

**CONFRONTING WHITE SUPREMACY  
(PART VI): THE EVOLUTION OF  
ANTI-DEMOCRATIC EXTREMIST GROUPS  
AND THE ONGOING THREAT TO  
DEMOCRACY**

---

---

**HEARING**

BEFORE THE  
SUBCOMMITTEE ON CIVIL RIGHTS AND CIVIL  
LIBERTIES

OF THE

**COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT  
AND REFORM**

**HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

ONE HUNDRED SEVENTEENTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

DECEMBER 13, 2022

**Serial No. 117-111**

Printed for the use of the Committee on Oversight and Reform



Available on: *govinfo.gov*  
*oversight.house.gov* or  
*docs.house.gov*

U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE

COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND REFORM

CAROLYN B. MALONEY, New York, *Chairwoman*

|   |   |
|---|---|
| ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, District of Columbia | JAMES COMER, Kentucky, <i>Ranking Minority Member</i> |
| STEPHEN F. LYNCH, Massachusetts             | JIM JORDAN, Ohio                                      |
| JIM COOPER, Tennessee                       | VIRGINIA FOXX, North Carolina                         |
| GERALD E. CONNOLLY, Virginia                | JODY B. HICE, Georgia                                 |
| RAJA KRISHNAMOORTHY, Illinois               | GLENN GROTHMAN, Wisconsin                             |
| JAMIE RASKIN, Maryland                      | MICHAEL CLOUD, Texas                                  |
| RO KHANNA, California                       | BOB GIBBS, Ohio                                       |
| KWEISI MFUME, Maryland                      | CLAY HIGGINS, Louisiana                               |
| ALEXANDRIA OCASIO-CORTEZ, New York          | RALPH NORMAN, South Carolina                          |
| RASHIDA TLAIB, Michigan                     | PETE SESSIONS, Texas                                  |
| KATIE PORTER, California                    | FRED KELLER, Pennsylvania                             |
| CORI BUSH, Missouri                         | ANDY BIGGS, Arizona                                   |
| SHONTEL M. BROWN, Ohio                      | ANDREW CLYDE, Georgia                                 |
| DANNY K. DAVIS, Illinois                    | NANCY MACE, South Carolina                            |
| DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Florida           | SCOTT FRANKLIN, Florida                               |
| PETER WELCH, Vermont                        | JAKE LATURNER, Kansas                                 |
| HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., Georgia       | PAT FALLON, Texas                                     |
| JOHN P. SARBANES, Maryland                  | YVETTE HERRELL, New Mexico                            |
| JACKIE SPEIER, California                   | BYRON DONALDS, Florida                                |
| ROBIN L. KELLY, Illinois                    | MIKE FLOOD, Nebraska                                  |
| BRENDA L. LAWRENCE, Michigan                |   |
| MARK DESAULNIER, California                 |   |
| JIMMY GOMEZ, California                     |   |
| AYANNA PRESSLEY, Massachusetts              |   |

RUSS ANELLO, *Staff Director*  
DEVON OMBRES, *Subcommittee Staff Director*  
MELANIE MPANJU, *Deputy Chief Clerk*  
CONTACT NUMBER: 202-225-5051  
MARK MARIN, *Minority Staff Director*

---

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CIVIL RIGHTS AND CIVIL LIBERTIES

JAMIE RASKIN, Maryland, *Chairman*

|   |  |
|---|--|
| KWEISI MFUME, Maryland                      | NANCY MACE, South Carolina, <i>Ranking Minority Member</i> |
| DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Florida           | JIM JORDAN, Ohio   |
| ROBIN KELLY, Illinois                       | ANDY BIGGS, Arizona  |
| AYANNA PRESSLEY, Massachusetts              | SCOTT FRANKLIN, Florida                                    |
| ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, District of Columbia | BYRON DONALDS, Florida                                     |
| ALEXANDRIA OCASIO-CORTEZ, New York          | CLAY HIGGINS, Louisiana                                    |
| RASHIDA TLAIB, Michigan                     |  |
| DANNY K. DAVIS, Illinois                    |  |

# C O N T E N T S

|   | Page |
|---|------|
| Hearing held on December 13, 2022 .....   | 1    |
| WITNESSES   |      |
| Eric Ward, Senior Advisor, Western States Center<br>Oral Statement .....  | 6    |
| Oren Segal, Vice President, Center on Extremism, on behalf of Anti-Defamation League<br>Oral Statement .....  | 8    |
| Alejandra Caraballo, Clinical Instructor, Cyberlaw Clinic, on behalf of Harvard Law School<br>Oral Statement .....  | 9    |
| Asra Nomani, Senior Fellow in the Practice of Journalism, Independent Women's Network<br>Oral Statement .....   | 11   |
| Amanda Tyler, Executive Director, Baptist Joint Committee for Religious Liberty<br>Oral Statement .....   | 13   |
| Mary McCord, Executive Director, Institute for Constitutional Advocacy and Protection, on behalf of Georgetown University Law Center<br>Oral Statement .....  | 14   |
| <i>Written opening statements and statements for the witnesses are available on the U.S. House of Representatives Document Repository at: docs.house.gov.</i> |      |

## INDEX OF DOCUMENTS

- \* Use of Force Handout; submitted by Rep. Biggs.
  - \* Search and Seizure Handout; submitted by Rep. Biggs.
  - \* Search and Seizure Bibliography Handout; submitted by Rep. Biggs.
  - \* Home Safety Handout; submitted by Rep. Biggs.
  - \* Firearm Safety Handout; submitted by Rep. Biggs.
  - \* FBI Response to Raskin QFR; submitted by Rep. Biggs.
  - \* Constitution Handout; submitted by Rep. Biggs.
  - \* Citizens Posse Pinal County Description; submitted by Rep. Biggs.
  - \* AZ Central article; submitted by Rep. Biggs.
  - \* Tweets Docs for the Record; submitted by Rep. Mace.
- Documents are available at: docs.house.gov.*



**CONFRONTING WHITE SUPREMACY  
(PART VII): THE EVOLUTION OF  
ANTI-DEMOCRATIC EXTREMIST GROUPS  
AND THE ONGOING THREAT TO  
DEMOCRACY**

---

**Tuesday, December 13, 2022**

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND REFORM  
SUBCOMMITTEE ON CIVIL RIGHTS AND CIVIL LIBERTIES  
WASHINGTON, DC.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:18 a.m., in room 2154, Rayburn House Office Building, and via Zoom; Hon. Jamie Raskin (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Raskin, Wasserman Schultz, Kelly, Norton, Tlaib, Mace, Biggs, and Donalds.

Mr. RASKIN. The committee will come to order.

Without objection, the chair is authorized to declare a recess of the committee at any time.

I just—I want to thank all of the distinguished members of this committee who are appearing both in person and on Zoom for their great, hard work over the course of the 117th Congress on matters of fundamental importance to the American people.

It's been a great pleasure to work with Representative Nancy Mace of South Carolina, the ranking member, who is a model of industry and seriousness and commitment to her constituents and to the country.

So, it's been an honor to get to serve with you, Ms. Mace. I got to read your book before we got started, and I continue to recommend it to everybody, "In the Company of Men," about her experience as one of the first women graduates of The Citadel.

Well, I want to recognize myself for an opening statement. I want to thank our excellent witnesses for joining us today. This is our seventh. And it is our final of several years' worth of hearings that we've conducted on the problem of violent White supremacy, a traditional and pernicious enemy of the voting rights, the civil rights, and the civil liberties of the American people.

In prior hearings over the last three years, long before violent insurrectionists bearing confederate battle flags overran the Capitol on January 6, 2021, we found that violent White supremacy and its partner, antidemocratic extremism, today constitute the most serious domestic terror threat facing our people.

Indeed, these same authoritarian and racist movements pose a similar danger to people living in many democratic societies on

Earth. Just last week German authorities arrested dozens of far-right extremists, including members of a royal house in Germany seeking restoration of the Second Reich, an active-duty German soldier, former members of the German police and elite special forces units, and neo-Nazi activists for allegedly participating in a violent right-wing plot to topple the German Government and seize power.

The coup plotters, many of whom were heavily armed when arrested, were inspired by the American insurrection of January 6 and are followers of deranged online QAnon conspiracy theories. They profess that the democratic German government is an imposture of corporate subsidiary of the United States, run by the American deep state. The insurrectionists planned to disrupt the German power grid and take parliament by force, to impose a new authoritarian and anti-Semitic government.

The German people and democracy around the world are fortunate that their law enforcement and intelligence agencies acted with speed and vigor to interrupt the conspiracy before the conspirators could succeed in staging a full-blown January 6-style attack on the German Government.

It would be comforting to believe that the threat of violent White supremacy has subsided here in America in the wake of more than 900 criminal prosecutions being brought by the United States Department of Justice against January 6 insurrectionists and rioters for assaulting Federal officers, destroying Federal property, interfering with a Federal proceeding, engaging in seditious conspiracy, which means conspiracy to overthrow or put down the government, and numerous other offenses. But the threats have not subsided and are very much still with us today.

On May 14, 2022, an 18-year-old White supremacist named Payton Gendron, jacked up on online propaganda about the racist and anti-Semitic Great Replacement Theory, entered a Tops supermarket in Buffalo with an illegally modified AR-15 semiautomatic rifle, and murdered 10 African-American people, wounding three others. He pleaded guilty to first-degree murder, state charges, and has offered to plead guilty on Federal charges including hate crime charges based on his premeditation to commit domestic terrorism.

We are living through an onslaught of such violent threats and attacks, taking place directly against political fusion, too. Everyone knows that Representative Gabby Giffords, of course, was the victim of an assassination attempt a decade ago at a constituent meeting in Arizona and Representative Steve Scalise was also the victim of a deranged political shooter back in 2017 at baseball practice not far from the Capitol.

