

Appendix

Summaries of the media scandals¹

Håkan Juholt, *politician, Social Democratic Member of the Swedish Parliament (October 2011–January 2012)*

The media scandal surrounding Håkan Juholt, who was party chair of the Social Democrats at the time of the scandal, mainly revolved around the revelation in the tabloid *Aftonbladet* that he had for several years applied for and received state compensation for a second home, in spite of his having shared his home in Stockholm with his partner, Åsa Lindgren, all this time. According to regulations, the couple should have covered Ms Lindgren's share of the rent themselves. The rules were examined but found not to be clearly formulated; consequently, a preliminary judicial investigation for fraud was discontinued. After intense and critical publicity, above all in the tabloids, Juholt nevertheless decided to refund the money. Before this, in connection with his being appointed party chair, newspaper billboards publicised the fact that his partner had once been convicted of fraud, which formed a kind of background for the revelations that followed later. That he continually made jokes in front of TV cameras, dropped a brick on a couple of occasions, and provided erroneous information in public speeches did not improve matters. As time went by, it became increasingly common for the media to describe Juholt as a charlatan, cheater, fiddler, and fraudster. The support of Social Democrats for their leader wavered and diminished along with the more and more intensified reporting in the media. However, it is not true that he was attacked by the

1 Two of the cases, those involving Ingmar Ohlsson and Floorball Dad, are presented in detail in Chapters 2 and 3 and are therefore not part of this overview. Nor is the scandal involving Peter Karlsson (fictitious name) presented, for obvious reasons.

media from the very beginning, as has been claimed by some people. In an analysis of the representation of Juholt in four newspapers during his first week as party leader, Gunilla Jarlbro and I arrived at the conclusion that he was generally described in very favourable terms, regardless of the political affiliation of the newspaper (Hammarlin and Jarlbro 2014:75–80). This media scandal, and the profound problems within the Social Democratic party which it laid bare, are described in detail in, among other works, Fredrik Loberg's biography *Håkan Juholt: utmanaren* (2012), Tommy Möller and Margit Silberstein's *En marsch mot avgrunden* (2013), and Daniel Suhonen's *Partiledaren som klev in i kylan* (2014).

Hanne Kjöllér, *journalist*, *Dagens Nyheter* (September–October 2013)

In 2013, the publisher Brombergs Bokförlag published Hanne Kjöllér's book *En halv sanning är också en lögn* ('Half a truth is also a lie'), which is about so-called victim journalism and deficient source criticism. Her scrutiny of a number of cases that had come in for attention in the media led to the conclusion that some journalism where victims play the main role is deficient in respect of accuracy, because it omits or suppresses information that undermines the original thesis of the reporting. However, a serious factual error in the book led to its contents ending up in the background. It turned out that the information about the home of a well-known restaurateur in Stockholm was not correct. The book claimed that the restaurateur owned a spacious apartment worth many millions of Swedish crowns, whereas he actually lived in a rented flat. Kjöllér quickly issued a public apology, but she had been hoist with her own petard. Criticising prize-winning Swedish journalists for being deficient in their fact-checking and then committing exactly that same mistake herself was asking for harsh criticism. Among other things, this led to a large number of journalists going through the book with a fine-tooth comb and discovering one 'factual error' after the other, in a sort of personal vendetta where an outsider could not possibly judge the credibility in each case. At times the reporting can be described as vicious, and it increasingly targeted Kjöllér as a person, something that commonly occurs in the context of media scandals. 'We have experienced media houndings many times before, but rarely have so many people simultaneously thrown themselves over one and the same person as when it comes to Hanne Kjöllér of *Dagens Nyheter* and her book', wrote Erica Treijs in *Svenska Dagbladet* in a summary analysis (Treijs 2013). For a detailed description of this

case the Swedish Wikipedia page ‘En halv sanning är också en lögn’ is recommended, not so much for the description of the course of events – Wikipedia should be considered an unreliable source – but for the wealth of links to other articles that is provided there.

