



Global Terrorism, Political Instability and International Crime Council June 2008

Global Terrorism, Political Instability and International Crime Council Members

Council Chair

Mr. Michael E. Bouchard

Vice Chair

Mr. Brittain P Mallow

ASIS Council Vice President

Dr. Kathleen Kiernan

Members

Mr. Doug Callen
Mr. Kevin Giblin
Dr. Richard H Ward
Col. Michael H Clancy
Dr. Stephen Sloan
Mr. Peter S Probst
Dr. Robin B McFee
Ms. Courtney B Banks
Mr. Thomas T Cromwell
Mr. Mark Camillo
Mr. Jim R Barton
Mr. Paul Aube
Mr. Kevin Eack
Mr. Jack L Johnson, Jr.
Mr. Patrick D Hynes
Mr. William Varley Fell
Mr. James T Dunne
Ms. Marcy Forman
Mr. Vahid Majidi
Mr. Mario A Possamai

Welcome to the fourth edition of the quarterly newsletter of the Global Terrorism, Political Instability and International Crime Council.

In this edition, we are honored to have contributions from two eminent Council members with international reputations in terrorism studies:

- **Peter S. Probst has penned a thoughtful perspective on the sophisticated political warfare campaign of the Muslim Brotherhood’s American Operations. (See below)**
- **Dr. Stephen Sloan has written an insightful piece on the importance of strategic thinking in combating terrorism. (See Page 2)**

This edition also includes:

- **An article by Deena Disraelly, a dynamic and well-received speaker at the Council’s 2008 conference. (See Page 2).**
- **Updates on current activities by Council Vice Chair Britt Mallow, Dr. Robin McFee and Peter S. Probst. (See Page 4)**
- **A profile of Council chair Michael E Bouchard (See Page 4).**

Political Warfare and the Muslim Brotherhood’s American Operations

By Peter S. Probst

“Allah is our objective. The Prophet is our leader. Quran is our law. Jihad is our way. Dying in the service of Allah is our highest hope”.

Credo of the Muslim Brotherhood

Introduction

Most of us who study terrorism focus primarily, if not exclusively, on the violence and the carnage. But there is another aspect to terrorism that represents a long term, sub-threshold threat and highly effective form of attack to which we are subjected on a daily basis. It is a campaign of sophisticated Political Warfare that is largely unacknowledged by the government and, as a consequence, is unappreciated by the American public. (Continued on page 5)

Strategic Intelligence: Laying the foundation for long-term gains in war against terrorism

By Dr. Stephen Sloan

When Michael E. Leiter, Acting Director of the National Counterterrorism Center, said that there was an increased focus given to the development of Strategic Intelligence at the ASIS Annual Conference on Terrorism in March 2008, his remark was certainly positive in nature.

For too long, the “war against terrorism” has focused on its tactical dimensions. Clearly, such a focus is understandable given the dangers inherent in present threats. But the short term, often contingency-driven intelligence, tended to ignore the importance of strategic, longer-term intelligence, and that gap still represents a major challenge to counterterrorism intelligence in general.

The focus on the short term ignores the reality that terrorism ultimately is a form of protracted conflict, a form of conflict where there will continue to be both continuity and change. But unless the respective intelligence agencies in the US and internationally look at the “big picture” and assess emerging threats, the reactive nature of combating terrorism will continue.

What is needed is broader longer-term assessment, which underscores the development of future threat environments and movements that may not be serious threats now but can be if not addressed. Moreover, such intelligence can serve as a means of addressing the fall out of short-term policies that may have longer term negative implications.

Whether it was supporting the Mujhaideen or now determining militias to support in Iraq, the need to appreciate the longer term “blow back” of current actions cannot be underestimated.

Moreover, if intelligence organizations focus more on longer-term trend analysis, then we may be able to provide senior leadership with the information to evolve effective policies that may not, in a sense like tactical intelligence, be often be immediate actionable, but can provide the foundations to evolve those courses of action to disrupt and perhaps destroy the development of new threats before they become so significant that a defensive reactive posture on the part of governments becomes the rule and not the exception.

Admittedly, the development of strategic intelligence in a superheated present environment is not easy, but its development can prove diplomatic, economic, psychological and, if need be, police or military measures at a level below that required in a full-blown crisis.

Strategic intelligence, therefore, can provide a means by which the counterterrorism community can take the initiative over the long haul instead of having a narrow focus tactical intelligence which all too often is primarily driven by the current crisis.

For the past five decades, Dr. Stephen Sloan, University Professor, University of Central Florida has been a leading thinker on issues related to terrorism and national security. Dating back to his early studies on political violence in Indonesia, Dr. Sloan has published an impressive body of scholarly works, including The Historical Dictionary of Terrorism and Simulating Terrorism.

