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Abstract


The purpose of the study is to analyse the *relationship between the capitalist hegemonic order and the mass media*, with the latter restricted to two elite newspapers (Swedish DN and Slovenian Delo) and the selection of news materials from three bodies of international media coverage: NATO’s military intervention in former Yugoslavia, 1999, the political demonstrations against the IMF and the World Bank in Prague, 2000, and 9/11, 2001. There are two sub-purposes, one *theoretical-methodological* and one *political-democratic*. The first sub-purpose is to accomplish an *integrative* kind of media analysis (Williams 1977) in which the approaches of *political economy* (emphasising the economic/material) and *cultural studies/discourse analysis* (emphasising the symbolic/discursive) are supposed to *interact*. The hypothesis is that such a ‘third way’ approach is possible to achieve through the qualitative analysis of *journalistic modes of writing*. The second sub-purpose (the *political-democratic* one) takes an interest in the modes’ political dimensions. In what manners do the identified modes counter-act, or co-produce, miscellaneous political struggles? In addition, the purpose of the study also includes a more *practical* dimension. In the light of the results, how should one nowadays imagine an *emancipating* kind of journalism that tries to explain, unmask, or even counteract the mechanisms of the contemporary global capitalist system?

The news media material consists of 438 items (articles, photos etc.), which are analysed by means of a cultural materialist CDA (critical discourse analysis). An identified journalistic mode is analysed as: (1) a *practice* with certain cognitive, discursive and linguistic characteristics, (2) a *structural product* (as constituted by underlying social and material structures), and (3) a *dialectical force*, being a potentially active part of an ongoing mode of production (the capitalist or another mode). The last analytical moment is the central one.

Two categories of journalistic modes are identified. To begin with, the *modes of de-permanence* (The Remote control mode, Differentiation, Semiotic compression), which comprises modes that are part of the ‘new economy’, of reflexivity, individualism, consumption, mobility, and flexibility. The political dimension of these modes is that they counteract radical (leftist) politics by reducing emancipation, freedom, justice etc. to a matter of individualism and privatisation. The second category is the *modes of permanence* (Disconnection, Cognitive recycling), which involves an opposing structural dimension of the capitalist system: the production of *reification*, i.e. the repression of the complex nature of reality – how seemingly autonomous ‘things’ (spaces, objects etc.) are de facto interwoven with a ‘complex whole’ of various social, material, cultural, economic *relations* that are in constant *motion*. More precisely, the here identified modes reify and eternalise an *explanatory structure* (the modern division of explanatory labour), a particular *power* (the US) and a particular *territory* (the nation state), generating the impression that social reality works ‘as usual’ while repressing the complex network-like development of global capitalism and its impact on our lives. By sustaining these increasingly archaic structures, what is politically counteracted is the emergence of ‘the new’: *transnational* politics and democracy (Beck 1998).

The analysis of modes (in total 8) furthermore demonstrates that Swedish DN is more integrated with the capitalist system than Slovenian Delo. The study emphasises the democratic importance of creating new journalistic modes endowed with a *transnational journalistic epistemology* that decisively include the reality of global capitalism in everyday (local) news reporting when covering and explaining social, political, cultural etc. issues.
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INTRODUCTION
Introduction

The following study examines the hegemonic order of capitalism and the way in which this order operates through news media discourse. In what manners are structural conditions such as wage labour, economic globalisation, individualism, private property etc. produced as well as counter-produced? What kinds of journalistic modes are possible to detect, and how, more exactly, are these modes intertwined with the dominant mode of production (or rather oppose it)?

At first glance, to justify further scientific research on this topic seems to be a hard task, as the very topic appears to be of the kind where everything has already been said and done. In media and communication research one must primarily pay attention to the rich contributions from the fields of political economy and British cultural studies, the research on the commodification of media and communication practices; the unequal distribution of communicative resources in the world and the development of cultural imperialism; class antagonism in the media industry and in media discourse; and the relationship between the mass media and consumer society etc. It is in this respect that it may seem relevant to ask: within this area, are there any scientific hypotheses left to be formulated that will not simply repeat already established conclusions?

In the following section I will, however, try to argue for the continuing importance of scientifically analysing the relationship between the capitalist system and the mass media. Initially there will be a presentation of the character and development of contemporary capitalism as such, and the way in which the object (capitalism) is supposed to be analytically handled in this context. This is followed by a presentation of the central scientific problem that occupies this study, involving the classic question of how to satisfactorily deal with the complex relationship between the ‘material’ and the ‘symbolic’ dimensions of capitalism in media research. Thereafter, there will be a presentation of the empirical approach and the actual three cases of news media coverage that have been selected for analysis. Before concluding the chapter, what needs to be clarified is the purpose of the study as well as the structure of the work as a whole.
Contemporary capitalism (on de-permanence and permanence)

The structural reality of the capitalist mode of production, or the capitalist hegemonic order, will successively be dealt with throughout this work. What is necessary at this initial stage is to define the way in which this object (capitalism) is supposed to be analysed in this study. More precisely, the intention of this study is to analytically include the (often cited) suggestion that capitalism can be seen as a system that is built upon a contradictory and dynamic tension between:

- **de-permanence** (referring to a reality that is constantly undergoing change and transformation)
- **permanence** (referring to a reality characterised by ‘solidity’ and ‘stability’)

What is basically meant by ‘de-permanence’ is that the capitalist system should be seen as a complex process in constant motion. In the following widely known textual passage, Marx & Engels suggest that this must be seen as one of the most essential features of the capitalist system as such:

> The bourgeoisie cannot exist without constantly revolutionizing the instruments of production, and thereby the relations of production, and with them the whole relations of society. Conservation of the old modes of production in unaltered form was, on the contrary, the first condition of existence for all earlier industrial classes. Constant revolutionizing of production, uninterrupted disturbance of all social conditions, everlasting uncertainty and agitation distinguish the bourgeois epoch from all earlier ones. All fixed, fast-frozen relations, with their train of ancient and venerable prejudices and opinions, are swept away, all new-formed ones become antiquated before they can ossify. All that is solid melts into air, all that is holy is profaned, and man is at last compelled to face, with sober senses, his real conditions of life and his relations with this kind (Marx & Engels 1987, 25).

If the social order is changing all the time, if capitalism is constantly transforming and developing, then there will consequently always be plenty of new and fresh phenomena to study. Considering the social sciences, no matter which decade one looks at, there is always some research available, containing theories about the ‘new’ characteristics of capitalism – new markets, new technologies, commodities, services (see Blackburn 1972), developments, trends, crises etc. – and consequently, the ‘all that is solid melts into air’ thesis is repeatedly confirmed to be true (see Berman 1983).

The object in focus, capitalism, is an object ‘in motion’. Due to these particular circumstances the following question must necessary be formulated: since an important aim of this study is to analytically deal with the capitalist system of contemporary times; the most important aspects of
contemporary transformation processes should briefly be presented, while more precisely involving the transformation of:

(1) The capitalist hegemonic order (as a whole)
(2) The relations of power within this order (between various interests/forces)

As a counterweight to the issue of change and transformation, what must also be included in this context is the ‘other side’ of all this (3), i.e. a theoretical treatment of the way in which a social system, such as capitalism, also must build upon some kind of *permanence*; that is to say, a ‘state’ or condition in which reality is somehow ‘stable’ and ‘fixed’ (rather than changing all the time).

(1) *The transformation of the capitalist system*

To begin with, an important aspect to include should be capitalism’s continuing ‘energetic’ dimensions and the ever-continuing development of a *globally expanding* economy (see Lechner & Boli 2003, Panitch 2004). During the last decade what has been on the carpet is the assumed importance of the ‘symbolic economy’ (du Gay & Pryke 2002), i.e. the increasing production, exchange, distribution and circulation of ‘cultural’ commodities and services (of information and knowledge) and the way in which this new industry is interwoven with the continuing rise of new information technologies (ICT’s). The observation of an info-technology driven and generated economy has furthermore contributed to sociological theories of the grand kind, suggesting that the global capitalist economy is about to generate new kinds of social structures, i.e. a so-called *network* society or world (Castells 1996) in which former economic, social, political and cultural constellations are radically challenged and transformed (involving new forms of communication, social relations, spatial formations, work processes etc.).

Alongside these theoretical notions, for the last decade there has also been focus on the rather negative consequences of a global economy characterised by increasing ‘time-space compression’ (Harvey 1989). More precisely it concerns the continuing expansion and impact of stock-exchange market processes, of the ‘immaterial’ speculation-economy (Martin & Schuman 1997) and the ever more rapid mobility, transferral and exchange of commodities, services and money. These processes make the world more interconnected; it makes the world truly global, while simultaneously, the global economic system is assumed to be becoming more fragile, irrational (Ramonet 1998, 87–99) and complex. More complex in the sense that capitalism is increasingly considered to be a system with less concrete and solid (spatial) *centres*, since the actual centre is more and more becoming
synonymous with an impenetrable web or network of (global) economic relations and processes (Hardt & Negri 2000).

(2) The transformation of relations of power
The first relevant power relation that I think should be included concerns the one between the capitalist system and the individual. The central development involves the (presumably) increasing market economic colonisation of people's life worlds (Habermas 1987:a). During the nineties, this process was particularly related to observations of an expanding neo-liberal ‘new economy’ including further demands for mobility, flexibility, reflexivity etc. (Sayer & Walker 1994, Sassen 1999, Sennett 1998) in which the individual is increasingly forced to dance to the logic of capital (as a wage labourer, consumer, unemployed etc.).

The second relevant power relation could be seen as a natural extension of the earlier one, involving the relationship between the global capital and local territory and the increasing power of multinational corporations, conglomerates, financial institutions (the IMF, the WB etc.) in an ever politically deregulated and deterritorialized transnational market world, on the one hand, and the decreasing autonomy of the nation state formation (its welfare-systems and democracies) on the other (Sassen 1999, Giddens 2002).

The third power relation concerns the one between the US/NATO and the rest of the world, which is related to the development of a presumed ‘new world order’. This social formation has established itself in the wake of the fall of the Berlin wall, primarily resting upon the economic, political, cultural and military power of the US and its Western allies. During the last decade, this order has been embodied through US’s (and NATO’s) military actions in various parts of the world (Iraq, Kosovo, Somalia, Afghanistan etc.) and in terms of the West’s dealings with the phenomenon of ‘new wars’ – be they ethnic wars, terrorism etc. (see Kaldor 1999) – while what has simultaneously been taken for granted in this context is the UN’s increasing lack of influence in international relations. This ‘new regime’ has furthermore become associated with an increasing state of insecurity, anxiety and instability (related to weapons of mass destruction, terrorism, etc.), while potentially paving the way for a deepened cultural and political gulf between the Western world and the muslim one (Huntington 1993, Barber 1995).

(3) On the repression of transformation (permanence and reification)
Above there is attention paid to the capitalist world as a world of constant change; and, if making use of Harvey’s (1996) vocabulary, of the constantly ongoing fluxes and flows of new commodities, technologies, practices, work-
ing conditions, wars, risks etc. However, as a necessary contrast to all this, it is also important to mention that the capitalist world cannot exclusively be understood as a formation in which ‘all that is solid melts into air’ all the time. It is, in matter of fact, hard to imagine that such a social system (where everything changes all the time) could actually function and ‘work’ at all. It is thus more reasonable to think that capitalism is a system that also needs some kind of ‘solid ground’ in which instability is being counter-balanced. There must be some structures of permanence that transform reality into a stable matter where things somehow ‘stay the same’. This important element could then consequently be observed in terms of how the capitalist system also tends to internalise, as well as become dependent on, miscellaneous traditions, i.e. the continuing commitment to particular ideas, ideals, norms, habits, spaces, identities, practices etc. (Weber 1958).

Concerning the need for stability and permanence, there is a particular Marxian angle to this matter that will be theoretically important in this study. The capitalist system can indeed be described as this rushing river, as a ‘floating reality’ that is impossible to step into twice (since it changes all the time). However, what makes the capitalist system ‘work’ (the everyday processes of production, consumption etc.) is the everyday repression of the fact that reality is in constant movement. In order to establish some kind of ‘stability’ in a complex, transforming (capitalist) reality, reality must to some extent become an object of reification (Lukács 1971).

Reification thus ‘happens’ when one constructs reality into something palpable, into solid, stable and eternal ‘things’ that seem powerful enough to overcome the processes of change and transformation. It could involve the everyday practice or procedure of treating spaces (like ‘the nation state’), practices (like ‘politics’, ‘science’) or objects (like ‘money’, ‘cities’, ‘landscapes’ etc.) as autonomous ‘things’, seemingly endowed with inherent ‘autonomy’ and ‘powers’, while reification, then, is more precisely synonymous with the actual repression of the rather complex nature of reality – i.e. of how these seemingly autonomous and isolated ‘things’ (spaces, objects, practices etc.) are de facto interwoven with, and subjected to, a ‘complex whole’ of various social, material, cultural, economic relations that are in constant motion (i.e. the global economy as such).

Reification is being practised in various forms (when producing, consuming, writing, talking) and its central function is hence to transform social material reality into seemingly everlasting ‘things’ with fixed properties. In the history of the scientific analysis of the capitalist system, reification has been a fairly central issue (Lukács 1971, Weber 1978, Habermas 1995, Harvey 1996), and therefore it must also be included in the kind of scientific analysis that is supposed to be performed in this con-
text. In conclusion, in the present scientific study, when it comes to the analysis of *this particular object (capitalism) as a whole*, the aim must necessarily be to constantly oscillate between the matter of *de-permanence* (change and transformation, the ‘new economy’ issue etc.), and the matter of *permanence* (reification).

**The scientific problem (on the materiality of media discourse)**

In media and communication research there are two fields that have mainly contributed knowledge about *the relationship between capitalism and the mass media*, i.e. political economy and cultural studies. One focuses on mass media’s structural integration within the overall economic system. Commercial mass media are seen as institutions functioning in accordance with the dominant (capitalist) mode of production in terms of being industries (Adorno & Horkheimer 1972) that provide consumers with various commodities and services. The other field emphasises instead the particular character of the mass media, i.e. its relative autonomy from the rest of society (Hall 1996:a etc.). Cultural studies may instead focus on mass media’s role as an everyday generator of signifying processes, of discourse, and how this production tends to be permeated by a dominant (capitalist) ideology.

Irrespective of their partly similar interests, there is a quite clear *dividing line* between these two fields, which could be related to other, more fundamental divisions: between materialism and idealism, economy and culture, the extra-linguistic and the linguistic, or between the base and the superstructure. There is thus a continuing discussion on how to constitute more harmonious links between those who favour the presumed ‘base aspects’ of communicative practices (ownership conditions, profit motives, the mode of production etc.) and those who invest their main analytic energy in so called cultural or superstructural matters (i.e. the particular role of discursive articulation for the survival of capitalism).

This study is intellectually concerned with this ontological and epistemological *gap*; while the hypothesis is that it is, in certain respects, unnecessary deep. What mainly generates the distance between these scientific ‘camps’ varies from time to time. In the seventies, for example, there was a strong trend of more materialist modes of thinking, which tended to ignore the potential power of discursive practices, and in many cases incorrectly classified language use as strictly determined by material structures. The post-Marxian development during the eighties and nineties, on the other hand, rather stimulated the opposite condition. The breakthrough of cultural studies and various discourse analytical approaches tended to generate what Mosco (1996) refers to as communicative essentialism, characterised by its seemingly exaggerated emphasis on the
nature and impact of discursive articulation itself, while increasingly placing the material dimensions or reality in an odd corner.

The most central task for this study is thus to push for, as well as to accomplish, a re-materialised mode of investigating media discourse. In order to more concretely present this overall ‘rematerialising’ aim, it is possible to refer to Stuart Hall (1997), one of the main representatives of cultural studies, and his theoretical discussion of the language culture of the Inuit Eskimo people (the famous and rather ‘worn out’ example for understanding the relationship between language and reality). Initially Hall notes that the Inuit people have as many as 22 words for snow, in contrast to for example the Swedes or Italians who have far fewer expressions (Hall 1997, 23). In accordance with Hall’s Saussurean mode of theoretical reasoning, this is supposed to illustrate how different language systems generate different conceptualisations of reality, and that our notions about reality are somehow a ‘product of language’. However, Mike Wayne (2003) has pointed out that there is something missing in this context. More precisely it concerns the material dimension within the multiple conceptualisation of snow. What Hall never mentions is that, in contrast to many other cultures, among the Inuit there is a particular material need to divide snow into many different segments; the complex conceptualisation of snow is immediately related to their mode of production and to their particular interaction with nature. Wayne suggests that Hall is guilty of linguistic determinism, since he seems to assume that it is the ‘system of language’ that produces meaning. From Wayne’s more materialist position, meaning cannot be seen as a product of signifying processes alone, since meaning is, in the same breath, a product of man’s practical relationship to the physical, material world (Wayne 2003, 165).

A central task of this study should consequently be to follow Wayne’s recommendation, to aim for a re-materialised form of analysing media discourse, while at the same time, to avoid following this recommendation too strictly by slipping back into material determinism or reductionism (in which language becomes merely an ‘effect’ or ‘product’ of material conditions or relations). The challenge here should thus be to analyse media discourse in such a manner that discourse is somehow simultaneously viewed as ‘material and economic structures’ and discursive/symbolic practice, while this aim must be accomplished by the attempt to avoid reductionism – in both directions.

Perhaps this ambition could be seen as a modest attempt to come closer to a ‘third way’ of analysing media discourse. In this respect the following study identifies with, and is inspired by, certain studies and approaches that have seriously tried to integrate the material and the symbolic dimensions
of reality in social analysis. To begin with, Thompson’s (1990) hermeneutic work on ideology, Jameson’s (1991) work on the ‘cultural logic of late capitalism’ as well as Kellner’s (1995) theoretical research on media culture, are three important contributions, since all of them are concerned with the question of how to grasp and analyse the complex relationship between cultural/symbolic practices (the use of language) and an overall dominant mode of (capitalist) production. Another source of inspiration is the field of critical discourse analysis (CDA). What is emphasised in this particular field is that language use should be considered a ‘social practice’ and a practice that is somehow ‘internally related’ to material relations, processes and structures (Chouliaraki & Fairclough 1999, Fairclough, Jessop, Sayer 2003). Such theoretical assumptions have consequently also paved the way for CDA’s interest in the important role and function of language use for the constitution of a dominant (capitalist) mode of production (see the special edition of Discourse and Society vol 13(2) 2003). However, the perhaps most important theoretical guidance derives from Raymond Williams (1977) and his goal of formulating a historical materialist approach that more radically reduces the gulf between ‘language’ and the ‘material’, mostly referred to as cultural materialism. According to Williams, as well as to some of his followers, such as Harvey (1996), language use (talking/writing) should be considered a particular kind of material activity (rather than symbolic reproduction) in terms of being a practice that is dialectical, i.e. intertwined with and internally related to material production in general.

Modes of writing (a brief introduction)
The applied method will be critical discourse analysis (CDA) of the somewhat cultural materialist kind. In the following qualitative analysis of news media texts, the scientific attempt to analytically capture the material dimension of media discourse will involve the analysis of so called journalistic modes of writing, which are, hypothetically speaking, various institutionally established ways of journalistically constructing reality (like ‘genres’ etc.). The purpose should be to examine the way in which ‘modes of writing’ are interwoven with particular material practices, and how they jointly constitute complex processes of the discursive/social/material kind. In this aim to analytically interrelate and integrate the ‘symbolic’ and ‘material’ dimensions of capitalist reality, what is more precisely supposed to be explained and argued for is how (journalistic) practices of writing (the labouring with words and sentences) potentially operate as ‘productive forces’ within the total discursive/social/material ongoing process of a capitalist mode of production (or, on the contrary, how modes of writing are possibly ‘constitutive parts’ of counter-capitalist processes).
Three cases of news media coverage (YU/Kosovo, the Prague-demonstrations and 9/11)

The decision to do CDA in this scientific context is additionally connected to the conviction that the relationship between the mass media and capitalism should be studied *empirically* (rather than merely staying at the high-theoretical level). The purpose with this particular section is thus to initially define and to present the empirical materials of this study. In the selection of empirical materials what has been important is the assumed ‘broadness’ of the capitalist system. More precisely, that the *hegemonic order* of capitalism, i.e. this dominant form of organising social and material relations, cannot and should not be narrowed down and reduced to ‘economic structures’ only. In this study, capitalism will refer to a complex ‘web’ in motion; involving economic as well as cultural, political, military etc. practices, struggles and relations (Gramsci 2000).

For the scientific analysis of ‘modes of writing’, three cases of news media coverage have been selected. They relate to three events, occurring round the millennium shift (1999–2001). It concerns the news coverage of the war in Yugoslavia/Kosovo (1999); the political demonstrations against the IMF and the World Bank in Prague (2000) and; the WTC terror attack (2001).

Even if it is obvious that, concerning an object such as capitalist hegemony, there are plenty of possible media materials and cases that could be analysed, still, the following news media coverage’s have been strategically selected due to their rather concrete and ‘natural’ relationships to the above ‘painted’ picture of the contemporary capitalist hegemonic order (see p. 15–18):

1. *The War in Yugoslavia and Kosovo* in the spring of 1999, involving NATO’s military intervention in former Yugoslavia in order to defend the Kosovo Albanian nation and people from the (Serbian) Milosevic-regime. The military intervention, initiated and accomplished by the US and its allies (the countries being core representatives of the Western capitalist system) is characterised by a political conflict between the NATO and the UN, as well as between NATO and particular countries (China, Russia).

2. *The political demonstrations against the IMF (International Monetary Fund) and the WB (World Bank)* in Prague in the autumn of 2000. This event is related to the rise of a ‘transnational social movement’ in the late nineties and its critique of the negative consequences of a globalized capitalist economy (against the continuing exploitation of miscellaneous third world countries, the growing socio-economic inequalities in the first world, the ‘new economy’ and the ‘logic of capital’ as such).

3. *The terror attack on WTC 9/11 2001*. The violent outrage, committed by the terrorist network al-Qaida, occurred in (and against) the US, the core representative of the Western capitalist world. This infamous event involves such matters as religious fundamentalism, the economic inequality between the first and third world, counter-hegemonic resistance, the political and economic relationship between Europe and the US etc.
The purpose should thus be to empirically and analytically ‘scan through’ a sample of the media coverage of these events and to then identify as well as deeply enter into all the forms (modes of writing) that could possibly elucidate the core object of scientific investigation: i.e. the relationship between capitalist hegemony and news media discourse (i.e. in what possible ways does this relationship operate in these media instances?).

The empirical materials
The empirical materials of this study consist of 438 items (articles, photographs or other textual artefacts). The materials derive from the elite news press of two European countries: Sweden (the liberal independent Dagens Nyheter) and Slovenia (the independent Delo). Sweden has a relatively long tradition of liberal democratic rule and political stability, partly due to the fact that the country escaped direct involvement in the two world wars of the former century. Sweden has become known for the hegemonic rule of its Social Democratic Party, and the implementation of the social welfare state in the wake of the Second World War as an attempt to develop an alternative social formation situated in-between capitalism and socialism. Another relevant historic factor is its ideology of neutrality and non-alignment, combined with a foreign policy closely connected to the UN. In recent decades Sweden’s traditional national identity has successively been questioned and reformulated, resulting in a more complex and ambiguous picture of what Sweden is and what it essentially stands for, which is partly connected to developments such as the malignant economic crisis of the nineties, the EU-membership (1995) and the successive rapprochement towards NATO.

Slovenia, with its two million inhabitants, has nurtured a market economy and liberal democracy since the beginning of the nineties. Its declaration of independence in 1991 was one of the initial steps towards the subsequent fall of the entire socialist Yugoslav federation. The ten-days-war in Slovenia in the summer of 1991 marked the beginning of a conflict that would involve all the Yugoslav republics. Before becoming an independent nation state, Slovenia has, as Grafenauer (2000) points out, been involved in numerous projects of ideological universalism ‘...be it Catholicism, pan-Slavism or Communism’ (Grafenauer 2000, 31). At the beginning of the new millennium the Slovenian voters chose to deepen their integration with the Western capitalist world, paving the way for today’s membership in EU, NATO as well as in the World Bank.

The fact that there are mass media from two countries involved does not automatically indicate that the goal is to achieve a full-fledged comparative study. There is an abstract object at the centre of analytic attention (the relationship between the capitalist system and media discourse) while in
order to capture this abstract matter one must of necessity make use of concrete materials, which in this case consist of materials from two countries. In this context one might refer to Althusser’s interpretation of the Marxian scientific method:

Marx does not analyse any ‘concrete society’, not even England which he mentions constantly in Volume One [Capital, authors remark], but the capitalist mode of production and nothing else. This object is an abstract one: which means that it is terribly real and that it never exists in the pure state, since it only exists in capitalist societies. Simply speaking: in order to be able to analyse these concrete capitalist societies (England, France, Russia etc.), it is essential to know that they are dominated by that terribly concrete reality, the capitalist mode of production, which is ‘invisible’ (to the naked eye). ‘Invisible’, i.e. abstract (Althusser 2001, 49).

If we translate this into this particular study, the concrete (the media materials from various national contexts) is mainly collected for the sake of the abstract. However, I want to argue that Althusser’s explicit dismissal of the national is partly misguiding. What is included in the following media analysis is the assumption that in particular contexts, further knowledge about the abstract object presupposes the act of taking into consideration differences of the ‘national’ kind (i.e. between national media discourses). In other words, in particular contexts deeper knowledge about the capitalist mode of media discourse, and its counter-powers, is necessarily dependent on more detailed investigations of ‘national differences’ (Gramsci 2000).

The selection of the two countries and their respective elite medias is related to the fact that in both cases we are dealing with semi-core nation states and therefore also semi-core mass media. The semi-core (or semi-periphery) position expresses the condition of being situated somewhere in-between the dominators and the dominated within a hegemonic order (see Wallerstein 2003, 62). The two nation states are dominated by structures emanating from certain centres of the capitalist world economy (the US/ Western Europe), while they are themselves members of the actual order and themselves dominate miscellaneous peripheries. Their most politically and culturally influential mass media could be interpreted in the same manner. They are dominated by mass media and other kinds of institutions, situated within or closer to the centre, while they simultaneously can potentially shape less powerful institutions within their respective national-local domains.
The purpose of the study

(1) The central purpose of this scientific investigation is to analyse the *relationship between the capitalist hegemonic order and the mass media*, while the latter is restricted to semi-core elite news media (DN and Delo) and to the selection of news press materials (articles etc.) from three bodies of international media coverage (YU/Kosovo, Prague and 9/11). This central purpose is divided into two sub-purposes: (1a) the theoretical-methodological and (1b) the political-democratic one.

(1a) *The theoretical-methodological purpose.* In order to analyse the current relationship (between capitalism and the mass media), what should be accomplished is an *integrative* kind of media analysis in which the approaches of *political economy* (emphasising the economic/material dimensions of the mass media) and *cultural studies/discourse analysis* (emphasising the ‘symbolic’ and discursive dimensions of the mass media) are supposed to *interact*. The hypothesis here is that such a *‘third way’* approach is possible to achieve in terms of the identification and analysis of *journalistic modes of writing*. It is consequently the analysis of modes of writing that could offer a quite complete understanding of how media discourse operates ‘within’ a (capitalist) mode of production. The research question here is the following: more precisely, in what possible manners does the *capitalist system* operate (or is being counteracted) *in the shape of* this particular kind of discursive/social/material practice, i.e. *the journalistic mode of writing*?

(1b) The second sub-purpose (the *political-democratic* one) takes an interest in journalism’s construction of the three international political ‘events’ (YU/Kosovo, Prague, 9/11) from a political and democratic point of view. In order to deepen the understanding of the journalistic modes’ role in a capitalist hegemonic order, the following should be investigated: in their construction of territory, identity, social relations, freedom etc. in what manners do the identified modes of writing *counter-act*, or alternatively *co-produce*, miscellaneous *political struggles* (such as the defence of the nation state territory; transnational politics; consumer boycotts etc.)?

*In addition,* the purpose of the study also includes a more *practical* dimension. The question here is whether or not the scientific investigation of journalistic modes could generate some palpable tools, potentially applicable for the mass media in their everyday efforts to handle social reality, epistemologically speaking? More precisely, in the light of the results from the analysis of modes, how should an *emancipating* kind of journalism that tries to explain, describe, take into account, *unmask*, or even *counteract* the mechanisms of the contemporary global capitalist system actually ‘work’ nowadays? From an *epistemological* point of view, are the results of this study able to contribute some additional knowledge about this matter?
Structure
In the following theoretical chapter, the initial aim is to further define the way in which this study conceives capitalism as a social and hegemonic order. This task is followed by an exposition of particularly relevant theoretical fields within media and communication research, their recent developments and their respective ways of tackling the core object of study. It also involves the necessity of theoretically positioning the study, further clarifying the actual scientific questions. The theoretical section is followed by a closer presentation of the selected method and the specific design of the cultural materialist CDA. The succeeding section consists of the actual results, which are presented as eight separate analyses (of modes of writing). In the concluding chapter, the purpose of the study is treated and critically examined in relation to the results. The study is closed with a summary.
Theory and previous research

The historical materialist perspective
The theoretical framework of this study rests upon a Marxian mode of interpreting the relationship between the capitalist mode of production and the mass media. This decision rests upon the conviction that it is necessary to apply a historical materialist view of reality in social analysis (in general). However, from a sociological point of view, the central objects that are involved in this study (capitalism, the mass media, newspaper articles etc.) could naturally be analysed from various theoretical perspectives. It would be possible to apply a functionalist approach, a Weberian sociological or critical realist one (and so forth). What should thus be emphasised here is that the aim throughout this work will be to uphold a non-dogmatic Marxian theoretical approach that is rather communicating with, as well as potentially being party inspired by, other theoretical positions as well (like poststructuralism, critical realism etc.).

From a Marxian point of view, scientific analysis necessarily demands investigation of the organisation and state of the ‘forces of production’, followed by attempts to trace the historic origin of the present mode of organisation. This is consequently often referred to as the scientific theory and method of historical materialism. Forces of production may include labour power, tools, machinery, scientific knowledge, raw materials etc., while the organisation of these forces expresses the social relations of production: the way in which people are connected to each other (and to their ‘things’). In a capitalist context, relations of production may for example include relations of mastery, ownership, serfdom or relations between supervisor and worker, manufacturer and consumer etc. The capitalist mode of production is not the only mode of production existing in our society, but it is the dominant one, and it therefore is hegemonic. The kernel of this mode is often said to be related to such structural features as prices, profit, rent and interest (Keat & Urry 1975, 105) while, what is, according to most Marxian positions, special about this mode is its inherently contradictory nature and the fact that it is built and dependent upon certain conflicts. From a Marxian perspective, the essential conflict is between capital and labour, i.e. between those who own the means of production and those who do not. The dominant (capitalist) mode of production is furthermore dependent on such structural features as the production of surplus-value, the commodity-exchange system, wage labour, private property, entrepreneurship, individualism etc.
**Base and superstructure**

Historically speaking, an important aspect of historical materialism has been the generation of various theories of what should be considered more or less important and *essential* aspects of the capitalist system. Often this discussion has referred back to Marx and Engels and their views on *base* and *superstructure*, on what should be considered basic features of the actual mode of production and what should be seen as second-hand matters, being rather ‘products’ of the base, i.e. superstructural. In the case of Marx and Engels there are several, rather disparate and even contradictory, versions of how to view this problem (see for example Marx & Engels 1976, 59–62) which made things extra complicated for following generations of interpreters. Throughout the history of Marxism certain materialist ‘orthodox’ views have been available, which have tended to consider language as a ‘non-material’ matter, and hence something less important to take into consideration. However, the below model, from Plekhanov (1969) has generally been considered to be a Marxian attempt to formulate a rather complex base-superstructure model, taking such matters as ‘mental processes’ (including language) more seriously. Plekhanov postulates five sequential levels, starting with the most basic:

1. the state of the productive forces;
2. the economic relations these forces condition;
3. the socio-political system that has developed on the given economic ‘base’;
4. the mentality of men living in society, a mentality which is determined in part directly by the economic conditions obtaining, and in part by the entire socio-political system that has arisen on that foundation;
5. the various ideologies that reflect the properties of that mentality.

(from Collier 1989, 52)

Another version, perhaps more renowned and influential, is provided by Althusser (1971) and was formulated more than thirty years ago; this version is, at least according to Althusser himself, mainly derived from Marx himself. The initial level is the base, which is followed by two separate superstructural levels:

1. the infrastructure or economic base (the ‘unity’ of the productive forces and the relations of production)
2. the politico-legal (law and the State)
3. ideology (the different ideologies, religious, ethical, legal, political, etc.)

(Althusser 2001, 90)
In both cases there is this *movement* of going *from* production/the material/the economic *to* the mental/ideas/language/culture, in which the earlier are assumed to ‘determine’, ‘affect’, ‘shape’, ‘influence’ etc. the latter. In order to avoid so-called materialist determinism, a great deal of the debate has concerned to what extent the superstructural could be seen as autonomous from the material/economic base. When Plekhanov formulated his model, it was consequently highlighted for its willingness to achieve a more differentiated view on base and superstructure (with as many as five different levels), while, still, what is evident in this context is that the relationship between the sequential levels seems to be based on rigid causal thinking (‘the mentality’ being determined by ‘economic conditions’ and so forth). Althusser is, however, the one in this context who has been associated with one of the most serious attempts to overcome this kind of ‘causal logic’; in terms of explicitly emphasising the (relative) independence of the superstructural. In his structuralist kind of Marxism, reality is a ‘structural whole’ consisting of the three rather intertwined levels (see above). These three levels are thus three (relatively) independent strata, and the power relation between them changes from context to context. In one particular context one of the strata could the dominant one (for example the politico-legal one), while in another context, another one is the most influential (for example the economic). However, due to his theory of overdetermination (Althusser 1969), he has still been criticised for falling into the trap of economism himself. This has been connected to his suggestion that the economic structure must be seen as ‘determinant in the last instance’, which more precisely means that, still, at the end of the day ‘...the nature of the economic structure of any society determines which level will be dominant in that society...’ (Collier 1989, 59).

**Towards cultural materialism**

Raymond Williams’ (1961, 1977, 1980) cultural materialist mode of dealing with base and superstructure is a quite original one. What Williams is striving for is not only to provide the superstructural with a greater autonomy, but also to somehow dissolve the borders and distinctions between the ‘layers’ or levels that appear in the above presented base-superstructure models. In order to clarify this particular Marxian theoretical perspective and its importance for this study, what will exclusively be touched upon is a certain kind of critique that Williams expresses concerning Plekhanov’s base-superstructure model above. Regarding Plekhanov’s contribution, Williams states that...
This is better than the bare projection of a ‘base’ and a ‘superstructure’, which has been so common. But what is wrong with it is its description of these elements as ‘sequential’; when they are in practice indissoluble: not in the sense that they cannot be distinguished for purposes of analysis, but in the decisive sense that these are not separate ‘areas’ or ‘elements’, but the whole, specific activities and products of real men (Williams 1977, 80).

Williams argues for a radically complex view of the capitalist system in which the ‘dominant mode of production’ is basically constituted by this mixture of indissoluble practices involving the ‘raw’, physical material reality (nature), language, instruments, knowledge etc. What is decisively emphasised here is that language/culture should not be seen as a ‘second-hand’ matter for the understanding of the overall production processes. In this particular context, Williams also receives some support from Althusser and his emphasis that ideology (the ‘area’ of ideas, language use) should be considered inherently ‘inscribed’ in, and necessarily operates within existing social and material relations and practices (Althusser 2001, Eagleton 1994, 116–117).

The endorsement of Williams’ attempt to somehow tear down the material base/non-material superstructure hierarchy does not automatically imply that a more vertical and stratified view of reality is neglected, and the view that, when explaining reality, some things should de facto be considered more basic than others. In my own case, I could initially agree with critical realism’s understanding of the constitution of reality in terms of going from the deep foundations (physical, chemical and biological processes) to the less fundamental (society, economy, culture) (see Collier 1994). When it comes to the nature of capitalism (or other types of societies), I could also endorse, that there is a base that could be referred to as the ‘mode of production’ which tends to influence or shape ‘the rest’. However, what is of importance here is the very conception of the base (what does it ‘consist’ of?) The cultural materialist standpoint is that in capitalism (or in other types of societies), material practices cannot be understood irrespective of social relations, relations between men, while, furthermore, since social relations cannot be imagined irrespective of language and communication, language use is also fundamental to the overall constitution of the capitalist system (i.e. the material, social and discursive are fundamentally intertwined). The important theoretical point of departure in this context is thus to see language use as a natural part of the economic/material base (rather than being superstructural), and to declare that generally speaking, the capitalist system is a system that is somehow equally much based upon discursive, social and material relations and practices (Williams 1977).
Three problems
In this emphasis on historical materialism, the actual references (Althusser, Plekhanov, Williams) are heavily connected to a specific period of time (the post-war period, particularly the 60’s and 70’s). This study’s emphasis on the importance of cultural materialism and the willingness to join a somewhat more materialised mode of CDA could thus be seen as a natural counter-reaction to certain developments throughout the 80’s and 90’s in social research, in which, for example, the study of the mass media (in general) tended to become de-materialised (Wayne 2003) and where the importance of the historical materialist perspective successively decreased (Mosco 1996).

This historic context (the de-materialisation of social and media analysis from the 80’s onward) is of central importance in the following section. The following theoretical exposition is divided into three parts. Even if each and every part brings up theoretical positions that are important sources of inspiration for this study, still, all three presented positions suffer from certain problems, hindering the possibility of performing the kind of cultural materialist (integrated) mode of analysing media discourse that this study is striving for.

The problem of political liberalisation of scientific practice. The initial theoretical section concerns the development of post-thinking (postmodernism, poststructuralism) and the general ‘liberalisation’ of scientific practice. Despite its legitimate critique of certain destructive aspects of modern science and thought, post-thinking should constantly be critically examined from a modern point of view (Habermas 1987:b). The main problem in this context concerns post-thinking’s involvement in the relative abandonment and ‘repression’ of capitalism as a structural reality. The re-establishment of capitalism as an all-encompassing hegemonic reality is thereby accomplished through the critical deconstruction of so called post-thinking and its somehow ‘neoliberal’ view of what may essentially constitute social material reality.

The problem of fuzziness (of cultural studies). While cultural studies is an authoritative source of inspiration for this study, there are certain unsolved issues within this field that should be critically examined. More precisely it concerns the continuing indeterminacy and vagueness as to how to conceive the relationship between discursive articulation and the overall material aspects of social reality. From certain Marxian quarters it has been stated that British cultural studies has ended up essentialising communicative and discursive practices. What will be argued in this context is thus that the text analytical approach of cultural studies (along with kindred approaches within the field of discourse analysis) should increasingly be re-materialised, and its theory of semiosis and ‘articulation’ become more decisively ‘re-connected’ to the economic and material dimensions of reality and thereby also to the socio-material structures of capitalism as a whole.
The problem of rigidity (of the political economy of communication). The purpose of the last section is to critically examine the field of political economy and its contributions to media and communication research. In contrast to culture studies, political economy is rather defined by its explicit and unbroken focus on economic and material aspects of the mass media. Despite its undoubtedly important insights into how the institution of mass media is intertwined with the capitalist economy, the problem is still that its view of the relationship between the dominant (capitalist) mode of production and media discourse (texts) tends to become too reduced and rigid. Even though political economy may produce analysis of media texts and content, there is still this tendency to treat the discursive as a second hand thing that is strictly determined by what is conceived as the material base of capitalist reality. Therefore closer analyses of ‘texts’ become more or less neglected. Along with Williams (1977) the aim here is to argue that a more detailed analysis of discourse does not necessarily exclude ‘production matters’ (and ‘basic’ material dimensions of capitalism). Provided that one is enlarging political economy’s definition of the base (in terms of also including discursive production, talking/writing, as an important part of the overall material production process), it becomes reasonable to claim that political economy is not the only field within media and communication research, doing studies of economic and material structures (but that this is also the case within certain forms of text and media content analysis).

The problem of political liberalisation of scientific practice
This issue includes a more historically oriented discussion, defining the background and the overall structural conditions for the present scientific analysis. If Marxian thinking was once obligatory and oppressively dominant in Western European social scientific thought, the scenario proposed in this context witnesses to a somewhat different condition. It concerns the eighties and nineties, with their successive abandonment of the structural reality of capitalism as an essential intellectual category or variable.

Nowadays it is possible to conclude that the so called post-thinking phenomena (postmodernism, poststructuralism) were not merely a temporary trend, nor did they develop into a repressed subculture, upheld by particular, marginalized researchers or schools defined by their supposedly provocative notions of truth, reality, media etc. Looking backwards it is now possible to conclude that the post-thinking phenomenon rather turned into an established institution, which has successively influenced social scientific practice in general. One way of describing this development more closely is to refer to the increasing political liberalisation of scientific activities. Foremost the liberalisation process concerns the overall structural transformation of higher education to include an increasing number of market liberal modes of reasoning, which is observable through the explosion of new subjects and courses, of new modes of scientific thinking etc.
The second aspect concerns how scientific practice itself, i.e. the systemised labour of observing, analysing and explaining reality, becomes intertwined with the logic of liberal philosophy and its essential protection of ‘individual choice’.

i) Science as a ‘choosing’ practice. Undoubtedly scientific practice includes a great deal of active choices: the choice of topic, theoretical framework, empirical materials, method etc. Post-thinking developed as a critique of the limited possibilities of choice within modern science, associating modern thought with repression of differences and plurality in terms of miscellaneous totalising modes of thinking such as positivism, behaviourism, historical materialism etc. From a post-thinking point of view, the continually ongoing particularisation and diversification of scientific practice is considered a consistently liberating development (Callinicos 1989). From a poststructural perspective, reality should ideally be seen as a disclosed system characterised by non-related signifiers and modes of meaning-production. If we translate this to the domain of science, the ideal scenario is thus a condition in which particular pieces of theory operate rather freely, offering their particular worldviews and unique keys on how and what to observe and analyse in reality. In some sense the utopian wishes within post-thinking have already been answered and fulfilled, as, in recent decades, the social and human sciences have been experiencing increasing fragmentation and particularism. This development has certainly had some positive effects, but what is simultaneously revealed here is the tendency of social sciences, to become possessors of numerous local truths and even succumbs to tribalism, deepening the absence of any consensual agreements as to what fundamentally constitutes scientific thought and objective knowledge (Habermas 1987:b).

