmark”, 2009).

Research conducted in 2008 also showed that Denmark is the world’s “happiest nation,” with a population of approximately 5.5 million people. In 2008 it was estimated that about one quarter of the population lives in and around the capital, Copenhagen. Roughly 8.8% of the Danish population is made up of immigrants “and their descendants,” which amounts to approximately 478,000 people. The labor force is at 2.8 million people, 1.4% of which is in the agricultural sector, 25.9% in the industrial sector, and 72.7% in the services sector. The principle religion is Evangelical Lutheranism, with 95% of the population being members of the church. Other Christian religions are at 3% of the population. The Muslim population thus amounts to approximately 190,000 people in Denmark, or about 3.5% of population. The majority of Muslims are migrant workers from Turkey and Pakistan. Refugees are typically from Afghanistan, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon and Somalia (“Denmark ‘world’s’ happiest nation”, 2008; Statistics Denmark, 2008; “Europe:

Denmark”, 2009; Mouritsen, 2009, p.40).

Denmark was originally a unified state in the 10th century, and became a constitutional monarchy in 1849. Denmark’s constitution was established on June 5th, 1953, and it is one that allows for a female head of state, which is currently Queen Magrethe II. A general government reformation on January 1, 2007, divided the country into five regions (from 13 counties), and 98 municipalities (from 271).⁴⁶ The current Prime Minister is Lars Loekke Rasmussen, who has been in office as of April 5th, 2009 (“Europe: Denmark”, 2009). The previous Prime Minister, Anders Fogh Rasmussen, who is the current Secretary General of NATO, was involved in the Mohammed Cartoons controversy.

Denmark is a welfare society that hosts a multiparty system. Denmark’s parliament, *Folketinget* (*People’s Assembly*), holds 179 seats, where members are elected by popular vote. The most recent election was on November 11, 2007. The seats of *Folketinget* members are made up of: forty-six for the *Liberal Party* (known as *Venstre*),⁴⁷ forty-five for the *Social Democrats*, twenty-five for the (radical) *Danish People’s Party*, twenty-three for the *Socialist People’s Party*, eighteen for the *Conservative People’s Party*, nine for the *Social Liberal Party*, five for the *Liberal Alliance* party (formerly the *New Alliance* party), and four for the *Red-Green Alliance* (“Europe: Denmark”, 2009; “Films > 10...”). The *Danish People’s Party* is the third largest party in Denmark, and has strong “nativist” policies on the “pro-welfare state platform and refusal to accept immigration” (Klausen, 2009). In short, the current “liberal-conservative” government was preceded by the “social democratic”

⁴⁶ The five regions of Denmark are: *Hovedstaden* (the Capital), *Midtjylland* (Mid-Jutland), *Nordjylland* (North-Jutland), *Sjælland* (Zealand), and *Syddanmark* (South-Denmark).

⁴⁷ The name *Venstre* comes from the “seating arrangements in parliament in the days of limited suffrage” (Klausen, 2009).

government in 2001, the latter of which had been in power since 1993. The parties that carry the most weight are the *Conservative People's Party*, the *Liberal Party*, and the *Danish People's Party*, which provides “the necessary additional votes to secure majority” (Mouritsen, 2009).

Appendix B. Description of the Mohammed Cartoons

A description of the Cartoons is as follows:⁴⁸

Drawing 1: A man's face in black (with a black beard and a white turban), with a green crescent moon around it.

Drawing 2: A man's face (with a beige color and a black beard), with a black turban shaped as a bomb. There is an inscription of verses of the Qur'an in an orange-gold color, and the fuse of the bomb is also an orange color (Laegaard, 2007).

Drawing 3: A line-up of seven turbaned men (numbered) of different ethnicities, with a woman (Pia Kjaersgaard, the leader of the radical *Danish People's Party*) saying, "Hmm... I can't quite recognize him..."

Drawing 4: A bearded, sandaled man, with a crescent halo (which could also be viewed as horns).

Drawing 5: Five rudimentary female figures (drawn with simple, single pen strokes), with facial features constructed with crescent moons and stars, with a caption: "Prophet! You crazy bloke! Keep women under the yoke!"

Drawing 6: An Arab man in white with sandals, holding a staff and leading a donkey with a rope.

Drawing 7: A man in an office, sitting at a drawing table with a lamp shining (the setting is night), looking over his shoulder and sweating as he draws an image of an Arab man with a turban and beard.

Drawing 8: Two bearded men in turbans and holding a sword, a bomb, and a gun, are running towards a third bearded, turbaned man. The third man is reading a sheet of

⁴⁸ Descriptions of the Cartoons are the author's, complemented with quotations from Fode (2006), unless otherwise cited.

paper and holding his hand up, with a caption: “Relax folks! It’s just a sketch made by an unbeliever from southern Denmark.”

Drawing 9: A teenage ethnic boy wearing a soccer shirt emblazoned with “The Future,” is pointing with a stick at a blackboard with Farsi text written on it: “Mohammed, Valby School, 7A,” and “The editorial team of *Jyllands-Posten* is a bunch of reactionary provocateurs” (Klausen, 2009).⁴⁹

Drawing 10: A bearded, turbaned man in white is standing in front of two women at each of his sides. He is holding a sword and his eyes are drawn over with a black stripe. The women behind him are wearing all traditional black coverings with only their eyes visible, which are alarmed.

Drawing 11: A bearded, turbaned man is standing on clouds with his arms wide as a group of men stand before him. The group of men has puffs of smoke rising from their heads. The man is saying to them: “Stop, stop, we ran out of virgins!”

Drawing 12: A western-looking man with glasses and a turban is holding a sketch in his hand. His turban has “Publicity Stunt” written on it, and the sketch in his hand is a stick man wearing a turban. The orange in the turban is a reference to a Danish “expression for receiving undeserved good luck,” and man is thought to be Kaare Bluijten (Klausen, 2009).

