

UNIVERSITY OF JYVÄSKYLÄ

TOM CLANCY AND ORIENTALISM

**Arabs and Muslims in the
Contemporary Technothriller Novel**

A Pro Gradu Thesis in English

by

Miika Malinen

Department of Languages

2006

HUMANISTINEN TIEDEKUNTA
KIELTEN LAITOS

Miika Malinen
TOM CLANCY AND ORIENTALISM
Arabs and Muslims in the Contemporary Technothriller Novel

Pro gradu -tutkielma
Englannin kieli
Joulukuu 2006

156 sivua

Tutkimuksessa analysoidaan arabi- ja muslimihenkilöhahmojen kuvausta amerikkalaisen kirjailijan Tom Clancyn kaunokirjallisuudessa. Tutkielma käy läpi aikaisempaa keskustelua orientalismista, jossa on perehdytty siihen miten Lähi-itä ja sen kansat esitetään länsimaisessa kulttuurituotannossa. Tekstissä nostetaan esiin miten Clancyn luoma kuva on muuttunut vuosien saatossa ja vaihtuvan kansainvälisen politiikan ympäristössä, varsinkin kylmän sodan loppuessa ja vuoden 2001 terroristihyökkäysten jälkeisessä tilassa. Clancyn arabi- ja muslimihahmoja verrataan hänen kertomustensa länsimaista tai muuta alkuperää oleviin henkilöihin. Lisäksi tutkitaan kirjailijan tapaa selostaa Lähi-idän tilannetta amerikkalaisen toiminnan ja politiikan kontekstissa.

Materiaali koostuu Clancyn kirjoittamasta kahdestatoista novellista, sekä yhdestä kirjasta joka on tehty yhteistyönä toisen kirjailijan kanssa. Erityisesti näistä käsitellään kuitenkin viittä teosta joissa arabit ja muslimit ovat keskeisessä osassa. Novelleja tarkastellaan kronologisessa järjestyksessä.

Jotkut orientalismin tutkijat, mm. Edward Said, ovat väittäneet, että länsimaisessa kulttuurituotannossa, kuten elokuvissa ja kirjallisuudessa esiintyy stereotypioita ja negatiivisia kuvauksia maailman eri alueista - varsinkin Lähi-idästä. Myös Clancyn tuotannossa tällaista on havaittavissa. Siitä huolimatta hänellä on negatiivisista stereotyyppioista poikkeavia henkilökuvauksia, ja esimerkiksi kylmän sodan ajan tuotannossa ja sen jälkeenkin löytyy neutraaleja ja kunnioittavia kuvauksia arabeista ja muslimeista. Yleisiä stereotyyppioita alkaa esiintyä enemmän Clancyn keskittyessä Amerikka-vastaiseen terrorismiin yleisenä teemana. Varsinkin vuoden 2001 terroristi-iskujen jälkeen hänen maailmansa on mustavalkoinen ja kuvaus arabeista ja muslimeista on negatiivinen.

CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS	5
1 INTRODUCTION	7
1.1 Introducing Tom Clancy	7
1.2 Constructing Identity and the “Other”	10
1.3 Arabs and Muslims in Contemporary Cultural Products	12
1.4 Arabs and Muslims in Clancy’s Novels	13
1.5 Research Questions	14
1.6 Thesis Plan	15
1.7 Thesis Writer’s Background	16
2 THE MIDDLE EAST AND ITS PEOPLES	17
2.1 Definition of Terms and a Look at History	17
2.2 Orientalism – The Study of the East in Europe	20
2.3 The Assault on Orientalism	22
2.4 Responses to the Critique of Orientalism	24
2.5 The US in the Middle East, Arabs and Muslims in Contemporary Cultural Products	26
2.6 Discussion	31
3 TOM CLANCY AND HIS NOVELS	33
3.1 The Author and His Followers	33
3.2 Clancy’s Genre and the Importance of Guns in Politics	35
3.3 Clancy’s World View in Fiction	37
3.4 Characteristics of the Good Guys and the Bad Guys	39
3.5 Clancy’s Enemies	44
3.6 Clancy and Orientalism	47
4 COLD WAR MUSLIM PEOPLES IN <i>RED STORM RISING</i> (1986) AND <i>THE CARDINAL OF THE KREMLIN</i> (1988)	48
4.1 Azerbaijani Muslims in <i>Red Storm Rising</i> (1986)	48
4.1.1 The Plot	48
4.1.2 Historical Context	49
4.1.3 Portrayal of Characters	49
4.1.4 Discussion	50
4.2 Afghan Muslims in <i>The Cardinal of the Kremlin</i> (1988)	51
4.2.1 The Plot	51
4.2.2 Historical Context	52
4.2.3 Portrayal of Characters	53
4.2.4 Discussion	56
4.3. Discussion: Clancy’s Cold War Muslim Peoples	58

**5 THE POST-COLD WAR MIDDLE EAST WITH PALESTINIAN
TERRORISM IN *THE SUM OF ALL FEARS* (1991) 60**

5.1 The Plot	60
5.2 Historical Context	62
5.3 The October War Introduction	64
5.3.1 Portrayal of Characters	64
5.3.2 Discussion	65
5.4 The Palestinian-Israeli Conflict	65
5.4.1 Portrayal of Characters	65
5.4.2 Discussion	68
5.5 Palestinian and Other Terrorists	71
5.5.1 Portrayal of Characters	71
5.5.2 Discussion	75
5.6 Bin Sheik, Islam, and the Middle East	78
5.6.1 Portrayal of Characters	78
5.6.2 Discussion	80
5.7 Discussion	81
5.7.1 The Palestinian Struggle and Islam	81
5.7.2 Palestinian Terrorism	82

**6 SHIITE MUSLIM EXTREMISM AND MIDDLE EASTERN TERRORISM
IN *EXECUTIVE ORDERS* (1996) 86**

6.1 The Plot	86
6.2 Historical Context	88
6.3 Ryan's Policies and Domestic Adversaries	89
6.3.1 Portrayal of Characters	89
6.3.2 Discussion	91
6.4 Iraqi and Iranian Political and Religious Extremism	92
6.4.1 Portrayal of Characters	92
6.4.2 Discussion	95
6.5 Middle Eastern Terrorism	97
6.5.1 Portrayal of Characters	97
6.5.2 Discussion	101
6.6 Bin Sheik, Islam, and the Middle East	103
6.6.1 Middle Eastern People, Culture, and Tradition	103
6.6.2 The Religion of Islam	106
6.7 Discussion	108

**7 POST-9/11 SUNNI MUSLIM EXTREMISM AND MIDDLE EASTERN
TERRORISM IN *THE TEETH OF THE TIGER* (2003) 112**

7.1 The Plot	112
7.2 Historical Context	114
7.3 American Politics and Leadership	114
7.3.1 Portrayal of Characters	114
7.3.2 Discussion	116
7.4 American Counterterrorism	118

7.4.1 Portrayal of Characters	118
7.4.2 Discussion	120
7.5 Sunni Muslim Extremism and Middle Eastern Terrorism	121
7.5.1 Portrayal of Characters	121
7.5.2 Discussion	130
7.6 Bin Sultan, Islam, and the Middle East	134
7.7 Discussion	138
7.7.1 The Arab Muslim and American Characters	138
7.7.2 The New World of Islamist Terrorism and America	141
7.7.3 The World After 9/11	143
8 CONCLUSION	146
8.1 Clancy's Portrayal of Arabs and Muslims	146
8.2 Clancy's Orientalism	149
8.3 Discussion	151
BIBLIOGRAPHY	154

ABBREVIATIONS

Primary sources:

<i>Hunt</i>	– <i>The Hunt for Red October</i> . Clancy 1985 (1984).
<i>Red Storm</i>	– <i>Red Storm Rising</i> . Clancy 1987 (1986).
<i>Patriot</i>	– <i>Patriot Games</i> . Clancy 1987.
<i>Cardinal</i>	– <i>The Cardinal of the Kremlin</i> . Clancy 1994 (1988).
<i>Clear</i>	– <i>Clear and Present Danger</i> . Clancy 1989.
<i>Sum</i>	– <i>The Sum of All Fears</i> . Clancy 1992 (1991).
<i>Without</i>	– <i>Without Remorse</i> . Clancy 1994 (1993).
<i>Debt</i>	– <i>Debt of Honor</i> . Clancy 1995 (1994).
<i>Executive</i>	– <i>Executive Orders</i> . Clancy 1997 (1996).
<i>Rainbow</i>	– <i>Rainbow Six</i> . Clancy 1999 (1998).
<i>Bear</i>	– <i>The Bear and the Dragon</i> . Clancy 2001 (2000).
<i>Red Rabbit</i>	– <i>Red Rabbit</i> . Clancy 2003 (2002).
<i>Teeth</i>	– <i>The Teeth of the Tiger</i> . Clancy 2004 (2003).

Other Abbreviations:

CIA	- Central Intelligence Agency, primary US foreign-intelligence agency with DIA and NSA.
Cold War	- Political setting after the Second World War where the West and the USSR fought for influence for their ideologies in the world rather than actual wars against each other.
DIA	- Defence Intelligence Agency, under the Department of Defence.
DEA	- Drug Enforcement Agency, enforces drug-control in the US.
EU	- European Union, economic and monetary union of European countries.
FBI	- Federal Bureau of Investigation, national interstate law-enforcement agency under the Department of Justice.
ICBM	- Intercontinental Ballistic Missile, capable of carrying nuclear weapons anywhere on Earth.
IRA	- Irish Republican Army, Irish nationalist resistance organization.
KGB	- Komitet Gosudarstvenny Bezopasnosti, Committee for State Security, former Soviet security and intelligence agency.
KKK	- Klu Klux Klan, extremist White supremacist group in the US.
Mossad	- Israeli intelligence service.
NATO	- North Atlantic Treaty Organization, military alliance between North American and European states, counter-force to the Soviet Warsaw Pact.
NSA	- National Security Agency, intelligence and security agency under the Department of Defense.
PIRA	- Provisional Irish Republican Army, break-away extreme faction of the IRA.

PFLP	- Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine, Palestinian militant resistance group.
PLO	- Palestinian Liberation Organization, umbrella organization joining diverse Palestinian resistance groups together in many countries.
Politburo	- The Soviet government, the thirteen full members and eight candidate members making up the ruling body of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.
START	- Strategic Arms Reduction Talks, under President Reagan in the 80's.
Stasi	- Staatssicherheit, State Security, former East German secret police.
SVR	- Russian foreign intelligence service.
ULA	- Ulster Liberation Army, extreme offshoot of the nationalist resistance group the IRA.
UN	- United Nations Organization, international organization for intercultural debate on world issues.
US	- The United States of America, also America or USA.
USSR	- Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, former union of countries with Communist ideology.
WMD	- Weapon of Mass Destruction, biological, chemical, or nuclear device causing great destruction.
9/11	- Nine-Eleven, the terrorist attacks of September 11 th , 2001, on New York City and Washington D.C.

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introducing Tom Clancy

When Tom Clancy, aged 36, submitted his work on *The Hunt for Red October* for printing in 1983, he had no expectations of the extraordinary reception it would get. The best he could hope for at the time was a few thousand copies in print; he never anticipated to make real money with it, especially as he was new in the business of writing.¹ Getting his name on the cover of a book was his dream. Yet, when President Reagan mentioned it in an interview and described it as “the perfect yarn”, demand for the novel shot upwards and it soon reached the bestseller lists. Clancy quit his job as an insurance broker in his own firm and began writing fulltime. Over twenty years later he continues as one of the biggest-selling authors with an amazing degree of success on the international market. (Greenberg 2005: 3-4)

Tom Clancy is now more than just the name of the author. His name has become a brand of a certain genre of products and a style of writing in America. Clancy’s personal works of fiction now consist of twelve novels. His production also includes nearly thirty franchises, novels bearing his name but which were only influenced by or co-created by him, as well as at least one fictional novel and one book on submarine warfare that he has coauthored. He has also written nonfiction displaying different sections of the American armed forces and military hardware. Seven of these are labeled “guided tours” to some specific weapon or unit of personnel, while four books were co-written with US generals and give an insight to the profession of military leadership. Four of his personal novels have been adapted for the Hollywood movie screen. More recently, a handful of computer games titling Clancy’s name have been inspired by his work on anti-terrorism units and the military’s special forces. If anything, Tom Clancy is a name that allows an escape from reality into his lively fictional world.

¹ Clancy’s previous publishing only consisted of a three-page article on a missile and a letter to an editor.

Clancy's genre of fictional writing has been labeled as the "technothriller", a term he himself rejected at first.¹ The novels are political thrillers, lengthy volumes of detailed development into the action-packed climax of the story. His ability to interweave the stories of a number of separate characters and culprits is the specialty of a Clancy novel. Some of the large-scale themes from previously established genres recurring in his books are the espionage of a spy-novel, science-fiction, the world politics and international affairs of a realist novel, and military strategy and advanced technology (hence the term "technothriller"). However, other themes which clearly come out on the level of character-building are family, relationships, and individuality. Clancy's knowledge on a wide range of issues and his vast amount of research shows in the detailed description of certain aspects of his stories, such as weapons, governing institutions, and countries and their people. His stories are mixed in with historical events and relate to actual on-going world issues. They seem to stride close to the real world.

Clancy's audience can easily be presumed to consist of mainly male readers. Michael Moore, the "prickly satirist" and producer of documentary films on controversial American domestic issues, mentions "airports full of white, middle-aged businessmen in suits reading Tom Clancy's new book," (in Greenberg 2005: 28). However, according to Clancy himself, there is a surprising amount of female fans who actively send him feedback on his novels.² Something in Clancy's writing inspires Americans of a wide spectrum, both sexes and all ages. Clancy is also famed internationally and much of his audience comes from other Western countries, as most of his books have been translated into many different languages. Perhaps his success is due to his story-telling ability and the fact that his stories are not the traditional James Bond spy-novel; they provide more of a variety for different readers to relate to.

Due to the amount of detailed information, some fans and commentators consider Clancy novels to not only provide entertainment, but also to give "a painless education" to the many topics being discussed (in Greenberg 2005: xiv and 5). This

¹ It seems that more recently he has started limiting his criticism of the term and accepting its use (Greenberg 2005: 55 and Garson 1996: 25).

² A third of the fan mail Clancy received for *Hunt* was from women (Greenberg 2005: 56).

idea, that Clancy is an expert on his subjects and knows what he is talking about, brings us to his most prestigious and thought-provoking audience. Not only has Clancy appeared on American national television a number of times to give his masterly opinions on current events, but he has also lectured at different branches of the American federal government and military headquarters: the CIA, NSA, FBI, the military academies at Annapolis and West Point, and the Air War College (Clancy's works of non-fiction are used as textbooks in the military graduate schools). He has visited the White House and the Pentagon on a number of occasions, conferred with their staffs, and has consulted with international intelligence experts (Garson 1996: 5, *Sum* back cover, Records 2001, and Trosky 1991: 111). Because of his positive portrayal of government and the military he is considered by many the authorized way to share information that will "help the military-procurement budget" (Garson 1996: 5) and be "good for business" (Trosky 1991: 110). His best known avid readers include not only President Reagan, but also President George H.W. Bush, President George W. Bush, certain Senators, Pentagon analysts, and other members of the US federal government. Former Secretary of State Colin Powell, a career military man with experience from places like Vietnam and the Middle East, even gave an appreciative if ironic comment once; "A lot of what I know about warfare I learnt from reading Tom," (Terdoslavich 2005: 237).

Clancy's production can be seen to attract readers for one more reason. Not only does he produce entertainment and an escape for millions of readers and viewers, nor does he only educate and inform his audience of the subjects he has researched. He also writes about his world view. He speaks his mind on American domestic politics and international issues through the events in his stories and the portrayal of his characters, cultures, and societies. He can establish his ideals of how a family, society, and government should operate. In the world of fiction he is free to shape his world as he wants it, and in the genre of political thrillers he can keep close enough to reality to support his opinion on actual events. One of his main characters, Jack Ryan, the unwilling hero and sympathetic family man, becomes his voice. Clancy himself admits: "I do talk about a number of different fundamental human values... if there's something in the book, if it's Jack Ryan's thoughts or the words of a narrator, it's probably me talking and saying something I happen to believe in," (in Greenberg 2005: 59). Apparently, as his numerous readers in the

United States might suggest, it is easy for many to relate to his opinions. Also, due to his political links and his fans in the US federal government, he does not seem to be insignificant in his contribution to actual political thought and policy.

One thing which is quite pronounced in Clancy's books is his strong patriotism. He speaks highly of the ordinary people in uniformed service: professional soldiers, the FBI, the CIA, the Coast Guard, firefighters, and policemen. "The real glue of our society are the people who... are willing to take their time and their energy to protect and preserve and restore things that are broken," he says in an interview (in Greenberg 2005: 58). With stories of these every day people he is enforcing a sense of American identity. Perhaps this is what so many of his readers are inspired by; belief in the country. But to be able to have stories of protecting, preserving, and restoring American national and cultural values, and so get to the enforcing of his views of the American identity, he needs to have someone trying to attack and destroy them first. He needs challenges for America, which are not difficult to develop in the fictional world, nor find in the real world. And the best choice for him is to pick his enemies from real past events which are still alive in popular memory, something the reader can relate to. According to some scholars soon mentioned, the most recurring enemy-image in Western contemporary cultural products has come from the Middle East.

1.2 Constructing Identity and the "Other"

Over the past four decades or so there has been a heated debate on the history of the development of "Western" identity. New reviews were published in the decolonization period after the Second World War, and the traditional style of seeing and writing European history came under attack. A growing number of scholars published outspoken critique of European (and American) identity construction. Edward W. Said, a Palestinian from Jerusalem with a Protestant Christian background, is the best known for his controversial ideas. According to him, there has been and continues to be a long tradition of seeing the East and Islam through established stereotypes: as something mysterious, decadent, irrational, and backward. Within the academia of orientalism, the study of the East, a Western

“Us” has been defined as opposed to an “Other”, where the “Us” is a masculine, rational, and modern self and the “Other” the feminized and primitive Orient.¹ These exoticising and racist representations have produced a fictional Orient for Europeans, a concept which became central to the strengthening European self-representation and the construction of Western identity (Said 1995).² Said was not the first to publish these kinds of theories, but it was he who provoked many others to give feedback and critique; traditionalist historians defended their tradition of writing, while others were inspired and continued reviews of culture and society based on Said’s work. Some scholars, such as Melani McAlister (2001), have realized the usefulness of Said’s input, but have also challenged and revised important aspects of his theories.

Through his collection of works Said repeats the idea that the Middle East, more than any other region, has been this “Other” to European and American identity construction. He says that this tradition has continued to the modern age in discussions about Islam and the Arabs, where the Arabs and Muslims especially became the stereotyped images created by Western culture. “For whereas it is no longer possible to write learned (or even popular) disquisition on either ‘the Negro mind’ or ‘the Jewish personality’, it is perfectly possible to engage in such research as ‘the Islamic mind’, or ‘the Arab character’,” (Said 1995: 262). Said also spoke for the Palestinian people, arguing that they specifically were still the victims of negative stereotypes (many of those opposed to Said give clear indication of being pro-Israeli, and so the Palestinian-Israeli conflict is a major theme in the discussion of orientalism). Later many scholars, such as Melani McAlister (2001), Douglas Little (2002), and Toine van Teeffelen (1995), have reviewed contemporary cultural products like popular novels. They have realized that there is a connotation in many authors’ texts which carry certain stereotypes when portraying Arabs and Muslims.

¹ The Orient – the East. Note the difference between “orientalism” and Said’s “Orientalism”. Discussion in Chapter 2.

² One influence Said has had on later scholarship has been his views of identity. “Human identity is not only not natural and stable, but constructed, and occasionally even invented outright,” (Said 1995: 332). The construction of a sense of identity, Said continues, can be strengthened by the establishment of opposites and the “Other”, against which the “Self” and “Us” can be contrasted. There is a difficulty in accepting this thought of no stable human identity, and resistance to it comes from those who have themselves an established positive and seemingly unchanging cultural or national identity. A variety of differing scholars, among them Michael Shapiro, Benedict Anderson, David Campbell, Samuel P. Huntington, and Melani McAlister, have been influenced by these ideas to develop new ways of analyzing the identity and foundation of human relations and societies.

However, as McAlister discusses, this is not necessarily due to the centuries old “Orientalist” tradition that Said argues for, but from more recent developments in cultural encounters and political relations.

1.3 Arabs and Muslims in Contemporary Cultural Products

Both Melani McAlister (2001) and Douglas Little (2002) analyze the history of America’s relations with the Middle East and its peoples. McAlister looks at news reports, films, novels, and museum exhibitions which, according to her, have served to influence the understandings that Americans have had of their own “interests” in the Middle East. Different ethnic, religious, and cultural groups have had their own views of historical events in the region, the important interests being the Cold War, religious affiliations, Israel, and oil. She discusses the roles of Israel and the Palestinians, Iran, Islam, and terrorism as factors influencing the rise of a conservative view in U.S. politics. She writes, “...terrorism, hostage taking, and captivity worked to construct the U.S. as a nation of innocents, a family under siege by outside threats and in need of militarized rescue that operated under the sign of the domestic,” (McAlister 2001: 201). McAlister says that the militarized US needed an “outside” to mark its boundaries, and a nationalist and expansionist narrative established Americans and the Middle East in this context of conflict. Cultural products, films and novels, carried these themes to their audience, where the Muslim terrorist became a recurring opponent. Very similar to McAlister’s account, Little (2002) lists the numerous events where the American business, military, and culture met and confronted the Middle East, Arabs, and Muslims.

Toine van Teeffelen (1995) has taken part in a study linking the political discussion on Palestine to fields of discourse and culture. Van Teeffelen writes about the dominating background assumptions appearing in Western popular fiction when talking about the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. He shows how these assumptions appear in texts and how they help to enforce Western concerns about dangers coming from the Arab and Islamic world. He claims that many authors in the second half of the twentieth century have chosen the Palestinian-Israeli conflict as the setting of their story. About twenty-five of these novels, which add “to the

stereotypical discourse which the question of Palestine has generated” (van Teeffelen 1995: 93), have reached the top ten of a U.S. bestseller list. Palestinian Muslim characters are related to terrorism in almost all of the books, and they are characterized as unprofessional and inhumane in some way.

According to van Teeffelen, recent cultural studies highlight that “bestselling realist novels in part win a large audience by providing a kind of fictional commentary upon contemporary developments which affect people’s concerns” (1995: 93). Popular fiction plays around with information which the reader already knows and has learned from other sources such as the media. The Middle East is constantly on the news and in people’s thoughts, especially with the recent developments in the world in the last five years, and many people identify with some party in the region. Some of the themes discussed by McAlister, van Teeffelen, and others can be seen in Clancy’s fiction. Clancy uses the region and its peoples as a basis for some events in a number of his books; in some aspects he uses them as the “Other”, the challenge he needs for America.

1.4 Arabs and Muslims in Clancy’s Novels

Four of Clancy’s books, *Cardinal*, *Sum*, *Executive*, and *Teeth*, concentrate a major part of their action into the Middle East or around Arab or Muslim characters. Other books do have minor Muslim characters or a short chapter with action placed in the Middle East, but not to the scale of these four. Also, two of these novels, *Sum* and *Teeth*, base at least a part of their storyline on the Palestinian-Israeli crisis. Yet, it would be naïve to say that Clancy shares the characteristics of the novelists and producers of cultural products that van Teeffelen and McAlister talk about. Clancy is too much of a complex writer; it is difficult at times to see what view he is trying to enforce with his story, especially as he argues that in his research he actively looks for ideas which he knows he is going to disagree with.¹

¹ Ultimately, as a reminder to his critics, Clancy writes for entertainment. And it is only for entertainment that anyone would pick up one of his hefty novels.

There is, however, a clear change in Clancy's writing over the twenty years he has been publishing works. Two major international incidents have had their effect on Clancy's view of the world and his choice of enemies for the US, and there is a change in the way he portrays the Arabs and Muslims before and after each incident. These two world-changing events are the end of the Cold War around the year 1991 and the terrorist attacks in New York and Washington on September 11th, 2001 (hereafter 9/11). During the Cold War the Middle East is more of a battleground for influence between the West and the Soviets, and the Soviets are the "Other" for the US in a black-and-white world. After the end of the Cold War, as Petri Vuollo also argues in his thesis (1993), Clancy comes up with more depth in his characters, and more enemies are found closer to home in the US. However, with the bipolar world and the Soviet enemy gone, he is free to use other parts of the world as his enemy; in many ways he also falls back on older stereotypes in his portrayal of the Middle East, Arab and Muslim peoples, as well as other societies and cultures around the world. After 9/11 Clancy concentrates on Arab Muslim extremist characters; the depth of his characters, the explanation of their past motivating factors, and the storyline once again becomes simpler, smaller scale, and with a clear enemy-image.

1.5 Research Questions

This thesis will only concentrate on the fiction which Clancy has written alone, not his franchised works.¹ This allows for the possibility to see how Clancy writes about the world, more specifically the Middle East, without any other influences. As an exception (similar to Terdoslavich 2005) I will add a short review of *Red Storm*, a novel coauthored with Larry Bond, to my analysis for support of my argument of the way Muslims are portrayed during the Cold War. This thesis concentrates on the four books mentioned, but a look at the minor portrayals in other books will also be included. More specifically, I will be researching the following:

- How Clancy portrays Arabs and Muslims in his fiction:

¹ The amount of influence Clancy has had on these franchises is not clear, yet the style and structure are very different from his own writing even as they bear his name on them. See Garson (1996: 15).

- How he does this in relation to past discussion of the portraying of the Middle East and its people in Western culture (Said (1995), McAlister (2001), van Teeffelen (1995)),
- How his depiction of Arabs, Muslims, and the world has changed over the years and over two major international incidents (the end of the Cold War and 9/11).

Research will also include discussion on the following:

- How Clancy portrays Arabs and Muslims in relation to American and Western characters,
- How he portrays Arabs and Muslims in relation to other peoples and societies around the world,
- How he portrays the Middle East in relation to current American involvement there.

1.6 Thesis Plan

Chapter 1 introduces the subject to the reader and outlines the research questions. Chapter 2 includes a definition of the terms and a discussion of the backgrounds of the Middle East and its many peoples involved in Clancy's stories. I take a look at the history and recent views of orientalism. Chapter 3 discusses Tom Clancy, his fans, his writing, and the world he constructs with certain clear characteristics distinguishing the heroes from the foes. Chapter 4 begins the analysis of Clancy's fiction with a look at the way he portrays the Muslim peoples of Central Asia during the Cold War in the two novels *Red Storm* and *Cardinal*. Chapter 5 involves a look at Clancy's portrayal of a Post-Cold War Middle East with the Palestinian-Israeli Conflict and Palestinian extremism in the novel *Sum*. Chapter 6 analyzes Clancy's portrayal of the Middle East and his use of Shiite Muslim extremism in countries like Iran, Iraq, and Lebanon in the novel *Executive*. Chapter 7 examines Clancy's description of a Post-9/11 world and Sunni Muslim extremism in the novel *Teeth*. Chapter 8 includes the conclusions reached in this thesis about Clancy's portrayal of Arabs and Muslims, as well as discussion on Clancy's policies and place in the world.

1.7 Thesis Writer's Background

I was born in Finland in 1980. Since then, I spent most of my childhood and youth in the Middle East; I grew up in and around Jerusalem, in both Israeli and Palestinian areas. My parents work for the Finnish Evangelical Lutheran Mission. Having this family background, having gone to an English language international school enriched with the dozens of nationalities represented, and having been given a multi-cultural and volatile political environment to explore have all given me a part of my field of interest. A mixture of various cultures, ethnic groups, nationalities, religions, ideologies, and languages appear in Jerusalem and contribute to the colorfulness of the city. People have differing interests in the city, and they have their own way of justifying their interests. Many people who have never even been there and have no intention of going there identify with it. I always found it interesting that a single event can be seen in so many different ways, where reality or historically accepted fact does not necessarily have any strength of argument.

We in Western countries seem to be fixated on and fascinated by the events in the Middle East: no other region seems to catch the attention of world media with the same intensity; cultural products contain awesome amounts of differing portraits of the area; no other conflicts affect such a large part of the world, where the Palestinian-Israeli conflict is at the heart of many foreign interests there. This thesis is about the analysis of identity; how it is constructed, and what it needs to support it. The concentration lies on the “Western” identity of a certain view of the world and the values that are important to it. More specifically, I analyze whether the Middle East has a central role in the awareness of a unique contemporary novelist, and if so, what that role is. I have attempted to combine my English major at the University of Jyväskylä and my Middle Eastern Studies at the University of Helsinki in my discussion of two bestselling authors, Said and Clancy, both of whom contribute greatly, in my view, to different parts of the debate on our “Western” identity.

2 THE MIDDLE EAST AND ITS PEOPLES

2.1 Definition of Terms and a Look at History

The term “**Middle East**” is Western in origin; it defines lands located to the east of where the term was first invented.¹ In the following pages the term will be used to refer to the geographical region extending from Egypt in the west to Iran in the east, and from Turkey in the north to the southern tip of the Arabian Peninsula. However, discussion will include the Muslim peoples of Central Asia and the Caucasus regions, such as the Afghans and the Azerbaijanis, as well as parts of North and East Africa.

The Middle East is largely **Arab** in ethnic background and culture, and the language of Arabic is spoken by the majority population in many of the countries.² Also, Arabic is well distributed around the world among Muslims as the holy language of the Koran, the sacred scriptures of Islam. Various dialects of the language now exist around the Middle East. The Arabs originally inhabited what is now called the Arabian Peninsula, the surroundings of the present day Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. In the seventh century A.D. they started an expansion which headed west to the Atlantic Ocean and east towards India, and spread the new faith of Islam in the process. An **Arab** is an individual who identifies themselves strongly with the language, culture, and heritage of the Arab peoples.

The foundations of the religion of **Islam** are in the seventh century A.D. Mecca and Medina in present-day Saudi Arabia. According to belief, Muhammad ibn Abdullah was summoned by God to his prophetic mission. Divine messages were passed to Muhammad for him to recite to the people, which were later collected into a book,

¹ As noted by K. Öhrnberg of the University of Helsinki, the term “Middle East” has some confusion over its origins, as with Macfie’s interpretation of it (see Macfie 2002: 19). Even nowadays it still has some ambiguous meaning, with different scholars using it for a different mixture of lands, with concepts such as “the central Middle East”, and with arguments for including Arab North Africa, Sudan, and Afghanistan in the coverage of the term (for examples see Cleveland 1994: xiii).

² Exceptions to these are Turkey, Iran, and Israel, though they each (especially Israel) have sizable Arabic speaking minorities.

the Koran (or Quran, meaning “Recitation”) (Cleveland 1994: 8-13).¹ The first **Muslims** (or Moslems), the adherents to the new faith, were Arabs in the Arabian Peninsula.² The Arab conquests which came about during the reign of the first four caliphs, the “successors” of the Prophet, brought vast areas under Islamic control with remarkable speed.³ Muslims and Christians came into contact with each other in the Middle East and Europe, and these contacts contributed to the development of Western philosophy, science, art, literature, and other fields of society. From the late eighteenth century onwards in the time of European imperialism Arabs, Muslims, and Europeans came into increasing contact again as Italy, Spain, France and Britain colonized large parts of North Africa and the Middle East. After decolonization in the early and mid twentieth century the influence of the US and the USSR grew in the Middle East (Cleveland 1994).⁴ According to estimates, there are now around 1.2-1.7 billion Muslims in the world, with most situated in a region stretching from Morocco on the Atlantic coast to the Philippines in the Pacific, though many other countries having sizable Muslim minorities as well.

The majority of Muslims are **Sunni Muslims**, but many countries have **Shiite** (or **Shi’a**) minorities as well. The core of the split of the two groups originates to the time immediately after the death of the Prophet. The major difference between the two is over the political leadership of the Islamic community, the Sunnis accepting the legality of the caliphs and their successors, the Shiites believing that only the Prophet’s son-in-law Ali and his descendents are the legal leaders of the community. The form of leadership in these two groups differs as well; Sunnis believe that the caliphs were mortals and religious doctrine is left to the community’s educated religious leaders, whereas the Shiite community leader has a divine aspect in his character as well (Cleveland 1994: 33-34). Iran is a Shiite state, with the majority

¹ Other religious texts central to the Islamic faith include the Hadith collections, which constitute of the Sunna: the way the Prophet carried out his life, an example to every Muslim how to carry out their lives.

² A common misunderstanding is to use the terms “Arab” and “Muslim” inseparably, even as synonyms, where it is important to remember that not all Arabs are Muslims, nor are all Muslims Arabs.

³ The Sasanid Empire (Persian, of Zoroastrian religion) was soon defeated. Later the Christian Byzantine Empire were also defeated, and Turkic Muslim armies entered the Balkans. The Battle of Poitiers in France and the sieges of Vienna are considered the furthest that Muslim forces penetrated Europe and have been canonized as great victories for European Christian forces.

⁴ The Suez Canal Crisis of 1956, where Britain, France, and Israel attempted to take over parts of Egypt and decrease the influence of the Arab nationalist leader Nasser, led to the growing involvement of the U.S. in the Middle East, while former European powers lost influence there.

population having a Persian ethnic background, and the major language being Farsi (an Indo-European language). Iraq, an Arab country with Arabic (a Semitic language) as the major language, has a majority Shiite population.¹ Most of the others are Sunni majority states. Other minority religious groups in the countries of the Middle East include the **Druze**, an offshoot sect of Islam, the **Christians** of the Eastern Churches, and the **Jews**.

The **Palestinians** are the peoples in Palestine with Arab identity background. The **Palestinian-Israeli conflict** has its roots in nineteenth century Europe with the birth of political Zionism² and with the increased amount of European Jewish emigrants to the British mandate of Palestine. Violence ensued, and the Balfour Declaration of 1917 and the white paper of 1939 showed a reassessment and changing of British policies over the years.³ However, the start of the Second World War and the horrors of the Holocaust⁴ changed attitudes to favor a homeland for Jews, and many Americans joined in the campaigning. Immigration grew again, and violence in Palestine continued, with continuous campaigns of sabotage against the British. When the British announced their plan to leave, a civil war started between the Jewish and Palestinian populations, where terror tactics were used by both sides against the other.⁵ The outcome was 700,000 Palestinian refugees fleeing their land

¹ Of Iraq's population about 60% are Shiites, 20% are Sunnis, and 20% are Kurds, a group with a variety of dialects of the Indo-European Kurdish language, most of them Sunni Muslims.

² Political Zionism is the belief in the right of return of the Jewish people to their historically and religiously significant lands in the Middle East, after being dispersed from there by the Romans in the first century AD. The oppression of Jews by European governments and individuals over two millennia motivated this visionary belief and gave hope in the harsh reality. (Cleveland 1994)

³ The Balfour Declaration, an ambiguous paper where a "national home" was promised in Palestine to the Jewish people from the British government in 1917, motivated immigration to the region. The Jewish National Fund and other Zionist organizations purchased land and leased it exclusively to Jewish immigrants and provided them with work. In 1922 the population of Arabs in relation to Jews in the British mandate of Palestine was still about eight to one, when in 1946 the relation was about two to one. With a growing amount of land going to the Jewish population, the Palestinian peasantry was being evicted from these lands and becoming unemployed. Violence broke out between the Jewish and the Palestinian population, where the Western Wall disturbances of 1929 and the great revolt of 1936-1939 were directly related to dislocations caused by immigration and land transfers. In 1939 the British government reassessed its policies with the white paper, which announced that immigration would be limited and the formation of a Jewish state would not be supported. (Cleveland 1994: 222-255)

⁴ Around six million Jews were systematically killed by Nazis in death camps across Europe, among other millions of gypsies, communists, homosexuals, Jehovah's Witnesses, and handicapped people; anyone who did not fit into the Aryan ideology of the Nazis.

⁵ The notorious act at the town of Dayr Yassin, where the independent and fiercely nationalistic militant organization Irgun massacred 250 Palestinian civilians (Cleveland 1994: 247), has become part of Palestinian memory. News of the massacre contributed to the panic and many fled. Retaliations occurred against Jewish targets and atrocity built on atrocity.

and the state of Israel being born in 1948 (Cleveland 1994: 222-255). The wars of 1948, 1956, 1967, 1973, and 1982 have brought Israel and the Arab countries to the world's attention, as have the waves of Palestinian refugees from 1948 and 1967 and the Palestinian uprisings of 1987 and 2000. The growth of Israeli settlements in the Occupied Territories of the Gaza Strip and the West Bank, taken in the 1967 war, have been a constant reason for Palestinian uprisings and motivation for resistance.¹

As will soon be discussed, it is these three categories, the Arabs, Muslims, and Palestinians, which Said (1995) specifies to be under political attack by forces in the West, and which according to some scholars are still a recurring theme of the "Other" in popular cultural products. This unjustifiably brief description of these peoples, nations, Islam, and the long history of the region should provide the reader if not with an understanding of the background of the present political and ideological situation in the Middle East, then at least with a realization that it should be difficult to simplify the region into a unified block of Muslim people or an "Islamic civilization" which certain scholars, myths, and political ideas want to simplify it to.²

2.2 Orientalism – The Study of the East in Europe

The "Middle East" is a relatively new category in the history of dividing the world into easily understandable and comprehensible regions. Beginning with the ancient Greeks, a clear split was made between the moral characteristics of Europe and Asia, a world view which continued in Roman times.³ From then on the Middle East was mainly known for the Holy Land, the birth place of Christianity. In the seventh century Christianity came into increasing contact with the growing religion

¹ Israel pulled out of the rest of the Gaza Strip and demolished its settlements in August 2005, after nearly thirty years of military and settler presence there. However, the violence and retaliations continue with less than peaceful borders between the two sides.

² See Huntington (1996) and Halliday (2005).

³ The ancient Greeks, whom the traditionalist Western world identifies as the forefathers of philosophy and science, divided the world into the continents of Europe, Asia, and Libya (later Africa). This world-view became widely accepted by the fifth century B.C. For the Greeks the greatest distinction was between Europe and Asia, Greece and Persia, the West and the East. According to Macfie (2002), Asia became famed "for its lavish splendour, vulgarity and arbitrary authority, all that was antithetical to Greek values," (Macfie 2002: 15).

of Islam, first in the Middle East, later in the Balkans, Spain, and other places. During the Middle Ages large numbers of pilgrims and crusaders from Europe traveled there and stories, travel accounts and histories written up by them included descriptions of Islam and Muslims. According to studies by Norman Daniel, *Islam and the West* (1960), and Richard Southern, *Western Views of Islam in the Middle Ages* (1962), there was a desire to distort the teachings of Islam and denigrate the Muslims; Christianity was seen as the one true faith, and these distortions provided by Christian scholars and polemicists were canonized through repetition. Islam was deemed irrational, violent, idolatrous, and sexually immoral, and a series of myths and legends supported these beliefs. This image lasted until the end of the sixteenth century. (Macfie 2002: 15-43)

The academic study of the Orient and its languages and cultures began in European countries in the seventeenth century. Holland, Hungary, Russia, France and Germany established schools of Hebrew and Arabic and gave birth to important orientalist.¹ Chairs of Arabic were created at the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge in England in the mid 1600's. A large motivating factor was biblical, where Arabic supported the studies of Syriac and Hebrew and hence the understanding of the Bible. Indic studies experienced a rapid expansion in the late eighteenth century through the work of many employees of the East India Company in Bengal.² Travel accounts, translations of works and religious texts, stories, plays, and art contributed to these studies, but also to a growing interest in Oriental things outside of academic circles. There was an obvious connection between the profession of orientalism and the expansion of European commerce, mostly English and French, and the colonialism and imperialism to which it eventually gave rise from the seventeenth century onwards. (Macfie 2002: 26-49)

According to Alexander L. Macfie (2002), a scholar who has written accounts about the relations between the East and the West, the word "orientalism" was used in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries to mean the study of the East, the Orient. An

¹ The birth of Oriental studies in France is dated to the late seventeenth century, in which a large part was played by Jesuit missionaries reporting back from China and Japan. A school of oriental languages was established in Paris in 1795. (Macfie 2002: 44-47)

² In 1786 the relationship between Sanskrit, Greek and Latin was first suggested, which later played a major role in the rise of the myth of Aryanism and racialist ideology in Europe (Macfie 2002: 31).

orientalist was a scholar with knowledge of the languages and literatures of the East. The orientalist style in the arts was one associated with the East. This meaning for the word remained the same until the period after the Second World War and decolonization. Macfie claims that a series of scholars transformed the word and gave it additional meaning associated with an “established institution” dealing with the Orient, an ideology and style of thought stereotyping, subjugating, and depriving Islam, Arabs, Palestinians, women, and other groups of people (2002: 4).

