

**THE HOMELAND SECURITY IMPLICATIONS OF
RADICALIZATION**

HEARING

BEFORE THE

**SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE,
INFORMATION SHARING, AND
TERRORISM RISK ASSESSMENT**

OF THE

**COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

ONE HUNDRED NINTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

SEPTEMBER 20, 2006

Serial No. 109-104

Printed for the use of the Committee on Homeland Security



Available via the World Wide Web: <http://www.gpoaccess.gov/congress/index.html>

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

35-626 PDF

WASHINGTON : 2008

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Internet: bookstore.gpo.gov Phone: toll free (866) 512-1800; DC area (202) 512-1800
Fax: (202) 512-2104 Mail: Stop IDCC, Washington, DC 20402-0001

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY

PETER T. KING, New York, *Chairman*

DON YOUNG, Alaska	BENNIE G. THOMPSON, Mississippi
LAMAR S. SMITH, Texas	LORETTA SANCHEZ, California
CURT WELDON, Pennsylvania	EDWARD J. MARKEY, Massachusetts
CHRISTOPHER SHAYS, Connecticut	NORMAN D. DICKS, Washington
JOHN LINDER, Georgia	JANE HARMAN, California
MARK E. SOUDER, Indiana	PETER A. DEFAZIO, Oregon
TOM DAVIS, Virginia	NITA M. LOWEY, New York
DANIEL E. LUNGREN, California	ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, District of Columbia
JIM GIBBONS, Nevada	ZOE LOFGREN, California
ROB SIMMONS, Connecticut	SHEILA JACKSON-LEE, Texas
MIKE ROGERS, Alabama	BILL PASCRELL, JR., New Jersey
STEVAN PEARCE, New Mexico	DONNA M. CHRISTENSEN, U.S. Virgin Islands
KATHERINE HARRIS, Florida	BOB ETHERIDGE, North Carolina
BOBBY JINDAL, Louisiana	JAMES R. LANGEVIN, Rhode Island
DAVE G. REICHERT, Washington	KENDRICK B. MEEK, Florida
MICHAEL MCCAUL, Texas	
CHARLIE DENT, Pennsylvania	
GINNY BROWN-WAITE, Florida	

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, INFORMATION SHARING, AND
TERRORISM RISK ASSESSMENT

ROB SIMMONS, Connecticut, *Chairman*

CURT WELDON, Pennsylvania	ZOE LOFGREN, California
MARK E. SOUDER, Indiana	LORETTA SANCHEZ, California
DANIEL E. LUNGREN, California	JANE HARMAN, California
JIM GIBBONS, Nevada	NITA M. LOWEY, New York
STEVAN PEARCE, New Mexico	SHEILA JACKSON-LEE, Texas
BOBBY JINDAL, Louisiana	JAMES R. LANGEVIN, Rhode Island
CHARLIE DENT, Pennsylvania	KENDRICK B. MEEK, Florida
GINNY BROWN-WAITE, Florida	BENNIE G. THOMPSON, Mississippi (<i>Ex Officio</i>)
PETER T. KING, NEW YORK (<i>Ex Officio</i>)	

CONTENTS

	Page
STATEMENTS	
The Honorable Rob Simmons, a Representative in Congress From the State of Connecticut, and Chairman, Subcommittee on Intelligence, Information Sharing, and Terrorism Risk Assessment	1
The Honorable Zoe Lofgren, a Representative in Congress From the State of California, and Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Intelligence, Information Sharing, and Terrorism Risk Assessment	60
The Honorable Peter T. King, a Representative in Congress From the State of New York, and Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security	6
The Honorable Charlie Dent, a Representative in Congress From the State of Pennsylvania	6
The Honorable Nita M. Lowey, a Representative in Congress From the State of New York	5
WITNESSES	
Mr. Javed Ali, Senior Intelligence Officer, U.S. Department of Homeland Security:	
Oral Statement	15
Prepared Statement	16
Mr. Randall Blake, Al-Qa'ida Group Chief, National Counterterrorism Center:	
Oral Statement	7
Prepared Statement	9
Mr. Don Van Duyn, Assistant Director, Counterterrorism Division, Federal Bureau of Investigations:	
Oral Statement	11
Prepared Statement	13
PANEL II	
Mr. Frank Cilluffo, Director, Homeland Security Policy Institute, The George Washington University:	
Oral Statement	31
Prepared Statement	33
Mr. Steven Emerson, Executive Director, The Investigative Project on Terrorism:	
Oral Statement	45
Prepared Statement	47
Dr. Walid Phares, Senior Fellow, Foundation for the Defense Democracies:	
Oral Statement	25
Prepared Statement	28
Mr. John D. Woodward, Associate Director, RAND Policy Institute:	
Oral Statement	39
Prepared Statement	42
FOR THE RECORD	
Dr. M. Saud Anwar, Chairman, American Muslim Peace Initiative:	
Prepared Statement	2

THE HOMELAND SECURITY IMPLICATIONS OF RADICALIZATION

Wednesday, September 20, 2006

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, INFORMATION
SHARING, AND TERRORISM RISK ASSESSMENT,
Washington, DC.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 1:32 p.m., in Room 2212, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Rob Simmons [chairman of the subcommittee] presiding.

Present: Representatives Simmons, King, Dent, Lofgren, Lowey, and Langevin.

Mr. SIMMONS. [Presiding.] A quorum being present, the Committee on Homeland Security's Subcommittee on Intelligence, Information Sharing, and Terrorism Risk Assessment will come to order.

Today the subcommittee meets to hear testimony on the homeland security implications of radicalization.

For some time, members of this subcommittee have been interested in this issue, but this hearing began to take shape last July when members of the subcommittee travelled with me to Toronto, Canada, to learn more about the alleged plot involving a group of individuals in the Toronto area who were arrested for conspiring to attack their own homeland using approximately three tons of ammonium nitrates.

We visited the neighborhoods, we saw the schools, and these were not disadvantaged individuals. In fact, as we observed the neighborhood, we were told that the homes were \$300,000 homes. It was an integrated neighborhood. The schools looked like the same sorts of schools that I have back in my hometown in Stonington, Connecticut.

And so, the question that I had in my mind and that we had in our minds was, what exactly caused these young, second-generation Muslims, many of whom were of Pakistani background, to become radicalized? What were the conditions that were at work here? And how can we better understand this issue?

This is not an issue just for Canada or just for Great Britain. This is an issue for us as Americans, here within the continental United States. This is an issue for us as people concerned about the homeland security. This is an issue for us who have Muslims in our districts and in our communities, who want to better understand what the forces might be at play that could cause this radicalization to take place.

Not testifying today but submitting testimony is a friend and a colleague of mine from Connecticut, Dr. Saud Anwar, who has written a paper on the subject and who has shared with me his thoughts on the subject. And I just want to mention a few of the conclusions and recommendations, and then I will ask that his whole paper be put in the record for future reference.

But one of the things he says is that the American Muslims are more integrated and assimilated into U.S. society than perhaps their European or Canadian counterparts. They are working to counter current challenges by being more socially and politically active. They are looking for better integration within our political community and increasing communication and coordination. And so on and so on and so forth.

And I can tell you that, from my own experience in dealing with Dr. Anwar, his family and his community, we have had many long and very constructive discussions about the issues that might give rise to radicalization.

And I would hope that this hearing, in a way, would become the beginning of a conversation—a conversation that we might initiate here in this subcommittee but that we can then extend out into our districts and into our states, to talk with our friends and neighbors in the Muslim community, to meet in their meeting places, to gather to exchange views, so that we can attempt to better understand what their issues might be and then attempt to better understand what the issues of other Muslims elsewhere in the world might be.

And so, it is with that in mind that I have called for this hearing.
[The statement of Dr. Anwar follows:]

FOR THE RECORD

PREPARED STATEMENT OF M. SAUD ANWAR MD, MPH, CHAIRMAN, AMERICAN MUSLIM PEACE INITIATIVE

Immigrant American Muslims and European Muslims: Similarities and Differences & Homeland Security Implications:

OPENING:

Chairman Simmons, Ranking Member Lofgren, and Members of the Subcommittee, My name is M. Saud Anwar; I am the Chairperson of the American Muslim Peace Initiative. American Muslim Peace Initiative is a network of organizations and leaders of various organizations uniting our voices to articulate the challenges and opportunities for promoting peace in our neighborhoods, our nation and our world.

I would like to thank you for holding this very important hearing today and also allowing me an opportunity to underscore the American Muslim Peace Initiatives' strong commitment to help understand and share the American Muslim community's perspectives and help identify ways of making our homeland safe and secure.

I have been the Founder and Past President of the Pakistani American Association of Connecticut, a grass root organization of Pakistani Americans in Connecticut. Subsequently, I have served as a Secretary of the Pakistani American Public Affairs Committee, a nationwide organization of Pakistani Americans. I am the President Elect of this organization. I am also the founder of a community out reach program for Pakistani Americans and American Muslim partnership with our law enforcement agencies to help build bridges between the American Muslims and our law enforcement agencies. With these initiatives I have had the chance to interact with a large community of American Muslims and Pakistani Americans to share perspectives informally and formally. In order to get a quantitative and qualitative perspective of the community members, a study was performed to look at the acculturation status and views of the American Muslims of Pakistani heritage and multiple group discussion with the people from different segments were held to help learn the perspectives of people from a wide array of backgrounds.

INTRODUCTION

The American-Muslims are believed to be a community of about seven million people. This group is highly educated: 67% of American Muslims have a Bachelor's degree or higher as opposed to 44% of Americans have a Bachelor's degree or higher. 33% of American Muslims hold an Advanced degree (above bachelor) and 8.6% of Americans hold an Advanced degree. (Bridges TV Data) This group is affluent with U.S. Average income is \$42,158 per year (U.S. Census 2000) 66% of American Muslim households earn over \$50,000 / year 26% of American Muslim households earn over \$100,000 / year.

Since September 11th, after the United State's coordinated response at multiple levels in the war on terror, there have been some statements and activities, which have led to concerns for an average Muslim in different parts of the world, as well as, in the United States. It is critical that the American-Muslim community, as well as, the United State's administration and Congress to have serious discussions to help understand each other's perspective and identify common grounds.

The American-Muslims have an important role to play in helping us understand perspectives, policies, reactions and responses in the war or terror. We the American Muslims enjoy religious freedoms in United States and do feel that we have a role in helping educate Muslims around the world on the true American values, and also to help educate the US Administration to be very conscious of some of the steps and wordings and activities, which have led the American-Muslim to question and be concerned about some of the US policies. There is an acute need for a combined analysis of the situation and this is the time to unite and work together to help build the bridges and reevaluate the positions which are in our best interest.

As a result of the above, some of the members of the American-Muslim community were reached out to identify some qualitative analysis of common grounds and perceptions as well as quantitative assessment of the perception and views of a segment of American Muslims that need to be shared.

Moreover, a number of that the questionnaires were sent out to the some of the American-Muslim community to help identify the makeup and the cross-cultural makeup of the some of the American-Muslim community. I will outline some of the following different components:

QUANTITATIVE DATA AND ANALYSIS:

To understand the views of American-Muslim community, the help was sought from the Pakistani American Public Affairs Committee to try and identify the views of the Pakistani American community and American community with regards to information on integration of this community and the current views in the post-9/11 era.

A questionnaire was sent to 2000 individuals by electronic means. There was a 10% response to it. The questions are placed in APPENDIX ONE. [All responses are maintained in the committee file.]

When asked the question if American Muslims were more assimilated and integrated than the European Muslims, of the responders to the questions, 69% of the people agreed that the American Muslims were more integrated than the European Muslims. 21% were not sure and the 10% felt otherwise.

When asked the questions whether the American-Muslims valued interacting with other Americans, 99.5% of the people valued interacting with their fellow Americans. These numbers are much higher than the British counterparts.

When asked whether the American Muslims would like to maintain the identity and values of their religious and ethnic origin, 84% of the people agreed and 7% were not sure and 9% said no. This suggests that the American Muslims are more inclined towards integration rather than assimilation.

When asked if the American Muslims had become more religious after 9/11 or the War on Terror, 76% of the responders said no, and 19% said yes and approximately 5% were not sure.

When asked if the American Muslims disagreed with the US foreign policies, 80% agreed with that and 4% were in disagreement and 16% were not sure.

When the community was asked if the Pakistani-Americans and American Muslims have had a wrongful negative perception in the United States, 73% were in agreement as opposed to 16% who felt otherwise. 11 % were not sure.

When asked if the American Muslims were politically and socially active, would that help change or improve the perception, 88% of the people felt yes and 12% were not sure.

When asked if the people had a feeling of hopelessness with the current situation, 22% of the people said yes as opposed to 58% of the people who did not feel hopeless and 20% were not sure.

When asked if the people were comfortable talking to a law enforcement officer, 75% of the people said that they were comfortable, as opposed to 13% who were uncomfortable and 12% were not sure.

This data does give us a glimpse into some important issues which are very relevant. This suggests that the American Muslims feel more integrated and assimilated within the American society. They also feel that they are much more integrated than their European counterparts. The percentages of people who feel marginalized or separated are minimal at this time.

With respect to the concern about people becoming more religious, a small percentage do feel that they are becoming more religious, but majority felt that that had not make them change their religious perspective and religiosity. It was also clear that the majority of the responders were in disagreement with the US policies and majority of them did feel that because of media portrayal or otherwise there was a negative perception about them. More importantly, the people do feel that to overcome this negative perception, they would have to be more politically and socially active. This to me is a good sign. In one of the questions, it was concerning to see that at least 22% some of the people have started to feel hopeless about the current situation, but majority approximately 78% of the people do not feel hopeless about the situation. The majority of the people are comfortable talking to the law enforcement agent. However, this number should increase and again appropriate actions need to be taken on the part of the American Muslim community, as well as, the law enforcement agency to try and build alliances and understanding so people feel more comfortable talking to a law enforcement officer.

QUALITATIVE DATA:

In order to develop a better understanding of some of the key issues at this time besides the quantitative data, some work was initiated on get some qualitative insight. In order to get quantitative information, some questions were sent as the qualitative questions to general community members, who were not necessarily in leadership position in organizations. These questions can be seen in APPENDIX TWO. Moreover, there were some discussions held with four groups of students and different American Muslims to get an idea about the concerns in people's minds with the current challenges.

The following are some of the patterns of issues that were raised in the discussion. Interestingly, many of the youth did not focus as much on being either of an immigrant heritage or American Muslims, but more as Americans and they felt that the life was going on a day-to-day basis. They did not feel that there was any profiling or felt prejudice from their peers.

Some in the discussions did mention about how receiving information that is out there through alternate media sources was making people upset and angry, which included the situation with the war on Iraq, Abu Ghraib, and the fact that a large number of civilians had died, and subsequently the war in Lebanon, and how that had impacted the lives of people. How the alternate media was helping people get information even simple information through BBC was a useful resource to get information on the misery of the people in the world.

A common issue that was raised was that the media and the policy makers in their commentaries or speeches should not to attack the religion of anyone which is the core of the people. Anybody who feels threatened starts to go towards the core as was seen in the post-9/11, then the churches were full because the people felt that there were under an attack and they obviously go towards the core. Whenever any community is attacked they seek refuge in religion. When a religion is attacked, people move to the core as well and when that leads to people beginning to harbor anger. This is an issue, which has been raised on multiple occasions where it appears that our account of terrorism efforts have become counter productive because of the inappropriate use of terminology. When the religion is suggested to be the source of the problem, the terrorists are given more legitimacy.

Again when asked what would be the way to help keep the people and the youth integrated in the community, appropriate use of terminology, wordings, fair implementation of policies, protection of rights, and again there also understanding of their responsibility has increased where they would be involved with more other communities to try and inform people about their true values and their ability to bridge building activity with the world.

Qualitative responses also included people's perspective of importance of stop negative portrayal of Islam and all Muslims. An acute need for empowering the moderate majority and legitimizing the efforts of the moderate Muslims was palpably felt. The psychological and emotional difficulties people feel with the bias languages used for them. People feel that Policy makers need to be educated about Islam by Muslims rather than the other sources. The introduction and information about

Islam should be set up by Muslims in a way where people can understand their perspectives and times like this, this is an acute and important responsibility of the policymakers and law enforcement agents to learn about this from appropriate sources rather than through sources, which is going to further enhance the negative stereotypes that have been created.

Profiling was again mentioned in multiple meetings and all actions should be kept to try and prevent marginalization to not to occur. This activity can help prevent the ghettoization of the American Muslims that some feel may have happened into the European Muslims. Issues about social injustice and foreign policies were mentioned by people multiple times. The written components of the qualitative questions are mentioned in APPENDIX THREE.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

(A) There are clear differences between the American and European Muslims. The American Muslims are much more integrated and assimilated into the US society than their European counterparts. The European Muslims are more likely to be separated and marginalized than what we are seeing here in the United States.

(B) The American Muslims are trying to counter the current challenges by being more socially and politically active. Majority are hopeful that their abilities to help educate and inform fellow Americans would help bear fruits by increasing understanding and harmony

(C) Wrongful use of terminologies and implicating Islam as the cause of the current situation helps legitimizes the activities of the terrorists and leads to weakening of the moderate voices amongst the Muslims and thus these careless remarks are counter-productive efforts in counter terrorism.

(D) Policies, positions and communications should be planned which would help further integration of the American Muslims within the larger society and reduce the probability of physical or psychological ghettoization that can occur.

(E) Increase communication and coordination of American Muslims and our law enforcement agencies needs to occur to help build better understanding and comfort for long term coordination and synchronization for a safe America.

(F) American Muslims do have an important role at this time to help United States make better policies with the Muslim Majority countries and help build bridges and share the true American Values with the rest of the world. Our domestic polices should help Muslims feel partners and owners in these responsibilities.

Chairman Simmons, Ranking Member Lofgren, and Members of the Subcommittee, I thank you for your consideration of my testimony and inviting me to share these perspectives.

Mr. SIMMONS. My ranking member, Zoe Lofgren from California, is tied up in the Judiciary Committee. I was told that she is on the way, and I am sure that she is on the way.

I know other members are extremely busy this week, but I would be happy at this moment to suspend the rules and to see if either of my colleagues here present would like to say a word or two on the subject. If so, I would be happy to yield to them.

The gentlelady from New York?

Mrs. LOWEY. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. And I want to thank you for calling this hearing.

And I think I will express my appreciation to you for giving me the opportunity to say a few words, but I am really anxious to get to the witnesses, because this is such a critical issue. And I don't, as the chairman says, expect to find a lot of answers in your testimony, but I do hope that we can really have serious discussions.

Not too long ago, I was in Jordan, and King Abdullah was talking about the Amman message, encouraging imams, encouraging those of the religious faith, encouraging leaders in the community to talk out publicly against equating Islam with murder, terrorism, and encouraging leaders in the community to truly be leaders and talk about reconciliation, talk about the issues that may breed radicalism.

So I look forward to the testimony. And, again, I would hope that there are more leaders, not just in the Middle East but in our country itself, who will speak out forcefully against equating Islam with terrorism and perhaps have an impact on those who might feel this is their only avenue to express their grievances.

So thank you so very much. As a citizen of the United States with three children and seven grandchildren, we realize that this is a worldwide challenge, and it is not just over in the Middle East, it is not just in London, it is not just in Europe, it is right here in the United States of America. And we have to approach it thoughtfully, intelligently and, hopefully, finding some answers that work.

Thank you very much.

Mr. SIMMONS. I thank the gentlelady from New York for her comments.

We have just been joined by the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from New York, Mr. King. And I would recognize him for any remarks he might wish to make.

Mr. KING. Thank you, Chairman Simmons.

I want to, first of all, thank you very much for convening this hearing. I believe it is a matter of great importance, the issue of radicalization of Muslims in prisons—or, Muslim radicalization of prisons is an issue which affects us right here in the United States, as well as, you know, overseas, London and Madrid.

And many of those attacks have been linked to prison radicalization. I know, for instance, I have met with various state officials from around the country, describing what a serious issue it is, whether it is California or New York. I know Senator Schumer has been very outspoken on this issue in New York.

I also know, from meeting with the police, about a number of mosques in New York which are under surveillance which do hire Muslim converts when they come out of prison. They use them as security officials at these mosques, which, to me, raises a number of serious issues.

We have to address this issue. We have to not be overly concerned about political correctness. We have to do what is right. We have to look into it. And we have to hope that more Muslim leaders will speak out and denounce terrorism which is carried out in their name.

And also we should be looking at who selects the imams to be in the prisons; what they are actually doing; what the rights are of people, as far as having religious freedom in prisons, when the imam is preaching a very radical form of Islam.

So I think this is a very, very significant and very timely hearing. And I commend the chairman for doing it. It may not be politically correct, but I think it is the courageous thing to do and the right thing to do. And I thank you very much.

And I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMMONS. I thank the gentleman.

I have, again, suspended the rules. I would be happy to recognize the gentleman from Pennsylvania for any comments while we wait for the ranking member.

Mr. DENT. Well, I just wanted to commend you, Mr. Chairman, for having this hearing on radicalization.

I think the events of the U.K. recently demonstrate why this issue should be high on the agenda. Many of us had always thought that those who became radical Muslims often maybe were brought up in squalid refugee camps, perhaps, in the West Bank.

But what we saw in the U.K. were young men who seemed to be raised in a Western environment, British citizens in many cases, who were not from a traditionally very poor or underprivileged background, and have taken on this radical ideology and attempted to do horrible things.

And for that, I commend you. And I really look forward to receiving the testimony of those who are presenting today. Thank you, and I yield back.

Mr. SIMMONS. I thank the gentleman.

I see we have also been joined by the gentleman from Rhode Island, Mr. Langevin.

I have taken the liberty of suspending the rules. If you have a comment that you would like to make at this point, we would be happy to hear it.

Mr. LANGEVIN. If it is okay, Mr. Chairman, I will ask to submit my statement for the record.

But, gentlemen, thank you for being here today.

Mr. SIMMONS. Very good.

Well, why don't we begin? We have two panels today.

The first panel consists of Mr. Randall Blake, the al-Qa'ida Group chief at the National Counterterrorism Center; Mr. Don Van Duyn, assistant director of the Counterterrorism Division at FBI; and Mr. Javed Ali, senior intelligence officer in the Office of Intelligence and Analysis, Department of Homeland Security.

The witnesses know that we have their full written statements for the record. And we would ask that you limit your oral testimony to no more than 5 minutes, thereabout.

Again, welcome, and thank you for being here.

And who wishes to start? Mr. Blake?

**STATEMENT OF RANDALL BLAKE, CHIEF, AL-QA'IDA GROUP,
NATIONAL COUNTERTERRORISM CENTER**

Mr. BLAKE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, for the opportunity to come down today and speak to you about the problem of radicalization and its implications for the homeland.

I plan to be brief this afternoon and let my colleagues from FBI and DHS tell you about some of the significant efforts under way to not only understand the scope of the problem in this country but also to counter it.

First, however, let me give you a strategic picture of the radicalization problem, as the National Counterterrorism Center sees it. I will speak to you first about two paths to radicalization, one in which young American Muslims, generally male, become radicalized overseas, and the other in which the radicalization process is predominantly homegrown.

Then I would like to conclude with a brief overview of what we sometimes call the gateways to extremism, in other words, those environments where the atmosphere is ripe for radicalization to occur.

Radicalization is not a new problem, nor is violent extremism, as you know and by your opening comments. What is disturbing, however, is the extent to which the message of violent extremism is reaching and resonating with some young Muslims around the world, including Europe, Canada and here. The examples this year from Europe, the U.K. in particular, and Canada have been well-publicized and already commented on.

One of the key lessons for us is that we cannot assume that young people who grow up surrounded by Western values, ideals and culture are immune from the messages of violent extremism.

Al Qaida is well aware of this point, and there is little subtlety in their approach to radicalization and recruitment of others here in the U.S. and elsewhere in the West. It is not an accident that many of the videotapes that we receive from Osama bin Laden and Ayman al-Zawahiri, his number-two, are produced with English subtitles.

The video that was released the week before the 9/11 anniversary on the 2nd of September featured California native Adam Gadahn, who is, himself, a radicalized American operating in Al Qaida's senior circles. And the suicide videos from two of the July 2005 London bombers speaking in perfect West Yorkshire accents are powerful examples of the direct recruitment and radicalization efforts of Western Muslims.

On this point, let me mention two examples of radicalization from this country since and around the time of 9/11 that are particularly striking.

Two young men, John Walker Lindh and Majid Khan, one born in this country and one born in Pakistan who spent his teenage years here, both became radicalized during extended time abroad.

For Lindh, a series of travels in the Middle East and South Asia before 9/11 put him on a path to extremism that terminated at Al Qaida's al-Faruq camp on the front lines, fighting for the Taliban during Operation Enduring Freedom.

In Khan's case, his parents have said that after 9/11 a relative in Pakistan led him to al-Qaida and to the 9/11 mastermind, Khalid Sheik Mohammad, where we know he brainstormed possible attacks against gas stations in his adopted country.

The examples of Lindh and Khan illustrate the first kind of radicalization I mentioned, radicalization that occurs overseas. Clearly the danger here is that young men who have attended extremist madrassas or terrorist training camps or studied with imams who condone violence, a violent form of extremism, could return to the homeland and act as agents of radicalization.

Today the overseas radicalization process appears to be the more common, at least when we talk about violent extremists who turn to terrorism.

The other form of radicalization is predominantly homegrown. In the cases we have seen of this since 9/11, young men, often converts to Islam, adopt extremist views and even engage in some nascent plotting efforts. Many of the homegrown extremists we have identified have criminal backgrounds, as Chairman King mentioned.

I will highlight two examples here, as well. In 2005, we saw in Torrance, California, a group that originated within the prison sys-

tem that was engaged in armed robberies to bankroll planned attacks. And earlier this year, a group with criminal ties that claimed some inspiration from a black separatist movement called the Moorish Science Temple was formulating a plot against the Sears Tower in Chicago and federal buildings in the Miami area.

These homegrown extremists have never been to Afghanistan or Pakistan or the Middle East or attended an organized training camp there. They have, as far as we know, never met a member of Al Qaida or other foreign terrorist organizations. But they have absorbed the message of violent extremism, and they have incorporated it into their group's culture and are using it to justify crime and terrorism.

