

Original address: http://www.gregfelton.com/media/2008_12_09.htm

Excerpt of a 3-part article. Part 2 dealing with the complaint against Maclean's at the B.C. Human Rights Tribunal is complete.

Greg Felton was a commentator for *Canadian Arab News*.



The screenshot shows a Windows Internet Explorer browser window. The title bar reads "Propaganda, fraud and defamation were the year's big stories (again) - Windows Internet Explorer". The address bar shows the URL "http://www.gregfelton.com/media/2008_12_09.htm". The page content includes a red heading "ONE LAST LOOK BACK", a main title "Propaganda, fraud and defamation were the year's big stories (again)", the author "Canadian Arab News", and the date "December 9, 2008". The main text begins with "Year-end columns are always difficult. The desire to tie up loose ends runs up against the urge to write on new events. Alas, the bombings in Mumbai and Stephen Harper's political temper tantrum will have to wait a while longer while I look back at three stories:"

ONE LAST LOOK BACK

Propaganda, fraud and defamation were the year's big stories (again)

Canadian Arab News
December 9, 2008

Year-end columns are always difficult. The desire to tie up loose ends runs up against the urge to write on new events. Alas, the bombings in Mumbai and Stephen Harper's political temper tantrum will have to wait a while longer while I look back at three stories:

2. “Human Rights Tribunals neither good nor bad—just necessary, unfortunately” ([August 11](#); see also [July 8](#), [August 19](#))



The human rights cases against *Maclean's* this year showed the Lobby that anti-Muslim defamation tactics come with a price. (*file art*)

When I last wrote, the B.C. Human Rights Tribunal had yet to deliver its [judgment](#) on Mark Steyn's anti-Muslim diatribes in *Maclean's*. It did so on October 10, and in showed both the good and bad side of trying to hold the Lobby accountable to the law.

First, it is an axiom of logic that if evidence “A” leads to punishable offence “B,” and if “A” is recognized as true, then “B” must necessarily follow. Yet that is precisely what the tribunal did *not* do.

Despite accepting the all of the plaintiffs' arguments about the fallaciousness and defamatory nature of Steyn's piece, the tribunal managed to rule that the case did not meet the standard of defamation.

“The only explanation is that the tribunal rendered a political decision, not a legal one,” said plaintiff Khurram Awan. “It could just as easily ruled in our favour. Nevertheless, we do not plan to appeal the decision because we attained our strategic objective—to increase the cost of publishing anti-Islamic material.”

Awan said *Maclean's* spent \$500,000 alone on the B.C. case, but that does not take into account the case in Ontario. The total legal cost to *Maclean's* is somewhere around \$2 million.

Faisal Joseph, counsel for the plaintiffs, surmised that the tribunal members chickened out because they were intimidated by the propaganda campaign launched by *Maclean's* and its media acolytes. The real reason may never be known since members do not comment on decisions, but the following excerpts from the ruling should prove that the plaintiffs did, in fact, win the case.

Para 94: Dr. [Naiyer] Habib testified that, after he read the Article, he began searching the Internet for comments about, and reaction, to it. He discovered several Internet blogs referring to the Article. He was offended by their content, which included calls to exterminate European Muslims with DDT because they were multiplying like mosquitoes... calls for an end to Muslim immigration, and calls for enough bullets or nuclear bombs to eliminate the Muslim "problem."

Awan said the tribunal let *Maclean's* off because it said the magazine could not be held responsible for the content of these blogs, but that reasoning is irrelevant since it has nothing to do with the essential bigotry and incitement to violence depicted in the Steyn article.

Para 115: ...the Article's description of an Islamic conspiracy with "serious global ambitions" to dominate the world, and create what the Article calls "Eurabia," has no basis in the Qur'an or Islamic traditions. As part of their beliefs, adherents of Islam are not exhorted to conspire to take over the world. Dr. Ayoub testified that similar accusations had historically been levelled at the Jewish community.

If such calumnies against Jews are unacceptable—the Lobby still trots them out to smear those they accuse of being “anti-Semitic”—the same should hold true for non-Jews, right? Wrong:

Para 6: The panel has concluded that...the complainants have not shown that the Article rises to the level of hatred and contempt... to breach s.7(1)(b) of the [Human Rights] Code.

I leave it to you to judge the validity of the plaintiff's case, as well as the stupidity and cowardice of the tribunal's judgment.