⁴⁹ Valby is a town located in the western region of the Greater Copenhagen area.

Appendix C: Huntington

C.1. Huntington's Definition of "Civilization"

To Huntington, 18th century French intellectuals created the idea of civilization, "as the opposite of 'barbarism'." Civilizations are a cultural entity and a "totality." Most members of civilizations have a moral sense of "what is right and wrong." They evolve and adapt to their regional climates and they are "mortal" (Huntington, 2002). They come from "the highest cultural grouping of people and the broadest level of cultural identity people have short of that which distinguishes humans from other species." The definition also has "double standards: people apply one standard to their kin-countries and a different standard to others" (Huntington, 1993). Civilizations are in a constant flux of "phases of expansion and phases of conflict." Religion is seen to be a "central defining characteristic of civilizations." "In the modern world," Huntington writes, "religion is a central, perhaps *the* central, force that motivates and mobilizes people." Civilizations "have no clear-cut boundaries and no precise beginnings and endings. People can and do redefine their identities and, as a result, the composition and shapes of civilizations change over time" (Huntington, 2002).

C.2. Huntington's Five Factors of the Islamic Resurgence

Huntington (2002) writes that there are five factors that contribute to the conflict between Islam and the West. These factors can be argued to be instigators of feelings of threat. The first factor is that Muslim population growth has created a pool of "disaffected" youth who "become recruits for Islamist causes, exert pressure on neighboring societies, and migrate to the West." The second factor is that the "Islamic Resurgence" has created security and confidence in peoples of this faith, as a community of a greater whole of people. The third factor is that the West's global

power has created resentment in Muslim populations. The fourth factor is that Communism was once a mutual “perceived major threat,” between Islamic and Western civilizations, and now they are left to contend with one another. The fifth factor is the “increasing contact between and intermingling of Muslims and Westerners stimulate in each a new sense of their own identity and how it differs from that of the other.”

Appendix D: Documentary: *Bloody Cartoons*

D.1. Background On the “Bloody Cartoons” Documentary

This section will examine portions of a documentary, *Bloody Cartoons*, and engage in a discourse and content analysis of it. Within this discourse will be a dialogue of religion, democracy, and access to free speech. It reflects ideas already explored in this thesis, such as the negotiation of being “tolerant of the intolerant,” how definitions of free speech can be established, and how notions of identity are supported by the advent of threats of cultures and multiculturalism.

D.2. Discourse Analysis of the “Bloody Cartoons” Documentary

Karsten Kjaer, a journalist who has worked as a foreign correspondent for World Media and is now working in television, directs the documentary. He has “produced more than 200 programmes for Danish and European television as well as numerous specials on world affairs, especially in the Middle East... He is best known for his use of satire, humour and extraordinary methods in the coverage of sensitive political and cultural issues.” The documentary is filmed in Denmark, France, Iran, Lebanon, Qatar, Syria, and Turkey. *Bloody Cartoons*, in summary, “goes behind the controversy of the Muhammad caricatures by documenting the escalation of the political crisis and in the process [examines] the need for freedom of speech in democratic societies” (Films > 10 Documentaries > Bloody Cartoons).

The premise of the Cartoons, Kjaer (2007) explains in the beginning of the documentary, is that “you must be able to satirize religious figures in a modern democracy.”⁵⁰ He confides, however, that “like every other Dane, [he] watched in total disbelief, when Danish flags and Embassies, were suddenly set on fire, all over the world.” Within these two sentences, lies the message of the film: a clear

⁵⁰ All quotations and information is from Kjaer (2007), unless otherwise cited.

delineation of “us” versus “them.” To make the assumption that “every other Dane” could not comprehend or accept the violent aftermath of the Cartoons is ambitious. To use language such as “like every other,” invokes a sense of entity and unity that cannot be questioned in the film, but is certainly questionable in reality. The beginning of the documentary can be interpreted as sending a message that the exotic “other” is against Danish values and Western civilizations. The noun “grotesque” is used in a clip depicting an unnamed Muslim leader ominously shouting, with subtitled text, “Bring down your wrath upon the heads of the people of Denmark, oh Allah.” This clip, complete with an angry, turbaned man, speaking in a voice that is not pleasing to the ear, could invoke an immediate sense of fear and loathing in a viewer, particularly a Dane.

Shortly after this clip is a music video. “These are crazy people and their top guy is an idiot,” a male Arab singer intones in a monotonous voice, addressing Danes, “...the flames of hell will burn in your faces.” In the background of the clip there is an image of former Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen and a Danish flag with indiscernible drawings on it. We are not told that the singer is Egyptian pop singer, Shaaban Abdel Rahim, and that the song, “We’re All Out of Patience,” had only been released in video format. This singer was a former laundry worker, and has spurred an anti-Western movement through *Sha’abi* pop music in Egypt (Arabs rock to anti-war song; Grippo, 2006).

Kjaer returns to scenes of Denmark and says the following:

Like most Danes, I rarely go to church. That’s why in my Copenhagen neighborhood, I find the beautifully kept church nearly empty on a Sunday morning-- So I’m badly equipped to understand why believers flock to their makeshift mosques, that won’t win any Danish design prizes, in the very same neighborhood-- We have built mosques with slim elegant minarets, in the Copenhagen skyline-- though only as amusement in the Tivoli [entertainment] gardens.

This paragraph is loaded. Again, there is the language of “most Danes.” The church, Kjaer does not tell us, is “beautifully kept,” because there is a church tax that all members of the church pay automatically from their salaries.⁵¹ This contrasts with the privatized (and thus low-budget) Muslim prayer spaces. Why such spaces should merit a Danish design prize seems out of place, and serves only to mock in a way that constructs a line between the “primitive,” “makeshift mosques,” and the solid, constructed Danish churches. The use of imagery from Tivoli Gardens provides another opportunity to mock and provoke. Minaretes are used to calling the masses to prayer, not to entertain. This comment again displaces the naturalized Danish Muslim population.