2.3 The Assault on Orientalism

There were numerous attacks on colonial cultural domination, but only in the period of decolonization did the criticism of European orientalism become widespread. Macfie (2002: 73) says that in particular the work of four scholars had a powerful effect: Anouar Abdel-Malek, A.L. Tibawi, Edward W. Said, and Bryan S. Turner.¹ The best known of the four critics is Edward W. Said. Said was born in Jerusalem in 1935 to a Christian Protestant Arab family. He was educated in Egypt and the US, including Princeton and Harvard universities. He became Professor at Columbia University, where he taught English and Comparative Literature from 1963 onwards. He became active in anti-Vietnam War issues and the Palestinian liberation movement especially after the Six Day War of 1967. Said lectured in various countries, his two main interests being the Palestinian-Israeli conflict and the

¹ **Anouar Abdel-Malek**, born in Cairo in 1923, studied sociology and philosophy and later worked as a teacher, writer and journalist in Cairo and Paris. His interest lay in Marxism, and in his essay “Orientalism in Crisis” (1963) he claims that as national liberation movements were victorious after the Second World War, a crisis appeared in the European-centered study of orientalism. A revision of the study was needed; the prejudices, the “constituted otherness”, and ethnic typologies such as “homo Arabicus” had to be reviewed. **A.L. Tabawi** was born in Tayba, Palestine, in 1910. A Palestinian, he lectured on education in London and on Islamic law in Harvard, and he died in 1981. In his first essay “English-Speaking Orientalists” (1964) he discusses the prejudice that he finds in English-speaking orientalism against Islam and Arab nationalism. He relates the prejudice to a distorted view of Islam given by Medieval Christian theologians. In his second essay “Second Critique of English-Speaking Orientalists” (1979) he acknowledges some tolerance shown by Christian clerics towards Islam, but claims that there is still a bias in orientalism against Islam and Arabs. **Bryan S. Turner** was born in Birmingham, England, in 1945. In 1982 he worked as Professor of Sociology at Flinders University of South Australia. In his book *Marx and the End of Orientalism* (1978) he looks at the effect of the “failures” of orientalism on Marxism and the way the history and social structure of the Middle East were pictured in the nineteenth century. He claims that orientalist were able to establish an ideal type of Western society in comparison to the Islamic society; North African and Middle Eastern societies were defined by what they lacked, and not by their own characteristics. (Macfie 2002: 73-85 and 93-95)

relationship between the Islamic world and Western powers. During the past three decades Said became the main voice of the Palestinian people in the West. As an elected member of the Palestinian National Council in the US he seemed to make enemies in all possible circles, speaking against religious fundamentalism and political extremism. He left nothing uncontested or unsaid, criticizing Palestinian, Israeli, and American leaders and their policies. After a decade long battle with leukemia Said died in September, 2003. (Newsweek 2003, and Macfie 2002: 75)

In his book *Orientalism: Western Conceptions of the Orient* (1995), which first appeared in 1978, Said adds to the earlier work of other critics of orientalism.¹ According to him, British and French orientalism, as well as later American orientalism, became a way to come to terms with the Orient: “The Orient is not only adjacent to Europe; it is... its cultural contestant, and one of its deepest and most recurring images of the Other,” (Said 1995: 1). The Orient helped define Europe and the West as a contrasting image; orientalism, the study of the East, became “Orientalism”, a style of thought based on the distinction between the “Orient” and the “Occident”. Said expands his critique to cover many aspects of European life.² Instead of seeing the Orient for its true self, orientalism imposed limitations on European thought and opinion on the Orient, and it became a self-sustaining myth of prejudices upheld by European scholars and artists, where Orientals were by nature mysterious, menacing, irrational, demonic, and sexually corrupt (Macfie 2002: 87).³

¹ Said built on the work of critics such as Abdel-Malek, but probably found Tibawi’s Islamic fundamentalism unattractive (Macfie 2002: 85).

² According to Said, orientalism was a systematic discipline through which European culture in the post-Enlightenment period managed and produced the Orient “politically, sociologically, militarily, ideologically, scientifically, and imaginatively,” (Said 1995: 3).

³ In the first part of his book Said explains in detail his case about orientalism as an all inclusive discipline, and also its roots and origins. Orientalist circles have an obsession with classical texts according to him, and the origins of the idea go further back to the classical works of the Greeks. From the Greeks to Roman geographers, to Medieval merchants, Crusaders, and Christian writers, the idea of the East (and later Islam) was established as irrational, with ties to terror, and as the Biblical Sodom and Gomorrah. Said traces this stereotyped way of thinking to the European academia of orientalism. With the Jesuit missions to China, the British East India’s influence over India, and scholars with Biblical studies and Semitic languages as their educational basis, orientalism was turned into a vast center of learning with the inbred stereotypes. According to Said, with the expansion in overseas exploration, the development of comparative studies and historicist ideas, and an obsession with clarification and explanation, modern orientalism came to include a condescending idea interwoven with racism, imperialism and ethnocentrism. (Said 1995)

Said lists the main objects of the attack of modern orientalism to be Arabs and Muslims. “For no other ethnic or religious group is it true that virtually anything can be written or said about it, without challenge or demurrals,” (Said 1995: 287). Islam, he says, has been established as a religion of resistance to Christianity over the centuries.¹ Arab Muslims have become a figure in American popular culture; compared to the rational and humane West, they are either selfish sheikhs controlling the world’s oil or then they are portrayed as an anti-Zionist force or anti-Semitic ideology, especially when speaking about the Israeli-Arab disputes and the on-going Palestinian-Israeli crisis. Said specifies the Palestinians as being victims of Western stereotyping and a Zionist invasion and colonization of their country, where Israel has been left without critique and the history of the region without a realistic look. He also claims that the Palestinians have been seen as the Orientals, the savage with the undeveloped mind. Said extends his study into the second half of the twentieth century, claiming that this stereotyped way of thinking continues in modern Western (especially American) policies and publications. (Said 1995)

2.4 Responses to the Critique of Orientalism

Other critics of orientalism did not reach as large an audience as Said did. Said writes in his new Afterword in the 1995 edition that he received a lot of attention, “some of it (as was to be expected) very hostile, some of it uncomprehending, but most of it positive and enthusiastic,” (1995: 329). According to Macfie, the reactions around the world were mixed, and they were not divided on the basis of ethnic, racial, national, cultural, philosophical, or religious affiliation. For example, many Arab reviews were critical of Said, and did not provide the support one might expect. However, Macfie claims that scholars of the traditional (realist) approach to the writing of history (Marxists, Bernard Lewis, John MacKenzie) generally disapproved of Said’s study, while critics with a modern or post-modern approach generally approved of it (2002: 108-9 and 216).

¹ See Said (1995: 268). For further studies on the issue of Islam in Western culture see Said’s *Covering Islam – How the Media and the Experts Determine How We See the Rest of the World* originally from 1981 (Said 1997).

One of the common critiques of Said's approach is the argument that he, criticizing European orientalism's "essentialization" of the Orient, in fact has himself essentialized Europe; he has hypocritically provided Europe with a fixed and unchanging identity, while he himself claims that identity is unstable and an illusion. Perhaps without this he would not have been able to sustain his attack on European orientalism, a style of thought based on the distinction between East and West. Other critiques relate to Said's choice in attacking only British and French orientalism or assaulting the whole profession of orientalism rather than concentrating on certain orientalists (Macfie 2002: 100-118).¹ Some criticism of Said's works claims that his views are too unsympathetic, unscholarly, and too politically motivated. One scholar, Martin Kramer (2001), accuses Said and others of being responsible for the failure of Middle Eastern Studies in the US.² Bernard Lewis, the British-American traditionalist historian of Jewish background, has continued to debunk Said's arguments during the last three decades. In fact, the lasting discussion between Lewis and Said swells into more of a personal rivalry than anything, and personal ideologies over the Palestinian-Israeli conflict come out with great opposition to anything the other says.³ One of the greatest effects Said's eloquent writing seems to have had was to scare Westerners with a fixed and established world view identifying with the state of Israel.

According to Macfie (2002), almost all case studies of intercultural relations of the East and West and the history of orientalism and imperialism show that European relations to the Orient were more complex, varied, irregular, discontinuous,

¹ Some argue that, even more than the Orient, the European powers England and France have been each other's opponent and the "Other". Other critical responses have included Said's lack of depth in researching German and Russian orientalism, equally important in the study of East-West relations. Macfie (2002) agrees with the questioning of Said's use of the words orientalist and orientalism, his attack on the whole profession of orientalism and not only certain individual orientalists and writers, and his occasional historical errors and evasions. More criticism sets around Said not discussing "Occidentalism", where "Easterners" frequently make similar distinctions of the West. Also, there is criticism of Said failing to include criticism of colonial cultural domination produced in India and Latin America, only that of the Middle East. (Macfie 2002: 100-118)

² Kramer argues that a deep prejudice and ideological struggle in the academe has diverted the studies into unscholarly grounds, where changes in actual real world politics are unexpected and unexplainable (2001). See www.mesa.com for discussion.

³ Compare the writings of Said and Lewis. Lewis' text is full of opportunistic use of facts, simplification and generalization of the world (what he argues Said's is full of), with a clear political message in the Palestinian-Israeli context. Other scholars, such as Kramer (2001), Buruma and Margalit (2004), clearly bring out their political agendas and allow them to affect their attempts at objective scholarship.

heterogeneous and unstable than Said proposed in 1978. Many recent scholars, such as McAlister (2001), accept the contribution Said has given to scholarship, but they take it critically nonetheless and do not agree with every argument. However, Said's work has provoked over sixty reviews of orientalism and it gave rise to an expansive discussion around the world. Said gives his answer to the feedback in his Afterword in 1995; he claims he intended no attack on the West as some have defensively accused him of, and as others have used to further their own attacks on the West. He says that he, a Palestinian of Christian background, did not intend his book to be a defense of Islam and Arabs, yet his works have been linked to recent Islamism by certain parties. He only criticizes the accepted concepts such as the "Orient" and the "Occident", the East and West. The terms, according to him, do not correspond to any stable reality; they are constructed to give people identity.¹ Having an "Other", a contrast and an opposition, may strengthen this identity of the "Self" and "Us". Said inspired critical self-scrutiny with a continual re-examination of methodology and practice in academia and cultural thinking (Said 1995: 329).

2.5 The US in the Middle East, Arabs and Muslims in Contemporary Cultural Products

Melani McAlister, assistant professor of American Studies at the George Washington University, has written an extensive study of cultural products and foreign affairs in the US from the end of the Second World War onwards (2001). The goal of the book, similar to Said's work, is to study the intersection between cultural texts, foreign policy, and constructs of identity. It is about the cultural and political encounters that have made the Middle East meaningful and important to Americans, and it explores "how Americans have claimed their 'interests' in the Middle East," (McAlister 2001: 4). News reports, blockbuster films, bestselling novels, and museum exhibitions provide the objects of analysis. McAlister studies different ethnic, religious, and cultural groups in the US, and their differing views of

¹ Said's view of knowledge in the orientalism debate is one which consists of unstable representations which depend on the subject's perspective. He agrees with the philosopher Nietzsche that "truths are illusions about which one has forgotten that this is what they are," (1995: 203).

historical events. She argues that cultural products are tied in close to foreign policy, and that they help clarify certain views of the Middle East to the audience.¹

Another author influenced by Said is Douglas Little (2002). In fact, his work resembles a post-9/11 version of the earlier McAlister book, but he also goes into numerous detailed examples of US involvement in the Middle East and the Middle East in American culture. Both McAlister and he claim that the expansion of American involvement abroad after the Second World War was more dramatic in the Middle East than in other regions, where "...something very like Said's orientalism seems subconsciously to have shaped US popular attitudes and foreign policies toward the Middle East," (Little 2002: 10). One more scholar leaning in this direction is Samuel P. Huntington, whose *Clash of Civilizations* supports the idea that Islam and the West have been each other's "Other" for hundreds of years, especially recently. Only during the years 1980-1995, for example, the US engaged in 17 military operations in the Middle East, with no comparable pattern on other "civilizations" as Huntington puts it; all of them were against Muslims (1997: 209-217). He has, however, received criticism for his generalizing of "civilizations" and cultures and for putting them against each other in a competition over resources and land. Said has criticized the generalizing and the building of civilizations and cultures as such "water-tight compartments" (1995: 348).²

¹ McAlister has clear influences from Said, and she also builds on the work of other scholars such as Michael Shapiro, Benedict Anderson, and David Campbell. For example, Anderson has written of the concept of a nation as an "imagined community" which depends on cultural articulation and construction; in other words, novels and TV shows have intimate connections to the production of nationalism and imperialism (McAlister 2001: 120 and 241). Campbell argues that the repetition of danger in foreign policy issues is not a threat to the state's identity; the constant sense of threat can in fact even provide support for its power. McAlister comes up with two clear arguments about the fields of culture and politics. Firstly, "Foreign policy is one of the ways in which nations speak for themselves; it defines not only the boundaries of the nation but also its character, its allies, and its enemies," (2001: 6). These alliances change and national interests alter, and outside threats not only provide support for the power of the state but also secure the nation as a cultural and social entity. Secondly, "Culture is an active part of constructing the narratives that help policy make sense in a given moment." Cultural products help make meanings by their historical association and, in the case of the Middle East, help a certain discourse about it be understood as "common sense" (2001: 6-8).

² Huntington wrote a controversial essay and later the book *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order* (New York: Touchstone, 1997). In it he specifies his view of the new state of affairs after the Cold War, of "civilizations" competing against each other for resources and space, instead of nations and ideologies being the driving force. In it he justifies the simplification of reality so that we can understand it better, "...a map that both portrays reality and simplifies reality in a way that best serves our purposes," (1996: 31). He highlights the differences especially between the "West" and the "Islamic civilization", and gives his reasons for why the two are going at each other. Towards the end his message is more of a warning that the West should keep its technological and military superiority if it wants to preserve its culture. Said has attacked this generalization and

McAlister (2001) specifies that the most important reasons for American involvement in the Middle East were the Cold War, religious affiliations, Israel, and oil.¹ The region became a battle field for influence where the power of the Soviets was to be limited during the **Cold War**. McAlister continues that with the moral component of saving the peoples from the “slavery” of communism there was also the economic aspect of **oil** and the strategic aspect of sharing a border with the USSR. **Religious affiliations** have a background farther in history, where the Holy Land and holy sites are important to Christians, Jews, and Muslims.² Novels and movies carried Biblical and Judeo-Christian religious historical themes in them, supporting the increase in religious feeling in the late nineteenth century and the post-Second World War period.³ These kinds of cultural products encouraged a positive view of **Israel**, and motivated American support for the state.⁴ Religious publishing increased in the 1970’s, as after the 1967 war where religious sites were “repossessed” by Israelis (as would happen according to a popular interpretation of Christian prophesy), White Protestant evangelicals became more interested in government and politics in the US.

The interest in Israel increased among Americans as the end of the Vietnam War drew to a close. The war was not being shown in positive light on television and there were rising doubts of the campaign’s success. The successes that Israeli forces displayed against Arab armies in 1948 and 1967 and against terrorist groups came to represent a stage where Americans could re-fight (and win) the war in Vietnam.

portraying “civilizations” as such clear-cut compartments, “...since one of the great advances in modern cultural theory is the realization, almost universally acknowledged, that cultures are hybrid and heterogeneous and... that cultures and civilizations are so interrelated and interdependent as to beggar any unitary or simply delineates description of their individuality,” (1995: 349).

¹ Other scholars highlight the Cold War and Israel as reasons for American involvement in the Middle East. See Little (2002), Kaufman (1996), Neff (1995), and Sheffer (1997) for examples.

² McAlister (2001) discusses the African American movement of the Nation of Islam (NOI) in the period 1955-1972. These American Muslims related differently to the Middle East than Christians and Jews, and they experienced the historical events and cultural products in a different way.

³ Examples of these novels are *Ben Hur* (1880), a bestseller for forty years, and *Quo Vadis* (1895). The 1950’s saw these stories come out as blockbuster movies with a continuation of the religious historical theme: *Quo Vadis* (1952), *The Ten Commandments* (1956), *Ben Hur* (1959), among many others. A major theme in almost all of the epics of the 1950’s is “liberation from bondage and slavery”, which related to the Holocaust, the recent establishment of a homeland for the Jewish people, and to the threat of communism. (McAlister 2001)

⁴ According to McAlister, the most influential of these was the film phenomenon *Exodus* (1961). With pro-Israeli and anti-Arab themes (with every possible kind of stereotype) it became “the primary source of knowledge about Jews and Israel that most Americans had,” (2001: 159).

The militarized image of Israel served right-wing conservatives in their challenge to liberal parties, and came to play a rhetorical role in arguments about US foreign policy and American identity. “Over the course of the decade, a dominant view emerged that it was at once morally just and in U.S. national interests to act not only *with* Israel but also *like* Israel on key international issues,” (McAlister 2001: 168).¹

McAlister (2001) continues that news broadcasting of events kept acts of **terrorism** constantly in the headlines in the US. This also kept up the American support for Israel (until the first Intifada in 1987) as it was seen to be fighting “a good fight”. After the Six Day War of 1967 a large part of the Palestinian population came under Israeli control while others became part of the second wave of refugees. The war altered their attitudes; they lost their belief in the leaders of Arab states to whom they had trusted the recovery of Palestine, and many liberation movements took things in their own hands and became militant.² The late 1960’s and 70’s showed a growing amount of raids into Israeli held territory and numerous hijackings of civilian planes for political reasons (Cleveland 1994: 327-331). The attack in the 1972 Munich Olympics against Israeli athletes had an extraordinary impact on the world.³ Israel’s hard line of not negotiating with terrorists, and especially its revenge tactics were criticized by American liberals and the left-wing. Conservatives and news editors in general announced their understanding and sympathy with Israeli actions. Another incident, the Entebbe hostage crisis of 1976 in Uganda, where Israeli special troops sorted out the situation with minimal casualties, became “the most famous incident of terrorism in a decade obsessed with terrorism,” (McAlister 2001: 181).⁴

¹ Also, see Little (2002) and Sheffer (1997) for supporting arguments.

² Groups such as al-Fatah became active in Jordan and other countries and recruited youths into their independent organizations. The different and often fractious resistance groups coexisted under the unifying Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO). Yasir Arafat was one of the founders of al-Fatah in 1957 in Kuwait, and became chairman of the PLO in 1969 (Cleveland 1994: 327-331). He later became Chairman of the Palestinian Authority (PA) until his death in 2004.

³ The irony of eleven Israelis being killed in the same city where the 1936 Olympics were held by the Nazis did not go unnoticed. Director Steven Spielberg has captured this event on a recent epic film, *Munich* (2006), starring Eric Bana. While Western critics have hailed the movie for showing both sides of the conflict, Palestinian commentators have claimed that once again, like in many previous movies, Palestinians are portrayed only as either victims or as terrorists (inspired by *Talking Movies*, BBC World, February 2006). Later discussion on *Munich* in chapter 7.

⁴ Novels and movies, such as *Black Sunday* (film produced in 1977, based on Thomas Harris’ novel), started displaying Israeli heroes saving Americans from Palestinian terror attacks (McAlister 2001: 187). *Black Sunday* is important when analyzing Clancy’s production due to it being mentioned in

Toine van Teeffelen (1995) wrote his work in a collection of essays which relates cultural products and discourse to the political discussion on Palestine. Van Teeffelen writes that certain stereotypes and ideas are a recurring theme in Western popular fiction when talking about the **Palestinian-Israeli conflict**. Some twenty-five books focusing on the conflict have reached the top ten of a US bestseller list.¹ In these books the Palestinians are usually terrorists, while Israelis are the soldiers or Mossad agents confronting them. The books activate previous background expectations through “rhetorical description of ‘routine stories’ of terrorist actions” of the Palestinian characters. Also, they casually refer to real previous acts of terrorism which are deep in the memory of the public to help support the stereotypes. In order for the story to have suspense and intrigue it includes discussion of controversial themes of terrorism, such as giving the terrorists some professionalism in their actions, maybe even trying to give a sympathetic view of their motivating factors in the analysis of their psychological make-up. “Many thrillers aim to establish a sense of realism by avoiding a too one-dimensional account of political affairs,” (van Teeffelen 1995: 95).

According to McAlister and Little, the hostage crisis of 1979-80 in **Iran** was another subject dominating news coverage in the US. During the 444 days of imprisonment Americans came to see themselves as victims, rather than the Israelis. Islam became a dominant signifier of the region, and the US became to be seen more and more as a “Christian” nation. Islam became related to terrorism.² McAlister continues that the mid 1980’s saw the theme of rescuing hostages from Middle Eastern terrorists a near obsession in American cultural texts carrying racist and militarist portraits within them.³ The theme became popular in true-story narratives and moved to other genres of text and film as well. While Israel had come to be respected and identified

his novel *The Sum of All Fears* (1991), and due to the similarity in the two of having pro-Palestinian terrorists plotting to kill 80,000 Americans at the Super Bowl.

¹ Thomas Harris’ *Black Sunday* (1975) is an example.

² Said has spoken of this in his book *Covering Islam: How the Media and the Experts Determine How We See the Rest of the World* (1997). The argument that Islam had in fact invented terrorism became popular among certain conservative circles, due to publications such as Benjamin Netanyahu’s *Terrorism: How the West Can Win* (1986) and repetition from scholars such as Bernard Lewis in *The Assassins: A Radical Sect in Islam* and other books. Said, writing in *Nation* about Netanyahu’s book, said that the essays in it “would be considered the rankest racism and incompetence in any other field” (McAlister 2001: 218-219).

³ The movie *Delta Force* (1986) is a classic example, with Chuck Norris kicking bad guys.

with, Muslims and Arabs, Iran, Iraq, and other countries came to be seen in a negative light, as the opponent. Cultural products carried and canonized these ideas. “While it is simply inaccurate to say that all American representations of the Middle East demonized Arabs and/or Islam, such demonization was never entirely absent,” (McAlister 2001: 270).

McAlister, like Little, seems to agree with the main idea of Said’s claims in *Orientalism* and his other books; the world is displayed in a bipolar setting in many cultural products, and there is a continuation of the undermining of Arabs and Muslims. However, one thing which she claims does not fit into the American society is the picture Said draws of the West as a unified and stable entity. American society is not homogeneous but is of diverse ethnic background, as a nation with immigrants from all over the world (also, as McAlister shows, the US military from 1991 onwards came to be shown as a multicultural group with both sexes represented). She also claims that the argument of the West being represented as “masculine” and the Middle East as “feminine” does not fit the contemporary US; women and femininity are in an important role in American identity and not marginal in the idea of nationalism. “‘Marriage and family’ have consistently been evoked as the foundation of national identity,” (2001: 272). However, the cultural production of a “modern” family, “...in which the ‘home’ belongs to both man and women,” does provide some type of a unified identity for Americans.

2.6 Discussion

I have only touched the surface of the long and deep discussion of orientalism, nationalism, identity, and cultural products which has lasted for half a century. The aim of this thesis is not to get into further detail on the topic, nor to look at related subjects such as occidentalism.¹ It is, however, important to be aware of the debate

¹ Occidentalism, the way the “West” is portrayed in the cultural productions of the Middle East, will not be discussed in this thesis. There is plenty of material for such studies, and plenty of reason to expect certain recurring stereotypes of the “West” in use even nowadays. Recent movies produced in Islamic countries portray America in negative light, as the aggressor and as the “Other”. For example, the Turkish B-class movie *Kurtlar Vadisi – Iraq* (2006), “Wolf Valley - Iraq”, has become a blockbuster in Turkey, showing American forces as the bad guys bombing a mosque at prayer time, shooting civilians in a wedding ceremony etc. The good guys are Muslims – Arabs, Turks, Kurds –

and the source of inspiration for taking a critical look at our own culture and its products. This discussion of past relations and ways of portraying the Middle East will be the background through the analysis in this paper.

Said, McAlister and others do not mention Tom Clancy's works in their studies. Van Teeffelen mentions Clancy in his PhD thesis, but only briefly. I have not been able to find any other sources analyzing Clancy's orientalism or him in light of this previous discussion. There are reviews of Clancy though, such as ones by William Terdoslavich (2005) and Helen S. Garson (1996), with some discussion of identity and policy. Certain aspects of the ideas of continuous stereotypes stated by Said, McAlister, van Teeffelen, and others can be found in Clancy's novels. In the discussion of an unstable reality and an imagined identity, considering his political involvement and his relations with the US government, Clancy seems to be a worthy target for an analysis on the intermixed topics of foreign relations, cultural productions, and identity. It is with these thoughts in mind that I launch my own study of his production.

and the main hero is Turkish. In Germany there have even been an outcry to ban the movie from theaters (Albayrak 2006 and Väärät Sankarit 2006). Orientalism and Occidentalism are related topics and move hand-in-hand. However, studies such as *Occidentalism* (2004) are equally, if not more so, politically motivated works as is claimed of Said's *Orientalism* (1995). The pro-"Clash of Civilizations" theme is undeniably obvious in them. This simplified Huntingtonian idea is becoming widely spread in the conservative groups in the West, as well as with groups in the Islamic world, and recent events seem to have only encouraged this kind of thinking.

3 TOM CLANCY AND HIS NOVELS

3.1 The Author and His Followers

Thomas Leo Clancy Jr. was born in 1947 in Baltimore, Maryland, in the United States. He was brought up Catholic, studied at Catholic schools, received his education at Loyola College, and graduated in 1969 majoring in English Literature. He partnered and then bought a private insurance company before having a serious attempt at writing. However, Clancy became known for more than just his works. He has been actively interviewed for his opinions on international affairs, and he has been more than keen to share his views. He married his first wife in 1970 and had two children with her. The years 1995-98 resulted in a widely publicized divorce, where his wife charged him with abandonment and committing adultery.¹ He married his second wife in 1999, and now has four children altogether. After a marred attempt at acquiring ownership of the Minnesota Vikings football team, Clancy became part owner of the Baltimore Orioles baseball team.² Otherwise, he is described as guarding his private life from the media and other outsiders.

Clancy is a thought-provoking person. He seems to be quite conservative and head-strong in some of his arguments.³ He is a definite Republican when it comes to certain American domestic and foreign policy, obvious in his support and

¹ According to Garson (1996) Mrs. Wanda Clancy filed for divorce in 1995 due to Tom's infidelity. The irony is clear when discussing the way Clancy portrays the importance of family to American identity in his novels, as he himself "...turned his back on the rules he declared to live by," (Garson 1996: 23). For example, in an interview in 1991 Clancy criticized politicians saying: "Therefore, I ask if we apply that standard to our neighbors, why should we not apply that same standard to the people who represent us in Congress? Again, I take a very provincial view of public life. If a guy can't run his family successfully – be a good husband, be a good father – why the hell do we trust him with anything else?" (in Greenberg 2005: 62).

² American football appears to be important to Clancy also as a theme in his writing characterizing American identity; see attack on Super Bowl in *Sum* and football placed on terrorist in *Teeth*.

³ Garson notes that Clancy likes to be in control of things; "...the general opinion is he doesn't allow points of view different from his own," (1996: 11). This became evident during Clancy's experience in the presidential commission on the future of space programs requested by Vice-President Dan Quayle, an ardent admirer of Clancy's.

campaigning for certain presidents and candidates,¹ his support for the eradication of restrictions put on the president, his seemingly strong stands in abortion issues (in *Executive*), the death penalty (in *Patriot, Sum, Teeth*), socialism (in *Hunt, Red Storm*, Greenberg 2005), gay rights,² environmental issues (in *Rainbow*) and the targeting of government funds.³ His fans in government and on the internet seem to be supportive of many of these ideas. He does not come out as an overtly religious person, but he does respect the Judeo-Christian cultural background and his Catholic upbringing. One commentator claims that his political views gained him such a great following; it was his bold anti-communism in his first books which was the reason for his success (Greenberg 2005: 5). Yet, again he seems less conservative on other issues, supporting a Democrat in government, and once even siding as pro-union in a baseball team strike (Garson 1996: 10). He himself encourages his audience to read up on ideas they might disagree with, "...because the price of intellectual honesty is the act of examination of contrary ideas. You have to admit to the fact that you're not always right and even somebody you disagree with a lot may have an idea that's better than yours," (in Greenberg 2005: 57).

The research Clancy incorporates into his novels and weaves into his stories seems to give some fans all the education they may get on those subjects. The internet is full of fan sites which base their historical knowledge and world view on Clancy novels; many of them get their facts wrong in the process. One Clancy-guide is similarly faulty in its historical details.⁴ The author should not be held in account for the ignorance of his fans, and internet sources especially should be taken with skepticism. However, it is important to see the influence Clancy has on his less prestigious and more prestigious audiences. Many of his fans are found amongst the neoconservatives of Washington D.C. who have invited him to lecture at the White House and the Pentagon on a number of occasions. Republican politicians such as

¹ Clancy has supported the presidents Reagan, Bush, and George W. Bush, as well as other Republicans such as Colonel North and Senator Bentley. Clancy regularly donates funds to Republican candidates or parties (Newsmeat 2006).

² Garson discusses Clancy's apparent homophobia, which comes out strongly in his novels and his portrayal of liberated "bad guys"; he is an "unapologetic homophobe" (Garson 1996: 17).

³ Clancy has advocated the importance of funding Space-research and the military over directing it at social reform and the poor (Garson 1996: 11). Money also seems to be a badge of success for him individually and for his good-guy characters.

⁴ The makers of *The Tom Clancy Companion* (Greenberg 2005) have been sloppy in their work; an amount of important details listed are historically and factually incorrect.

President Reagan and Senator Quayle (Indiana) have used Clancy's novels, such as *Red Storm*, for the basis of their knowledge on certain issues and in their politics (see further discussion in chapter 4). "They are not just novels," Senator Quayle said before his vice-presidency, "They read like the real thing," (Terdoslavich 2005: 236). Congressman and Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich, a former college professor, similarly recommends Clancy-books with the belief that they help people understand history (Garson 1996: 7). Many other figures like Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger and Secretary of State Colin Powell have given him praise (Trosky 1991: 109). It is the sum of these types of comments, where the care and critique which usually characterizes the reading of fiction (and other media) seems forgotten, that makes Clancy a worthwhile object of analysis in the study of culture.

A determined reader will also gain insights into the commodities market, epidemiology... Japanese culture, and an insider's look at the public and private lives of the powerful in places such as Washington, D.C., pre- and post-communist Moscow, London, Northern Ireland, Afghanistan, and the Middle East. (Marc A. Cerasini in Greenberg 2005: 6).

3.2 Clancy's Genre and the Importance of Guns in Politics

Greenberg (2005) and Garson (1996) have discussed Clancy's fiction in relation to the previously established genres of science fiction, thriller-fiction, the spy novel, and political thrillers. They agree that Clancy's production contains themes from these genres, yet his style is also unique and he can only be described as the forefather of the new genre of "technothrillers". Even as his writing is innovative and exciting with new ideas, twists in stories, and new technology, it is also quite the traditional formula-writing style; the reader knows more-or-less who will win and who will be killed in the end.

Clancy's text is impersonal, unemotional, and "masculine" if compared to genres of writing such as romance novels. The characters are all very professional and mostly rational. Even at times of violence and death the language used is descriptive of physical and mechanic factors and any emotion of sadness is lost in the excitement. Some critics have described his machines as more interesting, complex, and lifelike

than his characters; his characters are more “types” than actual individuals (Garson 1996: 37). Clancy has his own personal style of story-building, where he describes a multiple of scattered and unrelated events and forces around the globe, all of which contribute to the final climax of the novel. He picks fictional individuals from different groups and countries, and narrates a detailed progress of events through their thoughts and experiences. It is his narration through the thoughts rather than emotions of his characters that makes his novels thrillers, not stories to weep over.

One thing which is obvious about Clancy is his undying interest in guns, weapons technology, and the armed forces. Apparently, he had hoped to serve in the US military, but his poor eye-sight failed him and he was rejected from service during the Vietnam War (Garson 1996: 4). Helping to provide this image of him are the paper-back versions of his books, where he is often pictured standing on a deck or a pier with a US Navy battleship in the background, or donning a cap or jacket bearing the insignia of a Navy vessel. The weapons-buff side of his character comes out in the loving detail of his writing, but also in his interviews and essays. In an essay titled “But I *Like* to Shoot”, which first appeared in *The Washington Post* in 1991, he discusses his enjoyment of shooting guns as a hobby, the society and crime around him, the relation of drug-use and murders, individual rights, and American history and values (Greenberg 2005: 109). He argues that as long as a person uses their weapons responsibly, there is no reason for anyone to interfere in their business. He owns handguns and rifles, has a shooting-range in his house, and enjoys good relations with the armed forces, where he has had the opportunity to try out different weapons. Clancy even has his very own World War II Sherman tank parked on his lawn.¹

Perhaps, though, Clancy is less responsible in his weapons-use in the fiction he writes. Battles and wars give excitement to a story, and Clancy shamelessly uses violence and killing to give color to international relations. They also provide the base for his plot outline. However, this armed conflict can be seen as part of Clancy conveying his political views and his identity-building as well. In many novels the US or its interests are threatened by an aggressor, and America then answers back

¹ The tank was a Christmas present from his first wife (Garson 1996: 22).

with further organized violence until the problem is solved. Military force is the tool to fix problems, and the killing of the enemy is justified and an important part of the ending of the story. William Terdoslavich, a critic who makes a case of analyzing Clancy's fiction in context of the real world, calls this kind of play "blue collar nationalism", where a working man sees challenges to America as a matter of sending troops in to kick ass (Terdoslavich 2005: 13). It is a simple, black-and-white, gung-ho attitude, yet it is very much part of Clancy's fiction. The attacker, or the "Other", provides a challenge, after which the victorious American forces provide a strengthening of patriotism for the US.

3.3 Clancy's World View in Fiction

According to Terdoslavich (2005), Clancy's world is simplified in the political sense; on domestic issues, presidents give grants to buy the best weapons and provide the best defense without any tight budgetary pressures. The US Congress barely has any influence in comparison to the strong and "all-powerful demigod" of a president (2005: 14). Foreign affairs are limited to the idea that force works, diplomacy does not. "Military people are much more honorable than politicians," (in Greenberg 2005: 69) Clancy says to an interviewer, because these military people cannot lie and cheat like politicians can, a theme in many of the stories.¹ On the international side of Clancy's fiction the UN barely exists. Other peoples and powerful countries do not intervene with American doings. No one really speaks out against American policy, except for the bad guys, and they get killed or quarantined somewhere in the end anyway. The ending is a clean one, and there are no repercussions and reviews of the events.

Clancy's world is also simplified in the geopolitical sense. He uses many regions of the world for his plots, and picks many individual characters to build his stories. Mostly the arena is split in two, with America and its allies versus the rest of the world, "The West and the Rest", with a clear "good guy-bad guy" distinction as

¹ In his most recent post 9/11 novel *Teeth* (discussed in chapter 7) Clancy takes this theme further as he writes that "...anyone who judged America by its political leaders probably thought the U.S. of A. was a nation of fuckups," (*Teeth* 275).

Clancy himself likes to call it (Garson 1996: 1). Many times, also, the split is a conservative one, with real world old enemies and old allies remembered. This idea was clearer in the Cold War setting, but it is also part of Clancy's most recent novel on the character-level. In many of these countries he establishes a friendly character who speaks for that part of the world and has good relations with the main heroes.

Clancy's stories do not provide this theme of the "Other" versus "Us" without some variation and ambiguity though. Sometimes his enemies are less clear as there may be two opposing forces in a foreign group; with one moral character in a party to balance out the immoral ones. Also, the threat to America or its interests does not always come from abroad; sometimes it comes from inside the American society in the form of immoral politicians or radical extremists. The challenges to the US that the aggressors provide vary, and each novel is different. The aggressor is not always clearly "evil"; there is some attempt at complex identities and detailed motivating factors. These enemies have also changed over time, and old enemies from the first novels have even become allies later on. The two major incidents, the end of the Cold War and the terrorism of 9/11, have altered Clancy's world, his good-guy characters, and his enemies.

Clancy's world moves with the events from the real world. Not only is his historical and technological research obvious in his writing, but so is his awareness of contemporary political issues. Many of his fictional characters resemble some real-life figure.¹ His American and foreign leaders of state, politicians, professional soldiers, and America's enemies seem to be actual counterparts to ones we read about in current affairs. Many scandals and known events appear in his writing similar to ones reported in our newspapers and magazines. Some events Clancy has seemingly prophesized, having had them happen in fiction before they occurred in real life.² The question is then not necessarily whether his writing follows current

¹ As Garson (1996: 5) discusses, Clancy admires certain people in the highest positions of the CIA, FBI etc. His good-guy characters resemble these individuals, yet his main character resembles Clancy himself.

² The most infamous case of Clancy writing it in fiction before something similar happened in real-life is the incredible climax at the end of his novel *Debt*, where a Japanese pilot turns his passenger plane into a missile and flies it into Capitol Hill, killing off most of the federal government. After 9/11 in 2001, where airplanes were similarly used in terrorist attacks on New York's Twin Towers and the headquarters of the US armed forces at the Pentagon, Clancy has been questioned about this similarity on several occasions (Greenberg 2005: 33).

affairs and politics in a strict manner, but whether he may, in fact, have an effect on the course of these events. Many of his readers, both the more as well as less influential ones, are definitely inspired and allow themselves be led by him.

Clancy's books flow into each other, and earlier books many times prepare the plot, characters and enemies for the next book.¹ All of the books, except for *Red Storm*, are connected by the same characters and with events leading up to future plots. Twelve of Clancy's novels are termed Ryan-verse books, where the character Jack Ryan plays a major or minor part in the events (in *Without*, *Rainbow*, and in *Teeth* Jack Ryan only has a minor part or is commented on as a background figure). Also, many books comment on previous events in Clancy's earlier fiction. This sequence of self-enforcing stories provides the reader with a history and a world that Clancy has created himself, and where he can move the players according to his needs.

3.4 Characteristics of the Good Guys and the Bad Guys

John Patrick "Jack" Ryan was born in Baltimore, like Clancy, and was also brought up a good Catholic. He has Irish roots, an "Irish temper", and comes from a working-class family. After serving with the Marines he gets his doctorate, works at Merrill Lynch, makes a fortune with his investments, and lectures as a history teacher at the Naval Academy at Annapolis. He has an inbred sense of right and wrong which guides him through the novels, and he always sticks to the right. His training with the Marines also helps him through the action. His life is of honor and self-sacrifice, but he is also humble and a realist. Ryan is patriotic, but he is a reluctant hero in every story. He finds himself by accident in the midst of political crises, and his sense of duty makes him unable to back away from the challenges. From a history researcher and a lowly analyst he rises through the CIA and NSA before becoming, by accident, President of the US.²

¹ In *Sum*, for example, amongst all the trouble from the Middle East and the Russians, there are events which already prepare the stage for the next political conflict with Japan (*Without* comes in between). The books *Debt*, *Executive*, and *Bear* are obviously connected through their enemy plots, as will be discussed later.

