

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Are We Ready for Confrontation .....                        | 1  |
| Jyllands-Posten 7 August 2006 .....                         | 1  |
| The Western World has been caught with its pants down ..... | 4  |
| Den Danske Forening's homepage februar 2006 .....           | 4  |
| This is why the Danes fight ... ..                          | 5  |
| Internet-information February 2006 .....                    | 5  |
| Deficient Cold War Report with an Academic Veneer .....     | 9  |
| Jyllands-Posten 10 August 2005 .....                        | 9  |
| Explanation of the Cold War eagerly desired.....            | 12 |

## Are We Ready for Confrontation

*Jyllands-Posten 7 August 2006*

**There is no more breathing room for being slow on the uptake or fickle. He who neither understands the foundations for the benefits he enjoys nor is willing to act accordingly is bound to lose them.**

**It isn't written anywhere that the West and our model of society will win. Thus there is no basis for dialogue with Islam, as long as that faith's practitioners only consider such as a tool for deception, says the author of today's article.**

The waters have been parted after the Mohammed Affair. Those who do not now understand what the situation is will probably never understand.

It wasn't a case of a spontaneous and popular indignation over some not very sensational cartoons: The affair started months after the publication, the Egypt government acted as midwife, and the authentic cartoons were supplemented with a set of fakes and lies. And one doesn't burn embassies and flags in that part of the world without governmental approval.

Within the Arabic cultural sphere a feigned anger over an alleged offense is a well-known trait. Last winter there were many reasons to invent such an outrage: Egypt was facing a parliamentary election, and the regime needed a cause to boost their image. Iran needed a diversion from the Western attention to the nuclear ambitions of the country. Syria needed to have the pressure lifted after the involvement in the assassination of the former Lebanese prime minister. The negotiations about Kosovo's future were imminent. The new Palestinian government needed legitimacy. Finally there was a need for tougher blasphemy laws to cap the increasing tendency in the Western European media to occupy themselves with the unacceptable parts of Islam — the British parliament was about to discuss "The Religious Hatred Bill".

In short, the Mohammed Affair wasn't set off by an offense. It was created in the expanding Muslim world in use for the conflict with the West.

This conflict is fundamentally about whether a political ideology clothed in a religious mantle will be allowed to force its dogma upon others, and even dictate that this must replace empirical knowledge. If this succeeds, we're back to the times when

Copernicus and Galileo were facing the Inquisition. On such a foundation no decent society can be built.

As the Mohammed Affair shows, the means that are employed against us are unusual.

The core element is the demographic trend. As Danish Minister of Foreign Affairs Per Stig Møller noted in JP Jul. 7:

“In the middle of this century half a billion Europeans (included herein a large number of Muslim immigrants. ed.) will be facing a Middle-East and Northern Africa with four times as many people.”

He could have added that demographers at Copenhagen University have predicted a foreign majority in Denmark within this century. (Berlingske Tidende August 8, 2005).

This situation is being exploited by the frontrunners of Islam. In Norway the resident fundamentalist, Mullah Krekar, says it this way: “Look at the development in Europe’s population, where the number of Muslims is growing like mosquitoes. Each western woman in the EU produces on average 1.4 children. Every Muslim woman in the same countries is producing 3.5 children. In 2050, 30% of the population in Europe will be Muslims” (Dagbladet March 13, 2006). Libya’s Gadaffi states it this way: “We have 50 million Muslims in Europe. They are a sign that Allah will give Islam victory over Europe — without swords, without cannons, without conquest. The 50 million Muslims in Europe will turn Europe Muslim within a few decades. Allah is mobilizing Muslim Turkey to add that to the European Union. That is an addition of 50 million more Muslims. Then there will be 100 million Muslims in Europe. Albania, which is a Muslim country is already in the EU. Bosnia which is a Muslim country is already in the EU. 50% of the population in those countries are Muslim.” (Memri-TV)

It is further known which currents that dominate the Muslim immigration groups. Based on the Mohammed Affair one can mention the survey LO (the Danish Confederation of Trade Unions, translator) published in Ugebrevet A4 on March 13, 2006: Under half would distance themselves from the anti-Danish riots in the Middle-East — 11% even fully endorsed flag-burnings, the destruction of embassies, and boycotting Danish goods.

