
APPENDIX

CBSC Decision 06/07-0009 CFMJ-AM re a segment on an episode of *Coast to Coast AM*

The Complaint

The CBSC received the following complaint via its website form on September 3, 2006:

station: CFMJ, CKTB and others
program: *Coast to Coast AM* with Art Bell
date: September 3, 2006
time: 1:00 am CFMJ - 5:00 am CKTB

concern: The program in question was a live edition of *Coast to Coast AM* broadcast overnight Sunday September 3, 2006 1:00 am EDT. It is a popular overnight talk show originating outside of Canada but re-broadcast from many Canadian radio stations including CFMJ, CKTB, CHQR, CHED, CJBK, CINW, CFUN, CFAX, CKLW and CJOB.

The host (Art Bell) opened the show with a 12 minute monologue in support of the war on terror. It actually was an essay he was reading that had apparently been written back in 2005 by a retired US Major General. The host read the essay in a manner where one could easily have concluded he was speaking in his own words. At the end he declared that while they were not his words, he was in total and full agreement with the content and had made the decision to read it "on air" because "he had to do what he had to do" regardless of the consequences.

The content was tantamount to a diatribe directed against all Muslims delivered (and I would suggest constructed) in a manner intended to incite hate and kindle racism towards the entire Muslim community. Using the topic of the war on terror as a pretext the listener was "convincingly" steered through false arguments and manipulated with the emotion of fear to arrive at the conclusion that all Muslims are the enemy.

The essay (monologue) interchanges the term "Terrorist Muslims" with "Muslims" leaving the listener with the distinct impression that all Muslims are the "enemy" and not just any enemy but one that will stop at nothing to advance their cause using the most brutal of means. An equally important issue is the fallacious nature of the argument presented. Normally such an argument would simply be an expression of opinion; however, in the context of a commentary that incites hate, the use of a fallacious argument greatly exacerbates the issue by providing a supposedly rational foundation for the perspective being argued.

I am including excerpts from a transcript of the program broadcast on Sunday September, 3, 2006 on CFMJ (1:00 am EDT) and CKTB (5:00 am EDT) (I assume the other Canadian affiliates that carry this program also participated in the broadcast).

Excerpts from Art Bell's Monologue on the "War on Terror" on *Coast to Coast AM*:

"Who were the attackers? In each case, the attacks on the US were carried out by Muslims. What is the Muslim population of the World? 25%."

"So who are we at war with? There is no way we can honestly respond that it is anyone other than the Muslim terrorists."

"The attacks will not subside, but rather will steadily increase. Remember, they want us dead, not just quiet. If they had just wanted us quiet, they would not have produced an increasing series of attacks against us, over the past 18 years."

"If we lose the war, our production, income, exports and way of life will all vanish as we know it. After losing, who would trade or deal with us, if they were threatened by the Muslims? If we can't stop the Muslims, how could anyone else?"

"Name any Muslim countries throughout the world that allow freedom of speech, freedom of thought, freedom of religion, freedom of the press, equal rights for anyone -- let alone everyone, equal status or any status for women, or that have been productive in one single way that contributes to the good of the world. This has been a long way of saying that we must be united on this war or we will be equated in the history books to the self-inflicted fall of the Roman Empire. If, that is, the Muslim leaders will allow history books to be written or read."

"If we don't win this war right now, keep a close eye on how the Muslims take over France in the next 5 years or less. They will continue to increase the Muslim population of France and continue to encroach little by little, on the established French traditions. The French will be fighting among themselves, over what should or should not be done, which will continue to weaken them and keep them from any united resolve. Doesn't that sound eerily familiar?"

"They (Muslims) have universally shown that when they have taken over, they then start brutally killing each other over who will be the few who control the masses. Will we ever stop hearing from the politically correct, about the "peaceful Muslims"?"

The complainant sent another letter on September 5.

