CAIR and Hamas

In addition to their roots in the IAP, a Palestine Committee organization that served as a Hamas propaganda organ, top CAIR officials have refused to criticize Hamas, even in the wake of deadly attacks.

CAIR incorporator and current executive director Nihad Awad has publicly expressed his support for Hamas. At a symposium at Barry University in Florida on March 22, 1994, he said, “I am in support of the Hamas movement.”1 Again, on CBS’ 60 Minutes in November 1994, when Mike Wallace asked him what he thought “of the military undertakings of Hamas,” Awad responded, “the United Nations Charter grants people who are under occupation [the right] to defend themselves against illegal occupation.”2

Awad also has echoed Hamas’ absolute rejection of Israel’s legitimacy. In an April 1994 letter to the editor of The Message, an American-Muslim publication, he criticized the magazine for using the term “Israel.” “I hope,” he wrote, “that the use of ‘Israel’ in your news briefs was the result of an oversight and not intentional...Furthermore I hope you will return to the terminology ‘Occupied Palestine’ to refer to that Holy Land.”3

Awad has sought to justify these clear statements of support for Hamas in terms of their timing. In Senate testimony, he wrote, “You will never find a CAIR statement supporting Hamas after the commencement of suicide bombings and United States government’s designation of them as a foreign terrorist organization on January 24, 1995.”4 Similarly, Awad commented on the context of his Barry University remarks, “It [Hamas] has not attacked civilians then, and it was not designated by the United States government as a terrorist organization.”5

In fact, Hamas had executed numerous attacks prior to the 1995 Executive Order. Here are just a few examples:

- On May 3, 1989, a Hamas member stabbed five people, killing two of them, in a Jerusalem market.6
- On October 16, 1992, Hamas stabbed an orthodox Jewish seminary student.7
- On January 3, 1993, Hamas bombed a bus.8
- On September 24, 1993, Israeli discovered the body of an Israeli farm worker who had been stabbed to death. On his corpse was a note from Hamas.9

---
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On April 6, 1994, a Hamas suicide bomber blew up a bus in northern Israel, killing eight and wounding 44.  

Days later, on April 13, 1994, another Hamas suicide bomber blew up a bus, killing five and injuring 30.

On October 9, 1994, two Hamas terrorists ran down a busy street firing AK-47s indiscriminately. Two people were killed – one Israeli and one Palestinian. Thirteen were injured including an American diplomat.

The 1992 State Department Patterns of Global Terrorism report states, “Various elements of HAMAS have used both political and violent means including terrorism, to pursue the goal of establishing an Islamic Palestinian State in place of Israel…Other elements, operating clandestinely, have advocated and used violence to advance their goals.”

It is also notable that CAIR opposed the 1995 Executive Order. CAIR spokesman Ibrahim Hooper told the Washington Post, “We’ve been fearing something like this for a long time because there have been elements in the pro-Israeli lobby accusing Muslim groups of raising money for these kinds of purposes, with no evidence whatsoever of diversion of funds.”

And while some CAIR officials have avoided openly stating their support for Hamas following the 1995 Executive Order, one leader was not so circumspect.

Speaking at a 2001 event at the New York Interfaith Center, Ghazi Khankan, who served as executive director of CAIR-NY from at least April 2001 through September 2004, said, “The people of Hamas who direct their attacks on the Israeli military are in the correct position.” When pressed on his definition of a “civilian,” Khankan revealed his view that anyone over 18 was a legitimate target: “Who is a soldier in Israel and who is not? Anyone over eighteen is automatically inducted into the service and they are all reserves. Therefore, Hamas in my opinion looks at them as part of the military. Those who are below 18 should not be attacked.”

13 Patterns of Global Terrorism 1992, US Department of State.
Others have also openly supported violence against Israelis. The Cleveland Plain Dealer summarized the attitude of Hooper, CAIR’s chief spokesman like this: “While the Islamic council says it has denounced suicide bombings against Israeli civilians, spokesman Ibrahim Hooper yesterday would not criticize suicide attacks against Israeli soldiers. Instead, he spoke of Palestinians exercising ‘the right to resist military occupation.’” And, in January 2004, at an event in Los Angeles, CAIR-Southern California Executive Director Ayloush affirmed the “legitimate right of the Palestinians to defend themselves against the Israeli occupation.”