Kjaer admits this displacement when he says, “the protests against the Mohammed Cartoons, went far beyond our failure to accommodate the Muslim faith in Denmark.” This phrase again shows that there is an issue of differentiation, integration, and acceptance of peoples and practices of the Muslims faith. Of course, this brings the issue back to its origin, Flemming Rose. In the documentary Rose says, “If I said that I regretted [printing the cartoons], and wouldn’t do it again, So- With that, I’d be sending a signal, to the most reactionary and violent forces- the most intimidating forces-- And told them that that if you intimidate and use enough violence, you will get it completely your way.”⁵² With this in mind, someone (the majority) always has to “get their way,” a message that is reflective of the original act of publishing the Cartoons, i.e. that they were an act to assert power within struggles

⁵¹ Members are automatically inducted into the Danish Church at baptism. (http://www.nyidanmark.dk/en-us/citizenship/citizen_in_denmark/10+culture+and+leisure+time.htm).

⁵² Translation author’s.

in Denmark over characteristics of Danish nationalism. Also, if Rose was to back down from a statement he had already made, he would lose credibility.

In the suburbs of one of Denmark's major cities, Aarhus, lies Grimhoej. Kjaer tells us that this is where the Danish Muslim anger started. An interesting note in Kjaer's presentation of a mosque in that area is the use of a background voice of the imam which is amplified in a grandiose way, as if he was speaking in a large auditorium, when he is actually speaking in a small room. Such a room could not have such an echo. An imam speaks to an interviewer about the Cartoonists:

It's like knife to our heart. If they talk about me, or if they talk about average people, there is no problem for us- But they have told poor things, on the most important thing for Muslims, a real symbol for Muslims. They-- We, love the Prophet, Mohammed [peace be upon him], more than my father and mother-- more than my child.⁵³

In Grimhoej, an imam that incited the Danish reaction against the Cartoons, Raed Hlayel, moved from Denmark because of the Cartoons. Hlayel is educated in Sharia law at the Islamic University of Madinah in Saudi Arabia. To Kjaer he had, "suddenly disappeared after the cartoon conflict." In this scene, which shows Kjaer "searching" for Hlayel (though he had undoubtedly located him before shooting the documentary) in Hlayel's hometown of Tripoli, Lebanon. During this scene is a thriller-type music done by a synthesizer, warningly indicating danger. "I don't think that the Danish government and newspaper have issued an apology for the cartoons," Hlayel lectures loudly in a mosque to a group of men, "They still insist that it is a question of free speech. The worst part is the West, headed by Denmark, still cannot understand the heated reaction." Despite his disagreement over the Cartoons, Hlayel and Kjaer greet each other warmly.

⁵³ Translation author's.

“I am happy that I left Denmark,” Hlayel says to the camera later, “I see myself as a winner, not a loser. I believe that if I live in a country, I have to be respected... Of course, as a Muslim I can’t see a better system for the world than Islam... Islam is built on values that are much more suitable for a human being, than the democracy we see in the West.” Most of the filming of this sequence is inside a mosque, with raw brick walls in the background, carpet on the floor, soft lighting of Hlayel when he is speaking, as well as a few frames of him reflecting quietly with his words voiced-over. Hlayel is wearing a traditional shirtdress, glasses and a black turban. He has a graying beard. At the end of this transcribed portion, there is footage of Hlayel taking his toddler daughter (assumed by her pink jacket and tied hair) by the hand, and his wife following in a burqua (though her eyes show through a thin sliver of exposed skin), as they leave a house. This scene is showed at the point with Hlayel’s voice over, saying “than the democracy we see in the West.” Evidently Kjaer is presenting a contrast between his daughter in pink and wife in burqua and notions of the “West” where little girls are not necessarily gender-coded by color and women are not always covered or needing to be accompanied when leaving the house.

Hlayel seems to be proud of his actions regarding the Cartoons. “It was good because we awakened the issue in the politician’s minds.” He had “Stirred up action,” by contacting Lebanon’s leader of Sunni Muslims, Sheik Qabbani, who had strong political influence in the region. The Sheik’s initial reaction to the Cartoons was that, “They must have been made by a person with no morals.” On being asked about his role in being responsible for the demonstrations, Hlayel stated, “Not at all. I bear no responsibility for this. When people want to demonstrate peacefully, and others interfere, it’s not their fault. None of them were intending to create any kind of unrest or violence.” Kjaer’s response to this differed; “A peaceful demonstration, well [that]

depends on your idea, of a Sunday afternoon picnic.” His voice-over is accompanied by scenes of cars vandalized, and burning. The documentary does not state where these scenes originate. “I do not think that the conflict is between a modern society with freedom and Islam,” Hlayel says seriously to the camera in the previous scene in a mosque, eyebrows raised, “The problem is with a society that has had a hatred of Islam since the Crusades. Even though western society is secularized it still has this hatred towards Islam in its mind.”

A person Kjaer indicates who played a principle role in the clash is the Secretary General of OIC, the Organisation of the Islamic Conference. Kjaer introduces the Istanbul office of this figure, Professor Ihsanoglu, by making the point that it is located in the former harem of the Ottoman Empire. In reference to the Mohammed Cartoons, the Secretary General, Professor Ihsanoglu questions,

Is this civilized that you disrespect fifth of the human kind- of human peo- of human beings, of mankind? Fifth of mankind’s belief? Is it- Does it worth a kind of respect, from one side-- Or just you say this is our country- free country- I can do whatever I like.-- Okay then-- Then the other people, who are, in my understanding, are also uncivilized people- they can go and put your Embassy on fire! This is irresponsible-- and that was also irresponsible.