This complaint pertains a portion of a live edition of *Coast to Coast AM* broadcast overnight Sunday September 3, 2006 between 1:00 am and 2:00 am EDT and again at 5:00 am. It is a popular overnight talk show originating outside of Canada but re-broadcast from many Canadian radio stations (primarily CORUS Entertainment) including: CFMJ, CKTB, CHQR, CHED, CJBK, CINW, CFUN, CFAX, CKLW and CJOB.

Specifically the host opened the show with a 12 minute monologue in support of the war on terror. The monologue was actually an essay he was reading that had apparently been written back in 2005 by a retired US Major General. The host read the essay in a manner where one could easily have concluded he was speaking in his own words. At the end the host declared that while they were not his words, he was in total and full agreement with the content and had made the decision to read it "on air" because "he had to do what he had to do" regardless of the consequences.

From my perspective the content was tantamount to a vicious rant directed against all Muslims delivered (and I would suggest constructed) in a manner intended to incite hate and kindle racism towards the entire Muslim community. Using the topic of the "war on terror" as

a pretext, the listener was "convincingly" steered through false arguments and manipulated with the emotion of fear to arrive at the conclusion that all Muslims are the enemy.

The essay (monologue) interchanges the term "Muslim terrorists" with "Muslims" leaving the listener with the distinct impression that all Muslims are the "enemy" and not just any enemy but one that will stop at nothing to advance their cause using the most brutal of means. An equally important issue is the fallacious nature of the arguments presented. Normally such arguments would simply be an expression of opinion; however, in the context of a commentary that appears to incite hate, the use of fallacious arguments greatly exacerbates the issue by providing a supposedly rational foundation for the perspective being argued.

The following are excerpts from a transcript of the host's monologue which was broadcast live on Sunday September 3, 2006 on CFMJ (1:00 am-2:00 am EDT) and as a repeat broadcast on CKTB (5:00 am EDT). I assume the other Canadian affiliates that carry this program also participated in the broadcast.

"Who were the attackers? In each case, the attacks on America were carried out by Muslims. What is the Muslim population of the World? Twenty-five per cent."

"So who are we at war with? There is no way we can honestly respond that it is anyone other than the Muslim terrorists."

"The attacks will not subside, but rather will steadily increase. Remember, they want us dead, not just quiet. If they had just wanted us quiet, they would not have produced an increasing series of attacks against us, over the past eighteen years."

"If we lose the war, our production, income, exports and way of life will all vanish as we know them. After losing, who would trade or deal with us, if they were threatened by the Muslims? If we can't stop the Muslims, how could anyone else?"

"Name any Muslim country throughout the world that allows freedom of speech, freedom of thought, freedom of religion, freedom of the press, equal rights for anyone - let alone everyone, equal status or status for women or that have been productive in a single way that contributes to the good of the world. This has been a long way of saying that we must be united on this war or we will be equated in the history books to the self inflicted Fall of the Roman Empire. If, that is, the Muslim leaders will allow history books to be written or read."

"If we don't win this war right now, keep a close eye on how the Muslims take over France in the next five years or less. They will continue to increase the Muslim population of France and continue to encroach little by little, on the established French traditions. The French will be fighting among themselves, over what should or should not be done, which will continue to weaken them and keep them from any united resolve. Doesn't that sound eerily familiar?"

"They (Muslims) have universally shown that when they have taken over, they then start brutally killing each other over who will be the few who control the masses. Will we ever stop hearing from the politically correct, about the peaceful Muslims?"

The commentary that the host read and endorsed was reiterated by the same host in his program on Monday September 4 (1:00 am) with a clarification as to the essay's author (apparently unknown) and a reaffirmation that regardless of the identity of the author the host stood by the content of the essay that he had read the night before.

I am not a professional ethicist and therefore am not qualified to suggest that his words constitute a hate crime. I therefore bring this issue to the attention of the Canadian Broadcast Standards Council and will defer to their judgement as to the nature of the content, its appropriateness for public broadcast and determination if it constitutes criminal behaviour.

