

**INTERNAL INQUIRY INTO THE ACTIONS OF CANADIAN
OFFICIALS IN RELATION TO
ABDULLAH ALMALKI, AHMAD ABOU-ELMAATI
AND MUAYYED NUREDDIN**

**FINAL SUBMISSION ON BEHALF OF
CANADIAN COALITION FOR DEMOCRACIES**

DAVID B. HARRIS
Barrister and Solicitor
100 Frank Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K2P 0X2

Tel. (613) 233-1220
Fax (708) 844-3468

A) BACKGROUND OF INTERVENER

1. The Canadian Coalition for Democracies (hereinafter also “Coalition” and “CCD”) is a registered not-for-profit organization that is generally recognized as a multi-ethnic, multi-religious Canadian national human rights organization and international affairs’ “think tank” dedicated to the protection and expansion of democracy and democratic principles in a secure Canada and stable world.
 - a) The Coalition has a large paid Canadian membership.
 - b) The Coalition’s website, <http://canadiancoalition.com>, attracts significant Canadian and international interest and participation at a rate of 1.6 million visits per year.
 - c) The Canadian Coalition for Democracies has advanced its goals through, *inter alia*, close study of developments and policy bearing on intelligence, terrorism and national security.
 - d) This study has, since the CCD’s founding, benefited from the participation of Coalition Executive and Senior Fellows who have served, or otherwise had serious involvement in, related fields in law, intelligence, counterterrorism, academe, journalism, and public policy, and some of whom have testified as experts before Canadian parliamentary and American Congressional bodies in relation to these

- subjects. Reflected in these efforts has been the Coalition's commitment to the need to mount a vigorous, responsible defence against terrorism and associated subversion, in order to safeguard free and democratic societies at home and abroad.
- e) Based upon this background, the Coalition maintains regular and direct contact with parliamentarians and government leadership, consulting with and making frequent representations to the Office of the Prime Minister, Ministers of the Crown, and diverse other senior Canadian offices and officials. The Coalition also works informally on issues of terrorism and democracy with non-governmental organizations in Canada and the United States of America.
- f) The Coalition's Senior Fellow for National Security was chosen to speak as an advocate at the side of Members of Parliament and terror victims and their families – including Air India families – at the Parliamentary Press Gallery press conference launch of a multi-party parliamentary initiative aimed at securing through legislation the right of terror victims to sue terrorists and their enablers for damages, wherever in the world the offenders might be found, and whomever they might be.
- g) The Coalition is an intervener in the Air India Inquiry, a federal inquiry established under Part I of the Inquiries Act to look into various security issues pertaining to the 1985 bombing of an Air India airliner.

- h) The Coalition, particularly through its multi-ethnic, mutli-religious Executive members and officers, has examined, from policy, legal, political and security perspectives, matters understood to fall within the remit of the Inquiry, and has commented publicly and encouraged informed public discussion about these matters.
- i) Since 2004, the Coalition has worked to find a balance between national-security concerns and the rights of individuals, realms of concern that are reflected in the Inquiry's terms of reference.
- j) Consistent with the Inquiry's terms of reference, the Coalition has given extensive consideration to the subject of terrorism-related detentions and trials.
- k) Through sustained public education and media-outreach initiatives, Coalition personnel have served as speakers and media commentators on intelligence and terrorism, terrorism and the law, terror financing in Canada, the Air India disaster, the Arar Inquiry, international affairs, and democratic rights and responsibilities, in many media outlets across Canada, including print, radio, cable, and internet. As well, members of the Coalition have appeared on PBS, CNN, Fox News, MSNBC, BBC, and been quoted or published in foreign print media ranging from *US News and World Report* to the *New York Times* and the *Jerusalem Post*.

B) Introduction

2. This Commission was established by the Government of Canada under Part One of the *Inquiries Act*, R.S.C., C. I-13, and has operated according to the terms of reference specified in Order-in-Council P.C. 2006-1526, as amended by P.C. 2008-31. As the Commission's 2 September 2008 reporting-date approaches, the Commissioner has invited final submissions from the parties and interveners. The Canadian Coalition for Democracies makes the following general response to the Commissioner's request for final submissions.

C) Observations

3. The Canadian Coalition for Democracies has had various discussions with, and made a number of representations to, the Commissioner and Inquiry officers. The CCD is confident that its views have been noted, and wishes to make only a few observations.

4. Today, pluralist democracies and other states live in an era of extremist infiltration and developing mass-casualty threats. Individually and collectively, citizens of these countries face threats to their safety and security, including potential for their civil liberties to be menaced by severe remedial government action that might be made necessary or unavoidable by mass-destructive or mass-casualty assaults. It is submitted that this is the backdrop against which the matters confronted by the Commissioner must be measured and resolved.

5. Whilst generally accepting the broader conclusions reached by the earlier and related Arar Inquiry, the Canadian Coalition for Democracies continues to have misgivings about some

aspects of the conduct of that Inquiry. The CCD is concerned that certain weaknesses in the Arar Inquiry's approach and procedures, left questions unresolved. Examples of such weaknesses include the failure of the Arar Inquiry to hear certain important evidence under oath, and the possible impression of the Toope fact-finding investigation as a belated, and *pro forma*, exercise in reaching largely-predetermined conclusions. The Canadian Coalition for Democracies is gratified to note that the present Commissioner and staff appear to have avoided such shortcomings, and pursued an objective course.

6. The Canadian Coalition for Democracies recognizes that the subject-matter of this Inquiry has necessarily involved occasional reference to the worldwide threat of radical and extremist Islamism. During the course of Inquiry hearings, the Commissioner has heard suggestions that Canadians of Muslim background may face particular difficulties owing to alleged anti-Muslim attitudes in this country. The CCD believes that such assertions, if not competently supported by evidence, have significant and potentially damaging implications for social cohesion and, ultimately, public safety. The Canadian Coalition for Democracies brings to the Commissioner's notice concerns that the CCD, as an intervener in the Air India Inquiry, recently expressed in submissions to that Inquiry.

... the Canadian Coalition for Democracies draws to the Commissioner's attention certain concerns raised by various observers, about an apparently concerted effort by some groups to institutionalize words such as "Islamophobic" and "Islamophobe".

Serious doubts have been raised about the term "Islamophobia", its meaning, underlying assumptions and assertions, and the possibly-divisive intentions of some of those who propagate it. The Canadian Coalition for Democracies is concerned about potential policy and attitudinal consequences that might result from, or be built upon, an uncritical embracing of the concept of "Islamophobia" as an analytical tool. Such consequences could include the risk of alienating Muslims, especially Muslim youth, with exaggerated

impressions of their community's victimhood.

Kenan Malik is among those wary of the term, and remarks that "[t]he charge of "Islamophobia" is all too often used not to highlight racism but to silence critics of Islam, or even Muslims fighting for reform of their communities." (Malik, Kenan (2005). Islamophobia Myth. FrontPageMagazine.com (February 10). Digital document : <http://frontpagemag.com/Articles/ReadArticle.asp?ID=16735>. February 10, 2005.)

Novelist, human rights' activist, and fatwa-survivor Salman Rushdie has spoken of "this new crime of what's called "Islamophobia"" as an emergent fundamentalist form of censorship and reflective of efforts by some to enforce, through silencing, privileged status for one religion. Distinguishing what he seems to regard as a contrived word, on the one hand, from a manifestly-unacceptable abuse of Muslim individuals, on the other, Rushdie has said:

I mean I just have some problem with the word because it must be in any free society OK to be as open as you want to be about your dislike of a set of ideas. I mean otherwise it becomes impossible to think. It becomes impossible to have any kind of interchange of thought in a society if you're told that there are ideas which are off-limits. Nothing is off-limits. [Rushdie, Salman (2006). [Secular Values, Human Rights, and Islamism](#). cfinc.org (Center For Inquiry) (October 11). Digital document: <http://cfinc.org/resources/secular-values-human-rights-and-islamism>. January 1, 2007.]