Ring of Steel: Making Security Fiction a Fact

By Deena Disraelly

Four explosions. April 19, 1995: Timothy McVeigh leaves a Ryder rental truck, filled with explosives, in front of the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City; the truck detonates shortly thereafter, killing 168 and injuring more than 800 others. October 12, 2000: Suicide boat bombers hit the USS Cole in Aden Harbor killing 17 and injuring 39 more. July 7, 2005: Suicide bombers in London detonate bombs on three subway trains and one bus, killing 56 and injuring over 700. March 6, 2008: a bicyclist cycles to the Times Square Armed Forces Recruiting Station and leave a package which detonates a few minutes later, injuring no one.

Four separate explosions. Individuals and group actors, representing both domestic and international terrorism. Targeting the government, the military, the general public, the transportation sector. Some causing massive fatalities and injuries, while one caused limited damage.

So, what do these four explosions have in common? Each event was caught on tape by installed security cameras. In all four cases, security camera footage documented the planning, initial steps, and/or execution of the attacks.

In the weeks following the 7/7 London attack and the subsequent attempted repeat attack two weeks later, authorities credited London's Ring of Steel – a series of hundreds of cameras and other technological devices – with helping identify the attacks' perpetrators. New York City and several other cities around the United States are considering or have already implemented similar systems. These systems may include cameras, recognition tools, license plate readers, and possibly even chemical, biological, and radiological (CBR) sensor equipment. But in the case of the London bombings and even the other attacks mentioned, the Rings of Steel showed themselves to be useful forensically but were not quite as impenetrable as some might have hoped.

The question for security professionals then is how to create their own rings of steel. How can one organization use technology to its best advantage to protect its most important resources – people, products, and facilities?

Some of the solutions are obvious: security cameras, physical or electronic fences, identification cards and security checkpoints, among others. But what about CBR equipment? What equipment should organizations employ to protect themselves against CBR attack? The answer, of course, depends on the organization – its role, locations, clientele, etc.

That said, there are ways to make the Ring of Steel more of a reality.

First, remember that the Ring is actually several rings – a technological solution as the first line of defense, supported by the people who watch the cameras and monitor the alarms. The responders (not the same as the watchers) are the second line of defense; these local teams should be trained and have practiced how to respond to different possible incidents. A third layer of defense is provided by those in the action/decision roles; these are the organizational leadership with the authority, power, and knowledge to make decisions regarding the organization, its employees, and its stakeholders.

Second, remember that technology and people are good, but planning gives them the tools and the confidence to take action on what they see.

Third, training and exercise make perfect. And, despite what many think, the two are not synonymous. Training is the familiarization process – where employees are taught about the plans and educated about appropriate action and responses to developing events. Exercise is where that training is practiced and put into realistic scenarios.

So, is the Ring of Steel fact or fiction? It's both.

The Ring of Steel as a solely technological solution is fiction. Security cameras, sensors, and alarms cannot be effective without people who are trained to monitor, analyze and respond to the events as they unfold.

When put into practice, though – when technology and personnel come together with plans, training, and exercise – the Ring of Steel can be successfully employed. It may not stop an event from occurring, however, it will allow for faster, more effective reaction and response and overall better results for your organization.

Deena Disraelly is a research staff member at the Institute for Defense Analyses and a doctoral candidate at The George Washington University focusing on education, modeling, policy, and planning for emergency and consequence management in the military and civilian sectors. The views expressed in this article presented are those of the author and do not necessarily represent or reflect those of the Institute for Defense Analyses, the Department of Defense, or the federal government.

Britt Mallow: Lectures to Michigan law enforcement

On April 23, 2008, Council Vice Chair Britt Mallow spoke at the Michigan State Police Homeland Security Conference in Grand Rapids Michigan. Britt spoke on lessons learned from the Global War on Terrorism, Department of Defense Terrorism investigations, the DoD Criminal Investigation Task Force (CITF), detainee operations and interrogation methods. Britt is currently Director, National Security Programs, SRA Homeland Security Center.

Dr. Robin McFee: Addressing the complex needs of returning troops

There are significant challenges the military face – physical, mental, social and financial – and a relative lack of familiarity among much of the civilian health care system in terms of addressing the complex needs of returning troops. In an effort to address this, Council member Dr. Robin McFee in collaboration with Elsevier Publishing authored a monograph entitled “Gulf War Servicemen and Servicewomen: The Long Road Home and the Role of Health Care Professionals to Enhance the Troop’s Health and Healing.” It was published in its entirety in the May 2008 edition of Disease A Month.

Peter S. Probst: Lectures at key NATO conference

Peter S. Probst, Senior Partner National Security Associates World Wide, continues to have one of the busiest schedules of any Council member. In March 2008 he participated in a NATO terrorism conference on deradicalization in Budapest. He addressed the conference on the “Political Action Operations of the American Branch of the Muslim Brotherhood.” Peter has also accepted an invitation to join the International Advisory Board of the prestigious International Institute for Counter Terrorism (ICT) at the Interdisciplinary Center Herzliya.

