

Freedom of Information for National Movements in Denmark

A brief presentation

by professor dr. Ole Hasselbalch

2002 – Epilogue 2018

Part 1. Introduction

1. The Social Concept

The modern Scandinavian societies are built on the Western, democratic tradition which differs widely from totalitarian ideologies:

According to the *democratic* view, human life cannot be regulated by an ideological or religious formula decreed in advance. Instead things have to be dealt with on the basis of concrete and empirical investigation, and all citizens have the right to participate in decisions regarding the community. This right has to be both defended and developed.

The *totalitarian* concept on the other hand is based on an "ideal" formula for human life. This formula might be thought up. Or it is considered to have a pre-given historical, moral or religious foundation. The total political ideology or religion can be small brain-child of some few persons or even only one person (the "Prophet"). This little elite feels entitled to form the society in accordance with the laws of its ideology or religion.

The two modes of thought are top to bottom opposed to each other.

The traditional democratic view is that each individual can be relied upon both to look after himself and to take part in governing the state. Each citizen is seen as capable of carrying out this duty as well as generally being inclined to behave in such a way that he does not infringe his neighbor's fundamental rights and interests. Therefore no constricting regulations are necessary for the relations between individuals - only a rough framework of general rules of the game are needed. No-one is required to do more than is necessary to make the community function and all are free to shape their lives as they see fit for example in accordance with Christianity, tradition or the tenets of a political party. Furthermore the democratic mode of thought is empirical inasmuch as it is founded on the conviction that the best decision-making is based on fact, and facts should therefore be gathered and expounded as scrupulously as possible. It is also tolerant in the sense that it accepts other opinions.

According to the totalitarian - and opposing - point of view, the interests of society are best taken care of in the hands of an "elite" which has the moral right and duty to impose the "correct" ideals on other citizens. This implies that all are not regarded equally wise and responsible. Moreover the totalitarian view is not empirical but based on speculation. It is intolerant vis-à-vis other solutions to problems of the society, as it sees itself - in whatever shape it takes - as the only "historical", "ethical", "moral" or "righteous" validity possible. It therefore permits itself to use any means whatever to create or safeguard its own ideal society. Most totalitarian societies also prescribe detailed regulations for living. This means that the individual's freedom is dramatically reduced or even made totally to vanish in order to facilitate these regulations being properly enforced and all thinking and behavior brought into line with them.

2. Democratic Government by Rule of Law

Democracy in democratic countries is underpinned by the law. Constitutions prescribe democratic government and guarantee the integrity of the individual and his right to freedom of thought, speech and belief. Other laws strengthen the many functions of democracy and give economic support to institutions that further the democratic process and determine how the citizen's influence on social affairs can best be directed into the appropriate channels. The democratic countries have also established international conventions which constrain each country to protect the

individual, secure his elementary rights and ensure his participation in running the country.

In a democratic society a variety of legal guarantees enable the individual to speak freely about political subjects, so that controversial - or even erroneous - information can circulate openly, where it can be weighed in the balance and possibly form basis for political action. Moreover only little censorship is applied and the citizen's access to information is kept as open as possible.

This is best brought about by wide media-coverage representing every imaginable opinion and interest. The media with an actual monopoly (official libraries and to some extent radio and television) are therefore duty bound to be as all-round and neutral as possible. And citizens need to have good practical possibilities to communicate openly and be entitled to form societies and meet each other (also about political issues) without restraint but to what is urgent in order not to undermine society. These activities should be supported both financially and with practical help by the state.

3. The Challenge

During the last few years Scandinavia has been under severe immigration pressure from overpopulated countries. The changes brought about in the global situation in an extremely short period have been so dramatic that politicians and the public alike have had difficulty both mentally and physically adjusting to them. As a result, serious social problems have appeared which have put not only members of the original societies at loggerheads with one another but have also created a division between them and the newcomers, many of whom have brought with them attitudes and traditions from abroad which are inconsonant with Scandinavian thought and customs.

A number of new organisations have tried to analyze and discuss this new situation with a view to influencing politicians and the public in favour of the original inhabitants or at least to keep relevant information open to the public. Other organisations have the opposite goal: to give immigrants better opportunities to establish themselves in Scandinavia. This has applied in particular to the organisations which have for long time been operating in the humanitarian and international area. Members of what is referred to as the Left, who after the fall the Berlin Wall, have concentrated their energies on combating "racism" and "xenophobia" constitute part of this group.

Organisations whose members believe that the people who have hitherto lived in Scandinavia should be protected from the pressures of immigration can be grouped in various categories: There are individual and groups of individual with traditional national values (for examples veterans of the Second World War), and others who think that the present situation is untenable in the long term. A third - and not very numerous - group are right-wing extremists of whom some are neo-Nazis.

The groups supporting immigration have not surprisingly been favoured by influential people with the same leanings, and have therefore been supported financially and politically by the state and communities, as well as by the press. Their opponents have not had the same advantages. Thus their democratic right of free speech and freedom of assembly has often been infringed upon, not because of their views as such which - with the exception of the extreme right - are wholly in keeping with ordinary people's feelings, but because they have challenged the existing privileges and positions in society. Thus the right to have national sympathies has been systematically circumvented in many different ways.

As the partisans of free and unfettered immigration often seem to think of this freedom as a law of nature, they automatically assume that those opposing them have no right

to do so, and that their “unwillingness to see the light” must therefore be an expression of an odious right-wing extremism.

This trend asserted during the Nineties to such a degree that society's democratic foundation was slowly eroded, and repression spread. Not openly and brutally as in unashamed totalitarian societies (e.g. imprisonment of dissidents), but indirectly and covertly. Democratic traditions were still existing in principle but were adhered to less and less in practice by the very people who have been appointed to safeguard them. This has led to under-surface tensions which little by little manifested itself openly as the discrepancy between the elitist attitude and popular feeling grew steadily more apparent. Substantially it is a conflict between a political, intellectual and economic elite on the one hand and ordinary people on the other. Thus the latter felt they were being misinformed and misled. In this situation extremist organisations marketing themselves as problem-solvers might well be seen as a viable alternative to a system which calls itself democratic but in reality is increasingly totalitarian.

The following survey of the situation in Denmark is based on observations made by *The Danish Society* (Den Danske Forening) up til the turn of the Century. This society has right from the year of its inception systematically noted and characterized the inroads made in this regard on the freedom of speech.

The Society was formed in 1987 on a cross-political basis. It was a reaction to legislation in the 1980's liberalizing foreigners' access to Denmark. This legislation was enacted without any heed at all to the immigration pressure on Denmark from the Third World. The Society's statutory aim is “*in accordance with the Danish constitution and independently of economic and political interests to strengthen Danish culture, thought and way of life*”. There were high-profiled veterans of the resistance movement 1940-45 among the founders. The Society has always systematically informed its readers of current events - often before these events were written about in the press – if they were reported at all - and for this reason often been slandered and obstructed. The society's members represent practically the whole spectrum of political parties.

These assertions are documented in the following pages. We also refer the reader to the current articles in the Society's magazine *Danskeren/IndsigtUdsyn*. On a more general plan we refer to the Society's pamphlet *5 år for Danmark* (Five Years for Denmark), 1992, which concentrates precisely on the subject of this report, and Peter Nerup Buhl's book *Menneskerettigheder i konflikt. Ytringsfrihed og national selvbestemmelse i en folkevandringstid* (Human Rights in Conflict. Freedom of Speech and National Self-Determination in the Midst of Mass-Migration), 2001. For more detailed information see Ole Hasselbalch's book *Opgøret med Indvandringspolitikken* (2003).

Part II. The General Information Scene

The general information climate in Denmark has not been conducive to open debate about these issues. Discussion and even information was for a long time avoided and stigmatized, sometimes even repressed – and to a large degree still is. This repression has taken the following forms:

- The established political parties and the institutions they control have lied continuously about the actual situation to such a degree that it is no longer natural for people to give credence to what they hear.
- The press, radio and TV have neither been objective purveyors of information nor a channel through which all opinions could be expressed. Instead their roll has largely been one of censorship and manipulation, whereby politically incorrect information and opinions have been excluded.
- The established political parties have all flinched from the task of ensuring that information reaches ordinary people at least in a way that they can understand it. Some of these parties have actively opposed spread of key-information.
- The public institutions that are directly or (via public money) indirectly controlled by the established political parties have been extremely remiss in fulfilling their in some cases even legal duty to ensure freedom of information and pluralism.
- The established political parties have to some extent been able to introduce legislation penalizing discussion of the worsening situation.

1. Imaginary Reality

A massive lobby and disinformation activity has succeeded in suppressing awareness of the real situation and has substituted it with a spurious one in which erroneous information is passed off as a matter of fact, (see the special issue on this subject in *Danskeren*, September 1990, which contains detailed examples and source references).

