
CONSEIL CANADIEN DES NORMES DE LA RADIODIFFUSION
COMITÉ RÉGIONAL DE L'ONTARIO

CFRA-AM concernant un épisode du *Lowell Green Show* (le Coran)

Décision du CCNR 05/06-1380

Rendue le 18 mai 2006

R. Stanbury (président), M. Ziniak (vice-présidente), D. Braun (*ad hoc*),
R. Deverell (*ad hoc*), H. Hassan, J. Pungente

LES FAITS

Le *Lowell Green Show* est une tribune téléphonique qui passe à la radio entre 9 h et midi les jours de semaine. Pendant cette émission, l'animateur et les interlocuteurs discutent, sur les ondes de CFRA-AM (Ottawa), de l'actualité et des reportages de nouvelles. L'épisode du 31 mars 2006 s'intitulait « Friday Open House » (Vendredi portes ouvertes), auquel les auditeurs étaient invités à contribuer en discutant d'un sujet de leur choix. Cependant, l'animateur Lowell Green a proposé quatre sujets de discussion possibles : la collusion en vue de fixer les prix de l'essence; l'attention que les médias ont consacrée au débardeur porté par le Premier Ministre Stephen Harper lors de son voyage au Mexique; le maintien de l'ordre et la violence attribuable aux bandes; et un reportage de nouvelles au sujet de l'arrestation d'un terroriste musulman au Canada. Lowell Green a présenté ce dernier sujet en donnant l'information suivante (la transcription davantage complète de l'émission se trouve à l'Annexe A) :

[Traduction]

Oh là là. Il semblerait que nous avons attrapé un autre terroriste qui se cachait au Canada. Écoutez bien et puis vous pourrez vous mettre à vous poser quelques questions. Raja Mustafa, âgé de quarante ans, a été arrêté à Newmarket il y a deux semaines. Nous apprenons la nouvelle que ce matin. La police dit qu'il a des liens directs avec Osama bin Laden. Il a reçu sa formation dans un camp d'entraînement terroriste afghan. En fait, il est apparemment

capitaine dans l'armée d'Osama. Quand il a été attrapé, il avait un gros montant d'argent sur lui et il semble qu'il était sur le point de quitter le pays. Il se peut qu'il ait été averti à l'avance, ce qui soulève, entre autres, des questions perturbantes : qui l'a averti à l'avance? Y a-t-il un informateur au sein de la police quelque part? Puis, écoutez, l'histoire ne se termine pas là. Mustafa vivait avec son beau-frère Syed Ali, un réfugié recherché aux États-Unis pour trafic de stupéfiants et fraude. À un moment donné, ces deux hommes vivaient avec le frère de Syed, lequel est soupçonné d'être un passeur de clandestins recherché par les autorités américaines. Il n'est pas clair si ces deux hommes ont été attrapés. La raison pour laquelle il leur a été permis de vivre ouvertement au Canada pendant tout ce temps n'est pas claire non plus. Ce matin, il y a une photo de l'épouse de Syed dans *The Sun*. Les autorités sont allées chez lui et, euh, sa femme a dit, oh non, voilà cinq ans qu'elle ne l'a pas vu, alors que des enfants de Syed étaient derrière elle. Je veux dire c'est juste, entretemps un autre homme recherché aux États-Unis pour avoir commis des actes de terrorisme a comparu dans un tribunal à Toronto hier. Il s'agit d'Abdullah Khadr. Oui, de l'infâme famille Khadr. C'est l'homme dont le père, un terroriste notoire et bon ami d'Osama bin Laden, a été libéré d'une prison pakistanaise suite aux mesures de lobbying prises au nom du Premier Ministre du Canada, Jean Chrétien. Le père a été tué lors d'une fusillade avec la police au Pakistan. Le frère cadet d'Abdullah, accusé d'avoir tué un infirmier américain, est détenu à Guantanamo Bay. Et, certains des frères Trudeau sont parmi ceux qui font des pressions pour le libérer. La mère de M. Khadr a dit à des journalistes à un moment donné qu'elle serait heureuse si ses enfants mourraient en tant que martyrs, autrement dit dans des attaques suicide à la bombe. Elle vit toujours au Canada en toute liberté. Aiye yie yie yie yie yie yie yie yie yie. Puis, nous en avons chopé un autre. Celui-ci tentait apparemment de voir comment attacher des bombes à des modèles d'aéronefs. Et, il n'y a pas de terroristes au Canada. La moitié du pays, les trois quarts du pays, ne croient pas que des terroristes viendraient jamais au Canada. Entretemps, il y a une lettre fort perturbante au rédacteur du *National Post* ce matin, écrite par H. Klatt, professeur émérite à la University of Western Ontario. Il fait mention des moyens de pression utilisés en Afghanistan en vue de tuer un homme qui a converti de l'islam au christianisme. Le professeur Klatt écrit, et là je veux bien préciser avant que vous m'envoyez des petits défenseurs des libertés civiles et ainsi de suite. Je tiens à bien préciser, que je lis la lettre qui est publiée ce matin, publiquement, dans le *National Post*. D'accord? Je ne dis pas que je suis d'accord ou non. Je lis sa lettre. Donc, avant de commencer à porter des accusations et à faire faire des mandats d'arrestation et tout le reste, veuillez vous souvenir que je lis une lettre qui paraît dans un journal. Je cite, voici ce que le professeur Klatt a écrit, je cite, « C'est éternel », euh, excusez-moi. « C'est la volonté éternelle d'Allah et le décret de Muhammad que tous ceux qui apostasient soient tués, quoiqu'il s'agisse uniquement de ceux qui convertissent de l'islam à d'autres religions. » Citation du Coran, chapitre quatre, verset 89, « S'ils te délaissent, saisis-les et mets-les à mort là où tu les trouves. Tue celui qui change de religion », fin de citation. Le professeur Klatt dit également « Le Coran contient la volonté du Dieu tout-miséricordieux et a été inscrit sur des tables gravées au ciel, lesquelles sont surveillées par des anges, même avant la création de l'univers. Il n'est pas facile d'infirmier un document du genre par le biais du parlement d'un État ou de pressions faites par des gouvernements étrangers. En outre, Allah punira tous ceux qui apostasient de l'islam en les soumettant aux flammes éternelles de l'enfer. » Il ajoute, et je cite, « Tant que nous demeurons imbus de nos dogmes d'orthodoxie politique, comme l'islam est une religion de paix qui est tolérante et compatible avec la vie dans une démocratie, nous serons déconcertés et n'arriverons jamais à comprendre. Chaque musulman est d'abord et avant tout un musulman qui accepte les dogmes de sa religion avant d'être un Algérien, un

démocrate, un partisan des droits de la personne ou de la tolérance envers autrui. La perspective est loin d'être rose, » fin de la citation. Avant que vous n'intentiez des poursuites, je lis des extraits d'une lettre dans le *National Post*. D'accord? Je lis simplement ce qui est dit dans la lettre. Le professeur H. Klatt de la University of Western Ontario dont la lettre paraît aujourd'hui dans le *National Post*. Je n'ai aucune idée si ce que le professeur a écrit est exact. Si c'est le cas, il me semble que la perspective est, comme il le dit, effectivement loin d'être rose. Cela pose certainement la question de savoir si – si cela est vrai – des cultures si diamétralement opposées peuvent vivre ensemble paisiblement. Vos commentaires? 521-8255. 521-8255.

Après une pause commerciale, M. Green a de nouveau parlé de la lettre publiée dans le *National Post* :

[Traduction]

[C]ette lettre de la part du professeur Klatt me dérange véritablement. Si c'est en fait ce qui est dit dans le Coran, et j'en déduis que c'est le cas, tous ceux qui changent de l'islam à une autre religion doivent être tués, oh. Permettez-moi de vous demander si l'on devrait demander aux musulmans souhaitant entrer dans ce pays s'ils croient en cela? Et s'ils disent que oui, devrait-on leur permettre d'entrer dans notre pays? Peut-on vivre paisiblement ensemble avec des gens qui croient qu'il y a lieu de tuer quiconque change de sa religion à une autre? Pouvons-nous vivre paisiblement ensemble? Avec ce genre de croyance? 521-8255. Ça vraiment. Je trouve que, euh, le professeur Klatt dit, euh, que la perspective, la perspective est loin d'être rose. Il risque fort bien d'avoir raison si c'est vrai.

Quelques personnes qui ont appelé l'émission au départ ont parlé des sujets suggérés, soit le prix de l'essence, la violence attribuable aux bandes et les choix vestimentaires du Premier Ministre. D'autres s'intéressaient au reportage de nouvelles sur les terroristes accusés à Newmarket. Par la suite, le plus grand nombre d'appels concernait la lettre du professeur Klatt dans le *National Post* et les questions qui en découlent, comme les politiques canadiennes sur le multiculturalisme et l'immigration, ce qui se passe au Moyen-Orient et un cas d'apostasie en Afghanistan, lequel a été étroitement lié, dans l'émission, à diverses parties du Coran. En bout de ligne, la grande majorité des personnes qui ont appelé dans les deux dernières heures ont centré leurs commentaires sur l'enjeu de l'apostasie et la réaction de l'islam à cette question. La transcription se limitant uniquement aux parties les plus pertinentes du dialogue pendant cette émission de trois heures est trop longue pour la reproduire dans la présente décision, mais sa version davantage complète est reproduite à la fin de la présente à l'Annexe A. Bien entendu, les extraits les plus pertinents font partie du texte de la présente décision.

Le CCNR a reçu une plainte datée du 31 mars de la part d'un auditeur qui se préoccupait des commentaires diffusés au sujet des musulmans et du Coran. Il a joint à sa plainte une copie de la lettre qu'il avait envoyée directement à CFRA

(le texte intégral de toute la correspondance afférente, disponible en anglais seulement, se trouve à l'Annexe B) :

[Traduction]

M. Green a tacitement incité à la haine en indiquant effrontément que tous ceux qui croient en le Coran constituent une menace physique pour les Canadiens en raison de leur croyance en le Coran. Il a délibérément juxtaposé le Coran et le Nouveau Testament (N.T.) et a prétendu qu'à la différence du Coran, le N.T. ne prescrit jamais la mise à mort arbitraire ou fondée sur la religion, établissant ainsi une distinction précise entre les deux fois dans le but d'encourager la haine envers un groupe en particulier en raison de ses croyances religieuses. Cela est inacceptable de la part de tout radiodiffuseur sur les ondes publiques.

Voici la copie de la lettre que j'ai faite parvenir à M. Green et à CFRA :

Monsieur Green,

Aujourd'hui, vous avez prétendu qu'à la différence du Coran le Nouveau Testament ne contient pas de passages favorisant le meurtre à caractère arbitraire.

Examinons le passage dans Marc 7,1-13. Jésus a accusé les Pharisiens en disant « Vous laissez de côté le commandement de Dieu pour vous attacher à la tradition des hommes » (7,8). Il ajoute « Vous rejetez bel et bien le commandement de Dieu pour observer votre tradition » (7,9). Les commandements auxquels Jésus faisait allusion sont des commandements de l'Ancien Testament : « En effet, Moïse a dit : Honore ton père et ta mère » et « Celui qui maudit son père ou sa mère sera mis à mort » (7,10). Dans ce passage, Jésus applique l'Exode 21,17 et le Lévitique 20,9 dans le contexte du N.T. On retrouve le même récit dans Matthieu 15,1-14, soit le même N.T. qui selon vous ne contient aucune mention de mise à mort fondée sur la foi. Selon, par conséquent, le Nouveau Testament, Jésus était d'avis que quiconque maudit ses parents doit être mis à mort ... ah, comme c'est gentil de votre part Jésus. De toute évidence, le Canada fait face à une menace de la part des chrétiens qui prennent parti pour leur Dieu. Je crois bien que ce passage poserait au moins autant de menace que ceux dans le Coran. Je cite simplement les Saintes Écritures, Lowell, je n'invente rien.

Il est vrai que le Coran, en tant qu'ancien texte, est dérivé d'une époque fort différente de la nôtre. Il contient effectivement des passages favorisant la mise à mort des non-croyants et des convertis, mais le Nouveau Testament n'est pas exempt de ce genre de convictions. Comme dans tous vos arguments partisans *ceteris paribus*, vous faites fi du contexte. Le Nouveau Testament représente l'évolution des croyances mises de l'avant par Dieu lui-même, tout comme le musulman moderne représente l'évolution de l'époque à laquelle le Coran a été révélé. Les véritables croyants (dans toutes les religions) comprennent les défauts d'une application littérale. Ces livres saints sont des textes et non pas des paragraphes isolés.

CFRA a envoyé la réponse suivante le 7 avril :

[Traduction]

Nous vous indiquons avec respect que si vous avez écouté l'émission de Lowell Green au complet, vous savez très bien que la discussion s'est centrée spécifiquement et exclusivement sur les gens qui estiment acceptable de tuer quelqu'un qui a converti de la foi musulmane au christianisme.

C'est la position adoptée par les extrémistes dans les régions instables du monde, laquelle a été mise en évidence par le cas, notablement, d'Abdul Rahman en Afghanistan, où le parlement musulman a insisté que M. Rahman soit mis à mort au lieu de lui permettre de quitter le pays pour se réfugier en Italie. Étant donné la constitution de l'Afghanistan et les demandes publiques de lui imposer la peine de mort pour avoir converti au christianisme, il n'est pas déraisonnable de conclure que les extrémistes du genre posent effectivement une menace physique, tout particulièrement pour les convertis. Ce cas est une nouvelle internationale et il est tout à fait approprié de discuter de cette question en tant que préoccupation publique au Canada.

Pendant toute l'émission, Lowell a bien précisé qu'il parlait uniquement des extrémistes qui veulent émigrer au Canada, et qui sont pour la pratique d'exécuter les musulmans qui convertissent au christianisme. Il est peu surprenant que des musulmans qui ont appelé l'émission aient convenu qu'il ne devrait pas être permis à ces extrémistes d'importer leurs points de vue extrémistes au Canada, et que le Canada a entièrement le droit de poser la question.

Il ne vous est aucunement nécessaire de défendre le Coran en tant qu'« ancien texte [...] dérivé d'une époque fort différente de la nôtre. » M. Green n'a pas attaqué le Coran; en effet il a souvent fait l'éloge du prophète Muhammad, le qualifiant de visionnaire véritablement attaché à l'amour et à la paix. M. Green se préoccupait uniquement de ceux qui interprètent des passages littéralement pour préconiser la mise à mort des convertis au christianisme en 2006, non dans « l'époque ancienne ».

M. Green n'a pas dit que « tous ceux qui croient en le Coran représentent une menace physique pour les Canadiens en raison de leur croyance en le Coran. » Il ressort clairement de toute l'émission qu'il n'a jamais dit ou laissé entendre quoi que ce soit de la sorte. Il n'a pas non plus enfreint une disposition quelconque des règlements ou codes sur la radiodiffusion. Il est regrettable que vous n'ayez pas saisi le sens véritable de ce qu'il a dit.

L'examen de vos interprétations personnelles de certains passages bibliques n'a aucun rapport avec le cas qui nous occupe. Si des chrétiens extrémistes se mettaient à faire des émeutes dans les rues pour insister que les convertis à l'islam soient mis à mort, il y aurait également lieu d'examiner plus en profondeur l'extrémisme qui les motive. Même en pareilles circonstances, M. Green préciserait, bien entendu, qu'il ne parle pas de tous les chrétiens, mais plutôt de ceux qui tiennent des points de vue extrémistes et violents.

Le plaignant a répondu à cette lettre le 7 avril :

[Traduction]

Malheureusement, votre explication n'aborde aucunement le but de M. Green quand il a juxtaposé le Coran et le Nouveau Testament. Comme vous l'avez déjà dit vous-même en défendant M. Green, le Nouveau Testament ou les interprétations de ce texte n'ont aucun rapport avec la discussion que, prétendez-vous, M. Green présentait. Or, c'est bien lui qui a dit de façon terre à terre, qu'à la différence du Coran, le Nouveau Testament n'accepte pas la mise à mort fondée sur la foi.

Par conséquent, il est raisonnable de croire que son intention était d'établir une distinction entre ces fois. Il est raisonnable de prévoir que cela risque, que ce soit intentionnel ou non, d'inciter à la haine ou à la peur au sein d'un groupe (majoritaire) envers un autre groupe (minoritaire). Nous vivons une période de grands bouleversements, une période où des soldats canadiens meurent dans un pays musulman. Il est important pour les radiodiffuseurs publics de formuler leurs commentaires publics en tenant compte des dangers qui courent à l'heure actuelle. Vu que M. Green a choisi, pour des raisons que lui seul peut expliquer, de présenter cette comparaison, je suis d'avis que le CCNR devrait examiner plus en profondeur son jugement et son rôle en tant que radiodiffuseur public.

Je n'ai pas écouté cette discussion au complet, comme d'ailleurs la grande majorité des gens qui écoutent votre station, j'en suis certain. J'étais dans ma voiture lorsque j'ai syntonisé CFRA. Si 35 minutes d'une discussion diffusée publiquement ne fournissent pas suffisamment de contexte, il se peut que vous deviez examiner de plus près le choix ou le contenu des sujets de discussion avant de les présenter dans le cadre de la formule que vous avez adoptée.

[...]

Veillez prendre note de ce lien propre, car le contenu que vous y trouverez démontre le mieux les raisons qui sous-tendent mes préoccupations quant aux commentaires faits par M. Green. Je ne crois plus que M. Green avait forcément l'intention d'inciter à la haine.

<http://www.beyondintractability.org/essay/dehumanization/>

Voici des extraits du site indiqué ci-dessus :

« L'image ennemie est un stéréotype négatif présentant le groupe opposant comme étant mauvais, à l'opposé de son propre côté, lequel est perçu comme étant bon. De telles images peuvent découler du désir d'établir une identité de groupe et du besoin de faire contraster les attributs et les vertus distinctifs de son propre groupe avec les vices du groupe "de l'extérieur". Dans certains cas des images ennemies du souverain malveillant se forment. Alors que les membres ordinaires du groupe sont perçus comme étant neutres, ou peut-être même innocents, leurs dirigeants sont considérés des monstres hideux. En général, les images ennemies sont perçues en noir et blanc. Les actes négatifs de l'opposant sont tenus pour le reflet de sa nature, de ses caractéristiques ou de ses motifs fondamentalement mauvais. Ses propres fautes, ainsi que les valeurs et les motifs qui sous-tendent les actes de son adversaire sont généralement mis à l'écart, niés ou ignorés. Il devient difficile d'empathiser avec son adversaire ou de comprendre son point de vue. La véritable communication est peu probable et il devient difficile de percevoir un terrain d'entente.

Une fois formées les images ennemies ont tendance à résister au changement et servent à perpétuer et à intensifier le conflit. Étant donné que l'adversaire est perçu comme un "ennemi diabolique", le conflit prend l'allure d'une guerre entre le bien et le mal. Une fois que les parties ont ainsi formulé le conflit, leurs positions deviennent davantage rigides. Dans certains cas, une philosophie de somme nulle se développe à mesure que les parties deviennent convaincues qu'elles doivent soit, assurer leur propre victoire soit, faire face à la défaite. Des nouveaux objectifs en vue de punir ou de détruire l'opposant se créent, et dans certains cas des dirigeants davantage militants accèdent au pouvoir.

Bien que la désindividuation et la création d'images ennemies soient très communes, elles forment un processus dangereux qui devient particulièrement préjudiciable lorsqu'il atteint le niveau de la déshumanisation.

Une fois que certains groupes sont stigmatisés comme étant mauvais, moralement inférieurs et pas entièrement humains, leur persécution devient plus acceptable sur le plan psychologique. Les contrôles contre l'agression et la violence commencent à disparaître. Il est peu surprenant que la déshumanisation augmente la probabilité de violence et risque de transformer un conflit en une situation irredressable. Une fois que la violence a éclaté, il peut sembler davantage acceptable que les gens fassent des choses qu'ils auraient considérées moralement inconcevables auparavant.

En effet, la déshumanisation prépare souvent le terrain pour la violation des droits de la personne, les crimes de guerre et le génocide. Par exemple, pendant la Deuxième Guerre mondiale, la déshumanisation des Juifs s'est soldée par la destruction de millions de personnes. [9] Des atrocités semblables ont eu lieu au Rwanda, en Cambodge et dans l'ex-Yougoslavie. »

Ou la création de camps d'internement pour les Japonais au Canada ... nous savons tous ce qui a été dit au sujet de l'histoire.

CFRA a donné une deuxième réponse au plaignant le 10 avril :

[Traduction]

Merci d'avoir reconnu que ce n'était pas l'intention de Lowell d'inciter à la haine. L'argument se centre donc sur la question de savoir s'il a involontairement incité à la haine, ce qu'il n'a catégoriquement pas fait.

Non, il n'est pas raisonnable de conclure que les commentaires de Lowell inciteraient à la haine ou la peur envers tous les musulmans, comme vous l'avancez. J'ai consulté un spécialiste de la Bible et celui-ci déclare que vos exemples sont si hors contexte et leur interprétation si faible qu'ils n'ajoutent aucun poids à votre argument. Toutefois, le débat sur la Bible et l'interprétation que vous en faites entraînent dans une digression que notre correspondance ne saura pas résoudre.

Il n'en demeure pas moins que la question en jeu se rapporte au fait que certains extrémistes interprètent le Coran littéralement de sorte à justifier l'exécution des musulmans qui convertissent au christianisme. Même si votre argument au sujet de la Bible tenait [...], il s'agit d'un argument spéculatif parce qu'on ne l'interprète pas littéralement et les chrétiens ne s'en servent pas pour justifier de tuer ceux qui convertissent à une autre foi.

C'est de la folie de suggérer que poser des questions au sujet de l'extrémisme a pour conséquence de « déshumaniser » d'une façon quelconque tous les musulmans. Aucune personne raisonnable aurait peur des musulmans (ou les détesterait) parce qu'un groupe spécifique d'extrémistes parmi eux fait une utilisation abusive des textes sacrés pour justifier la mise à mort des convertis. Lowell a bien précisé pendant toute l'émission qu'il parlait de ce groupe très spécifique d'extrémistes et non de tous les croyants.

La discussion entamée par Lowell était d'actualité. Il a bien précisé qu'il ne parlait pas de tous les musulmans. Son examen d'un groupe très spécifique de gens (les extrémistes) était approprié. Et, il n'y a eu aucune violation des codes ou des règlements.

Je regrette que nous ne soyons pas d'accord, mais à moins qu'il n'y ait des nouvelles questions à examiner, la présente termine, avec respect, notre correspondance sur cette question.

Le plaignant a réécrit à CFRA le 10 avril :

[Traduction]

Dans l'intérêt d'une parfaite clarté :

1. Je ne me suis pas opposé à l'interprétation du Nouveau Testament, mais bien à la comparaison entre le Nouveau Testament et le Coran qui a présenté le Coran sous un jour moralement inférieur. Vous n'avez aucunement traité de cette préoccupation.
2. Je n'ai pas dit que M. Green n'avait pas l'intention d'inciter à la haine. J'ai dit que je ne crois pas qu'il avait FORCÉMENT l'intention d'inciter à la haine. Je ne peux pas me prononcer avec certitude sur les intentions de Lowell. Cependant ses gestes sont suspects.

Le plaignant a également présenté sa Demande de décision au CCNR le 10 avril et y a ajouté les commentaires suivants :

[Traduction]

Malheureusement, CFRA refuse de comprendre, ou ne comprend pas, l'essentiel de ma plainte. Ma préoccupation ne se centre pas du tout sur le Coran comme tel ou le Nouveau Testament comme tel. Ma préoccupation a trait au fait qu'on a juxtaposé un texte religieux et un autre pour souligner une différence principale, soit que le Coran, lequel représente une minorité ciblée au Canada, préconise le meurtre et que le Nouveau Testament, lequel représente la majorité bien retranchée, ne le fait pas. Je n'appartiens à ni l'une ni l'autre de ces religions, et je suis franchement indifférent envers la religion. Cependant, je ne suis pas indifférent envers le fait que l'histoire a démontré que la haine est favorisée par l'isolement de la minorité lorsqu'on la différencie de la majorité de sorte à clairement diaboliser cette minorité. Si, comme le prétend CFRA, la discussion de M. Green n'avait aucun rapport avec le Nouveau Testament, mais visait seulement le Coran, pourquoi a-t-il comparé les deux? Qu'est-ce qui motivait la

comparaison? Il n'est que raisonnable de conclure que certains pourraient abuser de commentaires si clairement irréflichs et erronés pour vilipender la minorité, tout en faisant de leur propre religion un pilier d'une moralité davantage évoluée. C'est une délinéation claire entre les cultures. La haine fonctionne de la sorte; le poids de la preuve à l'appui de mes préoccupations est écrasant. J'ose croire que le CCNR possède une expérience assez vaste et suffisamment d'autonomie pour en venir à une conclusion semblable. Je ne cherche pas à faire interdire le sujet dont M. Green a discuté; c'est un sujet qui présente une préoccupation légitime. Ce qui me préoccupe c'est qu'il ait présenté le Nouveau Testament comme étant un élément qui sépare clairement les deux fois. Les musulmans dans ce pays risquent déjà d'être la cible de la haine étant donné la situation géopolitique actuelle. Juxtaposer leur foi et celle de la majorité d'une manière négative est un geste qui est loin d'être constructif ou exploratoire dans le cadre de la discussion du sujet qui a été soulevé.