Dr. Sam C. Holliday of The Armiger Cromwell Center, writes of "Islamophobia - a term invented to shut down legitimate and vital debate about the threat of the Third Jihad," (Holliday, Sam C. (2007). Effective Communication Against the Third Jihad. politeia-dbase.blogspot.com (October 21). Digital document: <http://politeia-dbase.blogspot.com/2007/10/effective-communication-against-third.html>. October 23, 2007.) his designation for the current global terrorist and subversive offensive against the liberal-democratic-pluralist world. Meanwhile, author Christopher Hitchens rather less charitably dispenses with "the stupid neologism "Islamophobia," which aims to promote criticism of Islam to the gallery of special offenses associated with racism"." (Hitchens, Christopher (2007). Facing the Islamist Menace. city-journal.com (Winter). Digital document: http://www.city-journal.org/html/17_1_urbanities-steyn.html. February 1, 2007.) One US Muslim scholar, Khalid Durán, condemned a hardline Saudi-funded Islamic "human rights"" organization for perpetuating unsubstantiated and misleading claims of wide-ranging persecution of Muslims: "it denounces offenses against Islam where there are none, and it demonizes moderate Muslims who criticize Islamist distortions." (Durán, Khalid (2002). How CAIR Put My Life in Peril. meforum.org (*Middle East Quarterly*) (Winter). Digital document: <http://www.meforum.org/article/108>. September 25, 2005.)

Persisting doubts about "Islamophobia" terminology, together with questions about the

reasons for its propagation, should be explored in a sound, systematic way by independent persons and organizations who have not formerly been involved in advocating or otherwise pressing upon the public, the “Islamophobia” notion.

7. In order to assist the Commissioner and staff in related matters, an annotated bibliography is appended, as an appendix to this submission. Material in this appendix deals with assessments of the concept of “Islamophobia”, and critically assesses allegations of same in Canada and abroad. At least one reference deals critically with a study of purported anti-Muslim tendencies in Canada, a study that was the basis of evidence heard by the Arar Inquiry. (See Appendix entry, “Commission of Inquiry into the Actions of Canadian Officials in Relation to Maher Arar (2005). Public Hearings Transcript, Thursday, 9 June 2005.”)

ALL OF WHICH IS RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED

Date: 19 June 2008

“David Harris”

DAVID B. HARRIS

Counsel for Canadian Coalition for Democracies

APPENDIX

Note:

Views expressed in the following articles, websites, links and other sources, do not necessarily reflect the opinions of the Canadian Coalition for Democracies, its directors, members or affiliated or associated persons or organizations.

APPENDIX

Note:

Views expressed in the following articles, websites, links and other sources, do not necessarily reflect the opinions of the Canadian Coalition for Democracies, its directors, members or affiliated or associated persons or organizations.

Annotated Sources on the “Islamophobia” Concept, and on Claims of Anti-Muslim Behaviour

19 June 2008

(a) “Islamophobia” Concept

Bawer, Bruce (2006). *While Europe Slept*. New York: Broadway Books. ISBN 978-0-7679-2005-6. [Bawer, a gay New York essayist and critic of the US evangelical Christian movement and its influence, has lived in Europe since 1998. His book’s “Afterword to the Paperback Edition” offers a reaction to developments following the submitting to his publisher in 2005 of his draft of *While Europe Slept*. These events included widespread Muslim riots in Europe and elsewhere, in response to the publishing by Denmark’s *Jyllands-Posten*, of the “Mohammed cartoons.”]

Since this book first appeared, European freedoms have faced a series of aggressive challenges by radical Muslims – challenges that have been met mostly with appeasement and apologies, censorship and self-censorship. During this time efforts have intensified across Europe to ban “Islamophobia” – a word that has been employed with increasing frequency in attempts to silence criticism of anything whatsoever relating to Islam. {239}

....

For many, the *Jyllands-Posten* cartoons represented the powerful mocking the faith of the weak. No: what was happening was that a gang of bullies – led by a country, Saudi Arabia, where Bibles are forbidden, Christians tortured, women oppressed, Jews labelled “apes and pigs” in the state-controlled media, and apostasy from Islam punished by death – was trying to compel a tiny democracy to follow theocratic rules. ... {240.}]

Bayefsky, Anne (2007). *Voting Against Hate*. nationalreview.com (December 27). Digital document: <http://article.nationalreview.com/?q=NmIxNTZiNzdiZjI3ZDBINTU2YmYyMWYyODkwNzRjYWY=>. January 18, 2008. [Human rights’ lawyer Bayefsky anticipates the United Nations’ Durban II conference:

Durban II promises to raise the clash against civilization to new levels of hypocrisy and to inflame racial and religious intolerance the world over. The rallying cry of the U.N. mafioso this time will be “Islamophobia.” At the U.N. Islamophobia is not invoked to mean legitimate objection to discrimination that wrongly targets people of the Islamic faith. It has become a code word for hysterical accusations that Western democracies are engaged in a phony war to end terrorism as a ploy to subjugate Muslims everywhere. Mindful that the best defense is a good offense, Pakistan (on behalf of the 56 member states of the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC)) made the following announcement on opening day of the first Durban II preparatory meeting held this past August. “The defamation of Islam and discrimination against Muslims represent the most conspicuous demonstration of contemporary racism and intolerance...It is regrettable that the world media has allowed defamation and blasphemy in this form...” With that, they marked the kick-off of an aggressive campaign to curtail freedom of expression under Durban II auspices.]

Commission of Inquiry into the Actions of Canadian Officials in Relation to Maher Arar (2005). Public Hearings

Transcript, Thursday, 9 June 2005. Digital document: http://epe.lac-bac.gc.ca/100/206/301/pco-bcp/commissions/maher_arar/07-09-13/www.stenotran.com/commission/maherarar/2005-06-09%20volume%2025.pdf (accessed 18 January 2008). [The Arar Inquiry hears evidence from an intervener organization, the Canadian Council on American-Islamic Relations (CAIR-CAN), a chapter of the Washington, DC-based Council on American-Islamic Relations (CAIR). (CAIR was declared an “unindicted co-conspirator” by the US Justice Department for the purposes of the 2007 *Holy Land Foundation* terrorism-financing trial, and, like CAIR-CAN, is a defendant in a New York 9/11 lawsuit, *Estate of John P. O'Neill, Sr. et al. vs. Al Baraka Investment and Development Corporation.*) At p. 6320, l. 19ff of the Arar Commission transcript, Simon Fothergill, Counsel for the Attorney General of Canada, begins cross-examining CAIR-CAN Chair, Dr. Sheema Khan on a CAIR-CAN survey, “Presumption of Guilt: A National Survey of Security Visitations of Canadian Muslims,” released by the organization at a well-publicized press conference, the previous day. The study purported to document considerable unpleasantness and “Islamophobia” in the lives of Canadian Muslims. Fothergill exposed several methodological and other weaknesses in the study. The inference is that, contrary to CAIR-CAN claims, these weaknesses combined to exaggerate the adversity felt and encountered by Muslim Canadians in a post-9/11 world. Features of the study that emerged:

respondents were anonymous (6321, l. 6-8); compendium of results was “based on 467 respondents” (6321, l. 9-10); there were three primary categories of solicitation to participate: (a) questionnaire available on CAIR-CAN website (6321, l. 16-21); (b) e-mailing by CAIR-CAN of questionnaire to CAIR-CAN list of, according to Khan, “about 6,000 to 7,000” (6321, l. 16-21); and (c) distribution of hard copies of the questionnaire “at various centres and mosques” (6321, l. 25-6322); about half the responses – 211 – were generated from the distribution of hard copies at Islamic centres, mosques and events (6322, l. 10-15); a little more than half the respondents – 256 – , in Fothergill’s words, “learned of the survey in some way through a connection with CAIR-CAN.” (6323, l. 3-6); and, a “good proportion” – Fothergill’s words – of responses were from those interested in Muslim and/or Arab advocacy or issues (6323, l. 17-22).

From this, the following problems, among others, might be anticipated with the reliability and credibility of the study: (a) persons who had never visited Canada, much less been citizens or residents of the country, could have had access to and completed the questionnaire, and attested to harsh experience’s in Canada (“Not all of them are in Canada mind you. We have a lot outside the country,” said Khan of those on the CAIR-CAN list (6321, l. 16-21)); (b) sampling problems and bias would be clear risks given distribution of the questionnaire to those already connected to CAIR-CAN, an organization whose hallmark – like that of its American CAIR headquarters – has been its eagerness to argue on debatable evidence that Muslims are victimized and are therefore entitled to special consideration. Dr. Khan’s Inquiry testimony about the survey was remarkable for its failure to clarify foundational matters about the study: asked how many forms were distributed: “I can’t really say.” (6321, l. 16-21); as for the number of hard copies distributed at centers and mosques: “I don’t have the number on me right now.”(6322, l. 1-2); asked again, about the take-up rate: “I can’t give you – I can’t answer that. I’m sorry.” (6322, l. 8-9); asked whether those responding were statistically representative in ethnic terms of Muslims in Canada: “I would have to look at the Census to speak to that.” (6322, l. 25-6324, l. 1-2).

