

The following program is an original production of Link TV. For more information or to share your thoughts, go to Link TV – dot – org.

SHOW OPEN	(MUSIC; RS VOICE OVER) It's nearly unimaginable to see any prospect for hope in the crisis of September 11 th . But that day unleashed a passionate reexamination of Islam. How are the world's 1.4 billion Muslims reclaiming their voice from the radicals who say they speak for all? In the next hour we'll explore what mainstream Muslims think about a multitude of topics including democracy, women's rights and the radicals among them...coming up in this special program: Who Speaks for Islam? What a Billion Muslims Really Think.
09:35:06- 09:35:40 :35 sec	(MUSIC FADES) RS: Welcome. Thanks for joining us. I'm Ray Suarez. Perhaps the only thing the Muslim world and the Western world can agree on is that misunderstandings are common. While militants make up only a tiny fraction of the global Muslim community, do they command too much space and air time in the mainstream press. Who does speak for the more than one billion Muslims around the world? In this hour, we'll answer that question with hard polling data. We'll try to clear up misconceptions and shine a bright light on topics that too often get too little play. Let's start with a short piece about Islam, because misconceptions of the religion itself are also common.
VT-SOT 1:55	(RS Voice Over) While Islam originated in the Middle East in the 7 th century, today it has spread across the world. 57 countries have Muslim majorities and most of them are in Africa or Asia. The most populous Muslim country? Indonesia. And there are about 2 million Muslims in the United States. Islam is the world's second largest religion after Christianity. In short, Muslims believe Muhammad is God's final prophet in a long line of prophets, including Abraham, Moses and Jesus. Islam rests on five pillars of faith. The first is the shahada, the declaration of faith. To become a Muslim, a person makes this declaration: "There is no God but God and Muhammad is the messenger of God." The second pillar is prayer. Muslims pray five times each day as an obligation and also because they say prayer helps them feel closer to God. The third pillar is fasting—the month-long period of Ramadan when all Muslims must fast from dawn to dusk. It is a time for spiritual reflection, repentance and prayer. The fourth pillar is zakat—or almsgiving. Muslims must give 2.5% of all non-essential assets to the poor, sick or suffering. The final pillar is the hajj, the pilgrimage to the city of Mecca, where Muhammad was born. All Muslims who are able, must make the Hajj at least once in their lifetimes. Each year, more than two million Muslims from across the world experience this spiritual journey.

09:42:12-09:43:14 1 min	RS: Joining us for the next hour are Dalia Mogahed, Executive Director of Gallup's Center for Muslim Studies and co-author of the book <i>Who Speaks for Islam: What a Billion Muslims Really Think</i> . The book synthesizes six years of thousands of hour-long, face-to-face interviews with people in 35 Muslim majority countries around the world. It's the most comprehensive survey of its kind and the results are the foundation for our show today. Dalia, welcome.
	DM: Thank you.
	RS: Also here is Reza Aslan, professor at the University of California, Riverside, and author of the recent <i>How to Win a Cosmic War</i> . Reza Aslan, welcome.
	RA: Great to be here.
End 09:43:14	RS: Now, in our admittedly very brief overview of the main ideas in Islam, violence, war, struggle, conversion, isn't listed as one of the Five Pillars, but if you watch sort of the public display of Islam around the world, you would almost think that <i>jihad</i> is a sixth pillar. Could you blame people for thinking that?
9:43:15-9:9:44:05	RA: No, I don't think so, and I think, frankly, there are some Muslims who would agree that <i>jihad</i> is a sixth pillar. But I mean I think it's important to understand, as Dalia and this book so brilliantly portrays, that it's often the case that the loudest voice is going to be the voice that is heard, that's going to be drowning out the voices of moderation. You know, people always ask me all the time, "Why don't we see, you know, the voices of moderate Islam in the media?" Well, there's a very simple reason for that, 'cause it's boring. It's not news. News is violence and sex and threat. And so it's only natural that that's what we hear about when we turn on our television, but I think we need to be careful not to make the fundamental mistake of confusing the loudest voice for the majority voice.
	RS: But there is violence though.
	RA: Of course, there's violence.
Start 9:44:06 - 9:44:28	DM: Well, Ray, I'd like to just interject with a study that was done on media content analysis in TV news media in the United States, and it found that the majority of protagonists portraying Islam were militants. More than 50 percent of representatives of the faith were militants, in contrast to other faiths, like Christianity and Judaism, where those representing those faiths were religious leaders.
	RS: So in the case of Islam, we're giving the privilege of describing the religion to people who hold . . .
	DM: [overlapping] Exactly.
	RS: . . . a very minority view?
End 9:45:00 1 min	DM: Absolutely. And not only a minority view, but a sliver of the actual makeup of the Muslim community are people who take up arms. And so you've got a fraction of 1 percent being blown up as the majority in the representation of Muslims in TV news media. And that leads to very skewed perceptions.
9:45:02	RS: Well, Dalia, you polled Muslims around the world, specifically on these questions.
	DM: Sure.
	RS: On whether attacks on civilians are ever justified. Let's show our viewers what you found.