One of the characteristic gambits of this campaign has been the creation of sententious slogans purporting to be facts, and the proposal of “solutions” which are completely out of touch with reality. These slogans are promoted as a creed which no decent person can fail to adhere to. One example is the dubious aphorism “*we invited them ourselves*”, and “*they are only a tiny minority*”. Another is the assertion that all problems can be solved by “*integration*” although no one has desired - or been able to spell out what “*integration*” actually means in this context. With the help of these tacit assumptions a mythical reality has been created which only those with time and energy enough to keep themselves properly informed can see through.

2. The Roll of the Press

The press has played a major role in creating this mythical reality and attendant direct and indirect censorship.

The root cause of the gradual perversion of the roll the Danish press might be the new form of journalism that emerged in the Seventies. Whereas formerly journalism had been neutral it now became ideologically coloured. Thus, its aim was no longer to inform but to educate and persuade. Traditional journalistic virtues were even discarded by the very institution that was supposed to teach them: *The Danish College of Journalism*, which for many years enjoyed a monopoly on journalistic training. Thanks to the influence - or rather pressure - from the Marxist orientated Youth Revolt here the new form of journalism emerged. It was positively tagged as

“critical journalism” – a term covering the opposite of how ordinary people understand the words. As students graduated here and found jobs in the media this form of journalism began to dominate.

“Critical” journalism is not so much concerned - if at all - with objectivity, but with preaching attitudes and suggesting courses of action which will “change society”. The journalist became an investigator, a prosecutor and a judge, all in one. Unlike the traditional journalist, he does not leave it to his audience to draw a conclusion from a neutral description of facts; instead the “critical” journalist implies the conclusion himself on their behalf, and leads the audience where he wants them to go. The motive for this has very little to do with objectivity. And in matters concerning immigration and refugees, the politically correct ideology of the day became the journalist's guiding light. It illuminated his path and he thereafter magnified it so the whole thing became self-perpetuating.

As a result the Danish public has without knowing it been denied a neutrally presented picture of what is going on. Instead it has been given news that has been selected and described in such a way as to point to the conclusion it designed to up to.

This has led to an in fact intentional manipulation of the public via the media which one would have thought impossible in an open, democratic society.

This manipulation works in two ways on the psychological level: 1) If somebody has no knowledge of certain opinions or events, then these opinions and events will simply not exist in his mind. 2) It is likewise true that if people accept what they perceive as facts, then this perception - for them - will be one of fact.

Regarding the first example, people can be kept out of reach of certain information in two ways: *either* by direct censorship *or* by “colouring” the information or the people who purvey it in such a way, that the recipient rejects them without even considering them.

Regarding the second example - inculcating people with ideas and concepts that have no basis in reality - there are many ways of going about it. It is not even necessary to use false information. If people are given *true* information which is *presupposing* that the situation in an uncharted area is such and such, then they will almost certainly feel convinced that the situation is what the information has lead them to believe. Another method is the use of background music and pictures with a manipulative connotation, cutting-room mixing, and so forth which can often suggest things to the unconscious mind that have no bearing on what is actually being shown or said.

See the article *Fra forgiftningsstrategi til humbugjournalistik* (From poison strategy to humbug journalism) in *Danskeren* 2/1994.

3. The Political Parties

The traditional political parties have not reacted to attempts to undermine the right to freedom of speech.

Example 1:

As early as 1988 the Common Market Commission elaborated a proposal for decision in the Council of Ministers (Dok KOM 88/318), whereby “racist” acts and utterances should be punishable and “anti-racist” organisations should have the right to appear as a party in such cases. Moreover freedom to publish was to be “adjusted”. In 1991 The European Parliaments “Investigation Committee on Racism and Xenophobia” presented a paper which, supported by false information on “racism” in European countries, listed a set of proposals (the so-called 77 point program) which were in flagrant violation of the principle of free speech. We quote in direct translation from the Danish version: “proposal 68. Member states should strengthen their legislation regarding racism and anti-Semitism, and people convicted of these offences should lose their civil rights for the duration of their imprisonment”. “Proposal nr. 3. A system should be put in place for monitoring racist and xenophobic tendencies (incl. right-wing extremist and

fascist groups) and proposals to this effect should be followed up to ensure that they are put into effect." ... "Proposal 32: A proposal should be tabled before the 31/3/1991 harmonising Common Market directives regarding dissemination of anti-Semitic and racist material". It is clear from the comments to this proposal that the idea behind it is to stop the post office from sending "racist" material, and to prevent this material being distributed as leaflets and pamphlets in front of schools, youth clubs and other public places. "Proposal 28: A campaign should be staged in order to make media-personnel aware of the important role they play to remove prejudice based on race and xenophobia, in particular by dissemination of appropriate news". Since then there have been a stream of various measures pointing the same way.

On Dec. 2nd 1991 the Common Market Parliaments report on "racism" was presented - with adjacent corollaries - in the Landsting Hall at Christiansborg Palace (seat of the Danish parliament). A galaxy of "antiracists", politicians, journalist and trendsetters took part... The event was arranged by *Fair Play 1991*, an organisation run from extremist quarters. Nobody protested even if it is easy to see that *any* inconvenient opinion could be classified as a "racist" one in the sense of the suggested oppressive tools.

Each Member of Parliament received a letter asking them to state whether or not they would oppose the 77-proposal program (17/2/92). The letter expressed concern regarding the totalitarian tendencies that were gathering strength in the shadow of "anti-racist" measures, and quoted examples from the program. The letter closes with the words *"We kindly ask you to state whether you are in agreement with these proposals, and, if this is not the case, what you have done to prevent these incursions on fundamental civil rights"*. Only one of the 179 MPs (Kofod Svendsen from the Christian People's Party) replied. He still adhered to valid Danish rules (*Danskeren* nr. 2/1992).

The political parties have not reacted to systematic violence directed at members of The Danish Society at their meetings either. When so called "antiracists" tried to break up a meeting on 26 September 1988 in Østerbro Meeting Hall (subject of the meeting: "Constitutional Rights on Freedom of Information"), all MPs were informed by letter (19/9 89) with a detailed description of the attack. The letter stated *"We cordially invite you to attend the lecture. Your attendance will illustrate your support for these principles"*. None of them came.

The established parties don't bother to reply to well-documented questions from political dissidents either.

Example 2:

The Danish Society started its existence at the end of the Eighties by sending the various ministers in the (conservative) government then in power a set of questions on immigration statistics, social benefits etc. No meaningful answer was received. This was reported in a special issue of *Danskeren* in September 1989.

On 9 December 1987 The Danish Society proposed that the government set up an independent, public committee of enquiry with a brief to inform the public about immigration and refugees. In spite of a further letter on 27 June 1988 there came no reply.

The then chairman of Social Democracy's aliens-committee Ove Dalsgaard, also refused to support such a committee at a party debate 2 March 1989.

The established parties have likewise refused to take part in a debate with members of the Danish Society. There are even examples of mother parties forbidding their youth sections to act as a forum for exchanges of opinions.

Examples:

A former lord mayor, later minister of the interior, ends his refusal to discuss immigration problems with the Society with the words: *"Furthermore I have no wish to give your so-called Danish Society any recognition by taking part in one of its arrangements"* (letter 20 June 1988). A political key figure Kirsten Lee has said much the same: *"I see no reason to waste time on people who stand for xenophobia and racism, as is the case with The Danish Society"* (letter 16 March 1990).

Conservative Youth in Vallensbæk not far from Copenhagen invited The Danish Society to mutual discussion about refugee and immigration problems. But the arrangement was cancelled after pressure from the mother party.

4. Human Rights Private aid Organisations (“NGO”s)

Denmark houses several institutions with various objectives whose goal it is to strengthen human rights, not only in those parts of the world where they are threatened but also in Denmark. Dissidents in opposition to the established parties' and institutions' stance on immigration have characteristically not found support with them, not even when their civil rights have been violated. On the contrary. Immigration dissidents have been labeled as being against civil rights, and human rights institutions have even taken part in activities actively subverting dissidents' civil rights.

Examples:

On 1 October 1987 The Human Rights Centre in Copenhagen hosted a meeting on *“The Increasing Racism in Europe”*. Among those present were people from the extreme left, some of whom had taken part in attacks on the national organisations. According to written notes made by a participant, action against The Danish Society in order to silence it was discussed at the meeting. None of the Centre representatives protested.

The Society informed The Human Rights Centre in a letter of the 22 November 1994 of the assaults perpetrated on its members including a recent one at a Constitution Day ceremony in Hillerød North of Copenhagen. The letter contained a proposal suggesting that The Centre, either on its own or in conjunction with the Society, conduct a hearing on political violence. The Centre replied by letter on 25 November 1994, stating that it could not hold public meetings on violence in partnership with anybody, because *“this type of problem is not specifically in our area”*, and because *“a series of seminars and lectures has already been planned for 1995”*.

The Society replied by letter on the 6 December 1994 that it hoped that the Centre would have the Society in mind if an opportunity to discuss freedom of speech and freedom of assembly arise. There was no reply and the Society has never been invited to take part in any of the Centre's activities.