Broadcaster's Response

CFMJ responded to the complainant on September 19:

The Canadian Broadcast Standards Council (the "CBSC") has asked us to respond to your email of September 3, 2006 in which you raised concerns regarding comments made during *Coast to Coast AM* (the "Program") aired on CFMJ (the "Station") that same morning.

As you know, the Station's format is news/talk. The Station's programming is directed at an adult audience of 18 years and over, and consists of a mix of news, talk and information programming that covers diverse topics of public concern. It offers frank and open debate on an array of issues that are sometimes controversial.

In your email, you refer to a segment of the Program in which the host was reading an essay, and you suggest that "it was constructed in a manner intended to incite hate and kindle racism towards the entire Muslim community".

After carefully reviewing the Program, we respectfully disagree. The Program was inspired by a major news story that a leading Muslim terrorist had issued a threat to non-Muslims "to convert to Islam or die". We suggest that if there was any attempt to "incite hate and kindle racism", it was in that statement, not in the Program, which was essentially a discussion about why the war on terror should be taken more seriously than it has been.

You further allege that the essay used the terms "Terrorist Muslims" and "Muslims" interchangeably, "leaving the listener with the distinct impression that all Muslims are the enemy". In your email you include excerpts from the Program and inaccurate quotes to substantiate your allegation, which we don't believe have any basis in fact. When the Program is heard in its entirety and specific passages are taken in context, it is clear that the author is referring to "Muslim Terrorists" throughout the piece.

In the following excerpt of the Program, it is made abundantly clear that the author is talking about Muslim terrorists, not all Muslims:

"... Muslim terrorists. They focus the world on the U.S. but they kill all in their way - their own people or the Spanish, French, anyone else. (The) point here is just like the peaceful Germans were not protection from the Nazis, no matter how many peaceful Muslims there may be, they are no protection for us from the Muslim terrorist leaders and what they are fanatically bent on doing from their own pronouncements like the one we heard today killing all of us infidels. I don't blame the peaceful Muslims. What would you do if your choice was to shut up or die?"

In reference to the specific quotes you refer to in your email, we have the following response:

1. The first reference you make is to the following statement:

“Who were the attackers? In each case, the attacks on the US were carried out by Muslims. What is the Muslim population of the World? 25%.”

In this case, the host was reading from the essay in which the author made reference to several terrorist attacks dating from 1979 in Iran – what came to be known as the “U.S. hostage crisis”. Each of the attacks he made reference to were undertaken by Muslims, and in this sense, the statement is factually correct.

2. The second reference you make is to the following statement:

“So who are we at war with? There is no way we can honestly respond that it is anyone other than the Muslim terrorists.”

In our view, this quote makes it clear that the author is not speaking about all Muslims, but about Muslim terrorists.

3. The third reference you make is to the following statement:

“The attacks will not subside, but rather will steadily increase. Remember, they want us dead, not just quiet. If they had just wanted us quiet, they would not have produced an increasing series of attacks against us, over the past 18 years”.

When taken in context, however, it is clear the word “they” refers to terrorists. The author goes on to say: *“the plan was clearly for terrorists to attack us until we were neutered and submissive to them.”*

4. The fourth reference you make is incorrect. You quoted the Program as having broadcast the following statement:

“After losing, who would trade or deal with us, if they were threatened by the Muslims? If we can’t stop the Muslims, how could anyone else?”

Careful review of the Program indicates that the statement made was actually: *“After losing, who would trade or deal with us, if they were threatened by the Muslims? If we can’t stop the Muslim terrorists, how could anyone else?”*

As the Program continued, reference was made to the reason Spain withdrew troupes [sic] from Iraq. In this portion of the Program, the author clearly reiterates the term “Muslim terrorists”, citing the following reason: *“because the Muslim terrorists bombed their train and told them to withdraw the troops”.*

Later in the Program, the host, reading from the essay, makes reference to France and again, clearly makes the point that the author is not talking about all Muslims, as you allege, but about Muslim terrorists. In reference to France, he stated *“... they can’t resist the Muslim terrorists without us”.* You correctly point out that the word “terrorists” was not used after the first use of the word “Muslims” in that passage, although the word “terrorists” was used in the following sentence, which you have misquoted. When taken in context, we believe that there is no confusion as to whom the author is referring.

