

Norwegian and American news coverage of the 22 July case: two different cultural approaches



**An interdisciplinary task based on English and
Communication & Culture**

April 2014

Table of Contents

PART 1 – INTRODUCTION

1.1-Introduction.....	1
1.2-Foreword.....	2
1.3-Choice of research question.....	2

PART 2 – RESEARCH

2.1-Background information and research.....	3
2.2-Different penalty systems.....	5

PART 3 – METHOD

3.1-A qualitative method.....	6
3.2-Selection.....	7
3.3-Sources of error.....	7

PART 4 – OWN RESEARCH

4.1-Human expression – language and behavior.....	7
4.2-Factual result.....	10
4.3-A comparison.....	12

PART 5 – ANALYSIS/SUMMARY

5.1-Analysis/summary.....	14
---------------------------	----

PART 6 – CONCLUSION

6.1-Conclusion.....	15
---------------------	----

PART 7 – OUR SOURCES.....	17
---------------------------	----

PART 1 – INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

This research report is written by Rikke Cecilie Hjorth Bergh, Mina Sofie Pedersen and Lovise Magdalena Sletten. We are students from Askim Upper Secondary School. First of all, we have chosen to fulfill an interdisciplinary task based on English and Communication & Culture mostly because we would like to correspond to the modern research tendencies and to sound “internationally”. The two subjects also fit perfectly together in topics and ways of implementation. Our theme and research questions are crafted out of personal interest and achievement of objectives in the two subjects. As our task includes two subjects, we have to incorporate issues and themes from both. We are focused to write about the dramatic happening in Norway, 22 July, mainly because it is something close to our hearts. We consider the event terrible and painful, but still open to more specific investigation as the Norwegian society needs further overestimating. None of us has any personal connection to victims or families of victims, something that makes this project easier for us to complete. The purpose of the project is to illuminate the dimension of cultural differences in media, comparing Norwegian and American approaches to the subject. Choosing mainly one case to study deeper, we can get a clearer result, but at the same time we have to conduct some comparative analysis of various news coverage as well as of equal happenings in America. Throughout the process it is important for us to reflect our subjective positions without distorting objective views and events. In this work we try to emphasize our comprehension of some different ways America and Norway dealt with the 22 July case in media. We live in Norway and show great interest to what other countries cover in their mass media about our life here, that is why our research is based on information we obtain in Norway and information presented by other sources which we assume to be reliable ones. The 22 July touched upon the entire Norwegian nation, but it also had its impact all over the world. What reaction did it produce in America which lies in another semi sphere? We believe it to be an interesting topic to research as obviously its presentation and interpretation could differ depending on the background.

We have processed information and data ourselves surfing the internet, watching videos, reading articles and searching for factual information. We are also very grateful for all the help we got from exchange students in America who kindly took time to receive information from teachers, host families, friends, we thank Thomas Skjennum Johnsen for helping us with a cover photo, and our Communication and Culture teacher Märit Opperud and English teacher Elena Linchenko for all the guidance.

1.2 Foreword

In the modern world we are surrounded by mass media, advertising and news both in paper editions, online, on radio and television channels. Norway is a multicultural society, where people from many different cultures live side by side. This affects the community and characterizes the interaction between the cultures. Equally, America is also a multicultural country, but the advertising and news industry is much bigger than in Norway. There are also some major differences in the multicultural societies of the two countries as well. The United States is a country that has been multicultural ever since the country was founded. Norway has been a heterogeneous society (with diverse arties) including Norwegians + Sami people and Kvens in minority. With the first Vietnamese and Pakistani immigrants who came to Norway in the 70s, the country became more multicultural, but it is a process that has been going on for 45 years. In America the process started in 1776, nearly 240 years ago.

Something that is common for both countries is the fact that they have received immigrants with very different cultural backgrounds from around the XX-th century, and mostly Muslims from the Middle East or Africa. Can we see different depictions presented in the news due to cultural specific approaches of the two countries? What will be pointed out and what will be omitted, moreover forgotten? These are questions we have tried to answer in our report. We believe that certain things will be obviously covered in the similar ways and the same recognizable videos will be showed in both countries. But we truly believe that we can find some variations in the news reports too. Our Norwegian exchange students in America helped us to collect information and answers from their host families and teachers to questions we sent down. Therefore our assignment is created out of a qualitative method which is described later.