VT-SOT TRT 00:22	(RS: Voice Over) Strong majorities in some of the world’s largest Muslim countries say attacks on civilians are never justified, including Pakistan at 86 percent and Indonesia at 74 percent.
09:45:46- 09:45:56	RS: What do you think is behind those numbers?
09:49:27- 09:50:00	DM: In majority Muslim countries you, you find a very interesting pattern when it comes to support for violence, and so when we unpack the numbers, those that support violence, what makes them different than the mainstream? And what we see is that they’re actually not more religious. So religious fervor is not what’s driving that support. We’ve actually done even further research, where we’ve asked them to explain their position on attacks on civilians. And those who support attacks on American civilians specifically talk in terms of political ideology. They say that the United States kills civilians, so this is their rightful punishment. They talk about the U.S. being an imperialist power, trying to control the world. Not a single one of them, not even one, cited a verse from the Qur’an to support their support or to justify their support of attacks on civilians. In contrast, those who said that attacks on civilians were wrong, they justify that position in many cases using religious justifications, by explaining that Islam prohibits murder, by actually quoting from the Qur’an verses that prohibit killing innocent people.
	RS: It’s just that question that I think bedevils Americans as they try to think this through. We’ve invited viewers from Seismic-dot-1com, a video blogging website, to submit questions for our show. Here’s one from Anthony in Miami, Oklahoma.
00:31	BLOGGER: Since 9/11 we’ve been hearing a lot from our world leaders about how Islam is not extreme. It’s a moderate, temperate religion and that Muslims are a peace loving people. And I'd like your guests to contrast that with the fact that Mohammed’s own writings encourage the destruction of infidels—read that as anyone who is not a Muslim—and that Islam in its early days did spread primarily through war and force.
	RS: Reza?
09:51:56- 09:53:17	RA: Well, almost everything that he said is incorrect. First of all, Mohammed never wrote anything. But I think what he means, of course, is by the Qur’an. And the Qur’an actually has absolutely no verses whatsoever that talk about compulsion towards religion. And it’s also factually incorrect that Islam spread by the sword. Quite the contrary. For the first 150 years of Islam’s expansion not only was conversion not forced; it was actually discouraged because it meant less tax revenues into the state. But the larger issue here that I want to emphasize is this idea that Islam is a religion of peace. Islam is not a religion of peace, nor is it a religion of war. It’s just a religion. And like any religion, it’s capable of the greatest heights of compassion and the greatest depths of depravity. We must understand that it is people who are peaceful or violent, not religion. And so in that regard, back to the discussion that we were having earlier, if the images that we see over and over again of our – is of people who are acting, you know, in extreme or radical ways, then it’s only natural that we associate that action and behavior with, you know, the worldwide community of 1½ billion Muslims. But the issue

	here goes back to this larger question of who gets to speak, you know, for a religion. I think that most Americans would like to hear a united voice of condemnation coming out of the Muslim world. They want to hear some, some representative of the world's Muslims come out and unequivocally say the kinds of things that, that they, that they would like to hear. But there is no such person in Islam. You know, the simple answer to this question of who speaks for Islam is nobody speaks for Islam.
	DM: I . . .
	RS: Go ahead, Dalia.
09:55:53	DM: I think that Reza's right. There is no central authority to, in, in Islam. There's no equivalent to the Pope, for example. But that's not the same as saying there's no authority, because there are religious authorities, and they're multiple, and they disagree on many things. But one thing that they have actually been very united about and have been very vocal in terms of issuing official statements is on this issue of condemning attacks on civilians. I can count several official statements signed by the most prominent clerics in the Sunni and in the Shia tradition, unequivocally condemning and saying that terrorism is a complete violation of Islam. This is not a battle within Islam in that sense, because there's actually unanimous agreement within the tradition that this is wrong. And so what the terrorists have done is taken widely held grievances around America's role in the Middle East, around dictatorships in the region, and have said, "We have the solution: vigilante violence toward this utopia that we're promising." The, the debate is how does change happen in the region; how do we get to a better society with better governance and less corruption without the use of violence? The debate right now, the real battle is on the road to reform, not for the soul of Islam.
9:57:55	RA: There is no discussion between the jihadists and, and the clerical institutions because the jihadists don't accept the clerical institutions at all.
09:58:48- 09:58:58	RS: Now many of our viewers might be wondering how Gallup collected the data we're using in this program, and we have a question about this from our online community. Here's Patrick in Louisville, Kentucky.
VT-SOT TRT:53	BLOGGER: My question would be about the freedom citizens feel in fundamentalist Muslim countries to respond honestly. I wonder if perhaps respondents who may have a politically incorrect poll answer or response to a polling question may not give their answer out of a few of some sort of retribution. Also, women. Are women included when sampling citizens, or is it just men? And when women are included, is it more likely that they would feel even more pressure to give the politically correct answer when questions arise about the secularization of their society or women's rights or human rights or anything, for that matter, which goes against the status quo?
	RS: Terrific. Let's talk about methodology.
09:59:57- 10:01:38	DM: Very good questions all around. First, we do all of our interviews in-home and face to face. So they're not over the phone. They're not done in a way where people believe that someone is listening in on, on, on the phone. We also match local people with, with respondents. We, we don't have, say, Americans going in