In yet another passage of the Program, the host makes it clear who the author is concerned about: *“The radical Muslims know full well what is riding on this war and therefore are committed to winning at any cost.”*

Furthermore, when making the argument that we need to lose some civil rights temporarily, the author makes it clear that he is referring to Muslim terrorists": *"Remember: the Muslim terrorists stated the goal and it is to kill all infidels. That would be us. That translates to all non Muslims, not just in the United States but throughout the world."*

5. The fifth reference you make is to the following statement:

"Name any Muslim countries throughout the world that allow freedom of speech, freedom of thought, freedom of religion, freedom of the press, equal rights for anyone -- let alone everyone, equal status or any status for women, or that have been productive in one single way that contributes to the good of the world. This has been a long way of saying that we must be united on this war or we will be equated in the history books to the self-inflicted fall of the Roman Empire. If that is the Muslim leaders will allow history books to be written or read."

Here, the author is once again clearly referring to "Muslim countries" and not Muslims per se, and can in no way be construed as inciting hate or kindling racism.

6. The sixth reference you make is to the following statement:

"If we don't win this war right now, keep a close eye on how the Muslims take over France in the next 5 years or less. They will continue to increase the Muslim population of France and continue to encroach little by little, on the established French traditions. The French will be fighting among themselves, over what should or should not be done, which will continue to weaken them and keep them from any united resolve. Doesn't that sound eerily familiar?"

Again, this excerpt must be viewed within the context of the Program. You are correct to point out that the word "terrorist" was not used. This being said, when taken in context with the author's earlier remarks about France, it is clear he is referring to Muslim radicals.

7. The seventh reference you make is to the following statement:

"They (Muslims) have universally shown that when they have taken over, they then start brutally killing each other over who will be the few who control the masses. Will we ever stop hearing from the politically correct, about the 'peaceful Muslims'?"

When listening to the statement in its entirety, it is clear that the author is referring to radical Muslims and radical Muslim regimes. The word "they" in the paragraph you quoted, when taken in context with previous sentences, clearly refers to *"those who have shown world wide that they abhor freedom and will not apply it to you – or even themselves"*. That, again, is a reference to "radicals" or "terrorists", and not a reference to all Muslims.

Please note that The Canadian Association of Broadcasters' *Code of Ethics* (the "Code"), which is administered by the CBSC, actually requires broadcasters to present news and opinion on any controversial matter that may be of interest to the public.¹ While the Program did focus on a controversial topic, we believe that the Program reflected this part of the Code, and as such, helped the Station fulfill its mandate as a responsible broadcaster.

Please also note that while the Program was focused on a topic that had surfaced in the news media, the Program is not a newscast. It is a public affairs show. Unlike a newscast, a public affairs show is not constrained by the need for *complete* objectivity, and its hosts are generally at liberty, and are in fact urged to take a point of view on subjects that are controversial. In a previous decision, the CBSC has said that a host of a public affairs show is permitted to present a point of view on controversial subjects, as long as his or her

presentation is fair and balanced.² We believe that the host of this Program discharged his responsibilities appropriately, and in keeping with the CBSC's view of his overall journalistic mandate.

We do regret that the Program offended you. We agree that it is important for hosts, commentators, guests or callers to refrain from making abusive comments toward a particular group, but we disagree that this occurred here. Please be assured that we work hard to ensure that all of our programming complies with the *Broadcasting Act*, the *Radio Regulations* and the Code and standards required of us as a member of the CBSC. Our programming producers are sensitive to everything that is broadcast on the station, while also ensuring that the Station presents controversial topics of public interest.

We hope that we have addressed your concerns. At CFMJ-AM, we recognize the importance of listener feedback and appreciate all comments. Thank you for taking the time and initiative to share your thoughts with us.