The so-called moderate Muslims are insignificant. Only 1,000 signed up for “Democratic Muslims” in four weeks — the same number as the fundamentalists at any time can muster in Nørrebrohallen (Meeting place of Hizb-ut-tahrir — translator). The moderates will thus very likely be silenced in the long run, simply because there will be insufficient police resources to protect them.

Now it is certainly not a law of nature that the most populous cultures always are victorious. The Spaniard Cortez toppled the mighty Inca empire with a few hundred soldiers. The people behind the Mohammed Affair know that they can neither defeat the West militarily or economically. This is why they operate on the psychological level by inventing fictitious offenses and demand “respect” for their “religion”. They need our passivity, until the population increase makes it impossible to stop them.

Therefore criticism of Islam is characterized as smear campaigns and hatred, natural defenses are called “discriminatory”, and those who for 25 years have warned about what is going on, are being labelled and stigmatized with the aid of Danish collaborators as “rightwing extremists”.

If we for that reason allow ourselves to be sucked into debates about the “tone of the debate”, we lose precious time — and at the same time overlook how the respect for other religions are being practiced the deeply intolerant Middle-East, where in the last

100 years they have virtually succeeded in wiping out the Christian and Jewish societies.

The status today is that Europe is about to be lost because of European leaders who lack the ability to identify the character of the threat, or at least are looking the other way, who are fickle, reluctant to say things clearly, and dislike taking the unpleasant steps now that will prevent something even worse later on.

As a consequence of this a society after Middle-Eastern fashion with corruption, nepotism and religious madness is waiting at the door. Along the way the rights of freedom will be suppressed — first because he who risks being suicide bombed would usually rather give in on the ideals than lose his life. Taxation will break down as the conditions in the kiosks and small shops (mostly owned by Muslim immigrants, and known for cheating on taxes — translator) will spread to other branches of commerce. The Police will not be able to enter increasingly larger geographical areas. The social structure will collapse as a result of the Muslims' family structure, their views on women's place in society, and a lack of understanding among too many of them about the connection between giving and receiving benefits. The consequence will be worse than the medieval Black Death, since our successors will be a suppressed minority who will not have the ability to rebuild what has been lost.

Humans often have difficulties imagining calamities that haven't happened yet, and the many influential Seidenfadens and Skov Christensens (multi-cultural Islamic apologists — translator) will, with their fantasy tales, pull the wrong way.

There is however, no more breathing room for being slow on the uptake or fickle. He who neither understands the foundations for the benefits he enjoys nor is willing to act accordingly is bound to lose them. It isn't written anywhere that the West and our model of society will win.

It is thus damaging to continue to support the establishment of a culture here, whose supporters considered as a group haven't — and after all human experience never will understand — the preconditions for the peace and prosperity that they enjoy. Such an "integration" is the same as a retreat of the Western order on our own soil. We have both a right — and to our descendants a duty — to protect ourselves from this.

Therefore the awarding of citizenship to persons who cannot be expected to respect our values must stop — and those who have received citizenship anyway must be motivated to strike camp. Likewise, the current influence of Middle-Eastern culture in the daily life of Danes must be opposed and not supported. When Jewish high-school students are being harassed and threatened in school, their parents should not be advised to transfer their children to other schools, but rather the school needs to be cleared of Muslims who can't behave. And if Muslim ladies can't bathe together with others in swimming pools, they are to be referred to the Red Sea instead.

It is furthermore important to gain insight into how much influence has been purchased by petrodollars on the press, the bureaucracy and politicians who are pushing in the direction of where we are heading, and how much manipulation of Middle-Eastern origin the public is exposed to. It is known that the oil-sheiks have bought not only American ambassadors, but even a former president. How is the situation in this country (Denmark - translator)? NATO can resist a frontal tank battle, but the Western leaders have been completely unprepared for the scams and tricks behind the Mohammed Affair. Are they better prepared today?