Our expectations for the task were to get as much information as possible so we could confirm or deny our research question and hopefully disseminate our thoughts. We studied both media presentations in the two countries, various reactions of the American people on the matter and the way they perceived the happening.

1.3 Choice of research question

It was hard to find a suitable theme that would include both Communication & Culture and English as school subjects, even harder – to specify a research question working with a qualitative method. We used a lot of time thinking about a theme that would fit perfectly, and accepted starting point in cultural differences. As our research work evolved we carefully shaped a research question with the following final formulation:

“Did Norwegian and American news cover the 22 July case differently, in terms of cultural approaches?”

We also examine how the Americans perceive the happening today, more than two years afterwards. They can naturally regard it differently than Norwegians do, but what are the

memories they are left with after the event? The theme of our assignment considers some specific features of Norwegian mass media compared to mass media in America concerning news presentation on the matter in internet. We reduced the task to investigating what kind of information, how much of information and how long Norwegian and American online news sources have been displaying. In this country we normally never experience cases like this in contrast to America where murder and terror are more common especially in certain areas. We suppose the American people in a bizarre way are tired of all the fuss and negative information they get from the American news.

We limited our research area to the internet which is one of the most used and reliable mass media sources, both because it contains a great variety of articles and videos shown on the television as well and because we could not possibly cover all the platforms. Our main focus has been on CNN in America and VG in Norway, with some other sources included. We have chosen CNN mainly because it is a fairly legitimated news source with a high reputation throughout the world. Fox news on the other hand is not a news outlet at all. It is a propaganda outlet for the Republican Party and they report only one side of every story. We want a trustworthy news source from America which is CNN in our opinion. And we have chosen VG in Norway because we could definitely collect lots of information from them and because most of the Norwegian people believe it to be a national leader and read VG news daily.

PART 2 – RESEARCH

2.1 Background information and research

Due to the fact that Norway is a social democratic country, the habit in our minds is to find something in Anders Behring Breivik's childhood and adolescence that can explain or even excuse his behavior in different ways. Social democracy nowadays is an ideology that emphasizes the importance of individual freedom, and a relatively high degree of political or democratic control that is necessary to develop the individuals' freedom to determine their own lives. The Norwegian news went deep into his childhood, family issues and the divorce of his parents. Breivik stayed with his mother and half-sister, while his father worked for the responsibility of his son. Already when Breivik was only four years old a psychologist was connected to observe the interaction between him and his mother over time. It was claimed that he was neglected, and it was recommended to move him out of home. This never happened. Instead, all contact between him and his father was broken before he became 17, and the only contact they shared was a short telephone conversation after ten years. Later in his memoir Breivik describes a deep betrayal from his father's side, and blames him for their failing relationship.

As an adolescent Breivik tried to join several violent and criminal gangs, but failed every time. He was rejected by both the immigrant and ethnic gangs in Norway, and it seems like a reactive attachment disorder evolved into a personality disorder. He was craving for recognition, and by the people who knew him he was described as a person with inability to understand social relations. He remained an outsider.

According to several news articles in Norway, the complicated family background and his extreme need for comfort and affiliation, something he never completely got, are a number of factors that contributed in making Anders a mass murderer. Journalists believe something inside him was broken long before he even planned the attacks, and that traumatic experiences from his past resulted in his need of extra attention. Both his mother, father and the Norwegian child welfare was criticized in the Norwegian news, and the statement "without his troubled childhood and the lack of comfort, 22 July would never have happened" is written by multiple journalists in Norway.¹

So the main idea of Norwegian internet mass media is to reveal as many Breivik's life facts as possible in order to prove his unhappy and unstable background influenced his behavior.

In American news they touch upon his upbringing, but in the manner of instances where he was supposedly slighted and barred by Muslims. They also include another provocative theory that Anders subconsciously felt hatred for the youthful, progressive Norwegians and that he wanted payback for his own lonely upbringing. Even though he claims that he targeted the Labour Party because of their multiculturalism supportive policy, psychologists made a good case about how he certainly felt abandoned and how jealous he was of the youngsters communicating beyond him.