(On this study, see below, for Harris, David B. (2008). *Is Canada Losing the Balance Between Liberty and Security? In Immigration Policy and the Terrorist Threat in Canada and the United States*, eds. Alexander Moens and Martin Collacott. Fraser Institute, 129-159. Digital document: http://www.fraserinstitute.org/Commerce.Web/product_files/ImmigrationTerroristThreatChapter8.pdf. ISBN 978-0-88975-235-1.)]

Holliday, Sam C. (2007). *Effective Communication Against the Third Jihad*. politeia-dbase.blogspot.com (October 21). Digital document: <http://politeia-dbase.blogspot.com/2007/10/effective-communication-against-third.html>. October 23, 2007.

[Many Americans and Europeans either do not understand or deny the threat of the Third Jihad, claiming that Islamic terror is caused by our actions in Islamic countries. They stress the differences between Shiites and Sunnis. They often speak of Islamophobia - a term invented to shut down legitimate and vital debate about the threat of the Third Jihad - and narrow their focus to the personal, inner, nonviolent Jihad al Akbar. ...]

Rushdie, Salman (2006). [Secular Values, Human Rights, and Islamism](http://cfinyc.org/resources/secular-values-human-rights-and-islamism). cfinyc.org (Center For Inquiry) (October 11). Digital document: <http://cfinyc.org/resources/secular-values-human-rights-and-islamism>. January 1, 2007. [On 14 February 1989, the Iranian leader issued a fatwa requiring the execution of author Salman Rushdie, in reaction to Rushdie's "blasphemous" fourth novel, *The Satanic Verses*. Following are excerpted remarks about freedom of speech and "Islamophobia" made by Rushdie at a 11 October 2006 meeting sponsored by the Center for Inquiry, New York.

Meanwhile, the BBC has been instructed we are told that the term "Islamic terrorist" can't be used because it discriminates against Muslims. Never mind that all the terrorists who claim to be acting in the name of Islam tell us that it is Islam that is their motivation, the BBC can't say that they're Islamic terrorists because that's now this new crime of what's called "Islamophobia." I mean I just have some problem with the word because it seems to me if you have a set of ideas which I don't like, it's perfectly OK for me to be phobic about them. There were plenty of people who seemed to have no problem being phobic about mine but, you know, "Salmanophobia" didn't enter the language somehow.

I remember I got a T-shirt soon after the, how shall I put it, soon after the excrement hit the ventilation system. Somebody sent me in the mail a T-shirt on the front of which it said, "Blasphemy is a victimless crime." I always, I thought there was a truth there. And I think, you know, Islamophobia is also a victimless crime because it must be in any free society OK to be as open as you want to be about your dislike of a set of ideas. I mean otherwise it becomes impossible to think. It becomes impossible to have any kind of interchange of thought in a society if you're told that there are ideas which are off-limits. Nothing is off-limits.

If you take that further into discrimination against or prejudice towards individuals, that's another matter. You obviously need to protect individuals against prejudice but you can't ring fence their ideas, and that's what seems to me why terms like that, you're not allowed to say "Islamofascist" either because, of course, no Muslims are fascists, as we know. Even though there was a rather brilliant article recently by an Egyptian journalist in which he pointed out that what Muslims needed to take onboard is that while obviously not all Muslims were terrorists it also did seem to be the case at the moment all terrorists were Muslims. And how you couldn't avoid that connection if you wanted to look at the world as it really is.]

(a) Critical analyses of studies and assertions of anti-Muslim tendencies

Bray, Thomas J. (2002). The Backlash That Wasn't: Why does the press keep hyping nonexistent threats to Arab civil rights? *opinionjournal.com (The Wall Street Journal)* (September 3). Digital document: <http://www.opinionjournal.com/columnists/tbray/?id=110002210>. April 3, 2004.

Breinholt, Jeffrey (2008). Islam in American Courts: 2007 Year in Review. *strategycenter.net* (January 7). Digital document: <http://www.strategycenter.net/research/pageID.47/default.asp>. January 9, 2008. Includes Appendix A, "2007 Opinions Involving Muslim Asylum Claimants" (<http://www.strategycenter.net/research/pageID.46/default.asp>), and B, "2007 Opinions Involving Muslim Employment Discrimination" (<http://www.strategycenter.net/research/pageID.47/default.asp>).

I found only three opinions in 2007 that referred to violence inspired by anti-Islam animus.^[20] The small volume of these cases is surprising, and cuts against the notion that the U.S. has a major anti-Muslim hate crime problem. If they incidents are as widespread as the Muslim civil rights organizations claim, they are somehow eluding judicial opinions.

Author's footnote: ^[20] *U.S. v. Patrick Syring*, --- F.Supp.2d ----, 2007 WL 4105545 (D.D.C. 2007), *State v. Caultley*, Slip Copy, 2007 WL 136471 Ohio App. 12 Dist., 2007. *Mazloun v. District of Columbia Metropolitan Police Dept.*, --- F.Supp.2d ----, 2007 WL 1141581 (D.D.C. 2007). In addition to these three cases, I found a burglary conviction where the victim was a Muslim community center. *People v. Romayor*, Not Reported in Cal.Rptr.3d, 2007 WL 4443865 Cal.App. 6 Dist., 2007.

Breinholt, Jeffrey (2008). The Secret Evidence Canard. counterterrorismblog.org (February 6). Digital document: http://counterterrorismblog.org/2008/02/the_secret_evidence_canard.php. February 7, 2008. [US prosecutor dealing with complaints be some Muslim groups that Muslim charities are unfairly targeted by the American Government.

... Picking on Muslims? Hardly. You find me a case in which a fundamentalist Christian charity is furtively sending funds to violent operatives hoping to take control of Old City Jerusalem, or a radical Jewish non-profit is secretly scheming to violently evict Muslims from the Temple Mount, and I will find you plenty of American prosecutors who salivate at the prospect of putting those charities in the dock.]

CBC.ca News (2005). Islamic group calls for federal probe of interrogation tactics. cbc.ca (June 8). Digital document: <http://www.cbc.ca/story/canada/national/2005/06/08/islam050608.html>. June 8, 2005. [CAIR-CAN's Executive Director, Riad Saloojee, gives press conference "after releasing a survey saying federal officials used the threat of arrest to coerce people into being interviewed, discouraged legal representation and asked inappropriate questions." (Similar coverage of the news conference was carried on CBC Radio News, 8 June 2005, by reporter Bill Gillespie.)]

Durán, Khalid (2002). How CAIR Put My Life in Peril. meforum.org (*Middle East Quarterly*) (Winter). Digital document: <http://www.meforum.org/article/108>. September 25, 2005. [An American Muslim's view of the mission and activity of CAIR, whose Canadian chapter is the Canadian Council for American Islamic Relations (CAIR-CAN).]

CAIR has attempted to build a wider following by "defending" Islam and Muslims against perceived acts of misrepresentation, defamation, and discrimination. American Muslims are rightly sensitive to manifestations of prejudice, and have every right to protest them. But CAIR goes further: it denounces offenses against Islam where there are none, and it demonizes moderate Muslims who criticize Islamist distortions.

....

... CAIR is one of several groups of parasitic imposters who have built upon the insecurities of a Muslim community only now coming into its own. That community can only take its rightful place if it builds upon hope and dialogue, not the fear and defamation retailed by CAIR.