A month ago, an extremist, who was loaded up on internet conspiracy theories and made statements like “Hitler did nothing wrong,” broke into House Speaker Nancy Pelosi’s home in San Francisco and bludgeoned her 82-year-old husband, Paul Pelosi, in the head with a hammer with the intent of kidnapping the Speaker and breaking her kneecaps.

In the run up to January 6, Michigan Governor Gretchen Whitmer was the target of a kidnapping and assassination plot by racist, antigovernment extremists.

The ranking member, Ms. Mace, has seen her home vandalized and her privacy violated by someone who scrolled antifa symbols on it.

We live in a violent society and the violent exists across the spectrum of political extremism, but the movements of violent White supremacy and antigovernment extremism lead America in fomenting terroristic violence and disseminating propaganda to incite it. Both the FBI and the Department of Homeland Security identify White supremacy as the most lethally dangerous domestic terror threat our country faces.

This hearing will help us to understand the continuing evolution of the White supremacist and extremist anti-government movement, specifically, the strategic turn of major far right groups to focus their wrath on local governments and school boards since the January 6 riot and insurrection and subsequent Federal criminal prosecutions; the mobilization of White supremacist groups to attack the LGBTQ community in private clubs and public places; the emergence of Christian nationalism as an organizing ideological principle; and the growing prominence of the Great Replacement Theory as a unifying field conspiracy theory for the motivation of far right-wing politics.

Please consider this video highlighting the proliferation of extremist violence against Americans.

[Video shown.]

Mr. RASKIN. I look forward hearing the testimony we will hear from our witnesses, and how we can all work together best in Congress across the country to combat violent extremism when it appears.

With that, I now recognize the distinguished ranking member, Ms. Mace, for her opening statement.

Ms. MACE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The love is likewise. Ditto. Appreciate that. It has been an honor to serve with you on this Subcommittee on Civil Rights and Civil Liberties. I have learned a lot, and have enjoyed the colloquy and the debate that we have had and learning that we agree on so much and I wish that the rest of Congress can learn from many of lessons that we've, you know, shared here.

Americans of all races, religions, creeds deserve to achieve their American dream in a secure society where they don't have to fear harm, simply on account of who they are, where they live, where they come from, or what their political affiliation is, skin color, gender orientation, et cetera.

We hear a lot about threats to our democracy and Constitution these days. Those threats are real. That warning is used so often to advance a political agenda that it has lost some of the impact that it should have. But let me be clear. The only alternatives to our constitutional system of government are a descent into authoritarianism, fascism, or the embrace of anarchy.

Chairman Raskin, you and I agree that there are serious threats to our democratic ideals lurking on the horizon. We took an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic. Yet there are those who seek to undermine the Constitution for their own ends, and even people who want to damage our republic and harm our citizens.

As you mentioned in your opening remarks, I have seen both sides of the coin on this, both politically.

America is founded on the idea enshrined in our Declaration of Independence and one we've ever since been struggling to achieve for all Americans that we're endowed by our Creator with certain unalienable rights. Among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Our democratic ideals demand that we engage in a robust debate about how to solve the most challenging problems facing our country. This necessarily means that we're going to have disagreements, and passions will flare. But part of the American experiment, as you know, Chairman Raskin, is the ability to debate these ideas and not fear the threats or attacks that are—that may or may not come and have often come, especially in the last 2 to 3 years.

Our Constitution and the rule of law provide for an open and honest debate with people we disagree with. A view placed may be met with strong criticism, but they must never be met with violence or censorship, both of which threaten this American experiment.

First, we must not be tempted to misuse power to silence those we disagree with, or sensor lawful speech. We have seen not just the Twitter files, but we've seen a number of examples over the last few months where censorship has been overreaching and one-sided. I am a firm believer in the concept that free speech creates human interactions within the marketplace of ideas and enables us to, as one witness who appeared before our subcommittee in April explained, feel like we can talk to people who disagree with us fervently to learn that they are people of good will who often want the same good things for society but we just have different ways of getting there. Our goals are the same, but how we approach them may be different.

Second, we must recognize that violence as a solution to problems or as an expression of extreme and hateful ideas, whether from the far right or the far left or anywhere in between, cannot be tolerated as it sows fear, suppresses civil discourse, and comes to a great human cost.

It's not partisan. As someone who's seen it on both sides, I've had my house trespassed on not once but twice in the last year. I've had my car keyed. I've had my family, including my children, threatened for political positions that I have taken.

As you mentioned, Chairman Raskin, you know, in 2017 when Republicans were targeted and Steve Scalise was shot multiple times in that tragic incident, Rand Paul was attacked by his neighbor. We've had instances which had the FBI called to this committee and talking about antifa attacks, anarchist attacks, something that they don't really, the FBI doesn't truly track in terms of their metrics. They don't call out antifa for what it is in their internal metrics we learned earlier this year.

My district knows this truth all too well as we continue to mourn nine churchgoers murdered by a racist domestic terrorist at Mother Emanuel in 2015. Racially motivated violent extremists are excessive, particularly lethal, and particularly dangerous, especially as they are most likely to be and conduct lone-wolf attacks. White su-

premac y violence is a very real threat and so are the threats emanating from other pernicious and racist ideologies.

We must be—confront a spike in anti-Semitism in the United States with documented cases of target harassment assaults against Jewish Americans on the rise in recent years. Anti-Semitic ideologies lead to violence against Jewish people, and I have always condemned anti-Semitism, whether it is found at a dinner party or echoed in the halls of Congress.

We must also confront rising discrimination and violence against Asian Americans, as you mentioned in your video as well. We must strengthen our domestic society and ensure that we're doing everything in our power to protect the Constitution—we're not flushing it down the toilet or putting through it through a shredder, not now, not ever—the rule of law, and ensure Americans have the security they need to prosper and achieve their American dream.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I yield back.

Mr. RASKIN. Well, what a wonderful opening statement.

I want to specifically associate myself with everything that you said about the Constitution and how the only alternative to the Constitution, if you think you want to replace it, is going to be authoritarianism, fascism, or a collapse into anarchy. And I appreciate that very much and that's very much in the spirit of the views of our Founders.

So, thank you, Mrs. Mace.

Before we got to our witnesses, I want to recognize the distinguished chair of the Oversight Committee, Mrs. Maloney, for her opening statement.

Mrs. MALONEY. Thank you. I want to thank you, Chairman Raskin, and also Ranking Member Mace, for holding this incredibly important hearing.

Too many Members of Congress, like Representative Mace and people in this country are innocently attacked by the violence in this country, and I think the recent attack on the Speaker's husband showed that you're not even safe in your own home, which is outrageous here in America. So, this hearing is very important.

And, Mr. Chairman, your leadership of the subcommittee has been exemplary. I look forward to following the work you will do moving forward on this issue and many others.

White supremacy is one of the most terrible threats to our democracy today. Both the FBI and DHS recognize White supremacy as the deadliest domestic terror threat facing the United States. According to the Southern Poverty Law Center, there are more than 733 hate groups operating in the United States today. This includes 98 white nationalist groups; 61 anti-Semitic groups; 50 anti-Muslim groups; 65 anti-LGBTQI+ groups; 16 Neo-Confederate groups; and 18 Ku Klux Klan groups. This is a horrifying amount of people and numbers, and hate is on the rise here in our country.

That is why it's critical that Congress continue to shed light on this growing cancer and come up with substantive solutions to address hate and violence. We may disagree on politics. But there is no room in this country for discrimination, violence, and hate.

Thank you again, Chairman Raskin and Ranking Member Mace, for holding this vital hearing and all our panelists today and for your life's work.

Thank you, and I yield back.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you, Chair Maloney, for your inspired and extraordinary leadership of our committee. And thank you for joining us in this committee today.

I want to introduce our panel of witnesses.

We have, first, Eric Ward who's Executive Vice President of Race Forward and senior advisor to the Western States Center. He joins us over Zoom.

Then we'll hear from Oren Segal, the Vice President of the Center on Extremism at the Anti-Definition League.

Then we'll hear from Alejandra Caraballo, a clinical instructor for the Cyberlaw Clinic at Harvard Law School.

Next, we'll hear from Asra Nomani, a senior fellow in the practice of journalism at the Independent Women's Network.

Then we'll hear from Amanda Tyler, executive director of the Baptist Joint Committee for Religious Liberty and, finally, from Professor Mary McCord, the executive director for the Institute for Constitutional Advocacy and Protection at Georgetown University Law Center.

The witnesses will all be under muted so we can swear them in.

Would you all please rise and raise your right hands, if you would?

Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you're about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Let the record shows that all of the witnesses have answered in the affirmative. Thank you.

You may be seated.

Without objection, your more elaborate written statements will be made part of the record. But you will all be recognized for five minutes.

With that, Mr. Ward, you are now recognized for your testimony.

**STATEMENT OF ERIC WARD, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT,  
RACE FORWARD, SENIOR ADVISOR, WESTERN STATES CENTER**

Mr. WARD. Good morning, Chairman Raskin, and members of the committee.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak with you about the ongoing crisis of anti-democracy extremism and white nationalism, currently present in this country.

I commend you for using this forum to address the urgent threats posed to American democracy. White nationalists and other bigoted groups are driving harassment campaigns against elected officials, law enforcement, leaders of color, the LGBTQ community, school officials, and many more at an alarming rate.

This harassment has a chilling effect on the ability of many people to engage in civil society, but I believe that despite an acceleration in anti-democracy formations, it is possible to build a shared commitment to a country where elected officials, business, non-profit institutions, faith leaders, and ordinary citizens join together

and reject the violence and anti-Semitic conspiracies of white nationalism, and begin the important work of closing the door to political violence and stopping anti-democracy extremists from mainstreaming their tactics and agenda.

