

Country Report on Islamization: Denmark

Brussels 18.10.2007

By Lars Hedegaard¹

The Resilience of the Commoners

There is not sufficient time here to go into the situation in Denmark in great detail. For more comprehensive reports and analyses of recent events in my country I append two separate papers.²

My talk consists of two parts. After a brief report on important developments in Denmark, I intend to address issues of a more general and strategic importance.

It is by now quite clear that the Danish cartoon crisis that erupted a few months after Jyllands-Posten's publication of the Muhammed drawings on 30 September 2005 was deliberately triggered to test if Denmark was ripe for a take-over in the sense that the Danes were willing to bow to sharia law and accept their place as dhimmies.

Bernard Lewis went even further and observed that the death sentences against the Danish cartoonists and editors were a sign that the Islamic strategists were already considering Denmark to be part of the Dar al-Islam where the sharia applies.

As subsequent research has revealed, it is equally evident that the main instigator of the troubles in the shape of embassy and flag burnings, violent demonstrations, death threats and boycotts were muslim states in cahoots with The Muslim Brotherhood.

I shall refrain from speculating as to why the leaders of the umma thought of Denmark as a soft spot ready to be conquered. Perhaps they had been looking for a suitable place to show off their global reach and decided that it might as well be Denmark since it presented itself as a target at the right time.

Recently the entire charade has been repeated following the Swedish artist Lars Vilks' publication of a drawing of a prophet (he didn't say it was Muhammed) as a dog in a traffic circle. The same death threats were issued although the street demonstrations were not as well organised or violent as in the case of Denmark.

Interestingly the Swedish experience sheds new light on the Danish case. Danish Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen was roundly blamed and vilified for his refusal to meet with the ambassadors from muslim states who would like to lecture him on the proper "tone" in the press and demanded an official apology. Rasmussen's unwillingness to see the muslim emissaries was then cited by Danish apologists for the imams as the true cause of the subsequent troubles. Had the Prime Minister only

¹ This text differs in some respects from the speech delivered in Brussels.

² Lars Hedegaard: "The Growth of Islam in Denmark and the Future of Secularism" printed in Kurt Almqvist (ed.): *The Secular State and Islam in Europe: Perspectives from the Engelsberg Seminar 2006*. Stockholm (Axel and Margaret Johnson Foundation) 2007. Lars Hedegaard: "The Cartoon Jihad and the Coming of Parallel Societies" to be published in Dutch.

agreed to listen to the well-founded grievances of the concerned ambassadors, matters would never have got out of hand.

Well, the Swedish prime minister did receive a deputation of muslim ambassadors to discuss internal Swedish affairs and he got precisely the same result as his Danish colleague – death threats.

The refusal of the Danish Prime Minister to issue a formal apology for activities that were perfectly legal under Danish law to countries that do not allow freedom of expression may be seen as proof that Denmark did not surrender. But the picture is mixed.

If we look at most members of the Danish elites – among writers, journalists, academics, the Lutheran Church and several political parties – particularly on the left – they were only too eager to apologise and publicly condemn Jyllands-Posten for using free speech for purposes for which it had never been intended, i.e. to cause dismay among muslims. While paying lip service to the principle of free speech, these elites were perfectly willing to accept guidelines for its appropriate use issued by the self-proclaimed spokesmen for "1.6 billion muslims".

Most disturbing of all was the fact that leaders of the Danish security police, known as the PET, reacted to the well-orchestrated onslaught against Danish interests at home and abroad by lauding the calming and benevolent influence of the Danish imams and declaring its intentions to collaborate more closely with them in future. The very people who had been instrumental in stirring up trouble by travelling around in the Middle East showing pictures that had not been printed in any Danish newspaper – including a photo that they claimed to be showing Muhammed as a pig, but was in reality a photo of a man participating in a pig-squealing contest in France.

The most important outcome of the Muhammed affair – undoubtedly Denmark's most serious foreign policy crisis since 1945 – was that by and large the common man stood firm in his defence of free speech. Several subsequent opinion polls have confirmed that despite some erosion of support for Jyllands-Posten and the right to offend and ridicule religion, there is still a majority of unbowed Danes behind our old freedoms. We are thus faced with a truly remarkable state of affairs, where those who make a living out of writing are more than willing to stay within guidelines dictated by representatives of powers where teenage homosexuals are whipped and hanged in public, whereas the common folks defend the very freedom of speech for which the professionals have little use.

The resilience of the commoners makes Denmark stand out among so many of our neighbours as a country to watch.

It is also this popular support of freedom that encourages our government to take action where other countries would rather look the other way. As in the case of Ayaan Hirsi Ali who was recently denied protection by Holland during her refuge in the U.S. This led the Deputy Mayor of Odense, Alex Ahrendtsen from the supposedly extreme right party, The Danish People's Party, to invite the black Somalian woman to seek asylum in his town. When this initiative was decried as "disgusting" by a representative of the left socialist and third-worldist Unity List, and after Danish PEN

had declared that Ms Ali was in no need of protection and was not even an author, the Danish Minister of Culture, Brian Mikkelsen (Conservative) extended an official invitation to her on behalf of the government and declared that it would assume all necessary expenses for her protection. To make the government's stance absolutely clear, Prime Minister Rasmussen subsequently chastised the Dutch government for having abandoned the troublesome Ms Ali.

