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**Introduction**

Judicial Watch promotes transparency, integrity and accountability in government, politics and the law. We carry out our mission through investigations, research, litigation and public education. As part of our educational activities we produce Special Reports on important public policy matters to illuminate the operations of government in a way that informs the public and holds our trusted public servants accountable.

This Special Report documents the Federal Bureau of Investigation's (FBI) purge of anti-terrorism training material and curricula deemed “offensive” to Muslims. The curricula purge occurred following a February 8, 2012, meeting between FBI Director Robert Mueller and various Islamic organizations. This purge is part of a broader Islamist “influence operation” aimed at our government and Constitution.

Judicial Watch filed Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests on March 7, 2012, seeking records pertaining to FBI Director Mueller’s secret meetings and the curricula purges. The FBI refused to respond substantively to our request, forcing us to file a lawsuit in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, *(Judicial Watch v. Federal Bureau of Investigation and U.S. Department of Justice (No. 1:12-cv-01183))*.

The litigation compelled the FBI to comply with the law and produce the requested records to Judicial Watch, many of which are discussed in this report.

The American people deserve complete, accurate, factual information concerning the threats of subversion and terror posed to our country. Accordingly, Judicial Watch will continue to investigate, analyze and pursue additional lines of inquiry concerning Islamist influence operations, and other “active measures” targeting the law enforcement and intelligence agencies, the Defense Department and the media.
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I. **Abbreviations & Terminology**

**Abbreviations**

AQ  al Qaeda  
CAIR  Council on American-Islamic Relations  
COMINTERN  Communist International  
DoD  Department of Defense  
DoJ  Department of Justice  
FBI  Federal Bureau of Investigation  
FOIA  Freedom of Information Act  
HAMAS  Harakat al-Muqāwamah al-ʾIslāmiyyah, ("Islamic Resistance Movement")  
ISNA  Islamic Society of North America  
JTTF  Joint Terrorism Task Force  
MB  Muslim Brotherhood  
MPAC  Muslim Public Affairs Council  
NAIT  North American Islamic Trust  
OIC  Organization of Islamic Cooperation  
UN  United Nations

**Terminology**

Specific terminology in this report frames the analysis, while providing context and meaning. The terms **“active measures”** (aktivnyye meropriyatiya) and **“influence operations”** were used by the Soviet Union to describe covert and deceptive activities carried out in support of its foreign policy objectives. The United States Department of State documented and reported the Soviets’ campaign.\(^3\) We use the terms in the same way to describe the activities of the Islamists.

The goal of active measures is to influence the opinions and actions of persons, institutions, governments and the public at-large. They are activities distinct from intelligence and diplomatic operations. The essence of active measures is deception.\(^4\) Deception has been a staple of international politics and statecraft for centuries.

In applying the Soviet-era terminology to Islamists, a parallel can be drawn between the Communist International (COMINTERN), and later, the International Department of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee to that of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC) and the Muslim Brotherhood (MB). It is
important to differentiate the OIC and MB as ideological, intergovernmental organizations with political and sociological objectives.

The OIC (a 57-nation organization that seeks to represent the Muslim world, and an international organization second in size only to the UN) maintains an “Islamophobia Observatory,” and claims an "institutionalization and legitimization of the phenomenon of Islamophobia" in the West over the last five years.\(^5\)

The MB was founded in Egypt in 1928 and acts as a transnational Islamic organization. Their motto is: “Allah is our objective; the Quran is our law, the Prophet is our leader; jihad is our way; and dying in the way of Allah is the highest of our aspirations.” The English language website of the MB states the organization is: “an Egypt-born Islamist organization founded for launching jihad against the infidels in general and Christian West in particular has been an ideological protectorate of Saudi Arabia for over half a century.”\(^6\)

Islam (in its religious context) is the organizing element of the OIC and the MB, but neither is strictly a religious group. Both are organized to address political, economic, and social issues. A taxonomy of the OIC and the MB reveals structures and functions akin to the internationalist organs of the Soviet communists.

