

THE TYRANNY OF SILENCE * BOOK FORUM * October 7, 2014

John Samples:

Welcome to the Cato Institute - my name is John Samples, I'm vice president and publisher here at CATO. I'd like to begin with just an administrative matter. I would like to ask everyone to please turn off their cell phones so that we can have a peaceful conversation throughout the afternoon. In particular I'd like to welcome you to a book forum today on the Cato Institute book, *The Tyranny of Silence*, which is published this week. I would like to add that we are proud to be the English language publisher for this work, which originally appeared in Danish, and indeed this work, as we shall hear, grew out of events in Denmark in 2005 and thereafter. Those events, the publishing of cartoons that offended some, raised profound questions about freedom of speech and liberalism broadly understood. Our author today has dealt with those questions deeply and humanely in this book, and as I say, Cato is very proud to have published it. In particular at Cato I would like to thank John Allison, our CEO, who is a big supporter of publishing this book, David Boaz, and an early editor working on this, Jason Kuznicki. We are departing a little bit from our usual format of book forums here at Cato. If you come here you will notice that. I thought it might be interesting to have a leading American defender of free speech talk with Flemming Rose about his book. Jonathan Rauch graciously accepted our invitation to participate, and so we are going to have a conversation about *The Tyranny of Silence*. Let me begin by introducing our participants, and then after they talk for a bit I will return for the question and answer session in about 40 minutes or so. Flemming Rose is the author of *The Tyranny of Silence*. From 1990 to 1996 he was the Moscow correspondent for the newspaper *Berlingske*. Between 1996 and 1999 he was that newspaper's correspondent here in Washington D.C. In 1999 he became Moscow correspondent for *Jyllands-Posten* and in April 2004 was named its cultural editor from which he made the decision to publish these cartoons. Since 2010 he has been the paper's foreign affairs editor. Jonathan Rauch, a contributing editor at *National Journal* and *The Atlantic*, is senior fellow in governance study at The Brookings Institution and is the author of several books and many articles on public policy, culture, and economics. He is the winner of the 2005 National Magazine Award for Columns and Commentary and the 2010 National Headliner Award for Magazine Columns. His latest book is the expanded edition of a CATO Institute book, which we are also proud to have published, *Kindly Inquisitors: The New Attacks on Free Thought*. Previously to that he published *Gay Marriage: Why It Is Good for Gays, Good for Straights, and Good for America*, published in 2004 by Times Books. Gentlemen, we look forward to hearing your conversation.

Jonathan Rauch:

Thank you all for being here. It is a privilege to sit on the same dais with Flemming Rose who is, although he would deny it, I think you'll know in an hour why I regard him as a genuine hero - a remarkable man who has written a remarkable book. It's really an extraordinary read. I can't recommend this book strongly enough, because it's not only - it's got very good theory on the

importance of free speech and on what's going on in Europe, but it's also a person's journey of discovery, of finding out, in a very immediate way, why these things matter. Going to the core of some very dark truths in Europe and also in America. Most of you probably know something about what happened in 2005 but I thought we'd just begin there, with at least a brief recap, as Flemming's book does. This begins with self-censorship that predates the Mohammed cartoons, right? It involves a children's book.

Flemming Rose:

Yes. In the middle of September 2005, a very famous Danish children's writer, his name is Kare Bluitgen, he went public to the Danish news service saying that I'm writing a children's book about the life of the Prophet Mohammed, and in children's books you do need illustrations of the main character, but I have problems finding an illustrator for this book. And, according to Mr. Bluitgen, three illustrators turned down his offer, as far as I remember, and the one who finally says yes insisted on anonymity, which is a form of self-censorship. Out of fear you do not want to appear under your own name when you do something. He was specifically referring to the Salman Rushdie, who received a threat from Ayatollah Khomeini in 1989 because of a few pages in the satanic verses but he was also referring to the fate of Theo van Gogh, a Dutch filmmaker, who was killed in Amsterdam almost exactly ten years ago because he had made a movie that a young Muslim, a young Dutch Muslim, found had offended his god. But we had only Kare Bluitgen's word in the beginning - he was the only source to this story. So - and he was a front-page story in Denmark and then we had a following up discussion at the paper, how can we follow up on this story? And then this idea came up - why don't we invite illustrators or cartoonists to draw the Prophet Mohammed as they see him, so we can see if there is censorship, and there is this fundamental journalistic principle, don't tell it - show it. So they would have to do, you know, using their medium to answer this challenge and you can also see from the drawings up there that they are very different, very diverse. They are not all in fact depicting the Prophet Mohammed. One especially that is now very famous. So because we didn't have a confirmation in the beginning, we in fact held the cartoons for two weeks. We didn't publish them immediately. And over the course of those two weeks we were confronted with, I think, five or six other examples pointing to the problems of censorship when dealing with Islam. One was Tate Gallery in London. They removed an installation out of fear for, you know, possible aggressive reactions among Muslims in the U.K., a publishing house, deleted a sentence in an essay by Ayaan Hirsi Ali, this Somalia-born former Dutch politician.