Everything said above shows us that both Norwegian and American news try to find a reason, an excuse for what Breivik had done. They try to show there is something more underlying to his actions, something that to a certain degree can explain the background for the attacks. The Norwegian culture is based on a safe, steady and secure environment for the children both at home and in kindergarten or school. We have workplaces to ensure that these privacy policies are being maintained, and any violations in these aspects will have serious consequences. Norway is known as a safe country with independence for everyone, including the youngsters. It is therefore natural for Norwegian reporters to emphasize Breivik's family environment and draw lines to his upbringing. Neglection and cases of violence are more characteristic to the American society, and they don't have the same security programs and helping centers as we have in Norway. Gangs and youth communities are more common to see in America, most of family situations are kept more hidden, rather not talked about. For the American news reporters the most natural subject is the influence he got from different youth circuits.

Comparing American and Norwegian approaches to presenting Breivik's case in mass media we observe a lot of similarities such as his neglecting both from home and out among other people, the absence of any supporting network for him as well as his extreme political views. It is approved these factors made him search contact and help from different groups online, including Knight Templar and the freemason's organization. But we can also underline here: tracing causes Norwegian journalists are concentrated mostly on personal issues of Breivik's biography while their American colleagues mostly deal with his social background and problems related to it. This proves two differentiating ways of media analysis.

2.2 Different penalty systems

In Norway we believe that everyone can be rehabilitated and our penalty system is based on this presumption. In America they mean that you must stand up for what you do, and the law system is much stricter.

In contrast to America, death penalty is something we do not have in Norway. To be more specific there are 32 states in America that have death penalty and 18 that do not. If a person murders someone – they will most likely sentence to death in those states with a death penalty. Whether the person is mentally ill or not is irrelevant. In Norway we ensure the stability of a person's psychological health, before judges decide which punishment the competent should get.

Anders Behring Breivik performed an awful crime - terror attack. In modern terms It could be possibly labeled as a "traditional" crime. From what we have been reading we gained an understanding that Breivik's action could have been the result of both moral-legal model and the disease-model. The moral-legal model emphasizes on the individuals free will where each of us has to take own responsibility for our actions. It is a conscious choice, a cold calculation, either he accepts the laws or not. Any individual has right to choose between what is wrong and right. Considering Anders Behring Breivik's devious plan, needing a certain level of ambulatory and thinking to get completed, he should definitely have been aware of the operation he has done.

Within the second part of the individual-model we find the disease-model. Where the offender is seen as a sick person, where one of the reasons could be poor childhood conditions. Such people are not responsible for their actions, and will not be punished. Anders Behring Breivik didn't have an adequate childhood with characters to rely on. This could have affected him to be mentally ill, but not to the extent that he has become psychotic. As we believe, since he clearly can speak well for himself and is known with the law and legal terms. But he could have been delusional while he was doing the crime. Something must have triggered his mental behavior to be able to perform killing other

human beings. It could have been a combination of these two sociological models, thus both are right.

Timothy McVeigh got sentenced to death, which proves that the jury in America meant that he was accountable and ambulant enough to know that what he did was wrong, according to the moral-legal model. If the same had happened in Norway or Sweden for that matter, the disease-model would have been drawn strongly forward with following discussion what sentence could be appropriate. He could have been estimated to be unaccountable and that his actions were psychotic, which later on would have taken him to custody.

We believe the reason for why we try to find an excuse or a reason for the offended crimes, which in this case is Anders Behring Breivik, is first of all because we have to figure out the relevant punishment meant for the offender. It is written in our law system and protocols to do it. Then we are curious, what triggered a man to do this? What were his motives? Is he sick? And finally we feel a responsibility for relatives of victims and our own nation, we want to have an explanation to where it all went wrong, and our curiousness wants to figure out why. Our national core still hurts and we have to answer many questions.

PART 3 – METHOD

3.1 - A qualitative method

A quantitative method is a research method that concerns numbers and measures (quantifiable). Counting and measuring are common forms of quantitative methods. The quantitative studies have a main principle of accuracy. The researchers have in many ways predetermined which selected aspects of the sources to be examined. The result of the research is a number or a series of number. These are often presented in tables, graphs or other statistical representations.