J'ai tenté à deux reprises d'expliquer mes préoccupations à CFRA, mais ses responsables centrent leur attention davantage sur l'exactitude de mon interprétation du Nouveau Testament que sur le but de comparer le Coran au Nouveau Testament.

J'ai de FORTS sentiments au sujet de cette question. Je ne me suis jamais plaint au CCNR auparavant et je vous assure que M. Green et moi n'avons pas les mêmes vues sur plusieurs sujets. Ma plainte ne tient pas à des différences sur le plan politique; elle ne tient pas à de la rancune; elle tient à la promotion tacite de la haine dans un environnement fort sensible.

De but en blanc : Quelle est la raison pour la comparaison? CFRA ne s'est jamais penchée sur cette préoccupation centrale.

CFRA a fait parvenir une autre note au plaignant le 11 avril :

1. La comparaison que Lowell a faite entre la Bible et le Coran se fondait sur son interprétation, ce qu'il est entièrement libre de faire. Que votre interprétation et la sienne soient semblables ou non n'a aucun rapport. Les lignes téléphoniques étaient ouvertes et nous avons invité les gens ayant tous les opinions possibles à participer. Nous leur avons tous accordé l'occasion de présenter leurs opinions et leurs interprétations. Des vues fort divergentes ont été présentées sur les ondes de CFRA à un auditeur raisonnablement constant au cours d'une période raisonnable. (Il s'agit de l'obligation – mot pour mot – énoncée dans le règlement.) Lowell a traité cette polémique entièrement dans les limites des règlements et des codes.

2. Merci d'avoir précisé ce que vous entendiez par « forcément ». Comme vous pouvez le constater d'après ma réponse, c'est l'interprétation que j'ai prêtée à la déclaration que vous avez faite à l'origine.

Le plaignant et la station ont poursuivi leur dialogue écrit, lequel se centrerait principalement sur la question de savoir s'ils avaient chacun compris les mots précis de l'autre dans la correspondance antérieure. CFRA a fait parvenir de l'information supplémentaire directement au CCNR le 13 avril :

[Traduction]

[...]

Pour ce qui est de la question principale sur laquelle repose la plainte : il n'est pas raisonnable de conclure que les commentaires de Lowell inciteraient à la haine ou à la peur envers tous les musulmans comme l'avance [le plaignant].

Il n'en demeure pas moins qu'il y a eu une grande couverture dans les nouvelles de certains extrémistes qui interprètent le Coran littéralement de sorte à justifier l'exécution des musulmans qui convertissent au christianisme. Même si l'argument [du plaignant] au sujet de la Bible tenait (ce qu'il ne fait pas), il s'agit d'un argument spéculatif parce qu'on ne l'interprète pas littéralement et les chrétiens ne s'en servent pas pour justifier de tuer ceux qui convertissent à une autre foi. Le gouvernement de l'Afghanistan voulait mettre un converti à mort, et Lowell a demandé aux gens qui ont appelé s'il y avait lieu de demander aux nouveaux arrivants au Canada s'ils sont d'accord avec l'idée de mettre à mort quelqu'un qui a converti de l'islam à une autre religion. Même ses interlocuteurs musulmans ce jour-là et d'autres ont convenu qu'il s'agit d'une question légitime et que le Canada a le droit de la poser à ceux qui font une demande d'immigration.

[...]

La discussion entamée par Lowell était d'actualité. C'était une question légitime dans les journaux et dans les bulletins de nouvelles à la télévision et à la radio. Il a bien précisé qu'il ne parlait pas de tous les musulmans. Son examen d'un groupe très spécifique de gens (les extrémistes) était approprié. Et, il n'y a eu aucune violation des codes ou des règlements.

CFRA a envoyé une autre lettre au CCNR le 9 mai dans laquelle la station réitérait la majeure partie de sa lettre du 13 avril, mais a ajouté les points suivants :

[Traduction]

Dans la section consacrée aux lettres au rédacteur du *Ottawa Citizen* du 9 mai 2006, l'écrivain musulman M. Husain Sadar a dit (« Canadian Muslims must stop hijacking of their Faith » (Les musulmans canadiens se doivent d'empêcher que d'autres détournent leur foi à leurs propres fins)) :

... il règne un silence scandaleux adopté par d'autres musulmans y compris la plupart d'entre nous en Amérique du Nord. Malheureusement, cela laisse la porte grande ouverte aux organismes douteux, surtout le Congrès islamique canadien, souhaitant publier des déclarations éhontées pour s'assurer d'une autpublicité ...

... trop souvent, les terroristes, surtout Al-Qaeda et ses partisans, se servent du « parapluie islamique » pour justifier le meurtre de gens innocents ...

... Les musulmans doivent se poser la question suivante : comment pouvons-nous prétendre que l'islam représente la paix alors que certains de ses partisans s'emploient à causer la mort et la destruction à chaque heure?

De toute évidence, la plupart des *musulmans* sont des gens raisonnables et modérés, et n'ont aucun problème à extirper les vues extrémistes afin d'améliorer la compréhension et les rapports avec d'autres Canadiens. Les nombreuses lettres à la rédaction en font foi, comme celle de M. Sadar, et aussi les nombreux participants musulmans aux tribunes téléphoniques de CFRA. Aucune personne raisonnable n'avancerait que de telles opinions sont racistes ou discriminatoires, ou qu'il devrait être interdit aux gens de les exprimer.

Même si l'opinion personnelle de M. Green était erronée quant à la comparaison entre la Bible et le Coran, il y a droit et les gens sont toujours invités à appeler et à mettre cette opinion en question. Lowell demandait au public s'il serait raisonnable de demander aux immigrants s'ils estiment acceptable de tuer ceux qui convertissent au christianisme. Le fait même que des musulmans canadiens aient appuyé cette mesure ainsi que d'autres pour extirper l'extrémisme parmi eux constitue la preuve concrète que cette discussion n'est aucunement *abusivement discriminatoire*.

LA DÉCISION

Le Comité régional de l'Ontario du CCNR a étudié la plainte à la lumière des articles suivants du *Code de déontologie* de l'Association canadienne des radiodiffuseurs (ACR) :

Code de déontologie de l'ACR, Article 2 – Droits de la personne

Reconnaissant que tous et chacun ont droit à la reconnaissance complète et égale de leurs mérites et de jouir de certains droits et libertés fondamentaux, les radiotélédiffuseurs doivent veiller à ce que leur programmation ne renferme pas de contenu ou de commentaires abusifs ou indûment discriminatoires quant à la race, l'origine nationale ou ethnique, la couleur, la religion, l'âge, le sexe, l'orientation sexuelle, l'état matrimonial ou le handicap physique ou mental.

Code de déontologie de l'ACR, Article 6 – Présentation complète, juste et appropriée

C'est un fait reconnu que la tâche première et fondamentale de chaque radiotélédiffuseur est de présenter des nouvelles, des points de vue, des commentaires ou des textes éditoriaux d'une manière complète, juste et appropriée. Ce principe s'applique à toute la programmation de la radio et de la télévision, qu'il s'agisse des nouvelles, des affaires publiques, d'un magazine, d'une émission débat, d'une émission téléphonique, d'entrevues ou d'autres formules de radiotélévision dans lesquelles des nouvelles, des points de vue, des commentaires ou des éditoriaux peuvent être exprimés par les employés du radiotélédiffuseur, leurs invités ou leurs interlocuteurs.

Les membres du Comité décideur ont lu toute la correspondance afférente et ont écouté l'émission mise en cause. Le Comité conclut que l'émission n'a pas enfreint l'article 2 mais qu'elle a enfreint l'article 6 précité.

Les questions afférentes

Plusieurs questions distinctes sont soulevées dans la correspondance détaillée et réfléchie entre le plaignant et le radiodiffuseur. Étant donné que les parties naviguaient souvent à contre-courant, le Comité estime utile de cerner ces questions d'après la totalité de leur correspondance par courriel avant d'analyser ces questions.

Les préoccupations du plaignant

Le plaignant a soulevé deux questions qui étaient pour lui inextricablement liées. Sa première préoccupation, et d'ailleurs la plus constante, se rapportait à la comparaison faite par l'animateur entre le christianisme et l'islam. À son avis, cette comparaison avait clairement une incidence néfaste sur l'islam. Comme l'a énoncé à l'origine le plaignant, cela résultait de la technique rhétorique utilisée par l'animateur qui a « tacitement » incité à la haine, et ensuite par le radiodiffuseur [traduction] « dans le but d'encourager la haine envers un groupe en particulier en raison de ses croyances religieuses. » Dans un courriel qu'il a envoyé plus tard au sujet des points soulevés par le directeur des nouvelles du radiodiffuseur dans son intervention, il a noté que c'était Lowell Green [traduction] « qui a dit de façon terre à terre, qu'à la différence du Coran, le Nouveau Testament n'accepte pas la mise à mort fondée sur la foi » et le plaignant a de nouveau conclu, à partir de cela, qu'il était [traduction] « raisonnable de croire que [l']intention [de l'animateur] était d'établir une distinction entre ces fois. » Cela risquait, a-t-il affirmé en termes légèrement différents, [traduction] « d'inciter à la haine ou à la peur au sein d'un groupe (majoritaire) envers un autre groupe (minoritaire). » À l'appui de sa position, il a également cité plusieurs passages du Nouveau Testament qui semblaient préconiser la violence. Dans son dernier envoi au radiodiffuseur, il a élucidé sa position quant au fait que selon lui l'animateur incitait à la haine en concluant qu'étant donné qu'il (le plaignant) n'était pas en mesure d'évaluer les *intentions* de l'animateur, il ne pouvait pas conclure que l'animateur avait [traduction] « FORCÉMENT l'intention d'inciter à la haine » [c'est le plaignant qui souligne] bien que, selon le plaignant, les déclarations faites par l'animateur ont produit cet effet.

Le plaignant a également communiqué deux pensées importantes qui se rapportent aux préoccupations précitées. Bien qu'elles n'ajoutent aucune nouvelle question, il y a quand même lieu de les énoncer. La possibilité de la désensibilisation est un facteur qui préoccupe généralement le CCNR dans les cas du genre dont il est saisi dans la présente affaire. Empruntant des mots d'un site Web qu'il a mentionné dans son deuxième courriel, le plaignant a dit [traduction] « Une fois que certains groupes sont stigmatisés comme étant mauvais, moralement inférieurs et pas entièrement humains, leur persécution devient plus acceptable sur le plan psychologique. » Il a également dit, dans son

dernier courriel au CCNR, [traduction] « Cependant, je ne suis pas indifférent envers le fait que l'histoire a démontré que la haine est favorisée par l'isolement de la minorité, lorsqu'on la différencie de la majorité de sorte à clairement diaboliser cette minorité. » Sur ce point, il a également cité du site Web mentionné plus haut : [traduction] « Bien que la désindividuation et la création d'images ennemies soient très communes, elles forment un processus dangereux qui devient particulièrement préjudiciable lorsqu'il atteint le niveau de la déshumanisation. » Il s'inquiétait que le but de la comparaison entre les religions était de faire en sorte que [traduction] « certains pourraient abuser de commentaires [...] erronés pour vilipender la minorité, tout en faisant de leur propre religion un pilier d'une moralité davantage évoluée. »

Les questions du côté du radiodiffuseur

Le directeur des nouvelles du radiodiffuseur a fait observer que l'émission en cause s'articulait sur la question et les conséquences de l'apostasie en ce qui concerne spécifiquement [traduction] « les gens qui estiment acceptable de tuer quelqu'un qui a converti de la foi musulmane au christianisme. » Il a qualifié d'international le reportage au sujet d'Abdul Rahman, soit le citoyen afghan qui avait été condamné à mort en mars 2006 pour avoir converti de l'islam au christianisme, et il a déclaré que ce reportage était un sujet de discussion approprié en tant que préoccupation publique au Canada. Dans un sens, le directeur des nouvelles a pris la position selon laquelle l'importance de cette question-là justifiait toutes les façons dont l'animateur l'a traitée. Néanmoins, le directeur des nouvelles a expliqué que l'animateur n'a ni [traductions] « attaqué le Coran » ni avancé que « tous ceux qui croient en le Coran constituent une menace physique pour les Canadiens en raison de leur croyance en le Coran. » Il a également affirmé que les exemples d'extraits de la Bible donnés par le plaignant étaient [traduction] « si hors contexte et leur interprétation si faible qu'ils n'ajoutent aucun poids à votre argument. » Dans le message qu'il a envoyé plus tard, le directeur des nouvelles a ajouté que [traduction] « La comparaison que Lowell a faite entre la Bible et le Coran se fondait sur son interprétation, ce qu'il est entièrement libre de faire. » Il a déclaré que la différence entre l'interprétation de l'animateur et celle du plaignant n'avait [traductions] « aucun rapport » et qu'on avait donné aux gens qui ont appelé l'émission « l'occasion de présenter leurs opinions et leurs interprétations. » Il est revenu sur ce point dans des messages qu'il a envoyés par la suite et a affirmé que la discussion sur l'apostasie était [traductions] « une question légitime » et « d'actualité ». À divers points dans la correspondance, il est également revenu sur la question des extrémistes et de la distinction faite entre ces personnes et les autres croyants.

Le directeur des nouvelles de CFRA a également admis que le fait de savoir si l'animateur [traductions] « a involontairement incité à la haine » posait un problème, mais il a prétendu que M. Green ne l'a « catégoriquement » pas fait. Dans un courriel qu'il a envoyé plus tard et dans lequel il a abordé, de façon périphérique, le point soulevé par le plaignant au sujet de la comparaison entre

les deux religions, il a dit que ce point [traductions] « entraîne[nt] dans une digression » et il a conclu qu'il « n'est pas raisonnable de conclure que les commentaires de Lowell inciteraient à la haine ou la peur envers tous les musulmans. »

Points préliminaires

Il n'y a pas le moindre désaccord en ce qui concerne l'importance de la discussion sur cette controverse comme telle. L'histoire de M. Abdul Rahman a fait des échos autour du monde. Puisqu'il s'agit d'une question qui a vivement intéressé le public et qui a soulevé à son tour des questions qui revêtent une importance majeure, il ne faisait aucun doute que les émissions causerie consacrées aux actualités la mettraient en vedette. Le plaignant a qualifié cette question de [traduction] « sujet qui présente une préoccupation légitime » et le directeur des nouvelles de CFRA s'est évertué à justifier le fait d'avoir soulevé la question dans l'émission, même si la discussion à cet égard sur les ondes n'a suscité aucune contestation. Bien entendu, le CCNR affirmerait fermement d'emblée la pertinence et la valeur d'un débat sur cette question controversée sur les ondes.

La question pertinente pour le CCNR ne se rapporte pas au sujet, mais au *traitement* du sujet. Tout comme il ne peut y avoir aucun doute quant à la légitimité de diffuser une émission sur les conséquences entraînées par l'apostasie de M. Abdul Rahman, il n'y a pas non plus de doute que les radiodiffuseurs ne sont pas libres d'amorcer des discussions sur cette question qui peuvent également finir par enfreindre toute autre norme établie par le *Code de déontologie de l'ACR* (comme la disposition sur les droits de la personne, sans en exclure d'autres).

Par conséquent, dans la présente affaire le Comité régional de l'Ontario se penche seulement sur la question de savoir si la discussion sur les ondes constituait des commentaires abusifs ou indûment discriminatoires fondés sur la religion à l'endroit d'un groupe identifiable d'une part, ou la présentation de points de vue, de commentaires ou d'éditoriaux injustes ou inappropriés d'autre part.

Notons également que de *nombreux* sujets sensibles ont été soulevés dans l'émission par rapport au thème central de l'apostasie qui n'ont pas déclenché de problèmes en matière de réglementation. Non seulement le Comité régional de l'Ontario ne trouve-t-il pas en faute, dans la présente décision, la discussion de ce *sujet-là* (à l'exception de certains aspects de son déroulement), il ne trouve pas en faute la discussion des questions substantives qui suivent par l'animateur et ses interlocuteurs (les renvois à tous ces sujets, disponibles en anglais seulement, se trouvent à l'Annexe A) : le filtrage des terroristes par les autorités de l'immigration; l'immigration en provenance des pays musulmans; la

publication, dans le *Western Standard*, des dessins humoristiques danois et d'ailleurs controversés concernant l'islam; le traitement des musulmanes dans le contexte nord-américain; l'hypocrisie de groupes chrétiens qui vont au Moyen-Orient pour contester les mesures qui y sont prises par les militaires de l'occident, alors qu'ils bénéficient de ce genre de mesures prises pour leur compte; une plainte présentée à la commission des droits de la personne de l'Alberta et d'autres présentées à d'autres commissions des droits de la personne en général; le fait d'accepter certaines pratiques culturelles non chrétiennes (comme le port du kirpan par les sikhs) et la réaction correspondante de ne pas accepter certaines pratiques chrétiennes (comme la récitation du Notre Père); la violence relative de l'islam et du christianisme; les auteurs d'attaques suicide à la bombe; les conflits entre les musulmans et les Juifs; l'application moderne de la doctrine du Coran; et ainsi de suite.

Commentaires abusifs ou indûment discriminatoires

Le CCNR a toujours stipulé que ce n'est pas la simple mention d'un groupe identifiable qui constituera une infraction du *Code de déontologie de l'ACR*. Les commentaires doivent être abusifs ou indûment discriminatoires, ou, autrement dit, extrêmement négatifs ou insultants envers un groupe, ou constituer des généralisations négatives au sujet de l'ensemble d'un groupe. Le plaignant estime que la comparaison faite par l'animateur des deux religions était odieuse et qu'elle a eu pour conséquence d'inciter à la haine envers l'islam, pour emprunter ses paroles. Bien que le Comité de l'Ontario trouve en faute, comme nous le verrons dans la prochaine section, la façon dont l'animateur a traité la question, cette faute ne tient pas à des commentaires abusifs ou indûment discriminatoires de sa part.

Il y a lieu de noter, premièrement, que critiquer une politique religieuse n'enfreint aucune norme codifiée. Dans *W Network concernant My Feminism* (Décision du CCNR 01/02-1120, rendue le 28 février 2003), par exemple, le Comité national des services spécialisés a examiné une plainte portant sur un film documentaire dans lequel des femmes de cinq religions distinctes ont fait des commentaires sur la façon dont leur religion respective traite le féminisme, le Comité a dit qu'il

se doit de faire remarquer qu'un cinéaste ou le radiodiffuseur qui présente son œuvre n'est pas obligé de se garder de critiquer le sujet abordé. *La critique à elle seule ne revient pas au commentaire indûment discriminatoire*. C'est la critique injustifiée, non soutenable, qui ne passera pas. C'est la critique désinvolte, gratuite, sans fondement qui ne peut pas supporter les phares des normes codifiées des radiodiffuseurs privés. Il n'y a rien de la sorte dans ce cas. Ce n'est pas l'opinion critique et réfléchie de la seule intervenante catholique irlandaise qui puisse faire l'objet d'un examen équitable en situation isolée, mais la présentation de la totalité du documentaire qui doit faire l'objet d'un examen collectif. En ce qui concerne la question à caractère religieux, celle-ci est raisonnablement équilibrée, équitable et crédible [c'est nous qui soulignons].

Et, dans *CHWO-AM concernant un épisode de Durant's World* (Décision du CCNR 04/05-0447, rendue le 24 mai 2005), l'animateur de radio a critiqué, dans son article d'opinion, le point de vue de l'Église catholique sur le mariage entre deux personnes du même sexe. Le Comité de l'Ontario a conclu

que le commentaire de Bob Durant se rapportait à une question de politique, question sur laquelle de nombreuses religions ont adopté une position à vrai dire. Cependant, ses commentaires se limitaient à la religion dont son épouse et lui étaient profondément conscients et dont la position leur avait apporté des conséquences personnelles se rapportant à la question même au sujet de laquelle il (et *plusieurs* autres commentateurs canadiens, tant dans la presse écrite que parlée) exprimaient chacun leur perspective. Le Comité considère que ses commentaires n'étaient pas du tout discriminatoires, et encore moins indûment discriminatoires. Il n'y a aucune infraction au *Code* à cet égard.

Dans la présente affaire, le Comité trouve que bien que l'animateur ait critiqué des aspects de l'islam, cette critique était loin d'être une condamnation générale de cette religion et ne visait pas à la dénigrer. Il se préoccupe de la justification de la violence. Même s'il en est venu à des conclusions injustifiées dans certains cas, en raison de ses piètres connaissances, d'ailleurs évidentes, de cette religion, le Comité ne trouve pas que les commentaires faits par l'animateur, même lorsqu'il a comparé les religions, équivalent à des commentaires abusifs ou indûment discriminatoires. Cela dit, le Comité trouve que certaines des comparaisons critiques faites par l'animateur frôlaient la limite de l'acceptable. Cela est attribuable, en partie, au fait qu'il était prêt à adopter l'approche de deux poids deux mesures. À un moment donné, par exemple, il a affirmé [traduction] « Je connais assez bien la Bible chrétienne et le, le Nouveau Testament [...] et je vous dis que le Nouveau Testament, on y dit nulle part qu'on doit tuer quiconque change de religion. En fait, le message du Nouveau Testament, de Jésus-Christ, c'est un message de miséricorde. » Dans un entretien qui a eu lieu plus tard avec un des interlocuteurs musulmans, Maser en l'occurrence, l'animateur a répété ce point :

[Traduction]

En fait, le message de la, de la Bible chrétienne – je ne dis pas qu'un est mieux que l'autre – mais je vous dis que le message de Jésus-Christ, le fondateur de la foi chrétienne, est un message de miséricorde. Vous savez, si un homme demande, si, si un homme vous frappe la joue droite, tendez la joue gauche.

Dans sa prochaine intervention, M. Green a déclaré [traduction] « Le Coran dit exactement l'opposé. » Le point est que l'animateur connaissait si peu le Coran qu'il semblait ignorer la caractéristique fondamentale de la miséricorde qu'affichait le prophète Mahomet. Lorsque l'interlocuteur Alex lui a précisé cet exemple, il a fait abstraction de la description du prophète miséricordieux (et du principe de la miséricorde qui fait partie intégrante de l'islam comme tel). Et,

l'interlocutrice Jessie a fait mention du respect et de l'équivalent de la moralité chrétienne qui font partie de l'islam. L'animateur n'a pas tenu compte de ces deux observations positives, préférant dans les deux cas de s'en tenir à ses renvois au Coran, qu'il faisait littéralement sans se préoccuper du contexte. C'est comme s'il a brandi la massue morale de la religion qu'il connaît contre celle dont il ignore beaucoup. Bien que le Comité convienne, comme l'affirme le plaignant, que M. Green a agi de la sorte dans le but de critiquer des aspects de l'islam, il n'estime pas qu'il tentait d'exprimer des propos abusifs ou indûment discriminatoires à l'endroit des musulmans en général. Par conséquent, le Comité ne considère pas que cette comparaison constituait un commentaire interdit par l'article 2 du *Code de déontologie de l'ACR*.

Les commentaires injustes ou inappropriés : la question

Bien qu'il ait fait observer le point indiqué plus haut, le Comité tient à répéter qu'il considère que la question de l'apostasie, *particulièrement* dans les circonstances l'entourant en Afghanistan en mars 2006, était, et demeure, indubitablement un sujet d'intérêt public qui mérite d'être examiné minutieusement par les médias. Le Comité est tout autant conscient que la question susciterait probablement de fortes réactions de la part des auditeurs. Même si cela ne crée pas, en soi, de problème, la situation exige des techniques de navigation habiles de la part de l'animateur afin qu'il puisse assurer le traitement « juste, complet et approprié » du sujet. Simplement dit, le problème se rapporte moins à « quoi » qu'à « comment », c.-à-d. non pas au sujet abordé par l'émission, mais à la façon dont l'animateur a traité le sujet. Et, c'est là que le Comité juge que le radiodiffuseur laisse à désirer du point de vue des exigences stipulées par le *Code*.

Les commentaires injustes ou inappropriés : la représentation inexacte du Coran

En premier lieu, et tel que nous avons déjà clairement indiqué, l'animateur a décidé de fonder la grande partie de sa discussion sur une lettre qui avait paru ce matin-là dans le quotidien *National Post* et qui avait été écrite par le professeur (émérite) Heinz Klatt de la University of Western Ontario. Bien que l'animateur ait cité une grande partie, quoique pas la totalité, de la lettre, pour Lowell Green, l'élément central de cette lettre était l'âyat 89 de la sourate 4 du Coran. M. Green l'a cité comme suit :

[Traduction]

Citation du Coran, chapitre quatre, verset 89, « S'ils te délaissent, saisis-les et mets-les à mort là où tu les trouves. Tue celui qui change de religion », fin de citation.