Fatah, Tarek (2008). Islamists who have a problem with free speech should leave. network.nationalpost.com (June 10). Digital document: <http://network.nationalpost.com/np/blogs/fullcomment/archive/2008/06/10/tarek-fateh-islamists-who-have-a-problem-with-free-speech-should-leave.aspx>. June 18, 2008. [Fatah, founder of the moderate Muslim Canadian Congress (MCC), condemns the Canadian Islamic Congress (CIC) and certain of its associates. He regards the CIC's formal complaint against *Maclean's* magazine, for publishing an extract from Mark Steyn's book, *America Alone*, as an assault on free expression, and an attempt to "bully" the media into submission to "Islamist" diktat. Fatah recoils from CIC President M. Elmasry's reported statement that there is more press freedom in Egypt than in Canada, and the MCC founder invites like-minded fundamentalists to return to such spiritual homelands. Fatah reserves particular bile for what he seems to regard as the pretence of Muslim victimhood undergirding the *Maclean's* episode. In this regard, he lashes out at Khurram Awan, one of the "law students" whose research is said to have underpinned the CIC complaints.

An Islamist law student, known for his exaggerated and forced sense of victimhood, now threatens Canadian newspapers with legal "consequences," if they refuse to be bullied into printing what Islamist groups want to publish. Referring to the media, Khurram Awan of the pro-shariah Canadian Islamic Congress, said, "You might be liable for a few million dollars."

Khurram suggests the mainstream media is ignoring "Muslims" and their message. Ironically, he made this claim as he sat next to the *Toronto Star's* Haroon Siddiqui. Siddiqui writes a twice-a-week column, more of a diatribe, where he seems to me to be advocating the agenda of the Islamists. This includes supporting shariah law in Canada, admiring the Saudi royal family in a series just months before the Saudis struck New York on 9/11, making the Iranian regime look like an innocent victim, all while lambasting liberal and secular Muslims, including Québec legislator Fatima Houde-Pepin.

It seems a twice-a-week column on the editorial pages of the country's largest newspaper has failed to satiate this Islamists' voracious appetite for attention and a sense of entitlement. Perhaps a *Toronto Star* daily column for Khurram Awan on its front page might let the newspaper off the hook when it comes to legal bullying and non-stop whining.

Fatah further confronts the "victim" theme by adding that even the *Globe and Mail* has a regular monthly Muslim columnist, Sheema Khan, whom he identifies without obvious enthusiasm as a "former president {sic} of CAIR, the U.S.-based Islamist organization that receives Middle East monies and has been declared an unindicted co-conspirator in a Texas terror trial." Warning to his subject, Fatah appears to castigate Barbara Hall's Ontario Human Rights Commission for the way in which it recently smeared *Maclean's* – without giving the magazine's representatives a chance to make arguments – in the course of dismissing the CIC's complaint about Steyn's article. Alluding to fundamentalist efforts to claim Muslim victimhood in order to manipulate and draw advantage from "progressive" consciences, Fatah writes of "a naive and guilt-ridden liberal elite that includes Barbara Hall and the three commissars in the B.C. Human Rights Commission," the latter Commission being the venue of yet another CIC complaint against *Maclean's*, for publishing the same Steyn article. Fatah's final volley:

Canada is a country where Muslims are respected and accommodated like in no other land on Earth, including Saudi Arabia and Iran. It is immoral for the Islamists to slander my country with the slur of Islamophobia. As Statistics Canada has shown, incidents of racism in Canada are far more likely to affect Christian black Canadians and Jewish Canadians than Muslims. However, truth is the first casualty in this propaganda war being waged against Canada by its own Islamists.]

Friedman, Max (2003). Anti-Muslim Discrimination? FrontPageMagazine.com (August 25). Digital document: <http://www.frontpagemag.com/Articles/ReadArticle.asp?ID=12502>. March 27, 2004. [Reference to statistical analysis of Evan McCormick, "CAIR's 'Discrimination' Hysteria," FrontPageMagazine.com, 22 July 2003]

Globe and Mail (2005). First, remember who the real victims were. [theglobeandmail.com](http://www.theglobeandmail.com/servlet/story/RTGAM.20050714.EMUSLIM14_COPY/BNStory/) (July 14). A14. Digital document: http://www.theglobeandmail.com/servlet/story/RTGAM.20050714.EMUSLIM14_COPY/BNStory/. January 3, 2008. [Following the 7 July 2005 Islamic extremist bombings of the London mass transit system:

The victims of last week's London bombings have not all been identified, or even located, yet some Muslim intellectuals in Canada have already begun jostling for a spot on victimhood's centre stage. This is not only bad form; it's plain wrong on the facts, and a shamefully equivocal reply to terrorism.

"If there is one segment of Canadian society that has lived with the constant fear of terrorist attacks," wrote Sheema Khan, who is head of the Council on American Islamic Relations (Canada) and has a regular op-ed column in *The Globe and Mail*, "it is Canadian Muslims and Arabs. They know they will bear the brunt of the fall-out." She went on to wonder what would happen if Islamist terrorists were to strike at Canada. "Is internment in the works? Mass deportation of non-citizens? Limits placed on individual rights and freedom of movement?" The Canadian government, she says, has been "conspicuously silent on its contingency plans."

....

These exemplify the "yes, but" responses to terrorism. Yes, but we are victims, too. Yes, we abhor terror, but what about Israeli settlements, what about the U.S. invasion of Iraq, what about all those bad things the West does to Muslims? This is the tilling of the very soil from which terrorism springs – not poverty or disaffected youth in and of themselves (they are nearly universal), but victimology, a sense of grievance so profound it justifies virtually anything done in its name.

....

Much is made by Ms. Khan and Dr. Elmasry of the potential backlash in Canada, but this country's record suggests little reason for worry. After the terrorist attacks in New York and Washington on Sept. 11, 2001, prime minister Jean Chrétien went to religious services at a Muslim mosque to promote tolerance. Conspicuous? Yes. Silent? No.

And Statistics Canada reports that the number-one target of hate crimes in 2001 and 2002, after the worst act of terrorism ever against the West (3,000 dead, including 24 Canadians), was not Muslims but Jews. Twenty-five per cent of 1,000 hate crimes reported by 12 big-city police forces were committed against Jews. Blacks made up 17 per cent. That was no backlash; it was just the regular lash of daily life. By comparison, Muslims (11 per cent) were targeted in roughly the same numbers as South Asians (10 per cent) and gays and lesbians (9 per cent).

Internment camps? Mass deportations? Orders restricting free movement? Canada has used its anti-terrorism legislation, passed shortly after 9/11, all of once. It also called a national inquiry into the tragedy of deportation (from the United States) and torture (in Syria) that befell one Muslim citizen of Canada, Maher Arar. This country is quite willing to lash itself over its failings. And so it should be.

These are dangerous times for Muslims and non-Muslims, in Canada and around the world. The immediate danger is to life and limb; the broader danger is to the economy and, beyond that, to the trust and mutual acceptance that are the glue of democracy. All people share in the struggle to maintain a safe, open society. But because extremists have issued a clarion call to Muslims worldwide, and because that call is a powerful one that has drawn in four British-born Muslims believed to have perpetrated the bombings, Muslims everywhere must confront the threat within.]

Harris, David B. (2008). Is Canada Losing the Balance Between Liberty and Security? In *Immigration Policy and the Terrorist Threat in Canada and the United States*, eds. Alexander Moens and Martin Collacott. Fraser Institute, 129-159. Digital document: http://www.fraserinstitute.org/Commerce.Web/product_files/ImmigrationTerroristThreatChapter8.pdf. ISBN 978-0-88975-235-1. [Harris applies himself to a 2005 study conducted by the Canadian Council on American-Islamic Relations (CAIR-CAN).

The credibility of one of CAIR-CAN's surveys on the treatment and perceptions of Canadian Muslims came into question when a representative of CAIR-CAN testified before the Maher Arar Commission regarding its curious statistical "survey," conducted in June 2005 and titled *Presumption of Guilt*.

Testifying about the survey, CAIR-CAN's Chair, Sheema Khan, faced only deferential questions from Commission staff. However, Simon Fothergill, Counsel for the Attorney General of Canada, exposed doubts about the survey's reliability and credibility (Commission of Inquiry into the Actions of Canadian Officials in Relation to Maher Arar, 2005: 6290ff). It turned out that the anonymous, questionnaire-based study had made response-forms available on the internet, making it possible for foreigners who had never even set foot in Canada to attest to the imaginary anti-Muslim abuse they had suffered in the country. Copies had also been emailed to those on the CAIR-CAN member list, raising issues of bias, given CAIR-CAN's *idée fixe* about "anti-Islamic" behaviour.