¹ Clause 7 – *CAB Code of Ethics Commentary*

² *CFTM-TV re the Mongrain Show* (CBSC Decision 93/94-0100)

Additional Correspondence

The complainant submitted his Ruling Request on September 25 along with the following letter:

In reviewing the September 19 response from Corus Entertainment-CFMJ-AM concerning the *Coast to Coast AM* broadcast, their position seems clear that the concerns raised in the complaint are without merit; to that end, a Ruling by a CBSC panel is being requested.

The following provides rationale and outlines reasons why the Ruling Request is being made. It would be appreciated if this rationale could please be included with the various submissions that go to the panel as there is concern that the Corus Entertainment-CFMJ-AM response suggests that they do not fully grasp the nature and dynamics of the concerns expressed and/or that they approached the complaint from a biased position.

The bases for the position that Corus Entertainment-CFMJ-AM have given for dismissing the complaint seem to rest on the ideas that the complaint took the host's comments out of context and that the complaint was not warranted because of the broadcast's status as a public affairs program. On a disturbing note, the Corus Entertainment-CFMJ-AM position also suggests that it is acceptable in Canada to identify a criminal sub-group, by using or associating a minority community's common religious designation/affiliation in identifying that criminal sub-group. Please reference the following from the Corus Entertainment-CFMJ-AM response: "When the Program is heard in its entirety and specific passages are taken in context, it is clear that the author is referring to 'Muslim Terrorists' throughout the piece."

This statement, while not part of the actual broadcast reflects and in fact states unequivocally, the interpretation of the context of the broadcast from the Corus Entertainment-CFMJ-AM perspective. In addition, this statement confirms that the broadcast clearly used and intended to use the common religious designation/affiliation of a minority community in identifying a criminal sub-group. It follows that by associating that community with a criminal sub-group (of the most deplorable kind, it should be added) that the entire minority community is exposed to risks created by that association. Those risks are exacerbated when the contemptuous tone and ideas outlined in the broadcast (e.g. "suspension of civil rights") are factored in.

First, with respect to the context of the broadcast segment, it is curious that rather than allowing the content of the segment to speak for itself (e.g. provision of a full transcript or audio file of the segment), Corus Entertainment-CFMJ-AM takes a position in which their own interpretation of the context is first stated and then in the subsequent five pages of their response, the excerpts (examples) that had been provided with the original complaint are parsed against that interpretation. One would think that if the context is as clear they suggest, then a simple submission of the full transcript of the segment in question would be more than sufficient to address the issues, e.g. the context would become self-evident. Moreover, in their response they do not dispute that the terms "Muslim" and "Muslim terrorist" are used interchangeably but instead point to the context. Corus Entertainment-CFMJ-AM appear to be saying that it is acceptable to use the religious designation/affiliation of an entire minority community as a replacement word for that of a violent criminal sub-group, if done in context.

Second, it is also curious that there is a need in their response to selectively refer to a prior CBSC decision and one particular portion of the CBSC *Code of Ethics* (both of which relate to latitude for opinions on controversial topics being permitted on community affairs programs). In making such references it would appear that Corus Entertainment-CFMJ-AM are attempting to categorize the complaint in respect of those areas. By framing the complaint in that manner it not only suggests that the host's opinions were fair and balanced, but sets up dismissal of the complaint altogether as a misguided response to a public affairs program.

Not to suggest that Corus Entertainment-CFMJ-AM are casting themselves in the role of the CBSC by pre-judging this matter; but it is puzzling that in their response there is no mention of CRTC regulations that pertain to the prohibition of comment that is abusive or the CBSC *Code of Ethics* pertaining to abusive material. Instead Corus Entertainment-CFMJ-AM state, in an almost patronizing manner, that "it is important for hosts ... to refrain from making abusive comments towards a specific group".