In her analysis of the state of politics in western societies, Chantal Mouffe (2003) suggests that the present hegemonic order of ‘high liberalism’ tends to repress the traditional left-right (i.e. labour vs capital) conflict by replacing it with questions about multicultural society, racism, discrimination of minorities etc., in which the solution to society’s problems increasingly seems to be of the ethical kind (rather than the socio-economic), as the implementation of (cultural) tolerance between various differences of identity (Zizek 2000). Similar observations have then been possible to make within the social scientific context. Even though the production of reliable, scientific knowledge by necessity presupposes the liberal ideology with its unbreakable defence of free and diverse thinking, still, if this ideology colonises scientific culture to an excessive degree, it can potentially generate certain negative consequences (the ‘neoliberalisation’ of scientific practice). This is rather the case when considering the increasingly fragmented and
loose character of the structure of social and humanist sciences, imprinted
by isolated engagements in which individuals and groups are preoccupied
with *their* particular ‘private matters’, i.e. formulating *their* particular
‘truths’ and ‘realities’ (Habermas 1987:b, Callinicos 1989, Jameson 1995,
Eagleton 1997). It stimulates further development of local knowledge and
local truths, while antagonistic modes of thinking are supposed to be
regulated by the liberal policy and its multiculturalist principle of distant
tolerance.

Unrestricted diversity and plurality support scientific progress *provided*
that they appear as *public communication* in which various modes of
thinking are argumentatively defended, challenged and falsified. However,
in a context in which scientific practice is more and more imploding with
the liberal ‘individual rights’ principle, it is somehow becoming increasingly
‘inappropriate’ to formulate critique from an external position (scientific
critique may collide with liberalist ideology in the sense that the critique is
experienced as impolite ‘interference’ into somebody else’s private doings
and possessions).

**ii) The differentiation of power and hegemony.** The ‘post-thinking’
development with its liberal features has thus loosened up the view of
hegemony and power. Conditions of hegemony and power are to a lesser
extent defined as all encompassing structural realities, involving great
majorities of people. In accordance with its atomistic view on reality,
according to the post-thinking logic, hegemony and power is split up into a
great number of particular structures, for example into bureaucracy, jour-
nalism, racism, objectivism, mass media, religion, experts, the nuclear
family, science, the State, nationalism, capitalism, the male gender, hetero-
sexuality, fundamentalism, normality etc. From a Marxian realist perspective,
the suggested problem with this condition is not the actual diversity but
rather the increasing lack of a stratified and hierarchical way of conceiving
all these ‘alternatives’. Since they are seldom analytically interrelated, they
consequently tend to appear as ‘equally fundamental’, somehow situated at
the same strata of reality. In media and communication research, for
example, different theoretical perspectives and research traditions tend to
‘place’ structures of power in different domains of social reality: in the over-
all economic structures (the political economic view), in the media institu-
tions themselves (liberal journalism studies: Schudson 1995, 1996), among
separate writing/practising media workers themselves (the biographical
perspective), among the audiences/consumers (some versions of culture
studies) etc. The well-known problem here is consequently not the diversity
of perspectives as such, but rather the fact that they too often tend to appear
as ‘competitive’ views, as if they were equipped with equal arsenals of explanatory power.

The overall ‘liberalisation’ development is thus closely related to the relative abandonment of the capitalist system as an obvious intellectual category within social scientific thought. The growth and expansion of the (liberation) process is necessarily dependent on the repression of something else, which is the existence of the capitalist system as such. The development suggested here is that the structural reality of capitalist hegemony has successively (for the last two decades) been shrinking; from being an all-encompassing reality it has turned into a particular ‘view’ of reality – into one view among a great number of other views (and thereby the pluralisation and diversification of power and hegemony issues).

In media and communication research, a concrete example of the present development is to be found in so-called representation research. In an intellectual climate where there seems to be no common, all-encompassing, underlying structural reality that could lay the initial explanatory foundation of why things are as they are with and within the mass media, scientific thought has rather shifted focus towards such questions as ‘representation’. Not least cultural studies has increasingly been imploding with the liberal democratic projects on ‘multiculturalism’ (see Hall 1997), in which one of the important tasks is to analyse how people become constructed in media discourse, commercials etc. while the critical project consists of deconstructing stereotypical representations of various identities (gender, sexuality, ethnicity etc.). The high liberal mechanisms operate in the sense that scientific labour is characterised as the act of ‘choosing’ this or that particular identity, and thereby ‘choosing’ this or that particular hegemonic order (the State, the heterosexuality, the male gender, Swedes etc.). According to the view that this study represents, even if this kind of research is, without doubt, important and valuable in many respects, it is still part of a larger tendency that could be seen as rather problematic, one in which scientific practice increasingly becomes a matter of ‘picking out’ this or that particular piece of reality, and of ‘free’ (consumer) ‘selections’ among a vast number of particular theories and perspectives supposedly meant for scientific explanation (while, at the same time, the more common and general structures of reality somehow tend to ‘disappear’ or are being neglected).

**Doing and thinking science from the ‘within’ the hegemonic order**

Within the field of media research, the criticism of postmodern and post-structural theory has mostly been a philosophical one; i.e. the liberation and increasing ‘individual freedom’ about how to view matters such as objectivity, truth, method, theory etc. has mainly been criticised for leading
to relativism, nihilism and radical constructivism, as well as for abandoning scientific rationality and serious truth claims. The willingness to embed this philosophical critique within an economic context has not been particularly strong except for the contributions deriving from certain political economic directions (see Ampuja 2003). What this political economic criticism concentrates on is equally important, namely how post-thinking could become considered a cultural force ‘within’ the dominant (capitalist) mode of production (Jameson 1991, Ampuja 2003).

This philosophical-economic criticism has paid attention to the fact that the liberal, ‘post-oriented’ scientific practice continues to mainly conceive power and hegemony as closed structures whose repression consist of fixing and determining identity (who to be, how to be) and meaning (how to think, what to think, how to interpret reality, etc.) and thereby producing homogeneity. The critical theory of post-thinking is thus still exclusively occupied with detecting and deconstructing (Derrida 1976) the way in which the imagined hegemony (the State, Normality etc.) forces the subject to internalise this or that identity/meaning. What has been repeated from various Marxian quarters (Zizek 2000) is that current ‘post-thinking’ somehow represses the capitalist system’s tendency to increasingly include and internalise different, alternative, pluralistic lifestyles. What is indicated here is that capitalism somehow ‘needs’ free-playing individuality and meaning, that the system is de facto expanding by means of the relative abandonment of ‘fixated’ ways of being, thinking and doing (this is also treated in post-fordist theory, continually confirming Marx & Engels’ thesis on how the solid melts into air: see Harvey 1989). In other words: the arsenal of emancipating philosophical principles within post-thinking, i.e. the autonomy of the signifier, diversity, differentiation, implosion, transgression etc. are more likely operating within the capitalist hegemonic order. Salecl (1994) sheds further light on this matter:

Paradoxically, theorists, who in the Foucauldian fashion cherish the anti-essentialist attitude and the subversion of fixed identity, do not see that contemporary capitalism is no longer based on the idea of fixed and stable identities. On the contrary, capitalism today relies precisely on non-fixed identities. Contemporary capitalism ‘needs’ the subject who constantly questions his or her identity, changes sexual roles, and is above all primarily concerned with making his or her life ‘a work of art’. /.../ Does not contemporary consumer society rely upon changing, subversive identities in order to inspire people to develop ever new desires and to seek new modes of enjoyment? Maybe it is time to rediscover the Marxist insight that capital is the general force behind ‘deteritorialization’ (to use Deleuze and Guattari’s term), which undermines any fixed identity. Late capitalism, therefore, should be seen as the epoch in which the traditional fixity of ideological positions, such as fixed sexual roles or patriarchal authority, has come to hinder the expansion of consumer society. In this regard, politically correct behaviour
and theoretical attempts to subvert fixed identities suit perfectly the ideology of late capitalism. As long as people are concerned with their own performances, they pose no threat to the political system (Salecl 1994, 3–4).

‘Post-theory’, I think, could be considered a relevant intellectual instrument, provided that scientific labour is also turned the other way around, that its key normative concepts (individual choice, polysemy, differentiation, intertextual play etc.) are potentially used for investigating the expansion of the capitalist market economy (see Rose 1998). In accordance with this ‘opposite’ logic, when confronted with elements of hybrid, polysemic, free play of meaning and identity-construction in contexts of media production, media discourse or media reception, one does not necessarily find empirical proofs of ‘counter-hegemonic’ processes – but perhaps elements of hegemony reproduction instead (Berglez 2001).

**Conclusion: on scientific practice and liberal democracy**

From a historical point of view it is not difficult to find legitimate grounds for the successive abandonment of historical materialism. There have been many examples of theory (orthodox Marxism) being used in a mechanistic and reductionist manner. On the other hand, this does not necessarily indicate that the ‘paradigm shift’, i.e. the relative abandonment of Marxian theory in the eighties and nineties, was the end result of an epoch-making ‘epistemological progress’ in which the Marxian theory of the nature of capitalism was finally proved to be incorrect and untrue. Its most general contributions to the social sciences have in fact never been challenged and dismissed (see Desai 2002), which could be linked to the fact that many contemporary liberal economists tend to endorse many of its general theses. The abandonment could then rather be seen as a complex mixture of psychological, economic and political factors.

To begin with there are the psychological reasons: the boredom and sense of meaninglessness caused by the seemingly repetitive character of the historical-materialist conclusions, and a longing for fresh theories and views. This psychological factor has supposedly operated in conjunction with certain general economic developments. The overall commercialisation processes in the eighties (Harvey 1989) somehow also got a grip on science in terms of the increasing ‘commercialisation’ of philosophical-intellectual thought (which could be linked, while not reduced, to so called ‘post-thinking’). The political factor should then also be included, and the impact of the disillusionment about the development of real socialism. There have been those who have stated that Marxian thinking could be falsified via the political, that the fall of certain totalitarian, communist regimes proves the falsity of Marxian science as a whole. The problem with this kind of rea-
soning is that it confuses scientific theory with politics and totalitarian interpretations of the *Communist Manifesto* (Marx & Engels 1848/1987). The standpoint of this study is that it is two different things to, on the one hand, critically investigate the way in which the dominant mode of production is interwoven with social relations and language use – within this area various modes of Marxism have contributed to the question of how to reach *objective* knowledge – and on the other, to celebrate the dictatorship of the proletariat or the like.

**In conclusion:** provided that the mode of production is important to include when trying to understand and explain social relations and institutions (and vice versa), and provided that the capitalist mode is the dominant mode of production in our context, then, when preparing the theoretical and methodological framework for how to analyse social reality, the possibilities of (liberal) choice ought to be somehow *limited*. Referring to the problematic aspects of the (neo)liberalisation of scientific practice – for example, in the context of analysing media production, texts or reception – it is worrying, I think, that the inclusion of the economic/material seems increasingly to be becoming a matter of ‘free choice’ (rather than a necessary ‘must-do-thing’). This should however not suggest scientific totalitarianism or the straight way back of Marxian reductionism or essentialism, nor should it mean that the economic/material is the only thing that counts. It is rather reasonable to think that historical materialism is unable to provide us with a complete understanding of social phenomena, and it is also reasonable to assume that not all social phenomena should in the first instance be linked to economic processes. What is however meant here is that such a fundamental structural reality (as the dominant mode of production: capitalism) must not be *dropped* to the extent that was the case in the eighties and nineties.

**The problem of fuzziness (of cultural studies)**

In the seventies cultural studies developed as an attempt to more systematically analyse the role of symbolic processes in the reproduction of power relations in capitalist societies. Stuart Hall (1995:a, 1995:b, 1996:a, 1996:b, 1992, 1997) was initially influenced by the Marxian effect-theoretical conclusion that the mass media have the power to set the agenda, to select, frame, classify and define issues in accordance with the interests of the economically and politically powerful elite. Media communication could thus be defined as a structured activity, framing reality in accordance with the ‘dominant ideology’. However, cultural studies early dissociated itself from the effect-theoretical field. The symbolic support of the hegemonic capitalist order was not meant to be considered a case of short-term effects (par-
ticular campaigns etc.) but it was rather the *culture* itself, the ‘general organisation of life’, which was supposed to imprison the subject (see Williams 1961).

Considering the development of cultural studies from the early seventies onward, what has somehow become the core of this field is its particular interest in the power of language and language use. The theoretical foundation of cultural studies consists of de Saussure’s structuralism on the one hand, and the so-called culturalist theory (Gramsci etc.) on the other. Structuralism initially provided cultural studies with knowledge about the repressive aspects of language, it being assumed that language, seen as a system based on differences, more or less ‘constitutes’ the subject. The culturalist dimension, on the other hand, has represented the humanist perspective within the field, emphasising instead disclosure and voluntarism, i.e. the possibility of freeing oneself from structure through agency and counter hegemonic acts.

The presence of these two approaches has simultaneously indicated the presence of two forms of *Marxism*. Hall and others were initially inspired by Althusser (2001) and his theory of the relative autonomy of superstructure, and Althusser’s aim to more decisively emphasise the relative independence of signification practices in relation to economic and material relations (Althusser 2001, 90–92). This attempt supported cultural studies’ eagerness to avoid the kind of economic reductionism that considers the superstructural simply as a product of the material base. With the support of Althusser, the mass media could thereby, in accordance with Althusser’s own terminology, become an ideological apparatus, characterised by its promotion of the dominant order (capitalism) through its particular mode of symbolic labour (codes) while still being somehow autonomous from the base.

The references to this Marxian contribution have still been ambiguous and hesitating (Hall 1980/1996:b, 29), which is to a great extent related to Althusser’s (1969) theory of *overdetermination*, or what Bhaskar (1977) later has referred to as multiple determination. Althusser consequently lays stress on the idea that even if the various strata are truly independent from each other, the separate mechanisms of the various strata tend to co-determine the direction of social reality. In the final instance it is still the economic stratum that determines the path and nature of human action. Interpreting this as a suspected case of economic determinism, Hall and others have never been willing to adopt Althusser’s Marxian structuralism altogether. Even if Althusser considers signification a form of ‘production’ and ‘work’ in its own right, and even if plurality and counter-discourse may appear when people produce signification, still, if signification is determined
by economic structures in the final instance, consisting of the same
determinate logic as material production in general, then, for Hall, it
becomes difficult to “...discern how anything but the ‘dominant ideology’
could ever be reproduced in discourse” (Hall 1982/1995:b, 358). In this
class context cultural studies has also been somewhat inspired by E.P. Thompson’s
(1977) renowned criticism of economic determinism.

The problem of how to obtain a critical, Marxian identity without ending
up in the presumed determinism of Althusser was somehow ‘solved’ by
Gramsci (2000). The mentioned culturalist approach within the field has
been inspired by Gramsci’s thesis on hegemonic struggle, in which social
reality is considered to be relatively dynamic and changeable. The hegemonic
order of capitalism has a structural nature (people are imprisoned in a
complex productive system) while the structures are relatively open in the
sense that hegemonic power must be achieved through discursive struggle.
The status quo of the dominant mode of production is not simply a result of
material and economic structures alone – social consent is rather the end
result of discursive battles between antagonistic interests, in which the
capitalists and the bourgeoisie are forced to manipulate the working class
by symbolic means (with words) in order to achieve a peaceful status quo.

By relying on Marxian thinkers, such as Volosinov (1973) (for language)
and Gramsci (2000) (for politics), Hall and others somehow formulated a
post-Marxian contribution that defined signification as ‘struggling practice’.
The culturalist vein and the primacy of Gramsci (rather than Althusser) has
been quite important for cultural studies’ view of language. In the seventies
it paved the way for an approach in which the superstructural domain of
reality (of language, ideas, meanings) came to be considered a system on its
own rather than an end product of the economic base.

In a media and communication theoretical context, the encoding/decoding
model (Hall 1980/1996:b) represented an attempt to more decisively
unchain discursive articulation from the material and economic. It was based
on the assumption that there is an inevitable crack in social reality that
separates the domain of encoding (where the text is produced) from the
area of decoding (where it is read). Encoding and decoding practices are
assumed to take place in different social and cultural contexts, while this
‘gap’ indicates that productive activities (the base) cannot wholly control
the outcome of the manufactured information (the superstructural); signs
may achieve different meanings in separate contexts, and reading practices
may generate unforeseen mechanisms (struggling processes etc.). This then
further developed into the explicit analytic focus on media texts, as well as
on the complex relationships between texts and audiences, concerning
The path away from historical materialism

In the late eighties and throughout the nineties cultural studies’ dissociation from Marxian theory deepened. The structuralist and culturalist dimensions successively imploded into a single theory, so-called poststructuralism. The structuralist approach within cultural studies was increasingly challenged and loosened up by the voluntary perspective in culturalism and the subsequent establishment of poststructuralism (see Derrida 1976, Laclau & Mouffe 1985 etc.). Alongside this development, cultural studies has also tended to engage in the kind social scientific thinking that has been sharing its successive journey away from historical materialism (Giddens’ high modernity approach, the cultural mode of globalisation theory, information society theory etc.). This theoretical milieu has then also stimulated certain idealist tendencies within culture studies (while keeping away the materialist ones), in terms of supporting more advanced expeditions into the world of signifying processes and discursive articulation. The underlying promotion from miscellaneous post-Marxian sociology (Giddens etc.) and its decentring of the economic, alongside the successive impact of poststructuralism, has further paved the way for cultural studies’ conviction as to the exclusive role of language and language use (of ‘text production’) for the constitution of social relations (identity, the self) and social reality as a whole (space, history etc.).

As has been pointed out from several directions, throughout this development, even if the critical Marxian vein of culture studies has not been totally erased, it has certainly become fuzzier (Sparks 1996). The actual concept (‘critical’) is still widely used and referred to, while its meaning and function it often quite unclear. The concluding section thus concerns the core problem of this development: the oscillation within cultural studies between, on the one hand, its goal of producing critical research, to include relations of power and hegemony in a Marxian or post-Marxian manner when analysing texts/discourse, and on the other hand, its ambiguity when it comes to how to intellectually deal with the hegemonic order of capitalism.

Where is the mediating link between media discourse – and the rest of reality?

During the seventies, when Marxian thinking tended to be obligatory and even hegemonic in several western academic contexts, the political project of cultural studies might have been progressive, functioning as a welcomed alternative to miscellaneous Marxian orthodoxies. However, what has been suggested here is that the, in many respects, legitimate, struggle against economism and Marxian essentialism has developed in a direction where ‘the
semiotic’ has increasingly lost contact with its own material identity, as well as with the other, deeper material dimensions of social reality. In an article from the beginning of the nineties, Hall, rather philosophically concludes his ‘de-materialised’ view of the discursive:

/.../ there’s always been something decentred about the medium of culture, about language, textuality, and signification, which always escapes and evades the attempts to link it, directly and immediately, with other structures (Hall 1992, 284).

Hall is continually protecting the particular nature of the ‘cultural’ from those realists and materialists who are presumed to represent another opinion on this matter. The very character of this defence, the standpoint that language ‘escapes and evades any direct links to other structures’, I think somehow exemplifies how language/discourse is mystified and treated as something that by necessity must be treated exclusively. The consequences of this are thus known. Throughout the eighties and nineties, with the establishment of the ‘cultural turn’ and the increasing focus on the unique nature of language, what was abandoned was the relationship between language/discourse and ‘the rest’. Within culture studies, there was this cancellation of the task of how to understand the relationship between what has traditionally been referred to as the base (the material/economic) and the superstructure (language/discourse).

According to Peck (2001) cultural studies has tended to act as if a new mode of conceiving the relationship between base and superstructure could be achieved by mainly paying attention to the latter: cultural studies ‘...tried to rethink the base/superstructure relationship by focusing all of its energies on the latter and leaving the received notion of the former essentially intact’ (Peck 2001, 241). The elements traditionally referred to as the base (the material, economic, ‘production’) have thus been set aside. As a consequence of the lack of interest in the so called ‘base matters’, cultural studies has not primarily invested its energy in challenging and reformulating the more orthodox, strictly materialist, views on the base. The one-sided focus on the discursive has rather tended to conserve the kind of traditional and narrow definition of the the base that Raymond Williams (one of the actual founders of British cultural studies) dismissed in the late seventies:

In many uses of the proposition of base and superstructure, as a verbal habit, ‘the base’ has come to be considered virtually as an object, or in less crude cases, it has been considered in essentially uniform and usually static ways. ‘The base’ is the real social existence of man. ‘The base’ is the real relations of production corresponding to a stage of development of the material productive forces. ‘The base’ is a mode of production at a particular stage of its development. /.../ we have to say that when we talk of ‘the base’, we are talking of a process and not a state. /.../ we have to revalue ‘the base’
away from the notion of a fixed economic or technological abstraction, and towards the specific activities of men in real social and economic relationships (Williams 1980, 33).

During the eighties and nineties, Williams’ cultural materialism, endowed with its more complex view on the base, never experienced a serious breakthrough. Williams’ purpose was consequently to formulate a materialist theory of signification in order to situate discursive articulation and the overall economic and material dimensions of reality within a common analytical framework. Cultural studies, however, tended to choose another path, i.e. to (a) continually accept a more orthodox mode of conceiving base and superstructure, followed by the choice to (b) focus on the superstructural. Due to this development within cultural studies, language/discourse has never really been analytically integrated with the economic/material. Either there is this one-sided focus on the discursive dimension of reality in which the material dimension is more or less neglected, or language/discourse becomes this separate ‘area’ that is potentially reproducing this other separate ‘area’ (the economic/material). In some sense the latter logic is found in (cultural) studies of, for example, the propagandistic discourse of Thatcherism (Hall 1988), or in rather recent ones, like analyses of the political rhetoric or discourse of New Labour (Fairclough 2000), of how the discourses of neoliberalism, new capitalism etc. symbolically support the assumed underlying ‘material order’, i.e. the capitalist system.

Mike Wayne (2003) relates cultural studies’ privileging of the superstructural to the observation of how the ‘later’ Hall tends to conceive the material dimensions of reality as fixed inertia, as a collection of ‘dead’ things, in contrast to the assumed energetic and dynamic nature of discursive articulation. In Hall’s approach:

/…/ the world is presented as an assortment of passive things while language is credited with being a practice, that is, a creative, active process of meaning production. But it is not only language which is a system. The world in fact is not made up of discrete things – natural or social – but of relationships or practices which like language are material, but which have a deeper materiality about them because they constitute our very mode of production, our very mode of physical interchange and reproduction with nature and each other. Language is part of that interchange, but the interchange itself cannot be understood by privileging language within it (Wayne 2003, 165).

Already at this stage, I would like to bring up the desired theoretical framework of this study. The general suggestion here is that, on the one hand, it is reasonable to think and state that talking/writing is a particular kind of practice, and that, at a certain level, it is somehow autonomous from other types of practices (Habermas 1995). On the other hand, in contrast to Hall’s position, provided that language use is viewed as production, then, at this
more abstract level, language use is not an autonomous phenomenon, since it is interwoven with a more general structural condition: production processes in general. From this viewpoint, the discursive production of, for example, the private property principle is only one among several other practices, mutually producing this formation within the dominant mode of production (i.e. along with practices such as, for example, the physical construction of private spaces and territories, the accumulation of private capital etc.). Following this theoretical reasoning, discursive articulation may, at one particular level, possibly obtain its identity as an ‘autonomous structure’ with an ‘irreducible and decentred nature’ (Hall) while, at another level, still being able to be seen as ‘immediately’ intertwined with the base (i.e. to be considered a dimension of the base). In the last section of the chapter, this argument, based on the cultural materialism of Williams, will be further clarified. Before that, the purpose should be to more closely examine the field of political economy and its relative scepticism towards these attempts to enlarge the base.

The problem of rigidity (of the political economy of communication)
In the eighties and nineties several scientific fashions were popping up in the field of media communication research. What they had in common is that they all dissociated themselves from more materialist perspectives on social reality and discourse. Cultural studies, with its increasing interest in semiosis, should to a great extent be interpreted as one of these ‘post-materialist’ trends, reaching mainstream status and increasing institutional power. Throughout these decades, the political economy of communication has been an important counterweight with its imperturbable focus on how the institution of mass media is intertwined with the capitalist economic system.

The political economy of communication is defined by its interest in relationships between economic organisation and political, social and cultural life. Liberal political economists, such as Adam Smith (1776/2000) defined freedom and democracy in terms of the degree of free choice between various competing commodities and services. In contrast to Smith, political economists put the economic system in relation to Marxian theory in terms of analysing how production, distribution and exchange takes place within a certain structural framework – within a dominant mode of production. At present time, the particular section of political economy intended in this context, the political economy of communication, is mainly characterised by its aim to situate media production and communicative activities within an economic context in terms of conceiving it as an industry:
Although there is understandable tension over this, political economists of communication have sought to *decenter* the media even as they have concentrated on investigating their economic, political and other material constituents. Decentering the media means viewing systems of communication as integral to fundamental economic, political, social and cultural processes in society. There are several ways to accomplish this, including, for example, starting from constituents of capitalism, such as capital accumulation, wage-labour, etc., and situating the media within the framework of production and reproduction set out by these constituents (Mosco 1996, 71).

Political economy of communication concentrates on topics such as the unequal distribution of symbolic resources (for instance ICT:s) and its consequences for democracy, ownership conditions (McChesney, Wood & Foster 1998), the role of advertising in media production (Smythe 1981) and the commercialisation of the public sphere (Garnham 1995). A close relative to political economy is the so called instrumentalist approach, focusing on how economic and political elites make use of the mass media as means for canalisation of propaganda (Herman & Chomsky 1988, Nohrstedt & Ottosen 2001, 2004, 2005), while this issue is often related to questions on cultural and national autonomy (Schiller 1972, Nordenstreng & Schiller 1993). What most of these approaches have in common is their ambition to establish ‘concrete links’ between economic structures and the mass media and to demonstrate how the earlier shapes the latter. It is thus in this context that one can trace the logic behind political economy’s main criticism of cultural studies and its analyses of media discourse. From political economic directions it is often suggested that there is an inherent structural feature within cultural studies that makes it unable to demonstrate *decisive relationships*, for example causal ones, between the dominant (capitalist) mode of production and media discourse.

*The criticism of cultural studies*

In cultural studies contexts, the kind of discourse that reproduces the capitalist mode of production is defined as the *dominant* meaning or the hegemonic code. Elite mass media in capitalist countries tend to promote, for example, the private property principle, through certain codes, and thereby potentially reproduce the dominant mode of production. One is, however, rather unwilling to deal with ‘concrete motifs’. Scientific labour is restricted to the observation of (a) an ideological code, followed by the conclusion that (a) is promoting (b), the dominant mode of production, while one is seldom interested in whether (a) happens for some particular *reason*. The hegemonic order is embedded in the very language of the mass media and therefore it is taken for granted that elite media *tend* to produce (a) for the sake of (b). Garnham (1986) considers this a shortcoming caused by the
fact that cultural studies, including Hall, focuses so heavily on ‘textual issues’.

Hall’s failure to do this leads him to explain the ideological effect in terms of pre-existent and ideologically pre-determined communicators or encoders choosing from a pre-existent and ideologically pre-determined set of codes so that there is a systematic tendency of the media to reproduce the ideological field of society in such a way as to reproduce also its structure of domination. That is to say he offers the description of an ideological process, but not an explanation of why or how it takes place, except in tautological terms (Garnham 1986, 18).

Murdock (1997) adds to this by claiming that cultural studies, discourse analysis etc. is lacking the kind of theory that more decisively mediates the relationship between the dominant discourse and the dominant capitalist order. In discourse analysis what is established are relationships between texts and contexts rather than ‘immediate relationships’, i.e. the kinds of relationships that are able to demonstrate how media content is concretely shaped by particular economic conditions, transformations or motifs. According to miscellaneous political economists, what should be done in order to remedy this condition is to focus more concretely on what Marx & Engels (1990) referred to as the control of the means of mental production; to focus on how media discourses are affected by such factors as ownership structures, class structures within media institutions etc.

The political economy of communication is not necessarily suffering from a lack of textual analyses or developed notions on how such analyses should be performed. Its analyses of media texts consequently aim at demonstrating the kinds of ‘decisive relationships’ between economic conditions and texts that cultural studies is less willing to acknowledge. As an example of its ‘decentred’ mode of text analysis, one could mention the investigations of ‘cultural forms’ in which the core object of study is how media products become endowed with determined attributes in order to adapt to the presumed needs of particular markets and audiences.

/.../ critical political economy is concerned to explain how the economic dynamics of production structure public discourse by promoting certain cultural forms over others. /.../ it allows us to trace detailed connections between the financing and organization of cultural production and changes in the field of public discourse and representation in a non-reducible way, that respects the need for all full analysis of textual organization (Golding & Murdock 1997, 25).

Studies of cultural forms could be linked to research that in one way or another focuses on how the commodification of cultural artefacts, i.e. the transformation of use values into exchange values, shapes media content. For example how the popular styles of the yellow press (Dahlgren & Sparks
or the inclusion of spectacle in various television concepts are concrete outcomes of the producer’s economic motives. This then represents the general strength of miscellaneous political economic research, i.e. the achievement of causal mediations between (i) certain structural features of the dominant mode of production (the organisation of production in terms of mass production of commodities) and (ii) the structural feature of some piece of text or discourse. Even more convincing are however the rarely occurring kinds of studies that trace and demonstrate the structural and causal relationships between the manufacturing of texts, the textual outcome, and people’s reception of them, as in the case of Eriksson’s (2002) research on mediated politics.

The view of base and superstructure

The political economic mode of handling media content is mainly inspired by Adorno’s & Horkheimer’s (1972) theory of the culture industry. According to the Frankfurt school, mass production and commodification of aesthetic forms necessarily transform content in a determined direction, leading to the pessimistic conclusion that literature, journalism etc. become increasingly standardised, repetitive and banal. Adorno & Horkheimer have also been rather influential on how to conceive the relationship between base and superstructure. It is the Frankfurt school that political economy is leaning on when reasoning in terms of how the base colonises the superstructural. Guided by the ontological assumption that material activities precede and determine consciousness, political economists tend to stress that potentially autonomous area of mental and cultural activities (art, miscellaneous aesthetic practices, discourse) become increasingly colonised by man’s material doings (in terms of industrialism, processes of commodification etc.).

Political economy’s criticism of cultural studies and Hall’s encoding-decoding model has to a great extent been related to the interpretation that, within cultural studies, there has been this tendency to conceive of the foundations of capitalist reality in the exact opposite direction. Instead of accepting the notion of how the base successively conquers the superstructure in an ever more commercialised social reality, representatives of cultural studies have rather seemed to stress how the superstructural colonises the base in terms of considering discursive practices themselves as increasingly essential for what basically constitutes the dominant mode of production.

It is the resistance towards miscellaneous attempts to experiment with the base-superstructure model that very much defines the political economic field, simultaneously representing its strength and its Achilles heel. Its
important ability to demonstrate decisive casual relationships between material production (base) and discursive practices (superstructure) also represents its weakest point, since the whole approach is dependent on a rather narrow definition of the base. There is the foundation of reality, the base, constituted upon ‘non-discursive’ activities of material production and the organisation of it in accordance with a particular mode, and there is the superstructural, the symbolic, discursive etc., ending up as the ‘the rest’ – the thing being shaped or affected by relations of production. There is consequently an inherent rigidity in the political economic analysis where such matters as meaning, culture and discourse are mainly conceived of as a potential ‘oasis of freedom’ and cultural autonomy (while always being threatened by commodifying practices, decisively pressing their way up from the deeper economic/material strata of reality). The core problem is similar to the one pointed out in the previous criticism of cultural studies, namely the tendency to conceive of language use as an immaterial activity somehow ‘outside’ material production, as if discursive activities would not be, from the very beginning, necessarily intertwined with nature, the physical, production etc.

From the theoretical horizon of this study, cultural studies and political economy are commonly criticised for stimulating notions that strictly separate the discursive from the non-discursive when conceptualising the structures of the capitalist mode of production. According to the theoretical approach of this study, what is needed is an increasing acceptance among political economists of the fact that talking and writing are kinds of active, material production too (rather than simply a second-hand effect of it), while furthermore, there is also this continual need to push for a more materialist conceptualisation of social reality within cultural studies, critical discourse analysis etc., and more precisely, within its textual analysis (i.e. when for instance qualitatively investigating hegemony production in media content etc.).

Since the mainstream of cultural studies developed into a rather de-materialised theory of signification, it is consequently Raymond Williams, rather than Hall, who mainly represents the ambition to include materialist theory in discourse analysis, together with these inspired by his approach (Harvey 1996, Fairclough 2001). However, even though Williams’ materialist position has been an important influence on political economists (see Garnham 1986), his cultural materialist approach has been viewed with a touch of scepticism (see Garnham 1986, Murdock 1997). From political economic positions, what has been pointed out is the assumed risk of conceptual confusion – since, if everything is suddenly conceived as material or part of the material, then this concept (the material) somehow loses
its scientific function. Another risk concerns the assumed collapse of an established epistemological hierarchy. If everyday discourse, ideas, journalistic modes etc. become ‘productive forces’ within the dominant mode of production, then the ‘deeper’ materiality of capitalism, the impact of commercial industry, the power of transnational media conglomerates, ownership structures etc. might be ignored or even dropped. In other words, there may be a growing confusion as to what should be conceived as ‘essential matters’ for explaining and understanding mass media’s role within the dominant mode of production. This is also what many political economists have felt when experiencing the radical breakthrough of cultural studies, discourse analysis and other approaches seemingly dealing with linguistic materials alone.

As a concluding (cultural materialist) response to this, the following point should be made. Political economists are correct when suggesting that analysis of media content and discourse could never replace studies such as, for example, the unequal distribution of information technology in particular nation states, or the economic power of Time Warner. However, whether it is Rupert Murdoch’s media empire (News Corp) or the hegemonic codes of everyday mass media that mainly sustain the capitalist order is a quite senseless question that, I think, is impossible to finally decide. What primarily matters is the complex sum of all this (material) production: ‘...the whole and connected social material process’ (Williams 1977, 140).

Conclusion
Cultural studies: what is particularly important and valuable with this field is its demonstrations of the role of communicative processes in the constitution of power and hegemony. Problematic tendency I: linguistic determinism, i.e. exaggerated focus on discursive processes per se and their role in the constitution of social reality, in which the material dimensions of reality are neglected or repressed. Problematic tendency II: the disconnection of language/discourse and the economic/material. Even though material processes and practices may be included in the analysis, language/discourse and the economic/material often appear like disconnected separate ‘worlds’ or ‘areas’ in which (the Marxian, critical theoretical kind of) cultural studies tends to choose to analyse the way in which the earlier ‘area’ ‘promotes’, ‘supports’ or ‘reproduces’ the latter ‘area’.

The political economy of communication: what is valuable with this field is its ability to concretely demonstrate the way in which economic interests/structures determine communicative practices (communication as a commodity, the commercialisation of discourse etc.). Problematic tenden-
**Problematic tendency I: economic determinism**, i.e. exaggerated focus on how the economy shapes discourse, in which discourse is only a product of material and economic structures and interests. **Problematic tendency II: the disconnection of the economic/material and language use/discourse.** Even though language/discourse may be included in the analysis, the economic/material and language/discourse tend to appear like disconnected, *separate* ‘areas’ in which the research field of political economy primarily considers its core mission to be to study the way in which the earlier distinguished ‘area’ determines or ‘shapes’ the latter one.

**A common problem: (The lack of dialectics).** The suggestions in both fields’ problematic tendency II, witness to cultural studies and political economy having a problematic tendency in common, namely their lack of a more *dialectical* view of the economic/material and language/discourse. In other words, a view in which one focuses on how these two ‘domains’ are rather fundamentally *intertwined* and *internally related*, and how they jointly constitute discursive/social/material *processes*.

The overall aim should be to develop a theoretical framework for analysing media discourse that more decisively includes *dialectics in the cultural materialist sense*. More precisely it concerns a framework that tries, on the one hand, to avoid the kind of ‘linguistic determinism’ that Garnham (1995), Mosco (1996) and other political economists are concerned about (the study of discourse must always simultaneously be the study of the general processes of material production) and, on the other hand, that tries to avoid the ‘economic determinism’ of political economy in which discourse exclusively tends to appear as a product of ‘underlying material factors’. Even though media discourse could be seen as something that is determined by underlying economic/material interests, still the core suggestion here is that media discourse could *simultaneously* be seen as a *force* in its own right *within the complex process* referred to as the ‘dominant mode of production’. The theoretical framework that will try to include all this is the framework of analysing media discourse as *modes of writing*. 
The relationship between media discourse and capitalism (on journalistic modes of writing)

Modes of writing: an introduction
In order to achieve a more ‘complete’ picture of the relationship between media discourse and the capitalist hegemonic system, the suggested hypothesis is that this relationship should be analysed as *journalistic modes of writing*. More precisely, the proposal is to consider a *mode* as a phenomenon that contains at least three different dimensions. Simultaneously, one could see a mode as;

1. a *practice*, with certain cognitive and discursive characteristics.
2. a *structural product*, i.e. being constituted by various ‘underlying’ structures (economic, political, psychological, cultural, technological etc.).
3. a *dialectical force*, i.e. being a potential ‘active’ element within the ongoing process of a mode of production (the capitalist mode or another mode).

Below, these three dimensions will be presented and discussed more in detail, while this passage is supposed to pave the way for an elucidation of the theoretical framework for the analysis of news discourse (i.e. the framework of analysing news discourse as modes of writing).

1. The mode of writing as a discursive practice
In media research the concept of modes is applied in various ways. In his studies of sports journalism, Rowe (1992) refers to different ‘modes of sports writing’, having in mind various discursive aspects of this genre. Furthermore, in his investigations of TV journalism, Ekström (2000) concludes that this particular kind of journalism contains of three ‘modes of communication’ (information, storytelling and attractions). In this study, to begin with, a mode is taken as referring to an:

   institutionally established (writing) practice, expressing a *particular way* of cognitively-discursively structuring social material reality.
When journalism is ‘putting reality together’ (Schlesinger 1987), manufacturing ‘events’ (Boorstin 1972) and ‘framing’ reality in accordance with the thing called ‘news’ (Tuchman 1978, Ekecrantz & Olsson 1994), i.e. when transforming the usual ‘raw materials’, i.e. peoples, objects, spaces, problems etc., the journalistic practice is more or less related to certain pre-given categories that, furthermore, lay the foundation for certain ‘modes of writing’. Beginning with these so called categories, it more precisely involves the journalistic construction of people’s (identity), spaces, practices, problems etc. in terms of:

| Private-public (for example, is a space, practice, problem, issue etc. constructed as private or public/common?) |
| Simplicity-complexity (is a group of people, territory, problem, practice etc. constructed as rather ‘uncomplicated’ and ‘obvious’ or rather as a complex, elusive phenomenon?) |
| Contingency-structures (is a social problem, ‘event’ etc. constructed as a contingent one – i.e. as a rare phenomenon happening by chance – or rather as a ‘structural’ one?) |
| Solidity-fluidity (is reality, a space, a condition etc. constructed as a stable, fixed and ‘everlasting’ phenomenon or as something fluid, ‘ongoing’ and changing?) |
| Homogeneity-heterogeneity (is reality, a person, group of people, ‘thing’, space, practice etc. constructed as homogeneous (being uniform in structure) or as heterogeneous, as diversified and pluralistic?) |
| Particularity-universality (is a ‘thing’, problem, condition, process etc. constructed as particular/unique or rather as universal/general?) |
| Consensus-antagonism (is a space, society, condition, process etc. constructed as harmonious/consensual or rather as conflict-oriented/antagonistic?) |

The aim here is to postulate the most basic kinds of intellectual categories that journalism as well as other practices (scientific, aesthetic, everyday talk etc.) make use of when discursively dealing with social material reality (society). This figure is, however, hardly representative of all the possible kinds of ‘mental’ categories that may be involved in journalism’s structuring of reality (further categories could certainly be added). But, provided that one is briefly scanning the entire content of, for example, a newspaper, it ought to be possible to relate and to somehow ‘place’ most of the materials within these above-presented categories. In its intellectual/practical interaction with social material reality, journalism is consequently presumed to constantly
oscillate between these contradictory elements: between the private and the public, the simplistic and the complex, the solid and the fluid etc.

To scientifically analyse media discourse as ‘modes of writing’ should thus initially involve an investigation of the way in which reality is constructed ‘within’ and in relation to these categories, or more precisely, to study the journalistic act of consciously choosing, or unconsciously deciding, to construct social material reality (an object, space, practice, problem etc.) in accordance with one of the ‘elements’ rather than with the other. Is a particular phenomenon being constructed as consensual or antagonistic, homogeneous or heterogeneous, private or public (and so forth). To journalistically write in accordance with a particular mode is, for example, to construct a social process in a simplistic/reduced manner (rather than in an ambiguous/complex way), to construct a territory as a private one (rather than public) and so forth. To construct a crowd of people as an anonymous mass (homogeneity) or as a flow of diversity and individualism (heterogeneity) are, consequently, two separate journalistic modes of constructing one and the same object (a crowd).

A mode is thus possible to observe at the so called macro-oriented level (i.e. the overall ‘form’), while it is simultaneously characterised by particular features at the so-called micro-level, involving the syntactic and lexical features of the matter that is journalistically constructed. When a space, practice, object etc. is constructed in accordance with a particular mode, with what specific kinds of syntactic and lexical instruments is this mode accomplished and realised? With what rhetorical means and strategies?

With modes of writing, I am primarily imagining rather fundamental ways of organising and structuring reality, potentially operating ‘within’ all sorts of different journalistic styles (in commercially driven as well as in less commercially driven journalism), and within different journalistic genres (economic journalism, political journalism, sports journalism etc.). What one could, however, reflect upon, is whether or not some of the presented ‘elements’ explicitly refer to the very ‘nature’ of journalism – while other ‘elements’ do not? To go for simplicity, antagonism, contingency (the rare and occasional) and the particular (the unique, the extreme), are not these what journalism is more or less about (see Hartley 1995, 75–86) – in contrast to science, for example, which is instead built upon the investigation of structures, the general and universal? As a suggestion, the important matter in this context is to consider the matter from a relative point of view. Even if the mass media (in general) are known for their production of, for example, simplicity (rather than complexity), it is still the case that, in the mass media, certain events and issues tend to be constructed in a more simplistic manner than others – and, consequently, it is these relative differences
within the general practice of journalism that I am particularly interested in (see also Berglez 2000, 194–195).