Michael R. Bouchard: Senior ATF executive makes a smooth transition to the private sector

With his calm professionalism and work ethic, no one doubted that Council Chair Michael R. Bouchard would make a smooth transition from senior levels of law enforcement to the private sector.

But he’s quickly achieved that – and more.

Mike, who retired in 2007, currently serves as EOD Technology’s Corporate Security Manager, with oversight over EODT’s domestic and international sites, as well their IT assets. Prior to assuming this position, he was EODT’s Homeland Security Senior Advisor. He has expertise in Homeland/Corporate Security and has specific expertise in areas including Risk Management, Disaster Response, Crisis Management, Program Oversight, Strategic Planning, Workforce Management, and Regulatory Compliance.

Mike has more than 25 years of senior law enforcement experience. In December 2007, he retired from the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (ATF) where he served in a number of key positions such as: Assistant to the Director, Assistant Director Field Operations, Deputy Assistant Director for Intelligence and Information, Chief of Arson and Explosives Programs and Special Agent in Charge, Resource Management Branch. He held several key field positions such as Special Agent in Charge, Baltimore Field Division and Assistant Special Agent in Charge, Baltimore Field Division.

Throughout his career, he supervised several significant incidents for ATF. He supervised ATF’s assets at the Pentagon on September 11, 2001, and was one of the incident commanders during the Beltway Sniper investigation. He also supervised ATF’s National Response Teams during several events, including the 2002 Winter Olympics in Salt Lake City, Utah.

Prior to joining ATF, he was a police officer. He earned a Masters of Science degree in National Security Strategy from the National War College, Washington DC, and a Bachelors of Science degree in Fire and Arson Investigation from the University of New Haven, West Haven, Connecticut. He also attended the “Pinnacle” course for senior flag officers at the National Defense University, Washington DC; was a member of the Senior Executive Service for more than four years and received extensive executive leadership training throughout his career. He is also a Certified Protection Professional through ASIS.

He is active in a number of organizations such as: the International Association of Police Chiefs, International Association of Arson Investigators, Intelligence and National Security Alliance, ASIS International, Police Executive Research Forum and serves on a number of committees within these organizations.

Political Warfare and the Muslim Brotherhood’s American Operations (continued from page 1)

Radical Islam, in a multitude of forms and guises using a broad array of tactics and strategies, represents the prime internal security threat to our country. The government focuses primarily on the external threat, but, for literally decades, highly trained Islamist cadre have been operating successfully and with significant effect on American soil. The nature and scope of this growing and complex internal threat is rarely addressed in public forums. Some have described it as the “third rail” of American political discourse.

These American-based Islamists and the groups they represent are increasingly reliant on sophisticated Political Action operations designed to eviscerate government capabilities to uncover and dismantle terrorist cells and support mechanisms. They capitalize on our government’s failure to recognize and counter their Political Action activities, which are being promoted through a variety of instruments including seemingly independent and benign front groups established to advance the radical Islamist agenda. They use our freedoms, constitutional guarantees, and the advantages of an open society as both a sword and shield in this latest iteration of ideological warfare.

They seek to foster malignant self-doubt as best expressed by the question so many of the well meaning ask: “Why do they hate us?” The answer should be painfully obvious but, regrettably, eludes too many political figures and pundits. The truth is, the Islamists do not hate us because of the freedoms we enjoy. They do not hate us because we are wealthy and powerful. They do not hate us because of our support of Israel. They hate us because they see us as the prime impediment to the realization of their messianic vision of a global caliphate under Sharia law. They recognize that they cannot conquer us through force of arms, economic warfare or even terrorism. Their strategy is one of Political Warfare to sap our strength, self-confidence and will to resist and, thereby, leave us vulnerable to more conventional forms of aggression. History has taught that once a nation’s internal defenses are compromised and the public psychologically disarmed, a country can fall into the hands of an adversary like a ripe fruit – a strategy practiced successfully by both the Bolsheviks and the Nazis.

Political Warfare

Political Warfare is an unfamiliar concept to most Americans. Essentially, it is an umbrella term that embraces a panoply of strategies, tactics and capabilities. It is, in essence, a tool kit from which the operator may draw to mount and tailor a campaign to demoralize, paralyze, bleed and, ultimately, vanquish an adversary. At its most effective, it is usually a mix of Psychological Operations, Political Action, and Terror. Tactics may oscillate between extreme violence and the apparently benign, the aim being to erode the public’s will to resist and to foster a readiness to accept seemingly reasonable compromises that in reality represent a slippery slope to ultimate surrender. The approach is insidious and effective.