The Society wrote to the Centre again on the 8 April 1996, this time about CERD's report on discrimination in Denmark, a report which in the Society's view was based on references to non-existent conventions or misinterpretations of international conventions. The Society asked if the Centre believed that conventions criminalising open debate - and thereby invalidating democracy - where consistent with human rights. When no reply was received, the Society repeated its request in a letter of the same year, after which the Centre replied with a formal review of valid convention rules and a final remark that it held *“that clear racist utterances should be punishable by law”* in view of ethnic minorities' weak position.

It has also been largely impossible to establish a discussion with the central, private aid organisations.

Example:

The Danish Society is in possession of a memorandum of the 6 March 1997 stating Danish Refugee Aid's information strategy. This entails instruction with regard to letters-to-the-editor and other campaigns, which are *“solely based on negativity and rejection”*. And further, that *“arrangements, programs and debates leading up to a confrontation with extreme and ill-informed anti-refugee opinions are to be avoided”*. Thus critical opinions are by definition “ill informed”. See *Danskeren* 3/1 1997.

These organisations have also refused to support a proposal for an organ ensuring independent, objective information.

Examples.

Danish Refugee Aid avers in *“Goals for Danish Refugee Aid”* (1991), that the organisation will *“effectively and in a variety of media present the facts and real information about national and international refugee work so that debate in Denmark can be qualified and informed”*. However, overtures to Danish Refugee Aid asking for their support for an independent investigation committee gave no positive response. (See

the national daily *Jyllands-Posten* 16 June 1988, letter from The Danish Society 22 December 1988 and Refugee Aid's answer 10 January 1989).

The then chairman of Danish Refugee Aid, Finn Slumstrup, explains the rejection in a letter of the 16 September 1989: *"Danish Refugee Aid thinks that there should be no doubt about the organisation's independence of party politics. We are therefore very chary about taking part in debates that have a strong party-politics bias"*.

Part III. Some Aspects

1. Definition of "Racism in the Penal Code"

The Danish penal code's § 266 b is in its latest form (1995) formulated as follows:

"1 Whoever publicly or with a view to dissemination to a wider circle issues a statement or other communication which threatens, derides or denigrates a group of people because of their race, skin colour, national or ethnic origin, faith or sexual orientation, is punishable by fine or imprisonment not exceeding two years.

2. If the offence is of a propaganda nature, this will be considered an aggravating circumstance"

A series of cases show how the regulations are applied. It is however difficult to get an overall view of the sentences passed, as the Public Prosecutor (Rigsadvokat) has refused to put the material at disposal for an enquiry (see Peter Nerup Buhl, *"Menneskerettigheder i konflikt"*). Peter Nerup Buhl has however done this off his own bat on the basis of various sources, (see Peter Nerup Buhl, *Menneskerettigheder i konflikt*, p. 186).

The Supreme Court decision against the politician Mogens Glistrup of the 23 August 2000 (published in *Ugeskrift for Retsvæsen* - the weekly periodical of legal affairs, p. 2234) has now become a precedent. During a TV discussion in 1997 when forced by the media requirement to deliver a political message in few words, Mogens Glistrup said:

"Okay, but since the Mohammedans have all that part of the world from Morocco in the West to the Philippines in the East, there are so many places they can be, where they belong, and why in Heaven's name should we expose ourselves to the invasion, castration and murder, which The Danish people will be the object of"

"...and it is the sword's territory, where there are infidels like us, who aren't Mohammedans, and they are going to be/are supposed to be exterminated, and that's what the essence of Mohammedanism is in..."

"...Mohammedans are global criminals par excellence..."

"nobody has explained what kind of global crime Mohammedanism is..."

"...about whom everybody knows that they're only here to ingratiate themselves until they're strong enough to execute us. They have to get out because they're such a danger that the woman who rang, her grandchildren will certainly be killed by Mohammedans, if we don't exterminate Mohammedans in Denmark".

His extremely thorough book on Islam was offered as evidence proving the veracity of his statements, but was rejected as evidence by the court. He was finally found guilty on the grounds that his utterances were directed at the faith and origin of a section of the population and encouraged hatred towards its members. Therefore his utterances could not be justified by claiming factual objectivity and the right to open debate. The court found that the question of Islam's nature had no bearing on the issue, at neither

had the social consequences of radical Muslims' realisation of their program in other countries of any relevance. The right to freedom of speech was to be exercised with due respect for other rights, including the right to protection against vilification of people's religion. It was not in itself an infringement of the law to refer to written or oral sources proving ones' point, the court decreed, but such references cannot justify the derision and vilification Glistrup's remarks expressed, and debate on Glistrup's political goals would not be impeded if they were judged to be in contravention of the law. The specially wide margins for freedom of speech accorded to politicians could therefore not exempt him from punishment.

This is the legal position today. It means that people expressing opinions and judgements, or giving information in a compressed and sweeping form about facts, can risk court sentences on the grounds of "racism", if the content is critical of foreign segments of the population, i.e. is too far from the judges' own conceptions (or prejudice).

The Public Prosecutor does not however customarily press charges when the original Danish population is vilified in a similar way.

Example:

In *Ekstra Bladet* (a tabloid newspaper) the psychologist Carsten Nagel called Danes "clodhoppers" and spoke of "weevil-coloured Danes". He wished there were more dark-skinned people here, so that the wishy-washy hue were strengthened "so that we got the right colour". The Danish Society reported Nagel to the police for racism, but the charge was dismissed. See *Danskeren* 6/1992.

2. Libel and Slander

Attempts to silence dissidents have always been justified by the claim that they are all in some way or other "racists" and "antidemocratic". Making statements on this which are not definite enough to form basis of a lawsuit has in many areas been developed to a fine art in the mainstream press.

The Danish Society has continually refuted charges of racist and Nazi sympathies in court. Although the Society has won the lawsuits, it would have been impossible to do so without the resources at the Society's disposition, which have included having for many years a professor and doctor of jurisprudence as chairman. One of the latest cases of the kind has been against a trade unionist, who via accusations of racism legitimized violent and in other ways unlawful attempts to hinder the Society's summer meeting in 1995, despite the fact that she had been apprised of previous court decisions invalidating these accusations. Due to the defending party's interminable delaying tactics the case dragged on for 5 years. The High Court judge finally refused to allow this to go on, but then passed sentence in accordance with the Penal Code's section on ordinary libel and not according to the special libel section, which empowers the court to imprison whoever maliciously slanders or libels another party.

This means that ordinary people whom political correct radicals deem to be the "enemy" have in practice no real means of guarding themselves against such accusations. They can in consequence of this be gratuitously depicted as villains without being able to defend themselves, as the picture painted of them gradually becomes an established "fact".

3. Freedom of Association

Dissidents in Denmark are allowed to form associations, although in practice they have not been able to indulge in the usual activities connected with forming

associations (see below on Freedom of Assembly). Neither have they had access to the tax exemptions for voluntary contributions usually accorded to other associations.

Example:

The Danish Society whose statutory aim is to “*uphold Danish culture, language and lifestyle in a world threatened by chaos, overpopulation, violence and fanaticism*”, has not achieved “*public utility*” tax-exemption, so that donors can deduct contributions to The Society's information activity from their income tax. The formal reason for this, is that The Society is run by a board and not by a general assembly. However, other societies run in the same way have not been the object of similar proscriptions.

This decision was appealed to the ombudsman, who replied in a letter of the 31 May 1992 (j. nr. 1990111 2220 ja/ah) to the effect that he could not overrule the competent authorities right to decide which associations in accordance with tax law § 8A can be said to be of “*public utility or otherwise publicly beneficial*”.

Organisations on the other wing have been recognised as being of public utility, even though their methods are sometimes questionable. Among those sanctioned are *The National Danish Refugee Society* (which supported Palestinians who occupied a church in 1991 after having been refused asylum), and the *Committee for Refugees Underground*, which on its own admittance aims at “*sabotaging*” restrictions in Denmark's policy towards refugees. Even “*The Committee of Co-operation for Peace and Security*” which, according to the KGB-defector Oleg Gordievski took its instructions from the Soviet embassy (the national daily *Jyllands-Posten* 18 October 1990) was accepted as being of public utility.

Lastly, the dissident groups cannot get advertisements advertising their existence published in official, publicly funded periodicals.

Example:

The Danish Society has tried to have a paid advertisement published in the tax-payer funded *Hjemmeværnsbladet* (journal of The Home Guard) with the text: “*Thousands and thousands are flooding here from the third world. We should help the persecuted, but let us say no to all those who are just out for economic benefit. Denmark's future depends on it, and it's urgent. Send in this advertisement at get all information free by post*”. The advertisement was refused on the grounds that the editors found “*the message too particular to be printed in Hjemmeværnet*” (letter of the 25 October 1990).

In contrast to this a well-known “*antiracist*” and vituperative heckler of the Society, EU-politician Ejner Hovgaard Christiansen, was given editorial space in *Hjemmeværnet* nr. 8 1991 so that he could explain that the reason for the Society's being exonerated for racism in court was due to the fact that the legal system in Denmark was the same as in Nazi Germany. People who warn of coming perils have, according to Ejner Hovgaard, a lower level of intelligence than Neanderthal Man. Not even an assertion from Ejner Hovgaard Christensen that the Danish Society “*would not hesitate to attack immigrants*” was considered too “*particular*” to be printed in *Hjemmeværnet* nr. 1 1992.