Fothergill pointed out that over half the respondents were connected to CAIR-CAN (6323, l. 3-6), and a "good proportion" were from those interested in Muslim and/or Arab advocacy or issues (6323, l. 17-22). In the end, the survey's credibility – and its implicit claims regarding anti-Islamic tides – were dashed as Khan proved unable to clarify fundamental aspects of the study, including the number of forms that were distributed: "I can't really say"; the number of hard copies that were distributed at centers and mosques: "I don't have the number on me right now"; and whether the ethnic make-up of respondents was statistically-representative of Muslim Canada: "I would have to look at the Census to speak to that" (6321, l. 16-21; 6322, l. 1-2; and, 6322, l. 25-6324, l. 1-2).

Harris writes broadly about the misleading and divisive nature of such "studies". Of "Hard-line immigré-based groups such as the Canadian Council on American-Islamic Relations (CAIR-CAN) and the Canadian Islamic Congress (CIC)," he says:

... These groups have caused alienation within the Muslim community with their improbable "studies" ... that allege Canadian Muslims are being victimized everywhere, and their calls for further "accommodation" of the fundamentalist view.

Challenging CAIR-CAN statistics, Fraser Institute CANSTAT Project Director Neil Seeman (2002, Sep. 14) concluded that "however much some in the media tried to imagine a 'backlash' against

Muslim Canadians, the truth is there never really was one.” In fact, Statistics Canada reports that the number-one target of hate crimes in 2001 and 2002 after 9/11 was not Muslims but Jews. Twenty-five percent of 1,000 hate crimes reported by 12 big-city police forces in Canada were committed against Jews. By comparison, Muslims (11%) were targeted in roughly the same numbers as South Asians (10%) and gays and lesbians (9%) (*The Globe and Mail*, 2005, July 14).

In the United States, FBI statistics have led the *Investor's Business Daily* to declare that “Muslim groups are crying wolf about exploding anti-Muslim abuses” (2007, Dec. 3):

In 2006, a whopping 66% of religiously motivated attacks were on Jews, while just 11% targeted Muslims, even though the Jewish and Muslim populations are similar in size. Catholics and Protestants, who together account for 9% of victims, are subject to almost as much abuse as Muslims in the US ...

“[I]t is unclear why anyone would propagate unreliable information that might trigger upheavals,” concludes Harris, “but this is part of the challenge Canada now faces.”

Hustmyre, Chuck (2008). CAIR backs off support for terror suspects. *worldnetdaily.com* (January 17). Digital document: http://www.worldnetdaily.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE_ID=59728, January 18, 2008. [US case of Youssef Megahed and Ahmed Mohamed. Ahmed Bedier, executive director of CAIR's Tampa office, declared that their arrest was merely an example of “racial profiling”. According to authorities, Megahed and Mohamed were stopped for speeding, and, according to *worldnetdaily.com*, their trunk disclosed “four pieces of PVC pipe packed with what appeared to be explosives. { ... } 20 feet of safety fuse, a nearly full five-gallon can of gasoline, a drill and a box of .22-caliber bullets. Arrested near a sensitive US naval facility, the suspects said they were going to the beach and carrying fireworks. As the evidence emerged, CAIR began to back away from its initial position:

"I've never said that these people were innocent, or that we were providing any kind of support for them," Bedier told WND. "If they did anything wrong they should be punished."

But when FBI agents searched Megahed's home in August, Bedier claimed the case was nothing more than an example of racial profiling.

"Definitely, this is not related to terrorism," Bedier told the Associated Press. "Had these been two good ol' boys from South Carolina driving through and speeding – and even if they did have some fireworks – nobody would have been arrested."

In light of the implicit suggestion of official bigotry, note that, on 18 June 2008, Ahmed Mohamed pleaded guilty in this matter to providing material support to terrorists. See: Mitch Stacy, AP (2008). Egyptian student pleads guilty to terrorist aid. *news.yahoo.com* (June 18). Digital document: http://news.yahoo.com/s/ap/20080618/ap_on_re_us/explosives_arrest. June 18, 2008. Meanwhile, in the wake of the plea, terrorism expert Steven Emerson derided what he took to be post-plea radical-apologetics by the now-former CAIR-Tampa spokesman, Ahmed Bedier; see Investigative Project on Terrorism (2008). Bedier Reaches New Low on USF Plea. *investigativeproject.org* (June 16). Digital document: http://www.investigativeproject.org/article_print.php?id=689&v=3223283121. June 18, 2008. To Emerson, Bedier's statements after the plea seemed to suggest that Mohamed had been the victim of an anti-Muslim “climate”, an impression that was inconsistent with evidence of Mohamed's having put together an instructional video for bomb-making.]

Investor's Business Daily (2007). Hying Hate Crime Vs. Muslims. *ibdeditorials.com* (December 3). Digital document : <http://www.ibdeditorials.com/IBDArticles.aspx?id=281576932449479>. December 4, 2007. [Release of FBI's hate-crimes' statistics for 2006.

New FBI data on hate crimes reveal Muslim groups are crying wolf about exploding anti-Muslim abuses. They're actually shrinking, belying claims of mass Islamophobia.

Not only are anti-Islamic hate crimes way down, but they're a fraction of overall religious hate crimes.

The overwhelming majority of such crimes target Jews, something CAIR and other Muslim groups don't seem all that concerned about.

In 2006, a whopping 66% of religiously motivated attacks were on Jews, while just 11% targeted Muslims, even though the Jewish and Muslim populations are similar in size. Catholics and Protestants, who together account for 9% of victims, are subject to almost as much abuse as Muslims in this country.]

Malik, Kenan (2005). Islamophobia Myth. FrontPageMagazine.com (February 10). Digital document : <http://frontpagemag.com/Articles/ReadArticle.asp?ID=16735>. February 10, 2005. [Originally in Prospect Magazine.] [Article focuses on claims of the Muslim Council of Britain, not on those of CAIR/CAIR-CAN.]

But does Islamophobia exist? The trouble with the idea is that it confuses hatred of, and discrimination against, Muslims on the one hand with criticism of Islam on the other. The charge of "Islamophobia" is all too often used not to highlight racism but to silence critics of Islam, or even Muslims fighting for reform of their communities.

In reality, discrimination against Muslims is not as great as is often claimed. ...]

Malkin, Michelle (2003). CAIR's War on conservative radio. townhall.com (May 5). <http://www.townhall.com/columnists/michellemalkin/mm20040505.shtml>. May 5, 2004. Also as Malkin, Michelle (2004). Waging a radio war. washingtontimes.com (May 12). Digital document: <http://www.washtimes.com/commentary/20040511-085204-8815r.htm>. January 25, 2005. [Malkin writes of "CAIR's campaign to stifle critics of radical Islam," claims CAIR "won't condemn Muslim fanatics, but it has declared war on outspoken Americans who will," and says of the organization's report on "anti-Muslim bias" that "CAIR fights dirty — fabricating quotes, taking comments out of context, indulging in the cult of victimology and exploiting a gullibly sympathetic press. By manufacturing an anti-Muslim hate epidemic that doesn't exist, CAIR obfuscates its own suspicious role in fomenting anti-American extremism."]

Malkin, Michelle (2003). More Muslim hate crime myths. townhall.com (May 30). Digital document: <http://www.townhall.com/columnists/michellemalkin/mm20030530.shtml>. September 16, 2003.

Malkin, Michelle (2003). Myth of the Muslim hate crime epidemic. townhall.com (May 28). Digital document: <http://www.townhall.com/columnists/michellemalkin/mm20030528.shtml>. September 16, 2003.

Mumin, Ibrahim Abdul (2005). A Muslim Against Terror. defenddemocracy.org (Foundation for the Defense of Democracies) (February 28). http://www.defenddemocracy.org/research_topics/research_topics_show.htm?doc_id=263292. March 5, 2005. [Originally at FrontPageMagazine.com. Mumin, a Muslim, states:

I denounce the so-called Islamic organizations such as CAIR (The Council on American-Islamic Relations), which constantly tells Muslims in America that they are in danger from some sort of non-existent plot to defame Islam. These fear-mongering organizations succeed because their followers are too ignorant of their own religion and history to see them as liars and hypocrites.