**CAIR officials have been notably silent when asked to condemn Hamas.**

An October 27, 2001 *National Journal* article reported, “Asked to describe CAIR’s view of Hamas, spokesman Hooper declined to comment.” A November 18, 2001 *Washington Post* article quoted Hooper as saying, in response to an Anti-Defamation League (ADL) request to condemn Hamas and Islamic Jihad by name, “It’s not our job to go around denouncing, that when they say jump, we say how high.” Asked by the *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette* in February 2002 to condemn Hamas, Hooper called such questions a “game” and declared, “We’re not in the business of condemning.”

Asked in a May 27, 2003 deposition, “Do you support Hamas,” Omar Ahmad responded, “It depends. Qualify ‘support.’” Similarly, he was asked whether he had “ever taken a position with respect to… [Hamas’] ‘martyrdom attacks.’” Ahmad responded, “No.”

In addition to voicing its support for “martyrs’” families and refusing to label Hamas a terrorist group, CAIR vocally protested the killing of Hamas leaders. On March 22, 2004, Israel assassinated Hamas founder Ahmed Yassin “CAIR Condemns Israeli Assassination of Religious Leader,” the organization announced in a press release that day. It criticized Israel for killing a “wheelchair-bound Palestinian Muslim religious leader.”

Similarly, after an Israeli missile killed Abdel Aziz Rantisi, Yassin’s

---


20 MSA-UCLA Islamic Awareness Week, Los Angeles, California, January 28, 2004.


replacement as head of Hamas, CAIR issued an April 17, 2004 press release blasting Israel for killing a “political leader.”

CAIR’s 1997 report, “The Status of Muslim Civil Rights in the United States,” characterized as an act of discrimination the failure of the U.S. government to respond to pressure by the Muslim Public Affairs Council (MPAC) to investigate and “to seek justice” for the death of Ahmed Hamida, an Arab-American terrorist killed in Jerusalem. In its description of the incident, CAIR depicted Ahmed as an innocent “Palestinian-American Muslim” visitor “gunned down by armed Israelis.” CAIR also implied that the shooting was committed in retaliation for a Tel Aviv bus bombing that occurred a day prior to Hamida's killing.

CAIR failed to mention that Hamida was shot by civilians while attempting to flee after deliberately driving his car into a group of Israelis waiting at a Jerusalem bus stop. In the attack, he killed a mother of two and injured 22 other Israelis. The subsequent investigation left no doubt that the car crash was not an accident, but rather a terrorist attack. Eyewitnesses heard Hamida yell “Allahu Akbar!” as he jumped out of his car. Also, he had indicated to friends on the morning before the attack that they would see him on television that night. Hamas later took credit for the attack.

Also of note is the fact that in 1994, IAP posted a CAIR press release that closely mirrored language in Hamas’ Covenant. The press release, which discussed the Hussein-Rabin Summit, was quickly modified to remove this text. The covenant says Hamas “believes that the land of Palestine has been an Islamic Waqf [endowment] throughout the generations and until the Day of Resurrection, no one can renounce it or part of it, or abandon it or part of it.”

CAIR’s original release described the Cairo and Oslo peace agreements as a chance “for all those who met secretly with the Zionists behind the scenes to come out in public and take their masks off.

---

We have affirmed repeatedly the danger of such agreements lies in abandoning the basic legitimate Palestinian rights, and it is a way to penetrate economically, politically, and culturally the ME region where Arab states are in their worst conditions. Thus, we affirm the followings:

1. Palestine is an Islamic and Arabic land which no one has the right to trade, sell, or give up
2. The current situation of the Arab states is at a weakness stage that must end sooner or later, and rights can’t be lost with signing agreements.