Il a précédé cette citation, peut-être parce qu'il anticipait la nature tendue de la question, de sa propre déclaration afin de se disculper :

[Traduction]

Le professeur Klatt écrit, et là je veux bien préciser avant que vous m'envoyez des petits défenseurs des libertés civiles et ainsi de suite. Je tiens à bien préciser, que je lis la lettre qui est publiée ce matin, publiquement, dans le *National Post*. D'accord? Je ne dis pas que je suis d'accord ou non. Je lis sa lettre. Donc, avant de commencer à porter des accusations et à faire faire des mandats d'arrestation et tout le reste, veuillez vous souvenir que je lis une lettre qui paraît dans un journal.

Ce que le Comité trouve curieux c'est que la question n'est pas de savoir si l'animateur est d'accord ou non avec l'auteur de la lettre. Comme les comités du CCNR ont déclaré à maintes reprises, et au sujet de cet animateur même, le Conseil appuie le droit des animateurs d'émissions de causerie d'avoir des opinions et de les exprimer. Cela ne pose aucun problème. Une partie du contenu, à savoir la partie ne se rapportant pas à une opinion, exigeait de l'exactitude et sur ce point, l'animateur, Lowell Green, a déclaré fermement et sans équivoque qu'il *citait du Coran*. En outre, il a donné davantage de poids à ce point en disant qu'il citait ce texte de la lettre à la rédaction écrite par un *professeur* qui citait le texte coranique. Mais, en effet, la phrase finale qui pose un problème et sur laquelle se fonde l'argument du jour de M. Green – « Tue celui qui change de religion » – ne se trouve aucunement dans le Coran. Et, l'auteur de la lettre, soit le professeur Klatt, ne l'a pas non plus attribuée au Coran.

Le Comité accorde beaucoup d'importance au fait que M. Green a été très précis lorsqu'il a axé son argument sur la partie suivante du verset : [traduction] « Tue celui qui change de religion ». Il a commencé avec cette affirmation (telle que citée plus haut) et puis il a répété ce verset dans de nombreuses circonstances au cours de l'émission ce matin-là. Par exemple, pendant son entretien avec l'interlocuteur Jerry, il a dit:

[Traduction]

[C]ette lettre de la part du professeur Klatt me dérange véritablement parce qu'il cite directement du Coran. Il dit, et je cite, « Il est écrit dans le Coran, s'ils te délaissent, saisis-les et mets-les à mort là où tu les trouves. Tue celui qui change de religion. »

Puis, lorsqu'il discutait de la question avec l'interlocutrice Madeleine, il a répété ce point.

[Traduction]

Ce, ce qui me dérange véritablement, et je reviens toujours à cette lettre, si, si ce que dit le professeur Klatt est vrai, que, qu'en fait il est dit dans le Coran qu'on doit tuer ceux qui convertissent de l'islam au christianisme –

Après la prochaine personne qui a appelé à l'émission et la pause commerciale subséquente, l'animateur a répété sa version de l'extrait de la lettre du professeur Klatt :

[Traduction]

Parce que selon le professeur Klatt de la University of Western Ontario, il dit que le Coran déclare très clairement, et là il cite, il dit que le Coran, euh, au, euh, au chapitre 4, verset 89 il est dit, et je cite, « S'ils te délaissent, saisis-les et mets-les à mort là où tu les trouves. Tue celui qui change de religion. » Il cite du Coran.

Le prochain interlocuteur s'appelait Danny, et encore une fois l'animateur s'est appuyé sur la « citation ».

[Traduction]

Il est dit ici, selon l'auteur de la lettre qui cite le Coran, que, euh, qu'il y a lieu de tuer quiconque change de religion, c'est-à-dire de l'islam à une autre religion.

Ensuite, lorsqu'il s'entretenait avec Omar, un des premiers musulmans à appeler l'émission de ce jour-là, l'animateur s'est de nouveau fié à la « citation » du Coran :

[Traduction]

Est-ce que vous avez, êtes-vous d'accord pour dire qu'il est écrit dans le Coran que, euh, « S'ils te délaissent, saisis-les et mets-les à mort là où tu les trouves. Tue celui qui change de religion? »

Il y a d'autres exemples d'occasions auxquelles l'animateur a tablé sur cette « citation ». Ses entretiens avec les interlocuteurs Alex et Jessie démontrent l'importance de la confiance que l'animateur accordait littéralement à la citation tirée de la lettre du professeur Klatt en premier lieu, et ensuite au texte du Coran comme tel lorsqu'il a apparemment obtenu un exemplaire de ce livre sacré plus tard dans l'émission. Ces deux entretiens démontrent l'approche *littérale* adoptée par l'animateur. Lorsque, par exemple, Alex a expliqué la nature miséricordieuse du prophète Muhammad (telle que mentionnée plus haut), l'animateur a répondu :

[Traduction]

Bien je, je lis directement. Je veux dire, dans ce cas-ci, c'est très clair. Je veux dire qu'il n'y a rien d'équivoque. Euh, que si, si quelqu'un abandonne cette foi, et je cite, « S'ils délaissent l'islam, saisis-les et tue-les là où tu les trouves. » Je, je ne vois pas comment on pourrait mal interpréter ce qu'il a dit.

Alex a continué à mettre le point de vue de l'animateur en question, mais M. Green a persisté et à répété plusieurs fois de suite [traduction] « Bien, je, je ne fais que citer le Coran. » Alex et d'autres personnes qui ont appelé ont donné l'occasion à Lowell Green de s'extirper de la situation, c.-à-d. sa confiance erronée en le texte, mais il a constamment refusé de le faire. Jessie a même dit, plutôt par préscience, [traduction] « Je ne sais pas. Je, je n'en sais pas assez au sujet de ce professeur. » Mais malgré cette invitation, l'animateur ne s'est pas replié.

La question en jeu, telle que présagée ci-haut, tient au fait que la « citation » du Coran est incorrecte. Les mots [traduction] « Tuez celui qui change de religion » ne figurent simplement pas dans le Coran. Le radiodiffuseur avait sa propre obligation de s'assurer, aux moments pertinents, de l'exactitude de la documentation qu'il *invoquait*. En omettant d'effectuer cette vérification, il a permis d'avancer un argument ou une position qui *semblaient* plus soutenables qu'ils ne l'étaient. Le Coran fait autorité comme il se devrait, tout comme le fait la Bible. Élaborer un argument qui se fonde sur ce qui semble être le contenu du livre sacré de l'islam met les interlocuteurs et les auditeurs sur la défensive; ils ne voient la situation qu'en termes d'affrontement dès le départ. L'animateur savait, ou aurait dû savoir, que sa position semblerait davantage inattaquable en faisant appel à un tel recours. Il aurait dû vérifier, ou un employé du radiodiffuseur aurait dû vérifier, un point si important avant d'en faire le *fondement* de presque la totalité de l'épisode. En négligeant de présenter des renseignements exacts à l'auditoire sur le contenu du Coran, ils se sont montrés trompeurs et injustes. Ils ont pipé les dés sans divulguer qu'ils l'ont fait, même s'il s'agissait d'un choix involontaire. En fin de compte, le radiodiffuseur n'a pas fait une présentation juste, complète et appropriée et a donc enfreint l'article 6 du *Code de déontologie de l'ACR* pour avoir tablé constamment sur une citation erronée d'une partie du texte du Coran, et pour avoir également refusé de plier lorsque des interlocuteurs musulmans ont signalé l'erreur.

Les commentaires injustes ou inappropriés : le traitement des interlocuteurs et du contexte

En tant que commandant du microphone et contrôleur de l'accès aux ondes, l'animateur exerce un pouvoir disproportionné sur le déroulement du dialogue. Bien que le CCNR ait toujours été d'avis que cette réalité est acceptable, il a également toujours été d'avis qu'une telle autorité doit s'exercer judicieusement. Ainsi, dans *CFRA-AM concernant l'émission de Lowell Green* (« *New World Order* ») (Décision du CCNR 95/96-0012, rendue le 30 avril 1996), le Comité a

dit ce qui suit, après avoir examiné les divers styles des animateurs d'émissions de causerie :

Le Conseil estime que peu importe où se situe l'émission de ligne ouverte dans cette gamme de possibilités, il revient au radiodiffuseur de garantir « la présentation complète, impartiale et appropriée des nouvelles, des points de vue, des commentaires ou des textes éditoriaux », tel que prescrit par [...] le *Code de déontologie de l'ACR*. Il n'y a pas un style d'animateur qui soit davantage libre qu'un autre d'agir de façon abusive envers les invités ou les interlocuteurs. Il n'y a pas non plus un style d'animateur qui ait le droit de faire fi du devoir du radiodiffuseur de veiller à « la présentation complète, juste et appropriée ».

Dans cette perspective même, ce Comité a expliqué, dans *CKTB-AM concernant le John Michael Show* (Commentaire sur le Moyen-Orient) (Décision du CCNR 01/02-0651, rendue le 7 juin 2002), comme suit :

La dissension et le désagréable sont monnaie courante dans le forum électronique. C'est là que doit transparaître tout l'art de l'animateur. S'il est vrai que l'animateur et les participants ont tous droit à leur opinion, n'oublions pas que les avis n'ont pas tous le même poids. La personne au micro qui commande la technologie possède un net avantage dont elle ne doit pas abuser. À son meilleur, la tribune téléphonique ne doit pas verser dans le monologue ou l'arbitraire. Les praticiens experts de cet art doivent être habiles [...]

Dans la présente affaire, l'animateur semble avoir compris qu'il était important de donner la parole à des représentants de la collectivité musulmane, tel qu'en témoigne le fait qu'il a tenté à plusieurs reprises de convaincre les musulmans d'appeler son émission. Le Comité est entièrement d'accord que cette tentative de trouver des interlocuteurs musulmans constituait la bonne voie. Cependant, il éprouve de graves difficultés avec la façon dont le dialogue avec certains de ces interlocuteurs s'est déroulé.

La première tentative d'encourager des gens de la collectivité musulmane à appeler a eu lieu au début de la deuxième heure de l'émission. La méthode utilisée par l'animateur était de dire que les musulmans appellent souvent pour argumenter avec lui et qu'il voulait qu'ils appellent maintenant pour mettre les choses au point. Il a également indiqué qu'il leur accorderait [traduction] « tout le temps voulu pour parler. »

[Traduction]

J'invite les musulmans à appeler. Ordinairement, euh, beaucoup de musulmans appellent effectivement l'émission, d'habitude pour argumenter avec moi. Mais il n'y a rien de mal à ça. Est-ce que vous, en tant que musulmans, croyez que le Coran stipule que les musulmans tuent ceux qui convertissent de l'islam à d'autres religions? Croyez-vous cela? Êtes-vous d'accord avec cela? Je suis d'avis qu'en tant que collectivité nous avons le droit de savoir si ceux qui vivent parmi nous estiment que quiconque convertit de la foi musulmane à une autre foi devrait être tué. [...] Euh, vous n'hésitez pas à m'appeler pour me donner le diable, mettez-nous donc les choses au clair. Est-ce que, est-ce que l'auteur de

cette lettre, est-ce que ce professeur a raison ou tort là-dessus? Et s'agit-il d'une question qui devrait nous préoccuper en tant que société? Euh, je vous donnerais tout le temps voulu pour parler. [...]

Après avoir parlé avec l'interlocuteur Dave, il a rappiqué. Il a ajouté un nouvel engagement : [traduction] « Je ne vais pas vous interrompre. »

[Traduction]

Bien, il est évident que nous ne recevrons pas d'appels de la part des musulmans. Je trouve cela décevant. Je voudrais savoir si en fait, vous savez, les musulmans qui vivent parmi nous croient réellement cela. Une, une dernière occasion. S'il vous plaît. Nous vous donnerons tout le temps voulu. [...] Dernière chance pour les musulmans d'appeler. Et, et dites-nous juste comment, vous savez, si c'est vrai ou non. 521-8255. Nous avons, nous tenons les lignes ouvertes pour vous. 521-8255. Vous êtes des milliers à m'écouter. Vous n'avez aucun problème pour ce qui est de m'appeler sur d'autres questions. Je ne vais pas vous interrompre. Vous n'avez qu'à expliquer ce qu'est la situation dans ce cas. Je vous lance mon dernier appel.

La technique a porté fruit. Le premier des auditeurs musulmans, Omar, a appelé. Il était nettement en désaccord avec le fait que M. Green se soit reporté à l'âyat 4,89; il a fait observer que les musulmans ne sont autorisés à tuer qu'en cas de légitime défense. [Traduction] « Non, non, non, non, non. [...] D'accord. L'islam ne demande jamais aux musulmans de tuer qui que ce soit, à condition qu'ils se défendent. » L'appel d'Omar était suivi de celui d'une musulmane appelée Jessie, qui a soulevé la question du contexte. [Traduction] « Je crois qu'on peut prendre n'importe quel texte écrit, et vous savez, le prendre hors contexte et en faire ce que l'on veut. » Elle a ajouté qu'elle n'était pas [traduction] « d'accord avec le terrorisme. Cela va complètement à l'encontre de l'islam. » Elle a dit qu'elle ne savait pas ce que certains musulmans croient, mais elle a maintenu [traduction] « je n'ai jamais vu ce genre de chose dans le Coran, que j'ai d'ailleurs lu. » Il était évident que l'explication donnée par Jessie de sa religion ne concordait pas avec ce que l'animateur voulait, et il a donc répété qu'il tenait [traduction] « simplement à poser la question, » démontrant ainsi clairement qu'il voulait reconduire l'argument dans la voie qu'il favorisait, notamment l'admission que les intérêts du pays seraient le mieux servis si l'on [traduction] « autorise les autorités à questionner les musulmans qui viennent ici pour savoir s'ils sont d'avis qu'il y a lieu de tuer ceux qui convertissent de la foi musulmane. Devrions-nous avoir le droit de leur poser cette question? » Autrement dit, la question n'avait rien à voir avec le contenu du Coran. L'intérêt que portait l'animateur envers la réaction des musulmans sur ce *point-là* n'a pas de pertinence. Lorsqu'il n'a pas pu susciter un point de vue sur cette question qui correspondait au sien, il a changé la prémisse et s'est éloigné du but qu'il avait déclaré, soit d'établir [traduction] « si le professeur a tort ou raison là-dessus? »

Ensuite, Mike a appelé et a déclaré que bien qu'il ne soit pas un musulman, il songeait à convertir à l'islam. Il a fait observer que selon ce qu'il avait lu dans le

Coran [traduction] « il n'y a rien du tout qui incite à la violence. » Encore une fois, l'animateur a choisi de laisser ce point complètement de côté et de dire [traduction] « permettez-moi de poser cette question [...] ». Jonathan, un homme semblerait-il non musulman, avait un exemplaire du Coran devant lui et a lu l'âyat 4,89 à haute voix; la dernière phrase de la citation tirée de la lettre envoyée par le professeur Klatt au *National Post* n'y était pas. Sans admettre la différence dans le texte, l'animateur a déclaré, [traduction] « Bon, bien tout est expliqué. » De l'avis du Comité, la question n'avait pas été « expliquée ». Comme l'a dit M. Green quelques instants plus tard, [traduction] « J'ai lu le Coran. » Cependant, ce qui importe matériellement c'est qu'il n'avait pas, de façon utile ou approfondie que ce soit, lu le Coran. Ce n'est pas que l'animateur tentait d'induire qui que ce soit en erreur sur ce point; c'est simplement que sa représentation n'avait, dans un certain sens, aucune pertinence. Il avait lu un âyat du Coran (augmenté plus tard de deux autres âyats lus par d'autres interlocuteurs), mais il ne pouvait pas, en aucun sens raisonnable, être considéré comme quelqu'un qui possède une bonne connaissance du *contexte* du texte cité.

Maser était le prochain musulman qui a appelé et il a été le premier à faire observer ce *point-là* vigoureusement et avec exemples à l'appui. Les parties d'intérêt matériel de leur entretien sont les suivantes (c'est nous qui soulignons) :

[Traduction]

Maser : D'accord, si, je veux juste mettre tout le Canada au défi. Si vous le lisez dans son contexte et si vous avez des objections, vous, je, je paierai quelle que soit l'amende. Alors, vous lisez ça dans son contexte –

Lowell : Bien je l'ai lu dans son contexte.

Maser : Non. Je, laissez-moi vous dire ceci –

Lowell : Bien, monsieur, j'ai le Coran ici devant moi. Quel, quel, quel est le contexte dans lequel je ne l'ai pas lu?

Maser : D'accord, je suis un musulman et je l'ai lu de nombreuses fois.

Lowell : Enh, enh.

Maser : Laissez-moi vous dire. Laissez-moi vous dire exactement ce qui en est.

Lowell : Mm hm.

Maser : C'est, *c'est au sujet de, il y avait, c'est une description d'une guerre. Si vous le lisez, cela porte entièrement sur la guerre. Donc, c'est une description d'une guerre* dans laquelle les musulmans étaient, euh, se disputaient avec, euh, ils se battaient également contre d'autres fois. Et ce qui normalement, et [??] aussi, c'est qu'ils deviennent des musulmans et ils, ils créent, euh, vous savez, euh –

Lowell : Monsieur, monsieur, monsieur, monsieur –

Maser : – des problèmes, euh, des problèmes dans –

Lowell : Monsieur, monsieur, excusez-moi. D'accord? Euh, j'ai, j'ai, j'ai lu directement, euh, du Coran, monsieur.

Maser : Vous l'avez lu correctement. Vous l'avez lu correctement. Mais –

Lowell : Ouais, ouais. *Et il n'y a rien, il n'y a rien, euh, rien qui se rapporte spécifiquement à une guerre.*

Maser : *Oui, c'est en effet le sujet.*

Lowell : *Non, je regrette, monsieur.*

Maser : *Oh oui, c'est en effet le sujet.*

Empruntant ce que le Comité estime être une tournure étonnante, l'animateur a accusé l'interlocuteur musulman, lequel agissait de bonne foi, de tenter de le *tromper*. Justifiant son propre raisonnement et sa propre interprétation en disant [traduction] « j'ai le Coran ici devant moi », l'animateur prenait la position selon laquelle il en savait plus qu'un musulman qui a déclaré qu'il l'avait [traduction] « lu [le Coran] de nombreuses fois. » Le Comité estime que l'affirmation de l'animateur était trop zélée : [traduction] « Je vous dis [c.-à-d. Maser] ce que dit l'islam. Je vous dis, je lis du Coran. » Ces déclarations faisaient complètement fi de sa promesse d'accorder aux musulmans tout le temps voulu pour mettre [traduction] « les choses au clair. » Le Comité comprend que son but était d'inciter les musulmans à appeler; cependant, son indifférence envers ce qu'ils souhaitaient expliquer au sujet de *leur* religion était à la fois injuste et inappropriée.

Un homme qui a appelé plus tard, en l'occurrence Roshdie, a soulevé une autre question importante, notamment l'importance de présenter des gens ayant des connaissances spécialisées du Coran pour aborder la question. Les questions plus larges se rapportant à l'histoire et au contexte, a-t-il effectivement expliqué, l'exigeaient.

[Traduction]

Je tenais simplement à vous dire que nous, si vous comptez faire cela, si vous comptez ouvrir le Coran et commencer, euh, à l'interpréter sur, sur les ondes, vous pourriez au moins présenter quelqu'un, un interlocuteur, qui soit véritablement en mesure de vous faire mieux comprendre. Parce que les gens qui vous appellent ne possèdent pas suffisamment de connaissances.

L'animateur a riposté en se fondant sur la perspective littérale, et l'interlocuteur a fait valoir qu'on ne pouvait pas adopter cette perspective-là.

[Traduction]

Lowell : Bien, je ne vois pas ce que, je veux dire, ils, les, les versets du Coran, personne n'a tenté de les interpréter. Nous les avons simplement lus et les avons pris littéralement.

Roshdie : Non, ce, ce n'est pas de cette manière que ça fonctionne.

Lowell : Bien, je regrette, monsieur. Si vous, si vous lisez un verset, c'est ce que dit le verset.

Roshdie : Je l'ai lu. Je l'ai lu et ce n'est pas ce qui y est dit. Il n'y est pas dit que si vous êtes musulman et vous changez de religion, vous serez tué. Il n'y est pas dit.

Lowell : Bien, le mus-, c'est ce qui est dit dans le Coran.

Roshdie : Non, ce n'est pas ce qui y est dit.

Lowell : Mais oui, c'est ce qui est indiqué.

Roshdie : Non. C'est, c'est pourquoi, je veux dire, il est très dangereux de –

Lowell : Bien, comment pouvez-vous dire que non, monsieur?

Roshdie : – [??] alors que ce n'est pas le cas.

Roshdie a fait valoir un point essentiel concernant le texte écrit à l'origine en arabe.

[Traduction]

Quand allez-vous continuer plus loin? Je le lis. En fait, il n'y a pas, il n'y a pas de mention du tout du mot islam en arabe. Il n'y a pas de mention de Muhammad ou, ou de l'islam ou de pratiquer une autre religion, ou tout ce genre de chose.

Et Roshdie en est venu à la conclusion juste, en tant que le musulman parlant l'arabe, dans ce dialogue [traduction] « Et ce qui compte vraiment c'est ce que je comprends du texte. » Étant nettement dans l'impossibilité de gagner l'argument sur le Coran, et ne voulant aucunement céder quant à son interprétation, l'animateur a de nouveau changé de voie et s'est mis à parler de la pratique des imams afghans qui avaient condamné Abdul Rahman à mort.

Le Comité régional de l'Ontario trouve que les tactiques utilisées par Lowell Green pour traiter ses interlocuteurs et aborder la signification de l'âyat coranique sur lequel il a fondé son argument étaient injustes et inappropriées. L'animateur avait le droit de faire observer son point de vue au sujet de l'apostasie et il a eu toutes les occasions de le faire. Il ne lui était pas nécessaire d'avoir recours à cette section du Coran. Il a opté pour cette façon de faire. C'était son choix. Puis, après avoir invité les musulmans à appeler l'émission en

leur disant qu'ils pourraient lui donner, ainsi qu'aux auditeurs de CFRA, des éclaircissements sur le livre qui est le fondement de leur religion, il n'a aucunement tenu compte de leurs explications sur la nature même du Coran, et de leurs arguments concernant le contexte de l'âyat qu'il avait cité. Lorsqu'un des interlocuteurs musulmans s'est même donné la peine d'expliquer que la version arabe, c.-à-d. la version originale du Coran qui fait autorité, laquelle il avait devant lui, ne contient pas les mots sur lesquels l'animateur fondait son argument, M. Green a changé de sujet. Entre parenthèses, il est intéressant que l'animateur se soit montré davantage accommodant envers l'interlocuteur Mohammed, à qui il a permis de donner certaines explications sur la variété d'interprétations de l'islam (lesquelles ne portaient cependant pas sur la question centrale de l'apostasie). En tout et pour tout, l'émission a laissé aux gens de l'auditoire une impression très déséquilibrée de la signification du Coran. Ils méritaient plus. En refusant de permettre aux interlocuteurs de fournir, de bonne foi, des explications quant au texte du Coran qui avait été cité à faux, alors qu'il les avait invités à le faire, le radiodiffuseur a présenté ce texte de façon incomplète, injuste et inappropriée, ce qui constitue par conséquent une infraction de l'article 6 du *Code de déontologie de l'ACR*.

Réceptivité du radiodiffuseur

Dans chaque cas dont ils sont saisis, les comités décideurs du CCNR évaluent la qualité de la réceptivité du radiodiffuseur envers les plaignants, ce qui est d'ailleurs une des obligations du radiodiffuseur en tant que membre du CCNR. Bien qu'il y ait souvent plus d'une communication de la part du plaignant, le radiodiffuseur n'est obligé de répondre qu'une fois. La communication qui a eu lieu dans la présente affaire était ni plus ni moins exemplaire. Elle s'est poursuivie à mesure que le plaignant et le directeur des nouvelles de CFRA prenaient chacun le contre-pied des arguments de l'autre. Peu importe. Il n'y a aucune obligation de s'accorder ou même de percevoir les questions sous le même angle. L'essentiel c'est le dialogue, et le représentant du radiodiffuseur s'est avéré un participant dont les réponses étaient conséquentes et bien réfléchies dans ce processus. On ne saurait s'attendre à davantage d'un membre du CCNR.

L'ANNONCE DE LA DÉCISION

CFRA-AM est tenue 1) d'annoncer la présente décision selon les conditions suivantes : une fois pendant les heures de grande écoute dans un délai de trois jours suivant la publication de la présente décision et une autre fois dans les sept jours suivant la publication de la présente décision dans le créneau dans lequel elle a diffusé le *Lowell Green Show* mais pas le même jour que la première annonce obligatoire; 2) de fournir, dans les quatorze jours suivant les diffusions des deux annonces, une confirmation écrite de cette diffusion au plaignant qui a

présenté la Demande de décision; et 3) d'envoyer au même moment au CCNR copie de cette confirmation accompagnée de l'enregistrement témoin attestant les diffusions des deux annonces.