The term best used to describe the process was coined by Matyas Rakosi, the Hungarian Communist Party Boss who prided himself on his slavish devotion to Stalin and who, in a moment of cynical candor, explained how the communists seized power. Basically, it was “Salami Tactics,” Rakosi boasted – “demanding a little more each day, like cutting up a salami, thin slice after thin

slice...” Salami tactics were a favorite of the Communists, the Fascists, and now have been embraced by the radical Islamists.

America as Safe Haven

Although we may be loath to admit it, for years America has been used as safe haven by terrorist groups. Shielded by our constitutional guarantees, such groups have felt free to raise funds, disseminate propaganda, recruit cadre and foot soldiers, and mount operations. One of their prime goals has been to influence the American public and our elected representatives. They lobby, lie and dissemble, counting on American naiveté and good will to cut them the slack they need to promote the revolutions they seek.

They burrow deep, and integrate themselves into our communities and political fabric. They cultivate members of Congress, media, pundits, civil rights organizations, and those the Communists labeled “useful idiots.” Through a variety of mechanisms such as political fronts, mass organizations, friendly media, NGOs, charities and agents-of-influence, they mobilize support, forge alliances, and exploit the sympathy needed to provide political advantage and expand their political base.

American-based Islamists intensively promote coalition building across divisions of class, party, religion and ethnicity. They are extremely adroit at exploiting the hubris, vanity and lust for power of politicians, pundits and opportunists; as well as, the best impulses of the well-meaning who are desperately seeking to build a better world through accommodations that too often paper over fundamental differences and promise peace in our time.

Successful terror groups demonstrate a keen appreciation of the art of Political Warfare. They capitalize on the mistakes of governments that either fail to respond to the threat they represent, or respond in a heavy-handed and predictably counterproductive fashion. Only recently have we come to realize that organizations committed to Global Jihad are active in the United States, and for years have been engaged in operations designed to destroy the nation.

Targeting of America

Most Americans are unaware that until 9/11, the terror group HAMAS, a creation of the Muslim Brotherhood, received its primary funding not from the Middle East or the Gulf States, but from American citizens and legal resident aliens who constituted its primary source of financial support. Radical Imams and HAMAS cadre from Jordan, Egypt, Gaza and the West Bank criss-crossed the country speaking and raising funds at radical mosques, local community centers, college campuses and corporate boardrooms, as well as at gatherings in private homes where they courted the wealthy and influential. They inspired their audiences by vivid accounts of heroic sacrifice and lauded the success of suicide operations. Sometimes they would even be accompanied by a wanted HAMAS terrorist who would regale the audience with first-hand accounts of mayhem and murder. These “circuit riders” galvanized support among the impressionable and the committed, generating a flow of contributions that kept HAMAS flush and lethal.

Successfully circumventing INS controls, individuals such as Abdel Aziz Odeh, the spiritual leader of Palestinian Islamic Jihad (PIJ) and an unindicted co-conspirator in the World Trade Center bombing, made multiple visits to the U.S. to fundraise and for purposes political recruitment. Yusef Al Qaradawi, the Muslim Brotherhood leader who has called for the taking over of the United States and for suicide bombings, also traveled throughout the country as has Kamal Hilbawi, a Muslim Brotherhood spokesman who advocates attacks on American targets.

HAMAS and other Jihadii groups use such visits to propagandize, identify new opportunities, spot and develop new talent and, ultimately, recruit likely prospects. Young Americans – blond haired, blue eyed, and carrying American passports – are the gold standard. Former military are particularly prized. By virtue of their American citizenship, such operatives can travel the world in the cause of revolutionary Islam and, for the most part, remain above suspicion.

For some 16 years, the head of the political wing of HAMAS, Mousa Abu Marzook, lived in Falls Church, Virginia. The current head of Palestinian Islamic Jihad (PIJ), Ramadan Abdullah Shallah, worked as a professor at the University of South Florida. There he taught America’s children, before leaving the United States for Damascus to assume control of the PIJ. Khalid Sheik Mohammad, the architect of the 9/11 attack, went to school in North Carolina. Sami al-Arian, an engineering

professor at the University of South Florida, opened a university-affiliated think tank called the World Islamic Studies Enterprise from where he ran PIJ terrorists worldwide. These American-based operatives hid in plain sight. They often chose small towns and cities because they presented, and continue to present, a permissive operational environment.

Some of the most valued al Qaeda operatives have been U.S. citizens. Wadi Al Hage, Osama bin Laden's former private secretary and a trusted al Qaeda operative, is a U.S. citizen. He attended the University of Southwest Louisiana and lived in Tucson, Arizona and Arlington, Texas. Al Hage was a prime mover in al Qaeda's entry into the international diamond trade, which resulted in a close working relationship between Sunni (al Qaeda) and Shia (Hizbullah) Jihadists. (Jihad makes strange bedfellows.) Al Hage is now serving a life sentence in a maximum-security prison for conspiracy to commit terrorism and for his role in the August 1998 bombings of our embassies in Nairobi, Kenya and Dar Es Saalam, Tanzania.