Last but not least, respect for Islam's wickedness isn't promoting any Islamic soul searching. Islam as of today contains some serious systemic problems: It interferes aggressively, and without paying attention to the means, in other peoples lives in the

same way as totalitarian ideologies. Other world religions had to be re-interpreted before they — in the past — could be used in the same way.

There is thus no basis for a dialogue with Islam, as long as this belief's practitioners just consider such dialogue as a tool for deception.

## **The Western World has been caught with its pants down**

*Den Danske Forening's homepage februar 2006*

### **The Western World has been caught with its pants down.**

It is obvious now that the cartoon crisis has nothing to do with cartoons at all. The cartoons were published months ago - the crisis exploded after what has been revealed as an intentional disinformation campaign. This campaign has nothing to do with cartoons or hurt religious feelings since this is not the first time Muhammad has been depicted in cartoons.

The aim of the campaign is to pull Western countries by the nose. The means to do this is to inflict severe casualties upon a small country so as to scare other countries to become more "flexible" towards the never ending demands from the Muslim World and thereby to extend the possibilities for even more inadaptible Muslims to settle in Western Europe.

If this operation proves successful, within a few years the Muslims will get their hands on the French and British nuclear arms.

It is therefore pathetic to see a former Danish Foreign Minister, Uffe Ellemann-Jensen as argue that the whole problem could be solved if the editor of JyllandsPosten, Karsten Juste, would just resign. Ellemann-Jensen is well known in Denmark not only for his firm resistance to the Soviet Union during the Cold War but also for a complete lack of understanding of the nature of the ongoing Muslim invasion and its consequences. Due to his influence in this field during his time in office, he has a direct and personal responsibility for the present situation.

The problem is that the concept of defense in the Western World is based upon the idea that a threat to us is a traditional military attack. After 11 September this concept and the NATO "musketeer oath" was extended so as to include terrorism as well. However, now we are facing quite a different threat: the danger that the madmen of the Middle East will make us hostages one by one and in this way impose upon us their own solutions.

The obvious response to this technique is not appeasement.

To limit freedom of speech will just be further gas on the bonfire. The proper answer is a firm will to resist blackmail.

The tool is therefore to launch endless cartoons in the Western press and for our Governments to make the bandits understand that if they put an official or unofficial embargo upon one of us, none of us has really anything to sell – and to extend this message to anybody else who dared exploit the situation and fill the gap.

After all, Western industry and know-how is still second to none. Furthermore, the Middle Eastern Countries are not even able to feed themselves neither with food nor

with industrial products. Due to the religious insanity prevailing in these countries, this situation will not change within a foreseeable future.

The key to a solution is therefore to make them understand this fact and impose our agenda upon them and not the other way around.

The Danes therefore are still waiting for an effective support of this kind from their allies.

But even if we don't get it, we have no intention whatsoever of giving up our freedom of speech.

## **This is why the Danes fight ...**

*Internet-information February 2006.*

What is democracy without freedom of speech?

The essence of democracy is that it is legal as well as possible to bring forward all facts and opinions as part of the political decision-making process. It also means that any member of a democratic society has the right to participate in this process, to speak up in public and to publish his or her opinions and whatever s/he believes to be important information.

This process is vital to the spiritual as well as technical development of a society. It is in fact the very basis of progress within Western societies since the European Renaissance.

### **FREEDOM OF SPEECH**

Freedom of speech does not only come to life through words. Also other means to present information or to speak out one's opinion and ideas can be used. An opinion or a fact can be expressed and communicated in a variety of manners; through irony as well as argumentative conclusions and through words as well as images.

Thus, freedom of speech is also the right to argue with humor and irony and to condense an idea, an assessment or a fact into a cartoon or an image. Cartoons might in one short glimpse pinpoint something which it would take thousands of words to explain, and cartoons are often much easier to understand.