	and, and polling. In many cases we also match gender. Women interview women, and men interview men. And, yes, half of our sample, of course, women, because we are nationwide representative in, in, in our science. We go into rural as well as urban settings, and all of our interviews are conversations. Now, how do we make sure people aren't giving us simply the politically correct answer? There are several ways that you do that. One way is to ask open-ended questions, so you're not giving people predetermined choices. With open-ended questions you can ask general questions that give people the space to be honest without being afraid.
10:03:14	RS: When you ask Muslims around the world about what they saw in the West, did they find anything to admire about life there?
10:03:20-10:03:54	DM: Absolutely. We found that Muslims in large majorities, to an open-ended question, said that what they admired most about the West was Western technology and expertise, as well as Western liberties, democracy, and human rights. And those were the two top responses we got from Muslims. Interestingly, we asked Americans the same question: What do you admire most about the West? And got the exact same two top responses. Liberty and democracy, and technology.
10:04:03-10:04:14	RS: As Dalia mentioned, she and her team polled across the Muslim world to gauge support for democracy, and the degree of support people expressed might surprise you.
VT-SOT Pckg #5 TRT :22 sec	(RS: Voice Over) Support is strong for democracy across the Muslim world. Egypt had the highest level of support at 88 percent. Indonesia, again, the most populace Muslim country, 75 percent. And even in conservative Saudi Arabia, 58 percent of those surveyed support democracy.
10:04:45	RS: Reza, with so much stated support for democracy, why isn't there more of it across the Muslim world?
10:04:50-10:06:34	RA: Well, there's actually quite a lot of democracy in the Muslim world. The largest Muslim country in the world, Indonesia, is a democracy. The second largest Muslim country in the world, Pakistan, is a democracy. Turkey is a democracy. Malaysia is a democracy. Bangladesh is a democracy. Senegal is a democracy. So it's, it's just simply not true that, you know, democracy has not rooted itself in the Muslim world. I think, though, that when people think about this issue of democracy and Islam, it, very specifically we are referring to a region, the Middle East, in, in more particular the Arab world. When we talk about democracy, we're not talking about something that actually exists in space. Democracy is just merely a set of elements and a set of principles, like popular sovereignty and, and religious and ethnic pluralism, and government accountability and constitutionalism and rule of law, and these are things that, as our previous president, George Bush, never got tired of saying, are not American ideas. They're not American principles. That they're, they're universal aspirations, and they're aspirations that, regardless of one's culture or ethnicity or religion, people

	do strive for. And so it's not unusual to see such high support for these kinds of ideas and principles, especially in countries like Saudi Arabia, like Egypt, like Iran, where they're lacking.
10:06:34-10:07:03	RS: Well, Dalia, you mentioned that the questions you asked were open-ended. Does somebody on the street in Ankara have the same thing in mind when they're asked the question as somebody on the street in Kuala Lumpur, when they're asked the same question?
10:07:36-10:08:38	DM: We've asked people if they could write a constitution for a new country, what would they include, and found that majorities would include freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, and freedom of religion. We've also looked at women's rights and their support for that. And so the word, "democracy," does mean different things to different people. But we can understand what at least – do, do people have a basic understanding of what it means? I would argue that if we polled Americans and asked them to describe what democracy means, we would get very different answers. Ask a French person what a democracy is, you'll get a radically different response from someone in the Bible Belt here in the United States. So there isn't entirely a – there isn't uniform agreement on what that concept means in the West, even in the United States. But the basic building blocks are things that we've found are supported within the Muslim community.
10:08:39	RS: Let's go now to a question from our online community. Tom in Seattle has a question about Shariah law.
VT-SOT Pkg #6	BLOGGER: I know that two of the countries that have the largest Muslim populations, Indonesia and India, neither one practice Shariah law. But you hear a lot about it in the press. Our mainstream and majority Muslims interested in Shariah law? Or is it something that falls into the fundamentalist camp and really a minority of that religion? I'm interested because I see conflicts between Shariah law and the laws of, say, the United States, France, England, or Turkey.
	RS: Well, Dalia, let's start with a quick overview. What do we mean when we say Shariah law?
10:09:39-10:10:48	DM: That's a very good question. That's the beginning point. What we mean are Islamic religious principles. Shariah is often translated into the term Islamic law, which is actually incorrect. Shariah is not law. It is a set of principles from which law is derived, and the word for Islamic law in Arabic is <i>fiqh</i> and not <i>shariah</i> . So when we ask people about Shariah being a source of legislation, it means a set of principles that informs law. Now, to the question of how much support is there? With very few exceptions, majorities in every country we polled in say that they believe Shariah should be at least a source of legislation. In some cases a majority want it to be the only source of legislation. The notable exception is Turkey, where the majority say that it should not be a source of legislation at all. But what is interesting to note is that what people mean, what people are primarily thinking about when they are talking about Shariah is rule of law. That's really the bottom line. A law that is going to make society more just and that cannot be co-opted or thrown out at the whim of a despotic leader.
10:12:18-10:12:29	RS: So, Reza, does that explain why in different places in the world where they call what they have Shariah, they actually have different laws on the books?