**2. The mode of writing as a structural product**

A journalistic mode of writing can never be a neutral form. A mode of writing is consequently an ideological mode (Thompson 1990). Since modes involve a discursive handling of social material relations, they can never be freed from the involvement of power (Foucault 1984), underlying conflicts (Gramsci 2000, Laclau & Mouffe 1985, Mouffe 2003), nor the presence of economic interests, political desires, historical traditions etc.

It is, however, exactly this condition that generates the will and motivation to scientifically study modes in the first place. To formulate critical questions about *why journalists write in accordance with this or that mode*. However, in order to approach an answer to such a question, one is forced to somehow try to dissect the ‘body’ of the current mode. To analyse, as far as possible, what de facto constitutes a mode:

```
  economic interests \  background/biography of the journalist
  class              traditions/routines/policies in the media inst.

  national and sociocultural context  \  political interests/tradition/agenda
```

In this figure I have sought to collect the most important structural ‘ingredients’ that might possibly shape the journalistic practice, although, I am aware of the fact that the figure is hardly complete. Consequently, the core matter here is, to use political economy’s terminology, the determination of the modes; i.e. what kinds of underlying structural forces could possibly explain the presence of a particular mode of writing? For example, in the news, why is a particular health issue constructed as a private problem (as the person’s own problem) rather than as a public one (as society’s responsibility)? Why do certain political ideals or practices appear as permanent (as solid and ‘everlasting’), while others are constructed as temporary, momentary or declining? Why is that particular space (like a nation state) constructed as a culturally homogeneous, consensual territory rather than as a contradictory and antagonistic kind of place? Why is that group of people constructed as a homogenous ‘mob’ rather than as a complex assembly of enlightened individuals? (and so forth). In order to explain such matters,
here is a more precise definition of the structural dimensions that I primarily take into consideration:

*The background/biography of the journalist:* Even if journalism, like all institutional practices, is characterised by structural constraints (Ekström & Nohrstedt 1996, 33), it does not exclude the possibility of considering journalistic discourse as a co-product of the particular individual journalist and his/her particular biography, interests, goals, desires etc. This condition might manifest itself to different degrees depending on the context (is it a matter of ‘hard’ foreign news or a ‘soft’, personal causerie?) as well as in relation to different factors (the status and authority of the particular journalist etc.).

*Traditions/routines/policies in the media institution:* Traditions, routines or policies within the media institution, or within a particular department, potentially explain the presence of particular modes of writing. The continuing journalistic mode of constructing, for example, the EU as a homogenous bureaucratic ‘thing’ (rather than a heterogeneous flow of particular national interests) could be ‘rooted’ within the media institutional milieu, being based on conscious considerations (‘this is the way in which our journalism constructs such things’) – or on unconscious stereotypes (Lippman 1997) – being intimately intertwined with miscellaneous everyday journalistic routines (Tuchman 1978) including the use of graphical and technical means etc.

*Economic interests:* Newspapers, like DN and Delo, are part of the capitalist market economy due to the fact that their production of news is a profit-maximising activity. While DN belongs to the international media conglomerate of Bonniers Corp., Delo is a media enterprise (including other media), and is listed on the Ljubljana stock exchange. It is possible to assume that these elite media are trying to secure and enlarge economic profit through the practice of *journalistic values* (to provide the customers with qualitative ‘hard news’ and information in contrast to the yellow press) as well as so called *market values*, i.e. the strategic focus on what in particular *sells* (McManus 1994). Regarding the latter, for example, a particular mode of writing could more or less be selected for its explicit ‘commercial attractiveness’ (for example, the commercial attractiveness of simplifying instead of focusing on complex structures, of going for the particular/unique rather than the universal/general etc.).

*Class:* In Western capitalist societies, elite media (like DN and Delo) to varying extents function as everyday watchdogs on behalf of the (bourgeois) upper middle-class and middle class and its particular interests (the magnitude of this ‘defence mechanism’ depends on more exactly how leftist/rightist the particular mass medium is, as well as on the socio-economic position and political leanings of the journalistic staff as a whole etc.). However, it is here assumed that particular modes of writing are consciously performed in order to protect certain class interests – and/or that class interests are reproduced unconsciously through an unreflective, routinised use of particular modes. Within a media institution, class structures and beliefs could however interact
with, as well as be challenged by, other identities (gender, ethnicity, sexuality etc.), while, consequently, these latter identities could also be seen as relevant factors for understanding the choice and constitution of miscellaneous modes of writing (see Carter, Branston & Allan 1998).

**Political interests/traditions/agenda:** A news medium (including its owners) could have more or less developed political interests and traditions, and/or a so called political agenda, that is defended openly and explicitly in the editorial section while more implicitly and unconsciously in other departments. The choice, or presence, of a particular mode of writing could consequently be generated by particular underlying political desires (expressing the protection of a certain group or socio-economic strata [see Class]; or the ideological defence of certain institutions, organisations, countries, political actions etc.). Following Schlesinger (1991), elite news media necessarily include political and economic journalists who operate as ‘counter-insurgency’ thinkers; i.e. journalists whose function is to sustain hegemonic status quo in society; for the sake of ‘….the prevention of revolution’ (Schlesinger 1991, 66).

**The national, historical and sociocultural context:** the choice of various modes of writing in different news contexts could be explained by the fact that the current mass media more or less internalise socioculturally established traditions, interests, worldviews, or socio-psychological ‘states’ (like xenophobia, anxiety etc.) operating within a nation state or national culture (Anderson 1991, Chouliaraki 1999); or a society (Hall 1996:a, van Dijk 1988).

In sum, then, more precisely why everyday journalism performs a particular mode of writing in a particular context is thus related to a complex, contradictory as well as antagonistic interplay between underlying economic interests, political desires, journalistic routines, sociocultural mechanisms etc.

**(3) The mode of writing as a dialectical force**

The above presented analytical ‘stage’ or level (the structural constitution of the mode) is a relevant one; while, still, it is not adequate enough to provide us with a more complete insight into what a mode of writing actually is. The principal limitation of this level of analysis is that a mode of writing tends to appear as a passive ‘end-product’, i.e. as a discursive ‘object’ that is ‘multi-caused’ by ‘surrounding’ forces (the economy, political strategies, socioculture etc.). It is further problematic that, at this level of scientific analysis, the mode appears as an isolated ‘thing’, being somehow separated from (external to) the ‘things’ that presumably shape or cause it. For these reasons it is necessary for the analysis of modes of writing to move forward. The analysis must proceed to a more complex level in which one explicitly focuses on the inherent power of a mode and the way in
which it is intimately intertwined with the ongoing production of society (as a whole). What I have in mind here is consequently the need for a dialectical analysis of modes of writing.

**Dialectics**

Dialectical analysis is nowadays associated with Marx’s analysis of capitalism, who in turn was relying on a philosophical tradition that includes names such as Aristotle, Spinoza, Leibniz and Hegel. In everyday language, dialectics is often primarily associated with ‘development through contradiction’ (the thesis-antithesis-synthesis way of conceptualising the development of human history). However, in the dialectical analysis, one is initially supposed to (1) analyse reality as a process in constant motion; and furthermore to (2) interrelate seemingly isolated ‘things’ in order to demonstrate their deep interdependency. The most basic aim of dialectical analysis is thus to expose reality as being a complex set of ongoing relations between material practices, actions, beliefs, discourses, systems etc. The dialectical mode of scientific thought thus defines itself in sharp contrast to the kind of research that instead studies isolated forms (the isolated study of the isolated ‘thing’ called ‘language’, ‘the economy’, ‘gender’, ‘culture’ etc.) and/or that separates aspects of reality that are de facto deeply interwoven (mind and matter, the material and language etc.):

The dialectic is a process and not a thing and it is, furthermore, a process in which the Cartesian separations between mind and matter, between thought and action, between consciousness and materiality, between theory and practice have no purchase (Harvey 1996, 48).

Dialectical thinking emphasizes the understanding of processes, flows, fluxes, and relations over the analysis of elements, things, structures, and organized systems. /.../ There is a deep ontological principle involved here, for dialecticians in effect hold that elements, things, structures, and systems do not exist outside of or prior to the processes, flows, and relations that create, sustain, or undermine them (Harvey 1996, 49).

In dialectical analysis, what primarily counts is how objects, processes, ‘wholes’ etc. are constituted through miscellaneous relations, primarily internal relations (Ollman 2003, 51–56). A classic example of an internal relation is that between the master and the slave in which it is pointed out that without a master there cannot be a slave and vice versa (Sayer 1992, 89). One ‘parts’ existence is dependent on the existence of some other ‘part’; while, consequently, the ‘parts’ mutually constitute each other, as well as a structural ‘whole’ (i.e. the power structure of a master-slave relationship). The gender structure in a society, to take another example, could be considered an ongoing ‘whole’ that is constantly being constituted by miscella-
neous ‘parts’, i.e. of various discursive and material practices that are internally related. Furthermore, in dialectical analysis the ‘capitalist economy’ is thus not viewed as an abstract, ‘macro-oriented’ structural greatness that somehow determines miscellaneous ‘micro-phenomena’, such as media discourse. Media discourse is rather analysed as a potential integral dynamic ‘part’ of an ongoing ‘whole’; a ‘part’ being more or less internally related to all other ‘parts’ that constitute the material relations of the capitalist economy.

**On the reification of language**

To begin with, to bring scientific analysis up to the level of dialectics means that the ‘things’ that in the previous section were listed as ‘things’ that somehow determine or ‘cause’ the current modes of writing (national culture, political traditions, socioculture etc.) are instead treated as processes that are themselves partly constituted by language use (and hence by journalistic writing and modes). The reality-constitutive power of language use is thus an essential dimension that must be included in the overall understanding of modes. However, in this context it is crucially important to emphasise that it is this particular scientific mission, the demonstration of the discursive dimension of reality, that somehow went too far during the eighties and nineties. The so called cultural and linguistic turn stimulated extended and exaggerated interpretations of central poststructuralist contributions (Derrida, Foucault, Laclau & Mouffe etc.), and unfortunately, the role of language concerning the constitution or reality became overelaborated, leading to what Mosco (1996) defines as communicative essentialism or what Palmer (1990) refers to as the reification of language. The specific interest in the discursive dimension of the economy, culture, gender, identity etc. tended to generate a sense that these phenomena are somehow (immaterial) discourses (see Carey 1989, Grossberg 1995 etc.). In the same way as orthodox materialist reductionism of necessity degenerates into non-dialectics (in which reality as a whole, collapses into ‘material relations’), the exaggerated emphasis on the ‘discursive’ tends to neglect and even abolish the dialectical dimension of reality, i.e. how processes (like the economy, identity etc.) are necessarily constituted by complex relations between material conditions/practices and discourse (language use).
The dialectical analysis of modes of writing

A rather natural element in dialectical analysis is the focus on the relationship between parts and wholes, in which ‘...parts and wholes are mutually constitutive of each other’ (Harvey 1996, 53). A dialectical analysis of modes of writing of the cultural materialist kind specifically involves the (potential) dialectics between, on the one hand, a journalistic writing practice, and on the other, the kind of ‘structural whole’ that is considered to be most fundamental, consequently, a mode of production. This initially leads us back to our theoretical hobbyhorse: the base/superstructure distinction. In the below example, Andrew Collier (1989) questions the kind of Marxian theory that continually stresses the superstructural (second-hand) status of language use in the context of material relations and production; while rather arguing that language use (or what he signifies as ideas) should be seen as related to other ‘parts’ of a current ‘process of production’:

The metaphor of a ‘superstructure’ sounds rather odd if it is used to refer to a carpenter saying ‘Pass me that hammer, Bill, will you?’ – leaving the passing of the hammer and the hammering that ensued as part of the ‘base’. At this level it is best to say: ideas are an aspect of the process of production (Collier 1989, 55).

It is not difficult to agree with Collier that, in this context, it would be rather strange to strictly separate the material from the ‘immaterial’, and to comprehend the discursive activity (‘Pass me that hammer...’) as somehow ‘determined’ by the physical doings (the building process). It is more reasonable to think that this is a ‘process of production’ in which language use and the physical actions commonly constitute a ‘complex whole’. It is therefore in this manner that it becomes possible to endorse Williams’ (1977) suggestion that discursive activity (talking/writing) is a particular ‘productive force’ potentially intertwined with other (and materially deeper) dimensions of production (see also Peck 2003).

It is possible to apply Collier’s example in a more metaphorical sense in order to grasp the particular role and function of everyday media discourse in society. More precisely one could imagine the current everyday flow of media discourse as the communicative activity in Collier’s example (‘Pass me that hammer...’), while this particular activity is then more or less internally related to miscellaneous ‘building and hammering practices’ (other ‘production activities’) within a ‘complex whole’ (within a particular mode of production operating in a society).

Hence, the mode of production of particular interest in this context is capitalism, which is a globally operating ‘complex totality’ that is presumed to be built upon an ongoing web of discursive/social/material processes. It is however important to stress that capitalism is not a sutured structure. In
accordance with Bhaskar’s (1977) suggestion, a ‘structural whole’ (like capitalism) should instead be considered a *dysfunctional* totality. It is dysfunctional in terms of never really being ‘closed’ or ‘completed’ but instead being complex, contradictory, open, unpredictable and dynamic. Harvey (1996) imagines a discursive/social/material totality exactly in terms of a dysfunctional, i.e. *incomplete* whole, constituted by constantly ongoing (more or less internal) relations between the following kinds of moments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse/language</th>
<th>Power</th>
<th>Beliefs/values/desires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social relations</td>
<td></td>
<td>Institutions/rituals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Material practices  

(Harvey 1996, 78)

Harvey then suggests that discourse/language (in our case: modes of writing) is a moment, that, like other moments in the above figure, internalises all the other moments; i.e. the moments somehow exist and operate *within* each other:

Each moment is constituted as an internal relation of the others within the flow of social and material life. Discourses internalize in some sense everything that occurs at the other moments (Harvey 1996, 80).

When analysing modes of writing it is possible to make use of Harvey’s framework as an overall source of inspiration. The particular questions that should be raised in this context are thus of the following kind: When journalism is discursively constructing an object/practice/space/problem etc., what kinds of power relations, social relations etc. can be ‘seen’ ‘within’ the current mode of writing? In what manners is the journalistic mode related to miscellaneous other practices – i.e. other ongoing social material practices in society? The overall aim of the analysis of relations in this manner is therefore to detect what kinds of discursive/social/material processes that are being produced (ongoing processes like, for example, private property, circulation of capital etc.).

To summarise all this in a more cultural materialist manner: Within the context of a mode of production (as a ‘complex whole’), more specifically what kinds of processes do various journalistic modes of writing (as ‘parts’) co-constitute along with other ‘parts’ operating in society, i.e. other possible practices, relations and activities?
**In conclusion**

The purpose is then to attempt to analyse the selected media discourse as modes of writing, and to do it in the proposed threefold way: as a journalistic practice, structural product and dialectical force. With the integration of the level of dialectics in the above presented way, this symbolic/discursive practice (a mode of writing) turns into an *ideological* practice, but perhaps not exactly in the manner that for example Thompson (1990, 1995) suggests. Thompson consequently defines an ideological practice as serving, ‘...in particular circumstances, to establish and sustain relations of domination’ (Thompson 1995, 213). One could however reflect upon whether it is enough to stress that a mode of writing is potentially serving, establishing, sustaining etc. relations of domination, (i.e. the dominant mode of production). It is perhaps necessary to add to this, in accordance with Raymond Williams’ reasoning, that an ideological practice, such as a mode of writing, is an *integrative, constitutive part* of relations of domination/the dominant mode of production while, consequently, the aim of this study is to somehow demonstrate this condition in the particular context of (qualitative) news discourse analysis.
Method

Cultural materialist CDA

The qualitative analyses of modes are accomplished through critical discourse analysis (CDA). The relatively short history of CDA involves the process of successively going from formal linguistics to more socially engaged modes of language analysis (sociolinguistics, social semiotics etc.) and further towards full-scale analyses of the complex relationship between language use, institutional practices and encompassing social structures (Fairclough 1995, Chouliaraki & Fairclough 1999). CDA represents a partly ‘de-linguistic’ way of analysing linguistic phenomena. Syntax and grammar are supposed to be scientifically examined – although never for their own sake, but rather because of their intertwined relationship with social material reality as a whole. Hence central CDA-analysts conceptualize:

/…/ discourse – language use in speech and writing – as a form of ‘social practice’. Describing discourse as social practice implies a dialectical relationship between a particular discursive event and the situation(s), institution(s) and social structure(s) which frame it: the discursive event is shaped by them, but is also shaping them (Fairclough & Wodak 1997, 258).

This study’s identification with CDA is mainly based on two factors. First due to the fact that CDA is inspired by the tradition of critical theory (Morrow 1994) and its analytic focus on relations of power (repression, antagonism, discrimination, exploitation etc.). Second, due to CDA’s orientation towards a dialectical understanding of reality (see Fairclough 2001) and the mutual relationship between language use and reality as ‘a whole’ in the constitution of politics, economic systems, history etc. Particular representatives of CDA are furthermore in dialogue with cultural materialist thinking, being engaged with the question of how to analyse the complex interplay between the discursive and the ‘non-discursive’ (Chouliaraki & Fairclough 1999, 28–29, Fairclough 2001).

CDA is an interdisciplinary research field (Weiss & Wodak 2003) that could be based on relatively diverse theoretical and methodological traditions, while, in this particular study the purpose is to apply CDA in a cultural materialist manner. The current CDA-approach and method will be introduced and clarified step by step in the below sections. The following matters will be discussed: (a) the collection of empirical materials; (b) the initial, first-step CDA of the empirical material; (c) the identification of 8 separate modes of writing and the character of the deepened and developed CDA of these modes. The overall research design is thereafter discussed in
relation to questions on (d) scientific generalisations as well as to (e) reliability and validity.

The first-step CDA

The collection of empirical material

The below figure demonstrates the empirical material that has been collected from the three selected cases of media coverage. Due to the quantitative scope of the media reporting from the war in former Yugoslavia (YU) and the 9/11 event, it has been necessary to pick out particular days. In the case of YU, I have chosen to start on 24 March 1999 (the day before the military intervention) and to proceed three days forward, while in the other case I have selected materials from 12 September (the day after the attack) and the two following days. The choice of days is strategic, being related to my interest in the media reporting of an event in its initial phase, supposedly involving journalism’s initial and somehow spontaneous interpretation of the current event. In the case of the IMF/WB summit in Prague it has however been possible to include all items (i.e. the whole media coverage).

| NATO’s military intervention in former Yugoslavia: 24, 25, 26 and 27 March 1999 (the initial phase of the military intervention): | 139 items, i.e. articles, photographs or graphic representations (as statistics, models, illustrations etc.) (70 from Swedish DN, 69 from Slovenian Delo). |
| The IMF/WB summit in Prague: 24, 25, 26, 27 and 28 September 2000 (the whole coverage): | 43 items (27 from DN, 15 from Delo). Including an article from 30 September (from the weekly cultural edition). |
| The WTC terror attack: 12, 13 and 14 September 2001: | 256 items (177 from DN, 79 from Delo). |

One should make a note of the quantitative difference between DN and Delo when it comes to the number of items. DN’s 9/11 coverage consists of 177 items, Delo’s 79. This kind of ‘national difference’ is in itself a relevant object of scientific investigation (integrated with the forthcoming analysis of some of the modes). However, already at this stage it is possible to mention at least two possible reasons. The first one is that, generally speaking, when Delo covers an event is makes use of relatively few, though text-rich, articles, while DN instead goes in for more, though shorter, ones. The second reason is that the Swedish newspaper, generally speaking, publishes far more photographs and graphic representations.
The first-step CDA of the 438 items

The initial CDA is partly of the descriptive kind (the mapping of the central content of every item) and partly of the qualitative analytic kind in which the purpose is to detect possible underlying (ideological) structures in each and every item. The items are mapped and analysed in accordance with the following criteria (for more detailed information, see appendix):

The position of the item: the registration of the spatial placing of the item (front page, foreign news section, economy section, arts/culture section, sports section etc.).

Headline(-s): the registration of the headline, including subheadline(-s) placed above or/and underneath the headline.

Introduction/preamble: the registration of the introduction (as a whole).

Thematic structure: the mapping and definition of the main content of an item, involving the main theme (or topic) and the related sub-themes (see also van Dijk 1988).

Ideological problem: This moment is assumed to achieve the initial abduction of the empirical material in terms of transgressing the everyday understanding of the current item (the news article etc.), i.e. to describe the current discourse as something else than it initially appears to be (Danermark, Ekström et al. 2002, 88–95). ‘Underneath’ the manifest ‘text’, i.e. the concrete presence of words and sentences – is there something else going on; something less obvious or visible? Does the particular phenomenon (the particular piece of discourse) rather express a more general and all encompassing matter; a social structure of some kind, some historic conflict or antagonistic relation etc.? The abductive inferences are thus navigated towards the search for structures, conflicts etc., possibly related to the capitalistic hegemonic order.

Linguistic structures and elements: Provided that the current item can be abducted in the above-described manner, more precisely what kinds of textual materials does this concern? The headline and/or the introduction of an article? Particular discursive extracts from an article (and so forth)? The relevant linguistic elements are thus registered for the sake of forthcoming analysis.

In sum: It is necessary to make a note of the fact that not all items are news articles, but can be photographs, graphic contributions etc. The analyses of such items can therefore not be wholly accomplished in accordance with the above formulated criteria. In the case of photographs (as well as when it
comes to graphics) what is registered and analysed is their denotative and connotative meanings, interpreted in relation to the news article(-s) that interact with these visual artefacts.

**The further abduction of the news material**
The initial CDA and the abductive inferences of the 438 items (the **ideological problem** moment) has paved the way for a narrowing down of the empirical material, resulting into the identification of particular (1) ideologemes (2) modes of writing and so called (3) sub-modes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. The ideologeme</th>
<th>2. The mode of writing</th>
<th>3. Sub-mode(-s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The overall discursive construction of 'society' (the YU/Kosovo War and 9/11 coverage)</td>
<td>The <strong>Multi-colouring mode</strong> (DN) vs the <strong>Greying mode</strong> (Delo)</td>
<td>(subordinated, contrasting, counteracting or complementing modes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The journalistic construction of the arrival of the political/financial representatives in Prague; and the construction of public space (the IMF/WB coverage)</td>
<td>The <strong>Remote control mode</strong> (DN/Delo)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The journalistic construction of the social organisation of the political demonstrations in Prague (the IMF/WB coverage)</td>
<td><strong>Differentiation</strong> (DN)</td>
<td>The 'unifying' mode (DN/Delo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The journalistic construction of the political action and 'behaviour' of the politicans and demonstrators in Prague (the IMF/WB coverage)</td>
<td><strong>Semitic compression</strong> (DN/Delo)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The journalistic construction of ‘national culture’ – of the ‘Serbs’ and ‘Kosovo Albanians’ (the YU/Kosovo War coverage)</td>
<td><strong>Locking</strong> (DN)</td>
<td>The ‘complexity-generating’ mode (DN/Delo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The journalistic construction of the US (the 9/11 coverage)</td>
<td><strong>Disconnection</strong> (DN/Delo)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The journalistic explanatory discourse on 9/11 – why did it happen? (the 9/11 coverage)</td>
<td><strong>Cognitive recycling</strong> (DN/Delo)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. On ideologemes: The abductions of the items have resulted in the identification of a limited number of ideologemes. The concept of ideologeme is borrowed from Fredric Jameson (1993) who defines it as the particular moment in text analysis when the interpreter is confronted with a traumatic wound within the text, a wound which, in the last instance, is assumed to be related to the economic infrastructure and class relations (Jameson 1993, 108–109). In this context, then, an ideologeme represents a substantial news discursive ‘area’ in which a conflict, struggle, interest, economic structure etc. is operating. The identified ideologemes thus involve the journalistic construction of space, identity, social relationships, political engagement etc. (see the figure). In six of the analyses (of modes) the identified ideologeme has been found in one particular case of media coverage (in the Prague, YU/Kosovo or 9/11 news coverage), while the exception here is the (common) ideologeme of the Multi-colouring mode (DN) and the Greying mode (Delo). The ideologeme here is ‘the discursive construction of society’; a rather ‘broad’ and abstract ideologeme that consequently operates in the current newspapers in general (in all of their cases of news coverage – more or less).

2. On modes of writing: It is in the more detailed qualitative analysis of an ideologeme that a mode of writing is supposed to appear. An ideologeme is consequently built upon one or several modes, i.e. of ‘particular ways of cognitively-discursively structuring social material reality’ (see p. 51), while the modes are possible to more concretely trace and fix through certain journalistic cognitive-discursive categories, such as the private vs the public, heterogeneity vs homogeneity, simplicity vs complexity etc. A mode of writing thus ‘happens’ when journalism chooses to construct an object, space, problem etc. in accordance with one of the opposite elements (for example, when an object is constructed as heterogeneous – but not as homogeneous).

How ‘much’ news material is needed to infer the empirical presence of a mode? There is no exact quantitative criterion formulated in this context, although, it is logical that only one sentence, appearing on one occasion in one article cannot be considered enough. In the news coverage of an event, a mode of writing is rather supposed to go on simultaneously within several items. A mode is thus essentially a structural phenomenon that transcends, i.e. that crosses and operates ‘right through’ miscellaneous items (news articles etc.) and their particular narrative wholes (the article form). A mode should therefore rather be interpreted as this ‘great journalistic style’ that somehow ‘violates’ the manifest cognitive and discursive divisions/borders in a newspaper (i.e. the cognitive dividing and organisation of reality as separate news articles etc.).
As a result of the first-step CDA, this study thus identifies eight relevant modes of writing (see the figure). These eight modes are supposed to represent the most valid and relevant ‘objects’ for analysing the relationship between the current news media discourse and the capitalist hegemonic order. Each and every mode is conceptually baptised in accordance with its assumed function or role (i.e. *semiotic compression* is a journalistic mode of writing that constructs reality in a rather compressed manner – and so forth). Due to different analytical observations of the news material, the qualitative analyses of these modes are structured in partly different ways;

*The Remote control mode, Semiotic compression, Disconnection and Cognitive recycling involve modes of writing, operating strongly in both newspapers.*

*Differentiation and Locking involve modes, operating strongly in one of the newspapers* (but not in the other one). These analyses thus open up the possibility of inferring the presence of ‘national differences’ (among other relevant aspects).

*The Multi-colouring and the Greying modes involve two different modes, but with the same ideologeme (the overall discursive construction of society).* These modes appear in each of the newspapers, thereby paving the way for a ‘national’ comparative analysis. These analyses are furthermore different from the above presented ones as the ideologeme includes news materials from *two* sets of media coverage (The YU War and 9/11).

3. **On sub-modes.** In the third column above, the sub-modes are presented. These (subordinated) modes potentially co-constitute, complement, counteract etc. the eight ‘superior’ modes. As an example, within the ideologeme ‘the journalistic construction of national culture’, what is primarily being identified and analysed is the *locking mode*, which is a mode that operates in DN but not in Delo. However, within the same ideologeme, in DN as well as in Delo, what is also found is this other, contrasting mode (the ‘complexity-making’ mode), which is thereby included in the analysis of the *locking mode*.

The identified and selected eight ‘core’ modes are scientifically relevant due to their assumed connection or relationship to the capitalist hegemonic order. However, for the analysis of media discourse and capitalism, sub-modes should also be considered relevant. The question then is: why have the selected eight modes been prioritised in the first place; why do they achieve special treatment? Why are they considered more relevant for scientific analysis than the so called sub-modes? The eight modes are analytically prioritised as a combination of the following three criteria;
– far-reaching ideological implications; modes that are possible to analyse ‘the whole dialectic way’ are prioritised, i.e. journalistic modes that are, rather explicitly, dialectically intertwined with certain material practices, social relations etc. within the context of a capitalist mode of production – or the kinds of journalistic modes that operate in sharp contrast to some economic/material dimension of the capitalist mode (see further below: on dialectical analysis).

– strong power and appearance; the more a mode appears as a structural phenomenon in the news, the more relevant for analysis (i.e. the more item-transgressive, the better). As an extension of this criterion;

– structural magnitude; modes with extensive structural ‘breadth’ are prioritised, such as for example modes that, within their structural constitution, embrace other, so called subordinated modes (i.e. a mode could be built upon a relationship between two sub-modes).

The second-step CDA
The deepened and developed analysis of the eight identified modes includes the items that belong to the defined ideologemes (in several cases one and the same item appears in different ideologemes); i.e. all news discursive materials that constitute the current modes as well as the possible sub-mode(-s). For more detailed information on the empirical constellation of every particular analysis, see appendix. The second-step CDA thus includes the following three parts: (a) the discourse analysis of the mode, (b) the analysis of the structural constitution of the mode, and (c) the cultural materialist dialectical analysis of the mode.

(a) The discourse analysis of the mode
Initially the discursive structure and character of the mode (and possible interrelated sub-modes) is analysed. The analysis must demonstrate the way in which the mode is practically accomplished, and the way in which it operates as a structural phenomenon in the news. Furthermore, since a mode of writing is of necessity ideological, the analysis of discourse becomes very much an analysis of argumentation. For example, the remote control mode is analysed in relation to the cognitive-discursive category of the private vs the public, while the core observation in this context is that the Swedish and Slovenian news media tend to construct the streets and squares of the city of Prague as private property. The analysis then concerns: more precisely with what kinds of syntactic means is the current mode operating (i.e. through sentences and relations between sentences)? When constructing space as private, with what lexical instruments is the mode produced (the choice of particular words)? More generally, what is important in this analytic context is the relationship between the present (the observable ‘text’)
and absent (Fairclough 1995, 203) and how the presence of one perspective, view, belief etc. might indicate the absence and repression of another one (the absence of another mode of discursively constructing the current matter). Even though this discourse analysis is mostly related to news text extracts and photographs, in two cases (The Multi-colouring mode and the Greying mode) it also includes a more detailed analysis of the front page structure. In these two analyses, and in Differentiation, the discourse analysis is also complemented with minor quantitative studies.

Due to the social scientifically oriented approach of analysing modes of writing, the analysis of linguistic elements is supposed to be situated at a ‘semi-detailed’ level. What is performed here is a kind of CDA that analyses grammar, syntax etc. in a less detailed manner than, for example CA, though it is simultaneously endowed with a more detailed analytic interest in discourse than miscellaneous sociological research, which instead tends to consider language use as a second hand matter for the understanding of material practices, social structures etc. (a problem that is still present in the social sciences in general – see Chouliaraki & Fairclough 1999, 28, Fairclough, Jessop & Sayer 2003).

(b) The structural constitution of the mode
The next analytic step involves the analysis of the structural constitution of the current mode. Consequently, the initial identification and abstraction of a mode requires abductive inferences, while, in the analysis of a mode’s structural constitution the intellectual process instead proceeds into retroductions (Danermark, Ekström et al. 2002, 96–98). When retroducing the current ‘object’ one formulates the rather fundamental questions: How is this mode possible? What particular properties must exist for this mode to be a mode? What causal mechanisms are related to the current mode? (Danermark, Ekström et al. 2002, 110). In the above discussion of modes of writing, the following presumably central factors were briefly introduced: the background/biography of the particular journalist, the traditions/routines/policies of the particular media institution, economic interests and strategies (the profit-maximising rationale), class, political interests/traditions/agenda, and the national, historical and sociocultural context (see p. 55–56 in this study).

Retroductive labour is not only supposed to present the various causal mechanisms that possibly constitute the current mode, but to also focus on the way in which the causal factors are related and more exactly how they jointly constitute the mode (Danermark, Ekström et al. 2002, 96–97). In this particular context, the retroductive operations are, however, kept at the rather basic level. They primarily aim to detect the most fundamental
underlying mechanisms that constitute the mode. Further analyses of the complex relations between the various causal mechanisms are instead restricted, while this decision is primarily related to the (limited) nature of the empirical material in this study (news discourse). For more advanced retroductions, what would be needed are ethnographic studies of news production, empirical observations on ‘what is de facto going on’ in the news room, and depth interviews with journalists etc. (see Schlesinger 1987, McManus 1994, Ekström & Nohrstedt 1996, Eriksson 2002).

(c) The dialectical analysis of the mode
The third task consists of analysing the journalistic mode as a dialectical ‘productive’ force, i.e. as a potentially internal, integrative ‘part’ of a ‘complex whole’ (such as the capitalist system). In order to demonstrate the current method, I will initially return to Harvey’s (1996, 78) figure. To begin with, in order to make the figure slightly clearer, I have complemented it with a particular piece of information. More precisely, in the center I have placed private property, which exemplifies a particular ongoing discursive/social/material process that is internally related to the whole ongoing process of a global capitalist system:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language/discourse (as a journalistic ‘mode of writing’)</th>
<th>Power</th>
<th>Beliefs/values/desires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private property</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social relations</td>
<td></td>
<td>Institutions/rituals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First, the existence of private property is of necessity dependent on the existence of all these moments, i.e. one cannot imagine this process irrespective of material practices, social relations, power, language use etc. Second, the current process is necessarily constituted by ongoing internal relations between these moments. Third, there is a relative autonomy between the moments which indicates that none of them could entirely colonise or explain the others, nor could one moment by itself explain the process.

In contrast to certain variants of discourse analysis, it is not the particular moment language/discourse that is analysed in this context, but this moment’s complex dialectical relationship to material practices (as well as to other moments). This scientific task is, however, endowed with particular difficulties. It is one thing to somehow theoretically assume that the moments
mutually affect and constitute each other, but is another thing to try to *demonstrate* the way in which they are de facto internally related. More precisely, how could one possibly ‘see’ this matter? How should one formulate a *cultural materialist method* for such an analytic operation?

**Dysfunctional homologies**
The kind of dialectical analysis that I intend to apply in this context is related to something called *dysfunctional homologies*. The hypothesis is that, through the analysis of dysfunctional homologies, it becomes possible to concretely demonstrate the internal relations between the outlined ‘moments’, while this analysis will particularly concentrate on the prioritised internal relation for cultural materialism: i.e. the one between language/discourse and material practices. However, my intention to clarify the dialectical approach begins with the imagination of a certain scenario. More precisely it involves the scenario of a news coverage of some event, in which, what is being observed in the current newspaper, in several articles, is:

**the journalistic mode of constructing a particular space as private (rather than as public)**

In this hypothetical news coverage, the ‘private property discourse’ is detected as a structural phenomenon, i.e. as a macro-oriented ‘form’ (as a certain mode of writing), while it is empirically traced and decomposed into miscellaneous micro-phenomena, for example, through particular verbal comments being included in the news reporting (a woman quoted in the news saying; *This street is private property!* etc.).

The rather fundamental question that I intend to raise is the following: In what way is it possible to scientifically conclude that the current discursive mode is being an integral, dialectic ‘part’ of the whole economic process of private property? How do we de facto *know* that this is the case?

What one is initially confronted with is the assumed autonomy of the various moments, and particularly the unique nature of language and language use (Derrida 1976, Thompson 1981, Ricoeur 1991). One could here recycle Hall’s (1992) emphasis on the elusiveness of language use, that words and sentences always seem to evade and escape ‘the rest of reality’, and are impossible to wholly link to other structures – economic and material ones in particular (Hall 1992, 284).

Keeping the above presented news scenario fresh in mind (on the private property discourse), the suggested elusiveness of language/discourse could thus involve the following issues:

---
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**Intention and interpretation**; the ‘meaning’ of the current mode of discourse is related to the intention, agenda, sociocultural belonging etc. of the journalist/the mass medium as well as to the personal history, sociocultural belonging etc. of the audience. The possible conscious or unconscious journalistic intention to affect and control the minds and actions of the audience could always fail due to semi-oppositional (negotiating) and oppositional interpretations (Hall 1996:b), or perhaps, when ‘reading’ the ‘text’, some interpreters will associate the current news discourse with something totally different than ‘private property’.

**Context**; in what way and more precisely where does the discursive mode appear? If it appears in the editorial section of the *Financial Times* it is possibly co-producing the private property phenomenon, while if it appears in the context of a critical political art exhibition it will potentially achieve the exact opposite, i.e. instead counter-produce the colonising power of private capital (or the like). *It all depends on the context.*

Even if this unstable and complex condition must be taken into consideration; it hardly ‘nullifies’ the analysis of the way in which language use is potentially internally related to material practices. The central assumption of the cultural materialist position is that, irrespective of fleeting contexts and elusive meanings, the link between discourse and the rest of reality cannot be seen as somehow hopelessly disconnected.

In this context, the cultural material dialectical analysis returns to the most basic question: What makes the above imagined mode a potentially integral ‘part’ of the overall capitalist economic process in the first place? The (obvious) answer is that the discursive construction of an object, space etc. as private (rather than public) somehow relates to a process that takes place, ‘goes on’ in ‘real life’ as such – to a process that is partly constituted by language/discourse, but not wholly, but also by something else, as particular material practices. Therefore, what is possible to establish is the occurrence of an underlying coherence or homologous relationship between: (a) the form of the practice of discursively constructing an object, space etc. as private and, (b) the form of a particular material practice, such as, for example, the physical, material activity of decisively enclosing a piece of land with a fence of steel. What makes these two forms homologous is thus that they (potentially) contribute to/achieve the same thing: the capitalist economic process of private property.

The complex task here is to proceed with the observation of a homologous relationship without overstepping the relative autonomy of (a) in relation to (b) and vice versa. If the matter of autonomy is not taken into consideration, one ends up either in linguistic reductionism (reality reduced to discourse or text), or in materialist reductionism. In the latter case, one could relate to the critique against the Marxist researcher Lucien Goldmann
(1973, 1976) and his materialist studies of homologous relationships between the form or ‘mental structures’ of literary works (from Racine to Robbe-Grillet) and the ‘material processes’ of the capitalist economy. Goldmann suggests, for example, that the structural character of the novel form – i.e. the novelistic mode of writing – strictly corresponds to the individualistic nature of the capitalist market economy (Jameson 1993, 77–79). Goldmann’s attempt to wholly overcome the division between mental/discursive processes and material processes has hence been accused of vulgar materialism. When ‘forms of language use’ are immediately translated into ‘material relations’, the autonomy of the previous is totally erased (Eagleton 1978, 39, Jameson 1993, 79, Aspelin 1982, 196).

Goldmann’s homologies are theoretically disturbing, but nevertheless, to settle down in discourse analysis or cultural studies, whose willingness to study the dialectics between language use and material practices is too lacking, is no serious alternative either. Irrespective of the vast complexity of this matter, what a cultural materialist dialectical approach is forced to do here is to try to chisel out an ‘in-between position’. In this study, the suggested analytic ‘third way’ involves the abstraction of dysfunctional homologies, which is instead inspired by critical realism’s theories on the constitution of ‘structural wholes’ (Bhaskar 1977, Collier 1994). A dysfunctional homology, then, indicates that, in a particular context, there is something with the structural composition of a particular mode of talking/writing that somehow makes it ‘converge’ with a certain material practice (and vice versa) but not in the absolute, ‘complete’ way (see Collier 1994, 116–117). In other words, in their homologous relationship the involved ‘moments’ still uphold some kind of relative autonomy (having their own emergent capacities, i.e. unforeseen powers).

To refer back to the above example, there is a process defined as ‘private property’. This process is of necessity co-constituted by the moment of language/discourse, for example by the journalistic mode of constructing a space as private. This mode is then more or less homologous with, for example, the material practice of transforming natural assets into private capital, while furthermore, these ‘forms’ could, at a certain level, be dysfunctionally homologous with the social relation of a ‘bourgeois mode of a private conversation’ (and so forth). The homologous ‘thing’ in this context, i.e. the underlying ‘common denominator’, relies on all these ‘forms’ involving some kind of exclusion (a denial of public access to the space, the natural assets, the conversation). Different moments to different extents, in different contexts, produce a common process. In particular contexts, but only in particular contexts, then, the current journalistic mode, to a certain extent, co-produces the ‘whole’ capitalist private property process – a pro-
cess going on all the time in society through miscellaneous dysfunctionally homologous practices and relations etc.

| Particular modes of writing (language/discourse), material practices, social relations and other possible ‘moments’ become internally related through their mutual constitution and production of one and the same process, while their internal relation is possible to detect, observe and scientifically analyse in terms of the occurrence of dysfunctional homologies (i.e. imperfect or incomplete homologies). |

The power relations between dysfunctionally homologous ‘moments’ are differently stratified in different contexts, with the result that the one which is the most fundamental switches from context to context. For example, in a conversation between two persons, language/discourse, i.e. the practice of talking, is the most basic ‘moment’ for the possible constitution of the particular process (the process of private property), while in another context, it is instead some material practice that is the stronger one (while discourse has second or third-hand relevance).

**Two issues before concluding**

1. **On asymmetric internal relationships.** In order to further endorse the autonomy of language/discourse and to prevent a situation in which the analyses of modes of writing become confused with ‘Goldmannian materialist homologies’, what should be further emphasised is that the above presented example of private property is likely to indicate the occurrence of an asymmetric internal relationship. Such a relationship involves the situation ‘...in which one object in a relation can exist without the other, but not vice versa’ (Sayer 1992, 90). Provided that the discursive practice of constructing reality as ‘private’ could also appear in other societies than in the capitalist one – in other historic contexts etc. – under such circumstances the dialectical internal relationship between the discursive mode and the current capitalist process should rather be conceived as asymmetric. The capitalist system, and its transformation of social material reality into private capital, is dependent on a particular mode of talking/writing (on the discursive construction of space, property etc. as ‘not public’), while this discursive mode is not dependent on the existence of capitalism.

2. **On ‘empty discourse’.** Even though Chouliaraki & Fairclough (1999, 28–29) endorse the cultural material theoretical perspective of Williams (1977, 1980) and Harvey (1996) they critically reflect upon the latter’s view of the internal relationship between language/discourse and material prac-
tice. According to Chouliaraki & Fairclough, Harvey somehow privileges material practice by considering ‘empty discourse’ – the kind of discourse that does not internalise some material practice or action – as ‘less real’ (due to its inability to affect the ‘material reality’). My reaction to this is twofold. To begin with, unlike Chouliaraki & Fairclough, I do not get the sense that Harvey is necessarily privileging material practice, since it is repeatedly claimed that ‘moments’ mutually internalise each other (Harvey 1996, 78–80). This is, as far as I understand, a central principle for the cultural materialist approach. Secondly, I agree with Chouliaraki & Fairclough that the practice of language use (discourse) is real, being endowed with certain powers, also in contexts where there is no internalisation of some material practice. However, from a cultural materialist position, what makes language/discourse into a relevant object for scientific investigation in the first place is its internalisation of some material practice. The core object of study is the relationship between the discursive and the material. ‘Empty words’ are thus not less real than material practices, but, in the cultural materialist context, they become somewhat less relevant objects for scientific analysis.