It is not possible either to disseminate knowledge of these organisations through official channels of sale.

Example:

In the early nineties The Danish Society tried to get The Dane sold in *DSB* (Danish Rail) kiosks. This request was refused by the responsible district supervisor on that grounds that it would lead to problems with immigrants. This refusal was appealed to the minister who upheld the refusal on “*economic grounds*” (See *Danskeren* 1/1993).

4. Freedom of Assembly

4.1. Meeting Rooms

Political meetings are traditionally held in public halls. This is permitted by the leisure-activity laws. Thus the Public Information Law ("folkeoplysningsloven") obliges local councils to put meeting halls at the disposal of local societies that are of public (not commercial) utility and democratically run. There are no exceptions made for societies that are in practice not able to be run on a democratic basis because of the attacks made on them so that no general assembly is practically possible. The legal restrictions in this field have even been tightened. But even before it was difficult to get the respective authorities to respect the traditional lending out of meeting rooms.

Example:

An extreme example of obstruction is documented in Ole Hasselbalch's book *Svig* (Fraud) 1993, and concerns Hillerød council which went so far as to allow itself to be assisted by "autonomes" (who act as red-wing storm troopers) and a legal expert from Copenhagen University, Henning Koch, who was ready to provide a biased interpretation of international conventions.

In 1990 The Danish Society requested permission to borrow the Landsting hall of the Parliament for a press meeting in which it intended to publicize a suggestion to send refugee aid directly to the UN High Commission on Refugees instead of to the Danish organisation *Refugee Aid*, which had itself consumed a large part of the public money collected in 1986 promised "in its entirety" to relief "abroad". Instead the money had been spent on "liaison administration" and other activities at *Refugee Aid's* headquarters in Copenhagen. The request to the Parliament administration was refused with a referral to the relevant rules for lending meeting rooms. These rules stipulate that societies that have not previously borrowed rooms can only use them in special circumstances (a letter from The Chairman of the Parliament 7 May 1990). However, new borrowers among the Society's *opponents* have been able to obtain rooms without trouble.

4.2. Physical Protection

According to articles 19, 21, 22 of the Human Rights' Convention "everyone is entitled to freedom of speech: this right includes the right to receive and send messages and thoughts of all kinds ... verbally, in writing or in print ... The right to engage in peaceful meetings shall be respected. ... Anybody should enjoy the right to organise". This has been followed up in the European Human Rights Convention by corresponding stipulations. The Convention has formally been implemented in Danish law and preparatory works in conjunction with § 137 of the penal code, which stipulates that whoever tries to prevent a lawful meeting taking place is liable to a fine – or even imprisonment up to two years in extreme cases of threats and violence.

These rules have not been respected. Dissidents' meetings have continually been subverted by political extremists. Their methods range from vandalism of the meeting hall, threats against the owner and personnel, lies about the meeting holders that make it difficult for them to have use of the hall, physical attacks and harassment of participants. All quite common. The Danish Society has made a list of incidents of this nature (see the preliminary list in Ole Hasselbalch's book *Svig*, (1993, p. 77). The instigators of these attacks are well known and their doings have been reported regularly in the Society's publications (e.g. *5 År for Danmark*, 1992, Ole Hasselbalch, *Svig*, 1993, *Forbudte Foredrag*, 1997, the article (and documentation) *Mødeballade i Medierne*, (Meeting-spoiling in the Media), in *Danskeren* nr. 3. 1993.

Even though this kind of thing has taken place all over Denmark, the Ministry of Justice has taken no steps to prevent it. The problem has been left to the local police authorities who have normally done no more than ensure the personal safety of meeting participants. The general criminal activities behind the attacks have not been

investigated, the instigators have (with one exemption) not been brought to trial, and the measures to protect participants have been inadequate, as the local police has not always been informed from their superiors about the nature of the threats involved. Only on one occasion has there has been police investigation and charges made against violent meeting-spoilers. Those arrested were tried and sentenced. Private investigation (the names were kept secret to the public) proved, at half of them had previous convictions for violence. See the article about this called *Hæftestraf for mødestormere* (Police Custody for Meeting-spoilers), *Danskeren* 3/1995.

Examples:

The police report on the Society's inaugural meeting in Virumhallen 18 March 1987 states that "*banger fireworks*", "*small grenades*" and a "*fair sized bomb*" were thrown at the meeting hall. "*Large fragments*" of an "*aluminum tube bomb*" were found afterwards. The attackers "*had tried to throw a smoke-gas bomb similar to those used to exterminate vermin through the hole*" (police report page 4 and 5). These bombs contain poison gas. The attackers tried to hinder the participants from coming in.

The Society's then chairman, an internationally well-reputed medical scholar dr. med et h.c. Johannes Clemmesen wrote to the Minister of Justice (23 June 1987) complaining of the dreadful circumstance in which the meeting was held. Nothing however was done by the authorities, and succeeding meetings in the Copenhagen area were spoiled by similar incidents. One of the participants (a WW II veteran) was privately followed and his car totally vandalized.

An attack on a meeting in Brønshøj near Copenhagen in which there was vandalism and a theft, was reported to the chief of police in Copenhagen (2 September 1988) and a letter sent to the Minister of Justice (4 September). The minister referred the Society to the local police chief, who replied by a letter of the 14 September 1988 in which he rejected the protest.

7 September 1988 an attempt was made to prevent a veteran of resistance from WW II from speaking at a Society meeting in Gentofte Library. The Society's then chairman dr. phil. Sune Dalgård lodged a formal and documented complaint 19 September 1988 encompassing all the meeting-spoiling attacks. This was sent to the Copenhagen chief of police

26 September 1988 The Society was scheduled to hold a meeting in Østerbro Citizen's Center. The speaker was to be professor jur. dr. Ole Hasselbalch speaking on freedom of speech. The center was threatened and the Society was obliged to hold the meeting in the street. Here the speaker was shouted down and threatened with shooting if he continued to speak. The participants were attacked with cobblestones and paint bombs. The police asked the participants of the meeting to disperse on ground that the police could not guarantee their safety, but this request was refused and the meeting held. The Centre was daubed with paint despite the fact that the meeting had not been held there. The affair was reported to the police by Ole Hasselbalch 4 October 1988 and also by a number of participants who reported what happened to the police in Store Kongensgade 25 October. Copenhagen police rejected the complaint in a letter of the 10 November 88. The rejection was appealed 29 November 1988 to the Public Prosecutor for Copenhagen with an appendix listing the long series of attacks the Society had been subjected to. On the 8 January 1989 one of the participants wrote to the Minister of Justice drawing his attention to the fact that the police had been remiss in not accepting their complaint. A Society committee member also wrote to the minister of Justice, who referred him to the Copenhagen police authorities.

The 2 May 1989 the Public Prosecutor rejected the complaint of 29 November 1988 with regard to the events at the Citizen's Center, but took no stance on the other issues. One of the participants then complained to the Director of Public Prosecutions. On the 17 August 1989 the author of the present document drew the attention of the Minister of Justice to the unsatisfactory procedure, as well as to the errors in the rejections' facts. The appeal instances had not considered the same complaints let alone all the complaints. The Minister rejected this complaint on the grounds that it was being dealt with by the appeal instances (Director of Public Prosecutions) and that they had been apprised of the case. The appellant to the Director of Public Prosecutions also complained of the procedural irregularities pointed out by the undersigned (11 September 1989).

The Director nevertheless rejected the complaint again 19 December 1989 but only with regard to events at Østerbro Citizens' House. The author then wrote again to the Minister of Justice, drawing his attention to the fact that The Director of Public Prosecutions had not made a decision on all the points complained about.

The 6 March 1990 the Minister of Justice was informed that activists whose identity it was not difficult to establish had - apparently encouraged by the prosecuting authorities' passivity - resumed their attacks on

meeting participants. He was again told that *"it is incomprehensible that the Law has given us no speedy and wholehearted support"*.

14 March 1990 the Ministry of Justice rejected the complaint and referred to the fact that the description of the attacks had been solely construed *"as background information"* to the complaint and that no *"concrete complaint"* had been made. The Society was referred to the local Chiefs of police.

On 19 March 1990 the Society wrote to the Ministry about the continued attacks and spoke of its fears that there was an orchestrated campaign against it. Referring the Society to one chief after another was no solution. The letter concluded: *"The Society is appalled by the passivity shown by the authorities, and hereby leaves all aspects of the case in your hands. If we can furnish more information we will do so gladly. If the Ministry decides not to take further action, we will regard any further attacks on us as the responsibility of the Ministry, as we feel we have done all we can to obtain assistance from the authorities."*

16 May 1990 The Ministry reiterates that complaints be sent to local chiefs of police.

A violent attack on the Society's Constitution Day meeting in Århus 5 June 1990 was reported to the Århus police, which rejected it. The rejection was endorsed by the Public Prosecutor in Viborg 22 November 1990, who wrote: *"I have stressed the fact that the caterer has informed us that his decision to cancel the agreement had nothing to do with later telephone calls, and also that the mere announcement of a counter-demonstration is not an infringement of the penal codes § 137. And lastly, the episodes referred to in 'List of Attacks on the Danish Society' cannot be linked to any one organisation or identifiable person"*.