I live and work in the Pacific Northwest, a place deeply shaped and impacted by anti-democracy extremism. This region has been a proving ground for extremists and anti-democracy formations. Over these past five years, as the fight for inclusive democracy has become both a national and international commitment, it becomes imperative that we soberly assess the drivers of these threats and invest in the communities and local governments who are working to combat them.

First, it is important to understand that the insurrection did not end on January 6, 2021. Across the country, in small communities and towns, the insurrection is still a daily reality for many Americans. Health workers, educators, local government officials, civil rights activists, election workers, and community leaders are the targets. They are bearing the brunt of intimidation, physical violence, and acts of domestic terrorism from those who are supportive or took part in the insurrection.

Perhaps no incident illustrated the continuity of January 6 is better covered than the violent assaults on House Speaker Nancy Pelosi's husband, Paul Pelosi, in October. The attacker stands accused of promoting anti-Semitic and racist language and conspiracy theories. This incident brings home the crisis for those communities that are being targeted in much the same way, but without the benefit of Federal intention and mainstream media attention.

It has also demonstrated that the cultural shift that has occurred in the almost two years since the insurrection, a shift to an environment where individuals feel empowered to carry out political violence on their own, or in an increasingly unpredictable way.

The reports of attacks on electrical infrastructure in North Carolina, Oregon, and Washington are raising the stakes. Law enforcement is reportedly investigating posts by extremists on online forums that encourage attacks on critical infrastructure, and whether the North Carolina attack was intended to disrupt the local LGBTQ event, this after a series of attacks on the LGBTQ community in recent weeks and months.

Much of the violence and intimidation I've been describing is perpetrated by those who have been influenced by the Great Replacement, a genocidal conspiracy theory belief that is grounded in anti-Semitism. It falsely purports a global force is orchestrating a master plan to undermine white political power and white existence.

Depending on the version of the theory one comes across, conspiracy might be run by global elites, or an international cabal, monied interests, all thinly veiled references to Jewish people. This is anti-Semitism in its most modern form. It is a form of racism. It places Jews not as a religious other, but as a racialized other.

If we seek to counter domestic extremism, we must recognize that anti-Semitism and the Great Replacement Theory remain the energizing principle behind white nationalism.

With the Federal Government's help, local governments and communities can respond with strategies that strengthen democratic practice, while closing the space for political and hate violence. Re-

spectfully, I offer three actions that could reduce the threat to local communities from anti-democracy extremism.

One, block grants to counter the impacts of extremism on local governments; two, require Federal agencies to provide respective action plans; and three, root out extremism in law enforcement and the military.

We remain inspired by the broad coalitions of local elected leaders, civil servants, and community members who raise their voice against violence and bigotry every day.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you very much for your testimony.

Mr. Segal, you're recognized for your five minutes.

**STATEMENT OF OREN SEGAL, VICE PRESIDENT OF THE  
CENTER ON EXTREMISM, ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE**

Mr. SEGAL. Thank you, Chairman Raskin, Ranking Member Mace, members of the committee.

I'm grateful for the opportunity to speak to you today to address ongoing threats of White supremacy and extremism, and the impact they have on our communities, our democratic institutions, and the very fabric of American society.

Since 1913, ADL has worked to stop to the defamation of the Jewish people, and to secure justice and fair treatment for all. We have a world-class team of analysts and investigators who track and respond to extremism and threats from across the ideological spectrum.

Our work shows that domestic extremism remains a clear and present danger to our democracy. While the Jewish, Black, LGBTQ communities continue to be primary targets for White supremacists, extremists embrace and promote a wide range of hatreds, including Islamophobia, misogyny, and dangerous anti-democratic conspiracies. These narratives are often combined in the minds of extremists who seek to create fear and anxiety, and erode trust within our society and in our public institutions.

It is important to underscore how broadly and profoundly these forms of extremism impact all Americans, regardless of how they identify, their political affiliations, or where they live. From Charleston to Charlottesville, Pittsburgh to Jersey City, El Paso to Buffalo, we have seen the deadly consequences of these conspiratorial and hate-fueled ideologies and movements.

In this moment, we are watching the dangerous normalization of ideologies that animate White supremacy and other forms of extremism. Thanks to disinformation and toxic conspiracy theories, including those surrounding the pandemic, election denial, and the Great

Replacement Theory, once-fringe beliefs are taking root in our public discussion.

This normalization could not happen without elected officials, television pundits, and other high-profile influencers legitimizing these views. A recent study by ADL and the Princeton's Bridging Divides Initiative documented the proliferation of threats and harassment against local officials. These threats discourage civil—civic engagement, increased social and political division, and terrorized elected officials.

But we also need to address threats from inside our institution. Another ADL report identified hundreds of individuals on the Oath Keepers membership list in sensitive positions including law enforcement, military personnel, and elected officials. Extremists thrive in times of political and social unrest, and technical tools and platforms help extremists reach, recruit, and radicalize more especially than ever before.

The Buffalo shooter, who earlier this year left 10 people dead and a city reeling in horror, was drawn to hateful content on 4chan. He incorporated this content into his online manifesto. He used Twitch and Discord to record his views, and ultimately amplify live footage of his attack.

Modern extremists have developed a deadly blueprint. They prepare their social media strategies to signal back to their online communities, at the same time they are preparing their weapons.

And thanks to inconsistent action by Meta and Twitter, who continue to put profits over people, extremism continues to incubate and thrive on mainstream social media platforms.

Last week, ADL issued a report showing that exposure to White supremacist ideologies and online games more than doubled in 2022. Among young gamers, ages 10 to 17, 15 percent have been exposed to White supremacist ideologies.

It is clear the time to fight back against the rising tide of hate and extremism is right now. Congress has advanced some promising initiatives such as increasing nonprofit security grants, but many of those are piecemeal or reactive and fail to keep up with the pace and breadth of the challenge. We need whole-of-government solutions.

This is why ADL introduced its comprehensive civil rights-forward PROTECT plan, which includes calls to pass an appropriations bill that resources to the threat; grow the nonprofit security grants program; combat extremism within our institutions, including through NDAA; and the complicity of social media services in facilitating extremism; establish an independent clearinghouse for online extremist content; and, finally, make hate crime reporting mandatory.

I thank you for your leadership in ending the scourge of extremism and hate and violence. I urge you all to work across the aisle to find lasting, bipartisan solutions to this problem.

I look forward to your questions.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you, Mr. Segal, for your testimony.

I recognize now Professor Caraballo for her five minutes.

**STATEMENT OF ALEJANDRA CARABALLO, CLINICAL INSTRUCTOR, CYBERLAW CLINIC, HARVARD LAW SCHOOL**

Ms. CARABALLO. Good morning, Chairman Raskin, Ranking Member Mace, and members of the subcommittee.

My name is Alejandra Caraballo, and I am a clinical instructor at Harvard Law School Cyberlaw Clinic and LGBTQ rights advocate. I have worked in LGBTQ rights advocacy for years as a civil rights attorney, and I have monitored anti-LGBTQ extremist content online as part of my advocacy work.

Thank you for the opportunity to appear before you in my personal capacity to discuss the pressing issues of rising White su-

premac in the context of anti-LGBTQ hate and the ways that social media have amplified this issue and made it worse.

In the balance of my testimony, I will seek to document a more detailed nexus between White supremacy and the recent rise in extreme threats against the LGBTQ community.

Additionally, I will provide some recommendations for how Congress can better hold social media companies accountable for their role in amplifying this rise in extremism, while also aiding law enforcement and civic society groups in limiting extremist conduct that endangers and harms vulnerable, marginalized groups.

We only need to look at recent events to gain an understanding of the extent of the problem. At the beginning of this month on the weekend of December 2, several extremist groups targeted the LGBTQ community. This wave of bigoted action was caused by the Proud Boys, the anti-Semitic Goyim Defense League, Patriot Front, and other White supremacist groups.

This weekend of hate comes just weeks after five people were murdered and at least 19 people were injured in a shooting at Club Q, an LGBTQ club in Colorado Springs.

At the start of the week, the Department of Homeland Security bulletin warned of broad threats against LGBTQ, Jewish, and immigrant communities. The weekend itself began with the arrest of a Texas man for making death threats against a Boston physician who provides gender-affirming care to transgender patients. This doctor was affiliated with the national LGBTQ health center at Fenway Health, an organization of which I am proud to serve as a board member.

In Columbus, Ohio, armed militia members, Proud Boys, and Patriot Front showed up to forcibly shut down a holiday-themed drag event at the First Unitarian Universalist Church of Columbus. In Lakeland, Florida, the neo-Nazi group NatSoc Florida, carried swastika flags and banners that called drag queens quote, "pedophiles with AIDS." They also used a projector to place texts on the building, called for the death of pedophiles, clearly meaning that drag queens, when led in context with their banner.

In New York, a drag event at Lincoln Center was targeted by members of the Goyim Defense league, a bigoted neo-Nazi org that promotes virulent anti-Semitism.

Finally, a drag event in Southern Pines, North Carolina, was subjected to weeks of threats after a tweet by Libs of TikTok highlighted it. The event itself went on, despite the threats against organizers and the presence of several Proud Boys outside. However, it was disrupted by power loss due to intentional sabotage at a power station nearby.

While there's no confirmed link between the threats against the LGBTQ community event and the attack on the power substation, the timing has put the local LGBTQ community on edge.

The events in Ohio and North Carolina, Florida, and New York feature well-worn, baseless accusation of grooming and so-called child abuse. They underscore the ongoing amplified threat to an LGBTQ community already reeling from deadly violence. This has been a long, winding road of escalating rhetoric and tactics that were first popularized on social media and spread to the physical world.

Prominent social media accounts often perpetuate incendiary language that manifests into real-world violence. There is a direct connection between these accounts and violent threats against people, events, and institutions they target.