² Other important male good-guy characters, supportive of Jack Ryan, include John Clark, Pat O'Day, Robby Jackson, and Ed Foley. John Clark/Kelly has become more of a legend in Clancy's novels; a former Navy Seal and a Vietnam War veteran, he joins the CIA as a field officer and carries

What comes across from the character of Jack Ryan is probably Clancy himself trying to make a point, as Clancy has admitted. The relationship between the author and the fictional character seems a lot closer though, as the two have had the very same upbringing, live in a very similar house, have the same amount of children; Ryan gets positions which Clancy seems to crave for for himself. According to Terdoslavich, Ryan is a “vehicle for conveying the author’s political views, used as a template to meet the challenges facing the United States,” (2005: 13). Ryan is the author’s voice himself, and the normal every day guy getting to speak his rational mind. The climax of Clancy’s political cry occurs when Jack Ryan becomes President after the Japanese passenger plane kills off most of the federal government (see *Debt* and *Executive*). Clancy has wiped the stage clean; Ryan can reconstruct the government without any of the old bureaucratic entanglements. Ryan’s long presidential speeches are written with such ingenious idealism and patriotism that the reader will definitely be inspired by them.¹

Not only are Clancy’s political views manifested, but his ideal moral values as well. Ryan is a good guy. He is honest, trustworthy, patriotic, and stands up to challenges when he needs to. A big theme in Clancy’s world is the “warrior code” with stronger ones protecting the innocent. Ryan is a family man, not a James Bond womanizer, and his daily life is about providing for his wife and children and taking care of other people. Clancy speaks of family as “...the basic building block of society... the beginning and end of everything we’re supposed to be working for” (in Greenberg 2005: 59). Family being a theme in Clancy’s novels brings its own sense of realism, perhaps what so many readers can relate to. Family relations are also the defining factor in Clancy’s description of characters, where the good guys tend to have perfect families, while the bad guys do not have them at all. Good marriages provide supporting partners, and children portray innocence and are the ultimate object of the parents’ protection. Attacks on the family, especially physical attacks on the children, are serious issues and show the inhumanity of politicians or

out the rough jobs in espionage, counter-terrorism, arresting and killing individual enemies. He also becomes somewhat political and philosophical to support Ryan in his life and his policies.

¹ Ryan, for example, encourages Americans to vote normal people into government with a background of serving the nation, not career politicians with agendas and support groups (*Executive*).

terrorists.¹ There are other good-guy families as well; most of these families are threatened in one way or another by aggressors in at least one of the stories.² Connected to the concept of family, yet also seemingly independent from any traditionalist interpretation of it, are Clancy's strong female characters.³

There are some similarities between the good-guy characters of the Ryan-verse novels. They are all professionals in some field of work, and they are all the best at what they do, really leaning towards perfection; these include the ones in the intelligence business, the generals, the foot soldiers, and the superior machinery portrayed. They are all well-off financially and well incorporated into society in an important and responsible job. Many of them are of obvious Catholic Irish-American descent with "Pat" somewhere in their name, but that fact is not highlighted out of the American context.⁴ There are plenty of exceptions as well: Robby Jackson, Ryan's best friend, a fighter pilot who becomes the first African-American president; Domingo Chavez, Clark's right hand man and son-in-law of Hispanic descent, respected for his intellectual and his physical attributes; Mary Pat Foley traces her family to pre-communist Russia; the Caruso brothers, Ryan's nephews and the heroes of the latest novel *Teeth*, have some Italian blood in them. Many of these good guys are established as having an upbringing with awareness of religion, many of them raised Catholic, some Protestant, but none of them are

¹ In *Sum* fidelity becomes an issue where immoral politicians use journalists and lies to threaten Ryan's political career and family peace. Irish terrorists in *Patriot* and Muslim terrorists in *Executive* threaten the lives of the Ryan family children.

² Other good-guy families include that of John and Sandy (O'Toodle) Clark, Robert "Robby" and Cecilia Jackson, Edward and Mary Patricia (Kaminsky) Foley, Domingo and Patricia Doris (Clark) Chavez, and Sean Patrick "Pat" O'Day.

³ Cathy, Jack Ryan's wife, is the most important female character in Clancy's fiction. As a mother and a wife leaning towards perfection she provides a support and motivation to her husband. She is also quite the independent professional worker; she works as an eye-doctor at Johns Hopkins Hospital and her private practice becomes a well respected one. And she drives a green Porsche. Cathy's strong character in the Clancy novels seems to show a liberal side to women's position in society (An interesting issue is Jack Ryan's position on abortion; he is strictly pro-life, perhaps his Catholic upbringing kicking in. It is interesting that Cathy does not comment on this). Other strong female characters include Mary Patricia Foley, a wife and a mother, but also a "cowboy" in the field of espionage, a daring CIA agent and later Director of Operations. She provides a contrast to her calmer husband. John Clark's wife is a nurse. Andrea Price, a US Secret Service agent who is always around Ryan during his presidency, is also the best at her job, and even gives her point of view on discussions of policies when Ryan asks for it.

⁴ Clancy's name itself has Irish origins. However, when analyzing *Patriot* and the events that happen to Ryan in London and the US, Clancy is more Anglocized than Irish. He pictures Irish characters as terrorists and in quite a negative light. Ryan is knighted after saving the British Royal family and he becomes tightly related to the monarchs; an event which continues to be highlighted in many of Clancy's novels. The British are close friends of the Americans, and this is once again strongly established in *Rainbow*, with Irish Catholic terrorists as the aggressors again.

especially religious (In events of shock and dismay the typical “Oh my God” is uttered; in events of anger the word “God” is also spoken, but with “damn” following soon after to form Clancy’s most recurring cuss word).

The main good-guy families mentioned are untouched by any serious loss of life, except for the briefly mentioned assassination of President Robby Jackson (see *Teeth*). Many times in Clancy’s novels though, the loss of family members due to aggression from an enemy plays as a source of motivation for individual heroes to fight against the enemy. This sense of victimizing a character occurs with American characters (such as Clark in *Without*) as well as other nationalities. The witnessing of violence towards innocent women and children provides justification for the actions of many male good guys when they end the lives of the enemy (as in *Teeth*). This justification of actions is usually related only to the good characters who are not enemies of America, while the enemy attacks America or its interests with the motivation of greed, or some twisted interpretation of an ideology.

Even when writing of romance and sex Clancy tends to concentrate on thoughts rather than emotions, and this differentiates him from any romance novelist. Romance and sex are not an important part of his plots, but they are another theme unifying and differentiating characters and providing a good-guy bad-guy identity. The good guys tend to have good romantic relationships with acceptable and moral sex with their partner, while bad guys are the opposite. The female characters, such as Ryan’s wife, have an important role in this; Cathy is a moral, responsible mother figure, while female politicians are sometimes portrayed as using sex to gain power and influence, and as a weapon against Ryan.¹ Some other politicians in America opposed to Ryan are also portrayed as sexually corrupt.² Many enemy state leaders and enemies in general are portrayed as sexually immoral.

The good-guy characters that Clancy establishes outside the US provide for friendly relations between America and allied countries. These are all members of their country’s military or intelligence agencies, and very professional at their jobs. The

¹ The scene in *Sum* comparing Cathy’s and E. Elliot’s lifestyles is clear-cut.

² Kealty, Ryan’s main political opponent in the Ryan-verse universe, has a history of sexually assaulting women, one of whom later committed suicide (*Debt* and *Executive*).

Prince of Wales appears in two novels, and Sir Basil Charleston, the head of the British Secret Intelligence Service, provides assistance to Ryan on many occasions. General Abraham Ben Jacob of the Israeli Mossad works closely with Ryan in two of the Middle East-centered novels (*Sum* and *Executive*), giving aid in finding terrorists in both of them. Prince Ali Bin Sheik, head of Saudi Arabia's foreign relations and intelligence, also provides help and support to Ryan in his ventures in the Middle East (interestingly, Clancy fancies Saudi Arabia as a near democracy at times). Sergey Nikolayevich Golovko is first a KGB officer and an enemy, but later the Chairman of the SVR and a friend of Ryan's appearing in many stories. Clancy has these individuals speak for their countries and come to support his view of the world. As Garson argues, "For foreigners to be "good guys" they usually have to be high-minded enough to understand the superiority of the West," (Garson 1996: 16).

It is easier to find similarities in Clancy's good guys than his enemies; his good-guy identity is that of a professional, well educated, well-off, well incorporated into society, with family support and an important job. His enemies vary in characteristics though. Some are leaders of countries or armies, some are social outcasts, and some are well imbedded in society. Some are Americans, as any American who commits treason is automatically a "bad guy". Many times these characters are "super-liberal white Anglo-Saxon Protestants" as Garson calls them, bringing out Clancy's strong homophobic theme (Garson 1996: 17). Many other nationalities are represented as well. Some are religious fundamentalists and abstain from all forms of physical comfort, many are secular and sexually immoral. What unifies them is the fact that they are the aggressors, they have made plans to conspire against what Clancy portrays as the existing ideal American society and its values.

It appears that when the enemy is a clear one from abroad, the character-building of both the good guys and the bad guys is limited. There is, for example, least concentration on family and romance in the books from the Cold War era portraying the Soviets as the enemy and later in the post-9/11 era with Muslim extremists as the enemy. The fight is on and the job must be done, the enemy is a clear opposition and "Other" and there is no need for the portrayal of "Self" identity through family values. In books written in the 1990's portraying a more ambiguous enemy, who

sometimes comes from within the American society, Clancy concentrates more on the description of Ryan's family members and family life, but also on developing the psyche of the enemy. It seems that the Cold War and 9/11 simplify the arrangement of identities in the stories, and even simplify the plot. Perhaps in these times of clear enemies there is need of more patriotism.

3.5 Clancy's Enemies

It is important to note that many different peoples and nations, in addition to Arabs and Muslims, appear in Clancy's thirteen novels as the enemy-figure of the US. The Soviets are the first ones, and they appear in four novels, as well as in a more ambiguous form in *Sum*. In the Cold War era the world is clear-cut with two opposing parties; the good and moral America and the evil and immoral Soviet Union. As Petri Vuollo mentions in his thesis, the enemy picture is quite stereotyped, with the Soviets being portrayed as conspiratorial, unemotional, alcoholic, immoral, and spiritually void (1993: 14-17). Marc A. Cerasini discusses Clancy's portrayal of the New Soviet Man as aggressive, greedy, amoral, and self-serving (in Greenberg 2005: 7).¹

As communism falls and the USSR disintegrates Clancy becomes ever friendlier towards the Russians. More new enemies begin appearing, with Irish Catholic terrorists already in *Patriot* from 1987. There seems to be no sympathy for these Irish characters, with them failing to show any humanity or decency towards others and only showing a cold-blooded killer nature. Marc A. Cerasini considers their portrayal as even harsher than the Soviets in Clancy's first two books; the family unit of the Ryans' and the Royals' are compared to the distorted sociopaths

¹ In *Red Storm* Russian soldiers are caught killing the parents and raping the pregnant daughter of a family in Iceland, even as a Soviet general comes out as a rational and sympathetic figure. In *Cardinal* the Soviet forces attack Afghan civilian centers and bomb women and children. The main source of evil is the institution of communism and the politicians in Moscow: in *Hunt* the Soviet defector Marko Ramius is motivated by his rage for the Communist system which caused a famine in his motherland and the death of his wife by a drunken surgeon and unreliable Soviet antibiotics. Similarly, in *Cardinal* the Soviet traitor Mikhail Filitov is motivated by the loss of his wife and sons due to the incompetence of the system and its products. In *Red Storm* children are killed to stage a justified war against the West. The Russian civilians, portrayed as badly clothed and poor-spirited, are often the victims of the oppressing Communist Party.

(Greenberg 2005: 15). These encounters with the Irish terrorists end up being remembered repeatedly by Jack Sr. and Jr. in later novels; they come to serve as an example of individuals identifying themselves as Catholic Christians in the debate about the relationship between terrorism and religion. Irish-American characters stand in comparison to Irish terrorists as the moral, professional family-men.

Clancy also uses Latin American criminals, Japanese aggressors, Chinese dictators, and Indian annoyances. In *Clear* the Colombian drug cartel smuggling cocaine into the US is immoral, ruthless, and sadistic.¹ In contrast, Clancy provides a respected Hispanic-American character as well. The development of Japanese characters into enemies already begins in *Sum* and blooms into a military conflict in *Debt*. The Japanese are portrayed as economically selfish, militaristic, and sexually corrupt; in comparison a Japanese-American character is a good-guy in a later novel. The Chinese leadership as the enemy begins in *Executive*. The reader finds out that China is the main mastermind in the anti-American trio with Iran and Japan. China also shows no regrets over its killing of civilians. In *Bear* the portrayal of the Chinese people and society, the government's horrific enforcement of the one-child policy, its military aggression against Russia, and its launching of nuclear weapons at the US provide a clear enemy. India, as a minor annoyance, has a Prime Minister who looks greedily upon Sri Lanka and Pakistan and acts egoistically towards Clancy's main heroes, Ryan and the American forces. Each of these foreign enemy groups has its main negative stereotypes enforced by Clancy, and they all threaten the sacred family unit in some way.

American politicians are amongst the disrespected figures in Clancy's world. Vice Admiral Cutter in *Clear* is irresponsible and self-centered, National Security Advisor Alden is linked to a sexual scandal in *Sum*, Elizabeth Elliot is egoistic, paranoid, and tied to sexual immorality in her past and in her seducing of President Fowler, and Vice President Kealty is connected to sexual scandals and rapes in *Debt* and makes an incompetent leader in *Teeth*. The exceptions to the politicians in Washington D.C. are of course President Ryan, his administration, Senator Hendley, and a few other sympathetic and soldierly characters; they do not really fit Clancy's

¹ The theme of the Columbian drug cartel continues in *Teeth* where they smuggle Arab Muslim terrorists into the US in exchange for help in targeting the European market with their product.

category of “politicians”. Other American bad-guys include political extremists with differing views as well as criminals helping terrorists (such as in *Patriot*, *Sum*, and *Teeth*). A Baltimore drug cartel terrorizes civilians in *Without*. The Mountain Men of *Executive* are opposed to the bureaucracy of the Federal Government and try to assassinate President Ryan. Environmental extremists in *Rainbow* attempt an attack of biological terrorism on the whole planet, and they are tied to extra-marital affairs and violence, as well as testing out a deadly virus on human guinea-pigs. There are also some short accounts in a number of novels of White Supremacists and the attacks they have carried out on other Americans, such as the bombing of a Sunday school, the assassination of President Jackson by an elderly KKK member; he receives the curses of the new hero, Jack Junior, such as “klukker retard” and “redneck racist fuck” (*Teeth* 59 and 70).

Clancy’s enemies are usually picked from contemporary themes which affect everyone’s lives; the topics most common in his fiction are economy, security, terrorism, and drug-enforcement. The Soviets are chosen due to the polarized situation of the Cold War world; a clear and simple setting. Irish Catholic terrorists are an exceptional enemy, yet from a time when the violence in Northern Ireland was affecting the British and the Irish-Americans and their loyalties. Columbians are an easy choice in the 1980’s when the growing effects of cocaine were seen on the streets of the US and the Contragate scandal was tarnishing President Reagan’s administration (the novel *Clear* from 1989 became the most bought novel of the eighties in America). The Japanese became major competition to the US automobile industry in the 1980’s and jobs were lost to cheaper Asian goods leading to a recession in the US; Japan’s growing influence was feared and started a whole new genre of writing.¹ Similarly, the recent growth of the Chinese economy with an unfair trade balance and economic policies towards the US, added with a history of human rights violations, provides another simple and black-and-white setting. Clancy is getting back at old enemy-figures in his fiction, enemies which are still fresh in his readers’ minds.

¹ The book about Japan as first in the world, by Ezra Vogel in 1979, started off a whole new genre in literature. Americans feared the decay of their own culture for a while, but Japan ran out of steam by the early 1990’s (Mykkänen 2006). This economic assault and the militarism from Japan’s past are clearly displayed in *Debt*, where even the pro-Clancy fan Marc A. Cerasini calls it “Japan-bashing” (in Greenberg 2005).

3.6 Clancy and Orientalism

Clancy uses characters from Middle Eastern and Islamic countries to construct some stories in his fiction. He has Azerbaijanis, Afghans, Somalis, Palestinians, Iraqis, Iranians, Lebanese, and Saudis in his stories. Considering Clancy's American characters' point of view, each of these Arab or Muslim characters can be seen fitting into one of the following categories: "Friend", "Victim", "Enemy", or "Terrorist". I will analyze how he portrays them all, whether there are similarities or differences, and whether there are some connotations in this portrayal to previous productions and their stereotypes.

One thing can be noted right away, which is critical to the discussion of orientalism and Western conceptions of Arabs and Muslims: there are no important female Arab or Muslim characters in Clancy's novels, as of yet at least. There are no strong female characters as there are in American families, or as the opponent state India has as its leader in *Executive*, or as America's mission of espionage in China encounters in *Bear*. Where Said argues that traditionally authors sexualized the Middle Eastern female, Clancy seems to stay away from the female character altogether. As McAlister argues about the importance of females, family, and ethnic diversion for American identity, so also Clancy portrays the American identity as one of the family with husband, wife, and children, and with characters of all kinds of immigrant backgrounds. It is with these diverse thoughts in the background that I will analyze Clancy's use and portrayal of Arabs and Muslims.

4 COLD WAR MUSLIM PEOPLES IN *RED STORM RISING* (1986) AND *THE CARDINAL OF THE KREMLIN* (1988)

Clancy's second and fourth works of fiction, *Red Storm* and *Cardinal*, are novels based on the Cold War world. Clearly the major enemy of the West is the USSR and its allies and their communist ideology. In *Red Storm* the two sides fight each other on the battlefield, whereas *Cardinal* is a spy novel and gets into the complicated struggle for information through espionage. The Middle East and other regions of the world were, according to McAlister (2001) and other scholars, a battle ground for these two different ideologies. Clancy's Muslim characters play a part in the greater act of the relations between the Russians and the Americans in these two novels. They are not from the Middle East but from the Caucasus and Central Asia. *Red Storm*, a novel Clancy co-authored with Larry Bond,¹ only has six pages displaying Muslims as characters in the introductory chapter of the story. In *Cardinal* Clancy gives a longer narration of Muslim characters and even concentrates on one character in more depth.

4.1 Azerbaijani Muslims in *Red Storm Rising* (1986)

4.1.1 The Plot

The introductory chapter begins with Azerbaijani Muslims attacking a massive oil refinery in Nizhnevartovsk which is central to Soviet oil production. They kill the Russian workers and put the refinery and production field on fire. KGB border guards storm their hideout and kill them off. The complex is destroyed, and the Soviet Union leaders realize that their country will have a shortage of energy for a few years without the incoming oil. The logical conclusion for them is to plan an invasion and occupation of oil fields in the Middle East. Before this can take place, however, the Soviets attempt to neutralize NATO forces in Europe which is a possible threat to their expansionist plan. They even stage an attack where Russian

¹ Larry Bond is a former US Navy officer and war-game designer, and he has written political thrillers of his own.

children are killed to get justification for an invasion of West Germany. The main body of the novel consists of the ultramodern World War Three, fought with conventional weapons in Europe between Soviet and Western forces.¹

4.1.2 Historical Context

Azerbaijan is a Muslim republic in the Caucasus region. Azerbaijan's history and identity have been molded by the Russo-Iranian wars and the encounters between these two countries, yet the largely Shiite population of the republic also emphasizes their Turkic ancestry and identity.² Nationalism during the repressive Soviet period was entangled with religious fundamentalism and interest towards Turkey and Iran. Russian military involvement in the region continues with the problematic relations between different ethnic and religious groups (Bremmer and Taras 1993: 225-255). The story of the novel also fits into the period of the Carter Doctrine in the US with growing fears of declining Soviet energy production and a possible invasion of countries in the Middle East.³

4.1.3 Portrayal of Characters

The small team of three Azerbaijani Muslim characters in this short introductory section is described as disciplined and professional. Two of them work as engineers at the valuable oil facility, so they have planned out their attack with care. Ibrahim Tolkaze is the leader and carries out much of the sabotage with Mohammed, opening and closing pipelines on the control board. He is educated, methodical, and careful in every detail. He also shoots a guard and a coworker before setting the site on fire. Rasul is described as a large-sized former sergeant in the MVD who kills a number of guards with his pistol, some with his hands. He wipes out all the watch engineers with "elegant patience" (*Red Storm 3*), one round into each from his assault rifle.

¹ The individual soldiers and officers in airplanes, ships, tanks, and on foot provide a variety of colorful narrations and skillful changes in the plot. The narration comes from both sides, both American and Russian officers who are competent and professional. On the political level, though, the U.S. government and the UN do not really exist, whereas there is a continuous narration of the Politburo proceedings. An adventure in Iceland, after it is occupied by Soviet forces, provides us with another sympathetic American hero and with intriguing firefights (*Storm* is not *Ryanverse*).

² Note that this discussion only includes Soviet Azerbaijan, not Iranian ("Southern") Azerbaijan. Russian imperial expansion and the Treaty of Turkmanchai of 1828 separated the area from Iran that later became Soviet Azerbaijan. The republic of Azerbaijan was first created in 1918, which then became part of the Soviet Union (Bremmer and Taras 1993: 228-230).

³ Terdoslavich discusses the Carter Doctrine, of making the Persian Gulf region a vital part of US interests, due to the fear of Soviet invasion there to gain oilfields (2005: 212).

When the fast-response team of KGB troops storms the place the three wait immobile and ready for death.

The motivation for this attack seems to be Azerbaijani nationalism intermixed with strong religious reasons, where religion seems to be the stronger of the two. Tolkaze's grandfather apparently died in rebellions against Moscow, and because his father was "shamed by helpless subservience to the infidel state, Tolkaze had been seduced by Russian schoolteachers into joining their godless system," (*Red Storm* 4). He was saved by his uncle, who was an imam in secret, and turned to religion. The short narration of this character is full of references to religion, and he reads a verse from his prized Koran before he releases the oil flow. He leaves the starting of the fires to faith, and in the end sparks from accidental events begin the fires. As he faces certain death he shouts a quote from the Koran to the Soviet soldiers, and unafraid finishes his mission with the Arabic "Allahu akhbar!"¹

Mike Edwards provides the novel with a new reluctant man of action. An Air Force officer/weatherman, he survives the Soviet attack on Iceland, evades capture, and reports on the progression of the battle there to his superiors. He and some marines catch Russian soldiers raping and killing a family, and they kill the Russians. This character's honorable and chivalrous conduct towards the inhabitants of the island, especially one pregnant female native, in contrast with that of sexually immoral Russian troops establishes a clear good-bad division in this part of the story between NATO and Soviet forces. The Russian military leaders though are portrayed as professionals in comparison to the Kremlin politicians. The ousting of the immoral politicians responsible for the war from the Politburo solves the crisis.

4.1.4 Discussion

It is obvious that this six page episode with the Muslim characters serves no other reason than to prepare the stage for the larger plot of the war in Europe. The USSR is the main opponent of America and its allies, and the portrayal of the Muslim attackers is quite neutral and without any major sympathizing or demonizing. However, this gives the first example of how Clancy uses Muslim characters to

¹ "God is great" in Arabic, the holy language of the Koran. Clancy has misspelled the word "akbar" (*Red Storm* 6).

prepare the main part of his stories, namely through violence. According to Terdoslavich, in this co-authored book Clancy has provided more of the small-unit level and individual character-based action, while Bond has always had a better feel for larger operations, convoys, divisions, and the masses of troops (2005: 205). With this in mind it is highly likely that Clancy wrote this part of the story by himself. Also, the events portrayed here show much similarity with some of Clancy's later stories, and give the feel of a Clancy trademark.¹

Red Storm is historically significant. According to Marc A. Cerasini, Clancy's Third World War is another portrayal of a "future war", a theme that has appeared in fiction in the masses from the nineteenth century onwards.² Cerasini argues on, however, that the timing of *Red Storm* was perfect, appearing supportive to President Reagan in 1986 during his controversial arms buildup, and helping the American public with a long awaited victory after the Vietnam War, even as it was only on paper (in Greenberg 2005: 12-14).³ What is significant about this book is that *Red Storm* it is rumored to have been President Reagan's only preparation for his meeting in 1986 with Soviet Premier Gorbachev. One of the topics discussed was Reagan's offer to remove all ballistic missiles from Europe and decrease both countries' ICBMs by fifty percent. Also, Senator Dan Quayle (Indiana Republican, before his vice presidency) also spoke in favor of antisatellite missile technology as Clancy had described in *Red Storm* (Terdoslavich 2005: 236). Clancy's book was then read and used as a supportive source for Republican views of policy.

4.2 Afghan Muslims in *The Cardinal of the Kremlin* (1988)

4.2.1 The Plot

The prologue of *Cardinal* begins with action, as Afghan Muslim rebels battle against Soviet forces in Afghanistan. The first pages introduce the reader to the main Muslim character, the Archer, a fighter with expertise in shooting down

¹ See *Cardinal* and *Sum*.

² Most of these novels have ended up with nuclear war and Armageddon, but *Red Storm* has managed to keep the fighting on the conventional level. Clancy goes for the nuclear war theme in *Sum* though.

³ Cerasini also claims that Clancy predicted certain types of untested weapons which came into use later on (in Greenberg 2005: 12-14).

helicopters and airplanes with his missiles. Through the novel he and his group carry out a number of attacks. They get replenished with weapons by an American CIA officer in Pakistan whom Archer befriends, and with whom they share information. Another important Muslim character is an Afghan Major in the pro-Soviet puppet government's army who aids the rebels, and finally joins them. In the end the Afghans attack a massive Soviet laser-defense system site in Dushanbe in the USSR close to the Afghan border. The story climaxes in the destruction of the complex and the gunfight between the rebels and Soviet forces.

The story occurring in Moscow builds around Colonel Mikhail Filitov, codename Cardinal, a decorated hero of his country working on the personal staff of the Minister of Defense. He is America's highest-placed agent in the Soviet Union, and has been passing secret information to the CIA for three decades. During one of these contacts with American agents he is exposed by the head of the KGB, Nikolay Gerasimov. Gerasimov, a hard-liner, plans to use him against the Soviet Premier and his reforms and growing mutual understanding with the West. Meanwhile, this diplomatic crisis endangers the arms-reduction talks which Jack Ryan is entangled in. Ryan solves the issue by persuading Gerasimov to save his own life by defecting with Cardinal (Filitov) to the US. In a daring escape Ryan selflessly ensures their safety over that of his own. The Soviet superiority in laser-defense and in the arms-race, a theme which has worried the American side through the novel, ends with the Afghan attack on the Soviet research facility.¹

4.2.2 Historical Context

The history of Afghanistan is colorful, with many different armies and conquerors passing through and establishing their influence. The nineteenth century was eventful with British and Russian imperialist involvement, and with soviet influence the government in Kabul became communist-led in 1966. A popular Islamic uprising began against the government which led to the Soviet invasion in 1979, and the West began to see the Afghan resistance mujahideen as "freedom-fighters". After the Soviets left in 1989 the Islamic fundamentalist Taliban regime came into power (Tanner 2002: 221-270). At the time of the novel's publication Soviet

¹ The complicated world of espionage in *Cardinal* includes many other factors, such as an American traitor spying for the Soviets and the KGB kidnapping an American leading weapons-expert.

Premier Gorbachev was attempting political reform, which led to the dissolution of the USSR in 1991 and the end of the Cold War (Terdoslavich 2005: 84).

4.2.3 Portrayal of Characters

The Afghan rebels are described from the beginning in context of their uprising against the occupying Soviet forces and the communist government of Afghanistan. The war is another continuation of the fight against a new invader, a “timeless struggle”. The mudjaheddin¹ – “Freedom Fighters” – are portrayed as primitive in certain aspects of lifestyle, weapons handling and troop organization,² yet courageous, able, and inventive with the limited resources that they have against a powerful enemy. Clancy describes their physical attributes as harsh, dark, and aged, and the look in their eyes seems an important aspect of their character. “The Afghan tribesmen held their Islamic faith as the reason for their resistance, but the obstinate courage of these men was as much a part of their racial heritage as their dark pitiless eyes,” (*Cardinal* 11). According to one description, the characteristics are due to the weather (which also appears as a deciding factor for the description of Arabs in another novel)³; “The Afghans are a handsome people whose forthright features and fair skin suffer quickly from wind and sand and dust...” (*Cardinal* 11). However, the harshness and aging have in the Archer’s case been brought about due to the long war.

The Archer is the main Muslim character in *Cardinal*. A thirty year old strong-bodied guerilla fighter with “old eyes”, there is no other name given for him. His ability to use shoulder-launched anti-aircraft missiles has given him the title, and he is well respected for it. He is a college graduate, and he worked as a teacher of mathematics in Ghazni before he decided to join the fight. He is motivated by what happened to his family; his wife and daughter were killed by a Soviet airplane, after which his son was kidnapped with other surviving orphans and shipped to the Soviet Union to be educated in Soviet ways. The Archer turns to Islam and is counseled by his group’s imam, and becomes “the most ruthless – and most effective – man in the

¹ Clancy (see *Cardinal* 12) has given a misspelled version of the term “mujāhidīn”, or “mujāhidūn”, meaning “freedom fighters” (from K. Öhrnberg, University of Helsinki). “Mujahideen” according to Tanner, is derived from the term *jihad* for “soldiers of God” (2002: 244). Various other forms appear as well, but Clancy’s is the most far-fetched.

² See *Cardinal* 153 where the leader dies and the soldiers disperse, described as “primitive troops”.

³ See *Sum* (chapter 5); the German scientist describes Arabs through similar characteristics.

band, clearly an expression of God's own plan," (*Cardinal* 12). Another Muslim character, the Archer's trusted helper Abdul, is described as a teenager and an orphan with "burning eyes".

Clancy's portrayal of the Archer is of cunning, patience, and intelligence as he shoots down Soviet aircraft. It is also a description of quiet personal pain, and justified unwavering resolve to continue the struggle with nothing to lose. He kills with vengeance and without remorse. The American CIA officer Ortiz, who gives the Archer his weapons, provides much of the Western view of Afghanistan and the guerillas in the novel. He compares the Afghans to the Native American Apache Indians; their clothing is similar, they provide small agile fighters, and captives make "noisy amusements for their knives," (*Cardinal* 36). His treatment of the Afghans is of respect and even friendship. He chides a Captain who calls them savages and sand-niggers. However, he does think of the Afghans in context of American foreign policy issues: "These people are working for us. They're bringing us stuff that we can't get any place else. You will, repeat, *will* treat them with the respect they deserve. *Is that clear?*" (*Cardinal* 69). Ortiz wonders if the Archer knows that he is being used by the Americans, and he shortly questions America's involvement in the region.¹ He is wary of the Archer though, he analyzes the Muslim's character, and understands how "The force that drove him could suppress his humanity," (*Cardinal* 36). He questions the Archer's strong desire for revenge: "Jesus, what have we made of this man?"

There is one event where this steady and ruthless character of the Archer gains some humanity. Whereas the Russians are always calling the Afghans ignorant savages and barbarians, the Archer actually takes care of one Russian captain. The Archer finds him a survivor in one of the airplanes that he shoots down, but instead of slitting his throat as he has done before he shows pity for the wounded captain. The reason for this is the photographs the Archer finds in the captain's wallet showing his wife and his ill son, the son now being dead from cancer. The Archer decides not to cause more pain to the lady in the picture. His decision to take care of the Russian amazes him; he even feels disappointment when the Russian captain dies

¹ See *Cardinal* 283 and 312.

after some time. However, all the compassion that he feels disappears in the next Soviet bombardment of an Afghan refugee camp in Pakistan. There the Archer witnesses his rifleman being blown up with his infant son. “There was no trace of the freedom fighter or his son, and even the certainty that both now stood righteously before their God could not mask the bloodchilling rage that coursed through his body. He remembered showing mercy to the Russian, feeling some regret at his death. No more. He’d never show mercy to an infidel again,” (*Cardinal* 311). Ortiz and the Archer witness a newly made widow screaming for her family, then they work together to help with the wounded. “To attack a place of women and children is an abomination before God!” (*Cardinal* 312), the Archer exclaims.

The religion of Islam becomes an important defining factor of the story with the Archer and his compatriots. They are constantly referring to Allah, and thoughts and acts are carried out with religious context and prayers; “The Archer blessed Allah’s name as he withdrew his knife from its sheath,” (*Cardinal* 17). Even as he is strongly religious, the Archer does question God at times though, especially in relation to what happened to his family; he allows himself to use his rational and emotional self as well. Ortiz shows great respect for the Archer’s religion and custom. “I observe their laws and respect their ways. That means no booze, no pork; that means I don’t fool with their women,” (*Cardinal* 69). The respectful relation develops into a mutual friendship. When Ortiz shares his regrets that he can only give the limited help that his government allows, the Archer says that “believers should strive together against Godless ones” (*Cardinal* 283), but that the task in his country is for the Afghans, not for Americans.

On the Russian side, resentment towards the Soviet system motivates Cardinal to betray the current government.¹ Another Russian soldier who gets a good description from Clancy, who from the beginning is a definite “good Russian”,² is Colonel Gennady Bondarenko. He is a professional with technical skills which get him picked for challenging projects. In many Clancy novels he realizes the

¹ The Cardinal disagrees with a form of government that makes the communist party members an elitist group. He is driven to treason due to personal negative experiences with the party: he lost his wife and two sons to the incompetence and militarism of the USSR.

² The term has also been used by Terdoslavich (2005: 68).

inefficiencies of his country in security and other matters and blames the politicians in Moscow, but he goes about to solve and improve the problems by himself.¹ He is at the laser-defense site when the Afghans attack, and he leads the defense against the poorly planned assault. The site gets damaged for the most part, but Bondarenko manages to save the important civilian personnel. In the battle he himself kills the Archer: “He saw the man’s eyes... the rage there, the hatred, nearly stopped the Colonel’s heart. But Bondarenko was a soldier before all things. The Afghan’s first shot missed. His did not,” (p600). With his last breath the Archer finishes off with the Arabic “Allahu akhbar!”²

4.2.4 Discussion

Cardinal is a thriller novel where Afghanistan provides the battle ground and the colorful gun fights which Clancy specializes in. It balances out the part of the story with the detailed yet less violent world of espionage and intellect in Moscow and the US. In this sense Afghanistan serves as another battlefield where American equipment demonstrates its superiority over the Soviet arsenal. The true adversary for the US is the USSR, and the Afghans gain a respectful if not a positive description within this context. Clancy seems to even show admiration for their fighting and their strength of spirit. The Afghans are victims of Soviet aggression, and their counterattacks are justified as defending their families and their national rights. Clancy joins together American intelligence operatives and Muslim Afghan people to fight against the common enemy. Islam is portrayed as a fellow religion against the influence of the godless atheist Soviets.

The description of the Archer and his cause is one of admiration. Yet, the Archer is doomed in the mind of the reader from the beginning because of his inability to escape the reality of his world or the ruthless emotions inside him driving him on.³ A change has occurred in the story where the Archer moves from counterattacking Soviet troops to an offensive against the laser-defense facility inside the USSR. Before, the Afghans were portrayed as the justified guerillas fighting Soviets who killed women and children, now the difference is that the Afghans attempt to wipe

¹ In *Bear* he takes over and leads the Russian defense against the Chinese assault.

² Once again Clancy has misspelled the word “akbar”. See *Cardinal* 601.

³ The CIA officer isn’t surprised when the Major comes back from the last raid alone (*Cardinal* 622).

out the facility and its civilian workers. The Russian Colonel Bondarenko, who manages to defend the civilians against the Archer, now gets the credit and turns out as the good guy, and the winner. The Archer's own loss of humanity and his revengeful attack against a nonmilitary target is the reason he loses the gunfight and the justification for his actions in Clancy's world.

In the discussion of orientalism Said argues that writers have traditionally pictured the East through exoticizing and racist representations, where characters are irrational, backward, and sexual. The Afghans are considered savages by the Russians in Clancy's novel, yet understandably so in the Russians' fear of ending up in the hands of the Afghans. There is the implied argument that the Afghans do not reach their ultimate goal of destroying the whole laser-defense facility. There is also one description which the critic might relate to an "Orientalist" description: when the Archer takes down a Soviet airplane, "It was almost a sexual release when the launcher tube bucked in his hands," (*Cardinal* 151). This event is the only relation to sexualizing an action of one of the Muslim characters, and does not seem to imply anything else than a description of that one moment.

The traditionalist scholar Bernard Lewis, one of Said's greatest subjects of criticism, speaks of Afghanistan as an example of the failure of the Islamic world, where it was left to American forces to organize any resistance to the invading Soviets (2003: 91-92). Also, Clancy does mention the 10th century A.D. radical sect of the Assassins, which is a common topic of discussion for those who want to argue a long relationship between terrorism and Islam.¹ However, Clancy does not go to this extreme. On the contrary, he shows the Afghans as carrying out their own missions with success against the Soviet military (admittedly with American equipment), and Islam as a personal faith is a source of courage and motivation. The Major, who takes up the position of leadership of the rebels after the death of

¹ See *Cardinal* 460. A topic which one finds in many of Lewis' works is that of the 10th century A.D. radical sect of the Assassins. His book on the subject (*The Assassins: A Radical Sect in Islam*, London: Weidenfeld&Nicolson, 1970) is based on his Doctoral Dissertation from 1940, and it first came out in 1967, which, as Kaj Öhrnberg of the University of Helsinki notes, is a significant year for the discussion of Muslims and orientalism. As Melani McAlister claims, Lewis presents the Assassins as an "early and emblematic example of the Islamic use of terror," and connects them to the modern day (2001: 219). As with many topics about Muslims, Lewis ends one of his essays about them with "It ended in total failure. The Assassins disappeared, having accomplished none of their purposes," (in Netanyahu 1986: 69).

the Archer, is described as a trained soldier and even more experienced for the position. Clancy gives a positive prophesy for the future of the rebels in the last chapter, when the Major confidently claims “We’re winning now,” (*Cardinal* 622).

Cardinal, like *Red Storm*, is historically significant. It appeared when the Soviet-West relations in the 1980’s were complicated, with a renewed vigor in the arms-race from President Reagan leading to increasing talks about limiting weapons, the second START negotiations. The Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI)¹ and similar projects were a major issue in the militaries and politics of each country, and both sides researched anti-ballistic missile defense shields to defend against the other’s possible nuclear strike, a project which had started in the 1960’s. Reagan advocated for space-based antimissile defense. Even as nothing concrete came of the SDI, it did raise fears and then discourse between the two superpowers. Clancy’s novel can be seen once again to support President Reagan’s policies.

4.3 Discussion: Clancy’s Cold War Muslim Peoples

There are a lot of similarities between *Red Storm*’s Ibrahim Tolkaze and *Cardinal*’s the Archer. Both are highly educated in a scientific field; Tolkaze in engineering, the Archer in mathematics. Both have lost family members because of Soviet aggression. Both are aided back to faith in their religion by an imam, a religious leader. Both turn to using their past education and intelligence in avenging the occupation of their country. Both attack an important more-or-less civilian target in the Soviet Union, and both die in the process, shouting “God is great!” The clear difference between the two is that the Archer is given much more description, and many more pages are used to investigate his motivations, thoughts, and actions.

In both novels the Soviets, more specifically the Soviet leaders and politicians in Moscow, are the real bad guys. Many individual Soviet military leaders are still the respected professionals which Clancy portrays most characters in uniform to be, even though certain soldiers do carry out atrocities of some kind. However, a

¹ Also known as the “Star Wars” program.

common enemy has helped Clancy in portraying the Muslim peoples of Central Asia as allies of the West. Even as they are groups who in the end attack civilian targets – a.k.a. terrorists – they are not the bad guys or “Enemies” of the stories’ American good-guy characters. They are given the loss of family members and close ones as a reason, if not justification, for their actions. The religion of Islam is also given a positive view in *Cardinal*.

