

## Washington Post's Disturbing Hostility to Daniel Pipes

A **thread on LGF** discusses President Bush's appointment of **Daniel Pipes** to the Board of the new **Institute of Peace**. The moderate (i.e. anti-idiotarian) Islamic **Pakistan Today**, wholeheartedly **approves**:

American Muslims welcome the nomination of Daniel Pipes, a scholar of militant Islam and director of the Middle East Forum, by President Bush to serve on the board of the US Institute of Peace. They note in particular his care to distinguish between the minority of Islamists and the majority of normal, patriotic Muslims.

Many moderate American Muslims, frustrated by and angry at the extremist policies of militant Islamist organizations in the US and their efforts to portray themselves as the sole voice of Islam, have welcomed the nomination of Daniel Pipes

So do we. By contrast, the Washington Post **condemns the choice**:

Many Muslims received the news that the White House had nominated scholar Daniel Pipes to, of all places, the U.S. Institute of Peace as sort of a cruel joke.

It urges Congress to rescind the appointment, accusing Pipes of seeming

to harbor a "disturbing hostility to contemporary Muslims."

Consider the logic of these two opposite spins on what American Muslims think. If Pakistan Today is right, then the WaPo is opposing moderate Muslims and siding with "militant Islamist organizations in the US and their efforts to portray themselves as the sole voice of Islam". If the WaPo is right, then the American Muslims quoted in Pakistan Today's editorial are themselves extremists: Muslims with a disturbing hostility to contemporary Muslims? But they characterise most contemporary American Muslims as "normal" and "patriotic". Hmm.

Oh, of course! They are guilty of the most unforgivable of all

extremisms: support for the US Government.

UPDATE: The editor of Pakistan Today **protests** in a letter to the Washington Post:

At best, your editorial confuses Pipes's opposition to militant Islam with opposition to Islam as a whole. At worst, it reduces all Muslim opinion to an enthusiasm for a totalitarian form of the religion. Fortunately, a broader spectrum of Muslim opinion exists. Unfortunately, many anti-militant Muslims do not speak out, fearful of retribution even in the United States.

Sun, 04/20/2003 - 10:38 | [digg](#) | [del.icio.us](#) | [permalink](#)

## York University

It is interesting to note that when Daniel Pipes was invited to speak at York University, certain student groups violently prevented him from doing so on the grounds that he was a "racist", "nazi", "bigot" and no doubt in whispers "Jew". Determined not to become another Concordia (Concordia students had recently made violent attacks on Benjamin Netanyahu and sabotaged his visit. He was unable to speak and sent away) York hired armed security guards, mounted police and set up metal detectors so that Pipes could speak to a small group of students who had bought their tickets months earlier. Even then protestors were right outside the door. What is Pipes' crime? That's right, it will sound familiar: *he supports Israel*.

by [Daniel Strimpel](#) on Sun, 04/20/2003 - 18:39 | [reply](#)

## York University in the UK

To Daniel Strimpel:

Are you referring to York University in the UK? If so, when did this happen?

by a reader on Sun, 04/20/2003 - 18:45 | [reply](#)

## York University in Canada

I think it was at York University in Toronto, Canada. In January, 2003.

by [Gil](#) on Sun, 04/20/2003 - 21:17 | [reply](#)

## Not that one...

He's referring to **this** York University, in Toronto.

by a reader on Sun, 04/20/2003 - 21:21 | [reply](#)

## York Canada

Yes its the Canadian one. I think Pipes has a write up on it either on

his home page [www.danielpipes.org](http://www.danielpipes.org) or his admirable [www.campus-watch.org](http://www.campus-watch.org). Its also worth noting that Pipes, along with Martin Kramer ([www.martinkramer.org](http://www.martinkramer.org)) are at the forefront of diagnosing the state of Middle East Studies at American Universities. IMO they are both right on the mark.

by **Daniel Strimpel** on Sun, 04/20/2003 - 23:18 | [reply](#)

## Good Article

**This** is such a good article of his. The guy has real insight.

by a reader on Tue, 04/22/2003 - 15:04 | [reply](#)