The framing and language used often mirrors a more accessible version found on extremist sites, such as 4chan. Their audience of millions are eager to engage with replies of the tweets of these accounts featuring threats, including violent memes of bullets and woodchippers. Social media companies have failed to intervene in meaningful ways, allowing the active spread of hate speech through algorithmic amplification and the monetization of this hate content.

Last, I want to highlight the great personal cost of being a highly visible trans woman in this atmosphere.

Earlier this year, I, along with my parents, were doxed and had our personal information published including my home address, personal contact information, Social Security number, and my driver's license number.

I have been baselessly called a groomer and a pedophile on social media more times than I can count, solely because I am a queer and trans person. This is particularly and deeply offensive as I have spent—I spent three years as an attorney representing the survivors of sex trafficking and intimate partner violence. These spurious accusations hurt real victims of sexual abuse by depriving the language they use to describe what happened to them.

I have been threatened by anonymous online accounts that have stated they wanted to “tie me to an effing post and set me on fire.” Others have targeted me with violent imagery of trans people being hanged. I have received physical letters that have glorified genocide and openly fantasized about being able to legally murder people like me.

In September, I met with the FBI regarding these threats against me, an utterly surreal experience. No one should go through this solely for being who they are and defending their community. However, I will not be intimidated, and I will not be silenced in spite of the constant harassment and threats I receive. I will continue to speak out against the hate and violence being perpetrated against my community and LGBTQ, Jewish, immigrant, and Muslim siblings.

I thank you for the opportunity to testify here today on these issues, and I look forward to answering your questions.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you very much for your testimony and for coming to join us.

Ms. Nomani, you're recognized for your five minutes.

**STATEMENT OF ASRA NOMANI (MINORITY WITNESS), SENIOR FELLOW IN THE PRACTICE OF JOURNALISM, INDEPENDENT WOMEN'S NETWORK**

Mr. RASKIN. Is your microphone on? Could you just hit the little button? OK.

Ms. NOMANI. Good?

So, my name is Asra Nomani. I came to the United States at the age of four. I was an immigrant to the great state of New Jersey, and I grew up in Morgantown, West Virginia, a mostly White state.

I was affirmed. I was supported. And I was able to grow up a girl who knew not a word of English when I arrived to become a reporter for The Wall Street Journal.

I am sitting here before you today, apparently the face of White supremacy. I am wearing a shirt that my father made. My father survived literally White supremacy in India. My father is 5 foot 3. Because when he was a boy, the White supremacists, that were the British rule in India, literally funneled food away from the people of India and my father starved.

So, he grew up to be a young man who came to the United States of America because he believed in the values and principles of this great Nation.

My father made this shirt for me, inspired by the gown that Representative Ocasio-Cortez wore to the Met Gala. It says on here the names that we, the parents, in the United States of have been called, including the video that you featured, Chairman Raskin, things like domestic terrorists, White supremacists, QAnon moms.

What is it that we the parents have dared to stand up against in the United States of America over the last couple of years? It is a divisive ideology expressed through this book called "Critical Race Theory." It is a book that is taught in law schools. But it is translated into our school system with books like this, "Not My Idea: A Book About Whiteness." The trickle-down effect of the demonization of any human being because of their race is books like this.

Where does this book take us as an idea? It takes us to this very simple idea, an idea that is a new hierarchy of human value. There's no doubt that the hierarchy of human value that was about White supremacy is illegitimate. Every single person is opposed to the idea of White supremacy, but we cannot replace an old hierarchy of human value with a new hierarchy of human value that demonizes children with this book. Whiteness is a bad deal. Signing a contract with the devil.

What is the message in this? The message is the shaming of human beings. No child should be shamed. And why is this a threat to our democracy? Because we then have posters like this one in the Los Angeles school district. What does it say? Ef America with KKK replacing the "C," because the idea is that our Nation has become a White supremacist nation. That is not true. That is not the reality, and we can see exhibited here today this poster also, Ef the police.

This is an ideology that I call the woke army. It is an ideology of activists who are going through America's school districts and our communities, and what they are doing is a threat to democracy. What is the greatest threat that our children face today? It is the learning loss that has happened in our school districts. The Department of Justice declares clearly the characteristics that lead any human being to extremism includes having less education.

Chairman Raskin, I don't know if you know it, but the reading level in your school district, the Montgomery County schools, is at 32 percent of kids that are reading at grade level. Math is at 30 percent. Congresswoman Tlaib is here. In Detroit, it's 18 percent and then 12 percent for math. It is a failure. This is a system failure.

White supremacy must be defeated, as must all extremism. This is our mandate as adults for our children. Our children are in a crisis today, and the idea that we the parents are now the agents of White supremacy is unacceptable. All of these books that I have here today are the indoctrination that are being put into the minds of our children instead of the fundamentals that are critical to make them educated, enlightened citizens that protect our democracy.

That is our greatest mandate, and that is the one that I am honored to serve with you to realize for our children.

Thank you so much.

Mr. RASKIN. Thanks so much.

Now we'll hear from Amanda Tyler, the executive director of the Baptist Joint Committee for Religious Liberty.

Welcome.

**STATEMENT OF AMANDA TYLER, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR,  
BAPTIST JOINT COMMITTEE FOR RELIGIOUS LIBERTY**

Ms. TYLER. Well, good morning, Chairman Raskin and Ranking Member Mace, and other members of the subcommittee.

I'm Amanda Tyler, executive director of the Baptist Joint Committee for Religious Liberty.

As a faithful Christian and a patriotic American, I am honored to be here this morning to offer testimony about the connection between Christian nationalism and White supremacism, why Christian nationalism must be addressed, and why I believe Christians have a special responsibility to address the harms of Christian nationalism.

BJC has a long and consistent record of defending religious freedom for all, supporting both of the First Amendment's religion clauses, the no-establishment and free exercise clauses. We chaired the coalition that pushed for passage of RFRA.

In July 2019, BJC launched Christians Against Christian Nationalism. It's a grassroots project of Christians from every congressional district in the country who oppose the rise of Christian nationalism and its threat to our faith and our country.

Christian nationalism is a political ideology and cultural framework that seeks to merge American and Christian identities. It suggests that real Americans are Christians, and that true Christians hold a particular set of political beliefs.

The "Christian" in Christian nationalism is more about ethno-national identity than religion. Christian nationalism is a gross distortion of the Christian faith that I and many others hold dear.

Opposition to Christian nationalism is not opposition to Christianity, and a growing number of Christians feel a religious imperative to stand against Christian nationalism.

Christian nationalism uses the language, symbols, and imagery of Christianity. In fact, it may look and sound like Christianity to the casual observer. However, closer examination reveals that it uses the veneer of Christianity to point not to Jesus the Christ, but to a political figure, party, or ideology.

Christian nationalism often overlaps with and provides cover for White supremacism and racial subjugation. It creates and perpetuates a sense of cultural belonging that is limited to certain people

associated with the founding of the United States, namely native-born White Christians.

Christian nationalism is not patriotism. Patriotism is a healthy love of country. Nationalism is an allegiance to country that demands supremacy over all other allegiances. Christian nationalism relies on a cherry-picked and misleading version of an American history in order to thrive

The Christian Nation myth must downplay or ignore the role of indigenous communities, Black Americans, immigrant populations, religious minorities, secular Americans, and all others who undercut the false narrative that the U.S. is special because it was founded by and for White Christians.

But the myth of a Christian Nation is worse than just bad history. It undermines and contradicts the U.S. Constitution, specifically the prohibition in Article VI against religious tests for public office, one of the truly revolutionary aspects of the Constitution that laid the foundation for the U.S. being a faith-freedom Nation.

As a Baptist, I became a leader in the fight against Christian nationalism because of my increasing alarm about the violence it has inspired at our country's houses of worship: Mother Emanuel AME Church in Charleston, Tree of Life Synagogue in Pittsburgh, Chabad of Poway near San Diego.

As recently as earlier this year at the Tops supermarket in buffalo, Christian nationalism inspired White supremacist violence in public spaces. Christian nationalism helped fuel the attack on the U.S. Capitol on January 6, uniting disparate actors and infusing their political cause with religious fervor.

We applaud this committee's sustained work to confront White supremacy and investigate its myriad causes. Understanding Christian nationalism is imperative to both dismantling White supremacy and preserving religious freedom for all.

Christianity does not unite Americans. Our belonging in American society must never depend on how we worship, what we believe, or how we identify religiously.

Do not allow anyone to say that confronting Christian nationalism is somehow anti-Christian. All across this country, Christians are deeply alarmed by this ideology, especially the way it gives an illusion of respectability to White supremacy, and undermines our Nation's foundational commitment to ensure religious freedom for all.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you for your testimony, Ms. Tyler.

Professor McCord, you are recognized now for five minutes.

**STATEMENT OF MARY MCCORD, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, INSTITUTE FOR CONSTITUTIONAL ADVOCACY AND PROTECTION, GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY LAW CENTER**

Ms. McCORD. Chairman Raskin, Ranking Member Mace, and distinguished members of the committee—subcommittee, thank you for inviting me to testify.

I will focus today on the evolution of the extremist paramilitary organizations and the ongoing threat they pose to democracy.

Evaluating this threat requires not only understanding these groups' use of paramilitary training and promotion of insurrectionist ideology, but also understanding and responding to the

strategies and developing alliances through which they seek to enter mainstream American politics.

Since January 6, this has been a decentralized strategy, focused on local politics. Social media platform Gab outlined it this spring. Quote, “Capture your local county, then several of them, then maybe your state. We need to take the concepts and values of nationalism and decentralize them to our backyards.”