<p>10:12:30- 10:14:14 1.45 sec</p>	<p>RA: That's right. I think Dalia said it best. Shariah is a divine, perfected code of moral law. It doesn't exist in the real world. What it does exist, as Dalia said, is <i>fiqh</i>. There's a very simple reason why the largest support for Shariah comes from a country like Egypt and the smallest support comes from a country like Turkey. Because Turkey already has a rule of law. It already has a constitution. It already has a mechanism through which issues of social justice and human rights can be addressed. Egypt does not. Egypt's law is in the hands of a single individual whose whim decides, you know, what happens and what doesn't happen. It's an issue of identity as well. It's a - it's a way, I think, for the Muslim world to say that there is a difference in the way that I see myself and my place in the world, and that difference has to do with my conception of morality, which is based on an Islamic framework. What I want is the rule of law that takes into consideration my moral codes, my moral values, which, in fact, is what all people want.</p>
<p>10:14:14- 10:14:39</p>	<p>RS: Dalia, when Islamic law, whether it's called Shariah or not, is talked about in the United States, it takes the form of reaction to what's coming from abroad involving stonings, canings, chopping off of hands. What about this is consistent with Shariah and what is a totally separate thing from that?</p>
<p>10:14:40 – lower 10:15:28 : 10:16:45- 10:17:14</p>	<p>DM: I think it's a great question. It's a very complicated question. So one thing we did ask is do people associate severe criminal punishments with Shariah compliance, and find that in many parts of the Muslim world the majority actually said, yes, they do associate these things with Shariah compliance. But what was interesting is it was dramatically lower in terms of percentage than those who simply associated it with a more just society or protection of human rights. When Muslims are talking about Shariah, though, what is primary on their mind is rule of law and not these severe punishments.</p>
<p>10:21:20- 10:21:33</p>	<p>RS: It's clear that majority populations in the Islamic world support democracy, but do they support greater rights for women? Let's listen to a question from our online community.</p>
<p>VT-SOT Pkg #7 :36 sec</p>	<p>BLOGGER: With all due respect to the Muslim women, and I'm sorry if this breaks it down to like a primer, but I don't see how – the women put up with the separation, and it seems to me that they're like second class citizens, and even that seems generous. I just don't see how women put up with it.</p>
	<p>RS: Well, Dalia, are women in the Islamic world second class citizens? And where does that question come from? I mean why does this man from Seismic.com even have that uh, that perception?</p>
<p>10:22:24- 10:24:43</p>	<p>DM: Well, I think it's very clear why. If – there are studies, again, on media content analysis, that depict Muslim women as the most silent, the most victimized, and the most oppressed group in the world, literally in the world. And so it's very natural that he would have that impression. Now, if we look at the facts around Muslim women and where they stand, and we look at a global context, Saudi Arabia's laws prohibiting women from driving are absolutely an exception. That's not the case for the other 56 majority Muslim countries. So to take that as, you know, an example is, is not fair. If we look at other things like percentage of</p>

	the professional class, say, in the Arab world, you have 30, 35 percent of professionals are women. This is on par with countries like South Korea or other developed countries. In fact, the majority of college students in Iran, in the UAE, in Kuwait, and other parts of the world that are majority Muslim, are women. Where there is dramatic gender inequality, inequality is actually in the lower socioeconomic level of society, where, when you get into the poor areas, the rural areas, where men's literacy and education is low, women's is even lower.
	RS: Now, many of you at home might use voting rights as a benchmark for democracy. Do women want the right to vote? Let's look at what the polling numbers tell us.
VT-SOT Pkg #8 TRT: :36 sec	(RS: Voice Over) Gallup found that Muslim women overwhelmingly agree that they should be allowed to vote freely. In these countries, from Lebanon to Iran, support is above 90 percent. Even in Saudi Arabia and Pakistan, considered two of the most conservative Muslim countries, more than two-thirds of respondents support a woman's right to vote without influence.
10:25:25- 10:25:38	RS: Well, is there a thriving women's rights movement in the Islamic world, Reza, and is what they're yearning for, is what women yearning for in those countries similar to their sisters in other places in the world?
10:25:39- 10:27:20	RA: Absolutely, and, and what's interesting is that those countries that are generally seen to be most conservative, say, Pakistan or Iran, are ironically the countries that have, I think, the most vibrant women's rights movements, and this is particularly true of, of a place like Iran, where women's literacy is almost at 90 percent, levels that match female literacy in the United States.
	DM: And it actually jumped after the, after the revolution.
10:25:39- 10:26:55	RA: Yes. Absolutely, it did. I, I think that this issue of gender relations is an important one because it really does indicate the differences in culture between, say, the United States and parts of the Arab world. Legally speaking, there is no difference between a man and a woman when it comes to issues of Shariah. But culturally speaking, there is a difference. We should not, we should not pretend that there, that there isn't a difference in the way that gender roles play themselves out in rural Pakistan than they do in San Francisco.
10:27:23- 10:27:56	RS: You know, Dalia, a lot of the speculation and conversation about women in Islam ends up focused on symbolic things.
	DM: Yes.
	RS: Focused on outward, visible things, like head scarves, where Turkey had a ruckus over it, France has an ongoing debate over it, Britain, and to some extent the United States. Now, your hair is covered.
	DM: Yes.
	RS: What do women have to say, and does it vary from country to country, whether it's required or optional, how people reflect on laws around modesty?
10:27:59- 10:29:34	DM: Well, I think it's a very easy question – question to answer for me because we've actually done the research. We've asked women do they wear a head scarf in public, and then we've asked whether they said yes or no, why or why not. OK? And those who say that they wear a head scarf in public say the primary reason they wear it is because they believe simply it's a religious tenet. They believe that