On generalisations
Science is a particular kind of labour, defined by its striving for general knowledge (Danermark, Ekström et al. 2002, 73). To do science is synonymous with trying to transcend the particular and unique dimensions of reality in order to ‘see’ general patterns, relationships and structures. If there is no desire to transcend the particular, there is no scientific practice (but rather some other practice).

It still happens, sometimes, that the matter of generalisation is mistaken for being exclusively a quantitative affair (see Holme & Solvang 1991, 89). In such contexts the whole matter of generalisation is reduced into empirical inductive modes of thinking, involving how often a phenomenon occurs or is represented, or to what an (exact) extent it is possible to confirm a causal relationship between certain variables. If this particular study were a quantitatively oriented investigation, the striving for generalisations would be related to questions such as; i) how ‘much’ of the capitalist hegemonic system is there to be found in the collected materials? ii) how ‘often’ does this or that pro-hegemonic or counter-hegemonic opinion occur in the coverage? In such a quantitative content analysis it would be possible to include all articles, pictures, headlines etc. from the current body of media coverage and to systematically code the discourse as ‘pro-capitalist’, ‘counter-capitalist’ as well as ‘negotiating’ opinions. The point, consequently, is that empirical generalisations of this kind express only one particular
form of striving for general knowledge and that there are other modes of achieving general knowledge as well (Danermark, Ekström et al. 2002, 76).

Compared to statistical, empirical generalisations, the general knowledge that is hopefully generated in this intensive study is of a more deep structural kind, achieved through retroductive and abductive inference. To begin with, the core object of scientific analysis in this context is a relationship, i.e. the relationship between semi-core news media discourses and the capitalist hegemonic order. In order to study this relationship, what has been necessary to generate is the theoretical operationalisation of modes of writing. When abstracting the empirical material as modes of writing, one isolates a partial aspect of the current object (the news discourse) (Sayer 1992, 87), while this aspect is assumed to express the general: how, for example, an all-encompassing (i.e. general) dimension of capitalism operates through the form of journalistic practice and news discourse.

More precisely, the abductive and retroductive inferences are thus meant to chisel out how general structures (private property, individualisation etc.) operate through the particular (media discourses, particular cases of media coverage). Or, one could here put it in the following way: the manner in which a particular journalistic mode of writing is dysfunctionally homologous with some general structure in society. The identification of a mode in the news material is then simultaneously the identification of something that goes on and constantly occurs in other practices and institutional contexts, i.e. in society as a whole.

However, the great difficulty concerns how to analytically determine the occurrence of general structures without neglecting the complex and often contradictory nature of the news material (that witnesses to elements in the ‘text’ that cannot be included in the current general structure). The evidence of the current generalisation is thus dependent on the quality of the scientific argumentation. Is the interpretation of the ‘text’ scientifically valid? Is it reasonable to argue that this general structure really operates in this news discourse? (see the below discussion on validity and reliability)

On validity and reliability
Whether or not produced knowledge should be considered scientific knowledge depends on its validity and reliability. Validity concerns whether the scientific argumentation and the overall dynamic play between one’s theoretical assumptions, methodological instruments and the empirical reality, actually captures the investigated object to such an extent that objective knowledge is generated, while reliability is related to the organisation of the empirical materials (the collection and systematisation of the data etc.) and the correctness of the current scientific analysis.
Validity and reliability often seem to exclusively refer to the evaluation of quantitative research. Reliability is then related to ‘degree of intersubjectivity’; i.e. if several, independently made, scientific measurements of an object generate the same result there is a satisfying degree of reliability. In validity tests, on the other hand, the internal operational procedures are evaluated, i.e. whether the theoretical assumptions have been translated (operationalised) into proper measurable indicators – while when testing the external validity, one is rather concerned with the scientific status of the results (does the survey really represent a greater population? etc.).

The quantitative ‘identity’ of these concepts has led to somewhat misconceived conclusions about qualitative research, namely that qualitative research is less able to produce valid and reliable scientific knowledge. It has tended to reproduce the notion that qualitative research is an impressionistic, second-hand version of scientific practice, able to generate exciting theories and hypotheses but with no serious potential to make valid and reliable statements about the world (Rosengren 1993).

For the social sciences, which deal with *open systems*, it is impossible to entirely control or manipulate reality (as in the case of the experimental natural sciences). There is no absolute way of deciding the validity of the results; the conclusions drawn in social research could always to some extent be reformulated. This does not, however, mean that we cannot distinguish between more or less valid (and reliable) instances of research. Different scientific methods involve different modes of argumentation, but what is common for all of them is that their argumentation can be critically examined – including qualitative research:

**Validity**

When dealing with the subject of validity, I am mainly concerned with the question whether my scientific argumentation de facto captures the research object, i.e. the relationship between the capitalist hegemony and semi-core news discourse. In the context of CDA, this involves the question of how to create valid criteria or principles for the interpretation of *texts* (such as a news article etc.). According to Ödman (1979) the hermeneutic interpretative process is related to several tasks. To begin with, there is (1) the construction of an interpretative system in which the interpreter ‘unites’ separate elements or ‘parts’ of a ‘text’ in a logical manner and thereby creates an interpretative system. Furthermore, what is needed is (2) the demonstration of the way in which the interpretative system is relevant to the studied object (the ‘text’). Does the interpretative system really explain the object? Does it express the ‘truth’ about it? The tasks of (1) and (2) are thus very much related, expressing two aspects of one and the same problem (Ödman 1979, 86).
The core validity problem is that when interpreting an object, for example news discourse, one often tends to see what one wants to see and exclude the things that contradict one’s original hypothesis. We are thus back in the discussion on the risk of (Marxian) reductionism (see p. 37–38). Making use of Ödman’s hermeneutic vocabulary, it is possible to say that the interpretative work in this study involves a pre-determined theoretical system (the Marxian, cultural materialist one), which is implemented through the CDA of so called modes. Consequently, on the one hand, there is a pre-determined theoretical perspective (the Marxian cultural materialist one), expressing certain ontological and epistemological assumptions about reality that somehow ‘navigate’ the analysis of news discourse. On the other hand, the history of social sciences has shown that no theory, including Marxism, has been able to wholly explain society. For this study, this generates a problem, which also expresses a contradiction. The point is that the conscious and active choice of one particular theoretical position (the Marxian cultural materialist one) automatically undermines the inclusion of other, competing theoretical positions. To wholly write off this dilemma is quite impossible. What one must do instead is to take this problem into account as far as the form of the study permits. In the analysis of news discourse, even though the chosen theoretical perspective plays an authoritative role, it is simultaneously necessary to include its flaws and incompleteness (by including other possible ways of interpreting the current ‘text’ such as liberal theory, functionalism, poststructuralism etc.).

Finally, the (internal) validity problem concerns whether modes of writing really do explain and illuminate the studied object (the relationship between the capitalist system and semi-core news discourse). Are there perhaps better ways of analysing this relationship? In the previous chapters, I have presented certain arguments for the relevance of analysing news discourse as modes of writing. This (internal) validity matter must, however, be critically reflected upon at the end of the day (in Conclusions).

**Reliability**
According to Ödman (1979), the scientific interpretation of texts involve a third task, which is; (3) the mediation or communication of the interpretations (Ödman 1979, 86–87). The researcher comes to the conclusion that the ‘text’ should be interpreted in accordance with the theory of X, but has the researcher provided the reader with enough ‘data’ to understand the various steps in the interpretative process? Is it possible for the reader to judge the relevance and ‘truthfulness’ of the interpretations?

These questions are more or less related to the reliability issue. The reliability of this study foremost involves the collection, organisation and
The appendix presents detailed information about these matters, while the previous sections in this chapter (the first- and second-step CDA) include extended information. There are two more basic reliability problems that must be discussed. The first concerns the subject of translation and its (assumed) negative influence on the analysis. In the interpretations of the news discourse, three languages are involved: Swedish (native language), Slovenian and English (second languages). The main problem concerns the risk for misconceptions about the national context when interpreting the Slovenian newspaper. In this context, two standpoints should be put forward. First, it has previously been clarified that the core purpose of the study is not to analyse ‘national differences’ at some detailed micro-linguistic level. The success of such a scientific approach would to a great extent depend on exceptional language skills (which I do not possess). Second, the analysed media discourse is quite international (Western cultural) rather than being based on some national traditions. The content of news discourse is, as a result, relatively predictable and repetitive (van Dijk 1988), being similar from country to country. These two factors speak in favour of the notion that the translation procedures should not affect the scientific analysis too negatively. It is, I think, rather one’s skills in social theory (in politics, economy, culture), that primarily decide whether the interpretations of the news discourse succeed or not. The most problematic translation problem thus involves how to ‘translate’ the empirical materials into relevant social-material structures and mechanisms. However, this does not mean that the issue of the ‘national code’ can be entirely dismissed as a potential reliability problem. Certain national features (historical knowledge, insights into the particular media system and the political structure of the nation state etc.) could become quite important in particular analytic contexts. If one lacks this knowledge, it will affect the research in a negative manner. In order to mitigate this problem as far as possible, the perhaps most important strategy here is time management and the fact that the analyses of Slovenian media materials, by necessity, demand some extra time.

Another reliability problem concerns the transparency of the presented analyses. Transparency is a matter of presenting the approach as clearly as possible, from the initial stage of the collection of the material and further to the organisation, selection and interpretation of the news material. It should thus be possible for anyone to follow the various steps of the scientific analysis. The particular transparency issue in this context concerns the logic behind the inclusion and exclusion of empirical materials, and the reader’s insight into this matter. Consequently, the basic logic behind the selection of particular items (articles, photographs etc.) for the analyses of modes of
writing has been presented above (about ideologemes). Every mode-analysis relies on certain empirical extracts (text materials from articles, headlines, captions etc.) which are potentially derived from various news discursive ‘areas’, i.e. from different sets of coverage, articles, sections or days. These extracts are selected and analysed together due to the observation that they somehow constitute a cluster of meaning, expressing a particular ‘structural quality’, which paves the way for the conclusion that there is an occurrence of a mode of writing. What makes it legitimate and relevant to abstract, i.e. to ‘lift out’ these particular text extracts from their separate ‘local settings’ (the articles, sections etc. from which they originate), is consequently their ‘logical relationship’, ‘common function’ or ‘homogenous character’.

However, the current problem here concerns the possible reception of these mode analyses. If one as a reader expects and too strongly holds on to an everyday conception of media discourse, it may generate the feeling that the scientific analyses suffer from a lack of transparency. When taking part of the mode analyses, what one somehow loses is the overall picture that one is used to in everyday media reading contexts, that is, the immediate insight into the content of articles, news pages etc. as a whole. The core issue here is that the scientific practice transcends mass media’s own borders (the borders set between articles, headlines and text, news sections etc.) and totalities (an article is a media totality, a section, a defined area of media coverage etc.). By identifying structures and mechanisms that transgress the media form, the scientific analysis instead pays attention to other (more hidden) borders and totalities. In order to detect and demonstrate the underlying (ideological) structures that constitute news discourse, one must, consequently, go beyond the (everyday) media discursive form. The scientific instruments dissolve and reorganise the well-known (everyday) form of media discourse, and it is this cognitive and intellectual clash between the everyday understanding and the scientific understanding of media discourse that may generate the feeling of ‘lack of transparency’.

To include miscellaneous ‘surrounding’ discursive materials in the presentation of the mode analyses (to rigorously present and analyse news articles as a whole etc.) would perhaps increase the feeling of transparency. However, apart from the inclusion of basic contextual information, there is no rational reason to provide the reader with the entire content of articles, sections, events etc., if this text material is not relevant to the particular structures and mechanisms being analysed and explained. The position that I want to put forward is that the reliability is instead more dependent on the act of including a particular category of news discourse, which is the category of contradictory discourse (counter-argumentative discourse). Provided that there are also textual extracts that potentially oppose or under-
mine the discursive structures that constitute the current mode of writing, these must necessarily be included and analysed. It is, I think, exclusively this particular procedure that should been seen as the core principle for achieving transparency and reliability.
THE ANALYSIS
OF JOURNALISTIC MODES
The analysis of journalistic modes

The three bodies of media coverage: a general overview
Before proceeding with the analyses of journalistic modes of writing, I would like to present a more general overview of the days selected for analysis. In the following presentation, the most relevant news themes in Dagens Nyheter and Delo are defined. These results consequently emanate from the first-step CDA of the 438 units (see p. 65–66).

NATO’s military intervention in former Yugoslavia: 24, 25, 26, 27 March 1999
On 24 March the journalists from DN and Delo primarily focus on NATO’s preparations for a military intervention in Yugoslavia (Serbia, Montenegro and Kosovo), i.e. military action against the regime of Slobodan Milosevic in order to protect the ‘human rights’ of the Albanian minority in Kosovo. Other important news themes are: the collapse of the ‘peace negotiations’, speculations about exactly where and how NATO will strike against Yugoslavia, Milosevic and his forthcoming strategies in order to survive politically, and, finally, juridical discourse on whether NATO’s forthcoming intervention is compatible with international law. On 25 March the ‘opening’ of the war becomes the central news theme, with ‘instant reports’ from Serbia, Montenegro and Kosovo. This core theme is then complemented with themes such as: the reactions of the international community, particularly Jeltsin’s and Russia’s critical view on the matter, the focus on the streams of refugees in Kosovo, heading for Albania and Macedonia, the situation in Belgrade and the reactions among its citizens, the juridical circumstances (Is NATO breaking international law?), and the evacuation of foreigners. On 26 March the continuing air strikes constitute the main news theme, while other themes are: domestic political discourse (i.e. the focus on the own country’s – Sweden or Slovenia’s – role and reaction to the process), speculations about what is going on in Milosevic’s head and among his administration in Belgrade, the reactions of certain countries (especially China and Russia), the subject of refugees and humanitarian aid, and the juridical circumstances. On 27 March the following themes are central: reports on Serbian violence against Albanians in Kosovo, the continuing air strikes, domestic political discourse (see above), the political power of Milosevic in Serbia and Montenegro (will he be able to retain it?), the actions of US president Clinton and the attitude of the US public opinion, the situation regarding the Albanian refugees, and, finally, public reactions in the neighbouring country of Croatia.
The IMF/WB summit in Prague: 24, 25, 26, 27, 28 & 30 September 2000

On 24 September the main theme is the arrival of the politicians, economists (of the IMF and World Bank) and demonstrators in Prague, and the speculations about whether there will be any confrontations between the demonstrators and the Czech police. The other core theme concerns the current state of global poverty, and more precisely, the economic situation in the Third World and IMF’s/WB’s forthcoming plans for it. In this context, what is especially discussed is the debt issue (the financial debts of the developing countries). On 25 September there is still a focus on the arrival in Prague and the supposed ‘concentration of forces’ (in accordance with the logic of ‘the hooligans’ vs the police) as well as on the disagreement between the financial institutions and the demonstrators on how to conceptualise the world. Furthermore there is news discourse about the initial political demonstrations on the streets of Prague, as well as on the Tobin tax issue (the rather famous ‘Robin Hood taxation’ for the benefit of poor countries of the third world). On 26 September the three core themes are: the riots between demonstrators and the police, the public discussion on the Tobin tax, and the financial debt issue, i.e. whether it is realistic to cancel the debts of the poorest countries in the world. On 27 September the most important theme is the ongoing riot and the antagonistic relationship between certain groups of demonstrators and the police. Another theme, somewhat related to the first one, is an explicit focus on the police force (its engagement, situation, role etc.). On 28 September the core themes are: Sweden’s role in Prague (domestic discourse), the debt cancellation issue, the role, guilt and responsibility of the US administration for the existence of global poverty, the violent confrontations between the assumed antagonists (the hooligans vs the police) and, finally, a news focus on the Czech police (its particular view and comments on the riots). On 30 September there is an article (in the cultural section of Delo) on the social and political composition of the demonstrators (a comparison with the 68 leftist movement etc.).

The WTC terror attack in New York: 12, 13, 14 September 2001

On 12 September the central theme is the ‘event’ as such (the terror attack, primarily on the WTC Twin towers in New York) – in terms of ‘what happened?’. Other related themes are: peoples’ reactions and experiences of the attack, the rescue and relief process, speculations about the political/economic/cultural repercussions of the attack, the spontaneous reactions around the world, domestic discourse (any Swedish/Slovenian victims? etc.), discourse about the prime suspect – Osama bin Laden, as well as about Afghanistan (a potential terror network ‘area’). On 13 September the following
themes are on the carpet: the hunt for the terrorists – the ‘war on terror’ – and speculations about the Bush administrations’ forthcoming actions, the rescue and relief process in Manhattan, victims’ stories, speculations about the political/economic/cultural repercussions of the terror attack, miscellaneous political reactions around the world, the relationship between Europe and the US, domestic (Swedish/Slovenian) discourse, verbal comments from Hollywood (on the popular cultural and somehow ‘fictional’ character of the terror event), and the situation in Afghanistan and in Palestine (on the relationship between the Israeli/Palestine conflict and the terror attack). On 14 September the following themes are central: The ‘war on terrorism discourse’ and the hunt for the terrorists, especially the prime suspect Osama bin Laden, the political actions of the Bush administration, victims’ stories from Manhattan, the underlying reasons for the attack, the political/economic/cultural repercussions of the attack, domestic (Swedish/Slovenian) discourse, the political reactions around the world (in China etc.), the situation in Afghanistan and in Israel/Palestine, and finally, news discourse on the situation of Muslims in the world (regarding the tendency towards bullying and discrimination of Muslims in the wake of the attack).

Structure
At the beginning of each and every mode analysis, there is a short introduction. First, there is a presentation of the core scientific conclusion of the analysis, which is consequently related to the dialectics of the current journalistic mode (since the dialectical dimension is defined as the most relevant in this context). This initial information is then followed by a short presentation of the current empirical material and a closer description of the actual constitution and character of the mode (the way it is related to some sub-mode etc.).

The analysis: The arrangement of the qualitative analysis follows the assumed threefold dimension of a journalistic mode (see p. 51). To begin with there is: (1) the analysis of the mode as a practice – as a ‘particular way of writing’ – which thus involves the analysis of discourse (of discursive structures and elements), which is followed by: (2) the analysis of the mode as a structural product. This is the moment where one analyses the structures and mechanisms that constitute the current mode. The analysis is then finished off with: (3) the examination of the dialectical nature of the mode.
The Multi-colouring and Greying Modes

Introduction
In order to survive as the dominant mode of production in the world, capitalism must increasingly absorb as well as generate ‘colours’, i.e. heterogeneity, which is evident in the ever greater diversification and ‘pluralization’ of society, in the constant generation of new and diverse goods, markets, occupations, life-styles, labour conditions, desires etc. (Jameson 1991). Western journalism has its particular role in this process. The following analysis investigates a journalistic mode in Swedish DN, the Multi-colouring mode, which is an integrated part of the late capitalist generation of diversity and pluralism – a mode simultaneously co-producing the erosion of the more homogeneous and ‘one-dimensional’ (socialist) welfare structures of Sweden. In contrast to this there is Slovenian Delo that instead paints society in grey. The Greying mode operates as a refusal of the market liberal, ‘colour explosive’ mode of communication – and instead expresses the attempt to slow down the entrance of the capitalist ‘colour-generating’ machinery. This potentially counter-hegemonic journalistic mode is then interwoven with all the other the ‘greyish’ material practices/phenomena in post-socialist Slovenia that for various reasons have not yet been wholly absorbed by the ‘new economy’ (like abandoned industrial plants, certain bureaucratic structures, rural peripheries etc.).

The ideologeme
The news material for the analysis of the two modes is taken from the news coverage of the War in Yugoslavia (1999) and the WTC Terror Attack (2001). The modes operate within the ideologeme of the discursive construction of society. This abstract ideologeme could be investigated from several empirical angles, but is here restricted to two news discursive objects. First (1) there is an analysis of the front pages (their forms in terms of design and graphics) as they are assumed to manifest the identity of the papers and the way in which society is dealt with in general. As an extension of (1) there is (2): a deepened analysis of the visual communication of the newspapers (primarily in terms of a quantification of the usage of photos). The scientific analysis of these two topics is supposed to empirically crystallise two opposing journalistic modes.
The modes as discursive practices  
*The Multi-colouring and Greying modes*

Colouring means ‘the art, manner or process of applying colour’ [1]. The *multi-colouring mode* is a mode that constructs society as a heterogeneous playground of prospering social and cultural mishmash, diversity and pluralism, journalistically, aesthetically, politically and visually speaking, and as a less hierarchic constellation. In contrast to this, the *greying mode* constructs society as homogeneous and one-dimensional, as well as a more hierarchical and non-democratic kind of constellation (considered from a liberal ideological point of view).

*The front pages (see the attached samples)*

Beginning with DN, at the top of the page there is this *thick red line* (0.5 centimetres) beneath the black logotype: DAGENS NYHETER. On the left side of the page we find miscellaneous ‘information-teasers’ about the overall news content. These are constructed as ‘mini-versions’ of each section of the newspaper (economy, culture, politics etc.) while every mini-section is provided with a particular colour; green for sports, orange for economy, blue for culture, grey for the editorial etc. The various colours are there in order to embody the pluralistic, many-sided, nature of the present society. At the centre of the page, occupying approximately a third of it, there is ‘Today’s Photo’. It is always in colour and is always endowed with a certain semiotic ‘depth’ which is supposed to stimulate intellectual reflection and propagate for the theoretical status of visual communication. The adhering news article is mostly placed above the photo. Underneath this central sector of the front page one finds ‘mini-versions’ of supposedly interesting articles belonging to various sections within the paper, often complemented with tiny photos in colour.

The front page generates the feeling of a *loosely organised* and *harmonious public sphere or market place*, which is achieved by means of multiple communicative elements (visual, graphical, textual ones). Regarding the subject of organisation, on ‘entering’ the front page one is confronted with a dominant object (today’s photo) followed by the *heterogeneous swarm* of separate info elements that surround the photo, i.e. textual ‘parts’ that have no logical connection. There is this loose, somewhat fragmentary organisation of the world (of news), although one never really gets disoriented; the ‘information desk’ is easy to find as well as one’s particular desires. The creation of a *harmonious public sphere* is built up by the ‘personal’ appeal (*Weekend with DN* etc.), the ‘soft start’ mode (no ticklish mass of text) – and the fact that everything is wrapped in various colours. The front page space is very much a friendly milieu for the eye: hence a visual object is the
"Kosovo ligger i ruin"
The front page in Delo, 24 March 1999
central element of the page, the size of the text (11) is visually pleasant and practical, and there is an explicit attempt to balance the literary and the visual. This is however elite media, which means that the colourfulness and user-friendliness (large text, ‘over-explicit’ pedagogy etc.) must be accomplished with a touch of restraint. There must be a clear distinction (Bourdieu 1984) between it and more popular forms of communication, not the least the tabloid press with its ‘oversized’ typeface and more ‘vulgar’ use of colours. Finally, as an extension of the harmony aspect, there is also something rather lively about DN’s front page. What I have in mind here is the obvious balance between the positive and the negative in which anxiety-generating events are contrasted with news that instead stimulates the lust for life (hope, happiness and ‘positive energy’ for the sake of the continual reproduction of society).

In the case of Delo’s front page, there is no similar presence of an imagined news consumer. Delo certainly presupposes a reader, but not primarily a consumer with strong demands for service. It begins and ends with an atmosphere of intellectualism and gravity. Delo introduces itself and ‘talks’ to its readers with a rather authoritative ‘voice’ by delivering discourse-thick articles (size 9 or 10), and a homogeneous mass of political words. In contrast to DN, the front page is not supposed to function as a soft ‘settling-in period’ where one is gently invited to slowly enter the complex world of social and political news. This serious approach is however common among the kinds of papers that define themselves as elite, taking The Wall Street Journal or Die Frankfurter Allgemeine as role models. The relationship between the news producer and the newsreader is meant to build upon a mutual respect for education and enlightenment, while the relationship is not supposed to go further than this. The severe layout and communicative mode consequently precludes a more ‘intimate’ and ‘personal’ kind of relationship (i.e. the very thing that DN tends to strive for with its readers).

At the top of the page one finds the DELO logotype printed in dark blue with a black background. Above the logotype there is information on supposedly attractive and interesting articles. The arrangement is rather modest, monomodal and homogeneous: a black headline, and two or three sentences about the article followed by the page number. Underneath DELO, on the right, one finds the spatial home territory of the ‘Theme of the Day’, which is one of the elements that really establishes ‘seriousness’. It is a daily political column that introduces and critically discusses the political issue of the day (domestic or foreign). It is always written by some authoritative journalist and printed in italics, size 10. If moving to the left, seriousness will continue, since here one finds the (political) head article of the page. If one goes even more to the left one is confronted with the photo(-s) connected
to the head article. Immediately underneath this (core) area of the first page there is space for more short articles; there might be one or two articles, sometimes even three. The bottom right corner of the page is like an overall ‘information desk’ (brief information about the head news from all particular sections, all in black). The only thing that could somehow challenge and balance the grave, grey, text loaded identity of the front page is Marko Kocevar’s popular daily political cartoon (in black and white) and the tiny advertisements at the very bottom of the page.

Visual communication and society
In contrast to DN, Delo’s relationship to the visual and to multimodal play with different communicative means (text and photo, graphics etc.) exhibits defiance and reluctance. This will be investigated more closely by means of a simple quantification of the 9/11 coverage. Due to its spectacular nature and its connotations of popular culture (the disaster genre), the WTC Terror Attack has become one of the central symbols for the power of (mass mediated) visual communication (Kellner 2003). The question in this context concerns to what extent the newspapers are adjusting to the logic of visual media (television), in terms of explicit (visual) focus on the planes crashing into the skyscrapers, the victims, the fleeing people, the catastrophic landscape of smoke and dust etc. Below, what is examined is the proportion of articles explicitly related to, supported by, or complemented with some visual element (a photo, graphics, a caricature etc.) in the days after the terror attack:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Swedish DN</th>
<th>Slovenian Delo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day 1 (12/9)</td>
<td>65% (17/26)</td>
<td>70% (14/20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 2 (13/9)</td>
<td>59% (22/37)</td>
<td>53% (17/32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 3 (14/9)</td>
<td>65% (15/23)</td>
<td>35% (7/20)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have excluded short paragraphs, very common in the Swedish case, while hardly occurring in the Slovenian mass medium.

These figures do tell us that DN visually portrayed 9/11 to a greater extent than Delo, but they do not clearly enough demonstrate the vast difference between the two newspapers and the fact that Delo deals with this event in a radically less visual manner. The vast difference between the newspapers would become clearer if one would (i) measure how much news space (square centimetres) is occupied by written text and visual elements respectively. While the Slovenian mass medium opts for political articles with a small sized (10) text, DN consists of large photos occupying half the page or even
räckslagen flykt ut ur kaos

Visualisation of reality in DN, 12 September 2001
Visual reconstruction of reality in DN, 12 September 2001
Visualisation of the elite in Delo, 12 September 2001
a whole page (see attached materials). Another thing that is important to take into account here is (ii) that the content and the motifs of the present photos are structurally different in the two papers. The point here is that DN’s visual communication is more heterogeneous than Delo’s. The purpose of the following quantification (of 9/11) is to demonstrate this condition. When going through all possible visual elements (photos, graphics etc.) the aim has been to register the central motif:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building(-s)/ graphics/ maps</td>
<td>4 (20%)</td>
<td>11 (52%)</td>
<td>5 (29%)</td>
<td>10 (35%)</td>
<td>1 (20%)</td>
<td>9 (31%)</td>
<td>10 (24%)</td>
<td>30 (38%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politicians</td>
<td>9 (45%)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5 (29%)</td>
<td>7 (24%)</td>
<td>1 (20%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>15 (36%)</td>
<td>8 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security personnel</td>
<td>4 (20%)</td>
<td>2 (10%)</td>
<td>1 (6%)</td>
<td>2 (7%)</td>
<td>2 (40%)</td>
<td>3 (11%)</td>
<td>7 (17%)</td>
<td>7 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victims/relatives</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>3 (14%)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2 (7%)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>4 (14%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>9 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilians</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>4 (19%)</td>
<td>2 (12%)</td>
<td>5 (17%)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>7 (25%)</td>
<td>3 (7%)</td>
<td>16 (21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experts</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>4 (24%)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>4 (10%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public celebrities</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3 (10%)</td>
<td>1 (20%)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>3 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrorists</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3 (11%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>3 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum. of photos</td>
<td>20 (100%)</td>
<td>21 (100%)</td>
<td>17 (100%)</td>
<td>29 (100%)</td>
<td>5 (100%)</td>
<td>28 (100%)</td>
<td>42 (100%)</td>
<td>78 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Security personnel include the police, military and fire brigades. Experts: academics and intellectuals. Public celebrities: authors and film stars (in two cases A. Schwarzenegger).

What is particularly noteworthy is Delo’s tendency to mainly visually portray experts and politicians (mostly ordinary photos of Bush, Chirac, domestic politicians etc.) and the obvious absence of illustrated victims and civilians. On day one, 45% of Delo’s photos consist of foreign or domestic politicians (while 0% in DN’s case). The scarce visual presence of victims and ‘ordinary people’ in Delo is furthermore confirmed in the YU/Kosovo coverage where Delo avoids visual portraits of Albanian and Serbian victims (and civilians in general). In DN’s case, on the other hand, there is a small number of visually portrayed politicians (10%). DN’s visual communication is more diverse in terms of a generous inclusion of victims, relatives and of society as a whole, i.e. of ‘ordinary people’, individuals, families etc., and their particular experiences, feelings, thoughts and opinions.
In sum
To summarise the analyses (the front page + the visual communicative approach), in the case of DN there is this congruence between (1) the multi-modal/heterogeneous communicative approach: the use and mixing of diverse elements (visual, textual, graphical and aesthetic) in order to serve the desires of the news consumer, and (2) the manifold/heterogeneous appearance of society: the journalistic construction of society as diversity – as a plural constellation of individuals and groups of a more ‘democratically horizontal’ and harmonious kind. All this together then constitutes the multi-colouring mode. In the case of Delo there is this congruence between (1) the monomodal communicative approach (the relative refusal of colours and graphical, multimodal ‘play’), and (2) the monomodal, or more precisely one-dimensional and homogeneous appearance of society: consequently the relative lack of social diversity and pluralism, the gravity and profuse political discourse, the absence of obvious ‘consumer friendliness’, and the (elite-) construction of society as deeply hegemonic and hierarchic (the greying mode).

The structural constitution of the modes
The structural constitution of the two modes, and the differences between them, should be explained as a complex and partly contradictory mixture of the following three factors:

(1) Commercial interests
(2) Political and cultural traditions
(3) Ideological positions

(1) Commercial interests: DN’s aesthetic, graphical and visual strategies should be explained by the fact that the newspaper is a commodity (Haug 1986, Barnhurst & Nerone 2001). The explicit service-oriented approach, the user friendliness, the multimodal approach, the pleasant mixture of colours etc. are parts of a commercial strategy (to sell the product). However, the question is then how to explain the monomodal mode of Delo from a commercial point of view.

//.../ there has long been an insistence on the monomodal, especially in the most ‘serious’, the most highly valued kinds of speech and writing. //.../ Many academic papers, important documents and ‘high’ literature worked, and to some extent still work, with words alone, in densely printed pages, with a minimum of visual illustration, and without much overt attention to layout and presentation (Kress & van Leeuwen 1998, 186–187).
Delo’s monomodal approach could be seen as a potentially commercial strategy too. Upholding a monomodal mode becomes a strategy to differentiate oneself from the mainstream news form (the multimodal form) and to sustain an aura of being ‘serious’ and elite [2]. In order to preserve the monomodal, but not lose readers with ‘multimodal needs’, Delo sometimes publishes separate editions that are more visually oriented (with more photos). This was, for example, the case immediately after 9/11 when Delo published a complementary paper with all the ‘spectacular’ photos from the catastrophe. However, at the same time there are also indications that Delo’s ‘greyish style’ is not wholly a commercial strategy, but rather a lagging aesthetic leftover of Socialism. In a 2004 edition of the Slovenian magazine MM (Marketing magazin) there is an advert for the future Delo saying: ‘Delo: Colours on every page. Delo: with all the colours of the world’. This Benetton-inspired mode of argumentation consequently indicates that at least the marketing people of Delo (who should be distinguished from the journalists) want to orient the newspaper towards a similar commercial-aesthetic approach as DN [3].

(2) Political and cultural traditions: The current modes are furthermore products of the two newspapers’ political and cultural traditions. In the case of Swedish DN, the strong liberal stance generates a plural (‘multi-coloured’) construction of the world, journalistically, aesthetically, graphically and visually speaking. For DN, journalistic objectivity then primarily becomes a matter of achieving pluralism, to include, as far as possible, all the diverse aspects of society (peoples, issues, conflicts etc.). Delo’s socialist past generates a more monomodal and ‘greyish’ mode of constructing society. Society is here reduced to two entities: the political and economic capitalist elite (previously the Party), and the people (or the mass). It is the elite who strongly occupy the news, while the citizens are consequently mostly portrayed as this abstract category (the people) which is seldom resolved into individuals, families, minor groups etc. For Delo, journalistic objectivity is thus less a matter of pluralism (to cover the whole complex spectrum of society) but more a case of relevance: to focus on things that are relevant from a power perspective – i.e. to report on the ruling class (see Berglez 2003). Due to its ‘anti-plural’ construction of society, Delo could be accused of elitism. Delo could on the other hand defend its approach, claiming that it concentrates on the true picture of society – i.e. the harsh reality of fundamentally hegemonic rule and domination. Swedish DN, with its more ‘hegemony-absent’, liberally ‘diverse’ and ‘popular’ picture of society could thus be accused of masking the ‘true reality’. The multi-colouring mode of DN consequently constitutes a relatively harmonious liberal democratic order, supposedly built upon deliberative practices and actions by numerous
involved parties – individuals, groups, organisations – although, what is simultaneously repressed is the underlying, monopolistic condition of power: the fundamental rule of a capitalist class.

(3) Ideological positions: The two journalistic modes are there in order to promote particular ideological positions. The multi-colouring mode is a defence of liberal democratic values (related to differences, diversity and plurality) as well as of capitalist market liberalism. Delo is more difficult to explain, ideologically speaking. On the one hand Delo is a hegemonic institution in terms of its everyday defence of the introduction of capitalism in Slovenia and the abandonment of the Yugoslavian federation. On the other hand, the greying mode is like a counter-hegemonic structural ‘cover’ that encloses an otherwise hegemonic news content. The homogeneous and monomodal approach indicates that there is a journalistic, aesthetic, graphical etc. restraint towards the capitalist order. This mode might be interpreted as a critique of what the multi-colouring process (society as an explosion of plurality and diversity) stands for politically speaking; i.e. the liberal ideology. It is however not in this political way that the greying mode should be primarily understood, as Delo is consequently an important defender of the liberal democratic order in Slovenia (of parliamentarianism, freedom of speech etc.). The greying mode should rather be interpreted as an obstinate socialist dissociation from, not the ‘multi-colouring process’ of pluralism and diversity itself, but the underlying structure that tends to wholly regulate and colonise it: i.e. Western capital (Klein 2002). It is a mode that, in spite of its commercial nature (it is a commodity), and in spite of its defence of market liberalism, still activates this hesitant stance towards the rapid introduction of the new (capitalist) system. The greying construction of reality/society operates in a counter-commercial manner, generating a mode that tries to delay the inevitable, namely the capitalisation and commercialisation of the whole social, material, political and cultural body of Slovenia.

The modes as dialectical forces

The late capitalist (global) economy (Jameson 1991) is like a multi-colouring process. What is intended here is capitalism’s need to crumble away structures of homogeneity for the sake of further social/material/cultural heterogenisation of society (in which the economy absorbs as well as generates this diverse spectra of material, cultural, discursive etc. goods, practices, conditions etc.). The intention here is thus to determine journalism’s role and function in this respect, more precisely how the multi-colouring mode of DN is dialectically intertwined with the ongoing economic/material ‘multi-colouring’ process of post-welfare Sweden. One should consequent-
ly imagine an ongoing (dysfunctional homologous) relationship between the following two ‘domains’:

– the economic/material ‘multi-colouring’ process of post-welfare Sweden: In recent decades Sweden has been facing a rather radical transformation, materially, socially, culturally and economically speaking, which has made Sweden into a less one-dimensional and homogeneous structure and a more colourful body of material, social and cultural diversity. This development is related to such matters as increasing mobility, the structural transformation of the industrial sector, global mass media, Sweden’s integration in the EU and its increasing involvement in the global world and economy as such. The withering away of Swedish homogeneity structures is associated with the breakthrough of a (liberal democratic) carnival of social, cultural etc. pluralism and diversity, including the neoliberal production of socio-economic and material ‘pluralism’ and diversity (Zizek 2000), more precisely the dismantling of the welfare system and the breakthrough of socio-economic and material heterogeneity/variety among peoples, groups and individuals, between the elite and the citizens, between the highest and lowest incomes, the urban and the rural, the south and the north, the centre and the periphery, the ‘Swedes’ and the foreigners, employees and unemployed (Lindvall 2004).

– discursive multi-colouring: the journalistic and/or aesthetic mode that constructs society as a harmonious organism of prospering pluralism and diversity, thereby potentially being an integrative part of the ongoing production of socio-economic ‘pluralism’ and diversity among classes, regions, cultures, groups, individuals etc. (Lindvall 2004). [4].

In contrast to the market-liberal and capitalistically integrated multi-colouring mode of DN, Delo’s greying mode operates as a counter-hegemonic/counter-capitalist force. In contemporary Slovenia one should imagine this whole ongoing ‘greying process’, which is involving the dialectical relationship between the following two (homologous) ‘domains’:
What is most noteworthy in this context is Delo’s split identity: its structural constitution of two forces that counteract each other. On the one hand, there is its hegemonic identity and its active establishment of a new (capitalist) order in Slovenia (see analyses of other modes). On the other hand are its counter hegemonic powers: the remains of the previous communist system discovered in the form (the greying mode).

– the economic/material greying process in post-socialist Slovenia involving practices, actions, elements etc. that are producing economic and material homogeneity, thereby upholding the past (certain socialist structures) within the new (capitalism). In Ljubljana, the capital of Slovenia, two separate dimensions of colour are evidently present. On the one hand are the sparkling, colourful commercial activities and the advertisements (Boss, Nokia, SONY etc.), which embody the emergence of Western capital. On the other hand there are the spaces, things and practices ‘outside’ all this, the less fancy and rather pale remains of the old system (the socialist architecture of the parliament building, the bureaucracy-like Delo skyscraper etc.). There is this sharp dividing line between the material elements inside the (Western) economy, and the material elements outside the domain of Capital, not least the ramshackle, shabby buildings and apartments in the city centre, which for some reason have not yet been overtaken, transformed and ‘coloured’ by the commercial powers. These greyish elements are like counterforces, delaying and opposing the emerging ‘capitalist colouring process’ and its introduction of socio-economic pluralism/diversity.

– discursive ‘greying’: the journalistic and/or aesthetic mode that constructs society in a more monomodal, one-dimensional and homogeneous manner. The greying mode is thus potentially interwoven with all other ‘material leftovers’ – all other agents of social and material homogeneity (that somewhat naively operate against the rather unbreakable ‘multi-colouring process’ of the Western capitalist economy).
The Remote Control Mode

Introduction
This analysis investigates the relation between the private and the public (Habermas 1989) and more precisely the way in which public areas (such as squares and streets etc.) and public behaviour (Sennett 1976) are dominated by the structures of private entrepreneurship (the presence of private capital, corporations, advertisements) and consumption (Klein 2002), i.e. the social activity of consumer-choice. There is a journalistic mode that operates as an active ‘part’ of all this. It is designated the remote control mode as it discursively constructs public activity and communication in accordance with the so called ‘zapping’ logic – public life/communication as smooth alternation between or selection of available differences (commodities).

The ideologeme
The mode is operative in the news coverage from the financial summit in Prague and more precisely in its initial part. The ideologeme is the arrival of the political/financial representatives (the delegates of the IMF, the World Bank and the demonstrators) and the initial construction of public space/activity/communication. The mode is structurally present in both newspapers.

The mode as a discursive practice
The remote control mode
The journalistic remote control mode reduces the public sphere into a market economic phenomenon in which public activity and communication become synonymous with ‘consumer choice’. More precisely journalism reduces ‘the public’ into practices of including/excluding (selecting) spaces, transport systems, places, peoples, buildings etc., and predominately commodities. It is a journalistic mode that turns the public sphere into a passive object, or a screen that is supposed to project ‘differences’ (various goods) for the purpose of constant selecting or dropping (the ‘this I like, that I dislike’ logic).

The analysis of the remote control mode begins with an observation of the way in which journalism handles the pre-summit phase (one or two days before the summit) in a more general sense. The suggestion here is that, in this news discursive context, journalism divides the social space into two worlds: the internal and the external world. The construction of
an external word involves two social formations: the political and economic elite (the IMF and the WB) and the political demonstrators (Attac, Jubel 2000 etc.). These are ‘external elements’ in terms of being located outside Prague, although they successively come closer and closer to the city. The two external parties are furthermore constructed as ideological enemies, which generates journalistic speculations about whether there will be some violent clash or conflict. The external world is associated with trouble, while somehow, trouble is coming to town in two versions: in software (the ‘civilised’ political and economic elite) and in hardware (the ‘less civilised’ ones, the demonstrators).

The build-up to the World Bank and IMF Summit is in full swing. Economists and politicians are pouring in from all the corners of the world, as well as critics of the present economic world order (introduction from the economy article ‘The residents of Prague are ready for trouble’ DN 24/9).