The Muslim characters in these two books do not serve as long-term characters in Clancy’s world; they do not become part of the established and ongoing Ryan-verse universe, only providing part of the story in each of these two novels. Central Asia does get visited again in the politics of *Executive*, and Afghanistan is mentioned as a new battleground in the post-9/11 novel *Teeth*, but with a new kind of attitude towards it. One noteworthy fact is that, in the political thrillers of Clancy, devout Muslims are from the very beginning related to violence and extremism. In these two novels they provide the start of a war in *Red Storm* and the battle ground in *Cardinal*. In the Cold War period their actions are directed against the forces of communism. However, the attachment of Muslims to some type of violent struggle continues in later novels; this characterization becomes an important part of Clancy’s orientalism, his use and portrayal of Muslim characters.

5 THE POST-COLD WAR MIDDLE EAST WITH PALESTINIAN TERRORISM IN *THE SUM OF ALL FEARS* (1991)

Sum is one of the most complex books of fiction produced by Clancy. There are a number of unrelated plots that develop over some time and build up to the final political crisis. Due to the complexity of the novel I have analyzed by itself each part of the story portraying different characters. The inspiring factor about this novel is the depth Clancy has given the Middle East, especially the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. Another narration is the developing terrorist plot against the US by an international group including Palestinian extremists. I will also analyze one Arab Muslim character separately due to the differing view of the political and religious environment in the Middle East that he gives.

Sum could be classed as a Cold War-era novel for its central plot of developing a crisis between the US and the USSR. The Soviets are present and they are still considered the enemy by some American characters. Clancy even reintroduces the theme of nuclear war and Armageddon in the story. However, the world in *Sum* fits into the changing events of the turn of the nineties, and the Middle East and parts of Europe fit into the post-Cold War and New Era world. The view of the old enemy, the Soviets, is changing, with the USSR prophesized to change internally and gain friendly relations with the West. Clancy moves on to produce newer and more decisive enemies for America.

5.1 The Plot

Clancy begins his introduction to the novel in the heat of the October War of 1973 between Israel and Syria. The narration is from the point of view of the Israelis who have been taken by surprise by the Syrian offensive.¹ In Clancy's novel fighter planes are equipped with plutonium fission bombs in readiness for the worst

¹ Even as the situation was later turned around on the third day for the Israelis, they had a few critical days with feared expectations.

outcome. In the busy environment of the air force base one atom bomb is accidentally left attached to a plane. This fighter plane is sent on a mission over the battle fields and gets shot down into Syrian lands. The nuclear weapon lays deep in a farmer's field until the 1990's when it is rediscovered by Palestinian extremists.

Jack Ryan and others are trying to put an end to the Palestinian-Israeli crisis. Problems have welled up for America's ally when a religious Israeli policeman shoots a peaceful Palestinian protestor in cold blood and in front of the international media. The US intervenes to stop an escalation into a holy war, and from Ryan's idea a peace plan is carried out; a Palestinian state is established with the UN securing its borders,¹ and neutral Swiss troops under Vatican jurisdiction take over the responsibility of the security of Jerusalem, which becomes a "Holy City" governed by a trio of one Moslem, one Jewish, and one Christian leader. American forces are sent to Israel to ensure her safety in the region. Everyone in Jerusalem lives more or less happily ever after.

Not everyone is happy with the developments in the Middle East, nor with the end of the Cold War in Europe. The Palestinian extremists with their nuclear bomb join up with a former West German extremist. The German is worried about the decreasing influence of Marxism in Europe. Together, with the help of a German physicist and a Native American criminal, they fix and improve the bomb and ship it into the US. They plan to increase the old animosity between the Soviets and the West and so reclaim their causes. The bomb goes off at the Super Bowl of American football in Denver and tens of thousands die. Other deliberate acts of terrorism organized by German extremists and some coincidental events have the Soviets and the Americans clash in a number of places around the globe, and the world comes to the brink of a nuclear World War Three. Then Ryan steps in to save the day.²

¹ This is one of the only mentions of the organization in this novel.

² One more plot that develops through the novel is that of Ryan's private and public life. He works for the CIA and works on the peace deal in the Middle East. The stress at work with power-playing politicians affects his family as well; National Security Advisor Elliot attempts to dig up dirt on him and destroy his family and political life. Clark intervenes and sorts out Ryan's family and the media, Cathy Ryan stands up to Elliot. After the acts of terrorism lead to the brink of war, Ryan with his daring manages to solve the crisis between Russian and American leaders. These immoral and irrational American politicians are forced to leave politics. The terrorists are caught and killed.

5.2 Historical Context

The October War of 1973, which starts off the story, took place when Egyptian and Syrian forces launched a coordinated attack against Israel. The war is thought of as a failure of the Israeli intelligence agency and as a political success for the Egyptian and Syrian leaders; the Israelis were taken by surprise, but performed well in later stages of the war.¹ The war led to the Oil Embargo, which became an incentive for the US to get a peaceful resolution to the Arab-Israeli conflict. In September 1978 the Camp David Accords led to a later peace treaty between Israel and Egypt (Cleveland 1994: 336-340).² It is generally acknowledged that Israel has nuclear weapons, even as the Israelis have never officially admitted to it.³

In Clancy's novel some of the yet unsolved key questions of the **Palestinian-Israeli Conflict** seem to be discussed as a major topic: the Palestinian refugee problem and the borders of a Palestinian state. The civil war in 1947-48 created a massive wave of 700,000 Palestinian refugees into the cities of neighboring Arab countries, including the West bank and Gaza Strip, and in the aftermath of the 1967 war another 400,000 Palestinians fled in a new wave of refugees.⁴ There are now millions of Palestinians living in Diaspora in countries like Jordan, Lebanon,⁵ and

¹ The Egyptians managed to gain back some respect from the forces which had driven them to war; they regained the East bank of the Suez Canal lost in the Six Day War in 1967 for a while, which has become to be known in Egyptian consciousness as "the crossing". President Sadat also achieved his purpose of getting the superpowers involved in the Middle East conflict. The cease-fire was arranged by Soviet and US officials, after each side had been replenishing their ally/allies for the continuation of the war. Egypt lost 7,700 soldiers and Syria lost 3,500, and together they lost over 2,000 tanks and 450 aircraft. Israel lost 2,500 soldiers, and over 800 tanks and 100 aircraft (Cleveland 1994: 336-337). Statistics like these from wars where American allies or its equipment perform well are accounted by Clancy in his fiction and nonfiction.

² The Palestinian rights which Sadat had pursued never materialized from this treaty. The situation is still a stalemate between Israel and Syria (Cleveland 1994: 336-340).

³ Mordechai Vanunu was the "whistleblower" who gave information about Israel's nuclear weapons program to foreign press. He was kidnapped in Europe by Israeli agents and served numerous years in prison. Vanunu continues under house-arrest, and is periodically jailed for shorter terms.

⁴ The Golan Heights from Syria, the West Bank from Jordan, and the Gaza Strip and the Sinai Peninsula from Egypt became occupied by Israel in the 1967 war. Israel still holds on to parts of these conquests.

⁵ In Lebanon the hundreds of thousands of Palestinian refugees became part of the squabbles and differences between the Lebanese Christian, Shiite Muslim, Sunni Muslim, and Druze populations, and had a part in the civil war which started in 1975. Between 1976 and 1982 Lebanon disintegrated into warring sectarian enclaves, each with its own militia faction, and reprisals and political assassinations became a way of life. The alliances between the different groups varied over time, as well as with the foreign powers. The civil war also attracted external intervention with the Syrian invasion in 1976 (involvement until 2005), the Israeli invasions of 1978 and 1982, and American involvement in 1983-84. The Israeli invasions were to destroy the PLO stronghold in Lebanon. In

Syria. The refugee camps in these countries, the Gaza Strip, and the West Bank have played an important role in the formation of Palestinian consciousness and they have provided recruits for liberation movements and militant organizations. (Cleveland 1994: 244-251 and 324-327)

In December 1987, after twenty years of growing resistance in the Palestinian community in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip against the Israeli occupation, a popular movement burst into flames in the form of an uprising, the first Intifada – a “shaking off” (Cleveland 1994: 425). A campaign of civil disobedience, strikes, shop closures, unwillingness to pay Israeli taxes, and boycotting Israeli goods attempted to make the Palestinian territories economically self-sufficient. There were riots and demonstrations, and “stone-throwing youths defied Israeli military firepower on the streets” answered by “might, power, and beatings” according to Defense Minister Rabin’s orders (McDowall 1995: 99-100). As the conflict wore on the use of guns grew and the fatalities soared. According to Judith Elizur, the picture of Israel in the news media changed; what had once been the haven for the survivors of the European Holocaust and a victim of the Arab armies and terrorism was now seen as a “morally suspect garrison state,” (in Sheffer 1997: 212-222). What had been the subject of admiration in American cultural products changed, and the Palestinians and the PLO were now in the position of a victim of Israel’s actions. As is evident from *Sum*, Clancy has followed up on this and has taken quite a different stand compared to conservative pro-Israeli views and the popular novels of the past; he seems more critical of Israel’s actions.

Due to international pressure on both Israel and the Palestinians during the Intifada uprising, the situation after the Gulf War of 1991, and other reasons, the two sides met to talk about peace (McDowall 1995). “Eleven fruitless rounds of talks” took place in Washington, while secret talks were underway under the supervision of the Norwegian government. These culminated with the open-ended agreement of

the latter invasion, operation “Peace for Galilee”, Israeli forces placed Beirut under siege and bombarded the western half and predominantly Palestinian civilian part of the city. The PLO agreed to withdraw its forces from Lebanon ending up in Tunis, and Israel agreed to protect the Palestinian civilians left behind. The massacre of 1000 Palestinian civilians by the Phalange Christian militia produced an international outcry. Israel occupied a strip of land in Southern Lebanon as a “safety zone” until 2000. Militant Shiite organizations, such as Amal and Hezbollah, grew stronger and gained power. (Cleveland 1994: 344-351)

formal mutual recognition between Israel and the PLO in Washington. For a while the world seemed to be in a state of euphoria (a theme which Clancy's novel has also participated in at an earlier date). Many critics, Said amongst them, have much to say about the false sense of finality the peace process caused. The Oslo Peace Accords and the agreements reached there have become one of the greatest paradoxes in history. The Palestinian-Israeli Conflict is ongoing, with a growth of religious and political extremism on both sides.

Other characters in this part of the story include German Marxist extremists. Germany had been divided into two between NATO and Soviet forces. The Berlin Wall in between the Western and Soviet held parts of the city stopped East Germans from eloping to the West, and the Stasi of the communist East Germany kept its people under tight control. The Berlin Wall finally came down in 1989, Germany reunified, and in many countries communism fell.

5.3 The October War Introduction

5.3.1 Portrayal of Characters

Clancy's introduction is narrated from the point of view of the Israelis. Israeli civilians, specifically children, are said to be threatened by the Syrian armored force rolling down from the Heights (*Sum* 4). In the frantic atmosphere of a military airbase Clancy introduces us to Mordechai "Motti" Zadin, an eighteen year old pilot. Zadin is eager to get into battle because the Syrians are getting closer to the home of his parents in a northern kibbutz. His older brother died in the Six Day War of 1967. He is portrayed as young, boyish, with the "gangling awkwardness of his age" (*Sum* 7), aggressive, yet skilled. In his excitement he flies off to war unaware of the nuke attached to his plane. His mission fails due to Syrian anti-aircraft missiles which cripple his fighter plane, but he manages to destroy the missile battery before crashing down behind the Syrian lines.

While Zadin is given a character and a name, the Syrians are only portrayed as faceless enemies. "Motti grinned savagely beneath his mask as he fired rockets and now 20-millimeter cannon fire into the mass of men and vehicles," (*Sum* 10). The

battery gets destroyed and all ninety Syrians are killed. The enemy is portrayed quite literally as faceless; the largest piece recovered after the attack is the Syrian commander's headless torso. The Israelis are given more description and detail. As a collective they are portrayed as the professionals and family men. However, even they have their failures in combat in Clancy's introduction, and even their losses are described. These losses of life, though, are those of individuals, while Clancy's enemies usually have the high casualty rates of faceless masses.

5.3.2 Discussion

Clancy has said in an interview that he wrote this opening chapter of *Sum* in 1978-1979; a few years before he started writing full-time, and about a dozen years before this novel was published (in Greenberg 2005: 55). Even as this serves only as a short introduction to a long complex story, it can be seen through its description and historical context to support those ideas which were popular at the time among conservative political ideas. The Vietnam War had gone badly for the Americans, and the public's belief in their military suffered. Israel was seen increasingly as an important ally and even a role-model of military strength and ability; Israel became more and more important to American identity. The encounter with Motti Zadin is brief, but Clancy provides the reader with a sympathetic hero and with a justified mission. The enemy is a mass of aggressors who have enough ability to provide a threat to the heroes, but not enough wisdom to win the war.

5.4 The Palestinian-Israeli Conflict

5.4.1 Portrayal of characters

The third chapter of the book starts off with some similarity to the bloodiest day of the first Intifada.¹ In Clancy's story, an Israeli police captain, Benjamin "Benny" Zadin, has recently turned to religion and becomes affiliated with an extremist Jewish group. His motivation is the passing away of his mother, the departure of his adulterous wife, and his regret for his past secular and sinful lifestyle. He is mentioned as a father of two sons and, curiously, the brother of two who were killed

¹ In October 1990 Israeli police opened fire on a demonstration on the Temple Mount in Jerusalem. Seventeen Palestinians were killed, some 150 injured. (McDowall 1995: 111)

in separate wars against the Arabs; one of them a pilot named Motti Zadin. He is portrayed as a victim of a sum of different factors, but his grief takes him in the direction of racism and violence. Arabs to him are “No better than animals, really, the people who’d killed David and Motti” (*Sum* 55), and they are pictured as a surly, dirty mass in his narration.

With his troops and extremist rabbis he heads to the Temple Mount of Jerusalem to clear the area from Islamic influence. The protesting Palestinians organize themselves to demonstrate peacefully; they sit down and sing “We Shall Overcome” in Arabic. Their leader is Hashimi Moussa, a fearless and patient student inspired by Gandhi and Martin Luther King Jr. and with previous personal experience with Israeli clubs and rubber bullets. A Jewish friend of his told him of the religious group’s plans and allowed him to prepare in advance. The Israeli captain, in his fury at the Palestinians’ surprising tactics, in the midst of his orders to use gas and rubber bullets against them, shoots Moussa in front of the international media. The crowd stays courageous and defiant and the Israelis back off. Zadin is pulled away as he realizes and regrets his actions: “He had broken faith with himself. He had killed in cold blood. He had taken the life of someone who had threatened no man’s life. He had murdered,” (*Sum* 61). In this chapter, the Palestinians are shown as the victims and the moral winners, and the Israeli extremist group as the aggressor. Both parties are portrayed as religious, calling out to God to grant them victory.

In the story the US plans to intervene to save Israel from international criticism and an escalation to violence. The administration pushes for a long-term peace plan and an end to the conflict. During the negotiations the Israelis are described as the “only stumbling block” to the process, putting up serious resistance (*Sum* 130). The President decides to deal with it by pressuring the Israelis into agreeing with the terms or otherwise find themselves alone in a hostile world. The most extreme response from one Israeli minister is “We’ll break his career... We’ve jerked American politicians into line before!” (*Sum* 148). The Israelis come out as hard-headed, arrogant, and paranoid, yet in the end they agree to join in the peace plan. Thousands of Israelis are actually displaced from settlement outposts which are demolished. As the peace process evolves, and as Swiss and American troops move in to provide order, Palestinians are described as being happy with the developments

while the Israelis are not. The peace is pictured as a better deal for the Palestinians than the Israelis; “American tourists snapped pictures. Jews still looked a touch resentful. Arabs smiled,” (*Sum* 276). Later on, Palestinians are said to proclaim with triumph their political victory over Israel.

A matter worthy of analysis is the difference between Ryan’s thoughts in forming the peace plan and his opinions about enforcing the plan on others. The developments were Ryan’s idea, yet he feels queasy about pressuring the Israelis. He brings up the memory of the Holocaust constantly, the moral aspect of America’s support for Israel. In comparison to the other politicians in the administration, he is the only one who wonders about the justification of forcing Israel to do something against its national political beliefs. Later on, however, when Ryan meets his Israeli counterpart again, he tells Avi Ben Jacob to “get off that horse” of the holocaust, to stop being paranoid (*Sum* 279). Similar to this are Clark’s comments about the Israelis, showing both understanding for their political thoughts in a region surrounded by challenges, as well as exasperation for their inability to change their thinking. One fact comes out very strongly though; even in their fatigue with Israeli actions and mentality the American characters swear commitment to the state of Israel, Ryan even promising to protect her himself if it comes down to that. “There will be no second Holocaust. Not while I live. My countrymen will not let it happen ever again,” (*Sum* 280).

Another factor that is highlighted is America’s part in establishing this peace. It is not one which the two sides of the conflict develop through negotiations, but it is one that America, with help from the Saudis, the Soviets, and the Vatican, develop and impose on the region. The Saudi Ali bin Sheik agrees that America is the only one who can ensure peace in the region. According to Ryan’s thoughts, America was the only country trusted by both sides (*Sum* 145). The President uses this idea in his speech “...America has led the way on the road to justice and peace,” (*Sum* 263). He also ensures the fact that American men and women will be sent to protect the state of Israel.

The Arabs would see this as a fundamental change in U.S. policy – which it was – America was slapping Israel down. Israel would see it

the same way, but that wasn't really true. The peace would be guaranteed the only way that was possible, by American military and political power. The demise of the East-West confrontation had made it possible for America, acting in accord with the other major powers, to dictate a just peace. *What we think a just peace is*, Ryan corrected himself. (*Sum* 145)

5.4.2 Discussion

Clancy's solution to the Palestinian-Israeli Conflict is based on similar ideas from half a century ago.¹ His portrayal of the Palestinians and Israelis in these chapters follows some of the actual events of the late 1980's and early nineties; he even prophesizes the coming peace agreement between the two groups. He also follows what was, according to Elizur, the popular feeling the world had of the conflict at the time (in Sheffer 1997: 212). In one way, his portrayal of the conflict seems quite exceptional; considering the neoconservatives listed as his fans his portrayal is quite different from extreme pro-Israeli attitudes. As Vuollo says in his thesis (1993: 74), Clancy found his own answers to political questions; he exercises ways to express his own opinions about these issues. The picture of America's ally is not anymore one of inspiring admiration, but that of showing the extreme sides of religion and politics in Israel. The description of these Israeli characters (politicians) or troops is not romanticized in any way; on the contrary, the description seems much closer to the actual political discourse that appears in Israeli newspapers. Clancy has described Israeli aggression and bullying in this fictional story, which is quite remarkable if compared to previous bestsellers listed by van Teeffelen (1995).

Clancy's America does not need the role model which the right-wing politics of the 1970's used, according to McAlister (2001). Clancy is an author who establishes the US as having her own strength and operating alone as leader in international affairs. America even enforces her own plans for the future of the two nations without really discussing them with the two sides. In the case of Israel's defense,

¹ The British and UN plans were to establish two states with Jerusalem as an international city. The division of the city in 1948 between Israeli and Jordanian authority received great criticism from the world, and still in 1952 the UN attempted to encourage Jerusalem to be put under international supervision. Ironically, Clancy's peace plan happening around 1991 is Vatican-led, when in fact it was only in 1993 that Israel and the Vatican started diplomatic relations; the Vatican did not accept Israeli control in the religiously significant places until this recently. In 2000 the Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Barak was ready to discuss limited authority for Palestinians over East Jerusalem, but the Israeli leadership has never accepted ideas of international forces in the lands it controls.

these American policies actually resemble the actual events of the Gulf War of 1991.¹ The fictional pressuring of Israel into the peace plan reminds of the actual failed attempts by President Bush (Sr.) to pressure Israel to stop its large-scale settlement building projects in the Occupied Territories (Cleveland 1994: 441). In fiction, America's power and influence are easier to implement. Other than a mention of disagreements and riots by Israeli groups, in Clancy's story most problems get solved there. Here, the two parties serve as subjects for the actions of the US, and the conflict serves as a challenge for Ryan and the US government; the US has solved the problem by using its intellect and putting its military into the region.

Even as Clancy has a radically different approach to solving the conflict than would the extreme pro-Israeli parties, he never doubts America's support for Israel. He has Ryan show a personal attachment to the state and the people a number of times. Through his fictional story Clancy is even able to clear the negative picture the world has of Israeli policies. America has done the region, especially the Arab side, a favor; the Palestinian refugees may return to some of their land in a state of their own. An Arab extremist² is described as feeling betrayed by America for taking away his enemy, and by Israel for "making something akin to a fair peace," (*Sum* 147). There is an implied argument here that the Palestinians have gained so much from Israel, for whom the deal is described as unfair, that there is no reason or right to ask for more. Israel has now learned its lesson about mistreating others and now can start anew. From now on in later stories the Israelis are again the good friends and the more or less moral allies of America. The Palestinians as a nation continue to be a faceless mass (except for individual terrorists), with the pacifist leader and the fanatic policeman soon forgotten, and with individual narration coming from the Israeli point of view.

The fact that there is barely any mention of the UN in Clancy's fiction in context of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict is worthy of mention. The organization is only

¹ During the Gulf War of 1991 the US persuaded Israel to stay out of the war with Iraq to keep the American-led coalition intact, even as Iraqi missiles were shot into Israel. This was difficult for Israel to swallow politically, the country always having counted on its own forces and avenge any attacks on it. US air defense Patriot missiles were shipped into Israel, as the US continued ensuring Israel's safety in the region. (Terdoslavich 2005: 85)

² Ismael Qati, discussed in Chapter 5.5.

mentioned a few times and is given a minor part when sent out by the Americans to secure the borders of Israel and the new Palestinian state. Clancy's world has no competing organizations of international diplomacy; it has its own policy only. The UN has been very important to the Palestinians in their pursuit of their claims through the last sixty years though. Some scholars have claimed that the US has been trying to "massage the Palestinian case out of existence" (McDowall 1995: 113). Said also has strong comments about this issue: "Where Washington has been busiest is in the enfeeblement and marginalization of the United Nations, historically a forum of Palestinian protest... the only international guarantee that their claims would not be ignored," (in Bayoumi and Rubin 2000: 390). One could argue that Clancy's novel, even as it does not "massage out" the Palestinian case but seems to do the contrary, does put the Palestinians "winning their rights" in a context where certain real-world factors are left out, and which is more acceptable to most of his conservative readers and to policy in Washington.

Clancy wrote his story of a happy ending for the Israeli-Palestinian conflict a few years before the actual peace deal was made. What is of interest is the question whether his story helped pave way for the euphoric feeling in the West, a hope of finality to the violence in the Holy Land. The question is how strong an effect has he on popular thought on this issue. The incidents and the feeling which in reality occurred amongst Palestinians during the Oslo Accords are quite different from Clancy's story. According to McDowall, one Palestinian man's comments represented the popular feeling in the area during the peace talks:

I feel like a man who has lost a million dollars and been given ten. But you see, I lost the million dollars a long time ago. So I will keep the ten. We cannot go on the way we are. I accept, I accept, I accept. After so many rejections, I accept. But please, don't ask me how I feel. (McDowall 1995: 118)

Said for one was a major critic of the Oslo Accords. In his arguing for a two-state solution and against extremism of all kind he still considered Oslo "an instrument of Palestinian surrender, a Palestinian Versailles," (Newsweek 2003). The paradoxical reality which the process hid behind it, with ongoing oppression of human rights and settlement projects, blew up into another Palestinian uprising in 2000. Considering

today's situation between the Israelis and Palestinians, the prospect of near future negotiations is bleak.¹

5.5 Palestinian and Other Terrorists

5.5.1 Portrayal of characters

A Druze farmer finds the old Israeli nuclear bomb in his garden. The farmer's wife has died from an Israeli artillery round, four out of five of his children have died before reaching puberty, and his only surviving child fought and has been wounded in the 1973 war against the Israelis. Distrusting the Syrians for their aggressive history towards the Druze and their rough-handed manners in solving issues like this, the farmer's son turns to Palestinian extremists for help in removing the bomb from the garden. The Druze farmer and his son are pictured as hard-working, proud, strong people, yet also as victims in a world hostile to them and their religion. After their introductory part in this story these characters cease to exist in Clancy's world.

One of the main Palestinian characters in this group is Ismail Qati. Qati is the commander of a Palestinian militia group involved in the armed struggle against Israel. He is portrayed as an older respected leader, with his men watching out for him. Even as he is fighting the effects of cancer he is tough on himself and tries his best to endure the pain. He speaks five languages well and is a devout Muslim, with much of his discourse consisting of religious references. Qati is shocked and devastated by the progress towards peace between the Israelis and the Palestinians. A large part of his thinking is contemplating his prospects for the destruction of Israel. "Peace? And yet Israel will continue to exist? What, then, of his sacrifices,

¹ McDowall writes that Palestinians began to feel that the peace process was kept going to disguise the deteriorating prospects in Palestine (1995: 113). While the peace talks were going on, Israel's biggest ever settlement building program continued in the Occupied Territories. Money donations from the world which were supposed to help the Palestinian people ended up lost in the mismanagement and corruption of the Palestinian Authority. What was supposed to provide the Palestinians with a state of their own and peaceful relations between the two peoples ended up with the rise of extremism on both sides. As of now, Israeli forces have disengaged from the Gaza Strip (in August 2005) and democratic Palestinian government elections have been held. However, the ongoing humanitarian crisis and the abuse of the human rights of the Palestinian population, the mismanagement of the PA, the rise of the extreme political party Hamas into power in the Palestinian government (in February 2006), the West's choice not to give funds to the Hamas government, and the continuation of Israeli military intrusions into Palestinian held territory do not provide a positive prospect for the future of negotiations between the two parties.

what of the hundreds, thousands, of freedom fighters sacrificed under Israeli guns and bombs?" (*Sum* 256).

Ibrahim Ghosn is the other main Palestinian character in this part of Clancy's novel. He is a fighter in Qati's group with special expertise in bomb manufacturing. He is described as youthful and handsome in appearance, a near graduate of the American University of Beirut with a degree in engineering. However, he is a gifted self-taught engineer, applying his intellect for use in the struggle. One of the most thrilling developments in Clancy's production is the description of Ghosn's dismantling of the device he received from the Druze, unaware that he is roughly tampering with a nuclear bomb. Speeches of world leaders hailing the peace process and praising God are simultaneously narrated to give colorful irony to the story. When Ghosn recognizes the device for what it is he shouts out "Allahu akhbar!"¹

The motivation behind these characters is the historical events which Clancy touches at times with the help of his characters' thoughts. Ghosn is from a Palestinian family who had "evacuated Israel at the time of the country's founding, confidently expecting to return as soon as the Arab armies of the time erased the invaders quickly and easily," (*Sum* 182). He grew up in the crowded, unsanitary refugee camps where the antipathy for Israel towered over any other thinking, "a creed as important as Islam".

Disregarded by the Israelis as people who had voluntarily left their country, largely ignored by other Arab nations... Ghosn and those like him were mere pawns in a great game whose players had never agreed upon the rules. Hatred of Israel and its friends came as naturally as breathing, and finding ways to end the lives of such people was his task in life. It had never occurred to him to wonder why. (*Sum* 182)

Similarly, Qati feels strongly about the past of his people. He contemplates his religion of Islam in relation to the other monotheistic religions and the political environment in the region. He realizes the similarity between the three predominant religions and feels respect for both Christianity and Judaism. He understands that

¹ Once again Clancy has misspelled the Arabic word "akbar". See *Sum* 223.

“His war against Israel was not about religion. It was about his people, cast out of their land, displaced by another people who also claimed to be motivated by a religious imperative when it was really something else,” (*Sum* 437). Here Qati himself excludes the religion of Islam from the path of violence he has chosen.

Another character who helps to establish Palestinian motivation for struggling against Israel is a Native American criminal, Marvin Russell. Russell is a clever, fearless, powerfully muscular Indian. He was born into a poor society with his parents falling for alcohol and marital infidelity and he and his brother soon ending up doing time in prison. “He was also slightly mad, but Marvin Russell did not know that,” (*Sum* 47). In prison he becomes acquainted with the AIM,¹ and he returns to the religion of his ancestors and romanticizes the Native American past and blames the White Man for the degradation in his society. Russell watches the news as his drug-pushing brother is shot by the FBI. He himself escapes to join the group of terrorists, where he is both disrespected as a heathen and respected for his physical strength and intelligence. A thought-provoking topic is raised when Russell, a number of times, compares the history of the Palestinians with that of the Native Americans; he relates the history of Indian wars and Indian reservations to the conflict and refugee camps of the Palestinians.² “I never knew there were other folks who been fucked over like my people, man – but you guys are better at fighting back. You guys got real balls,” (*Sum* 299). These phrases seem to support an understanding of the political environment and a feeling of sympathy for the Palestinians in the minds of the American audience. Yet they come from a character who is not the most admirable in every aspect.

Another political extremist who joins this group is Günther Bock. Bock is a Marxist and a terrorist from West Germany, and with his wife was part of the Baader-Meinhof Gang and the Red Army Faction.³ Bock managed to escape to East-Germany, and later to Bulgaria, but his wife was caught by the West-German police. He feels enraged for the loss of his children to adoption, and is angered further by

¹ AIM – American Indian Movement, radical activist political organization tied with terrorism and crime from the 1970’s onwards (Greenberg 2005: 164).

² See *Sum* 184 and 378.

³ The Baader-Meinhof Gang, named after its two leaders (who later committed suicide in prison), was a Marxist terrorist organization working in West Germany in the 1970’s. The Red Army Faction evolved from it. (Greenberg 2005)

the death of his wife in prison, which he doesn't believe to be suicide. He lives in a changing world: Germany is reunifying, and with the Soviet forces withdrawing from the former East-Germany and the Stasi being de-established, he loses his old supporters. Bock has an important role in the planning of the nuclear attack, trying to get the two Cold War rivals to fight each other again. He manages to recruit a German engineer, Doctor Manfred Fromm, to improve the nuclear weapon. With his Stasi companion he manages an attack against the American and Soviet forces in Berlin to get them fighting each other. He is killed in the incident.

Manfred Fromm, the civilian nuclear physicist, plays a part in providing one portrayal of the Middle East and Arabs. While working on the bomb, thoughts such as "this young Arab (Ghosn) is very clever" (*Sum* 334) make it seem that he has a positive picture of the Arabs. At times he is excited about his project and praises his uneducated yet skilled Palestinian helpers. However, he also treats especially Ghosn in a patronizing manner, calling him "my young friend," commenting "very good mein junge" more than once (*Sum* 376). Other times he nags about the miserable climate and calls the Arabs surly workers and associates (*Sum* 404). When yet another mistake is made by one of the Arabs causing a delay, Fromm explodes with: "The ignorant bastard couldn't read!" (*Sum* 562). In another description he calls them "dirty, scruffy people" who he admired anyways; the landscape is dry and harsh, so it was "not these people's fault that they looked as they did," (*Sum* 563).

The international terrorist group which forms up to retaliate against the forces which have changed the world seems like a very unlikely cooperative group. They are of different religious and ideological backgrounds: the Muslims consider the atheists and the Indian as infidels; to balance out the German physicists negative comments, the Arabs consider the German genius an arrogant infidel and claim they would much rather work for a Jew (a comment which portrays Arabs with a natural anger towards Jews). Bock has a habit of commenting disrespectfully about the Native American, which makes the Germans seem ethnocentric, if not racist. Perhaps these different views distribute the image of savagery to all three peoples represented in the terrorist group.¹ Yet they share similar positions as social outcasts ready to use

¹ For examples see *Sum* 377, 407, 419.

terrorism for their purposes. They have similar enemies, America and Russia, which brings them together, and each one's expertise in some field give them an important part in the mission. Ghosn himself excuses Fromm's bad manners and arrogance, praising his skills and genius: "But this Fromm... what I am learning from him!" (*Sum* 408).

5.5.2 Discussion

Just as van Teeffelen (1995) argues in his essay about previous novel writers, Clancy attempts to give each individual terrorist their understandable, maybe even slightly sympathetic, background motivation to escape too much of a one-sided political setting. In a few cases it is the loss of family members which angers the subjects and starts them on their path of vengeance. With Bock, the German terrorist, the loss of his supporting parties and the loss of his family are the factors which determine his direction. However, Bock's ideologies are the enemy of the good guys and the world is only better with his loss of his family; his children are adopted by a police captain and get a more stable and moral upbringing than they would with their real parents, and Bock's wife was a killer who is better dead to society than alive. The fact that she took her own life in jail shows her extreme character, and Qati's confession that he slept with her on one occasion mars any morality in the relationship between Bock and his wife. Bock's grief for his loved one is undermined in the reader's eyes by Qati's grief for the same woman.

The Native American, Russell, is angered by the loss of his brother. He too, though, was killed for a reason; he was a criminal tied with drug smuggling and an extremist organization, and he was shot by the FBI, a respected force in Clancy's world. Russell as a character also lacks understanding of the world. He gets used by the other characters; to the end he does not know of the nuclear bomb, but believes them to be normal explosives. He is stabbed by Qati and Ghosn and dies from his wounds before the nuclear bomb goes off. Clancy's discussion of Native American history does not generally seem very positive. He definitely does not romanticize it in any

way; on the contrary, Clancy is quite Anglicized, as with the issue with the Irish characters and Irish background.¹

The Palestinian characters in this section of Clancy's novel are given the most time and psychological analysis out of all the terrorists. Here the Palestinians fit the categories of "Terrorist", but also the category of "Victim". Israeli forces are considered the aggressors in the case of the Druze characters at least, though Qati and Ghosn are not mentioned to have lost any family members to the cause. In their case it is about the Palestinian cause, which is given much thought and space even in this part of the book. There are references to the history of the region, through Qati's, Ghosn's, and Russell's narration, where the Palestinians are the victims of invading forces. However, there are no detailed descriptions of actual events of the "evacuation" of Palestinians, not like the ones historians such as Neff (1995) have described and concentrated on.² As Van Teeffelen claims about previous bestsellers, that "an understanding of Palestinian political motives beyond compassion is absent from almost all thrillers" (1995: 102), this part of Clancy's novel, even when there is some description of a motive for the terrorists from their history, only ends up as an attempt at explanation for such strong feelings. In the end the fact that these narrations come from immoral and fanatical "Terrorists", both the Palestinians and their support group, undermines any political views that they may share with the reader.

The cause is established as one of unrelenting hate and vengeance, and the extremists are unable to change their thinking when they are given the chance to do so. It becomes their natural state of being; the hate and drive towards vengeance pushes all other possibilities out of the minds of the Palestinian extremists. Peace and prosperity for their people become second to the goals of the cause. On his visit to Jerusalem Ghosn witnesses the positive effects of the peace deal as an increase of

¹ In interviews in 1991 Clancy highlights the achievements of the White European settlers. In context of a discussion of economics, "...A few hundred years ago America was a strip of dirt that did not extend as far west as Wisconsin. That belonged to the Indians – assuming there were any Indians there 200 years ago. In 200 years we have settled a continental land mass, created the most powerful economy in the world," (in Greenberg 2005: 74). Also, "In two hundred years we took a continent of empty land and made it into the world's richest country," (in Greenberg 2005: 124).

² Neff (1995) would disagree that the "evacuation" of Palestinians had been so clean and simple. In fact, his work gives accounts of atrocities carried out by Jewish terrorist gangs trying to inflict fear in the Palestinians to make them leave their homes.

wealth and opportunity.¹ “But prosperity was not what Ibrahim Ghosn wanted for his people or his land. Ultimately, perhaps, but only after the other necessary preconditions had been met,” (*Sum* 286). Religion is also secondary to the cause; according to Qati’s own wondering, he “faced his own beliefs in all their contradictions. Israel was his enemy. The Americans were his enemy. The Russians were his enemy. That was his personal theology, and though he might claim to be a Muslim, what ruled his life had precious little to do with God, however much he might proclaim the opposite to his followers,” (*Sum* 437). The highlight of the this part of the story is that it is tens of thousands of American civilians at the Super Bowl, a sign of American identity in Clancy’s world, who become the victims of terrorism in the end. The Palestinian characters move quite drastically from being the victim and subject sympathy to being the blood-thirsty terrorist.

According to van Teeffelen’s discussion, Palestinian terrorists “possess features of professionalism which make them less primitive than the stereotype would expect them to be,” (1995: 96). However, the terrorist usually lacks an important aspect of professionalism: self-control. In many novels this is where the terrorist falls apart and makes a fatal mistake. In Clancy’s novel, Ghosn and Qati are educated and motivated for a cause. Ghosn especially shows intelligence and ability to learn new concepts. They act rationally and do not allow their emotions or pity to stop them from eliminating security threats. Qati, the leader, shows some impatience, but this is explained by his fear of dying before he can witness the outcome of his handiwork, and it does not interfere with the terrorist plot. Clancy’s terrorists plan everything smoothly and with professional style and, at least to some degree, succeed in their mission. There is, however, a slight “collapse in competence and control” in the terrorists’ actions. One of the fighters guarding the atom bomb decides on his own to help out the engineers. By ignorance and forgetfulness he ends up damaging the bomb; it becomes a “fizzle”, weakening its explosive force into a tenth of its designed yield. Thus, because of this minor accident, the handicraft of experts is undermined.

¹ It is incredible that the Palestinian character from Lebanon has been allowed to visit Jerusalem in Clancy’s fiction. In reality this would not be so due to strict Israeli security and political measures.

Van Teeffelen also speaks of a “helper” which appears in many bestsellers, who is usually a Western professional, a scientist or businessman; “The mind-related elements are associated with the Western helper, while the action- and emotion-related aspects are assigned to the Palestinian,” (1995: 97). This minimizes the professionalism and the competence of the Palestinians, yet this also establishes them as threatening and powerful emotionally. The helper, according to van Teeffelen, is given much of credibility when observing the Palestinian. In *Sum* we have the civilian nuclear physicist who rebuilds and enhances the atom bomb for the Palestinians. It is from the Western professional helper, the nuclear physicist, that we get most of the degrading comments about Arabs in *Sum*. There are some similarities with these undermining and stereotyping themes and Clancy’s portrayal of his characters. Through innocent-sounding comments, the Arabs are undermined, just like in previous bestsellers.

5.6 Bin Sheik, Islam, and the Middle East

5.6.1 Portrayal of characters

Clancy has dedicated one longer extract of his novel to the history of the religions in the Middle East. His Catholic side shows through as he explains the history of the three monotheistic beliefs and the violence each has wrought and experienced. “Rapine, plunder, slaughter, all the basest crimes of man would become something more than a right – made into duty, a Holy Cause, not sins at all,” (*Sum* 96). Especially including examples from the Crusades, but also including the other religions, he narrates through Ryan’s thoughts the blasphemy of wars in a consecrated region. “...All men are alike in their virtues and their vices,” (*Sum* 96). Clancy says that the same still continues now in recent times; the Israelis relating their near extinction at Christian hands and “...surrounded by countries that had every reason to see the Jewish state immolated, had elevated paranoia to an art form, and national security to an obsession ...The difference was that they now held the sword, and had well and truly learned its use,” (*Sum* 97).

There are quite a few comments about the similarities between the different religions. Some come from the Palestinian terrorists mentioned before, and their

pondering about the Muslims, Christians, and Jews all being People of the Book. Many comments come from Clancy's leading American characters. "Hell, I read the Koran last month, and it's the same as what I learned in Sunday school," (*Sum* 16). Ryan explains that similarity doesn't always matter; Catholic and Protestant Christians are killing each other in Northern Ireland, "Safest place in the world to be Jewish." Ryan's whole idea for a peace plan comes from getting the religious leaders from every religion and denomination together to support the establishment of an international Holy City in Jerusalem.