Ali Muhammad, a former Egyptian Intelligence Officer, became a U.S. citizen and worked at the John F. Kennedy Special Warfare Center at Ft. Bragg. There, he lectured on Middle East Culture and terrorism to some of our most sensitive and elite military units. He was widely regarded as an expert on radical Islam, a reputation that was well deserved since he also served as a key bin Laden military advisor, helping to plan some of al Qaeda's most devastating attacks including the bombing of the U.S. Embassy in Nairobi.

Adam Ghadan, convert to Islam and the American spokesman for al Qaeda, was born in California. Attracted to Islam at an early age, he ultimately embraced it in its most radical form. He promotes the concept of an Islamist America under Sharia law and owing fealty to Osama bin Laden.

The Strategy

While we understandably worry about terrorist infiltration across our borders, the uncomfortable truth is they already live among us as quiet, affable, next door neighbors who keep an immaculate lawn, are members of the garden club, and baby-sit our kids. Border security is vital but so is countering the internal threat which, too often, is treated in a dismissive and even contemptuous fashion. Often labeled by the foolish or malevolent as "Islamophobia" or "bigotry," the American-based Islamists do their best to erode our confidence in government's efforts to secure the homeland and, too often, such efforts are inadvertently aided by government incompetence and misdirected zeal.

And when the motivations of the Islamists are called into question and links between them and terrorist groups exposed, they turn to invective lawsuit in an attempt to intimidate and silence their critics. Being blessed with deep pockets, they were, in the past, too often successful. They had learned that the best defense is an aggressive "take-no-prisoners" offense. But their detractors also learned to meet their lawsuits head on using "discovery" and other tools of the American legal system to turn the tables. The War on Terrorism is being fought on a variety of fronts by some very unlikely people.

Soft Power

When we talk of the radical Islamist arsenal most think in terms of AK-47s, improvised explosive devices and weapons of mass destruction. But there are other weapons that topple governments and destroy democracies. These are the tools of "soft power" that mold public opinion and influence public policy.

Most fail to recognize that even the most seemingly benign and inoffensive organizations established by such political cadre seek to advance the radical Islamist agenda, which is anything but benign and inoffensive. Such organizations operate on two levels. There is the public face – the image being one of reasonableness, openness, tolerance and a readiness to seek compromise and accommodation, asking only the right to peacefully practice their faith as is guaranteed under our constitution. Then there is the hidden agenda, which is to destroy our constitutional guarantees and democratic values that enable them to operate so freely. It is part of a calculated effort to dissemble and mislead. It is a bit like the pedophile who carefully bandages the knee of the little girl injured in a school yard and gently dries her tears. The action may be laudable, but the motive is vile.

A prime target has been the American education system. We see evidence of significant Islamist inroads not only on college campuses, but in elementary, secondary and high school classrooms where radical Islamists have successfully sought to influence the content of text books and provide subtly slanted educational material. In some cities, Islamists are helping design curricula ostensibly “sensitive” to “Muslim concerns,” but in reality are part of a broader cultural offensive that distorts history, devalues the American experience and attempts to use our educational system as a tool of political indoctrination to advance a brutal and intolerant ideology. As the Jesuits have noted: “Give me a child until he is seven, and I will give you the man.” It is a principle that holds true for good or for ill.

The Actors

A prime mover in such efforts was Abdurahman Alamoudi, the founder and Executive Director of the American Muslim Council (AMC), which, for many years, was regarded as the premier American Muslim organization. Alamoudi was regarded by both Republican and Democratic administrations as the “go to guy” on issues that could affect Muslim America. Alamoudi was an honored guest at the White House, posed for photographs with American Presidents and their families, and rubbed elbows with political movers and shakers of both political parties. This was a man the government believed represented moderation and the best Muslim America had to offer. He even represented the Muslim American community at memorial services held at the National Cathedral to honor the victims of 9/11.

Alamoudi’s luck held until 2003, when he was detained at Gatwick Airport trying to enter the U.S. with some \$340,000 of Libyan money. He was arrested on his arrival at Dulles and ultimately charged with making some 10 illegal trips to Libya in violation of U.S. law. As part of a plea agreement, he surrendered an estimated \$910,000 he had received from the Libyan government, and acknowledged his role in a plot to assassinate then-Crown Prince Abdullah of Saudi Arabia. (Alamoudi had agreed to try to recruit the assassins.)* Alamoudi also acknowledged membership in the Muslim Brotherhood, and the Treasury Department reports that he had raised a million dollars for al Qaeda.