A qualitative method is based on theories of interpretation and human experiences. The method includes various forms of systematic collection, processing and analysis of material from conversations, observations or written texts. Qualitative research methods can be used to systematize and provide insights into human expression whether linguistic utterances in writing or speech, or action/behavior. Language and action have a meaningful dimension that requires qualified and reflexive interpretation to develop scientific knowledge.

Therefore we used a qualitative method. We collected information from written texts, processed and analyzed it, observed videos and watched the body language and actions of the reporters. It is the most suitable method for the type of work we have been doing.

The task has reached another level with a questionnaire. Several of our friends happen to be in America as exchange students this year, and we took advantage in sending them some

questions. We gained insight into what knowledge real Americans have about the case and what emotions they are left with.

3.2 - Selection

To achieve the necessary breadth in our task we choose to interview people with some common features (positive social background), but nevertheless – people of different ages and both genders. In other words we collected a rough selection of answers from men and women, teachers and parents, children and the elderly – everyone ethical Americans.

A positive factor is that we got a broad study from several parts of America as the exchange students live in different parts of the country. They also made sure that people with ordinary jobs and people with higher status in the society answered and that there was a difference in age. Thus we have covered several states and various groups of people.

3.3 - Sources of error

In almost every research we can face possible sources of error. In our case we cannot register the fact that we have interviewed the people ourselves. Therefore we are not sure if the information is totally correct. It is easy to get wrong information, but we prefer to trust our informants. It is also an “extra favor” to get your friends to do schoolwork “for you” when they live in another country, so we only got answers from seven people in total. We have not got as much information as we anticipated, and even though we cover some parts of the USA and various groups of American citizens.

We are not exactly sure either if the students asked the questions indeed or came up with answers themselves. One more complication about not interviewing people by ourselves is that we could not take the opportunity to use backup questions or some comments in the conversation. This would have given us more material to work with and a more detailed answer.

Another unpleasant part of our research work was the fact that we tried to establish contact with a correspondent from TV2 that lived in America at the time 22 July happened (we sent her email). She was really positive to our project and wanted to help us, and offered to answer all of our questions. We sent her a bunch of questions – but she never replied again. We got really disappointed because we could use her expertise in the area.

PART 4 – OWN RESEARCH

4.1 - Human expression - language and behavior

The vocabulary and phraseology choice in commenting Breivik’s case in America differs from that one in Norway. American journalists are dedicated in emphasizing the fact that Breivik was a free mason. Free masonry is a brotherly organization with a gradual system of degree providing special activity which takes place in Masonic lodges, in local associations or lodges

built on esoteric learning systems where the members are initiated through rituals. The members work together in an organization with a pyramidal structure. It is a much closed group and its real purposes are quite mysterious. Historically Freemasonry has for many centuries been associated with the upper class, the elite, the nobility and royal houses.

Breivik's thoughts and ideas stand back for hundreds of years and have been reunited with the rebirth of the Knights Templar, a branch of the free masons; Brevik says he is a part of. Knights Templar is a branch within the masonic that believes they are morally superior and bettering the world in different ways. The American news points out that famous people like George Washington, Andrew Jackson and Jessie Jackson are members of the free mason organization, but regardless don't share the same ideas.

The reporter, Alex Jones, tells that he just got back from a great coverage of another masonic organization that carries on some of the more secretive rituals, for example the black magical ritual. Because of the secrecy they can organize behind closed doors, and he believes that this can be the start of world war three or at least underlying ideologues for it.

2

The American reporters believe that lots of important pieces were not being told. For 10 years – after 9/11, authorities and investigators have been focusing on the threat of Al Qaida, and dismissed the danger of right wing extremist. They believe that Breivik wasn't a man that worked alone, and that the event is a window into a much larger problem, something that the scriptwriters do not add up to.

"I predicted that they would start moving the terror threat away from Muslims in Europe and the United States, over to right wing Al Qaida. People that won't go along with the new wars, the banker bailouts and open borders".

The fact that the news put out his manifesto, videos and pictures serves as drawing attention and creating a bible to lone wolves that undoubtedly will carry out events. This reminds of the CIA setting out the radical Muslim ideas to Al Qaida – and extremist picking up and developing them.