Consistent with this strategy, paramilitary organizations have rebranded and reorganized since January 6. The Three Percenters original and the Proud Boys both dissolved their national organizations in favor of state and local chapters. Local groups like them tout their civic engagement, claim to have working relationships with local government and law enforcement, and advertise their tax-exempt, nonprofit status. This rebranding helps legitimize their political activity.

For example, in 2021, they packed school board meetings in opposition to mask and vaccine mandates and to teaching about race and diversity.

In 2022, they have shown up heavily armed and intimidating at events promoting White supremacy, LGBTQ-friendly programs, and at demonstrations in opposition to the overruling of *Roe v. Wade*.

Paramilitary actors, including some who participated in the January 6 attack, have successfully run for office in multiple states. They’ve taken over local GOP executive committees where they aggressively push the party from its establishment roots toward the fringe, and they’ve sought recall elections of moderate Republicans in favor of election deniers and extremists.

Elected Federal and state officials have used private militias as quote, unquote “security.” They’ve appeared at events with militia members and have even echoed their insurrectionist propaganda. Some have downplayed or denied the violence on January 6, emboldening extremists.

After receiving death threats to themselves and their families, four of the 10 Republican House Members who voted to impeach Donald Trump in 2021 opted against running for reelection.

Paramilitary groups have also recruited and sought favor from law enforcement. The ADL’s recent analysis of the leaked membership list for the Oath Keepers identified 373 persons then serving in law enforcement across the country and approximately 1,100 who had previously served.

Paramilitary groups have also aligned with so-called constitutional sheriffs, elected sheriffs who believe that they answer only to the U.S. Constitution, are free to refuse to enforce any law with which they disagree, and espouse election denialism. Some have advocated deputizing local militias.

The combination of false election fraud claims and sheriffs with expansive views of their authority and willingness to deputize militia members is an obvious threat to democratic processes.

So, what must be done? Too little law enforcement action has been taken against paramilitary activity across the country. Private militias are not authorized under Federal or state law, are not protected by the Second Amendment, and are unlawful in every state. Insurrection is not allowed by the United States Constitution

and is a felony under Federal law. Yet, local law enforcement agencies lack resources and sometimes the political will to use the legal tools available in their states.

Congress should consider a Federal anti-paramilitary law that includes a civil law enforcement mechanism for seeking injunctive relief and civil forfeiture against armed paramilitary actors and their organizations. Federal funding for state and local enforcement of existing state laws would also help.

Law enforcement must eradicate extremists from their ranks. Although police have First Amendment rights, those rights are not limitless. Even when speaking in their personal capacities on matters of public concern, law enforcement officials may be fired or disciplined when their speech or association interferes with the mission of the agency.

Congress should consider conditioning Federal law enforcement grant funding on proactive efforts to eradicate extremists from the force. State and local officials also must step in when law enforcement, whether part of the constitutional sheriff's movement or not, overreach their authority. Election administration is the job of election officials, not law enforcement officers.

Thank you for the opportunity to address the subcommittee.

Mr. RASKIN. Professor McCord, thank you very much for your testimony.

We'll now go to member questioning, and I'm going to allow the members on my side to go before me.

Ms. Mace, you've got your five minutes if you want to go now.

Ms. MACE. I've got other people.

Mr. RASKIN. OK. Great. I will call first on Congresswoman Delegate Eleanor Holmes Norton from the District of Columbia.

You're recognized for your five minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I have some very astounding statistics here from the Anti-Defamation League that, for example, over 50 percent of domestic terror killings have been committed by White supremacists over the last 10 years or so, and about 75 percent of these killings were committed by right-wing extremists.

The mass shootings and recent attacks in El Paso, Texas, and Buffalo, New York, killed a combined 33 people after posting racist manifestos, citing their belief in White replacement theory.

Mr. Ward, can you elaborate on why you have described the Buffalo shooting as part of, and here I'm quoting,

"unfolding of mission-oriented hate crimes"? That was the quote.

Mr. WARD. Absolutely, Representative.

Over the last 10 years, there has been an increase in a specific type of hate violence in this country, often referred to as mission-driven. Mission-driven means that there's a political ideology. There is a goal of undermining democracy, causing fear.

This is different from what most hate crimes constituted previous to that period. Most hate violence, while despicable, was driven, has a spontaneous reaction, usually young people, young men, intoxicated, spur of the moment, driven by a conscious or unconscious bias.

But what we're seeing in the country now—El Paso, Pittsburgh, Buffalo, Charleston—are planned acts of violence that are driven

by a world view that believes that Jews are somehow part of a racialized conspiracy to destroy the White race. It is dangerous, and its attempt is to undermine democracy, to create instability, and to cause fear.

This is something different in the form of hate crimes that we have seen previously.

Ms. NORTON. Thank you. My goodness.

Mr. Segal, can a statistical comparison be made between killings committed by White supremacists and killings by racially motivated extremists belonging to other groups, like Black nationalists or even other categories of violent extremists identified by the DOJ?

Mr. SEGAL. Thank you for the question.

As you cited earlier, the data from ADL looking at extremist-related murders is very clear. Seventy-five percent of extremist-related murders in the past 10 years have been carried out by right-wing extremists, and the majority of those by White supremacists. Now that does not mean that extremist violence is the sole domain of any one extremist movement or group. We do count examples of Black nationalists, Islamists, left-wing murders as well, but they, frankly, pale in comparison to the threats we see from the threats and violence from right-wing extremists.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Segal, is it possible that the number of White supremacist-related killings is much higher than the available reporting suggests?

Mr. SEGAL. It is possible. Murders tend to get a lot of attention. But we also know that identifying a motive for some of those murders takes time. We don't always have all the information until years later.

So sometimes we have gone back and added more to our numbers based on revelations that come out during court proceedings, et cetera. So, the numbers are quite high and probably even higher than the data we provided.

Ms. NORTON. Well, following up on that, do murders committed by a male supremacist or incels fit the paradigm of hate-related killings?

Mr. SEGAL. Yes, so primarily the murders that we have tracked from extremist movements, they tend to be perpetrated by males and incels, or involuntarily celibates. Those were motivated by misogyny or hatred of women. That level of violence has significantly increased, both in the U.S. and North America more broadly.

Ms. NORTON. Well, hearing this, it's clear why DHS and DOJ have identified racially motivated violent extremists and militia-violent extremism as the deadliest domestic terror threats facing the country.

So, I submit that.

Mr. RASKIN. All right. The gentlewoman's time has expired. Thank you, Ms. Norton. I now recognize the gentleman from Arizona, Mr. Biggs, for his five minutes.

Mr. BIGGS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You know, the Federal Government uses five categories to describe threats presented by domestic terrorism, including racially or ethnically motivated violent extremism, anti-government or anti-authority violent extre-

mism, animal rights, environmental violent extremism, abortion-related violent extremism, and all other domestic terrorism threats.

But this committee in—this is our seventh, and probably the last it sounds like—it has been focused exclusively, it seems to me, on category 1 racially or ethnically motivated violent extremism. I wasn't planning to do this, but since it's been up, the Buffalo shooter heinous, evil being.

Absolutely, there can be no excuse for it. But, you know, we hear a lot about right-wing extremists. But this guy was an admitted socialist who was thankful that the conservative movement was dead. He attacked Rupert Murdoch as a Christian Zionist. He mentioned Ben Shapiro multiple times, as with rather pejorative terms because of his Jewish heritage. That's evil. That guy is evil. And I raise that because I'm thinking this was in tone today as well, the Pelosi attacking. David DePape. David DePape was a leftist himself. A radical leftist.

The point is, there's no exclusivity here. There's evil in the world, and we have to deal with that evil in the world. It seems to me, statements like we heard in your written statement, Ms. McCord, actually provided climate for a rhetoric that is dangerous as well.

So, for instance, you attack Sheriff Mark Lamb of Pinal County, Arizona, because he has nonprofit and because he has a group of posse that he is there. And I'd like to submit for the record, Mr. Chairman, an article about the posse that goes on there. They receive training. They receive education in law enforcement practices, and they don't arrest people, and they don't cause trouble. They go through a vetting and a background check. So, I—

Mr. RASKIN. Without objection.

Mr. BIGGS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that. So, we hear those types smears constantly. We heard one—on of the statements was that these individuals refused to enforce the law. That's one of the ways you define terrorists, domestic terrorists. Yes, that is a quote, refuse to enforce the law. And yet, I find myself saying, Well, if you're the ICE—if you're the head of Homeland Security and you tell Immigration Custom Enforcement, you know, that 1.25 million people that have actually had due process in courts where they have actually now had a removal order, but you specifically tell your agents, we can't look for them and nor will we remove, is that not the same thing? So, the point is there's a lot of issues that go on with this.

I also want to raise a point here that I think is critical. There was implication that this is widespread domestic—White nationalist terrorism is widespread in law enforcement. And yet—and I'm going to submit this for the record, too, Mr. Chairman, this is a response to the FBI to questions for the record arising from a September 29, 2021, hearing.

Mr. RASKIN. Yes, and without objection.

Mr. BIGGS. Thank you, sir. The questions were put to the FBI about a White nationalism and terrorism in the—domestic terrorists in the local police agencies. This is what the FBI said, quote, "The FBI does not have information to support the assessment that these individuals are broadly representative of the hundreds of thousands of sworn law enforcement officers operating in the U.S. across nearly 20,000 Federal, state, county and local agencies. And

available FBI reporting has not revealed RMV infiltration into law enforcement.” You just don’t find it. But that doesn’t mean anything to my friends on the left, because the rhetoric is what is important to you, the narrative that you’re trying to construct is important to you, and that’s unfortunate, because it prevents us from getting to the bottom of what is causing this. I think Ms. Nomani is exactly right. It is indoctrination, and we need to find a way to stop that.