Czech President Vaclav Havel is doing what he can to reduce the antagonism between the demonstrators and the leaders from IMF and the World Bank. On Saturday, Vaclav Havel gathered representatives from the demonstrators and some of the leaders of the criticised institutions with the intention to create a constructive dialogue and reduce the tense atmosphere ahead of the expected demonstrations (extract from the economy article ‘The residents of Prague are ready for trouble’ DN 24/9).

/…/ Prague will serve as a boxing ring /…/ (extract from the introduction of the first page article ‘Argumentative battle between the bankers and the demonstrators’ Delo 25/9)

The internal world: The presence of the external world is dependent on the presence of another world. Journalism observes reality and ‘speaks’ from within Prague, which then constitutes this other, internal world. The journalists and the citizens of Prague are somehow jointly awaiting the arrival of the ‘external elements’, while journalism is discursively generating a spatial body (Prague) that is being attacked and occupied from different directions and angles. In the news, the internal world thus appears in terms of the focus on the physical and psychological state of the city:

About 11 000 policemen will try to keep the demonstrations under control. Several banks have installed security materials on their windows, and shops in the more fashionable parts of the city have rented extra security guards. Children are allowed to stay at home (extract from the economy article ‘The residents of Prague are ready for trouble’ DN 24/9).

The demonstrators went through a rigorous security check when arriving at the Czech border. Even the residents of Prague are suspicious (extract from ‘The residents of Prague are ready for trouble’ DN 24/9).
The Czech capital has become the object of incredible control efforts, such have not been seen since the ‘velvet revolution’ (extract from the front page article ‘Argumentative battle between the bankers and the demonstrators’ Delo 25/9).

The authorities have closed down the schools for two weeks; the children have been evacuated to summer camps outside Prague. A great number of people have left the city. Many stores and facilities have closed down. The owners are expecting the worst case scenario, and they have barricaded their properties with extra materials (extract from ‘Argumentative battle between the bankers and the demonstrators’ Delo 25/9).

The arrival of the ‘external’ is constructed by means of verbs such as ‘arriving’, ‘pouring in’ and ‘entering’, which more or less establishes an atmosphere of intrusion. This atmosphere is further based on lexical materials such as ‘Prague is prepared for trouble’, the inhabitants are ‘suspicious’, the banks and stores want extra ‘security’, the authorities are ‘closing’ the schools and children are being ‘evacuated’, the police force will try to keep the demonstrations under ‘control’, and the activists are rigorously ‘checked’ at the Czech border. This discursive cluster transforms urban space, with all its heterogeneous and contradictory characteristics, into a homogeneous community. In Prague they all seem to think and act in a similar way as there is no contradiction between the actions of closing, barricading, securing, controlling and evacuating. The presence of a ‘harmony of actions’, transforming Prague into a ‘singular voice’, indicates that the city-body is representing a particular subject-position (‘Prague’).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media Discursive features</th>
<th>Internal (private) World</th>
<th>External (public) world</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘Subjects’/Social formations</td>
<td>The city (‘Prague’)</td>
<td>The political/economic elite and the political demonstrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The State authorities (the police, the border police, the military) as an extension of ‘Prague’, protecting the everyday practices of entrepreneurship (‘the owners’) and consumption</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>controlling, securing, evacuating, closing, barricading</td>
<td>arriving, pouring in, entering, communicating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spaces</td>
<td>banks, shops, stores, facilities, properties</td>
<td>the congress hall, the castle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The purpose is thus to translate the internal vs external matter into a struggle between the private and the public, and thereby also trace the underlying journalistic mode. To begin with it is clear that ‘Prague’ does not want public space to become political as this interrupts everyday life (job, education, transportation etc.). ‘Prague’ simply wants to go on with its life, which is being explicitly expressed in the Slovenian newspaper: ‘As the residents of Prague told us, they want the summit to be as peaceful as possible, and they want the summit to end as quickly as possible’ (extract from ‘Argumentative battle between the bankers and the demonstrators’ Delo 25/9). What is essentially being interrupted is the hegemonic activity in the city centre, private entrepreneurship and commodity-exchange, which in the news is emphasised through the concerns for the ‘the owners’ and their shops, banks, stores, facilities and properties. The distinction between the internal/private and external/public world thus involves two contrasting aspects of coping with differences. For the external world, differences are related to such thing as antagonism, confrontation and communication. Differences (different worldviews, ideologies etc.) serve as the raw material for political discourse and struggle. From the vantage point of the ‘private property’ of ‘Prague’, however, this appears rather alien, as for ‘Prague’, differences are primarily supposed to be mastered and selected (as commodities). When journalism cares about the internal world (‘Prague’) it is thus this more consumerist public behaviour that is promoted.

More precisely, when embracing the ‘Prague-position’, journalism is working for a remote control mode of public behaviour. A (mass) mediated public sphere (Dahlgren 1995), such as the fragmentary ‘public world’ on the TV screen, is, at least ideally speaking, associated with ‘quick selection’ in accordance with the viewer’s personal taste and desire through the practice of remote controlling. Even though remote control cannot be reduced to some market economic choice-logic, still, it very much corresponds to exactly this: the imagined possibility of ‘smooth choice’, the inclusion of what one fancies and the exclusion of artefacts that one does not want to be confronted with. The general idea about what characterises ‘perfect’ remote control potentially expresses certain ideas about what the ideal society and public sphere should look like. What I have in mind here is a remote control oriented society/public sphere, which I imagine as a (market economic dominated) structure in which social relations primarily involve frictionless inclusions and exclusions of various ‘objects’ (peoples, goods, desires etc.), and in which the public sphere becomes the sum of numerous ‘sovereign individuals’ transforming themselves into private cocoons through practices of ‘smooth selection’. The central concern for the journalists is thus the sudden lack of ‘remote control power’ for the central subject: ‘Prague’. There
is this intruding ‘thing’ (the political) that is hard to (remote) control; it is uncontrollable as it does not appear and ‘behave’ like an object meant for (consumer-) choice. ‘The political’ consequently undermines a remote control oriented society/public sphere, i.e. it counteracts the everyday public behaviour of mental zapping between commercial offers and objects due to its harsh call for something else, i.e. political discourse and struggle.

‘Prague’ is however a journalistic construction of an ideal Western consumerist subject. It expresses an ideal because people in general do not fancy the commodity exchange logic and consumption in all possible contexts, but rather put much determined energy into avoiding commercial life (such as annoying sales offers etc.). Furthermore it expresses a particular ideal since, when it comes down to it, the journalistically constructed ‘Prague-subject’ does not have very much in common with most of the citizens of the real Prague and their everyday life struggles in a post-socialist society. In Slovenian Delo there are, however, elements of discourse that momentarily counteract the dominance of a mode that consequently reduces ‘Prague’ to a Western consumer subject. More precisely there is this journalistic attempt to reduce the assumed ideological gap between the citizens of Prague and the arriving political demonstrators:

Milan, an old friend of mine from Prague, computer programmer and engaged environmentalist, felt sorry that the demonstrations against globalisation, that destroys the environment and increases poverty, failed due to the actions of the most violent demonstrators from abroad, and some anarchists from Prague (extract from the culture article ‘New Marxians on the streets of Prague’ Delo 30/9).

Milan somehow abolishes the division between the internal and external worlds by being a mixture of the internal (‘…from Prague…’) and external (‘…engaged environmentalist…’). However, in this particular article, the division is soon built up again due to the emphasis on the assumed non-political identity of the citizens of Prague. Instead of establishing an ideological link between the everyday struggles/anxieties of the citizens of Prague and the global agenda of the demonstrators, ‘Prague’s’ desires become constructed as something that are in opposition to the desires of the demonstrators:

At least 95 percent, if not 99 percent of the Czechs, are indifferent to the reasons that the demonstrators have been gathering. They are primarily interested in other things, for example why the gas is becoming more expensive every week /…/ (extract from the culture article ‘New Marxians on the streets of Prague’ Delo 30/9).
The structural constitution of the mode
The structural constitution of this hegemony-producing mode of writing should primarily be explained by the following three matters:

(1) **Commercial interests**
(2) **The bourgeois watchdog procedure**
(3) **The journalistic tradition of ‘privatising’ social reality**

(1) **Commercial interests**: The presence of this mode is explained by the fact that it contains commercially attractive elements, psychologically and emotionally speaking. The mode operates ‘within’ this ‘thrilling’ news story about a ‘person’ or/and community that is wrestling with the threatening outside world, which is a fundamental theme in the history of human narration; see for example M. Night Shyamalan’s film *The Village* (2004). The commercial attractiveness is also related to the possibility of immediate identification. The more external elements that enter the city, the more the stressed, everyday life focused subject (‘Prague’) suffer from lack of safety, autonomy and control, and who cannot identify with this kind of situation?

(2) **The bourgeois watchdog procedure**: The remote control mode is defending the interests of the dominant mode of production through the celebration of private property and capital. Even though the journalists know that the financial summit concerns the negative effects of economic globalisation and the material poverty of the third world, still they cannot resist caring about ‘private property’ (‘Prague’). Taking the analysis of the *Multicolouring* and *Greying* modes as a point of departure, my hypothesis here is that the two newspapers’ defence of private capital is founded on partly different premises. DN’s ideological defence ought to be rather enthusiastic due to the newspaper’s market liberal identity, whereas it should be more restricted in post-socialist Delo, in accordance with the following rationale: Even though capitalism and Western consumption is not the perfect world, nevertheless it has saved the Czechs as well as the Slovenes from communist totalitarianism, and furthermore, does not the ‘external world’, which is decisively pushing *politics* into the ‘private domain’, remind ‘Prague’ of the old, socialist system? However, a counter-hegemonic journalistic mode in this context would be the kind of mode that would refuse to construct Prague as a ‘private economic garden’, but rather as a field exclusively intended for political struggle, communication and confrontation.
The journalistic tradition of ‘privatising’ social reality. The current mode could also be explained as a product of a more general tradition within Western capitalist journalism, the tradition of ‘privatising’ social reality in general, that is to say, spaces, relations, politics etc. (Habermas 1989). In the eighties and nineties, research on the journalistic privatisation/intimisation of social reality was partly neglected due to the breakthrough of postmodernism’s notions of time and space and its emphasis on the assumed disembodiment nature of the mass media – i.e. its presumed ability to generate an unlimited public world by separating ‘…interaction from the particularities of locales’ (Giddens 1997, 20), and this very much in accordance with Meyrowitz’s (1985) motto that nowadays ‘television escorts children across the globe even before they have permission to cross the street’ (Meyrowitz 1985, 238). The theoretical trend here was to push for global media technology and its expected democratic potential to ‘release’ the media audiences from their local and private worlds and to bring them into the global, public world, and thereby promote political citizenship, including a transnational one (Thompson 1995). The analysed journalistic mode however demonstrates that whether or not journalism actually manages to ‘catapult’ its audiences out in the external/public world is not simply a matter of media technology. What media technology optimists such as Meyrowitz and Thompson tend to neglect is that provided that the public is constructed in accordance with a ‘private gaze’, is it really possible to state that the media audiences actually ‘leave’ their private lifeworlds at all? The current journalistic mode constructs social reality from within a ‘private spot/state’ (from within the ‘private consumerist’ mind of ‘Prague’) and therefore the media audiences are never really forced to ‘go public’, i.e. to be confronted with the public sphere and its political struggles. According to McLuhan (2001) the revolutionary function of the mass media consists of the ability to serve as a sixth sense, as the extension of man. In this context, it is possible to reformulate this in terms of interpreting the mass media as an extension of, not simply of man, but of the private world of man.

The mode as a dialectical force
The continuing expansion of the private in capitalist societies includes the expansion of remote controlling, and hence the sovereign controlling of one’s social and material surroundings. The ongoing remote controlling process involves the following (dysfunctionally homologous) practices/domains:
Remote controlling consequently mediates the way in which this journalistic mode of writing is an ongoing ‘part’ of a ‘whole’ economic/material/technological process in the context of a capitalist mode of production, i.e. the continuing colonisation of private capital/private selection (consumption) in public space/life.
Differentiation

Introduction
The capitalist mode of production is deeply dependent on differentiation. It is impossible to imagine a capitalist economy apart from the upholding and generation of differences, essentially involving differentiated incomes and (different) degrees of power over miscellaneous material resources. There are particular communicative acts, i.e. ways of talking/writing, which should be considered integrated, ‘natural parts’ of this structural phenomenon. In this context, what is thus being observed is the journalistic mode of differentiation – a mode embedded in the whole general process of capitalist differentiation.

The ideologeme
This analysis involves the media coverage from the financial summit in Prague. The current ideologeme is the journalistic construction of politics, and more precisely, journalism’s way of constructing political engagement (the social organisation of the political demonstrations). The mode in question (that of differentiation) is primarily being observed in the Swedish news medium, which indicates that we are potentially dealing with a ‘national difference’ (why is differentiation less present in the Slovenian case?). Regarding the current ideologeme, there is this other, less structurally present, mode that should be included in the analysis, the unifying mode, operating in both newspapers. The analysis starts with the sub-mode (the unifying mode) and then moves on the core mode (the differentiating mode).

The mode as a discursive practice
The unifying mode (the sub-mode)
The unifying mode is a mode in which journalism constructs a political and/or a social process in terms of unity (the political engagement of different individuals, peoples, groups etc. becomes compressed into one political formation/will/desire/behaviour etc.). Perhaps the most common example of such a ‘unifying practice’ is the construction of a national identity and/or culture (Anderson 1991).

In this particular context, the unifying mode is related to the assumed ‘bad behaviour’ of the political activists; i.e. the mode operates in the context of the violent and negative dimensions of the political demonstrations. In order to demonstrate this matter, to begin with, I would like to outline the bad behaviour discourse. In Swedish DN (24/9), one can find the following:
In the middle of a page there is a photo of an activist dressed in black. His face is covered with a scarf, except for his eyes, standing in front of the Vaclav statue in central Prague. The message of this photo is evident: this is someone who would be prepared to join the Baader Meinhof group, al-Qaida or the like. It fits well with a debate article appearing two days later, written by the leader of the Swedish Christian Conservatives, Alf Svensson and some other politicians who are defending the free trade ideology. The headline announces ‘It’s time to stop the hooligans’. The following day (27/9), a small photo from the march accompanies the leading article in which an activist holds his left arm in accordance with a Nazi ‘Sieg Heil’ salute. On the one hand, both newspapers are rather restrained with regards to this kind of obvious propaganda against the transnational political movement. On the other hand, this journalistic ‘enlightened’ behaviour (the self restraint concerning publication of pictures of black-dressed hooligans etc.) becomes relatively pointless when considering the news focus on all the violence going on, in which political activism explicitly and repeatedly becomes associated with riots, fire, smoke, teargas, injured police officers etc.

The networks criticising economic globalisation do not only represent riots and broken windows (extract from introduction, the economy article ‘Political apathy broken’ DN 24/9).

The peaceful demonstrations degenerated into riots, where the demonstrators threw rocks and Molotov cocktails, while the police responded with water cannons (introduction to the front page article ‘Violent protests in Prague’ DN 27/9, together with a photograph of demonstrators and police forces fighting in the streets. Smoke, tumult; at the centre of attention, a black dressed demonstrator acting aggressively towards a group of policemen).

The demonstrators attacked the security personnel with rocks and Molotov cocktails, causing burn injuries to several policemen, who were rescued by their colleagues’ water cannons. The policemen, however, were not particularly gentle, as they sprayed the demonstrators with water cannons (extract from the front page article ‘Hot start for the IMF summit’ Delo 27/9, which is dominated by a photograph portraying the riots and the violence).

In the above news discourse the ‘bad behaviour’ discourse is intertwined with the so-called unifying journalistic mode. To begin with, the representatives of the political engagement/process are constructed through certain unifying signifiers such as ‘the networks’, ‘the demonstrators’, ‘the demonstrations’. These forms of political unity are then linked to the destructive things going on: ‘riots’, ‘broken windows’, ‘rocks and Molotov cocktails’ etc. It is clear, then, that the ‘guilty subject’ is the political unity itself: ‘The demonstrators’ (the political unity) were throwing rocks etc. (while the police ‘responded’). To sum up, occasionally in the news, hooliganism is
constructed as a psychological phenomenon in which a few bad apples (‘Seattle-vets’, ‘criminals’) infiltrate the political demonstrations in order to achieve their primitive goals, but generally speaking, it is instead as if hooliganism emanated from the very centre of the movement, as if it were the primitive kernel of the whole (united) movement. In conclusion, when the political engagement appears as a united formation (the ‘demonstrators’ etc.), there are primarily bad things to be said about the criticism of economic globalisation.

Journalism is, however, well aware of the propagandistic effect of turning all political activists into a bunch of hooligans. Therefore it is also possible to find news discourse questioning this stereotypic assumption:

[A Swedish representative of Attac says]: “We do not wear any ‘hoods’ or ‘boots’. Our sympathisers are ordinary, engaged, citizens who have started to realise the gap between the reality they see described in the mass media and the one they observe by themselves”, she says. /…/ All four protest movements that DN has talked to dissociate themselves from the violent events during the WTO summit in Seattle last winter (excerpts from economy article ‘Political apathy broken’ DN 24/9).

The differentiating mode (the core mode)
The unifying mode should be considered a tendency in both newspapers, i.e. its presence is sporadic rather than something that colonises the current ideologeme. When it comes to the construction of the political demonstrations there is this mode of differentiation, which is somehow more structurally present. When journalism performs the differentiated mode of writing, the following two aspects seem to be obligatory (a); the establishment of distance and ‘borders’ between different individuals and/or groups and their ‘ways of political thinking/doing’, followed by (b); the construction of social beings and/or groups as ‘autonomous entities’ in terms of transforming their political goals, desires, dreams etc. into isolated practices and highly specialised/divided labour.

While the unifying mode is related to the bad behaviour of the political demonstrators, the mode of differentiation is intertwined with more neutral observations about the movement and/or even more positive ones. The central observation here is that journalism differentiates the political movement (the unity) at two separate structural levels. First, there is differentiation at the organisational level concerning variations between different political interests within the movement. In the news, this is visible in the sense that particular political desires receive particular attention in the news: the Anarchists, Attac, Ya Basta, the Feminists, Jubel 2000, the Christianity Group, the critical intellectuals, the environmentalists, the Black Block, the Communists, the Marxist-Leninists etc. In different articles and discursive
contexts throughout the media coverage, diverse interests, desires, groups, interests etc. become manifested. In the Swedish news medium, the movement is sliced into as many as 22 different political interests throughout the entire coverage period (14 in the Slovenian case). The consequence of this is that there is no united movement, no common will etc. Furthermore, what paves the way for the mode of differentiation in Swedish DN is the explicit emphasis on how Prague becomes this playground for a chaotic variety of different political desires:

At the same time as an Anarchistic cultural festival engaged in resistance through art (theatre and poetry), a silent procession of mourning demonstrators walked through the streets of Prague (extract from the economy article ‘Protest march mourned the victims of the debt crisis’ DN 25/9).

Today, Monday, ‘Public Forum’ begins, a seminar arranged by Jubel 2000 and the environmental organisations, to discuss debt relief, economic globalisation and the threats to the environment. The extra-parliamentary Leftists concluded their alternative conference on Sunday (extract from economy article ‘Protest march mourned the victims of the debt crisis’ DN 25/9).

At once, ‘A was doing this, while B was doing that’ and ‘while A finished their thing, B continued with their’s’. Due to the emphasis on parallel events and happenings, this news discourse show symptoms of a ‘roundabout ride of political meaning’ in which journalism emphasises the dis-united character of political engagement. Furthermore, the central political topic (the destructive structural effects of economic globalisation) is treated in accordance with the similar differentiating logic. Different organisations are discussing different topics. There is, consequently, no Topic at stake, but rather several topics. The debt relief issue (for the underdeveloped countries), the economic globalisation issue and the environment issue are all treated as equally important matters, and as if they only were loosely connected. The consequence of this, then, is that the core ideological struggle, i.e. the challenging of the global capitalist system, is being repressed in the news discourse.

The second observation of differentiation involves the split character of the political subject as such. More precisely it concerns the journalistic focus on the individualised networking variety of political engagement, in which it is, in a rather positive spirit, pointed out that there are a great number of individuals among the political activists, enthusiastically practising a dis-united political behaviour:
Instead of representing some group or organisation, a great number of the activists have chosen to travel to Prague as individuals (extract from the economy article ‘Debt relief everybody’s demand’ DN 24/9).

It is also the loose organisational structure that distinguishes this protest movement from many earlier popular movements. Internet has made it possible for a great number of people to come in contact concerning a specific political issue, without establishing a formal organisation (extract from the economy article ‘Debt relief everybody’s demand’ DN 24/9).

According to this news discourse, the positive thing about the movement is that it consists of a great number of ‘private’ persons who have made the trip to the Czech Republic in order to join an event that ‘feels right’ according to their subjective notions of the ‘world situation’. Implicitly, in contrast to the ‘reactionary communists’ or the ‘primitive hooligans’, these are the complex beings who choose to rely on themselves. The way they reason and feel ‘within’ themselves comes first, and in order to uphold their ‘private’, individualist way of dealing with politics they must resist being absorbed into the presumably degenerate group-mentality of the movement. The collective struggle for a better world is more like a ‘supplement’, a ‘structural support’ for the subject in its need to achieve its own ‘unique thing’. In conclusion, what one should thus pay attention is that positive notions about the political activism are only expressed on the condition that the political unity be sliced up in smaller pieces. To achieve some ideological credit, political engagement has to be subjected to differentiation.

The structural constitution of the mode
We are confronted with two pro-hegemonic modes, while the latter mode appears with a certain structural strength in one of the newspapers. As a proposal, to explain the structural constitution of differentiation, and why it appears in the first place, we should take into account the following:

(1) Reflexivity
(2) The bourgeois watchdog procedure
(3) Class identification
(4) The national cultural tradition

(1) Reflexivity: To begin with, one should focus on the effects of journalistic reflexivity. In the state of ‘late modernity’, the production of institutional knowledge can no longer rely on any naturalised, unquestioned traditions and routines. Institutions, like journalism, increasingly are forced to behave like ‘human beings’ who constantly ‘keep in touch’ with the grounds of what they do as an integral element of doing it. This ‘reflexive monito-
ring of action’, as Giddens (1997, 36) puts it, indicates that institutions, in order to be successful, are forced to quickly respond to inputs from their social surroundings, constantly generating a ‘never-to-be-relaxed’ oriented behaviour (Beck 1995, 7). Reflexivity could then help us explain why the current unifying mode (the ‘demonstrators’ reduced to hooliganism) never really dominates the current ideologeme, as well as help us explain the breakthrough of differentiation. There is this reflexive, ‘self-critical’ behaviour in which journalism wants to ‘break with tradition’ in terms of not doing what many newsreaders assume them to do (to simply dismiss the demonstrators as hooligans). They rather want to somehow ‘understand’ the presumably ‘new winds’ in politics and the awakening struggle against global capital. Reflexivity is thus operating in terms of the journalistic attempt to treat the political movement in a more ambiguous way (i.e. the movement is not only hooliganism), which is, in turn, generating the splitting and differentiation of the political movement.

(2) The bourgeois watchdog procedure: The mode of differentiation is related to a somehow ‘emphatic’ and ‘reflexive’ treatment of the political movement, although, this mode is still propagandistic in terms of protecting the capitalist status quo. To begin with, the point is that this journalistic mode dissolves the underlying, common agenda of the political demonstrators, and this very much in accordance with Thompson’s definition:

/.../ differentiation – that is, emphasising the distinctions, differences and divisions between individuals and groups, the characteristics which disunite them and prevent them from constituting an effective challenge to existing relations or an effective participant in the exercise of power (Thompson 1990, 65).

What is de facto being dissolved and dismissed is the potential public dimension of the political demonstrations, i.e. that the protests in Prague might actually represent a greater population, that they might be the embryo of a united, single voice (beyond the differences between the organisations) being expressed, representing the common will of a ‘people’. What is likely to be repressed is the birth (or rebirth) of a transnational people’ (Carleheden 2001), calling for a more radical transformation of the capitalist system and its institutions. The repressed and absent (counter-hegemonic) journalistic mode in this context is a unifying mode, constructing the political movement as one subject while argumentatively promoting the above mentioned political desire.
(3) **Class identification:** The breakthrough of differentiation could also be explained in a more psychological manner, involving the processes of (more or less unconscious) identification among the current journalists. When conceiving the political demonstrations in a more positive manner, journalism consequently sees this fragmentary field of different desires, wills, goals etc., as in this context, there seems to be this preferred market liberal structure to identify with. More precisely, what seems to be there to cherish is an (economic) market place of ‘commodities’ in which the assumedly sovereign political subject/consumer freely chooses this or that concept/idea. The journalistic construction of political engagement is thus imagining the ideal bourgeois individualistic market place behaviour in which politics is nothing but the sum…

/.../ of the action of countless autonomous individuals on each other and in response to each other, behaving as rationally as possible for the protection of their private interests...with no regard for any trans-individual authority or values (Goldmann 1973, 18).

(4) **The national cultural tradition:** The mode of differentiation, constructing political engagement in accordance with a post-ideological market logic (politics as a constantly changing market of particular issues/preferences) is consequently operating more strongly in the Swedish newspaper. This could naturally be explained by the liberal identity of DN in contrast to the socialist past of Delo. Furthermore, from a national cultural point of view, the journalistic differentiation of politics in DN embodies the neoliberal ‘post-welfare’ condition in Sweden from the nineties onwards, and the relative abandonment of class politics (leftist vs rightist antagonism). In Slovenia, on the other hand, for the last fifteen years there has been a rather rapid development of market capitalism (the expansion of the private sector etc.). The restricted presence of differentiation in Delo, however, indicates that the journalistic discourse does not necessary adopt a neoliberal logic with the same rapidity, but consequently that there is some kind of inertia operating (see also the Greying mode).

The mode as a dialectical force
One should here imagine one process referred to as differentiation. Differentiation is a fundamental dimension of human cognition, i.e. the cognitive/intellectual distinguishing of various elements: A differs from B, and so forth (see Derrida 1978), while in particular contexts, differentiation is a structural phenomenon within a capitalist mode of production, generated by the following intertwined (and dysfunctionally homologous) practices/domains:
– **economic/material differentiation**: involving the necessary difference of power between people concerning material resources and capital. Economic/material differentiation in a late capitalist context is characterised by increasing social differentiation (Harvey 1989), and more precisely an *individualistically* oriented mode of coping with everyday reality in an ever competitive capitalist economy (which is operating in terms of the expansion of private solutions for health care, education etc). In the late capitalist context, individuality (Rose 1998) becomes this important ‘cogwheel’ of economic/material differentiation.

– **political differentiation**: the differentiation and individualisation of political thinking, political engagement and political action. Considered from a late capitalist point of view, it involves the gradual decline of class politics and the expansion of the ‘politics of difference’ (Laclau & Mouffe 1985) and ‘lifestyle politics’ process, in which the political increasingly becomes this fragmentary, constantly changing smorgasbord of various topics, identity struggles, actions etc.

– **discursive differentiation**: including the journalistic mode of constructing politics, social relations, reality, society, the public etc. as a play or/and spaces of ‘unconstrained differences’ (of freely ‘swirling atoms’ i.e. of individuals who only bond and communicate temporarily).

Economic/material differentiation cannot exist apart from social/political/discursive differentiation. Our daily differentiating practices with money and commodities *and* other kinds of differentiating practices, including the current journalistic mode of constructing transnational politics, are like *one ongoing (differentiating) process* within the dominant (capitalist) mode of production.
Semiotic Compression

Introduction
The capitalist system is a matter of time and space compression (Harvey 1989): compression in terms of overcoming distance and the generation of ever more rapid transportation of goods and transmission of information by means of technology (Carey 1989). In capitalist societies there is an overall technological/economic ‘compressive logic’ characterised by the striving for immediacy, whereby the ever more immediate transportation of material and symbolic goods is connected with the hunt for ‘immediate’ economic growth/profit. What should be added here is a particular journalistic mode that is being dialectically intertwined with the process of technological/economic compression: a mode that could be designated semiotic compression. This journalistic way of writing compresses (reduces) discourse/meaning for the sake of achieving a more immediate sense of reality. This is, for example, the case when the mass media only portray an event visually (‘live pictures from…’) instead of explaining and discussing its historic and economic origins. The purpose of this analysis is therefore to demonstrate the way in which journalistic compression is part of the whole compressive ‘ontology’ of capitalism.

The ideologeme
Semiotic compression is operating within the following ideologeme: the construction of politics, and more precisely the political action and ‘behaviour’ of the financial institutions (IMF and WB) and the demonstrators (Attac etc.) during the international financial summit in Prague (2000). The ideologeme involves the relationship between the First and Third worlds, and the way in which one should imagine political action in a global context (i.e. political engagement for the Third World). Semiotic compression is operating in both newspapers.

The mode as a discursive practice
Semiotic compression is a journalistic mode that strives for immediacy by compressing, i.e. reducing/minimising the distance between;

(a) ‘pre-discursive’ reality, a state, a feeling, an action etc. ‘before’ or ‘irrespective of’ writing/talking, meaning-making.

(b) discursive reality: the writing/talking, meaning-making about an event, a feeling, an action etc.
It thus concerns the journalistic striving for portraying reality in its purest and most present form (where discourse/journalistic commentaries are not really necessary). Semiotic compression consequently presupposes the reduction of distance. This is often considered a technological matter in terms of reduction of time and space obstacles. The mass media, by means of technology, compresses (minimises) the distance between the potential media audiences and the ‘event’ ‘out there’ (which is somehow the philosophy of live television). Semiotic compression and its ‘elimination’ of distance are however also achieved by means of a certain journalistic writing technique. When the news media ‘describe’, ‘present’ or ‘narrate’ social reality, distance is conquered through the reduction of elements that might possibly undermine a more proximate media reception of an event (a catastrophe etc.), feeling (such as suffering etc.) or state (poverty etc.). There is this journalistic minimisation of ‘superfluous’ discourse and information for the sake of a more immediate sense of reality, supposedly characterised by ‘empirical presence’, ‘authenticity’ and ‘down-to-earth’ oriented constructions of the human condition.

Taxes, debts and charity (Semiotic compression I)

More precisely, this analysis involves news media’s compressive construction of political action when it comes to how to make the world a better place. In the news, this compressive logic is related to (1) taxes, (2) debts and (3) charity, all three being closely connected to each other.

The news media demonstrate a certain willingness to pay attention to the political movement (Attac, Jubilee 2000 etc.) and its critique of the relevant financial institutions. What the movement wants is a reduction of poverty in the Third World, while journalism is somehow supporting this goal by emphasising the relevance of the reform proposals emanating from Attac and other organisations. In the Swedish news case, what is supposed to be Attac’s ‘hobby-horse’, the so-called (1) Tobin tax, is debated throughout the whole media coverage period. From the very beginning, the tax matter reaches ‘important topic’ status, combined with the implicit journalistic appeal to the two powerful financial institutions to take it into consideration. This proposed taxation of international currency speculation receives slightly more attention in the Swedish case due to the fact that in Sweden it is constructed in terms of an entertaining ‘internal governmental quarrel’ in which two members of the same Social-Democratic government, the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Commerce, partly disagree on whether such a tax is at all realistic:
Currency tax divides the government (headline). On Sunday the Jubilee 2000 movement demonstrated against the effects of globalisation. At the same time it is clear that the members of the Swedish government disagree regarding the question of whether a tax on international currency transactions is needed (extract from economy article DN 25/9). No disagreement on the currency tax (headline). The Minister of Finance Bosse Ringholm is open to discussion of taxing foreign currency transactions. However, he has not taken sides in favour of such a tax. ‘It is not a prioritised question’, he says (introduction from economy article DN 26/9).

What is important here is that journalism chooses to focus on a tax due to its generation of immediate identification. What is assumed to be too complicated and abstract (how to solve global poverty) is transformed into an immediately graspable product, for the purpose of identification. The ‘how to change global capitalism’ issue becomes synonymous with simply saying yes or no to a tax reform; the Tobin tax pulls the whole global capitalism issue down from the assumed (utopian/ideological) heavens to the concrete ground of ‘pure action’.

This simplified down-to-earth reasoning about solving the structural problems of poverty is furthermore present in the news in terms of (2) debts. It concerns whether or not totalitarian nation states should have the right to receive Western funds in order to get their economies back on track. And if this is the case, which particular countries have the right to receive money from the financial institutions? And for the chosen lucky ones: how much money should they get? As in the matter of the Tobin tax, identification is essential. Financial debts involve the social sign of money, which is perhaps the most well known sign in the world. What also makes debt into proper material for identification is the fact that most people are not fortunate enough to escape the knowledge of what a financial debt is:

\[\text{At yesterday's press conference, the President of the World Bank James Wolfensohn emphasised that the world economy is stronger this year, in comparison with the last decade; economic growth in the developed countries is up to five percent – the same level as before the Asian crisis. When he spoke about the future challenges for the World Bank, he emphasised that together with the IMF they want to reduce the debts of the poorest and most indebted countries (extract from 'Argumentative battle between the bankers and the demonstrators' Delo 25/9).}\]

\[\text{Difficult to get money for debt relief (headline). Tear gas and crowding, are what the protesting groups expect during the forthcoming demonstration. Reduction of debt is a topic of present interest at the World Bank and IMF Summit – for economists as well as for demonstrators (introduction from economy article DN 26/9).}\]
The news discourse on taxes and debts is embedded within the logic of (3) charity. On the one hand the financial institutions are considered repressive, making life even more miserable for the already miserable poor countries. These authorities on international financial matters are forcing underdeveloped countries, which already spend thirty-five to forty percent of their budgets to repay their foreign debts, to cut wages to a minimum and reduce public spending even more. On the other hand, the sunny side of the IMF and the WB is their assumed ‘cash cow’ potentials, that they can, quite easily, do some good for the poor by opening their thick wallets:

$50 billion to the poorest (headline from economy article Delo 26/9)

/.../ Yesterday, both organisations, which over the last few days have been criticised from several different perspectives, announced that at the end of this year, the thirty poorest and most underdeveloped countries in the world will be partly forgiven their financial debt – to the sum of 50 billion American dollars, which will reduce their debt by 65 percent (introduction).

Concerning this matter, James Wolfensohn, the President of the World Bank, stated that ten countries have already been relieved of their debt to the amount of 15 billion dollars, and that in the forthcoming months, another 20 countries, counted among the poorest in the world, will face a radical improvement of their debt situation (extract).

Donating more money to the poor is assumed to be a central aspect of what the political movement is fighting for. The income from the Tobin tax is supposed to fill the pockets of the poor with more money while the cancellation of debt is expected to generate the same positive effect. The protesters in Prague play the role of being the ‘refreshing’ political wind that forces the rich institutions to drop their cold and rational character, while making them work harder on their ‘softer’ and more ‘feminine’ qualities (forgiving-ness, empathy). Noteworthy, then, is the way in which the financial institutions and the movement become one – jointly involved in charity-like engagements:

Kristina Hellqvist, who works for the Church of Sweden and is heading the Swedish Jubilee 2000 delegation, sees no reason to celebrate. The Jubilee Year will soon be over but the hated debts are still there. In 1996, International Monetary Fund for the first time approved a comprehensive programme to cancel part of the debts of the poorest countries. Four years later, only one country, Uganda, has had the opportunity to take full part in the programme (extract from economy article ‘A protest procession for the victims of the debt crisis’ DN 25/9).

Difficult to get money for debt relief (headline). Tear gas and crowding, are what the protesting groups expect during the forthcoming demonstration. Reduction of debt is a topic of present interest at the World Bank and IMF Summit – for economists as well as for demonstrators (introduction from economy article DN 26/9).
The news media consequently equate ‘solving global poverty’ with ‘more money to the poor’. This is however also the actual agenda of the Christian international network Jubilee 2000, blessed by Bono as well as the late Pope J. Paul, and comprising organisations such as Caritas, the Red Cross and Save the Children. To a respectable degree the agenda of Jubilee 2000 becomes synonymous with the movement as a whole (while the Marxian dimension of the movement is repressed). As a matter of fact, the news media complement the charity matter with connotations of Christian morality, in which the benefactor-oriented actions by the financial institutions are explicitly cherished for displaying the virtue of forgivingness (‘…the thirty poorest and underdeveloped countries in the world will be partly forgiven their financial debt – to the sum of 50 billion American dollars…’).

At the end of the media coverage, when the political gathering in Prague is summarised, ‘charity-like’ action appears as the preferred form of political action when it comes to the question of how to deal with the negative aspects of economic globalisation. In order to demonstrate this discursive situation further, one could analyse the way in which the policy of the US is handled by Swedish DN:

*The US should take responsibility* (headline). *When it comes to financing the debt cancellations, the Swedish Minister for International Development Cooperation, Maj-Inger Klingwall, wants to increase the pressure. ‘If Sweden is to contribute more money, the US must contribute its portion’, she says* (introduction from economy article DN 28/9).

It is somehow ironic that the Swedes are criticising the US government for not being sufficiently charity-oriented. Is it not in the US that charity is the standard instrument for masking and repressing the negative effects of capitalism and the market economic system? In sum: the entire ‘more money to the poor’ rationale, embracing the financial institutions, the political movement as well as particular nation states (such as Sweden), expresses a (Christian) conservative, as well as US oriented mode, of dealing with social material problems.

*Where is semiotic compression located?*
How could one then discern some concrete traces and empirical evidence of a ‘word compressed’ mode of writing (semiotic compression)? The suggestion here is that one foremost should take into account the following ‘narrative’ journalistic rationale:

(a) *The concern for the immediately empirically observable negative aspects of global capitalism: Third World poverty.*

(b) *The ‘urge for action’, initiated by the political movement and followed by the financial institutions (IMF, WB).*
The relevant issue here is the radical reduction of ‘how to solve the negative aspects of economic globalisation’ into certain quick fix oriented practices and actions (taxes, debts, charity), i.e. the immediate switch from (a) to (b) to (c) and the compressed relation between these different ‘levels’. Due to the (semiotic) compression of political action, there is a presence of detailed and proximate insights into poverty, human suffering etc., while what is absent is the actual structural condition – the complex whole that continually generates material inequality (the capitalist system and the exploitative relation between the First and the Third World). The compressed news discourse does not really explain the structural condition of global poverty; it rather focuses on the visible effects of this condition (it is the immediate, empirical presence of poverty that counts, not the overly complex discourse about it). There is only one article, a debate article in Swedish DN, that somewhat counteracts this compressed mode, written by a socialist politician who is discussing how Swedish companies, as well as consumers, are part of the ongoing systematic exploitation of the Third World (‘Sweden’s role in the exploitation’ DN 26/9).

Compassionate non-communication (Semiotic compression II)
Semiotic compression is present in journalism’s construction of global politics as immediate action. Journalistic compression, however, also operates in its treatment of the political ‘behaviour’ of the demonstrators. Half-way through the summit, a DN front page headline emphasises how a ‘Mourning procession against the economic summit in Prague’ (25/9) marched towards the city centre the second day. The accompanying photo is an evocative image consisting of numerous white crosses, carried by hundreds of participants (see attached photo). The financial section of DN is dominated by a close-up version of the same event: a close-up of demonstrating mourning middle-aged women, carrying crosses that are supposed to represent the death and poverty of the Third World (see attached photo). In this mobile manifestation of death due to poverty – in this so-called funeral procession – all the participants are wearing black t-shirts with the message ‘break the chains of debt’ printed on the front:

The procession was arranged by Jubilee 2000 to mourn the 19,000 human beings who, according to UN reports, die every day as a result of the debt crisis in the poorest countries of the world (extract from economy article ‘A protest procession for the victims of the debt crisis’ DN 25/9).
‘Political mourning’ in Prague, DN 25 September 2000
‘Political mourning’ in Prague, DN 25 September 2000

Protesting woman in Prague, DN 27 September 2000
Cross in protest. With their crosses, demonstrators at the IMF and WB summit in Prague wanted to show that thousands of people die every day as a result of the current world order (Caption to the photo of the mourning women, financial section, DN 25/9).

What is of interest here is that the news media construct political engagement as ‘arranged’ and ‘staged’ behaviour. There is the symbolic mourning (the construction of a funeral procession) complemented with theatrical illustrations of death (white crosses representing the fact that people die every second due to famine) as well as catchword-bombing strategies in which the financial institutions are attacked by concise imperatives (‘break the chains of debt’). These engagements as a whole somehow operate as a comment, not only on global poverty and injustice, but also on politics in general, as a statement expressing distanciation from convenient political discourse and the whole democratic tradition in which desired political goals are achieved through ‘rational’ argumentative communication between the public and actual institutional powers. In accordance with the way in which the news media portray them, these political demonstrators are truly engaged and compassionate citizens but they hardly seem to be in the mood for ‘real’ political communication or some ‘demanding’ ideological analyses of the world.

Journalism ‘compresses’ the political behaviour of the movement by associating it with word reductionism. The practice of reducing or eliminating words/discourse appears as an essential instrument for achieving the desired effect (less poverty). The economy article ‘A wall of policemen protected the delegates’ (DN 27/9) includes a photo of an elderly woman standing in front of a human wall of Czech policemen (see attached photo). A steel fence separates her from the police, while in sharp contrast to the armed policemen, the woman is holding a coloured balloon (endowed with a slogan). She ‘communicates’ the urge to do something about global poverty precisely by not ‘saying’ very much, but instead staging this dangerous and crazy event of placing herself at the extreme epicentre of hooligan battles with nothing but a (political) balloon. In accordance with a similar inarticulate rationale; even though the white crosses manifest a structural condition (that people die every second due to the capitalist world order) they do not indicate the beginning of a communicative process, but rather represent the beginning, as well as the end, of communication. It is as if this symbolic representation (the white crosses) is the essential communicative ‘content’. Finally, this ‘verbal reductionism’ is perhaps most concretely manifested in the slogan ‘break the chains of debt’ operating in accordance with the energetic Nike imperative: Just Do It! (Do it – break the chains of debt – now!). It is an imperative that does not seem to have a natural
communicative continuation. Further discourse is somehow superfluous. *Just Do It!* In this way the whole political agenda of the movement is compressed/reduced into this simple desire (immediate charity).