Here Ihsanoglu creates a conceptually large question by using notions of disrespect and language in the first person. According to this rather choppy formulation, the Mohammed Cartoons were an uncivilized form of communication, which invoked feelings of disrespect. This disrespect was licensed by the idea that the Mohammed Cartoons were created out of an impulsive and egocentric idea, promoted and supported by all Danish individuals (i.e. “you”). Setting Embassies on fire are also egocentric impulses, and so, everyone is wrong in the end. What Professor Ihsanoglu fails to acknowledge in this definition, is the role of the systems of values

of nation-states. The Mohammed Cartoons were always presented as an instigator of an initially unclear (and multi-layered) dialogue, and not the result of frivolous impulses of their creators. The notion of “irresponsibility” here means that there is a lack of moral judgment, and Ihsanoglu attempted to analogize the Cartoons that were published in a paper to “violence occurring in the streets.”

At an OIC summit in Mecca, Prof. Ihsanoglu reportedly shaped the organization into an “effective political tool” by using the Mohammed Cartoons as an example of Islamic blasphemy. Immediately after the Cartoons were published, Ihsanoglu wrote a letter to then-Prime Minister, Anders Fogh Rasmussen. “You urged the Danish government to take action to avoid further escalation,” Kjaer says to Ihsanoglu. To Kjaer, this then implied that the OIC played a role in the violence and did not hold itself accountable. Ihsanoglu’s reaction was angry, “You cannot say that I am associated with the street. I am associated with calm in the street.” Kjaer made it a point, however, to ensure that the footage of the angry Ihsanoglu remain in the documentary, where he speaks in a commanding tone, interrupting Kjaer when he tries to speak after a pause. After this interview, Kjaer “had to conclude that, even though [Professor Ihsanoglu] was able to foresee the riots, he refused to be in any way, responsible.” In reviewing this content, there seemed to be a weak attempt at correlating the OIC with the violent reaction in the Islamic world. A letter “urging” action to “avoid further escalation,” implies a reaction that would be strongly suspected of occurring, and no more than that.

Kjaer returns to Denmark, showing scenes of the Danish parliament, seemingly as a parallel with that of the OIC’s entrance. Here he seeks the Prime Minister’s point of view on “this Islamic move, to ban blasphemy.” Anders Fogh Rasmussen provides his consistent reply:

This overall was about, in truth, a global plan to limit free speech when it concerns critical debate on religion. And there I had to say that we are fully steeling ourselves on this case- that we are completely set on, at there is a commitment to free speech which also includes the right to critical debates on religion.⁵⁴

Clearly the reactions to the Cartoons were not structured in such a way as to imply that there was a “global plan” to prevent free speech. By focusing the attention away from Denmark, the Prime Minister was protecting his own political interests. Kjaer then shows the Prime Minister a letter written to the Danish government, addressed to the “Royal Republic of Denmark.” This letter, as written previously, was from eleven Muslim countries.⁵⁵ It was a similar copy of the letter sent by Ihsanoglu. “Of course we took notice of what was written,” Anders Fogh Rasmussen replies to questions about the letter, “but the answer we gave must of course be clear, precisely that the government could not rule over a free and independent newspaper.”

Reactions were still imminent. In Qatar, Sheik Yusef-al-Qaradawi, a televangelist for Arab television station Al-Jazeera intones: “The nation must rage in anger- We are not a nation of jackasses, We are not jackasses to be ridden, but lions that roar.” Kjaer tells the viewer that “his message is picked up all over the Middle East, and turned into action, more than half a year after the cartoons were printed.” He tells us that in the days after Sheik Yusef-al-Qaradawi’s televised address, the Danish Embassies in Beirut, Damascus and Tehran are burned. What Kjaer does not tell the viewer is that the reactions were likely a mixed reaction of the reprinting of the Cartoons, which occurred around that time, as well indignation over *JP*’s original article.

⁵⁴ Translation author’s.

⁵⁵ These countries are specifically: Algeria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Egypt, Indonesia, Iran, Libya, Morocco, Pakistan, Palestine, Saudi Arabia, and Turkey.

Sheik Yusef-al-Qaradawi holds an important position in the practice of Sharia Law in his television show, "*Sharia and Life*". When Kjaer is able to obtain a rare interview with the Sheik, the Sheik's reaction is similar to previous ones. "They wronged the Prophet Mohammed!" the Sheik exclaimed in the interview, "This is considered an insult to each and every Muslim, to the Islam nation, to 1.5 billion people."⁵⁶ What is important in this quote is that the Sheik invoked not only the idea of personal offense, but offense to the "Islam nation." There is also the assumption that all Muslims would share this sentiment, that presumably all "good" Muslims would share his view as he is a religious leader.

When shown the Cartoons, the Sheik responded, "This is a picture of Mohammed, showing him in a certain way-- What does anyone who sees this picture understand from it?" It is precisely this that is the core question of the controversy, especially given the fact that many people protesting the Cartoons may very well not have seen the original ones. Kjaer brings the documentary to the region of Tehran, where a man by the name of Ali Bakhsi lives. This man is a demonstrator who had been photographed with bloodied hands outside the Danish Embassy. He had not seen the Cartoons but had "heard that his Holiness the Prophet Mohammed had been offended." When shown the bomb-in-a-turban cartoon, Bakshi's reaction was surprising, "This is the Prophet Mohammed? How can it be? The prophet looks like an Indian Sikh and not the prophet Mohammed." And so there is the return to the question of interpretation. The power of the Cartoons, Kjaer is showing the viewer, is not in the images themselves but how they were disseminated and incited reactions internationally.