All Danish institutions and public persons are subjected to cartoons from time to time – individuals as well as the Church, political parties etc. Even the Queen has had her caricature drawn. If abuse of power, wooden-headedness of political and religious leaders and sources of disorder and stupidity could not be pinpointed, criticized and cartooned, we would still live in a Middle-Age society.

If criticism is defined as disrespect and offence and consequently forbidden, the clock is reversed and we will become a Middle-Age society once again.

As a participant in a democratic society, the Danish newspaper Jyllands-Posten had a right to cartoon the prophet Mohammed. In fact, the very reason to do this was to see whether it is really true that cartoonists dare not draw cartoons about Islam.

The reactions and events following this have proved the importance of this test.

## OFFENCE

It is up to the individual whether he chooses to feel offended or not. If he feels offended, he has his free right to argue why his critics are wrong and deceitful and even through the legal system prosecute his offender. If an obvious offence exceeds the borderline of truth, a lawsuit for slander may be initiated. If an offence directed at a religion has no other obvious reason than to offend, it will be penalized as blasphemy.

If freedom of speech is limited by the sole reason that somebody is offended, there would in fact not be any freedom of speech at all:

Surely, the sovereign kings of previous times felt offended when they were met with claims for democracy.

Hitler felt offended when Charlie Chaplin made a caricature of him in the movie "The Dictator".

And the Pope felt highly offended when Northern Europe refused him, cartooned him and had its Reformation. He felt even more offended when scientists claimed that it was not the sun which circled around our globe but the other way around. He even managed to burn some scientists on the bonfire for that reason.

But how would our countries have looked today if nobody had dared to stand up and put the Pope under this offence?

Of course many Muslims feel offended when they see their prophet associated with bomb-making in a cartoon. But is the proper response then to launch aggressive actions against Danish society as a whole and even to threaten it with bomb attacks?

It is therefore a surprise to us to hear US and British governments condemn the "offences" of the Danish newspaper Jyllands-Posten. Do these governments actually understand what democracy implies? - Or are they themselves subjected to the same self censorship which prevents cartoonists from doing their job?

It is also offensive for us to see mobs of the Middle Eastern Countries burn our flag. The flag has a cultural meaning to Danish people similar to the religious meaning of the prophet Muhammad. But we can live with that, because we see it as their right to express their opinion about the situation.

## WHAT IS A SOCIETY WITHOUT FREEDOM OF SPEECH

Our democratic model is in strong contrast to the totalitarian concept of how a society should work.

Totalitarian concepts have the shape of political ideologies or religions which leave no room for the individual to have an opinion different from the official opinion or the truth handed over from an authority or an authoritative figure. A totalitarian society is governed not by the citizens but by an elite which has monopolized the right to have an opinion and claims to represent the only truth. The only legal opinion in such countries is one and for all formulated by the ideology or religion. There is no tolerance to differing opinions, and information that does not fit into the over-all concept is suppressed.

Totalitarian societies will always face severe problems in the course of time because sooner or later reality and theory will not fit together in an ever-changing world. Moreover, totalitarian societies will never be able to reach the level of a free society.

Instead they will suffer from abuse by the privileged classes, mutual mistrust among citizens, lack of goods and – eventually - widespread destruction.

Nazi Germany was based on a totalitarian concept and so was Soviet Russia and Mao's China during the Cultural Revolution. Today there are actually similar conditions in many Middle Eastern countries.

## THE PRESENT SITUATION

It is therefore pathetic to us to see mobs in Middle Eastern countries, which are unable to create decent living conditions for their own citizens, burn our flag and threaten to kill innocent people because a free and independent newspaper wanted to test whether cartoonists feel threatened not to draw cartoons on Islam. It is even more pathetic since we know that such behavior has been generated intentionally on the basis of black propaganda which leaves no room for the Middle East public to know what in fact was in these cartoons and what was the reason to publish them.