Jonathan Rauch:

And given these precedents, did your paper expect trouble when you published this page?

Flemming Rose:

No, no. I mean no one could anticipate - I think all the people today say why, how stupid can you be? You must have expected these kinds of reactions. I think it's what we call after rationalization in Danish. In fact, there had been published cartoons of the Prophet before this, but it didn't cause this kind of outrage and reaction. And I think the reason why it became such an explosive event four months later was partly coincidence, you know, there were political situations in some Islamic countries where those in power could use this case in order to promote themselves as, you know, the true defenders of their faith.

Jonathan Rauch:

So often the case with censorship and protest, isn't it? So, yeah, initially there's an interesting wrinkle - the initial reaction was not all that large.

Flemming Rose:

No. You know, the day of the publication I received one phone call from a newspaper [inaudible] to the west of Copenhagen and he complained and said they had had a discussion about it at the mosque that Friday and that he didn't want to sell my newspaper anymore. Well, you know, I receive this call - people, readers calling in and complaining about this and that, so I didn't take especially notice.

Jonathan Rauch:

So in 2006 when people begin going around the world showing purported cartoons which, in fact, were phony, stirring up trouble - we begins to see protests, then we begin to see deaths. How many - do we know how many people died in those series of protests over these cartoons?

Flemming Rose:

I think the estimation is around 200. The vast majority in Nigeria and the, I mean, the important thing about Nigeria is, in fact, that clashes between Christians and Muslim had been going on for about - at least since 2000, when this happened. So this was, you know, it was just one event in a chain of events that had to do with clashes between Christians and Muslims.

Jonathan Rauch:

We'll come back to the violence in your lives - in your life and Kurt Westergaard's life - but let's talk about for a minute about how your reading of the situation developed. This book is - the

title, which is wonderful, actually, made me think: The Tyranny of Silence. The idea here is that a lot of what is going on is not state censorship, it's self-censorship and that that can be just as important. You make an important, as you call it, "the important distinction between self-censorship and good manners." What do you tell people who say, look, what do you expect to happen when you're that obnoxious?

Flemming Rose:

No, yes - my distinction between good manners and self-censorship is basically that, you know, good manners are something we choose out of our free will. I mean, I like when you talk nice to me and I try to talk nice to you, and I behave when I go to a restaurant, I do not try to destroy, you know, public order and things like that. But self-censorship is when you say I would like to say this. I would like to make this painting or this movie and write this book but I'm not doing it because I'm afraid of the consequences. To me that is self-censorship and it has nothing to do with good manners, because it is driven by fear. Not about a wish to be polite.

Jonathan Rauch:

How prevalent is it now in Denmark and Europe, elsewhere?

Flemming Rose:

I think it's getting worse and you know, a lot of people back then thought that we had made up this situation - that we provoked it and nothing would have happened if it hadn't been for - we would not have this kind of situation but I think it's clear to everybody now that we do have cartoon crises every now and then where - and it has to do with, you know, some fundamental factors that have changed our societies and one is, you know, migration. The fact that people are moving across borders in numbers never seen before in the history of mankind, which means that - not only the United States, you have this experience already, but basically any society in the world is getting more multicultural, multiethnic, and multi-religious. We are getting more and more diverse. And on the other hand you have technology, the fact that what is being published in a newspaper in a small country in a language that very few people, in fact, can read, is immediately published everywhere and compared to say, let's say fifty years ago, when you know Pakistani or Afghan - Afghanistan village - people went through their whole life maybe encounter only 50 or 200 people and they would now know what was going on 50 kilometers away. Now they know what is going on 5,000 kilometers away. And even though they cannot read and write, they react politically to what is happening, let's say, in Denmark. And the question, as you know, how do we handle this new diversity? And my point is that with growing diversity in terms of religion, ethnicity, and culture, you will also have to accept more diversity when it comes to ways of expressing ourselves. And the irony, I think, is that a lot of people who support a multicultural society, they do not support the same diversity when

it comes to speech. And I think that's a paradox. And quite often they cannot see it themselves.