Hamas has itself posted CAIR information and activities updates on its official web site (http://www.palestine-info.net), including a June 5, 2001 article in which Nihad Awad called for a demonstration at the U.S. State Department to protest American support for Israel. 40

CAIR’s Propaganda Minimizes Terrorism

- CAIR refuses to condemn Islamic terrorists.

Although Nihad Awad claimed in September 2003 Senate testimony that “CAIR’s principled position on terrorism has always been evident,” CAIR, in fact, refuses to condemn terrorists. 41

As documented in Section V, “CAIR and Hamas,” Awad is obscuring reality when it comes to attitudes toward that terrorist group.

Moreover, CAIR issued a press release offering condolences on Yasser Arafat’s death. 42 Ignoring the fact that he had overseen countless terrorist attacks by the PLO and stolen perhaps billions of dollars, 43 CAIR’s statement said, “President Arafat was the embodiment of the Palestinian struggle for justice and freedom.” 44

In an appearance on MSNBC’s Buchanan & Press program on Feb. 20, 2003, Ibrahim Hooper downplayed the actions of PIJ, a terrorist group responsible for over 100 deaths (including those of two Americans):

Well, obviously, I’m not going to support some tactics of the Islamic Jihad, but they're in a world apart from al

At the May 27, 2004 CAIR-Tampa press conference in support of Sami Al-Arian, CAIR Florida spokesman Ahmed Bedier was asked, “Do you agree with the government designation of the Palestinian Islamic Jihad as a terrorist organization?” He responded, “We are not here to discuss the Palestinian Islamic Jihad or any other terrorist organization or any other group. We are here strictly to discuss the confinement conditions of this individual who is not in Palestine or in Israel. You are here right here in Florida.” When later pressed on the issue, asked if CAIR has a position on the Palestinian Islamic Jihad, Bedier dismissively said, “We haven’t published one,” and was ushered away by Nihad Awad and other colleagues.

And rather than condemn attacks against U.S. troops in Afghanistan and Iraq, CAIR Research Director Mohamed Nimer affirmed Muslims’ “right to self-defense” and noted that “CAIR criticized American bombing in Afghanistan and Iraq when the conduct of warfare contradicted Islamic values.”

Even when four American civilian contractors were ambushed in Iraq in March 2004 and their bodies were burned, mutilated, dragged, and finally hung from a bridge, CAIR condemned only “the mutilation of [the] bodies,” not the murders themselves and the terrorist murderers.

- CAIR criticizes any reference to militant Islamic activity as “stereotyping” all Muslims and uses intimidation tactics to harass anyone who criticizes Islam in any fashion.

While professing to serve as a watchdog group promoting fair and balanced reporting, CAIR criticizes any articles that expose or detail Islamic extremism, discuss terrorism, or involve other issues deemed “offensive” to CAIR -- regardless of accuracy.

CAIR officials have attacked as “anti-Muslim” a wide range of publications, including The New Republic, US News & World Report, The Atlantic Monthly (it had an article about the militant Islamic rule and oppression in Sudan), The Dallas Morning News (it exposed the Hamas infrastructure in Texas), The Reader’s Digest (it published an article exposing the repression of Christians by Communist regimes and Islamic extremists), The Tampa Tribune (it exposed the Islamic Jihad infrastructure in Tampa), The Weekly Reader’s Current Events (it featured a story on international terrorism) and even The Journal of the American Medical Association (for an article about the victims of terrorism).
CAIR has also attacked a wide variety of other media outlets for their reporting or presentation of Muslim issues.

For example, CAIR’s Southern California branch issued a press release on Oct. 28, 1998 to protest the existence of billboards in the Los Angeles area that featured pictures of Osama Bin Laden with the headline “the sworn enemy.” CAIR argued that the billboards, which were displayed by Los Angeles-based KCOP Television, Inc., were offensive to, and negatively stereotypical of, all Muslims.

CAIR says it has similarly “succeeded in defending Muslim rights and Islam” in cases involving NPR, Paul Harvey News, Seneca Foods, the House of Representatives, Adirondack Transit Lines, Denny’s, 20th Century Fox and Connecticut University.