⁵⁶ Klausen (2009) indicates that the Sheik had already accessed the dossier presented in the Middle East by the Danish imams, which conflicts with Kjaer's presentation as the Sheik seeing the cartoons for the first time.

Kjaer summarizes his documentary by stating: “Too many people were frightened into saying, ‘of course we are for freedom, but with some limits’-- But of course, I wouldn’t have objected had someone had been bright enough to detect a fire, before the conflict exploded.” In a fashion, Kjaer’s ending opens up further questions about the controversy: the conviction that freedom of speech is absolute and that agency is a subversive reaction to be questioned.

D.3. Critique of the “Bloody Cartoons” Documentary

There are several important critiques of the documentary which reflect back to the arguments of this project. The first point is that Kjaer’s translations of Danish were not used. This was because the translations were not an accurate or adequate enough representation of what the speakers were actually saying. Not translating language correctly provides leeway for the manipulation of context and the reception of viewers. A second point was that there was a lack of commitment to transparency.

Two specific examples of this would be in the juxtaposition of the Egyptian pop star who represents a faction of Egyptian pop music, which is of the *Sha’bi* style and known as music of the common people. This is important because the singer Shaaban Abdel Rahim, is known to make controversial comments in his songs, such as the promotion of the 9-11 terrorist attacks in the United States and anti-Israeli proclamations (Grippio, 2006). Using this singer to make a point in the documentary is irresponsible on the part of Kjaer, because this singer is a particular person in a specific circumstance, and not reflective of a general phenomenon. Another example was the use of riot imagery, which Kjaer sarcastically describes to the viewer of the idea of a “Sunday afternoon picnic.” Without explanations as to when or where the riot scenes are occurring, the viewer is then encouraged to imprint such scenes as a general representation of violence as a banal act in Arab societies. To imply that

violence is commonplace (and not support this with facts) in any context is equally irresponsible as a journalist because it does not promote an effort towards transparency. Kjaer returns to this footage after these initial scenes, however this does not mean that the generalization has not already been made.

A third point is that Kjaer does not acknowledge that religion is not within a fixed place. All the scenes with Islam in them were represented in a context and not a part of a cosmopolitan life of people: the mosque in Denmark with the Danish imam, prayer scenes in Denmark, and interviewees in their indigenous countries. To force religion into a context then prevents the acknowledgement that religion can cross borders and exist in societies outside of nationality, civilization, or concrete places of worship.

The most important and concluding critique is that Kjaer does not offer an in-depth investigation of the Cartoons controversy domestically. Kjaer uses imagery of Muslims as international figures, and not figures that are a part of the Danish diaspora. By showing Muslims in their international context, Kjaer seems to be perpetuating pre-existing ideas of them: that they come from war-torn regions and are belligerent (Bashir), or that they are dictatorial and authoritative (Ishanoglu and Yusef-al-Qaradawi), or that they have definitive ideas of Islam in the word (Hlayel). Whether or not this was Kjaer's intention, *Bloody Cartoons*, repeats arguments made in this thesis and represent sentiments that mirror notions of "us" and "them."

Works Cited

- Aarhus. *DENMARK.DK: The Official Website of Denmark*. Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark. Updated February 13, 2009. Accessed March 5, 2009. <http://www.denmark.dk/en/menu/About-Denmark/Denmark-In-Brief/Map-of-denmark/Aarhus.htm>.
- About Jyllands-Posten. *Jp.dk – About Jyllands-Posten*. Updated May 7, 2007. Accessed July 31, 2009. http://jp.dk/info/about_jyllands-posten/article927865.ece.
- Abrahamian, E. (2003). The US Media, Huntington, and September 11. *Third World Quarterly*, 24(3), 529-544.
- Alhassan, A. (2008). The Twelve Cartoons: A Discursive Inquiry. In E. Eide, R. Kunelius, A. Phillips (Eds.), *Transnational Media Events: The Mohammed Cartoons and the Imagined Clash of Civilizations* (p.39-55). Gothenburg: Nordicom – University of Gothenburg.
- AP. (2008, March 20). Bin Laden Warns Europeans Over Cartoon. *The New York Times*. Accessed March 5, 2009. <http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=950CE7D7143CF933A15750C0A96E9C8B63>.
- Arabs rock to anti-war song. (2003, March 11). *BBC News Middle East*. Accessed August 13, 2009. http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/2839795.stm.
- Barber, B. R. (1996). *Jihad vs. McWorld: How Globalism and Tribalism Are Reshaping the World*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Becker, K. (2008). The Power of Picture in Journalistic Discourse: As news, as Commentary, as Art. In E. Eide, R. Kunelius, A. Phillips (Eds.), *Transnational Media Events: The Mohammed Cartoons and the Imagined Clash of Civilizations* (p.117-132). Gothenburg: Nordicom – University of Gothenburg.
- Belien, P. (2005, October 22). Jihad Against Danish Newspaper. *The Brussels Journal*. Accessed March 5, 2009. <http://www.brusselsjournal.com/node/382>.
- Bilefsky, D. (2006a, February 10). Danish Editor Responsible for Cartoons to Take Indefinite Leave. *International Herald Tribune*. Accessed March 6, 2009. <http://www.nytimes.com/2006/02/10/international/europe/10cnd-cartoon.html?fta=y>.
- Bilefsky, D. (2006b, February 12). Cartoon Dispute Prompts Identity Crisis for Liberal Denmark. *The New York Times*. Accessed November 9, 2009. <http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=9F04E3D6153EF931A25751C0A9609C8B63&sec=&spon=&pagewanted=2>.