Jonathan Rauch:

Though they would argue that we can't live with each other if we constantly offend each other, I suppose.

Flemming Rose:

Yeah.

Jonathan Rauch:

One of the factors you mention that is particularly interesting - you're not politically naive, but you refer to *The Tyranny of Silence* - this is one of a lot of very good quotations about it - "as a society in which grievance fundamentalism is consistently practiced, where nothing meaningful can be uttered since any speech or any sort may potentially be characterized as offensive to some person or group." What is grievance fundamentalism and to what extent is it driving this phenomenon?

Flemming Rose:

I think it's a consequence of the erosion of the very important distinction between speech and action, between words and deeds. A lot - an increasing number of people believe that words can be as criminal as deeds and I think the irony is that this is, in fact, the way the Christian church thought about these issues before the Enlightenment, that when you criticized the church or doctrine, verbally it was being perceived as a physical attack on the church and therefore you could be condemned to death. But I think the issue is, you know, it's also because people want harmony. They don't want conflict. They believe that if we, you know, if we are quiet, if we don't talk about things that bother us then we will keep the peace but I don't believe so. And I think basically, you know, there are two ways to go. You can say if you respect my taboo, I respect yours. If you do not criticize what is sensitive to me, I will not criticize what is sensitive to you. If Holocaust denial is a criminal offense, as it is in many European countries, publication of cartoons like this should also be a criminal offense. And if that's the case, then you would also need not to publish cartoons of other religions, making fun of other religions and Prophets, and if you do that with religion you would also have to do it the same with nonbelievers, a lot of people like Karl Marx, or Milton Friedman, or Adam Smith, so then we're not allowed to make fun of them as well. And I basically believe, you know, this is the road to the title of my book, *The Tyranny of Silence*, where you are not able to say anything

that not will be offensive to somebody. And I make the point that, you know, in a democracy, you have many rights: the right to free speech, to freedom of religion, freedom of assembly, you have a right to vote, freedom of movement, but I think the only right you should not have in a democracy is a right not to be offended. That we have to pay - you know, the price we have to pay for living in these nice, free, open societies is that there are people who from time to time will say something we find offensive. And that is growing - that risk is growing with diversity.

Jonathan Rauch:

Your book has a theoretical backbone which I think makes it unusual. You point out something that - to back up a bit, impelled me to write *Kindly Inquisitors*, or begin writing it, in 1989. This of course was the Ayatollah Khomeini's fatwa against Salman Rushdie. The first time I think in all of human history when a sovereign state issued a global murder warrant against an individual human being anywhere in the world, forever, based on something that that person said and written. That was astonishing. But at the time it was even more astonishing to me, and what set me off writing *Kindly Inquisitors* was that the reaction for many in the west was that well, it's certainly bad to threaten Salman Rushdie with murder, but it's equally bad for him to have written this book. He is the perpetrator, in a way. And offended Muslims are victims. That comes back very strongly in the cartoon crisis. You have a couple sentences about it: "Vivid. Thus perpetrators were transformed into victims, victims into perpetrators. The view that the newspaper and I would be to blame if there were a terrorist attack is something that you refer to. It was by no means an uncommon charge. What is this topsy-turvy world?"

Flemming Rose:

It has to do with what I mentioned earlier - the erosion of the distinction between words and deeds and I mentioned Theo van Gogh who was killed almost exactly ten years ago by a young Muslim who was offended by what he had done or said - said - in this movie and at that time the Minister of Justice of the Netherlands went public saying, you know, if we had had a law outlawing what van Gogh was saying, he would still be alive. This is in one of the leading liberal democracies in Western Europe. You know, making it exactly the other way around. But my favorite example when it comes to, you know, this erosion, that makes it difficult to distinguish a perpetrator and a victim is a Russian story. Some years ago there was an exhibition at the Sokurov Museum in Moscow called *Religion Be Careful* and most of the pieces of art that were exhibited there were dealing with Christianity. It's a private museum, and within, I think, a couple of days, some offended Orthodox Christians showed up and they basically destroyed the exhibition and the room of the exhibition. And the guard called the police, they showed up, and they arrested the perpetrators. And you would think end of story. Unfortunately not so. Two weeks, three weeks later charges were being dropped against the people who committed this crime and charges were being brought against the director of the museum and the curator for inciting religious hatred. And they were, in fact, convicted a year or two later. That case is

now before the European Human Rights Court. But this is exactly the consequence of eroding the distinction between committing violence and saying something, expressing something offensive.