The Islamists’ active measures techniques include:

- **Disinformation** – a deliberate effort to deceive public or government opinion through written materials or oral representations. Occasionally, forgeries of documents and government records may be used in an attempt to damage or discredit a person or organization.

- **Front Groups** – normally presented as non-governmental, non-political organizations engaged in promoting desirable goals such as world peace, civil rights, tolerance, understanding, ecumenism and education.

- **Non-ruling Islamist Political Parties** – encouraging communication, liaison and mutual support, including specific political action or propaganda campaigns.

- **Political Influence Operations** – Islamist operatives take an active role in political, governmental, press, business, labor or academic forums. Their goal is to leverage their participation and influence into real policy gains for Islam. Cooperators and “dupes” help the Islamists achieve their interests.\(^7\)
Sharia is an Islamic doctrine establishing a comprehensive legal, sociological and political framework.

Islamophobia is a term favored by the OIC, MB and other Islamist activists. It is used as an offensive weapon to accuse non-Muslims of bigotry, and as a defensive weapon to invoke victim status for the accuser. It is a neologism that takes “Islam” and attaches the “phobia” suffix in order to assign to a person or group a diagnosed mental illness characterized by irrational fear.

Contemporary coinage of "Islamophobia" is attributed to the Runnymede Trust, a leftist think tank in London, specializing in racial and ethnic theories. Their 1997 paper, “Islamophobia: A Challenge for Us All,” details eight (8) distinctions of “closed and opened views of Islam.” Islamophobia was defined by the Trust as "an outlook or world-view involving an unfounded dread and dislike of Muslims, which results in practices of exclusion and discrimination."

Islamists wielding the term “Islamophobia” for political and other purposes benefit in the word’s negative connotations. Mentally ill, racist, hate criminal, fearful, fear-monger? In the context of influence operations, the word is a potent weapon that is used often to terminate rational discussion. For that reason, in December 2012, the Associated Press decided to drop the term from its reporting AP Stylebook.

Terrorism is premeditated, politically motivated violence perpetrated against noncombatant targets by subnational groups or clandestine agents. (22 USC §2656f(d))
II. Background

“Only a coalition of Marxists and Islamists can destroy the United States.”
~ Ilich Ramirez Sanchez
a/k/a “Carlos the Jackal”
*Revolutionary Islam*, 2003

“The future must not belong to those who slander the prophet of Islam.”
~ Barack Obama
President of the United States
67th Session, United Nations General Assembly
September 25, 2012

“Our job is to change the Constitution of America.”
~ Sayyid Syeed, PhD
Islamic Society of North America (ISNA)
43rd Annual Conference
Rosemont, IL
Labor Day, 2006

On March 7, 2012, Judicial Watch submitted FOIA requests to the FBI and the Department of Justice (DoJ) seeking access to records about a controversial February 8, 2012 meeting between FBI Director Robert Mueller and various Islamic organizations.

Judicial Watch sought “any and all records setting criteria or guidelines for FBI curricula on Islam or records identifying potentially offensive material within the FBI curricula on Islam,” as well as any directives to withdraw FBI presentations and curricula on Islam. Judicial Watch also sought records of communications between the Office of the Attorney General and several entities, including the Obama White House, the Executive Office of the President, and Muslim organizations, such as the MB, the Islamic Society of North America (ISNA), and the Council on American-Islamic Relations (CAIR) regarding the FBI’s curricula on Islam.

The FBI acknowledged receipt of Judicial Watch’s FOIA request on March 20, 2012, and was required to respond by May 1, 2012. The DoJ acknowledged receiving Judicial Watch’s FOIA request on March 14, 2012, and was required to respond by April 11, 2012. On July 18, 2012, Judicial Watch filed suit in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia to compel the Obama administration and its Holder Justice Department to comply with the law, due to the FBI’s and Justice Department’s failure to provide the records as federal law requires.
III. Documenting the “Purge”

A. FOIA Lawsuit Record Production

In June 2013, as a result of its lawsuit, Judicial Watch obtained and released hundreds of pages of FBI records revealing that, in 2012, the agency purged its anti-terrorism training curricula of material determined by a group of “Subject Matter Experts” to be “offensive” to Muslims. The FBI refused to disclose the identities of these “Subject Matter Experts.” The excised material included references linking the Muslim Brotherhood to terrorism, tying al Qaeda to the 1993 World Trade Center and Khobar Towers bombings, and suggesting that “young male immigrants of Middle Eastern appearance … may fit the terrorist profile best.”