And I will say this, Ms. Caraballo. I do agree with you that social media has exacerbated the problem. I’m not quite sure how you resolve that, but I don’t think necessarily censorship is the answer either. But with that, Mr. Chairman, I realize my time is gone, and I’ll yield back.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you very much for your questioning. I now would like to recognize the very distinguished gentlelady from Michigan, Congressman Tlaib, for her five minutes.

Ms. TLAIB. Thank you so much, Chairman, for this incredibly important hearing. You know, I want to begin with submitting for the record, if I may, an article that specifically talked about how the Buffalo shooter—shooting suspect says his motive was to prevent eliminating White race.

Mr. RASKIN. Without objection.

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Ward, can you tell me a little bit more about the Buffalo shooter? Because I don’t want people in Buffalo, especially the community that was targeted to feel like we don’t understand and see that they were targeted because of who they were.

Mr. WARD. Yes, Representative Tlaib. We should be clear that those targeted at the supermarket were targeted because they were Black. It was Black shoppers. Not all the victims were Black, but the majority were. We should understand that the killer himself identified himself as an ethno-nationalist, as an eco-fascist, and a national socialist, which is a reference to the Nazi party in Germany. When asked if folks could call him that, he said, in his own words, I would not disagree with you.

I think it’s important not to mislead in terms of the driving force of these killers which was anti-Semitism. They were attacking a Black population because they saw African Americans as puppets of a Jewish cabal, of a Jewish conspiracy. And that’s why the killer acted in violence.

Ms. TLAIB. Thank you very much, Mr. Ward. Ms. McCord, in a 2006 intelligence assessment, the FBI warned that, quote, “White supremacist infiltration of law enforcement can result in other abuses of authority,” and, you know, passive tolerance of racism within communities served. And the issue is getting worse. I mean, in the last few years we have seen countless videos of law enforcement officers wearing badges associated with extremist groups, like the Three Percenters and private law enforcement Facebook groups filled with racism. Hey, I even saw law enforcement, you know, in Detroit, specifically, targeting Black Lives Matters protesters and so forth. A member of the U.S. Capitol was even caught reading a printed-out copy of the disgusting anti-Semitic text or protocols of elders of Zion at the interest of our cap—you know, literally short months after January 6.

More recently, and this is even more disturbing, an internal FBI email revealed that there is, quote, “a sizable percentage of the FBI employee population that felt sympathetic to the group that stormed the Capitol.”

So, Ms. McCord, I want to talk about this because, you know, we see a growing link—and I know it’s intentional by the White supremacists and nationalists of—between law enforcement personnel and White supremacy, can you talk about how that is threatening the constitutional multiracial democracy that we live in?

Ms. MCCORD. Yes, thank you for the question. You know, we know that extremists do actually recruit from law enforcement, particularly, paramilitary organizations like Oath Keepers, like Three Percenters. They recruit because of their training and paramilitary tactics, their use of weaponry, their knowledge about incendiary devices. And, unfortunately, you know, it’s not the predominance among law enforcement, but the number of those who espouse extremist views, including White supremacy within law enforcement has an outside impact, of course.

And, you know, the threat to democracy comes—if these are the people who are in charge of, you know, complying with the rule of law, actually protecting public safety in their communities, and they have no—their communities can’t trust them to actually protect them, represent their values—or not represent, but protect their values and allow them to have the equal opportunity to participate in democratic processes, it really does break down. And that is why courts have recognized, including the Supreme Court, that even though First Amendment rights do apply to police, it can’t be such that they can undermine the mission of their agencies by espousing the type of extremist rhetoric which makes them unable to actually protect public safety in their communities.

Ms. TLAIB. Thank you, Ms. McCord. Mr. Ward, you know, one of the things I learned from a Black Baptist pastor in Detroit—you know, as you know, I grew up in the most beautiful blackest city in the country, the city of Detroit, is he said, you know, we’re not a country that’s divided, we’re disconnected. And I know exactly what he means because when I called Rabbi Miller in Michigan when his synagogue was targeted recently by hateful rhetoric, it was some of his employees that were Black that were first targeted. And he seemed so incredibly worried about even that more than obviously at the moment of the fact that they were targeted because of their Jewish faith. And it was at that moment I remember them saying, can you talk about this impact of how we need to understand that the person that went into Buffalo, the person that targeted the synagogue in Michigan, that we’re all connected in this form of hate. And there is no hierarchy who gets hated the most, it is they want us all gone.

Mr. RASKIN. The gentlelady’s time has expired, but please, Mr. Ward, if you would answer, that would be great.

Mr. WARD. I will answer briefly. We should understand that this is a movement that doesn’t drive hate, whether it’s anti-Muslim, anti-Jewish, anti-Black. It is tapping into bias in order to build a political platform to overthrow the United States of America. That is the goal of White nationalism. And what we have connected is that we are all victims of White nationalism, whether we come

from minority communities, law enforcement, government workers, we are the victims in this country, and we have to respond and defend our community and defend our Constitution. And we do that by denouncing bigotry and political violence.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you very much. Two articles have been submitted for the record. One, the Buffalo supermarket shooting suspect posted an apparent manifesto repeatedly citing Great Replacement Theory, and alleged Paul Pelosi attacker posted multiple conspiracy theories.

Mr. RASKIN. With that, I will recognize Mr. Donalds for his five minutes of questioning.

Mr. DONALDS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Never a dull moment in this subcommittee. I will always say that. Let's go through a couple of things. First, yes, look, if you go back to the Buffalo shooter, which was awful for all reasons considered, did he cite replacement theory? Yes, he did. Did he also cite socialist theories? He most definitely did. Did he target Black people 100 percent? He did. So, if you combine all of the issues with the Buffalo shooter, you had somebody who wanted to kill Black people. Obviously, that's a White supremacist move. That was his whole focus. But he also espoused ideals from the left wing of politics. Both things can occur at the same time, and they did in the Buffalo shooting. And I think the thing that's most frustrating in hearings like this is because the supposition from my colleagues is that if you are a White supremacist, then all at the same time, you're also—and somehow on the right side of politics, the Buffalo shooter actually demonstrates that's not true. That's actually not true. White supremacy is awful. Nobody should be defending it. It should always be denounced, but we also have to be careful not to just conveniently circle together our political opponents so that it makes us look good in narratives, in press clippings, in hearings, or when you go to ask people for their votes in elections.

We do have an issue in the United States with domestic terrorist violence. There is an issue. But it's across the political spectrum. Even the FBI—we got some questions that we need to ask them about other things going on in the United States—but even the FBI does not categorize domestic violence based upon political viewpoints. They do not do that. I wish the news media would report it, but the FBI does not categorize it based upon political thoughts. They categorize it based purely on the violence that people inflict. These are key conditions that we have to understand if we're going to have real hearings about what must be quote, unquote, “done” in the United States.

One other point I have to bring up—and this is with respect to my colleague who just cited the point about White supremacy infiltrating law enforcement from a report back in 2006. On October 24, 2022, the FBI submitted to this committee, and I quote, The FBI does not have information to support the assessment that these individuals are broadly representative of the hundreds of thousands of sworn law enforcement officers operating in the U.S. across nearly 20,000 Federal, state, county, and local agencies. And available FBI reporting has not revealed, has not revealed an infiltration of—into of law enforcement.

The FBI said that two months ago. So, are we going to sit here and just try to create these cute little narratives that sound good politically, or are we going to get to the bottom of what's actually happening in the United States of America? And truth be told, the bottom of what's happening in the United States is that we are making cute narratives that look good for politics and sound good in press clippings, and we are not being honest about all the various factors that are happening in the United States, namely, a major social media problem. We know about the Twitter files. Let me give you guys a preview. We're going to be talking that in the 118th Congress.

Real quick before my time expires, because when these issues flare up in our politics and in our country, we have to be careful not to quickly assign blame to one group or another group, or one side of the political aisle or another side of the political aisle. We have to get to the facts. And there's actually demonstration of that right here in this hearing.

Ms. Caraballo, on page 12 and 13 of your written testimony, you explain to concerned parents as having been infiltrated by White nationalists and far-right militia groups, which played a significant role in school board protests. This has not, this has not actually been my experience with concerned parents.

In your testimony you wrote that in Loudoun County, Virginia, unfounded rumors had spread in local parent groups on Facebook about an alleged trans student sexually assaulting a girl in a bathroom led to a firestorm of several heated school board protests that descended into violence. But, in fact, the perpetrator, it actually turned out, had committed two sexual assaults at two different Loudoun County schools in 2021, and was arrested on October 7, 2021, by the Loudoun County Sheriff's Office. These weren't unfounded rumors, as you suggest. It actually turned out law enforcement had to act because a sexual assault occurred. So, given this, I'm assuming that until now, you were unaware of what happened here, and you're going to update your testimony for the committee. Is that correct?

Ms. CARABALLO. Thank you, Representative. What I was referring to in terms of unfounded rumors was that the perpetrator was trans. At the time there was no indication, and later came out that the perpetrator was not have any trans identity and—

Mr. DONALDS. I'm out of time, but the only thing I'm going to say is this. This is an example of what is concerning us in America. We have to be very careful not to quickly label groups and people just because it's politically convenient, which has been one of the issues in this committee. We have to be very careful about this. We are all Americans. We do not want violence against any citizen. We want all people to be safe in America. We want all people to speak freely in America. That is the thing that will actually help us cure some of these violence extremist issues we currently have in the United States. I yield back.

Mr. RASKIN. All right. Thank you for your questioning. Is Ms. Wasserman Schultz here? I think she is. You are recognized for your five minutes of questioning.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you so much. Mr. Chairman, White supremacy and other extremist movements thrive in social

media cases, in part because algorithms drive user engagement which promotes increasingly extreme content. The Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee recently found that the most recent acts of political violence in the United States are committed by people who do not belong to any formal organization, but were instead radicalized online through social media and screening platforms and in sites and blogs.