**Abdurahman Alamoudi Sentenced to Jail in Terrorism Financing Case,” U.S. Department of Justice Press Release, October 15, 2004, http://www.usdoj.gov/opa/pr/2004/October/04_crm_698.htm.*

This is a man who represents the quintessential agent-of-influence, and his loss no doubt was a severe blow to the Muslim Brotherhood. Abdurahman Alamoudi is currently serving a 23- year sentence in a federal penitentiary

Dallas and the Smoking Gun

Last fall, there was a watershed event that ironically involved a mistrial and a case the government plans to retry. The drama played out in a courtroom in Dallas, Texas where key members of a Muslim charity, the Holy Land Foundation, were charged with conspiring to funnel funds to the terrorist group HAMAS.

Particularly telling were documents that had been seized from personal files of the radical American Islamist leadership. Their authenticity was not disputed by the defendants.¹ The government charged that these papers revealed that for some 40 years, the Muslim Brotherhood has been carrying out aggressive operations in the United States, using fronts, charities and a variety of other mechanisms to fund HAMAS and other terrorist groups.

The Muslim Brotherhood, established in Egypt in 1928, is the umbrella organization for at least 70 Islamist organizations around the world. Most Americans, even those who are politically savvy, know little about the Brotherhood other than that it is a shadowy, politically powerful organization that operates globally and often follows a dual track policy. Where legal, it enters the political process much as any other political party, and is often successful in realizing or, at least, advancing its political agenda. Where illegal, it has historically resorted to terrorism, assassination and other

¹ Court documents that pertain to this case as well as accurate and detailed analysis can be found on the web site of the NEFA foundation at <http://www.nefafoundation.org/hlfdocs.html>, and in the articles/analyses of Douglas Farah, Ron Sandee and Josh Lefkowitz.

forms of violence. It is active and powerful across the Middle East, North Africa and in Europe. The trial revealed the Muslim Brotherhood and its affiliates have also developed a significant and entrenched presence in the United States.

For those of us who remember the Cold War, the activities of the American branch of the Muslim Brotherhood has a very familiar ring. That was a period in our history when subversion and espionage were rife, and the goals of local communist parties were set and coordinated by Moscow. These tactics were well documented by former Cold War warriors who spent their careers locked in this life and death struggle. Moscow made wide use of front groups, agents-of-influence, vicious propaganda, covert action and individuals they dubbed “useful idiots.” The use of these and related tactics is now mirrored by the activities of the Muslim Brotherhood in America.

It is increasingly clear that Political Warfare did not die with the end of the Cold War. The Holy Land Foundation trial helped bring into sharp focus the nature and extent of the Brotherhood’s activities within the United States. One of the most important documents the government entered into evidence was a 1991 memorandum titled “*On the General Strategic Goal for the Group in North America.*” Written by a senior Muslim Brotherhood official, the document lays out the role of the Brothers or *Ikhwan* in America:

“The process of settlement [in the United States]² is a “Civilization-Jihadist Process” with all the word means. The Ikhwan [Brothers]³ must understand that their work in America is a kind of grand Jihad in eliminating and destroying the Western civilization from within and “sabotaging” its miserable house by their hands and the hands of the believers so that it is eliminated and God’s religion is made victorious over all other religions. Without this level of understanding we are not up to this challenge and have not prepared ourselves for Jihad yet. It is a Muslim’s destiny to perform Jihad and work wherever he is and wherever he lands until the final hour comes, and there is no escape from that destiny except for those who chose (SIC) to slack...”⁴

There is no ambiguity as to the aims of the group, nor any effort to dignify their interpretation of Jihad as some sought of an existential spiritual struggle. It makes clear that the goal of the Brotherhood’s American branch is the destruction of the United States, Judeo-Christian values, and the ultimate Islamization of America.

The document also lists 29 groups under the heading “A list of our organizations and organizations of our friends...” and includes some of the most prominent and vocal Muslim-American organizations in the United States. Those listed include the Islamic Society of North America (ISNA), the North American Islamic Trust, the Muslim Student Association (MSA), the Muslim Arab Youth Association, and the Occupied Land Fund which later became the Holy Land Foundation.

According to exhibits entered into evidence at the Holy Land Foundation trial and recently made available to the public by the NEFA Foundation, the Muslim Brotherhood, shortly after it had established HAMAS, directed its Palestinian Committees worldwide to energetically support the organization. To this end, a complementary, seemingly independent stable of front organizations were established.*

Fronts established in the United States included: The United Association for Studies and Research (UASR) which functioned as a ‘think tank;’ The Islamic Association for Palestine (IAP) which focused on propaganda and political action; and the Occupied Land Fund that later became The Holy Land Foundation, and was created to collect and funnel contributions to HAMAS.⁵

The government also entered into evidence information pertaining to a 1993 clandestine meeting held in Philadelphia. There, Omar Ahmad, then-President of the Islamic Association of Palestine

² My note added for clarity.

