

Currently, the media perform a very controversial function, which is still to be evaluated, and it cannot be assumed yet, that the media would be able to react adequately at the state of relations between Europe and Islam. In its quest for objectivity of description, the media are unable to meet the requirement of the so-called Second Modernity, *i.e.*, to investigate their own interpretive framework set behind references and resources, that shape the media and allow them to act as an intermediary between what they refer about, and to whom they refer. All of this somehow without knowing, what brings the possibility of conveying something through communication. It's just a different, more differentiated phase of trying and searching to find the way to the so-called implicit knowledge, by which some discourses are able to emancipate from stereotypical schemas and patterns of coupling, the separation and formation of statements about reality.

Thus, the contemporary commentators of the European and Islamic relations are faced with analogous problems, as the media: *i.e.*, in-compatibility, self-referencing and tacit assumptions of knowledge.

If we already talked about the double differential explanatory schema of Europe and its relation to Islam, we mentioned two essential aspects: The first is forming or founding acts – we can also say self–founding myths of Europe, and the second, not entirely compatible legal, ideological, and religious systems. Basically, these can be called dilemmas, for which there is not exactly easy to find rational solutions.

Bernard Lewis points out very aptly at the first dilemma: *"...the asymmetry (meaning incompatibility of Europe and Islam) is rather apparent. "Europe" is a purely European concept, like the entire geographic system of continents, where Europe has the primacy. Europe invented and created Europe: Europe discovered, named, and in a way created America. A few centuries ago Europe devised Asia and Africa, whose population was up to the 19th century – the age of European world domination – completely unknown to those names, those identities and even those classifications, the Europeans have created for their own purposes, and to their need.*

*Islam is not a territory: it is a religion. However, Muslims do not associate "religion" with the same concept Christians have today, or what Christians used to have in the Middle Ages...*

*For Muslims, Islam is not just a system of faith and piety... Islam is more of life as a whole and its rules include elements of civil and criminal law, and even what we call constitutional right". (cd: p.10-11)*

In principle, we can say that the tension between East and West is based more on geohistorical and geopolitical tradition, and is much older than the differences between Islam and Europe.

For our interpretation of the concept of Islamization in the media it means, however, a certain disproportion. While contemporary media report on the relationship between Europe and Islam almost regularly in the discourse of today, and moreover in its highly reduced form, the relation between the two parties is better graspable in the long term only. This makes it, in fact, unavailable for the mass media referencing.

The above mentioned framework of Modernity in Europe has reached a stage of the so-called Post-modernity, *i.e.*, a criticism focused at the form and content of the Enlightenment ideals, which the Modernity could not fulfill by any means. In a way, it is the second dilemma, however, which complicates the media image of the first dilemma. The media cannot, even with the best pursuit of objective description, deliver on the demand of a so-called Second Modernity, *i.e.*, to investigate their own interpretation framework on a background of references and resources, that shape the media and allow them to work.

The problem lies, however, in the aforementioned difference between external–internal. In other words, the very concept of an alien – a concept with a wide range of cultural, ethnic and other connotations – changes with the advent of Modernity, as perceived by Simmel.

*"In Pre-modern cultures, where the local community always forms the basis of a wider social organization, the designation of an 'alien' refers to the 'whole person' – it is someone, who comes from outside and is potentially suspect. There may be many factors, that cause a person, who arrives in a small community from somewhere else:*

*, not to gain trust by the members of this community, even after many years of living in it. It is significant, that in a modern society we are not dealing with aliens as with 'whole people' in the same manner.*

*Especially in many urban residences we interact more or less constantly with people who we either do not know well, or have never seen before – but this interaction has a form of cursory contacts."*

(Giddens, A.:1998:76)

We are now a similar situation, when we see the relationship between Europe and Islam through media forms of communication. We perceive them in the majority of cases as cursory relations, but in an institutionalized media space – contrasting our everyday normal social interactions – we cannot afford a "*feedback*" based on the outside–inside difference. At best, such communications take the form of "*polite inattention*", with which E. Goffman has already operated.

The Islamization in the media has been progressing more through inattentive description, rather than through the pursuit of a consensual view. Without such a view the media will continue to produce more or less empty simulacra and marginal notes to the main topic, which the media have, however, still largely left unopened.