- Brinkley, J., Fisher, I. (2006, February 4). U.S. Says It Also Finds Cartoons of Muhammad Offensive. *The New York Times*. Accessed March 10, 2009. <http://www.nytimes.com/2006/02/04/politics/04mideast.html>.
- Boe, C., Hervik, P. (2008). Integration through Insult? In E. Eide, R. Kunelius, A. Phillips (Eds.), *Transnational Media Events: The Mohammed Cartoons and the Imagined Clash of Civilizations* (p.213-234). Gothenburg: Nordicom – University of Gothenburg.
- Bolks, S., Stoll, R. (2003). Examining Conflict Escalation Within the Civilizations Context. *Conflict Management and Peace Science*, 20, 85-109.
- Bonde, B.N. (2007). How 12 Cartoons of the Prophet Mohammed were Brought to Trigger an International Conflict. *Nordicom Review*, 28(1), 33-48. http://www.nordicom.gu.se/common/publ_pdf/247_bonde.pdf.
- Buchanan, M. (2006, February 1). Cartoon outrage bemuses Denmark. BBC Europe. Accessed March 2, 2009. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/4669210.stm>.
- Chiozza, G. (2002). Is There a Clash of Civilizations? Evidence from Patterns of International Conflict Involvement, 1946-97. *Journal of Peace Research*, 39, 711-734.
- Corstange, D. (2007). Drawing Dissent: Political Cartoons in Yemen. *PS: Political Science and Politics*, XL(2), 293-296.
- Craft, S., Waisbord, S. (2008). When Foreign News Remains Foreign: Cartoon Controversies in the US and Argentine Press. In E. Eide, R. Kunelius, A. Phillips (Eds.), *Transnational Media Events: The Mohammed Cartoons and the Imagined Clash of Civilizations* (p.133-148). Gothenburg: Nordicom - University of Gothenburg.
- Danish cartoon ‘plotters’ held. (2008, February 12). BBC Europe. Accessed March 3, 2009. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/7240481.stm>.
- Danish Muhammad cartoon reprinted. (2008, February 14). BBC Europe. Accessed September 24, 2009. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/7242258.stm>.
- Danish Muslims despair at portrayal. (2008, February 18). BBC Europe. Accessed March 3, 2009. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/7251378.stm>.
- Denmark adds terrorism charge to cartoonist attack. (2010, January 11). Reuters. Accessed January 15, 2010. <http://www.reuters.com/article/idUSTRE60A2CI20100111>.
- Denmark ‘world’s happiest nation’. BBC NEWS Special Reports. July 3, 2008. Accessed August 1, 2009. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/7487143.stm>.

- Devji, F. (2006). Back to the future: the cartoons, liberalism, and global Islam. *Open Democracy.net* [Online Article]. http://www.opendemocracy.net/conflict-terrorism/liberalism_3451.jsp.
- Eide, E. (2008). The Loop of Labelling: Orientalism, Occidentalism and the Cartoon Crisis. In E. Eide, R. Kunelius, A. Phillips (Eds.), *Transnational Media Events: The Mohammed Cartoons and the Imagined Clash of Civilizations*, (p.151-172), Gothenburg: Nordicom – University of Gothenburg.
- Eide, E., Kunelius, R., & Phillips, A. (2008). Contraptual Readings: Transnational Media Research and the Cartoon Controversy as a Global News Event. In E. Eide, R. Kunelius, A. Phillips (Eds.), *Transnational Media Events: The Mohammed Cartoons and the Imagined Clash of Civilizations*, (p.11-27). Gothenburg: Nordicom – University of Gothenburg.
- Europe: Denmark. *CIA – The World Factbook – Denmark*. Updated July 2, 2009. Accessed July 31, 2009. <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/da.html>.
- [Facebook demonstration supports freedom of speech], *Facebook-demo stoetter ytringsfrighed*. (2010, January 8). Accessed January 21, 2010. [DR - Domestic News]. <http://www.dr.dk/Nyheder/Indland/2010/01/08/104622.htm?rss=true>.
- Fair, L. S. (2003). Muslims in Denmark: Discourse of the Veil. *Middle States Geographer*, 36(10), 15-24.
- Fattah, H.M. (2006, January 31). Caricature of Muhammad Leads to Boycott of Danish Goods. *The New York Times*. Accessed March 6, 2009. <http://www.nytimes.com/2006/01/31/international/middleeast/31danish.html>.
- Films > 10 Documentaries > Bloody Cartoons. *Why Democracy – FILMS > 10 Documentaries > Bloody Cartoons*. Accessed August 1, 2009. <http://whydemocracy.net/film/11>.
- Fode, H. (2006, March). *Decision on Possible criminal proceedings in the case of Jyllands-Posten's Article 'The Face of Muhammed'* (File No. RA-2006-41-0151). The Director of Public Prosecutions (Denmark). Accessed March 3, 2009. http://www.rigsadvokaten.dk/media/bilag/afgorelse_engelsk.pdf.
- Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and Self-Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Grippo, J. R. (2006). The Fool Sings a Hero's Song: Shaaban Abdel Rahim, Egyptian Shaabi, and the Video Clip Phenomenon. *TBS [Transnational Broadcasting Studies, The American University of Cairo]*, 16. <http://www.tbsjournal.com/Grippo.html>.
- Hadar, L. (1993). What Green Peril? *Foreign Affairs*, 72(2), 27-41.