Regardless of whether the radicalization occurs overseas or at home, the stark lessons of Madrid and London, the transportation attacks there, the arrests in Toronto that the chairman mentioned, and most of the examples here at home that I have cited, is that the next homeland attack may not come from individuals who penetrate our barriers but rather from long-term residents and citizens already in our midst who view their own country as the enemy.

While there is no one-size-fits-all answer to radicalization and why some turn to terrorism and others do not, let me conclude by mentioning a few of those gateways to extremism that the intelligence community has identified as areas ripe for exploitation by extremists.

The prison system, as Chairman King mentioned, is a fertile ground for radicalization, with its gang culture and population of Muslim extremists. The cell I mentioned in Torrance, California, was actually formed in Folsom Prison, and members were recruited both inside and outside the prison.

University campuses offer an atmosphere where extremists, either radical imams or students themselves, can spot and assess young men and women who could be susceptible to the message of violent extremism. We need look no further than the radicalized Hamburg cell of students who piloted three of the four hijacked planes on 9/11.

Some mosques and community centers offer a similar environment, where extremist religious leaders encourage Muslims to travel overseas and fight, ostensibly for Muslim causes. We have seen that threat played out with deadly consequences from foreign fighters who fought against us in Iraq.

Finally, the Internet. The Internet continues to worry us as a virtual recruiting station, open to anyone with access to a computer and an Internet connection. It is the convergence of globalization and technology all happening in real-time.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to review this critical topic, and I look forward to your questions.

[The statement of Mr. Blake follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT FOR THE RECORD OF RANDALL A. BLAKE

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Ranking Minority Member Lofgren, and members of the Subcommittee for the opportunity to come today and speak to you about the problem of radicalization and its implications for the Homeland. I plan to be brief this afternoon, so my colleagues from the FBI and DHS can describe the significant efforts their Agencies have undertaken to understand the scope of the problem in this country and to counter it.

First, however, let me give you a strategic picture of the radicalization problem as NCTC sees it. I will speak to you first about two paths to radicalization—one in which young American Muslims, generally male, become radicalized overseas, and the other in which the radicalization process is predominantly homegrown. Then I will give you a brief overview of what we sometimes call “gateways to extremism”—in other words, those environments where the atmosphere is ripe for radicalization to occur.

Radicalization is not a new problem, nor is violent extremism—as you know. What is disturbing, however, is the extent to which the message of violent extremism is reaching and resonating with some young Muslims around the world, including Europe, Canada, and the United States. The examples this past year from Europe, the UK in particular, and Canada have been well publicized. One of the key lessons for us is that we cannot assume that young people who grow up surrounded by Western values, ideals, and culture are immune from messages that translate into violent extremism.

Al-Qa’ida is well aware of that point and there is little subtlety in their approach to trying to radicalize and recruit others here and elsewhere in the West. It is no accident that many of the videos from Usama bin Ladin and Ayman al-Zawahiri are produced with English subtitles. The video released the week before the five-year anniversary of 9/11 featuring California native Adam Gadahn—a radicalized American operating in al-Qa’ida senior circles—and the martyrdom videos of two of the July 2005 London bombers—spewing extremism in perfect West Yorkshire accents—are powerful examples of direct recruitment and radicalization efforts of Western Muslims.

On this point, let me mention two examples of radicalization from this country since 9/11 that are particularly striking. Two young men, John Walker Lindh and Majid Khan, one born in this country and one born in Pakistan but spent his teen years here, became radicalized during extended time abroad.

For Lindh, a series of travels in the Middle East and South Asia before 9/11 put him on a path to extremism that terminated at al-Qa’ida’s al-Faruq camp and on the front lines fighting for the Taliban during Operation ENDURING FREEDOM. In Khan’s case, his parents have said that after 9/11 a relative in Pakistan led him to al-Qa’ida and to 9/11 mastermind Khalid Shaykh Muhammad, where—we now know—he brainstormed possible attacks against gas stations in his adopted country.

The examples of Lindh and Khan illustrate the first kind of radicalization I mentioned—radicalization that occurs overseas. Clearly the danger there is that young men who have attended extremist madrassas or terrorist training camps, or who have studied with imams who condone a violent form of Islamic extremism, could return to the Homeland and act as agents of radicalization. Today, the overseas radicalization process appears to be more common—at least when we talk about violent extremists who turn to terrorism.

The other form of radicalization is predominantly homegrown. In the cases we have seen of this since 9/11, young men—often converts to Islam—adopt extremist views and even engage in some nascent plotting efforts. Many of the homegrown extremists we have identified also have a criminal background. I’ll highlight two examples here as well: in 2005, we saw a Torrance, California group that originated in the prison system, Jam’iyyat Ul-Islam Is-Saheeh, engage in armed robberies to bankroll planned attacks. And earlier this year, a group with criminal ties that claimed affiliation with a black separatist movement called the Moorish Science Temple, was formulating a plot against the Sears Tower in Chicago and Federal buildings in the Miami area.

These homegrown extremists have never been to Afghanistan, Pakistan, or the Middle East or attended an organized terrorist training camp. They have, as far as we know, never met a member of al-Qa’ida or any other foreign terrorist organization. But they have absorbed the message of violent extremism. And they have incorporated it into their groups’ culture, and are using it to justify crime and terrorism.

Regardless of whether the radicalization occurs overseas or at home, the stark lesson of the Madrid and London transportation attacks, the arrests in Toronto, and most of the examples here at home that I have cited is that the next Homeland attack may come not from individuals who penetrate our borders, but from long term residents and citizens already in our midst who view their own country as the enemy.

While there is no “one size fits all” answer to radicalization and why some turn to terrorism and others do not, let me conclude by mentioning a few of those “gateways to extremism” that the Intelligence Community has identified as areas ripe for exploitation by extremists. The prison system is a fertile ground for radicalization, with its gang culture and population of Muslim converts. The cell I

mentioned in Torrance was actually formed in Folsom prison and members were recruited from both inside and outside the prison.

University campuses offer an atmosphere where extremists—either radical imams or students themselves—could spot and assess young men and women who could be susceptible to a message of violent extremism. We need look no further than the radicalized Hamburg cell of students who piloted three of the four hijacked planes on 9/11.

Some mosques and community centers offer a similar environment where extremist religious leaders encourage Muslims to travel overseas and fight, ostensibly for Muslim causes. We have seen that threat play out with deadly consequences from foreign fighters who have fought against us in Iraq.

Finally, the Internet continues to worry us as a virtual recruiting station open to anyone with access to a computer and an Internet connection. It is the convergence of globalization and technology—all happening in real-time.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to review this critical topic with this subcommittee. I look forward to your questions.

Mr. SIMMONS. Thank you, Mr. Blake.

The next witness is Mr. Van Duyn.

**STATEMENT OF DON VAN DUYN, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR,
COUNTERTERRORISM DIVISION, FEDERAL BUREAU OF
INVESTIGATIONS**

Mr. VAN DUYN. Chairman Simmons, Chairman King, members of the subcommittee, I want to thank you for this opportunity to speak to you on the topic of Islamic radicalization in the United States.

I would like to emphasize, before I begin, that the issue is not Islam itself but how the religious ideology is used by violent extremists to inspire and justify their actions. The FBI does not investigate members of any religion for their religious beliefs, but rather focuses on investigating activities that may harm the United States.

Successes in the war on terrorism and the arrests of many key Al Qaida leaders have diminished the ability of the group to attack the United States homeland. At the same time, a broader Sunni extremist movement has evolved from being run entirely by Al Qaida central to a broader movement. This is demonstrated by the 2004 Madrid bombings, the July 2005 bombings and attempted bombings in London, and recent disruptions in the U.S., United Kingdom, Canada, Bosnia, Denmark and elsewhere.

That said, core Al Qaida remains committed to attacking the United States and continues to demonstrate its ability to adapt its tactics to circumvent security measures and to reconstitute its ranks.

Al Qaida is also attempting to broaden its appeal to English-speaking Western Muslims by disseminating violent Islamic extremist propaganda via media outlets and the Internet.

Although the most dangerous instances of radicalization have so far been overseas, the Islamic radicalization of U.S. persons, whether foreign-born or native, is of increasing concern.

Key to the success of stopping the spread of radicalization is identifying patterns and trends in the early stages. The FBI defines homegrown Islamic extremists as U.S. persons who appear to have assimilated but reject the cultural values, beliefs and environment of the United States. They identify themselves as Muslims and, on some level, become radicalized in the United States. They

intend to provide support for or directly commit a terrorist attack inside the United States.

The threat from homegrown Islamic extremists is likely smaller in scale than that posed by overseas terrorist groups, such as Al Qaida, but is potentially larger in psychological impact.

The FBI has identified certain venues, such as prisons and the Internet, that present opportunities for the proselytizing of radical extremist Islam. Particularly for Muslim converts, but also for those born into Islam, an extremist imam can strongly influence individual belief systems by speaking from a position of authority on religious issues.

Extremist imams have a potential to influence vulnerable followers at various locations of opportunity, can spot and assess individuals who respond to their messages, and could potentially guide them into increasingly extremist circles.

Although the activities of radical imams are typically associated with Salafist-Wahhabi lectures given in the mosque, they are not limited to the mosque itself. Imams are often active and influential in other venues, such as prisons, publishing, online forums, audio lectures, and at Islamic conferences and institutes.

The propagation of radical ideas is not confined to Sunni Islam. The government of Iran is also committed to promoting Shia Islamic activism.

The European and American experience shows that prisons are venues where extremists can radicalize and recruit among the inmate population. Mr. Blake has already addressed some of these issues.

Most of the cases of prison radicalization appear to be carried out by domestic Islamic extremist groups with few or no direct foreign connections, like the Torrance group cited by Mr. Blake.

I would like to emphasize that not all prison radicalization is Islamic in nature. Domestic groups, such as white supremacists, also recruit in prison.

In response to this possible threat, the FBI and the Bureau of Prisons have been actively engaged to detect, deter and interdict efforts by terrorists and extremist groups to radicalize or recruit in federal, state and local prisons since February of 2003. As part of these efforts, we have identified best practices for correctional institutions to combat the spread of radicalization.

As Mr. Blake noted, the Internet is also a venue for radicalization of young, computer-savvy Westerners, both male and female, who identify with Islamic extremist ideology. An older generation of supporters and sympathizers of violent Islamic extremism, in the post-9/11 environment of increased law enforcement security, have migrated their radicalization, recruitment material, and support activities online.

Overseas experience can also be a significant element in facilitating the transition from one who has the proclivity to be radicalized and who may espouse radicalized rhetoric to one who is willing and ready to act on those radicalized beliefs.

Although radicalization can occur without overseas travel, the foreign experience appears to provide the networking that makes it possible for interested individuals to train and participate in operational activity.

We assess that the overseas experiences of John Walker Lindh played a pivotal role in his involvement with the Taliban. Once overseas, he was directed by radicalized individuals to attend extremist universities and ultimately training camps in Pakistan and Afghanistan.

The FBI approaches the radicalization issue on two levels. We are attempting to understand and describe the dynamics of individual and organizational radicalization to identify early indicators as to whether individuals or groups are demonstrating the potential for violence. We are also engaged in extensive outreach to Muslim communities to dispel the misconceptions that may foster extremism.

Thank you for the opportunity to address this important issue. I am happy to answer your questions.

[The statement of Mr. Van Duyn follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF DONALD VAN DUYN

Mr. Chairman Simmons, Ranking Member Lofgren and members of the Subcommittee, I want to thank you for this opportunity to speak to you on the topic of Islamic radicalization in the United States. I would like to emphasize before I begin that the issue is not Islam itself but how the religious ideology is used by violent extremists to inspire and justify their actions. The Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) does not investigate members of any religion for their religious beliefs, but rather focuses on investigating activities that may harm the United States.

Successes in the war on terrorism and the arrests of many key al-Qa'ida leaders have diminished the ability of the group to attack the United States (US) Homeland. At the same time, a broader Sunni extremist movement has evolved from being run entirely by al-Qa'ida central to a broader movement. This is demonstrated by the 2004 Madrid bombings, the July 2005 bombings and attempted bombings in London, and recent disruptions in the US, United Kingdom, Canada, Bosnia, Denmark and elsewhere.

That said, core al-Qa'ida remains committed to attacking the United States and continues to demonstrate its ability to adapt its tactics to circumvent security measures and reconstitute its ranks. Al-Qa'ida is also attempting to broaden its appeal to English-speaking Western Muslims by disseminating violent Islamic extremist propaganda via media outlets and the Internet.

Although the most dangerous instances of radicalization have so far been overseas, the Islamic radicalization of US persons, whether foreign-born or native, is of increasing concern. Islamic radicalization in the United States does not appear to be endemic, but it does exist nationwide. Key to the success of stopping the spread of radicalization is identifying patterns and trends in the early stages.

The FBI defines homegrown Islamic extremists as US persons who appeared to have assimilated, but reject the cultural values, beliefs, and environment of the United States. They identify themselves as Muslims and on some level become radicalized in the United States. They intend to provide support for, or directly commit, a terrorist attack inside the United States. The threat from homegrown Islamic extremists is likely smaller in scale than that posed by overseas terrorist groups such as al-Qa'ida but is potentially larger in psychological impact. Several recent cases illustrate the nature of the issue.

- Since August 2005 the FBI, other federal agencies, and our foreign partners have dismantled a global network of extremists who are operating independently of any known terrorist organization. Several individuals affiliated with this network were arrested for providing material support in connection with the plotting of a terrorist attack in the United States.
- The apparent increase of cases involving homegrown Islamic extremists may represent an increased sensitivity of law enforcement to activities not previously regarded as terrorism, but we cannot rule out the possibility that the homegrown phenomenon is growing.

The FBI has identified certain venues, such as prisons and the internet, that present opportunities for the proselytizing of radical Islam.

Particularly for Muslim converts, but also for those born into Islam, an extremist imam can strongly influence individual belief systems by speaking from a position of authority on religious issues. Extremist imams have the potential to influence

vulnerable followers at various locations of opportunity; can spot and assess individuals who respond to their messages; and can potentially guide them into increasingly extremist circles.

Although the activities of radical imams are typically associated with Salafist-Wahhabi lectures given in the mosque, they are not limited to the mosque itself. Imams are often active and influential in other venues such as prisons, publishing, online forums, audio lectures, and at Islamic conferences and institutes. These various forums allow imams to reach new audiences and potentially susceptible followers outside of the mosque itself.

The propagation of radical ideas is not confined to Sunni Islam. Iran is committed to promoting Shia Islam activism.

The European and American experience shows that prisons are venues where extremists have radicalized and recruited among the inmate population. Prison radicalization primarily occurs through anti-US sermons provided by contract, volunteer, or staff imams, radicalized inmates who gain religious influence, and extremist media. Ideologies that radicalized inmates appear most often to embrace include the Salafi form of Sunni Islam (including revisionist versions commonly known as “prison Islam”) and an extremist view of Shia Islam similar to that of the Government of Iran and Lebanese Hizballah.

Most cases of prison radicalization appear to be carried out by domestic Islamic extremist groups with few or no direct foreign connections, like the Sunni Islamic extremist group in California, the Jam’iyyat Ul-Islam Is-Saheeh (JIS), identified in July 2005. I would like to emphasize that not all prison radicalization is Islamic in nature. Domestic groups such as white supremacists also recruit in prisons.

In response to this possible threat, the FBI and the Bureau of Prisons (BOP) have been actively engaged in efforts to detect, deter, and interdict efforts by terrorist and extremist groups to radicalize or recruit in US prisons since February 2003. As part of these efforts, we have identified “best practices” for correctional institutions to combat the spread of radicalization.

The Internet is also a venue for the radicalization of young, computer-savvy Westerners—both male and female—who identify with an Islamic extremist ideology. An older generation of supporters and sympathizers of violent Islamic extremism, in the post-9/11 environment of increased law enforcement scrutiny, have migrated their radicalization, recruitment, and material support activities online.

Radicalization via the Internet is participatory, and individuals are actively engaged in exchanging extremist propaganda and rhetoric online which may facilitate the violent Islamic extremist cause. These online activities further their indoctrination, create links between extremists located around the world, and may serve as a springboard for future terrorist activities.

Overseas experience can also be a significant element in facilitating the transition from one who has a proclivity to be radicalized, and who may espouse radicalized rhetoric, to one who is willing and ready to act on those radicalized beliefs. Although radicalization can occur without overseas travel, the foreign experience appears to provide the networking that makes it possible for interested individuals to train for and participate in operational activity. The experience may vary from religious or language instruction to basic paramilitary training.

- We assess that the overseas experiences of John Walker Lindh¹ played a pivotal role in his involvement with the Taliban. Once overseas, he was directed by radicalized individuals to attend extremist universities, and ultimately training camps in Pakistan and Afghanistan.

The FBI approaches the radicalization issue on two levels:

- We are attempting to understand the dynamics of individual and organizational radicalization to identify early indicators as to whether individuals or groups are demonstrating the potential for violence.
- We are engaged in extensive outreach to Muslim communities to dispel misconceptions that may foster extremism.

Thank you for the opportunity to address this important issue. I am happy to answer your questions.

Mr. SIMMONS. Thank you, Mr. Van Duyn.
Mr. Ali?

¹John Walker Lindh, after pleading guilty in the Eastern District of Virginia to supporting the Taliban, in violation of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA) (50 U.S.C. §1705(b)), and carrying an explosive during the commission of a felony (18 U.S.C. §844(h)(2)), was given a 20-year prison sentence.

**STATEMENT OF JAVED ALI, SENIOR INTELLIGENCE OFFICER,
DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY**

Mr. ALI. Chairman Simmons, other members of the subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to share perspectives from the Department of Homeland Security on radicalization in the United States.

As described by my colleagues and by the various members here, since 2004 a variety of actions overseas and here in the U.S. has really spurred attention on the issue of radicalization inside the United States, to include the cell that was disrupted, the JIS, in the California prison system, and the arrest of the individuals in Toronto.

As a result of these episodes, or activities, the department's Office of Intelligence and Analysis has convened a study which seeks to develop a broader understanding of how and why radicalizing influences take root and spread in the United States. This project is part of a broader DHS approach in addressing the issue of radicalization and will inform the department-wide effort to understand and mitigate the phenomenon.

During the course of our study, we have found that no universal definition of radicalization exists in the intelligence or the academic and social science communities. As a result, our study has developed a working definition whereby radicalization entails "the process of adopting an extremist belief system, including the willingness to use, support or facilitate violence as a method to effect societal change."

This definition separates radicalization from terrorism. It focuses more on an understanding of behavior and how and why that behavior develops over time.

A major focus centers on our attempts to examine radicalization nodes, which we define as the conduits that facilitate or support a person or group through the radicalization process. The nodes may be physical institutions, virtual communities, charismatic individuals, written or reported material, or even shared experiences.

We are conducting our study in a phased approach, focusing on examining radicalization dynamics in key geographic regions throughout the country. Our first phase focused on assessments in California and the New York–New Jersey area, while our second phase focuses on the Midwest and the national capital region.

We hope to conduct other regional or state assessments in future phases, with the goal that these will provide the building blocks for a broader national assessment.

Each regional assessment has begun with our attempts to frame an intelligence picture particular to that state or region by examining national-level intelligence reporting and open-source information. We then take those findings and share them during face-to-face meetings with federal, state, and local law enforcement, intelligence, and homeland security professionals.

As of September 2006, we have held meetings with representatives from New York City; Los Angeles; San Diego; San Francisco; Sacramento; Chicago; Columbus, Ohio; and Springfield, Illinois. And we will soon meet with officials from Virginia; Maryland; Washington, D.C.; and Texas.

We have also found a number of foreign governments keenly interested in the radicalization issue, and our meetings with them have helped strengthen our perspective.

Thus far, we have found that relationships between radicalization nodes and radical actors or groups inside this country vary across ideological and ethno-religious spectrums, different geographic regions, and socio-economic conditions.

Further, we have found many diverse pathways to radicalization inside the United States based on an examination of the nodes I described earlier.

Further, we are finding that radicalization is not a one-way street and that individuals or groups can radicalize or de-radicalize based on a variety of factors.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, our work on radicalization is preliminary and by no means complete. Continued dialogue and relationship-building with federal, state, local and even foreign partners is a critical aspect of this work, in order to gain the most accurate and nuanced intelligence perspectives on radicalization activities both in the United States and abroad.

Mr. Chairman, thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak with you and members of the subcommittee. I welcome your questions.

[The statement of Mr. Ali follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT FOR THE RECORD OF JAVED ALI

INTRODUCTION

Chairman, Ranking Minority Member Thompson, and members of the Committee, thank you for the opportunity to share perspectives on an important national security topic—*radicalization in the United States*. Since 2004, a spate of terrorist activities in Western Europe carried out or supported by radicalized “homegrown” Sunni extremists, including the Madrid and London attacks, focused national attention on the overseas phenomenon. More recent developments in the United States and Canada, including the disrupted California prison-based Jam-iyat ul-Islam As-Saheeh (JIS) cell and the “Toronto 17”—have focused attention on the phenomenon in North America.

While traditional counterterrorism analysis emphasizes the who, what, where, and when of potential terrorist threats, the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) Office of Intelligence and Analysis (OI&A) has convened a radicalization study which seeks to develop a broader understanding of *why and how* radicalizing influences take root and spread in the United States. By identifying critical factors at the “front end” of the radicalization process, we hope to assist policymakers, intelligence officers, and law enforcement officials in their efforts to develop tools, practices, and methods which may prevent radical beliefs from “crossing the line” towards actual violence. This OI&A project is part of a broader DHS approach in addressing the issue of radicalization, and will inform the Department-wide effort to understand and mitigate the phenomenon.

CONCEPTUAL APPROACHES

During the course of our study, we have found that no universal definition of radicalization exists in the intelligence or the academic/social science communities. As a result, our study has developed a “working” definition whereby radicalization entails “*the process of adopting an extremist belief system, including the willingness to use, support, or facilitate violence, as a method to effect societal change.*” This definition separates radicalization from terrorism, and focuses more on an understanding of behavior and how, why, and where that behavior develops over time. We are attempting to identify and examine radicalization “nodes”—which we define as conduits that facilitate or support a person or group through the radicalization process. Nodes may be physical institutions, virtual communities, charismatic individuals, written or recorded material, or even shared experiences.

METHODOLOGY

We are conducting our study in a phased approach, focusing on examining radicalization dynamics in key geographic regions throughout the country. Our first phase focused on assessments in California and the New York/New Jersey area, while our second phase focuses on the Midwest and National Capital Region. We hope to conduct other regional or state assessments in future phases, with the goal that these will provide the building blocks for a broader national assessment.

Each regional assessment begins with our attempts to frame an intelligence picture particular to that State or region by first examining national-level intelligence reporting and open-source information. After this research is conducted, we then take those findings and share them during face-to-face meetings with Federal, State, and local law enforcement, intelligence, and homeland security professionals. As of September 2006, we have held meetings with representatives from New York City, Los Angeles, San Diego, San Francisco, Sacramento, Chicago, Columbus, Ohio, and Springfield, Illinois, and will soon meet with officials in Virginia, Maryland, Washington DC, and Texas. We have also found a number of foreign governments keenly interested in the radicalization issue, and our meetings with them have helped strengthen perspectives on radicalization.

KEY FINDINGS

Thus far we have found that relationships between radicalization nodes and radical actor/groups vary across ideological and ethno-religious spectrums, different geographic regions, and socio-economic conditions. Further, we have found many diverse “pathways” to radicalization in the United States based on an examination of the nodes I described earlier. We have found that nodes may be physical institutions, virtual communities, charismatic individuals, written or recorded material, or even shared experiences. Further, we are finding that radicalization is not a “one-way street,” and that individuals and groups can radicalize or “de-radicalize” based on a variety of factors.

CONCLUSION

Our work on radicalization is preliminary and by no means complete. Continued dialogue and relationship-building with Federal, State, local, and even foreign, partners is a critical aspect of this work, in order to gain the most accurate and nuanced intelligence perspectives on radicalization activities both in the United States and abroad.

Mr. Chairman, thank you again for giving me the opportunity to speak with you and the members of the Committee. I welcome your questions.

Mr. SIMMONS. Thank you very much.

And I will start with some questions myself, and I know my colleagues have some questions to ask, as well.

You made some comments, Mr. Ali, that I think are very appropriate, that, “Our work on radicalization is preliminary and by no means complete.”

It was mentioned by witnesses at the panel that radicalization does not necessarily deal just with the Islamic religion. It can deal with white supremacist groups. It can deal with homegrown Americans, such as those who blew up the Murrah Building in Oklahoma, for example. And so, I don’t think there is any effort right off the bat to characterize one group or another or another.

But what we read about today is what is going on in Great Britain; what we read about is going on in Toronto. And of course our concern is that this could go on in this country, as well. I believe that in the Toronto case and in the Great Britain case, there were perhaps some connections to individuals or groups here in the United States.

So, again, even though we are at a preliminary stage in looking at this issue, what characteristics or motivating features have come out of the London case or the Toronto case that would apply to us here in the United States?

What motivating factors—was it the introduction of a charismatic leader, for example, into a group of young people who re-

sponded to it? Was it conditions of discrimination or alienation? Was it a sense that young Muslims could not participate fully in the Western society in which they found themselves—alienation, if you will?

What is your thinking along the lines of these issues?

Mr. ALI. Sir, I will take that first part of the question.

Part of the issue we are having here with the depth of the assessment or the judgments we are able to make is we just don't have a lot of data in order to, sort of, do the comparative analysis. And that is the reason we are trying to look at this issue from a regional approach and see what we can cull from that—

Mr. SIMMONS. And if I could just interrupt on that point, I think we all understand that, but intelligence officers sometimes have hunches or intuitions or feelings. And I realize we are in an open session and on the record, but if there is some commonality among those hunches and feelings, feel free to share that.

Mr. ALI. Sure, sure, Chairman.

One issue I was going to raise was, the things that we have seen as important nodes or these conduits or catalysts for radicalization here in the United States seem to have some resonance or applicability with what we have seen in the U.K. context, other parts of Western Europe, or even the Canada experience.

What we have found so far at a macro level in the U.S., not to say this holds true in every region or every state, is that the nodes that appear to be of importance to us are the Internet, which was described before, the power of the Internet as a radicalizing node; certainly the use or the involvement of a charismatic leader to drive those beliefs; and then propaganda.

That is not to say that you necessarily need to have all three of those in order to develop a radicalized group or cell, but if you look at what occurred in the London context, and the U.K. context to a degree, and then look at the smaller set of data we have here in the U.S., there do appear to be commonalities with those as drivers. But then there are also examples, like the prison example, where some of those factors aren't as significant.