Sven Otto Littorin, *consultant, former politician for the Moderate Party (July 2010)*

Right in the middle of Almedalen week,² on 7 July 2010, the then Minister for Employment, Sven Otto Littorin, announced his resignation following questions from *Aftonbladet* which contained accusations about the purchase of sexual services (which is a criminal act in Sweden). Littorin was also supposed to have sex-chatted while in the Government offices. At that time Littorin was going through a custody battle, covered in detail by the tabloids, and he came directly from a hearing in the District Court of Stockholm to Gotland. Already at the airport he was met by *Aftonbladet*'s reporter, who ran alongside the Minister and pantingly asked his questions, an example of what media researchers Mats Ekström and Bengt Johansson have called ‘attack journalism’ (Ekström and Johansson 2011). The Minister defended himself against the accusations with the words, ‘No, no, please stop!’ and ‘No comment.’ During the press conference at his resignation, Littorin used emotional language and, among other things, referred to his three children by name – for which he was later criticised – claiming that it was the heavy scrutiny of his private life and the price his children had had to pay for their father being a public figure that caused him to hand in his resignation, effective immediately. This became an intensely covered news item in all the Swedish media and led to a physical hunt for Littorin, which is described in Chapter 1. The soundness of *Aftonbladet*'s sources was weak. The paper had information from an anonymous woman who claimed that she had sold sex to Littorin a few years before. In an email interview in *Dagens Nyheter* a week later, Littorin's disclaimer was published, a disclaimer in which the accusations according to which he had committed a crime were firmly rejected. Analyses of this affair have since been conducted by the periodical *Fokus* (Agerman 2010) and

2 Every summer, ‘Almedalen week’ on the island of Gotland features public speeches by senior representatives of the Swedish political parties as well as a number of events arranged by various public bodies as well as private companies. Almedalen week has served as a source of inspiration for ‘democracy festivals’ in neighbouring countries.

in student essays, among others the readable 'Efter avgången: En studie av affären Littorin' ('After the Resignation: A Study of the Littorin affaire' [*sic*]) (Hovne et al. 2010).

Maja Lundgren, author (August 2007)

Literature professor Sara Danius called the debate surrounding the novel *Myggor och tigrar* ('Mosquitoes and tigers'), published by Bonniers, the literary scandal of the year 2007. In an analysis of the course of events, Danius writes that 'Lundgren was accused of lying, indeed, even of not being right in the head' (Danius 2010). The book is a kind of feminist settling of scores with a certain type of male chauvinism, and it was an early contribution to bringing to public attention the both explicit and implicit oppressive acts against women perpetrated by the so-called *kulturman* ('culture-man', a designation for a man of high standing in the intellectual-cum-artistic world who poses as a major authority on cultural issues and whose ego is typically expressed in the kind of speech known as 'mansplaining'). A number of named male cultural workers are criticised in the novel, men who mainly worked in the culture-and-arts editorial office of the tabloid *Aftonbladet*. There was much publicity about the book even before it appeared, and as it came out the media reporting about it, and about its author, was intense. Initially, attention focused on the way the book moved in a controversial borderland between fiction and reality; but soon the main interest of journalists came to be directed at Lundgren's personality. When the debate was at its most intense, the novel was called a 'scandal book', and a considerable amount of journalism was devoted to discussions of Lundgren's mental health. She was described as being unstable, a woman on the verge of a nervous breakdown. That caused other writers to react: when men with an exalted standing in the realm of literature write about their lives in confessional mode, it is considered a noble art; but when a female author does the same thing, it is condemned as tasteless, unintellectual, and even pathological. The publisher felt that there was a real threat against Lundgren and deployed private security guards at a few of her public appearances. Sara Danius again:

Nowadays it's acceptable for books to portray hard-core pornography, sadism, and masochism, even rapes. But there is one thing you mustn't do. You mustn't attack cultural workers in the royal capital, especially if they are in positions of power. Then all hell breaks loose. (Danius 2010)

An analysis of this case has been conducted in the unpublished Master's thesis 'Kulturmaffians myggor och tigrar: en litteratursociologisk studie av litteraturkritik och härskartekniker i en tidningsdebatt' ('The mosquitoes and tigers of the cultural mafia: a literature-sociological study of literary criticism and domination techniques in a newspaper debate') (Mattisson 2011).