Clancy also speaks about the religious fanatics. While the world's political and religious leaders are planning a peaceful future for the Middle East, extreme groups demonstrate against the process. The head of a Jewish paramilitary group concludes that "Jews were fools to trust anyone at all except the weapons in their own strong hands," (*Sum* 153). Israeli right-wing groups continue the demonstrations for some time in the novel. The religious leader of Iran, Ayatolla Daryaei, preaches against all unbelievers, "...consigning each and every one to his personal version of hell..." (*Sum* 153). Extremists in Saudi Arabia threaten their king. An American charismatic Christian from the South first denounces Roman Catholicism as the anti-Christ, then claims that God doesn't hear the prayers of Jews or "Mohammedans", an insult to Muslims. In Clancy's story, these extreme views are sidelined and the peace deal becomes a popular phenomenon; clerics of different religions meet up as old friends in the streets of Jerusalem and peace reigns in the Middle East.

Clancy has incorporated short reviews of different countries and their histories in his novels. The Saudis have become an important asset for the Americans because of oil. A short description from Clark, the CIA agent, gives a positive view of them, though he does wonder about the treatment of women there.¹ Clancy describes them as a "...curious mixture of the primitive and the sophisticated," (*Sum* 113). He compares the only recent nomadic lifestyle of a large part of the population with the "admirable tradition of Koranic scholarship, a code that was harsh but scrupulously fair, and remarkably similar to the Talmudic traditions of Judaism." Prince Ali bin

¹ See *Sum* 158.

Sheik¹ is a member of the ruling monarch family in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. Ryan meets him for the first time when he works to get all possible parties involved in the peace process. Educated and trained in Britain and the US, Bin Sheik is working as foreign affairs and intelligence advisor of the Saudi King, and he is the main Muslim character to be supportive of Ryan's ideas. In the end he befriends Ryan and comes to represent the good-guy Arab Muslim in Clancy's world.

The beginning of a war between religions is close at hand near the end of the novel. When the nuclear bomb goes off in the US, the misled administration prepares to get its revenge first on the USSR, which Ryan prevents, then on Iran. The Palestinian terrorists being interrogated by Clark claim that Ayatolla Daryaei of Iran has bankrolled and supported the mission; they attempt to start a religious war and make the US an enemy of all of Islam to stop the peace process. The president is ready to hit the city of Qum in Iran with a nuclear strike until Ryan stops him; Ryan refuses to kill innocent civilians. He quotes the Koran in his criticism of the terrorists when he meets them face-to-face. He also confronts Ayatolla Daryaei, a future adversary, and criticizes his take on religious matters: "Wrong. I believe, just as you do, but in a different way. Are we so different? Prince Ali doesn't think so," (*Sum* 909).

5.6.2 Discussion

In this novel, Clancy's take of God and religion seems to be one of universalism; he respects all religions and gives a respecting portrait of all of them. He gives the adherents of each religion the opportunity to speak out and say their opinion. Ryan has good contacts with the moderate representatives of each political and religious group. He highlights the solving of sectarian violence and religious disputes by concentrating on the similarities between the beliefs. The sum of it all is a euphoria of love and acceptance. Clancy seems to dislike all fanatics who use religion as a reason for applying violence and death. They are, however, excellent pawns for political thrillers, as later novels will continue to show.

Bin Sheik comes to play a big part in representing the Arab and Muslim peoples in Clancy's world. He also takes on a role supporting Ryan in the Arab and Muslim

¹ Clancy uses this misspelled form of the Arabic word "sheikh" in his production. A sheikh is an Arab prince or leader, or the leader of a Muslim community.

world, similar to Golovko in Russia, ben Jacob in Israel, and Sir Charleston and the Prince of Wales in Britain. While countries such as Syria and Iran are shaken off as extremist countries harboring terrorists, bin Sheik represents the moderate pro-Western Muslim, the good-guy “Friend” of America, and his religion is one of peace. At the end of the story the intelligence operatives watch the beheading of the Palestinian terrorists in Saudi Arabia. Bin Sheik then gives the sword used for the beheading to Ryan as a show of thanks, respect, and the symbol of justice and vengeance. In a similar way Ryan was knighted in Britain, and similarly the Japanese prime minister will in a later novel consider him “samurai”.

5.7 Discussion

5.7.1 The Palestinian Struggle and Islam

The introduction, from the late 1970’s, shows some romanticizing of Israeli military power in contrast to the masses of Arab attackers. However, that is as far as the romanticizing goes in this novel. During the conflict in the late 80’s and early 90’s the Palestinians are portrayed as the victims of aggressive Israeli policies. The events culminate in the description of armed Israeli police killing defenseless and peaceful Palestinian protestors. This is one of the striking examples where a person in uniform can abuse his powers against a civilian, one of the most immoral acts possible in Clancy’s production. The outcome of the peace process is portrayed much more favorably towards the Palestinian people than the Israelis, and the Israeli military and government are shown as arrogant and unyielding until they finally cave in to international demand.

The religion of Islam is also portrayed positively, not as an opposing religion to Judaism and Christianity, but as an equal, a sister-religion. This comes about not only with the description of practicing Muslims entering Jerusalem for prayers, a Saudi Muslim cleric meeting up with a rabbi for discussion, and the speeches of the world’s political and religious leaders calling for peace, but also in Clancy’s narration of the history of the Middle East. He concentrates on the similarities between the three systems of belief and considers subjects in each one responsible for the wrong interpretation used to justify extremism and acts of violence. Ryan

claims that “There is much to admire about Islam, you know. We in the West often overlook that because of the crazies who call themselves Muslims - as though we don’t have the same problem in Christianity,” (*Sum* 20-21). The Israeli policeman becomes a religious fanatic and carries out his crimes. Clancy mentions the Crusades as a heavy example of using religion for domestic and political purposes. From Islam there are no such specific examples. There is no attempt to degrade or stereotype Islam; even the Palestinian terrorists’ motives are clearly extracted from any religious motivation.

5.7.2 Palestinian Terrorism

A major theme in *Sum* is the deep irony of the world trying to work towards peace while Palestinians are plotting to destroy it. What overshadows the peace talks, the criticism of Israeli aggression, and the establishment of an independent Palestinian state, is the constant narration of a developing terrorist plot. While speeches are given to the world and thankful prayers are directed to God, a group of Palestinian extremists opposed to the peace finds out that it has a nuclear weapon in its hands. The irony is overwhelming. The concentration and detail Clancy puts into the Palestinian terrorist characters supercedes any others in the Middle East. He gives a somewhat sympathetic view of these characters at first, highlighting their respectable attributes of intelligence and education, and with a description of their motives and the history of their people. The fact that these Palestinian characters turn evil and receive the title of “Terrorist”, when attacking American civilians, towers over any sympathy previously produced for them. The ending, where these terrorists are beheaded in front of a crowd of Muslim Arabs, provides Ryan with the justice and vengeance for the nuclear attack. It is also a warning to any other possible extremists.

Even as there is straightforward criticism of past Israeli policies and the abuse of certain individual characters, the description of these policies and the details of the historical events are left vague.¹ There is admittance that Israeli troops and politicians have led an aggressive history towards the Palestinians, but there is also Ryan’s contemplation of the “special relationship” with Israel and numerous

¹ Ben Jacob’s vague statements such as “...when it (Israel) had seized land that might or might not have been owned by Arabs” (*Sum* 256) provide these uncertain descriptions of history.

mentions of the “moral responsibility” to support Israel, which nearly justifies every injustice ever carried out by it. As van Teeffelen mentions, “While Israeli actions are criticized in this novel, the Masada framework once again appears to give them a measure of credibility. Also, whereas Palestinian project-type actions are allowed to come forward, they are narratively superseded by the threatening terrorist script,” (1992: 220).¹ In other words, even when Israeli policies are looked at critically, the fact that Israel is seen to be fighting for its existence against inner and surrounding outer threats gets them off the hook. As McAlister claims of the film *Black Sunday*, that “the issues behind the Israeli-Palestinian conflict are clearly secondary to the film’s primary concerns” (2001:190), so Clancy’s balanced view of the situation is undermined by the knowledge that a Palestinian terrorist is attempting to sabotage the peace process by attacking America.²

If compared, there are some differences in the descriptions of the actions of the Israeli police captain and the Palestinian terrorists. The Israeli captain is driven to commit an act of murder due to extremist religious fervor and a recent family crisis. The history of his own personal life is told in detail to give some type of understanding for his feelings. His act is more spontaneous than premeditated, even when he has planned for the use of violence and is racist in his thoughts about the Arabs. After his act he feels horror and regret for what he has done. The act is also quite clearly a mistake carried out by an individual barely mentioned again, but the state of Israel, which is only indirectly responsible for it, is held fully responsible. The Palestinian terrorist, on the other hand, has his whole life built on his want for revenge and regrets nothing. In Clancy’s world, if the reason for vengeance has not been justified in a detailed way, then the subject does not gain the author’s or the

¹ Masada is a mountain fortification by the Dead Sea where Jewish zealots holed up at the end of the Jewish Rebellion around 70A.D. The Jews held off Roman legions for a number of years until they all decided to commit suicide rather than surrender to Roman rule. This historical event and its teaching, of being surrounded by enemy forces and defending to the death rather than succumbing to enemy rule, is a big theme in contemporary Israeli political thinking.

² Said, in his essay *The Middle East “Peace Process”: Misleading Images and Brutal Actualities*, argues that Western experts have come to believe that Islamic fundamentalism and terrorism are the only obstacles to peace (in Bayoumi and Rubin 2000: 383). If it weren’t for the extremists everything would be alright, the belief goes. Said says that the scholars, such as Bernard Lewis, have followed what politicians have declared in speeches and as policy. The US media has continued the writing of these misleading images of the peace process. Said says that “This peace process must be demystified and spoken about truthfully and plainly,” (in Bayoumi and Rubin 2000: 397). In this context, Clancy’s novel and his later novels are similarly concentrating on Palestinian extremism and giving a picture of an impossible peace process because of them. Israeli aggression does not continue against civilians, yet Palestinian extremism goes on; two big themes in Clancy’s orientalism.

reader's acceptance. These Palestinians, as the Afghan Archer in *Cardinal*, are driven by a vengeance and a natural anger, and as they are unable to change their thinking it becomes their end. They get an opportunity to kill tens of thousands of innocent people, and after months of careful planning carry it out, killing fellow compatriots in the process. In the end Clancy provides no sympathy for them. "...By targeting civilians rather than military persons the terrorist defies the most elementary standards of humanity," and because of this reason the terrorist is "well-suited for the role of non-civilizational Other," (van Teeffelen 1995: 94).

Terrorist events such as the one in Munich in 1972 are almost casually referred to by the author in many previous bestsellers, as well as relating previous attacks to the history of the characters. Usually these events are ones the reader most probably is acquainted with. This aids the rise of certain expectations and stereotypes in the reader's mind (van Teeffelen 1995: 94). Clancy does relate his characters to the bombing of the US Marines barracks in Beirut in 1983, as well as events of Palestinian terrorism against Israel. Clancy's novel then helps to avenge the real-life attack on American forces with the creation of the capture and killing of someone responsible for it, a theme which will appear in many of Clancy's novels.¹ Also, an Israeli general tells the reader that "In 1972 the Black September faction of the Palestine Liberation Organization contracted the Japanese Red Army to shoot up Ben Gurion Airport, which they did, killing off mainly American Protestant pilgrims..." (*Sum* 279). Not only do these kinds of specific passages provide support for the rise of stereotyping Palestinians as terrorists; they also provide the continuation of Clancy's saga to stereotype the Japanese who are the next adversary.

Even as there is no romanticizing of Israel in *Sum* in the context of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict, Israel continues as America's friend and staunch ally, and gets America's full support. In later novels the Israeli military is still considered arrogant and hard-headed, even towards Americans (*Executive* 186). There are some mentions of the progress of the peace deal, most including the mention of extremism as well. With enemies still surrounding Israel, "The Mossad was still in the business of making people disappear. The newly found peace in the Middle East hadn't

¹ See Chapter 6 - *Executive Orders*, the discussion about the avenging of the loss of American lives and interests in Somalia, Iran, and Iraq.

changed that..." (*Executive* 249). A big part of Clancy's orientalism is that the Israelis are and will be in Clancy's "Friends" category, while the Palestinians are "Victims", even "Winners", but never as America's "Friends"; they are more pronounced as "Terrorists" towards the end of this novel. In later novels, where Clancy continues the use of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict as a background theme, the Palestinians are terrorists and aggressors, and terrorism against Israel is mentioned off hand in relation to the terrorism carried out against the US.

This is not the first or last time that Clancy writes about terrorism. In fact, terrorists are established as the bad guys in six of Clancy's thirteen novels, and *Sum* is third in order of the six books. As shown in Chapter 3, much of this terrorism is created by extremist groups in Europe and the Americas. However, even in these narrations of Irish Catholic terrorism in *Patriot* and Columbian cocaine cartel terror in *Clear* the concept of Palestinian terrorism is already introduced in them. There are mentions in each of characters such as the well known dissident Abu Nidal, a.k.a. Sabri El-Banna, as examples of terrorists. Also, in *Patriot* there are terrorist camps in North Africa tied in with the story. It seems that these earlier novels prepare the reader for the future Palestinian adversary in *Sum* and the Middle East as a whole as a breeding ground for terrorists.¹

¹ The recent Hollywood movie *The Sum of All Fears* (Paramount Pictures 2002) showed no Israel or Palestinians and no peace process. The Native American and the German Marxists are gone. What was considered the end to problems in the Middle East has disintegrated, but the Western public only realized that with the beginning of the Second Intifada in 2000. In the movie German nationalists are the bad guys. The only Arabs pictured are rough desert-dwellers who get cheated by a German to sell the bomb for a cheap price. In the air-raid on Syria in the introduction there are no enemies killed; in the movie the Israeli pilot looks at a picture of his family and gets shot down by missiles. Terdoslavich writes about a "left-wing filter" in Hollywood, where Clancy's conservatism gets a blow; "Arab terrorists are not marketable or politically correct, even though they've been pretty commonplace as terrorists in deed these last three decades. The movie bad guys have to be people that everybody hates – neo-Nazis bent on taking over the world..." (2005: 193). Ironically, the bomb in the movie is shipped from Lebanon through Israel to the US, hardly possible in real life.

6 SHIITE MUSLIM EXTREMISM AND MIDDLE EASTERN TERRORISM IN *EXECUTIVE ORDERS* (1996)

From all of Clancy's lengthy novels, many of which reach over one thousand pages in length, *Executive* is the most massive of them at 1,358 pages. This book has been dedicated to President Ronald Reagan, "Fortieth President of the United States: The man who won the war," (*Executive* opening pages). The novel is as complex as *Sum*, if not more so. This one also concentrates on the Middle East, especially on the Shiite Muslims in Iran, Iraq, and Lebanon, as well as Sunni Islam in Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, and other states. Clancy also discusses the Arab culture and a "Middle Eastern tradition". The three novels *Debt*, *Executive*, and *Bear* are a trio with different yet connected enemies; each one has a foreign country, or "civilization", attempt to weaken the US or its ally to gain an upper hand in a military confrontation with a neighboring area. *Executive* is then not only an independent novel, but also a story related to a larger plot against the US.

6.1 The Plot

Executive continues from the events of the previous novel *Debt* with Ryan as the new president.¹ The first few hundred pages of the novel detail the life of the President and his family, and how their lifestyle has been changed, even limited, by Ryan's new responsibilities.² Ryan has a difficult time settling into his new role, and much of his discourse is about the criticism of power. He begins the investigation on the airplane attack and starts his tasks as leader of the country. His major challenge is the rebuilding of the government after its destruction, and his strong idealism and patriotism shines out. However, not everyone is in agreement

¹ At the end of *Debt*, after an economic and military conflict with Japan and its criminal businessman leader, Ryan is sworn into the position of vice president. Minutes after, a Japanese airline pilot, motivated by the death of his son in the conflict, flies his passenger plane into the Capitol Building. Most of the US federal government is killed, including the President. Ryan becomes President.

² The Ryan family now lives in the White House surrounded by Secret Service agents, servants, and government figures, and finding privacy becomes difficult. Cathy Ryan continues her job as an eye surgeon and the children go to the same schools as before.

with Ryan, and the media (encouraged by immoral politicians) directs much criticism towards him for his political mistakes. Many foreign heads of government are unimpressed by Ryan. A constitutional crisis is about to ensue when the former Vice President challenges Ryan for the position of President of the US. An even bigger international crisis develops when the media gains access to information about Ryan's secret CIA past and his adventures listed in previous novels.

One of the sets of political militant extremists in this novel, which attempts to inflict harm on the administration, appears from within the US. The other group of political extremists is from the Middle East. The previously introduced leader of Iran, Ayatolla Daryaei, has far-reaching plans for the spread of his influence and the future of all of Islam. The dictator of Iraq is assassinated by what seems to be a Shiite Muslim assassin. Daryaei leads the process of increasing Iranian influence in Iraq, and in the end the two countries unite to create the United Islamic Republic (UIR), which the former Soviet nation Turkmenistan also joins. Daryaei next turns his sight towards Saudi Arabia, and Prince Bin Sheik asks for America's help. By now the US military, like the American society, has been weakened by terrorism in the US. To add to that the governments of India and China have been conniving against the US to divert its forces from the Middle East, the Chinese even shooting down a Taiwanese passenger plane to create political havoc. A massive tank battle takes place between the UIR forces and the Saudis, Kuwaitis, and Americans.

To ensure the success of his plans in the Middle East Daryaei attempts to weaken Ryan and the US on its own soil. Attackers attempt the kidnapping of President Ryan's daughter from her day-care center. Meanwhile, an Iranian doctor working in Congo comes across the Ebola virus which he then transports to Iran, where it is experimented on and enhanced. A secret mission spreads the virus into numerous civilian centers in the US and thousands of people become afflicted. At the same time an Iranian assassin in the President's very own security detail is waiting for a command, and in the end makes his move to decapitate the US administration. Ryan and the rest of America battle against these numerous different challenges at the same time, and turn out to be the victors.

6.2 Historical context

The 1967 Arab-Israeli War started a wave of “soul-searching” in the Arab world which led to many unstable regimes being overthrown. In Iraq, a coup d’état in 1968 brought the Sunni Muslim secular nationalist Ba’th party into power, in which Saddam Hussein (or Husayn) became a major political player in 1971. He became president in 1979, and stayed in power until the controversial American-led invasion in April, 2003.¹ The democratic rebuilding of the Iraqi government has now provided it with a Shiite majority. Opposition to the allied forces and sectarian violence continues, with especially Sunni and Shiite Muslims fighting each other in a struggle nearing civil war. (Cleveland 1994: 353-376 and Terdoslavich 2005: 45)

In Iran the 1979 revolution overthrew the pro-Western Shah and established an Islamic Republic, an event where the US lost its strongest ally in the Persian Gulf. The revolution was inspired by secular student movements calling for an end to the Shah’s repressive form of rule, and religious leaders such as Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini calling for a fundamental change from secular laws to Islamic code. In its aftermath Iranian society became Islamized, with Khomeini gaining political power. The Iran-Iraq War of 1980-1988 further strengthened Khomeini’s power in Iran.² US-Iranian relations have had their ups and downs during the hostage crises around the Middle East (Iran, Lebanon, and others), the Irangate affair, and other events (Cleveland 1994: 370 and 398-413). Iran’s relations with the West continue to be under stress with Iran’s continuing pursuit for nuclear power, with the West in tough opposition.

¹ The Ba’th party reign in Iraq included industrial development and the pursuit of a social welfare state in the 1970’s with free health care and education, as well as military build-up with Soviet arms in an arms-race with Syria, warfare against and brutal repression of demonstrations and rebellions by the Kurds and the Shiite Muslims, the attempt at Kuwaiti islands in 1973, the invasions into Iran in 1980 and Kuwait in 1990, and the Gulf War of 1991. Saddam Hussein was captured by American forces in Iraq in December, 2003, and his trial in the reformed Iraqi court has him facing the charge of crimes against humanity. (Cleveland 1994: 353-376 and Terdoslavich 2005: 45)

² Started by Hussein, with support from the Arabian Peninsula and the US, the invasion was an attempt to quell Iranian support for Kurdish and Shiite militancy in Iraq; the Ayatollah called for the spread of Islamic revolution all over the Middle East and the overthrow of the Ba’th party in Iraq. The war devastated the two countries economically and hundreds of thousands were killed. (Cleveland 1994: 370 and 398-413)

The Hezbollah (or Hizballah), the “Party of God”, is a Shiite Muslim militant organization operating in Lebanon. With ties to the Shiite state of Iran and with funds provided by her the organization calls for the establishment of an Islamic state. The Shiite population was one third of Lebanon’s population in the late 1980’s. A large part of Lebanon’s Shiite population lives in Southern Lebanon, and came to rally behind the militant groups Hizballah and Amal in the Lebanese civil war, which also fought against Israeli troops in the “security zone” which Israel continued to occupy after its 1982 invasion (Cleveland 1994: 443-445). Israel pulled out its forces from Southern Lebanon in 2000; yet clashes at the border continue, which provoked Israel into the infamous war of 2006.¹

6.3 Ryan’s Policies and Domestic Adversaries

6.3.1 Portrayal of characters

Ryan is portrayed as a victim of events, taking up responsibilities that he never asked for and a position he never wanted. He truly turns out to be the “poor dumb bastard” that Clancy calls him for getting stuck with all the hard work and then actually doing it (in Greenberg 2005: 58). He is too honorable to slink away from it all. His complaining about the politics and the loss of privacy makes him seem human, believable, and lovable enough. He is inexperienced in the world of politics, never having been elected as President, yet in his speeches he brings out his own style of speaking with wit and knowledge. They are not of the traditional political banter but seemingly more straight-to-the-point and realist, and his background as a history teacher shows up. Yet there is a strong feeling of idealism and patriotism as well, where much of his message seems to lean more towards the conservative and

¹ In the summer of 2006, after long ongoing attacks and reprisals between Hezbollah and Israeli forces, two Israeli soldiers were captured (similar to the capturing of one Israeli soldier in Gaza only shortly before). In the war that ensued, the population centers of both Lebanon and Israel were targeted and over 150 Israelis and 1200 Lebanese died. As was with the Palestinian population of Gaza, large parts of Lebanese society and infrastructure were destroyed in the military assault and economic embargo. Incredibly, the leaders of the US and the UK allowed the Israeli invasion to continue for weeks, even as the civilian death toll rose. Iran has been blamed for inciting Hezbollah into the war. The way “terrorism” is discussed nowadays has changed; the War on Terrorism seems to carry the generalization that massive civilian casualties in the Middle East are part of the process.

Republican side of the American political spectrum.¹ A lot of Clancy's important characters sympathize with him while his enemies underestimate him.

Ed Kealty acts as the anti-hero in the American political arena. Kealty is the former Vice President who had to resign due to a scandal from previous extramarital affairs; he raped a number of his aides, one of who committed suicide because of it (in *Debt* 1994). After the airplane kills off the government, Kealty untruthfully claims that he never resigned and should now be President. He shares confidential information about Ryan's CIA past with members of the media, turning them against Ryan's policies. The media deceives Ryan and stages a critical attack at him on live television, making him look bad. Later on one TV anchor apologizes to the President and the media gains a more positive picture of Ryan. Towards the end Kealty attempts to sue Ryan for restricting people's freedom of movement during an Ebola virus pandemic in the US caused by terrorism.

The American extremists in this novel are a group of nationalist White militants called the Mountain Men. They are anti-federal, anti-bureaucrat, and consider the destruction of much of the government the "best thing that's happened to our country since Jefferson," (*Executive* 81). They consider the display of the stars and stripes on the coffins of politicians as blasphemous. Much of their discourse is also edged with racism. Their previous positive attitude towards a gun-slinging Ryan is changed by, what seems to be, an inbred suspicion of government and its employees. They plan an attack against the administration by loading a cement truck with explosives and driving it towards Washington DC.

6.3.2 Discussion

Kealty is the exact opposite of the honest, sincere, moral, unselfish, and responsible Ryan. The fact that Kealty's claims gain some support in the political world and the media allows Ryan to gain a strong adversary, but also shows the weaknesses of democracy.² However, Kealty's immoral character and irresponsible and selfish

¹ Ryan is said to have registered himself as an independent (*Executive* 467), yet a lot of his policies lean towards the conservative Republican views, such as his thoughts on abortion and gun-control laws, and his strengthening and renewing of the US military and the intelligence agencies, and the renewing the tax policy into a form more advantageous to the wealthy.

² The reader learns about the many possibilities to sideline values and principles when in politics.

actions only enforce Ryan's position in the end; when he falls Ryan is even more respected and loved by the nation. The reader sympathizes with Ryan, as do the Secret Service, the CIA, the FBI, government workers, and Ryan's friends, for his honest critical view of power and his life as a victim of his responsibilities described in great detail. Yet, when the challenges start appearing for America Ryan solves them with cool-headed rationale and professionalism, and turns out to be the best leader possible for such challenges.¹

In Clancy's world of fiction the author has wiped the slate clean from all the factors which he dislikes about government. Ryan is given the opportune chance to renew everything: to motivate people not to fill Washington with lawyers and politicians, to appoint Supreme Justices for life, to renew the tax code in favor of those who have a larger income, to renew the military and intelligence services which were depleted after the end of the Cold War. According to Terdoslavich, the Democratic majority that was wiped out by the passenger plane attack in *Debt* is replaced with an implied Republican majority (2005: 44). Clancy can construct his own ideal government with his main character at the head of it. *Executive* stands as the most central book for Clancy's political views on domestic issues, patriotism, and American identity.

The Mountain Men, the American political extremists who attempt to assassinate Ryan, serve two differing roles as another domestic adversary. They are strong nationalists, they believe in American values, yet they disagree with the existing political leadership and attempt to change it by force. In Clancy's world they have a twisted view of reality and of the American government; where they try to eradicate the corruption of government through revolution, the moral Ryan goes about it with constitutional change and evolution. In this sense the Mountain Men ensure that Ryan will not be seen as the most extremist and passionate super-patriot, but more as a trusted realist and rational reformer. The other role they play is to allow Clancy's novel to gain some sense of a realist and balanced portrayal in face of

¹ Marc A. Cerasini, the evident Republican Clancy fan, discusses one of the main political questions of the novel to be whether political outsiders are better reformers of government than those from within the system. Ryan seems to be the perfect candidate for President; he is not a politician, he is not corrupt, he has made his own money and owes nobody any favors, "the first true outsider in the history of politics," (in Greenberg 2005: 35).

foreign extremism. The Mountain Men argue their views about political issues and they begin to carry out their plan to assassinate Ryan, but in the end they are caught by the police and their plan is foiled. In the larger context of the novel this narration has no effect on the main story, and it seems to serve no purpose. However, by providing terrorists from inside America, Clancy avoids an overly demonized portrayal of the novel's foreign terrorists; the story attempts to avoid a too black-and-white comparison of Americans and Middle Eastern Muslims.

6.4 Iraqi and Iranian Political and Religious Extremism

6.4.1 Portrayal of characters

The assassination of the dictator of Iraq called the Mustache, with obvious resemblance to Saddam Hussein in appearance and actions, directs the attention in the novel to the Middle East. The assassin is a colonel from the very security detail of the Mustache, and he shoots the dictator in the head during an event broadcast on Iraqi national television. His motivation is religious fervor, punishing the Mustache for desecrating Islam by kidnapping, murdering, and raping people. As a mole it has taken him eight years to burrow close to the Mustache, during which he himself has had to commit the worst sins imaginable. The description is indiscreet: "...he'd tortured and killed men, women, and children from behind blank and pitiless eyes. He'd raped daughters before their fathers' eyes, mothers before their sons'. He'd committed crimes to damn the souls of a hundred men, because there was no other way," (*Executive* 194). Having done it all in God's name for a bigger Holy Cause, he begs for forgiveness and understanding from God before he himself is shot.

What becomes clear later is the relation between the assassin and the main villain of this novel, Ayatolla Daryaei. Apparently, he was sent by Daryaei in the first place, and so must be a Shiite Muslim hiding his origins in the Mustache's Sunni Muslim protective guard. After this incident, a representative from Daryaei arrives in Turkmenistan to talk to a local religious leader, and motivates Turkmenistan's Muslims to join the union of all of Islam. Soon after, the Premier of Turkmenistan, an opportunistic dictator claiming to be a Muslim, is assassinated by his own people. He had led a controversial and sinful lifestyle of fornication and drinking, and many

of his people despised him. The people then turn to their leaders and those inspiring the union of all Believers for guidance.

Ayatolla Mahmoud Haji Daryaei is the 72-year old religious leader of Shiite Muslims in Iran,¹ and he is the successor to the historical figure Ayatollah Khomeini. In the novel, while Khomeini was in exile in France, Daryaei was working in Iran against the Shah. He was tortured by the Savak, the Shah's Israeli-trained security service, but stayed true to the faith; he comes out as a stronger leader than Khomeini himself. He is a religious fundamentalist from the city of Qom, and his thoughts are crowded with prayers and citations from religious texts. He abstains from sinful lifestyle, especially that of the secular Iraqi Mustache and Turkmenistan's Premier. In fact, decency, sex and sexualizing partly become his measure of morality and comparison between his ideals and other lifestyles, especially that of the West and its influences.

Daryaei is another character with opposite characteristics to President Ryan. He is not a family man, and he criticizes Ryan's public show of sympathy towards the newly-made orphans; "Their place was to learn, and to serve, and someday to do the deeds of adults," (*Executive* 160). He does not become the protector and caretaker of children or people in general, the respected responsibilities which Ryan has. After his meeting with Ryan in *Sum* he remembers Ryan as spiteful, arrogant, and defiant – typically American.² America to him is a godless land with godless people in it, which Clancy has him mention on a number of occasions. The plane crash that devastates the government is in his view a clear sign of God's judgement on the US. In Ryan's description of Daryaei, the Iranian has the angriest eyes that he has ever seen; "That man knows how to hate," (*Executive* 262). Also, while Ryan comes out as an honest person unable to lie to the public, Daryaei uses deception to enhance the chances for his own goals. He deceives the US and Saudi Arabia by claiming that he means no harm to anyone.³ "We desire only peace... there is nothing for you to fear from us," (*Executive* 738). Later, while the US is crippled with terrorism

¹ The title of the leader of Shiite Muslims in Iran is generally spelled "Ayatollah" in transliterated and transcribed form from the Farsi language. For some reason Clancy has decided to skip the last letter and spelled it incorrectly.

² See *Executive* 18-19 and 76.

³ See *Executive* 736 and 839.

organized by him, Daryaei sends his Iraqi-Iranian forces, the sizable Army of God, into Saudi Arabia.

In Clancy's world, Daryaei has extremist plots of his own; he wants to recreate the Caliphate and unify the Islamic world and the True Faith with himself at its head. For this he needs to control the three holy cities of Mecca and Medina (in Saudi Arabia), and Jerusalem. He begins with absorbing Iraq and Turkmenistan with Iran into the new United Islamic Republic. Iraq, to him, has strayed too long from the Word of God; the Saudis are Believers, but they are fat and rich and corrupt, and they are not striving on *the* Way. However, at an old age, Daryaei's time is running out, and even as a man of God he is still human enough to want to see the outcome of his work. "And because his goal was so pure and bright, and his remaining time so short, he'd never asked himself how deeply he would cross into darkness in order to get there," (*Executive* 352). He has once ordered and supervised the fire-bombing of a crowded theater because of people's interest in Western influences rather than the True Faith. He is ready to do anything for his goal again; he does not shy from using known terrorists to assist him in his expansionist policies, nor does he decline from using terrorism itself to ensure his plans.

The important character involved with Daryaei is Ali Badrayn. Badrayn is Iraqi in origin whose family had moved to Jordan. There he joined the movement to fight against Israel, but was thrown out in King Hussein's Black September operation in 1970. He is an intelligence officer in a militant organization in Lebanon, and is connected to previous acts of terrorism against Israel as well as the US Marines barracks' bombing in Beirut in 1983 (which interestingly, Clancy implies, was very similar to what the Mountain Men are attempting in the US).¹ Due to his many contacts Daryaei has him supervise the negotiations between Iran and the Iraqi generals. After Badrayn helps to unify Iran and Iraq he remains an advisor to Daryaei. Badrayn's connections around the Middle East, for example the Palestinians and Lebanese, and his expertise on militant issues makes him Daryaei's advisor in terrorist matters.

¹ See *Executive* 69.

The two men are quite different though. Badrayn is not religious but secular, drinking alcohol and not carrying out his prayers, not minding when others violate the laws of Islam. He had lived in Lebanon, which had been “a place where the strict Islamic rules could be violated, and there he had indulged in Western vice along with everyone else,” (*Executive* 389). He has not seen the inside of a mosque for a long time. As a down-to-earth rationalist he provides an important and differing portrayal of Daryaei in his narration. “But Daryaei was one of those who was sure that his policies were inspired by Allah, an idea Badrayn had long since disposed of,” (*Executive* 405). To Badrayn, Daryaei seems insular; not dumb, but too centered on his own ideas to know much about the world. He describes Daryaei as a Holy Man on a Holy Mission – not fully inclined to reason.¹ While Daryaei highlights the religious aspects of his plans with the unification of all the believers in Islam, Badrayn only sees the power and the politics, and he concentrates on the image of a new super-state in the Middle East with its economic and political strengths. Only on one occasion does Badrayn start musing over religious matters; when he is unsure about his survival on a mission in Iraq.

6.4.2 Discussion

Badrayn has characteristics of the stereotypical Iraqi from the Sunni Muslim Ba’ath party during Saddam Hussein’s reign. He is secular and military-trained, and he works to establish a state with economic and military superiority in the region. There is no clear distinction whether he is Shiite or Sunni Muslim, which is a critical factor for understanding Iraq and the rest of the Middle East; his close ties to the Hezbollah organization and Ayatolla Daryaei would imply that he is Shiite though. Daryaei, on the other hand, is the stereotypical Iranian Shiite religious fundamentalist, with strong similarities with Ayatollah Khomeini himself, but being even more fanatical in his pursuits. Both of these characters are connected with past violence and terrorism, some of it against their own people. Both have ideas of destroying Israel and America, similar to some past and recent discourse and actions from leaders of Iraq and Iran.² However, in Clancy’s world only Daryaei is the hypocrite who ties it all in with his religious beliefs, and he finds his justification of deception, violence and terrorism from his faith, while Badrayn is not religious at

¹ See *Executive* 741.

² The President of Iran called for the destruction of the state of Israel recently.

all. Daryaei calls for restoration and peace even as the reader already has an idea about the destruction that he will inflict in the world.

Terdoslavich discusses the likelihood that Iran could annex Iraq in the way that Clancy portrays it (2005: 45-49). Even as the process is a lengthy one in the novel, and even as Clancy's characters admit some doubts for the success of the plan (as Daryaei worries about the rift between the Sunni and Shiite Muslims on one occasion), the fictional union is too clean and simple.¹ It is difficult to accept that the Sunnis in power would give up their position without a fight and without the whole demolition of their system; the near civil war with growing sectarian violence and continuous opposition to the occupying forces speaks against an easy peace between an Iranian leadership and an Iraqi population. Also, even as Iran has influence over the Shiites of Iraq, the Shiite Imams do not wish to lose influence in their own country by allowing Iran to call the shots.

This novel is only fiction, of course, and Clancy does not need to follow any rules when creating his fictional world. The UIR provides an awesome and aggressive adversary for the last standoff between American-led allied forces and the UIR's massive Army of God, a mixture of the Iraqi and Iranian military. The assassination of the apparent Saddam Hussein, the justified revenge-attack on Ayatolla Daryaei at the end of the novel, and the total destruction of the Army of God provide not only with the solution to the crises in the novel, but they also provide the justified revenge for all the American losses and embarrassments in the Middle East; the loss of Iran and Iraq to religious extremism and nationalism, and the hostage crises in Iran and Lebanon. Clancy brings up old and existing enemies and finally provides the revenge, even if it is only on paper, a theme which seems to be an important part of his orientalism. Clancy's love for smaller forces beating bigger armies allows him to delve into the skill, professionalism, and individuality of American victors.

¹ In Clancy's novel a few dozen generals are shipped out of Iraq while others are left to be killed. In reality the Ba'th Party organization consisted of hundreds of thousands of members and the Iraqi military included around 11,000 generals and 14,000 colonels. The language, cultural, and religious differences argue against an easy union, added with the recent long and horrid Iran-Iraq War which devastated both countries. (Terdoslavich 2005: 45-49)

6.5 Middle Eastern Terrorism

6.5.1 Portrayal of characters

Executive, as a novel, has a lot of pages dedicated to the development of terrorist plots. There are a number of simultaneous ongoing narrations of terrorist plans in the novel which develop through most of the story. They are all building up to a certain attack directed at the US. Each of them also includes much analysis of the minds of Middle Eastern terrorist characters. The first two such events are organized by Badrayn according to orders from Ayatolla Daryaei. According to Badrayn, it is not difficult for him to find the thirty recruits he needs for these attacks, because “If there was a surplus of anything in the Middle East, it was terrorists, men like himself... who had dedicated their lives to the Cause...” (*Executive* 647). These recruits are of Lebanese and other Middle Eastern origin, and as is repeated a number of times, many of them are tied to the Lebanese Hezbollah and other militant organizations. One of the most recurring thoughts the terrorists have is about the Jihad, the Holy War, where some of them accept it as their destiny which they are willing to die for, while others do not.

The first terrorist plot begins in Zaire (modern Democratic Republic of Congo) with a sick patient infecting a nurse with the Ebola virus. The nurse is a Catholic Christian nun, and she gets treated by an Iranian doctor, Mohammed Moudi. Instead of destroying the virus and burning the inflicted bodies according to safety procedures, Moudi manages the smuggling of the Ebola and its carrier to Iran, where he continues experiments on the virus and develops it into a deadly weapon. Twenty of Badrayn’s terrorists, who are described as well educated, many of them having studied at the American University of Beirut, carry the virus into preplanned locations in the US, mostly exhibitions and popular centers. Thousands of American civilians become afflicted and the process of fighting a pandemic begins. Cathy Ryan and other doctors serve as figureheads in the physical fight, while President Ryan carries out the rational defensive measures to stop the spread.

Dr. Moudi provides the novel with yet another part of the discourse on the religion of Islam in his comparison of it with Christianity and the West. He is a Western-trained Iranian physician from Qom and works with the World Health Organization

in Zaire. He is a devout Shiite Muslim, and according to one description is tall, thin, swarthy, cold in demeanor, but proficient. He has been working with some Christian nuns in a hospital in Congo, a challenging and animistic heathen environment. His thoughts about Christians have changed from previous extreme ones; before he hated all Westerners and thought of them all as enemies of his country. The two Catholic sisters have surprised him by their respectful serving of others and strong devotion to God. His respect for them grows over time and comes out more than once; he considers the nuns chaste, proper, and later on even righteous people. He compares their religion to his own and finds many similarities and unifying features;

She was a woman of great virtue who spent as much of her day in prayer as any Believer in his home city of Qom, whose faith in her God was firm, and who had devoted her life to service of those in need. Those were three of Islam's Five Pillars, to which he could add a fourth – the Christian Lent wasn't so terribly different from the Islamic Ramadan. (*Executive* 218)

What disturbs this development of respectful attitudes over religious boundaries is what he proceeds to do with the Ebola virus and these two nuns.

The horrific description of the effects of the virus on the human body starts from the very beginning of the novel, the “disintegration” of body tissue, the “melting from the inside out”,¹ and its detailed outlining continues from the first patients to the human guinea-pigs used in Moudi's experiments in Iran (or the UIR). By the time the thousands of American victims suffer from its consequences the reader is well informed of the virus' deadly and merciless character. Moudi sets aside his beliefs in Islam's rules of mercy during his experiments on criminals, but he does not carry out these deeds without some remorse, especially when thinking about the two nuns. Also, differing from others working with him on the virus project, he separates his religious beliefs from his deeds; “He would not apply this act to the will of his God. Whatever it might be, however necessary it was to his country – and a new one at that – he would not defile his religious beliefs by saying or even thinking *that*,” (*Executive* 665). However, all of his sympathy and respect for the Christian nuns and his changed ideas about the world are overshadowed by the fact that one nun is

¹ See *Executive* 363.

turned into fertilizer for the growth of the virus and the other is shot in the head for fear of security leaks.