It is sad to hear or overhear the demand from Islamic institutions and people that our Prime Minister should condemn or apologize for the actions of an independent and free newspaper. He has no influence whatsoever on what is printed in our newspapers, and his office would not last another day if he tried to. The Danish people would see to this immediately. The press should be free to publish whatever it finds suitable. This is the very core of our democracy. And only the maximum freedom of the press will ensure that the average citizen is always provided with a variety of information that will enable him to make relevant decisions on political matters.

## WE WILL NOT SURRENDER

We don't interfere in other people's right to have a differing opinion. We have never interfered in the Muslims' right to worship their religion.

In certain Muslim countries, Christians are not only cartooned but violently mocked, prosecuted and ill-treated and Christianity as such is banned. Jews are threatened even worse, harassed and suppressed – and cartooned in a way which has no precedent in modern times but in Nazi Germany. In spite of this, we have tried to help when help was needed. We sent help to Muslim Indonesia after the flood of 2004. We sent help to Pakistan after the big earth quake in 2005. We have supported the Palestinians with millions of dollars every year in order to enable them to build their own society. When Kuwait was overrun by Saddam Hussein and Saudi Arabia feared to be next in line, we responded to their call for help against the aggressor. When Muslim Albanians were massacred in Kosovo we also sent troops to their aid.

In return we demand respect for our right to run the political system we find best in our own country.

If a Muslim here feels offended by the way this system works, he is free to go. If he – as some Muslim leaders who have enjoyed our hospitality have actually done - goes to the Middle East and launches lies on what does actually take place here and claims that Danes threaten Muslims, we even find he should not return but rather settle in the part of the world where habits fit him better. Why do these incendiaries who respect nothing and build nothing but hatred, misery and deserts out of fertile soil insist on staying with us?

The Danes met with open-minded curiosity immigrants which came to Denmark from Muslim countries. We gave these immigrants homes and money and all the

opportunities they lacked where they came from. Many contribute and take part in the Danish society in a fruitful manner. But many also reward the hospitality with everlasting complaints and with stubborn adherence to habits which are in open contradiction to the ideas upon which our society is built.

The result of this has been a growing mistrust among Danes towards not only such persons but also against Islam as such. Within wide circles of Danish society the last events have transformed this mistrust into open disgust and in some cases even hatred.

Why did these people come here - and why do they stay, if they will not respect the order of the house?

Our house order includes democracy and freedom of speech – and under no circumstances will we abandon this freedom.



## Deficient Cold War Report with an Academic Veneer

*Jyllands-Posten 10 August 2005*

**The Diis Report "Denmark during the Cold War" demands no accounting from the alternative political majority\* that perpetrated a distortion of Danish security policy during the "footnote" period. But substantive information is lacking and the resultant conclusions are omitted.**

An intelligence conference was held in Moscow in 1959, with the participation of about 2,000 officers. The purpose was to introduce to them a plan to secure Communism's world domination without provoking a major war with NATO - a war whose consequences would be unacceptable.

The conference was the opening volley in a well organized "silent" war whose purpose was to demoralize us (the Danes, translators note) and erode the sense of reality among our decision-makers. All of the tools that a totalitarian regime might control were put to work, and both open and covert methods - as well as illegal tactics when needed - were employed. For that reason, the KGB was allotted a key role, although this organization had before been primarily involved with espionage and internal security. "Active operational measures" (*aktivnyye meropriyatia*) was the name of the new "product line."

From this point on, there was a more intensively planned and better structured input than the report would indicate.

The tools are discussed in the report: Traditional political and diplomatic channels, Soviet interethnic, cultural and trade organizations, as well as the nation's scientific institutions and press bureaus, the legal Communist Party in other countries, organizations put up for the purpose (or existing national organizations overtaken for the purpose) in the same places - i.e. front organizations - and other wholly or partially controlled entities (such as private enterprises, public bodies etc.). In addition persuaders, trustworthy/reliable contacts and the usual fellow-travelers were used.