New York Times made a big mistake when they wasted no time jumping in conclusion about Breivik being a "gun-loving", "right-wing" "Fundamentalist Christian". The American reporters were wrong. Even though Breivik one time described himself as a "Christian" in his manifesto, he also described himself with a great number of other words that made it clear he didn't mean "Christian" as most Americans understand the term. He uses the word "Christian" as a practical nickname to mean "European non-Islamic" and not a religious Christian or even a vague monotheist. In fact it is clear that he uses the word in similar ways as some Jewish New Yorkers use it to mean "non-Jewish". Breivik is also very clear that you don't even have to believe in God to join his movement. This he writes in a self-interview:

“Q: Do I have to believe in God or Jesus in order to become a Justiciar Knight?

A: As this is a cultural war, our definition of being a Christian does not necessarily constitute that you are required to have a personal relationship with God or Jesus”.

Breivik also explains that Knight Templar is not a religious organization, but a Christian ‘culturist’ military order. And he wants the “European Jewish, Buddhist and Hindu community” to join his fight against the Islamization of Europe”.

It looks like “New York Times” didn’t bother to read Breivik’s manifesto to see that he didn’t use the term “Christian” as the rest of us do. ³

And here we emphasize an important cultural difference in modern American and European interpretation of the term “Christian”. In the context of our research we conclude that in Europe the words “Christian” and “Islamic” are often used as juxtaposing terms or antonyms, while in the US they mean mostly religious belonging (with extreme Islamic it can be synonymous to terror as well). Subsequently we can register that many European countries share the modern tendency (in linguistic and cultural variants) to use both terms as “rivals”, what can be connected with some negative aspect of multicultural policy. Nevertheless we support the idea that no one has the right to oppose various religions.

In Norway news attention was rather on showing the most deferred youngsters at Utøya and the thoughts and reactions from them. Most of the coverage was from families that lost someone – sisters, brothers or friends from the Labor party. It was later during the trial that the attention in Norway was brought on Breivik. The main focus concentrated on his actions and the impossibility of innocent, and not so much on his membership in different organizations.

The fuss which took place in America about Breivik’s religion was not even mentioned here before a US terrorist researcher emphasized it. It shows us a certain difference in the manufacturing of Norwegian and American news.

We also want to talk about the different body languages that the reporters in America and Norway use. In America they use a more evident and clear body language, while in Norway they use a more confined and little apparent body language. This is something we try to prove in a short analysis of the American news casting from CNN⁴, where we observed the body language of the two reporters – in what manner they were talking about the case, acting and which messages they wanted to get true with.

The woman:

→Uses her hands: opens, keeps them in cross.

→Face expression: skeptical, closes her eyes for a long time, raises her eyebrows.

→Body: not that eager, more curious.

The woman's face expression indicates that she is skeptical while talking about 22/7. She raises her eyebrows at points in the report where she is telling something "shocking". At times she also closes her eyes for as long as 2 seconds and looks straight back in the camera. She uses this intense technique, which is expressed exquisitely in her eyes to indicate that she wants you to listen.

She also opens and crosses her arms frequently, to express that she has an authority. Her whole body-expressions are not very eager, but more curious, especially when she talks with the other reporter.

Alex Jones, the male reporter:

→Uses his hands a lot.

→Face expressions: frowns his eyebrows and forehead, looks skeptical.

→Body: really eager to get true with a message, leans forward a lot, eager to tell, uses almost the whole body.

His face-expression shows us that he is slightly skeptical too, but more serious than the woman. He frowns his eyebrows and forehead a lot, and uses his hands as an element to get through with his message. His whole body is leaning forward – indicating that he is eager to talk and comment on. He talks loudly and puts pressure on words we earlier in the report have written extensively on.

In Norway the reporters are more withdrawn compared to Americans. They use less body language, talk in a lower tone of voice and are overall more neutral. They have no intention of "stealing the show", compared to American colleagues where the reporters commonly drown each other with words and talk in a louder tone of voice at each sentence. The Norwegian news castings feel more organized, serious and planned – and the reporters interact with each other to make the news item more seriously taken.