And social media is being maliciously used to normalize extremism. Hitler, Nazis, and Holocaust denial were all trending on Twitter after they saw the mainstreaming of it by cultural, political, and even sports icons.

Mr. Segal, can you shed light on the link between hate spread on these platforms and hate-fueled messaging and violence that we see in our committees? Like, for example, in the Nazi—this message is recently and repeatedly spray-painted across parts of my own hometown of Weston. In other words, how does virtual hate turn into physical or real-life hate.

Mr. SEGAL. Thank you for the question. I think we need to understand these virtual spaces as the lifeblood of extremism. Over and over, we see how the ability for people to reach recruit and radicalize in these spaces has actually animated real-world activity. Now, this is true for the violent extremism that we've seen where people have referenced previous shooters, their online manifestos, their online footprints, but also for some of the more day-to-day, if you will, types of activities.

So, ADL has tracked over 5,000 White supremacist propaganda incidents over the last several years. Year over year, it's increasing. Where is this propaganda created? It is created in online spaces, leveraged amongst people who share it, and then shows up on the ground. There's a direct pipeline between the hate that is incubated in these online spaces and the impact that it has on the communities on the ground.

And, frankly, one last point is that many of these individuals are actually live-streaming their activity on the ground in real time, knowing that there are people sitting in the comfort of their own homes around the world who are encouraging them to harass people on the ground in real time. Anti-Semitism, White supremacy, other forms of hatred have become a form of entertainment, and they are spread to viewers across various platforms. And that's one of the concerns that we have for even more violence in the future.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you. And just a followup question, how do mainstream social media sites like Facebook, Twitter, and YouTube allow extremist movements to radicalize those who might not otherwise be exposed to this extremist White supremacist messaging?

Mr. SEGAL. So certainly, the algorithms on many of these platforms where they drive people to, you know, basically spend more time on these platforms require even more and more sort of extreme sort of content. But in addition, we have noticed, by design, tactics by White supremacists and other extremists to not necessarily rely on terrible content, if for fear that they may be taken down or often not, but actually using in their handles and their profiles links to other platforms that are much more permissible in terms of the hate and violence that they will allow. And so, it's

using the wide reach of Twitter and YouTube and Facebook in order to drive individuals into more free spaces where there are even more concentrated echo chambers of hate.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you. In September, the anti-parliamentarian task force to combat [inaudible] anti-Semitism which I [inaudible] coach there—held a hearing with parliamentarians from around the world. We confronted social media representatives on their lack of action to prevent radicalization and regulate hate speech. This was before Elon Musk opened the floodgates on content regulation.

Ms. Caraballo, what tools or tactics do sites like Twitter and Facebook possess to stop or blunt their algorithms that fuel radicalization of anti-Semitic or racist content.

Ms. CARABALLO. Thank you, Representative, for the question. In particular, these sites have the ability to minimize the ability for negative emotional content to spread by the algorithms. The algorithms rely on engagement, and oftentimes can detect certain types of sentiment and oftentimes that's used to promote certain types of content.

Additionally, advertisers, and particularly political advertisers may seek to raise negative engagement, particularly around certain content targeting particular minority groups. And, particularly, my testimony, I cited the use of the Daily Wire constantly advertising around anti-trans content. And so, that then gets promoted and reinforced. And, additionally, one of the things to also note is the ability for more contextual content moderation that looks at the ways that targeted harassment on the basis of identity is perpetrated because it is a constant moving target, and is very difficult in particular to always know what is being used in that context. Thank you.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you. I know I'm out of time, Mr. Chairman, but we have to address how social media fuels extremism. It can't function as an extremist recruitment tool. And we have to make sure that there is moderation of toxic rhetoric that leads to actual violence, because it's seen as good for business, but it's not good for the health of our civic spaces. We have to make sure that we address it. Thank you so much. I yield back.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you very much. And I hope it's something that we will be able to work on in the next Congress. And now, I recognize the distinguished ranking member of the subcommittee, Ms. Mace.

Ms. MACE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I agree about social media and the comments today about it being an extremist recruitment tool, but I see it, I believe, from both sides of the aisle.

Threats to our democracy comes from those who seek to undermine our Constitution and our three branches of government. We've got to take a stand to support the Constitution and the rule of law against those who debased our society with violence or harassment of government officials carrying out their constitutional duties, for example.

I have a few simple "yes or no" questions I would like to ask the panelist today. My first one is do you believe that rhetoric, you know—that rhetoric is a way to inflict harm on our democracy, people's words? Mr. Ward, yes or no?

Mr. WARD. Yes.

Ms. MACE. Mr. Segal?

Mr. SEGAL. Yes.

Ms. MACE. Ms. Caraballo?

Ms. CARABALLO. Yes.

Ms. MACE. Ms. Nomani, yes or no.

Ms. NOMANI. Yes.

Ms. MACE. OK. Ms. Tyler?

Ms. TYLER. Yes.

Ms. MACE. Ms. McCord?

Ms. MCCORD. Yes.

Ms. MACE. Is rhetoric on social media a problem and a threat to our democracy? Mr. Ward?

Mr. WARD. Yes, absolutely.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Segal?

Ms. MACE. Ms. Caraballo?

Ms. CARABALLO. Yes.

Ms. MACE. Ms. Nomani?

Ms. NOMANI. Yes.

Ms. MACE. Ms. Tyler?

Ms. TYLER. Yes.

Ms. MACE. Another question I have. Do you believe that rhetoric targeting officials with violence for carrying out their constitutional duties is a threat to democracy? Mr. Ward?

Mr. WARD. Yes.

Ms. MACE. Mr. Segal?

Mr. SEGAL. Yes.

Ms. MACE. Ms. Nomani?

Ms. NOMANI. Yes.

Ms. TYLER. Yes.

Ms. MCCORD. Yes.

Ms. MACE. All right. Thank you very much. Only a few weeks after the attempted attack on the Supreme Court Justice on June 25, one of the witnesses, Alejandra Caraballo tweeted out the following in response to a decision on abortion, overturning Roe v. Wade. And I will quote directly from the tweet:

The six justices who overturned Roe should never know peace again. It is our civic duty to accost them every time they're in public. They are pariahs. Since women don't have their rights, these Justices should never have a peaceful moment in public again.

I know something about being accosted. The night of January 5, I was physically accosted on the streets of D.C. in Navy Yard by a constituent of mine. I fervently blamed rhetoric, rhetoric on social media, rhetoric at public events for being physically accosted. I carry a gun everywhere I go when I am in my district and I'm at home, because I know personally that rhetoric has consequences. I've had my car keyed. I've had my house spray painted. I had someone trespass in my house as recently as August. I've been doxed on social media about where I live. And I've had to add the security everywhere I go often because I can't afford it. I have to carry my own firearm wherever I go.

And Alejandra Caraballo also recently tweeted on November 19, not even a month ago, that the Supreme Court vested with the judicial power of the United States by our Constitution stated they

are not a legitimate court issuing decisions. And also, the Supreme Court is an organ of the far right.

So, my last question today of Ms. Caraballo, do you stand by these comments, this kind of rhetoric on social media, and do you believe it's a threat to democracy?

Ms. CARABALLO. Thank you, Representative, for the opportunity to clarify and provide context to my tweets. And——

Ms. MACE. I asked a question. Is it yes or no? Do you believe your rhetoric is a threat to democracy when you're calling to accost a branch of government, the Supreme Court?

Ms. CARABALLO. I don't believe that's a correct characterization of my statements.

Ms. MACE. But you tweeted it. Did you not tweet that, that you thought that the Supreme Court Justices should be accosted?

Ms. CARABALLO. What I'm saying is that——

Ms. MACE. Yes or no? Did you tweet it?

Ms. CARABALLO [continuing]. it is not a characterization of my statements.

Ms. MACE. On June 8 of this year, a man was arrested near Justice Brett Kavanaugh's home in Maryland. He told law enforcement officers he wanted to kill the Supreme Court Justice. He was found with a knife, with a pistol, two magazines, ammunition, pepper spray, zip ties, a hammer, crowbar, and duct tape. The threats that Members of Congress, the threats that branches of government face on the left and the right. As was mentioned by the chairman earlier in the committee hearing, what happened to the Speaker's husband is every Member's worst nightmare.

So it's clear to me that we have to call out the threats to our democracy emanating from wherever they come, whether it's the right or the left. It is incumbent upon every one of us to call it out on both sides of the political spectrum, and we recommit ourselves to the Constitution and the rule of law.

I look forward to working with anyone, Republican or Democrat, as you know, Mr. Chairman, to address these threats from within and without. And I look forward to inviting more people who actually know what they're talking about to our witness panel in the 118th Congress. Thank you, and I yield back.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you, Ms. Mace. I turn now that Ms. Kelly for her five minutes.

Ms. KELLY. Thank you, Mr. Chair. We have talked a lot today about the dire threat to democracy posed by the spread of White supremacy and related extremism. But I'd like to discuss the means to combat radicalization and private unregulated militias.

First off, nearly every state has a statute on the books prohibiting ad hoc militias from organizing and operating, but these laws are seldom enforced.

Ms. McCord, two quick yeses or noes. Many militias seem to believe that there's a constitutional right that allows for the violent overthrow of the government to take it back for the people. Does that right exist?

Ms. MCCORD. No, it does not.

Ms. KELLY. Does the Second Amendment provide this right?

Ms. MCCORD. No, it does not.

Ms. KELLY. That's what I thought. OK. What more can states do—be doing to investigate and enforce those anti-militia laws? And are there any states you appoint to that have demonstrated strong enforcement? And what can we do on the Federal level in Congress?