Among the records produced is an FBI policy document, “Guiding Principles: Touchstone Document on Training,” which provided the rationale for the curriculum purge. The “Touchstone” document contains an extraordinary statement: “Mere association with organizations that demonstrate both legitimate (advocacy) and illicit (violent extremism) objectives should not automatically result in a determination that the associated individual is acting in furtherance of the organization’s illicit objective(s).” Perhaps not “automatically,” but it should definitely result in a preliminary inquiry and some fundamental investigative work.

B. Outside groups and purge pressure

The FBI should not “outsource” its counterterrorism training to the terrorists and/or their agents of influence who have sworn to destroy our country. The Muslim Public Affairs Council (MPAC) has lobbied successfully for years to remove references to Islam, sharia and jihad from the national security dialogue and terminology of law enforcement, intelligence and defense agencies – even though terrorists from AQ to Hamas use those terms and Quranic doctrine and quotes to justify their operations and attacks.

In 2005, MPAC founder Salam al-Marayati made the following public statement at an Islamic Society of North America (ISNA) conference in Dallas:

"Counter-terrorism and counter-violence should be defined by us," he said. "We should define how an effective counter-terrorism policy should be pursued in this country. So, number one, we reject any effort, notion, suggestion that Muslims should start spying on one
another ... That is why we are saying have them [law enforcement] come in community forums, in open-dialogues, so they come through the front door and you prevent them having to come from the back door.”

During the notorious February 8, 2012 meeting, FBI Director Mueller reportedly assured the Islamic groups in attendance that the agency had ordered the removal of presentations and curricula on Islam from FBI offices around the country that were deemed “offensive.” One group that reportedly met with Mueller – ISNA – was already “tied to the terror groups Hamas and the Muslim Brotherhood in federal court documents.” The government had named ISNA in 2007 as an unindicted co-conspirator in the Holy Land Foundation terrorist financing lawsuit, along with CAIR, and the North American Islamic Trust (NAIT).

MPAC posted to its website that its February 2012 meeting with Director Mueller concerned the use of “inflammatory training material . . . that depicts falsehoods and negative connotations of the Muslim American community.” MPAC stated that the FBI’s proposed training changes were a “welcomed first step in ensuring that such a mistake does not occur again.” It also sought a formal statement from Director Mueller “acknowledging the negative impact of these training materials on the Muslim American Community.”

The Department of Defense (DoD) instituted a purge similar to the FBI’s. On April 24, 2012, Joint Chiefs Chairman Gen. Martin E. Dempsey ordered the entire U.S. military to “review” its educational and training classes, files, and rosters of instructors to ensure that no members of the armed services were studying material “disrespectful of the Islamic religion.” MPAC issued a statement on May 18, 2012 that, “While we are spending treasures in both lives and finances overseas trying to win hearts and minds, here at home we are training our young servicemen and women to fill their hearts and minds with hate.” [Emphasis added]

Curiously, the purge of FBI training materials seems to have been initiated by the reporting of one journalist (Spencer Ackerman of Wired) concerning one briefing presented at Quantico. As Ackerman himself reports:

“It’s apparently true that FBI intelligence analyst William Gawthrop — who conducted the counterterrorism training Mueller apparently referred to [in congressional testimony in October 2011] — only held a particular three-day seminar at the FBI training academy on one occasion.” [Emphasis added]
Senator Dick Durbin (D-IL) encouraged the systematic purge. Back in the spring of 2011, Senator Durbin had organized a U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee special hearing on Muslim civil rights in America. The event purportedly came in "response to the spike in anti-Muslim bigotry." The Senate panel featured then-Assistant Attorney General Thomas Perez, who led the agency's civil rights division, and Farhana Khera, who runs a San Francisco group called Muslim Advocates. Attorney General Holder has been the guest of honor and a featured speaker at the annual dinner of the Muslim Advocates. Muslim Advocates described itself as follows:

We are experts with deep experience in the courtroom and powerful connections in Congress and the White House. As a thoughtful voice in Washington, we ensure the concerns of American Muslims are heard by leaders at the highest levels of government. As a watchdog of justice, we use the courts to bring to task those who threaten the rights of American Muslims. Our team of legal advocates, policy experts and communications professionals.