4.2 – Factual results

While conducting research we have used a questionnaire that we sent to the Norwegian exchange students in America. The questionnaire was crafted to help us get a closer and more concrete answer from the people that live in the USA, so we could count not only our own thoughts, opinions and speculations but factual information as well. This gave us a broader overview of what American citizens got out of the case and what they really were informed with. We included 5 questions, and the answers were actually quite surprising. In this connection another question has arisen - "Are the answers determined by far distance between the two countries, or Norway's minor status in the world society?"

These are our comments on the questionnaire.

Our first question was: *Whether they normally follow the news, or not*. The answers we got were – “do follow the news” (5), and “do not” (1). One out of the six respondents said he does follow the news - he normally reads them online, and mostly follows the economic news.

Our second question was: *What is the first thing that comes to your mind when you hear “22 July or Anders Behring Breivik”?* Only two out of the six we interviewed knew something about him, and these are the answers we got:

-Anti Muslim terrorist

-I don't know

-He's the prime minister

-Some athlete

-Is it the same as our 4th July?

- I image a man so miserable that handled to perform the most killing terrorism ever done by one man only.

Our third question was: *Which news channel they got information from*. The three respondents followed the ABC news - both TV and the radio news. The other three followed either Worldnetdaily.com, the Fox news channel or US network news. But as well as in Norway the people get information from different channels, not only from the main mentioned.

Our fourth question was: *What kind of details American news printed out about the case*.

Our respondents could not remember exactly what was printed out. One said that little information was given, another said that the information that was given was none, two preferred to say they don't know, and finally two said that the information in press was brief and little detailed so they read about it online.

Our last question was: *How long the case stayed on the news*. Four respondents answered – “don't know” or say “it never hit US network news at all”. One said that it probably fronted the news for maximum 3 days. And the last one thought that “it probably still comes on the news every year in July”.

So we can conclude that Americans do not know a lot about 22 July. The people, that answered these questions and showed some knowledge about the case and Breivik, were a government teacher and a history teacher. Other respondents had no idea at all who Breivik is and what he did. It proves that the case was deeply investigated and spotlighted in detail here in Norway while in other countries, America at least, the information presented by

news sources was limited to a certain degree or given with some “national twist” depending on historical and cultural background.

One of the host parents said he particularly liked following the news online. He read something about 22 July and Anders Behring Breivik but the case didn’t stay as a front page for very long. The only information he could remember was something about a bomb and a man killing youngsters on an island. How many people died there – he had no clue about. His statement was sad enough: “These things happen here all the time”.

Another family could remember something about images fronting the television for some days, showing the destructions of the bomb and injured people in Oslo. Besides, some videos of the Utøya Island with screaming youngsters were shown. They believe many died, but had no overview of exactly how many. They remember noting more.

If you look at the Norwegian news overall you will see that we get information and newsreports from America several times a week including politics, local events and criminal news. America is a big country – and everyone knows about it, while Norway is a small and “unknown” country that many Americans can hardly identify. So claiming that the distance is a reason for the lack of information America gave the people after 22 July is in our opinion wrong. We believe both political and social status has a much larger space in this context. American position on the world arena is firm and strong. Everything happening there, if so with the president, nature disasters or criminal events, is reported in Norway commonly. Due to the US great area and status the rest of the world shows immense interest in knowing about it. America itself has many various cultures and people from many different countries – so they get knowledge and experiences from those and have a smaller need for information about “unknown” countries like Norway.

4.3 - A comparison

We are determined to run a short comparison to see if the media’s presentation has something to say about the fact that the case took place in Norway. It is therefore instructive to find a similar case in America – and compare differences and similarities.

9/11 and 22 July have some similarities. Both terrorist attacks were extremely violent and surprising, and they struck in a way that the whole nation became affected. In either case the terrorists also attacked targets of an important national value. For the United States it was a financial center and defense institution and in Norway - organizational life, youth engagement and the state's main heart.

But there are also fundamental differences between the two. 9/11 was an attack from the outside of America. It joined into a series of carefully planned terrorist attacks from a sophisticated terrorist network. The terror that happened 22 July came from the inside –

Breivik is a Norwegian citizen. Breivik acted on his own, with his own motives and without the support of any organized network what so ever. Therefore the reactions differ.