Anders Pihlblad, *political reporter and commentator, TV4*
(October–November 2007)

Late one evening in October 2007, TV4 reporter Anders Pihlblad sat in the restaurant Judit & Bertil in Stockholm together with Ulrica Schenström, then Under-Secretary of State and right-hand woman of Prime Minister Fredrik Reinfeldt. They drank wine, talked, and were merry, possibly inebriated. After a tip to the tabloid *Aftonbladet*, a team consisting of a photographer and a reporter went there. A number of compromising pictures were taken of the couple from the newspaper's car through the windows of the restaurant, which gave the photos a paparazzi character. One of the photos captures the two kissing and embracing. The newspaper made a big thing of the photo, splashing the image across its pages; but at that point no major affair was made of it – that is to say, relatively few news media followed up on the news. A few days later Håkan Juholt, who was at that time a Social Democratic Member of the Swedish Parliament working for the Swedish Defence Commission, raised the question of whether Schenström had been 'on call' at the time: had she been responsible for the national crisis management in the event of a possible disaster on that particular evening? Reinfeldt did not want to reveal this information and for a long time referred to secrecy concerns, but the pressure became too great. In connection with the Prime Minister's confirming that Schenström had indeed been on call during the much-publicised evening at the restaurant, she handed in her resignation. At the same time, a preliminary judicial investigation was initiated. Schenström was suspected of corruption and Pihlblad of bribery. Both crimes were committed as the TV4 reporter paid the restaurant bill, claimed the director of public prosecution, Christer van der Kwast. However, the investigation was dropped because of a lack of evidence. Pihlblad was deeply shaken by the scandal, which led to a severe personal crisis. He later wrote a book on the topic, *Drevet går: Om mediernas hetsjakt* ('The hunt is on: On being hounded by the media') (Pihlblad 2010).

Tiina Rosenberg, *professor, former non-professional politician (Feminist Initiative) (September-October 2005)*

Tiina Rosenberg has been in hot water with the media on a number of occasions. In 2005, political scientist Johan Tralau accused her of plagiarism in her research, which led to newspaper-billboard publicity and big headlines. In a debate article in the tabloid *Expressen* in connection with these events, historian Dick Harrison wrote a kind of apology for Rosenberg. ‘Gender witch Tiina, that queer professor who drives heteronormative patriarchy up the wall, is actually a big bluff. Her books are pieces of plagiarism. Her opinions are crazy’, he wrote in a few ironic introductory lines which exactly captured the image that the media had already established of Rosenberg, an image that was later reinforced (Harrison 2005). My interview with Rosenberg mainly revolved around how news journalism portrayed her during her period as a non-professional politician in Feminist Initiative (Fi). Among other things, she was then accused by Fi’s Ebba Witt Brattström of having made scandalous statements, such as ‘women who sleep with men are gender traitors’, which resulted in intense media attention. Political scientists Maria Wendt and Maud Eduards later conducted an analysis of the portrayal of Fi in the press (Wendt and Eduards 2010). They write that while they were working on the piece, it was difficult not to be troubled by the emotional, scornful tone of voice that many journalists used. This aggressive tone was mainly directed at Rosenberg who was, taken altogether, more or less explicitly portrayed as an extremist, militant, lesbian academic who hated men. When Rosenberg resigned from the party executive committee, the reporting in many instances came to be about her physical appearance. She was, among other things, described under the headline ‘Problemet med Fi-Tiina’ (‘The problem with Fi-Tiina’) as a loud-mouthed, middle-aged woman who dresses like a man and deliberately conceals her beauty (Marteus 2005). The excitedly hostile publicity about her appearance, which took on the proportions of a scandal from time to time, and the threats that ensued, contributed to Rosenberg leaving her post within the party, a development outlined in Chapter 1 above.

Gudrun Schyman, *politician (Feminist Initiative, former party leader of the Left Party) (September 1996, November 2001, January 2003)*

Like Tiina Rosenberg, Gudrun Schyman has been under attack in the media many times. Among other things, there was a good deal