	<p>it's a part of their faith to do so. Those that don't wear it, their primary reason for not wearing it is because they don't believe it's a religious tenet. And so it's, it's basically around an interpretation of what is required in Islam. Now, the – the understanding in mainstream Islam is that one of the things a woman has to cover because it is a, considered an ornament of beauty, is her hair. Whereas a man's covering requirements are basically his body and, and not his hair. And so a man will look like everyone else, and it appears that he doesn't have a code, whereas he, in fact he does. It just is less different than the majority around him.</p>
	<p>RS: Let me, let me stop you there. There is not something of a two-way street in that the conception of men's hunger for women is not different from the perception of the way women look at men. Reza has very nice hair, but he didn't cover it today . . .</p>
	<p>DM: [Overlaps] He does have great hair . . .</p>
	<p>RS: . . . before he came in. But there's an idea about men, that when they look on women, there's certain reactions, and there don't seem to be accompanying ideas about what women see when they look at men.</p>
	<p>DM: For women hair is more of an ornament of beauty than it is for men. And so the, the rule for both is to cover and to privatize their ornaments of beauty, so that they are choosing who they wish to share them with, rather than the public choosing whether or not to look at them. It, it's not about hunger or preventing men from their desires going crazy, because the Qur'an is pretty, pretty clear. It starts off by saying, "Tell to the believing men to lower their gaze and guard their chastity. That is better for them." The first commandment is actually to men to not gawk at women, even if she's naked. She has the right not to be touched or even looked at. And then it turns to women and said, "Tell to the believing women to lower their gaze and guard their chastity." The commandment is quite equal. It's just simply the manifestation of it is different simply because women and men are biologically different in the way they look.</p>
10:32:06-10:34:42	<p>RA: It is, it is important, though, I think you bring up a very good point. When I was in Iran, in which all women are forced to cover their hair when they are outdoors, I made mention to a young woman friend of mine about the fact that she's forced to wear a head covering everywhere she goes. And I said, "Well, how do you feel about that?" And she said, "How do <i>you</i> feel about the fact that it takes a naked woman to sell a wrench in the United States?" It never occurred to me that that's true. I mean we, we think of the female body here as almost an issue of advertising. And we see that as a flourishing of feminism, the fact that women can dress how they want and use their sexuality, you know, as, in very potent ways. Well, in many Arab and Muslim societies the cultural standard of what feminism means is the exact opposite. It's the protection of one's sexuality, not the presentation of it.</p>
	<p>RS: Dalia, what do men say about women's rights in the Muslim world?</p>
Out 10:35:27	<p>DM: Well, in general they're very supportive of women's rights. Majorities of men do believe that women should have the right to vote without influence, work at any career that she's qualified for, and, in many cases, even lead. But in many cases women are more likely, in some cases significantly more likely, to support women's rights than are men. In other countries, the two are very, very similar.</p>
	<p>RS: But do men perceive this as something that, of necessity, automatically</p>

	reduces their power inside a society?
	DM: In many cases I'm sure that that's the case. When we look at where there is the biggest difference between men and women, it just happens to be countries with very, very high male unemployment. So Egypt is one example. The unemployment rate is astronomical in Egypt, and men, who are still considered primarily responsible for the maintenance of the family, feel that the job should be ones that they should get preference for because of so few jobs.
	RA: And with regard to the issue of, of political leadership, I just, you know, would like to remind everybody that there have been far more heads of state in Muslim majority countries than there have been, say, here in the United States. As a matter of fact, until quite recently there were more female representatives in the Iranian Parliament and currently right now there are more female representatives in the Afghani Parliament than in both houses of Congress combined.
10:37:28-10:37:45	RS: Well, certainly Turkey, Bangladesh, Indonesia, Pakistan, they've all had women heads of government. Changing gears to another civil rights issue, freedom of speech. Gallup asked Muslims around the world if they support freedom of speech, and they went on to define it pretty much the way Americans do, as allowing all citizens to express their opinions on political, social, and economic issues of the day.
SOT :13 SEC	(RS: Voice Over) Gallup found that substantial majorities in all nations surveyed support freedom of speech. Even in conservative Pakistan, 82 percent support freedom of speech.
	RS: Dalia, give us some context for those numbers. What do they tell us?
10:38:17-10:39:17	DM: Well, I think they tell us that in principle there is common ground between the American public and Muslim publics around the world, around this idea of freedom of speech. Now, of course, the subtext and the backdrop is we probably have different lines that we are not willing to cross when it comes to what freedom of speech means. So, for example, 97, 98 percent of Americans say that they would guarantee freedom of speech or they support freedom of speech. That's not surprising. It's something that's enshrined in our constitution. At the same time, a majority want to implement a constitutional amendment prohibiting flag burning. And so as Americans we can say we want freedom of speech, but this is the line that it should not cross. In the same way, Muslims in principle are saying they want freedom of speech and they support it. But they also draw a line around where it will be limited.
10:40:18-10:40:28	RS: Reza, is this one of those places where there's a gap between governments and the mass of respondents to Dalia's poll?
10:40:29-10:41:19	RA: No question about it. Particularly when we were talking regionally, the Middle East, which is a, a part of the, the world that is dominated by despots and tyrants and dictatorships, in which there is no such thing as freedom of speech. It's only natural that we see these massive majorities of population saying that, of course, I think we should live in a society that allows me to express what I think about the government itself, my opinions about how our society is being run. I will say that, again, just piggy-backing on, on what Dalia just said, that this is true not just of freedom of speech. It's true of all freedoms. There is no such thing as