Because of the 9/11 attacks many Norwegians cannot deny the first thought of Al Qaida being the attacker in Norway as well. These thoughts are a subsequent cause of the events which happened in the United States a few years earlier. Breivik claims that Al Qaida is the biggest threat in Europe, yet he describes the terror organization as a great source of inspiration.

A more appropriate comparison is rather to observe the reaction in Norway with the reaction in the USA after the bombing in Oklahoma City, 1995. The bomber, Timothy McVeigh was a right-wing extremist just like Breivik. McVeigh looked at himself as if he was in war against the state and he acted alone. The bombing was the deadliest act of terrorism within the United States prior to the 9/11 attacks – similar to the terror attacks in Norway.

At that time the White House reacted pretty similar as the Norwegian government reacted to the 22/9 attack. After Oklahoma attack the former president Bill Clinton said the following in his speech:

"Let us let our own children know that we will stand against the forces of fear. When there is talk of hatred, let us stand up and talk against it. When there is talk of violence, let us stand up and talk against it. In the face of death, let us honor life. As St. Paul admonished us, Let us "not be overcome by evil, but overcome evil with good.""

Norwegian Prime Minister Jens Stoltenberg emphasized the following in one of his speeches after 22/9 (take notice this is only a section of the complete speech).

"People across the country are at this moment shoulder to shoulder. We can learn from it. Do more of it. Each one of us can make democracy tissue slightly stronger. We see here.

To the young people I would say this. The massacre on Utøya is also an attack on young people's dream of contributing to a better world. Their dreams were brutally crushed. Your dreams can come true. You can carry forward the spirit of the evening. You can make a difference. Do it! My message is simple. Engage yourselves. Heed. Sign you into an organization. Participate in debates. Use vote. Free elections are the jewel in the crown of democracy. By participating you say a resounding yes to democracy."

We can see similarities in the two speeches and their messages. They both speak to the nation, but mostly to the younger generation. They want to push the people to strive against their goals and not let the tragedies put a spoke in the wheels. Both speeches are about facing the fear and sorrows together and celebrate life.

In comparable situations the stands of Stoltenberg's reactions turn out to be nothing extraordinary. It does not make the reactions less good or irrelevant, but it might unsettle many people's notion that the Norwegian people are a very special casting that reacted right where others reacted wrong.

PART 5 – ANALYSIS/SUMMARY

5.1 - Analysis/summary

Our report contains major facts and our ideas corresponding to our hypothesis. First of all we collected and submitted background information of Breivik's attack that shows us the way Norwegian news presented him and the case. Norway is a social democratic country that is why our culture presumes the priority of explaining everything and finding the reasons for some one's actions. Our law system is also built up on the principles of examining the criminal's mental health and of evaluating the possible penalty, as our report reflects. We shortly described the law systems in Norway and in America (difference in penalty). This kind of analysis proves the fact that Norway and America, both being multicultural states, used slightly different approaches in covering and investigating the events with the most Norwegian focus on personal assessing the youth-back-ground of the suspect while the focus in American news was on his social, religious and organizational contacts.

We used a qualitative method to fulfil our research, because it was the most suitable method for the type of work we were doing. We watched videos, collected information from news commentaries (most online media channel), observed and analyzed the body language of the reporters of the news castings from the 22 July. We interviewed a few people in America using a short self-prepared questionnaire which was sent to our exchange students in America so they could interview the people for us. This gave us a larger breadth in describing the task with answers directly from the country mentioned in this work.

The part with "our own research" contains analysis of human expression – language and behavior of the news hosts of the CNN [1] news casting. We have worked with this subject during some of our Communication & Culture lessons, thus it was very useful in this section. It gave us a broader understanding of the different ways you can express yourself to display a message. Besides we emphasized the idea of different styles of news reporters' body language accepted in the USA and in Norway. This was also of great interest to compare the manners of presenting information by American and Norwegian news journalists. We also produced a questionnaire, collected the answers to our interview questions, monitored the overall picture and placed the results with our comments in the special section of our work.

Finally, we compared another similar happening that took place in America – to see how the news presented that case differently from the 22 July case in Norway. We found out that it

was presented pretty much the same as 22 July was in Norway – just in a shorter period of time, something that brings us up to the last part – the conclusion.