of publicity about her alcoholism, and about the scandalous situations she found herself in because of it, during the 1990s. After she admitted her addiction and publicly chose sobriety, criticism was checked and she could continue working as the leader of the Left Party. During my interview with Schyman, she was asked many open questions about media scrutiny during her long career as a politician. In her answers, she dwelt particularly on the *Expressen* affair. On 27 November 2001, the tabloid published an article about a film which party leader Schyman's former husband, Lars Westman, had made and which was partly based on conversations between himself and his ex-wife. The newspaper billboards on the same day read, 'GUDRUN SCHYMAN records EROTIC FILM with her ex-husband'. Under this headline, there was a quotation from Westman: 'YOU'RE SUPPOSED TO GET HORNY'. In my interview with Schyman she emphasised how completely exposed she felt when she saw the newspaper billboard, and she realised that it was pasted all over Sweden. There was nothing she could do to defend or explain herself. She experienced it as an assault and burst into tears. During the legal proceedings against the newspaper that followed, she argued that the billboard gave the impression that she was starring in a porn film, which was an offence both against her personally and against the party of which she was a representative. In 2003 the newspaper and its publisher, Joachim Berner, were convicted of defamation in the Swedish Supreme Court. The same year Schyman left her post as chair of the Left Party in connection with an affair that had to do with erroneous tax deductions, a more traditional media scandal by Swedish standards.

Cecilia Stegö Chilò, professional board member, former journalist, and former politician for the Moderate Party (October 2006)

The scandal surrounding Cecilia Stegö Chilò was part of the so-called minister affair that took place in October 2006, when the non-socialist Alliance government was being assembled for the first time. In the article 'Extra Extra. Hon sågas – hon avgår' (Extra Extra: 'She is denounced – she's resigning') (Pollack 2009:99–120), whose title is taken from a spread in *Aftonbladet* (15 October 2006), media researcher Ester Pollack investigates the dramaturgy of this scandal. Minister for Trade Maria Borelius and Minister for Culture Cecilia Stegö Chilò had to leave their posts after only a few days because of revelations about nannies paid under the table and advanced tax-avoidance schemes in the case of the former and a continual

failure to pay the TV licence fee in the case of the latter. In her analysis, Pollack takes newspaper opinion pieces as her point of departure and shows how the reporting stripped both ministers of their competences in favour of a one-sided, negative focus on their characters. In one column and analysis after the other, Stegö Chilò and Borelius were portrayed as greedy, elitist people with dubious private morals, who believed they were above the law and who acted for their own benefit. Pollack calls it character assassination (Pollack 2009:116). She describes the chain of events as a play in three acts, where the final act is when the female protagonist of the drama, like the diva in innumerable operas, must die. She calls this the *peripeteia* of the scandal, its turning-point, when ‘the sacrificial lamb is placed on the altar, the guilty party is punished, balance is restored, and the social body is purified’ (Pollack 2009:116).³ Pollack finds a few counter-voices in her material, one of which came from the left. Gudrun Schyman, who was then leader of Feminist Initiative, noted that of course she condemned both a failure to pay the licence fee and the use of undeclared labour, but that neither offence deserved these unanimous calls for resignation that echoed through the public sphere.

Ireen von Wachenfeldt, *former Chair of ROKS, the National Organisation for Women’s Shelters and Young Women’s Shelters in Sweden (May–July 2005)*

‘Könskriget’ (‘The gender wars’) was the name of a TV documentary by journalist Evin Rubar which was broadcast in two parts as a component of the programme *Dokument inifrån* (‘Documents from inside [the country]’), Sveriges Television, in May 2005. The documentary was about the influence of so-called radical feminism on politics in Sweden. It came in for a very great deal of attention and was given a Golden Spade award; however, the Swedish Broadcasting Commission found it to be in breach of the regulations regarding partiality, and it was criticised for heavily biased interviews. Rubar’s interview with Ireen von Wachenfeldt was found to be particularly noteworthy. The latter described the course of events to me as follows: During the interview Evin Rubar had the ROKS periodical *Kvinnotryck* (‘Women’s pressure/print’) in her lap and referred to a review in that particular issue, which was two years old, of Valerie Solanas’s feminist classic *SCUM Manifesto*, where men are described

3 This quotation has been translated from Norwegian into Swedish and then into English.

as animals. ‘Do you think men are animals?’ asked the reporter. ‘No, I never even thought about it’, chuckled von Wachenfeldt, whereupon the question was asked again and again with the justification that the reviewer in the periodical thought so. Because von Wachenfeldt was the chair of ROKS and the publisher of the periodical, she should support what was written in it, argued Rubar. This irritated von Wachenfeldt, and she eventually, under obvious pressure, fell into the trap and said, ‘Men are animals, don’t you think, don’t you think so.’ This interview technique, which may be described as a technique of exhaustion, can be seen in a long, unedited sequence on YouTube.⁴ The statement caused a huge outcry. Condemnations were numerous, pleas in defence few. The ‘men are animals’ statement turned out to have considerable staying-power and is still alluded to. In time it has become a rhetorical figure, an example of *pars pro toto* (that is, where a part is made to represent the whole). It is customarily used in contexts where gender studies or so-called radical feminism are debated and criticised. To Ireen von Wachenfeldt the statement, and the subsequent media scandal, brought an abrupt end to her career; she also became the victim of numerous death threats, which led to her developing a social phobia, as described in Chapter 1.