So it is a bit of a difficult question, but at an abstract level those are the nodes that seem to be important, to us.

Mr. SIMMONS. Gentlemen?

Mr. BLAKE. Let me add a couple comments about the London bombing and particularly the 7/7 bombers.

In that case, you do have a couple of dynamics going on. One is the issue of age. You did have, in Mohammad Sidique Khan, a charismatic leader of the group there, the cell there, of the 7/7 bombing. He was in his mid-30s. The other bombers were much younger—early 20s, one I think still in his teens.

The other dynamic in this radicalization issue is, the London case appears to be a case in which you have two aspects: One is those who grew up in that West Yorkshire atmosphere and had their life experience there. But, in the case of a couple of them, you had those who had gone to Pakistan for a period of time in the months leading up to the attack. Al-Qa'ida has been quite willing—Ayman al-Zawahiri, in particular, in some of his videotapes—to take credit for that, their level of involvement.

But you have the issue of travel, to where you have some exchange with terrorist leaders who either encourage, support, sanction, direct some activities. And then you have those who are willing to be radicalized and participate, don't have that involvement but are swayed by some of the others.

Mr. VAN DUYN. I think we see, in addition to the apparent role of mentors, which seems to be key, and some sort of influence in, I think also the effectiveness of propaganda, whether it is over the Internet or otherwise, that has portrayed Muslims as being oppressed and under attack. There are clearly some—there is some great anger that has developed, obviously, among the two cells that you are speaking of. So the effectiveness of the propaganda out has been very effective.

The other thing I think that many people have noted, too, is just what may be the speed of radicalization now that is occurring.

Mr. SIMMONS. If I could just make a comment on that, in going to Toronto, Canada, it was our understanding that the period of time between the introduction of a charismatic leader and the time of the arrests, which seemed to be at the cusp of action, was around 3 months, maybe a little more.

That is pretty rapid. And I guess what that suggests to me is that the circumstances of that radicalization were resident within those individuals and within that community. So they needed a spark.

And so, I guess the overreaching question and concern that we have is, do those circumstances exist elsewhere in this country and around the world? So that the spark results in that very quick radicalization. Is that your perception?

Mr. VAN DUYN. I think, in the United States, we see, I think as you cited from your colleague's testimony, that we don't see, in many respects, the same sorts of conditions, that the populations are better assimilated.

That said, it is clear that, from our own experience, there are people with that same sort of anger and who take on that same sort of ideology. So it certainly cannot be dismissed. Nor can something happening quickly or one individual taking it into his own head to do something—nor can that be dismissed, as I think perhaps may be indicated by the student down at North Carolina.

Mr. SIMMONS. Thank you.

The chair recognizes the distinguished chairman of the full committee, Mr. King of New York.

Mr. KING. Thank you, Chairman Simmons.

I will, as I did in my opening statement, focus on the issue of prison radicalization.

And also, on a personal note and somewhat humorous note, thank you, Mr. Ali, for not bringing up the Michigan–Notre Dame score.

[Laughter.]

It was very thoughtful and generous of you.

Mr. ALI. Go blue, sir.

[Laughter.]

Mr. KING. Getting back to a serious note, just from my own analysis and study, it does appear that the issue of prison

radicalization is increasing. The Federal Bureau of Prisons has attempted to address it. Several states have attempted to address it.

I would ask, really, if each of the three of you would try to comment on, one, to the extent you do believe it is a problem; secondly, what remedies there are, again, under our Constitution; are there any constitutional prohibitions about actually vetting chaplains that come in; how we find organizations that are positioned to vet them, to perhaps work through them.

I know, for instance, several years ago, in fact last year, of all institutions, the fire department of New York—this isn't even a prison situation—they hired a Muslim chaplain who was then seen putting out statements basically denying the reality of September 11th.

Also, as a Catholic, I know Catholics have faced persecution in this country, as have all religions—Jews, certain sects of Protestantism. You have to be careful as to exactly how to vet or select. But on the other hand, there is also a political dynamic we can't deny, and that is the terrible impact I think many of these imams and self-appointed imams in prisons have, as far as radicalizing prisoners.

So anyway, I would just appreciate any of the comments or any of the suggestions that each of the three of you could make on this.

Mr. VAN DUYN. Again, as I indicated, we have been working with the Bureau of Prisons since February of 2003. And there are a number of measures. And I don't want to speak for the Bureau of Prisons, but they are very cognizant both of the constitutional rights of prisoners and also the generally beneficial impact of religion. Conversion is generally considered to be a good thing, because it gives direction to lives that might otherwise be directionless.

The Bureau of Prisons does have programs to monitor the spread of ideologies that could lead to violence within their systems. And they certainly have, I think, the authorities to do that. And they are paying attention both to who comes into the prisons to preach.

And, in many cases, this is being done by contract imams. There is a limited staff within the Bureau of Prisons for the federal system, and then they contract out to others to come in and to serve those prison populations. And that is a very important part of what they do.

In addition, they do monitor the materials also. And there were a couple items cited in a hearing yesterday that dealt with the Noble Koran and also the guidelines of Islam. The Noble Koran, which has a very extremist interpretation of Islam, has been banned from the chapel libraries and the libraries of the federal system.

And they are also disseminating this information, and have been, out to the state and local systems. But, as you know, there are well over 2,000 state, local, federal, tribal institutions in this country. We have surveyed somewhere over 2,000 of them at this point and are trying to get those messages out.

Mr. KING. Do you think we are making progress?

Mr. VAN DUYN. I believe so, because I think the dissemination of education and awareness is really what is going to make the difference here.

Mr. KING. Mr. Blake? Mr. Ali?

Mr. ALI. Yes, sir. From our perspective at DHS, in terms of just looking at it as a macro issue, it is certainly an issue of concern, prison radicalization, of deep interest.

What I think we don't know or we have less of an understanding of: What is the level of operational threat that potentially could be within some of these prison systems or some of the small groups or clusters within them who are really promoting these radical beliefs? And that is just an unknown, how many other potential JIS-like entities are there. Hopefully there aren't many, but there may be some we just have not come across yet.

And I think there are also two ways to think about the issue, as well. There appears to be, sort of, the bottom-up type of activity, which you could potentially say that is a better characterization of the JIS. You have someone who truly almost developed his belief system and then promoted that, and at the output came a small group of people who bought in to that belief system and were willing, potentially, to take action on it.

So you have the, sort of, bottom-up phenomenon. But there may also be a top-down phenomenon, as well, from transnational organizations that, as Mr. Van Duyn mentioned, potentially the government of Iran, that are also trying to spread a certain ideology within the prison system. And I think we also don't have a clear understanding of what that level of top-down influence looks like.

So with that said, in terms of just potential ways to get a better insight as to what is actually happening, I agree that more potentially needs to be done in terms of how we vet certain individuals who are coming into the prison system; dialogue with Muslim communities as well, to get potentially more involved into the, sort of, either the chaplaincy corps or other types of volunteer services that are provided to prisoners in the systems.

And from our perspective at DHS, getting a better understanding as to what is really happening at the state and local level, so building and expanding on those partnerships.

Just as an example, when we conducted our California study, until we went out to California and had discussions with representatives, both in Los Angeles and in northern California—Sacramento, San Francisco—we just did not have the picture that they had at the ground level, as to the prison radicalization phenomenon, because there is very little national intelligence reporting that captures that.

So from our perspective, building those relationships and then furthering them is an important part of this equation.

Mr. BLAKE. I would just say, on a bit of a strategic point, that one of the things we look at as we look at the, kind of, Sunni extremist movement, the way that it has evolved, it has changed, it has decentralized over time, one of the concerns is the development of leaders and leadership and leadership abilities. And if you look at some of the prison experiences of Abu Musab al-Zarqawi in Jordan, of Ayman al-Zawahiri in Egypt, you recognize that their time in prison was an important part of their formative experience.

Mr. KING. Thank you.

Mr. SIMMONS. I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

For the second round, you have mentioned nodes, and I think we have identified four basic nodes where this radicalization appears

to take place. One is university campuses; another is in mosques and community centers; a third is the Internet; and the fourth is the prison system.

And I guess, as somebody who has taught on a college campus, worked for a newspaper, we are concerned about freedom of speech, academic freedom, religious freedom. These are fundamental freedoms that those of who have served in uniform felt we were fighting for and want to protect.

When it comes to the prisons, it is a somewhat different node. It would seem to me that it is much more under control. And I think the chairman has asked those very appropriate questions. So I would like to focus a little more on the university campuses, the mosques, and the Internet.

There is a balancing act, always, between freedom and security, between civil liberties and the right to be safe or to expect to be safe. We know there are limits on free speech, that fighting words, for example, are not protected, libel is not protected, hate speech is not, or words that could lead to harm, to damage.

Years ago, Zechariah Chafee at Harvard Law School wrote a book called "Free Speech," and I recall vaguely that he made the statement that your to swing your arm ends where my nose begins. And it kind of captures how we have to address the issue of freedom of speech, civil liberties and the right to be secure and be safe.

Have either of your three agencies encountered legal difficulties in trying to examine more closely these nodes? Have you been either restricted by the staff attorneys or been given advice and guidance? And how does that issue, the issue of individual liberties and freedom, interfere, let's say, as you try to address radicalization in these different nodes?

Don't look at each other.

[Laughter.]

I know it is a hard question, and maybe it is a question for the record. But if you could provide some kind of answer, I think it could be useful.

I mean, we value the academic freedom of our college campuses, but we don't want to see people teaching or preaching hate. And that is the same, I guess, when we go to our mosques, our cathedrals, our Protestant churches, this sort of thing.

And the Internet—we value the Internet as a communications tool, but I don't want to see sexual predators using it, for example. I don't want to see drug lords using the Internet for their nefarious business. And quite frankly, I don't want to see terrorists using the Internet.

Mr. VAN DUYN. The FBI is very aware of the rights of freedom of religion and also freedom of speech. And that is why we focus our efforts on actual connections to terrorist activities and predication that there is activity and intent to harm the United States. But we are not looking at any particular node or venue in particular. We are looking at the activities that occur there that would be reflective of some type of harm that is to be a plan for the United States.

Mr. ALI. Chairman Simmons, just to add to that, we have the same concerns with the tension between civil liberties and the ability to further investigate potential activities that could cause harm

in the U.S. And from our perspective, we also are not focusing specifically on these entities in and of themselves.

We are only examining them in the course of, if the disseminated intelligence suggests that there is activity of concern or interest there, then that is where our analysis takes us. But we are, at least the Office of Intelligence in DHS, we are not a collection agency, so we are not actively collecting the information on any of these institutions.

Mr. BLAKE. Our answer would be somewhat similar, in that the National Counterterrorism Center does not have a tactical and collection mission, investigative or operational mission. So we are recipients of the information. It is quite different.

Mr. SIMMONS. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman?

Mr. KING. Thank you, Chairman Simmons.

First of all, I regret that I had to leave the room several times during your testimony. I had different messages coming in. So you may have covered this in your opening statements.

But what level of cooperation do you believe you are getting from the Muslim community, especially imams, in trying to screen out those who would be more radical or recommending those who would be more mainstream and would not create problems? Again, I am focusing on the issue of prisons.

Mr. VAN DUYN. We do—and, again, I think it may be better for you to speak to the Bureau of Prisons about their efforts, because I know they reach out to the Muslim communities in the various areas where they are looking for assistance in identifying imams.

As I indicated, there is a very small staff—I believe it is only 11 staff imams in the Bureau of Prisons. So they go out extensively to local institutions to find people to serve the prisoners' religious needs. So they are out in the communities.

Speaking for the FBI, we have, as I said, an extensive Muslim outreach program, both in our headquarters, where we bring people in to discuss various issues, and then also with our Special agents in Charge in their various field offices.

Mr. ALI. And, Mr. Chairman, for the department, our office, the Office of Intelligence and Analysis, we don't have that function, in terms of outreach with anyone. But there is an element within the department, the Office of Civil Liberties and Civil Rights, that this is part of their mission, to have that kind of dialogue with various groups around the country.

I do not know whether that dialogue consists of the prison issue, but we can certainly research that and get a better answer back for you.

Mr. KING. Good. I would appreciate it, even if it is just anecdotal, as to what you believe the level of cooperation is.

Thank you.

Mr. SIMMONS. I know that they are going to be calling for votes, I believe in 20 minutes to half an hour or so. I reluctantly dismiss this panel. I have more questions.

And all members, of course, can submit questions for the record.

But I want to thank you gentlemen for coming forward and testifying on this issue. I think this is probably one of the first hearings

we have had on the subject in either the House or Senate, even though there has been a lot of discussion of it.

I realize that the work that we are doing on this subject is preliminary in nature. But I also feel that it is an extraordinarily important issue for us to understand better and to work with.

So, again, I thank you for your testimony. And this will not be the last time that we talk about this subject. Thank you very much.

Mr. KING. Thank you very much. Thank you.

Mr. SIMMONS. The second panel consists of four individuals.

Our first witness is Dr. Walid Phares—and if I have mispronounced your name, I apologize—senior fellow at the Foundation for the Defense of Democracies, where he focuses on Middle East history, politics, global terrorist movements, democratization and human rights.

Dr. Phares also leads the foundation's Future of Terrorism Project, which considers how the militant Islamist threat will mutate over time and what can be done to defend against new, more deadly strains of terrorism.

He holds degrees in law and political science from St. Joseph and the Lebanese University of Beirut, a master's in international law from the Universite de Lyon in France, and a Ph.D. in international relations and strategic studies from the University of Miami in the United States.

Our second witness, Dr. Frank Cilluffo, is associate vice president for homeland security at The George Washington University and leads the university's homeland security efforts on education, research, training and policy.

He also directs the multidisciplinary Homeland Security Policy Institute and teaches a graduate-level course on counterterrorism and homeland security at the Elliott School of International Affairs.

He joined G.W. from the White House, where he served as special assistant to the president for homeland security.

Our third witness is Mr. John Woodward, associate director of the RAND Intelligence Policy Center. From October 2003 to 2005, John served as director of the U.S. Department of Defense Biometrics Management Office. Prior to joining RAND, Mr. Woodward served as an operations officer for the Central Intelligence Agency for 12 years, with assignments in East Asia and East Africa.

Our final witness is Mr. Steve Emerson, executive director of The Investigative Project on Terrorism. Mr. Emerson is the author of five books on terrorism and national security, most recently the national best-seller, "American Jihad: The Terrorists Living Among Us."

Mr. Emerson started the investigative project in late 1995, following the broadcast of his documentary film, "Jihad in America," on public television. The film exposed video of clandestine operations of militant Islamic terrorist groups on American soil.

For the film, Mr. Emerson received numerous awards, including the George Polk award for the best T.V. commentary, one of the most prestigious awards in journalism. He also received the top prize from the Investigative Reporters and Editors Organization for

best investigative report in both print and television for the documentary.

I want to thank all of you gentlemen for being here today.

I will also say that we have your written testimony in the notebook, which we have reviewed, so we hope that you can summarize in about 5 minutes.

Dr. Phares?

**STATEMENT WALID PHARES, SENIOR FELLOW, FOUNDATION
FOR THE DEFENSE OF DEMOCRACIES**

Mr. PHARES. Thank you very much.

Mr. SIMMONS. Did I pronounce your name correct?

Mr. PHARES. Close enough. It is Phares.

Mr. SIMMONS. Close enough for government work. Phares, okay. Thank you, sir.

Mr. PHARES. Ferris wheel.

[Laughter.]

Mr. SIMMONS. There we go. Simmons like the mattress. No relation.

[Laughter.]

Mr. PHARES. Thank you, Chairman. I would like to thank you very much. It is a privilege and an honor to appear before you today to discuss the theme of the homeland security implications of radicalization. My contribution is titled, "Intercepting Radicalization at the Indoctrination Stage."

Your concerns about radicalization as a threat to U.S. homeland security are warranted. For after 25 years of studying the ideology and the evolution of the doctrines that produced the self-declared jihadist movement—"al haraka al Jihadiya" in Arabic—I conclude, along with a number of my colleagues in the United States and across the Atlantic that the terrorism America and its allies are facing in the war on terror is direct product of this radical ideology.

The 19 men who massacred 3,000 United States and other citizens belong to al-Qa'ida, and the latter is a self-declared Salafist Jihadist organization. Every single case of terrorism uncovered on U.S. territory since 9/11 was motivated by this ideology.

To name a few: Virginia Paintball gang, the dirty bomb case, the shoe-bomber case, Al Qaida's John Walker, Azzam al Amriki Adam Gadahn, the Oregon case, the Virginia multiple cases, Jihadi charities, so on and so forth. Even the case of Abdelrahman in 1993, Sheik Abdelrahman, and the first bombing of the New York towers is also grounded in its literature of jihadism.

Statements made by Zarqawi networks, Osama bin Laden, Ayman al-Zawahiri since 1998, the jihadist ideology, which also has been expressed by the Ayatollah Khomeini teaching and Hezbollah and Lebanon—all of the above comes to one source: the jihadist ideology.

We know that there are two trees of this ideology: the one born under Jihadi Salafists, their thinking, and the one born under Jihadi Khomeinist thinking.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, jihadism is the ideological common identity of terror groups such as al-Qa'ida, Salafi Combat Group, Islamic Jihad, Hamas, Jemaa Islamiya, Taliban, Laskar Taiba, and

dozens and dozens of others around the world, including other chapters within the United States.

These organizations and individuals are responsible and were responsible for attacks against the United States and its allies in the 1990s, 9/11, Madrid, London, Beslan, Mumbai, Riyadh, Casablanca, Sunni Triangle in Iraq, and other violence associated with terrorism.

First conclusion, Mr. Chairman, is, at this stage of the war on terror, the ideology behind the threat has been already identified. The jihadists themselves identified it. And that should be addressed as such: as an ideology.

Second remark is about the development of the threat itself, the making of jihadism.

Prior to 9/11, the spread of this ideology was operated by a variety of Salafi, Wahhabi, Ikhwan—or Muslim Brotherhood—Tablighi, Deobandi, and Takfiri schools of thought around the world, mostly by means of religious schools known as madrassa. And then moving into the United States gradually out of the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s, jihadi cadres took the control of existing religious schools funded by foreign support but also formed their own indoctrination networks, often in and around mosques and other social and cultural centers.

In about 20 years of militant activities, this ideology produced three generations of radicals, a pool which basically allows the terrorists to recruit from.

Certainly the perpetrators of 9/11 could be defined as foreign jihadists, but the worry, the concern for the homeland security are the American jihadists, those who have been recruited by the original first generation of jihadists, and therefore constitute today a direct threat against homeland security.

Third point, component of that threat, what are we talking about. This is not a vague radicalization of one or other community. This is a very specific, systematic, ideological network that penetrates, has strategies, has visions, and therefore is and constitutes a direct threat against homeland security in the United States and our allies around the world.

The components are as follows. It rejects the legitimacy of our national liberties: pluralism, role of secular law. The jihadi ideology—and that is important—is not another social or political way of thinking within democracy, nor is it a political alternative to one particular party or a specific policy in domestic or foreign affairs.

Jihadism rejects the American Constitution, the Bill of Rights, the international declaration on human rights, the United Nations and international law. Jihadism aims at destroying democracies and installing a totalitarian regime named, for some, caliphate, for others, imamate.

And to do so, jihadism creates the conviction—and that is the important point—in the minds of adherents that war against the government, people, and Constitution of the United States is the path toward achieving the universal goal. And here, Mr. Chairman, is the beginning of the threat, when the “click” that transforms a citizen into a jihadist. That is the beginning of the process, not at the end of it.

Strategic penetration operated by the jihadist movement before and since 9/11 is based on various models. First model are those who originates overseas, move to the United States—I am talking about cadre—legally or an illegal way, and starts operating inside of the country, using its laws and facilities. The estimate of jihadists who have infiltrated the country over the past two decades is certainly in the hundreds, possible close to a thousand people.

This first-generation jihadist has organized itself to perform two activities: One is to grow its own strength for future jihads. Two, very relevant to us now, is to produce the second generation of American-born jihadists. If you analyze the average age of U.S.-born jihadists, you would conclude that the production of the second generation has begun in the late 1980s and mostly since the early 1990s.

The first generation of jihadists does two things. It indoctrinates, then recruits within the Muslim community, using various methods and influence already-penetrated institutions. Second, and more important, is for them to take the control of religious conversions of non-Muslims. The issue is not conversion at all. The issue—this is a free and pluralist society, of course—the issue is basically who does the conversion and who shepherds the converts into being recruited into the jihadist ideology.

Once the pool of indoctrinated individuals is formed, mostly of younger persons, then the terror organizations can recruit from. It is a fact that the most dangerous jihadists, both on the individual level or as self-formed cells, are those who have been able or are in the process of penetrating the defense-security system of the United States.

The threat shield. There are several shields that “protect” the U.S.-based jihadists from containment. Among these shields are: A, the little ability of the public, that is the American public, to identify them, since their ideology hasn’t officially been identified by the government.

How can we ask ordinary citizens or people in the agencies to find out who is the jihadists if the government has not identified it to start with, from the top level all the way to agencies and, of course, at the front of this, Congress?

B, without the public, law enforcement and homeland security cannot mobilize on a large scale to identify and isolate the jihadist activities.

C, the ideology of jihadi terrorism enjoys, obviously, if not identified and banned, enjoys the political freedoms of the country. It is protected, naturally, by advocacy groups, legal defense, and is funded both domestically and by foreign regimes and organizations.

Mr. Chairman, I do, in a very summarized way, suggest a resistance to radicalization. What could be done? Six points. And I would be more than happy to answer questions about the details of these points later.

One, first of all, identification of the ideology of jihadism by government, media and experts. It is unescapable, every single plan we have in every single department in the United States—and I have been visiting and in touch with other experts around the world, in Canada and Europe and the Middle East—without this

identification, I don't think that the fight against jihadism will be successful.

Two, once this is done, then mobilization against the ideology of jihadism by the public and educational institutions. If our students—and I have been a professor for 14 years—over the years are taught the wrong interpretation of what this ideology is in the classroom, those who are going to be recruited to agencies, government, media and the rest of the public space are not going to be able to be very helpful in the future in that war of ideas.

Three, the most sensitive, the most difficult aspect, although had to be raised, is, after we identify this ideology and we are sure that under the Constitution this ideology is harming society, is calling for violence, is making a distinction in society between one slice of it and the other slice, encouraging one against the other, therefore under the Constitution of the United States and the charter of the United Nations, it has to be banned by the U.S. Congress.

Four, mass education of the public about it. That involves public libraries. That involves a good use of the public services funded by taxpayers, including C-SPAN, PBS, NPR. All these publicly supported organizations should be very helpful in encouraging the mass education of the public about where is the danger.

Five, it is imperative to work with domestic NGOs, with the general public in general, and specifically with the Muslim community. But working with the Muslim community should basically begin with working with those organizations that not just are moderate but willing to inform the public within the Muslim community and at large of the danger, of the threats.

Six, working with international non-government organizations and particularly with liberal, democratic and humanist Muslims.

In conclusion, terrorism is threatening homeland security, and jihadism is a main root of terrorism. Therefore, the capacity of the United States protecting homeland security and defending national security will depend largely on developing policies and laws that would identify, ban, isolate and shrink jihadism, with the help of the American public in general and the Muslim and Middle Eastern communities in particular.

Such a shift in homeland security must be based on a comprehensive strategy of containment of the terror ideology within the framework of civil and democratic rights of society.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[The statement of Mr. Phares follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF WALID PHARES

Chairman Simmons and Members of the Committee,
It is a privilege and an honor to appear before you today to discuss the theme "*The Homeland Security implications of radicalization.*" My contribution is titled: "Intercepting radicalization at the indoctrination stage."

Identification of the Threat

Your concerns about "radicalization" as a threat to U.S. Homeland Security are warranted. For after twenty five years of studying the ideology and the evolution of the doctrines that produced the self-declared Jihadist movement (*al haraka al Jihadiya*) which has declared, waged and continues to conduct war against the United States and other democracies, I conclude along with a number of colleagues in this field of expertise that the Terrorism America and its allies are facing in the War on Terror, is a direct product of this radical ideology. The 19 men, who massacred 3,000 US and other citizens on September 11, belong to al Qaeda and the

latter, is a self declared Salafist-Jihadist organization. Every single case of Terrorism uncovered on U.S. territory, since 9/11, was motivated by this ideology. To name a few: The Virginia Paintball gang, the dirty bomb case, the shoe bomber case, al Qaeda's John Walker, Azzam al Amriki AKA Adam Gadahn, the Oregon case, the Virginia multiple cases, the Jihadi charities, etc. This ideology was omnipresent in the cases than ended with court sentences and those which didn't; in the Sheikh Abdel Rahman case of 1993; in the statements made by the Zarqawi networks while assassinating innocent civilians; in all speeches by Usama Bin Laden, Ayman al Zawahiri from 1998 till now; and all jihadi web sites in all languages: one global common thread is always omnipresent: The Jihadi ideology. And in parallel to al Qaeda's radical doctrine another ideology of Jihadism follows the teachings of Ayatollah Khomeini and is embodied by the public speeches of Iran's President Mahmoud Ahmedinijad and Hezbollah. Hence, the ideologies that produces "Radicalization," are the Jihadist ones. They are of two main "trees," the Jihadi Salafist and the Jihadi Khomeinist. These doctrines, taught and disseminated worldwide and in America, are the producers of the "Jihadists" (*al Jihadiyun*) who have declared war and waged it against the United States both overseas and in the homeland. Jihadism is the ideological common identity of terror groups al Qaeda, Salafi Combat Group of the Maghreb, Hamas, Islamic Jihad, Jemaah Islamiya of south Asia, the Taliban of Afghanistan, Laskar Taiba of Pakistan, the Mahakem Islamiya of Somalia, and other Salafi-Wahabi groups internationally, in addition to Hezbollah. Jihadism was the inspiration for the 1990s attacks, 9/11, Madrid, London, Beslan, Mumbai, Riyadh, Casablanca, the Sunni Triangle in Iraq and other violence associated with Terrorism. Hence at this stage of the War on Terror, the ideology behind the threat has been identified and thus should be addressed.