CAIR should be helping Muslims to become part of the "American Fabric," to co-operate, and integrate into our society. Instead, CAIR pushes Muslims into a kind of emotional helplessness, trying to force upon them the unpleasant gratification of feeling themselves victims, and then filling them with a sort of lurking, sardonic consciousness that the "victim" is stronger than the "victimizer." In the end they want the victims to pull down their victimizer like a pack of hyenas on an unwary lion... America. The victimization by America, however, is false. The real victimizer is CAIR itself. Expose their Wahabbi Saudi backed agenda. Muslims are not in danger from or in America. America and Muslims are in danger from CAIR.]

National Public Radio (2005). Profile: Non-scientific approach used by activist groups to obtain statistics supporting their claims about hate crimes. NPR Transcript of "Day to Day" program of 23 May 2005, host Alex Chadwick,

reporter Mike Pesca. Digital document: <http://www.npr.org/transcripts/story.html>. June 1, 2005. [Incorporates Pesca interview with CAIR National Legal Director Mr. Arsalan Iftikhar regarding allegedly “dubious” reporting and statistical methods used in CAIR’s annual report on the status of Muslim civil rights in the US. (See also Daniel Pipes, “MSM Criticizes CAIR, CAIR Brazens It Out,” [danielpipes.org](http://www.danielpipes.org), 23 May 2005 <<http://www.danielpipes.org/>> (accessed 1 June 2005).) CAIR claimed bias crimes against Muslims reached 1,522 incidents, up fifty percent. However, referring to a single episode in which there was a delay in a Muslim group’s Canada-US travel – possibly when the group was returning from a Toronto conference sponsored by an Islamic organization under Congressional committee financial investigation – Pesca observed that, “[b]y CAIR’s reporting methods, those 40 travelers delayed in Toronto would count as 40 separate incidents.” The NPR transcript continues:

PESCA: {....} The category of unreasonable arrest was the largest single category of civil rights violations CAIR counted. While CAIR’s report refers to the well over 1,200 arrests of Muslim and Arab men after September 11th, the official statistics reflect only cases CAIR can document. Last year, that number was 385. Iftikhar acknowledges that some of the cases in the report should not have been included. Soon after it was issued, the report was jumped on by a few conservative commentators who called it inaccurate. Two different men, originally reported as victims, have been charged with setting fire to their own businesses. Iftikhar says the removal of those cases does not affect the overall trend the report documents. Even so, the vagaries in the numbers point to the difficulty of compiling accurate statistics.

Mark Potok, of the hate crime-monitoring Southern Poverty Law Center, says his organization gave up quantifying bias as a fruitless pursuit years ago.

Mr. MARK POTOK (Southern Poverty Law Center): I think that the better policy for independent groups, watchdog groups and so on, is to, as much as possible, stick scrupulously to the truth. And in my opinion, the truth is that it is not possible to say whether hate crimes are going up or down. The material to make judgments like that, the statistical material, simply isn't out there.]

Nawash, Kamal (2005). Response to Freedom House Investigation. [Freemuslims.org](http://www.freemuslims.org) (February 22). Digital document: <http://www.freemuslims.org/news/article.php?article=439>. February 23, 2005. [Author is a lawyer and President of Free Muslims Against Terror (FMAT), Washington, DC.

Most importantly, extremism in the Muslim world continues to grow because most Muslims are unwilling to admit that we have a problem with extremism and support for terrorism. The response by Muslims to the Freedom House report is not the first time that the Muslim community resorted to denial and accusations of Muslim-bashing when presented with evidence of Muslim culpability.

....

Muslims must wake up, look inward and put a stop to many of our religious leaders who spend most of their sermons teaching hatred, intolerance and violent jihad. We should not be afraid to admit that as Muslims we have a problem with violent extremism. We should not be afraid to admit that so many of our religious leaders belong behind bars, and not behind a pulpit.

Only moderate Muslims can challenge and defeat extremist Muslims. We can no longer afford to be silent. If we remain silent to the extremism within our community, then we should not expect anyone to listen to us when we complain of stereotyping and discrimination by non-Muslims. We should not be surprised when the world treats all of us as terrorists. And we should not be surprised when we are profiled at airports.

Simply put, not only do Muslims need to join the war against extremism and terror, we need to take the lead in this war.]

Pipes, Daniel and Sharon Chadha (2005). CAIR’s Hate Crimes Nonsense. FrontPageMagazine.com (May 18). Digital document: <http://frontpagemag.com/Articles/ReadArticle.asp?ID=18109>. May 18, 2005. [CAIR’s annual report, *Unequal Protection: The Status of Muslim Civil Rights in the United States 2005*, claims – in Pipes’ and Chadha’s words – ““anti-Muslim hate crimes in the United States” has gone up dramatically: from 42 cases in 2002, to 93 cases in 2003, to 141 in 2004.” Article continues: “But CAIR is part of

the Wahhabi Lobby, so { ... } we thought it a good idea to take a closer look at the report,” and this closer examination was said to disclose “a pattern of sloppiness, exaggeration, and distortion.” Examples are given of the report’s reliance on false claims (including counting as a hate crime a “victim’s” committing arson upon his own property), followed by this summary:

Of twenty “anti-Muslim hate crimes” in 2004 that CAIR describes, at least six are invalid – and further research could likely find problems with the other fourteen instances.

Nor is this the first unreliable CAIR report; earlier ones were just as bad. Speaking about the 1996 CAIR report, terrorism expert Steven Emerson noted in congressional testimony that “a large proportion of the complaints have been found to be fabricated, manufactured, distorted or outside standard definitions of hate crimes.” The 1996 report included the arrest of Musa Abu Marzouk, a Hamas leader, and the trial of Omar Abdul-Rahman, the blind sheikh and ringleader of the foiled “Day of Terror” plot to blow up New York City landmarks.

Even more absurdly, CAIR classified as an American hate crime the shooting of Ahmed Hamida in Jerusalem on February 26, 1996, as he fled after driving his car into a crowd of Israeli civilians, killing one and injuring twenty-three others. One wonders why the killing of a terrorist in Israel would be classified as an American issue; more of CAIR’s sloppiness?

Pipes and Chadha then assess the implications of CAIR’s allegedly sponsoring, and the mainstream media’s publishing, exaggerated hate-crime statistics:

Indeed, very little of what CAIR asserts checks out. CAIR’s significant inaccuracy has potentially great consequence. Note what happened after Newsweek reported in its May 9 {2005} issue that the Koran had been desecrated at the U.S. military prison in Guantánamo, Cuba. Protests raged in the Muslim world, including demonstrations that turned violent in Afghanistan and killed at least sixteen people. Newsweek eventually retracted the story but a bit late. Had things turned out otherwise, CAIR’s erroneous report could have provoked similar violence.

The staff at CAIR does not divulge to us its reasons for not retracting at least the provably false incidents embedded in its inflated “hate” figures, but we can think of two reasons: to scare its constituency, thereby raising more money; and to put the American public on the defensive, thereby winning more privileges for Islam, such as the 2000 U.S. Senate resolution inveighing against the “discrimination and harassment” suffered by the American Muslim community.

But why do journalists report the results of CAIR’s survey – as though it came from a source without a viewpoint bias, as though past studies had been reliable, as though its polls are scientific, as though it has not been party to threats against an American Muslim dissident, and as though it has not protected Osama bin Laden’s image, as though five of CAIR’s staff and board members have not already been associated with terrorism, and as though it is not named as a defendant in 9/11 terror lawsuit?

One wonders what it will take for old media to ignore CAIR’s unreliable research and instead start reporting the words of Steven Pomerantz, a former chief of the FBI’s counterterrorism section, that CAIR’s activities “effectively give aid to international terrorist groups.”]