The second act of terrorism carried out is much shorter in its planning and development, and it occurs before the effects of the Ebola-attack are known by the US administration. It is a kidnapping attempt on President Ryan's youngest child from her day-care center. A character called Movie Star (because of his looks) carries out a reconnaissance mission and organizes the attack. Movie Star's background is left ambiguous, except that he is from somewhere in the Middle East even though he looks Caucasian, he is on Mossad's list of wanted terrorists, and he is a Muslim. There is some indication that he may be Lebanese Shiite or Palestinian by origin. He has been educated by former Savak members (the Shah's secret police). He is one of Badrayn's many contacts, and he is sent by Badrayn to supervise the mission. Another nine men, described as younger than the previous group carrying out the Ebola attack, with more religious fervor, and all of them of Lebanese Hezbollah origin, are chosen by Badrayn to carry out the actual attack.

Movie Star brings in another point of view about the relation between religion and violence. He is a Muslim, but not a devout one anymore. He has a long history of militant activity behind him, and in many of his thoughts he supports Badrayn's views about religion and terrorism. "What had begun with religious fervor for the liberating Holy War of his people had, with the passage of time, become work for which he was paid," (*Executive* 573). He considers it ironic that the true believers in the cause were all killed because of their passion; those who were left to give hope to his people were those who didn't really care anymore. While contemplating the attack on the children he knows that his God would not approve of his work. "There was not a religion in the world that sanctioned harm to a child, but religions were not instruments of statecraft, regardless of what Badrayn's current superior might believe. Religions were something for an ideal world, and the world wasn't ideal," (*Executive* 580). According to Movie Star's thinking, one could use "unusual means" to serve religious goals, but he himself is not at all sanctimonious about it. The other participants in the attack are driven by religious fervor, but he thinks of the kidnapping attempt as a political attack, not a matter of religion. He has his

doubts about the whole mission as he does not believe in the Jihad anymore, the “military-religious act” for the protection of the Faith.¹

The third plot against the US is the assassination attempt of President Ryan himself. A sleeper agent has managed to place himself into the President’s security detail, the Secret Service. As he tells President Ryan, Agent Aref “Jeff” Raman claims to have a Lebanese mother and an Iranian father, and that they had to flee Iran in 1979 after the Islamic revolution due to the father’s close ties to the Shah’s regime. Ryan sees him as a Mediterranean looking, blue-eyed, and shy-smiling agent. He is also described as straitlaced, but fanatical only about sports, more specifically basketball. The plot slowly unfolds through the novel, and the events begin to tighten around Ryan as the reader finds out about the would-be assassin’s plans, him being one of the President’s closest bodyguards by then. He is in discourse with Ayatolla Daryaei through a ring of operatives, the one in direct contact with him posing as a rug-merchant in the US. Apparently, Raman’s real parents were killed by accident by the Shah’s army, after which he was coached and taught by Daryaei himself, and played an active role in the militant part in the Islamic Revolution. After twenty years of quiet and faithful service in the American system he has made it into the President’s own chambers.²

Raman’s own secret contemplation gives away his devout religious thinking. His mission is from God, and President Ryan to him is the embodiment of Satan himself. He wonders about the timing of his act, asks for guidance from Daryaei, and awaits the go-sign. In one scene, during the attack on the nursery, Raman steadies President Ryan in his anguish. He says the aggression on children is a hateful act to God and man, then later he privately questions himself for saying that. He finds he has grown close to the Presidential family as he is shocked and displeased with the attack on children. The Ebola attack is easier for him to comprehend; even as it is distasteful, it is life, and the spread of the virus over the country is the matter of

¹ See *Executive* 692 and 859.

² See *Executive* 442 and 524. The origins of Raman are left obscure, as he is said to be from the holy city of Qom in Iran (*Executive* 461), similar to the carpet merchant Alahad and Ayatolla Daryaei, but also that he has Arab blood in him as well; in one section Raman thinks about the Iraqi dictator’s assassin, “...easier than the task his brother – ethnic, not biological – had performed in Baghdad a short time earlier,” (445). Apparently, his mother may have been Lebanese (Arab) and his father Iranian (Persian).

God's Will. His previous experience with militancy, the firebombing of a movie theater in Tehran which Daryaei also mentions, and the killing of members of the Shah's army, all add to his contemplation of spreading and defending the Faith with the help of the sword. The scenes where President Ryan and the administration are going about their business, sometimes even discussing the Middle East, and Clancy narrates Agent Raman's deadly thoughts behind his blank face, are thrilling and threatening.¹

6.5.2 Discussion

There are certain clear similarities between the culprits in these three attacks; the Ebola-virus attack, the kidnapping attempt, and the assassination attempt. Each major character contemplates their own mission and even has doubts about it. Minor characters around them provide a more fanatic and extremist way of thinking against which the characters can portray their own views: in Dr. Moudi's case it is the Director working with him, who justifies his actions with strong religious views; in Movie Star's case it is the kidnappers he is supervising, who have enough religious fervor to be able to attack children; in Agent Raman's case it is the news of the two previous attacks ordered by Ayatolla Daryaei, which he is not totally comfortable with, but which Daryaei apparently accepts without any doubts. These thoughts and doubts against extremism have the reader sympathize at least briefly with these characters.

The inhumane acts which they are part of makes sure that they are not relieved from the categories of "Terrorist" and "Enemy". Any sympathy for Dr. Moudi is surpassed by his actions of preparing a weapon of mass destruction ready to be used against Americans. His guilt is also apparent in the comparison of him with the Catholic nuns, the true victims of horrible events. Similarly, the attack on children of toddler age is demonized enough to wipe any respect for Movie Star's and Badrayn's ability for secular and rational thinking and displeasure for the mission. Raman's discomfort over the attack on children is overshadowed by his mission of attempting to kill the most important character in Clancy's world. An important detail, which also has the reader turn his or her back on these characters, is the way

¹ See *Executive* 448, 907, and 1224.

many of them break the oaths they have sworn and deceive the good-guy characters in the novel (similar to what Ayatolla Daryaei does to the Saudis, Kuwaitis, and the Americans). Dr. Moudi, as a physician, has sworn to preserve life and fight for the health of his patients, yet he becomes part of studies experimenting with the deadly Ebola on humans, and later inflicting thousands of civilians with it. Agent Raman, one of the people to whom the President must give his ultimate trust, has sworn to protect and defend the very person he will try to assassinate. The irony in these cases is obvious.

The second terrorist attack, the kidnapping attempt of President Ryan's toddler, seems to be a separate narration from the rest of the novel.¹ While the other terrorist plots and narrations of American and other characters develop over time and over a great number of pages, this one seems to appear out of the blue and ends as quickly. As Terdoslavich argues, it distracts from the main plot of the novel and is relatively inconsequential to the larger scenario (2005: 56). It is a classic Clancy gunfight episode, where every movement and every bullet is described in detail, and it provides a thrilling read. However, the narration seems to serve no other purpose except to provide the action, the intriguing hostage situation, and the establishment of individual law-enforcement professionals as heroes. Of course, the event also supports the dehumanizing of Middle Eastern terrorists, as kidnapping and attacking children are some of the most inhumane acts possible in Clancy's world.

There is a surprising amount of discussion during the first two terrorist missions which relates the events to terrorist incidents in Israel. Over half a dozen times characters bring up the discussion during the terrorist plots or immediately in their aftermath. These characters include the terrorists themselves, news commentators, and the investigators of the events mentioning either the possibility of attacking Israeli targets or actual incidents which have occurred in Israel. One terrorist contemplates using similar means against an Israeli civilian target while he is

¹ The attack does not go as planned for the terrorists, as the dedicated Secret Service agents take care of most of the aggressors. Two of the kidnapers reach the nursery itself and shoot a teacher in front of the children. After a hostage crisis they are finished off by the FBI agent Pat O'Day, who happens to be around and who happens to be an expert pistol handler. The Israeli Mossad leader Ben Jacob helps to get identification on the terrorists, but Movie Star gets away. The FBI especially comes out as the branch which fights the inhumane crime of kidnapping in Clancy's novels. See similar texts about the issue in *Executive 768* and *Teeth 14*.

carrying out his virus attack in the US, and Movie Star mentions off hand previous tactics of using bomb-clad fools or heroic martyrs. FBI inspector O'Day and members of the media each mention an attack in Ma'alot in 1975 where Israeli children were killed.¹ Not only are the terrorist characters themselves already related to terrorism against Israel before their attack, but passages like these keep the theme alive in the novel. In fact, the whole incident resembles an Americanized version of an Israeli experience.

6.6 Bin Sheik, Islam, and the Middle East

6.6.1 Middle Eastern People, Culture, and Tradition

There are, once again, a number of different narrations about the Middle East and Islam in this novel. The ones already mentioned concentrate on the view that the Middle East is a source of and a breeding-ground for terrorists. All the Muslim characters mentioned up till now, whether they are religious or not, are somehow tied up with a plot of violence and aggression. Some parts of the novel tie this factor into the very cultures and traditions of the Middle East. One theme of this is the discussion of the history of the Arabs as nomadic tribesmen, raiding each other, "...guys on horses going after other guys on horses..." (*Executive* 759).² Another theme is the individual assassins; as CIA officer Clark discusses the subject with authority, it is "Fairly typical in a cultural sense. One martyr, sacrificing himself and all that," (*Executive* 262). The Movie Star wonders about the tradition of sacrifice in the Middle East and supposes it is some flaw in the character of his culture.³ Badrayn speaks about the single individual becoming a sacrifice for a cause as being part of the region's tradition, especially that of the *jihad*, or "holy war".⁴ Also, the historical topic of the Assassins, the radical Nizari sect in the twelfth century Middle East establishing the "first terrorist state", is included a number of times to establish a historical link to contemporary violence. The

¹ See *Executive* 766, 787, 871, 913, 930, 943, 949.

² Also, see *Executive* 648.

³ See *Executive* 692. Also, see *Executive* 1129 for Foley's comment: "It's part of their tradition, remember?" as if reminding the reader of the novel of this part of Middle Eastern tradition.

⁴ See *Executive* 647-648

narcotic hashish is related to the Assassins, of course.¹ With these discussions, and with later repetitions of these themes, the novel soon establishes these certain ideas as constants.

There are also some less than romanticized accounts of the people in different countries. Most representatives of these countries are the ones in leadership positions, and they all seem somehow corrupt. The Mustache from Iraq and his assassin the Colonel, Iraqi generals and a bodyguard named Saleh, the Premier of Turkmenistan, and Sudanese officials all are somehow related to opportunism, deception, misuse of power, or political and sexual corruption in leadership positions.² The masses of people are also sometimes sexualized and portrayed in less than positive light. In one such narration Badrayn is watching the Iraqi dictator's funeral on Iraqi television with an organized crowd shown weeping for their leader. He says the following about his own people; "The Iraqis, like most people in the region, were a passionate race, particularly when assembled in large numbers and encouraged to make the proper noises," (*Executive* 306). Badrayn then compares this event to a woman feigning an orgasm. He continues with more locker-room humor; "The question was, would the men who so often took their pleasure without giving it notice the difference?" wondering if the Iraqi leadership will stay smart or fall under the displeased masses of opponents.

Another aspect of the Middle East which is mentioned a few times in the novel is the Arab culture of trade and business. The culture is described as one of bargaining,³ a maritime trading culture that predates Islam, and Arabs are "Not ideologues, not fanatics, not lunatics, but businessmen," (*Executive* 446). President Ryan's contemplation even has him relate Arabs as very much like Americans, people who have trouble understanding the ones who are not willing to do business, to accommodate, and to exchange. Here Iran stands at the extreme, as a theocracy, a

¹ See *Executive* 210 and 525. Newer reviews disclaim the traditionally held linguistic relation between the narcotic hashish and the Arabic word "hashshash" and the word "assassin" (inspired by course by J. Hämeen-Anttila of the University of Helsinki).

² Saleh used to work for the Iraqi Security Service and inflicted pain on others in his line of work (*Executive* 591). The Sudanese officials are Islamic, but not devout, claiming to be faithful and "...proclaiming it as loudly as they could lie..." to get aid from Iran and Libya (*Executive* 353). The Sudanese officials also keep secrets and risk the safety of their own people (632). The Iraqi generals enjoy alcohol, have mistresses, and are of course linked to the Mustache who is evil to the core.

³ See *Executive* 774.

culture which is not like the Arab and American culture of communication and trade. A number of narrations from CIA-man Clark remind the reader of the 1979-1980 revolution and the difficulties Americans experienced there, the mobs chanting “death to America,” and the hostage crises; the place had been even more unfriendly than the Soviet world ever.¹ A previous narration but a more recent encounter with an Iranian shop-keeper in Tehran, however, gives a face to an individual in the Iranian population who clearly wants to show the abating of enthusiasm for a totalitarian regime; “We are not all barbarians,” (*Executive* 836). This detail separates the fanatic Iranian leadership from the ordinary civilian population.

Saudi Arabia, a country which is admittedly undemocratic, ironically stands at the other side of the balance as the friend of the US and is promised all possible support. Once again Prince Ali bin Sheik² comes out as the representative of the Kingdom as well as the part of the Arab world which is friendly to the US. His personal friendship with President Ryan is repeated over and over, described as a strong bond which also represents the closeness of the two countries. The most representative scene for this is one where bin Sheik meets Ryan’s wife and children. “And the Arabs were supposed to be cold, humorless, and disrespectful of women? Cathy asked herself. Not this guy,” (*Executive* 174). Bin Sheik also takes the children into consideration and gains important points from the American characters. He also relays thoughts of pity that his own culture uses its women so inefficiently in society. His close relationship with Ryan even goes so far as to admit his disagreements with his own government. Bin Sheik comes out as a pro-Western and pro-Ryan representative from the Arab world.³

There are some other less discouraging mentions of American views of the Middle East. The American administration seems apologetic and admits some responsibility over one episode in history; the CIA chief, in a discussion about the Shiite opposition groups destroyed by Saddam Hussein in 1991, says “We tried to help during and after the Persian Gulf War, but all we really managed to do was get people killed. For sure nobody over there trusts us,” (*Executive* 204). The Saudi

¹ See *Executive* 1168 and 1191.

² The Arabic term “sheikh” continues to be misspelled by Clancy.

³ See *Executive* 206, 447, 560, 621, 743, 797, 1182, 1275, 1277.

and Kuwaiti troops are also described in fairly positive light. Major Ismael Sabah, for example, a Kuwaiti working at a spying listening post, gets a positive description of being Dartmouth-educated, intelligent, experienced, and being liked by the American personnel. A Saudi captain, a twenty-five year old handsome man, is described as devoutly religious, which is said to be the reason why the American intelligence officers in his country are to be treated as guests and deserve his protection.¹ Terdoslavich even argues that Saudi and Kuwaiti troops are described to perform better in the novel than they have acted in reality (2005: 114).

6.6.2 The Religion of Islam

The more lengthy passages in the novel that discuss Islam provide a broad look at the recent history, the religious and geopolitical situation in the Persian Gulf region. There is a discussion of oil being at the center of the Middle East, which leads to the more important issue in the region; religion. Any details of the differences between Sunni and Shiite Islam are left out; Clancy only looks at the overview of the distribution of ethnic and religious groups. The ethnic difference between Iraq and Iran is established, however, even as the two progress into a united country under the same religion (this ethnic difference becomes important at the end in the massive tank battle). There are also short extracts where characters compare similarities between Islam, Christianity, and Judaism, as mentioned before. Mostly these comparisons turn out as positive descriptions, where the universalistic similarities between all people are reached. Other times this is less so.

In most cases where the religion of Islam is tied in with a discussion of violence, the Jihad and sacrifice, the narrator rationally excludes religion from the act itself. Dr. Moudi, Badrayn, and the Movie Star do this, where they think that religion is only a facade for the terrorist mission, where religious fanatics "...ultimately proved that Islam, like any religion, could be corrupted by its adherents," (*Executive* 648).² Ayatolla Daryaei is the extreme exception to this, as he ties his faith to his actions, no matter how "inhumane" they seem to the reader. His comments about Islam's messages of peace and brotherhood fade away in view of the aggression that he

¹ See *Executive* 1246. Ironically, some other "devoutly religious" groups, such as the Al-Qaeda leader Osama Bin Laden consider the American military presence in Saudi Arabia as an insult to Islam. See *Executive* 341 for Kuwaiti officer.

² Also, see *Executive* 766.

organizes. After his terrorist attacks against the US, the Saudi Prince bin Sheik appears as the defender of Islam against the twisted interpretations of the religion by the Iranian fanatic. “Those who would use such weapons, Mr. President, this is an act of utter barbarism... One man. One godless man... this is not our religion, this is not our faith,” (*Executive* 1182).

One character in Ryan’s administration has mentioned that Islam is a unifying force, the only major religion to condemn racism and speak for equality of all men before God. However, the most important defense against anyone holding the religion of Islam as guilty for the atrocities comes from President Ryan. In a speech broadcast on international television channels he addresses the American public, the American forces in the Persian Gulf, and the population of the UIR:

The attack on my daughter, the attempt at my own life, and the barbaric attack on our country was undertaken by people who call themselves Muslims. We must all understand that religion had nothing to do with these inhuman acts. Islam is a *religion*... Just as my family was once attacked by people calling themselves Catholics, so these people have twisted and defiled their own religious faith in the name of worldly power, and then hidden behind it like the cowards they are. What God thinks of that, I cannot say. I know that Islam, like Christianity and Judaism, teaches us about a God of love and mercy – and justice. (*Executive* 1248)

American forces get their justice in a massive battle where they and the allied Saudi and Kuwaiti troops devastate the invading UIR army in Saudi Arabia.¹ They get their revenge against the bad guys, the “rag-head-sons-of-bitches”.² At the end of inflicting the “mechanized death” of “slaughtering” and “chopping into bits” and killing at least ten thousand soldiers within twenty-four hours, the American troops are said to concentrate their energies on Iranian troops more than the Iraqis. President Ryan again assures people in a speech that the only person held responsible is Ayatolla Daryaei, not the religion of Islam or the people of Iran and Iraq. America gets its final justice when President Ryan orders the killing of the Ayatolla with a smart-bomb dropped on his house; this event is also broadcast on television for all to see. The Iranians and Iraqis cooperate with American demands,

¹ This portrayal is very similar to the “Highway of Death” from the 1991 Gulf War.

² See “rag-head” examples in *Executive* 960, 1151, 1236, 1321.

friendly relations are established between the countries, the media sides with President Ryan, and Ryan runs for a second term as President.

6.7 Discussion

Executive Orders can be seen to be the most central novel out of all of Clancy's production for the development of his own political opinions and his ideas about American national identity. Much concentration is put on President Ryan's youthful and idealistic speeches, which are long and inspiring and addressing both Americans and other nationalities. The government has been swept clean for him to create a renewed and improved one in its stead, and he makes an argument for the changes in domestic issues that he sees fit to carry out. The overlaying theme in the novel is of Ryan trying his best to rebuild and strengthen America while his enemies do their best to weaken and destroy her. The opposition Ryan faces comes not only from abroad, but from within the American political system and the American society as well; the political extremists even attempt to do physical harm to the administration. However, the novel clearly develops towards a climax with America facing her greatest foe, and it so happens that this enemy originates from the Middle East. Perhaps it is a coincidence, perhaps not, that the strongest opposition for the development of American identity, i.e. the Other, should be from the Middle East.

The complexity of the characters and the diversity of developments makes *Executive* a challenging novel to analyze. The Middle East is not simplified to be one united enemy force. The many countries involved in the story have some of their own historical descriptions included. The characters have their differing motives for their actions. There are limits to these accounts, however. The sectarian divisions in Iraq seem to have been underestimated for one. Terrorist characters and militant organizations, such as Hezbollah, gain no historical explanation for their motives to oppose Western and Israeli involvement in the region; the novel leans heavily on the audience's existing prejudices. Israel is tied tightly to the US and even to the American identity. Saudi Arabia and Kuwait are friendly nations that become victims of aggression, as is the US. The Middle East then becomes a bipolar region: on one side you have the countries and people close to America and American

identity, which are, like the US, the morally good and politically peaceful ones, which become the Victims of aggression, but which also end up as the victors in the end; on the other side there are the characters and countries that oppose American influence and interests in the region, and they are either secular, sexually and politically immoral, or then religious fanatics who are inhumane and immoral.

There is another split in the portrayal of the Middle East. While the militant Arab characters gain a similar analysis as any other terrorists, as either religious fanatics or as rational thinkers (the Arab terrorist narrators tend to be the latter), they do have bin Sheik, Saudi forces and Kuwaiti officers as good-guy representatives which balance out the view of Arabs in the novel. The Iranians do not have this kind of a balance; except for the quick encounter with a Tehran shopkeeper, all the Iranians are in on the terrorism directed at the US. Whereas the Arab characters only become the henchmen of Iran, the true masterminds and major villains come from Iran. In the battlefield the Iranian enemies gain more destruction from the American forces than do the Iraqis. On one occasion agent Raman, while on his way to meet his carpet-seller contact, wonders how “So many Americans thought that Iranians became either terrorists, rug merchants, or impolite physicians,” (*Executive* 459). Ironically, considering the portrayal of Iranian characters in the story, Clancy’s novel supports this view, with the addition that the Iranian rug merchants and physicians are all terrorists.

Islam as a religion is given a respectful treatment with some positive mentions from Clancy’s heroes, and especially with the Saudi bin Sheik, other Saudis, and Kuwaitis it is shown as a religion of universalism and brotherhood. The enemy figures in the novel come from within Shiite Islam, adherents who twist the religion to fit their own extreme views. The good-guy Muslims of the novel, the Victims of aggression, are Sunnis. Even as Clancy does not give much detail about the differences between the two, in the Middle Eastern geopolitical outlay he plays the two sects against each other. The radical fanatics all come from Shiite Islam, and in this novel it is that characteristic, with the Iranian nationality, that describes the villains Clancy uses in the novel.

Clancy's Middle Eastern enemies, both the main villain and other individuals, are based on actual popular historical enemy figures of the US, Saddam Hussein and Ayatollah Khomeini. Even in their extreme differences both figures carry a heavy politically-loaded stereotype in Western culture. The audience does not need the past to be explained to it; as with militant organizations fighting against the Israelis, the basic prejudice seems to be that the characters are expected to be evil towards the West. Somehow their acts are also much worse than anything the Japanese pilot or the American White extremists could come up with. In the end it is not such a surprise that Iranian, Iraqi, and Lebanese based extremism is the force used for comparison in an identity-establishing novel.

The gratification that Clancy gains by stirring up past events with historical enemies is that he can, in his fiction, get his revenge on them for the loss of American lives. He can finally hold them responsible for their sins against the West. This is a major theme in his orientalism, his use of the Middle East and its peoples. Two old enemies are dealt with, and previous cultural demands for justice are satisfied.¹ The revenge, like with the beheading of the Palestinian terrorists in Saudi Arabia in front of large crowds, is more spectacularly symbolic than anything: in Mustache-Hussein's case, he is shot in the head on live television; in the Ayatolla's case, he is bombed out of existence on live television. These are not, of course, unique incidents of America's Muslim enemies being held to account. In *Debt* the Clark-Chavez team kidnaps and brings to justice General Mohammed Abdul Corp, a stand-in for Mohammed Farrah Aideed, the Somali warlord in Mogadishu responsible for the lives of nineteen US soldiers in October 1993.² The Palestinians

¹ In real life, Clancy has come out as the strong supporter of President Reagan's and President Bush's (Sr.) military activities in Grenada and the Middle East. He believes, however, that the US should have gone on in 1991 to overthrow or eliminate Saddam Hussein (Garson 1996: 7 and Donnelly 1997: 1). In *Executive* he carries out his passion. The destruction inflicted on the UIR troops also closely resembles the "Highway of Death" where in 1991 Iraqi troops were destroyed, an event which Clancy seems quite keen about. He speaks highly of President George W. Bush and also praises him; however, Clancy is more reluctant to show any support for the more recent war into Iraq in 2003 (Associated Press 2004).

² See *Debt* 22 and Terdoslavich 2005: 38. Aideed was in reality killed in Mogadishu in August 1996. Contrary to his usual policy of getting rid of enemies Clancy has Abdul Corp kidnapped and brought to justice; "...responsible for the deaths of twenty American soldiers. Two years ago, to be exact, far beyond the memory horizon of the media, because after he'd killed the American soldiers, he'd gone back to his main business of killing his own countrymen. It was for the latter cause that Clark and Chavez were nominally in the field, but justice had many shapes and many colors, and it pleased Clark to pursue a parallel agenda. That Corp was also a dealer in narcotics seemed a special gift from a good-humored God," (*Debt* 22).

Qati and Ghosn in *Sum* and Badrayn in *Executive* represent the parties responsible for the bombing of the US Marines headquarters in Beirut in 1983 where 241 soldiers lost their lives. Clancy's latest novel, a post-9/11 story, continues with this same theme as will be shown in the next chapter.¹

Iran and Iraq both have a special place in our Western culture, as they do in Clancy's orientalism. The historical encounters between the West and these countries have been troublesome. Due to the past experiences of "losing" the countries to nationalism and religious extremism and their highlighted threat to Western identity and security, the need to put them back in their place has grown strong. Fuelled by neo-conservative forces (and cultural products such as this novel) the belief is now being carried out. After 9/11 the main target for some members of the US Administration was not Afghanistan, Saudi Arabia, or Egypt (countries where the terrorists were hiding or were from); some wanted to hit Iraq immediately. On the eve of the invasion of Iraq in 2003 American and British government and intelligence members allegedly "sexed-up" reports about the threat Iraq constituted to the world, similar to what is now happening to Iran. Some voices have spoken in a manner that "Anyone can go to Baghdad, only the real man goes to Tehran." There has even been debate about possible militarized intervention against Iran's nuclear program, including a nuclear strike against it.²

¹ Clancy does not limit his revenge only on Arab and Muslim enemies. See Chapter 3.

² See daily newspaper Helsingin Sanomat, 4 Oct 2006.

7 POST-9/11 SUNNI MUSLIM EXTREMISM AND MIDDLE EASTERN TERRORISM IN *THE TEETH OF THE TIGER* (2003)

Teeth is Clancy's first real post-9/11 novel. The effects of the terrorist attacks on New York and Washington are clearly to be seen. The novel continues as Ryan-verse, even as characters have changed and the big man Jack Ryan does not appear in it in person. It is one of Clancy's shortest novels, and it was whipped up within a year of the publication of his previous one. It seems to only be a preparation and an introductory story for a bigger future book. The major theme in the novel is terrorism; Clancy has included Rudyard Kipling's poem "Macdonough's Song" as well as quotes by George Orwell and Winston Churchill, which effectively set the mood of the story with a black-and-white world.¹

7.1 The Plot

The very first pages introduce the reader to one of the enemy characters in the novel. An Israeli Mossad agent working at his station in Rome prepares for a pickup of information from his Palestinian informant who has ties to the PFLP militant organization. However, the agent is deceived and he is killed in a restaurant bathroom by a Saudi Muslim character called Mohammed Hassan al-Din. This character is a central enemy figure, the field operations officer of a terrorist organization which is plotting attacks against American targets. With the help of the Columbian drug cartel and its contacts in Latin America, sixteen Arab terrorists are smuggled over the Mexican border and into the US. They carry out simultaneous

¹ Kipling's "Macdonough's Song" discusses secular and religious forms of state and a collective people, a Holy People and a Holy State. The main message seems to be a warning against allowing fundamentalist interpretations of religion to lead a society, where it has occurred before but was crushed. It is easy to find aspects which relate Kipling's poem to the current state of affairs, with themes like religion, democracy, individualism, collectivism, freedom, and terrorism, which are undoubtedly Clancy's reason for including this poem at the beginning of his novel. The poem being ambiguous in its message brings with it the question of who the destructive Holy People are; the Islamist extremists which Clancy portrays in his novel, or, ironically, the neoconservative Christians appearing in Western governments. Orwell's and Churchill's quotes both support the idea of rough Western warriors protecting the innocent against aggressors.

massacres of civilians in four American shopping malls around the country, inflicting fear in the population, and they all die in the end as armed forces arrive at the scenes. Behind this terrorist organization is a figure called the Emir, a rich Saudi living in Riyadh. He has plans to gain a position of power and influence through a radical movement in the religion of Islam. He supports and leads the fight against what he deems are Western offenders.

With this developing terrorist attack the first half of the book simultaneously narrates the establishment of an unofficial counterterrorist force. A former Senator has formed a company called Hendley Associates with the support of former President Jack Ryan. The organization works with a cover of a trading and arbitrage business; in reality it is a privately-financed intelligence service which gathers information on known terrorist characters in the world by secretly tapping into the data of official American intelligence agencies. “The Campus”, as it is called, recruits three young men to help it fight against international terrorism. Two of these characters are to form a special squad to work in the field to identify, locate, and neutralize terrorist threats.¹

At first the Caruso team is not convinced of the morality of the secret counterterrorist organization. After the four terrorist attacks on the shopping malls, one of which the Caruso twins witness close-hand and effectively neutralize by killing the aggressors in an action-packed shootout, the two have no more problems with their Catholic consciences and are eager to partake in their first missions. The mission is reconnaissance by fire; killing a few terrorists, then waiting and seeing what the opposite side does. They are given a newly developed needle-weapon which inserts a poison into the target and kills in a few minutes. The rest of the novel follows the movements of individual members of the terrorist organization across Europe with the Carusos eliminating them one by one. The novel culminates at the fourth such assassination with Jack Junior himself killing Mohammed, the

¹ At the beginning of the novel one of the heroes, a US Marine Captain named Brian Caruso, is interviewed about his experiences in Afghanistan. His twin brother, an FBI agent named Dominic Caruso, has just investigated and solved a child kidnapping in Alabama, and is chosen as the second member of the team. They begin further physical- and weapons-training at a secret location, and they are taught the field crafts of reconnaissance and surveillance. It turns out that the Caruso twins are nephews of the former President Ryan, and cousins of one Jack Ryan, Jr. Jack Junior also manages to join the outfit as a financial analyst and data-gatherer, oblivious of his cousins at the Campus.

murderer of the Israeli agent. The story ends with a promise of a continuation in the next book.

7.2 Historical Context

On September 11th, 2001, Arab Muslim terrorists from the Middle East hijacked four airliners in the US, crashed two of them into the Twin Towers of New York, one into the Pentagon, and one into the ground. Nearly 3000 people, passengers, office workers, and firemen, were killed that day. The US and its allies soon sent troops to confront the Afghanistan-based terrorist organization, al-Qaeda, and also continued with a controversial invasion into Iraq in 2003 (Terdoslavich 2005, Little 2002). Terrorist attacks targeting public transportation have also occurred in Madrid, linked to Al-Qaeda, and London, linked to dissatisfaction over British policies in Iraq (“7/7”). CIA detention centers, flights over European countries, the alleged deprivation of human rights in places like Guantanamo, and the situation on the ground in Iraq and Afghanistan have been recent controversial topics of debate.

7.3 American Politics and Leadership

7.3.1 Portrayal of Characters

Teeth provides a new generation of heroes. John Patrick Ryan, Jr., the son of Clancy’s main hero President Ryan, is one of the new main characters. President Ryan himself does not appear in this novel. However, through his son the Ryan-verse saga continues, especially as Jack Junior continuously reminds the reader of Dad and what Dad did and what he is doing now. At the beginning of the novel Clancy has Jack Junior discuss what has happened to all of the former main characters.¹ Kealty as President and Congress being again full of corruption and

¹ Apparently, President Ryan quit his job before his term was finished, and his vice, Robby Jackson, became the first Black President of the US. Robby was then assassinated by an elderly member of the Ku Klux Klan, and Ed Kealty, the weasel from *Executive*, is now President.

irrational politicians is a major background theme in the novel, and it is the one of the main reasons for the existence of the secret intelligence service.¹

Congress and the media are described in quite negative terms. Congress is mostly portrayed as an opposition to the American armed forces and intelligence services. Jack Junior says outright that "...a lot of people there hate the intelligence services," (*Teeth* 65). He mentions how his Dad the President and his Secret Service agent hated dealing with corrupt congressmen or with politically and sexually immoral foreign politicians. Many other main characters, such as FBI Agent Caruso, enforce this view.² Similarly, the media is described negatively, where it only searches after scandals and anything that annoys the good-guy characters of Clancy's world. It is because of these weaknesses in democracy when faced with a new powerful enemy that a former Senator has agreed to establish the Campus.

Former Senator Gerry Hendley is the only politician who sticks out above the scum. His wife and three children died in a car accident while he was in office. Hendley is described as a Democrat from South Carolina, and his political views are liberal on civil rights issues, but conservative on foreign relations and defense (*Teeth* 32-34). With the experience as a former politician, he believes in soldiers in the fight against an enemy: "They talked about terrorism, and fairly intelligently, Hendley thought. People in uniform often did. As opposed to elected officials," (*Teeth* 45). He argues that to be able to accomplish anything, you had to be outside of the restricting system of the federal government. Hendley uses a petty scandal as an excuse to

¹ This new development is shocking to a Clancy fan, as President Ryan worked hard to clean up the federal government (of course, the development should be seen as unstoppable; nobody else can equal President Ryan's charisma and ethics). President Kealty's drinking, his past immoral sexual acts still hovering in the memory of the reader, and his political moves, such as kicking out a good character like Ed Foley from the head of the CIA, go against all rationale in Clancy's world. The fact that Kealty is opposed to the death penalty is a negative thing; as Hendley thinks about the matter "...The drawback to that position is that you cannot then deal decisively with people who do harm to others – sometimes serious harm – without violating your principles, and to some people, their consciences or political sensibilities will not let them do it," (*Teeth* 98). Even the execution of President Robby Jackson's KKK killer is threatened by Kealty's inability to act decisively to terminate an evil person.

² FBI Agent Caruso speaks of the "clowns from the Northeast and Far West" (*Teeth* 110), meaning Democrat politicians, were bothered by cops and soldiers for some reason, and they like to close down military bases, withhold grants to the CIA and other intelligence services, and tighten the oversight and restrictions on the agencies. For more examples of arguments of bad politicians vs. good soldiers see *Teeth* 45, 46, 65, 68, 69, 110, 128, 130, 179, 220, 230, 275, 293, 300, 316, 557.

leave public service, and encouraged by his close friend President Ryan, he sets up Hendley Associates, or “the Campus”. On the outside it looks like a trading business, but in reality it steals classified information from the transmissions of other intelligence services and supports itself financially in this way.¹

One other important member of the Campus is Jack Ryan, Jr. He has been brought up as Catholic by his parents and the Jesuit schools he went to. He is single, fairly good-looking, well-dressed, well-off financially, intelligent, and drives a Hummer 2 SUV. Jack is fresh out of Georgetown University, with history and an economics minor as his expertise. He has also had the experience of living inside the White House, learning and training with the political and intelligence experts there. He develops a nose for being able to pinpoint critical information on certain individuals of the terrorist organization. Jack also provides much of the argument for dealing harshly with terrorists, as he reminds the reader of Irish Catholic terrorists who attacked his family and were later executed for it, as well as his Dad’s past history of defeating aggressors with hard measures. At the end of the novel Jack himself takes the last terrorist down with a lethal injection and delivers to him a message from America.

7.3.2 Discussion

For a reader who has not read the previous Ryan-verse novels, the narration of the past main characters may seem distracting and overwhelming. However, for the fans who have been tied to the previous Clancy world, it provides a final farewell to the old heroes and their world. The world has changed, and Clancy needed a new generation with new characters and personalities to confront the new form of the “Other”. President Ryan is, however, established as a strong background figure, and his moral and intelligent persona still seems to have great effect on the characters and the world of this new generation. He continues to be an example for others in the intelligence community, in opposition to the immoral politicians and members of the media, and with the old rivalry with Kealty continuing. The eleven previous

¹ With a work force of less than 150 at the Campus, other characters include analysts and intelligence experts, currency and bond traders, forensic accountants and poison developers, training officers and the hit men. Many are the military type with experience of real action, which is narrated on occasion.

novels provide the basis for what now seems to build up into a Jack Ryan personality-cult more than anything.

Senator Hendley and Jack Junior are Clancy's new political voices. Hendley acts as an enlightened Democratic politician who has witnessed the restrictions of government, sees the reality of world affairs, and understands the importance of freedom for the armed forces in fighting terrorism.¹ The Campus that Hendley sets up is illegal and unethical, but President Ryan's approval immediately justifies much of it ethically and legally. Halfway through the book, at the latest, the Campus and its militant mission are justified by the demonic terrorist attack on civilians. Also, the reader's own preexisting knowledge of the events of 9/11 increases the acceptance of Clancy's policies (calculating the one and a half year existence of the Campus in 2003 means that the outfit was established right after September, 2001). The main domestic political theme in *Teeth* is comparing people in uniform with politicians and bureaucrats; politicians are portrayed as corrupt while soldiers of the armed forces, police, and intelligence services are honorable. In a new world of terrorism politicians are weak; they do nothing constructive to protect the civilian population. As Clancy implies, that is why soldiers have had to take matters into their own hands, be it constitutional or not. The illegal organization is in the end ethically more justified than leaving things to the government.

There is one subject which appears throughout the novel and so builds into a strong background theme; the Middle East. The American characters all take part in the discussion of the Jewish people and Israel. Beginning with recurring talk about the killing of the Israeli agent in Rome, the debate continues with many short mentions of the political situation in Israel, suicide bombers and car bombs in Jerusalem, and the Mossad. These comments usually appear in context of the discussion of terrorism, the terrorists in the novel, and their political ideology; they are usually left short without further political or historical background. There is also a growing amount of delving into European history, mostly about Hitler and the Holocaust, especially when the Campus' counterterrorism team enters central Europe. These

¹ A major theme playing here is of an unhappy government insider struggling to get out from a restraining establishment so that he can accomplish something real, in fact the exact opposite of the theme in *Executive*, where Ryan is forced into the system and tries to improve it and make it work.

two subjects, European history and the political situation in the Middle East, seem to weave together, and they are also related to the Americans' experiences of terrorism. Most of this discussion about the Jewish people and Israel comes from the terrorists themselves though, which will be discussed later.¹

7.4 American Counterterrorism

7.4.1 Portrayal of Characters

US Marine Captain Brian Caruso is introduced in an interview with a general discussing his recent experiences in Afghanistan. He managed a shootout which ended well for the American forces; no friendly casualties and sixteen dead Arabs, of which Brian himself shot three or five.² He has no qualms or nightmares about the incident, it was business and not personal, and the simple fact to him is that "...those people were making war on my country. We made war back," (*Teeth* 37). Captain Caruso comes out as intelligent, language-qualified, physically well-trained, educated with a degree in engineering, responsible, and a caring commander, and he drives a C-class Mercedes. He gets recruited into the Campus' special action team to provide more of the muscle side of the duo. With his Marine-learned code of honor he does at first have qualms of conscience about the possibility of killing individuals without uniforms out in the open.

Brian's twin brother, FBI Agent Dominic Caruso, is introduced during an investigation of a kidnapping of a young girl by a sexual offender. He searches and locates the kidnapper in his house and finds the child with her throat slashed open. Instead of arresting the rapist Dominic startles him and shoots him three times in the chest. The official story goes that he had to shoot the kidnapper in self-defense, but in an interview with a superior Dominic admits that he killed on purpose; he is rewarded with support from other characters that it was a rightful and righteous shooting. Like his brother, Dominic has no nightmares about the incident. He is smart, language-qualified, educated in law and psychology, equipped with his past

¹ For the American characters' discussion of the Jewish people and Israel see *Teeth* 81-2, 84, 153, 156, 176, 276, 282, 326, 327, 330, 339, 345, 397, 418, 540, 541, 570.