Development of the Threat

Prior to 9/11, the spread of Jihadis was operated by Salafi, Wahabi, Muslim Brotherhood (*Ikhwan*), Tablighi, Deobandi and Takfiri schools of thought around the world, mostly by the means of religious schools known as Madrassa. Moving into the United States gradually as of the 1970s, and increasingly in the 1990s, Jihadi cadres took the control of existing religious schools funded by foreign support but also formed their own indoctrination networks, often in and around Mosques and other social and cultural centers. In about twenty years of militant activities, the Jihadist ideology produced three generations of radicals, a pool which Terrorists have and continue to recruit from. The perpetrators of the September 11, 2001 attacks are foreign Jihadists. But most of the other arrested Terrorists (or alleged Terrorists) claiming the same ideology and who identify with al Qaeda or its allies, are "American Jihadists," citizens or permanent residents, U.S.-born or naturalized. Hence the most dangerous dimension of the ideology of Jihadism is the fact that it has already recruited and inspired Americans to wage war against their own nation. Therefore Jihadism is a direct threat against Homeland Security

Components of the threat

This threat against national security and against the foundations of civil society and democracy is embodied by a set of ideas and concepts that reject the legitimacy of citizens' free choice, their natural liberties, pluralism, and the rule of secular law. The Jihadi ideology is not another social or political way of thinking within Democracy, nor is it a political alternative to one particular party or a specific policy in domestic or foreign affairs. Jihadism rejects the American constitution, the bill of rights, the international declaration on human rights, the United Nations and international law. Jihadism aim at destroying democracies and installing a totalitarian regime named Caliphate. And to do so, Jihadism creates the conviction in the minds of its adherents that war against the Government, people and constitution of the United States is the path towards achieving the universal goal. The beginning of the threat starts with the "click" that transforms a citizen into a Jihadist. From there one, the constant objective of the Jihadi recruit is to strike against the national security of the United States. The Terrorist can be a member of al Qaeda if he/she are successful in establishing the contact, as for example with the case of Adam Gadahn and Jose Padilla, or they could operate under an al Qaeda like Jihadism, without having established a link with the mother ship.

Strategic penetration

The strategic penetration operated by the Jihadists before and since 9/11 is based on three models: One are the Jihadists who originates overseas and move to the United States, either legally (visa, lawful immigration, marriage, political asylum) or illegally. In either of these cases the Jihadis ends up operating on the inside of the country, using its laws and facilities. The estimate of Jihadists who have infiltrated the country over the past two decades is certainly in the hundreds, possibly

close to a thousand. This “first generation” Jihadists has organized itself to perform two activities: One is to grow its own strength for “future Jihads.” Two is to produce the second generation of American-born Jihadists. If you analyze the average age of U.S. born Jihadists, you would conclude that the production of the second “generation” has begun in the late 1980s and mostly since the early 1990s. The formation of this “second generation” can only happen through two methods. First is to indoctrinate then recruit within the Muslim community using a variety of methods and already penetrated institutions. Second, is for them to take the control of the religious conversion of non-Muslims and indoctrinate the converts during the process or after the process: Hence a first generation of radical Salafists-Wahabis has already processed a radicalization and the recruitment of American-born Muslims or converts. The issue is not conversion: This is a free and pluralist society. Certainly there is and would be a problem with the radicalization taking place within a particular community. But the real issue affecting Homeland Security is the systematic penetration of a religious community and the recruitment of Jihadists to perform acts of Terrorism and aggression against national security.

And once the “Pool” of indoctrinated individuals is formed, mostly of younger persons then the Terror organizations can recruit from. However, Jihadists in the West in general and in the U.S. in particular, are of two types once they are formed: Either they join an organization and moves into a cell, or they form their own cell, without connecting with a larger organization or al Qaeda. The most dangerous Jihadists, both on the individual level or as self-formed cells are those who have been able or are in the process of penetrating the defense-security system of the United States. In this realm, the Jihadists can harm the most the national security of the Homeland, and analytical indications project that one of their ultimate goals is to penetrate and weaken U.S. Homeland Security.

Threat shield

There are several shields that “protect” the U.S.-based Jihadists from containment. Among these shields are:

- a. The little ability of the public to identify them since their ideology wasn’t officially identified by the Government.
- b. Without the public, Law Enforcement and Homeland Security cannot mobilize on a large scale to identify and isolate the Jihadists activities. Furthermore, by not identifying the ideology and its strategies, the U.S. Government cannot direct its agencies and resources against the threat.
- c. The ideology of Jihadi-Terrorism unfortunately, enjoys the political freedoms of the country. It is “protected” by advocacy groups, legal defense and is funded both domestically and by foreign regimes and organizations.

Resistance to “radicalization”

To establish a national resistance to “radicalization” following are 6 suggestions:

1. Identification of the ideology of Jihadism by Government, media and experts.
2. Mobilization against the ideology of Jihadism by the public and educational institutions
3. Ban of the ideology by the U.S. Congress
4. Mass education of the public about it
5. Working with domestic NGOs, with the general public and specifically with the Muslim communities
6. Working with international INGOs and particularly with liberal, democratic and humanist Muslims

Looking at the future

In summary, Terrorism is threatening Homeland Security and Jihadism is a main root cause of Terrorism. The U.S. capacity of protecting Homeland security and defending national security will depend largely on developing policies and laws that would identify, ban, isolate and shrink Jihadism, with the help of the American public in general and the Muslim and Middle Eastern communities in particular. Such a shift in Homeland security must be based on a comprehensive strategy of containment of the Terror ideology within the framework of civil and democratic rights of society.

In closing, I would like to thank you and the committee members and staff for the opportunity to present this testimony today. I look forward to responding to any question that you might have.

Mr. SIMMONS. Thank you very much for that very interesting testimony. It went over the 5 minutes, but I felt that it was very much worth it. So thank you very much.

Mr. Cilluffo?

STATEMENT OF FRANK CILLUFFO, DIRECTOR, HOMELAND SECURITY POLICY INSTITUTE, THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

Mr. CILLUFFO. Chairman Simmons, thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today. I echo others in congratulating you for your foresight and leadership to address these issues. We don't want to be having this hearing after an incident occurs.

I will try to adhere to Shakespeare's rule on public speaking: Stand up to be seen, speak loudly to be heard, and sit down to be appreciated.

[Laughter.]

So I will try to be brief, and I am already seated.

As discussed, radicalization has manifested itself in a series of terrorist attacks and activities, such as those in Madrid, London and the operations thwarted in Canada. Though Al Qaida in its classic form is now a degraded entity, it has franchised itself across the globe. These groups are prepared to act locally and largely independently.

And we are now seeing the emergence of a leaderless movement, marked significantly by self-enlistment and taking its inspiration from "Al Qaida classic" to join the global Salafi jihad.

The Internet has fueled this development, wherein chat rooms have sort of replaced the smoke-filled bars, in essence building a virtual umma.

Ironically, it is when homegrown groups attempt to reach out to Al Qaida that they have been caught in key instances. And fortunately, these groups have not yet attained a higher level of competence.

It is essential to better understand the life cycle of the terrorists, specifically the process by which an individual becomes motivated to listen to radical ideas, read about them, enlist oneself or respond to terrorist recruiting efforts, and ultimately act upon those ideas, from sympathizer to activist to indiscriminate violence.

Together with my colleagues at the University of Virginia, particularly Dr. Greg Saathoff, we have just co-chaired a task force on prison radicalization, which we released yesterday on the other side of the U.S. Capitol. My remarks today will focus on the findings of that group.

But I should say that it was a request to brief the chairman and ranking members of this committee that actually led us, in a closed-door session, and reinforced our belief that a task-force study was sorely needed.

Our dedicated volunteer group did a deep dive into the issue and brought to bear a range of perspectives on the issue. We looked at the challenge through the distinct lenses of imams and chaplains, officials at all levels of government, scholars of religion, and behavioral science experts, and of course the more traditional law enforcement and intelligence perspective, and integrated these views into a prism, so as to come up with effective, multidimensional recommendations for action.

To put things in context, prisons have always been an incubator for radical ideas, in part because they are the captive audience. Examples run the gamut over time and geographic space, from Hitler,

to Stalin, to Bosnia's Arkan, to the spiritual philosopher of Al Qaida, Sayyid Qutb, on to al-Zarqawi.

Of course religious radicalization is not unique to Islam and remains the exception, rather than the rule, irrespective of the faith at issue.

To date, select cases, from the well-known, such as Richard Reid, the new Folsom Prison case, and Sheik Rahman, to the lesser-known, such as El Rukn or the extremist Christian group Covenant, Sword and Arm of the Lord, have revealed connections between former prisoners and terrorism. Each held the potential to be a high-consequence event, and authorities have attested that these cases appear to be just the tip of the iceberg, though they cannot discuss ongoing investigations in great detail.

The potential scope of our challenge is considerable. America's prison population is the world's largest, at over 2 million. Our incarceration rate is the world's highest. Ninety-three percent of U.S. inmates are in state and local prisons and jails, not at the federal level.

The figures in California alone are staggering. Facilities are hugely overcrowded, operating at 200 percent capacity. Wardens, understandably, have their hands full dealing with day-to-day operations and safety issues alone. And prisoners with radical Islamic religious views often conduct themselves as model prisoners, so wardens and other prison staff, who are already overburdened, may have little incentive to focus on these inmates.

Despite such overstretch, California officials have demonstrated an impressive level of resolve and commitment to countering prisoner radicalization. Arizona and New York have also been particularly forward-leaning in this approach.

However, even those that are proactive, most of the successes, one would argue, are due to luck, such as the new Folsom Prison case where it was one of the perpetrators dropping a cell phone that unraveled a much larger plot.

In short, strides have been made, but disconnects remain. Crucially local information is yet to fully find its way into regional and national intelligence processes and networks, and strategic analysis is not yet fused with the investigatory efforts.

Complicating this matter, there is currently no database to track inmates after release or to identify inmates associated with radical groups, and no comprehensive database exists to track religious service providers who are known to expose inmates to radical religious rhetoric.

Compounding the threat posed by Islamic radicalization is the established presence of violent gangs and extremist groups in prisons. Some of these groups have found common cause with extremist Muslim groups, who share their hostility toward the U.S. government and Israel—the “enemy of my enemy is my friend” effect.

It should go without saying that religion may have a tremendously constructive impact upon inmates, imbuing them with a sense of discipline and purpose, among other things. Prisoners obviously also have a legal right to practice.

Unfortunately, a shortage of suitably qualified Muslim religious services providers has opened the door to underqualified and rad-

ical chaplains to enter prisons. In fact, prisoners have often taken on this role themselves altogether.

Their captive audience may, in large part, have had no prior exposure to Islam and no way to put the radical message into context. The only version some may ever learn is the cut-and-paste version of the Koran that incorporates violate prison gang culture known as Jailhouse Islam, or Prislam, from gang leaders or other influential inmates.

Moreover, there is no consistently applied standard or procedure to determine what reading material is appropriate at the state level, at the local level. Radical literature and extremist translations and interpretations of the Koran—we talked about the Noble Koran—has been distributed to prisoners by groups suspected or known to support terrorism.

Nor is this unique to the United States. In fact, I think we have an opportunity to get in front of the problem, not behind it.

Let me, just in closing, I would be delighted to get into greater detail on why we think we need a commission. But we need broader avenues of dialogue with the Muslim community. They need to be identified and pursued to foster mutual respect, trust and understanding. To confine the discussion of these issues to terrorism alone is bound to encourage a defensive posture and impede a constructive dialogue.

Prison radicalization is but one subset of the battle of ideas, and it is only by challenging ideas with ideas, both within and beyond prison walls, that we can succeed and moderate some of these views.

[The statement of Mr. Cilluffo follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF FRANK J. CILLUFFO

Chairman Simmons, Representative Lofgren, and distinguished members of the Subcommittee, it is a privilege to be afforded the opportunity to testify before you today. Your foresight and leadership in examining the homeland security implications of radicalization is to be commended.

Some months ago, I was asked to brief the Chairmen and Ranking Members of the House Homeland Security Subcommittees on the more specific issue of prisoner radicalization in the United States. That briefing, provided jointly with Dr. Gregory Saathoff, a leading behavioral science expert, was well attended by both sides of the aisle and the discussion, which took place in a closed door session, was a spirited one. Congressional leadership and political will in connection with this particular challenge has been manifestly evident, and you should all be recognized for your efforts in this regard. Proactive consideration of this challenge and a carefully calibrated response, implemented in timely fashion, will bolster national security. Getting ahead of the curve requires the courage to assume risk, and those who embrace risk in the interest of furthering public safety should be supported in their efforts to serve the public interest. Let us not wait until we are faced with the need to manage a crisis.

That briefing, taken together with other conversations I have had with a bipartisan group of Representatives, served to reinforce my belief, as well as Dr. Saathoff's, that there was a real need to explore the question of prisoner radicalization in order to sharpen our sense of the nature and scale of the problem, and thereby serve as a spur to action. Against this background, The George Washington University's Homeland Security Policy Institute (HSPI) and the University of Virginia School of Medicine's Critical Incident Analysis Group (CIAG) blended their expertise and networks, and jointly convened a dedicated volunteer task force of subject matter experts to examine radicalization in prisons from a multidisciplinary perspective. Rather than studying the issue through a single lens or solely from a traditional law enforcement and/or intelligence perspective, the task force interviewed and received briefings from imams and chaplains, and brought together officials at all levels of government with scholars of religion and behavioral science

experts. The aim was to integrate insights from each of these professions (received under “Chatham House rules” and in the experts’ individual rather than institutional capacity), and recast their distinct lenses on this issue as a prism. Each community represented is a critical part of the solution and no analysis would be complete without the benefit of their insights and input. The task force report is a product of its members’ collective talents and I would be remiss if I did not express my gratitude for their willingness to join in this endeavor and share their valuable insights.

What follows is, in large part, a distillation of the most salient findings generated by this unique partnership, between HSPI and CIAG, on the subject of religious radicalization of inmates in US prisons. To set these remarks in broader context, however, I turn first to the matter of radicalization writ large. Prison radicalization is, of course, a subset of the more general phenomenon of radicalization that has manifested itself in a series of terrorist attacks and activities including the bombings in Madrid (3/11) and London (7/7), and operations recently uncovered in Canada. The larger terrorist threat is the tapestry against which prisoner radicalization must be studied, but that fabric is ever changing. Al Qaeda in its classic form is now a degraded entity, with many of its remaining key figures on the run. However, it has franchised itself across the globe, with its franchisees prepared to act locally, and largely independently—in effect a network of networks. Having transitioned from Chief Financial Officer to Chief Spiritual Officer, Bin Laden has spawned and successfully marketed the Al Qaeda “brand.” Recently, we have seen the emergence of a leaderless movement, marked significantly by self-enlistment, and taking its inspiration from “Al Qaeda classic” to join the global Salafi jihad. The internet has fuelled this development by encouraging and accelerating the formation of stronger initial bonds inside chat rooms than would occur through face-to-face interaction, and facilitating the re-affirmation of aberrant attitudes—building in essence a virtual umma. Ironically, it is when homegrown groups attempt to reach out to Al Qaeda that they have been caught in key instances; fortunately, these groups have not yet attained a higher level of competence. The internet has also provided an avenue for participation in jihad for women who could not otherwise become involved.¹

Whether beyond prison walls or inside them, it is essential to better understand the life cycle of a terrorist—specifically, the process by which an individual becomes motivated to listen to radical ideas, read about them, enlist oneself or respond to terrorist recruiting efforts, and ultimately, undertake terrorist activity.

In the prison context, the process of radicalization plays out in a particular way. For present purposes, the term “radicalization” should be taken to mean “the process by which inmates . . . adopt extreme views, including beliefs that violent measures need to be taken for political or religious purposes.”² Inmates in general are particularly vulnerable to radical religious ideology due to their anti-social attitudes and the need to identify with other inmates sharing the same background, beliefs or ethnicity. Radical rhetoric may exploit the inmate’s vulnerabilities and lack of grounded religious knowledge by providing validation to the inmate’s disillusionment with society and creating an outlet for their violent impulses. Possible psychological factors increasing vulnerability include a high level of distress, cultural disillusionment, lack of intrinsic religious beliefs or values, dysfunctional family system or dependent personality tendencies.³ These factors are prevalent among prison populations. From an ideological standpoint, radical religious groups allow the inmates to demonize their perceived enemies and view themselves as righteous. Prisons are inherently violent environments and therefore fertile ground for radicalization. Inmates are drawn to radical groups out of the need for protection or to gain status amongst other prisoners.⁴

Studies have suggested that terrorist recruitment methods are not always expected to yield a high number of recruits.⁵ Radical messages may be delivered to many prisoners with the understanding that most will resist radicalization. Even if the radical message resonates with only a few inmates, they could then be targeted for more intense one-on-one instruction. How an inspired sympathizer turns into an activist who then goes on to kill innocents is the crucial question. Only a few who become radicalized go on to actively pursue terrorism, and an important resource

¹ Interview with Scott Atran, Professor of Psychology and Public Policy, University of Michigan.

² *A Review of the Federal Bureau of Prisons’ Selection of Muslim Religious Services Providers*, Department of Justice, Office of The Inspector General, April 2004.

³ S. Gerwehr and S. Daly, *Al-Qaida: Terrorist Selection and Recruitment*, (McGraw-Hill Homeland Security Handbook, 2006), p. 84.

⁴ HSPI-CIAG Task Force Report, *Out of the Shadows: Getting Ahead of Prisoner Radicalization* (Washington, DC, September 2006), p. 4.

⁵ Gerwehr and Daly, *supra*, note 3.

for combating terrorism would be to determine which factor or factors that exist in prison influence some radicalized prisoners to make the specific leap from radical beliefs to violence in the name of those beliefs. Bear in mind, however, that a single radicalized inmate can be a significant threat.

Prison radicalization is not a new threat. Prisons have always been an incubator for radical ideas, in part because there is a captive audience. Recall that Hitler wrote *Mein Kampf* while in prison; and Stalin, while himself incarcerated, recruited inmates to power the Bolshevik Revolution. Zeljko Raznatovic, the founder of Arkan's Tigers, took part in the ethnic cleansing of Bosnia in the 1990s, was just a petty criminal until he spent time in Western Europe's prisons. The spiritual philosopher of Al Qaeda, Sayyid Qutb, wrote the radical Islamist manifesto *Ma'alim fi al-Tariq (Milestones Along the Road)* while in an Egyptian prison; and Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, initially merely a petty criminal, recruited followers while imprisoned. Of course, religious radicalization is not unique to Islam—and remains the exception rather than the rule, irrespective of the faith at issue.

To date, select cases that have revealed connections between former/current prisoners and terrorism have each held the potential to be a high-consequence event:

- In 1985, a group called El Rukn brokered a deal with the Libyan government to carry out attacks on US police stations, government facilities, military bases, and passenger airplanes in exchange for \$2.5 million and asylum in Tripoli. El Rukn was founded by a Chicago gang leader who converted to Islam while imprisoned in 1965.
- When the compound of the extremist Christian group Covenant, Sword and Arm of the Lord (CSA) was raided, authorities discovered landmines, US Army anti-tank rockets, and a large amount of cyanide apparently intended to poison a city's water supply. CSA's founder had earlier received spiritual tutelage in prison from a fellow inmate—a leader in the radical "Christian Identity" movement.
- John King and Russell Brewer were convicted of murdering African-American James Byrd Jr. in 1998. The two had entered prison as petty criminals, but left startlingly transformed, having joined a white supremacist group and covered their bodies with racist tattoos. King's own attorney ". . . admitted the significance of the prison experience. 'What I do know is [King] wasn't a racist when he went in. He was when he came out'."⁶
- Richard Reid, apprehended while attempting to detonate a bomb on a US-bound commercial flight in December 2001, is believed to have been radicalized by an imam while incarcerated in Britain.
- A recently foiled plot to attack numerous government and Jewish targets in California was devised inside New Folsom State Prison. Two men implicated in the scheme were recruited from a local mosque by a former prisoner.
- Sheik Omar Abdel Rahman, the emir of Egypt's Gama'at al Islamia (the Islamic Group), is the radical cleric who plotted to bomb New York City landmarks in 1993. Upon being sentenced to a life term, he issued a decree from federal prison, declaring of Americans that "Muslims everywhere [should] dismember their nation, tear them apart, ruin their economy, provoke their corporations, destroy their embassies, attack their interests, sink their ships, . . . shoot down their planes, [and] kill them on land, at sea, and in the air. Kill them wherever you find them." Osama bin Laden later claimed that this fatwa provided religious authority for the 9/11 attacks. Abdel Rahman has continued trying to run his organization while incarcerated—and three defendants were convicted of terrorism charges in 2005 for helping him do so.

These cases would appear to be just the tip of the iceberg, however. According to authorities who briefed the task force, numerous other examples exist, but due to the sensitive nature of ongoing investigations, cannot be discussed publicly in detail. In short, we have snippets of data but do not currently have a sense of how these various "pixels" fit together as a mosaic—the big picture as it now stands is fuzzy, and needs to be brought into focus in order for effective response measures to be formulated and implemented.

That said, officials in California confirm that "for every rock they turn over" in this context, they "find something there." While resource and personnel constraints have inhibited further investigation of many of those leads, at least the bounds of what we do not know may be apparent to those authorities. Potentially even more disturbing is the further scenario in which we do not know what we do not know. In short, there is a dearth of data in this area which inhibits a fulsome assessment of the threat posed by religious radicalization of inmates in the US correctional sys-

⁶Anti-Defamation League, *Dangerous Convictions: An Introduction to Extremist Activities in Prisons* (2002), p. 2.

tem. Further, social scientists and other academicians interested in examining the issue have been largely unsuccessful to date in gaining access to prison facilities to conduct research, and prisoner radicalization therefore remains a poorly understood phenomenon.

The task force set out to determine what is currently known about radicalization and recruitment in the US prison system at the federal, state and local levels. From the outset, however, I should emphasize that the problem is by no means unique to the US. In Europe, for instance, the number of Muslim inmates has been growing for decades, and their numbers incarcerated are not in proportion to their representation in the general population.⁷ By comparison to American Muslims, Muslims living in Europe are more socio-economically marginalized, and therefore more vulnerable to radical messages, religious and otherwise. Indeed, the *Washington Post* recently reported that whereas Muslims living in the United States “tend to be more educated” and “have higher incomes than the average American,” the reverse is true for Muslims in Britain.⁸

The European experience is relevant to our own in at least two ways, though: as a containment challenge and a learning opportunity, respectively. First, inmates radicalized in Europe may travel to the US or participate in networks with individuals inside the US; and indirect internet access, which may be accorded to some prisoners in the US, facilitates such cross-border networking. Second, and more encouragingly, the European experience offers us a chance to learn and adapt lessons, and craft effective tailored strategies to the US context *before* the problem manifests itself here to the extent that it has overseas. In point of fact, the problem is a global one and, moving forward, information-sharing between and among the US and other countries will be crucial.

Within the US, the potential scope of the challenge is considerable: America’s prison population is the world’s largest at over two million, and our incarceration rate is the world’s highest at 701 out of every 100,000.⁹ The overwhelming majority of these inmates, that is ninety-three percent, are in state and local prisons and jails.¹⁰ As a result, the threat of prisoner radicalization gains even greater salience here than at the federal level. The figures for California alone are staggering. There, thirty-three adult prisons contain an inmate population in excess of 170,000. With facilities hugely overcrowded—operating at 200% capacity—staffing, management, funding, and logistics pose a tremendous challenge, and wardens there understandably have their hands full dealing with day-to-day operations alone. All of these inmates must be fed, clothed, housed and, most importantly, supervised and secured. Concerned with dangerous inmates and hardened criminals, prison officials simply do not have the manpower to oversee every prayer service or investigate every lead. Further, prisoners with extremist religious views often conduct themselves as model prisoners, hence, wardens (and other prison staff) who are already overburdened may have little incentive to focus on these inmates.

Notwithstanding such overstretch, officials at the state level have demonstrated an impressive level of resolve and commitment to countering prisoner radicalization. The issue has been identified as a priority, and a concerted investigative effort is underway in California (within the bounds of prevailing resources). A deliberate effort to identify and remedy key gaps in the state’s prevention and response posture has given rise to a number of noteworthy initiatives including pilot programs intended to draw on the expertise developed over time by institutional gang investigators, and model terrorism and training awareness courses under development for correctional officers. State liaison officers posted at each prison meet monthly to share information across facilities. Beyond the prison-to-prison network, the long term and crucial process of building relationships and trust between and among officials at different levels of government is furthered by monthly meetings of a collective including prison staff, the Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department (LASD), the Los Angeles Police Department, the FBI, the Drug Enforcement Agency, and the Assistant US Attorney for the area. Notably, California is not alone in doing good work—Arizona and New York have also been forward-leaning in their approach to this problem, and they too should be commended for their proactive efforts.

⁷N.H. Ammar et al., “Muslims in Prison: A Case Study from Ohio State Prisons,” *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, Volume 48, Number 4 (2004), pp. 416–17.

⁸59% of US Muslims hold a Bachelor’s degree or more, versus 27% in the US overall; and 52% of US Muslims earn \$50,000 or more, versus 45% in the US overall. Geneive Abdo, “America’s Muslims Aren’t as Assimilated as You Think,” *Washington Post* (August 27, 2006).

⁹Roy Walmsley, *World Prison Population (5th Ed.)* (Home Office Publication 234, 2003).

¹⁰Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics, *Prison Statistics*, August 15, 2006; <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/correct.htm> (September 13, 2006).

Even in California, however, publicized successes may be due in no small part to luck. For instance, while the LASD in conjunction with the area's Joint Terrorism Task Force managed to foil the New Folsom plot referenced above, it was the fact that one of the plotters carelessly left a cell phone behind during a robbery that provided the key break in the case. While strides have been made in the wake of this episode, disconnects remain—crucially, local information has yet to fully find its way into regional and national intelligence processes and networks, and strategic analysis is not yet fused with investigatory efforts so that synergies emerge. Significant cultural obstacles also hinder the information-sharing process, highlighting further the complexities of working across jurisdictions. Bureaucratic infighting continues to hamper information sharing even between and among federal agencies, in part because of differing views on tradecraft—while some agencies are inclined to string people up at a relatively early stage, others are predisposed to stringing them along in order to tease out additional valuable information.