PART 6 – CONCLUSION

6.1 – Conclusion

The aim of this study was to answer the research question “Did American and Norwegian news present the 22 July case differently, in terms of cultural approaches?” with a particular focus on the manufacture of Anders Behring Breivik. According to our hypothesis different cultural approaches can influence some specific features in news coverage. Subsequently we have found out that Norway, where the terror attack of 22 July took place, presented the whole event with all possible details outlining heavier weight on investigating personal reasons of the terrorist. Norwegian mass media studied the case from all the angles and gave the maximum of information to our people without holding back any of commentaries. Living under social democracy we consider it to be natural. We are aware that 22 July is our ever-lasting pain as our best national feelings and hearts were “bombed out” on that day. We got a lot of support and sympathy from all over the world, and many countries monitored the case. Exactly in the sphere of news coverage we have found out some culturally determined variations, particularly on the example of the USA. As a result of our research we state that our hypothesis is also confirmed in terms of the analysis and result we got. Thus, comparing to Norwegian mass media American news covered a relatively smaller part of the 22 July, basing on their national approach to the problem and rather explaining Breivik’s membership in various groups instead of going deeper in investigating the actual happening. Definitely, America is a much bigger country compared to Norway, both politically and globally, and the distance is elongated, but still they experience a great deal of extremism and terrorism as well. Considering all said above we come to the conclusion that in Norway the most detailed covering of 22 July is predictable - the event was covered almost every day for a year after the accident and run on the news 24/7 in this country. In the USA this case was presented in a restricted way and interpreted in accordance to American cultural tradition. Anyway some other similar happenings in America (e.g. Oklahoma bomb attack, 1995) show less of coverage in mass media compared to how the 22 July was presented in Norway.

We have to take in consideration that Norway is a much smaller country, which enables a much closer relationship to the victims. The possibility that you know someone or a family of someone from those who died either in Oslo or at Utoya is quite big. America on the contrary is a vast land with a huge population where “no one knows anybody”. This has an impact on the results we got as well.

But the phrase we had early in our minds that “these things happen in America all the time” was also repeated in one of the answers we got from an American citizen. It is true that some of the American people are used to brutal incidents, perhaps because of the cultural tradition allowing many to carry a gun. This could be an answer why common Americans are not hurt by the 22 July the same way as Norwegians are. We believe this also has its impact on the manner of broadcasting the 22 July case in America – it happened there before.

Logically our hypothesis is right and proved with some facts and outcomes of our work, but it is still hard to find the only true answer having several underlying reasons we might not thought of before we started this project. Something we are completely sure of is that any case of terrorism is destructive, horrible and terrifying for all of people living in the modern world. While accomplishing this work we discovered that cultural differences and various traditional approaches have a large impact on how dramatic cases are presented in the news.

PART 7 – OUR SOURCES

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gaU5rBjcDus> – Documentary of 9/11 case

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1n910iky5-k> – Fox news

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-FTDBYzF8kg> – CNN covers the case

<http://www.cbsnews.com/news/norway-mass-killer-anders-behring-breivik-claims-self-defense-in-bomb-and-shooting-massacre/> - CBS news

<http://www.cbsnews.com/feature/massacre-in-norway/> - CBS news *in depth*

<http://www.vg.no/nyheter/innenriks/terrorangrepet-22-juli/anders-behring-breivik-arver-ikke-moren/a/10117450/> - VG

<http://www.nrk.no/verden/ -han-er-en-kristen-terrorist-1.7735739> – Nrk news

<http://www.vg.no/nyheter/innenriks/22-juli/tidslinjeabb/> - VG

<http://www wnd com/2011/07/326733/> - Wnd commentary

<http://www.deathpenaltyinfo.org/states-and-without-death-penalty> - Death penalty information center.

"Focus" Human and society

Sociology and Anthropology

Author : Erik Sølvberg, Hans Arne Kjelsaas og Thomas Hylland Eriksen.

<http://www.dagbladet.no/2013/11/09/nyheter/innenriks/terror/bok/litteratur/30235929/>

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=t94gpoOgIOQ>

<http://www wnd com/2011/07/326733/>

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=t94gpoOgIOQ>