	unconditional freedoms
10:45:44-	RS: The numbers in support of free speech... line up in high relief, in great contrast, to what the world watched with the publication, first in Denmark, and then around Europe, of cartoons lampooning the Prophet Mohammed.
	DM: Absolutely.
End 10:46:17	RS: Work that through for us. How, how does that stated desire for freedom of speech butt heads with that, that idea that this, this was just beyond the pale.
10:46:19- 10:48:39	DM: Mm hmm. Well, I think the cartoon controversy needs to be looked at in a much wider frame than simply a debate about whether or not Muslims understand free speech. It is much closer to something that we actually have in our country, a much more familiar issue, which is really around race relations. And this was really a case of a reaction to a perceived attack on an identity by a powerful against the powerless group. And if we take the analogy of race riots in the Sixties in our country, they are triggered by something that from the outside looks very small, but there is a difference between the trigger and the fuel. Something small triggers them, but they, it's igniting a much more combustible and widespread set of issues that are beneath the surface. So, for example, the Watts riots. They were triggered by a white police officer pulling over black young men who they thought were drinking while driving. And there was an exchange of words, which then erupted into one of the biggest riots of our history, where 35 people were killed, and around 150 million dollars of damage was done. Is it because African Americans in that neighborhood didn't understand the subtleties of traffic laws? The answer is, of course, no. It's because it was a small trigger to a much wider set of issues. And the same is the case with the cartoon controversy.
	RS: Let me jump in there, because it would be hard to imagine black men on the south side of Los Angeles rioting because they had seen videotape of a man being beaten up in Pakistan. But in capitals around the Muslim world people were motivated to take to the streets, burn effigies, surround the Danish embassies in these various countries because of the existence of cartoons, in many cases they hadn't seen, or that, cartoons or photographs that weren't even published in the Danish newspaper. There was, I think, a difference of both degree and kind in, in these eruptions around the <i>Jyllands-Posten</i> publication.
	DM: Well, I, I take your point, and I think you're, you're right, but the point I'm trying to make isn't that they're exactly analogous, but that the cartoon was triggering many issues that actually varied from one Muslim capital to another. But what is similar between the two is that there is a difference between the trigger and the fuel. And the fuel is not a misunderstanding of freedom of speech. It is a set of profound grievances or perceived grievances that people have. There is this widespread perception that the United States and the West to some-degree in general, but the United States specifically, is waging a war on Islam. It's in Iraq, it's in Afghanistan, it's in support of Israel. And that cartoon was just the symbol of that idea, igniting that anger.
10:51:50- 10:52:03	RS: Now, Reza, you've written a lot on this, and thought a lot about it. What does the <i>Jyllands-Posten</i> incident tell us about how Islam regards another person's ability to say whatever's on his mind?
10:52:06- 10:54:32	RA: Well, I – you know, I have sort of a different view on this. I think that it's a perfect example of how thoroughly Muslims, not just in the traditional Arab and