Ms. MCCORD. I would point recently to the elected district attorney of Albuquerque, New Mexico, Bernalillo County, Raul Torrez. He brought a civil enforcement action against an unlawful private militia that was operated in Albuquerque, the New Mexico civil guard. My organization at in Georgetown co-counseled with him in that enforcement action, and we obtained injunctive relief, court-ordered relief prohibiting that militia and its officers, directors, members, and successor organizations from continuing to operate as a military unit outside of governmental authority or to usurp the role of law enforcement by assuming the functions of law enforcement. That is a really commendable use of the state laws in New Mexico, and that's something that could be replicated elsewhere.

However, as your question notes, there is, I think, a lack of resources for many state and local law enforcement and prosecutors, and sometimes a lack of political will to take the kind of action that Mr. Torrez took. And that is why I have worked with the chairman and his staff on, you know, some proposals for Federal anti-paramilitary activity legislation.

Ms. KELLY. Thank you so much. These unregulated militia are major contributors to gun violence, so it's very critical that, you know, that these laws are enforced.

Mr. Segal, turning to you, briefly, what does the whole-of-government approach to combating radicalization and extremism look like? And what funding and grants are needed?

Mr. SEGAL. So, I recommend that folks look at ADL's protect plan which is a comprehensive set of recommendations, which includes opposing extremists in government service, taking domestic terrorism prevention measures. Specifically, though, it also includes creating an independent clearinghouse for online extremist content. You can imagine it modeled after in part the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children where, essentially, people who are identifying extremist activity or threats of violence online have a place to report it that is fund—that is nonprofit, independent, but funded by the government. I think that would be a good step.

And then, last, I think we need to also identify potentially looking at targeting foreign White supremacist terrorist groups, because we know White supremacy is a global terror threat. And the ability for extremists to translate their ideologies of hate through the internet across the world is something that we're seeing impact communities on the ground here in the United States.

Ms. KELLY. Thank you so much. Ms. Caraballo, I wanted to give you a chance to—it seems like you wanted the opportunity to have a little rebuttal, so I wanted to give you that opportunity.

Ms. CARABALLO. Thank you, Representative, for the opportunity to provide some context to my speech, or to my tweets. The tweets aren't necessarily representative entirely of my views. Every American has the right to protest, protest peacefully on sidewalks as the Supreme Court has held, and to protest public officials, peacefully.

And I wholeheartedly support the peaceful protests of government officials. And I stress the word “peaceful.” In terms of the word “ac-cost” means to confront, verbally. And that is entirely what I meant, and that is what I was pointing to.

And yet, in terms of the second tweet, I was referring to reports about—in the news media that Justice Alito had taken meetings with a family and leaked a Supreme Court decision back in, I believe, 2014, the Hobby Lobby decision. And those are my personal views. And I hope every American is able to share their personal views on social media and exercise their First Amendment right to free speech. Thank you.

Ms. KELLY. Thank you. And I just want to say thanks for your explanation. But I do agree with my colleagues, we want to be able to do our jobs in a peaceful way and don’t want to have things, what happened to Nancy Pelosi’s husband, or any Member of Congress or elected official be physically hurt from doing their job. Thank you. I yield back.

Mr. RASKIN. And I thank the distinguished gentlelady from Illinois.

Ms. Mace, if there’s nobody else on the Republican side, I’m going to take my five minutes of questioning.

Ms. MACE. Oh, that’s fine. I just ask unanimous consent to enter the tweets into the record.

Mr. RASKIN. You got it.

Ms. MACE. Thank you.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Segal, let’s just clear up one bit of semantic confusion. The Buffalo shooter invoked the Great Replacement Theory, engaged in other racist and anti-Semitic speech. He said he was inspired by the New Zealand mass murderer who killed more than 50 people and proclaimed his loyalty to anti-Semitism, racism, and so on. If that person calls himself a national socialist, would you categorize him in your research on the left, national socialism being, I guess, the linguistic root of Nazi for Nazi Germany?

Mr. SEGAL. I think any sober look at the Buffalo shooter’s manifesto statements—and by the way, the symbols and names on his weapons, symbols of White supremacy, names of White supremacist shooters before him, would recognize that attack as clearly a White supremacist attack.

Mr. RASKIN. OK. Good. I wanted to ask you about something that Ms. Nomani said. And there were some things she said I agreed with. There were some things she said I disagreed with. But she used the phrase of a woke army. And I just want to be clear about this because we’ve been focused on violence today. Is there such thing formally, literally as a woke army that has ever killed anyone in a synagogue, like the Tree of Life Synagogue, or a church like the Mother Emanuel Church in Charleston, South Carolina, or a supermarket like the Tops supermarket, or a Walmart? Does a woke army exist as a violent threat to the American people?

Mr. SEGAL. I’m not aware of any woke army other than in a semantic argument type of way.

Mr. RASKIN. OK. Ms. Tyler, can I ask you, what motivated the Joint Baptist Committee to take on the problem of White Christian nationalism?

Ms. TYLER. Well, the problem with White Christian nationalism, it exactly fits with our mission of defending and extending religious freedom for all people. And that's because Christian nationalism strikes at the heart of the foundational ideas of what religious freedom means and how it's protected in this country. And that, of course, is with the institutional separation of church and state.

Mr. RASKIN. Can I ask you quickly about that because everybody knows about Jefferson's famous letter to the Danbury Baptists. Well, why have the Baptists always been such strong champions of religious freedom and pluralism and toleration?

Ms. TYLER. It really goes back to the beginning of the Baptist movement in the early 17th Century, and Thomas Helwys, who wrote the first defensive universal religious freedom in the English language and was imprisoned by King James I for his advocacy. It continued with Roger Williams, who founded the First Baptist Church of America. What unites these early Baptist advocates with modern-day advocates like me and others at the Baptist Joint Committee is our theological commitment to sole freedom, and our living out of Jesus' command to love our neighbors as ourselves. We protect our—the religious freedom of our neighbors as we protect our own religious freedom. And we do it in our constitutional democracy by defending the First Amendment.

Mr. RASKIN. Well, thank you for your testimony, and thank you for your work.

Professor McCord, the Constitution says that the states shall appoint the officers of the militias that Congress has the power to arm, to organize, to discipline the militias. And so, the groups that are out on the streets of—in different states and cities that arrived in Washington on January 6 were calling themselves militias. They have no formal legal status, do they? And what is their status in the states?

Ms. MCCORD. That's correct, Chairman. There is no authority under the Federal Constitution or any state Constitution for private groups of individuals to ban together and form their own private armies or private militias. Well-regulated has always meant regulated by the government, even since before the founding. As you indicated, Article I gives Congress the authority to provide for the organizing and disciplining of the militia, and it gives states the ability to appoint officers.

Congress has executed that authority through the Militia Acts which have authorized since the late 1700's what has become our modern National Guard. So, the only lawful militia is a militia that reports up through the government. There's state-level militias, and they can be Federalized.

Mr. RASKIN. The Proud Boys are not a militia. The Three Percenters are not militia. In fact, the Constitution says that Congress has the power to call forth the militias of the states, i.e., the National Guard, in order to put down insurrections by groups like that that might pretend to be a militia, right?

Ms. MCCORD. That's correct. They have no status under law. They have no authority to engage in insurrection.

Mr. RASKIN. All right. Well, let's see, if there are no other members present, then I think we can move to close.

Ms. Mace, do you have any closing thoughts before I give a few?

Ms. MACE. No, Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to thank you for this committee hearing. As I reiterated earlier today, it's been an immense honor to serve with you in this committee. And I hope that we can do much more in the 118th Congress together here on Oversight. So, I hope you'll be staying on the Oversight Committee when you do.

But I appreciate your constitutional arguments or constitutional expertise, and your passion for civil rights, just like I have a passion for civil rights in my district. And we agree on so much. The goal, at the end of the day, is often the same, but how we get there might differ. And I have enjoyed working with you together on this committee. So, thank you, and I yield back.

Mr. RASKIN. Well, thank you, Ms. Mace. It's been a real honor and a pleasure to get to know you and to get to know your very sincere and heartfelt commitment to the civil rights and civil liberties of all Americans. And, you know, we've all been through some tough times together. And it's been wonderful to see you stand up as an independent thinker and someone who always has the courage of her convictions. And, again, I refer anybody out there to Ms. Mace's really excellent book, *In the Company of Men*, about the experiences that she shaped her in coming into public life. So, I wish you all the best.

I want to thank all of our colleagues for their involvement. And I do hope that we will be able to maintain a bipartisan commitment to rejecting violent extremism, which continues to haunt the American republic. One thing that Ms. Nomani said that I agreed with very much was her rejection of the idea that America is becoming a White supremacist society. On the contrary, America has consistently moved away from White supremacy. We began as a White supremacist country, and that's what Justice Taney declared in *Dred Scott* decision that America was founded as a White man's compact. And that view was overthrown in the Civil War and by the Reconstruction amendments. And we've made tremendous progress in the direction of becoming a government of the people, by the people, for the people, all the people. And that has vindicated people's belief from all over the world that have come here as immigrants that they will be treated fairly in an open society open to people's talents and skills, regardless of their race or their ethnicity or their religion.

So, what we're seeing, I think, in the explosion of White supremacist violence in public places like supermarkets and Walmarts and churches and synagogues is a kind of rearguard action. Let's hope it's a last gasp of that view.

There is a place for everyone in this beautiful, multiracial, multicultural, multi-ethnic constitutional democracy where all of us are equal under law and all of us have the opportunity to seek our freedom and our happiness together.

So with that, I want to thank all of the panelists for their lucid and excellent educational remarks today. I want to commend my colleagues for participating in this important conversation.

Without objection, all members will get five legislative days within which to submit additional written questions for our witnesses today, which will be forwarded to you for your response, please get

them back to us as quickly as you can. And at that point, this hearing is adjourned, and I thank you all for being with us.  
[Whereupon, at 11:53 a.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]