Pipes, Daniel (2005). MSM Criticizes CAIR, CAIR Brazens It Out. danielpipes.org (May 23). Digital document: <http://www.danielpipes.org/>. June 1, 2005. [Discussing National Public Radio’s “Day to Day” report on “dubious” hate-crime statistics and CAIR’s annual report on Muslim civil rights [see National Public Radio, “Profile: Non-scientific approach used by activist groups to obtain statistics supporting their claims about hate crimes,” NPR Transcript of “Day to Day” program of 23 May 2005, host Alex Chadwick, reporter Mike Pesca <<http://www.npr.org/transcripts/story.html>> (accessed 1 June 2005).], author refers to NPR reporter Mike Pesca’s related exchange with CAIR National Legal Director Mr. Arsalan Iftikhar. Of Pesca:

He then quotes the CAIR report's author, Arsalan Iftikhar, acknowledging that some cases should not have been included. Alluding to the piece by Chadha and me, Pesca continues:

Soon after it was issued, the report was jumped on by a few conservative commentators who called it inaccurate. Two different men, originally reported as victims, have been charged with setting fire to their own businesses. Iftikhar says the removal of those cases does not affect the overall trend the report documents. Even so, the vagaries in the numbers point to the difficulty of compiling accurate statistics.

Spoken like a true Islamist – never apologize, never retreat. Caught with fraudulent stats, Iftikhar brazens it out, denying that the inaccuracies have any importance. Or, as a *New York Times* editorial ineffectually expressed it in another context, "fake but accurate." Still, the important thing here is that NPR has questioned CAIR's reliability, and that is a major step.]

Poole, Patrick (2007). Lies, Damned Lies, and CAIR's Statistics. americanthinker.com (June 5). Digital document: http://www.americanthinker.com/2007/06/lies_damned_lies_and_cairs_sta.html. June 14, 2008. [Author alleges that he caught Ahmad Al-Akhras, identified as "national vice-chairman for CAIR", the Council on American-Islamic Relations, in an inconsistency. Poole reports that an Al-Akhras letter-to-the-editor in the *Columbus Dispatch*, touted a Pew Research Center poll, "Muslim Americans: Middle-Class and Mostly Mainstream" as evidence of the moderate, mainstream nature of most US Muslims. Poole concludes that, in an apparent effort to play up attractive features of the poll's portrayal of US Muslims, the CAIR official has forgotten that certain significant poll findings are diametrically opposed to longstanding CAIR "spin":

The Pew Study refutes two of the most regular claims offered by CAIR. The first is the 8 million Muslim myth - the attempt by CAIR and other Islamist organizations to inflate the Muslim population to claim greater political clout. But Pew estimates only 2.35 million Muslims - less than one percent of the total population. This is in line with most other official studies conducted over the past decade by Pew, the University of Chicago, Columbia University and others.

The second myth propounded by CAIR destroyed by this study is that Muslims in America are everywhere oppressed and alienated by non-Muslims. Al-Akhras himself claims that American Muslims are well-integrated into society, and the Pew poll finds that Muslim-American personal income and education are comparable to the public at-large. This is hardly the portrait of a victimized community, and is evidence that the fear-mongering which is the staple of CAIR's public statements has no basis in fact. The support by Ahmad Al-Akhras for the Pew study findings contradicts some of the very claims he has made about the downtrodden Muslim community in the past.]

Prager, Dennis (2007). Why "Islamophobia" Is a Brilliant Term. townhall.com (July 31). Digital document: http://www.townhall.com/columnists/DennisPrager/2007/07/31/why_islamophobia_is_a_brilliant_term?page=full&comments=true. February 22, 2008.

[Whoever coined the term "Islamophobia" was quite shrewd. Notice the intellectual sleight of hand here. The term is not "Muslim-phobia" or "anti-Muslimist," it is Islam-ophobia -- fear of Islam -- yet fear of Islam is in no way the same as hatred of all Muslims. One can rightly or wrongly fear Islam, or more usually, aspects of Islam, and have absolutely no bias against all Muslims, let alone be a racist.

The equation of Islamophobia with racism is particularly dishonest. Muslims come in every racial group, and Islam has nothing to do with race. Nevertheless, mainstream Western media, Islamist groups calling themselves Muslim civil liberties groups and various Western organizations repeatedly declare that Islamophobia is racism.

....

The fact remains that the term "Islamophobia" has one purpose -- to suppress any criticism, legitimate or not, of Islam. And given the cowardice of the Western media, and the collusion of the left in banning any such criticism (while piling it on Christianity and Christians), it is working.

Latest proof: This past week a man in New York was charged with two felonies for what is being labeled the hate crime of putting a Koran in a toilet at Pace College. Not misdemeanors, mind you, felonies. Meanwhile, the man who put a crucifix in a jar of urine continues to have his artwork -- "Piss Christ" -- displayed at galleries and museums. A Koran in a toilet is a hate crime; a crucifix in pee is a work of art. Thanks in part to that brilliant term, "Islamophobia."]

Salman, Omran (2006). Misguided Muslim groups. philly.com (August 31). Digital document: <http://www.philly.com/mld/inquirer/news/editorial/15401769.htm?template=contentModules/printstory.jsp>. September 1, 2006. [Author is identified as a Bahraini journalist and editor-in-chief of www.aafaq.org :

On Aug. 10, British police arrested 24 Muslim suspects in a plot to blow up 10 U.S.-bound jetliners over the Atlantic. If successful, the attack would have killed thousands of people. The terrorists were motivated by religious extremism.

Rather than just condemn the plot and address the scourge of Islamic extremism, Muslim groups such as the Council on American Islamic Relations (CAIR), the Muslim Public Affairs Council (MPAC) and the Muslim American Society (MAS) sought to both legitimize terror and portray Muslims as victims.

Do these organizations really represent Muslims in the West? Hardly. It is their apologia of Islamic extremism, rather than discrimination or religious hatred in Western society, which most victimizes American Muslims.

The basic narrative of these self-described civil-rights groups is twofold: The United States provokes terrorism because of its foreign policy, and Muslims in the West face a backlash in the wake of terror.

On July 31, for example, Salam al-Marayati, executive director of MPAC, penned an op-ed piece in the Denver Post arguing that "we should not be surprised" when Islamist extremists "respond with belligerence to their continued humiliation and not-quite-human treatment by the international community." He made no mention of the Saudi religious schools that indoctrinate generations of children into a philosophy of hate and violence.

After law enforcement stopped the mid-Atlantic massacre, Nihad Awad, executive director of CAIR, warned, "We ought to take advantage of these incidents to make sure that we do not start a religious war against Islam and Muslim." He called on Muslims to step up security at mosques and community centers to counter negative backlash to news of the plot.

But does such a backlash exist? According to the 2004 FBI hate-crimes report, the latest published, there were 156 incidents of anti-Muslim hate crimes; in comparison, there were 95 anti-Christian, and 954 anti-Jewish attacks in the United States. Rather than fear American freedom, most Muslims embrace it. At more than \$42,000, average income for Muslim families is higher than the American average.

Rather than help Muslims in America, most Muslim organizations hinder them. Self-appointed representatives downplay religious extremism and focus more on the image of Muslims rather than on the loss of innocent life. They remain silent on the assault waged on liberalism by Islamists. Most Muslims in America, though, fled the Middle East for the liberal values of their adopted country.]

Schwartz, Stephen (2005). "Profiling" the Critics of Extremist Islamic Ideology. Tech Central Station (April 27). Digital document: <http://www.techcentralstation.com/042705E.html>. April 28, 2005. [Author says "A continuous propaganda of grievance emanates from the Wahhabi lobby in America," and identifies among this lobby "the Islamic Society of North America (ISNA), the Council on American-Islamic Relations (CAIR), the Muslim Students' Association of the U.S. and Canada (MSA), the Arab American Institute (AAI), the Muslim Public Affairs

Council (MPAC), the Muslim American Society (MAS), and the Islamic Circle of North America (ICNA).” Schwartz condemns attempts by similar groups to smear as “Islamophobic” such thinkers as Dr. Daniel Pipes and Steven Emerson, and goes on:

American governmental "profiling" of Arabs and Muslims has been a trivial phenomenon at worst. U.S. federal investigators have in most cases been extremely cautious, notwithstanding hysterical claims and rumors fostered by the Wahhabi lobby. This blather focuses on accusations of wholesale injustice and supposed preparation of internment for Arabs and Muslims, comparable to the wartime relocation of the ethnic Japanese in the Western U.S. during the second world war.]