Source-critical reflections

Discussions are ongoing within this research field about what should be referred to as a ‘media scandal’ and how that concept should be defined. For example, political scientist Tobias Bromander uses a wide-ranging method when selecting his scandal material (Bromander 2012:26–35), while media scholar Sigurd Allern and others choose a more precise method (Allern et al. 2012:30ff). Selecting scandals for my study, I sometimes collated the degree of intensity in the media coverage with media scholar Ester Pollack who, together with Sigurd Allern and other researchers, created a list of political scandals in the Nordic countries from 1980 to 2010 (Allern et al. 2012:29–51).

As a result of my desire to broaden the analysis, I included three people whose experiences might be characterised as something other than regular media scandals: the cases of Maja Lundgren and Hanne Kjöllér could be designated as ‘heated cultural debates’, while the writings about Floorball Dad might be categorised as belonging to

4 https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pBtKxYKQI_8 (accessed 7 March 2019).

the ‘public shaming’ phenomenon. In the latter case, this is precisely how I analyse it, public shaming being a kind of variant or extension of the media scandal. At the same time, these three informants have experienced the same things as the others, namely how the story about their actions – actions that were judged to constitute a severe violation of norms – multiplied through reporting in the media and reached a strength which is characteristic of the concept of media scandals, where harsh condemnations in public have been prevalent. As was the case with the rest of the informants, the scandal writings transformed them into embodied examples of morally reprehensible behaviour.

Because the book is built on interviews, I have been dependent on finding people who have had these experiences, but who were also prepared to talk about them and be part of a research study, which of course not everybody was. As one potential informant told me when declining my request for an interview, ‘there are experiences in life which you would prefer to put behind you’.

I contacted the informants via email or telephone and then made an appointment for an interview in offices, in homes, and, in one case, in a café. Each informant was interviewed with a tape recorder for one to three hours, except for Gudrun Schyman, whom I met briefly before she was due to participate in a debate. That interview was short, about forty minutes, and was written down in a field diary; consequently, it is considered to be secondary material. Schyman invited me to her home for a longer session, but a lack of time unfortunately put paid to those plans. Hanne Kjöllner agreed to be interviewed on condition that she could talk about journalism in particular and about personal experiences of scandal reporting only as an exception. For this reason I mainly refer to the interview with her in the final part of the book, which is based on journalists’ perspectives on media scandals.

The interviews were conducted from time to time over the course of the project, spread out over several years, a circumstance which is likely to have affected the end result. If all interviews had been conducted in rapid succession, I would have had a different overview over the material from the outset and would have found patterns more quickly. The main reason why they were spread out in this manner is that different interviews were linked to different part-studies and that other tasks – I am also a senior lecturer – have sometimes had a disruptive effect on my research time. The unexpected advantage with this is that my knowledge of the subject grew before each

interview, and that, I would argue, gradually increased the quality of the interviews. If I had done all the interviews at the beginning of the project, I would probably have missed some important questions that turned out to be crucial along the way.

The interview method I am using is tried and tested in ethnological and anthropological contexts and is best described as conversational, the researcher being the listening party. The ethnological interview is similar to a personal meeting between two individuals. It is more like an informal conversation than an interrogation on the basis of a previously prepared form (Fägerborg 1999, Ehn and Löfgren 1996). Before each occasion, I did research about the course of events of the pertinent media scandal and wrote down a number of questions; but during the meeting I put these aside in order to concentrate on listening to the informant with an open mind. I reacted spontaneously to what I was told, just like in a normal conversation, and interjected comments and follow-up questions as we went along. Afterwards, when we had reached some sort of concluding point, I returned to my prepared questions in order to check if we had missed anything.