Le Conseil canadien des normes de la radiotélévision a jugé que CFRA a violé le *Code de déontologie* de l'Association canadienne des radiodiffuseurs lorsqu'elle a présenté une séquence du *Lowell Green Show* le 31 mars 2006. Dans cet épisode de l'émission, l'animateur a incorrectement cité à maintes reprises des parties du Coran, donnant ainsi à l'auditoire une fausse perspective de la signification de certains versets du Coran qui portaient apparemment sur la conversion de l'islam à une autre religion. En ne permettant pas aux musulmans qui ont appelé l'émission de bonne foi de donner, sans être interrompus, leur explication du texte mal cité du Coran lorsque l'animateur les a invités à le faire, et en mettant à l'écart les considérations contextuelles pertinentes qu'ils ont fournies, le radiodiffuseur a présenté le texte coranique de manière incomplète, injuste et inappropriée, ce qui enfreint par conséquent l'article 6 du *Code de déontologie de l'ACR*.

La présente décision devient un document public dès sa publication par le Conseil canadien des normes de la radiotélévision.

APPENDIX A

CBSC Decision 05/06-1380 CFRA-AM re an episode of the *Lowell Green Show* (the Qur'an)

The *Lowell Green Show* is an open-line radio program broadcast on CFRA (Ottawa) every weekday morning from 9:00 am to 12:00 noon. On the episode of March 31, Lowell Green offered three possible topics for discussion: gas price collusion; the media's focus on Harper's vest during his visit to Cancún; and a news report about Muslim terrorists being arrested in Canada. The following is a transcript of the relevant portions of the program:

Lowell: Oh boy. Looks like we've caught another terrorist hiding out in Canada. Just listen to this. And you can start asking yourself a few questions. Forty-year old Raja Mustafa was arrested in Newmarket a couple of weeks ago. We're only learning about it this morning. Police say he has direct links to Osama bin Laden. He was trained in an Afghan terrorist camp. In fact, he apparently is a captain in Osama's army. When caught, he had a large amount of cash, appeared to be about ready to leave the country. He may have been tipped off, which, among other things, raises some disturbing questions: Who tipped him off? Do we have a police informant someplace? Now listen, it, it doesn't end here. Mustafa was living with his brother-in-law, Syed Ali, a refugee wanted in the United States for drug trafficking and fraud. At one time, both men were living with Syed's brother, a suspected human smuggler wanted by U.S. authorities. Whether those two men have been caught is not clear. Why they have been allowed to live openly in Canada all along isn't clear either. *The Sun* this morning has a picture of Syed's wife. They went to the home and, uh, his wife said, oh no, she hadn't seen him in five years and yet behind her were some of Syed's children. I mean it's just, meantime, another man wanted in the United States for terrorism appeared in a Toronto court yesterday. That is Abdullah Khadr. Yes, from the infamous Khadr family. This is the man whose father, a notorious terrorist, good friend of Osama bin Laden, was released from a Pakistani prison following lobbying efforts on behalf of Canada's Prime Minister, Jean Chrétien. The father was killed in a police shoot-out in Pakistan. Abdullah's younger brother is being held at Guantanamo Bay on charges of killing an American medic. And among those lobbying on his behalf are some of the Trudeau brothers. Khadr's mother once told reporters she'd be happy if her children died as martyrs. In other words, as suicide bombers. She still lives in Canada free as a bird. Aiye yie yie yie yie yie yie yie yie. And then we got another one, apparently involved in trying to figure out how to attach bombs to model aircraft. And there're no terrorists in Canada. Half the country, three quarters of the country doesn't believe that terrorists would ever come to Canada. Meantime, there's a very disturbing letter to the editor of the *National Post* this morning. It is written by H. Klatt, professor emeritus at the University of Western Ontario. He refers to the pressure in Afghanistan to kill the man who converted from Islam to Christianity. Professor Klatt writes, and here, I want to make this very clear before you start sending little civil libertarians after me and all the rest of it. I want to make it clear, I am reading from a letter that is published this morning, publicly, in the *National Post*. Okay? I'm not saying I agree or disagree. I'm reading this letter. So before you start all of the charges and the arrest warrants and the rest of it, please remember I am reading a letter that appears in a newspaper. Quote, this is what Professor Klatt writes, quote, "It is etal", er, I'm sorry, "It is Allah's eternal will and Muhammad's decree that all apostates be killed, albeit only those who convert from Islam to other faiths and not the other way around." Quote, from the Qur'an, chapter four, verse 89, quote, "If they desert you, seize them and put them to death wherever you find them. Kill him who changes his religion," unquote. Professor Klatt goes on to say, "The Qur'an contains the will of the All-Merciful God and has been deposited on tablets in Heaven, guarded by angels

even before the creation of the universe. A document like that is not easily overturned by some state parliament or under pressure from foreign governments. Allah, in addition, will punish every apostate from Islam with eternal hell fire.” He goes on to say, quote, “As long as we remain imbued with our politically correct dogmas, such as that Islam is a religion of peace and is tolerant and compatible with life in a democracy, we will be bewildered and remain without understanding. Every Muslim is first and above all a Muslim, who accepts the dogmas of his faith before he is Algerian, a democrat, a believer in human rights or tolerant towards others. The prospect is grim,” unquote. Before you launch the lawsuits, I’m reading from a letter in the *National Post*. Okay? I’m simply reading what the letter says. Professor H. Klatt at the University of Western Ontario writing in today’s *National Post*. Now I have no idea if what the professor writes is correct. If it is, it seems to me, as he says, a grim prospect indeed. Certainly poses the question whether, if this is true, such diametrically opposed cultures can live peacefully together. Your comments? 521-8255. 521-8255. [goes on to present other two topics: Stephen Harper’s choice of clothing on his trip to Mexico and the Competition Bureau’s finding that there is no price fixing at the gas pumps.]

- commercial break

Lowell: I’ve still got a couple of lines available. Let me ask you, let me ask you this. Uh, this really concerns me. This letter, I know that most of you want to talk about gas and I’m sure that we will, but this letter from Professor Klatt really disturbs me. In fact the Qur’an does say this, and I gather that it does, that anybody who changes from Islam to any other faith should be killed, oh. Let me ask you, should, should Muslims, when they wish to enter this country be asked if they believe that? And if they say that they do, should they be allowed in this country? Can we live peacefully side by side with people who believe that anybody who switches from their faith to another should be killed? Can we live peacefully side by side? With that kind of a belief? 521-8255. That really, I find that, uh, Professor Klatt says, uh, the prospect, the prospects are grim. If that is true, he may be right. Steve, you’re on CFRA, good morning.

[Steve comments on gas prices.]

Lowell: Uh, down to Smiths Falls. Ron, you’re on CFRA.

Ron: Morning, Lowell.

Lowell: Yes, sir?

Ron: I wonder if our, if our good Prime Minister Harper turned up the screws to get these Al-Qaeda guys to, to be servicing or something. Uh, something’s going down here and, and it seems like now in the paper we have this morning about these two taxi drivers in Toronto that were, that were also being looked into.

Lowell: Yeah. But you know, you know, it begs the question, Ron. I mean, h-, how can it be that people wanted for very serious crimes in the United States including terrorism and fraud and human smuggling, how can it be they live free in this country?

Ron: That’s a good question. And, you know, I’m very angry when I heard you said, say this morning that the Trudeau boys, the Trudeau family are –

Lowell: Well, it’s one of the sons. I forget which one it is. One of the brothers.

Ron: – are trying to help and trying to talk to these people and give them encouragement. You shouldn’t even be near those people. As far as I’m concerned, they’re building a brand new, um, jail up at Millhaven for these terrorists. By golly, go ahead and get them all

corralled up and do something with them and get them the hell out of this country. But how the hell are they coming in here? This is, you know, this is scary. And, and, and something's gotta be done with these characters. You, you know? Like she says "Oh, I haven't seen my husband in, in, in so many months." That's b.s. You know that and everybody else knows that.

Lowell: Well, here, I'll just read you the, uh, the story in *The Sun* today about that. Uh, two taxi drivers, one with alleged terrorists links and the other facing outstanding charges in the U.S. were nabbed two weeks ago outside a modest townhome, ta da, de da, ta da, de da. Secrecy, mystery surrounding the arrest. We've gone through this. Meanwhile *The Sun* learned last night that Mustafa entered Canada about eighteen months ago using a fake name of Raja Ghulam Murtaza, obtained refugee status. Lovely, eh? Surprise, surprise. Refugee status. When first approached by *The Sun* at the home where she lived with her husband and Mustafa, a woman who identified herself as Nuzrat Sheikh claimed she had not seen Syed since she had separated from him in Pakistan five years ago and bare, barely knew Mustafa. "I hadn't seen him in a year." She'd made these claims despite having three of Syed's children in the house. Neighbours say the children are a five-year-old girl, three-year-old twins, boy and a girl. Neighbours also confirmed that two men they identified as the husband and brother-in-law lived at the house and have not been seen since a small fleet of unmarked cruisers descended on the house during the March Break. So, the neighbours are saying "Hey, wait a minute. These guys were living with her." So, like, I mean, are they, it's, it's just wild.

Ron: Well, you know, Lowell. You know, the question, uh, here is, if you're a customs officer and you see some character like this comin' across there with a name that's as long as your arm and he's looking for immigra-, he's looking for, for status, would you not really say "Hey, there might be a problem here"?

Lowell: Well –

Ron: Like, how in the hell does this guy even, even think –

Lowell: Well, how, but, but, but listen to this though, okay? This guy, this guy was a captain with Osama Bin Laden. He was trained by Bin Laden in Afghanistan as a terrorist, as a captain in a terrorist army. You know, in Al-Qaeda. So, he comes to Canada and he changes his name. He presents a fake name, which means that he must've had fake documents of some kind and they let him into the country.

Ron: Isn't that wonderful?

Lowell: I mean, is that, are you trying to tell me that all it takes to get into Canada is just make up a name and come on in?

Ron: Well.

Lowell: Apparently.

Ron: Apparently so. I, you know, I'm going, I'm going away for quite a while here, uh, in a week. And maybe when I come back through Canada I'm gonna, I'm gonna change my name and see what happens to me as a white man.

Lowell: God almighty. I, I, I hope, I hope that this new government starts to clamp down against this.

Ron: Well, Lowell, I, I think, I think from what I see with our new government and our

Prime Minister down there right now in Mexico and the way he's presenting himself, I think we're going to see changes. And if the lefties don't see that there's something happening here with this guy, then they're, then, you know, we really are in trouble.

Lowell: Thank you, Ron.

[next caller Robert talks about media's coverage of Harper's clothing]

- commercial & news break

[Lowell presents another issue for discussion: policing & gang violence]

Lowell: Let's go to, uh, Jerry. Jerry, you're on CFRA, good morning.

Jerry: Yes, good morning.

Lowell: Yeah?

Jerry: I can see your frustration regarding these, um, Al-Qaeda, uh, people, uh, Lowell. But, you know, somehow, when you look at our country, we have this family who came in and have been [?] by the previous government whose, um, son was injured in the firepower –

Lowell: You're talking about the Khadr's?

Jerry: Yes, I am.

Lowell: Yeah.

Jerry: And, and we're supporting these people.

Lowell: Oh yeah.

Jerry: Uh, we have [??] whose son is, uh, uh, making bombs in London.

Lowell: Well, that's what the charge is, yes.

Jerry: Yeah. And we had the previous government holding hands with the Tali-, well, not the Taliban, but the Tamil Tigers.

Lowell: Oh yes.

Jerry: Uh –

Lowell: And Hezbollah for a long time.

Jerry: Yes. So the point is, we're putting the cart before the horse. And I think you were, you were, brought this out to us: we've lost 35,000 illegal immigrants in this country. But we don't know where the hell they are.

Lowell: No, it's a lot more now. But it's 35,000 we know of, yes.

Jerry: Yes. But why, if we're at war, with these people – and we are at war, let's, let's take our bloody heads out of the sand – why are we continuing to bring in people from these Muslim countries? And, and, I think until, do you think, for instance, in the Second World War would've immigrated Japanese and Germans into their country? When we're at war

with them? But we do that here. And it makes no sense. Now I'm not sayin' they're all, they're all terrorists. But how the hell do you know? How do you know the guy next door to you who may be a Muslim is not a terrorist? I mean, these guys we've picked up, their neighbours say, oh they were nice people, were very nice. Of course they were very nice! They'd a job to do. They didn't want to be, make you suspicious and say "look I'm a terrorist"

–

Lowell: You, you think that we should just stop all immigration?

Jerry: I think we should stop all immigration and we should stop bending backwards and trying to please these people.

Lowell: Or just immigration from Muslim countries?

Jerry: From Muslim countries! And, and, by the way, I'll end this by, on a lighter note, I think we should give the Ottawa Senators a big pat on the back for what they did yesterday. [talk about hockey game] And, Lowell, as I say, if, if Canadians aren't going to get their heads out of the stand, out of the sand, it's time, and, and, and demand that the new government stops immigration from these countries –

Lowell: Well, I'm going to tell ya. I, I don't know if I want to go that far. But, I am, this, this letter, and I wish I could get some more comments on it, this letter from Professor Klatt really disturbs me because he is quoting directly from the Qur'an. He says, quote, "The Qur'an says if they desert you, seize them and put them to death wherever you find them. Kill him who changes his religion."

Jerry: Well.

Lowell: And if we, if people are coming to Canada with that belief, that really disturbs me.

Jerry: Well, you've listened to your, if you've listened to, to, uh, Muslims who have called you and, and, uh, want you to have your head chopped off, I'm just being, you know, uh, because you're, you're talking about them. I mean –

Lowell: Well, on the other hand we've got very mi-, mo-, very many moderate Muslims who disagree. But I, I, ah, this, if in fact they, they really believe this, because apparently the Qur'an says if they desert you, in other words you leave the Is-, the Muslim faith, they should be killed. If people really believe that and they're coming here, boy that's disturbing.

Jerry: It's time to put the clamps on.

Lowell: Thank you. Thank you, Jerry. Uh, let's talk to, uh, Lucy. You're on CFRA, good morning.

Lucy: Hi, Lowell.

Lowell: Yes.

Lucy: Congratulations for your 50th year.

Lowell: Oh that's fine, okay.

Lucy: And now, um, I agree with the previous caller a hundred and fifty, a hundred and fifty per cent.

Lowell: Right.

Lucy: And I've seen, I agree and not only immigration. Especially refugees from those countries. All the Muslim countries, for a while. And I feel so sorry for those Portuguese that we deport lately when they are a good worker. They are, anyway, and, uh, we have so many of other faiths, of Muslim faith, I should say. They're not all, um, --

Lowell: All right.

Lucy: No. But uh --

Lowell: Thank, thank you, Lucy.

Lucy: I feel very sorry.

Lowell: Thank you. Uh, Steve, you're on CFRA, good morning.

[Steve talks about policing first & then turns to the Muslim issue]

Steve: One thing I'd like to comment on, on another thing is the, uh, the Alberta Human Rights Commission --

Lowell: Oh yeah.

Steve: -- investigation on, on the *Western Standard*, which is absolutely ludicrous. I mean, I, I laud the *Western Standard* for publishing the cartoons. They had the intestinal fortitude to publish the cartoons. I, I subscribe to the *Western Standard*. And I'm seriously considering, uh, donating money on behalf of their, uh, defence fund.

Lowell: Well, I think we should. I --

Steve: Because the fact of the matter is it's a small magazine.

Lowell: Yeah.

Steve: It's extremely well-written.

Lowell: Yeah.

Steve: And, uh, they could go under.

Lowell: Not only that, but it's, excuse me, it's one of the few publications in all of Canada that presents any kind of an alternative point of view.

Steve: Exactly. And, in the meantime, they, they could go, but the, the mainstream, uh, media, the big, uh, newspapers didn't have the intestinal fortitude to publish these cartoons. And that's right through, across North America. This is --

Lowell: Yeah.

Steve: -- absolutely scandalous and that we're abandoning our democratic principles.

Lowell: Well, you see, these people know that if they go to the, uh, Human Rights, whatever, whatever province it is, that nine times out of ten, these are, these people are on the hard left, on the Human Rights Commission. They're, they're extreme leftists. Socialists. Some of

them Marxist. And, they, they know very well that one complaint can very well put an entire smaller operation out of business. Do you know that to defend in court somebody who, one person who complains about me and it goes to court or goes to lawyers, you're looking at about 25,000 dollars.

Steve: Oh, I, I don't doubt it whatsoever. But I really think people should seriously consider maybe a, you know, I'm certainly going to send some money to, to the magazine and that's not my character to do so, but I, I'm going to do it.

Lowell: Good. Well, it's defend freedom of speech.

Steve: Exactly.

Lowell: Thank you for calling, Steve. We'll be back. CFRA.

- commercial break

Lowell: You're on CFRA, Linda.

Linda: Yes, good morning.

Lowell: Yes.

Linda: I want to make a comment about how big publicity, immigration ousted the Portuguese, you know, these people living here, um, draining the Canadian economy. Bull. They work. They sent them a letter and these people were so honest, responded. Where, you know, the real immigration officers who have turned their eye on people who evade them, that they have to go and find them –

Lowell: No, but wait a minute. Before you go further, Linda.

Linda: Yes?

Lowell: Look, these people are here illegally. They cheated the system.

Linda: Yes.

Lowell: While, while there are thousands of other people –

Linda: Mm hm.

Lowell; – who are following the rules and regulations –

Linda: Mm hm.

Lowell: – and applying to get in here properly, et cetera, et cetera.

Linda: Yes?

Lowell: We have other people who come here under false pretenses and we allow them to stay? Then why don't we just disband all of the immigration department and let everybody in?

Linda: Well, I'm sayin' is, no, I'm not saying to ban, but you're, you're allowing these other people that come in with five and six kids who drain the system, who don't work, who send

money back to support Al-Qaeda and all this, these, these groups. They know they're here. They hide terrorists in their families. They don't work. And yet you're goin' after people who work?

Lowell: But surely, but surely what you're talking about is a system that's like a sieve, that lets virtually anybody in. Very clearly. I mean, this guy is a terrorist. This guy was a captain with Osama Bin Laden.

Linda: Yeah.

Lowell: He changes, he changes his name –

Linda: Yes?

Lowell: And we let him into the country as a refugee.

Linda: Yeah, but that's what I'm sayin'. No flags go off at immigration? Nobody opens their ears? You know, nobody picks up on these things? And yet you have people comin' in from other, from European countries that they're goin' after?

Lowell: No, but, but you've made this point three or four times. All I'm trying to say –

Linda: What I'm sayin' is, is that the system has to be, has to be changed because we know these people are comin' in, no flags go up.

Lowell: Okay, you've made that point, Linda.

Linda: Okay. Well, that's what I'm, that's what I'm –

Lowell: All right.

Linda: -- sayin' then. It's not fair.

Lowell: All right.

Linda: It's just not fair.

Lowell: Thank you for calling.

Linda: Thank you.

Lowell: Uh, to Plantagenat. Madeleine, you're on CFRA.

Madeleine: Yes, I was just a-, agreeing with all the pre-, previous callers about the, about the Muslims in this country. I'd like to kick them all out, but I guess we can't. But I –

Lowell: Well why would you want to do that? There are many very fine Muslims here.

Madeleine: Well there's lots of good ones, but how do you tell the difference?

Lowell: Well, I mean, I have a good friend who's Muslim and I don't want the guy to leave. The, the guy is a wonderful person.

Madeleine: No, I know. I just said I'd like to, but I know we can't do it and, and there are a lot of good ones.

Lowell: But the thing that –

Madeleine: They hide the bad ones.

Lowell: The, the thing that really disturbs me. And I keep coming back to this letter, if, if what Professor Klatt says is true, that, that in fact the Qur'an says that you are to kill those who convert from Islam to Christianity –

Madeleine: Mm hm.

Lowell: And he said, not only that, but he says every Muslim is first and above all a Muslim.

Madeleine: Yes.

Lowell: Who accepts the dogmas of his faith. So if this is true, that all, if, if all Muslims who come here think that anybody who converts to Christianity should be killed, I find that very disturbing. I hope that's not true.

Madeleine: So, so all the good Muslims believe that?

Lowell: I don't know.

Madeleine: They all, they all believe in Islam –

Lowell: No.

Madeleine: – before they believe in Canada?

Lowell: No, no. What I'm saying is, I don't know if that's true, but if it is, I find it very disturbing.

Madeleine: And there's another thing that disturbs me, I'll tell you. And I, I'm tired of these women that subjug-, sub-, subjugate themselves to their men and wear, they wear their headscarves here and our women go over there and wear headscarves over there. And these are the women that are really, uh, strong women. They go over and, and submit to their rules over there. Yet we, they come over here and we're supposed to submit, we're supposed to, we're supposed to give in to what they want in, in this country. Although they're –

Lowell: In other words, what you're saying is we change our cultural habits –

Madeleine: Yes!

Lowell: -- in order to, to meet their requirements.

Madeleine: That just, that just drives me crazy that the, they'd, and the women, –

Lowell: Well, you know what? Can I tell you something?

Madeleine: – it'll take another five hundred years –

Lowell: Can I tell you something, Madeleine? I'm glad we're finally about to have a debate on it.

Madeleine: Yes.

Lowell: Because until now we couldn't even talk about it. Uh, you know, it would be just too risky for me to do it.

Madeleine: That's right. And there's one more thing about those people that go over there to, to, like, so-called Christians that go over there. They hate the Armed Forces, they'll, they'll go on the street and demonstrate them –

Lowell: They hate, they hate the West.

Madeleine: – and yet, my God, they'll ask them to come and save them when, and I think we should tell them, they go over there, they're on their own.

Lowell: All right. Thank you for calling.

Madeleine: Okay. B-bye.

Lowell: Uh, to Avenmore. Bruce, you're on CFRA.

Bruce: I read in the *Ottawa Citizen* this morning, it says, uh, that a Christian peace, peace-maker was staggered by freedom. And, uh, I just, uh, you know, over there it seems like that there's a, the Christian peace-makers have a misguided, contradictory moral crusade they're on here.

Lowell: Well I find the hypocrisy of Jim Loney astonishing. This man is gay. He, he, of course, if they had known this over there you can be sure he would've been put to a horrible death almost immediately. He knows very well that, that gays are put to death in many of these countries. Certainly, certainly the terrorists in Iraq would do so and in Afghanistan. And yet he is, he goes over there to lobby against the West, against the intervention, et cetera, et cetera. And then of course he comes back here and he can marry and this, this is the country that, that he is working against. And yet this is the country where he's free to do what he wants.

Bruce: Now, now people would have to think, I mean, what are you actually fighting for when you're against, as you say, the notion of fairness and equality for another human being. And, and really, uh, that's a total, totally against the Christian peace-making ideal that he's trying to fight for, er, against. Um, now, uh, I, I'm sure he was asked the question if he'd be returning, which he didn't answer. But he certainly won't be returning too quick now the cat's out of the bag.

Lowell: Oh, he won't be returning now that, now that it's known he's gay. There's no way.

Bruce: You're, you're exactly right. And, I mean, if he thinks, he said you won't gain peace by, by the barrel of a gun. That's exactly how it got him out of there.

Lowell: But you know, and see –

Bruce: He should've just stayed there. He should've said "No, I can't. That's, uh, by force. I'm stayin' here. I can't come out of here because you're, by force. I gotta stay here –

Lowell: Sir.

Bruce: – if you can't take me out by peaceful means."

Lowell: Sir, sir. One of the things we've commented on before is that, while many of these people over there are trying to blow us up and, you know, saying terrible things about the West and our culture and the infidel and all the rest of it, if given the opportunity, this and the United, this country and the United States, they would emigrate in a moment if they could.

Bruce: And we see that's what's happening right now. We got a list of people that want to come into these fair-minded countries of, of, of North America and Europe, uh, by the, by the hundreds of thousands. Uh, er, again –

Lowell: The terrible infidel nations.

Bruce: [??] Exactly.

Lowell: Thank you for calling. Thank you, Bruce.

- commercial & news break

Lowell: All right. Uh, very busy in that first hour, but you'll have no trouble getting through now. 521-8255 and the toll free is there, 1-800-580-2372. Absolutely anything you wish to discuss. I would like to invite Muslims to call. And now, ordinarily, um, many Muslims do call this program, usually to argue with me. But that's fine. Do you, as a Muslim, believe that the Qur'an instructs Muslims to kill those who switch from Islam to other faiths? Do you believe that? Do you agree with that? I think that we in this community have a right to know if those who live amongst us feel that anybody who switches from the Muslim faith to another faith should be killed. Because according to Professor Klatt, University of Western Ontario, he says the Qur'an very clearly states, and here he quotes, he says the Qur'an, uh, this would be, uh, chapter four, verse 89 says, quote, "If they desert you, seize them and put them to death wherever you find them. Kill him who changes his religion." He quotes the Qur'an. Now I have, uh, one very good Muslim friend. I've never questioned him about this. He's out of the country right now, but I want to, but I'd to talk with some of the rest of you. Is, is this something that you believe? 521-8255. 521-8255. Uh, you have no hesitancy in calling me to give me hell, how about setting us straight here. Is, is this letter-writer, is this professor right or is he wrong on this? And is it something that we should be concerned about in our society? Uh, give you all of the time in the world to talk, folks. Anything else that you want to talk about, please feel free to do so. As I say, you've got, uh, several lines available right now. Let's go to first Danny in Nepean. Danny, you're on CFRA, good morning.