² See *Teeth* 114 and 199 for differing information on the amount of bad guys.

schooling as a federal agent, and he too drives a C-class Mercedes. When chosen to be part of the Campus' counterterrorism squad to provide the investigative part of the team, he does not have his brother's strong pang of conscience, even as he shows some reservations towards the activities they are being trained for.

The Carusos are professionals at what they do, and other characters support and justify their earlier killings,¹ but they also have a strong conscience; the twins have had a good Catholic upbringing. They are both single and childless.² In both of their cases, however, it is the gruesome death of a child described in detail which turns their heads around to believe in the justified killing of terrorists. In Dominic's case the abuse of the sweet-faced, blonde, blue-eyed, and kindergarten-aged girl makes his blood boil. Her innocence of singing "Jesus loves me this I know..." in a Methodist Sunday school is in sharp contrast to the demonized sexual molester, and is enough to justify the termination of his life. In Brian's case the killing of civilians, mostly women and children, during the shopping mall shooting has him comfortable enough to ensure the death of two individual attackers with an execution-style shot to the head. After the incident, the slow death of a five-year old boy, right in Brian's arms, is an event which comes repeatedly into his mind throughout the story and makes him eager to get back at the terrorist organization.³

As the novel progresses all the main characters start realizing that killing terrorists is not only justified, but that it is also their righteous responsibility. A lot of religious discourse and references to God become ever increasing in the context of killing. In Dominic's shooting of a pedophile he got to deliver justice and be the law, "God's Own Avenging Sword" (*Teeth* 42 and 171). Young Jack thinks of his cousins' assassin jobs as "...the Lord's work – or his country's work, which, to the way he'd been brought up, was pretty much the same thing," (*Teeth* 446). Similarly, Brian

¹ The shooting of enemies is accepted and justified by other soldier figures; after Brian's Afghanistan episode General Broughton and ex-Special Forces CIA Agent Jim Hardesty encourage him, in Dominic's kidnapping case Sheriff Turner and FBI Assistant Director Gus Werner, a former Marine and the FBI's Hostage Rescue Team member, accept and support his choice of action. After the terrorist attack on the shopping malls the Caruso twins and the Campus are encouraged by a national cry for vengeance: "But all the working men in the country knew in their hearts that somebody, somewhere, really needed to have his ass kicked," (*Teeth* 397).

² Many FBI or CIA characters mentioned are established as family people in comparison. The Carusos have part Irish and part Italian ancestry.

³ For examples of mentions of little David Prentiss see *Teeth* p370, 373, 556, 560.

thinks over about the progression of events and concludes that their missions are the Lord's work, "At work in the field of the Lord," (*Teeth* 598). Religious connotations also appear quite often in the American characters' normal everyday talk and everyday lives, and they add to the overall feel in the novel.¹

A few killings stand out from the progression of the story. These incidents of revenge help deliver the message of the novel, and each of the young main characters has his own personal moment of satisfaction. Dominic's moment is when he shoots the child molester. Brian's is in the aftermath of the shopping mall shooting; after shooting two terrorists in the head he approaches the last live one who has been critically wounded in the chest. He searches for an item from a sporting-goods shop, places it in the arms of the "raghead" Muslim terrorist, and watches him die; it is an American football, made of pigskin. Jack Junior's moment comes at the end of the novel where he confronts a terrorist in the very same bathroom where he killed the Israeli Mossad agent. Jack injects him with the deadly poison and watches him die, delivering a message: "Greetings from America... You fucked with the wrong people. I hope you like it in hell, pal," (*Teeth* 622). The last two acts of vengeance are of course directly related to the terrorists' culture and religion, as is discussed soon.

7.4.2 Discussion

The personalities and thoughts of the Caruso brothers and Jack Jr. are developed more than anyone else in the novel. Their active involvement makes them the basis of the novel's action as well as its central message. While Gerry Hendley gives a leader's and an intellectual's philosophical argument to the reason for counterterrorist missions, the Carusos especially build the practical and realistic arguments. The fact they have doubts at first provides for the full justification of killing terrorists in the end; the issue has been contemplated through rational and moral arguments, and it provides the story with a humane analysis of the two would-be hit-men.² After the attack on civilian targets the world becomes clear to them;

¹ For examples of Christian religious connotations see *Teeth* p19, 38, 42, 62, 142, 171, 201, 303, 328, 427, 446, 511, 541, 565, 569, 570, 595, 598, 599, 614.

² As will be shown later, these doubts and conscience that the Carusos have also serve to show the drastic difference between the characteristics of these soldiers and their counterparts in the terrorist organization. Also, their overcoming of what is portrayed as an inbuilt weakness that conscience and

they are motivated, trained, ready, and contemplation can be left behind as their mission is now justified. The world turns quite black-and-white and they have no more nightmares or questions. And the main idea that is given through the different incidents is that, due to the nature of terrorism, it is not only acceptable to kill terrorists, but that killing them is a righteous and honored duty. Killing them needs to be done, Clancy implies, and soldiers must be free to act to protect civilians.

There is more religious connotation and discussion in *Teeth* than in other Clancy novels. Not only are the religious and political situations in countries debated, but the personal faiths of the American characters are analyzed as well. Jack Junior provides much of this with other characters. However, this all seems to be in comparison with the analysis of the terrorists' minds; the religious (Christian and Jewish) discourse also comes out in comparison to the terrorists and their religion, Islam. These include the two revengeful killings highlighted before: the one where Brian places a pigskin American football on the dying terrorist serves not only as a sign of American identity beating a foreign aggressor, but as a direct offensive message to a Muslim terrorist;¹ the assassination of the Arab Muslim terrorist in the very same bathroom where he killed the Israeli agent brings in the Arab-Israeli conflict with a strong religious twist, and it also provides revenge for the Israeli side (also discussed later). Clancy's assassinations are heavily symbolic in many ways, and they provide the satisfaction of a ritual revenge for the hunger the reader has been given in the course of the novel.

7.5 Sunni Muslim Extremism and Middle Eastern Terrorism

7.5.1 Portrayal of Characters

The first Arab Muslim of the novel, Mohammed Hassan al-Din, is introduced at the very beginning when he kills the Israeli Mossad agent in the restaurant bathroom in Rome. Hassan, the supposed Palestinian PFLP contact, has been hired to draw out the agent by giving him information as bait, and Mohammed uses the opportunity to

previously held principles provide stands in contrast with politicians like Ed Kealty who are not able to do this.

¹ Pigs are filthy animals according to the Islamic tradition, as they are in the Jewish tradition, and Muslims should decline from eating or touching foods and items consisting of pork.

kill one of his enemies. Later it becomes clear that the killing was only a “recreational exercise” for him, a small fun deviation from a larger plot in the novel (*Teeth* 173). Mohammed is in fact working as the chief of operations for a large militant and religious movement called the Organization. He is very rich, single and religious. He is said to be Caucasian-looking, with blue eyes from his English mother, and he speaks British English from his days at Cambridge University. His father was Saudi Arabian. Saudi Arabia, however, has been closed to him for five years, probably due to his extremist activities, and Afghanistan is “out of bounds”. He stays in the Christian countries of Europe then, and uses a British passport with an English name as a cover for his real identity.

Another Arab Muslim main character much like Mohammed is called Uda bin Sali. Uda is an unmarried, affable, smart and handsome 27-year old Saudi living in London. He is from a rich family, his father being a senior banker with close ties to the King of Saudi Arabia, and who also has four wives, eleven sons, and nine daughters. From the family wealth of four to five billion dollars Uda gets a few million every now and then to play around with in the market, learning the business of international banking and stock exchange. He has an office in Lloyd’s Insurance building, dresses extremely well, and drives an Aston Martin convertible. He is careful and conservative in his money handling, except perhaps with the prostitutes that he is constantly ordering for himself. He also gives a lot of money to finance the missions which Mohammed plans out. Uda became religious in his teens and is considered by the novel’s American characters to be from the extreme right of the strict Wahhabi branch of Islam. Other characters include sixteen Arab Muslims who carry out the major terrorist attack in the novel, as well as a number of individuals who have ties to Mohammed’s Organization.¹

¹ These individuals work mainly as recruiters of new members and couriers of information between Mohammed and others. One of them is Anas Ali Atef, an Egyptian civil engineer, who apparently recruited three of the shopping mall shooters. He lives in Munich with his German lover, his motivator is the fact that the Israelis had humiliated Egypt on four occasions in history; during the 1973 war his brother was killed by the Israelis using American equipment. Another one is Fa’ad Rahman Yasin, an Austrian accountant based in Vienna and a courier for the Organization. He likes to chat on the internet and carry out his sexual fantasies there. His death is spectacular, as after he gets injected with the deadly poison he falls under a streetcar and gets cut up into four irregular pieces. Other minor characters working as couriers are Ayman Ghailani, Ahmed Muhammed Hamed Ali, Ahmed Musa Matwalli, Mahmoud Mohamed Fadhil, and Ibrahim Salih al-Adel.

In the background of this whole terrorist network and the Organization is an obscure figure called the Emir. The Emir lives in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, and is one of nine sons in a very rich family. He narrates that he turned to Islam in his teens inspired by the preaching of a conservative imam. He was educated in England where he was inspired by freedom of speech, but he is also wary of the chaos he considers it to cause. He wants to bring the world of Islam out of the past and into the world. The Emir's philosophy includes much contempt for the absolute monarchy of the large Royal Family of Saudi Arabia. He believes in a single religious leader for all of Islam, a pope interpreting and applying a tolerant view of the religious laws of Islam, ending to such differences as the one between the Sunnis and Shiites, and tolerating Jews and Christians as well. Most importantly, he believes he himself should be the new Mahdi in leadership position. He goes about this by converting a few people to his particular belief system, but has to depend on the young fanatics from within Islam; he rationally realizes that this is his misfortune, to depend on the zealots with strong opinions who may turn against his tolerant views and replace him.¹ The Emir is given one long passage where he seems to come out as a modernizer and a realist, paradoxically at the head of a group of fanatics. However, barely has he been introduced that his stream of thinking ends, leaving a promising feeling that he will be encountered again in a later novel.

The operations officer Mohammed's motivation is what at first seems to be a strict devotion to his ideal and reactionary interpretation of the religion of Islam. He speaks with constant religious references, much more so than the Emir. He is ready to die and send others to die for the Cause. Christianity, Judaism, and Israel are a major enemy theme in his contemplation; America, an infidel country, protects Israel, has stationed troops in his country, is corrupting his culture, and is subordinating Islam and much of the region under its control for its own interests. Mohammed thinks about how to get rid of the ruling Wahhabis and Royal Family of Saudi Arabia, whom he despises as the corrupt rich who acted differently than they spoke, indulging in vices at home and abroad. Along with his extreme religious ideas Mohammed admits controversial and selfish thoughts as well; the sixteen martyrs he sends to die are only "expendable assets" to him. He even wonders

¹ Apparently, the Emir even tongue-lashed Mohammed for killing the Israeli agent for personal amusement.

whether the Paradise he motivates them with really exists; “He sometimes thought that it was a tale told to impressionable children, or to the simpleminded who actually listened to the preaching of the imams,” (*Teeth* 386). Mohammed’s main goal is to gain power in the Islamic world by using the Organization he works for. Ironically, Mohammed turns out to be similar to the people he despises, using money for his pleasures in life such as European clothes, food, and alcohol, carrying out his prayers only for show for his superiors, and striving to gain power for himself. “...Power, the ability to direct people, to bend others to his will. For him, religion was the matrix that set the shape of the world that he would be controlling,” (*Teeth* 387). As a mere chief of operations he has superiors to please, but by controlling the field operations he may lead the Organization into a direction where he can gain influence; by allowing for his obsessions to attack America. The manner in which he attempts to gain notice and power does not matter, as the outcome is the most important to his selfish interests.

Mohammed has connections which he uses to set up the major terror operation of the novel. Against the rules of Islam and the opinions of some of his compatriots, he makes a deal with the Columbian Drug Cartel to get their help against their common enemy; the Columbians aid in smuggling his men into the US, and in exchange he provides the assets of his organization for the smuggling of cocaine into Europe. He then chooses sixteen men who start from Lebanon and travel through France and Mexico using Qatari passports and Bahraini visa cards in a narration much like the terrorist missions in *Executive*. All the sixteen men are devout Sunni Arab Muslims in their late twenties, most of them Saudis, but at least one Iraqi among them. They all contribute to the religious discussion, and the Iraqi especially brings in a strict view of the Sunni-Shiite division in Iraq. Mustafa, the leader of the group, is more tolerant as he believes in Islam as a large tent with room for all Muslims.¹ Much of the developing terrorist mission is narrated through Mustafa’s thoughts, and he provides similar views about the world as did Mohammed previously, with similar references to the same religious concepts such as God, the Holy Cause, their role as Holy Martyrs.² America is the Great Satan, full of arrogant idolaters and Israel-

¹ Other members whose names are mentioned include Sabawi, Saeed, Mehdi, Rafi, and Zuhayr.

² For Mohammed’s, Mustafa’s, and others’ discussion of such concepts as Allah, Paradise, Faith, and Holy Warriors, see *Teeth* 53, 119, 121, 124, 136, 154, 162, 172-3, 189, 195, 213, 221, 248, 250, 262,

supporters, corrupting the Faithful with alcohol and dirty magazines. His understanding of his role is, however, to obey without questioning, to provide sacrifices if God asks for them, and to accept the fact that he does not understand it all.¹

The Columbians and their contacts give their own description of the Arab Muslim characters. The only thing the two groups seem to have in common is the shared enemy they are facing. While the Columbians and Mexicans are infidels and unbelievers to the Muslims, their only passion being greed and their only God being money, the Hispanic characters turn out to gain a more human portrayal than their fellow criminals. To Ricardo, a Mexican who is mentioned to have a family, the Arabs are “morose” people, and in contrast do not have families to go back to. Juan, a hitman who provides the terrorists with weapons, is at unease with them as they grin too much when they receive their guns; “They were not as he was...” (*Teeth* 259). Ernesto, a senior Cartel man, speaks of Mohammed as the “towel-headed thug” and tries to understand the fanatics who seek after death. Pablo, a Cartel contact man, wonders how many women and children Mustafa and his group will kill, and considers it a “...cowardly way to kill, but the rules of honor in his ‘friend’s’ culture were very different from his own,” (*Teeth* 208). After the act of terrorism the Cartel man, Ernesto, displays shock at the nature of the crime.²

The nature of the attack is gruesome. With an “Allahu Ackbar”³ sixteen men in four different shopping malls around the US open fire on civilians. “Victoria’s Secret store. The customers all had to be women of no morals even to look at such whorish clothing, and perhaps, he thought, some would serve him in Paradise. He just pointed and held the trigger down,” (*Teeth* 355). Women are shredded into pieces in a detailed narration, and there is blood, screams and whimpers everywhere. “Brian passed a little girl, perhaps three years old, standing over the body of her mother, her arms fluttering like a baby bird’s,” (*Teeth* 363). Eighty-three people die, some 143 are wounded, mostly women and children. What increases the effect of the horrific

284, 287-9, 294-5, 305-6, 314, 319-22, 324, 329, 330, 332, 337, 345-6, 354-5, 365, 367, 369, 386, 413, 439, 470, 492, 494, 517, 520, 532, 534, 536, 545, 605, 611.

¹ On one occasion Mustafa does not carry out his prayers due to fatigue, trusting Allah to be merciful. See *Teeth* 320-329.

² See *Teeth* 119, 124, 159, 197, 246, 388.

³ Clancy’s new way of spelling the Arabic word “akbar” once again misspells it. *Teeth* 355 and 367.

incident in the American context is the fact that the attacks take place in specific and known commercial centers in the US. To enforce this is the large amount of brands which are displayed in the story; the repetition of everyday stores and signs in the American society brings the issue close to home.¹ “Even a Disney Store! That he had not expected, and to attack one of America’s most treasured icons would be sweet indeed,” (*Teeth* 336).

What is worthy of note is the way the Arab Muslims are portrayed in this section. In their religious extremism they think of civilians, especially young women and their toddlers, as targets, and they unquestioningly carry out their mission. Never does it occur to them to wonder about, what the Western reader would call, the “morality” of their actions; ironically, what Mustafa, like Mohammed before him, worries more about is what the Prophet would have said about their excessive smoking of cigarettes.² In fact, they are described as being exhilarated about the attack when it finally starts. “Abdullah’s face was grinning broadly as he walked into the store, firing as he went. The faces he saw were full of disbelief – and for an amused moment he told himself that *disbelief* was the reason he was killing them,” (*Teeth* 361). Another one is described as smiling as he sees death approach in the form of Brian Caruso, and manages an “Allahu Ackbar” before he gets shot in the head. After the attack many of the background figures of the terrorist plot display their pleasure with the event. The Arab Muslims are true religious zealots as they believe that Allah Himself is smiling on their plan.

There are a number of themes, other than the ruthless acceptance of attacking civilians, which come out as characteristics related to the Arab Muslims and which get a fairly good amount of repetition in the novel. At the point of death some of the Muslim characters display a ferocity which gives them extra energy and which amazes the Americans: in the shopping mall shooting Mustafa gets shot five times in the chest without him feeling it; another receives twelve bullet-hits but still keeps moving; when Mohammed gets a lethal injection from Jack his face turns into

¹ See *Teeth* 335-337 and 349-368 for the brands JCPenney, Sears, Belk’s men’s and women’s store, Coke, Disney Store, Radio Shack, Zales Jewelers, Dunkin’ Donuts, Victoria’s Secret, Lens Crafters, Foot Locker, Stride Rite, American Eagle Outfitters, K*B Toys, Sunglass Hut, Kay Jewelers, Claire’s Boutique, Sam Goody, Coffee Beanery, Bostonian Shoes, and Legends.

² See *Teeth* 137 and 221.

“...something feral and dangerous” (*Teeth* 621), and he tries to lunge at Jack. They seem to fight to their deaths in inhuman fashion and with inhuman strength. Clancy also narrates their deaths with great detail and precision, ranging from the bloody mess of Fa’ad’s killing and streetcar accident to Mohammed’s symbolic assassination.

Another highlighted and repeated theme related to many of these Arab Muslim characters is immoral sex. Usually these sexual thoughts come up when they encounter Western women, as when the sixteen would-be attackers meet French females who prostitute themselves for a fee. Sometimes they are sexualized in the religious context: Mohammed fantasizes about a stewardess as a prize in Paradise; the sixteen attackers dream of a Paradise of “Milk, honey, and virgins”; Abdullah relates his fetishes of fast cars and women to Paradise. During the attack on the shopping mall Zuhayr shoots a wounded woman with “whorish red pants” in the back, sending her to serve him in Paradise, similar to what Rafi did earlier to other women.¹ Zuhayr also narrates that “He’d had only a few women in his life, and surely he’d killed more women here today than he’d ever fucked... but to him, here and now, somehow it felt just the same. And all that struck him as very satisfying,” (*Teeth* 364). There is a mention of some reading a *Playboy* magazine before their attack. Later on in the novel Fa’ad in Vienna has cybersex on the internet; he locates a willing partner in a chat-room and carries out a fantasy of being a German commandant taking out his desires on a Jewess in a concentration camp. The hidden humor in this perverse narration is that Fa’ad’s partner is not the 23-year old female he thinks she is, but a fifty year old man, half drunk and quite lonely. Another less decent description is a mention of an old oil executive from Dubai being a customer of a prostitute, and how she reminds him of his favorite daughters.² The one who stands out in this theme of undermining through sexualizing is Uda bin Sali; there are more than a dozen times that discussion of his immoral sex life, prostitutes and all, gets repeated.³

¹ For sexual thoughts related to Paradise, see *Teeth* 154, 189, 289, 356, 365.

² For Muslims and prostitution, pornography, and cybersex see *Teeth* 183, 288, 451, 552, 567.

³ Uda is a young man in London with a large ego, lots of money, and a passion for women. He keeps ordering two British prostitutes, and during the course of the novel up to his stinging death he has had numerous vigorous encounters with them. In his contemplation he also relates many other things like his fast car to sexual pleasure (the repetition of the idea of driving fast vehicles being better than sex seems to come from Clancy’s own experience; he himself has described the driving of

One controversial subject that also gets repetition is the drinking of alcohol. The drinking of wine is clearly prohibited in the Koran, yet many of the Muslim characters enjoy alcoholic beverages on a number of occasions, especially Mohammed. The first time Mohammed has a beer in the novel Clancy writes that “Though it was contrary to his religious beliefs, he had to fit in with his environment, and here everybody drank alcohol,” (*Teeth* 87). However, during the course of the story he does this again and again, and by the end he and his compatriots have had beer, red wines, white wines, cognac, and others on many occasions. Mohammed wonders about the religious significance of the banning of wine, whether the Prophet had left out mead from his list of prohibited drinks knowingly or due to ignorance of it. Uda is also at first thought to be religious by the American characters because of the very fact that they think he does not drink alcohol. However, he is soon portrayed in bed, tired after another active session with a paid girl, drinking French wine and later beer. On the last page a character called Mahmoud has wine in an airplane to calm down his nerves, leaving it to Allah the Merciful to forgive him.¹

One topic of discussion amongst the Arab Muslims is about the Jewish people and Israel. Like with the American characters, it begins with comments about the killing of the Israeli Mossad agent, which then becomes a major topic repeated throughout the novel (especially in the parts narrating Mohammed’s thoughts, until and including the event of his symbolic death). There is constant repetition from the Arab Muslims, the Hispanic Americans, and others, that Jews and Israel are the enemies of these characters and of Islam, and this builds into a constant of its own. America is loathed for its stationing of armed forces in Saudi Arabia and for its support of Israel. Israel is hated for its treatment of Arabs. Yet there is not but a

the M1-tank, firing weapons, special tours of submarines and frigates and bases as better than sex (Garson 1996: 5)). Uda openly tells Mohammed about his experiences with the ladies, and that is why Mohammed thinks of him as a “wastrel” and a “whoremonger”. Most of the repetition of Uda’s activities comes from British and American characters though. The prostitutes regularly report to the British Secret Service and describe each visit, as Uda is under surveillance. Jack Junior also follows Uda’s banking activities and private life from the Campus and discusses them with the other workers, and Uda’s organ’s size is mentioned as “grossly average”. Even at the time of his death his last thought is about having sex with a prostitute. For examples of Uda’s sex-life and discussion of it see *Teeth* 177, 190, 243, 277, 298, 319, 435, 439, 440, 451, 460, 463, 470.

¹ For Muslim characters with alcohol see *Teeth* 87, 154, 162, 172, 386, 440, 440, 605, 625.

few quick mentions of the wars and the political environment in the Middle East. The subject of the Nazi atrocities during the Holocaust is brought up many times and always in racist ways. The only one who really shows any tolerance of Jews is the Emir, while especially Mohammed and Mustafa's group cannot wait to target some supporters of the Jews, and maybe even a few Jews themselves as "an added bonus" (*Teeth* 305). Americans and Jews are then strongly tied together by the Arab Muslim characters themselves as the targets and victims of terrorism.¹

Clancy has given some idea of the way he thinks the Muslim terrorist mind develops. According to the story and the Campus' workers, most of the extremists live or have been educated in Europe, a "comfortable womb" where they were ethnically isolated but also liberated from the repression of their own societies. "It was a time of personal confusion and a time for seeking after identity, a period of psychological vulnerability when an anchor was needed and grasped at..." (*Teeth* 420). They are lost and choose a strong and radical opinion to live by; Clancy has the Emir agree with this in his contemplative monologue.² They hate the West for corrupting their society and them, and for allowing talk, articles, and acts which are offensive to Islam. The Emir and Mohammed themselves are these kinds of people, and they use others like these to pursue their personal ambitious goals. As Mohammed describes, he stays in Europe because those nations display a nearly "suicidal openness" and were so "self-destructively open" to strangers, "...afraid to offend those who would just as soon see them and their children dead and their entire cultures destroyed. It was a pleasing vision, Mohammed thought..." (*Teeth* 136).³ These ideas that Clancy shares, added with other comments by the Arab Muslim characters, serve as more of a warning than anything; he concentrates on the dangers of uncontrolled immigration and allowing Arab Muslims to move around freely.

¹ For discussion of the Jewish people, Israelis, and Israel by the Arab Muslim characters see *Teeth* 5, 53, 162, 173, 206, 248, 257, 284, 289, 296, 305, 330, 333, 335, 346, 487, 488, 494, 516-8, 532, 536, 552, 567, 610, 611, 616, 621.

² The Emir thinks that "...Most of them were people educated in Europe and America, where their foreign origin forced them to cleave together just to maintain a comfortable intellectual place of self-identity, and so they built upon a foundation of outsidersness that had led many of them to a revolutionary ethos," (*Teeth* 493).

³ Later on Mohammed again similarly considers Western nations weak and foolish for showing mercy to those who give them none in return (*Teeth* 174).

7.5.2 Discussion

The portrayal of Arab Muslim characters in *Teeth* comes under the simple category of “Terrorist”; all of the novel’s Arab Muslim characters who have an active part in the story are linked to the terrorist organization. The one main characteristic which all of them share is the acceptance, more like encouragement, for the targeting of America. The belief in the extreme religious and political ideology is fanatical and strong, even as there is some variation in the concentration on religious context; they follow orders and carry out their different jobs in the Organization. However, in context of their ideology there are issues which undermine the rationale and morality of the characters. Mostly this is due to their paradoxical way of practicing their religion: the hypocritical choices over how to apply and practice it when they so choose; the pedantic concentration on trivial matters while breaking certain obvious rules.¹ The main paradox is the fact that, amongst all the moral, religious, and ideological contemplations and worries, the characters never give one thought to wondering about the morality of killing civilian women and children. These factors undermine the humanity of the Arab Muslims.

In Clancy’s portrayal the American characters stand directly opposite in certain aspects to the Arab Muslims. Uda bin Sali is discussed in close relation to Jack Junior as Jack takes responsibility for tracking him. In a sense the two have some similarities: they are both in their twenties, single, with expensive clothes and nice car as they are both from rich families, and they both spend their working hours on a computer console. The main difference is that Jack works for a counterterrorist outfit while Uda works for a terrorist organization. Other smaller differences provide important basis for the characters: Jack is from a loving family where he received devotion and attention, while Uda is from a big family and is said to have gained money but not enough love; Jack was forced to work summer jobs such as construction, and he would then be able to survive in the real world in any job (and will not receive his trust fund until he is thirty), while Uda is spoiled and receives millions from his parents when he asks for it, and has never really worked in his life.

¹ The examples of undermined morality and rationale are many: Mustafa does not carry out his prayers on one occasion due to fatigue and leaves it to a merciful God to forgive him; Mohammed only prays for the show, not for real; Mohammed and Mustafa both worry on their own time about what the Prophet would have said about smoking cigarettes as they do a lot of it; Mohammed drinks alcohol on a constant basis, as do other characters in smaller quantities, and leaves it to God to forgive him his vice; Mohammed does not shy from working with drug-smugglers to reach his goals.

The most striking difference is about the two characters' relation to women though; while Uda pays money to get sex, Jack has normal girlfriends and strongly declares that he does not pay for it.

The American heroes generally provide a comparison to the terrorist characters. Jack Junior thinks that threatening the lives of women constituted "a big step over the line" (*Teeth* 210). Brian Caruso especially has some problems at first with the thought of killing people who are not shooting at him and who are not clearly labeled as the enemy. Clancy highlights this to be a Catholic conscience which they have been brought up with. As Brian wonders, "Hurting women was not part of his creed. Or children, which was what had set his brother off – not that Brian disapproved," (*Teeth* 342). Only a few pages later the ecstatic terrorists open fire and precisely target women and children, having no problems with conscience. The Carusos' consciences never leave them.¹ Even as the Carusos and Jack have some locker-room humor on occasion, it stays in the approved section of the good-guy world and never reaches the level of sexualizing, degrading, and hurting women that the Arab Muslims express. This difference of conscience, sexual morals, and respect is established on a continuous basis between the Americans and the Arab Muslims.

One other factor which undermines the Arab Muslim characters is the way they treat each other. Mohammed does not respect Uda and his life-style, yet he is patient with Uda as he needs him for his money. When Uda and other characters die Mohammed shows no sympathy for them. Similarly, when Fa'ad and Anas meet, Anas thinks of the other as a "son of a whore", just before they go off to pray together (*Teeth* 519). Both Anas and Fa'ad display a craving for more power, similar to what Mohammed and the Emir have also admitted. Neither Mohammed nor the Emir shies from using, even deceiving, their underlings for their own goals, even if the goals are different from what they preach to others. This fact undermines

¹ After the terrorist attack the American characters still have their consciences: they express worries of becoming like the terrorists (*Teeth* 478); after assassinating one member of the terrorist organization right after his visit to the mosque, the brothers do not feel guilty because "The one good thing about wasting a guy right out of church was that they could be reasonably certain that he wasn't going to hell. At least, that was one less thing to trouble their consciences," (*Teeth* 524).

the compassion and humanity of the Arab Muslims.¹ In comparison, the American characters form a family society, where the main characters are blood-related, and so are eternally devoted to each other.

The roles of the two parties are simple and clear. The American characters are established as the rational, moral, conscience-conscious, and professional protectors of children and women, characteristics which make them the obvious “good guys” in Clancy’s world. The Arab Muslims, in obvious comparison, are demonized into not having a conscience, not having the inbuilt awareness of good and evil, being disrespecting chauvinists sexualizing women, and shooting women and children, the very factors which are central to Clancy’s portrayal of American family, the building-blocks of society and identity. Their utter lack of sympathy for their victims, their treatment of them as only some kind of objects, strips them from any further human values. Even the Columbian drug Cartel members and their associates express some humanity in comparison to the Arab Muslims. Clancy makes no attempt at sympathizing with the terrorists even on a small scale.

These descriptions of the savage terrorists provide full justification for the militarized assault on them, the execution-style head shots and assassination of anyone part of the organization. As the terrorists do not really possess human characteristics to gain any sympathy, and after such ruthless and savage actions against American civilians the killing of them is more than accepted. However, Clancy does not leave the method of their assassination to work quickly and quietly, it would be too lenient for the terrorists. In fact, over a number of pages he describes the symptoms of the poison in the human body, the agonizing pain of the heart losing its oxygen supply and starting to die, the degrading form of death of not being able to move, the shock and incomprehension of what is happening to them. This type of death nearly satisfies the craving for revenge for the sins they have committed in the novel.

There is one further factor which strengthens the stereotyping of the Arab Muslim terrorist as evil. In the novel the terrorist attacks of 9/11 are never discussed or

¹ Similar to the way that van Teeffelen (1995) says the leaders in Palestinian groups are portrayed in previous novels; a leader abusing his power over others to strive for his own private cause.

mentioned outright. The incident does not get any detailed description. The American characters only mention facts like a “new spate of international terrorism” (*Teeth* 38) or a “Recent evolution in the world of international terrorism” (*Teeth* 77). Yet the Campus obviously exists directly due to the 9/11 events; it was established directly after it, and other hints provide more relations to it.¹ However, the terrorists themselves allow some clearer implication towards the attack with mentions of taking part in “flying lessons” (*Teeth* 125), and with Mohammed’s wondering about the Organization’s Department of Martyrdom and how easy it would be to “...kill the flight crew and dive the aircraft...” (*Teeth* 154). These small reminders make 9/11 a major background theme hidden in the events of Clancy’s fictional world, where Clancy’s terrorists themselves relate to the 9/11 terrorist attacks and add to the stereotyping of their own characters.

Mohammed’s thoughts about Europe as a safe-haven for people like him, his ability to move around freely, and his use of the system to build a network of terrorists fighting to bring down Western culture provides a warning to Americans and Europeans. The added fact that he is aiding Columbian drug Cartel cocaine to reach the European markets increases the threat on European societies. The American characters, in comparison, describe everything in Europe (the food, drinks, clothes, architecture, sights, automobiles, roads, airplanes, hotels, and services) as good, delicious, and admirable; there is no negative feedback from their stays in London, Munich, Vienna, and Rome, more like licking Europe’s boots. These two opposing treatments of Europe provide the idea that the Americans are friendly, respecting, and worthy visitors, while the Arab Muslims are not. The Americans carrying out their missions are protecting European interests at the same time. Clancy quite openly advocates a message of fear of the possible threat that Arab Muslims living in Western societies may create, and the strengthening of measures against possible terrorist cells, illegal immigration, and drug smuggling.²

¹ Some of the American characters discuss New York as a target of terrorism (*Teeth* 304 and 380). The terrorists of the attack in the novel are analyzed afterwards as “They did not learn to fly or anything like that,” (*Teeth* 380). Other small details, such as the Carusos’ car being a Porsche 911, add to the list of related details referring to 9/11.

² The recent decision by the US federal government to strengthen the Mexican-US border fence falls under these same fears of the uncontrolled movement of people; in Clancy’s novel this border is used to infiltrate terrorists into America.

7.6 Bin Sultan, Islam, and the Middle East

Clancy provides the novel with some discussion of Islam, the religion and its practice, and its relation to terrorism. Much of it is about the importance of the rules and laws within the religion. Jack Junior shares his views while he spies on a dozen characters through the internet;¹ Jack tries to analyze the lifestyle of those connected to terrorism, what motivates them, and the way they think. This leads him to study the religion of Islam and its practices through its religious scriptures. Jack's core belief is that all men are fundamentally the same, an idea which he learned from his Dad. "But that also meant that, just as there were bad people in America, so there were also bad people elsewhere in the world, and his country had recently had some hard lessons from that sad fact," (*Teeth* 179). Most of his narrations follow this pattern that there are bad people in Islam, but that there are bad people elsewhere as well, and that there are other kinds of followers of Islam too. "...The fact that most of the world's terrorists prayed to Mecca. But that, Jack reminded himself, wasn't the fault of Islam," (*Teeth* 209). Jack reminds the reader of the Irish Catholic terrorists of a previous Clancy novel who had tried to kill his family and him on the very night he was born; "Fanatics were fanatics the world around," (*Teeth* 210). The individuals they were hunting were sociopaths using religion as a cover, not really active members of the society. As one of the workers at the Campus instructs Jack, "Islam is not a belief system for psychopaths, but it can be perverted to the use of such people, just like Christianity can," (*Teeth* 212).

Jack Junior brings up the contents of the Koran on several occasions. Muslim terrorists somehow gain an illusion that they are doing God's work, which Jack believes to be due to a "shitty" mixture of political power and religion amongst the young and enthusiastic. They were not taught that war had rules as opposed to American soldiers and Marines, who, according to his Dad, learn the rules fast in a society where any undisciplined violence is punished harshly (*Teeth* 265). After reading some of the Koran Jack concludes that Islam has as much to do with terrorism as do the religious affiliations of Catholic and Protestant Irishmen, the

¹ All but one of the Muslim characters he spies on are originally from the Middle East, and they are all known to have ties to terrorism. A German living in Riyadh, Otto Weber, seems to be a short mention of an exception and probably not a terrorist.

same way that Adolf Hitler had thought of himself as Catholic and the Crusader nobles had leaned on religious arguments. He notes that there was nothing in the text about the acceptance of suicide or shooting innocent civilians; on the contrary, it was exactly like the way he was brought up in Catholicism. “So, if he was reading this right, Mohammed would probably have clobbered terrorists. He had been a decent, honorable man. Not all of his followers were the same way though, and those were the ones he and the twins had to deal with,” (*Teeth* 570).

The individuals Jack Junior is now tracking are Arab Muslims, but “...there were other Muslims,” (*Teeth* 227). Jack reintroduces another former character, Prince Ali bin Sultan, who is a senior official in the government of Saudi Arabia. Jack remembers bin Sultan, or bin Sheik¹ as he is called in previous novels, vaguely from his childhood for his beard, his humor, and as a good friend of his father’s. President Ryan liked the Saudis, and Jack calls bin Sultan a “good guy”. Just as the terrorists identifying themselves as Catholics become the repeated example in this novel of extremism in a religion other than Islam, so bin Sultan once again comes to represent the argument that not all Muslims are terrorists.² When there is discussion around Jack of Muslim extremism in Jerusalem, in Saudi Arabia, and other places, Jack remembers to mention bin Sultan on several occasions as the friend of his father, as the guy who wasn’t a maniac, because “...the Saudis, once you made friends with them, were the most loyal people in the world,” (*Teeth* 227).

Most of the people Jack Junior is tracking and most of the terrorists in the novel are Saudis, and bin Sultan’s role is to provide another more positive version of an Arab Muslim from Saudi Arabia. However, the Saudis constituting most of the bad guys with active roles in the novel, added with the fact that there is constant planning and plotting in the Saudi society against America and Israel (*Teeth* 176), weaken the positive effect of the background figure Ali bin Sultan. Jack takes it personally

¹ The reason for this name change from the Ali bin Sheik in *Sum* and *Executive* into Ali bin Sultan in *Teeth* is unclear. Both are titles of respect in the Arab or Muslim society, Ali being the son, “bin”, of the King. According to the Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary (Oxford University Press 2000), a sheikh is “1.an Arab prince or leader; the head of an Arab village, tribe, etc. 2.a leader in a Muslim community or organization” (1179), and a sultan is “the title given to Muslim rulers in some countries,” (1302).

² For mentions of the Irish Catholic terrorists see *Teeth* 209, 210, 570, for mentions of Ali bin Sultan see *Teeth* 179, 227, 276, 400, and 568.

when he finds many Saudis to be talking enthusiastically about the attack on the shopping mall; “Twice now, America had expended blood to save the mother country of Islam, and some Saudis were talking like *this*?” (*Teeth* 399). Were Ali bin Sultan to have an active part in the novel, the argument for there being a good-guy Arab Muslim would be more convincing. It seems that this will not be so in the following book either, and terrorists will continue to be the main representatives of the Saudi Kingdom.

The descriptions of the Middle East and Afghanistan carry certain basic stereotypes. The fact that much of it is desert is repeated a few times,¹ as is the fact that Mohammed is the most common name in the world. The region as a whole seems to be thought of through the American armed forces’ involvement there.² The Middle East seems to be a training ground for the forces, but also the major battleground in the fight against terrorism. The mentions of the real-world events are left vague though, with no detailed explanation of actual events. The fact that there are Arab fighters in the non-Arab country of Afghanistan is left without explanation, yet Brian provides some important comparison of these two peoples. At the start his group is mentioned in an unclear narration to have killed 16 Arabs and captured two captives, which are implied to be Afghans; “The Afghans were brave enough, but they weren’t madmen – or, more precisely, they chose martyrdom only on their own terms,” (*Teeth* 12). What seems to become of importance in describing people in Afghanistan is that they are brave and tough, not dumb, but they have not been trained.³ Later on Brian compares the Afghan Muslims to Arab Muslims like Uda bin Sali and his contacts. The people in Afghanistan, even if they were barbarians, did not attempt to kill women and children like Uda’s group; “It wasn’t manly – even the beard wasn’t manly. The Afghans’ were, but this guy just looked like some sort of pimp,” (*Teeth* 463). Here the Arab Muslims turn out as less respected adversaries than the ones Brian encountered in Afghanistan.

¹ See *Teeth* 213, 246, 294.

² Not only does Brian Caruso recount his experiences in Afghanistan, or “camel-land” (*Teeth* 49), but the other military figures are mentioned to have had tours in places in the area; Gunnery Sergeant Joe Sullivan was in Lebanon and Kuwait, while Pete Alexander helped run the CIA operation in Afghanistan in the 1980’s. Different wars, such as the Iraqi invasions, one in 1991 and one in Clancy’s fictional world, are also mentioned. Jack remembers the UIR war from *Executive*, and the satisfaction of seeing a UIR tank blow up (*Teeth* 399).

³ See *Teeth* 12 and 433.