**The structural constitution of the mode**

The journalistic mode of semiotic compression is primarily constituted by the following factors:

1. **Technology**
   
   Semiotic compression is generated by technology and its ability to reduce time and space obstacles. Semiotic compression is thus most developed in technologically advanced media (television etc.), such as in contexts of global live-television, while it consequently also operates in more traditional media (print media etc.) although in a less empirically obvious and visible way (as in this case). The assumption here is that the semiotic compression of television *influences other media* (like the press), somehow orienting them towards a more compressed mode of reporting the world (see Bolter & Grusin 1999). Furthermore on the matter of technology, there is a great deal of research demonstrating how technological compression necessarily de-stimulates more ‘meaning-laden’ and structurally oriented explanations of social reality (Virilio 1996, Ramonet 1998, Slayden & Whillock 1999). Immediacy and proximity, the desired end product of technological compression, is *dependent* on the ‘elimination of discourse’.

2. **Commercial interests.**
   
   Semiotic compression is further generated by commercial interests. When the mass media make use of advanced technology for compressing reality, and/or when a journalist writes about something in a compressed manner, a more commercially attractive product is manufactured (see Hvitfelt 1994). Semiotic compression is by definition the mode that makes reality less complicated, more immediate and clear; complex issues are reduced, even simplified. Reality is visualised rather than discussed and explained, emotionalised rather than intellectualised. Semiotic compression is then a close relative of popular journalism (Dahlgren & Sparks 1992) or rather populist forms of writing. Semiotic compression operates in all kinds of journalism, but in a more empirically obvious manner in
‘popular media’ (in commercial news, tabloid journalism etc.). (Semiotic compression could furthermore be traced in all possible forms of discourse, including scientific writing).

(3) The journalistic tradition of emotionalising and de-intellectualising political action and citizenship: Semiotic compression is also the result of journalism’s desire to activate citizenship. Semiotic compression could be seen as the applied journalistic ‘method’ or strategy for achieving this goal. The underlying ‘motto’ of semiotic compression is that an overly ‘wordy’ discourse might interrupt or disturb the proximate relation to the ‘empirically immediate’ (in this case: the victims of poverty). The more political and ideological the discourse, the greater the distance that is created to the ‘real thing’ (the people who are suffering and dying right now). The mass media somehow assume that ‘the emotional’, ‘immediate help-rationale’ (like charity) etc. may pave the way for a more intellectually ‘developed’ political engagement among the media audiences. In Thompson’s (1995) theory on the mass media and democracy, it is assumed that more visual representations of social and material problems (such as photos of suffering and starvation), are the proper medicine for the revitalisation of citizenship. First the media audiences are assumed to become upset by, for example, starving Rwandan children, and the resulting emotional storm within their hearts will generate an urge for ‘immediate action’ (charity), and their engagement is supposed to then successively reorient itself towards more ‘serious’ political meaning-making (in terms of joining a political organisation, network, party etc.). The initial impulses, filled with empathy, identification, anger, despair etc. are assumed to generate a deepened, ‘structural’ engagement (the focus on the structures, systems, institutional practices and laws that have originally generated the actual condition). Semiotic compression, however, counteracts this logic, since it is a mode that turns, i) the visual/emotional/immediate, and ii) meaning/discourse, into antagonistic parties. In the current media coverage, a more ‘developed’ political and ideological analysis of the poverty problem does not seem to be the natural second step and consequence of the public demonstrations. The only thing that really counts is pure and immediate action. What serves as a stamp of legitimacy of the political movement is its non-discursive and wordless behaviour and agenda, expressed in the supposed urge for immediate action. And what makes the financial institutions socially and politically legitimate is immediate action ($50 billion to the poorest).

(4) The bourgeois watchdog procedure: Semiotic compression operates in the news in order to protect the interests of capital. It somehow conjures away the capitalist system as a structural reality. In this news context, jour-
nalism compresses the global poverty issue into a case of charity ($50 billion to the poorest’ etc.). The compressed discourse ‘eliminates’ the existence of the encompassing structure or system that continually produces the current material inequalities (the global capitalist system). What ‘capitalist’ journalism forbids is comprehensive structural explanations of social reality, while what this journalism is feeding us with are pictures of the immediately observable reality itself (intimate descriptions and photos of starving people etc.). Consider the function of semiotic compression in miscellaneous ‘proximity-maximising’ media discourses on starvation, death, pain or human suffering (and the censorship of more ‘demanding’ explanations).

The mode as a dialectical force
The singular process in this context is the process of compression (the reduction/minimisation of distance) which is a necessary structural dimension of the capitalist system. Compression is continually constituted by the intertwined (and dysfunctionally homologous) relationships between:
The above three forms of compression are only partly compatible, and this is what dysfunctional homologies is all about. Semiotic compression does not entirely express the same thing as economic/material compression, but their underlying common denominator (the hunt for immediacy) indicates that they somehow work in the same direction, that they jointly constitute X (compression). In this particular analysis the journalistic mode of semiotic compression constructs global political action as a wordless practice of emotional compassion and charity, based on the violently impatient and restless need for quick fixes and immediate results in the whole global poverty situation, and this compressive mode of constructing political action
should thus be seen as an integrative part of the overall compressive nature of the capitalist system with its pervasive short-term thinking and ‘shortest route to satisfaction’ logic.
Locking

Introduction
Wage-labour requires, in one way or another, mental and physical locking (regulation). When occupied with some sort of wage-labour, one accepts being mentally and physically locked, meaning that one renounces one’s locomotive power, autonomy and freedom. The more one-dimensional and monotonic the mode of work, the more locked one is as an employee. The more supervised the workroom is (by a clocking-in card system, surveillance personnel etc.), the greater the ‘locking’ effect is. The capitalist mode of production and one of its most obvious effects – economic/material exploitation of labour power – thus requires a ‘locking kind of structure’. However, in capitalist societies, this ongoing economic/material locking is dependent on, as well as dialectically intertwined with, discursive locking; i.e. a particular, ongoing mode of talking/writing that co-constitutes the ‘whole’ economic/material locking process. In news discourse, discursive locking operates in the form of a journalistic mode of writing. This locking mode of writing involves the practice of discursively regulating a person or a group in the current news coverage. When discursively regulating a person/group, the superior force (the journalist, the media company etc.) forces the person/group to adopt and perform a pre-determined, one-dimensional ‘piece of work’ in the news discourse – and thereby objectifies and exploits it for some underlying economic, political or ideological purpose.

The ideologeme
The locking mode is operative in the media coverage from former Yugoslavia, and more precisely in the discursive construction of national culture (the ideologeme), i.e. in the journalistic treatment of the ‘Kosovo Albanians’ and the ‘Serbs’. A ‘national difference’ is empirically present in the news discourse, as the locking mode only operates in the Swedish news medium. The locking mode is furthermore co-operating with another mode, the complexity-generating mode (the sub-mode). This sub-mode is however operative in Slovenian Delo as well.

The mode as a discursive practice
The complexity-generating mode (the sub-mode)
The complexity-generating mode involves the journalistic practice of constructing a person, object, space, culture etc., in a relatively many-sided and contradictory manner. This is, for example, the case when journalism expli-
citly tries to ‘go beyond’ and break with the traditional and stereotypical picture of a person, country etc., i.e. when it tries to portray a well known phenomenon from a new and fresh point of view. This analysis thus begins with the complexity-generating mode of constructing the ‘Serb’ or the ‘Serbs’. From a relative point of view (in comparison with the Kosovo Albanians) the Serb appears as a divided and complex (bourgeois) individual, i.e. as a subject that is split between its primitive nature (based on its underlying military, political, sexual, etc. desires) and cultivated manners (based on its Western European cultural and ‘intellectual’ skills/traditions).

The construction of the Serb involves such discursive elements as ‘Slobodan Milosevic’, the ‘Serbian parliament’, certain political parties (the ones supporting Milosevic), ‘voices from the streets’ (Belgrade) and reporting on ‘everyday life in Serbia’. It is the construction of the political elite and the State authorities (the military, the police) that primarily constitutes the ‘general Serb’. The following presumed Serbian characteristics and conditions appear in the Swedish news coverage (to different extents in different contexts):

(1) **Foolhardiness**: Milosevic has chosen a path the consequences of which he is fully aware of (extract from front page article ‘No hope left of solving the Kosovo crisis’ 24/3).

(2) **Dialogical-democratic potentials**: Failed discussions (front page sub-headline from article ‘No hope left of solving the Kosovo crisis’ 24/3). Talks on Kosovo collapsed (headline 24/3). ‘The lines of communication between us and Belgrade are always open, even in times of conflict. Milosevic has my number’ (R. Holbrooke cited, extract from the article).

(3) **Pride**: The Belgrade regime’s attitude towards Nato’s plan was unbrokenly defiant and President Milosevic said on television that ‘we will defend our country if it is attacked’ (extract from front page article ‘Nato’s air raids have started’ 25/3).
(4) **Defiance:** And the Serbian parliament defiantly declared, during an extra session on Tuesday; we will not accept foreign military forces on our territory, not even if the price is that we are bombed (extract from front page article ‘No hope left of solving the Kosovo crisis’ 24/3). Continuous defiant attitude from Belgrade (front page sub-headline from article ‘Nato’s air raids have started’ 25/3). Unbroken defiance of Nato (headline, 25/3). The Belgrade regime’s attitude towards Nato’s plan was unbrokenly defiant /.../ (extract from article). If we lose Kosovo, then we can just as well lose anything – in this way the mood among Serbs seems to coincide with the regime’s defiance of Nato (extract from article ‘The wars strengthen Milosevic’ 27/3).

(5) **Chameleon-like behaviour:** Foreign diplomats met Milosevic, a man of the world, who learned to speak English with an American accent during his time in the US as director of a Belgrade bank. And to begin with, because of his gentle manner, they were misled into thinking that they had met someone who understood them. After all, they spoke the same language! (extract from article ‘Milosevic wants to become a mythical martyr’ 26/3).

(6) **Ruthlessness:** To save as many civilian Kosovo Albanians as possible from the ruthless Serbian special police forces (extract from front page article ‘Too late to save the village of Lausha’ 25/3).

(7) **Suffering:** For several years, a guerrilla war has been going on. It was started by the liberation army of Kosovo (UCK) /.../ The guerrillas have consistently operated in accordance with their aims, by means of 1) terror acts against Albanian and Serbian civilians; 2) attacks on police patrols, official institutions, Serbian refugee camps and military personnel; 3) the use of the civilian population as a buffer (extracts from debate article ‘Sweden must distance itself from the bloodbath’ 26/3).

(8) **‘Uncivilised behavior’**: Kosovo lies in ruins (front page headline 27/3). Refugees report that Serbs are committing mass executions (sub-headline). Serbian acts of violence in Kosovo (headline 27/3). Further evidence of Serbian violence and ethnic cleansing in the province. The few refugees who have managed to flee to Macedonia tell about the chaos in the region. The UN refugee organisation also fears that fleeing civilians are being stopped by the Serbs (sub-headline). Serbs harassing foreign journalists (headline 27/3).
All these features are also found in Slovenian Delo. The mixture of different ‘personal qualities’ consequently paves the way for the ‘complex Serb’. She could be a suffering victim (‘terror acts…against Serbian civilians’), she could be ruthless and uncivilised (‘…committing mass executions’) as well as a civilised European, or a ‘normal’ person who one could actually ‘talk’ to (in contrast to Osama bin Ladin etc.). Serbian elusive is particularly embodied in the journalistic construction of Slobodan Milosevic who is constructed as a chameleon-like subject who wears various masks and behaviours; his urbane and sophisticated manner on the one hand, and his primitive ‘defiant’ desires and behaviour on the other.

The urban subject
The Western news coverage from the wars in Croatia (1991–1995) and Bosnia and Herzegovina (1992–1995) often contained images of the entirely ‘evil Serb’ (see Berglez 1999). This Serbian portrayal was often embedded in a rural context, the rural (and primitive) Serbs attacking ‘civilisation’ – the cities of Sarajevo or Dubrovnik – from the surrounding hills (and so forth). What is noteworthy is that in the present news case (the war on Kosovo), Swedish news journalism places the Serb within urban spaces and contexts:

Everyday consumption: Description of photo: of Serbian citizens standing in line in a supermarket in Belgrade. Accompanying caption: On Wednesday, many of Belgrade’s inhabitants queued in grocery stores to hoard as much food and necessities as possible (DN 25/3).

Democratic efforts: Radio station forced to shut down (headline). Early on Wednesday morning, the independent radio station B-92 in Belgrade was ordered to stop their broadcasting (article DN 25/3).

Serbs standing in line in a supermarket in Belgrade, and the focus on ‘…the independent radio station B-92 in Belgrade…’, witness to a belonging in the consumption-oriented and liberal-democratic Western world, emphasising the existence of the civilised Serb who does not have much to do with the horrors going on in Kosovo. It is furthermore part of the journalistic constitution of a divided and sensitive Serbian subject that is urban and rural; civilised and primitive; modern and obsessed with history.

The locking mode (the core mode)
Locking implies an obvious absence of power and autonomy for the person or group that is provided space in the news discourse. Journalism dictates and regulates a person’s or group’s appearance in the news by completely constructing him/her in accordance with a pre-determined idea. In order to accomplish this, the complex and contradictory dimensions of the current
person must be peeled off and erased. The transition from complexity/multi-dimensionality to one-dimensionality paves the way for a news discourse in which the covered person appears strictly in accordance with journalism’s underlying interests. A discursively locked person is thus of necessity objectified and exploited by journalism. To scientifically analyse journalistic locking is a matter of investigating the level of transparency. Discursive transparency is present in media discourse if one, as a media consumer, gets the impression that one quite easily can see ‘entirely through’ the covered person or group, i.e. if it becomes ‘too easy’ to map and determine the person’s/group’s identity as a whole (if a person/group is repeatedly constructed in the same transparent manner, in the long run it might develop into a so called stereotype). The more transparent an identity appears to be, the more synthetic, manufactured and controlled it is (by the superior power: the media institution and the other powers that the mass medium is interrelated with).

The current mode is found in the Swedish news construction of the ‘Kosovo Albanians’. The central observation here is that the Kosovo Albanian subject is reduced to one identity, a suffering victim (see Boltanski 1999, Höijer 2004). The following three states and actions constitute the suffering victim:

| (1) Pain and waiting: Description of photo: human eyes expressing pain and fear, people behind a fence of some kind. A man and a woman looking away from the camera. The woman is pressing her hand against the fence. In front of them, blurred contours of a child sleeping in her mother’s arms. Caption: Thousands of Kosovo Albanians have fled the violence and insecurity in Kosovo. Here some of them are waiting to register in a refugee camp in Macedonia (the photo is linked to the article ‘Talks on Kosovo collapsed’ 24/3). Description of photo: Three women, a mother, her daughter and another child. Their body language expresses pain and hopelessness. The daughter leans on the mother, she is sleeping in a standing position. The other child is looking down at the ground, pressing her fingers against her eyebrows – she is crying. Caption: A Kosovo Albanian woman and her daughter are waiting to register at a refugee camp in Skopje (the photo accompanies the article ‘Half a million people fleeing’ 25/3). |
Description of photo: Kosovo Albanian men sitting in a bar in Skopje. Two of them are engaged in a discussion, one is holding his hand at the back of his head, staring into the television screen. His body language and eyes express anxiety and sorrow. Caption: In café Cha Cha in Skopje, Ilir Domis sits and watches Nato’s bombing of his hometown Pristina on television (the photo accompanies the article ‘Anxious atmosphere in Skopje’ 26/3).

Description of photo (see the following page): Two middle-aged women are crying, they are hugging in order to comfort each other. Caption: Two sisters, who have managed to escape Kosovo, hug each other. On Friday, they arrived by bus at Sarajevo in Bosnia (the photo accompanies the article ‘Serbian acts of violence in Kosovo’ 27/3).

(2) Under attack: /…/ the majority of the people under the newly built roofs had left again, scared away by Serbian tanks and harassment. Arben Geza repeated his appeal: ‘Only Nato can save us’ (extract from front page article ‘Too late to save the village of Lausha’ 25/3).

Under no circumstances could they have stayed in Pristina. Since Nato’s bombs started falling, no one in the family dared to go outside anymore. – ‘The whole city is full of bandits who are shooting and destroying. Several shops in our neighbourhood have been blown to pieces. We ethnic Albanians live entirely unprotected there – it is not the sort of life a father wants to offer his daughter’, says Skendar (extract from article ‘We had no other choice’ 27/3).

(3) Fleeing: Nearly half a million people in Kosovo are estimated to be fleeing from their homes. Half of them are still in the province, primarily in the vicinity of the main town, Pristina (extract from ‘Facts/refugees from Kosovo’ 26/3).

Description of photo (see p. 91) of seven Kosovo Albanian refugees crossing the Macedonian border on foot, carrying plastic bags. The central motif, a young mother carrying her baby. Mountains in the background. Caption: The Zega and Kada families are, more or less empty-handed, crossing the border from Kosovo to Macedonia. Sevide Zega, who is walking in the front with her three-month-old baby, has tried to cross the border two times before but has been stopped (the photo accompanies the front page article ‘Kosovo lies in ruins’ 27/3).
Serbiska våldsdåd i Kosovo

Crying Kosovo Albanian refugees, DN 27 March 1999
There is consequently a lack of discourse that could generate a more complex picture of the Kosovo Albanian people. There is no Kosovo Albanian modern society in the news, except the cases where it is mentioned that some Kosovo Albanian intellectuals have been killed, that there is a Kosovo Albanian information centre in Pristina and that the children have been forced to leave their schools. Another element that counter-acts the dominant ‘worthy victim’ construction (Herman & Chomsky 1988) is the (marginal) presence of the UCK in the news (the militant liberation organisation), representing political and militant separatism.

The rural subject

The news construction of the Kosovo Albanian subject is consequently one-dimensional (the passive victim), which is further established by the emphasis on the rural Kosovo Albanian. The dominant presence of the rural, and the simultaneous lack of urban elements, hinders the breakthrough of a more manifold and diverse picture of the Kosovo Albanian subject. When it comes to urban/modern elements; this is the closest news journalism gets:

> Description of photo: Front page photo of the capital Pristina, covered by smoke after the air raids. A minor skyscraper in the background. In the foreground, houses on fire. The attentive observer might notice a person walking near one of the houses. Caption: During Thursday’s Nato attack, houses in central Pristina were hit by bombs (the photo accompanies the front page article ‘The intensive bombing continues’ 26/3).

> Description of photo of Pristina under attack. It is taken from a distance, portraying threadbare terrace houses and industrial areas. Smoke and fire from the air raids. No people visible. Caption: Fires in Pristina after Nato’s bombing of Kosovo’s capital on Thursday. There are military barracks in the area (the photo accompanies the article ‘Unclear information about Nato’s goals’ 26/3).

The photos show smoke, fire, and ‘greyish’ buildings (some minor skyscrapers, industrial plants etc.) but hardly any people or social activities. One does not get the impression that this place, under normal circumstances, is dominated by some colourful/plural city-life. The construction of the urban Kosovo (of the capital Pristina) does thus not counteract the dominant picture of the Kosovo Albanian subject, which is the picture of a rural man, fundamentally stuck in material matters, trying to survive through primitive forms of agriculture. As a result of all this, the Kosovo Albanian culture becomes exaggeratedly reduced. The Kosovo Albanians, these poor and ‘pre-modern’ peoples from the Balkans, only think about and want one thing. They want ‘freedom’ and that is it. That is their whole identity.
This is then what the journalistic locking practice is all about. To begin with: the one-dimensional identity in the news is directed in accordance with NATO’s political and economic interests. The Kosovo Albanians are being liberated from Serbian hegemony, which is good for them, but simultaneously they are like a manufactured object; they are the (exploited) object that has been prepared in order to legitimise NATO’s military attack against Milosevic. In order to receive Western support and unlimited media visibility – whereby the whole world can follow their painful destiny – the powerless and poor Kosovo Albanians have no choice; they are forced to sign a contract that completely locks, i.e. controls and regulates their identity, forcing them to adopt the role that the (powerful) ‘producers’ have arranged for them.

The structural constitution of the mode
The current (locking) mode is primarily constituted by the following three underlying factors:

1. The subject’s/group’s status
2. The national/historical factor
3. The ideological position

(1) The subject’s/group’s status: The social, economic, political, cultural etc. status of the covered person/group determines the degree of locking (see also Roosvall 2005). The more economic, political, cultural etc. status one possesses in society, the more autonomy and locomotive power one receives in media discourse; while the less status one possesses, the more likely it is that one simply becomes raw materials for X (an exploited object for certain power interests, profit, a sexual desire etc.). Below, I intend to present three existing journalistic forms of constructing the subject (a citizen, a person or a group), and the way they differ is subsequently related to the status of the covered subject:

1. The subject’s view of the object (non-locked). In this context, journalism’s point of departure is the unique personality of a particular subject. The central genre here is thus personal interviews, in which the media audiences are supposed to ‘get to know’ the current subject (behind the ‘public mask’). The object is the whole social world that surrounds and embraces the subject, his or her profession, private life, everyday life, the things in life that generate inspiration, happiness, anxiety, desire etc. Journalism is not locking the subject into some pre-defined identity or role; the subject is in relative control. Journalism instead provides the subject with as much locomotive power as it might prefer, allowing it to flourish, discursively speaking, in order to reveal a many-sided and ‘complex’ identity.
The subject vs. the object (semi-locked): involves journalism that builds its stories on a conflict between a powerless subject and a powerful Object, such as the State, the law, the bureaucracy etc. A subject (or group of people) is oppressed, exploited etc. by some powerful institution, while journalism’s role is to defend the former party (see Ekström & Nohrstedt 1996, 130–131). The genre here is, for example, critical and investigative journalism, which legitimises itself in terms of protecting and representing the public. The defended subject is provided space in the news, not due to its attractive or authoritative personality or the like. It is not present in the news in order to express its complete personality and identity. It rather appears in the news medium in terms of being part of a social, political etc. conflict or problem, which makes it semi-locked.

The subject as an object (locked): journalism that decisively transforms a subject into an object. Journalism entirely locks the subject’s (or group’s) identity in order to make it perform in accordance with the interests of some powerful institution, profit hunting etc.

The above forms move from (1), the kind of journalism in which the covered/interviewed subject upholds some kind of power and integrity, to (3), mere transparency, in which journalism completely manufactures and controls the subject’s identity. Even if the Serb subject is the ‘bad guy’ in the current news discourse, still it is endowed with (1), whereby journalism demonstrates some kind of ‘respect’ for this complex, cumbersome ‘bourgeois-like’ being. The ideologically defended Kosovo Albanian subject, on the other hand, is constructed in accordance with (3), as a synthetic media product. Since it is lacking complexity in the news, it degenerates into an object (‘the victim’).

(2) The national/historical factor: Whether or not, or to what extent, a person, group, culture etc. becomes journalistically locked, is dependent on national/historical factors. In Swedish DN, the general image of Norwegians is more diverse and complex than that of Pakistanis and Kosovo Albanians due to Sweden’s historically and culturally close relationship to Norway. An interesting discovery in this analysis is that in Slovenian Delo, the Kosovo Albanian victim does not appear whatsoever. This could be interpreted as the ultimate kind of journalistic locking: to simply exclude a person/group from the news discourse. The absence of Kosovo Albanian people in Delo is related to the paper’s overall elitist stance, its focus on the elite and the relative absence of ‘ordinary people’ (see the Greying mode), but it could also be explained by the national/historical context, and more precisely by underlying Slovenian racism, emanating from the hierarchies between different ethnic groups and regions in Socialist Yugoslavia (Drakulić 1994, Salecl 1994) in which peoples from the south parts of the Balkans, including Kosovo Albanians, were (and still are) considered to be ‘less
civilised’ and therefore less newsworthy. Delo’s aloofness and de-humanisation of the conflict (the absence of victims and victim stories) is also related to Slovenia’s interests in staying out of the Yugoslav conflict as far as possible, its eagerness to say farewell to its Yugoslav and Balkan bonds and to enter a new (Western European) kind of era (including EU and NATO membership).

(3) The ideological position: The Kosovo Albanian subject is strongly locked in Swedish DN due to the newspaper’s enthusiastic and explicit defence of NATO’s military action. For US-friendly DN, it becomes crucially important to establish a non-ambiguous picture of reality in which the Kosovo Albanian subject appears as nothing but a victim of Serbian terror. Slovenian Delo, on the other hand, is a less liberal and US-friendly newspaper, which thus helps to explain the absence of the ‘Kosovo Albanian victim’. From Delo’s point of view, the conflict is rather more complex, politically and morally speaking (they are all bad guys: NATO, Milosevic and the UCK).

The mode as a dialectical force
In this concluding section of the analysis, we should imagine one dynamic, ongoing social/material/discursive process – the locking process – which involves the whole general flow of regulations, interpellations (Althusser 2001), and disciplining (Foucault 1984) of subjects. The keeping of a subject within bounds, forcing it into a determined position or function, and thereby shrinking its agency and autonomy. This (locking) phenomenon exists more or less in all types of institutions (the prison system, the educational system etc.) while, what is of central interest here, is its role in the coconstitution of capitalist hegemony. There is a specific (capitalist) locking process, founded on the ongoing (dialectical) relations between certain social, material, discursive etc. practices that are partly homologous. When trying to imagine the ‘whole’ capitalist locking process, what I primarily have in mind is the dysfunctionally (‘incomplete’) homologous relationship between economic/material locking and discursive locking:
What defines capitalist hegemonic locking is its generation of objectification and exploitation. The ‘Fordistically’ ‘locked’ (third world) working class is objectified and exploited by Western interests (by Adidas, H&M etc.); the ‘locked’ soul and body in pornography is objectified and exploited by the voyeuristic gaze; the journalistically ‘locked’ Kosovo Albanian people is objectified and exploited by certain Western powers (and so forth).

– economic/material locking: the regulation of human practice/action through monotonic wage-labour in which a person’s agency is reduced to a one-dimensional function. The less economic/material/cultural power at one’s disposal, the more locked one tends to become (in terms of being forced to be ‘regulated’ by the ‘capitalist machine’).

– discursive locking: the regulation of human identity through discursive (speaking/writing) and journalistic practice, in which a person’s/group’s agency is reduced to a one-dimensional function (into the ‘attractive body’, the ‘degenerated character’, the ‘poor victim’ etc.). The less economic/material/cultural power at one’s disposal, the more discursively/journalistically locked one tends to become (in terms of being forced to be ‘regulated’ by the journalistic pencil and some underlying power interest).
Disconnection

Introduction
The capitalist mode of production, involving such matters as money, price settings, labour power, spaces, natural assets, instruments, transportation, technology, stock markets etc. is very much characterised by complexity, by complex economic, material and social relations. However, the capitalist system also tends to rely on the fact that we (as producers, consumers, labour power etc.) intellectually repress the complex system we are involved in. More precisely, there is this everyday reification of reality. Reification means that, rather than constantly conceptualising everyday reality as a complex process of social material relations, we instead organise it as autonomous things (like spaces, events, instruments etc.), thereby providing our everyday activities with a sense of ‘stability’. When explaining reification, Lukács (1971) and following Marxians (Sohn Rethel 1978) take their point of departure in the abstraction of commodity exchange and how the social material context somehow ‘disappears’ when people ‘switch things’ [1]. Even though we all know that a commodity’s value is a result of social, material relations, still, in the market place, we still might treat a commodity as if it were endowed with an immanent power that somehow ‘escapes’ comparisons with other commodities. Reification thus happens when treating a commodity as if it were a sovereign ‘non-relational’ thing. In some Marxian theory it is assumed that the very (abstract) act of commodity exchange is dependent on this particular ‘de-relational’ procedure, i.e. that exchange succeeds provided that I act as if I have found the commodity’s ‘irreducible’ value, its ‘own’ value, existing irrespective of any relations to other commodities (Zizek 1989, 11–27). The practice of reification, this psychological disconnecting of the relational conditions of things, Lukács (1971) finds not only in commodity exchange but also elsewhere in capitalist societies; he finds it in scientific practice, in the bureaucracy and in everyday communication, including journalistic writing. It is this journalistic mode, the disconnecting mode, that is part of contemporary, ongoing capitalist reification. In the following analysis of the 9/11 news coverage, what journalism reifies is the nation state space and more precisely the US, which, in the news, appears as a thing, as a ‘de-relational’ container of power and hegemony. What is discursively repressed in the news is the deeply relational state of the US, i.e. the way in which the US space, as well as other spaces, are socially materially intertwined with the global economy. The disconnecting journalistic mode produces a reified world picture as it
excessively defines the hegemonic system as a particular space (the power of the US) rather than as a ‘spaceless’ ongoing global structure of social material relations that lacks a concretely distinguishable face, existing everywhere, in every pore of the social body more or less all the time (Jameson 1991, Ramonet 1998, Hardt & Negri 2000).

The ideologeme
More precisely then, the mode of disconnection operates in the context of the construction of the US (the ideologeme), and the mode appears in Slovenian Delo as well as in Swedish DN.

The mode as a discursive practice

*The disconnecting mode*

Disconnection: To sever or interrupt a connection. Referring to electricity: To shut off the current in (an appliance) by removing its connection to a power source [2].

*Disconnection* is a journalistic mode that interrupts the relation between an object, a person, a space, an event etc. and the whole social material structure to which it belongs. The more the focus on the object *itself*, the more the relational and structural dimension of reality disappears. In this particular case, it is this journalistic fascination for the US *itself* that automatically represses a *part-structure logic* i.e. news discourse on how the US is instead part of a structural condition, part of a hegemonic order (the whole capitalist system) [3]. As ‘the US’ *itself* becomes the structure (of hegemony, capitalism etc.) what is de facto repressed and neglected is *our* (the ‘Swedes’, ‘Europeans’ etc.) destructive role in the ongoing generation of a Western capitalist system (as exploiters, consumers etc.), as well as news discourse concerning the more *basic reasons* for the 9/11 terror attack (the material inequalities in the world).

The news discourse is reified in the sense that the US *is the space and power around which everything revolves*: the US as the target, the US as the victim, the US as the retaliator, the US as the hegemonic power etc. The discursive centring on the US operates in the news in terms of *multiple identity positions* in which journalism offers the newsreader several ways of coping with the US. You might choose to identify with the US, to partly identify with the US, not to identify with the US whatsoever, and so forth. The below section presents the intended identity-positions:

(a) Identification with the US as ‘superfluous’

*The War against Democracy* (headline DN 12/9). *The terror attack against the US shows the vulnerability of the open, democratic society* (extract). We
are all victims of the terror (headline DN 12/9). The world has declared war against terrorism (headline Delo 14/9).

‘These are brutal terror attacks, which are not directed at the US, but rather at the whole world, at democracy and social security’ (comment from Slovenian Foreign Minister Dimitrij Rupel, extract from article ‘Ministry of Foreign Affairs’ Delo 12/9).

When Sweden felt its roots (headline, editorial DN 13/9). The attack against New York and Washington was also an attack against Sweden /…/ The air attacks were directed at symbols of a ‘way of life’ that is also ours. Against the open society. The expression may seem old fashioned, but there is no better way of defining our society than with the words used by the philosopher Karl Popper half a century ago. This is why a wave of shock and horror swept through the Swedish society, this is why we will remember how and where we were first reached by the news of the attack on the World Trade Center, in the same way as did those who heard the news of the murders of Olof Palme and John F Kennedy (extracts).

As so many have concluded during the last twenty-four hours, the purpose of the perpetrators was not only to humiliate the US and to kill Americans, but also to spread horror and confusion in the whole civilised world. That an attack against New York is an attack against Stockholm (extract from the editorial ‘The civilised response’ DN 13/9).

The psychological process of identification presupposes an original distance. Identification consequently happens when a gap between A and B is reduced, as when A expresses empathy and understanding towards B. What characterises the above news discourse is that it propagates for the idea that there is no distance between ‘us’ (‘Swedes’, ‘Slovenes’, ‘Europeans’) and ‘them’ (the US) whatsoever. Identification is not really supposed to happen; identification with the US is somehow superfluous; it goes without saying. The news media emphasise the things ‘we’ have in common with ‘them’ to such extent that there is no cultural gap (‘an attack against New York is an attack against Stockholm’). It is thus not necessary to decide whether or not ‘we’ are ‘them’, since ‘we’ were ‘them’ already from the beginning. DN’s and Delo’s readers are considered co-victims of the terror attack (‘The War against Democracy’ etc.). What sometimes seems to resemble a distance between ‘us’ and ‘them’ (miscellaneous quarrels between Europe and the US) is mere appearance, since when it really comes down to it, there is no distance whatsoever (‘When Sweden felt its roots’).

(b) ‘Voluntary’ identification

The attack against the US (front page headline DN 12/9). The terror attack against the US (front page headline Delo 12/9).
Here it is pointed out that the attack exclusively involves the US (not Slovenia or Sweden, not Europe, not the ‘democratic world’ as a whole etc.). Journalism chisels out a defined ‘them’ (the US) which is clearly separated from ‘us’ (the Swedes, Europeans etc.). What we are instead dealing with here is the kind of news discourse in which there is an initial cultural distance (to the US) that is supposed to become reduced:

‘Today we’re all Americans’ (headline Delo 13/9). On America’s side against terrorism (headline, editorial DN 13/9). It is not difficult to feel American today (headline, cultural article DN 13/9). ... it is of vital importance that the world shows its solidarity with the affected individuals and the affected nation (extract from the editorial ‘The civilised response’ DN 13/9). It is time for Europe to help the US (headline DN 13/9).

Even though these statements are clearly supportive of the US, identification is not supposed to come immediately. Identification is rather expected to be the actual end product of some emotional and/or intellectual work. There is an initial distance to the US that the news audiences are supposed to reduce on a voluntary basis. The news audiences are urged to stand on America’s side, while this demand still implies the possibility of alternative decisions and outcomes. The identification process is relatively ‘open’ as the mass media themselves somehow take into account the ideologically controversial aspects of the US policy and the fact that there is a lack of consensus among the media audiences on how and what to think about the US in general. ‘Today we’re all Americans’ is a rather soft imperative, while ‘It is not difficult to feel American today’ instead appears as a modest proposal, implying that on all other days of the year, feeling American might be a difficult thing. The identification with ‘them’ is supposed to concern this particular moment (‘Today we’re all Americans’) and this particular political question (to fight against terrorism), while the rest of the time ‘we’ are allowed to go on cultivating ‘our’ domestic and national identities as much as ‘we’ possibly want. This explicit invitation to uphold a relative distance, and to rather negotiate with the US, is even more vividly visible when the ideological support of the US is complemented by critical reservations or counter-arguments:

The civilised response (headline). After the dreadful act of terror, the world has to stand by the US. But it is a matter of avoiding collective punishment, persecution and a war between civilisations (extract from editorial DN 13/9).

We may have many reasons to criticise the US policy and US politicians and companies, but the attacks on September 11 were not about all that, not about achieving another kind of politics. They were about the destruction of a social model, they made us realise how much we have in common with the American society. The people behind the hijacking of four American
aeroplanes are our enemies too (extract from the editorial ‘When Sweden felt its roots’ DN 13/9).

It is not difficult to feel American today (headline). The guilty ones should be captured and brought to justice. But hatred should not be responded to with hatred (extract from cultural article DN 13/9).

‘It is not difficult to feel American today’ but if the US policy is pushed in the wrong direction (‘...hatred should not be responded to with hatred’) these strong feelings may quickly fade away. The counter-arguments consequently accentuate the already established distance between ‘us’ and ‘them’.

(c) Disidentification:

Finally, regarding the diverse aspects of identification with the US, there is also discursive material that explicitly stimulates disidentification in terms of explicitly opposing the US. This kind of news material primarily occurs in the margins of the media coverage (in the culture sections, letters to the editor and personal columns):

World-wide scepticism about the US (headline from column DN 13/9). The US policy leads to terrorism (headline, cultural article DN 13/9). The Empire will strike back (headline Delo 13/9). The US and NATO pose a threat to democracy (letter to the editor DN 14/9).

The support for the US may reverse (headline). The world’s support for the US could quickly evaporate if the US chooses to strike back with military aggression against another tiny and poor nation in the Middle East, Africa or Latin America /.../ (extract from column DN 13/9).

An everyday-life thing, but under these circumstances, at least for me a shocking sight: in the market stall on the edge of the pavement, T-shirts with prints about the tragedy going on in front of our eyes are already for sale! It seems to me that the tragedy has perhaps not to any greater extent penetrated the thick skin of Manhattan, under which a tender heart may be hiding. Or, maybe, there is nothing that could dislodge the entrepreneur spirit, so characteristic for the Americans (extract from the column ‘New York, Day 2’ Delo 14/9).

This is the kind of critical discourse that in a rather explicit manner points out the ideological ‘personality’ of the US, upholding a cultural gap between the particular nation states (of Sweden and Slovenia) and the US. Concerning these mechanisms of disidentification, what is noteworthy is the twofold aspect of counter-hegemonic discourse. On the one hand the kind of opposition that exclusively focuses on the US foreign policy, and on the other hand, a more ideologically widened criticism, emphasising the commercial and capitalist spirit of the US (‘...T-shirts with prints about the tragedy...’).
**What is being disconnected**

The various identity-positions make the news discourse seem less US propagandistic. However, the ambivalence and the multiple solutions to how to intellectually deal with the US instead develop into this **fixation on the US**. Journalism makes the question of hegemony and power into a matter of saying ‘yes’ or ‘no’ to the US instead of introducing **whether or not ‘we’ identify with the hegemonic structures that include the US as well as ourselves** (‘us’ the Swedes, Slovenes, Europeans), that is to say, the Western capitalist system. The kind of (non-reified) discourse that I am looking for is, however, not entirely absent:

*The closer the answer comes to the third solution, the smaller the chances for Samuel P Huntington’s theories to come true in the 21st century within the world of economic globalisation (the global market), where the global ideology of profit increasingly also leads to a specific kind of global warfare (final paragraph of the political column ‘It all depends on the (right) response’ Delo 13/9).*

*The capitalist system creates repression and injustices (headline). A real democracy must be founded on people’s participation in and responsibility for all important areas in society. What is needed is a total reform of a society that creates injustices, repression and terrorism. To build instead a truly modern democratic society based upon justice, internationally as well as in each and every country, and ecological sustainability. In the long run, globalisation makes it impossible to continue with the capitalist industrial society and its increasingly watered-down version of democracy (extract from letter to the editor DN 14/9).*

Above, the US is not an autonomous power, it rather implodes with a system. There is a Western ‘we’, although not in the way that was manifested earlier – in the form of ‘us’, the democratic, ‘open’ and liberal world – but ‘we’ as the Western capitalist system (the global market, the capitalist system). The disidentification with the US is thus disidentification with the whole capitalist system (a system consequently containing ‘us’ too – Swedes, Slovenes, Europeans).

This then demonstrates the disconnecting mode. Journalism disconnects the link between the US and what the US ultimately represents (the world capitalist system). The more the media explicitly identify ‘them’ (the US) as the one and only bad Western party involved, the more this seems to draw attention away from the **structures of capitalism**. This ongoing structural condition could certainly be portrayed or exemplified by particular empirical ‘things’ (events, conditions, actions etc.) but could never be entirely grasped and explained – as a totality – by means of one-sidedly looking at particular persons (such as Bush), governments (such as the Bush administration) or nation states (the US). Capitalist hegemony, in the strictly structural sense,
is rather a condition that occurs all the time and everywhere (Hardt & Negri 2000), in everyday life (consumption etc.), characterised by constantly ongoing relationships between us and (material) things (Althusser 2001).

The structural constitution of the mode
The disconnecting mode is built upon the following structural features:

1. The bourgeois watchdog procedure
2. Historical/political/cultural factors
3. US ‘fetishism’
4. The nation state logic

1. The bourgeois watchdog procedure: The omnipotent presence of the US is related to the journalistic urge to censor discourse that emphasises the existence of an all-encompassing exploitative, capitalist system that also includes ‘our’ nation states (Sweden, Slovenia). This propagandistic procedure is achieved in terms of putting all the blame on the US when critically reflecting upon the Western system. The unifying discourse – i.e. the kind of discourse where ‘we’ (Europe) and ‘them’ (the US) become one big family – is only present in the news when positive aspects of this ‘we-world’ are emphasised: ‘we’ as ‘...the open, democratic society’ or ‘...the civilised world’, while the dark and nasty sides of this ‘we-world’ (Western capitalism and its negative consequences) are represented by the US – alone.

2. Historical/political/cultural factors: The vast amount of journalistic energy invested in the US is, however, related to the historical relationship between the US and Europe, as well as between the US and other parts of the world, and the way in which these relationships have developed due to the controversial post-war foreign policy of the US, its economic world superiority, and its world hegemonic aspirations in the wake of the fall of the Berlin Wall (Debray 2001, Sardar & Davids 2002). Ambivalence towards and criticism of the US have turned into something of a tradition. For the surrounding world, the US is more or less like an everyday love-or-hate companion: a famous ‘personality’ with a well-known ‘face’. No matter the location of the media audiences, no matter whether they are European, African or Russian, they for sure ‘know’ the US. In the European reception of American media culture (film, television etc.) there is a ‘habit’ of ‘practising’ counter-hegemonic attitudes, including ironic and critical interpretations of such texts as Top Gun, CNN, Fox Television etc.
(3) US ‘fetishism’: In the world there is an overall ‘fetish’ for the power of the US. The US seems to be an ultimate resource for the politics of passion, if we make use of Mouffe’s (2003) Gramsci-inspired conceptualisation. The US has a fundamental ability to stir up the minds and the hearts of the surrounding world; it is somehow ‘blessed’ with the ability to suddenly turn otherwise slacking and lazy consumers into passionately engaged political citizens and anti-imperialist revolutionaries. A passion for (or against) X necessarily leads to blindness and absorption in which everything else in the world except X dissolves (otherwise it is not real passion). Even if the US embodies and represents Western capitalism, still the passionate engagement against the US makes the latter disappear. The structural dimension of hegemony vanishes, while what is left is discourse on the attraction of the ‘agent’ (this is disconnection). A complex structure (such as global capitalism) hardly generates passionate energy since it does not have a distinguishable face, personality or charisma (its blurred countenance is instead a complex web of social material relations). As structures and systems lack ‘sexual appeal’, commercial media instead choose ‘agency’ (constructing political reality in terms of ‘countries’, ‘persons’, ‘governments’, ‘events’ etc.). Some researchers even assume that the focus on ‘agency itself’ rather than structures is what essentially defines commercial journalism (Lippman 1997).