³ My note added for clarity.

⁴ Government Exhibit 003-0085; 3:04-CR-240-G; U.S. v HLF, et al., P.21.

⁵ U.S. v Holy Land Foundation (N.D. TX.) No. 3:04-CR-240-G, Government’s Trial Brief <http://nefafoundation.org/miscellaneous/HLF/U.S.v.HLF.TrialBrief.PDF>.

(IAP) emphasized the need to strengthen radical Islamist influence with Congress. The IAP has been named by the government as both a Muslim Brotherhood and HAMAS front.

"This can be achieved by infiltrating the American media outlets, university and research centers... If Muslims engage in political activism in America and started to be concerned with Congress and public relations we will an entry point to use them to pressure Congress and the decision-makers in America."⁶

According to an article by Nihad Awad, (IAP Public Relations Director) he, together with Omar Ahmad (IAP President) resigned from the organization to establish the Council on American-Islamic Relations (CAIR).⁷ Joined by Rafeeq Jaber (who also had served as an IAP President), they wanted to create a new organization that would not be defined by the Palestinian struggle but, rather, had a broader mission and would project an image of moderation and accommodation. It was determined that CAIR would define itself as the premier Muslim American organization dedicated to combating anti-Muslim discrimination nationwide.

An article reportedly published by CAIR and cited in press accounts notes that the North American Islamic Trust (NAIT), an ISNA subsidiary,⁸ owns approximately 27% of the estimated 1,200 mosques in the United States.⁹ This platform provides the *Ikhwan* and their supporters a bully pulpit for indoctrination and recruitment. Many of those Mosques that they do not own or control are currently targets for hostile takeover.

In a 1999 testimony before a State Department forum, Shaykh Muhammad Hisham Kabbani, a highly respected Muslim leader and a moderate, testified that some 80% of the mosques in the United States are controlled by radicals, an analysis borne out by other analysts. As a result of his candor, Shaykh Kabbani was subjected to an organized campaign of harassment that was so extreme that many believed his life was in danger.

What was described in these exhibits is the creation of a sophisticated, coordinated covert action capability dedicated to the destruction of our constitutionally guaranteed liberties and the supplanting of the Republic by a radical Islamist theocracy.

Political Correctness Run Amok

To most in government, revelations such as these were worrisome but dismissed as anomalies. There was little speculation in government that there might be a larger, organized, well-oiled conspiracy. Those who sought to probe further often found their efforts constrained, undermined or thwarted by a culture of "risk avoidance" and "political correctness" that in recent years has run amok. It is the nature of government bureaucracies to abhor controversy, particularly controversy involving matters of faith. Few in government are willing to open themselves to accusations of bigotry, knowing that even groundless accusations can be costly in terms of time, money, lost promotions and battered reputations. For those working in such a setting, controversy is anything but career enhancing. It is like being accused of being a pedophile. Although the individual may be cleared of all charges, the accusation alone can cause irreparable damage. It is McCarthyism in reverse.

Muslim Americans constitute a significant voting bloc, and there has been little desire to risk antagonizing a vocal, wealthy and increasingly powerful minority by putting some of its most revered leaders under a microscope. These and other factors promote a culture that has contributed to government inertia which is reflected, today, by public indifference.

⁶ U.S. v Holy Land Foundation (N.D. TX.) No. 3:04-CR-240-G, Government Exhibit 016-0075, http://nefafoundation.org/miscellaneous/HLF/93Philly_12.pdf.

⁷ Nihad Awad, "Muslim-Americans in Mainstream America," The Link, February-March 2000

⁸ The government named CAIR, NAIT and ISNA as Muslim Brotherhood fronts and unindicted co-conspirators.

⁹ http://www.sptimes.com/2003/03/11/news_pf/Worldandnation: Saudi form of Islam wars with moderates

Despite all that has been documented and is in the public record, CAIR and its sister organizations successfully court American politicians who continue to seek their approval and endorsement. CAIR has even successfully partnered with the FBI to provide Bureau agents "sensitivity training." I am sure, if asked, Bureau officials who promote such programs would state that they are motivated by a desire to build bridges to the American Muslim community and to open productive communications with moderate elements within CAIR.

According to press reports, as many as 14 members of CAIR, some in senior leadership positions, have been linked to terrorist activities or are in jail as a result of such activities. There can be little doubt that other investigations are in play. I would argue that if FBI agents need sensitivity training, the federal government, with all its resources, surely could find a more reputable organization to provide it. To me, the situation is as absurd as if the Bureau were to recruit "moderate" Nazis or Communists to provide FBI agents an understanding of their respective ideologies, values and contributions to the American way of life. So my questions remain: "Just why is the FBI using CAIR to train its agents, and who within the Bureau championed this initiative?" Perhaps there are just some things man was not meant to know.