These unpleasant events have had practically no repercussions in Parliament.

Examples:

The incidents at Gentofte library occasioned Kofod Svenden MP (Christian People's Party) to ask the minister if he thought it consonant with the principle of free speech and free assembly that the Society was prevented from holding a meeting at the library (question 415). The minister replied that if a town council was obliged to break an agreement on the grounds that council personnel refused to work under police protection, then this was not a contravention of the Danish Constitution's guarantee of freedom of speech and assembly. Pia Kjærsgaard (from The Progress Party) also asked a question. *"What will the minister do to ensure freedom of assembly for members of the Danish Society?"* (question 403). The minister replied routinely that this was the task of the local police who are responsible for law and order. Asked if the council library in Gentofte was at the disposition of the public despite their political views (question 402); the Minister of Culture replied that that was something the council committee decided. The culture committee in Gentofte had discussed the issue, the Minister said, and neither the local politicians or library personnel wished to work under police protection.

The Minister of Justice Erik Ninn-Hansen was quoted in *Jyllands-Posten* 12/10 98 as saying that the Danish Society was not entitled to *"martyrdom"*. *"One should note that according to the chief of police 90 Policemen had been on the spot to protect the participants, and many more had been on stand-by"*. This is not consistent with the truth. The Society is in possession of a report from Police Station 2, dated 27 September 1988 which states that 35 police officers were present (6 in civilian dress) and 13 on stand-by. The participants saw only 20 or so. If the Minister of Justice's statement had been correct, the meeting-spoilers would not have been able to come within throwing distance, as the streets were narrow and could easily have been cordoned off.

The meeting spoilers have consistently tried to involve the Trade Unions in their actions. These attempts have on the whole not been very successful. Only notorious communist unions and fractions have taken part, but this has again and again been taken as proof by the press that *"the union movement"* supports the attacks. It has been possible because the unions have not informed their members of the real facts.

Examples:

After the events in Brønshøj and Gentofte 1 September and 7 September 1988 the Society's then chairman Sune Dalgård wrote to the chairman of TUC, Finn Thorgrimson (21 September 1988)

suggesting that the TUC in its members' magazine publicly distance itself from this kind of terrorism as a means to a political end. The 3 October Finn Thorgrimson replied that *"we have no intention of writing anything about this business in the TUC magazine"*.

On the 5 June 1990 "antiracists" tried to break up a Constitution Day meeting in Århus. The meeting had to be moved at the last minute after the police had told the owner of the premises that a bomb might have been placed there. He thereby broke the premises agreement. He wrote that *"re the booking of the 5/6 90 we are sorry we have to cancel. After talking to the police, who say that a bomb might have been placed here, we just don't dare"*.

The "antiracists" proclaimed at their "counter-meeting", that *"We have won the first victory...because the Danish Society couldn't hold its Constitution Day meeting...we won't give them a chance to win support by putting on kid gloves"*.

The Society's chairman wrote to all the unions and societies which directly or indirectly had supported the "antiracists". They were sent: 1. A list of all the attacks made 2. An article about one particular attack (which later became a libel case) 3. The "demonstration" poster which various unions and groups had concocted, and which accused the Society of "racism". The letter asked if the union in receipt of it was in agreement with accusations made against the society, and whether they distanced themselves from the attacks. Only one union, BUPL replied civilly. It said its local department was independent. Another, the Librarians Union, replied investing the meeting spoilers moral support.

The Society's chairman wrote simultaneously to the Trades Union chairman Finn Thorgrimson a second time and enclosed a survey of the attacks. He also told him about the attack in Århus. The letter finished: *"I should therefore like to ask what the TUC's official stance is to the campaign described in the survey"*. The chairman replied on the 12 June 1990: *"I have received your letter of the seventh, and see no occasion to comment on it"*.

The press has incidentally smoothed the attackers' path by implying that those attacked *"were just extremists"*.

Examples from Newspaper headlines:

The inaugural meeting:

"The Society was inaugurated amidst a hail of stones and smoke bombs. The Chairman of Parliament Svend Jacobsen distances himself from a new society which will strengthen danishness" (Jyllands-Posten 20/3 87).

"Krarup friends met with smoke bombs" (B.T. 19/3). (The vicar and writer Søren Krarup was a co-founder)

"Krarup party got a good hiding" (EkstraBladet, 19/3).

"come on Denmark, oy vay, oy vay" (Aktuelt, 19/3).

"Violent clash as new party is founded. Activists protest against xenophobia" (Politiken, 19/3).

"Disturbances as new party against refugees holds meeting" (Berlingske Tidende 19/3).

The meeting in Brønshøj (vandalism and theft):

"Demonstrators stop meeting against immigrants" (Politiken 2/9 88).

"Racists blown out of Brønshøj" (EkstraBladet, 2/9).

The meeting at Gentofte (where a veteran of the resistance is denied access to the library and called Nazi):

"Eight bitten by police dogs" (Politiken, 8/9 88)

"Police dogs defend danishness. The Danish Society denied access to hall and met by shouting demonstrators" (EkstraBladet, 8/9 88).

"Eight bitten by police dogs" (B.T. 8/9 88).

The meeting at Østerbro (a lecture on freedom of speech which had to be held in the street, the lecturer threatened with shooting, attack with cobblestones and paint bombs):

According to *Jyllands-Posten* the meeting in the street was a “Peaceful pavement meeting” (27/9 88), while B.T reported that “100 policeman had to protect a lecture” *Politiken* wrote that “BZers pushed into demonstration”, while *Berlingske Tidende* wrote “Meeting behind police shields” and *EkstraBladet* wrote “Old maids against immigrants”.

5. Public Information

5.1. General

The state uses taxpayers' money to disseminate information in various ways. It funds private organisations' information services, and humanitarian organisations (NGOs) are thus able to maintain a standing information system which feeds the media and politicians with “facts” and opinions. Concrete information initiatives from public bodies and private organisations are also heavily subsidised. This means that large sums of tax payers' money are channeled to activities which do not necessarily form basis of information according to the principle of pluralism.

Examples:

In 1990 The Danish Society applied for a share in an allocation of 10 million Danish Crowns in a public grant earmarked for the dissemination of information which in principle everybody could apply for. Since there were no adequate population statistics available to the general public, the debate was more like blind-man's-bluff. The request was refused on the grounds that the “*publication are not deemed to be within the framework of information service*” Ministry of Health 22 November 1990). In contrast a book with heavily manipulative information was found to fit this framework: Rune Bech's book “*Is it really true?*” purporting to be factual information on population statistics, did receive a grant, and printed in 30 000 copies and sent to all schools. Pia Kjærsgaard (then MP for *Fremskridtspartiet*) asked the following question in Parliament (S 179 1990). “*On what grounds has the Ministry for Social Affairs given a grant to the journalist Rune Bech's book 'Is it really true?', containing immigration statistics, while the government at the same time concedes that there are no reliable statistics at the moment?*” No adequate answer was given.

The Society has also applied for a grant from *DANIDA* (the Foreign Ministry's international aid organisation) “*towards publishing a leaflet on demography...a popular résumé of official reports The State of World Population from UNFPA, World Demographic Trends and their Consequences for Europe from the European Council, supplemented by reports from ILO, The World Bank, OECD and other relevant publications*” (cf. application of 1 September 1991). *DANIDA* had 14.7 mill. Danish Crowns at its disposal that year for such purposes. As a result of “*an appraisal of the theme variation and the probable diffusion effect of the planned information activities*” the application was rejected (22 November 1991). On the other hand *Denmark's Communist Youth* at that occasion was given 21,000 Danish Crowns for a three day seminar on the rain forest and the environment. *Danish Refugee Aid* was given 100,000 Danish Crowns for slide show with printed information about a rehousing project in Uganda, and additional 100,00 Danish Crowns for a young people's book on young Mozambican refugees. *Electricians for Peace* were given 22,000 Danish Crowns for a pamphlet on a hospital project in Nicaragua. And *Islamic Relief Agency* were given 20,000 for a picture exhibition.

The society also applied for some of the funds used for antiracism information (6 March 2001), and received the following rejection: “*Your letter of application of Jan. 28th 2001 requesting funds from the Ministry of The Interior in connection with The UN's world conference on racism, race discrimination, xenophobia and similar forms of intolerance has been examined. We find that your project 'Fatima and Finn Cheek to Cheek' lies outside the scope of the Ministry's funding, which is intended for activities ensuring a broad and popular understanding of the problem of racism so that will take a positive and constructive view. We are therefore not able to accommodate you*”.