Danny: Uh, hi Lowell.

Lowell: Yes, sir?

Danny: Um, I'm kind of surprised that in Western culture we don't know what you just read in the letter.

Lowell: Well, I, I hope that some Muslims will call because they're not hesitant to do it on other issues.

Danny: Okay.

Lowell: And can I only, if, if Muslims don't call on this, then I can only assume that in fact what the letter-writer says is true and they just don't want to admit it.

Danny: Well, in India we've known this for hundreds of years.

Lowell: Wh-, known what?

Danny: Known that, uh, some Islam, the pure Islam is very severe, harsh, mostly that, and does not have forgiveness in, in, its, ah ha, in its teachings.

Lowell: But this is, this is a little different. This says, according to this letter-writer and he quotes the Qur'an, that, uh, that anybody who changes their religion from Islam to anything else should be killed. And what, what prompts this of course is what happened in Afghanistan with that man.

Danny: Right. No, I don't know specifically about this one, but if you read history of India with the Sikhs and Muslims.

Lowell: Yes.

Danny: This kind of thing has been happening for hundreds of years. And most of us from India, who have come here from India, know this. So, so I won't be surprised if it's true. I don't know myself. The second thing I'd like to, uh, say is, whoever is listening, please contribute to *Western Standard*. Because this really burns me up.

Lowell: Yeah, this is pretty bad. The, uh, very obvio-, and, you know, I've done some investigation. There was one complaint and it was a wild, rambling complaint, filled with misspellings et cetera, et cetera. I mean, everybody has equal rights, but it seems to me that the Alberta Human Rights Commission should've dismissed this as frivolous. One complaint and they could very well put this publication out of business, trying to defend itself.

Danny: I think they have nothing else to do. That's my opinion. [laughs]

Lowell: You see, this is something a lot of people, well, there's, yeah, but this is seri-, very serious because a lot of people in this country don't realize, you know, that it's very easy to really put tremen-, this is why the, the press in this country is, is so silent on these issues. It's out of fear. Because, you know, if you, if you have to go to court, you're talking huge sums of money. And, unless you're a huge corporation like CHUM, you just can't afford it. So, you either keep quiet or you just go out of business.

Danny: Well, this is, this really bothers me. I'm going to contribute and I urge everybody to contribute.

Lowell: Thank you very much, sir. I couldn't agree with you more. Uh, Neil, you're on CFRA. Good morning, Neil. ... Neil, are you there or are you just –

Neil: Uh, yes, I'm here.

Lowell: Go ahead, sir, please, please.

Neil: I'm concerned about this guy who was, uh, somebody had tell him you'll be caught if you don't –

Lowell: I'm sorry, sir, I, I –

Neil: – [??] a pile of money.

Lowell: I, sorry. I don't know what you're talking about, sir.

Neil: The guy in Toronto?

Lowell: Yes. I'm sorry. What, what is your comment here?

Neil: Uh, somebody told him that he's, uh, followed or he's going to be arrested and he tried to [?] money.

Lowell: Well, apparently, it, it could very well, it would appear that maybe he was tipped off that he was about to be arrested, yes.

Neil: Is that somebody from the police or the –

Lowell: We don't know, sir. We don't know. But it would appear that, uh, the tentacles of some of these organizations go pretty deep. That much is clear, sir.

Neil: Well, I'm sure that is somebody that, uh, is looking for it.

Lowell: Are you a Muslim?

Neil: I'm not a Muslim.

Lowell: Uh, you know what? I, I'm finding it very strange that –

Neil: They don't call when you –

Lowell: – that they're not calling because they sure call me on other issues on this one. Thanks for calling. And I'll give you Muslims all the time in the world. We need to know. Brian, you're on CFRA, good morning.

Brian: Yes, uh, Lowell, I think we're taking a very dangerous path down a road in this country. We, the judge last week, they allowed this young lad to take a, a kni-, I call it a knife, to school. And in our public schools we can't even say the Lord's Prayer in a Christian country. Now I find this very sad.

Lowell: All right. Thank you, thank you for calling, sir. Thank you. Uh, Dave, you're on CFRA, good morning.

Dave: Good morning, Lowell.

Lowell: Yeah? Yeah?

Dave: Uh, two things. Um, is, (a), is Islam is a very violent religion and has been for 14 hundred years.

Lowell: Well, so, Christianity's been very violent as well.

Dave: Yes, it has been very violent. But it's recommended it. The things you say about the Qur'an or in the Qur'an are very true.

Lowell: Sir, sir, I didn't say this. I, I knew this was going to happen.

Dave: No, somebody else did.

Lowell: Yeah.

Dave: I'm sorry.

Lowell: Okay, please, because this, otherwise it's going to cost us –

Dave: Yeah. No.

Lowell: – hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Dave: You did not say that.

Lowell: I was simply reading from a letter in the *National Post* this morning.

Dave: Uh, what I really phoned for, Lowell, –

Lowell: Uh huh?

Dave: – was to say, because you deal with this, uh, Islam and, uh, the war over there a whole bunch, there's a book that you should probably read. It's called *Jerusalem Countdown* by John Hagee.

Lowell: Mm hm. Well there's all sorts of books on that.

Dave: There's all sorts of books, yes.

Lowell: Yeah, yeah.

Dave: But I found this, I've read about half way through this one and it describes a lot of the stuff that you deal with.

Lowell: Okay.

Dave: And I've left the book name with your producer.

Lowell: Okay. Well, it's obvious we're not going to get any calls from Muslims. I find that disappointing. I would like to know if, in fact, you know, Muslims living amongst us really believe this. One last, one last opportunity. Please. We'll give you all of the time in the world. Is was this professor writes in the *Post* this morning, is it accurate? And you as a Muslim, how do you feel about this? Do you agree that this, first of all, is a ruling? And that, uh, that those who convert from Islam to other faiths should be killed? Last chance for Muslims to call. And, and just tell us how, you know, whether this is true or not. 521-8255. We got, we're keeping lines open for you. 521-8255. There are thousands of you listening out there. On other issues you have no problem calling me. I won't interrupt. You just explain what the situation is here. Last call to you. We'll be back, CFRA.

- commercial break

Lowell: Several people have made mention of the fact that the *Western Standard* is in some difficulty. Let me read you just a little bit of a letter that is being published by the *Western Standard*: "As you know, the *Western Standard* was the only mainstream media organ in Canada to publish the Danish cartoons depicting the Muslim prophet Muhammad. We did so for a simple reason. The cartoons were the central fact in one of the largest news stories of the year. We're a news magazine. We publish the facts. We let our readers make up their minds. Advertisers stood with us. Readers loved the fact that we treated them like grown-ups and we earned the respect of many other journalists in Canada who envied our independence. In fact, according to a Compas poll last month, fully 70 per cent of Canada's working journalists supported our decision to publish the cartoons. But not Syed, but not Syed Soharwady, a radical Calgary Muslim Imam. He asked the police to arrest me for

publishing the cartoons. They calmly explained to him that's not what police in Canada do. So then he went to a far less liberal institution than the police, the Alberta Human Rights Commission. Unlike the Calgary police service, they didn't have the common sense to show him the door. Earlier this month, I received a copy of Soharwardy's rambling, hand-scrawled complaint. It is truly an embarrassing document. He briefly complains that we published the Danish cartoons, but the bulk of his complaint is that we dared to try to justify it. That we dared to disagree with him. Think about that. In Soharwardy's view, not only should the Canadian media be banned from publishing the cartoons, but we should be banned from defending our right to publish them. Perhaps the *Charter of Rights* that guarantees our freedom of the press should be banned too. Soharwardy's complaint goes further than just the cartoons. It refers to news articles we published about Hamas, a group labelled a terrorist organization by the Canadian government. By including those other articles, he shows his real agenda: censoring any criticism of Muslim extremists. Perhaps the most embarrassing thing about Soharwardy's complaint is he claims our cartoons caused him to receive hate mail. Indeed, his complaint includes copies of a few e-mails from strangers to him. Some of those e-mails even go so far as to call him humourless and tell him to lighten up. Perhaps that's hateful, but all of the e-mails were sent to him before our magazine even published the cartoons." So, uh, he goes on in this vein. What he points out is, is that, while it will likely be thrown out, he said "Our lawyers tell us we're going to win the case, but not before we have to spend hundreds of hours and up to 75,000 dollars fighting this thing at our expense." "Soharwardy, on the other hand," he says, "doesn't have to spend a dime because the taxpayers will pay for his side of it." So, and, uh, he's, he's asking subscribers and others who are interested in freedom of the press and real democracy to help them out. Can you imagine? In this country, our country, that's what it's come to, folks. Uh, Mark, you're on CFRA, good morning. ... Go ahead please, Mark, you're on the air. Mark, please go ahead. No. Uh, Omar, you're on CFRA, good morning.

Omar: Good morning.

Lowell: Yes, sir?

Omar: Yes, I want to talk about, uh, issues about Islam and, uh, --

Lowell: Are you a Muslim, sir?

Omar: Yes.

Lowell: Yeah. Now, did you, do you agree that the Qur'an says, uh, "If they desert you, seize them and put them to death wherever you find them. Kill him who changes his religion"?

Omar: Not at all, not at all, uh, Lowell. It's, uh, there's a sentence saying exactly, very clear in the Qur'an, God talking to Muhammad and tell him "Are you the one [??] the people?"

Lowell: Sir, we're having trouble hearing you. What, er, can you speak right into the mouthpiece because what you're saying is important?

Omar: I, I'm very sick, that's why, uh.

Lowell: But now he quotes, he says the Qur'an, this is chapter four, verse 89 says "If they desert you, seize them and put them to death wherever you find them."

Omar: No, no, no, no, no. This, uh, --

Lowell: Well, could you, sir, do you have the Qur'an with you?

Omar: Uh, it's not with me now. I'm in my car now.

Lowell: Right.

Omar: Okay. Islam never asks Muslims to kill anybody as, as long as they defend themselves. Okay, what I'm saying is –

Lowell: I'm sorry, I don't, why then, can you explain to me why then, uh, the, the, the imams and, and the other clerics in Afghanistan wanted to put to death that man who changed to Christianity?

Omar: No, no. The real problem is now, Lowell, it's, uh, radicals now, they are representing the Muslims, which is not right. There's a billions, three hundred millions of Muslims and, and five or ten percent of radicals representing the Muslims in the world. They are talking about Islam in the world. It's not right. There's more than a billions, more millions –

Lowell: No, I know that, sir. But my question –

Omar: They are, they are –

Lowell: My question, sir, is what does Allah say? He says that the Qur'an, this is, uh, chapter two, verse 217, says "Allah will punish every apostate from Islam with eternal hell-fire." Is that true?

Omar: You will never find anything in Qur'an. That's peoples judging others in believing. It's, it's not right.

Lowell: So, is it –

Omar: God –

Lowell: Is –

Omar: God will judge everybody, not only Muslims. God will, God will judge everybody and it's not between our hands to judge anybody's beliefs. Everybody has the right to believe whatever he wants. That's in Islam. I, I believe in, uh, Islam, I believe in Christianity, I believe in Judaism, whatever I want. I have a right to choose and God will judge everybody –

Lowell: So, so I want to get this clear, though, so that you as a Muslim do not agree that those who converted from Islam to Christianity or Buddhism, you do not agree they should be killed?

Omar: Not, it's, it's against, it's against humanity. It's against believing, it's against –

Lowell: No, no, no, sir. Answer my question. Do you believe that those who –

Omar: No, I don't believe in that at all.

Lowell: Okay. Thank you.

Omar: No, it's, it's, uh, it's not right at all.

Lowell: All right, sir. Well, I'm glad to hear that. Thank you. Uh, Fred, you're on CFRA, good morning. Fred, go ahead please.

Fred: Yeah, Lowell, uh, I'm a Christian. Remember Bill Phipps? Remember the United Church guy there a few years ago? Sayin', claimin' that Jesus wasn't, uh, wasn't God? I, I didn't get all excited about that, Lowell.

Lowell: I'm, I'm not sure what your point is here, sir.

Fred: Well, there's all kinds of, within Christianity, there's all kinds of sects, sects shall we say?

Lowell: Mm hm.

Fred: Catholics, there's, uh, Lutherans, there's Seventh Day Adventists –

Lowell: No, but, but we do not, but, Fred, before you go further, sir, um, you can't dismiss it that lightly. We, we had a situation in Afghanistan where it was widely agreed by the clerics and the govern-, and government and the Crown prosecutor that this man should be put to death. They very clearly said that the Qur'an states that anybody who converts from Islam –

Fred: No, but, Lowell, Lowell –

Lowell: Wait, let me finish. That anybody who converts from Islam should be put to death. We do not have the Christian faith, not today, saying things like that. Any sect of it.

Fred: No. No, but just because part of the Christian faith, you know, Bill Phipps, United Church, said that Jesus is not God.

Lowell: No.

Fred: Jesus was just a man.

Lowell: This is a, this is a very –

Fred: What does that have to do with me?

Lowell: No, but, sir, this is –

Fred: I'm not gonna, I'm not gonna respond, Lowell. That's what I'm saying.

Lowell: But Fred, Fred –

Fred: Muslims aren't calling to respond –

Lowell: Fred, Fred –

Fred: -- because they don't care. They think the people are, are espousing their own beliefs. If Bill Phipps wants to believe that Jesus is only a man –

Lowell: Fred, will you forget –

Fred: -- that has nothing to do with me.

Lowell: Come on, Fred. Let's, let's talk about this sanely and maturely. We're not talking about one guy. We are talking about the Crown prosecutor. We are talking about most of the clerics in an entire country said, very clearly, the Qur'an says he should be put to death. We're not talking about one rogue minister, sir. We're talking about, uh, we're talking about

most of the clerics in Afghanistan and the legal system.

Fred: No, but –

Lowell: They, they, they had to remove the guy surreptitiously in the dead of night or he would've been killed.

Fred: No, but like Omar said, like, Lowell, that, was, that the guy's name that just called, Omar.

Lowell: Uh huh, uh huh?

Fred: Said there's millions of Muslims, right? Th-, there's billions of Muslims.

Lowell: Uh huh?

Fred: And there's billions of Christians that believe that, that interpret the Bible differently.

Lowell: But, sir, excuse me, sir. I, I'm gonna, I'm gonna try to get this through your head. We, this is a situa-, to my knowledge, there is not a single Christian sect, Buddhist sect or Hindu sect that says that those who convert should be killed. I have never heard that in modern times said by any other faith. Anybody.

Fred: No, I agree.

Lowell: Anybody.

Fred: Absolutely. Absolutely. But, but if your opinion about something in, in the Christian Bible is different than mine, I, I don't feel it necessary to phone.

Lowell: Okay. Sir, I'm not gettin' through to you –

Fred: And –

Lowell: Okay, I'm not gettin' through to you. Mark, you're on CFRA, good morning.

Mark: Hello, how are you?

Lowell: Yes, go ahead, sir.

Mark: Okay. So, I'm just, uh, calling, uh, to tell you I'm coming from, I'm coming from Middle East, uh, uh, area, to this country –

Lowell: Are you Muslim? Are you Muslim?

Mark: No, no, I'm not Muslim.

Lowell: Okay.

Mark: But I lived, I lived in Middle East and I, I go home with these people, I grew up with these people. I know what I'm talkin' about. So, uh, in my country there are, if somebody change their religion from Muslim to any kind of religion, uh, they gonna kill him right away. So they don't, they don't, uh, they don't do anything. I didn't see, for like 23 years I lived that country –

Lowell: What country is that, sir?

Mark: That's Iran, sir.

Lowell: Okay.

Mark: Yeah. And I didn't s-, saw anybody change their religion. If they want to do, they have to escape from the country to, to the United Nations or any country around, uh, around the border, so, and then they change, they change their religion. That's what I saw. I'm not saying, um, that the Qur'an says that or the Qur'an not says that. But this is, this is happened to those countries, which is the government is a Muslim government living there, so, and, uh, nobody can change their religion. And even, any woman or any girl, they cannot marry just anybody who says they're not Muslim. So if they do, they, I think the, the, the law is doing the same thing to h-, to her. So, and that, that, that's a truth. I lived with it, I saw with my eyes and I know this is, this is totally true there. So they do it. So, I'm not saying the Qur'an says. Maybe Qur'an didn't says that, but they, they do this.

Lowell: All right, sir. Thank you for calling, Mark.

Mark: Thank you.

Lowell: We'll be back, CFRA.

- commercial and news break

Lowell: Uh, let's go way up the line to Deep River. Betty, you're on CFRA, good morning.

Betty: Good morning, Lowell.

Lowell: Yeah?

Betty: Um, I've been hearing for weeks about James Loney and the Christian peace-makers.

Lowell: Yes.

Betty: I don't know what they do. How do they spend their days and who pays their expenses and all that sort of thing? Do you know?

Lowell: I, I couldn't really tell you. Uh, we do know that, um, they went to Iraq to lobby against the, uh, the coalition invasion. Uh, they are demanding that the troops be removed. Uh, they are very clearly anti-Western, at least as it applies to that situation.

Betty: Yes, I understand that.

Lowell: Yeah.

Betty: Um.

Lowell: I just don't know what they think –

Betty: I don't know how they make peace.

Lowell: Well, I, I don't know what they think would happen. I mean, if, if the Western troops were to leave Iraq, what do you think would happen? I mean, there would be bloodshed, uh,

far beyond anything we've seen before.

Betty: Yes, for sure.

Lowell: Is that your question? Is that, that, I'm sorry, I'm not, I'm not sure why you called.

Betty: Well, I, I called to try to understand what it is these people do. Whether they're handing out food or blankets or something or just....

Lowell: I think they're just one more, they're one more example of people who really deep down hate the West, hate the way we live and yet are quite pleased to take all the advantages of living here.

Betty: Uh, yes, I've noticed that.

Lowell: They, uh, me too. Thank you, uh, Betty. Jessie, you're on CFRA, good morning.

Jessie: Oh, hi Lowell.

Lowell: Yes?

Jessie: Um, yeah, I'm just, uh, uh, calling to maybe give, uh, uh, my perspective as well. As a –

Lowell: On what?

Jessie: -- a Muslim person.

Lowell: Oh, okay.

Jessie: Um.

Lowell: Are you Muslim?

Jessie: Yeah.

Lowell: Okay.

Jessie: Yeah. And, um, I think, um, you know, I don't know that's for, for a fact what was, what's written in the Qur'an. I read it when I was younger. Uh, but, um, it's not supposed to be killing people. You're supposed to respect people.

Lowell: Well, but if, if in fact the Qur'an does say this, this, this seems to me to explain a lot, a great deal of what has happened.

Jessie: Well, I, I doubt that, you know, I mean, I think you can take any written text and, you know, take it out of context and make it whatever you want it to be.

Lowell: No, but this goes, but this goes beyond that, Jessie. If we didn't have the terrorism, uh, that we have today. If we didn't have situations where people are, are threatened to be killed because they're changing their religion, then it wouldn't be an issue.

Jessie: By the way, I don't agree with the terrorism. That's totally anti-Islamic.

Lowell: Right, right.

Jessie: Um, I, I completely don't agree with the terrorism. You're not supposed to kill people. That's just the way it is.

Lowell: And yet, according to this professor, that's what the Qur'an says should happen.

Jessie: Yeah. I don't know. I, I don't know enough about this professor.

Lowell: Let me ask you this then. He says the Qur'an contains the will of all-merciful God. Would you agree with that?

Jessie: Yeah.

Lowell: And he says it has been deposited on tablets in Heaven, guarded by angels, even before the creation of the universe. Is that, is that accurate?

Jessie: We don't know. I mean, how do I know?

Lowell: No, but is that what, is that what the Qur'an states?

Jessie: You know what? I have not studied the Qur'an, so I really can't comment on that.

Lowell: Okay.

Jessie: All I can comment on is my own, uh, understanding of the, the religion.

Lowell: Right.

Jessie: And –

Lowell: Let me ask you this.

Jessie: It's supposed to be peaceful.

Lowell: Oh, okay, I under-

Jessie: It's supposed to be respectful. It's basically Christianity. Um, it's, it's the same morals.

Lowell: Can I ask you a question, Jessie?

Jessie: Yeah, yeah.

Lowell: In light of the fact that very clearly some Muslims, we don't know how many, but some Muslims believe this, would you agree with that?

Jessie: Believe?

Lowell: Believe that the Qur'an a-, advocates murder.

Jessie: I don't know what they believe because I've never seen anything like that in the Qur'an and I've read it.

Lowell: Well, you know that before, well, you know that before a suicide bomber kills himself and tries to kill others, they say "God is great".

Jessie: Yeah. You know, a lot of people do a lot of things in this world –

Lowell: No, no, but –

Jessie: – in the name of God.

Lowell: I know. I realize, well.

Jessie: You know? I mean, wars have been fought in the name of God.

Lowell: Well, we're talking about today. We're talking about today, though. I mean, it's, it's almost exclusively radical Muslims who are doing this.

Jessie: Yeah. And, and they've waged a war –

Lowell: C-could I just ask the question, can I just –

Jessie: I guess they've waged a war. You know? And ...

Lowell: Just ask the question –

Jessie: And I don't agree with that war.

Lowell: Can I just ask a question?

Jessie: Sure.

Lowell: In light of the fact that very obviously some Muslims believe this, believe that, uh, that, uh, uh, that, that the Qur'an says this, --

Jessie: You know, I –

Lowell: Can I, can I just please ask my question?

Jessie: Yeah, please.

Lowell: Please.

Jessie: Go ahead.

Lowell: Should we, at the borders, have the right to ask Muslims who want to come to this country if they believe that?

Jessie: If it, you mean when they're coming into Canada?

Lowell: Yeah.

Jessie: Whether they believe that?

Lowell: That anybody who converts from, from Islam should be killed. Should we do, should we have the right to ask 'em if they believe that?

Jessie: Well, you know, it depends on the laws of the country.

Lowell: No, but, but, what I'm -

Jessie: Sure, if you want to create those kind of laws for this country -

Lowell: No, but I'm saying would you agree with that?

Jessie: You know what? I think there should be tremendous amount of screening done on -

Lowell: But should that be part of the -

Jessie: - people from all countries -

Lowell: But, Jessie, Jessie, uh, I think it's a fair question.

Jessie: - to get legitimate, contributing, you know, uh, uh, nation, which, um, -

Lowell: Jessie, you're not being fair here.

Jessie: -- where people.

Lowell: Jessie, you're not being fair here.

Jessie: Oh no, no, no, no.

Lowell: I'm asking you -

Jessie: I'm saying that, I am saying "yes" because, and we need to tighten controls on who gets in here and why.

Lowell: Okay, let me, okay, let me, please let me finish the question. Okay, afford me the courtesy of that. All right, my question is direct. In your opinion, should we be allowed to question Muslims who come here whether they believe that those who switch from the Muslim faith should be killed? Should we have the right to ask them that question?

Jessie: You know what? You can ask whatever you want. This is our country. We're allowed to screen.

Lowell: My question, my question to you is would you support-, would you agree with that or not?

Jessie: Absolutely.

Lowell: Okay.

Jessie: Because, you know what? We want a Canada that is peaceful, where people are here to contribute and make a positive impact. Right?

Lowell: I couldn't agree more. Thank you, thank you. Uh, Mike, you're on CFRA, good morning.

Mike: How you doin'?

Lowell: Go ahead, sir.

Mike: Good. I just want to co-, comment on a couple of things. Uh, regarding Islam, see

the thing is, I think Islam is under attack now. Like if want to, uh, you know, read something like that, I mean, is this not basic, uh, li-, like you have to read into it and study it and find the meaning of why it says that, if it does in fact say that. Now –

Lowell: Well, are you, are you a Muslim?

Mike: No, I'm not, but I'm thinking of converting to Islam.

Lowell: Okay.

Mike: Now, on another note, uh, you –

Lowell: Why, why are you thinking of converting?

Mike: My personal belief. But that's not why I'm calling.

Lowell: Okay.

Mike: The reason I'm calling is because, I mean, yeah, you can nit-pick. I mean, not nit-pick, but you could, you know, bring out the negatives of Islam and judge the religion by the people. But then on the same note, you can –

Lowell: Well, how else would you judge it?

Mike: Well, you can't judge Christianity on the fact that a lot of Klan members are racist and go kill, you know, anybody that's of any other colour –

Lowell: Well, very clearly, sir, very clearly, sir, that is wrong and we arrest anybody that does that.