The implications are deeply disturbing. Radical preachers might be caught in one prison, fired, and simply move on to work at another prison. Radicalized prisoners might be transferred between prisons, giving them an opportunity to spread their message to new audiences, without prison officials on the receiving end knowing the threat posed by their new charges. Radical groups might be communicating between different prisons, coordinating their efforts, without prison officials being aware of links between them. The importance of information and intelligence sharing cannot be overstated, in part because it is essential that operations be intelligence-driven. Complicating the matter, there is currently no database to track inmates after they have served their sentence or to identify prisoners associated with radical groups. Further, there is no comprehensive database that tracks religious service providers that have exposed inmates to radical religious rhetoric. The sort of database that is truly needed is one that encompasses both the prison context and beyond, and covers who joins jihad, when, and how.¹¹ In any case, it is critical that information regarding the radicalization of prisoners in state, local, and federal correctional facilities be included as part of the body of information shared through the Information Sharing Environment called for by the *Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004*.

Compounding the threat posed by Islamic radicalization is the established presence of violent gangs and extremist Christian groups in prisons. Gangs have a long history of organizing, recruiting, and violence within prisons, giving Muslim extremist groups an opportunity to learn lesson organizational lessons. Many terrorist groups use crime, including extortion, kidnapping, robbery, document fraud, drug smuggling and arms trafficking to fund their enterprises,¹² offering an opportunity for the groups to cooperate to their mutual benefit. More ominous is the potential for cooperation with right-wing Christian extremist groups, which not only have a history of terrorist attacks on US soil, but also a longstanding relationship with prisoners. These groups, which ascribe to “Christian Identity” ideology, include Posse Comitatus, The Order, and Aryan Nations. Some of these groups have found common cause with extremist Muslim groups, who share their hostility towards the US government and Israel—the “enemy of my enemy is my friend” effect. Most recently, a number of white supremacist groups vocalized their support for Hezbollah. Furthermore, radical Islamic groups have already begun adapting practices of gangs and extremist Christian groups. Where White Supremacist gangs use ancient runes or Masonic symbols as secret codes, radical Muslim groups increasingly use Arabic language and script to communicate in secret while imprisoned.

A key factor in the growth of prisoner radicalization is the shortage of suitably qualified Muslim religious service providers available for work in prisons. Prisoners have a legal right to practice their religion, and prisons are legally bound to provide for inmate worship. This has opened the door to under-qualified and, dangerously, radical preachers to enter prisons. Strikingly, the Federal Bureau of Prisons (FBOP) currently employs only ten Muslim chaplains for the entire federal prison system, while the California state prison system employs twenty Muslim chaplains for its 300,000 prisoners and parolees. This handful of chaplains cannot possibly tend to the religious needs of every Muslim prisoner or oversee every religious service. As a result, prisoners often take on the role of religious service providers and prayer leaders. A 2004 survey of 193 wardens of state correctional facilities showed that

¹¹Scott Atran and Marc Sageman, “Connecting the Dots,” *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* (August 2006).

¹²Steven C. McCraw, Assistant Director, Office for Intelligence, Federal Bureau of Investigation, “Narco-Terrorism: International Drug Trafficking and Terrorism—A Dangerous Mix,” Testimony before the Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, delivered on May 20, 2003.

half the institutions allowed inmates themselves to act as spiritual leaders.¹³ Radical prisoners who volunteer for religious functions and assume religious authority benefit from a captive audience which may, in large part, have had no prior exposure to Islam, and no way to put the radical message into context. Hence, the only version of their religion that they have ever known is a “cut-and-paste” version of the Qur’an that incorporates violent prison gang culture, known as “Jailhouse Islam” or “Prislam”. (It should go without saying, however, that in general terms religion may have a tremendously constructive impact upon inmates, imbuing them with a sense of discipline and purpose, among other things). Radical prisoners who want the role of religious leader for themselves have also been known to intimidate suitably qualified religious service providers into ceding their role.

The FBOP has attempted to deal with this problem by instituting new standards for prison religious service providers, and identifying a national organization that could vet religious service providers, ensuring a certain level of education and experience, as well as weeding out potential radicals who would incite violence. However, there has been no such national organization identified by the FBOP. As a result, prayer leaders and religious service providers only require endorsement by local organizations, making it more difficult to identify and track radical preachers, who often move between prisons freely. The situation at the state level is by no means more comforting. By way of illustration, there is no standard policy for vetting religious service providers in California prisons, leading potentially to thirty-three different policies in thirty-three different prisons. Without standard policies, it is possible for a chaplain to be removed from one prison for spreading radical ideas and inciting violence, only to find work at another prison, with officials none the wiser.

Due to the lack of proper religious authorities and academically credentialed experts available to review all materials entering the prison system, no consistently applied standard or procedure exists to determine what reading material is appropriate. In the absence of monitoring by authoritative Islamic chaplains, materials that advocate violence have infiltrated the prison system undetected. The lack of individuals with a thorough knowledge of Islam, the Qur’an and other religious materials entering prisons offers an opportunity for recruiters outside of prisons to paint a violent picture of Islam. Radical literature and extremist translations and interpretations of the Qur’an have been distributed to prisoners by groups suspected or known to support terrorism. The use of Arabic language materials obscures the content to untrained prison officials. Radicals often do not even need to rely on secret codes or foreign languages to smuggle in radical tracts. The Noble Qur’an, a Wahhabi/Salafi version written in English, is widely available in prisons. A recent review in *The Middle East Quarterly* characterized this version as reading more “. . . like a supremacist Muslim, anti-Semite, anti-Christian polemic than a rendition of the Islamic scripture.¹⁴ Of particular concern is its appendix, entitled “The Call to *Jihad* (Holy Fighting in Allah’s Cause).” Another text of concern is Saeed Ismaeel’s *The Differences Between the Shee’ah and Muslims Who Follow the Sunnah*, written in plain English. Extremist interpretations of the Qur’an use footnotes and supplements to lead the reader to a radical interpretation of the scripture. The FBOP is now requiring that Islamic teaching materials and study guides be prepared by Islamic chaplains who are full-time FBOP staff,¹⁵ but FBOP represents only a small fraction of the US prison system.

The threat posed by prisoner radicalization does not end when inmates are paroled or released. Former inmates are vulnerable to radicalization and recruitment because many leave prison with very little financial or social support. To the extent that radical groups may draw upon funding from well-financed, extremist backers, they can offer much more support to released prisoners than other more legitimate community programs that would facilitate genuine reintegration into society. By providing for prisoners in their time of greatest need, radical organizations can build upon the loyalty developed during the individual’s time in prison. If connections are made with a radicalized community group, the recently released inmate may remain at risk for recruitment or continued involvement in terrorist networks.

Moving forward, a fundamental imperative, in my view as well as that of the task force, is for Congress to establish a Commission to investigate this issue in depth.

¹³George W. Knox, “The Problem of Gangs and Security Threat Groups in American Prisons Today: Recent Research, Findings From the 2004 Prison Gang Survey,” (National Gang Crime Research Center, 2005)

¹⁴Khaleel Mohammed, “Assessing English Translations of the Qur’an,” *Middle East Quarterly*, Volume 12, Number 2 (Spring 2005).

¹⁵*Department of Justice Anti-Terrorism Efforts Since Sept. 11, 2001*. Department of Justice Fact Sheet, 5 September 2006 <http://www.usdoj.gov/opa/pr/2006/September/06_0pa_590.html>.

An objective risk assessment is urgently needed in order to better understand the nature of the threat, and to formulate and calibrate proactive prevention and response efforts accordingly.¹⁶

For a proper appreciation of the proposed Commission and its course of work, two additional caveats are essential. First, all relevant perspectives must feed into the process—as emphasized above, solutions in this context must be reflective of the complexity of the problem and, therefore, no one profession alone is equipped to analyze and recommend change. Law enforcement must come together with a range of non-traditional partners in order to get us to where we need to be on this issue. Second, it is crucial that balance be injected into this exercise, specifically, that the practice of religious freedom be given fulsome consideration and weight while means of preventing the spread of radical ideology in a religious context are studied.

While the task force would not presume to instruct the Commission on how to go about doing its work, we would urge that the following core issues be accorded priority status:

As a corollary to assessing the risk posed by the influence of radical groups within the prison system, there should be a companion assessment of current levels of information sharing between and among agencies at all levels of government involved in managing inmates and monitoring radical groups.

Equally crucial is the identification of steps to ensure the legitimacy of Islamic endorsing agencies so as to ensure a reliable and effective process of providing religious services to Muslim inmates.

Steps to effectively reintegrate former inmates into the larger society should also be identified, with an eye to diminishing the likelihood that former prisoners will be recruited by radical groups posing as social service providers, or act upon radical tendencies learned behind bars.

Fortunately, we are not building entirely from scratch: lessons can and should be learned and adapted from present and past efforts to combat gangs and right-wing extremists in prisons. Existing prison programs designed to prevent radicalization and recruitment or to disrupt radical groups—whether at the local, state, federal, or international level—should be evaluated to determine a set of best practices that can be used to develop a comprehensive strategy to counter radicalization. Knowledge must be translated into action across the board. Awareness, education, and training programs must be developed for personnel who work in prison, probation, and parole settings.

Finally, broader avenues of dialogue with the Muslim community should be identified and pursued to foster mutual respect and understanding, and ultimately trust. To confine the discussion to issues of terrorism alone is bound to encourage a defensive posture and impede constructive dialogue. Prison radicalization is but one subset of the battle of ideas, and it is only by challenging ideas with ideas—both within and beyond prison walls—that hearts and minds may ultimately be changed, and radical ideas moderated. Just as we cannot win the global war on terrorism abroad by military means alone, we will not win the battle against extremism domestically through law enforcement alone.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify before you today. I would also like to recognize the Subcommittee and their staff for their professionalism. Please note that I am submitting for the record our HSPI-CIAG Prisoner Radicalization Task Force Report entitled *Out of the Shadows: Getting Ahead of Prisoner Radicalization*. I would be pleased to try to answer any questions that you may have.

Mr. SIMMONS. I thank you very much. And I particularly appreciate that conclusion. I think it is excellent. And I am glad that the scheduling of this hearing stimulated work on the other side of the Hill. Glad to hear that.

Mr. Woodward?

**STATEMENT OF JOHN WOODWARD, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR,
RAND INTELLIGENCE POLICY CENTER**

Mr. WOODWARD. Good afternoon. I thank the distinguished chairman, ranking member, and members of this subcommittee for inviting me to testify about homeland security challenges, with ref-

¹⁶It should be noted that the FBI and the Department of Homeland Security are also conducting their own strategic assessments regarding the scope of radicalization and recruitment in US prisons from a law enforcement-centric point of view.

erence to a different aspect of this problem: how the U.S. government can make better use of biometric technologies to protect the nation in a matter consistent with American civil liberties.

I base my testimony on my RAND research, as well as my experience from 2003 to 2005 as director of the Department of Defense Biometrics Management Office, the organization responsible for planning, coordinating and implementing the department's biometric activities.

Today I want to make two basic points with respect to biometrics: First, the U.S. government is currently using biometric technologies in various ways to make the nation safer. Second, we can and should make better use of these technologies for homeland security purposes.

With respect to current U.S. government use, it is well established that biometric technologies are a significant tool contributing to homeland and national security. They are a significant tool because, among other things, they help authorities answer the critical question, "Who is this person?"

For instance, by comparing biometric data collected from a person to other biometric records in a database, we can conduct what is called a one-to-many search, thus matching and linking that person to, for example, previously used identities or activities.

Of particular importance for this hearing, these biometric processes work in a way that is race-neutral, ethnicity-neutral and religion-neutral. In this context, three U.S. government databases, all based on the biometric modality of fingerprint, help make these matches and links possible.

These databases are: the Federal Bureau of Investigation's Integrated Automated Fingerprint Identification System, operational since 1999, which contains the 10-rolled fingerprints and facial photographs of approximately 52 million people arrested in the United States, as well as the fingerprints of approximately 20,000 known or suspected terrorists.

The second database is the Department of Homeland Security's Automated Biometric Identity System, which contains approximately 50 million fingerprints, most in a two-digit, flat, fingerscan format, and facial photographs from various foreigners, to include visitors to the United States under the U.S.-VISIT program, recidivists, watchlisted persons, and asylum seekers.

The third database, the Department of Defense Automated Biometric Identification System, operational since 2004, which, in close cooperation with the FBI, enables automated searching of 10-rolled fingerprint data and includes facial photographs taken from detainees and other persons of interest in places like Iraq.

The U.S. government's use of biometric technologies has identified individuals who pose a threat to the nation's security. Let me share some examples with you.

A fingerprint match which identified Mohammed al-Khatani, the person whom the 9/11 Commission described as the 20th hijacker. Fingerprint matches which have identified persons in U.S. military custody in Iraq as: persons who, because of their prior activities, pose significant threats to the well-being of U.S. forces; people with prior U.S. criminal records; criminals wanted in the United States; recidivists, many of whom were previously taken into military cus-

tody using alias; as well as persons of interest for other reasons. Fingerprint and face matches have also identified person attempting to enter the United States as a security concern.

All of these biometric matches provided helpful information and, in some cases, valuable intelligence to U.S. authorities. Many of these matches, including al-Khatani's, occurred because of extensive DOD, FBI and DHS cooperation. A small but significant number of these matches no doubt saved American lives.

With respect to privacy and civil liberties, I have to say, Mr. Chairman, your timing for the hearing is impeccable, because the U.S. government, just yesterday, released several white papers, including one on biometrics and privacy in which the government discusses its approach to the use of biometric technologies.

And I have my visual aid for you. I recommend it to the subcommittee and staff.

Mr. SIMMONS. Without objection, we will insert it into the record of the hearing.

Mr. WOODWARD. The U.S. government has made commendable progress with respect to effective use of biometrics. However, more can and should be done. Specifically, I call the subcommittee's attention to two key areas where the U.S. government must improve: identity management practice and information sharing environment, ISE.

Identity management practice applies to any number of homeland security applications, for example: the foreigner seeking a U.S. visa; the registered traveler seeking to confirm her bona fides for travel; or the U.S. government employee, contractor or military member needing a common identity credential.

In general, identity management practice should focus on helping a person establish her identity through a process that would include robust biometric vetting—that is, the one-to-many search of biometric data against relevant databases—and then helping the person to verify that identity through what would be biometric verification, a one-to-one comparison, to facilitate the various daily transactions that require identity management.

For example, in the case of a foreigner seeking a U.S. visa, the visa seeker's biometric data can be searched against the FBI, DHS, DOD databases for any matches, as well as the database of visa applicants to ensure that that individual has not previously applied under a different identity.

By complementing the identity management process with a biometric, we make it easier for the person, particularly when names get confused, misspelled or misreported on watchlists of various sorts.

The impartiality of biometric technologies also offers a significant benefit for society. While humans, for example, are very adept at recognizing facial features, we also have prejudices and preconceptions. And the controversy surrounding racial profiling is a case in point. Biometric systems do not focus on a person's skin color, hairstyle or manner of dress. And they do not rely on racial, ethnic or religious stereotypes. By using biometrics, human recognition can be free from any human flaws.

With respect to the information sharing environment, this is an environment that still remains polluted with stovepipes, cultural

resistance, bureaucratic inertia, absence of comprehensive policy, and other impediments.

Three specific examples requiring immediate attention include: One, establishing a U.S. government biometrics-based watchlist of homeland security threats; second, sharing relevant biometric data with our international partners, particularly in light of global terrorism; and third, creating a net-centric approach to the biometric-based information sharing environment.

A word of explanation: Too much biometric information sharing is currently conducted by making copies of data, providing those copies, sometimes on a physical medium such as a compact disc, to another agency. This approach, while a temporary expedient, leads to problems in the long run, such as synchronization, correction, updating, data protection, et cetera. We should strive for a federated, synchronized database system based on a pooled information sharing environment.

Much of my testimony today has discussed fingerprints because that has been the biometric mainstay for our homeland security. However, this subcommittee should note that the future will be increasingly multimodal, featuring and fusing multiple biometric types such as fingerprint, iris, face recognition, voice and others. The U.S. government's identity management practices and information sharing environment must be able to respond nimbly to these technological opportunities.

In closing, the U.S. government use of biometric technologies is a success story, as measured by threats identified, intelligence gained, and lives saved. Hopefully I have provided the subcommittee with suggestions you may find worth pursuing.

I believe we are still in the very early stages of using biometric technologies for homeland security, with much more to do. As experience shows, the U.S. government can use this significant tool for protecting the nation while preserving civil liberties.

Thank you for having me testify today, and I welcome your questions.

[The statement of Mr. Woodward follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF JOHN D. WOODWARD, JR.¹

Introduction

Good afternoon. I thank the distinguished Chairman, Ranking Member, and Members of this Subcommittee for inviting me to testify about homeland security challenges, with particular reference to how the U.S. Government can make better use of biometric technologies to protect the nation, in a manner consistent with American civil liberties. I base my testimony on my RAND research as well as my experience from 2003 to 2005 as Director of the Department of Defense Biometrics Management Office, the organization responsible for planning, coordinating, and implementing the Department's biometric activities.²

¹The opinions and conclusions expressed in this testimony are the author's alone and should not be interpreted as representing those of RAND or any of the sponsors of its research. This product is part of the RAND Corporation testimony series. RAND testimonies record testimony presented by RAND associates to federal, state, or local legislative committees; government-appointed commissions and panels; and private review and oversight bodies. The RAND Corporation is a nonprofit research organization providing objective analysis and effective solutions that address the challenges facing the public and private sectors around the world. RAND's publications do not necessarily reflect the opinions of its research clients and sponsors.

²I also thank Nicholas M. Orlans, a biometric subject matter expert, and my RAND colleagues, John V. Parachini and Michael A. Wermuth, for their helpful comments on earlier drafts of this testimony.

Today, I want to make two basic points with respect to biometrics, which are automated methods of recognizing a person based on a physiological or behavioral characteristic:

1. The U.S. Government is currently using biometric technologies in various ways to make the nation safer.
2. We can and should make better use of these technologies for homeland security purposes.

Current Use

With respect to current U.S. Government use, it is well established that biometric technologies are a significant tool contributing to homeland and national security. They are a significant tool because, among other things, they help authorities answer the critical question, “Who is this person?” For instance, by comparing biometric data collected from a person to other biometric records in a database, we can conduct what is called a “one-to-many” search, thus matching and linking that person to, for example, previously used identities or activities. In this context, three U.S. Government databases, all based on the biometric modality of fingerprint for automated searching, help make these matches and links possible. These are:

- The Federal Bureau of Investigation’s Integrated Automated Fingerprint Identification System (FBI IAFIS), operational since 1999, which contains the ten-rolled fingerprints (*i.e.*, each digit taken “nail-to-nail”) and facial photographs of approximately 52 million persons arrested in the U.S., as well as the fingerprints of approximately 20,000 known or suspected terrorists (KSTs);
- The Department of Homeland Security’s Automated Biometric Identity System (DHS IDENT), which contains approximately 50 million fingerprints (most in a two-digit “flat” finger scan format which will transition to ten flats)³ and facial photographs from various foreigners to include visitors to the U.S. under the US-VISIT program, recidivists, watchlisted persons, and asylum seekers; and
- The Department of Defense’s Automated Biometric Identification System (DoD ABIS), operational since 2004, which, in close cooperation with the FBI, enables automated searching of ten-rolled fingerprint data and includes facial photographs taken from detainees and other persons of interest in places like Iraq.

The U.S. Government’s use of biometric technologies has identified individuals who pose a threat to the nation’s security. Examples include:

- A fingerprint match which identified Mohamed Al Kahtani, the person whom the 9/11 Commission described as the 20th hijacker.⁴
- Fingerprint matches which have identified persons in U.S. military custody in Iraq as:
 - Persons who, because of their prior activities, pose significant threats to the wellbeing of U.S. forces;
 - Persons with prior U.S. criminal records;
 - Criminals wanted in the U.S.;
 - Recidivists (who had previously been in U.S. military custody, often using a different name); and
 - Persons of interest for other reasons.
- Fingerprint and face matches which have identified persons attempting to enter the U.S. as a security concern.⁵

All of these biometric matches provided helpful information, and in some cases, valuable intelligence to U.S. authorities. Many of these matches, including Al Kahtani’s, occurred because of extensive DoD, FBI, and DHS cooperation. A small but significant number of these matches no doubt saved American lives.

⁴ *The 9/11 Commission Report, The Final Report of the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks upon the United States* (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2004), 11, on-line at <http://www.911commission.gov/report/911Report.pdf>, accessed Sept. 16, 2006. For an in-depth description of the Al Kahtani match, see John D. Woodward, Jr., “Using Biometrics to Achieve Identity Dominance in the Global War on Terrorism,” *Military Review*, Sept./Oct. 2005: 30–34, on-line as part of the RAND Reprint series at <http://www.rand.org/pubs/reprints/RP1194/>, accessed Sept. 16, 2006.

⁵ [F]rom its inception [January 5, 2004] through January 5, 2006. . . the use of biometrics alone has allowed DHS to intercept more than 1,011 known criminals and immigration law violators—including individuals wanted for murder, rape, drug trafficking, and pedophilia.” See Testimony of Jim Williams, Director, US-VISIT Program, Department of Homeland Security, before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Homeland Security, Jan. 25, 2006, 2, on-line at

<http://appropriations.senate.gov/hearings/JWTestimonyFINAL.pdf#search=%22jim%20williams%20usvisit%20senate%20appropriations%22>, accessed Sept. 16, 2006.

Better Use

The U.S. Government has made progress with respect to effective use of biometrics; however, more can and should be done. Specifically, I call the Subcommittee's attention to two key areas where the U.S. Government must improve: identity management practice and the information sharing environment (ISE).

Identity management practice applies to any number of homeland security applications; for example, the foreigner seeking a U.S. visa, the registered traveler seeking to confirm her bona fides for travel, or the U.S. government employee, contractor, or military member needing a common identity credential. In general, identity management practice should focus on helping a person establish her identity, through a process that would include robust biometric vetting (*i.e.*, the one-to-many search against relevant databases), and then helping her to verify that identity, through what would include biometric verification (*i.e.*, the one-to-one comparison) to facilitate the various daily transactions that require identity management.

We should achieve this focus, in part, by fully leveraging existing biometric databases. We should also use biometrics to "fix" or "freeze" a person's identity to defeat the use of alias identities. For example, in the case of a foreigner seeking a U.S. visa, the visa seeker's biometric data can be searched against the FBI IAFIS, DHS IDENT and DoD ABIS databases for any matches, as well as a database of all visa applicants to ensure that that individual has not previously applied under a different identity.

By complementing the identity process with a biometric, we make it easier, or more identity user-friendly, for the person—particularly when names get confused, mis-spelled, or mis-reported on watchlists of various sorts. The impartiality of biometric technologies also offers a significant benefit for society. While humans, for example, are very adept at recognizing facial features, we also have prejudices and preconceptions. The controversy surrounding racial profiling is a leading example.

Biometric systems do not focus on a person's skin color, hairstyle, or manner of dress, and they do not rely on racial, ethnic, or religious stereotypes. On the contrary, a typical system uses objective measures to recognize a specific individual. By using biometrics, human recognition can be freed from many human flaws. In essence we are enabling a person to use another convenient, impartial, reliable way to establish and verify who she is, and to make it more difficult for someone else to use her identity.

The information sharing environment (ISE) still remains polluted with stovepipes, cultural resistance, bureaucratic inertia, absence of comprehensive policy, and other impediments. Specific examples requiring immediate U.S. Government attention include:

Establishing a U.S. Government biometrics-based watchlist of homeland security threats.

Sharing relevant biometric data with our international partners, particularly in light of global terrorism. The U.S. Government should ask certain foreign governments to search, for example, biometric data taken from individuals in places like Iraq.

Creating a "net-centric" approach to the biometric-based ISE. Too much biometric information sharing is conducted by making copies of the data and providing those copies on a physical medium, such as a compact disk, to another agency. This approach, while a temporary expedient, leads to problems with synchronization, correction, updating, and data protection. We should strive for a federated, synchronized database system based on a pooled information sharing environment managed by a community of interest.

Much of my testimony today has discussed fingerprints because that has been the biometric mainstay for our homeland security. However, the Subcommittee should note that the future will be increasingly multi-modal, featuring and fusing multiple biometric types such as fingerprint, iris, facial recognition, voice, and others. The U.S. Government's identity management practices and the ISE must be able to respond nimbly to these technological opportunities.

Summary

U.S. Government use of biometric technologies is a success story, as measured by threats identified, intelligence gained, and lives saved. Hopefully, I have provided the Subcommittee with suggestions you may find worth pursuing. I believe we are still in the very early stages of using biometric technologies for homeland security, with much more to do. As experience shows, the U.S. Government can use this significant tool for protecting the nation while preserving civil liberties. Thank you for having me testify today. I am happy to answer any questions.

Mr. SIMMONS. Thank you for that testimony.

Mr. Emerson, you have been very patient. We appreciate it. Thank you for being here.

**STATEMENT OF STEVEN EMERSON, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR,
THE INVESTIGATIVE PROJECT ON TERRORISM**

Mr. EMERSON. Thank you.

I commend you for holding this hearing today, because in the last 2 years we have witnessed plots, some successful, others not, in Australia, Canada, the United States and Europe. In studying the background of the homegrown plots in the United States, Canada, Britain and Australia over the past 3 years, there are certain commonalities that we can observe.

The participants in these plots are largely first-or second-generation Americans or other loyal citizens in other countries but they come from a Middle Eastern or Southeast Asian ethnic origin. Suddenly, however, they become radicalized. And that convergence of ideology with some type of charismatic leader appears to be the instigator of many of the plots that we have witnessed.

In the United States, the commonalities have included a spiritual leader, mosque attendance, an Internet connection, and overseas travel. The majority of these radicalized individuals who have become involved in plots are below the age of 30, and are oftentimes radicalized in private study circles or by individuals they meet at the mosque.

In several instances, an older and charismatic imam or spiritual leader is involved, such as Ali al-Tamimi or Juma al-Dosari in the United States.

Certain radical Islamic groups and Islamic leaders engender radicalization through engendering a false sense of persecution and alienation in the Muslim community in the West, labeling the war on terror as a war on Islam.

These conspiratorial allegations facilitate and maintain indigenous Islamic alienation from host governments, reinforce loyalty to the larger Muslim umma, and in some cases rationalize acts of terrorism. In fact, in nearly all of the post-9/11 terrorist plots, unsuccessful and successful, the perpetrators have claimed that they are only avenging crimes committed by the West against Muslims.