Jonathan Rauch:

A thing that emerges from your book is we should not think of this as just some violent people now and then taking out their anger, that there's a deep and fundamental challenge to the freedom of expression and the philosophy that lies behind it. Words are bullets in this world. So you were - or Jyllands-Posten was investigated as part of all this. Cleared, ultimately. But the government was not exactly keen to take up the lance, is that right?

Flemming Rose:

Well I think, you know, we received the kind of support that we could expect from the government. I mean the Prime Minister was under huge pressure and at the heart of the crisis maybe he gave in a little bit but not that much. I would say broadly that we could have, you know, we could have had a lot less support than from our government at the time and United States - I mean, Denmark is a close ally of the United States and we went troops to Iraq and Afghanistan, but at the beginning of this crisis the Danish government, I think, could have hoped for more support from the United States. It only came when Danish embassies were burning - started to burn down in Syria and Lebanon. And the Danish government was also, you know, pretty isolated within the European Union.

Jonathan Rauch:

On balance were you satisfied with the government's response?

Flemming Rose:

I would say yes. But I was not satisfied with the general response of the European Union...

Jonathan Rauch:

The public response was not as good. And am I right to recall that there is an investigation of you and the newspaper by the government?

Flemming Rose:

Not quite - yes, by the government, but that was, you know, the prosecutor general, the general attorney in Denmark. But he dropped charges. He said in Denmark you can only raise a case if you - the state can only initiate a case if it believes that it can win it, and he didn't believe they could win it, so he dropped it. But we had two civil cases that we won.

Jonathan Rauch:

Today do you think anyone would publish a page like in Denmark?

Flemming Rose:

No, and not only in Denmark.

Jonathan Rauch:

Anywhere in Europe?

Flemming Rose:

No, but maybe in France there is a satirical magazine, Charlie Hebdo. Maybe they would do it. And we don't - we do not publish that page anymore. I mean next year is going to be the tenth anniversary of the publication and, you know, we have a challenge before us. How are we going to handle this without republishing? Because, you know, editors in Denmark, some of them are saying well, we don't have to publish them when we have a story about this issue because we now know what these cartoons look like. And my reply usually is we also know what Obama looks like. But every time we have a story in the paper about Obama we have a photograph of him. So it's a way of hiding or rationalizing your fear of what's a real motive. And I'm not criticizing my editor-in-chief or the CEO for not publishing. I'm just calling on - for honesty. We should say we are not publishing it because we are afraid. And I think, you know, we have also paid, I mean a big price in the sense that we are a heavily guarded building. I mean you cannot - every morning when I go to work I have to go through three or four fences and doors just to get to my office.

Jonathan Rauch:

We'll come back to that but I can't resist asking a slightly unfair question of the group here. Imagine that we had a big easel back here and a bunch of pens and imagined that I offered people in this room the opportunity to come up here now and draw a depiction of the Prophet.

How many of you would even consider doing that? Quite a few hands. How many of you would think that you would not consider doing that? About - well, more are saying they would than wouldn't. I actually thought about requesting this actually be put up and then see if people would do it but that seemed like too much of a stunt. More people are saying they are willing than not. I wonder if that's really right. I would be frightened to do that. These proceedings are going online. They will be there forever. I might do it but I'd sure worry about it and I'd sure think hard about it. And this page is no longer available via the newspaper?

Flemming Rose:

It is.

Jonathan Rauch:

Is it online? Can I...

Flemming Rose:

If you subscribe to the newspaper you can access it.

Jonathan Rauch:

It hasn't been suppressed?

Flemming Rose:

No.

Jonathan Rauch:

Your life changed. Tell us about that.

Flemming Rose:

Well, if we take the security side I had to live with bodyguards for awhile, but I made a very wise decision very early on after consulting with Danish police, I came back to Denmark from Russia in 2004, so I had only been living there for one year, so it was very easy to remove my

name from official registers and my address, so I'm living, you know, secret address. Everything, all subscriptions, are in my wife's name. And, you know, I have learned some small tricks from the police how to behave myself, not to catch attention, not to, you know, leave traces. Just to be careful.

Jonathan Rauch:

Are you still under guard?