For CAIR, participation in the program has been a propaganda bonanza. They cite their partnership with the Bureau as an unofficial endorsement and, in effect, a "Good Housekeeping seal of approval." They argue that no one should question their patriotic credentials when the FBI trusts them enough to train its agents.

Activities such as described not only suggest a serious lack of coordination within DOJ, but a failure to recognize that such actions confer a de-facto legitimacy that promotes the agendas of the Islamists and sends a mixed and contradictory message to the American public and to American citizens of the Muslim faith. To say that CAIR, ISNA, NAIT and their sister organizations are masters of Political Warfare would be gross understatement.

What has been revealed, largely as the fruits of that trial in Dallas, is that Political Warfare on a grand scale, is being played out across the American landscape, and little is being done to blunt, much less counter, the message of the radical Islamists or their political and cultural offensive being waged on American soil against America's citizens and institutions. It is being waged in the corridors of power, on the Internet and in local and national media. It is being waged not only in the Mosques but within America's Muslim communities as well. Many believe that moderate Muslims who constitute the majority have largely been isolated and marginalized by a driven, vocal, disciplined and ruthless minority.

Khalid Duran, a highly respected Muslim scholar and close friend, has described it as a "struggle for the soul of Islam." Several years ago, Dr. Duran, a resident of the United States and on the road to citizenship, was the target of a fatwa and, like Salman Rushdie, was forced into hiding. The decree, reportedly solicited by American Islamists, was issued by the radical Jordanian cleric Abu Zant. It stated that Khalid Duran's blood may be spilt, which is a standard formulation for sanctioning murder. To me, it is clear that Abu Zant's American supplicants had engaged in a solicitation to commit murder which, as I understand it, is a criminal offense. However, I have been unable to determine if any serious effort was made to determine if the American Islamists who sought the fatwa had violated U.S. law.

If all this seems eerily familiar, it should, as it appears that with just a bit of tinkering and tailoring, the American Branch of the Muslim Brotherhood has adopted the political play book of the Communist Party. As the Communists of an earlier era, it has established a web of front groups, media outlets, charities and other entities to promote an ideology that calls for our destruction.

Just as the Soviets, through the Comintern and similar mechanisms, mounted a more than 50-year campaign of subversion, covert action, deception, disinformation and misinformation against the Western democracies, so have the Radical Islamists through the Muslim Brotherhood. Like the Communists, they have been able to insinuate themselves into the highest councils of government and into the confidence of some of our most sensitive law enforcement and intelligence agencies. They meet with Presidents, policy makers, and those who shape American public opinion. Their assertion that they represent the voice of moderate Islam and Muslim America has largely gone unchallenged in the popular press and other media.

We are facing a sophisticated and calculated campaign to shape public perception and define a new political reality. Until our political leadership and the American public fully appreciate the nature and scope of the struggle, the Brotherhood, in its various forms and guises, will continue to mount aggressive operations to achieve the ultimate Islamization of America and the imposition of Sharia law. The government's failure to mount an effective and coordinated response to the Muslim Brotherhood's political/cultural offensive suggests a fundamental lack of understanding as to the nature of the conflict in which we are now engaged. The American people deserve better.

What we are engaged in is not a War on Terrorism but, rather, a protracted Political Conflict in which our War on Terror is but one component. This is a conflict that cannot be won with bombs, guns and technology. This is a war of ideas and competing ideologies. It is Political Warfare in the broadest sense. It is a conflict that will last generations. Our adversaries take the long view; whereas, we continue to be mired in an approach geared to the annual budget cycle. The radical Islamists demonstrate a sense of Grand Strategy. Regrettably, we do not.

Fighting terrorism is not a game for an impatient people. One must carefully think through second and third order consequences. Good intelligence, tenacity, uncommon courage, disciplined restraint, and an engaged public are required. Education is key. However, the public continues to be fed a diet of "feel good" messages and sound bites that do more to obfuscate than inform; and fail to frame for the public a comprehensive, coherent counterterrorism strategy needed to meet an escalating threat. The way we choose to meet the challenge; the strategies and tactics we employ; and how we marshal and deploy our resources will largely determine the winners, the losers, and the price paid by each.

Council member Peter S. Probst served most of his 30-year career with the Central Intelligence Agency and the Office of the Secretary of Defense addressing future terrorist threats and the development of strategies, tactics and policy initiatives to counter them. He also co-authored a provocative major study, "Terror-2000: The Future Face of Terrorism". He is now a private consultant advising government and Fortune 100 business leaders on the issues of terrorism, political warfare, and infrastructure vulnerability.