Grants were however given to a number of immigrant societies and several “antiracist” groups supporting immigration: The organisation *Facts* (see *Danskeren* 4/1993), *Fair Play* (see *Danskeren* 1/1992, 3/1992 and 4/1992 and the Society's publication *5 år for Danmark*), the association *Nydansker* (New Dane) (see *Danskeren* 4/1998, 4/1999), *POEM* (see *Danskeren* 3/1997) *SOS against Racism* and *Mellemfolkeligt Samvirke* (International Cooperation). All of them heavily biased or even part of the extreme Left.

So publicly funded information is often biased and misleading.

Examples:

In 1995 a big public campaign was launched under the title of *"Global generation"*. Its pamphlet was worded in the following way: *"Global generation, a book about mass-communication and advertising across barriers of race, colour and religion"*. (1995) Readers were informed that *"the only race-advertisement that ever worked was in the 1930's when Joseph Goebbels launched an advertising campaign, which made a whole country almost exterminate the Jews. The man was a brilliant advertiser but also an ice-cold psychopath... But if one can advertise so well for racism, then one can advertise equally well against racism...It won't be the first time a brilliant idea can do wonders for little money."*

Here one should pause and remember that Joseph Goebbels was the minister of propaganda for Nazi Germany. He said among other things that *"we can learn a lot from Bolsheviks, especially regarding propaganda"* (from Guido Knopp, *Hitler's Helpers*, Danish edition 1996 p. 27. And *"The secret of propaganda lies in its tactics of pervading the intended victim with its ideas without his noticing. Propaganda has an objective of course, but this objective must be camouflaged so subtly that victim doesn't see it"*. (o.c. p. 29). Moreover *"Propaganda is in essence an art form, and the propagandist an artist in the field of popular psychology. His most important task is to hear people's heart-beat every day and every hour and tune his message accordingly"* (o.c. p. 33).

There have been some attempts to ensure a more equitable division of public funds for information purposes, but these have always been circumvented and the real issue never addressed.

Example:

MP Tom Behnke asked the Prime Minister (17 December 1991, S 281 1991): *"Will the Prime Minister ensure that grants to information on refugees and immigrants are divided equally amongst those who are for and those who are against immigration to Denmark"*. The reply was this: *"The object of the information campaign is to enhance understanding for people from abroad living in Denmark ... it is not about propaganda for more or fewer immigrants"*.

The Society - in the Nineties - came into possession of the manual which *Danish Refugee Help* used as a guide for its grant applications. It is called a *"Project Catalogue"*, and gives detailed instructions as to where funds can be obtained and how they should be solicited. These instructions are quite revealing. The catalogue lists a series of projects designed for inspiration.

Examples:

One could mention *"refugee integration without clientising"*, *"café-advice-giving"*, *"fuller integration centered round the living space"*, the establishment of *"places-to-be-centers"*, leisure-time fishing groups and so on. The reader is told that such kinds of activity has received grants from *The Health Fund*, parish councils, sports clubs, and *Queens Margrethe's and Prince Henrik's Fund* (see *Danskeren* 5/1989).

Substantial funding comes from the Common Market/EU, but this is only put at the disposal of adherents to a liberal immigration policy.

Example:

The "anti-racist" front organisation *"Fair Play 91"* was given 100.000 Danish Crowns by the EEC even before the group had statutes and a committee (*Politiken* 4 June 1991) and was thus legally virtually non-existent. The unusual grant of money to an organisation of this kind, however noble its ideals, prompted a

private letter to the EEC Commission (5 July 1991) asking on *what* grounds a grant could be given to *one* of the parties in a Danish debate, *whether* the Commission intended to encourage and remunerate attacks on freedom of speech and assembly, *whether* the Commission considered a little country's desire to limit immigration as something criminal, and lastly *whether* grants can be made to organisations which believe that nations have a right to a national home, and that immigration is not the answer to the world's surplus population problem. The letter received no reply.

The Society sent an analogous letter to the EEC Commission's office documenting *Fair Play's* highly suspicious background. The letter continues: *"In view of this, I should be grateful to know whether the Commission usually gives grant to people who appear from nowhere with an apparently noble cause without investigating their background. If the grant is awarded to people who have asked for it on false pretenses, what recriminations are brought to bear? If the Commission acknowledges its support to the new organisation, does this mean a change of course? If this is the case, I should like to know if the funds granted are only to be used for manipulation of the press (as the recipient mr. Jens Sejersen admitted) (The Danish association has a tape to document this, red.), or if they are awarded without any strings attached to persons who are willing to use them for the purchase of explosives to be detonated at the The Danish Society's meetings"*. This letter too, went unanswered.

At the beginning of 1992 it became known that the EEC had again contributed to *Fair Play* and the EEC Commission was asked how large an amount it had donated (letter of the 6 April 1992). The 8 April 1992 the Commission's representative in Denmark regretted that he was not at liberty to divulge this kind of information to private citizens, and that it was up to the members of the European Parliament to monitor it.

5.2. Elementary, Comprehensive and Grammar Schools

Public schools are used as fora for massive indoctrination of the politically correct attitudes as regards immigration, and very few dissenters to these attitudes have been invited to voice their opinions there. As a counterweight, the Danish Society produced material propounding its views to the pupil committees (elected by pupils themselves) in 2000. This was sent to a large number of schools and contained the following question (20/11 2000): *"Do you think that a case should only be heard from one side? ... If you would like to know more about the Danish Society, you can contact us by letter, telephone or by clicking on our much visited home page ..."*.

In a number of cases the material was intercepted by teachers or other people in authority before it reached its destination. The Society's initiative was reported in the press and raised an outcry by the editors, as pupils were not deemed "mature" enough to read the Society's material.

5.3. Institutes of Education

In institutes of higher education things have been more or less the same as they were in schools. There has been criticism of the official line in some of them however, but this criticism has been largely forced underground by politically correct teachers and students.

Example:

A group called *Danish Forum* began to operate at the University of Copenhagen, It held meetings and distributed its magazine *Alætheia*. This resulted in a physical attack perpetrated by masked individuals from the urban guerilla, after which the University forbade Danish Forum to distribute its magazine in order to prevent further incidents. This prohibition was appealed to the Minister of Research who upheld the University's decision. See *Danskeren* 5/2000.

5.4. Libraries

According to § 2 of the Danish Law on Public Libraries *"Public libraries' books must be chosen because of their quality, all-round appeal and topicality. The religious, political or moral content of the books must not be the paramount factor."*

This stipulation has remained unchanged for many years. The preparatory works of the Act have emphasized that local groups are to have the same possibilities as public authorities as regards the promotion of their views and the distribution of material. They have also the right to announce meetings and lectures on library notice-boards (prior report to the bill). ‘

In spite of this, libraries are replete with books extolling the benefits of mass immigration, while critical literature on this subject is practically non-existent. The organisation *Mellemfolkeligt Samvirke* (International Co-operation) has for example published a much used survey called “*Literature on Immigrants*” with “*annotated bibliography*” as its subtitle. This “bibliography” contains only references to works promoting the same policy towards immigration.

The situation prompted a survey of the newspapers and magazines, which libraries put at the disposal of the public (see *Danskeren* 6/1990). The Society's members gathered information all over Denmark, and it appeared that central libraries subscribed to no less than nine pro-immigration periodicals and that other libraries had many of the same bent (*Danskeren* 3/1991). Most central libraries did not even subscribe to one periodical critical of immigration. Of Denmark's 1 000 libraries only 30 subscribed to *Danskeren* by the end of 2001.

The situation was the same as for books. Key works like *Hvad med Danmark* (What about Denmark?) published by the *Committee against the Refugee Law* in 1987 was at the time of the survey (1991) only represented by 30 copies on the library shelves. Ole Hasselbalch's *Viljen til Modstand* (*The Will to Resist*) by only 9 copies.

The limited choice is not accidental and is not due to librarian's lack of knowledge about dissident literature. In 1989 a subscription offer of 100 Danish Crowns was sent to all library so-called selection committees over the whole country in February 1989, and on the 12 May 1990 the Danish Society wrote to all library selection committees apprising them of the existence of *Danskeren*, that it was practically the only dissenting voice to the publicly funded pro-immigration publications, and that the libraries were by law committed to being all-round. This brought about no changes.

Example:

A response from Odense Central Library, 28 May 1990, demonstrates the atmosphere. The Dane was rejected after “*due consideration*”, and the letter went on to say that “*we find your offer scandalous, especially your contention that we do not uphold the law as regards all-round library material. ... Odense Library subscribes to other and more worthy publications than those which are filled with distortions, misused quotation and libel. The Library wants nothing to do with a society which has already anonymously disseminated crypto-racist material to our branch-libraries, and which will not even admit responsibility for its own campaign material. Public Libraries are here to enlighten and educate, not to assist in spreading inhuman and undocumented outpourings...*”.

One wonders what invective would be applied if the material really was offensive and not just a critique of uncontrolled immigration, but this is not the point. The answer implies that only authorized material may be on display in libraries, and if non-authorized material is put there anonymously by persons unknown - which the Society cannot be held responsible for - then the Society is made the scapegoat. And Sending the material openly is also regarded as scandalous.