One of the common denominators in the creation of homegrown terrorism are agents of radicalization. Primarily these have included radical imams in mosques or at prisons.

Another factor and venue by which youngsters have become radicalized has been the Internet. Indeed, the Internet has become an indispensable, multifaceted operational tool for terrorists, in terms of psychological warfare, publicity, propaganda, data mining, fund-raising, recruitment and mobilization, bomb instruction, networking, sharing information, planning and coordination.

We recently tracked a posting on a militant Islamic forum connected to Al Qaida about the bacterial botulinum toxin which causes the deadly disease known as botulism. The author of the post stated, "We are lurking in wait for you. Allah will torment you himself or use us to do it. You can plot, but we are plotting as well." Then the author provided specific instructions, very clear, how to produce toxins, lethal doses, experiments and observations and methods of dispersion for the toxin.

We have also seen that wannabe jihadists have been using MySpace.com. Instead of commenting on a party, telling a joke, or making social plans, increasing numbers, we have witnessed, increasingly condemn America, swear support for bin Laden or express graphic desires to inflict violence upon innocents in the United States or abroad. Some even have identified themselves as active terrorists and claim to have participated in attacks against American soldiers in Iraq, and they post pictures of themselves next to burn-out cars, armed with semiautomatic weapons.

The common ideological denominator for jihadists is their susceptibility to a narrative that the U.S. government or the West is engaged in a war on Islam as opposed to a war against terrorism.

This characterization serves to demonize the efforts of the United States government, or British or Australian government, and by extension the West, in order to demonstrate to the Muslim community that it is the target of an official discrimination campaign which ultimately serves to radicalize and alienate Muslims in the United States or other countries, creating fertile ground for extremists to operate and recruit followers.

This self-victimization gives the illusion of credence to the allegation that the war on terrorism is simply a war against Islam. Therefore it is not surprising to see this common claim in most of the terrorist networks that we have witnessed since 9/11, from the Virginia jihad network to Operation Pendennis in Australia, that acts of violence were justified because of the need to avenge the atrocities committed against Muslims.

We need to be sure that we are engaged in a dialogue with Islamic organizations, but we need to be sure that these organizations are not turning around and blaming the source of violence on the United States. We have to make sure we are not dealing with fake moderate groups, but genuine moderate groups.

It was noted briefly, recently, by Prime Minister John Howard and Tony Blair, at their own political expense, about the dangers that empowering various groups that focus only on self-victimization, reinforcing a hatred of the West.

The British prime minister recently stated, "Look, we have got a problem even in our own Muslim communities in Europe who will half buy in to some of the propaganda that is pushed at it such as the purpose of America to suppress Islam, Britain has joined with America in the suppression of Islam. And one of the things we have got to do is stop apologizing for our own positions. Muslims in America, as far as I am aware, are free to worship. Muslims in Britain are free to worship. We are plural societies. It is nonsense. That propaganda is nonsense."

U.S. government programs and official engagement can provide only a limited amount of success. A greater effort on the part of the Muslim community must be undertaken to counter a growing trend that sees jihad as the new counterculture for a generation caught between two cultures that are often at odds.

[The statement of Mr. Emerson follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF STEVEN EMERSON

Executive Summary

The radicalization of Muslim populations in Western societies has leapt to the forefront of homeland security concerns due to the rise in homegrown terrorist plots in the United States, Europe, Canada, and Australia. Every episode of radicalization is a unique process due, nonetheless these episodes often, but not always, share several commonalities, including, but not limited to, a charismatic spiritual leader, mosque attendance, an Internet connection, and overseas travel.

Homegrown terrorism poses a challenge to law enforcement because, as demonstrated in the aforementioned cases, the individuals in the plots, prior to their radicalization, have not necessarily shown any evidence of extremist views, much less any connection to terrorist activity. They appear to lead normal lives, at times even after indoctrination into an extremist ideology. The examples presented demonstrate that there are several underlying similarities characterizing homegrown terrorism.

Those involved come from an array of backgrounds, but are largely first or second-generation Americans with a Middle Eastern or South Asian ethnic origin. The significant role played by Islamic converts is apparent in the cases of the “Virginia *jihād* network,” the recent Canadian plot, the Folsom prison case, the Portland Seven and the London bombing cell.

The majority of these radicalized individuals who become involved in such plots are below the age of 30 and are often times radicalized in private study circles or by individuals they meet at their place of worship. In several instances, an older and charismatic imam or spiritual leader is involved such as Ali Al-Timimi or Juma al-Dosari in the U.S., and in the case of the Toronto plot, by Qayyum Abdul Jamal, a 43-year-old mosque volunteer from suburban Toronto. These homegrown *jihādists* are often well-integrated into Western society and many were students at American universities.

Certain domestic radical Islamic civil society groups engender radicalization through spreading a false sense of persecution and alienation in the Muslim community in the West, labeling the war on terrorism as a war on Islam. These conspiratorial allegations facilitate and maintain indigenous Islamic alienation from host governments, reinforce loyalty to the larger Muslim *ummah*, and in some cases rationalize acts of terrorism. In nearly all of the post-9/11 terrorist plots, unsuccessful and successful, the perpetrators have claimed that they are only avenging crimes committed by the West against Muslims.

The effect the Internet has on radicalization and the formation of homegrown cells has increased exponentially. Signs of the influence and use of *jihādist* websites and forums are conspicuous in many homegrown plots around the world, including some in the United States. Experts around the world agree that access to the Internet is having a radicalizing effect on Western second-generation Muslim youths who find themselves divided between two cultures with contrasting value systems. The Internet can facilitate the entire process of the development of a plot from initial radicalization to the formulation of a complex and potentially deadly terrorist attack.

Introduction

Terrorism is no longer only an external threat posed by foreign entities. Since 9/11, there is an increasing trend towards homegrown terrorism plotted and, in some cases, executed locally. This realization struck with painful clarity following the terrorist attacks in London in July 2005 and the foiled terrorist attack in Canada in June 2006. Within the United States, this trend has been characterized by the involvement of individuals who were integrated into American society and have had little or no affiliation with formal terrorist organizations prior to, and often after, their radicalization.

This testimony will attempt to elucidate the growing threat of domestic radicalization by analyzing some of the many plots that have already been hatched in the United States in addition to the agents of radicalization, including radical spiritual leaders and the Internet, that have been infusing the Muslim-American community with *jihādist* thought and knowledge for years. Unfortunately, describing these domestic plots as “homegrown” has only recently come into vogue in our national discourse. This belated awakening to the root causes of homegrown terrorism—including elements on the Internet, certain imams, and others in positions of leadership or counsel who advocate divisiveness and violence—has hindered our ability to understand the threat posed by militant Islamism from within our borders. However, with more events such as this hearing, designed to share a greater

understanding of the processes, risks, and vulnerabilities regarding radicalization, there is improved potential to successfully address this trend.

Homegrown Terrorism Plots

An overview of certain homegrown terrorists who have grown up in America and the plots they have nurtured and developed, often within our borders, provides a useful perspective on the causes and methods by which radicalization occurs and the dangerous ways in which such a process can manifest itself.

There is a misleading notion that those who fall prey to radicalization—and from within that pool, the minority who take the next step by committing or abetting acts of terrorism—are individuals who feel marginalized. Whether this marginalization is brought about via poor socioeconomic circumstances or simple unpopularity, there is tendency to assume that these are the individuals who are fodder for radicalization. While this is sometimes the case, relying on this template ignores other, more prevalent factors at play in the process of radicalization that direct a young man with friends in an environment healthy in terms of family and economic condition towards an extremist ideology.

John Walker Lindh

John Walker Lindh, known as the “American Taliban,” was raised in well-to-do Marin County in California.¹ As a teenager, he was quiet and limited his interests to basketball and hip-hop music. Later in his adolescence, he became interested in Islam and converted at a local mosque. People who knew him described him as a devoted Muslim.²

In May 2001, Lindh traveled to Pakistan and spent time at a recruiting center in Peshawar for Harakat ul-Mujahideen (HuM), a Pakistan-based terrorist group with links to Osama bin Laden and al Qaeda.³ After leaving the recruiting center, he spent twenty days at a training camp run by HuM.⁴ After his training, he returned to the Peshawar recruiting office and expressed a wish “to fight with the Taliban on the front line in Afghanistan.”⁵ Carrying a letter of introduction from HuM officials, Lindh traveled to Afghanistan and presented himself to Taliban recruiters in Kabul who sent him to al Qaeda’s infamous Al Faruq training camp after again expressing a desire to fight on the front lines for the Taliban against the Northern Alliance.⁶

During his two months at Al Faruq, Lindh learned to use rocket-propelled grenades and other weapons. Osama bin Laden visited the camp three times during Lindh’s training period and during one of these visits, Lindh actually had a five minute conversation with bin Laden. After he completed his training, Lindh declined to participate in plots against the United States, Israel, or Europe in favor of fighting against the Northern Alliance.⁷ In November 2001, Lindh surrendered to Northern Alliance troops.⁸

In late 2002, Lindh agreed to plea guilty to supplying services to the Taliban and carrying an explosive during the commission of a felony and was sentenced to twenty years in prison.⁹ Lindh will be eligible for parole in 2019.

The Lackawanna Six

The Lackawanna Six may have been influenced by a lecture given by an extremist imam named Juma al-Dosari at a Lackawanna, New York mosque in 2001.¹⁰ The mosque did not invite al-Dosari to speak again due to his radical beliefs.¹¹ In April 2001, the men decided to travel to an al Qaeda guesthouse in Kandahar, Afghanistan, and then went to an al Qaeda training camp where they received weapons training. While they were at the camp, Bin Laden visited and gave a speech to all of the trainees.¹²

The young men involved in the case were not always known to harbor extremist views. Neighbors recalled that “As teens, they liked to drive fast, party and pick up girls. But. . . sometime during or after high school, the young men became, in vary-

¹David E. Kaplan and others., “Hundreds of Americans have Followed the Path to Jihad. Here’s How and Why,” *US News and World Report*, June 10, 2002.

²Philip Sherwell, “The new Malcolm X?” *Sunday Telegraph*, April 9, 2006.

³Kaplan, “Hundreds Of Americans Have Followed The Path To Jihad.”

⁴*USA v. John Phillip Walker Lindh*, 02–37–A, “Sentencing Memorandum,” pp. 2–3 (ED VA October 4, 2002).

⁵*Ibid.*, 3.

⁶*USA v. John Phillip Walker Lindh*, 02–CR–37A, “Indictment,” (ED VA February 5, 2002).

⁷*USA v. Lindh*, “Sentencing Memorandum,” 4.

⁸*USA v. Lindh*, “Indictment.”

⁹Kaplan, “Hundreds Of Americans Have Followed The Path To Jihad.”

¹⁰Michael Powell, “No Choice But Guilty,” *Washington Post*, July 29, 2003.

¹¹*Ibid.*

¹²*U.S. v. Al-Bakri*, 02–M–108. “Criminal Complaint,” (WD NY September 13, 2002).

ing degrees, more devout. They stopped drinking, swore off sex and began praying five times a day at the local mosque.¹³ Federal investigators believe that al-Dosari helped persuade the men to travel to Afghanistan.¹⁴ According to Rodney O. Personius, the attorney who represented one of the six, al-Dosari told the men “that Mecca wouldn’t do, that they needed jihad training if they wanted to save their souls.”¹⁵ The imam was unable to testify at the trial of the Lackawanna cell members because he was in U.S. custody at the Guantanamo Bay Detention Center where he still remains.¹⁶ Kamal Derwish, a charismatic man described as the cell’s ringleader, further compelled his companions to attend the training camp.¹⁷ Additionally, cell member Yahya Goba later indicated that radical websites—specifically material from Qoqaz.net, the Chechen mujahideen website—also motivated his participation.¹⁸

In September 2002, the six men were arrested and indicted on charges of providing material support to a designated foreign terrorist organization.¹⁹ All of the men pled guilty to charges of material support and were sentenced to prison terms of seven to ten years.²⁰ A seventh member of the cell, Jaber Elbaneh, was arrested in Yemen in late 2003,²¹ but is believed to have escaped from prison in February 2006.²² Kamal Derwish, was killed in a CIA missile strike near Marib, Yemen in November 2002.²³

Virginia Paintball Jihad

In June 2003 eleven men, nine of whom are U.S. citizens, were indicted for their involvement with Lashkar-e-Taiba (LeT), a Specially Designated Terrorist Organization.²⁴ In a superseding indictment in September 2003 the men were further charged with conspiracy to levy war against the United States and conspiracy to provide material support to al Qaeda.²⁵

A member of the group, Randall Royer, a.k.a. Ismail Royer, who pled guilty to weapons and explosives charges in January 2004,²⁶ had helped form and recruit other men from the suburbs of Washington, D.C., to train as *mujahideen* with LeT. Their training—which included paintball war games intended to simulate combat—began in the United States and continued at camps in Pakistan.²⁷ For two years, the group trained at firing ranges in Virginia and Pennsylvania, and seven of the defendants traveled to Pakistan.²⁸

Although the indictment alleges that the network was involved with LeT, according to a court filing, the cell began playing paintball as early as 2000 to train for possible *jihad* in Chechnya, because, according to Nabil Gharbieh, one of the founders of the paintball group, “Chechnya was a very ‘hot topic’ among Muslims.”²⁹ Al-Timimi was integral in encouraging the members to travel to Afghanistan after 9/11, but both Randall Royer and Ibrahim Al-Hamdi, had taken an active role in the jihad prior to 9/11. Al-Hamdi stated that since the age of 12 he had aspired to die

¹³ “Defense Says Terror Suspects No Threat” *NBC*, September 19, 2002.

¹⁴ “Seventh Member of ‘Lackawanna Six’ in Custody,” *Associated Press*, January 29, 2004.

¹⁵ Powell, “No Choice But Guilty.”

¹⁶ Powell, “No Choice But Guilty.”, David Muir, “Suicide Pact; Guantanamo Suicides,” *ABC World News Tonight*, June 11, 2006.

¹⁷ Betsy Z. Russell, “Al Qaeda recruits say images on Web sites part of allure,” *Spokane Review*, May 21, 2004.

¹⁸ Patrick Orr, “Hussayen defense gets surprise help; Testimony of key witness is blow to prosecution,” *Idaho Statesman*, May 25, 2004.

¹⁹ *USA v Yahya Goba, Sahim Alwan, Shafal Mosed, Yassein Taher, and Faysal Gala*, 02–M–107. “Decision and Order.” p. 3 (WD NY October 8, 2002).

²⁰ “Sahim Alwan Sentenced For Providing Material Support to Al Qaeda,” *USDOJ Press Release*, December 17, 2003, http://www.usdoj.gov/opa/pr/2003/December/03_crm_699.htm (Accessed September 18, 2003).

²¹ “Seventh Member of ‘Lackawanna Six’ in Custody,” *Associated Press*, January 29, 2004.

²² “Man added to ‘Most Wanted Terrorist’ list,” *UPI*, February 26, 2006.

²³ John Lumpkin, “Yemeni-American Killed in Airstrike Was Alleged Leader of Buffalo Cell,” *Associated Press*, November 12, 2002.

²⁴ *USA v. Royer, et al*, 03–CR–296. “Indictment.” (EDVA June 25, 2003).

²⁵ “U.S. charges seven with ‘Virginia jihad,’” *United Press International*, September 26, 2003.

²⁶ “Two Defendants in Virginia Jihad Case Plead Guilty to Weapons Charges, Will Cooperate with Ongoing Investigations,” *USDOJ Press Release*, January 16, 2004, http://www.usdoj.gov/opa/pr/2004/January/04_crm_030.htm (Accessed September 18, 2006).

²⁷ “Defendants Convicted in Northern Virginia Jihad Trial,” *USDOJ Press Release*, March 4, 2004, http://www.usdoj.gov/opa/pr/2004/March/04_crm_139.htm (Accessed September 18, 2006).

²⁸ *Ibid.*

²⁹ *USA v. Masoud Khan, et al.*, 03–CR–296. “Memorandum Opinion.” p. 18 (EDVA March 4, 2004).

as a martyr and traveled with Royer in 2000 to a LeT training camp in Pakistan.³⁰ Royer, the son of a Baptist and a former Catholic nun, converted to Islam at the age of 19. From the beginning, he was extremely involved with issues facing Muslims around the world, so much so that in the mid 1990s, he traveled to Bosnia to fight with a unit that supported Bosnian soldiers.³¹ Seifullah Chapman, and former Marine and member of the “Virginia *jihad* network,” is also a convert to Islam, having been introduced to the faith by his second wife.³²

It appears the plot took hold after 9/11 when members of the “Virginia *jihad* network,” gathered in Northern Virginia where the spiritual leader of their prayer group, Ali Al-Timimi,³³ told the other men, “the time had come for them to go abroad to join the mujahideen engaged in violent *jihad* in Afghanistan.”³⁴

According to witness testimonies, after September 11, 2001, “Al-Timimi stated that the attacks may not be Islamically permissible, but that they were not a tragedy, because they were brought on by American foreign policy.”³⁵ Witnesses also testified that Al-Timimi was not permitted to give sermons at Dar al Arqam, a Northern Virginia mosque, after his comments on 9/11 which may have explained the reason why on September 16, 2001, cell member Yong Kwon “organized a meeting at the urging of Al-Timimi to address how Muslims could protect themselves, and invited only those brothers who had participated in paintball training and owned weapons.”³⁶

Al-Timimi, the last member of the cell to be indicted (in September 2004), was convicted in April 2005 for inciting terrorist activity, attempting to contribute services to the Taliban, and on explosives and other firearms charges. Al-Timimi was sentenced to life in prison.³⁷ Of the others in the cell, six have pled guilty, three were convicted, and two were acquitted.³⁸ In June 2006, the last defendant linked to the “Virginia *jihad* network, Ali Asad Chandia, was convicted of material support of terrorism.³⁹

Ahmed Omar Abu Ali

In November 2005, Ahmed Omar Abu Ali, a Texan by birth, was sentenced to 30 years in prison for joining an al Qaeda cell in Saudi Arabia and plotting with al Qaeda operatives to personally carry out the assassination of President Bush.⁴⁰ In December 2002, while pursuing religious studies in Saudi Arabia, Abu Ali joined a clandestine terrorist cell with ties to al Qaeda.⁴¹ According to court documents, Abu Ali received training from members of the al-Qaeda cell in weapons, explosives, and document forgery, and discussed plans to smuggle Saudi al Qaeda members into the United States through Mexico to carry out terrorist operations within the country.⁴² Abu Ali was raised in Falls Church, Virginia and worshipped at the Dar al-Hijrah mosque.⁴³ Abu Ali attended high school at the Islamic Saudi Academy (ISA) in Alexandria, which receives substantial funding from the Saudi government,⁴⁴ and graduated valedictorian of his class in 1999.

Abu Ali was not the only terrorist or extremist from this Virginia high school, founded in 1984.⁴⁵ Another former student, Mohammad Osman Idris, was charged with lying in immigration forms about his association with Hamas.⁴⁶ Idris and another ISA student named Mohammad El-Yacoubi were both prevented from entering

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 28.

³¹ Mary Beth Sheridan, Caryle Murphy and Jerry Markon, “Va. ‘Jihad’ Suspects: 11 Men, Two Views,” *The Washington Post*, August 8, 2003.

³² *Ibid.*

³³ *USA v. Al Timimi*, 04–CR–385. “Indictment.” (ED VA September 23, 2004).

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 5.

³⁵ *USA v. Masoud Khan, et al.*, “Memorandum Opinion,” 31–32.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 32–33.

³⁷ *USA v. Al Timimi*, 04–CR–385. “Judgment.” (EDVA July 13, 2005).

³⁸ “Defendants Convicted in Northern Virginia Jihad Trial,” *USDOJ Press Release*.

³⁹ “Maryland Man Sentenced to 15 Years for Providing Material Support to Terror Group,” *United States Attorney’s Office, Eastern District of Virginia*, August 25, 2006, <http://www.usdoj.gov/usao/vae/Pressreleases/08-AugustPDFArchive/06/20060825chandianr.pdf> (Accessed September 18, 2006).

⁴⁰ Ahmed Omar Abu Ali Sentenced to Prison on Terrorism Charges,” *U.S. Department of State Press Release*, March 29, 2006.

⁴¹ *USA v. Abu Ali*, 05 CR 53. “Opposition to Defendant’s Motion to Suppress” (ED VA September 19, 2005).

⁴² *USA v. Abu Ali*, 1:05CR53. “Superseding Indictment” (ED VA September 8, 2005).

⁴³ Jerry Markon, “Va. Man Convicted In Plot to Kill Bush; Defendant Claimed Confession Coerced,” *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, November 23, 2005.

⁴⁴ Matthew Barakat, “Saudi Academy Disputes Radical Reputation,” *Associated Press*, May 18, 2005.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*

Israel after a letter was found in their possession that has been described as a farewell letter for a suicide bombing mission from El-Yacoubi's younger brother.⁴⁷ The letter read, "When I heard what you were going to carry out, my heart was filled with the feeling of grief and joy because you are the closest human being to my heart." It continued, "I have no right to prevent you from your migration to Allah and his holy messenger, but it is incumbent on me to encourage you and help you because Islam urges *jihād* for the sake of Allah."⁴⁸ The comptroller of the school, Ismail Selim Elbarasse, has been described as an assistant to a high-level Hamas operative.⁴⁹ Court documents from a related case claim that Elbarasse shared an account used to launder money for Hamas with Mousa Abu Marzook, a Hamas official currently headquartered in Damascus.⁵⁰

After the Islamic Saudi Academy, Abu Ali spent a year at the Institute of Islamic and Arabic Sciences in America (IIASA) in Fairfax.⁵¹ The IIASA, founded in 1989 as a non-profit educational institution affiliated with Al-Imam Muhammad Ibn Saud Islamic University (IMSIU) of Saudi Arabia, also receives funding from the Saudi government.⁵² In 2003, eleven scholars at IIASA were asked to leave by the US government.⁵³ In the summer of 2004, FBI, Customs, and IRS agents raided the school.⁵⁴ Publications by the IIASA received much attention in a report by Freedom House—a non-partisan GNO that promotes human rights and religious freedom—on Saudi hate literature in mosques. IIASA publications are replete with anti-Semitism in addition to condemnations of liberal democracy, freedom of thought, Western society, and Zionism.⁵⁵

In June 2003, Abu Ali was arrested by Saudi authorities along with several others in connection with the bombing of a residential compound in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, that killed 34 people, including nine Americans.⁵⁶ Abu Ali admitted to his Saudi jailers that he came up with the idea to assassinate President George W. Bush on his own: "My idea was. . . that I would walk on the street as the President walked by, and I would get close enough to shoot him, or I would use a car bomb."⁵⁷ He compared himself to Mohammed Atta, who led the cell that carried out the September 11, 2001 attacks: "I wanted to be the brain, the planner, just like Mohammed Atta and Khalid Sheikh Mohammad."⁵⁸

In Abu Ali's home in Falls Church, where he lived with his family, authorities found a number of items that spoke to the level of his radicalization. These items included a six-page document on different types of surveillance methods used by the government and ways to avoid such surveillance; an undated two-page document commending Taliban leader Mullah Omar and the 9/11 attacks that criticized U.S. military action in Afghanistan; audio tapes in Arabic supporting "violent jihad, the killing of Jews, and a battle by Muslims against Christians and Jews;"⁵⁹ and a book written by al Qaeda's deputy leader Ayman Al Zawahiri that "characterizes democracy as a new religion that must be destroyed by war, describes anyone who supports democracy as an infidel, and condemns the Muslim Brotherhood for renouncing violent *jihād* as a means to establish an Islamic state."⁶⁰

Folsom State Prison, California

On August 31, 2005, a federal grand jury in San Ana, California indicted four men for their alleged roles in a conspiracy to levy war against the United States government through terrorism.⁶¹ The conspiracy allegedly involved a plot to attack

⁴⁷ Michael Hedges, "Goodbye Letter," *Houston Chronicle*, May 27, 2002.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*

⁴⁹ "Alleged Hamas figure arrested in Md. taping Bay Bridge," *Associated Press*, August 24, 2004.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*

⁵¹ Caryle Murphy and John Mintz, "Va. Man's Months in Saudi Arabia Go Unexplained," *The Washington Post*, November 22, 2003.

⁵² Susan Schmidt, "Saudi Group's Leader Critical of Clerics," *Washington Post*, December 11, 2003.; David B. Ottoway, "U.S. Eyes Money Trails of Saudi-Backed Charities," *Washington Post*, August 19, 2004.

⁵³ Ottoway, "U.S. Eyes Money Trails of Saudi-Backed Charities."

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵⁵ *Saudi Publications on Hate Ideology Fill American Mosques* (Washington, DC: Center for Religious Freedom, Freedom House, 2005)

⁵⁶ *USA v. Abu Ali*, 05 CR 53. "Indictment" (ED VA February 2, 2005).

⁵⁷ *USA v. Abu Ali*, "Opposition to Defendant's Motion to Suppress."

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*

⁵⁹ *USA v. Abu Ali*, "Indictment."

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*

⁶¹ *USA v. Kevin James, et al.*, 05-CR-214. "Indictment." (CDCA August 31, 2005).