- Counter anti-Muslim hate by challenging bigotry and hate crimes.
- Empower communities by strengthening American Muslim charities and educating people about their legal rights.
- Fight discrimination with high impact lawsuits against those who wrongfully target American Muslims.

We are strategic in the battles we take on, so our resources have maximum impact. We create coalitions with our allies inside and outside of government to tackle the most urgent issues facing the American Muslim community. [Emphasis in original]

Another member of the Illinois congressional delegation, Rep. Jan Schakowsky (D-IL), has been praised by CAIR for "her strong defense of the Muslim Community during questioning of FBI Director Robert Mueller by the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence." In the same October 6, 2011 press release, CAIR Director Nihad Awad thanked "Director Mueller for his pledge to perform a 'top to bottom' review of FBI counterterrorism training."
Nonetheless, other members of Congress, including then-Rep. Allen West (R-FL), objected to allowing radical Muslim organizations the opportunity to dictate U.S. counterterrorism policy and want the material to be reinserted into the documents: “Now you have an environment of political correctness which precludes these [FBI] agents from doing their proper job and due diligence to go after the perceived threat,” stated West.21

C. Identification of “offensive” training material

As reported in March 2012 by National Public Radio (NPR): “The FBI has completed a review of offensive training material and has purged 876 pages and 392 presentations, according to a briefing provided to lawmakers.”22 Documents obtained a year later by the Judicial Watch FOIA lawsuit revealed that among the reasons given by the FBI for purging “offensive” training documents were:

- “Article is highly inflammatory and inaccurately argues the Muslim Brotherhood is a terrorist organization.”23
- “Page 13 inaccurately states that AQ [al Qaeda] is responsible for the bombing of the Khobar Towers and that AQ is ‘clearly linked’ to the 1993 bombing of the World Trade Center.”24
- “The overall tenor of the presentation is too informal in the current political context.”25
- “The Qur’an is not the teachings of the Prophet, but the revealed word of God.”26
- “Remove references to mosques specifically as a radicalization incubator.”27
- “Remove sweeping generality of ‘Those who fit the terrorist profile best (for the present at least) are young male immigrants of Middle Eastern appearance.’”28
- “author seems to conflate ‘Islamic Militancy’ with ‘terrorism’ and needs to define the difference and use it in their analysis.”29

In its May 22, 2013 article on some of the Judicial Watch revelations, The Washington Examiner reported, “While the Muslim Brotherhood is not on the U.S.
State Department’s official list of international terrorist organizations, some of its offshoots, including the Palestinian group Hamas, are.”

Ironically, in 2011, then-FBI Director Mueller, who later ordered the purge of “offensive” material – including the “exoneration” of the Muslim Brotherhood – had described the Brotherhood as a group that supports terrorism in the U.S. and overseas.

**IV. The Islamist Influence Operation**

**A. 9/11 and the Immediate Aftermath**

Judicial Watch has a long history of pursuing national security matters relating to terrorism. We began representing FBI Special Agent Robert G. Wright in August 2001 concerning FBI efforts to silence him about Islamist money laundering and financial support to terrorist organizations.

Nine days after the attacks of 9/11, Judicial Watch filed a “Complaint Concerning Certain Tax Exempt And Other Organizations Reportedly Used As Money Laundering Front Operations for Terrorist Activities in The United States and Abroad” with the Internal Revenue Service. Our report specifically cited the activities of 20 terrorist front organizations. On November 24, 2008 the federal government finally obtained a guilty verdict against one of the organizations we named: the Holy Land Foundation for Relief & Development (and five individuals).