CAIR attacked former vice president and Democratic presidential nominee Al Gore for using the word “jihad,” and New York Times columnist Abe Rosenthal for praising the documentary “Jihad in America.”

Gore had referred in 1996 to a “jihad” against environmental protection. In response, Awad wrote: “If this type of casual stereotyping is used by the administration’s top decision-makers, what does that say about the objectivity of policies impacting upon the Muslim community in America and around the world. We call upon the vice president to re-affirm the positive statements about Islam he made in the recent past and to clarify his position on the stereotyping of religious minorities.”

After The New York Times published an article entitled “Cry of Muslim Women for Equal Rights is Rising,” which was critical of the state of women’s rights under Koranic law in Morocco, Awad protested the author’s reporting as unprofessional and labeled the writer “Islamophobic” and biased.

In the October 1997 issue of First Things, Father Richard John Neuhaus reviewed The Decline of Eastern Christianity Under Islam: from Jihad to Dhimmitude, by Bat Ye’or. He favorably reviewed the book and commented about the growing threat of militant Islam. CAIR responded with a press release calling upon the Catholic Church to investigate Neuhaus because he:

- portrayed Islam as a permanent threat to Western society,
- used racial and ethnic slurs against Arabs,
- offered inaccurate and offensive information about the spread of Islam,
- seemed to agree with those who think Muslim

---

immigration is a ‘low-level jihad’ and suggested Christian-Muslim dialogue might be a ‘delusion.’"..."

In a letter to the general secretary of the National Council of Catholic Bishops, Awad called for an investigation to determine whether Neuhaus’ article reflected authentic church doctrine, and demanded appropriate actions to bring him into conformity with these teachings.

Following CAIR’s statement, Neuhaus received a flood of hostile communications, including terms such as “venomous diatribe,” “hateful xenophobia,” “doing the work of Adolph Hitler,” “agitating for a new Crusade” and “obviously mentally ill.” Neuhaus commented:

The attack initiated by CAIR produced dozens and dozens of letters from as far away as Australia, some of them accompanied by hundreds of signatures of Muslims who claimed to be deeply offended by the review...The campaign obviously had the aim of intimidating into silence anyone who dares to say anything less than complimentary about things Muslim...My best judgment is that the critics of CAIR are credible and that CAIR is less than candid about its connections with the politics of the Middle East. Confidence in CAIR is not enhanced by its hamfisted efforts to intimidate and silence its critics.

CAIR similarly attacked columnist Nat Hentoff, a consistent advocate of human rights and free expression, for two columns criticizing Louis Farrakhan, Jesse Jackson and others for failing to speak out against slavery in Sudan and Mauritania. Hooper wrote, “Perhaps this hesitancy results from a reluctance to indulge in politically and religiously motivated sensationalism that plays on and amplifies existing Islamophobic tendencies in Western society. Mr. Hentoff demonstrated the nastier aspects of this trend with his use of offensive terms such as ‘Islamic enslavement’...”

CAIR also takes on movies, sometimes even before they are produced. The organization launched a two-year campaign to have Paramount Pictures ensure that “Muslim” terrorists did not set off a nuclear bomb in the film, “The Sum of All Fears.” Before we had typed a word on paper,” producer Mace Neufeld told Slate, “I was getting complaints. Due in large part to CAIR’s protests, the terrorists in the movie were subsequently changed from Arabs to neo-Nazis.

More recently, CAIR has expanded its intimidation campaign by filing lawsuits.

---

Ayloush sued National Review in 2003, when a guest article by Shawn Steel on National Review Online stated that the CAIR official had co-hosted an event at which an Egyptian Muslim leader called Jews the “descendants of apes.”

Ayloush did not, in fact, co-host the event, and was not present at it. However, it was sponsored by another branch of CAIR and the offending remarks were made.

The National Review acknowledged its error but Ayloush continued his lawsuit. CAIR-LA Communications Director Sabiha Khan said, “We hope this action will deter hate-mongers from undermining the character and work of those who do not share their extremist views.” National Review stated, “We viewed this as an attempt to intimidate and punish NR.”