The edition of *Danskeren* which elicited the above response was 2/1990. 19½ of the magazines 24 pages were written by people with doctoral degrees (mainly incognito) ½ by a judge and ½ by one of Denmark's most well-known journalists.

The Society has not been permitted to display material in exhibitions which are often held in libraries.

Example:

"The library will encompass everything between heaven and earth", was the title of an article in *Frederikshavns Avis* (Frederikshavn County newspaper) in 1991. The occasion was "Library Day", with the librarian inviting "everybody that had some kind of passion" to put it on display in exhibition form in the library. "We are very open to all possible activities" she said.

The Society's local group offered to make an exhibition (letter of the 12 June 1991) but the offer was refused with the following words: "As the Society's exhibition is outside the scope of the current theme, we have to inform you that we are not interested in your exhibition this time" (letter of the 19 June). The library has not been interested since.

The scenario is the same at Copenhagen's main library (then at Kulturvet). Loaners here complained that *The Dane* was not available, which the chief librarian excused herself for in *Jyllands-Posten* (30 August 1990) by casting doubt on the veracity of the contents. This preoccupation with veracity had not however led her to preclude a stream of publications extolling communist Albania or presaging the demise of capitalism etc.

In the early months of 1991 the library exhibited pictures depicting the Danish Society as "racist". In reply to this provocation, The Society requested that it be allowed to exhibit its own material. This request was denied whereupon a letter-to-the-editor was sent *Berlingske Tidende* (25 February 1991), *B.T.* (27 February 1991). The library's reaction was that The Society "would have to accept that we take the Library Law seriously" (*B.T.* 4 March 1991). The Culture Mayor of Copenhagen, Tom Ahlberg, replied in the same newspapers that he had been through the last few months' exhibitions, and in his opinion they head the "breadth and quality" a Library is supposed to live up to. In *Berlingske Tidende* 5 March he explained what kind of breadth he was talking about. He referred to an exhibition called "Copenhagen between the Houses" and "Behind the Facade" from Peter Olesen's books. The book exhibition "Unlucky Heroes" and "Lucky Robbers". A Palestinian artists' drawings of Palestine and Palestinians. Works of a painter and etcher Sven Rose, The Book exhibitions "Voices from Eastern Europe" and "Klaus Rifbjerg" (a radical author). An exhibition called "Common Initiative against Racism". A photo exhibition called "Back Garden" by Lars Overby. The book exhibitions "Black Women Writers" and "The Arab World". Exhibitions arranged by *Indstøt*, *Indsam* (immigrants' associations) and *Indvandrerforeningernes Samvirke* (The Association of Immigrants). A photo exhibition on Christiania's 20th birthday.

This prompted a complaint to the Home Secretary (13 August 1991) who rejected it (21 April 1992) on the grounds that the library's obligation to have all-round material was to be understood generally and was not applicable in isolated cases (exhibitions). Since the Chief Librarian had pontificated that library's stock already included books representing the Society's opinions the case was closed. However, which books representing the Society's opinions actually were there was not disclosed. He had been informed from the library that it did subscribe to *Danskeren*, despite the fact that the librarian in a letter-to-the-editor had formally stated why it did *not*. Nobody at the library had noticed anything in the exhibition libeling The Society.

On the 31 March an "anti-racist" meeting was held in the newly formed (front) organisation *Studerende mod Racisme* (Students against Racism). The same library which had previously rejected The Society's request to exhibit asked the panel composed of well-known "antiracist" how it could prevent The Society from exhibiting at the main library. The panel advised the librarian to go to its trade union in order to gain support for censorship.

The case prompted an open letter to the Minister of Culture (*Berlingske Tidende* 29 May 1991) who did not answer.

The many controversies between users and libraries about unavailable "incorrect" literature have been written about in several issues of *Danskeren* (e.g. 2/1993)

6. The Press

6.1 The Ordinary Press.

According to Act on Media Responsibility § 34.1, the content and method of the mass media must be consonant with good journalistic practice. According to the official rules for this (A1,2,3,5,7) it is the duty of the press to supply the public with correct and speedy information. This information must be checked as far as possible, and a clear division made between information and commentary. Sources should be used critically, especially when their statements can be coloured by personal motives or noxious intent. Information which might be damaging or defamatory should be specially scrutinized and also made known to the person concerned before it is

printed. Corrections should be made spontaneously by the editors as soon as they are aware of errors in their texts.

According to § 36.1, of the Act, requests for the right to rebut information of factual character that prejudices someone financially or morally in some way cannot be refused, unless the information published is beyond doubt. According to §38.1 the rebuttal must be limited to the necessary factual information and must not be in contravention of the law.

A special Press Board has been established to implement this law with which plaintiffs can lodge a complaint. The board can criticize biased reporting and can constrain the media to publish a rebuttal from an injured party.

In practice the Board does nothing. The Danish Society investigated this and the result was published in Ole Hasselbalch's book *Pressenævnet* (The Press Board) published in 1994.

The investigation showed that the real problem was not to ensure the liberty of the press, but to prevent the press from abusing the same liberty by omitting information that contradicted the gist of articles published. The problem was not one of overt but of covert censorship behind closed doors.

Thus the investigation showed that the Board gave editors a free hand. A Danish medium can misinform and cut out any news which contradicts the picture created without any risk of censure from the Board. When handling a complaint in violation of all legal principles the Board does not in practice even uphold the right of plaintiffs to rebuttal.

So there is considerable uncertainty about the reliability of the basis of public debate, and people who are victimized by the media are left without recourse. The absence of legal protection sometimes takes extreme forms, as the Board does not even criticize journalism that contravenes The Penal Code.

Another point raised in the investigation of the Board is the fact that it adjudicates arbitrarily. The Board's attitude changes according to who the victim is. If he or she is controversial according to mainstream opinion there is no guarantee that decision reached will be consonant with those concerning a less controversial person.

The study also showed that the Board did not even comply with the Act in giving the offended party the right of rebuttal. The Act stipulates that a rebuttal "*shall in substance be limited to necessary factual information*". This is interpreted by the board in the narrowest possible sense. Furthermore the study showed that the Board in deciding whether or not the standards of good journalism had been upheld, was inclined to tone down the most important part, namely to wit what effect the publication complained about had on the public. This effect, apart from the *words* used, depends on what degree of appeal it had to the subconscious. Suggestive sound effects, deliberately biased context association, typography etc. can all be means to achieve a desired effect which the public seldom see through. The Board has shown no interest in these aspects. Neither does it insist on the Act being applied in cases where a plaintiff has demanded that damaging assertions in programs or articles should be publicly and fully rectified. This could easily be done by applying § 43 of the Act which as already stated, guarantees the right of rebuttal. The Board has been empowered to decide the rebuttal's "*content, form and place*", and can according to § 49 constrain an editor to "*publish a public statement whose volume is to be determined by the Board*".

There has been increasing pressure from immigration supporters and "antiracists" to make media statements favorable to immigration and immigrants. This pressure has

been rejected in theory (see *Danskeren* 3/1996). In reality the pressure has made it difficult for the press to describe the situation according to its real content. This means that the press still does not refer events neutrally but gives them a political slant.

On the practical level the Danish Society is seldom described in terms of what it actually says and does. Articles about it usually have a strong negative bias. The fact that the Society's predictions have turned out to be correct has in no way changed this (see i.a. the article *Berlingeren i Osteklokken* (Berlingske Tidende in a Bell Jar), *Danskeren* 6/1999).

The Society has also had difficulty in having simple advertisements announcing its existence accepted. See *Danskeren* 6/1995. This also applies to advertisement newspapers. See the *Danskeren* 5/1995.

Occasionally the Society has been able to publish accounts of what goes on in the editorial offices. See i.a. the article *Kluns, klamp og karakterbrist* (Shoddy journalism – shoddy character) by and insider, journalist Jørgen Hansen, *Danskeren* 1/1999. These article confirm the picture the Society formed from other sources.

6.2. Media with Preferential Treatment (Danmarks Radio) and TV2

Danmarks Radio (Denmark's Radio - DR) had a monopoly of ether transmissions for many years. DR and TV 2 still have a privileged position, as they are subvented by an obligatory license fee paid by TV and radio owners, (see Act on Radio and Television § 6 a.1).

Legislation in this area has traditionally required of television and radio that they be all-round. The former Radio Act § 6 stipulated that *"program planning should target quality, all-roundness and diversity. Information should be purveyed soberly and without bias"...* *"Program planning should put emphasis on freedom of speech and information. The programs broadcast should reflect quality, all-roundness and diversity"*. The same objectives were announced in DR's procedural memo in 1977 and are probably still valid. All-roundness is defined as *"the obligation to allow minorities to voice their opinions and the non-promotion of special interests to the detriment of general opinions"*.

DR and TV2 are still bound by the clause stipulating that program planning should target quality, all-roundness and diversity. Information should be purveyed soberly and without bias". See § 6 b of the Act (cf. § 6 a.1).