Third, this program was broadcast from Southern Ontario and from other Corus Entertainment affiliates across Canada to Canadians, where according to Statistics Canada, the Muslim community is a tiny minority comprising just two per cent of the Canadian population. As disturbing as it is to single out a criminal sub-group by using the religious designation/affiliation of a minority community, Corus Entertainment-CFMJ-AM seem to be stating that it is perfectly acceptable to do just that. The monologue, read and fully endorsed by the host of the public affairs program, is ripe with inflammatory rhetoric and fear mongering. For example, it enumerates a list of eleven of the most heinous terrorist attacks on the US, adds in a statistic of the more than 7,500 terrorist attacks worldwide over a twenty year period and then follows with the statement "Who were the attackers? In each case, the attacks on the U.S. were carried out by Muslims."

In conclusion, even if Corus Entertainment-CFMJ-AM are correct in their assessment of the context of the program, the issues of promotion of racism and incitement of hatred still remain; unless of course there is justification for using the common religious designation/affiliation of a minority community in the identification of a criminal sub-group. Alternatively if the context of the monologue is one where inflammatory rhetoric, false arguments and fear mongering single out and expose a minority community to contempt on the basis of their religious designation/affiliation, then this matter is a serious breach on a number of levels not the least of which is a violation of CRTC regulations and the CBSC *Code of Ethics*.

It is respectfully requested that the CBSC please take all necessary measures to address these concerns in view of the full range CRTC regulations and the complete CBSC *Code of*

Ethics. It would also be appreciated if this review could be undertaken in as timely manner as possible given the very serious nature of this matter.

To further substantiate the complaint and since Corus Entertainment-CFMJ-AM chose not to provide a transcript, a text version of the monologue follows.

Text of the Monologue Broadcast Sunday September 3, 2006 1:00 am EDT (10:00 pm PDT September 2, 2006) as retrieved from the program's archives (available for audio download by subscription at www.coasttocoastam.com).

(It should be noted that the nuance and subtle innuendo of the audio version is far more powerful than the text version)

"To get out of a difficulty, one usually must go through it. Our country is now facing the most serious threat to its existence, as we know it, that we have faced in your lifetime and mine (which includes WW II). The deadly seriousness is greatly compounded by the fact that there are very few of us who think we can possibly lose this war and even fewer who realize what losing really means.

First, let's examine a few basics:

1. When did the threat to us start? Many will say September 11, 2001. The answer as far as the United States is concerned, is 1979, 22 years prior to September 2001, with the following attacks on us:

- * Iran Embassy Hostages, 1979;
- * Beirut, Lebanon Embassy 1983;
- * Beirut, Lebanon Marine Barracks 1983;
- * Lockerbie, Scotland Pan-Am flight to New York 1988;
- * First New York World Trade Center attack 1993;
- * Dhahran, Saudi Arabia Khobar Towers Military complex 1996;
- * Nairobi, Kenya US Embassy 1998;
- * Dar es Salaam, Tanzania US Embassy 1998;
- * Aden, Yemen USS Cole 2000;
- * New York World Trade Center 2001;
- * Pentagon 2001.

(Note that during the period from 1981 to 2001 there were 7,581 terrorist attacks worldwide).

2. Why were we attacked?

Envy of our position, our success, and our freedoms. The attacks happened during the administrations of Presidents Carter, Reagan, Bush 1, Clinton and Bush 2. We cannot fault either the Republicans or Democrats as there were no provocations by any of the presidents or their immediate predecessors, Presidents Ford or Carter.

3. Who were the attackers? In each case, the attacks on the US were carried out by Muslims.

4. What is the Muslim population of the World?

[Estimates are that the proportion of Muslims worldwide is] 25%.

5. Isn't the Muslim Religion peaceful? Hopefully, but that is really not material. There is no doubt that the predominately Christian population of Germany was peaceful, but under the dictatorial leadership of Hitler (who was also Christian), that made no difference. You either went along with the administration or you were eliminated. There were 5 to 6 million Christians killed by the Nazis for political reasons (including 7,000 Polish priests).