Denmark also became the place that gave Lars Vilks the solidarity meeting nobody offered him in Sweden. On 2 October an overflow crowd in Copenhagen invited by The Free Press Society demonstrated their respect for the brave artist. Among the participants were luminaries such as cultural editor Flemming Rose and the cartoonist Kurt Westergaard of Muhammed fame, the "cultural muslim" politician Naser Khader and the recently appointed minister of social Affairs Karen Jespersen (Liberal).

The initiative was widely reported by the national press and was generally well received.

For the second part of my presentation, I should like to address another issue of general relevance, which is identifying our most pressing tasks in the immediate future.

Undoubtedly we ought to continue our gathering of information on the concrete actions taken by our opponents around the world. But I doubt that we shall get much wiser by simple fact-finding. We know more or less what the operatives of the umma are up to and how they usually go about their day-to-day business of undermining Western society.

We now need to proceed from fact collection and the dissemination of thoughts to active resistance. For we have long been faced with a determined offensive aimed at our defeat and eventual subjugation as dhimmies within an extended Dar al-Islam.

In order that we may begin to defend ourselves against this jihad – something we have up till now failed to do – we need continually up-dated analyses of the islamic strategy and tactics. They have to be analysed dispassionately as objective military problems exactly as any general staff would attempt to analyse the manoeuvres of the enemy on the battlefield. For we can be sure that we are being carefully observed by our attackers who have a good and often very precise idea of what weapons to use against us at any particular moment.

Jihad is not necessarily tantamount to violent warfare or terrorist attacks. Jihad employs a wide array of offensive instruments including psychological, economic, demographic, political, cultural, intellectual, social, criminal and violent ones. Unless we begin to analyse the world and the relationship of forces as our attacker would do, we are bound to miss the picture. In fact most of our leaders do not even acknowledge that we are under attack – indeed an ideal situation for any conquering army and one that has not even been anticipated by Western war theoreticians.

Our leaders keep looking for terrorists in a haystack – as indeed they should – but that is pretty much all they do thus allowing the enemy to conduct his main operations without them even being noticed. The English theoretician of military strategy B.H.

Liddell Hart talked about "the indirect approach". The umma is the true master of this discipline and has been for 1400 years.

Terror, violent insurrection and mass slaughter will undoubtedly play a decisive role in our final subjugation but they will only be employed on a grand scale if and when our will and ability to resist have been undermined by other – "peaceful" – means.

Here and now we may identify three tasks:

1. We must define who is the "we" which the umma is trying to subjugate and which must therefore defend itself. This we must know to be able to identify our potential allies.

Clearly we cannot be defined as "white", "Europeans", "Westerners", "Christian", "people of Greco-Roman or Judeo-Christian background" or the like. People fitting these descriptions are certainly prominent in our ranks, but then we have many other friends who do not match these labels.

The common characteristic of all those who have refused to accept the yoke of islam is precisely that they are determined to preserve our freedom or regain it if it has been lost. Little more can be said of them as a collective.

So what is going to be the umbrella under which the resistance fighters may gather? It cannot and should not be "whiteness", "Europeanness", ethnicity or even Christianity – although determined Christians will undoubtedly play a crucial role in our counteroffensive.

Our most likely banner will be a revived sense of nationality, which is a much more inclusive concept than any of the above. So we will defend ourselves as an alliance of like-minded nations as has been the case many times before

2. In the likely event that parts of Europe – and probably parts of other Western countries such as the U.S., Canada and Australia – will be lost to parallel societies outside of our political and judicial control – at least temporarily – we need to define achievable objectives for our defensive strategy.

It is clearly not enough for the voters in the democratic countries to elect new governments even if they promise to stem the inundation by umma-members or to resist the islamisation of our countries. Many of our institutions have already been undermined to a degree where they have effectively been turned into bastions of our enemies, and there is little any government, however well-intentioned it may be, can do to counteract this pernicious influence in the absence of independent and determined popular resistance.

Again it is the common man and the self-organising ability of the civil society that will count in the long run.

Dhimmification has hit many of our universities and in some places even our public schools, the courts, public administration, vast sections of the news media, international organisations such as the UN and the EU, a number of prominent

transnational NGOs, labour unions, women's movements, cultural institutions and, increasingly, large banks and corporations that have been penetrated by umma capital.

In this situation – which is bound to get much worse – what might be our objectives in the short, medium and long term?

Perhaps we must realise that it is no longer possible to preserve freedom throughout all of our national territories but that we shall be forced to relinquish control over parts of them.

3. We need to develop a strategy that may allow us to achieve our objectives. This means that we must develop a comprehensive and deep strategy equal to that of islam. This strategy must take into account that some of our public and private institutions may opt to side with our enemies unless we force them to side with us.

A successful defensive strategy may necessitate the creation of parallel institutions under our control accompanied by civil disobedience vis-à-vis the official, dhimmified ones – which is a classical occurrence in occupied countries.

We would undoubtedly benefit from a study of the modus operandi of primarily European resistance movements during World War 2 though our present situation is much more ominous at least long term.