In February 2004, the court found that Ayloush failed to prove that the article was false or defamatory and failed to produce evidence showing NRO acted recklessly in publishing it. Still, the suit cost National Review $65,000 in legal fees.

In April 2004, David Harris, a former Canadian Security and Intelligence Service agent, charged on radio station CFRA’s morning show, “Madeley in the Morning,” that the U.S. CAIR group had links to terrorism and called on the Canadian group to clarify its own position. CAIR-Canada sued him for libel, eventually settling for no damages and without an apology or retraction issued by Harris. In November 2004, CAIR-Canada also sued David Frum and The National Post for libel for accusing CAIR of being an “unscrupulous, Islamist, extremist sympathetic group in Canada supporting terrorism.”

CAIR also has sued anti-cair-net.org for defamation and threatened the Cornell University newspaper and a student reporter with a defamation lawsuit.

• CAIR Chicago’s executive director refused to label Hamas and Hizballah as terrorist groups.

In an interview with the BBC’s Stephen Sackur on the program “Hard Talk,” Ahmed Rehab refused to label Hamas and Hizballah as terrorist groups, only describing some of their actions as “terrorist activity.” The fact that they run hospitals and schools makes it inaccurate to characterize them in their entirety as terrorist groups, he argued.

---
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SACKUR: So you would entirely condemn a group like Hamas, would you?

REHAB: Well, Hamas definitely has an arm that engages in terrorist activity and I would condemn terrorism if it were at the hands of Israelis or at the hands of Palestinians. So I do condemn that…

SACKUR: But that wasn’t exactly straight-forward…

REHAB: Well, I will finish and then you may feel that it is straight-forward…

SACKUR: Do you condemn Hamas straight-forward, yes or no?

REHAB: Do I condemn the hospitals run by Hamas, or the schools that help children learn, in Hamas? No, I don’t condemn that. But do I condemn the blowing up of Tel Aviv pizzerias or cafes. Definitely, I condemn that. That’s a straight-forward answer.

SACKUR: Then you agree with the American government that Hizballah for example is a terrorist organization?

REHAB: Well, once again the militant arm of Hizballah because of the acts they have done against civilians would qualify them as terrorists, but as far as the schools and the hospitals –

SACKUR: It’s not so easy for you, is it? It’s not so simple.

REHAB: Well, to me that is a pretty simple answer. I mean, I would be hard-pressed to condemn a school or a hospital where no one else is helping these individuals empower themselves. They’re living in ghettos with high unemployment rates, no electricity for many hours of the day, no food or running water and when a certain group attempts to educate these individuals or create hospitals to help them our when they’re sick or injured; for me to turn and say these are terrorists - not that particular group of individuals.

A 2004 class-action lawsuit brought in New York federal court in the name of John. P. O’Neill, Sr., a former FBI international terrorist operations chief killed in the 9/11 attacks at the World Trade Center challenges the conduct of CAIR and CAIR Canada among other organizations. The complaint accuses the defendants of “hav[ing] aided, abetted, and materially sponsored al Qaeda and international terrorism…CAIR and CAIR-Canada have, since their inception, been part of the criminal conspiracy of radical Islamic terrorism.”

---

The two organizations “manipulate the legal systems of the United States and Canada in a manner that allows them to silence critics, analysts, commentators, media organizations, and government officials by leveling false charges of discrimination, libel, slander and defamation,” the lawsuit says. “In addition, both organizations have actively sought to hamper governmental anti-terrorism efforts by direct propaganda activities aimed at police, first-responders, and intelligence agencies through so-called sensitivity training. Their goal is to create as much self-doubt, hesitation, fear of name-calling, and litigation within police departments and intelligence agencies as possible so as to render such authorities ineffective in pursuing international and domestic terrorist entities.

The role of CAIR and CAIR-Canada is to wage PSYOPS (psychological warfare) and disinformation activities on behalf of Whabbi-based (sic) Islamic terrorists throughout North America. They are the intellectual “shock troops” of Islamic terrorism.”

The litigation, with CAIR as a defendant, remains active.
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