U.S. military facilities as well as Israeli government and Jewish facilities in the Los Angeles area.⁶²

The terrorist conspiracy was hatched in California's Folsom State Prison by an inmate who founded the clandestine, prison version of a militant Islamic organization known as Jam'iyyat Ul Islam Is Saheeh (JIS) and compelled JIS members to attack the infidel enemies of Islam.⁶³ The indictment further alleges that members of the conspiracy committed armed robberies of gas stations in order to finance their terrorist operation.⁶⁴ As FBI Director, Robert S. Mueller, III noted, this case involved a homegrown cell founded in a prison that saw themselves as "al Qaeda of California" and attempted to engage in crime locally to finance its terrorist activities.⁶⁵ If convicted of all charges, the defendants face a maximum sentence of life in prison.⁶⁶

Miami-Based Cell

On June 23, 2006, in Miami, Florida, seven suspected al Qaeda sympathizers were indicted on charges of conspiring to support al Qaeda by plotting attacks on targets that included the Sears Tower in Chicago, the FBI building in North Miami Beach, Florida, and other government buildings in Miami-Dade County.⁶⁷ It is important to note that while the men are thought to have sought to take part in the militant Islamist war against the United States, they were not Islamists in any traditional sense, but followers of a cult called the Seas of David, which reportedly drew on elements of Christianity and Judaism as well as Islam, and is allegedly tied to the ideologies of the Moorish Science Temple of America,⁶⁸ "an early 20th century religion founded by the Noble Drew Ali, an African-American circus magician who claimed he was raised by Cherokee Indians and learned 'high magic' in Egypt. Ali went on to style himself an 'angel' and prophet of Allah."⁶⁹

According to the indictment, Narseal Batiste, the group's ringleader, expressed the desire to wage a "full ground war" against the United States. The indictment further alleged that the individuals stated the urge to "kill all the devils we can" in planned attacks they hoped would "be just as good or greater than 9/11."⁷⁰ The cell came to the attention of law enforcement when Batiste sought to recruit an individual who was traveling to the Middle East to assist him in locating foreign Islamic extremists to fund his mission. This individual alerted the FBI, who arranged a meeting between Batiste and an informant of Arab descent who presented himself to Batiste as an al Qaeda operative. During several meetings with the informant in December 2005, Batiste requested boots, uniforms, guns, radios, vehicles, and \$50,000 in cash to help construct an "Islamic Army" to wage *jihād*.⁷¹ In a March 2006 meeting, each individual in the cell swore an oath of loyalty to al Qaeda. Just prior to the oath, which was covertly recorded by the FBI, Batiste told the informant that he "admired the work bin Laden was doing."⁷²

Adam Gadahn

Adam Gadahn, a convert to Islam, grew up on a farm in California. He was born Adam Pearlman to a Catholic mother and a Jewish father who later converted to Christianity, taking the name Gadahn.⁷³ As a young man, he was interested in death-metal music and hosted a show on the environment on a student television

⁶² *Ibid.*

⁶³ *Ibid.*, 2.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 5, 7–10.

⁶⁵ "Unity: The Greatest Weapon Against Terrorism; Remarks by Robert S. Mueller, III Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation," James Fox Memorial Lecture, New York, April 26, 2006. (Accessed September 18, 2006).

⁶⁶ "Four Men Indicted on Terrorism Charges Related to Conspiracy to Attack Military Facilities, Other Targets," *USDOJ Press Release*, August 31, 2005.

⁶⁷ *USA v. Batiste, et al.*, 06-CR-20373, "Indictment" (SD NY June 23, 2006).

⁶⁸ Frank Main, "Dad: Sears Tower Suspect under Spell of Man," *Chicago Sun-Times*, June 25, 2006; Paul Thompson and Sara Baxter, "Bizarre Cult of Sears Tower 'Plotter,'" *Sunday Times*, June 25, 2006.

⁶⁹ Thompson and Baxter, "Bizarre Cult of Sears Tower 'Plotter.'"

⁷⁰ *SA v. Batiste, et al.*, "Indictment."

⁷¹ *Ibid.*

⁷² *USA v. Batiste, et al.*, 06-CR-20373, "Government's Motion for Pretrial Detention" (SD NY June 29, 2006); "Seven Florida Men Charged with Conspiring to Support al Qaeda, Attack Targets in the United States," *USDOJ Press Release*, June 23, 2006.

⁷³ Steven Stalinsky, "A Jewish Musician's Son Joins Al Qaeda's Ranks; The MEMRI Report," *New York Sun*, September 13, 2006, <http://www.nysun.com/article/39535> (Accessed September 15, 2006); Peggy Lowe, "Gadahn tape urges conversion to Islam; Terror expert calls former O.C. man ideal convert for al-Qaida's purposes," *Orange County Register*, September 3, 2006.

station.⁷⁴ In 1997, at the age of 17, he converted to Islam under the tutelage of a purportedly moderate religious leader named Haitham "Danny" Bundakji and was hired as a security guard at the Islamic Society of Orange County.⁷⁵ Bundakji claimed that Gadahn was then befriended by a group of Pakistani nationals he described as "fundamentalist" who were outspoken in their criticism of moderation and Bundakji's interfaith activities, calling him "Danny the Jew."⁷⁶ One of the group was Hisham Diab, a well-connected al Qaeda operative who once hosted the blind sheik Omar Abdel Rahman at his home.⁷⁷ After Bundakji banned these men from the mosque, Gadahn stormed angrily into Bundakji's office, slapped him in the face, and accused him of not being a true Muslim. Shortly after this incident, Gadahn left for Pakistan and kept in touch with his family only occasionally.⁷⁸

Gadahn later traveled to Afghanistan where he attended al Qaeda training camps and served as an al Qaeda translator.⁷⁹ During his ongoing career as a terrorist, he has spent time with the captured al Qaeda leader Abu Zubaydah and John Walker Lindh.⁸⁰ Another associate of Gadahn's, Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, the mastermind of the 9/11 attacks, allegedly wanted to use Gadahn in a plot to bomb Baltimore gas stations.⁸¹ In May 2004, the FBI issued a BOLO (be on the lookout) for Gadahn and he was later added to the FBI's most wanted list.⁸² In December 2004, Gadahn resurfaced as Azzam al-Amriki, or Azzam the American, on an al Qaeda videotape threatening attacks against the United States that would far surpass those of 9/11.⁸³ In the tape, he stated:

People of America, I remind you of the weighty words of our leaders, Osama Bin Ladin and Dr. Ayman Al Zawahri, that what took place on September 11 was but the opening salvo of the global war on America, and that Allah willing, the magnitude and ferocity of what is coming your way will make you forget about September 11.⁸⁴

Gadahn made another appearance on September 11, 2005 in a video in which he called on the West to remove its, "current leaders and governments and their anti-Islam, anti-Muslim policies."⁸⁵ He threatened, "Yesterday, London and Madrid. Tomorrow, Los Angeles and Melbourne, God willing."⁸⁶ He also made an appearance in an al Qaeda video released on the first anniversary of the London transit bombings, in which he condemned American leadership and the American people who elected them. In the message, Gadahn decried the "crimes" of American and British forces in Afghanistan and Iraq. He blamed America for carrying out the majority of what he sees as atrocities against Muslims and blames the British for "coaching from the sidelines and lending a helping hand whenever possible" and being "the one who taught America how to kill and oppress Muslims in the first place."⁸⁷ Gadahn takes care to emphasize the legitimacy of attacking civilians as opposed to solely military targets.⁸⁸ Over the summer of 2006, an essay was removed from the website of the Muslim Student Association (MSA) of the University of Southern California. The author of that essay was "Adam Pearlman." In the essay, a young Gadahn transitioning into Islam wrote, "As I began reading English translations of the Qur'an, I became more and more convinced of the truth and authenticity of Allah's teachings. . . . Having been around Muslims in my formative years, I knew well that they were not the bloodthirsty, barbaric terrorists that the news media and the televangelists paint them to be." While it is true that there is only an unfortunate segment of extremist Muslims who meet the description of "bloodthirsty, bar-

⁷⁴ Brian Ross, "Married to al Qaeda; Woman Unsuspectingly Weds Terrorist," *Primetime Live*, ABC, December 23, 2004.

⁷⁵ Stalinsky, "A Jewish Musician's Son Joins Al Qaeda's Ranks.," Spencer Ackerman, "Why American Muslims haven't turned to terrorism," *New Republic*, December 12, 2005.

⁷⁶ Ackerman, "Why American Muslims haven't turned to terrorism."

⁷⁷ Ross, "Married to al Qaeda; Woman Unsuspectingly Weds Terrorist."

⁷⁸ Ackerman, "Why American Muslims haven't turned to terrorism."

⁷⁹ Salah Naswari, "Latest al-Qaida message seen as PR bid," Associated Press, September 3, 2006.; Evan Thomas, Daniel Klaidman, and Michael Isikoff, "Enemies among Us," *Newsweek*, June 7, 2004.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*

⁸¹ Thomas, Klaidman, and Isikoff, "Enemies among Us."

⁸² "Seeking Information RE: Adam Gadahn," FBI, <http://www.fbi.gov/terrorinfo/gadahn.htm> (Accessed August 19, 2005).; Stalinsky, "A Jewish Musician's Son Joins Al Qaeda's Ranks."

⁸³ Amy Argetsinger, "Muslim Teen Made Conversion to Fury; Intelligence Sources Say Californian Was on Tape," *Washington Post*, December 2, 2004.

⁸⁴ As Sahab videotape of "Azzam the American," identified by US intelligence as Adam Gadahn (Aired by ABC News, October 28, 2004)

⁸⁵ Ackerman, "Why American Muslims haven't turned to terrorism."

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*

⁸⁷ As Sahab video, July 8, 2006.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*

baric terrorists,”⁸⁹ Adam Gadahn unfortunately chose to join their ranks, stating in the As-Sahab release on the anniversary of the 7/7 attacks, “When we bomb their cities and civilians. . .no sane Muslim should shed tears for them.”⁹⁰

Agents of Radicalization

While there are many different factors that contribute to radicalization and the development of terrorist plots, two in particular stand out as acutely noteworthy: religious leaders and the Internet. Below, certain imams connected to terrorist activity and extremist rhetoric and the role of the Internet in radicalization and terror-plot development are discussed.

Imams and Spiritual Leaders

Ali Al-Timimi

Ali Al-Timimi was the primary lecturer at Dar al Arqam Islamic Center in Falls Church, Virginia from 2000—2001.⁹¹ As explained earlier in this testimony, he was convicted in April 2005 for inciting terrorist activity, attempting to contribute services to the Taliban, and on explosives and other firearms charges, and was subsequently sentenced to life in prison.⁹²

According to his indictment, Al-Timimi told a group of young men, later to be convicted for involvement with the terrorist group Lashkar e Taiba that “American troops soon to be deployed in Afghanistan would be legitimate targets of the violent jihad in which his listeners had a duty to engage.” He also told the men to “obtain jihad training from Lashkar e Taiba because its belief system was good and it focused on combat,” and provided information on how to reach the Lashkar e Taiba camp undetected.⁹³ Yong Kwon, one of the convicted paintball *jihadists*, testified at Al-Timimi’s trial that his lectures had “fired him up” and was a “big factor” in his decision to go to Afghanistan and fight with the Taliban, although his trip was never realized.⁹⁴

Al-Timimi, like Virginia *jihad* cell members Royer, Kwon, and Chapman, grew up as a secular individual. Although Al-Timimi was born Muslim, as a young child he celebrated Christmas, and it was not until his early years of high school, when his family moved to Saudi Arabia, that he became more religious.

While in Saudi Arabia, Al-Timimi was mentored by a Saudi trained imam named Bilal Philips.⁹⁵ Philips, a Jamaican born, ex-communist, convert to Islam who grew up in Canada was Al-Timimi’s Islamic Studies teacher at Manaret Riyadh High School in the early 1980s.⁹⁶ According to Philips, “The clash of civilizations is a reality,” and “Western culture led by the United States is an enemy of Islam.”⁹⁷

In 1993, Philips ran a program to convert US soldiers to Islam during the first Persian Gulf War. According to a 2003 *Washington Post* article, Bilal Philips, reported that the program was led by “a special team whose members spoke fluent English,”⁹⁸ educated in broadcasting and psychology. These conversion specialists financed pilgrimages and would later send Muslim clerics in the United States to their homes. He also encouraged some converts from this program to fight in Bosnia in the 1990s, which led to FBI investigations.⁹⁹

In a 2004 letter of appeal circulated in sympathetic circles in the US and the UK, Philips encouraged Muslims to assist Al-Timimi “financially, morally or politically.”¹⁰⁰ According to Philips, “whatever the charges against him [Al-Timimi] may be, from an Islamic perspective they are false and contrived in order to silence the Da’wah to correct Islaam.”¹⁰¹

Upon returning to the United States, Al-Timimi received a bachelor’s degree in biology and computer science and a Ph.D in computational biology.¹⁰² Simultaneously he continued his missionary work, retaining the severe interpretations that

⁸⁹ Stalinsky, “A Jewish Musician’s Son Joins Al Qaeda’s Ranks.”

⁹⁰ As Sahab video, July 8, 2006.

⁹¹ *USA v. Al Timimi*, “Indictment.”

⁹² *USA v. Al Timimi*, 04–CR–385, “Judgment,” (EDVA July 13, 2005).

⁹³ *USA v. Al Timimi*, “Indictment.”

⁹⁴ *USA v. Al Timimi*, 04–CR–385. “Trial Transcript” p. 17 (ED VA September 23, 2004).

⁹⁵ November 30, 2004 letter of appeal from Abu Amina Bilal Philips on behalf of Ali Al-Timimi circulated in the US and the UK.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*

⁹⁷ John Mintz and Gregory L. Vistica, “Muslim Troops Loyalty a Delicate Question,” *Washington Post* November 2, 2003.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁰ Letter from Abu Amina Bilal Philips.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*

¹⁰² James Dao, “Muslim Cleric Found Guilty in the Virginia Jihad Case,” *New York Times*, April 27, 2005.

he was introduced to abroad. For example, when asked, by an audience member during a lecture he gave whether it is permissible for a Sunni to pray with a Shiite, Al-Timimi responded: "Ok, you cannot pray behind any of these people. In fact if we were in an Islamic state these people their, their heads should be, you know, lopped off, that's what, you know, should be done to these people. They deserve nothing better than to just cut their necks, if we were in an Islamic country. To be [UI word] to make the chance to make repentance and if they do not repent to cut their necks, that's what these people deserve."¹⁰³

Fawaz Damrah

Fawaz Damrah was the Imam at the Islamic Center of Cleveland.¹⁰⁴ Damrah also was a close associate with Palestinian Islamic Jihad leader Sami al-Arian. In fact, Damrah actively raised funds for PIJ in the United States.¹⁰⁵

At a conference held in Chicago in 1991, Damrah promoted violence amongst the attendees, urging to ". . . point their gun toward the enemy, toward the children of pigs and monkeys, the Jews."¹⁰⁶ Damrah also raised money for violent *jihad* at another conference, "The Jihad is still going on in Palestine. The intifada is calling on you. Donate \$500. Who would add to that \$500? Who would add \$500?"¹⁰⁷

Damrah, defending the use of violence in the Palestinian territories, stated, "The Palestinians are being terrorized and being victims of state sponsored terrorism. . . And they have the right to defend themselves just like they did then, like they did now."¹⁰⁸ At a 1989 discussion panel moderated by Sami al-Arian, Damrah stated, "Terrorism and terrorism alone is the path to liberation."¹⁰⁹

Damrah was also identified as a co-conspirator in the 1993 World Trade Center Bombing.¹¹⁰ Damrah was affiliated with the Al Kifah Refugee Center,¹¹¹ a predecessor organization to al Qaeda.¹¹² Damrah is currently awaiting deportation for failing to disclose his membership to a terrorist organization on his application for citizenship.

Mohammed El-Mezain

Mohammed El-Mezain formerly served as the imam of the Islamic Center of Passaic County and as the former Chairman of the Holy Land Foundation.¹¹³ In July 2004, Mezain was indicted for material support to a terrorist organization.¹¹⁴ According to a November 5, 2001 FBI Memorandum:

an FBI source who has provided reliable information in the past reported that during a speech at the Islamic Center of Passaic County (ICPC) in November, 1994, Mohammad El-Mezain, the HLFDR's current Director of Endowments and former Chairman of the HLFDR Board, admitted that some of the money collected by the ICPC and the HLFDR goes to HAMAS or HAMAS activities in Israel. El-Mezain also defended HAMAS and the activities carried out by HAMAS.¹¹⁵

¹⁰³ Audio recording of lecture by Ali Al-Timimi.

¹⁰⁴ *USA v. Fawaz Damra*, 03-CR-484. 334 F. Supp. 2d 967. (ND OH September 13, 2004).

¹⁰⁵ *USA v. Fawaz Damra*, 03-CR-484. "Memorandum Opinion." (ND OH August, 2004).

¹⁰⁶ ICP event commemorating the "Great Intifada" at Currie High School, Chicago, IL, Sept. 29, 1991

¹⁰⁷ "People In Cleveland Take A Closer Look At A Muslim Leader After The September 11th Attacks." *National Public Radio (NPR), Morning Edition*, January 18, 2002.

¹⁰⁸ Elizabeth Sullivan and Robert L. Smith, "Parma Imam Says Palestinians Have Right To Take Up Arms" *Plain Dealer*, September 27, 2001.

¹⁰⁹ Elaine Silvestrini, "Video Evidence In Al-Arian Trial Shows Anti-Israel Rhetoric," *Tampa Tribune*, July 27, 2005, <http://news.tbo.com/news/MGB5AT9XMBE.html> (Accessed September 18, 2006).

¹¹⁰ *USA v. Elgabrowni, et al*, 93-CR-181. "List of 173 Possible Co-Conspirators Submitted by Mary Jo White." (SD NY February 2, 1995).

¹¹¹ *USA v. Damrah*, 03-CR-484. "Indictment." p. 2 (ND OH Dec. 18, 2003).

¹¹² "Additional Background Information on Charities Designated Under Executive Order 13224," United States Treasury Department, http://www.treas.gov/offices/enforcement/key-issues/protecting/charities_execorder_13224-i.shtml#m (Accessed August 12, 2005).

¹¹³ Joel Mowbray, "Corzine, Pascrell Attended Brunch With Links to Radical Islamic Groups," *The New York Sun*, March 29, 2004, <http://daily.nysun.com/Repository/getFiles.asp?Style=OliveXLib:ArticleToMail&Type=text/html&Path=NYS/2004/03/29&ID=Ar00600> (Accessed September 18, 2006).

¹¹⁴ "Holy Land Foundation, Leaders, Accused Of Providing Material Support To Hamas Terrorist Organization," USDOJ Press Release, July 27, 2004, http://www.usdoj.gov/opa/pr/2004/July/04_crm_514.htm (Accessed September 18, 2006).

¹¹⁵ "Action Memorandum, Holy Land Foundation for Relief and Development International Emergency Economic Powers Act," From Dale Watson, Assistant Director FBI Counterterrorism Division to Richard Newcomb, Director of the Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of Treasury, November 5, 2001, 46. (Watson Memorandum)

According to the same memorandum, El-Mezain attended a Muslim Arab Youth Association (MAYA) conference from December 30, 1994 to January 2, 1995 in Los Angeles, where an individual named Sheikh Muhammad Siyam was the keynote speaker. Siyam was introduced as “Head of operations of Al Jihad Al Islamia in Gaza, the HAMAS military wing.” His leadership in Hamas is confirmed with a flyer of the Islamic Circle of North America (ICNA) advertising its 1990 convention. On that flyer he is advertised as “Dr. Mohammed Siyam, Islamic scholar and head of *Intifadah* [uprising], Hamas Movement in Palestine.”¹¹⁶

At the MAYA convention Siyam stated, “I’ve been told to restrict or restrain what I say. . . I hope no one is recording me or taking any pictures, as none are allowed. . . because I’m going to speak the truth to you. It’s simple. Finish off the Israelis. Kill them all! Exterminate them! No peace ever! Do not bother to talk politics.”¹¹⁷

The same memorandum states that following Siyam’s speech, El-Mezain exhorted the crowd to contribute money, subsequently announcing that \$207,000 had been for “the cause.”¹¹⁸ At that conference, El-Mezain reportedly stated that during 1994 he raised \$1,800,000 inside the United States for Hamas.¹¹⁹

Adnan Bayazid

The imams addressed above have either been indicted or convicted of terrorism or are tied to a terrorist group. However, there are other imams who have preyed on their congregants and followers with incendiary rhetoric.

Adnan Bayazid served as the Imam of the Islamic Center of Greater Kansas City as well as on its board of directors.¹²⁰ In October 2002, Adnan Bayazid spoke to a Kansas City Art Institute class about *jihad*. The professor of the class noted “No one asked specifically about September 11, but [Adnan Bayazid] started going on a tirade. . . and for 30 minutes proceeded to tell us that there were no Islamic fundamentalists on the (hijacked) planes; that they had all been framed by U.S. and Israel; that the planes were flying by remote control by the Israeli government or secret police; that every Jewish person was told not to go to work that day at the World Trade Center. He blamed Israel for the whole thing, but he also said numerous times Jews not just Israel or the Israeli government, but that it was a Jewish conspiracy. He said that specifically numerous times.”¹²¹

When Bayazid was contacted by the media, he confirmed the account: “That’s what I believe, yes.” He furthermore added, “The planes who did the attack, the passenger and the pilots, their name is a public record, and none of them is a Muslim. So the 20 names or the 19 names of those Saudis they take, some of them are still alive in Saudi Arabia. Some of them were dead. It is not true.”¹²²

The vast majority of imams and Islamic spiritual leaders play a necessary and beneficial role in communities in which they serve, but a minority of this profession has taken advantage of their positions of trust and the vulnerability of American-Muslim community. These men have used their pulpits to preach malicious conspiracy theories and falsely paint the Global War on Terrorism as a war against Islam in order to alienate the Muslim community and engender radicalism and extremist thought. Any successful strategy to counter the influence of radicalism must employ imams who reject extremism and terrorism.

Internet

Another factor affecting the radicalization process is the Internet. It is common knowledge that the Internet is a resource widely implemented by terrorists and extremists. The Internet has become an indispensable multifaceted operational tool for terrorists in terms of psychological warfare, publicity, propaganda, data mining, fundraising, recruitment, mobilization, networking, sharing information, planning, and coordination.¹²³ Several of these functions can combine to serve the larger function of radicalization, which is crucial to the success of terrorists and extremists who propagate militant Islamism—particularly those who act on behalf of the ideology propagated by al Qaeda.

The U.S. led invasion of Afghanistan in response to the attacks of September 11, 2001 forced an historically and strategically significant shift on the part of al Qaeda

¹¹⁶ Flyer, ICNA 15th Annual Convention, 1990.

¹¹⁷ Watson Memorandum, 46—47.

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*

¹²⁰ Rick Hellman, “Blood libel: Muslim speaker at local college blames Israelis, Jews for 9/11.” *The Kansas City Jewish Chronicle*. January 17, 2003.

¹²¹ *Ibid.*

¹²² *Ibid.*

¹²³ Gabriel Weimann, “www.terror.net; How Modern Terrorism Uses the Internet,” Special Report 116, United States Institute of Peace, March 2004, 5—10.

that reverberated throughout the larger *jihadi* movement. The successful invasion decimated the hierarchy and configuration of al Qaeda, which was centralized in Afghanistan. Al Qaeda was forced to devolve to an ideological presence and surrender the greater portion of operational control outward to various affiliate groups. While these affiliate groups continued to direct *jihadi* around the world, the ideology of al Qaeda continued to spread and led to the formation of various provisional cells,¹²⁴ several of which have been homegrown. Instead of a centralized organization, al Qaeda has become a franchised idea. While many prominent *jihadi* thinkers agitated over the circumstances that forced this strategic shift, some—such as Mustafa Setmariyan Nasar, popularly known as Abu Musab al-Suri—had promoted the strategic necessity of this change for the wider Salafi *jihadi* movement for some time.

The nature and structure of the Internet serves the contemporary *jihadi* movement perfectly. It is a diffuse resource that can be utilized at almost any location to communicate any type of information. This resource is all too often utilized to convey and promote Islamist militancy and isolationism, which has had a radicalizing effect on individuals in almost every society with an Islamic population. As FBI Director Robert S. Mueller III pointed out last June:

Radical fundamentalists are particularly difficult to pinpoint in cyberspace. There are between 5,000 to 6,000 extremist websites on the Internet, encouraging extremists to initiate their own radicalization and to cultivate relationships with other like-minded persons.

Although we have destroyed many terrorist training camps in the past five years, extremists increasingly turn to the Internet for virtual instruction. Of course, not every extremist will become a terrorist. But the radicalization process has become more rapid, more widespread, and anonymous in this Internet age, making detection that much more difficult.¹²⁵

This sort of cyber-radicalization has tragically been demonstrated time and time again around the world, but most infamously and recently in Western countries—the United Kingdom, Canada, and the United States.

Exploitation of the Internet by terrorists and extremists for purposes of radicalization is finally getting the attention it demands from law enforcement, policymakers, and—most importantly—the public. By simply logging online, terrorists and extremists from Indonesia to Indiana are able to post articles, exchange information, and exchange thoughts and beliefs, often theologically flawed or distorted, on radical websites and in chat rooms. While there is an ever-growing trend towards the globalization of all thought and ideology, this communication of ideas regarding the harsher strains of Islam has led to an increase in the ease, level, and speed of radicalization and the networking of radicals that could not occur without the enabling medium of the Internet.

As noted by FBI Director Mueller, there is a plethora of extremist websites on the Internet that radicalize and educate an untold number of aspiring terrorists. Some of these websites and online forums provide explicit instructions on how to contribute to violent *jihadi*. Others disseminate the extremist thought that often serves as the central ingredient in the radicalization process. Websites in the first category are dangerous for obvious reasons and continue to proliferate at an alarming rate. Websites in the second category present a more subtle and perhaps more dangerous threat. Once they are identified, websites of the first category can occasionally be shut down or be traced to the individuals behind them in order to provide actionable intelligence to the pertinent authorities. These websites convey information on combat tactics, explosives, chemical and biological weaponry, espionage, attending a terrorist training camp, and executing operations. Websites of the second category are purveyors of a different sort of information—the sort that is intangible and focuses on theology and ideology designed to lead its visitors down the path of isolationism and extremism, shaping them into terrorists.

One example of a website in the first category was Qoqaz.net. One of the two main sites of Azzam Publications, Qoqaz.net was the English language website for the Chechen mujahideen.¹²⁶ This website, hosted by an Internet service provider in Connecticut for seven years until 2003,¹²⁷ was utilized to raise funds for the

¹²⁴ Yoram Schwietzer and Sari Goldstein Ferber, *Al-Qaeda and the Internationalization of Suicide Terrorism* (Tel Aviv: Jaffee Center for Strategic Studies, November 2005), 18–19.

¹²⁵ Robert S. Mueller, III, *Federal Bureau of Investigation*, City Club of Cleveland, Cleveland, Ohio, June 23, 2006, <http://www.fbi.gov/pressrel/speeches/mueller062306.htm> (Accessed September 11, 2006).

¹²⁶ Web archive of Azzam Publications, <http://web.archive.org/web/20000818175151/63.249.218.164/html/chechnyafacts.htm> (accessed February 28, 2006).