Thus, almost the same number of Christians were killed by the Nazis, as the six million holocaust Jews who were killed by them, and we seldom heard of anything other than the Jewish atrocities. Although Hitler kept the world focused on the Jews, he had no hesitancy about killing anyone who got in his way of exterminating the Jews or of taking over the world - German, Christian or any others.

Same with the Muslim terrorists. They focus the world on the US, but kill all in the way, their own people or the Spanish, French or anyone else. The point here is that just like the peaceful Germans were of no protection to anyone from the Nazis, no matter how many peaceful Muslims there may be, they are no protection for us from the terrorist Muslim leaders and what they are fanatically bent on doing by their own pronouncements: killing all of us 'infidels'. I don't blame the peaceful Muslims. What would you do if the choice was shut up or die?

6. So who are we at war with? There is no way we can honestly respond that it is anyone other than the Muslim terrorists. Trying to be politically correct and avoid verbalizing this conclusion can well be fatal. There is no way to win if you don't clearly recognize and articulate who you are fighting.

So with that background, now to the two major questions:

1. Can we lose this war?
2. What does losing really mean?

If we are to win, we must clearly answer these two pivotal questions. We can definitely lose this war, and as anomalous as it may sound, the major reason we can lose is that so many of us simply do not fathom the answer to the second question - What does losing mean?

It would mean that a great many of us think that losing the war means hanging our heads, bringing the troops home and going on about our business, like post Vietnam. This is as far from the truth as one can get.

What losing really means is: We would no longer be the premier country in the world. The attacks will not subside, but rather will steadily increase. Remember, they want us dead, not just quiet. If they had just wanted us quiet, they would not have produced an increasing series of attacks against us, over the past 18 years. The plan was clearly, for terrorist to attack us, until we were neutered and submissive to them.

We would of course have no future support from other nations, for fear of reprisals and for the reason that they would see we are impotent and cannot help them.

They will pick off the other non-Muslim nations, one at a time. It will be increasingly easier for them. They already hold Spain hostage. It doesn't matter whether it was right or wrong for Spain to withdraw its troops from Iraq. Spain did it because the Muslim terrorists bombed their train and told them to withdraw the troops. Anything else they want Spain to do will be done. Spain is finished. The next will probably be France. Our one hope on France is that

they might see the light and realize that if we don't win, they are finished too, in that they can't resist the Muslim terrorists without us.

However, it may already be too late for France. France is already 20% Muslim and fading fast!

If we lose the war, our production, income, exports and way of life will all vanish, as we know it. After losing, who would trade or deal with us if they were threatened by the Muslims? If we can't stop the Muslims, how could anyone else?

The Muslims fully know what is riding on this war, and therefore are completely committed to winning, at any cost. We better know it too and be likewise committed to winning at any cost.

Why do I go on at such lengths about the results of losing? Simple. Until we recognize the costs of losing, we cannot unite and really put 100% of our thoughts and efforts into winning. And it is going to take that 100% effort to win.

So, how can we lose the war?

Again, the answer is simple. We can lose the war by 'imploding.' That is, defeating ourselves by refusing to recognize the enemy and their purpose, and really digging in and lending full support to the war effort. If we are united, there is no way that we can lose. If we continue to be divided, there is no way that we can win!

Let me give you a few examples of how we simply don't comprehend the life and death seriousness of this situation.

President Bush selects Norman Mineta as Secretary of Transportation. Although all of the terrorist attacks were committed by Muslim men between 17 and 40 years of age, Secretary Mineta refuses to allow profiling. Does that sound like we are taking this thing seriously? This is war! For the duration, we are going to have to give up some of the civil rights we have become accustomed to. We had better be prepared to lose some of our civil rights temporarily or we will most certainly lose all of them permanently.

And don't worry that it is a slippery slope. We gave up plenty of civil rights during WW II, and immediately restored them after the victory and in fact added many more since then.