	<p>Muslim world, but, indeed, in, in Europe and the West have absorbed the principle of free speech. What we saw in Denmark, for the first five months after these cartoons came out, was the Danish Muslim community doing precisely what one would expect a democratic society to do—protest, ask for meetings, boycott of the newspaper, using the tools that a democratic society puts in front of you in order to make yourself heard. Where we saw violence, where we saw murders and death and destruction were in places in which there is no access to those kinds of democratic avenues to, to present one’s grievances. The best example I can say to this is that there was quite a large protest of Muslims in, in New York at that time, and I remember asking one of the protesters, who was quite angry about, about the, the cartoons, felt very offended by the way in which the Prophet Mohammed was depicted – I asked him, why is it, you know, “Why don’t you go out and, and burn some cars and, and, you know, bomb some, some buildings, like you’re seeing in, in other parts of the Muslim world?” And he said, “Cause I’ve got a BMW. ‘Cause I’ve got a job, and a house. There’s no way that I’m going to in any way threaten those things by, by resorting to violence.” So I think it’s very important to recognize the way in which sociopolitical and economic issues were wrapped up in the reactions to these cartoons. It was not, by any means, a universal reaction.</p>
	<p>RS: Dalia, that was, that incident, and I, I hate to harp on it, but it was, it sort of crystallized what a lot of people in the West use as ammunition to push their idea of a clash of civilizations. That here are a billion of our fellow human beings on the planet who just see life, see the questions of daily life, see who they are in a fundamentally different way, so we are definitely going to be in conflict, at war if you will.</p>
<p>OUT 10:57:14</p>	<p>DM: Well, I think that it’s a, it’s a way that we can frame it that is, frankly, inconsistent with the data. And I’ll, I’ll give you some examples. We asked publics in Europe about a series of different expressions and whether or not they thought they were acceptable, to, to really test this idea that there is an absolute free speech in the West, and that Muslims are simply being treated equally to everyone else. And what we found is that when it, when it came to other things, there was very little tolerance, for example, for a racial slur to be printed in the newspaper. That cartoon, to Muslims around the world, is akin to a racial slur. It’s calling the founder of their faith a terrorist. That is about as clear as, as it can get for many of them in, and this is an offense in terms of their identity, like a racial slur.</p>
	<p>RS: Well, but, but here, when we’re talking about majority Christian countries throughout Western Europe and in North America, there are common depictions in art and popular culture, in movies, of a other than biblically certified depiction of Jesus . . .</p>
	<p>DM: [Overlaps] I completely understand, yeah.</p>
	<p>RS: . . . who, after all, is, is revered as the son of God. Not some great guy or moral exemplar, but God’s own and only son. There are not riots. There are not cars turned over in the streets. There may be a dozen picketers outside “The Last Temptation of Christ,” but the movie is not shut down. The theaters that are showing it are not shut down. It’s not prevented from being distributed. It seems that there is, in practice, a very different set of reactions to analogous kind of . . .</p>
	<p>DM: I would argue that they’re NOT analogous. And here’s why they’re not analogous. Because it’s about identity. It’s about what is your identity? And in</p>

	<p>Europe very few people have a Christian identity. In small minorities. So to take a, a figure like Christ and, and portray him in, in ways that are not flattering is not going to offend most people because it's not part of their identity. The other piece is there's a very big difference between a majority making fun of a majority's symbols and a majority, in power, making fun of a powerless and underclass minority's sacred symbol. It is much closer, if we come back to our country, with the use of the "N word." And if you look at the history of, of our depictions of African Americans, they have evolved. They have evolved to be more inclusive of all of our citizens, and we've become a stronger democracy because of that evolution, not a weaker one. The cartoon is not akin to making fun of Jesus. It is akin to using the "N word" in the United States.</p>
10:57:14- 11:01:04	<p>RA: That's right. This is an issue of power. The Muslim communities in Europe rightly feel that they are under attack, that Islamophobia is institutionalized. They live socioeconomically far, far below those non-Muslim communities. So when you have the dominant culture making these kinds of very offensive comments, these offensive depictions, it becomes a sense that my very identity, who I am as a human being, is now under attack.</p>
11:01:38- 11:01:40	<p>RS: Is there a clash of civilizations?</p>
11:01:41- 11:02:23	<p>RA: No, there isn't a clash of civilizations. But I mean I think the very idea of a clash of civilizations is in and of itself kind of an absurd notion, for a number of reasons. First of all, what is the definition of a civilization? I've never met anyone who can tell me what an Islamic civilization actually means. Samuel Huntington himself, I think, said it quite clearly when he said in the book of the same title, that the problem for the United States isn't Islamic civilization; the problem is Islam. Because when you say Islamic civilization, what you mean is Islam. And for that very reason, the idea of a clash of civilizations feeds into this larger conception in the Muslim world that the War on Terror is a war against Islam. And, more importantly, to talk about Western civilization as somehow separate from Islam or from Islamic communities or even civilizations, if that's the term you want to use, is ridiculous. There is almost no part of what we could define as western civilization that is untouched by the succession of cultures and civilizations of the larger Muslim world. These two things are absolutely intertwined. They cannot be separated.</p>
11:08:31- 11:08:53	<p>RS: I think we'd all like to think this program is helping to bridge a divide, but it's probably clear to everyone out there that we still have a long way to go. The question I want to leave people with is how can the West and the Muslim world arrive at better relations, and I guess to make a diagnosis you have to examine the patient. What's driving anti-U.S. sentiment across the Muslim world, Dalia?</p>
11:08:54- 11:10:55	<p>DM: Ray, there are essentially three things that drive anti-U.S. sentiment. The first one is the anger around acute conflicts involving the U.S.—Iraq, Afghanistan, and our perceived support for Israeli violence. Two is the perception of political domination, that we talk about democracy, but there's a double standard in the way that we deal with Muslim countries, in our support for dictatorships, and also in some cases our violation of our own values in the treatment of Muslims around torture, Abu Graib, Guantanamo, etc. Political domination is Number Two. And Three is a deep perception of being disrespected. As Muslims believe around the world that we as Americans do not see them as equal people, that we do not</p>