The novel starts with the theme of the Palestinian-Israeli Conflict. Clancy introduces an American Jewish character who has moved to Israel, become part of the intelligence agency, and is killed a few pages later by an Arab Muslim.¹ After being given a face, name, and a history the Israeli gets stabbed by the arch-villain of the novel. Even as the novel continues without Israeli or Palestinian characters after this first encounter, the topic continues to have a powerful influence in the background as it is constantly discussed or referred to by both the Muslim Arab and the American characters.² Most of the discussion about Israel is about suicide bombers either being caught by the Israeli police or actually managing to create havoc in a civilian-rich location.³ The reasons for the Conflict between the two peoples are never detailed or explained. The novel seems to lean on the reader's previous understanding of the issue; in its vagueness it gives another one-sided portrait of the situation. In fact, the Palestinian-Israeli Conflict becomes only a part of the larger theme in the novel of extremist Islam versus the West and Israel; Jews and Israelis are established as the victims of Muslim racism and terrorism, and through this similar experience with Americans they are tied closely to American sympathy and identity. The Palestinian Cause disappears in the shadow of these larger themes.

There is one mention of the US-led forces in Iraq. According to the narration of a Sunni Muslim terrorist, the US has liberated the Shiite Muslims of Iraq from Sunni rule, which to him is not the best outcome. Even as there are individuals such as Mustafa and the Emir who speak about the importance of the unity between the two main branches in Islam, in this case the two groups are played against each other; the Shiites are the liberated ones and the Sunnis are the aggressors. Interestingly, in

¹ The Israeli agent is there to meet his Palestinian contact. Interestingly, Clancy has the Israeli agent remembering the Six Day War episode of 1967 as an inspiration for Americans in comparison to the news from Vietnam, supporting McAlister's (2001) views on the issue of America identifying with Israel.

² Examples: After the attack in the US the American police are said to use ethnic profiling in their search for more terrorists, anyone from "east of Israel" (*Teeth* 397); The Israelis and their intelligence personnel do not necessarily gain a positive picture from Clancy, as they are "...not entirely beloved by their American counterparts," (*Teeth* 418).

³ For examples of suicide bombers in Israel and the Middle East see *Teeth* 176, 276, 327, 330, 333.

the previous novel *Executive* the setting is the exact opposite.¹ The saving of one side from the aggression of the other is Clancy's main argument for justifying American presence in the Persian Gulf region.

7.7 Discussion

Teeth is one of the shortest books out of all of those discussed here. Considering the earlier publications, it also appears to be one of the fastest written novels out of Clancy's production (*Red Rabbit* appeared in 2002, *Teeth* already in 2003, when the longest novels have taken at least two years to appear). More importantly, it clearly provides the reader with a simpler view of the world than the other stories do. The two sides, "Us" and "Them", stand in direct and clear opposition to each other in their description of thoughts, views, and actions. The world is drastically black-and-white. On one side we have the American soldiers, while on the other side we have the Arab Muslim terrorists.

7.7.1 The Arab Muslim and American Characters

The portrayal of Arab Muslim terrorists in *Teeth* does not follow the same tracks as do the portrayals of other Middle Eastern terrorists in previous novels. There are a number of active characters in the novel bringing in some complexity to the terrorist Organization with their views, experiences of the world, and religious discourse. However, the portrayal is a clear and simple one, where the characters are grouped to have similar characteristics. In *Sum* and in *Executive* you also had Arab Muslim terrorists, but these novels included extremists from other ethnic and religious backgrounds and nationalities. These novels provided slightly more information on the background of the characters, with some attempt at humanizing them and sympathizing with them and their cause. Most significantly, there were characters that expressed some questioning of the activities they were up to, some doubts about the justification of their attack on American civilian targets, and some contemplating whether God would approve of their work, even if they did it in the end anyway.

¹ In *Executive*, Shiite extremist aggression is portrayed against the more agreeable and moderate Sunni Muslim characters, opposite to the setting in *Teeth*.

Teeth provides none of this kind of thinking. There is no questioning, doubts or uncertainty about the morality of attacking civilians. In Clancy's previous novels where the reader gets to know terrorist characters, even as they plant weapons of mass destruction in America or send others to attack civilians, the characters that gain a deeper analysis never directly take part in killing American civilians face-to-face.¹ In *Teeth* the reader gets to know characters which later empty their guns into the bodies of women and children. They lack sympathy for their victims and have no sense of family and the protection of children, the important signs of morality and the very basis of human values in Clancy's world. Only the child molester and his lack of humanity at the beginning of the novel can be compared to them. There is no attempt at sympathy for the terrorists, and there is no try at toning down their gruesome attack; in *Teeth* the terrorists enjoy their massacre with a grinning face. Their reasons for hating America are enough to make them lose their human values. Ironically, there is not much of an attempt at explaining the motivating factors either, or their personal and social background; the hate is portrayed as a natural part of them. Clancy's description supports the extreme stereotype of the inhuman Arab Muslim terrorist.

The description of the ideas and practices of sex, added to the degrading and sexualizing thoughts of women, brings in another undermining characteristic attached to the Arab Muslims. The sacred theme of family with an acceptable sexual partner is opposed by their gigolo life-style, perverted thoughts, and their engaging the services of prostitutes. The relating of the killing of women to the act of sex includes another perversion onto a list containing cyber-sex, fetishes and fantasies. Like with the savage nature that they display at the time of their death, the thoughts and practices of sex show a state of mind representing animal-like desires and actions. The cooperation with the Columbian drug-cartel and actual involvement in cocaine-smuggling is another immoral factor in their disfavor, as are their treatment of each other and the leader figures' use of their underlings to reach their own goals. All of this supports the stereotype of an immoral and savage Arab Muslim.

¹ The exception may be the attack on the kindergarten in *Executive*, where one attacker shoots the teacher of the nursery. However, this attacker has not become a known main character in the novel. Also, there is quite a difference between the brief description of the shooting of this teacher and the savage targeting of women and children in *Teeth*. Compare *Executive* 909-10 and *Teeth* 355-65.

The Muslim characters' treatment of their own religion also comes into question in Clancy's writing. The concentration in their religious thinking on the thought of female servants waiting in Paradise ties in the supposed Muslims' interpretation of Islam with their immoral sexuality mentioned above. The drug-smuggling and the enjoyment of alcohol, practices which are against the rules of Islam, undermine their religious conviction as they seem to be able to hypocritically choose which rules they want to follow and which they do not. Also, the way the leader figures abuse their religious messages by putting on a show to gain supporters and power for themselves gives a degrading immoral interpretation of Islam, similar to the manipulation carried out by leaders in previous bestselling novels listed by van Teeffelen (1995). The paradox is that on the one hand they are religious fanatics, zealots following their extreme ideology with utmost discipline, yet the manner it is carried out in and the small vices do not matter since God will forgive them. The hypocrisy appears when blaming the enemy for its evil and corrupting character while becoming evil and corrupt themselves. The idea Clancy is displaying here is that religion is used for political and personal ambitions, but that people and acts are not used for religion. The passion of hating the enemy is the main Cause, the ends justify the means, and rationality and morality are not important. Any way it goes, these factors support the idea of the irrationality, immorality, egocentrism, and self-indulgence of the Muslim characters.

On the American side Clancy provides a whole new generation of heroes. Even as the old main characters still have a great presence in the thinking of these new characters, the world has changed enough for Clancy to have had to let go of them and come up with a new cast. The new generation of Americans is similar to the Arab Muslims in some aspects; they are in their twenties, they are single, and they become devoted to the organization and the ideology which they work for. In other aspects they are strictly opposite to the Arab Muslims. While the terrorists have no problems with killing other people, the Americans have a conscience which makes them question the act, even if the target is a terrorist. While the Arab Muslims specifically target women and children, the American characters gain the role of the protectors of the innocent civilians. While the Muslim characters are sexually and religiously immoral, the American characters are sexually moral and stay true to

their upbringing and faith. While the Arab Muslims are terrorists, the Christian Americans are professional soldiers.

7.7.2 The New World of Islamist Terrorism and America

The US is once again portrayed as the victim of a terrorist attack. American actions in the Middle East, except for the just fight against terrorists, are never mentioned in Clancy's world. America once again does not fall for the category of "Victim" without taking justified action against the aggressors, and so the heroes take matters from politicians into their own hands. Clancy implies that only because of the savage and ruthless character of their new enemy do the culprits need to be killed. Because the mission is righteous there is no need for nightmares and pangs of conscience about it. There are no important active female characters in the novel, and there is no time for the development of family ties and relationships (except for the fact that the main American characters *are* family). In a sense the novel presents a clean fight between two groups of young passionate men. The Americans manage to track the terrorists only if they step over the line and enter the terrorists' own turf and killing them by the terrorists' own rules; without warning and without dignity. This course of action is legally wrong, yet morally more correct than not doing so, and hence justified. The world becomes a battlefield, and it comes to represent a polarized world of two extremes, where one is American, Christian, moral, humane, just, and professional, and the other is Middle Eastern, Islamic, immoral, unjust, inhuman, and irrational.

Islam, however, is clearly not at fault. Clancy's portrayal of the Arab Muslim terrorists is that they are abusing their own religion; they are "Islamist terrorists", not Islamic terrorists.¹ The American characters acknowledge this, and any larger themes of a Christian force battling the religion of Islam itself are limited, even when there are some mentions of it. Clancy even brings in the discussion of Irish Catholic terrorists, who have through their savage acts in the novel *Patriot* left a deep imprint on the Ryan family. Clancy also attempts to keep up the image of the good-guy Prince Ali bin Sultan as a picture of another kind of Saudi Muslim. Yet,

¹ The term "Islamist terrorism" has come into wider use in place of "Islamic terrorism" to decrease the connection between the religion of Islam itself and individuals who interpret it in such a way as to be able to carry out acts of terrorism (inspired by discussion with fellow student T.R. Stewart).

in his case, the fact that he is only a background figure, and the fact that his whole name has changed from previous stories, make his effect in the story a limited one. The only active Arab Muslim characters are the terrorists. Even as Islam cannot be related to the atrocities of terrorists, in *Teeth* the obvious aggressors are the Islamist extremists with no attempt at sympathy for their motivating factors. The world is a black-and-white split between the evil Muslim fanatics and the good guys: the American soldiers, families, and Dunkin' Donuts.

The implied argument in the novel is the importance of allowing soldiers the freedom to act to protect society in any way needed. Due to the nature of society, where politicians are too concerned about civil rights and liberties and keeping the intelligence agencies in a leash, soldiers need to step over the line into a world of vague rules. As Clancy has quoted George Orwell, "People sleep peaceably in their beds at night only because rough men stand ready to do violence on their behalf." The main message of *Teeth* then is: "You'd better not kick a tiger in the ass unless you have a plan for dealing with his teeth" (*Teeth* 37). This message comes out as an assurance to the American public, an encouragement for them to support their soldiers, as well as a warning to America's enemies.

The Israelis are quite strongly tied to American identity in the war between Islamic extremism and the West. There is no romanticizing of Israeli forces; they are similarly the victims and fighters of terrorism, even when Clancy keeps a distance from controversial Israeli policies with the Palestinians. The idea of tying the Israelis close to the American fight against terrorism is of course nothing new in cultural products or Clancy's fiction. In pre-9/11 novels they are already good friends with the American heroes, culminating in the novel *Rainbow* where an Israeli character is in fact a staff member of the elite international counterterrorist force. However, with the Palestinian-Israeli conflict being related to growing world Islamic fundamentalism, Israel being tied to the side of Western democracies as the victim of global terrorism, and with a lack of background history, any arguments for the Palestinian Cause in Western cultural products gets undermined.

One of the most interesting things about the story in *Teeth* is its surprisingly close resemblance to the events at the Munich Olympics and its aftermath. The terrorist

attack on Israeli athletes and the later decision by Israeli forces to send squads to Europe to assassinate any individuals involved in the planning of the attack seems to be the very image of Clancy's story. Clancy has Americanized and cleaned up his version of the story, with American civilian targets getting the hit from Arab Muslims and then American soldiers going on secret hunts to assassinate terrorists in Europe.¹ McAlister (2001) has commented on this fact of America learning from Israeli tactics and applying them in the world. In this case it seems to be Clancy who has taken Israeli experiences and reprisals and turned them into an argument for what America should do. In the post-9/11 world these ideas do not seem to have a difficult time getting support.

7.7.3 The World After 9/11

Clancy was interviewed after 9/11 on CNN and he gave his opinion on Islamist extremism and Islam.² According to one source he came out as "...an early, and to many, surprising defender of Islam" (Wikipedia 2006), just like in *Teeth*. However, the fact that the terrorists in the novel relate themselves to the acts of 9/11, similar to van Teeffelen's argument of the theme of terrorists relating to previous attacks (1995), is enough for the reader to put the Arab Muslim characters straight into the "evil bad-guy" category. With 9/11 as a strong background theme, this story reaches further than just the events in this novel; not only is it about killing the aggressors, but with the symbolic and agonizing deaths it also provides for the satisfaction of revenge after the 9/11 attacks. An enemy from the real world is avenged in fiction, just like in *Executive* and many other Clancy-stories. There is no real attempt at an analysis of the historical and geopolitical background of the Middle East and extremism appearing there; in this sense the story relies on the reader's previous knowledge and stereotypes of the world.

After 9/11 Clancy came out with an editorial called *To the Terrorists* where he said that the US would get its revenge. In another essay he defended the CIA and the government against public criticism, and instead accused the news media for giving such a disapproving picture of them (Baiocco 2003). The story of the novel *Teeth*

¹ The missions against terrorists in *Teeth* are clean and precise without any mistakes or collateral damage, while the actual real-world events were less clean, with at least one innocent individual getting targeted.

² Clancy was interviewed after 9/11 just like after the Oklahoma bombing in April 1995.

similarly advocates getting back at the terrorists and the strengthening of measures in the fight against terrorism, sidelining politicians and the media. With 9/11 in the background, the story takes a clear side in current political discussion about US policies. The top-most issues are the human rights of suspected terrorists, the detaining of suspects without fair trial in places like Guantanamo, and the alleged torture and deprivation of basic rights; the story in *Teeth* implies that individuals connected with terrorism should have none of their rights - not even life. Another issue is the disagreement between the EU and the US about the war on terrorism; the CIA operations, flights carrying terror-suspects using European airports, as well as secret detention centers around Europe holding individuals whose rights are questionably deprived. Clancy's novel argues for the importance of the US dealing decisively with these, what he portrays as, animal-like individuals. The novel also comes to support preemptive strikes against enemies from the Middle East, hitting them before they have the chance to attack, now that they have shown their true nature. The war in Afghanistan, the even more controversial war in Iraq, and the developments between the West and Iran over nuclear power with actual threats of military action, are all part of this new preemptive strike-policy, all in the name of the War on Terror. The message in *Teeth* can be seen to support these endeavors even as Clancy has come out publicly criticizing the invasion of Iraq in 2003.¹

Teeth appeared in the controversial year of 2003 with millions of people around the world marching against the possible US-led invasion of Iraq, with "sexed-up" intelligence to provide evidence of WMDs for the justification of the assault, and with the invasion itself occurring in March. It was a time of questioning the identity of America and her role in the world after 9/11. Clancy provides strong support for one type of policy with the strengthening and simplifying of the identities of America and her enemies. Fictional text in political thrillers should not be underestimated for the effect it has on the reader and its role in strengthening certain pre-established political thought.

¹ In fact, Clancy criticizes the decision to go on with the invasion into Iraq without "casus belli", or suitable provocation, in a new book called *Battle Ready*, co-authored with ex-Chief of Central Command and special Middle East envoy General Zinni. "It troubles me greatly to say that, because I've met President Bush. He's a good guy. ...I think he's well grounded, both morally and philosophically. But good men make mistakes," (Associated Press 2004).

Unfortunately, the book which may be most interesting and critical to the analysis in this thesis will not be out before the work on this paper has commenced, and so will not be included in the analysis. Apparently the new novel should be released this year (Clancyfaq 2006). If it is true what is implied in *Teeth*, that it is only an introductory book to another Clancy-novel on the same subject, then predictably the same style of writing, themes, and way of portraying Arab Muslims as terrorists will continue. The attacks of 9/11 have had such a profound change on the world, on American policies, as well as on Clancy himself, that he has enough material and motivation for a number of novels on the issue. Considering the fact that his biggest novels took him an average of two years to write and publish, and the fact that it has been three years from the publication of *Teeth* (2003), this new novel will most probably be another massive work (noting, of course, that Clancy came out with the coauthored nonfiction *Battle Ready* in 2004).

8 CONCLUSION

8.1 Clancy's Portrayal of Arabs and Muslims

Clancy begins to use Muslim characters in the Cold War era. The first peoples represented are the Azerbaijanis and Afghans of Central Asia in *Red Storm* and *Cardinal*. Their portrayal in the larger context of the Cold War, having a common enemy with the US, their cunning and motivated struggle against superior Soviet weapons, and them as the "Victim" of Soviet aggression, is a positive one. There are the stereotypical characters, like the Archer, who have lost their humanity and rationale due to the war, and they end up staging violent assaults on civilian targets and being killed by professional Russian soldiers. However, the struggle goes on against Soviet oppression with more hope for the future, and on the whole the Afghans are respected at least for their mindset and their passion.

Clancy begins *Sum* with the neoconservative militarist view of the Middle East, yet his take of the Palestinian-Israeli Conflict is surprisingly different. The description of Israeli aggression on the Palestinians soon withers, however, with the progression of the peace process and, more importantly, the developing narration of Palestinian extremists targeting the US with a nuclear device. The first impression is of the Israelis being the aggressors, yet in the end America with Israel is the Victim as the story falls for some of the previous stereotypes of the savage Palestinian terrorist. The Saudi Bin Sheik is around to convey a moderate pro-Western view of Islam and Saudi Arabia. He also comes to support the US political and military involvement in the Middle East as the policeman establishing and ensuring peace between the warring parties.

In *Executive* religious and political fanaticism in Shiite Islam is portrayed in harsh light. The individuals are either religious extremists or secular terrorists from different countries in the Middle East, but all are linked to immoral and savage attacks against the US. There is some questioning of the morality of the attacks by some of the main characters, though, even when they continue with the plans. The

main villain is the Iranian religious leader, who with the Iraqi dictator has a stereotypical immoral and savage character of a previous historical figure. There are good-guy Sunni Muslims such as bin Sheik as the victims of Iranian-Iraqi aggression, and they give a moderate and pro-Western view of Islam, Saudi Arabia, and Kuwait. They also provide the support and justification for US military involvement in the Persian Gulf Region. Israel is again established tightly in cooperation with the US in the fight on terrorism.

Teeth provides the simplest and clearest setting of the clean professional soldiers and the messy and bloody enemies. The religious and political fanaticism of Sunni Muslim terrorists from Middle Eastern Arab countries provide a demonized enemy with no conscience of any kind. There is no attempt at sympathizing or giving a background view on motivating factors; the enemy is savage, immoral, and sexualized in every way, with individuals irrationally twisting their faith. There are mentions of the good guy bin Sultan and his moderate Islam and good relations with the US, but he fades into the background with numerous other Saudis taking an active part in killing civilians. The portrayal of these stereotyped Arab Muslims in such an excessive way provides the justification for the presence of US troops in the Middle East to ensure the safety of all peoples.

On the whole, Clancy's depiction of Arabs and Muslims has changed over the twenty or so years that he has been writing about them. In every new novel the positive effect of a sympathetic Arab or Muslim character is less, while the savagery of the attacks on American families gets more detailed and gruesome. Also, the revenge tactics of US forces becomes increasingly pronounced and symbolic. It is clear that two historic incidents in world affairs have affected his stories and his portrayal. Taking into account the characteristics of figures and any sympathetic background narration in the novels, Clancy's depiction of Arabs and Muslims has gone from sympathetic and neutral to negative and dark. The next novel will probably continue in the same direction with the development of style, themes, and characterization.

All important Arab and Muslim characters in Clancy's production, except for the Saudi Prince, are either connected to or prone to violence and terrorism. Even the

Cold War Muslim characters are guilty of this, and like the others they die off with a call to God, typical of stereotypical portrayals of Muslim fanatics. None of them have families and children to give them some humanity and sympathy which the good guys generally gain from Clancy. Many Arabs and Muslims have a sexualized and immoral way of thinking. Amongst all this the Middle East and Afghanistan are used by Clancy as a battleground in which he stages challenges for American forces to display their superior machinery and strategy. In this sense Clancy falls for the upholding of older stereotypes about Arabs, Muslims, and the Middle East, also found in past orientalism as in many contemporary cultural products.

Surely there are other “Others” as well. Many peoples and regions around the world have received a certain, sometimes negative, view or “type” in Clancy’s fiction. The portrayal of the Russians, Irish, Latin Americans, Native Americans, Japanese, and Chinese carry strong stereotypes about each group. Some of their characteristics even resemble the way Arab and Muslim characters are displayed: they are depicted as greedy, self-seeking, self-righteous, sexually immoral, and prone to violence and militarism. These enemies also each represent historical figures that created fears and hysteria in the West, and they all plot against the US and its interests. Some enemies appear from inside the American society; scandals involving sex-offenders in politics, involvement in illegal operations around the world, drug-trafficking, White supremacy extremism, and ecological fanaticism are also topics from current affairs which Clancy stamps down on. It is not only Arabs and Muslims who get a portrayal which concentrates on highly negative aspects.

The difference between the American bad guys and the foreign aggressors is the amount of destruction they manage to inflict on American society and its interests, as well as the amount of concentration that they get in a story. The foreigners manage to wreak much havoc with economic meltdowns, military offenses, and terrorist attacks, while the ultimate goal of American extremists is generally stopped from being carried out.¹ Clancy allows the foreigners more devastating attacks on the US than he does the enemies from inside the American society. Muslim

¹ The Mountain Men from *Executive* and the eco-terrorists of *Rainbow* are stopped before their ultimate plan works, even when they do try to create destruction on a great magnitude. The KKK assassin manages to kill President Jackson (*Teeth*), but the event never gains anything but a background explanation; there is no direct narration of it.

extremists from the Middle East stand out from all the other foreign enemies with the magnitude of their attacks and the character of their aggression; no one else actually manages to attack American civilian centers with WMDs (they do it twice), and no one else carries out such horrid attacks gleefully gunning down civilians.¹ The threat that Arabs and Muslims direct at Clancy's most central unit of American values and identity (the family, children, and civilian population) is clearly bigger, more brutal, and more demonized than the threats from other enemies. The Arab and Muslim terrorists, as a concept, are more continuous, developed, and, especially lately, critically highlighted as Clancy's "Other".

8.2 Clancy's Orientalism

If one is to simplify and generalize Clancy's portrayal of Arabs and Muslims and compare them with those of previous reviews of orientalism, his portrayal does hold certain stereotypes which were alive in European thought already in the Middle Ages, if not before. One such example is the symbiosis Clancy has as a producer of cultural items to the real-life politics in the US, similar to the tradition where the study of orientalism was tightly connected to European colonialism in the seventeenth century and onwards. Also, Clancy's use of misspelled basic Arabic and Farsi terms is surprisingly careless, as he generally seems to do much research on the Middle East.² Adding his repetition of implied stereotypical concepts such as a Middle Eastern "tradition of terrorism", the argument of Clancy taking part in undermining Arabs and Islam gains some weight.

¹ Even the attack on the Capitol Hill by the Japanese airline pilot in *Debt*, who is excused later as an individual madman, fades in comparison with the devastation of the attacks by Middle Eastern Muslims. The airplane attack even looks more like a favor to America in Clancy's world. Irish terrorists manage one gun-shooting attack on Ryan's family, but nobody dies (*Patriot*). Other attacks on adult civilians and children occur in other novels, some on Americans, others on Europeans. The attack by Muslims on the nursery in *Executive* only results in the death of one teacher amongst many Secret Service agents, but the messing with toddler-aged children is as close as it can get to evil. Also, no other event gains as demonized, or sexualized, a description as the attack by Sunni Muslim extremists from Saudi Arabia and Iraq where they shoot dozens of women and children in a shopping mall. One of the most distinguishing characteristics of Islamist extremists is the religious fanaticism providing the willingness to kill innocent civilian women and children and the willingness to die in such an attack.

² Clancy uses misspelled forms of the terms "sheikh", "ayatollah", "akbar", and "mujâhidîn".

It would be naïve, of course, to relate Clancy as such to a long tradition of thinking. Categorizing him with a specific style or group of writers underestimates him as a novelist and an individual realist. Said's argument of feminizing the Orient cannot be applied to Clancy since he generally makes the concept of feminine and family a strong part of humanizing the American identity, not degrading a Middle Eastern one. The religion of Islam is portrayed positively, as are sometimes the Arab peoples. The Orient or the "Middle East" is not a single unified concept of its own. Also, considering the whole of Clancy's production, his world is too diverse with many different regions and characters being used for it to be a strictly bipolar world. Clancy's world is really more of the Huntingtonian world of nine or so different "civilizations".¹ However, the world-view which Clancy's writing also supports is "the West versus the Rest", where the West and the Islamic civilization especially seem to have the most highlighted differences. Interestingly, other claims by Huntington (1996), such as the anti-Western coalition of the "Confucian-Islamic connection", can also be found in Clancy's novels.²

Peoples in the Middle East are, however, the clear "Other" in at least three of Clancy's books. Two of these novels, *Executive* and *Teeth*, are the most pronounced stories in Clancy's production and central for his establishment of an American identity and a political message. In both stories Islamist terrorism, either Shiite or Sunni Muslim extremism, is the savage opponent in comparison to the ideal American identity.³ Clancy's orientalism is then of "othering" the Middle East and

¹ Clancy visits six or seven of these civilizations and uses them in his stories as friend or foe, giving them all their own characteristics and spokesmen.

² According to Huntington, the Confucian-Islamic anti-Western coalition appeared when the two "civilizations" grew to oppose America; the Asian challenge grew due to their growing political and military influence, whereas the growth of the Islamic challenge was demographic and cultural (as Muslims were more inclined to violence than anyone else) (Huntington 1996: 185 and McAlister 2001: 266-269). Clancy has also had these civilizations, more distinctly the Chinese, Japanese, and Muslims, plot together against the US. There is a surprising amount of similarity between Clancy's and Huntington's portrayals of a simplified world where the US and the West stand alone against grave challenges.

³ In *Executive* Clancy's main character and political voice gets to be President; he gets to carry out his own policies and can affect people's thinking. In that novel the primarily Iranian enemy with the demonized Shiite extremist and his use of immoral activities for his selfish purposes is used as a contrast to American values and government. In *Teeth* America is still in the post-9/11 world, with Clancy setting up new policies and systems of defense. With the use of a demonized Arab Muslim for comparison he finds the justification for the use of force and the strengthening of American identity in the world at a confusing time. His Israeli characters are also strongly attached to the good-guy side in most of his novels. The strong American identity as the good, moral, and justified party

Arab and Muslim peoples for the enforcement of his own political arguments and his ideas about American identity. Even as he finds the “Other” from many countries and “civilizations”, his orientalism is his most pronounced method for this.

8.3 Discussion

“Othering”, the practice of portraying ourselves or our collective society against an “Other”, can be argued to be a natural part of our everyday lives. It appears in all kinds of relations and relationships; we use it to create our own identity, to relate to other people, to strengthen our own ideas and beliefs and to give us security against the insecurity of the changing world. It is not necessarily an established institution of a way of thinking, and it does not need to lead to the oppression of others or the patriotism, xenophobic nationalism and chauvinism that Said says it can turn into (1995). Clancy is in the end a writer who uses the simple method of “othering” in his fiction to entertain readers and to make money.

This does not, of course, let Clancy and his writing off the hook. As van Teeffelen argues, popular literature does not sustain stereotypes in an unproblematic way simply because it is a less prestigious form of culture (1995: 93). Fiction is a powerful media for transferring world-views, and the political thriller especially is a strong instigator of issues that the reader deems important and personal;¹ Clancy’s style of fictional writing includes detailed facts and historical figures, issues which the reader can relate to, which makes his novels seem like “educating”. However, with stories leaning strongly on established background stereotypes and with facts out of context, Clancy’s “educating” novels do not provide the reader with new critical information for the wider understanding of the world. In fact, they establish a limited view of categorizing foreign regions and peoples. Through repetition of the negative aspects of the adversaries, even if there are exceptions to the portrayal

is Clancy’s main political message, and the Muslim Middle East is used as the main comparison in recent times as the “Other”.

¹ As Mykkänen (2006) argues, we tend to cherish ideas of the world which we have previously established for ourselves. We also choose our reading to support these ideas, even fictional texts, to strengthen our previous assumptions.

of some peoples, the “types” get enforced and a narrow-sighted view of peoples such as the Arabs and Muslims is strengthened.

The importance in this lies in Clancy’s political role. Clancy has strong ties to the highest echelons of the US government and military; he lectures about security issues, and his novels are read for more than just entertainment. After all, it was Clancy who was interviewed after 9/11 for his expert views, and he cannot be dismissed as a mere writer of popular fiction. As McAlister (2001) argues, culture and policy-making are tied together; they work together and create identity for a collective people.¹ Even Terdoslavich asks whether it is really that far-fetched that Clancy might influence policy (2005: 237). Clancy takes an active part in the making sense of policies at a given time. The alarming factor is the kind of policies he encourages as he simplifies his world into an American nation of innocents and a demonized enemy; within the context of his relationship with “blue collar nationalism”,² of getting back at your enemies, the idea of a justified use of force for solving problems is advocated. The fear in this is that conservative and militarist groups in Washington D.C. will gain more support for the continued American military endeavors around the globe, especially against Arab and Muslim peoples in the Middle East.³

Most critically, the encouragement of this stereotyped thinking, the painting of an inhumane picture of Muslim peoples, the creation of a fear of them, and the advocating of force in problem-solving give in to the possible justification of the

¹ “Thus if culture is central to the worlds we regard as political and social, it is not only because culture is part of history but also because the field of culture is history-in-the-making,” (McAlister 2001: 276).

² Clancy’s writing both supports “blue collar nationalism” and gets its support from that kind of thinking. The pro-Clancy Marc A. Cerasini says that the novels are cautionary stories warning about the consequences of neglect and political and military inaction (in Greenberg 2005: 11).

³ The neoconservatives in Washington DC have their views of “Islamofashism”, of seeing all of Islamist extremism as a global and united enemy that can only be dealt with with strict armed force (Sadeniemi’s (2006) article discusses Huntington’s ideas about the “Clash of Civilizations” and its influence in especially American neoconservative politics). The enhancing of the idea of getting back at enemy-figures makes Clancy’s stories support the US military endeavors around the world, even as he did criticize the invasion of Iraq without suitable provocation, where even President George W. Bush and good men “make mistakes” (Associated Press 2004). The discussion of “terrorism” has changed over recent years; it has become simpler, more generalized, and it is used to demonize any kind of struggle against Western forces. Clancy’s description of the Middle East in his stories can be seen to justify the actions of the US and Israeli military forces there, including the use of preemptive strikes and the killing of demonized targets without further care over civilian life.

undermining of the human rights of these generalized “enemies”. In places like the US Navy base at Guantanamo, secret detention centers in Europe, and the Abu-Ghraib prison in Iraq there has been an alleged deprivation of human-rights and torture, as well as degrading acts carried out on the detainees. Five hundred individuals are detained in the US without a fair trial; it shows the nature of thinking behind the war on terror. Others have argued that the very central aspect of American identity is the providing of and having the right to civil liberties and the right to a fair trial, and the treatment of insurgents taken to Guantanamo and Iraqi prisons hurts the very identity of America and the international human-rights establishment as a whole.

Clancy has no problems with this in his fiction; he limits the human rights and life of any aggressors, having those with any relations to terrorism assassinated. He portrays professional soldiers dealing with these enemies in a clean and moral way, yet the War on Terror has not been as clean and precise in reality as it is in Clancy’s world. In Iraq and Afghanistan, similar to the Palestinian territories and Lebanon, there has been the targeting of the civilian population by forces of “Western” countries, both accidental and deliberate, and heavy casualty rates in collateral damage. In July 2006 there was talk of providing “ethical training” for US troops in Iraq. Without detailed knowledge of culture and neglect over historically important themes Western countries continue sending soldiers to “liberate” the Middle East and try to make the world a safer place in that way. The irony and hypocrisy are clear; the number of civilians that are abused, that lose their rights, and that die at the hands of troops of Western democracies is incomprehensible, yet the justification for such action lives on because of the nature of the enemy, an enemy that is so different from “Us” since it will not shy from killing civilians.

Further studies will include analysis of the future production of Clancy and other authors of fiction and nonfiction in light of orientalism. Contemporary events have forced parties in the West and the Middle East into ever increasing contact, and Western cultural products will undoubtedly continue to carry this theme in some form.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources:

(in chronological order)

- Clancy, T. 1985 (1984). *The Hunt for Red October*. New York: Berkley.
- Clancy, T. 1987 (1986). *Red Storm Rising*. New York: Berkley.
- Clancy, T. 1987. *Patriot Games*. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons.
- Clancy, T. 1994 (1988). *The Cardinal of the Kremlin*. London: HarperCollinsPublishers.
- Clancy, T. 1989. *Clear and Present Danger*. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons.
- Clancy, T. 1992 (1991). *The Sum of All Fears*. New York: Berkley.
- Clancy, T. 1994 (1993). *Without Remorse*. London: HarperCollinsPublishers.
- Clancy, T. 1995 (1994). *Debt of Honor*. New York: Berkley.
- Clancy, T. 1997 (1996). *Executive Orders*. New York: Berkley.
- Clancy, T. 1999 (1998). *Rainbow Six*. New York: Berkley.
- Clancy, T. 2001 (2000). *The Bear and the Dragon*. London: Penguin Books.
- Clancy, T. 2003 (2002). *Red Rabbit*. New York: Berkley.
- Clancy, T. 2004 (2003). *The Teeth of the Tiger*. London: Penguin Books.

Secondary Sources:

- Albayrak, A. 2006. Länsi ja islam taistelevat valkokankaalla. *Helsingin Sanomat* 17 Feb 2006: B1.
- Associated Press 2004. Author Tom Clancy criticizes Iraq war. Associated Press interview 24 May 2004. (24 May 2004).
www.msnbc.msn.com/id/5053682
- Baiocco, R. (ed.) 2003. Readings on Tom Clancy. Library of Congress Catalog. (9 Dec 2003).
www.loc.gov/catdir/toc/fy041/2003041769.html
- Bayoumi, M. and A. Rubin (eds.) 2000. *The Edward Said Reader*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Bremmer, I. and R. Taras (eds.) 1993. *Nations and Politics in the Soviet Successor States*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Buruma, I. and A. Margalit, 2005 (2004). *Occidentalism. A Short History of Anti-Westernism*. London: Atlantic Books.
- Clancyfaq 2006. Tom Clancy. (22 Oct 2006).
www.clancyfaq.com
- Cleveland, W.L. 1994. *A History of the Modern Middle East*. Colorado: Westview Press, Inc.

- Donnelly, J. 1997. Hot Under the Epaulets. Defense Week 4 Jun 1997. (20 Oct 2006).
www.salon.com/june97/clancy3970604.html
- Garson, H.S. 1996. *Tom Clancy. A Critical Companion*. Critical Companions to Popular Contemporary Writers, Kathleen Gregory Klein (Series Editor). Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press.
- Greenberg, M.H. (ed.) 2005 (1992). *The Tom Clancy Companion*. Revised Edition. New York: Berkley.
- Halliday, F. 2005. *100 Myths About the Middle East*. California: University of California Press.
- Huntington, S.P. 1997 (1996). *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. New York: Touchstone, Simon&Schuster Inc.
- Kaufman, B.I. 1996. *The Arab Middle East and the United States. Inter-Arab Rivalry and Super Power Diplomacy*. New York: Twayne Publishers.
- Kramer, M. 2002 (2001). *Ivory Towers on Sand. The Failure of Middle Eastern Studies in America*. Washington: The Washington Institute for Near East Policy.
- Lewis, B. 2003. *The Crisis of Islam. Holy War and Unholy Terror*. New York: Modern Library, Random House Inc.
- Little, D. 2002. *American Orientalism. The United States and the Middle East since 1945*. London: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Macfie, A.L. 2002. *Orientalism*. Great Britain: Pearson Education Limited.
- McAlister, M. 2001. *Epic Encounters. Culture, Media, and U.S. Interests in the Middle East, 1945-2000*. California: University of California Press.
- McDowall, D. 1995 (1994). *The Palestinians. The Road to Nationhood*. London: Minority Rights Group.
- Mykkänen, P. 2006. Jos x:ää seuraa y, maailma on pulassa. *Helsingin Sanomat* 5 Mar 2006: B3.
- Neff, D. 1995. *U.S. Policy Towards Palestine and Israel since 1945*. Institute for Palestine Studies. London: I.B. Tauris & Co. Ltd.
- Netanyahu, B. (ed.) 1986. *Terrorism. How the West Can Win*. Toronto: Collind Publishers, The Jonathan Institute.
- Newsmeat 2006. Campaign contribution search. (22 Oct 2006).
www.newsmeat.com/celebrity_political_donations/Tom_Clancy.php
- Newsweek 2003. A Scholar and Exile. Edward Said was an elegant critic of U.S. Mideast policy. *Newsweek* 6 Oct 2003: 60.
- Records, S. 2001. Becoming Tom Clancy: Letters from Tom. (12 Nov 2005).
www.geocities.com/everwild7/clancy.html
- Sadeniemi, Pentti 2006. Professori Huntingtonin erehdys. *Helsingin Sanomat* 3 May 2006: A2.
- Said, E.W. 1995 (1978). *Orientalism. Western Conception of the Orient*. Reprint with a new Afterword 1995. London: Penguin Books.
- Said, E.W. 1997 (1981). *Covering Islam. How the Media and the Experts Determine How We See the Rest of the World*. New York: Vintage Books, Random House.

Sheffer, G. (ed.) 1997. *U.S.-Israeli Relations at the Crossroads*. London: Frank Cass and Company Ltd.

Tanner, S. 2002. *Afghanistan. A Military History from Alexander the Great to the Fall of the Taliban*. New York: Da Capo Press.

Terdoslavich, W. 2005. *The Jack Ryan Agenda. Policy and Politics in the Novels of Tom Clancy: An Unauthorized Analysis*. New York: Tom Doherty Associates, LLC.

Trosky, S.M. (ed.) 1991. *Contemporary Authors. A Bio-Bibliographical Guide to Current Writers in Fiction, General Nonfiction, Poetry, Journalism, Drama, Motion Pictures, Television, and Other Fields*. Volume 131. New York: Gale Research Inc.

van Teeffelen, T. 1992. *On the Edge of Wilderness. Popular Fiction and the Palestinian-Israeli Conflict*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. University of Amsterdam, Program of Discourse Studies.

van Teeffelen, T. 1995. Popular Literature and Palestine. In A. Moors, T. van Teeffelen, S. Kanaana, and I. Abu Ghazaleh (eds.), *Discourse and Palestine. Power, Text and Context*. Amsterdam: Het Spinhuis Publishers, 93-105.

Vuollo, P. 1993. *Clancy's Enemies. The Development of the Enemy Image in Tom Clancy's First Six Novels*. Unpublished Pro Gradu Thesis. University of Jyväskylä, Department of English.

Väärät Sankarit 2006. Väärät sankarit? *Helsingin Sanomat* 4 Mar 2006: B3.

Wikipedia 2006. The free Encyclopedia. (22 Oct 2006).
www.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tom_clancy

Other:

www.allreaders.com

BBC World television channel.

BBC news website.
www.bbc.com

Helsingin Sanomat daily newspaper, Helsinki.

Helsingin Sanomat daily news website.
www.hs.fi

www.mesa.com

Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary (2000). Oxford University Press.

www.wiredforbooks.org/tomclancy/

Courses at the University of Helsinki, 2002-2006.