The report leads the readers astray, when, in a sophistic manner, it reasons away the phenomenon of *fellow-travelers* (Vol. 3. p. 383). And it is deeply problematic - but fortunate for the footnote politicians - that the report only identifies the "*reliable contact*" (Vol. 1 p. 456) as a phenomenon, but does not explain the significance. The KGB inserted these people into its work. In Vol. 3, p. 408, the reliable agent is presented, but solely as stage of development on the road to regular agent.

The fact is that the KGB long believed it could manage without controlled and conscious agents. The chief of the KGB's Anglo-Scandinavian division, Viktor Grushko, therefore counseled his operatives not to develop the useful contact as an agent in the classic sense, even though the prospect seemed useful, since it might create unnecessary problems and put pressure on the man. Ignorant reliable contacts could, he felt, well be used, for example, in mapping an opinion-building system, a necessary process for locating its weak points, as well as to slip messages and materials into our media, archives, and databases.

A KGB officer therefore presented himself to reliable contacts as, for example, a diplomat or journalist - or simply as a friend.

Nor were these contacts educated in covert techniques, and the "duties" assigned to them normally were presented simply as cautious questions. A reliable contact could, therefore, only be directed in a very unstructured manner.

Both parties showed caution in their mutual connection, but on the other hand did not conceal the connection, which simply wasn't announced publicly or privately. The KGB also provided a cover story to explain it.

A reliable contact might, for example, be a person who was willing to accept/evaluate certain things as facts, and therefore pass them on. It might also be a person who was willing, in a friendly manner to talk about impressions and weak points among our politicians, journalists and opinion-builders. A defector from the KGB, Mikhail Butkov, relates that reliable contacts could provide considerable information that was more interesting than many top-secret documents, and they could be most effective in "influence" operations. Another defector, Stanislav Levchenko, relates that a goodly number of his Western contacts never knew that they were in reality working for the KGB. Often these otherwise well-oriented people had a remarkable ability to deceive themselves, he relates.

With the scant resources that PET [the Danish Police Intelligence Service] had at its disposal, there were few possibilities to counteract the KGB's use of reliable contacts - even less when it involved Danes whose ego kept them from accepting any direction at all from PET.

The battleground for the influence operation was the workplace, educational venues, associations, the press, the political scene, etc. All possible means were utilized without regard for morality or convention, as long as they worked. The activity extended thus from the gross to the sublime, from acts of violence and advance disinformation and to long-term, sophisticated influence operations. These might include "black" maneuvers (i.e. those in which the personal source is concealed, such as false identities); "gray" maneuvers (where the real source was not open, such as influence from Soviet-controlled front organizations); white" (in other words, completely open activities, for example publications in the Soviet media).

Any means whatsoever could be used to achieve a specific purpose (for example, to create political passivity at a certain point in a specific context). An action might be very limited, or it could be particularly comprehensive. It might, for example, be a Soviet journalist's "accidental" meeting with a politician, during which the journalist said just one thing which remained in his conversation partner's consciousness. But there could also be long-term combined operations utilizing many different tools (for example, to get Anker Jørgensen to feel that "*The North as a nuclear-free zone*" was a good idea).

The methods became - which the report downplays - more and more refined over the years. For example, "propaganda" was gradually superseded by a "marketing" which bore a semblance of objectivity and reason, and the reserved KGB types were replaced by sympathetic, "reasonable" people - if needed even people pretending to be critical of the Soviet Union. The planners clearly recognized the advantages of playing upon the inherent strengths and tendencies in Western society.

With Byzantine patience they eroded the positions and perception of reality among the core players in the development of Danish security. The result was an insufficient Danish contribution to the common defense, the shrinking of reinforcement possibilities from our allies (the latter discussed in Vol. 3, p. 582) and finally the footnote period.

The report concludes that since the footnote politicians' main adherence to NATO held firm and the influence campaign didn't alter the Danes' general picture of

conditions in the East, the influence campaign by and large may be regarded as having failed. However, according to the concept of the influence operations this was unimportant as long as NATO's ability to carry out its purpose was undermined. The effect of the operations must, of course, be measured by comparing what the footnote politicians did with what the enemy wanted them to do. Such a comparison is absent from the report.