Mike: Exactly. And now, and the priests, you know, I'm not gonna mention this, but they, the, a high percentage of priests molest children. Now, you're not going to, uh, you know, it wouldn't be fair for people to call and say, well, Christianity supports molestation of children.

Lowell: Well, no, but nobody questions whether, nobody, nobody questions whether those priests or whoever it is molesting children shouldn't be –

Mike: Exactly.

Lowell: – shouldn't be arrested and thrown in jail.

Mike: Exactly.

Lowell: But that, but that's, that's not the issue here. The issue here is, is there something in the religion itself that inspires violence?

Mike: Not at all. And, um, not at all. Okay? And –

Lowell: Well, then, sir, have you read the Qur'an?

Mike: I, I haven't read the full Qur'an. That's why I can't comment on that. Okay, but, but what I've read so far is there's nothing at all that incites violence.

Lowell: Then why then, let me ask this question then, sir.

Mike: Yeah, sure.

Lowell: If that is true, why then did so many clerics in Afghanistan say that the Qur'an does say this and there was so much effort put to finding this guy and putting him to death?

Mike: Because unfortunately, you know, as in Islam, and as in many, and even the prophet [??] said so, is that, uh, you know, Islam co-, is going to be, there's going to be 60 sections of Islam, there's going to be one true section that's left. I mean, just like any other religion, like Buddhism or –

Lowell: No, it's not like any other religion.

Mike: Yeah. And, and, no, but in terms of –

Lowell: No, I'm sorry. Buddhists, Buddhists are, Buddhists are not suicide bombers.

Mike: No, no, but I, my point is, in terms of misinterpreting the religion and practising it in the wrong way, a lot of people out there interpret it the wrong way.

Lowell: Then let me, then let me ask you, then, excuse me then. Let me put it this way to you then.

Mike: Sure.

Lowell: Why does it appear that almost all of those who are misinterpreting their religion today are Muslims?

Mike: No, no. It's not almost all. There's a billion plus Muslims in the world. I mean, yeah, –

Lowell: No, sorry, no. Listen, listen to my question again.

Mike: Sure.

Lowell: Is it not true that almost all the terrorism in the world today, the suicide bombing, is being carried out by Muslims?

Mike: Well, I say that most of the terrorism, okay, and now this, this is where you and I are going to differ on our views, most of the terrorism, I mean, you may look at it as terrorism and other people may look at it as these people are defending themselves because, if you do look at the reality of it, the Americans are the ones that are there –

Lowell: Excuse me. Excuse me, sir. I'm not going to buy this for a moment.

Mike: I'm not, I'm not –

Lowell: You know, are you suggesting, just a minute. No, it's time that you were challenged. Are you telling me that those people who went in with bombs strapped to them, and blew up innocent men, women and little babies in the London subway were somehow defending themselves?

Mike: I'm not saying, I'm not justifying what, what happened that day.

Lowell: You tried to.

Mike: No, no, no, no. Not at all. Okay? I'm saying what's, that, of course that is wrong. But, I mean, Bill Clinton, okay? And I'll tell you something. If, you know, –

Lowell: No, sir.

Mike: – if you do know, and I know your history, Bill Clinton blew, he bombed a pharmaceutical factory in the country of Sudan, which is a, and ended up killing millions, and not millions, but thousands of innocent workers because he suspected that it was a drug company. And later on when they did investigation was done, it turns out that it was just a medicine company.

Lowell: So, so this –

Mike: So he did the same thing.

Lowell: So, so this, so this is, this is the rule of equivalency?

Mike: It's not equivalency. But how come, why do people only, you know, why do people only, if you're going to be fair [??] –

Lowell: Sir, –

Mike: – equal, you know?

Lowell: Sir, sir?

Mike: Yeah?

Lowell: Bill Clinton is not the president of the United States today.

Mike: He's not the president, but he did a similar action. Did he or did he not?

Lowell: All right. Sir, who is, excuse me, sir. Who is it that is doing almost all the acts of terrorism around the world today? And not just against Americans. Who is it that blew up the nightclub in Bali? Who is it that blew up the bus in Spain? Who is it, er, the bus in Britain? Who is it blew up the train in Spain, sir? Who is it –

Mike: Yeah, but Lowell. What I'm saying –

Lowell: No, no, no. Who is it?!

Mike: It's people that're doing it in the name of Islam.

Lowell: Yes.

Mike: But what I'm telling you is that the people that do –

Lowell: Why? Why?

Mike: Yeah, but this is not Islamic, this is not the Islamic [??] –

Lowell: But why, why –

Mike: – there's a lot of people that –

Lowell: No, but, sir. My question is why does it, why does it appear that almost exclusively [sic], uh, er, is it Muslims who are doing it today?

Mike: I, I don't believe it's all, it's most, mostly Muslims. I believe, you know, there's millions of more Muslims and there's millions –

Lowell: Sir, that's not what I said. I said why is it that almost all the acts of terrorism today are being carried out by Muslims?

Mike: I don't think it is.

Lowell: Okay. Thank you, sir. Uh, we'll be back on CFRA.

- commercial break

Lowell: Now I understand, Jonathan, you have a Qur'an there?

Jonathan: Yes, um, Lowell, I have an official Arabic-English, uh, Qur'an here from, uh, in fact it says right on the front cover, it's from Islamic University in Medina.

Lowell: All right.

Jonathan: You can't get more official than that.

Lowell: All right. This, um, he quotes, uh, I guess it's, is it chapter four, verse 89?

Jonathan: That's right. I can give you a quote to that one verse.

Lowell: Okay.

Jonathan: Okay, and here's what it says: "They wish that you reject faith, as they have rejected faith and thus that you all become equal like one another. So take not protectors or friends from them 'til they emigrate in the way of Allah to Muhammad. But if they turn back from Islam, take hold of them and kill them wherever you find them. And take neither protectors or friends nor helpers from them."

Lowell: Good lord.

Jonathan: End quote.

Lowell: Good lord.

Jonathan: It's very plain. Now where is –

Lowell: Sir, would you read that again, sir?

Jonathan: Okay.

Lowell: This, this is, um, this is ch-, now I have a Qur'an in front of me here. This is, uh, what page is that on?

Jonathan: Oh well, this, uh, there're, there are different, uh, copies of the Qur'an.

Lowell: Okay. All right.

Jonathan: Okay, this one is, this is an official one from, uh, from Medina.

Lowell: Okay.

Jonathan: As they say, okay, I can give you the quotes here and so on.

Lowell: Right.

Jonathan: And it's in Arabic and English and, and that's what it plainly says.

Lowell: Read it again, would you?

Jonathan: Okay. It plainly says this: "They wish that you reject faith as they have rejected faith and thus that you all become equal like one another. So take not protectors or friends from them 'til they emigrate in the way of Allah to Mohammed. But if they turn back from Islam, take hold of them and kill them wherever you find them. And take neither protectors or friends nor helpers from them." Now, that's, that's quite plain. Now, I would like to know, where are these leftists, lousy human rights commissions with, with this kind of stuff circulating in Canada? Where are they?

Lowell: Mm.

Jonathan: It just goes to show you the double standard and how these, these human rights commissions are not human rights commissions. They should be gotten rid of. They're just trouble-makers.

Lowell: All right. Well.

Jonathan: I mean, this kind of stuff is going on. That's, that's sura four, uh, 89 and I can give you the quote, the, the, uh, the translator is Doctor Muhammad Muhsin Khan, Islamic University, Medina.

Lowell: Sura four. I –

Jonathan: Sura four, 89.

Lowell: Okay. I, the one I've got here, it doesn't seem to be sequential. It goes from sura 73 to sura 68.

Jonathan: Uh, remember, they go backwards.

Lowell: Oh, they go backwards. Of course they do. All right. So, let me find this. Sura four. I'm at sura five, sura two, sura three. Sura four, 89.

Jonathan: Yes.

Lowell: All right. Just to confirm what you're saying here. Um, sura four, where are we here? Holy smokes. I can't seem to find it. Um, [sound of flipping pages] yeah, it goes backwards. Okay, I'm finding it here, I'm finding it. Seventy-eight. Eighty-nine. Yeah, you're absolutely right. You're absolutely, "when they turn, but if they turn back from Islam, take hold of them and kill them wherever you find them. And take neither protectors or friends nor helpers from them."

Jonathan: Yes.

Lowell: Yeah, you're absolutely right. Thank you very much, uh, Jonathan.

Jonathan: You're welcome.

Lowell: Thank you. Well, that clears up that. The Qur'an very clearly states that. Terry, you're on CFRA, good morning.

Terry: Hi, good morning.

Lowell: Yes, sir?

Terry: Um, wow, he just took the punch away from me 'cause I was gonna, I was gonna make a couple of comments as far as the, uh, the way it was written. Uh, 'cause you know it's a fact that the Bible has been re-written in certain parts of the country in order to accommodate where the Bible is. So I'm assuming that the Qur'an has been re-written in order to accommodate, I guess, Canadians, Americans or whatever. But I'm assuming that the true Qur'an and the way it was written is back, like, in Afghanistan, Iraq and back in the, uh, Middle Eastern countries there. So they follow the original rules because if that's the case, why would they run after this man who tried to convert from, uh, Muslim –

Lowell: Oh, I mean, very clearly this is, this is a translation. Uh, by the way, er, the translation includes both the English version and the Arabic. And very clearly that's what it says. If they turn back from Islam, take hold of them and kill them.

Terry: That's scary. That's really unbelievable. I mean, he, he just took the punch away from me 'cause I was gonna, but, wow, when I heard that, that, and that's written in black and white.

Lowell: Yes, it is.

Terry: And, and, I mean, to me, if you want to convert from Christianity to, Christianity to Muslim, you kinda would wonder why they would not ban that because now an outsider's coming into their religion. But it's okay for that. You can do that. Because look what happened to Ray Stevens or Cat Stevens, who, uh, I can't remember his name, the, when he changed his name to a Muslim now and he's, uh, he's welcomed with open arms. So now if he wants to leave the Muslim clerics, go back to Christianity, is he gonna be killed? You wonder that.

Lowell: I, I, um, I'm just reading more here, um. It's, uh, it's very clearly, uh, you're not supposed to kill another believer because, uh, 92 says "It is not for a believer to kill a believer except that it be by mistake. And whosoever kills a believer by mistake, it is ordained that he must set free a believing slave and compensation, that's blood money, be given to the deceased's family, uh, unless the grace and mercy of Allah upon you." Anyway, you got a bad line there, Terry. Thank you for your call.

Terry: Okay.

Lowell: Thank you. Uh, Kamal, you're on CFRA, good morning.

Kamal: Hi, Lowell. Good morning, how are you today?

Lowell: Go ahead, sir. Right to the topic, please.

Kamal: Excellent. That's about Islam?

Lowell: Yes.

Kamal: Uh, let me just explain a little bit because I was trained in that Islamic faith and, uh [line cuts out].

Lowell: Go ahead, sir. No? What happened? Go ahead.

Kamal: You know, you believe and you're asking what you believe, isn't that?

Lowell: I don't know, sir.

Kamal: This is a logical way.

Lowell: All I know is that I have the Qur'an in front of me –

Kamal: That's right.

Lowell: And very clearly this is –

Kamal: That's right. I am, I'm going to agree with you. When my manual says you have to behave this way, if I believe in that manual, that's how I behave.

Lowell: Mm hm.

Kamal: And I want somebody to show me in the world today, in a Muslim country, that they don't do anything that this book says. Because there is not one Muslim country that they do not kill the converted ones. And I can give you evidence after evidence, uh, –

Lowell: Well, they don't do it, I must tell you this, sir. They do not do it in Turkey. And the new constitution of Iraq very clearly states that those who convert from Islam to another faith shall not be put to death. So, there are some Muslim countries that, that forbid this.

Kamal: But let me, in the constitution it says –

Lowell: Yes.

Kamal: – that the constitution is not overrule, er, is not overruling, uh, governor. The Qur'an is the overriding rule for the, all decisions at the Council of Islamic –

Lowell: But on the other, but on the other hand, we've gotta, we have to be fair here. And that is that, just as with the Christian faith, I mean, even though you may declare yourself to be a Christian, there are many who do not believe all of the teachings of the Bible. And I suspect that this is the same with Muslims.

Kamal: I understand that.

Lowell: But the problem is, is that obviously we have a large number of at least fundamentalist Muslims who do believe this.

Kamal: That's right. That's the problem. And today these are the ones, the majority that they come here with those fundamental understandings of Islam. And when you asked that lady if we have the right at the border to ask these guys "Do you believe in this fundamental, uh, uh, basic?" yes, we have the right. We should have the right to ask them. Because this country was based on understanding of all people, right? Freedom of speech, freedom of religion and who, whosoever comes here come to find shelter and refuge. And if we allow

these things come in and is spread all over the country, soon, and very soon, we will have these troubles at hand as well.

Lowell: All right, sir. We'll be back on CFRA.

- commercial and news break

Lowell: Uh, Johnny, you're first up in this hour. You're on CFRA, Johnny. Please go ahead.

Johnny: Hi, Lowell, how are you?

Lowell: Yes, go ahead, sir, right to the topic, please.

Johnny: Well, I, I'm flabbergasted at, uh, most of these calls that you're having. But, um, let me tell you something. Uh, those are facts. Eighty percent of Muslim people haven't read the Qur'an. Now, that's one, it's one, the other twenty percent that read the Qur'an, eighty percent of them don't, don't even understand it. Now the most important point here is, the Qur'an that you have in your hand is the official translation. Do you know that, and you're not allowed to translate, any other country is not allowed to translate the Qur'an unless that translation is from Saudi Arabia. This is one. Two, if you want to see the verses that exist in the Qur'an -- and I hate to see you from now on calling it radical or fundamental -- because if you read these verses, I don't know what you're going to be calling this religion. Look at, uh, verses eight, number 65. Verses two, number 217. All what you see there is verses that calling for the killing.

Lowell: I'm sorry, ver-, verses, it's sura, sura eight?

Johnny: Sura eight, verse 65.

Lowell: Sixty-five. All right.

Johnny: Sura two, verse 217.

Lowell: Okay.

Johnny: Sura 74, verse four to six. Sura 74, ver-, verse [85?]

Lowell: What do you say you will find there?

Johnny: You, all, all these suras will, uh, uh, Muhammad the prophet or, I don't know, maybe Gabriel gave him, uh, those suras. It tells the Muslim people go ahead and kill. Kill and kill because God will be with you.

Lowell: By the way, in reference to your saying that it all has to be printed in, um, in what count-, in what country did you say? In, um?

Johnny: Saudi Arabia. It has to be.

Lowell: In Saudi Arabia? Okay, I'm just, I'm just reading this. It says, okay, this is the, the prefix to the Qur'an that I have. It says "With the help and guidance of Allah, the printing of this noble Qur'an with a translation of its meanings was accomplished at King Fahd Complex for the printing of the Holy Qur'an" da da, da da, da da, "under the supervision of the Ministry of Islamic Affairs [Endowments?] and guidance of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia in the year 1420." Okay.

Johnny: Exactly. That is, there's no other translation because it's illegal for any other country to translate it because if, if other countries do, does a exact translation, then you're gonna see words in there that will boggle your mind. And that's why nobody's allowed to translate it and the official translation comes only from Saudi Arabia. So if you are to look at the Arabic transl-, er, Arabic, uh, Qur'an, uh, the way it's read and you are to translate it to English, you're gonna be amazed at some of the words that are in there. So that's why Saudi Arabia has the only right to translate that, uh, that book.

Lowell: I'm looking for, uh, eight 65. Uh, it says "Prophet Muhammad urge the believers to fight. If there are 20 steadfast persons amongst you, they will overcome 200. And if there be a hundred steadfast persons, they will overcome a thousand of those who disbelieve because they, the disbelievers, are people who do not understand."

Johnny: Exactly. Now, go to verse two, uh, two, number 217.

Lowell: Uh, well I haven't got time now. I, I don't find that as, as offensive.

Johnny: Yeah, well, there is, the other ones are more offensive than this one. This one is, you know, it's kind of, uh, a medium-sized, uh, killing there. But the others ones does exactly. He says the words.

Lowell: But, but, I mean, we have to be fair. And that is that if you read, particularly the Old Testament, you're going to find, uh, a lot admonitions to kill there as well and a lot of violence. Now, it's not true of the New Testament, but.

Johnny: That, that's the Old Testament. Now, go to the New Testament, to Jesus Christ. The only, the only book, the only book that most, uh, the Qur'an that believes in as the right book is, uh, the, the New Testament. And the only woman that is mentioned in the Ol-, er, in the Qur'an is the Virgin Mary. The only woman. And that Muhammad has 27 wives. His third wife was six years old when he married her. And the only woman that he speaks of in the Qur'an is the Virgin Mary.

Lowell: Interesting.

Johnny: And Jesus Christ is the only prophet that he speaks of most of the time.

Lowell: All right. I have, uh, this is, uh, sura two, uh, verse 217. Quote, "they ask you concerning fighting in the sacred months, i.e. first, seventh, eleventh and twelve months of the Islamic calendar. Say fighting herein, therein is a great transgression, but a greater transgression with Allah is to prevent mankind from following the way of Allah, to disbelieve in him, to prevent access, da da, da da, and to drive out its inhabitants. Is worse than killing. And they will never cease fighting until you turn back from your religion, Islamic, if they can. And whoever of you turns back from his religion and dies as a disbeliever, then his deeds will be lost in this life and in the hereafter and they will be the dwellers of the fire. They will abide therein forever." Ooh. So it says if, if, in other words, if you turn from the Muslim faith, you will abide in, in eternal hellfire.

Johnny: And, if you want to go to, uh, 74, four to six.

Lowell: Mind you, I, I don't want to go into any more, sir. But as, I just want to point out that, uh, that there're admonitions of that nature in the Old Testament of the Bible as well. Got to move on here. Thank you. Uh, to West Carleton. Donald, you're on CFRA.

Donald: Morning, Lowell.

Lowell: Yes, sir?

Donald: It seems that, uh, the nation of Islam is in a serious problem, having a serious problem nowadays. Um, this imam from Alberta, if he can, if he can go to a human rights tribunal, uh, for these, you know, this trump, this charge he, he's laying, then maybe the Qur'an should too. If it preaches murder, and I've read a little, uh, snippets of the Qur'an and, in general it's a marvelous book and I feel very sorry for the, the, the moderate Muslims. Um, if this book preaches murdering because, you know, because you've gone away from the religion, it should be, uh, they should have a, a, a commission on it and study the thing. 'Cause it seems that a lot of Muslims don't even know their, their own Qur'an.

Lowell: Well, it, the same would be true of Christians, sir. How many Christians, uh, do you think have ever read the Bible? Not too many.

Donald: True. But when, when, if it preaches murdering, uh, people on site basically because they're not, because they've changed that religion, there, there's a serious problem that should be looked at legally as far as a hate crime.

Lowell: All right, sir. Thank you for calling. Uh, let's go to Jerry. Jerry, you're on CFRA.

Jerry: Hi, Lowell.

Lowell: Yes, sir?

Jerry: Interesting topic today. Uh, I just, like, I don't really follow any religion specifically, but what I find is, like, all religions are the same, so –

Lowell: Well, not really. Not really, sir. No, no that's not true.

Jerry: Well, the reason why I say that is just to bring up my point, which is, first we've just got to look back, this is kind of scary, people actually believing this, but what is a Muslim? If a Muslim, if a good Muslim is the same as a good Christian, so anyone that's away from Islam could be someone that –

Lowell: Well, this I can tell you, sir. Because I, I'm quite familiar with the Christian Bible and the, the New Testament.

Jerry: Yeah, that's if someone –

Lowell: Can I just finish? Can I just finish, please?

Jerry: Yeah.

Lowell: Uh, and I'm gonna tell you that the New Testament, nowhere there does it say that anybody should be killed for switching religions. In fact, the message of the New Testament, of Jesus Christ, is one of forgiveness. You know, Jesus –

Jerry: Are you sure?

Lowell: Mm, okay.

Jerry: Sorry to cut you off again. I just learned that from you. But, um, does it say that anyone that switches religions or anyone that turns away from Islam? 'Cause maybe they mean by "Islam" the way of, of every religion, like Christians and the way that –

Lowell: No, no, no, no, no. It's very clear that it's talking about, talking about Islam. Very clear, sir.

Jerry: Oh, okay. 'Cause I just thought it might be that they're trying to –

Lowell: No, not at all.

Jerry: You need to define what, what Islam is first and then explain that if anyone lives, goes away from that –

Lowell: No, no. We've already got that clear. We've read you, we've read you directly from the Qur'an, sir. Thank you for calling.

Jerry: That's crazy.

Lowell: Thank you. Uh, Maser, you're on CFRA.

Maser: Yes, sir.

Lowell: Yes, sir?

Maser: Hello.

Lowell: Yes, sir?

Maser: How're you doing? Um, I don't know where to start, um, because there's lot of things here and people quoting without any reference and, um, --

Lowell: I'm sorry, what, sorry, what is it that you just said?

Maser: Uh, I, I said that there are lots of things that people are quoting, especially the Christians, uh, about Islam which is totally not correct.

Lowell: Well, I just read from the Qur'an, sir.

Maser: Yes.

Lowell: Is the Qur'an not correct?

Maser: Uh, Qur'an is absolutely correct.

Lowell: Okay. Well, the Qur'an is, then you know what the Qur'an says about killing people who switch from the Muslim faith. Very clearly it says kill them.

Maser: Yeah, can, can I describe it, what exactly it is?

Lowell: Well, I, I, how can you describe? I've read the Qur'an.

Maser: Okay.

Lowell: I've read what the Qur'an says.

Maser: Okay, if, I'm just make a challenge to all Canada. If you read it in context and if you have any objection, you, I'll, I'll pay whatever fine is. So, you reading that in context –

Lowell: Well I read it in context.

Maser: No. I, let me tell you this –

Lowell: Well, sir, I, I have the Qur'an here in front of me. What, what, what's the context that I didn't read it in?

Maser: Okay, I am Muslim and I read it many times.

Lowell: Uh huh.

Maser: Let me tell you. Let me tell you exactly what it is.

Lowell: Mm hm.

Maser: It's, it's about, there was, this is a description of a war. If you read that, all is about war. So it's a description of one war in which Muslims were, uh, had an argument with, uh, they were fighting against other faiths as well. And what usually, and [??] too, is they become Muslim and they, they create, uh, you know, um –

Lowell: Sir, sir, sir, sir –

Maser: – problems, uh, problems in –

Lowell: Sir, sir, excuse me. Okay? Uh, I, I, I, I read directly, uh, from the Qur'an, sir.

Maser: You read it correctly. You read it correctly. But –

Lowell: Yeah. Yeah. And it doesn't talk about, it doesn't talk about anything, uh, anything specifically about a war.

Maser: It does.

Lowell: No, I'm sorry, sir.

Maser: Oh yes, it does.

Lowell: I, I, it's, it's talking about general.

Maser: Okay, [?] –

Lowell: He says, okay, let's go to, all right, let's go to 95. Not equal are those are the believers. They're talking about believers and non-believers.

Maser: Yes.

Lowell: And stri-, and stri-, and what, talking about the war, the war they're talking about is the war, uh, against, against non-believers. I mean, that's, that's what the war you're talking about, sir. Wh-, I wish you wouldn't try to mislead me.

Maser: No, but –

Lowell: I mean, I have the Qur'an in front of me here.

Maser: No, sir. You can, you can write down my name and my number and I can, you can, I

can challenge you that there's –

Lowell: But I'm reading from the Qur'an, sir.

Maser: No –

Lowell: And not only that, it says “and whoever kills a believer intentionally, his recompense is held to abide therein and the wrath and curse of Allah upon him and a great punishment is prepared for him.” Seems to me that there are gonna be a lot of Muslims who are killing other Muslims out there who're gonna be spending a lot of time in purgatory, sir. In hell. But –

Maser: Sir, sir, let me say one thing. Uh, this is exactly what the difference between a, uh, radical Muslims and, uh, the Muslims with –

Lowell: No, but, but that's, that's fine, sir. But, please, –

Maser: Okay.

Lowell: – I mean, don't try to mislead us because that's not right.

Maser: Oh –

Lowell: You know, at least –

Maser: I'm not trying to mislead you.

Lowell: No, but the, the, the Qur'an that deals with this is talking about a war e-, in essence, between non-believers and believers. It's all about believers and non-believers. He says, quote, here's the verse: “They wish that you reject faith.” Not talking about a war, except he's talking about non-believers. “They wish that you reject faith as they have rejected faith. And thus that you all become equal like one another. So take not awliya, that's protectors or friends from them 'til they emigrate in the way of Allah to Muhammad. But if they turn back from Islam, take hold of them and kill them wherever you find them and take neither protectors or friends nor helpers from them.”