¹²⁷ *USA v. Ahmad, et al.*, 04–CR–301, “Indictment,” (D CT October 6, 2004).

mujahideen in Chechnya. The Qoqaz.net homepage, quoting Osama bin Laden's mentor, Abdullah Azzam, reads, "Jihad and the rifle alone. NO negotiations, NO conferences and NO dialogue."¹²⁸ Pages on Qoqaz.net detailed how one might donate to, train for, and join the *jihad* in Chechnya.¹²⁹ Qoqaz.net also played a role in motivating Lackawanna Six cell member Yahya Goba.¹³⁰

While Qoqaz.net is no longer operational, thousands of websites, forums, and cyber how-to manuals have taken its place. A recent posting on a militant Islamic forum about the bacterial botulinum toxin, which causes the deadly disease known as botulism, is one of a seemingly endless string of examples that should draw our attention to resources on the Internet that could allow radicalized individuals to execute a lethal plot. The post, published on an extremist forum hosted in the Middle East, details the preparation and preservation of the biological weapon botulinum toxin, the most potent toxin known today, and one of the Centers for Disease Control and Preventions (CDC) six Category A Bioterrorism Agents. After a brief, but ominous introduction in which the author, "We are lurking in wait for you. Allah will torment you himself or use us to do so. You can plot, but we are plotting as well," he includes facts about the bacteria, how to produce the toxin, lethal doses, experiments and observations, and possible methods of dissemination.¹³¹ The availability of such literature on the Internet provides individuals who are not trained scientists the opportunity to produce biological, chemical, and radiological weapons, though perhaps crude in form. Additionally, the easy distribution of information pertaining to various forms of attacks illuminates alternative and innovative methods of terrorism that might not be otherwise considered. In the case of the Al Qaeda affiliated individuals who were accused of planning to produce ricin in an apartment in London, the group was in possession of a recipe for making the toxin taken off the Internet.¹³² Equipment to produce biological threat agents, such as the castor beans from which ricin is processed, as well as makeshift laboratory materials are also available on the Internet. This technology provides the information to allow aspiring terrorists around the world, including those in the United States, to consider and produce biological, chemical, and radiological weapons that would otherwise be inconceivable.

Combating the operations of websites in this first category will prove to be crucial and effective in the fight against terrorism, however these efforts are largely reactive in nature. In order to achieve a meaningful victory in this long war against Islamic extremism, it will be necessary to take proactive measures, such as eliminating or lessening the influence of websites in the second category. A central challenge in this effort will be drawing the line between extreme-orthodox Islamic isolationism that cannot necessarily be restricted in a democratic society and "unacceptable forms of radical-Islamic isolationism."¹³³ It will undoubtedly be difficult, if not impossible, to achieve a cessation of the flow of extremist thought on the Internet, nonetheless efforts must be undertaken to reduce the allure of the fundamentalist message.

A dark corner of another website, MySpace.com, has essentially become a late-model innovation in this second category of extremist websites. MySpace, the popular online social networking site, is a cyber-refuge for people around the globe to keep in touch with old friends and make new ones. It is especially popular among American university students and young adults, but the subjects discussed in certain circles on this popular website go beyond social activities consisting of friendship and fun. There is a healthy and growing population on MySpace of Islamist extremists and their sympathizers. Through monitoring these networks and the individuals of which they consist, it is evident that there is a possibly dangerous level of radicalization occurring on one of America's most popular websites.

¹²⁸ Web archive of Azzam Publications, <http://web.archive.org/web/20000621135807/www.qoqaz.net/> (accessed August 10, 2005).

¹²⁹ Web archive of Azzam Publications, <http://web.archive.org/web/20000818175151/63.249.218.164/html/chechnyafacts.htm> (accessed February 28, 2006).;

Web archive of Azzam Publications, <http://web.archive.org/web/20000818175151/http://63.249.218.164/html/chechnyafacts.htm#faqs> (accessed February 28, 2006).;

Web Archive of Azzam Publications, <http://web.archive.org/web/20000816204345/63.249.218.164/html/chechnyajahadtrain.htm> (accessed August 10, 2005).

¹³⁰ Patrick Orr, "Hussayen defense gets surprise help; Testimony of key witness is blow to prosecution," *Idaho Statesman*, May 25, 2004.

¹³¹ "Toxins of the Next Phase," Forum Posting, June 2006. The forum will remain unnamed for security reasons.

¹³² Milton Leitenberg, "Assessing the Biological Weapons and Bioterrorism Threat" *Strategic Studies Institute*, December, 2005.

¹³³ *From dawa to jihad; The various threats from radical Islam to the democratic legal order* (The Hague: General Intelligence and Security Service, December 2004), 9.

Like other MySpace users, these individuals post extensively in their blogs and write notes on their friends' profiles; however, instead of commenting on a party, telling a joke, or making social plans, they angrily condemn America, swear support for Osama bin Laden, and express graphic desires to inflict violence upon innocents at home and abroad. Some even identify themselves as active terrorists and claim to have participated in attacks against American soldiers in Iraq, providing horrific photographs as evidence. These extremists who ascribe to the belief systems of groups like al Qaeda, Hamas, and Hizballah are largely adolescents and young adults. Apart from their *jihadi* inclinations, they share common similarities with others in their demographic. They often enjoy popular television shows, video games, and sports. The majority of these self-professed militants live in America—the land in which they were raised. Websites such as MySpace enable its users to connect with peers with greater ease, even if those peers are turning to violent extremist ideologies. While MySpace is not responsible for these growing radical networks, the service is a medium exploited to facilitate them.

Authorities around the world have already seen the heavy hand of the Internet in the development of homegrown terrorist cells. For domestic cells in London, Australia, Canada, the United States and elsewhere, cyber-radicalization and the use of the Internet's other resources mentioned above have reached new heights. In the case of the alleged terrorist cell arrested in the Toronto area early in June 2006, Qayyum Abdul Jamal, a 43-year old bus driver that served as a caretaker and prayer leader at the Al-Rahman Islamic Center, where the cell members worshipped, was an influential figure in the radicalization of the plotters, who were largely juveniles and young adults.¹³⁴ However, the investigation into this cell began in 2004 when intelligence officers monitoring an Internet chat room observed cell members promoting anti-Western sentiment.¹³⁵ Through the Internet, the cell members had connections with extremists all over the world. The arrests of the seventeen terrorism suspects in Toronto was the latest in a series of arrests and raids in Europe and North America—that began in Bosnia with a cell of two men who planned on attacking the British embassy in Sarajevo—all connected to a worldwide Internet terrorism network with links to al Qaeda in Iraq among other terrorist elements, including the now-detained terrorist Internet operative known as Irhabi 007.¹³⁶

Conclusion

Radicalism and homegrown terrorism pose unique challenges to the complex homeland security environment. The core of this threat is an extremist ideology that transcends borders. Until 9/11, the U.S. focused its efforts on the terrorist threat from overseas. However, as evident from these instances, extremism is as much of an internal battle as an external one. We, along with our allies, must be vigilant in combating this ideology at home as well as abroad with a multi-pronged campaign that relies on addressing root causes, but not at the expense of locating and incapacitating terrorist cells, with the result of isolating, retarding, and halting radicalization.

The growing pollution of the Internet by militant Islamist ideology is a particularly acute hazard that will continue to propel radicalization. There are no easy solutions to this crisis and innovative strategies are needed. Infamous terrorist Internet operatives, like Irhabi 007, can be tracked and arrested, but the ideology will continue to seep out on websites, online forums, and chat rooms. Currently, the most viable option available is to work to insulate Muslim communities in the West from this radicalizing influence through the empowerment of constructive and truly moderate Muslim leaders.

While government agencies and law enforcement authorities must engage the American Muslim community to address the root causes of radicalization, officials must take greater care to avoid legitimizing certain elements—whether radical imams or certain groups—within the organized Muslim community who act as agents of radicalization.

These radical groups and Islamic leaders falsely present themselves as moderates and make it their mission to push a narrative to their community that the US government's campaign against terrorism is, rather, a generalized "war against Islam" that must be shunned, discouraged, and monitored. This characterization serves to demonize the efforts of the US government and, by extension, the West, which ultimately serves to radicalize and alienate Muslims in the United States, creating fertile ground for extremists to operate and recruit followers.

¹³⁴ Rebecca Cook Dube, "Canada faces 'jihad generation,'" *Christian Science Monitor*, June 6, 2006.

¹³⁵ Michel Comte, "Canadian bomb plot suspects appear in court," *Agence France Presse*, June 6, 2006.

¹³⁶ "Worldwide web of terrorism suspects exposed," *Australian*, June 8, 2006.

To a large degree, the narrative propagated by these groups is a corollary of the primary message of radical Islam at large: That there is a conspiracy by the West to subjugate Islam. This self-victimization fuels paranoia that Muslims are being selectively targeted for racist reasons, because of “special interests,” or due to anti-Muslim bias in Western foreign policy. This, in turn, inflames self-alienation and degrades any positive connections between Western Muslim communities and their host state. It is therefore not surprising to see a common claim in most of the terrorist attacks the West has witnessed since 9/11, from the “Virginia *jihād network* to the cell that executed the London transit bombings: that they were committing acts of violence to avenge Western atrocities against Muslims.

Too often, the US Government empowers the very groups that are instilling alienation from the United States and the West. Many of the leaders of these groups falsely claim to speak on behalf of most Muslim Americans while they attempt to neutralize other voices within the Muslim community. The “dialoguing” that goes on—with group leaders who demand to be the only representatives of the Muslim community with whom the government should meet—has serious and far-reaching consequences. The extent to which the FBI, the Department of Homeland Security, and the State Department have legitimized radical groups masquerading as “moderate” warrants close oversight by Congress.

This same self-victimization formula has been applied by Islamic groups in Great Britain and Australia. The leaders of these countries, Prime Ministers John Howard and Tony Blair, at their own political expense, have recently articulated the dangers of empowering these groups that reinforce mistrust and hatred of the West. The British Prime Minister recently stated:

Look, we’ve got a problem even in our own Muslim communities in Europe, who will half-buy into some of the propaganda that’s pushed at it—the purpose of America is to suppress Islam, Britain has joined with America in the suppression of Islam. And one of the things we’ve got to stop doing is stop apologizing for our own positions. Muslims in America, as far as I’m aware of, are free to worship; Muslims in Britain are free to worship. We are plural societies. It’s nonsense, the propaganda is nonsense. And we’re not going to defeat this ideology until we in the West go out with sufficient confidence in our own position and say, this is wrong. It’s not just wrong in its methods, it’s wrong in its ideas, it’s wrong in its ideology, it’s wrong in every single wretched reactionary thing about it. And it will be a long struggle, I’m afraid. But there’s no alternative but to stay the course with it. And we will.¹³⁷

The U.S. government should seek out dialogue and cooperation with true Muslim moderates, who have neither supported terrorism nor justified their actions and who seek the integration of Muslims into the American family, rather than self-isolation. Lending legitimacy to extremist imams and organizations only reinforces to the American Muslim community that these groups do, in fact, speak for them. Additionally, law enforcement agencies should continue vigilantly monitoring known pockets of extremism in the United States and abroad, including the trafficking of Saudi religious materials—known for promoting both violent *jihād* and gross intolerance of Christians, Jews and the West—in U.S. mosques and Islamic schools.

U.S. government programs and official engagement can provide only a limited amount of success. A greater effort on the part of the Muslim community must be undertaken to counter a growing trend that sees *jihād* as the new counterculture for a generation caught between two cultures that are often at odds. Circumstances demand that these efforts go beyond condemnations of terrorist attacks and conditional statements of support.

Mr. SIMMONS. Thank you all very much for your testimony. It has been extremely interesting and informative.

And we are joined by our ranking member, the distinguished gentlelady from California, who has been deeply engaged in another committee on some very serious work. And so, I would like to yield my time for questions to her, give her the opportunity to—

Ms. LOFGREN. Well, thank you. That is very gracious, Mr. Chairman.

¹³⁷ “President Bush and Prime Minister Blair of the United Kingdom Participate in Press Availability,” The White House Office of Press Secretary, July 28, 2006, <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2006/07/20060728-1.html> (Accessed September 18, 2006).

I do offer my apologies. The Judiciary Committee was marking up the tribunals bill, as well as the wiretapping bill, and naturally I had to become involved in that. So I offer my apologies.

I have been able to read the testimony and be briefed on it. And, if I may, I would like to focus in on Mr. Woodward's testimony, because I think there are global issues and then there are some things that you can do right now that can help.

And when the chairman and I, along with some of our other members, went up to Toronto this spring, we had a meeting with members of the Muslim community, talking about radicalization. And I remember very well, one of the individuals there, who was a professional person, describe his father being humiliated. And this gentleman had tears in his eyes, because his father, who was a very respected person in the Toronto community, came up on a name check. And he wasn't a terrorist; everyone knew that. But he missed his plane, and it was embarrassing. And we thought about that.

And then, shortly after that, we went to the Toronto airport and watched the system in play. And the name check, would anybody named Mohammed Khan misses their plane, is what we were told. And, in fact, with frequent travelers, we are told that sometimes if they knew the person they would call ahead, because they knew this person wasn't a terrorist but they had to go through this same routine every single time for the same people over and over again. Even if it was a baby, even if it was a 100-year-old, there was no discretion.

And in August, I spent a morning overseas at a consular office to see on the visa issuance side. And they complained about the same thing. And I will just tell one story, and then I would like Mr. Woodward to say how we might solve this.

This consular official said, "We say that we are not against Muslims, and I believe that is true. But if you look at how we act, it is easy to see how people could reach a different conclusion."

And he gave an example of a young man who was the son of a very prominent person in the country he was in who had been admitted to a very fine college in the United States, applied for the student visa, his name triggered the name check, but they knew that it wasn't this kid. It was in the newspapers, it was very embarrassing for the United States. It took 6 weeks to get the kid cleared. Finally, this kid was cleared, went off to college. He had to come and reapply for his student visa the next year. Same thing all over again. Because nothing is stored. It is all as if, every single time, it is brand-new.

And it seems to me there ought to be some biometric way to solve this problem so that we stop people who should be stopped but that we don't keep spending time and effort on people who we have cleared. Because it has an impact not only on wasting our time, diverting us from who we ought to be focusing on, but it has a very negative impact on people who feel that they are being singled out for no good reason.

Can you come up or give us some advice on a technology solution to that, Mr. Woodward?

MR. WOODWARD. I am happy to, ma'am. And realize, when a former intelligence officer gives an attorney technical advice—

[Laughter.]

Ms. LOFGREN. We will love it.

Mr. WOODWARD. I do it all the time.

No, I think, basically, biometric technologies are a tool. They are only a tool. It is not the proverbial silver bullet. They are not perfect. However, I think they are a useful tool in this, what I call, the identity management part.

And what I mean by that, to take your example of the visa applicant, someone applies for a visa to come to the United States, we want to establish that identity. Well, how do we establish that identity? Well, we ask them questions, we have them fill out an application. Part of that establishment of identity should be providing biometric data that we can then search against relevant databases to see if we can make any matches that would show links to behavior—for example, having a criminal record.

There was actually a case of a foreigner applying for a visa in a foreign country where data was searched and matched to fingerprints indicating that that person had previously been a detainee in military custody in Iraq. Well, that wasn't disclosed on the visa application.

Ms. LOFGREN. Of course not.

Mr. WOODWARD. We can use this biometric data search to establish the identity.

Then once we do that, as best as we can judge, "You qualify for a visa, we want you to go to the United States, we want you to enjoy your American experience," that is where we need to help the person. I guess you would call this the identity user.

And one of the ways we can do that is to take the biometric, and you could pick your biometric du jour—I am not here to give you the technological solution, but a fingerprint, an iris, et cetera, et cetera—is there some way we can take that and associate it with that person by, for example, putting a template or representation of that data on the person's visa, a chip on a smart card, in the passport and so on?

So when the person now comes to the port of entry, I am here as a foreigner with a valid visa, I want to enjoy America. He or she can establish that identity by doing a one-to-one: Here is my biometric sample. Here is the biometric template the U.S. government has confirmed by establishing my identity. Do they match? I think we make that person's life a little bit easier.

Are we there yet? No. I think the concept is for the U.S. government to get there. But I am not certain we are moving as quickly as we should. Because I very much am sympathetic to the point you raised where, once people have done as good a job as they can at saying, "I am a legitimate traveler," "I am a legitimate visa seeker," and so on, we should try to make things a little bit easier for that person to be able to enjoy the American experience.

Ms. LOFGREN. I will say—and I see my time is up, and we will have votes sometime between 3:00 and 3:30—the line officers at the airport and in the consulate office are enormously frustrated, because they know they are wasting time. They know these individuals; they know who they are. But they are never allowed to connect identity with the name, so they keep doing—they are doing tasks that provide no value, while creating ill will—

Mr. WOODWARD. And part of that, ma'am, just quickly, is we are still in a paradigm of doing name-based searches. Sometimes we use a number, Social Security number, et cetera. That paradigm shift will come when we recognize the biometric as a way to get at unique identity, and we can do more searching that way. That I think would help visa officers, help inspectors at the point of entry. It would certainly help the United States military operating in places like Iraq.

Ms. LOFGREN. I don't want to abuse my time, but—

Mr. SIMMONS. Please, take your time.

Ms. LOFGREN. —the chairman suggested maybe other witnesses might comment on this.

Mr. SIMMONS. Hearing none, I have a question I want to ask.

Dr. Phares, you made the interesting comment, I believe, that we have to identify the beginning of the process. We have to be able to figure out when the click is taking place, if you will.

And then several of you concluded your testimony by making reference to engaging in a dialogue with Muslim organizations.

I am a believer, given my background and my experience—I lived in the Far East for 7 years. I speak Chinese, and I used to speak some Vietnamese. I always felt that my experience in a foreign country was not worth much if I couldn't talk the language, live in the community, eat the food, and fully and completely engage, to the extent possible as an American, in the social, political and economic life of the community. And the reward to me was understanding another culture.

I wonder, somehow, if we have taken full advantage of those opportunities here in the United States, in reaching out to the Muslim community and better integrating our political activities with them, social and economic activities. And that is the first part of my question.

Then the second question is, there is a lot of talk about the Internet, which is very interesting to me. We invented the Internet. It was our brainchild, if you will. It is a fantastic tool for communication. But isn't it ironic that this fantastic tool for communication has been taken over by a group that essentially wants to destroy the very culture that came up with this fantastic tool? And why can't we use the same tool to push back, to promote our point of view? Why is that not the case?

And then finally, is the U.S. media helping or hurting in this process? That is a tough one.

[Laughter.]

You may not want to answer that one. But these are the three points I would like to draw out a little bit.

Don't be shy.

Mr. PHARES. Yes. Quickly, couple points here, with regard to the actual title of the initial inquiry about radicalization, and then I will tie this in to your important question.

There is a thesis in Washington and many capitals that are dealing with terrorism that, originally, there is frustration in communities; that is how it starts. Then there is a radicalization because of this frustration. Nobody explains how the radicalization occurs out of the frustration, though, and that is an important academic question. And immediately, it becomes terrorism.

A young man or a young woman who are frustrated with the U.S. sending qualitative bombs to Israel overnight becomes a terrorist jihadi is the thesis. Or, in England, some of the members of the Muslim community are not getting the exact rights that other communities, not necessarily the Anglos but Hindus or East Europeans. Therefore, the next day they become terrorists.

I argue with this theory.

I do state that, at the beginning, the big bang is jihadism. There is an ideology that comes first. A, either it creates a frustration by explaining to the community, or to the weakest members of the community—here comes the psychological investigation, what have you—but before the psychological investigation, there is an investigation of what initiate that frustration and transformed it into terrorism. Or, what I call, hijacking frustration.

Frustration exists. But then comes that radical cleric or that ideologue or that cadre online, not online, in the classroom, in the mosque, anywhere, and then explains this frustration, that it is an attack against Islam, for example.

But more important than that, it explains to those individuals that you are here on a mission. It aggrandizes the personality of that person.

And here comes the last stage, which is, in order for you to help the whole community, imagined community—in French, *communité imaginaire*—then you have to perform that martyrdom, so on and so forth.

So, from that perspective, I would conclude that most of our energies—and we have no other alternative for now—most of our energies are put on the last 10 percent of the process. From where the individual wants to do terrorism on, we have 90 percent of our energies on the last 10 percent of the making of a jihadist.

Where the jihadist has been made is the click that convinced him or her that, “I have to do it.” And that is where I have moved to request to identify the ideology.

Let me show you an object here, Mr. Chairman. This bloated in the mind of an individual. This is an audiotape. This is one of the 105 audiotapes which were released at the case of terrorism in Detroit in 2003, which I have reviewed—105 audiotapes. This is the weapon of mass radicalization.

That is an example of individuals who basically were not jihadists and, because of this material and literature and what came with them, become jihadists. The rest is only a process of indoctrination into doing that terrorist activity.

Internet, quickly, jihadism is using Internet, but what is not happening is that the counterjihadist forces—democracy groups, human rights groups—are not using Internet enough. They are sampling, though. I mean, in the Middle East, there are Web sites that are very recent that are beginning to counter the jihadists. And their consequences, their effects are very interesting. What we need to do is let the American public, American Congress understand that there are alternatives to the Internet use of jihadism.

Mr. CILLUFFO. Mr. Chairman, I found your questions excellent and right on the mark.

In terms of working with the Muslim community, I think we have an awful lot more we need to be doing. Not just the Muslim—

American community, but the Arab-American community. And we need to expand that beyond the United States. Hopefully we can learn some lessons that others have learned the hard way and have the scar tissue for it, that we can inoculate ourselves before it becomes a crisis.

I think one of the challenges is, if we look at it through a counterterrorism lens alone, it is going to create a defensive posture automatically. So we need to actually look at the radicalization questions in a broader tapestry and try to isolate and marginalize those individuals, which, to some extent, does get to the role of the Internet, as well.

The United States wouldn't have much credibility to the people we are trying to touch if we use the Internet. What we actually need to be able to do is give the silent majority the voice to speak up and deal with the—to some extent, give them the tools to better help themselves.

Just think about what took down the Sicilian Mafia. It was not the fact that the carabinieri was so successful. It was the fact that they finally killed a judge, Falcone, who was very popular with the people, that they lost the hearts and the minds and the trust and the confidence of the people.

And we need to be looking to that, if there is a Martin Luther King, to some extent, that we need, in terms of that moderate voice, or whether we need a Gandhi, or whether we need someone who has credibility with the people. That can't necessarily be done from the United States.

But let me also jump on one other thing from the Internet. One of the things that is most unique that we have seen vis-a-vis these virtual ummas and the Internet chat rooms and relay sessions and the like is that people actually bond closer on the Internet than they do person-to-person, which is so ironic.

They don't know who they are talking to. The anonymity is a potential tool that we should be using more from a law enforcement, from a tactical standpoint. Just like we don't know who is behind the clickety-clack of the keyboard, they shouldn't either. So I do think that that is a tool we need to be looking at much more closely.

I also think one of the most concerning trends is, that reaffirms avarine attitudes. It gives them a sense of uniting, and these bonds get stronger and stronger, and they basically get bolder and bolder, and it empowers one another. It unites them. It is kind of interesting.

We have seen it, you mentioned, with juvenile predators and sexual predators. It could be six people, but if they have the same view they get stronger and stronger and bolder and bolder, and then they start acting on those ideas. That is the point—where do you go from the virtual, where they meet in an Internet relay chat room, to then go to do jihad, to actually operationalize it? That is where I think we have some points we need to think about more.

Mr. SIMMONS. And actually, your point is absolutely correct. In our work with police organizations in Connecticut and elsewhere, tracking the chat rooms that attract the Internet predators, they do reinforce each other. And there was a time when that predator

was a guy in a trenchcoat or standing at a bus stop or at a community center, waiting for the kids to come around.

Today, it can be highly educated, sophisticated, middle-class, white-collar folks who are using the technology and reinforcing each other. And, in some respects, that is the bingo, too, for reasonable well-to-do, second-generation Muslims who hear the click.

Mr. Emerson?

Mr. EMERSON. Yes, I think you raised an excellent question, and it is a very sensitive one, but we have to answer it honestly, which is, what type of Islam do we want to legitimize in the United States? Which type of group do we want to legitimize?

Dialogue has the purpose of trying to foster some commonality in a higher degree. Unfortunately, we have witnessed, in my organization, U.S. government sanctioning and legitimizing certain groups that are tethered to Hamas, Islamic Jihad, or other radical Islamic organizations. And, unfortunately, that reinforces their legitimacy in front of the larger Islamic community.

What we would like to see, really, is to seek out legitimate, authentic, genuine moderates, leaders and organizations, that will dispel the community of any notion that there is a war against Islam. Because, to the extent that these groups reinforce that their rights are being denied, that there is a war against Islam, it only reinforces their notion that the United States is an enemy, providing susceptibility ultimately to a terrorist plot.

Mr. SIMMONS. I think that is a really good point. I come from New England, as you know. We used to burn witches in New England.

[Laughter.]

Yes, yes, we would burn them. We would put them in dunking stools, you know, the dunking stools, because we did that, there were witches out there, and it was a witch hunt. And I think that it is incredibly important that we not fall into the trap of a witch hunt here in the United States.

Following 9/11, I immediately called friends in my Muslim community and said, "If you encounter any adverse commentary, yourselves in your professional life, your wives in the community, your children at school, call my office." We had two incidents; we put an end to it.

A week ago, the Islamic center in New London got threatening phone calls. We immediately got the FBI in to investigate.

I think it is incredibly important that we ensure that the Muslim community knows that they are part of the American community and that it is really a small sliver of folks who, for whatever reason, are hearing the click and are thinking of doing damage. And that we need their help in identifying the click. They might hear the click before we do. And that is the challenge. That is the huge challenge.

So I thank you all for your testimony and for beginning the process of trying to figure this out. And I suspect, at some future hearing, we will get a little more deeply into how we can shape and form our public policy to appropriately address this.

And I think the biometric issue is very, very important. Because the Muslim community that we met in Toronto was unanimous in expressing their concern about small insults on an almost daily

basis. One of them married to an American whose family lived in Maine, and they would visit the family once a month in Maine, and once a month on the way to Maine he would have to sit for 4 hours. And this went on year after year. It was absurd. And so, there has to be, I think, a way also of bringing technology into the equation.

The word "preliminary" was used an hour or so ago. I think that we have made a good step in the right direction.

I thank you all for your inputs. And if you have additional material to submit for the record of the hearing, please be my guest. Thank you all very much.

Without objection, we are now adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 3:21 p.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]