The main purposes of the offensive were defined in the so-called strategic long-term plan. This was a sort of screenplay giving the projected scenario in various areas - including every single Western nation - and was adjusted along the way:

During the first phase ("*The Period for the Preparation of Peaceful Coexistence*") the Soviet Union's isolation following the Stalin period was to be broken down. Krushchev was given credit for having convinced the West to believe that the East Bloc was willing to replace military competition with economic competition.

In the second phase ("*The Battle for Peaceful Coexistence*"), a split among the Western nations was to be fomented, just as social dissolution in these countries would be promoted. By penetrating the Western social democracies, these countries' connection to the US would be weakened and the desire to reach agreement with the East Bloc would be promoted. Through infiltration of the labor movement and student organizations, new areas of conflict would be opened. Anti-Americanism in Europe would be promoted, and America's wish to contribute to European defense would be weakened.

In phase three ("*The Period of Dynamic Social Change*"), the "*hope for a false democracy*" would be crushed and the West's total demoralization would be carried out. By pretending to be friends with the West, especially the US, it would be possible to achieve the greatest possible economic and technological help from them, along with convincing the capitalist countries that they had no need for military alliances.

America's military engagement in Europe would be dissolved, at the same time the Western European nations desire to maintain the necessary military expenses would be eliminated.

As can be seen, when our allies' firmness shattered the whole thing, the "footnote Danes" had pushed forward as far as phases two and three.

What has happened to this information in the report? And this despite the fact that they have already been collected and documented in this writer's book, "*The Silent War*" (2001) - which also is ignored, although it contains the only Danish, publicly available, systematic overview of the influence operations. The book has certainly been known to the report's creators. As a result, the KGB's massive use of reliable contacts, the gradual refinement of the propaganda facade and the "long-term plan" have also been known. The last mentioned more so, since it is discussed by the defector, Czech officer Jan Sejna, in the book "*We will Bury You,*" which the report's creators have referred to in another context (Vol. 2, p. 256, note 15).

It is a triumph for those who determined the framework for the preparation of the Cold War Report that they succeeded in producing a work which, by virtue of its extent, its welter of details and its academic veneer appears trustworthy, at the same time that key information and resultant conclusions that would demand an accounting from Danish political players have been kept out of sight.

\* The so-called "alternative majority" (in Parliament) included the left wing and traditional NATO skeptics in the Danish Parliament and - for opportunist reasons - also the Social Democratic Party from 1982 onwards when Denmark had a right wing government under Conservative Prime Minister Poul Schlüter. Politicians belonging to the alternative majority are usually called "footnote politicians" because they tried to impose their political intentions on the Danish Government by subjecting it to footnotes to the decisions made by the Parliament on security policy matters.

## **Explanation of the Cold War eagerly desired**

*Jyllands-Posten* Sept. 8, 2005:

In the Commentary for Sept. 5, Danish minister of culture Brian Mikkelsen points out the truly amazing aspect of the so-called DIIS Cold War report - that it fails to find that the Soviet Union constituted a real threat to us, since the East Bloc had no plans for an unprovoked attack.

One has to share the amazement. It is common knowledge that provocations can be understood according to need, and it is also common knowledge that dictatorships don't behave rationally with respect to academic predictability.

Brigadier General Michael Clemmesen supports that viewpoint, according to *Jyllands-Posten* on Sept. 1 and obviously has a different evaluation of the Soviet military potential than the report. I pointed out in *Jyllands-Posten* on Aug. 10 that the report has omitted core information from within the sphere of political active-measures operations

It is improbable that the younger historians who produced the preparatory works for the final report, have not included this information in their contributions. Any other research method would compromise them professionally in later job possibilities. It is also necessary to speak of conscious deletions with the intent to influence the conclusions one can draw from the material presented.