Maser: It's absolutely correct. But, but this is the difference between me and Osama Bin Laden. That he understands these things as literal, just like you're doing it right now. And I read it in context. The context is that, this is, this is actually the difference between a good Muslim and a bad Muslim. They, they read the words and just take it as it is. And it's, I can quote many things from Bible that if you take it out of context –

Lowell: Not from the New Testament. There's no place in the New Testament that says you should kill non-believers.

Maser: [?] get too many things [?] –

Lowell: In fact, the message of the, the Christian Bible, I'm not saying one's better than the other, but I'm telling you, that the message of Jesus Christ, which is founder of the Christian faith, is one of forgiveness. You know, if a man asks, if, if a man strikes you on the right cheek, turn to him the left. If a man asks that you walk a mile with him, walk yet a mile.

Maser: Exactly.

Lowell: Yeah.

Maser: And, and, sir, let me tell you. Uh, –

Lowell: But here the Qur'an, the Qur'an says just the opposite. He says they wish that you reject faith and if, and if, uh, they do reject their faith, kill them.

Maser: No. Let me tell you, sir. This is not my faith. This is what you're telling is not my faith. My faith is I do believe in all books, first of all. I believe in Bible, more than you do.

Lowell: Sir, the, sir –

Maser: I believe in Bible more than you do.

Lowell: Wh-, you know?

Maser: Yeah?

Lowell: I mean, for you to tell me that you believe more than I do, I mean, stop the damn nonsense, okay? You're not talking to a five-year-old child here.

Maser: No –

Lowell: You don't, you have no idea what I believe and what I don't believe. All I'm telling you is what the Qur'an says and very clearly large numbers of Muslims believe that. And that's a problem, sir. You got to face it. It's a problem.

Maser: Sir, no, sir, exactly you are doing exactly that thing in Christianity what Osama Bin Laden doing in Islam. Like, the radical thing. No. We, what we want here in Canada, we don't want any radicalism. If you don't want in Islam, then don't try to attack Islam like in the [?] –

Lowell: I'm not attacking Islam. I'm telling you what Islam says. I'm telling you, I'm reading you from the Qur'an.

Maser: No, no, but I'm listening to you, like, like, you know, uh, you know, red-neck people, uh, you know, comment about other people. You know, this, this is not the way we, we want, uh, [?] in Canada.

Lowell: Well, sir, sir, would you agree with this? You sound like a reasonable man. Would you agree that that verse at the very least is resulting in the deaths of thousands of people?

Maser: Exactly. And I totally agree with you and I, I, –

Lowell: All right. That's, that's –

Maser: – I was the first person, I was the first person who –

Lowell: All right. At least we agree, at least we agree to that, sir.

Maser: Yeah –

Lowell: We'll be back on CFRA.

- commercial break

Lowell: Just reading some more of the Qur'an. It's, it's interesting that, um, that Allah talks about the day of resurrection. Which, of course, is part of the Christian faith as well. Uh, let's talk to Alex. You're on CFRA, Alex.

Alex: Hello?

Lowell: Go ahead, please.

Alex: Hi, Lowell. Um, I have, uh, I really disagree with, um, what you were saying before about the killing. Um, there is a lot of forgiveness in this religion. Islam is not only about killing. It's very, very forgiving. There are many people who tried to kill the prophet and he forgave them. Right away.

Lowell: Well, I'm, I'm reading directly. I mean, in this case, it's very clear. I mean, there's no equivocation here. Uh, that if, if someone leaves the faith, quote, "If they turn back from Islam, take hold of them and kill them wherever you find them." I, I don't see how you could misinterpret what he said there.

Alex: No, it's not about misinterpretation.

Lowell: What is it then?

Alex: Well, I just feel like you're just pointing out every negative thing you possibly can about the religion.

Lowell: No. I'm, I'm quoting, wh-, if it's in the Qur'an, why is it negative?

Alex: Excuse me?

Lowell: It's in, I, I'm quoting you the Qur'an. Are you suggesting the Qur'an is negative?

Alex: No.

Lowell: Well, I, I'm just quoting from the Qur'an.

Alex: Well, if you quote things from the Torah or from the Bible that are very negative as well.

Lowell: Quote, quote me something from the New Testament.

Alex: From the New Testament?

Lowell: Yeah.

Alex: Have you read Timothy?

Lowell: Uh, Timothy? Yes.

Alex: Okay, there is something in there. It's not about killing, but it's very offensive to women. Basically it's saying that women –

Lowell: Oh, you'll find, you'll find some offensive stuff in, in the, uh, in Paul's epistles. Paul didn't like women. There's no question about that.

Alex: Okay.

Lowell: But there's no, there's no, there's nothing in there about killing people.

Alex: No, but that's because every prophet had their own message. Every prophet had their own –

Lowell: No, I realize that. But what I'm saying to you is, is that we have a serious problem in the world. Obviously there are a number of Muslims who really believe this chapter, this verse in sura four, 89. They believe this. Because they are killing people all over. And I think that, you know, we, we've gotta tell the truth. This is what the Qur'an says.

Alex: But a lot of, most modern Muslims don't believe that.

Lowell: But some –

Alex: And I think you're just scared that this is going to happen in Canada, that there's all these Muslims in Canada that really believe this. And there really aren't. [??] –

Lowell: Well, I must point out that there are over 3000 people killed just a few hundred miles to the south of us, including 25 Canadians. They have just arrested, uh, perhaps two, perhaps three terrorists who have been hiding out in Canada. We have another one who is on trial. And we have another one that was apparently trying to make, uh, bombs on, on model airplanes. These people are all Muslim. Why, why wouldn't we be concerned?

Alex: I don't know. But I just want to tell you there are really nice things in the Qur'an.

Lowell: I'm sure there are.

Alex: And I just want to point them out because I feel like you're just, you're just pointing out the negative things and I just want to tell you this. Um, "And you will find the nearest in love to the believers, those are the Muslims, those who say 'We are Christians'. That is because amongst them are priests and monks and they are not proud."

Lowell: Which, uh, which verse and, and uh?

Alex: That's, it's chapter five.

Lowell: Okay, sura five.

Alex: Verse 82.

Lowell: Verse 82. Okay. And, uh, but, but one of the things I noticed, that I find disturbing, is that he makes, Allah makes a great distinction between believers and non-believers. And which verse are you talking about here?

Alex: I was talking about 82.

Lowell: Eighty-two.

Alex: When, when he's talking about the believers versus the non-believers –

Lowell: Mm hm?

Alex: – he's really not so much talking about Christians. Like, everyone thinks that Muslims think that Christians and Jews are evil, but that's not true. He's really talking about

the people who were worshipping –

Lowell: Well, here. Just a minute. This is sura five and verse 82?

Alex: Yes.

Lowell: It says, quote, “Verily you will find the strongest among men in enmity to be the d-, the, uh, to the believers Muslims, the Jews. You will find the nearest in love to the believers, Muslims, those who say ‘We are Christians.’” So the, what, what –

Alex: The biggest problem, the biggest problem –

Lowell: Excuse me, uh, that doesn’t sound very loving to me. It says you will find the strongest among, among men in enmity to be the be-, the, the believers of Jews. In other words, he’s saying –

Alex: It says that. It says that, Lowell, because –

Lowell: Why would you advance that?

Alex: Lowell.

Lowell: As a, as a defence?

Alex: Can I, can I explain?

Lowell: I hope so.

Alex: It says that because, the reason why there’s so much conflict between the Jews and the Christ-, er, and the Muslims, I believe, is because, uh, it also says that the Jewish people, they didn’t accept Jesus Christ as the messiah.

Lowell: No, but, but –

Alex: That’s the biggest problem.

Lowell: – you advanced, but, sor-, but sorry, I’m sorry.

Alex: That’s why –

Lowell: No, but wait a minute, hold it. But I am, I am astonished and shocked that you would advance that verse as a defence of, of the, uh, forgiveness of the, of the Qur’an. When, when it says –

Alex: The Qur’an is a clear guide. It’s just, it’s just plain words.

Lowell: No, but it’s saying –

Alex: There’s so many things, we’re supposed to follow the examples of prophets.

Lowell: No, but you advanced this –

Alex: The prophet married a Jewish woman. He, they, there’s no hatred there. It’s just.

Lowell: Well it says, um, I’ll read you again. It says, verily –

Alex: I know what it says. Lots of people know what it says. Anyone who reads it can know what it says.

Lowell: Well, this is not one of the reasons perhaps that there is such enmity between Jews and, and Muslims then?

Alex: No, it's not because of what's written here. It's because –

Lowell: Well, I mean, the Qur'an says.

Alex: It's not because of what's written here. This, this was already written a long time ago. That's not the reason why there's so many problems. It's that –

Lowell: Okay, well, I, I just, I think you chose a very poor verse to convince me. That's, that's not forgiveness.

Alex: Well, that's not the part I was talking about. I was talking about –

Lowell: That's the verse you quoted me.

Alex: I quoted you "You will find the nearest in love to the believers, those who say 'We are Christians'."

Lowell: Yeah, but you forgot the part about –

Alex: I didn't forget it. It's right there.

Lowell: Well, yeah, but you didn't mention it until I, you didn't, huh. Come on, Alex. The, the verse very clearly says that the biggest enemies we have are the Jews.

Alex: It's the, it's not, it's not enemies.

Lowell: Well, that's what it says. "Men in enmity" means enemies. It very clearly says the biggest enemies are Jews.

Alex: Because they denied, they denied one of the most important prophets –

Lowell: Whatever.

Alex: Jesus.

Lowell: Whatever. It's hardly –

Alex: How can you deny that? How can you ignore that so –

Lowell: Deny what?

Alex: -- blatantly?

Lowell: No, but you advanced this –

Alex: This is, this is your most important person in your religion, in Christianity.

Lowell: Excuse me. I, I, I went to the verse that you suggested as an example of how the

Qur'an preaches forgiveness and I find there a verse that says our biggest enemies are the Jews. Huh. I, I, uh, it's, we'll be back, CFRA.

- commercial & news break

Lowell: Several callers have mentioned the fact that, uh, Jesus and Mary are mentioned in the Qur'an. Let me just read you the, uh, the verse. This is, uh, sura five, verse 78. Quote, "Those among the children of Israel" – that would be the Jews – "Those among the children of Israel who disbelieved were cursed by the tongue of David and Jesus, son of Mary. That was because they disobeyed Allah and the messengers and were ever transgressing beyond bounds." So it's very clear. 'Cause this was written long before the state of Israel was ever formed. Very clear that the animosity between Muslims and Jews started long before the state of Israel. Uh, let's go to, uh, Mohammed, uh, in Montreal. Mohammed, you're on CFRA.

Mohammed: Yes.

Lowell: Yes, sir?

Mohammed: I'm a Muslim of course.

Lowell: Yes.

Mohammed: Uh, I think, for you it's very difficult to, to, to understand the Qur'an because I read Qur'an twice and I am confused now more than I'd, I was before reading it.

Lowell: Mm hm.

Mohammed: A lot of contradiction in Islam. And, uh, so-, uh, in, in some sura you read that it is, uh, Christianity and Jew, Jew, like, the Jews and Christian people, they are people of, of the book, they call them. Like they have –

Lowell: Well, very clearly the, the verses that I have seen here, uh, makes it very clear that the Jews are no friend of Muslims.

Mohammed: Yeah.

Lowell: I don't think that comes as a surprise.

Mohammed: That's in one verse, but the others –

Lowell: Well, no, it's actually in more than one, sir.

Mohammed: Yeah, yeah, no –

Lowell: I just read, I mean, here, here is sura five, verse 78. Quote, "Those among the children of Israel" – that would be Jews – "Those among the children of Israel who disbelieved were cursed by the tongue of David and Jesus, son of Mary. That was because they disobeyed Allah and the messengers and were ever transgressing beyond bounds."

Mohammed: Exactly. I agree with you. It's, uh, so that's why Bin Laden and other people, they look from, like, a different angle, like, the, the moderate peoples. So what we need, actually, we need a courageous cleric or religious people denounce the, the bad aspects of the Qur'an. We said it can't adapt itself to the, the 21st century. For example, I can't marry a nine-year-old girl because Prophet Muhammad did. So this is unacceptable now. And, uh,

when this lady, the, Alex I think, the previous caller, mentioned that Muhammad, uh, married a Jewish woman, he married her the same night he killed her husband, so –

Lowell: He killed her husband?

Mohammed: Yeah. They, they raided the, the town and, uh, her husband was, he was the chief of the tribe and they, he was killed. And the same night, he married her. So this is unacceptable now. Uh, maybe but at that time it was. But now what we need is we need, uh, a new version of Islam which can adapt itself to the 21st century. And that's, actually we don't have it because most of the religious people intimidated by the radical Muslim, like Bin Laden and things because they, they will tell him, "Go back to the, the origin or to the real Islam".

Lowell: Yes.

Mohammed: So this is the problem among Muslim more than between the Muslim and the, the West. And because now it's poli-, it's politics, that's why the West becoming the enemy number one. Because, uh, they feel that the, you know, the democracy of the West will, will overrule or will dominate the, the Muslim countries. That's why they, they are desperate to fight the Western countries. Because they feel that they are the, the main, uh, challenge for, for their backward beliefs. So I don't think you can understand anything from Qur'an because –

Lowell: Well, well, we do. But, but –

Mohammed: It contradicts itself actually.

Lowell: Well, what, we can't, excuse me, sir. What, it seems clear to me that we can understand is that it certainly leaves itself open –

Mohammed: Yeah.

Lowell: -- to a lot of the radicals to use it as their sword and their shield.

Mohammed: Exactly. So, so actually I think –

Lowell: Just, just as the, as the Christian Bible did in earlier days.

Mohammed: Exactly.

Lowell: Yeah.

Mohammed: So, I, what I think is, is that, uh, well, the circumstances actually played a big role in, in these verses. So, when, uh, in the beginning, he needed, like, the, the Jewish and, uh, Christian people because, uh, he took most of the, the Qur'an is most, uh, you read the Qur'an, most of it is from the, the Old and New Testament. It's almost similar. But later on, it, uh, became, like, more, um, uh, more, uh, it, by itself.

Lowell: Well, sir, the only, I haven't read it all obviously, but, uh, I see it mentions Moses, that threw his stick and it became a serpent. That obviously is part of the Christian faith. The, the thing, there's, I mean, there's a radical departure between the Old and New Testaments in the Christian faith, as you know.

Mohammed: Yeah.

Lowell: I mean, the Old Testament, essentially is a history of the Jewish peoples. And it's

very violent. But the New Testament essentially is saying, hey, you know, you have heard it said an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth, but I say unto you, you know, if a man strike you on the right cheek, turn to the left.

Mohammed: Yeah.

Lowell: In other words, listen, no, what we want, what God really wants is love, charity and forgiveness.

Mohammed: Exactly. That's –

Lowell: That's, but I don't s-, I don't see that from what I have seen in the Qur'an.

Mohammed: Yeah, yeah, especially, well, 50 years ago, we had this version of Islam. You, but since Khomeini, you know Khomeini in Iran and became politics –

Lowell: Yes.

Mohammed: – and then Bin Laden Al-Qaeda took over, it became very aggressive. It became very, very –

Lowell: Now did the Qur'an change or was it just the interpretation?

Mohammed: No, that, that's what, because there are a lot of contradiction in Islam, so if you look it from one angle, it's a very, you know, merciful, it, it, because, uh, there's one, one, one sura in Qur'an, says, he's citing certain peoples, certain tribe, he said they became Muslim and then they deserted Islam and then they became Muslim again and then deserted Islam and God is the greatest merci-, you know, so he didn't mention killing them. But on the other hand, you just I think mentioned that everyone –

Lowell: Yeah.

Mohammed: – or every Muslim who deserts Islam –

Lowell: So what you're saying is that there's a sort of a more radical element that is taking this, the more violent aspects of the Qur'an, and espousing that. Sir, it's been a very interesting conversation. I thank you for calling.

Mohammed: You're welcome.

Lowell: Thank you, sir. Uh, let's go to, uh, Carl in Luskville. Uh, Carl, you're on CFRA, good morning.

Carl: Good morning, Lowell.

Lowell: Yes, sir?

Carl: Yeah, um, uh, let's see, where to start? Uh, yeah, I have a comment in regards to, uh, you said in the Qur'an it talks about, uh, an enmity between the Jews and the Christians and the Muslims.

Lowell: Very clearly.

Carl: Right. Well, throughout Christian prosecution of the Jews during, you know, the, back in the Middle Ages and whatnot, it was actually the Muslims that were protecting the, the Jews for most of, you know, –

Lowell: Sir, there, you know, there, there, hist-, history has many twists and turns.

Carl: Of course it does.

Lowell: All I am telling you is that this is the book that is obviously being used by some radical Muslims who, as I say, they're, they're using it both as their sword and their shield.

Carl: Mm hm.

Lowell: That's what's, that's seem, and this last Muslim caller agreed with me.

Carl: Oh, I agree with you as well.

Lowell: Yeah. So whatever, whatever history says, sir, the book is still there and obviously I believe it, it's being misused by some people.

Carl: Yeah, but he, I also believe too it's, it's being misused in the media as well because we're gettin' –

Lowell: In what way?

Carl: – misinterpretations sometimes. It's out of context.

Lowell: Uh, where, wh-, I don't, I don't recall ever having seen that, sir. What, in what regard?

Carl: Well, um, you stated earlier something in regards to, um, anybody that, that if they, if the non-believe, the non-believers, right?

Lowell: Mm hm.

Carl: If, uh, they don't believe then they'll be all killed. We have to remember that this God of the, of the Jews, the Christians and the Muslims, is all the same God. So, Allah is the same God to the Jews as it is to the Christians.

Lowell: Well, very clearly the, uh, the Qur'an doesn't agree with that, sir. The, the Qur'an talks about believers and non-believers, uh, throughout it. In fact –

Carl: Right. But these –

Lowell: – they even –

Carl: – believers is all believers all in one God.

Lowell: No, actually they, uh, er, I'm even reading another one here where it very specifically talks about the Jews. Uh, "They, the Jews, quraysh pagans, idolaters did not estimate Allah with an estimation due to him." So very clearly they're making, the, the Qur'an makes the definition, sir. I, I'm just reading you what's there. Uh, got to take a break. We'll be back. CFRA.

-commercial break

Lowell: Uh, Roshdie, you're on CFRA, good morning. [background noise] Go ahead, please. Okay, all right. We'll move on then. Uh, Richard, you're on CFRA, good morning.

Richard: Hi, Lowell.

Lowell: Yes, sir?

Richard: I, I looked back into the Old Testament in Deuteronomy. In 13:711 it says that if you're asked to join another religion, you shall kill them. You shall stone them to death.

Lowell: Yeah, that's in the Old Testament.

Richard: Yes.

Lowell: Now, obviously that –

Richard: Okay.

Lowell: The Christ-, the founder of the Christian faith says no, don't do that.

Richard: But why do we have it in our Christian Bible? That they have that in there.

Lowell: Well, because the Old Testament essentially is the history of the Jewish peoples and their beliefs. The, we are Christians, we, this, you know, so our faith was founded with the birth of Jesus who very clearly says, look, that's not the way it should be. It's love, forgiveness.

Richard: But I have Bible-spouters comin' to me –

Lowell: Mm hm.

Richard: – who are spouting Old Testament to me.

Lowell: Well, that's fine.

Richard: And, and if they really bel-, I mean, you're talkin' about not bringing in Muslims because they believe this. We should then not bring any, uh, fundamentalist Christians in who believe –

Lowell: Well, sir –

Richard: – in the Old Testament.

Lowell: They, the problem is is that fundamentalist Christians are not suicide bombers these days.

Richard: Well [chuckles], you got the one guy who's goin' out onto the, you know, he's maybe not a Christian in that sense, but –

Lowell: No, but, but sir –

Richard: – he's down on the ice –

Lowell: No, but you're not, no, but you're dealing with this far too lightly. I mean, the, the

world is under attack. They killed over 3000 people in New York.

Richard: I think we got the third world war goin' right now.

Lowell: But, sir, who is the war with? It's not with fundamentalist Christians.

Richard: But the fundamentalist Christians are part of the problem. Because –

Lowell: That, we're, we're not at war with fundamentalist Christians.

Richard: We aren't, but the Muslims are.

Lowell: Well, if they are it's because –

Richard: The Muslims are in, in, in –

Lowell: No.

Richard: – full pursuit of the fundamentalist Christians –

Lowell: No, sir, the Muslims are in full pursuit, uh, uh, radical Muslims are in full pursuit of even of their own people. I mean, they're killing fellow Muslims.

Richard: But I think that the reason they are is because you go back to the Crusades all, all told and what's going on today and it's the radical Christians that are causing the Muslims to do what they're doin'.

Lowell: I don't believe it for a moment, sir. Uh, let's talk to George. You're on CFRA, George.

George: Yeah, hi, how are you, sir?

Lowell: Go ahead, sir, right to the topic.

George: Yeah, I'm really glad that you're giving this opportunity –

Lowell: Right on to the topic, sir.

George: Uh, yeah, sorry. I, my name is George, I lived in Egypt, I'm Catholic Christian.

Lowell: All right.

George: But the difficulty –

Lowell: Right.

George: – [??] to be –

Lowell: Sir, George, we, I'm sorry, we got a really bad line here. Could you phone me back on a, on a better line? People just can't hear what you're saying. Roshdie, we're going to try you again, sir.

Roshdie: Okay, I'm here.

Lowell: Yeah?

Roshdie: I just wanted to tell you we, if you're going to do this, if you're going to open the Qur'an and start, uh, interpreting it on, on the air, the, the least you should do is to have with you someone, caller, that can really give you better understanding. Because people who are calling you don't have enough knowledge. And you don't really have even the, the, uh, the skills of talking on the air. Like you –

Lowell: Well, are you suggesting that, that everybody, including in the Muslim world, who reads this, uh, has the skills to interpret it, sir?

Roshdie: No, but the, but actually –

Lowell: But isn't that one of the problems?

Roshdie: In controversial issues like this –

Lowell: Mm hm.

Roshdie: – we listen to this caller and this callers when they interpret these things –

Lowell: Mm hm?

Roshdie: They don't just –

Lowell: Well, I don't see what's, I mean, they, the, the verses from the Qur'an, no one has attempted to interpret them. We've just read them and taken them literally.

Roshdie: No, it, it doesn't work that way.

Lowell: Well, I'm sorry, sir. If you, if you read a verse, that's what the verse says.

Roshdie: I read it. I read it and it doesn't tell me that. It doesn't tell me that if you are a Muslim and you change your faith, you're going to be killed. It doesn't tell me that.

Lowell: Well, the Mus-, the, the Qur'an says that.

Roshdie: No, it doesn't say that.

Lowell: Well, of course it does.

Roshdie: No. That's, that's why, I mean, it's very dangerous to –

Lowell: Well, how can you say it doesn't, sir?

Roshdie: – [??] when it does not.

Lowell: How can you say that it doesn't when it does?

Roshdie: Because, actually, this, this war was the beginning of, of Islam. The, the Muslim were actually the very weak and the very poor. And they were very weak and they were, and God gives them, uh, permission to defend themselves. That is the basis, that is the only permission to fight back.

Lowell: But, sir, but sir –

Roshdie: That's all.

Lowell: But, sir, I, all I've done is read what the Qur'an itself says in that regard.

Roshdie: The way they do it, sir, is they take, if you want to look at the issue if –

Lowell: All right, let me read it to you again, sir.

Roshdie: No, no, no. I, I know what, what it is.

Lowell: Well, don't, don't you –

Roshdie: If you want us to take the issue –

Lowell: What does it say?

Roshdie: If you want to take the issue of [?], you have to get everything in, in the context. All of the –

Lowell: Sir, I'm reading the whole verse. Quote, "They wish that you reject faith as they have rejected faith."

Roshdie: Under what conditions did this happen? Under what conditions?

Lowell: "And thus, thus that you have all become equal like one another."

Roshdie: Under what conditions?

Lowell: "So take not protectors or friends from them 'til they emigrate in the way of Allah to Muhammad. But if they turn back from Islam, take hold of them –"

Roshdie: No, it doesn't say that.

Lowell: "– and kill them –"

Roshdie: It doesn't say –

Lowell: "– wherever you find them and take neither protectors or friends nor helpers from them."

Roshdie: When are you just going to keep going? I'm reading it. In fact, it doesn't, it doesn't mention the word Islam in Arabic at all. It, it doesn't mention the Muhammad or, or Islam or being of a different faith or any of that stuff at all.

Lowell: Well –

Roshdie: It doesn't say that. I must know. I'm telling you that's –

Lowell: Sir –

Roshdie: – that's not my understanding.

Lowell: Well, sir –

Roshdie: And my understanding is the one that really counts.

Lowell: Well, what is your, what is your understanding of that verse?

Roshdie: My understanding, they are actually in the context of, of, of a war and you are gonna be wiped out.

Lowell: Wh-, a war against whom?

Roshdie: W-, war against the, the [?] people that lived at the time.

Lowell: No, there was a war against, it's a war, it's a war against non-believers.