(4) The nation state logic: The intense focus on the US itself is intertwined with the journalistic suggestion that the terror attack was directed against this particular power (the US). Not against some system, but against this (nation) state. However, even if the core crime scene (New York) is situated in the US, still this place represents the global world due to its multinational character and the presence of the UN, while the WTC Twin Towers might as well represent the whole capitalist system. The clear-cut (nation state oriented) definition of the terrorist target is partly explained by the fact that the current newspapers tend to naturalise the nation state phenomenon (Anderson 1991, Billig 1995, Morley 2000, Olausson 2005). Every day these mass media provide the nation state with existence as they ‘think’ and write nationally rather than transnationally and globally. When journalism cognitively structures reality, it still tends to strictly separate ‘domestic (national) news’ from ‘foreign news’, and constructs the global world primarily as relations between nation states (rather than as a transnational, complex system). Instead of ‘life under the conditions of global economy’, in the mass media, the existential status of the nation state as well as its status as a way of understanding/explaining social reality is continually solid (see Beck, Bonss & Lau 2003). In the current news coverage, then, the journalists without hesitation clothe the 9/11 discourse in a nation state logic in
which *the US is provided with too much existence*, being treated as an *autonomous force* with great power to make real things happen in the world: to lead the global economy, to repair the ozone layer, to solve the conflict between the Palestinians and Israelis etc. It is thus the journalistic belief in the omnipotent existence of the US that makes them conclude that US is the essential terror target, while what is absent in the news is a more critical *global* view of the terror attack. To claim that the only thing that exists is a repressive global economy, that there is no such thing as ‘the US’, would seem like a Baudrillardean absurdity, but still, the neglected question in the news discourse is, do the US, and US hegemony, really *exist* to the extent that nation state oriented news reporting wants us to believe? (are not Power and Hegemony rather a more complex, global system?)

The mode as a dialectical force

In capitalist societies there is a process referred to as *reification* (Lukács 1971) and this ongoing, dynamic structural phenomenon is constantly produced through *economic/material* and *discursive/journalistic* practices of *disconnecting*:

| **– economic/material disconnection:** the economic/material disconnecting of the link between a ‘thing’ and its structural origin (all the underlying relationships that constitute the ‘thing’) operating in contexts when treating commodities and capital as if they were sovereign forces; as if they possessed an immanent value themselves, independently of any social, material etc. relationships (Zizek 1989, 16–21). |
| **– discursive/journalistic disconnection:** The discursive/journalistic disconnecting of the link between a defined ‘thing’ (an event, a space, a nation state etc.) and its structural origin (all the underlying relationships that constitute the ‘thing’) which is operating in everyday discourse including journalism, when, for example, journalism treats and constructs spaces, institutions etc. as if they were sovereign forces, i.e. objects with certain immanent powers, existing independently of any social, material etc. relationships. |

In other words, something that goes on when we deal with money and ‘material matters’ simultaneously goes on when journalists construct political reality (as when reporting on 9/11), while these partly separate (dysfunctionally homologous) practices jointly constitute (capitalist) reification.
Cognitive Recycling

Introduction

Capitalist reification is associated with the everyday repression of social complexity. There is an ongoing ‘whole’ that is essentially relational (Althusser 2001) involving relations between peoples (as labour power, producers, consumers etc.) and ‘things’ (money, spaces, technology etc.), but by means of miscellaneous reified practices, reality is transformed into a de-relational multitude of seemingly independent ‘objects’. A widespread contemporary form of reification springs from the modern division of intellectual labour, i.e. the cutting up of reality into separate areas such as the economy, the political, the cultural etc. (Williams 1977). These areas are ‘real’ in terms of being materialised into certain practices and institutions, in terms of being important categories to think with, and in terms of having some independent powers, but they still tend to generate reification. While contemporary global capitalism is defined by its tearing down of the structural walls between these areas (Jameson 1991, Coniavitis & Ahrne 2003), these areas still continue to operate as if they were strong independent powers – and this is what causes reification. An everyday reality built upon complex relations between culture, economy, politics (the ‘real’ condition) is reified into separate things/areas (the ‘imaginary’ condition). The current form of reification includes the journalistic mode of cognitive recycling. This mode is related to explanatory discourse, and in this particular analysis, the way in which journalism tries to explain the 9/11 terror attack. In the 9/11 news, the explanatory discourse is delivered in separate divisions (the cultural explanation, the political variable, the economic way of understanding the matter, and so forth). Journalism thus reifies 9/11 by not interrelating and integrating these ‘areas’, i.e. by systematically avoiding the complex relations of a globalising reality. What characterises this reified mode is that it represses capitalism as a historical ongoing process that constantly changes and develops towards increasing complexity (Hardt & Negri 2000). By continually separating these areas in the news (the economy, politics, culture etc.), there is a cognitive recycling of an ‘out-of-date’ way of writing/thinking, the recycling of a whole journalistic mode that perhaps worked better during the earlier modern phase of capitalism, when society was not yet so relationally complex, but that is less valid in contemporary times, in the postmodern condition of global capitalism (see Jameson 1991, 410–411).
The ideologeme
The current mode operates in the context of explanatory discourse (the ideologeme), i.e. when journalism, mainly by means of authoritative sources, tries to explain why the terror attack happened. The mode is structurally present in Swedish DN as well as in Slovenian Delo.

The mode as a discursive practice
Cognitive recycling
Cognitive recycling is a mode that is activated when a phenomenon (a space, power, institution, action, event etc.) is explained in accordance with a *past form* of thinking/writing rather than being placed in a more contemporary and new context where one takes into account how history has shaped and transformed the phenomenon. The historical process and development is here imagined as the path towards increasing complexity from earlier phases of (*modern*) capitalism, when nation states were more independent, to today’s fully *global* (*postmodern*) system with its complex material, economic, social, spatial, cultural, technological, communicative etc. *relations* (Jameson 1991, 410–411). The journalistic mode of cognitive recycling is thus synonymous with the lack of a more transnational/global news epistemology, the systematic absence of ‘area-transgressive’ and ‘interrelational’ journalism when structuring and explaining the contemporary world.

The mode consequently operates in the context of explanatory discourse about 9/11. The current newspapers provide the readers with a motley collection of explanatory factors such as ‘terrorism’, ‘religious fundamentalism’, ‘US imperialism’, ‘fanaticism’, ‘insanity’, ‘Israel’, ‘the capitalist system’ and ‘evil’. These elements, however, appear in three separate news ‘domains’: as *cultural*, *political* and *economic* explanations.

Culture (*explanatory discourse I*)
The cultural explanations have indistinct and vague contents, expressing ideas that can not quite be defined as political. A common denominator is their way of generating imaginary *distinctions* between different ‘ways of life and behaviour’, involving good vs evil and normality vs insanity.

To begin with, what is analytically noteworthy is the tautological construction of *terrorism*. In the following news extracts, terrorism consequently appears as an independent phenomenon that de facto ‘caused’ 9/11:

*The terror has struck before, not least in the Middle East. World Trade Center has been affected; the attack on the office building in Oklahoma City is a tragic memory, as well as the gas attack against the Tokyo subway (extract from the editorial ‘The war against democracy’ DN 12/9).*
The Americans – the love object of terrorists (headline). Dubious difference between terrorists and criminals (main headline). More and more difficult to separate ‘terrorism as common criminality’ from the kind of terrorism that is directed against a particular country (subheading). According to certain information it is said that in the year of 1997 there were as many as 304 ‘acts of international terrorism’ and a good third of them were supposedly directed against the US (extract from article, Delo 12/9).

The new war of the terrorists is called asymmetric warfare – the tactic of the weak striking against a superior enemy’s weak points. This is a tactic that has not only been studied by terrorists but also by, for example, Chinese military expertise in preparation for an expected large-scale war against the US (extract from the chronicle ‘The world has become a more dangerous place to live’ DN 13/9).

Declaration of War against Terrorism (front page headline Delo 13/9). ‘Terrorism will not be allowed to win’ (Romano Prodi, headline Delo 13/9).

Terrorism is part of everyday criminality (‘Dubious difference between terrorists and criminals’), it is a well known crime (‘The terror has struck before’) constantly developing (‘The new war of the terrorists’), but now the ‘democratic world’ is determined to fight back (‘Terrorism will not be allowed to win’, ‘Declaration of War against Terrorism’) – in accordance with regular social ‘stop-campaigns’ (‘stop the criminality in our society’, ‘stop the violence’ etc.). These statements do not necessarily have the explicit intention to explain the attack, though they still have ‘explanatory effects’. There is this familiar subject (the terrorist) and criminal thing (terrorism) that is causing devastation. In order to make the world a better place, it is this thing (terrorism) – and no other thing – which must be removed:

NATO emphasised that these barbarian attacks amount to unpardonable aggression against democracy and demonstrate the urgency of cooperation among the member states as well as of the international community decisively fighting against terrorism (extract from ‘If N.Y. and Washington are able to fall, then no capital is secure’ Delo 12/9).

‘This concerns the whole of civilised humanity. This inhuman act also shows the urgency of Russia’s proposal that the world has to unite against terrorism, the plague of the twenty-first century. From our own experiences, we Russians know very well what terrorism is’, the Russian President said (extract from article ‘Putin condemned the outrage’ DN 12/9).

It does not matter if a majority wants to live in peace and if the development is positive; in an open society the fanatics can always set the agenda with attacks against innocent people (extract from the editorial ‘We are all victims of terrorism’ DN 12/9).

‘Mass terrorism is the new evil in our world today’ (Tony Blair cited in the editorial section DN 13/9). ‘The world has to stand united and fight terro-
rism in all its forms, and annihilate this modern evil' (Pervez Musharraf cited in the editorial/commentary section DN 13/9).

‘New terrorism, as much as there is actually information about it, has no clear goals. This terrorism is explicitly negativistic, its goals are gone, its program is destruction’ (extract from ‘Schüssel warns about hasty accusations’, interview with the Austrian President, Delo 14/9).

In the above, journalism cuts off the religious/political aspect of terrorism: it is as if the violent attack originates in a belief in terrorism. Terrorism is the cause and the effect. There is terrorism in the world due to the fact that there are people who believe in the ideology of terrorism (people who may exploit religion, politics etc. in order to fulfil their perverted desire: terror). The ideology of terrorism has no relevant political/religious goals/meaning; the reason behind terrorism is instead barbarism, evil, fanaticism or the desire for destruction. These descriptive words are supposed to emphasise the horrifying character of the terrorist act, but simultaneously they ‘explain’ 9/11. The following logic is present here: For some unknown, mystical reason, there is fanaticism, tyranny and obsession in the world, and when these destructive spirits come together and organise themselves, terrorism becomes a fact.

In order to further demonstrate the pseudo explanatory discourse one can look at the following news content: psychological advice meant for adults trying to explain to children what terrorism is about:

*Old folk tales as the Little Red Riding Hood, Sleeping Beauty or Snow White also contain violence and evil. These are stories that all children need as they are growing up. But do not deny that evil also exists in real life. Maybe a tale or a book – right now Harry Potter is of immediate interest for many children – may become a bridge between reality and fantasy. Because evil people exist in stories as well as in reality* (extract from the family section article ‘Children need time’ DN 14/9).

/…/ we live in a time when superfluous information is sweeping over us no matter if we want it or not. To ‘protect’ a child from the dangerous world – whether terror attacks, earthquakes or other catastrophes – is therefore difficult. Newspaper headlines, television programmes, adults on the bus or in the subway, fellow schoolmates…it is not possible to avoid finding out about ‘evil’ (extract from the family section article ‘Children need time’ DN 14/9).

There is an analogous relationship between (a) the ‘adult’ explanations (Blair’s ‘evil’, Putin’s ‘pestilence’ etc.) and (b) the explanations addressed to children. The ‘adult’ explanations, delivered by men of power (Blair, Putin)
are slightly more sophisticated versions of the explanations meant for children; both involve the narrative folk tale logic of the inevitable struggle between good and evil.

To sum up the cultural explanation: Terrorism caused 9/11. What may explain terrorism is evil and insanity, but evil and insanity have no explanation. Barbarism has always existed and always will; it reappears through history in ever new guises, demonstrating the dark and nasty side of man (potentially existing in all of us) – but it has no reason. It simply exists, and that is it.

Politics (explanatory discourse II)
If the cultural kind of explanation is abstract and fuzzy, then the political one is of a more concrete kind. Here terrorism loses its status as cause as it instead becomes the outcome of certain political conditions and conflicts.

(1) To begin with, the dominant political explanation is linked to religious belief in which it is implied that the terror attack expresses the political striving to spread Islam world-wide:

The fact is that the Islamic network centred on Osama bin Ladin already in February 1998 proclaimed a religious fatwa against the US involvement in the Middle East. ‘To kill Americans and their allies – civilians as well as military soldiers – is the personal duty of every Muslim in order to liberate the Al Aqsa mosque in Jerusalem from their grip, and force their armies out of all of Islam’s countries, defeated and incapable of threatening any Muslim’ (extract from article ‘Several threats had been expressed’ DN 12/9).

Until now Washington has not blamed the latest attack on anybody. Still, Osama bin Ladin is the one who is primarily suspected for the bloodiest attack on the US in history. The son of a Saudi millionaire, he is blamed by the US for committing the attack on the US embassies in Kenya and Tanzania in 1998 /…/. Even though the US has offered a 5 million dollar reward, until now he has been shown to be unassailable, in safety in Afghan territory and a guest of the Islamic Taliban movement (extracts from article ‘Osama bin Ladin, Enemy No. 1’ Delo 12/9).

Terrorism is thus related to Muslim fundamentalism and its assumed aim is ‘to kill Americans’ and ‘liberate the Al Aqsa mosque in Jerusalem’. The origin of contemporary Muslim fundamentalism is consequently connected to the conflict between Israel and Palestine. It concerns the notion that the Israeli treatment of the Palestinian people has generated the attack against the (Israel supporting) US and the Western world as a whole. In the news flow, this thesis is confirmed as well as questioned:

Magnus Ranstorp is an expert on politics in the Arab countries and terrorism, active at the University of Saint Andrews in Great Britain. /…/. Ranstorp does not think that the attacks against the American targets in the US are a
result of the conflict between Israel and the Palestinians (extracts from article ‘bin Ladin, probably behind it’ DN 12/9).

Inevitably – and without a moral ground – there will be attempts to hide the historical mistakes and the injustice, that underlie Tuesday’s firestorms. Instead there will be talk about ‘soulless terrorism’. The ‘soulless’ part is of course of crucial importance for not reaching insights about how hated the US has become in the country where three great religions once were born. / …/ No, Israel is not to blame, even if we can be sure that Saddam Hussein and the other grotesque dictators will claim this – but history’s malignant influence and our part in its heaviness must probably be placed in the shadow together with the suicide bombers (extracts from Robert Fisk’s cultural article ‘It is about broken promises’ DN 14/9).

In the latter news extract, an authoritative source (the journalist Robert Fisk) expresses his dissatisfaction with ‘cultural explanations’ (‘…there will be talk about soulless terrorism’) and claims that the terror attack was rather caused by the Palestine issue (through the way in which the West has handled this matter).

(2) The second kind of political explanation is exclusively related to the role of the US, that the US’s foreign policy (in general) should be seen as the underlying cause. This ‘controversial’ suggestion is however placed in the margins of the media coverage:

‘It is the USA’s own fault!’ Not exactly in this brutal manner did the half dozen Swedes express themselves, who called in to yesterday’s radio broadcasting show ‘Ring P1’. But their response to the terror outrage in New York and Washington was to express how pushily and egoistically the US behaves in world politics, and the way in which the US dominated economic world order generates completely understandable hate among poorer nations and peoples. In a similar vein Expressen’s Per Wirtén writes about the ‘symbolic power’ behind the targets of the terror attacks: World Trade Center as the centre of the global financial capitalist system and Pentagon as the very heart of the American military apparatus. Wirtén claims that there might be a direct connection between Tuesdays bombing outrage and the ‘American Empire’s’ assaults on human rights in different parts of the world (extract from article ‘World wide scepticism about the US’ DN 13/9).

The US policy leads to terrorism (headline). ‘The Pentagon has gotten itself so many enemies that it no longer knows who the real enemy is’ (extract from cultural article, interview with Gore Vidal, DN 13/9).

[Taken from a Chinese Internet chat]: The majority of the participants in the Internet chat have already managed to send different warnings to the US. ‘For the persons involved, I express my deepest sympathy, but at the same time I ask the Americans to reflect upon why such things happen right in their country. There will be a war! Down with hegemony!’ says the debate participant who signed as ‘Winter’ (extract from article ‘Between Shock and Triumph’ Delo 13/9).
While the two latter extracts tend to reduce the whole issue into a ‘US foreign policy’ matter, the earlier one shows some signs of relating the role of the US to the whole exploitative condition of global capitalism. One should, however, note that these kinds of extracts are more or less censored, and when they occasionally appear, the standpoint is brought forward as a rather goofy leftist intellectual product (see the first extract).

**Economy (explanatory discourse III)**

Finally the most repressed explanatory perspective: the economic one, in which the whole capitalist economy becomes the essential cause of the terror attack:

> The closer the answer comes to the third solution, the smaller the chances for Samuel P Huntington’s theories to come true in the 21st century within the world of economic globalisation (the global market), where the global ideology of profit increasingly also leads to a specific kind of global warfare (final paragraph of the political column ‘It all depends on the (right) response’ Delo 13/9).

> The capitalist system creates repression and injustices (headline). A real democracy must be founded on people’s participation in and responsibility for all important areas in society. What is needed is a total reform of a society that creates injustices, repression and terrorism. To build instead a truly modern democratic society based upon justice, internationally as well as in each and every country, and ecological sustainability. In the long run, globalisation makes it impossible to continue with the capitalist industrial society and its increasingly watered-down version of democracy (extract from letter to the editor DN 14/9).

These are the only found examples in which global capitalism is constructed as a condition that could potentially ‘cause’ global terrorism. Besides the relative censorship, what further helps to repress the the economy as potential causal factors is that it is primarily endowed with an effect-identity (how has the attack affected the economy?). Terrorism affects the economy, but not the other way around. I have collected certain financial/economic headlines in order to demonstrate this condition:

**Cognitive recycling (on a reified journalistic mode)**

In the news reporting, various kinds of explanations appear in various contexts (in different articles and sections). The explanatory discourse is delivered in separate containers (Beck & Bonss & Lau 2003), operating as autonomous variables, seemingly able to explain the matter (why terrorism?) ‘on their own’. In the below figure, the purpose is to clarify the overall structure of current explanations:

There are spatial and structural dividing lines between *culture* (evil, madness, primitivism), *politics* (religious fundamentalism, the US foreign policy) and *economy* (global capitalism and its generation of material inequalities in the world). When there is discourse on Islam fundamentalism, discussion of the material exploitation of the Third World are absent; when ‘cultural’ aspects are discussed, the topic of US foreign policy is disconnected (and so forth). The cultural and political discourses are dominant while the economic explanations, referring to the capitalist exploitation of the Third World etc. are placed in the margins. Even if there is a tangible dividing line between cultural and political modes of explanation, still the central dividing line runs between culture and politics on the one hand and the economy on the other.

When explaining miscellaneous matters, journalism cognitively recycles the *modern* division of labour, i.e. the *strict separation* between politics, economy, culture, technology etc. Journalism thus *reifies* reality by represing the relational origin of social phenomena (see Althusser 2001, 157–
and more precisely by not translating the deeply relational nature of globalisation into conformable cognitive categories, i.e. into a proper journalistic (postmodern) ‘language’. In the current news discourse the relevant explanatory ‘puzzle pieces’ are present; such as fundamentalism, the US foreign policy, imperialism, the fatwa, capitalism, Israel etc. but there is no established journalistic epistemology that more decisively tries to relate them in terms of fitting various pieces together (in different constellations, into various possible global journalistic narratives).

The structural constitution of the mode
The structural constitution of the mode is primarily built upon the following causal factors:

1. The bourgeois watchdog procedure
2. The mass media and their modern organisation of news

1. The bourgeois watchdog procedure: The division of intellectual labour (the separation of the political, the economic, the cultural and so forth) and the following absence of integrated global journalistic narratives is a matter of self-censorship. It is difficult to formulate ‘totalising’ explanatory journalistic stories, discussing more general relations between political, religious, economic etc. powers/interests/conditions in a globalising world without including the dark sides of the ‘democratic Western world’ and its deep involvement in the material inequalities in the Third World. A newspaper that is part of the whole capitalist hegemonic order will naturally, as far as possible, avoid such totalising stories. While more or less excluding giving-the-whole-picture kinds of explanations of terrorism, these newspapers instead slice up the ‘whole’ into dispersed fragments (Lukács 1971), into a quite rich smorgasbord of different explanations, which is legitimised in the name of journalistic objectivity and the striving for ‘pluralism’ and ‘impartiality’ (see Westerståhl 1972, Berglez 2003).

2. The mass media and their modern organisation of news: the mass media’s modern organisation of the world is simultaneously a solid routine that automatically frames the explanatory discourse. What really makes this so solid is that it is so general; the routine of dividing the world into such categories as politics, economy, culture etc. is still strong in several other explanatory contexts (not the least within the sciences). The whole expertise-culture in capitalist societies, with the purpose of explaining miscellaneous matters, is still very much based on a modern mode of thinking/writing (Beck, Bonss & Lau 2003). In the context of media discourse, what could possibly challenge this discursive recycling of modern forms is conse-
quently a reformation of journalism, and more precisely, a development towards a more global kind of news epistemology. For example, to partly abandon the economy, politics etc. news sections for the sake of more problem-based departments: World environment, the EU, Global security, Global processes/news etc., to partly abolish the domestic/foreign news division (as reality is fundamentally transnational), to organise news in accordance with new spatial categories (the global news section etc.) and journalistic competencies (as global journalism, see Nohrstedt 2005).

The mode as a dialectical force
The current singular process, relevant for the constitution of capitalist societies, is consequently reification, i.e. the daily treatment of reality as a set of solid, sovereign ‘things’ (rather than as ongoing and transforming relations). Reification includes a ‘recycling element’ in terms of ‘using X again’ (and again and again), which, more precisely, involves the following practices (that are dysfunctionally homologous):

- the reified practice of recycling ‘things’ (in general): a ‘thing’ (space, institution, practice etc.) successively loses its power and autonomy, due to historical change and due to its integration in complex relations, but is continually treated and employed as an ‘autonomous power’ (as if untouched by time and history).

- the reified practice of explanatory discursive recycling: an explanatory ‘thing’ (a model, a ‘variable’, a structure, a mode of interpretation etc.) successively loses its power to autonomously explain social phenomena, due to historical change and increasing social complexity, but is continually treated and employed as an ‘autonomous explanatory power’ (as if untouched by time and history): i.e. cognitive recycling.

The journalistic mode of cognitive recycling, with its constant reusing of seemingly autonomous explanatory powers such as the political, the cultural, the economic etc. consequently uses a modern explanatory logic in late capitalist postmodern times, which are characterised by partly new ‘postmodern’ problems, demanding a partly new kind of explanatory labour (involving problems such as ‘global terrorism and warfare’, the ‘vulnerability of the network-like global economic system’, the information society, the transformed status of the nation state etc.) (see Beck 1998, 6).
CONCLUSIONS
Conclusions

The purpose of this study has been to investigate the relationship between the capitalist hegemonic order and the mass media. The qualitative analysis has been restricted to semi-core elite news media and to a selection of news press materials (articles etc.). This final chapter includes the following sections: (1) To begin with, the first sub-purpose of the study (the theoretical-methodological purpose) will be critically examined and concluded. The critical issue concerns whether the abstraction of modes should be considered a scientifically valid way to achieve a cultural materialist oriented CDA, and the analysis of the way in which (journalistic) language use is dialectically intertwined with the economic/material dimensions of reality within the context of a capitalist mode of production. (2) The next section concludes the second sub-purpose of the study (the political-democratic purpose). In order to achieve a deeper understanding of the modes of writing in the context of a capitalist hegemonic order, the purpose here is to determine their political implications. In their construction of territory, identity, social relations, freedom etc. in what sense do the journalistic modes co-produce or counter-act miscellaneous political developments and struggles? The proposal here is that two types of modes have been discovered in the news media materials: the modes of de-permanence and the modes of permanence. These are endowed with somewhat separate political functions in the current capitalist societies (Sweden and Slovenia). (3) In this context, the most ‘practical’ aspect of this study is handled, and more precisely a discussion of the possibilities of an emerging, emancipating transnational mode of journalistic writing. In the final section (4) the question of ‘national differences’ (between DN and Delo) is critically reflected upon and concluded, and finally, there are some suggestions for further research.

(1) The theoretical-methodological purpose
The modes
The analysis of modes of writing has involved three analytical steps. To begin with, the abduction of ideologemes in the news media materials, i.e. the discovery of certain ‘traumatic and antagonistic fields’ involving underlying struggles over space, identity, the organisation of politics etc., that are more or less related to the dominant (capitalist) mode of production. The identification of an ideologeme has then paved the way for the detection of a particular journalistic ‘way’ of organising reality: the empirical crystallisation of a mode of writing, whose practice has been analysed syntactically
and lexically. In the second step, the structural constitution of the mode has been analysed (*why* does the mode look the way it does and why is it there in the first place?). The eight journalistic modes discerned are, according to this study, caused or constituted by such things as inherent journalistic routines, economic motifs, technological factors, political and ideological agendas, national traditions, sociocultural structures etc.

The third step, which has also been the central moment of analysis, has been devoted to a cultural materialist interpretation of these modes. The abstraction of a mode has involved the somewhat complex task to, on the one hand, obtain the distinction between language use and *other* practices (language use being a *particular* kind of practice), but on the other hand, to *dissolve* this distinction as far as possible, and consequently to, within reasonable bounds, counter-act the seemingly deep abyss between language use and material practices, and to do this without ending up in discursive idealism (in which reality as a whole is reduced into texts or discourses) nor in materialist reductionism (in which reality as a whole is reduced into material structures).

In order to navigate the analysis towards an ‘in-between’ position, I have tried to work in the *dialectical* way. The dialectical approach has consequently transgressed the level of causal explanation – i.e. how miscellaneous structures and mechanisms might affect, constitute, shape language use, or vice versa. At the dialectical stage of analysis, what have instead been analysed are *processes* and *relationships*, i.e. how the identified modes of writing are internally related to and active parts of more general social material practices in the context of ongoing processes:
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On the following two pages, two dimensions of the concluded modes have been put together. The left hand column defines the particular character of the journalistic activity, i.e. what do the journalists discursively do when generating the actual mode? More precisely how is reality constructed? The right hand column demonstrates the most *general dimension* of the mode; the mode’s potential powers and involvement ‘within’ the whole structure of private property, reification, individualism etc.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>The journalistic practice:</th>
<th>… is dialectically interwoven with</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Multi-colouring mode</td>
<td>the aesthetic, political, visual communicative etc. construction of society as the heterogeneous playground of a prospering social and cultural mishmash, diversity and pluralism.</td>
<td>liberal ideology but ultimately with late capitalism’s colonisation and utilisation of peoples’ urge for heterogeneity, diversity and pluralism, in which personal emancipation, differentiation, creativity, the definition of freedom and democracy etc. are being commodified and overtaken by the ‘commodity-selecting’ logic of market capitalism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Greying mode</td>
<td>the discursive generation of a monomodal form; of ‘colourless’ and spartan visual communication, layout, graphical design, typesize etc., and/or of a journalistic monomodal content: defined by its simplistic discursive construction of ‘the people’ as a greyish mass of ‘non-elite beings’ (rather than a ‘colourful’ explosion of individuality and cultural pluralism).</td>
<td>the monomodal, i.e. one-dimensional, homogeneous, collectivist, somewhat ‘socialist’ social/economic/material structure, restricted from the ‘market- and consumer-driven’ generation of heterogeneity, pluralism and diversity (and its commodity-selecting logic).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Remote control mode</td>
<td>the discursive construction of ‘the public’ (the public sphere and public communication) as a (market economic) object; as a passive object/screen that disseminates and projects ‘differences’ (a flow of different goods) for the purpose of individual mastery and ‘remote controlling’ (‘I like/include this, I dislike/exclude that’).</td>
<td>the overall commodification of ‘the public’; the continuing entrance of private capital into public contexts in which public communication, behaviour and action are overtaken by a market capitalist kind of logic (of consumption and the practice of saying/doing ‘yes or no’ to ‘things’).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiation</td>
<td>the discursive establishment of differentiation; of cultural/political etc. borders between individuals and/or groups, the discursive splitting of people into dispersed ‘autonomous entities’, and the discursive construction of political action, happiness, desire, dreams etc. as a matter of isolated ‘individualistic labour’.</td>
<td>economic/material differentiation: capitalism’s generation of economic/material differences and borders between individuals (individualism), which is related to capitalism’s inherent dependency on competitiveness and unequal distribution of material resources and capital.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semiotic compression</td>
<td>the discursive compression of reality and action: the discursive striving for an immediate and proximate relationship to ‘the real’, to visualise and ‘show’ reality instead of explaining it, or to construct political action as ‘immediate doing’ and ‘quick fix’ (charity etc.) instead of time-consuming, long-term transformation of sluggish structures.</td>
<td>economic/material compression: the compression of time and space in order to achieve an ever more ‘immediate’ relationship to the ‘real thing’ (profit), involving ever more efficient and time-saving forms of production, distribution and exchange of commodities and services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locking</td>
<td>the discursive regulation and controlling of a person’s or group’s appearance in which the person/group is completely covered and constructed in accordance with a pre-defined idea, and in which the person’s/group’s potential agency is dwindled down into a</td>
<td>the regulation and controlling of a person’s or group’s practice in the context of monotonic wage-labour in which a person’s/group’s agency is reduced into a one-dimensional function (labour for the sake of the generation of surplus-value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disconnection</strong></td>
<td>The discursive repression/disconnection of the relationship between X (an object, an event) and the ‘whole structure’ that constitutes X (historical background, economic interests, political tradition etc.). The more discursive energy invested in X in itself, the more the relational and structural dimension of X is diminished.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cognitive recycling</strong></td>
<td>The reification of ‘things’ in capitalist societies, essentially involving the abstraction of commodity-exchange and the treatment of a commodity as if it would be endowed with a ‘value in itself’ (irrespective of any comparisons with other commodities) and the simultaneous repression/disconnection of the commodity’s place in a relational and structural framework.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reification of ‘things’ in capitalist societies, essentially involving the abstraction of commodity-exchange and the treatment of a commodity as if it would be endowed with a ‘value in itself’ (irrespective of any comparisons with other commodities) and the simultaneous repression/disconnection of the commodity’s place in a relational and structural framework.
The right hand column’s content is therefore not some ‘structural greatness of the material kind’ that ‘determines’ the left hand column’s content (the current mode). The mode of writing cannot be caused or determined by some ‘capitalist structure’ as it is itself a constitutive part of it. For example: Individualism is an ongoing material/economic/discursive process in contemporary capitalism, which is constantly produced in different contexts such as the working place, in everyday language, in the practice of consumption, in the education system, in politics etc., as well as in the context of journalism (in the generation of a remote control mode of writing).

The mode’s power to co-constitute a structure (such as individualism) and the capitalist system as a whole, should be viewed as a matter of stronger and weaker powers. A mode is consequently built up by various factors (economic, psychological, journalistic, cognitive, political etc.). But provided that the structural constitution of a mode changes for some reason, then the mode will to a lesser extent function as a ‘productive force’ within the capitalist mode of production. In the analysis of the remote control mode, for example, it is concluded that reflexivity, class interests and ‘national cognition’ cause this mode. Provided that the power relations between these factors change, then, in such a case this mode might become less attached to the structure of individualism as well as to the capitalist mode of production.

**Media research and the question of base and superstructure**

The media theoretical framework of this study has been inspired by, on the one hand, the British Cultural Studies tradition (Hall 1996:a, 1997, Fiske 1989 etc.) and on the other hand, the political economy of communication (Mosco 1996, Murdock 1997). The methodological approach has, however, been formulated as a response to certain problematic aspects of these two research domains, more precisely, their limited ways of dealing with the categories of base and superstructure.

Firstly there is political economy’s continuing economic/materialist reductionist position, continually tending to treat language and culture as second hand aspects, rather than essential co-constituents of the dominant (capitalist) mode of production, and secondly, there is cultural studies and its gradual movement away from a culturalist materialist position to a more or less pure ‘culturalist’ one, with an increasing scientific highlighting of the (assumedly) exclusive role of language in the constitution of social reality, power and hegemony. Their common problem, it has been suggested, is their lack of a more dialectical (relational) conception of the hegemonic order of capitalism and their continuing treatment of capitalist reality as two distinguished areas; the areas of the material/economic (the base) and the symbolic/discursive (the superstructural). In order to avoid the current
media theoretical positions, this study has tried to apply the kind of (cultural materialist) Marxian theory that emphasises that the base of capitalist societies is constituted upon indissoluble material, social, discursive activities. This assumption has mainly been inspired by Raymond Williams’ view of the base, which we now return to:

It is only when we realize that ‘the base’, to which it is habitual to refer variations, is itself a dynamic and internally contradictory process – the specific activities and modes of activity, over a range from association to antagonism, of real men and classes of men – that we can begin to free ourselves from the notion of an ‘area’ or a ‘category’ with certain fixed properties for deduction to the variable processes of a superstructure. /.../ it is not ‘the base’ and ‘the superstructure’ that need to be studied, but specific and indissoluble real processes /.../ (Williams 1977, 82).

It is here necessary to formulate the following critical question: has the analysis of journalistic modes really strengthened the scientific assumption that the base is a dynamic process that by necessity includes ‘the cultural’, the practice of language use (and more precisely mass mediated discourse)?

As an answer to this; the aim has consequently been to explain modes of writing as practices that co-constitute and operate ‘within’ a more general, economic/material process. In order to achieve this, I have attempted to analytically interrelate the discursive logic of a journalistic mode to the logic of some economic/material practice or process, to identify and demonstrate how a particular mode of writing is partly or ‘incompletely’ homologous with some other (economic/material) practice and how these practices jointly constitute X (individualism, reification, differentiation etc.). Below, the differentiating mode of writing (Differentiation) is defined as dysfunctionally homologous with certain other practices, while these practices together constitute the whole process of (capitalist) differentiation:
The ‘whole’ ongoing process of differentiation

Language use (c) is not some superstructural phenomenon that is determined by, reproduces or rhetorically supports a material base – because language use is rather a constitutive part of the base. The cultural materialist argument is that one cannot imagine the existence of (b) and (d) i.e. of economic/material differentiation, irrespective of social relations (a) and language use, including a differentiating mode of writing (c). The differentiating mode of writing is internal to (b) and (d) though not entirely. The mode is only ‘partly’ homologous or ‘coherent’ with (b) and (d), which shows its relative autonomy. The mode is thus not determined to co-constitute the economic/material process; it does so only in particular contexts. For example, if a differentiating kind of discourse appears in the context of an modern art exhibition, as a piece of art, then it might instead function as a political criticism of individualism in contemporary capitalist societies (and so forth). To sum up, then, there is consequently one whole process here (differentiation), which is built upon the ongoing internal relations of (a), (b), (c) and (d). By analysing (media) discourse and journalistic modes in this dialectical way, this study has hopefully followed Williams’ proposal that “…it is not ‘the base’ and ‘the superstructure’ that need to be studied, but specific and indissoluble real processes…” (Williams 1977, 82).

This study does not ignore that the capitalist system is endowed with an ‘essential’ base (the capital vs labour conflict) and a superstructure (consisting of elements that are less fundamental for the existence of a mode of production). What is, however, emphasised is the presence of language use, the discursive and writing in every possible pore of the dominant mode of production, and that the base is instead a complex process of various material/social/discursive relations and activities. It is thus not the base-super-
structure distinction that has been considered problematic, only the generated gap between ‘economic/material relations’ and ‘language/culture’ (Williams 1977, Chouliaraki & Fairclough 1999, Peck 2001, 2003).

The ‘immaterial’ status of language (the problem of a powerful structure)
The language vs the material dualism is still flourishing within the sciences as well as in society as a whole. Thus, it is quite natural that, when analysing these news texts, in certain moments of doubt, one feels tempted to ‘submit’ to the more regular way of scientific thinking. As even if it is scientifically reasonable to imagine that ‘language is material’ (Williams), that ‘signs are material segments’ (Volosinov) or that ‘language internalises the material’ (Harvey) etc., still, when it comes down to it, when confronted with words and sentences inscribed on a piece of paper, it is quite easy to be seduced by the feeling that what one is experiencing is essentially ‘immaterial’; the feeling that the ‘symbolic elements’ (the newspaper headlines, paragraphs etc.) somehow derive from the mental domain and ‘consciousness’ alone rather than being intertwined with the material world (in terms of the constitution of material/social/discursive processes). It is therefore partly understandable (while nevertheless acceptable) that research fields that analyse ‘meaning processes’ per se (cultural studies, discourse analysis) easily end up in idealism-like notions, for example the kind of idea Stuart Hall is expressing when he suggests the ‘decentred’ nature of language, i.e. language as something that ‘...always escapes and evades the attempts to link it, directly and immediately, with other structures’ (Hall 1992, 284).

Irrespective of the important culturalist materialist support and guidance (Williams 1977, Harvey 1996, Fairclough 2001, Chouliaraki & Fairclough 1999, Wayne 2003); when scientifically dealing with ‘textual materials’ (such as news discourse) one’s scientific practice still seems to suffer from an ‘idealistic stamp’ that is difficult to rub off. It is as if, in order to do proper ‘material analysis’, one must still do the traditional political economic thing (to study ownership conditions etc). This study should, however, be viewed as part of a research field that will continually try to counteract such kinds of reasoning (and the whole language vs material dualism). The theoretical and methodological conclusions and suggestions in this study should consequently be discussed and related to all other research that, in partly other forms and by means of different empirical materials, tries to demonstrate the essential involvement of language use ‘within’ the economic/material processes of the capitalist system (Ray & Sayer 1999, 7–8, Peck 2001, 2003).
(2) The political-democratic purpose
In the following section, the modes are more decisively related to the particular media events (the IMF/WB Summit in Prague 2000 etc.) and what is supposed to be concluded here is the political powers of the modes. To begin with, I would like to suggest that primarily two categories of modes have been found in the news materials:

| The modes of de-permanence (The Remote control mode, Differentiation, Semiotic compression) |
| The modes of permanence (Disconnection, Cognitive recycling) |

The first category involves modes that are dialectically internal to the ‘fluxes and flows’ of the global economy. The economy is here comprehend as a complex process in constant transformation (due to the generation of new products, new knowledge, new conditions etc.) and where nothing seems to be really permanent. This condition has also been analysed as the rise of a ‘post-fordist economy’ (Harvey 1989 etc.) or a ‘new economy’, suggesting the increasing importance of reflexivity (Giddens 1997), individual consumption (Cross 2000), mobility as well as flexibility (Sennett 1998). The modes’ co-constitution of de-permanence involves the construction of the subject as an ongoing ‘project’ in constant motion: as a producer, wage labourer, consumer, adapter of new knowledge and skills, as well as a continuing developer of its individuality and personality (Rose 1993, 1998).

The second category of modes involves an opposing structural dimension of the capitalist system, which is the production of stability. Even though social practices, systems, spaces, institutions etc. are constantly objects of miscellaneous ‘fluxes and flows’ – of transformation – still, there is also this necessary demand for permanence whereby reality is transformed into something sustainable and stable, into permanent ‘things’ (Harvey 1996, 82). This is a necessary component in every social formation, including the capitalist one, since, as Harvey suggests, ‘If everything that is solid is always instantaneously melting into air, then it is very hard to accomplish anything or even set one’s mind to do anything’ (Harvey 1996, 7). In order to be efficient and productive, we need some kind of solid ground in our daily lives. This study has consequently suggested and analysed the mass media’s important role and function in this respect. There are particular journalistic modes that in their construction of politics, space, power etc., contribute to the general production of permanence. As in the case with the modes of de-permanence, in the below handling of the modes of permanence, what will be determined is their hegemonic consequences.
The modes of de-permanence: transnational politics, media discourse and ‘the everyday practice of radical political action’

The modes of de-permanence have all been found in the media coverage from the international financial summit in Prague (2000). The political context is the mass demonstrations and the loud protests against the exploitive and unjust dimensions of global capitalism, and the potential awakening of a political consciousness that transcends national and regional borders, potentially paving the way for new forms of citizenship and political action, and in the long run, for new transnational political (democratic) institutions, presumably better equipped to handle the negative effects of the global economy than the present ones (The UN, the nation state formation etc.). It is possible to conceive this political process of the late nineties and the turn of the millennium as a sign of a paradigm shift in the history of modern citizenship, as a visible indication of a real transnational people (Beck 1998, Carlehed 2001).

The elite mass media (DN and Delo) dismiss the anti-capitalist, transnational public by portraying the demonstrators as dangerous hooligans, communists, fascists, fundamentalists etc. [1]. However, this study’s aim has primarily been to demonstrate how the capitalist hegemonic order is preserved by means of underlying journalistic structures, modes of writing. To begin with, in order to clarify the function of the modes of de-permanence in this context, it is necessary to determine what the current journalistic modes actually do with the transnational, anti-capitalist, political engagement:
These journalistic modes consequently go with the new economic flow. They are integral ‘parts’ of the overall economic processes of de-permanence, since they all promote a subject in constant movement, busy with its private affairs (consumption, the creation of the self, the management of the daily life), and since the construction of politics and political action too, becomes absorbed or colonised by the logic of de-permanence.

This, basically speaking, demonstrates mass media’s fundamental involvement and adjustment to peoples’ daily lives, as a generator of social rituals and routines, as a provider of identity-construction and miscellaneous services etc. (Williams 1974, Carey 1989, Morley & Silverstone 1991).

When it comes to these journalistic modes, what is evident is the elite newspapers’ (obligatory) decision to serve and promote the news readers’ everyday doings – their daily obligations (job, social commitments, family life etc.) – rather than to be political forces that disrupt all this (in terms of being radical political powers). In the journalistic handling of transnational politics, no matter if the political demonstrations are constructed in a condemning way (the remote control mode) or in a more understanding

---

**The Remote control mode** (the news construction of the arrival of the political demonstrators) in which journalism constructs public space as an extension of people’s private property and lives, as an object for private transportation, production (entrepreneurship) and consumption (the practice of including/excluding), while the transnational political movement is constructed as an external, alien force that colonises private property, that is destroying the sovereign ‘cocoon’ of private desires and activities.