Schwartz, Stephen (2008). CAIR vs. the NYPD. [weeklystandard.com](http://www.weeklystandard.com) (April 11). Digital document: <http://www.weeklystandard.com/Content/Public/Articles/000/000/014/968cekhc.asp>. April 11, 2008. [Schwartz, a convert to Sufi Islam, complains that members of what he terms America’s hardline “Wahhabi Lobby”, are attempting to speak for the entire US Muslim community, in condemning a leading study of radical and extremist Islamism. According to Schwartz, the New York Police Department Intelligence Division document, *Radicalization in the West: The Home-Grown Threat*, “met with enthusiastic approval from anti-extremist, moderate Muslims, but with predictable condemnation from the “Wahhabi lobby” represented by the Council on American-Islamic Relations (CAIR) and its allies.” *Radicalization in the West* is, he says, “clear-sighted and path-breaking”:

It traced radical Sunni Muslim activities in non-Muslim countries to the "jihadi-Salafi" ideology, better known as Wahhabism, created in Saudi Arabia and supported by major extremist resources in Pakistan (the jihadist movement of Mawdudi) and Egypt (the Muslim Brotherhood).

As to its detractors:

But for Islamists in America, charges of "profiling" and "inappropriate" methods are the preferred reply to critical discussion of almost all significant matters. Those who investigate Wahhabism are accused of "profiling" Saudis, even though numerous Saudi subjects hate and reject Wahhabism. Questioners about radicalism in Islam are alleged to "profile" all Muslims, notwithstanding the recognition and repudiation of extremism by millions of ordinary Muhammadan believers. According to the radicals, they themselves represent the Muslim mainstream, their practices and beliefs are harmless, and any questioning of them amounts to persecution. Unfortunately for the extremists, many Muslims disagree with them, considering them a deviant phenomenon, their habits and views distorted, and their worldwide quest for domination worthy of decided opposition.]

Seeman, Neil (2002). Are we all Islamophobes? Not really. [freerepublic.com](http://www.freerepublic.com) (*National Post*) (September 14). Digital document: <http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/news/750816/posts>. April 3, 2004. [Indictment of statistical methods and data used by CAIR-CAN to support anti-Muslim bias claims. Author is CANSTAT project director, Fraser Institute

However much some in the media tried to imagine a "backlash" against Muslim Canadians, the truth is there never really was one. A February poll by Environics found strong support for diversity and tolerance toward minorities. Yet a month earlier, Marketing Magazine advised us that Canadian "biases have been exposed" since the terrorist attacks. A month before that, Maclean's reported that "Sept. 11 has given white supremacist organizations a shot in the arm." Maclean's had no data to back up its alarmism apart from unsubstantiated evidence from a talk-show host who had "no firm figures."

This kind of hyperbole expands the idea of "bias" beyond all rational bounds. Of the 262 incidents of alleged bias documented in the CAIR poll, most involved perceived slights -- impossible to verify -- such as "rude looks and stares," "comments attacking Islam," and a "bad attitude from public and service personnel." Meanwhile, the accusations against Jean Chrétien, the Prime Minister, whom CAIR has reprimanded as indifferent to Muslim concerns, were even less precise: The reason most given for why Mr. Chrétien deserved to be scolded was a "general impression" of ill will toward Muslims.

Racism is a serious charge. One should need more than a "general impression" to make the case against the Canadian media and the Prime Minister. And believe me: If there were reliable data to substantiate it, the media would happily report it. On page one.]

Skinner, David (2004). Behind CAIR's Hate Crimes Report. *weeklystandard.com* (Daily Standard) (June 5). <http://www.weeklystandard.com/Content/Public/Articles/000/000/004/054aycfi.asp>. January 27, 2005. [Disputing claims of 70 percent increase in bias crimes against Muslims asserted in CAIR's annual report, "The Status of Muslim Civil Rights in the United States 2004." Author says "We live in a society of singular, hair-trigger sensitivity to slight, and CAIR is situated at the wacky, exteroceptors end of such interaction. Long before a painful stimulus registers in the reasoning parts of the brain, this hysterical organization screams bloody bias." Asserts that unreliability of current CAIR bias data and analytical methods means "it would be best if their work were dismissed as the cheap agitprop it clearly is."]

Taranto, James (2008). Best of the Web Today. *opinionjournal.com* (November 14). Digital document: <http://www.opinionjournal.com/best/?id=110002620>. January 29, 2008. [Taranto criticizes exaggerated reporting of anti-Muslim hate crimes, particularly by Human Rights Watch. He points out HRW's inclusion of a crime of passion in the statistics. Taranto includes an excerpt from *The New Republic*, telling of the situation of UCLA Islamic jurisprudence Professor Khaled Abou El Fadl. After 9/11, El Fadl received a succession of abusive anonymous phone calls and e-mails, a suspicious vehicle hovered about his residence, and his SUV's windows were smashed.

When he brought these incidents to the attention of police, they requested--and he granted--permission to tap his home phone. UCLA installed a red panic button next to his desk, ensuring that campus cops could respond within minutes to any crisis in his office. The FBI even assigned an agent to track down his tormenters. (To date, they have not been found.) All of this might sound like the prelude to a textbook hate crime, but the Abou El Fadl case has a twist: The callers weren't angry white men accusing him of terrorist sympathies; they were fellow Muslim Americans accusing him of selling out the faith.]

thestyletoblog.com (2006). THE DAILY BLADE: CAIR's Non-Existent "Muslim Backlash". *thestyletoblog.com* (October 20). Digital document: <http://thestyletoblog.com/2006/10/20/the-daily-blade-cairs-nonexistent-muslim-backlash.aspx>. March 18, 2007:

[[P]On Wednesday, the FBI released a report detailing hate crimes that occurred in 2005. This report should drive a stake into the heart of incessant claims by the Council on American-Islamic Relations (CAIR) of an anti-Muslim backlash in the US since 9/11.

Of the 1,405 victims of an anti-religion hate crime, 69.5 percent were Jewish (848 incidents resulting in 900 offenses committed against 977 victims by 364 offenders). In comparison, 10.7 percent were Muslim (128 incidents resulting in 146 offenses committed against 151 victims by 89 offenders).

In its latest "anti-Muslim backlash" report – a very wide-margin and large type compilation of he-said-she-said anecdotes and local media coverage of press conferences at which allegations are made that almost never result in arrests, trials and convictions – CAIR claimed that it "processed" (whatever that means) 1,972 civil rights complaints in 2005, and received reports of 153 anti-Muslim hate crimes complaints.

While the FBI report corroborates CAIR's claim of anti-Muslim hate crimes, it completely discredits claims that Muslims are being targeted by hate-filled infidels (that is to say, American Christians and Jews). The incontrovertible (and inconvenient) fact is that there were seven Jews for every Muslim who was the victim of a hate crime in the US.

The Stiletto checked CAIR's Web site today and did not find any press release decrying the anti-Jewish backlash that the FBI report so clearly establishes.]

Vere, Pete (2008). Trial cites U.S. Web sites. washingtontimes.com (June 9). Digital document: <http://washingtontimes.com/news/2008/jun/09/trial-cites-us-web-sites/>. June 9, 2008. [Developments in the British Columbia Human Rights Commission complaint by Dr. Elmasry's Canadian Islamic Congress, against *Maclean's* magazine's publishing of excerpts from Mark Steyn's bestseller, *America Alone*.

"If at all there will be a anti-Muslim backlash, it will be because the Canadian Islamic Congress and Mr. Elmasry contributed significantly to it," Mr. Fatah told the Washington Times.

A practicing Muslim, Mr. Fatah accused the Canadian Islamic Congress of being agent provocateurs for Islamists by trying to provoke such a backlash.

"My feeling is - and I could be wrong - but they're trying to trigger a backlash against Muslims, so that the imams and the Hamas and the Hezbollah people back in the Middle East can say: 'Look, we told you that the West is at war with Islam,'" he said.

....

Mr. Fatah, who has criticized Mr. Steyn's book, said the vast majority of Canadian Muslims do not support the Islamists and crowded over a planned demonstration that the complainants had tried to organize at the hearing, since Vancouver boasts one of Canada's largest Muslim populations.

"Not a single person showed up," Mr. Fatah said. "The vast majority of the Muslim community are sick and tired of these crybabies. We have a good life in Canada."

Mr. Fatah also dared Canada's human rights tribunals, which he referred to as "a politically correct ... kangaroo ... troika," to bring a case against him for repeating many of Mr. Steyn's criticisms of radical Islamists.]