Roshdie: No! [??]

Lowell: All right, so it's, so, so what, who –

Roshdie: [??]

Lowell: So whoever it is they are, they're in a war against, sir, does it not say "kill them if they leave the faith"?

Roshdie: No, it doesn't say that.

Lowell: Well what does it say?

Roshdie: It doesn't say "leave the faith".

Lowell: What does it say?

Roshdie: Those, those are the people actually, they come to stop the, the spread of, of the word of God. That's how to interpret it and sometimes they try to pick them by saying "we are Muslim" and stuff like that, and, but we are not. So, it would be –

Lowell: Then, sir, let me ask you this. Roshdie? Okay?

Roshdie: Yeah?

Lowell: Then, if in fact that's not what this chapter says, why is it that so many clerics in Afghanistan were adamant demanding that the man who, who switched from Muslim to Christian faith be killed?

Roshdie: I don't [?].

Lowell: But, sir, they're the imams. These are the clerics. You're, you're accusing me of not having experts. Are not the clerics the experts?

Roshdie: Not of, of, the Afghanistan –

Lowell: You are, but they are not?

Roshdie: [??]

Lowell: You are, but they are not.

Roshdie: And they are, they are, uh, uh, [?]. There are a lot of things that they are doing wrong. Like go, for example, to the [?] and talk to them. And, and you won't find any of them [??].

Lowell: I, I hope not, sir.

Roshdie: Okay.

Lowell: But all I'm –

Roshdie: Or, or the entire Eastern world –

Lowell: Sir, let, would you, sir –

Roshdie: [??]

Lowell: Excuse me. Excuse me.

Roshdie: Yes?

Lowell: We're running short of time. Excuse me. Is it not true –

Roshdie: Mm hm?

Lowell: – that there are many radical Muslims –

Roshdie: Absolutely.

Lowell: Excuse me. Who are using verses like this as an excuse to kill?

Roshdie: Yes.

Lowell: Thank you, sir. That's all the point I'm trying to make here.

Roshdie: No, no –

Lowell: Timothy, you're on CFRA. Good morning.

Timothy: Hi, Lowell.

Lowell: Yes, sir? Quickly please.

Timothy: I believe that, uh, [?] more than I believe, like, the New and Old Testaments are inspired by reading them literally and bigottedly. But, if you go to, uh, if you have a Bible at home, it might be good to check out, uh, John 16.

Lowell: All right, sir. Uh, Asad in Orleans, you're on CFRA. Good morning. Go ahead, please. Let's go. We're running out of time, sir. Asad? Please go ahead, sir.

Asad: Yes, sir. The copy of the Qur'an you are reading –

Lowell: Uh huh?

Asad: – actually, there are not too many people, when they become educated, highly educated, they interpret the Qur'an their own way.

Lowell: Mm hm. Well, this was co-, this was interpreted by –

Asad: [??] own way. But I can tell you just –

Lowell: Well, sir, before you go further –

Asad: [??].

Lowell: Stop the nonsense, okay? This, excuse me, sir. This, this, this is the, this is the interpretation that has been approved by King Fahd in Saudi Arabia, sir. It's the official version that was done in 1420.

Asad: Yes. But I don't [??]. There is a different meaning, interpretations are there. And you know the true followers, if you [?] the [?] of the Qur'an, you will think they are [?] copying of the Prophet.

Lowell: Sir. Fine. Sir.

Asad: [?] copy of the Prophet!

Lowell: Sir. Asad, is it not true that radical Muslims are using this as an excuse to kill?

Asad: Yes.

Lowell: That's what we're talking about, sir.

Asad: They are, they are. But they are not the believers Muslims.

Lowell: Well, that –

Asad: You know there are [?]. In every nation there are evil, there are non-believers.

Lowell: So, sir, are you telling me that the clerics in Afghanistan, they are non-believers?

Asad: Yes, they can be.

Lowell: Okay. We'll be back on CFRA, sir.

APPENDIX B

CBSC Decision 05/06-1380 CFRA-AM re an episode of the *Lowell Green Show* (the Qur'an)

The Complaint

The following complaint was sent to the CRTC on March 31, 2006 and forwarded to the CBSC in due course:

CFRA, Friday, March 31, 2006. *Lowell Green Show*.

Mr. Green tacitly incited hate by blatantly suggesting believers in the Qur'an are a physical threat to Canadians because of their belief in the Qur'an. He purposely juxtaposed the Qur'an to The New Testament (NT) claiming that the NT does not ever support whimsical or religious based killing, unlike the Qur'an. He used this to clearly separate the two faiths in an effort to incite hate towards one particular group based upon their religious beliefs. This is not acceptable for any public broadcaster.

Here is a copy of a letter I have mailed to Mr. Green & CFRA:

Mr. Green,

Today you claimed the New Testament, unlike the Qur'an, does not contain passages which support whimsical murder.

Let's take a look at Mark 7:1-13. Jesus accused the Pharisees of "neglecting the commandment of God" so they could "hold to the tradition of men" (7:8). They set "aside the commandment of God in order to keep [their] tradition" (7:9). The commandments Jesus was referring to were OT commandments: "For Moses said, 'Honor your father and your mother'; and, 'He who speaks evil of father or mother, let him be put to death'" (7:10). Here we see Jesus applying Exodus 21:17 and Leviticus 20:9 in a NT context. The same account is found in Matthew 15:1-14, the same NT book where you claim there are no references to faith based killing. Therefore, according to the New Testament, Jesus believed anyone who speaks evil of their parents should be killed ... well, isn't that nice of you Jesus. Obviously Canada is under threat of Christians who support their God. I suspect this passage would pose at least as much threat as any found within the Qur'an. Just quoting the good book here, Lowell, not making this up.

Yes, the Qur'an, as an ancient text, is derived from a time far different from ours. It does include passages which support killing non-believers and converts; however, the New Testament is certainly not without its own convictions of death. As well, like in all of your one-sided ceterus [sic] paribus arguments, you entirely ignore context. As the New Testament is an evolution of the beliefs put forth by God himself, as is the modern Muslim an evolution of the days in which the Qur'an was revealed. True believers (in all religions) understand the failings of literal following. These holy books are texts, not isolated paragraphs. Today you revealed your ignorance of your own religion more than any inherent threat contained within the Qur'an. You are either a fool, or a very sad excuse for a man. Considering your daily following and local "celebrity" status, I suspect the latter.

Broadcaster's Response

CFRA sent the following response on April 7:

Further to your CRTC correspondence (CFRA, March 31, 2006 – Reference 295592) and CBSC file C05/06-1380:

Respectfully, if you heard the entire Lowell Green program, you will be well aware that the discussion centred very specifically and exclusively around those people who consider it acceptable to kill a person who has converted from the Muslim faith to Christianity.

That is the position taken by extremists in volatile parts of the world, the profile of which was raised most notably by the case of Abdul Rahman in Afghanistan, where the Muslim-led parliament demanded that Mr. Rahman be put to death instead of being allowed to travel out of the country for refuge in Italy. Given the constitution of Afghanistan and the very public demands of the death penalty for converting to Christianity, it is not unreasonable to conclude that such extremists do indeed pose a physical threat -- particularly to converts. This is an international story, and it is entirely appropriate to discuss this issue as a matter of public concern in Canada.

Throughout the program, Lowell made it abundantly clear he was addressing only the extremists who want to emigrate into Canada, and who support the practice of executing Muslim-Christian converts. Not surprisingly, Muslim callers agreed that such extremists should not be allowed to import their extremist views into Canada, and that Canada has every right to pose the question.

There is no need for you to defend the Qur'an "as an ancient text, derived from a time far different from ours." Mr. Green did not attack the Qur'an -- indeed he has often praised the Prophet Muhammad as a visionary man of true love and peace. Mr. Green was dealing only with those who interpret passages literally, to call for putting Christian converts to death in 2006, not in "ancient times."

Mr. Green did not suggest "all believers in the Qur'an are a physical threat to Canadians because of their belief in the Qur'an." It is clear throughout the program that he never said or implied any such thing. Nor did he breach any provisions of broadcast regulations or codes. It is regrettable that you missed his point.

To delve into your personal interpretations of biblical passages is not germane to the matter at hand. If extremist Christians were to begin rioting in the streets demanding the execution of converts to Islam, it would be appropriate to further delve into their extremism as well. Of course even under such circumstances, Mr. Green would make it just as clear that he is not referring to all Christians, but rather those who harbour extremist and violent views.

Additional Correspondence

The complainant replied to CFRA on April 7 and provided a copy of that e-mail to the CBSC:

Thank you for your response.

Unfortunately your explanation entirely fails to address the purpose of Mr. Green juxtaposing the Qur'an to the New Testament. As you yourself have already stated in defence of Mr. Green, the New Testament or its interpretations are not germane to the discussion you claim

was being introduced by Mr. Green. Yet it was he who stated, matter-of-factly, that unlike the Qur'an, the New Testament does not condone faith-based killing.

Therefore it is reasonable to believe that the intention was to draw a distinction between faiths. It is reasonable to foresee this could, whether or not intentionally so, incite hate or fear within one (majority) group towards or for another (minority) group. This is a time of great upheaval, a time in which Canadian soldiers are dying in a Muslim country. It is important for public broadcasters to frame public comments with a consideration for the perils of the times.

As Mr. Green, for reasons only he can explain, chose to introduce this comparison, I feel his judgment, and role as a public broadcaster requires further review by the CBSC.

I did not hear the entire broadcast of this discussion. Like, I am sure, the vast number of those who listen to your station, I was in my car when tuned to CFRA. If 35 minutes of a publicly broadcasted discussion does not provide sufficient context, then possibly the selection or content of your topics of discussion should be more stringently considered before being introduced into your chosen format.

Thank you for your time and consideration of my concerns,

Please note this clean link, as it best demonstrates the foundation for my concerns surrounding the comments of Mr. Green. I no longer believe Mr. Green necessarily intended to incite hate. <http://www.beyondintractability.org/essay/dehumanization/>

excerpts from above site

"An enemy image is a negative stereotype through which the opposing group is viewed as evil, in contrast to one's own side, which is seen as good. Such images can stem from a desire for group identity and a need to contrast the distinctive attributes and virtues of one's own group with the vices of the 'outside' group. In some cases, evil-ruler enemy images form. While ordinary group members are regarded as neutral, or perhaps even innocent, their leaders are viewed as hideous monsters. Enemy images are usually black and white. The negative actions of one's opponent are thought to reflect their fundamental evil nature, traits, or motives. One's own faults, as well as the values and motivations behind the actions of one's opponent, are usually discounted, denied, or ignored. It becomes difficult to empathize or see where one's opponent is coming from. Meaningful communication is unlikely, and it becomes difficult to perceive any common ground.

"Once formed, enemy images tend to resist change, and serve to perpetuate and intensify the conflict. Because the adversary has come to be viewed as a 'diabolical enemy,' the conflict is framed as a war between good and evil. Once the parties have framed the conflict in this way, their positions become more rigid. In some cases, zero-sum thinking develops as parties come to believe that they must either secure their own victory, or face defeat. New goals to punish or destroy the opponent arise, and in some cases more militant leadership comes into power.

"While deindividuation and the formation of enemy images are very common, they form a dangerous process that becomes especially damaging when it reaches the level of dehumanization.

"Once certain groups are stigmatized as evil, morally inferior, and not fully human, the persecution of those groups becomes more psychologically acceptable. Restraints against aggression and violence begin to disappear. Not surprisingly, dehumanization increases the likelihood of violence and may cause a conflict to escalate out of control. Once a violence break over [*sic*] has occurred, it may seem even more acceptable for people to do things that they would have regarded as morally unthinkable before.

"Indeed, dehumanization often paves the way for human rights violations, war crimes, and genocide. For example, in WWII, the dehumanization of the Jews ultimately led to the destruction of millions of people. Similar atrocities have occurred in Rwanda, Cambodia, and the former Yugoslavia."

Or the creation of Japanese Internment camps in Canada ... we all know what they say about history.

CFRA provided a second response to the complainant on April 10:

Thank you for acknowledging that Lowell did not mean to incite hatred. The argument then centres around whether he unintentionally incited hatred, and unequivocally, he did not.

No, it is not reasonable to conclude that Lowell's comments would incite hatred or fear toward all Muslims, as you posit. I have received advice from a biblical scholar who says your examples are so far out of context and so weakly interpreted that they add no weight to your argument. Again, however, debating the Bible and your interpretation of it is side-track which our correspondence will not resolve.

The fact remains that the issue at hand is that some extremists are interpreting the Qur'an literally and using that to justify the execution of Muslim-to-Christian converts. Even if your argument about the Bible were to hold true (which the expert I consulted says it does not), the argument becomes moot because it is not being interpreted literally, nor is it being used by Christians to justify killing people for faith conversion.

To suggest that asking the questions about extremism somehow "dehumanizes" all Muslims is folly. No reasonable person would fear (nor hate) all Muslims because a specific extremist group among them mis-uses the holy writings to justify killing converts. Lowell made it clear throughout that he was referring to that very specific group of extremists, and not to all believers.

Lowell's discussion was timely. He made it clear that he was not discussing all Muslims. His examination of a very specific group of people (extremists) was appropriate. And there was no breach of any codes or regulations.

I'm sorry that we disagree, but unless there are new issues to review, this will -- respectfully -- conclude our correspondence on this matter.

The complainant wrote again to CFRA on April 10:

To be perfectly clear:

1. It is not the interpretation of the New Testament, it is the comparing of the New Testament to the Qur'an, which placed the Qur'an in a morally inferior light, to which I have taken issue. You have in no way addressed this concern.

2. I did not say Mr. Green did not intend to incite hate, I said I do not believe he NECESSARILY intended to incite hate. I cannot knowingly speak to Lowell's intentions. His actions are, however, suspect.

The complainant then submitted his Ruling Request on April 10 with the following additional comments:

Unfortunately CFRA refuses to, or does not understand the point of my complaint. My concern centres not at all on the Qur'an itself, or the New Testament itself. My concern is the juxtaposing of one religious text to another in order to highlight a key difference in that the Qur'an, which represents a targeted minority in Canada, preaches murder, and the New Testament, which represents the entrenched majority, does not. I am of neither religion, and could honestly care less about religion at all. I do care that history has shown that hate is promoted by isolating the minority through differentiating them from the majority in a way which clearly demonizes the minority. If, as CFRA claims, the discussion Mr. Green was having had nothing to do with the New Testament, but only the Qur'an, why did he compare the two? What was the motivation of the comparison? It is only reasonable to conclude that some may take advantage of such obviously irresponsible and erroneous comments to vilify the minority, while using their own religion as a pillar of higher morality. A clear moral delineation among cultures. This is how hate works; the weight of evidence to support my concerns is overwhelming. I trust the CBSC has the breadth of experience and arms length relationship to draw a similar conclusion. I am not seeking a ban on the topic being discussed by Mr. Green; it is a topic of legitimate concern. His introduction of the New Testament as a clear separation of faiths is my concern. Muslims in this country are already at risk of hate due to current geo-political circumstances; juxtaposing their faith to the majority faith in a negative way is anything but constructive or exploratory to the discussion of the topic raised.

I have made two attempts to explain my concerns to CFRA, however they are focused more upon the accuracy of my interpretation of the NT than the purpose in the comparing of the Qur'an to the New Testament.

I feel VERY strongly about this. I have never complained to the CBSC before, and I assure you Mr. Green and I do not see eye to eye on many topics. This is not about political differences; this is not about a grudge; this is about the tacit promotion of hate in a very sensitive environment.

Point blank: Why the comparison? CFRA never addressed this central concern.

CFRA wrote again to the complainant on April 11:

1. Lowell's comparison of the Bible and the Qur'an was based on his interpretation and he is perfectly free to do so [*sic*]. Whether your interpretation and his are similar is irrelevant. The phones were open and people of all views were invited to participate. Everyone was afforded opportunity to present their opinions and interpretations. Very divergent views have been presented on CFRA to a reasonably consistent listener over a reasonable period of time. (That is the requirement -- verbatim -- contained in the regulations.) Lowell handled this polemic issue entirely within the bounds of regulations and codes.

2. Thank you for clarifying your use of the qualifier "necessarily." As you can see from my reply that is the interpretation I afforded your original statement.

The complainant replied to that e-mail the same day:

For clarity [S.], these are your words:

"Thank you for acknowledging that Lowell did not mean to incite hatred." I did not say this. Twice you have put words into my mouth, or failed to fully read or comprehend my statements.

"The argument then centers around whether he unintentionally incited hatred..." No, it does not. The argument centers around whether or not Lowell's comments could reasonably incite hate. As I stated already, I am unable to know why Lowell chose to inject into the debate his opinion that, unlike the Qur'an, the NT does not condone faith based murder. History is rife with Christians committing faith based atrocities. Why Lowell attempts to dismiss this fact in an effort to further an opinion that, in reality, there is only a "risk" posed by literal translation of the Qur'an is sheer folly, and potentially hate-mongering. As such his intentions are certainly suspect but, albeit, not clear.

If you no longer wish to discuss this topic, please refrain from putting words into my mouth, thus requiring my response.

I am continuing my complaint with the CBSC.

CFRA replied again on April 11:

I will try to simplify this. I did not write that statement twice, I wrote it once, and have since acknowledged your semantic clarification, i.e. your belief that he did not "necessarily" intend to incite hatred.

I have presented CFRA's views to you. We will unfortunately not agree on these matters, so our further correspondence will now be directed to the CBSC.

CFRA then sent a letter directly to the CBSC on April 13:

Enclosed please find two CD copies of the *Lowell Green Show* at the centre of the above-noted complaint, along with my original response to the complainant. While I believe there is no code-relevant aspect to his complaint, it seems [the complainant] is unwilling or unable to accept CFRA's position on this matter.

He has tried to side-track the issue by debating whether the New Testament condones faith-based killing, and by debating the semantics of his words in our email exchanges. While [the complainant]'s personal comments ("*Like Lowell, I cannot know your intentions ... but they too are suspect*") and ("*I fear there is some form of comprehension challenge facing you at this time*") may be amusing, they make it clear this matter will not be resolved through direct dialogue.

I referred the excerpts cited in [the complainant]'s original complaint to the attention of John Counsell, a part-time CFRA host, an ordained Christian minister and accomplished bible scholar. His response to [the complainant]'s position:

"... his take is absolutely laughable and betrays a total lack of respect and understanding of Christ's words and the context in which they are used.

Christ is quoting from the Old Testament an extreme example of how the Old

Testament uses profoundly strong language to teach respect of one's parents, he does this in order to expose the Pharisees' lack of respect of parents by showing that they think their small acts of kindness towards their parents are enough to please God. They are clearly not. To use this reasoning you would also assume when Jesus said if your right eye causes you to sin, pluck it out, if your right hand causes you to sin, cut it off ... he was not advocating a new movement "amputees for Christ". The contextual lesson is obvious: "sin is dangerous, take drastic measures to keep it out of your life." He often used irony (a very popular, and recognized form of humour at the time) to drive home profound truths. Other examples "take the plank out of your own eye before you take the speck out of someone else's eye."

To suggest that Christ is advocating some type of faith-based murder is ludicrous! Matthew 5, 6 and 7 (the sermon on the mount) Christ cites law after Old Testament law in which he teaches love, forgiveness, etc. Specifically: Matt. 5:21, 22 (look it up)"

To the central issue of the complaint, then: It is not reasonable to conclude that Lowell's comments would incite hatred or fear toward all Muslims, as [the complainant] argues.

The fact remains that there has been extensive news coverage of some extremists who interpret the Qur'an *literally* and use that to *justify the execution of Muslim-to-Christian converts*. Even if [the complainant]'s argument about the Bible were to hold true (which it does not), the argument becomes moot because it is not being interpreted literally, nor is it being used by Christians to justify killing people for faith conversion. The government of Afghanistan wanted to put a convert to death, and Lowell asked callers whether it was appropriate to ask newcomers to Canada whether they support the idea of putting a person to death for converting from Islam to any other faith. Even his *Muslim callers* this day and others agreed that it is a fair question, and that Canada has a right to pose it to immigration applicants.

[The complainant]'s suggestion that merely asking questions about extremism somehow "dehumanizes" all Muslims is folly. No reasonable person would fear (nor hate) all Muslims because a specific extremist group among them mis-uses the holy writings to justify killing converts. Lowell made it clear throughout that he was referring to that very specific group of extremists, and not to all believers. He has done this as standard procedure whenever he talks about sensitive race- or creed-related topics.

Lowell's discussion was timely. This was a legitimate matter in newspapers, on TV and radio newscasts. He made it clear that he was not discussing all Muslims. His examination of a very specific group of people (extremists) was appropriate. And there was no breach of any codes or regulations.

I look forward to your decision.

CFRA sent an additional letter to the CBSC on May 9 after the station was informed that the complaint was being sent for adjudication:

Enclosed please find the requested CD copies of the *Lowell Green Show* at the centre of the above-noted complaint, along with my original response to the complainant. CFRA maintains there has been no breach of any code or regulations.

The complainant has tried to side-track the issue by debating whether the New Testament condones faith-based killing.

I referred the quotations (used to support the complaint) to the attention of [...], an ordained

Christian minister and accomplished bible scholar. His response to [the complainant]'s position:

“... his take ... betrays a total lack of respect and understanding of Christ's words and the context in which they are used.

Christ is quoting from the Old Testament an extreme example of how the Old Testament uses profoundly strong language to teach respect of one's parents, he does this in order to expose the Pharisees' lack of respect of parents by showing that they think their small acts of kindness towards their parents are enough to please God. They are clearly not. To use this reasoning you would also assume when Jesus said if your right eye causes you to sin, pluck it out, if your right hand causes you to sin, cut it off ... (He was not being literal.) The contextual lesson is obvious: “sin is dangerous, take drastic measures to keep it out of your life.” He often used irony (a very popular, and recognized form ... at the time) to drive home profound truths. Other examples “take the plank out of your own eye before you take the speck out of someone else's eye.”

To suggest that Christ is advocating some type of faith-based murder is ludicrous! Matthew 5, 6 and 7 (the sermon on the mount) Christ cites law after Old Testament law in which he teaches love, forgiveness, etc. Specifically: Matt. 5:21, 22.”

To the central issue of the complaint, then: It is not reasonable to conclude that Lowell's comments would incite hatred or fear toward **all** Muslims, as [the complainant] argues.

The fact remains that there has been extensive news coverage of some extremists who interpret the Qur'an *literally* and use that to *justify the execution of Muslim-to-Christian converts*. Even if [the complainant]'s argument about the Bible were to hold true (which it does not), the argument becomes moot because this Christian text is not being interpreted literally, nor is it being used by Christians to justify killing people for faith conversion. The government of Afghanistan wanted to put a convert to death, and Lowell asked callers whether it was appropriate to ask newcomers to Canada whether they support the idea of putting a person to death for converting from Islam to any other faith. Even his Muslim callers this day and others agreed that it is a fair question, and that Canada has a right to pose it to immigration applicants.

We do not share [the complainant]'s argument that merely asking questions about extremism somehow “dehumanizes” all Muslims. No reasonable person would fear (nor hate) all Muslims because a specific extremist group among them mis-uses the holy writings to justify killing converts. In the *Letters* section of the *Ottawa Citizen* May 9, 2006, Muslim writer M. Husain Sadar writes (“Canadian Muslims must stop hijacking of their Faith”):

... there is sinful silence adopted by other Muslims, including most of us in North America. Unfortunately this leaves the field wide open for some fly-by-night kind of Organizations, especially the Canadian Islamic Congress, to issue outrageous statements to get self-publicity

... terrorists, especially al-qaeda and its supporters too often use the “Islamic umbrella” to justify killing innocent people ...

... Muslims need to ask themselves: “how can we claim that Islam stands for peace when some of its followers are engaged in death and destruction on an hourly basis?”

Clearly, most *Muslims* are reasonable and moderate, and have no problem rooting out extremist views to improve understanding and relations with other Canadians. This is illustrated by many letters to the editor such as Mr. Sadar's, and by numerous Muslim participants in CFRA open-line programs. No reasonable person would argue that such opinions are racist or discriminatory, or that people should be prohibited from expressing them.

Even if Mr. Green's personal opinion of the Bible and Qur'an comparisons were faulty, he is entitled to them, and callers are always welcome to call and challenge those opinions. Lowell was asking the public whether it would be reasonable to ask immigrants whether they felt it was acceptable to kill Christian converts. The very fact that Muslim Canadians have supported these and other steps to root out extremism in their midst is concrete proof that such a discussion is in no way *abusively discriminatory*.

Lowell made it clear throughout that he was referring to that very specific group of extremists, and not to all believers. He has done this as standard procedure whenever he talks about sensitive race- or creed-related topics.

Lowell's discussion was timely. This was a legitimate matter in newspapers, on TV and radio newscasts. He made it clear that he was not discussing *all* Muslims. His examination of a very specific group of people (extremists) was appropriate. Respectfully, we believe there was no breach of any codes or regulations.

I look forward to your decision.