Flemming Rose:

Not the way I used to be, but I have a permanent dialogue with the Danish police. And that will not - I don't believe that will change. But it's not, you know, it's not bothering me that - I think it was very unpleasant to have bodyguards, really. You had to coordinate all in your life.

Jonathan Rauch:

Imagine being Salman Rushdie.

Flemming Rose:

Yeah, yeah.

Jonathan Rauch:

Completely underground.

Flemming Rose:

Yes. And Kurt Westergaard, I mean, he is now...

Jonathan Rauch:

We should talk about him. Yeah, this is a remarkable man. He is significantly older.

Flemming Rose:

Yes. He is 79 years old now.

Jonathan Rauch:

The cartoon of - the famous cartoon is the one of the Prophet with the turban with the bomb in it, and that was drawn by Kurt Westergaard, a very prominent artist in Denmark, and he was the target of assassination attempts, yeah?

Flemming Rose:

Several, I would say. I mean, he was almost killed on New Year's Eve 2010. An offended Muslim went all the way from Copenhagen to Aarhus - that's a three-hour train drive - with an axe in his bag, and he went to his private home and he smashed the window and went into his house. He was there with his granddaughter and he fled to the safe room, the toilet. And that's why he is alive. So he could push a button and the police showed up within two minutes and the man with the axe was shot in his foot and he is now serving a prison time. But, you know, several other attacks have, in fact, been foiled at an earlier stage. And Westergaard is living with security in his backyard 24/7. I mean the police literally they do have - they have built a house in his backyard and they are there around the clock. 79 years old.

Jonathan Rauch:

So in that sense he'll never be a completely free man again.

Flemming Rose:

Never, no.

Jonathan Rauch:

What's he like? How does he feel about all this?

Flemming Rose:

He feels okay. I mean, he is retired and he really, I mean he is 79 years - suffered some health problems but you know he doesn't regret and he is still making drawings, not for the paper

anymore, but he is working with a private gallery in Denmark and he still travels every now and then and he is in a good mood.

Jonathan Rauch:

That's very good to hear. You are against treaties like the wonderfully named United Nations Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, surely something the United Nations can do with a piece of paper. You argue that the United States, which is on a different model from Europe and, indeed, most of the world, where hate speech laws are unconstitutional here. And that makes us I think unique, maybe Hungary, is similar.

Flemming Rose:

No. Not anymore.

Jonathan Rauch:

No longer?

Flemming Rose:

No.

Jonathan Rauch:

So we're now really the only major western country.

Flemming Rose:

And you are getting more and more unique.

Jonathan Rauch:

...that will protect the speaker against the offended. And you argue against European consensus that the United States is right and that they are wrong. Tell us why and tell us how that's gone over in Europe?

Flemming Rose:

To me this is a very important part of book because it's something that I didn't know, in fact, that I found out reading about it. And it goes back to the aftermath of the Second World War. You had the Nuremberg trial, you had Julius Streicher, the editor of Der Sturmer, an antisemitic magazine. He was among those convicted to death in 1946 and he was executed. And then when the members of U.N. started to negotiate and work out this convention on human and political rights, there was a struggle between what you can call, you know, free and un-free countries. And Article 20.2 in the convention on human - on political and civil rights - is the one justifying passing hate speech laws. In fact, obligating countries who sign this convention. What I didn't know was, in fact, that this paragraph was instituted into the convention on behalf of the Soviet Union and un-free countries, while Eleanor Roosevelt, who was chairing this committee at the U.N. and other western countries were against it, basically saying, you know, this is a rubber stamp for silencing dissident voices within dictatorships. And that is exactly what happened. And I think it is all - and an interesting thing when Stalin's ambassadors to the U.N. tried to get, you know, harsher language into this paragraph, Stalin, at the same time, was about to ethnically cleanse Jews and the Soviet press was full of antisemitic slurs in 1948 and 1949. And, but it basically boils down to a wrong reading of the reasons behind the Holocaust. Because a lot of people, when I discuss these issues, would say, defending hate speech law, that we know what happened in Germany and Europe in the 20s and 30s. That basically ever words will sooner or later lead to evil deeds. And if it hadn't been for too much free speech in the Weimar Republic, Hitler would never have come to power. But it turns out, in fact, that in Weimar, Germany, you had hate speech laws on the books. You had three different hate speech laws, and if you take Joseph Goebbels, Hitler's propaganda minister, he was fined many times when the Vice Police Director of Berlin, Bernhard Weiss, who was Jewish, he took him to court and he won all the cases. And Julius Streicher was in jail twice in the 20s in Germany for having published antisemitic images and his magazine was confiscated and taken to court, I think, 36 times. So there is no, you know, immediate correlation between hate speech laws and fighting racist violence.