	<p>respect Islam as a faith along with other faiths. And so those three are the underlying drivers of anti-American sentiment. What do we do about it? I'll say there are three R's actually: Reform, economic and political; Resolution of conflict around Iraq, the Palestinian-Israeli conflict, de-escalating our rhetoric around Iran and Syria; and three is this whole issue of mutual Respect. When we ask Muslims what can Muslims do to improve their relations with the Western world, we hear two things more often than anything else: show mutual respect to the West and, two, control extremism. In fact, Muslims are more likely to say that they should be helping to control extremism than are Americans to say that Muslims should be helping to control extremism. So there is a recognition of a responsibility among Muslims, who, in fact, are more fearful of being victims of terrorism than are Americans. They see it as a mutual enemy.</p>
<p>11:10:56- 11:11:19</p>	<p>RS: Reza, I'm wondering if we can sometimes make too much of that anti-U.S. sentiment by concentrating on it alone and not remembering that in much of the Muslim world that anti-U.S. sentiment has what you might call almost a conjoined twin, an affection, an admiration for the United States, as the same time as there's this antipathy.</p>
<p>11:11:20- 11:13:51</p>	<p>RA: So true. I've stood on the streets of Tehran and watched people shout, "Death to America," and then come up to me and ask whether they can get a visa. Everybody, I think, understands that the United States means something, that we've set ourselves up as a, a bastion for certain principles and ideals. Everybody, I think, also understands, including Americans, that we all often fall short of those ideals. And so when I look at anti-U.S. sentiment in the Muslim world, when I look at even anger at, at the United States, I can't help but also notice how tinged it is with disappointment, with sadness, with a sense even of betrayal of what America stands for. It's hard, I think, for the average Egyptian on the street of Cairo to understand why it is that the United States stands not with him, but with Mubarak. It's hard, I think, for a Palestinian to, to understand why it is that American sentiment is not with him and his suffering and his struggle against occupation, but instead is with the powerful.</p>
	<p>RS: Dalia, when I was in North Africa recently, I was in Tunis and Casablanca. And was sort of shocked by people, once they realized I was an American, gushing about President Obama. Does his arrival in the Oval Office create a, a pause in the fight, in the argument, where we can almost reframe it? Does it change anything?</p>
<p>11:20:02- 11:21:06</p>	<p>DM: I have to say that it does change things. It's – there're sort of two views, that it changes everything or that it changes nothing. And neither are true. It – there's a middle ground where it changes many things. It changes the whole idea of a – what a president of the United States can be and can look like. The fact that he talked about having Muslims in his family, I mean that's never happened before. That a president of the United States has said that. That he came from an immigrant background, as well as a mom that has, has, whose family has been here for, for centuries. His identity is important because it does give people pause. It makes people have to completely reassess what they think America has been, has, had stood for at least for the past eight years, which in, in many people's minds, a symbol that has been inherently against them in every way.</p>
<p>11:22:15-</p>	<p>RA: And you know what else this is? It's not just about the Muslim world, nor is it</p>

<p>11:23:26</p>	<p>just about O- Obama's connections to, to Islam. It's that as President Obama himself so eloquently said in his inauguration speech, it's that the, the promise of America, what America stands for, seems to have been fulfilled with this man in the White House. The idea, I think, and this is true not just in the Muslim world, but throughout the rest of the planet, the notion that a member of an oppressed minority can suddenly rise to the highest office is something that is unthinkable, not just in Egypt, not just in Saudi, but in the UK, in France, in Germany. This is what I meant when I said the United States stands for something. It, it, it makes a promise, and very often it fails in that promise. And with the election of Barack Obama, even if maybe for a fleeting moment, that promise has been fulfilled, and that's something that I think shocks the rest of the world.</p>
<p>11:23:27- 11:24:15</p>	<p>DM: Ray, I'd like to share a brief story. I was in Washington during the inaugural proceedings, and I attended many of them, and I heard Obama talk about a new way forward with Muslims built on mutual respect and mutual interests, on the most, on the day of the most sacred oath. I then had a business meeting. I just happened to have a business meeting that week in Saudi Arabia, where I attended Friday prayer in Mecca. And heard the Friday sermon. And in that sermon there was a prayer for Obama to, for God to guide him to be a just and compassionate leader. And so I feel like that week there was this amazing window, authentic window for reconciliation. Brief, but authentic. And we have to take advantage of it.</p>
<p>11:24:16- 11:24:47</p>	<p>RS: Well, it's with a certain amount of regret that I have to say that's all the time we have for today. But I'd like to thank you both for joining us, Dalia Mogahed, Executive Director of the Gallup Center for Muslim Center, and Reza Aslan, professor at the University of California Riverside. And we hope that you found this discussion enlightening, thought provoking. One thing that's clear. More understanding is needed all around. We hope this show has been a step in that direction. For Link TV, I'm Ray Suarez. Thanks for joining us.</p>
	<p>(END)</p>
	<p>FOR MORE INFORMATION, PLEASE VISIT LINKTV-DOT-ORG-SLASH-WHO-SPEAKS-FOR-ISLAM</p> <p>FUNDING FOR THIS PROGRAM WAS PROVIDED BY ONE NATION, A PHILANTHROPIC COLLABORATIVE, INVESTING IN IDEAS, PEOPLE, AND ORGANIZATIONS WORKING TO FULFILL AMERICA'S PROMISE OF LIBERTY AND JUSTICE FOR ALL.</p> <p>ADDITIONAL FUNDING BY THE DORIS DUKE FOUNDATION FOR ISLAMIC ART.</p>