The interviews were then transcribed by a transcription agency. I have thus missed out on the advantages of spending a lot of time with and being close to the material by personally transcribing the interviews. However, this was a very conscious decision on my part – it takes an unjustifiably long time to type out interviews, and it can be physically unhealthy for people who are not in possession of the correct technique. In return I have both listened to the recordings and read the transcriptions repeatedly, sometimes simultaneously, in order not to miss out on moods, nuances, and dimensions that are implicit in the material.

Sometimes the interviews with the informants are almost unreadable in their transcribed form while other people speak in whole sentences and are hence easier to quote. Some people are given greater space in the book because they possess a linguistic talent which means that they succeed in appropriately expressing what several of the informants only reflect and reason about. This is common in studies that are based on interview material. However, it is themes – mainly categorised on the basis of emotions expressed by the informants – that have governed the reproduction of the quotations, especially in Chapters 1 and 4.

A question that should be asked regarding the interviews in this publication is how feelings affect memory. A number of studies

show that there is a positive correlation between memory and emotions, insofar as events that arouse strong emotions promote the ability to remember them afterwards. However, some studies indicate that very powerful emotional reactions sometimes seem to have the opposite effect – trauma, for instance, can cause the memory of an event to fade (see Reisberg & Heuer 2004), although the opposite has also been argued (Thurén 2005:32f). I have assumed a position with respect to the inherent unreliability of memory by focusing on the significance of the personal experiences and incidents described by the informants, rather than foregrounding details – for example times and persons – in the depicted events.

The fact that I am myself a trained journalist and have worked within the profession for many years may have had an effect on the interviews, primarily those with the journalists. There is a risk that I might have identified with them, although several years have passed since I was last active in the profession. On all interview occasions, I told the interviewees about my professional background; with some of the journalist informants I was extra clear about it, especially at times when I felt that they were becoming defensive. I would like to add that a general point of departure for me as a researcher has been an aspiration to understand the experiences, emotions, thoughts, and circumstances of the informants, rather than criticising them.

Many studies contain source-critical discussions about the advantages and disadvantages of qualitative interviews, and I recommend those who are interested in this method and in reflexive discussions about it to read, for instance, ethnologist Bo Nilsson's doctoral dissertation *Maskulinitet* ('Masculinity') (1999), the anthology *Perspektiv på intervjuer* ('Perspectives on interviews') (Lövgren 2002), consumption researcher Sofia Ulver's doctoral dissertation *Status Spotting* (2008:63–98), and communication researcher Stephen Coleman's book *How Voters Feel* (2013:34–76).

I could have included more of myself in the text, trying to imitate the reflexive style which some of my role models within anthropology employ in an impressively assured manner (see Miller 2011b). As matters stand, though, I remain in the background. When all is said and done, that is where the ethnologist belongs.

I have attempted to conduct an open work process. For instance, before publication I allowed the informants to read the entire manuscript and was attentive to suggestions for changes, which were ultimately few in number. Some of the informants expressly asked not to have to read the text beforehand, a request I respected.

It is my hope that this serves as a guarantee regarding the ethical considerations which every study that starts out from the lives of real people must face and deal with.

One weakness inherent in the media material that is included in this study is that I have studied considerably more text than sound and image material, a shortcoming that is, embarrassingly enough, common in media research. At the same time, I have tried to listen for auralities in the text and develop a technique for examining how informal speech can be studied in writing (Hammarlin & Jönsson 2017). Even though I have been focusing on texts, I have been more interested in their motions and their modes of transfer, not least between speech and written text, than in the content itself. Regarding the Flashback threads that are included in the study, I have not kept statistics or drawn up lists of how often certain statements occur. Even so, there is a systematic element in my approach to this extensive material: I have subjected it to a kind of intermittent checking by studying every twentieth page, thereby forming a perception regarding the tone of voice and the changes over time among the posts. The relationship between traditional journalism and Flashback's citizen journalism has been at the centre of my searches in this area.

Google searches are, for obvious reasons, not mentioned in the bibliography; but the search engine has been a self-evident, indispensable, and daily part of my work. Media scandals have a wide impact, and it is impossible to account in writing for the vast quantity of interviews, articles, news items, commentaries, columns, analyses, and images that I have studied over the years and that form part of the secondary material of the book. As is customary, the media material mentioned in the bibliography is restricted to what has explicitly been part of the analysis and is directly mentioned or quoted.