- Hahn, O. (2008). Pictures Travel, Discourses Do Not: Decontextualisation and Fragmentation in Global Media Communication. In E. Eide, R. Kunelius, A. Phillips (Eds.), *Transnational Media Events: The Mohammed Cartoons and the Imagined Clash of Civilizations*, (p.191-211). Gothenburg: Nordicom – University of Gothenburg.
- Ham, M.K. (2009, November 9). Duke University Prof Out-Wimped by Yale: Will Publish Mohammed Cartoons. The Weekly Standard Blog. Accessed November 10, 2009.
http://www.weeklystandard.com/weblogs/TWSFP/2009/11/duke_university_prof_outwimped.asp.
- Hansen, J., Hundevadt, K. (2008, March 11). The Cartoon Crisis – how it unfolded. Udland [International], JP.DK. Accessed October 8, 2009.
<http://jp.dk/udland/article1292543.ece>.
- Hansen, R. (2006). The Danish Cartoon Controversy: A Defence of Liberal Freedom. In The Authors, *The Danish Cartoon Affair: Free Speech, Racism, Islamism, and Integration*, (p.7-16). *International Migration*, 55(5).
- Harrison, F. (2008, February 15). Danish Muslims in cartoon protest. BBC Europe. Accessed November 13, 2008. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/7247817.stm>.
- Henderson, E., Tucker, R. (2001). Clear and Present Strangers: The Clash of Civilizations and International Conflict. *International Studies Quarterly*, 45(2), 317-338.
- Hervik, P., Berg, C. (2007.1). Denmark: A political struggle in Danish journalism. In *Reading the Mohammed Cartoons Controversy: An International Analysis of Press Discourses on Free Speech and Political Spin*, (p.25-39). R. Kunelius, E. Eide, O. Hahn & R. Schroeder (Eds.). Working Papers in International Journalism. Bochum: Projekt Verlag.
- Hervik, P. (2008). Original Spin and Its Side Effects: Freedom of Speech as Danish News Management. In E. Eide, R. Kunelius, A. Phillips (Eds.), *Transnational Media Events: The Mohammed Cartoons and the Imagined Clash of Civilizations*, (p.59-80). Gothenburg: Nordicom – University of Gothenburg.
- Hervik, P., Eide, E., Kunelius, R. (2008). A Long and Messy Event. In E. Eide, R. Kunelius, A. Phillips (Eds.), *Transnational Media Events: The Mohammed Cartoons and the Imagined Clash of Civilizations*, (p.29-38). Gothenburg: Nordicom – University of Gothenburg.
- Higgins, A. (2008, February 29). Price of Notoriety: Sketch That Roiled Muslims Is for Sale. Wall Street Journal. Accessed March 4, 2009.
<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB120423589257000851.html>.

- Hines, N. (2008, January 30). Museum to house 'historic' Danish Muhammad cartoons. Times Online. Accessed March 5, 2009. <http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/comment/faith/article3277350.ece>.
- Huntington, S. P. (1993). The Clash of Civilizations? *Foreign Affairs*, 73(3), 22-49.
- Huntington, S. P. (2002). *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. London: Simon & Schuster.
- Hussain, A. J. (2007). The Media's Role in a Clash of Misconceptions: The Case of the Danish Muhammad Cartoons. *The Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics*, 12(4), 112-130.
- In pictures: Cartoon outrage. (2006, February 1). BBC Europe. Accessed March 3, 2009. http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/in_pictures/4671204.stm.
- Islamophobia is rife claims study. (2009, January 31). The Copenhagen Post. Accessed November 9, 2009. <http://cphpost.dk/news/1-latest-news/3024.html>.
- Joumaa, Awad (2009, April 21). Copenhagen's 'racial' gang wars. Al Jazeera English. Accessed October 8, 2009. <http://english.aljazeera.net/focus/2009/03/200933194152661158.html>.
- Keane, W. (2009). Freedom and Blasphemy: On Indonesian Press Bans and Danish Cartoons. *Public Culture*, 21(1), 47-76.
- Kimmelman, M. (2008, March 20). Outrage at Cartoons Still Tests the Danes. New York Times. Accessed March 5, 2009. <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/03/20/books/20cartoon.htm>.
- Kjaer, K. (Director). (2007, October). *Bloody Cartoons* [TV Documentary]. Freeport Media A/S & Associates. Approx. 53 mins. Accessed at *GUBA – Bloody Cartoons*. <http://www.guba.com/watch/3000095714>.
- Klausen, J. (2009). *The Cartoons That Shook the World*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Kunelius, R., Alhassan, A. (2008). Complexities of an Ideology in Action: Liberalism and the Cartoon Affair. In E. Eide, R. Kunelius, A. Phillips (Eds.), *Transnational Media Events: The Mohammed Cartoons and the Imagined Clash of Civilizations*, (p.81-98). Gothenburg: Nordicom – University of Gothenburg.
- Kunelius, R., Nossek, H. (2008). Between the Ritual and the Rational: From Media Events to Moments of Global Public Spheres? In E. Eide, R. Kunelius, A. Phillips (Eds.), *Transnational Media Events: The Mohammed Cartoons and the Imagined Clash of Civilizations*, (p.253-273). Gothenburg: Nordicom – University of Gothenburg.