**Differentiation** (the news construction of the organisation of the transnational political engagement) in which journalism transforms the political engagement into a disorganised market place, consisting of social diversity, fragmentation and fleeting connections between individuals and groups, all busy with their particular activities and desires.

**Semiotic compression** (the news construction of politics/the political agenda of the involved parties) in which journalism transforms political thought and action into immediate action and gratification; into a quick fix kind of distribution of capital (debt-cancellations, charity). The semiotic compression mode is intertwined with the time and space compressive nature of the ‘new economy’ and the compressed everyday life of the middle-class strata.
and positive manner (differentiation, semiotic compression), these modes are internal to middle class peoples’ everyday doings. The construction of public space (Prague) and the political process (the rise of a transnational political movement) is either contrasted with, or adjusted to, the ‘normal’ middle-class citizen’s desires and living conditions, to his/her lack of time for communication, his/her presumed need for ‘personal development’ and personal preferences, his/her need as well as desire to consume etc.

**Radical political action – another everyday practice**

Exactly this is what makes a mass medium hegemonic and ‘part’ of a dominating order, politically speaking, the fact that it delivers information on what goes on in society in such a way that it never really interferes with or undermines the overall ‘normal’ condition of order. A mass medium is hegemonic in terms of keeping everyday practices and processes going on as usual (Gramsci 2000). In this respect, *Semiotic compression* and *Differentiation* are particularly interesting. Here journalism:

(a) partly *embraces* and ‘shows understanding’ for the political struggle against the capitalist system, although in terms of:

(b) *neutralising* the radical dimension of the political struggle (making it less leftist and class-loaded), thereby paving the way for the:

(c) transformation of the radical political struggle into another (normal) ‘everyday life practice’.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Media discourse, internal to peoples’ everyday lives:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distribution and circulation of capital (a ‘private household’ logic involving wages, taxes, debts and charity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time and space compression (the hunt for time, efficiency etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumption logic (political action as ‘personal choice’; not ‘collective struggle’)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

The rise of ‘real’ transnational politics and peoples’ around the millennium shift; a process potentially endowed with the same radical magnitude as the historical shift from feudalism to liberal democratic societies, is, via the journalistic modes, *collapsing into this ‘bourgeois mini-project’*. Anti-capitalist struggle and radical political action, traditionally defined by its *interruption* of the normal order (in terms of strikes, house occupations, mass demonstrations etc.) is here neutralised and somehow integrated into the ‘normal order’. The propagandistic message is the following: transform the whole capitalist system in accordance with your ‘personal preferences’ and
‘individual choice’ (differentiation), do it in the quick ‘drive through’ way (semiotic compression), or simply exclude all this (‘no thanks!’) from your private life world (the remote control mode).

The normative interpretation of these modes should, however, not be understood as a total dismissal of the ‘new’ more individualistic and private kind of political engagement, for example, the challenging of powerful companies via private consumption and everyday consumer-boycotts (Klein 2002), or the political struggle against the system by means of the system itself, in terms of, for example, transforming green/ecological thinking into desirable commodities in the capitalist market. However, still, in order to change the whole system in a more fundamental way (involving the global ecological problem, the systematic exploitation of labour power in the third world etc.) what is really needed is a more radical interruption of one’s Western ‘everyday doings’ (for the sake of more ‘time-consuming’ forms or political engagement etc.). It is hard to imagine that ‘bourgeois everyday life politics’ really promotes a more decisive materialisation of the transnational political protests against global capitalism – i.e. a radical restructuring or construction of transnational political institutions in order to regulate the global economy (Beck 1998). At the end of the day, it instead counteracts and delays this (necessary) development.

The modes of permanence: on the ontology of global capitalism and ‘residual media discourse’

The modes of permanence have all been discovered in the coverage of 9/11. What defines these journalistic modes is their systematic rubbing away (Wayne 2003, 193) of the relational and process-like dimensions of social reality, their repression of the way in which the world looks as a totality (the world of global capitalism). The relevant context here will consequently be the ontology of global capitalism, the ongoing, complex relations between peoples, spaces, raw materials, technologies, institutions etc., while the central issue is the political and democratic effects of elite journalism’s systematic exclusion of a more ‘transnational ontology’ (when reporting on the world).

What these modes do is to turn complex relations into sovereign ‘things’. They turn X (a space, a practice, an idea, a system etc.) into a ‘thing’ with immanent and causal powers – rather than treating it as a part of something else (of a larger process, structure etc.). The relational state of the current ‘thing’ (its deep involvement in complex ongoing relations with other ‘things’) is being erased, and thereby the ‘thing’ is provided with permanence, that is to say, with stability, solidity as well as ‘eternity’ (Thompson 1990, 65–67). I would like here to put forward three permanences. More precisely an
**explanatory structure** (the modern division of explanatory labour); a particular **power** (the US) and a particular **territory** (the nation state):

**THE MODERN DIVISION OF EXPLANATORY LABOUR** (from *Cognitive recycling*): in which the ‘economy’, ‘politics’ and ‘culture’ appear as sovereign explanatory powers (the economic reason, the political reason and so forth), which is also embodied in the daily organisation of news information (the sections of economic, political, cultural news etc.). By strictly **isolating** these explanatory powers from each other, journalism represses the **relational dimension of social reality**, i.e. life under the conditions of global capitalism and the need for a (globalising) journalistic explanatory discourse that decisively **interrelates** political, economic, cultural, religious etc. structures and mechanisms (in order to explain such matters as ‘terrorism’ etc.).

**THE UNITED STATES** (from *Disconnection*): in which the US is formed into a sovereign, permanent Power that swallows all political identity building (The US: love it; support it; dislike it; hate it; negotiate with it etc.). As an effect of this gazing at the US itself, what is conjured away is the powerless dimension of the US and the capitalist hegemonic order as a whole – the ongoing process of political, economic, cultural, military relationships that includes ‘us’ too (as part of the Western world, as consumers, as shareholders etc.).

**THE NATION STATE**: As an extension of the results from *Disconnection* and the reification of the US; **there is the permanence of the nation state space** (in general); involving the news discursive repression of the deeply **relational dimension of this territory**. While journalism turns the nation state territory into a stable, permanent ‘thing’ and continues to centre its interpretations of the world around it (what it does, how it feels, what it plans to do, its imagined causal powers, its relations to other nation states etc.), what is of necessity conjured away is history’s impact on this territory: its transition from more to less sovereignty, its emerging political and economic non-existence and fundamental being in a transnational, global world.

In some contexts these permanences (the ‘political explanatory factor’, the US, the nation state territory) **are** real powers and agents, in the sense that they actually ‘make things happen’, cause or explain things. In this respect, their everyday presence in the mass media seems relevant and legitimate. In
other contexts they are consequently not some autonomous powers; not being particularly alive as they are so relationally interwoven with the totality of the overall fluxes and flows of the global capitalist order (Harvey 1996, 49). A journalistic mode of permanence thus appears when a space, practice, system, institution etc. is endowed with an exaggerated amount of power, autonomy and existence, i.e. when it becomes reified.

The modes of permanence and reification

This journalistic repressing and rubbing away of the relations that constitute or involve an X (the ‘nation state’, ‘the US’, the ‘political’ etc.) consequently displays reification. Lukács’ (1971) theory of reification wants to unite Marx’s (1954) theory of people’s relations to commodities in capitalist societies (the theory of commodity fetishism), on the one hand, and on the other, Weber’s (1978) theory of rationalisation (of the development of specialisation, calculation-oriented practices and bureaucratisation in modern societies). What is, however, at the centre of attention is the Marxian theory, and the way in which the social context somehow ‘disappears’ in commodity-exchange. While commodities and their values are constituted by complex social relations between people, still, in the market place we tend to treat commodities as if they were endowed with certain ‘immanent powers’ that somehow ‘conquer’ time and comparisons with other commodities. Lukács, however, concludes that, in capitalist societies, this peculiar logic not only appears in commodity-exchange, but also in other contexts: in scientific practice, everyday discourse, writing etc. In capitalist societies, the dominating (hegemonic) picture of social reality is the picture of a seemingly open space of autonomous ‘things’ (of practices, spaces, powers, systems etc.) cultivating lives of their own, while what is simultaneously repressed is the totality of society (the ‘whole picture’), i.e. how all the seemingly autonomous ‘things’ are relationally interconnected, jointly constituting the dynamic and contradictory totality of capitalism. It is thus in this sense that the modes of permanence with their de-relational construction of ‘the US’ etc. should be defined as reified media discourse and considered part of the general reifying processes of the capitalist mode of production (Sohn Rethel 1978, Zizek 1989, 11–17).

The Lukácián reification theory has been criticised from different angles (Berger & Pullberg 1966, Keat & Urry 1975, 180–183, Habermas 1995, 355–365 etc.). Among other things, what has been questioned is the notion that reification only appears in societies that are dominated by a capitalist mode of production. What has instead been argued is that reification might express a more fundamental dimension of man, occurring in social relations in general (see Adorno & Horkheimer in Habermas 1995, 378, Harvey
1996). In other words: even though capitalism is essentially dependent on reification (due to this systems’ division of labour, specialisation, increasing complexity etc.) still, reification could exist in other modes of production and societies as well. From this point of view, the reification of spaces, powers etc. – and its generation of permanence – are necessary for the organisation of social life; no matter the society (capitalist or some other), helping to ‘...solidify and give meaning to our lives’ (Harvey 1996, 8):

Reifications of free-flowing processes are always occurring to create actual ‘permanences’ in the social and material world around us. Examples might be material landscapes (such as cities), social institutions that seem almost impossible to transform by virtue of the solid way they have been constructed, divisions of labour that are so routinized and organised through infrastructure of factory and machinery that they seem impossible not to replicate, socially constructed discourses that tightly constrain and regulate behaviours…and even discourses which become so widely accepted and reified, that they themselves become part of a landscape of knowledge seemingly impermeable to change (Harvey 1996, 81).

However, even if reification is a necessary thing for the constitution of society, still, from an epistemological perspective, a de-reified picture of the world is definitively better than a reified one – as a de-reified worldview comes closer to truth. And even if reification might be a rather natural ingredient of social relations, still the discerned reified journalistic modes generate certain political and democratic problems that ought to be clarified. The issue here is continually the two newspapers’ handling of social reality under the conditions of global capitalism and its complex relations. The central suggestion here is that when the current journalistic modes repress the ontology of global capitalism, they repress the real conditions of power, autonomy, democracy, space etc. while instead producing memorial out-of-date versions of power, autonomy, democracy, space etc.

On the archaic, residual and emergent
The journalistic modes of permanence generate an omnipotent presence of particular spaces, powers, institutions etc., providing them with strength, relevancy and a great deal of existence at the expense of information about the relational nature of these permanents:
These and other permanents should be interpreted as *residuals*. In everyday language, the residual refers to ‘*the things that remains*’; ‘*the quantity left over at the end of a process, a remainder*’ [2]. In order to define this matter further, I will return to Raymond Williams (1977) and his discussion of the difference between the archaic and the residual:

I would call the ‘archaic’ that which is wholly recognized as an element of the past, to be observed, to be examined, or even on occasion to be consciously ‘revived’, in a deliberately specializing way. What I mean by the ‘residual’ is very different. The residual, by definition, has been effectively formed in the past, but it is still very active in the cultural process, not only and often not at all as an element of the past, but as an effective element of the present (Williams 1977, 122).

As an example, the Monarchy of Sweden (the Kingdom of Sweden) is an *archaic* power structure [3]. The power of the Monarchy is symbolically and materially embodied by personalities (The Queen etc.), buildings (The Royal Castle etc.), events, traditions etc. These embodiments are however simulations of power, since history has transformed the monarchic power into something archaic, into a museum of past power. A *residual*, then, is thus something that proceeds towards the archaic, but is not there yet. It still has importance and power, if not so much ‘real’, then at least symbolic. On the one hand, the permanents discerned (the US etc.) of this study are too important and powerful to be considered archaic, but on the other hand, they are too weak to qualify as something *emergent*, i.e. as part of the ‘...new meanings and values, new practices, new relationships...’ (Williams 1977, 123) that increasingly constitute, explain, have impact on the local as well as global world and our life-conditions in general. The reified journalistic permanences are thus *residuals*, in Williams’ sense, situated somewhere in-between the state of being archaic and emergent, being something ‘...that

---

– The modern mode of explaining/dividing of society: economy/politics/culture etc. treated as distinguished, autonomous powers with licence to explain their respective ‘domains’ of social reality (rather than being *mixed* in order to explain *complex processes*).

– The US: treated as the capitalist system, as world hegemony, rather than as a *part* of it.

– The nation state: treated as an autonomous territory, and as a natural, eternal source of political antagonism, political struggle, political action, democracy, independence, emancipation, sovereignty etc. – rather than as a territory that is fundamentally *sucked into* a complex global system.
has been effectively formed in the past, but it is still very active in the cultural process’ (Williams 1977, 122). The residuals discerned in this context, such as ‘the US’ (embodifying hegemonic power) or ‘the nation state territory’ (embodifying autonomy, democracy, political action etc.) are strongly embedded in our everyday thinking/writing (Williams 1977, 123, Hall 1996:b). They represent the habitual, familiar and traditional – the world we know – and are thus hard to remove, intellectually and cognitively speaking. But the more such (residual) modes of permanence are present in media discourse, the more the readers/audiences are provided with iconic forms rather than real forms: Iconic power (The US as the icon of world ruling), iconic counter-hegemonic discourse (the state or nation state as the icon of sovereignty, emancipation, political action etc.), or iconic explanatory powers (politics, economy, culture etc. in particular as icons of explaining things).

The political hegemonic aspect

The critical Marxian interpretation here is that elite mass media in capitalist societies (such as DN and Delo) have no interest in reformulating or replacing the current residual discourse – since that might undermine and counteract the interests of the elite and the hegemonic status quo. The modes of permanence and their journalistic censorship of a more enlightening discourse on globalisation’s impact on social reality, and its consequences when it comes to how to define and explain space, power, democracy etc. – seem to function as a tranquilliser, meant for the anxious late capitalist subject and its assumed need for more simplistic pictures of the world. Particularly ideologically effective, I think, is this daily dose of nation state opium i.e. of journalistic writing that somehow wants us to believe that the world is spatially organised, is possible to explain, and is working – as it always has. What is simultaneously counteracted, then, and effectively swept under the carpet, is the rise of the public force that might really challenge the neoliberal order as a whole: the transnational people (Carleheden 2001) or what Hardt & Negri (2000) defines as the multitude and its proceeding global mode of thinking/practising politics.

(3) For a transnational mode of journalistic writing

Below is a summary of the two categories of journalistic modes, their ‘qualities’ as dynamic parts of more general economic/material processes, as well as their political functions:
For the emerging, emancipating (*leftist*) journalism that consequently must avoid these modes of writing, what is waiting around the corner is the continuing development of *critical global journalism*. We are all familiar with expressions like the global village (McLuhan 2001) or globalisation: the world as a single place (Robertson 1994). These academic buzzwords are not however utopian, since the globally intertwined world has already arrived. The problem is consequently that while the world already is a single place, economically, information-technologically speaking etc. – in a *journalistic epistemological sense*, there is no corresponding single world. The examples are rather rare of journalism that more seriously defines the global world as its home territory, or of news media that try to cover this single place in accordance with the logic of *local journalism*.

I therefore do not have in mind the (global) flow of information, emanating from CNN, BBC World etc. What one primarily experiences here is either (1): rapid transmission of images and pieces of information (breaking news) on ‘events’ going on ‘out there’, i.e. the constant dissemination of seemingly disconnected elements of information (oil prices rising, warfare in Uganda, terror attack in Moscow etc.), or (2); the making of ‘global news’ into spectacular and western propagandistic narratives, such as Liberating Kosovo, Air Strikes Against Iraq, The War Against Terrorism etc. (see Nohrstedt & Ottosen 2001, 2004, 2005). By global or transnational journalism, what is intended is something quite different, a kind of journalism that exclusively takes its point of departure in *epistemology*. A journalism that:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The modes of de-permanence (<em>Remote control mode, Differentiation, Semiotic compression</em>)</th>
<th>The modes of permanence (<em>Disconnection, Cognitive recycling</em>)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>As economic/material forces</strong>: potentially integral parts of the dominant (capitalist) mode of production by exceedingly <strong>including</strong> the ‘fluxes and flows’ of the economic system (co-constituting privatisation, consumption, individualisation, economic compression, differentiation etc.).</td>
<td><strong>As economic/material forces</strong>: potentially integral parts of the dominant (capitalist) mode of production by exceedingly <strong>excluding</strong> the ‘fluxes and flows’ of the economic system, i.e. by <em>reifying</em> spaces, powers, institutions, explanatory discourse etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political function</strong>: censoring of political discourse that promotes class bonds/consciousness/conflicts (<em>remote control mode, differentiation</em>) and a more ‘structural’ way of analysing social problems (<em>semiotic compression</em>).</td>
<td><strong>Political function</strong>: censoring of <em>totalising</em> explanations; of ‘cognitive pictures’ of the world that demonstrate the presence of the ‘totality of capitalism’ in local and social reality, as well as censoring of the emerging (transnational) political forces that try to take into account the ‘capitalist whole’ in their political analysis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(1) *updates its everyday definition of power*: From the local horizon (Sweden, Slovenia etc.), journalism should look out at the world and ask itself: when it comes down to it, *how* and from *where* does power arise nowadays? There is a lot of routine reporting from the national parliaments, and other local/national institutions, but to what extent do they really affect people’s lives in comparison with certain emergent powers (the political power from Brussels; the economic/financial from Frankfurt, New York, Beijing etc.)? Critical question: If power is increasingly transnational, should not the reporting from transnational institutions and places then increase at the expense of information from and about domestic/national institutions (such as the national parliament etc.)?

(2) *increasingly internalises the totality (of the global capitalist system)*: a journalism that makes it into an everyday routine to investigate how people and their actions, practices, problems, life conditions etc. in different parts of the world are *interrelated*. Capital is not restrained or stopped by any borders, but (national) journalism still is, by its upholding of cognitive borders between territories, continents, cultures etc. (‘domestic vs foreign news’, the nation state territory vs ‘the rest’ etc.) – thereby sustaining *unnecessary distance and separation* between spaces, peoples, practices, processes, problems, interests etc. that are in fact *intertwined* or/and *common*.

(3) *establishes a standardised (transnational) ‘language’*; i.e. a more natural journalistic way of discursively constructing one world; a ‘language’ for the reporting on a ‘global people’ and its structural interconnectedness in the context of a singular territory. Journalism must invent a ‘language’ that, as easily as commodities and capital, transports itself across the globe, intellectually and cognitively speaking, that explains ‘events’ and social problems in such a way that real as well as imaginary barricades and borders are diminished – thereby making the global world into a *local territory* and means for *local journalism*.

New journalistic solutions on ‘how to meet the (global) world’ have so far been dominated by the assumed potentials of *technology* (the Internet, digitalisation, convergence etc.), and less by *epistemology*, i.e. how one should de facto journalistically think, speak and write about a world that is globally intertwined. However, the kind of *transgressive* epistemological labour that is found in the contemporary *transdisciplinary social sciences* (Beck, Bonss & Lau 2003) or in *postmodern art* (Debeljak 1998, 127–152); i.e.
the attempts to find partly new ways of categorising, dividing and explaining social material reality in order to grasp the complex reality of global capitalism – this kind of intellectual labour should consequently be included in journalism as well – more precisely in the context of an emancipating (transnational) journalism.

(4) In conclusion
Finally, my intention is to discuss some further important aspects of the scientific approach, more precisely the presence/absence of ‘national differences’ and the strengths as well as shortcomings of this kind of structural media analysis (of modes). Finally there are some suggestions for further research.

On national differences
The empirical material of this study has consisted of newspapers from two different nation states (Sweden and Slovenia). The collected articles, photographs etc. from DN and Delo are a homogenous body of material (semi-core elite media material), but with certain different features (the partly different political and ideological pasts of the newspapers and countries where they occur). The purpose of the study has been to analyse the relationship between the capitalist hegemonic order and semi-core elite media (by means of DN and Delo), and the central suggestion has been that one should analyse this relationship in terms of journalistic modes. This indicates that national comparisons, i.e. the analysis of why the two newspapers sometimes interpret and write differently about the same topic, has been taken into consideration only when such a difference has been considered relevant to the purpose of the study. There are consequently many ‘national differences’ in this news material that have been excluded due to their lack of relevancy in the analysis of modes.

Half of the analyses (4 of 8) are of the kind where a particular mode is structurally present in both newspapers, automatically indicating the absence of ‘national differences’. There are, however, two modes that especially involve a ‘national’ dimension: the Multi-colouring mode and the Greying mode. In this context it has been suggested that the newspapers’ different ways of constructing their front pages, as well as ‘society as a whole’, could be explained by the ideological belongings of the two newspapers, consequently the (market) strong liberal identity of DN in comparison with the politically independent (but rather recently communist) identity of Delo. While DN’s Multi-colouring mode is interpreted as an active part of the whole post-welfare, post-socialist era of Sweden, Delo’s Greying mode to a certain degree embodies the country’s restrained and moderate entrance...
into the Western capitalist system (compared to certain other post-communist states, such as Hungary etc.), consequently displaying the ongoing parallel existence of the communist system within the emergent capitalist one.

The Remote control mode, Semiotic compression, Disconnection and Cognitive recycling are co-hegemonic modes that operate in both newspapers. The Multi-colouring mode, Differentiation and Locking are co-hegemonic modes that operate in Swedish DN but not in Slovenian Delo. The Greying mode is a counter-hegemonic mode that operates in Slovenian Delo but not in Swedish DN. The results, then, from the Multi-colouring mode, the Greying mode, Differentiation and Locking indicate that Swedish DN is more integrated in, or rather more part of, the capitalist system than the Slovenian newspaper. This means that, in comparison with DN, Delo is a more ‘negotiating’ (Hall 1996:b) kind of news medium. Finally on national differences, Locking is a mode that could to some extent be explained from a national point of view, in which Delo’s journalistic treatment of Serbs and Kosovo Albanians should be related to the Yugoslav past of Slovenia, which has led to Slovenia being much more involved in the Balkan conflict than Sweden, culturally, geographically, politically, economically etc.

Further research

The purpose of this study has been to investigate the relationship between the capitalist hegemonic order and semi-core mass media, and to do this in terms of journalistic modes. I have tested the idea about journalistic modes on selected empirical materials (three samples of international political news coverage), and the abductive labour has been decisively navigated by Marxian cultural materialist theory. The concluded modes, such as the Remote control mode, Semiotic compression, Disconnection etc. consequently demonstrate the discursive mechanisms of the political economy. The relevance of this study and the fruitfulness of analysing journalistic modes should be further debated and discussed as well as investigated by means of additional research. When it comes to the latter (forthcoming research), I would like to take the opportunity to put forward some sketchy suggestions:

I would like to mention three outlines. Firstly, I would find it interesting and relevant to analytically deepen the analysis of language: to, in more detailed manner, investigate how the modes are constituted, lexically and syntactically speaking. Secondly, throughout the study I have taken for granted that these modes do not exclusively operate in the guise of news journalism, but also in other forms of language use and genres. It would thus be interesting to investigate how these modes operate in other kinds of
journalism (such as popular journalism, local journalism, web-journalism, sports journalism etc.) as well as how these modes might operate in other forms of discourse (from the novelistic style to everyday talk).

Thirdly, the most relevant forthcoming research task, I think, would be to develop the discerned modes theoretically speaking, by selecting new empirical materials that further demonstrate how they operate in the context of a dominant (capitalist) mode of production. Such a study would in addition hopefully help to further establish the analysis of journalistic modes as a potential complement to contemporary (Marxian) media critical research (Wayne 2003, Peck 2003), Critical discourse analysis (Chouliaraki & Fairclough 1999) as well as the analysis of ideology (Thompson 1990, Chiapello 2003).
The Multi-colouring and Greying Modes

[2] The ‘reluctant’ discourse of Delo has, however, become a successful product, as the paper has received several prestigious prizes for its (severe) layout philosophy.

[3] It is also interesting to note that the Delo corporation includes a yellow paper called *Slov. Novice*, whose graphic design and visual communication are fundamentally different from Delo’s.

[4] It is interesting to reflect upon this mode in relation to the Swedish film director Roy Andersson. His film *Songs from the Second Floor* (2000), as well as several of his other productions, are endowed with a greyish colour range, which embodies the homogeneously dull but still *equality* oriented nature of the Swedish welfare state, the greyish thus being synonymous with the existence of a more *diluted socio-economic* reality that has not yet been dissolved by neoliberal socio-economic ‘diversity’.

Disconnection
[1] In accordance with Lukács’ definition, the basis of the *commodity-structure* /…/ is that a relation between people takes on the character of a thing and thus acquires a ‘phantom objectivity’, an autonomy that seems so strictly rational and all-embracing as to conceal every trace of its fundamental nature: the relation between people (Lukács 1971, 83).


[3] This matter involves the traditional philosophical issue of the relation between the universal and the particular. Regarding the universalism-particularism debate, see for example Butler, Laclau & Zizek (2000).

Conclusions
[1] See the ‘bad behaviour discourse’ in *Differentiation*.


[3] The idea to exemplify the archaic with the decreasing power of the Monarchy, I got from an article written by Slavoj Zizek. In the article Zizek discusses the decreasing power of national parliaments in the context of global capitalism. However, I cannot find the actual article.
Sammanfattning

Introduktion


Studien argumenterar för att relationen mellan kapitalism och mediediskurser bör analyseras som journalistiska former. Studien är uppdelad i två delsyften, det första är teoretiskt-metodologiskt, det andra politiskt-demokratiskt.

Det teoretiska-metodologiska syftet
Avhandlingen tar avstamp i en kritik av medie- och kommunikationsvetenskapens idealistiska utveckling under 1980- och 1990-talet. Under de senaste decennierna har kultur- (cultural studies) och diskursforskningen (diskursanalys) på allvar etablerat sig som teoretiska och metodiska institutioner inom medieforskningen. Den lingvistiska och kulturella vändningen har medfört viktiga kunskaper om meningsskapandets, den sociala interaktionens, tolkningarnas, och de diskursiva handlingarnas betydelse gällande kon-
struktionen av verklighet, institutioner, maktförhållanden, normer m.m. Dess brist består emellertid i vad Palmer (1990) beskriver som ‘the reification of language’, dvs. att man överdriver språkets roll i tillvaron, och där andra aspekter, inte minst de materiella, ignoreras, eller reduceras till diskurs (se Wayne 2003).


I studiet av relationen mellan den kapitalistiska samhällsordningen och mediediskurser eftersträvas en teoretisk och metodisk ’tredje väg’ mellan kultur/diskursforskningen och den politiska ekonomin – ett sätt att kvalitativt analysera medietext där det språkliga och materiella mer tydligt samspelar. Vad som åsyftas är en teori och metod som drar nytta av diskursforskningens insikter om språkliga handlingars inneboende krafter, hur de på egen hand grundlägger makt- och dominansförhållandena, men som samtidigt fokuserar på hur diskursen är dialektiskt sammanvävd med olika pågående ekonomiska och materiella praktiker i samhället.

Förslaget är att relationen mellan kapitalism och mediediskurser bör analyseras som journalistiska former (journalistic modes of writing). En tämligen komplett inblick i relationen mellan det kapitalistiska produktionsläge och mediediskurser erbjuds eftersom den journalistiska formen på en och samma gång ses som:

| en diskursiv praktik med egna krafter och agentskap, och dialektiskt sammanvävd med, och medproducent av, den kapitalistiska ’ekonomiska/materiella basen’, dvs. pågående ekonomiska och materiella praktiker och relationer som t.ex. privat ägande, exploatering, ekonomisk differentiering etc. |
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Syftet är därmed att pröva den vetenskapliga hållbarheten i detta påstående. Kan man analysera den aktuella relationen som journalistiska former? Uppfyller analysen föreställningen om en teoretisk och metodmässig ’tredje väg’ mellan cultural studies/diskursanalys och political economy?

Det politiska-demokratiska syftet
Det teoretiska-metodologiska syftet berör mediediskursers involvering i olika ekonomiska och materiella processer. Mediediskurser kan ju dock också ha en politisk dimension. Studiens politiska-demokratiska syfte involverar mer direkt de tre internationella nyhetsdiskurserna (Jugoslavien/Kosovo, demonstrationerna i Prag, och 11/9). På vilket sätt kan de konstaterade journalistiska formerna ses som inslag i olika pågående politiska kamper (för eller emot transnationell demokrati, nationalstatens suveränitet, nyliberalism etc.)? Mot bakgrund av analysresultatet, hur ska man föreställa sig en emancipatorisk politisk journalistik i ett senkapitalistiskt samhälle, ett journalistiskt skrivande som inte enbart förmår att undvika en kollaps inför den marknadsekonomiska logiken, utan även klarar av att driva medborgarskapet och politiken in i ett nytt paradigm, in i den transnationella politiska framtiden?

Det empiriska materialet

Metod
Den kvalitativa analysen av journalistiska former inspireras av critical discourse analysis (CDA) (Chouliaraki & Fairclough 1999), som definierar diskurs som socialt handlande, och den marxistiska kulturmateriälistiska teorin (Williams 1977, Harvey 1996). Målet är att uppnå en kulturmateri-

**En kulturmaterialistisk CDA**


Den kvalitativa CDA:n utförs i två etapper. Den första etappen handlar om att identifiera textuella ideologem. Det sker genom en systematisk genomgång av nyhetsmaterialet som sammanlagt består av 438 enheter, och där en enhet kan vara en artikel, bild eller faktaruta. Det som registre-ras är enhetens placering (förstasida, utrikesnyheter etc.), rubrik(-er), ingress, tematiska struktur (artikels etc. huvudsakliga innehåll), ideologem (pågår det något mindre synligt i texten, en underliggande konflikt, som relaterar till ett mer generellt ekonomiskt/materiellt orättvisförhållande i samhället?), och lingvistiska strukturer och element (det funna ideologemets lingvistiska resurser, dvs. ord och meningar).

I den andra CDA-etappen reduceras nyhetsmaterialet, endast det material som relaterar till de upptäckta (och relevanta) ideologemen behålls. Det textmaterial (meningar, bilder, rubriker etc.) som konstituerar ett ideologem samlas ihop (se appendix), och i detta samlade diskurskluster framträder således en journalistisk form. En fördjupad kvalitativ analys av de journalistiska formerna tar vid, en analys som sker i tre steg och där det sista steget är det centrala. Den journalistiska formen analyseras som:

1. **En praktik med särskilda diskursiva och kognitiva egenskaper.** Om den aktuella formen t.ex. producerar det privata på bekostnad av det offentliga, dvs. argumenterar för privata alternativ istället för offentliga, i såfall mer
exakt hur går detta till i texten, kognitivt och diskursivt? Med vad för slags tankekategorier, ord och meningar, förverkligas denna journalistiska praktik?

(2) En strukturell produkt. Här tillämpas ett mer kausalt förarande. Vad är formen en produkt av? Vad för slags underliggande strukturer och mekanismer gör så att den journalistiska formen 'fungerar'? Viktiga faktorer här är den enskilda journalistens bakgrund, liksom särskilda rutiner, policies och traditioner på den aktuella redaktionen, bakomliggande kommersiella intressen, klass och genussstrukturer, politiska intressen och agendor samt sociokulturella och historiska faktorer.


Resultat

I analysen av det empiriska materialet konstateras åtta journalistiska former. Sju av dessa är hegemoniska, dvs. de är på olika sätt integrerade med den kapitalistiska marknadsekonomin, medan en form är mothegemonisk och motverkar de förhärskande ekonomiska och materiella processerna i samhället. De hegemoniska formerna kan delas in i två kategorier: förflyktighets- och permanensformer.
Journalistikens förflyktighetsformer (modes of de-permanence)


Remote control mode (fjärrkontrollformen): journalistikens konstruktion av det offentliga rummet och samhället som en post-politisk plats där gator och torg är som en förlängning av den privata sfären, en passiv rymd kontrollerad av den suveräna individ och dennes suveräna (konsumtions-)val av människor, produkter, platser, njutning etc.

Ekonomisk/materiell dimension: den journalistiska praktiken är dialektiskt sammanvävd med den generella kommersialiseringen och kommodificationen av platser, institutioner och lösningar som tidigare var, eller skulle kunna vara, offentliga, och framväxten av ett samhälle som till fullo struktureras som marknadsekonomin, ’val mellan olika enheter’ (ja tack till X, nej till Y och Z).

Differentiation (differentiering): journalistikens konstruktion av politiskt engagemang och medborgarskap som en differentierad (icke-kollektiv) och ensam praktik, där handling, lycka, begär, drömmar, framtid, samhälle, moral etc. är synonynt med individuellt arbete, och individens relation till sig själv.

Ekonomisk/materiell dimension: den journalistiska praktiken är naturligt integrerad med den kapitalistiska marknadsekonomin, differentieringsmekanismer, och systemets beroende av att det hela tiden råder ekonomiska/materiella skillnader mellan människor, dvs. en ojämlik fördelning av finansiella och materiella resurser.

Semiotic compression (semiotisk kompression): journalistikens strävan efter att minimera avståndet till X, dvs. till det autentiska, ursprungliga, verkligheten som den är, den omedelbara handlingen etc. vilket sker genom en ’visuell’ skrivstil där överflödig diskurs (ord och meningar), historisk kontext, bakgrundsinformation m.m. minimeras eller elimineras helt.

Ekonomisk/materiell dimension: den journalistiska formen är integrerad med den kapitalistiska marknadsekonomens strävan efter att minimera avståndet till X, dvs. till den maximala profitten, vilket uppnås genom eliminering av olika tidrum avstånd/hinder (genom rationalisering av produktionsprocesser, genom den hypersnabba transporten av information och kapital etc.).
**Det politiska-demokratiska syftet:** Genom dessa former framträder särskilda ekonomiska och materiella praktiker/relationer som journalistiskt skrivande, men där det socioekonomiska mellanskiktets (medelklassens) intressen också tydligt försvaras, politiskt sett. Mediediskursen motverkar effektivt den radikala politik som vill förändra det kapitalistiska systemet på ett mer grundläggande plan genom att omvandla den transnationella politiska rörelsen till ett hot mot den 'ultimata friheten', den privata konsumtionen, genom att göra politiskt handlande till en isolerad praktik (individualisering) och genom att förknippa politisk handling med kvick-fix-oriente rad välgörenhet snarare än att förändra samhällsstrukturer.

**Journalistikens permanensformer (modes of permanence)**


Denna studie finner två journalistiska former som bygger på reifikation, och båda har observerats i nyhetstidningarnas rapportering av 11/9: Disconnection (strukturell fräknkoppling) och Cognitive recycling (kognitiv återanvändning). Formerna kännetecknas av att de förtränger den globala kapitalismens tunga existens, och därmed nutidens komplexa och relationella natur:
Det politiska-demokratiska syftet: Dessa två journalistiska former reifierar den sociala verkligheten genom att tilldela överdrivet stor permanens och livskraft åt en särskild förklaringsstruktur (den moderna förklaringsdiskursen), en makt (USA), och ett territorium (nationalstaten):

– *Det moderna sättet att förklara samhället* (från *Cognitive recycling*): i journalistikens förklaringar av terrorattacken (11/9) framträder politiken, religionen, det kulturella, den globala ekonomin etc. som självständiga kategorier, åtskilda genom att de förekommer i olika sektioner i tidningarna, såväl som genom att de separeras i den journalistiska tanken. När den politiska förklaringen närvarar, fattas den ekonomiska; när den religiösa variblen förekommer saknas ett social-psykologiskt perspektiv osv. Genom att separera dessa variabler förtränger journalistiken den globala kapitalismens
komplexitet och fundamentalt relationella karaktär, där alltfler händelser och processer endast kan förklaras genom en bestämd integrering av ovanstående moderna tankekategorier ( genom en postmodern förklaringsdiskurs).

– USA (från Disconnection): USA konstrueras som en suverän makt som förväntas sluka all politisk energi (USA: en makt att älska, hata, kritisera, ifrågasätta eller förhandla med). USA framträder ensamt som Hegemonin eller Makten, snarare än som agent i en större global maktstruktur. USA:s omnipotenta närvaro i mediediskursen fränkopplar samtidigt den västerländska hegemonins komplexa och relationella karaktär; vad som förträngs är hegemonin och makten som en pågående global process av ekonomiska, politiska, kulturella etc. relationer och nätverk där även du och jag medverkar (Castells 1996, Hardt & Negri 2000).


I väntan på transnationella journalistiska former

Ytterligare tre journalistiska former (the *Greying mode*, the *Multi-colouring mode* och *Locking*) konstateras i studien. Dessa tre, som också berör Kosovo-materialet, hamnar således utanför ovanstående kategorisering (journalistikens förflyktighets- och permanensformer).

Om man ser till studien som helhet, är det fyra av åtta former som opererar i båda nyhetsmedierna, dock tenderar svenska DN att vara mer integrerad med den kapitalistiska marknadsekonomin än slovenska Delo. *Differentiation* och *Locking* (också pro-hegemonisk) opererar nämligen i första hand i DN, medan den enda mothegemoniska formen, the *Greying mode*, förekommer i post-socialistiska Delo. De åtta journalistiska formerna demonstrerar den kulturmaterialistiska teorins (Williams 1977, Harvey 1996), och kulturmaterialistiska CDA:ns relevans, dvs. att analysera diskurs och (journalistiskt) språk som potentiellt integrerat i mer generella ekonomiska och materiella relationer och processer, utan att för den skull göra avkall på de språkliga handlingarnas särart. Ansatsens för- och nackdelar bör givetvis debatteras, inklusive frågan om hur denna typ av CDA kan förbättras och utvecklas.


(a) **uppdatera definitionen av makt.** Det krävs en uppdatering av maktens karaktär och ursprung. Varifrån och på vilket sätt opererar makten eller maktens nufortiden? Det finns gott om rutinmässig rapportering från nationella parlament, från lokala och nationella institutioner, från invanda platser och rum, men i hur pass stor omfattning påverkar dessa våra liv i jämförelse med de globala maktmekanismer som pockar på från Bryssel, Frankfurt, New York och Tokyo? Kritisk fråga: Om makten blir alltmer transnationell, bör då inte rapporteringen av transnationella institutioner och processer breda ut sig på bekostnad av den delvis föråldrade nationella nyhetsdiskursen?

(b) **ytterligare internalisera totaliteten (det globala kapitalistiska systemet):** dvs. att göra det till en vardagsrutin att undersöka hur människor och deras handlingar, praktiker, problem, livsvillkor m.m. i olika delar av världen
hänger ihop. Medan det globala kapitalet med lätthet förflytta sig över alla tänkbara gränser fortsätter journalistiken att bygga kognitiva murar mellan territorier, folk, kontinenter och kulturer. Man fortsätter att konstruera världen som inrikes kontra utrikes, nationalstaten kontra ’omvälden’ osv. Journalistiken förtränger den globala verklighetens närvaro i det lokala rummet genom att diskursivt separera människor, territorier, intressen, processer m.m. som egentligen är fundamentalt sammanflätade.
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Appendix

First-step CDA (sample)
YU/Kosovo, DN (24/3-99)

Placering (Placing): förstasida (front page).

Rubrik (Headline): Hoppet ute lösa Kosovokonflikten
(No hope left of solving the Kosovo crisis).

Ingress (Introduction): ‘Misslyckade samtal. Milosevic har valt en väg vars konsekvenser han är fullt medveten om’ (‘Failed discussions. Milosevic has chosen a path the consequences of which he is fully aware of’).

Tematisk struktur (Thematic structure): 1) Misslyckade samtal med Milosevic över (the failed discussions with Milosevic over). 1a) Hoolbrokes resande resultatlöst (Hoolbrokes travelling without result). 1b) Möte i Serbiens parlament (Meeting in the Serbian parliament).

Ideologisk diskursiv problematik (Ideological discoursive problem): privat/offentligt the private vs the public – (the Serbian territory is protected/defended like a ‘private property’). Serbiskt trots (Serbian defiance).

Lingvistiska element, syntaktiska and lexikala val (Linguistic elements, syntactic and lexical choices): “Och Serbiens parlament deklarerade trotsigt vid en extrasession på tisdagen: ‘Vi accepterar inte utländska militärstyrkor på vårt territorium, inte ens till priset av att vi bombas’” (“And the Serbian parliament defiantly declared, during an extra session on Tuesday; ‘we will not accept foreign military forces on our territory, not even if the price is that we are bombed’”).

The empirical materials (selected for the second-step CDA)


**Cognitive recycling** (DN/Delo). Ideologeme: the journalistic explanatory discourse on 9/11 – why did it happen? (WTC). The ideologeme operates in ‘The war against democracy’ (12/9 DN), ‘Several threats had been expressed’ (12/9 DN), ‘bin Ladin, probably behind it’ (12/9 DN), ‘We are all victims of terrorism’ (12/9 DN), ‘London stock exchange building evacuated’ (12/9 DN), ‘The attack shows the vulnerability of the market’ (12/9 DN), ‘The stock market tumbles down, while prices dramatically rise for oil’ (12/9 DN), ‘The world economy is in shock’ (12/9 DN), ‘Worst stock market fall since 1987’ (12/9 DN), ‘Putin condemned the outrage’ (13/9 DN), ‘Worldwide scepticism about the US’ (13/9 DN), ‘The US policy leads to terrorism’ (13/9 DN), ‘The World of Finance in shock’ (13/9 DN), ‘The world has become a more dangerous place to live’ (13/9 DN), ‘Mass terrorism is the new evil in our world today’ (13/9 DN), ‘Children need time’ (14/9 DN), ‘It is about broken promises’ (14/9 DN), ‘The capitalist system creates repression and injustices’ (14/9 DN), ‘Anxiety among the stockbrokers’ (14/9 DN), ‘A loss of millions for the airline companies’ (14/9 DN), ‘Securitas’ share-price shaky’ (14/9 DN), ‘The Americans – the love objects of terrorists’ (12/9 Delo), ‘Osama bin Ladin, Enemy No. 1’ (12/9 Delo), ‘If N.Y. and Washington are able to fall, then no capital is secure’ (12/9 Delo), ‘Stock markets down all over the world’ (12/9 Delo), ‘The deadly attack makes the market fall’ (12/9 Delo), ‘Declaration of War
against Terrorism’ (13/9 Delo), ‘Between Shock and Triumph’ (13/9 Delo),
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