Jonathan Rauch:

Yeah, the history here is fascinating. You point out that, in fact, the hate speech laws helped the Nazis by giving them a public platform, a place to argue, and the experience with these laws is very often that they suppress speech on the part of those who are fairly reasonable and open to the kind of persuasion that public give and take allows while they magnify the influence of people like Fred Phelps who want to go to the Supreme Court...

Flemming Rose:

Yes.

Jonathan Rauch:

...and you found that in Europe. So you think that these kinds of conventions are wrong in principle, not just in practice? The hard case, of course, is it okay for German to ban Holocaust denial, for example?

Flemming Rose:

You know I'm not German, so I will not judge the Germans. I know they have a very horrific history and I know there are historical reasons for this, but I would say that the only reason for having Holocaust denial books - laws on the books - would be if it equals incitement to violence. That is there is a risk, that, you know, doing this would risk a repetition of what happened during Second World War. But what I found out when I wrote my book was - because I would have imagined that these laws had been passed in the 50s and in the 60s, but I found out the vast majority of them were passed after the fall of the Berlin wall, which I find very strange. But there is a reason for this. And it has to do with this grievance culture, although I know this is a very specific case and there were people who wanted to protect the victims of the Holocaust, which I found, you know, admirable. But it's a very good example of how, you know, the way - the road to Hell is paved with good intentions. And now we see that these Holocaust denial laws have in fact prompted other groups to come forward and insist on protection of their sensibilities. And the final example - it's not in my book, but this spring the Russian parliament passed a law referring to the Nuremberg trial as the Holocaust denial laws do, referring to Nuremberg trial and criminalizing criticism of the behavior of the Soviet Union during the Second World War, which means that my good friend, Antony Beevor, and British historian who wrote a book about the Soviet army going into Berlin in 1945 and they were raping women and riot - committing, you know, rioting crimes, which is a criticism of the behavior of the Soviet Union. And he would not go to Russia anymore. And it's this principle that you want to protect your own version of history. It's very basic for Russia because the victory of the Soviet Union in the Second World War is Russia's ticket to a seat the U.N. Security Council. So when people challenges their version of what happened during the Second World War, they feel it's an attempt to legitimize - delegitimize - their stages as a great power. And it's also playing into this identity politics, which is becoming more and more important because when a society is getting more and more diverse, you start asking yourself this question - How am I? And this...

Jonathan Rauch:

Yeah, I noticed that, I think last year, some bureaucrat in the European Union somewhere proposed that the states need to begin adopting sanctions against sexist speech. So the inkblot tends to spread. It's a reported book, which I'd like to emphasize this is not just about the cartoon crisis, but Flemming goes around Europe, he does some remarkable things. He goes to

Russia and talks to dissidents about their role and why it's important and likens what goes on in Islamist regimes to communism, in some ways. That's a good thing to discuss in the questions, which we should move to, but there's also a wonderful passage where you actually go to a prison and interview an Islamist who probably was getting ready to make an attempt on Kurt Westergaard's life. And that's an amazing episode. Before we go to questions can you just tell us what that was like?

Flemming Rose:

Yeah, well the Danish police tried to persuade me not to go to prison...

Jonathan Rauch:

I bet.

Flemming Rose:

...and see him. And it was like a secret security operation just to get there. But I interviewed him for about two hours and we had a friendly conversation. This was a young man from Tunisia who had married a Danish girl and came to Denmark. He was, in fact, secular, when he came to Denmark. And he spoke very good Danish and in that way he was integrated, but then at one point he ran into a fight and he beat a visitor to a discotech quite severely and he had to spend, I think, six months in prison. And after he came out of the prison he couldn't find a job. He tried, and tried, and tried. And this young man was frustrated and looking for an identity - a place in life. And then he started to frequent a radical mosque. And the man there offered him this very strong identity. And then, step by step, he started to radicalize, ending finally by, you know, trying to become a hero if he could have killed Kurt Westergaard.

Jonathan Rauch:

But what's interesting is your encounter - he's not a fierce ideologue, he's a lost soul. He's kind of a young pup. Doesn't know his way in the world and there's almost a kind of bizarre innocence to what's going on here.

Flemming Rose:

Yeah, exactly.