- Laegaard, S. (2007). The Cartoon Controversy: Offense, Identity, Oppression? *Political Studies*, 55(0). 481-498.
- Langer, R. (2008). Paths to discourse analysis of a sensitive research topic: The case of the Danish cartoon crisis. In N. Carpentier, P. Pruulmann-Vengerfeldt, K. Nordenstreng, M. Hartmann, P. Vihalemm, B. Cammaerts, H. Nieminen, T. Olsson (Eds.), *Democracy, Journalism and Technology: New Developments in Enlarged Europe*. Tartu: Tartu University Press, 2008. 343-354. Accessed October 24, 2009. http://www.researchingcommunication.eu/reco_book4.pdf#page=344.
- Lewis, B. (1990, September). The Roots of Muslim Rage. *The Atlantic Online*, 266(3). Accessed October 8, 2009. <http://www.theatlantic.com/doc/199009/muslim-rage>.
- Marcuse, H. (1965). Repressive Tolerance. In R.P. Wolff, B. Moore Jr., and H. Marcuse, *A Critique of Pure Tolerance*, (p.95-137). Accessed June 24, 2009. <<http://www.marcuse.org/herbert/pubs/60spubs/65repressivetolerance.htm>>.
- McGrory, D., Sabbagh, D. (2003, February 3). Cartoon wars and the clash of civilisations. TimesOnline. Accessed August 2, 2009. <http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/world/article725515.ece>.
- McLaughlin, K., Sulugiuc G. (2008, February 13). Danish newspapers republish prophet cartoon. Reuters UK. Accessed March 10, 2009. <http://www.reuters.com/article/worldNews/idUSL139371220080213>.
- Modood, T. (2006). The Liberal Dilemma: Integration or Vilification? In The Authors, *The Danish Cartoon Affair: Free Speech, Racism, Islamism, and Integration*, (p.4-7). *International Migration*, 55(5).
- Mohammed drawings fund satirical website. (2009, November 3). The Copenhagen Post. Accessed November 10, 2009. <http://cphpost.dk/news/national/47385-mohammed-drawings-fund-satirical-website.html>.
- Mouritsen, P., Lex, S., Lindekilde L., Olsen, T.V. (2009, July 21). *Immigration, Integration and the Politics of Cultural Diversity in Denmark: Political Discourse and Legal, Political and Educational Challenges, Integrated Country Report*. Department of Political Science, University of Aarhus. Accessed October 24, 2009. <http://emilie.eliamap.gr/wp-content/uploads/2009/07/emilie-integrated-report-denmark-final.pdf>.
- Moynihan, M.C. (2007, October 1). Revisiting the Danish Cartoon Crisis: An interview with newspaper editor Flemming Rose. REASON.COM. Accessed March 6, 2009. <http://reason.com/archives/2007/10/01/revisiting-the-danish-cartoon>.
- Muhammed cartoon row intensifies. (2006, February 1). BBC Europe. Accessed November 13, 2008. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/4670370.stm>.

- Nielsen, J.S. (2009, October 21). Danish Context of Debates on Islam (Part 2). IslamOnline.net. Accessed October 23, 2009. http://www.islamonline.net/servlet/Satellite?c=Article_C&cid=1256033859879&pagename=Zone-English-Euro_Muslims%2FEMELayout.
- Nizza, M. (2008, February 13). In Denmark, Encore for Muhammad Cartoon. The Lede Blog - The New York Times. Accessed March 5, 2009. <http://thelede.blogs.nytimes.com/2008/02/13/in-denmark-encore-for-muhammad-cartoon/>.
- Peters, J. D. (2008). Afterword: In Quest for Ever Better Heresies. In E. Eide, R. Kunelius, A. Phillips (Eds.), *Transnational Media Events: The Mohammed Cartoons and the Imagined Clash of Civilizations*, (p.275-288). Gothenburg: Nordicom – University of Gothenburg.
- Phillips, A. (2008). Who Spoke and Who was Heard in the Cartoons Debate? In E. Eide, R. Kunelius, A. Phillips (Eds.), *Transnational Media Events: The Mohammed Cartoons and the Imagined Clash of Civilizations*, (p.99-116). Gothenburg: Nordicom – University of Gothenburg.
- Phillips, A., Nossek, H. (2008). Ourselves and Our Others: Minority Protest and National Frames in Press Coverage. In E. Eide, R. Kunelius, A. Phillips (Eds.), *Transnational Media Events: The Mohammed Cartoons and the Imagined Clash of Civilizations*, (p.235-252). Gothenburg: Nordicom – University of Gothenburg.
- Rose, F. (2006, February 19). Why I Published Those Cartoons. The Washington Post. Accessed March 9, 2009. <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/02/17/AR2006021702499.html>.
- Saleh, I. (2008). The Bubble World of Polarization: Failing to Realize the Blind Spots in the Cartoon Controversy. In E. Eide, R. Kunelius, A. Phillips (Eds.), *Transnational Media Events: The Mohammed Cartoons and the Imagined Clash of Civilizations*, (p.173-190). Gothenburg: Nordicom – University of Gothenburg.
- Schmidt, C.H., Rynning, S. (2006, May). Muhammad Cartoons in Denmark: From Freedom of Speech to Denmark's Biggest International Crisis Since 1945. *UNISCI Discussion Papers Nr.11*, (p.11-21). Research Unit on International Security and Cooperation. Department of International Studies, Faculty of Political and Social Sciences. Madrid, Spain.
- Schmidt, G. (2009). Denmark. In G. Larsson (Ed.), *Islam in the Nordic and Baltic Countries*, (p.40-55). Abingdon: Routledge.
- Statistics Denmark. (2008, February). *Denmark in Figures: 2008*. Eds. Stefan Jul Gunnensen and Margrethe Pihl Bisgaard. Copenhagen: Fihl Jensen. <http://www.dst.dk/pukora/epub/upload/12750/complete.pdf>.

- Tansey, C. M. (2009). *Anti-Radicalization Efforts Within the European Union: Spain and Denmark*. M.A. Thesis. Naval Postgraduate School: Monterey, California. Accessed October 24, 2009.
http://edocs.nps.edu/npspubs/scholarly/theses/2009/Mar/09Mar_Tansey.pdf.
- The Kingdom of Denmark. *DENMARK.DK: The Official Website of Denmark*. Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark. Updated January 29, 2009. Accessed July 31, 2009. <http://www.denmark.dk/en/menu/About-Denmark/Denmark-In-Brief/Denmark-An-Overview/TheKingdomOfDenmark/>.
- The press in Denmark. (2005, December 20). BBC Europe. Accessed July 31, 2009. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/4059213.stm>.
- US charges two for 'Denmark plot' (2009, October 27). BBC Americas. Accessed January 15, 2010. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/8328388.stm>.
- Yilmaz, F. (2006). Religion As Social Ontology: The Muslim Immigrant In (Danish) Public Discourse. *Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, Dresden International Congress Centre, Dresden, Germany*. June 16, 2009. Accessed December 14, 2009. http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p90348_index.html.