Do I blame President Bush or President Clinton before him? No, I blame us for blithely assuming we can maintain all of our Political Correctness, and all of our civil rights during this conflict and have a clean, lawful, honorable war. None of those words apply to war. Get them out of your head. Some have gone so far in their criticism of the war and/or the Administration that it almost seems they would literally like to see us lose. I hasten to add that this isn't because they are disloyal. It is because they just don't recognize what losing means. Nevertheless, that conduct gives the impression to the enemy that we are divided and weakening. It concerns our friends, and it does great damage to our cause.

Of more recent vintage, the uproar fueled by the politicians and media regarding the treatment of some prisoners of war, perhaps exemplifies best what I am saying. We have recently had an issue, involving the treatment of a few Muslim prisoners of war, by a small group of our military police. These are the type prisoners who just a few months before were throwing their own people off buildings, cutting off their hands, cutting out their tongues and otherwise murdering their own people just for disagreeing with Saddam Hussein.

And just a few years ago these same type prisoners chemically killed 400,000 of their own

people for the same reason. They are also the same type of enemy fighters, who recently were burning Americans, and dragging their charred corpses through the streets of Iraq.

And still more recently, the same type of enemy that was and is providing videos to all news sources internationally of the beheading of American prisoners they held.

Compare this with some of our press and politicians, who for several days have thought and talked about nothing else but the 'humiliating' of some Muslim prisoners not burning them, not dragging their charred corpses through the streets, not beheading them, but 'humiliating' them.

Can this be for real? The politicians and pundits have even talked of impeachment of the Secretary of Defense. If this doesn't show the complete lack of comprehension and understanding of the seriousness of the enemy we are fighting, the life and death struggle we are in and the disastrous results of losing this war, nothing can.

To bring our country to a virtual political standstill over this prisoner issue makes us look like Nero playing his fiddle as Rome burned, totally oblivious to what is going on in the real world. Neither we, nor any other country, can survive this internal strife.

Again I say, this does not mean that some of our politicians or media people are disloyal. It simply means that they are absolutely oblivious to the magnitude, of the situation we are in and into which the Muslim terrorists have been pushing us, for many years.

Remember, the Muslim terrorists stated goal is to kill all infidels! That translates into ALL non-Muslims not just in the United States , but throughout the world.

We are the last bastion of defense. We have been criticized for many years as being arrogant. That charge is valid in at least one respect. We are arrogant in that we believe that we are so good, powerful and smart, that we can win the hearts and minds of all those who attack us, and that with both hands tied behind our back, we can defeat anything bad in the world!

We can't! If we don't recognize this, our nation as we know it will not survive, and no other free country in the world will survive if we are defeated.

And finally, name any Muslim countries throughout the world that allow freedom of speech, freedom of thought, freedom of religion, freedom of the press, equal rights for anyone, let alone everyone, equal status or any status for women, or that have been productive in one single way that contributes to the good of the world.

This has been a long way of saying that we must be united on this war or we will be equated in the history books to the self-inflicted fall of the Roman Empire. If, that is, the Muslim leaders will allow history books to be written or read.

If we don't win this war right now, keep a close eye on how the Muslims take over France in the next 5 years or less. They will continue to increase the Muslim population of France and continue to encroach little by little, on the established French traditions. The French will be fighting among themselves, over what should or should not be done, which will continue to weaken them and keep them from any united resolve. Doesn't that sound eerily familiar?

Democracies don't have their freedoms taken away from them by some external military force. Instead, they give their freedoms away, politically correct piece by politically correct piece.

And they are giving those freedoms away to those who have shown, worldwide that they abhor freedom and will not apply it to you or even to themselves, once they are in power. They have universally shown that when they have taken over, they then start brutally killing each other over who will be the few who control the masses. Will we ever stop hearing from the politically correct, about the 'peaceful Muslims'?

I close on a hopeful note, by repeating what I said above. If we are united, there is no way that we can lose. I hope now after the election, the factions in our country will begin to focus on the critical situation we are in, and will unite to save our country. It is your future we are talking about! Do whatever you can to preserve it."