DR's actual activity is completely at odds with this. It is no secret that DR is governed by an unwritten law stipulating that all news about immigration be slanted in favour of it. The General Director Christian S. Nissen said quite openly in *Jyllands-Posten* 15 November 1997 that *"if Danmarks Radio is to take its founding principle seriously, then we must combat the right-wing anti-immigration tendencies that are permeating the country"*.

Disinformation in DR is extensive and has been documented by examples many times. See for example *5 år for Danmark* (DDF 1992) p. 33 by Ole Hasselbalch, *Svig*, (1993 p. 51 and 65) and *Danskeren* 2/2000, 4/1999, 2/1993 and 6/1992.

The Danish Society has brought forward a whole series of complaints about DR in this respect. There have been tangible instances of manipulation, bias and a distortion of the Society's views. As a rule the Society is not allowed to participate or defend itself (letter from the Society 6 March 1988, 23 April 1989, 10 May 1989). These complaints have not led to anything.

Examples:

1 May 1989 The TV-news gave viewers a totally distorted picture of the situation in Norway. The Society, following in the TV-journalist's tracks, revealed that they lied on several points. One of the Norwegians interviewed also noticed that there were "technical hitches" every time he said something which countered the general trend of the program. (See *Danskeren* nr. 4/1989 and *Indvandringspropagandaens teknik* (Immigration Propaganda Technique, edited by The Society).

As a trial case these distortions were remarked on (and corroborated) for DR's management. The director of DR was asked (letter 11 August 1989) "1. What does DR intend to do with regard to correcting the bias in the program, 2. Have the journalist involved been reprimanded?, 3. What has DR done to ensure that this kind of thing does not occur again?"

These questions were dismissed on the grounds that the deadline for complaint (4 weeks) had been exceeded. Research had necessitated many weeks' work, and the questions put in no way contingent upon a deadline, since they deal with DR's management. Furthermore the legal principle is that fraud invalidates all deadlines.

The Danish Society has also asked DR to state plainly which programs live up to the ideals of all-roundness by letting the critics of immigration air their views (letter 8 April 1989, 10 May 1989, 19 June 1989). DR has not wished to clarify.

The Society has also proposed that DR arrange a public discussion in which experts that know about the extent of immigration can be asked questions by all interested parties (letter 12 May 1989 and 21 June 1989), but this was rejected. A corresponding suggestion was sent to TV 2 was similarly rejected (letter 5 April 1989 and 10 April 1989. TV 2 did however in 1995 arrange a public discussion (with The Society's chairman as representative of the critics of immigration). It ended up as a disaster for the advocate for the immigration lobby and has not been repeated elsewhere.

The Society has also tried to get into DR's so called tape workshop, but was refused each time (29 August 1990 and 2 July 1991). The tape workshop refused the following The Society paper: *"The world is threatened by an ecological catastrophe. World population has risen from 2 billion in 1950 to 5.3 billion. According to the UN's latest forecast it will have trebled to 14 billion in only 35 years unless something is done? Where are all these people going to live? What are they going to eat? What's going to happen to the environment? What will be left of Grundtvig's Denmark? We have other values in Europe than senseless procreation. Is it really desirable that democratic societies should be swamped in a human deluge from the Third World? The Danish Society has put these questions only to be met with a wall of condemnation from DR and others. A strong lobby fights tooth and nail to stop the general public from knowing what the consequences of immigration will be for Denmark. A film (made by the workshop) can take its starting point in the population explosion in the third world or on the Danish Society and its work, by interviewing various member types, for example. Archive clips from the overpopulated, conflict-ridden multiethnic societies, and from peaceful homogenous societies, like Japan for example, and also Denmark, which we ought to bequeath to our children in an even better state than we found it"*.

In April 1992 the journalists' own monthly *Journalisten* revealed that the members of the new Press Board (with their spouses) are annually invited to a cultural event as were the previous Radio Board. In 1992 it was a Pavarotti concert costing 3.100 Danish Crowns per ticket. According to then general director, Hans Jørgen Jensen, DR invited "opinion-makers" which are "interesting to influence", According to information received DR invited 600 decision-makers to similar events each year.

After the fall of the Berlin Wall East German documents have revealed that DR was involved in extensive collaboration with Eastern Europe. The first TV-director Laurits Bindsløv is reported to have told the East German ambassador in a confidential

conversation that “he felt duty bound to make DR a counterweight to the liberal/bourgeois press. The newspapers *Aktuelt* (Social-democratic) and *Land og Folk* (Communist) were the only working-class newspapers – and thus contribute to all-roundness, even though it might entail criticism for being left-wing”. See Mette Herborg and Per Michaelsen in the book, *STASI and Denmark*, p. 213 ff and Ole Hasselbalch's book *Den stille Krig* (The Quiet War).

Epilogue

The 2002 report was written in haste under difficult circumstances in order to attract international attention to the way Danish democracy worked out in practice. The hope was to cause an international respond.

However, nothing of the kind happened. Instead it proved that the situation in other Western European countries was the same as in Denmark or even worse and that most of the organisations and structures set up to promote free speech, democracy and the like had been hijacked by fake “antiracists”, imaginary “humanitarians” and the like. Even the European Court of Human Rights proved to be inaccessible. Only national movements like in Denmark stood up against the tsunami of disinformation and abuse, and they were all fighting for their lives.

After 1990 the conclusion in the board of The Danish Society was that it would *not* be possible to work according to the normal procedures of a democratic society. Instead the same methods of information and communication had to be applied which were originally designed to be used in case of a Communist invasion and occupation from East. Part of the informal “Stay Behind” network set up for that eventually was therefore involved – in particular experts on Soviet influence operations of that époque.

That meant that from then on the official Danish Society was scrimped, necessary efforts were performed anonymously and economy was supplied by individuals not known to the public. The Internet contributed considerable since it was now possible to distribute information directly to a growing number of persons without having to arrange meetings or print pamphlets etc.

To this day only few persons know what was done, even fewer know of the full structure of the operations and almost nothing has been left in writing or by other physical evidence to prove anything. The Danish Royal Library has expressed its wishes to have the existing archives. But even this was turned down due to opposition from survivors from the resistance of WW II who held the opinion that the Library would not be able to guarantee the secrecy of such disclosure in the long run. They remembered how the official Denmark acted as collaborators with Nazi Germany during WW II even up til 1943 when a public uproar made it impossible to proceed that way.

At the general election for Parliament in 1997 a new party, *Dansk Folkeparti* (Danish People's Party) came into Parliament. This party was largely based upon protest against the immigration policy and was supported by persons who had also been active in the Danish Society. Dansk Folkeparti was also highly critical to the disrespect hitherto shown to political dissidents as The Danish Society. The next election (2001) gave Dansk Folkeparti considerable progress. Therefore the balance within Parliament shifted and a new government came into office based upon the votes of the party.

About 2016 even *Socialdemokraterne* (the Social Democratic Party) – traditionally the biggest party in Parliament – got a new leadership which by and large hold the same opinions as The Danish Society.

Accordingly a new trend has grown even within the mainstream press towards the traditional immigration-policy. Thus from the mid Nineties there had been increased willingness to report facts instead of fiction within the field. By the turn of the Century even a positive attitude towards dissidents made itself felt in some medias.

The new trend made it easier for dissidents to have their opinions made known. However, the gruesome facts and dissidents' views are still (2018) not presented by the mainstream press in a way which attracts necessary interest by the public. Media coverage is simply insufficient to keep pace with the accelerating development into disaster. Consequently, even now the vast majority of the ethnical Danes does not understand how serious the situation is: that the country is going to be lost for them in the long run if nothing adequate is done to prevent it. Example: When the press comment on immigration issue it usually *never* bring forward fact-experts from our side even if experience have proved that we were right from the start on and our opponents were wrong.

The insufficient and partly directly misleading mainstream press coverage has provoked Dansk Folkeparti as well as Socialdemokratene to launch their own internet medias. The reason is expressed by one of the leading Social Democrats: he found it unacceptable that it was again and again impossible for him to recognize what he had said when he was quoted in the ordinary press.

So strong political powers in our favour have grown up in Parliament. Our side even decide who should be prime minister. And the chairman of the Parliament (2018) come from Danish People's Party.

But *no* prime minster is prepared to take the necessary steps to secure Denmark for the Danes because we do not have the necessary majority in Parliament. The political parties are simply unable to keep pace with influence of the NGOs and the "humanitarian" bureaucracy since most mainstream journalist are still heavily biased by inertia in their thinking and the consequences of the introduction of "critical journalism".

So most Danes don't understand what is coming up even if the situation in the demographical field has aggravated year by year: today (2018) the public, tax-paid social security system is heavily burdened by the hundreds of thousands immigrants from mainly The Middle East and North Africa, the public schools in the big cities are decomposing, jails have a heavy overload of foreigners etc. And in contrast to the few thousand members of Danish Jewish Society who have contributed considerably within art, industry and science, insofar within the Muslim group is difficult to find just few examples of similar achievements.