Of the 19 hijackers on 9/11, 15 of them were Saudi subjects. The report contained many redactions that the Justice Department claimed were made in the privacy interests of the Saudi subjects it identified. It is not clear how the Justice Department concluded that the alleged privacy privileges of non-U.S. persons trump the public’s interest in obtaining full information about the government’s investigative response to the 9/11 terrorist attacks. Additional redactions were claimed for law enforcement investigative purposes even though the report claims
that "no information of investigative value" was learned from interviews of bin Laden family members and Saudi royals.

New information detailing flights of Saudis out of the U.S. from Las Vegas and Providence, RI were in the report. FBI procedures in processing the Saudi flights were also revealed. It is apparent from the report that bin Laden family members and Saudi royals were subject to only cursory, *pro forma* questioning by the FBI. Experienced investigators suggested detailed counterterrorism interviews would have taken a minimum of two hours per passenger. There was no evidence offered that any such interviews were conducted by the FBI. The report is silent as to the identity of the official who approved any of the flights.

This extraordinarily favorable treatment of bin Laden family members and other influential, wealthy, Saudi subjects was facilitated through the personal connections and influence of Prince Bandar bin Sultan, the Saudi Arabian ambassador to the United States from 1983 to 2005. Foreign nationals with contacts, communication, travel, investments, family associations and other material witness information concerning the largest terrorist attack on U.S. soil were given a "pass" because of an elaborate, well-cultivated influence operation personified by a Saudi prince. Entirely consistent with his long ambassadorial service in the United States and his knowledge and appreciation of influence operations, Prince Bandar was appointed Director General of the Saudi Intelligence Agency on July 19, 2012.

American Islamists also engage in influence operations and active measures operations. Anwar al Aulaqi, a U.S. citizen and militant imam of the *Dar al-Hijrah* mosque in Falls Church, Virginia is a perfect example. He is described as the "spiritual leader" and inspiration of the 9/11 hijackers; the Fort Hood murderer, U.S. Army Major Nidal Hassan; and the 2009 Christmas Day (attempted) airline bomber, Umar Farouk Abdulmutallab of Nigeria, and others. Judicial Watch began an investigation of Aulaqi and has gone to court to compel the government to produce records concerning his terrorist connections.

To date, Judicial Watch’s litigation has resulted in the release of more than 1,800 pages of responsive records, many of which were previously classified. The documents pertain to the FBI’s investigation of Aulaqi’s connections to two of the 9/11 hijackers; his suspected involvement with terrorism as early as 1999; his banking activities; his frequent patronizing of prostitutes; and, the State Department’s revocation of his passport approximately six months before his death by drone strike.
Aulaqi was interviewed by the FBI four times in the eight days following the 9/11 attacks. Aulaqi’s telephone number had been found by German police in the Hamburg apartment of hijacker Ramzi bin al Shibh. Aulaqi had also been investigated by the FBI in 1999 and 2000 for his contacts with operatives associated with bin Laden, Omar Abdel-Rahman (the “Blind Sheik” and mastermind of the ’93 World Trade Center bombings) and the terror group, Hamas. Six days following the 9/11 attacks, Aulaqi suggested on an Islamist website that website that Israeli intelligence agents might have been responsible for the attacks. Documents suggest the FBI was aware as far back as September 27, 2001, that Aulaqi may have purchased airplane tickets for three of the 9/11 terrorist hijackers, including mastermind Mohammed Atta. The FBI was sufficiently concerned by Aulaqi’s activities and contacts that he was placed under surveillance in November 2001.

Aulaqi presented himself publicly as the face of moderate Islam in America. He gave a number of media interviews and appeared on National Geographic; National Public Radio; and, in the New York Times. Aulaqi also frequented prostitutes in Washington, DC hotels, spending thousands of dollars. An FBI memo seeking prosecution of Aulaqi for prostitution-related charges provides a detailed account of his conduct, up to the evening before his speech to a Pentagon audience.

On February 5, 2002 Aulaqi had lunch in the dining room of the Secretary of Defense and made a presentation to Pentagon brass, as part of the military’s outreach to the Muslim community. In preparation for Aulaqi’s Pentagon luncheon, a Defense Department lawyer who purportedly vetted his background and credentials wrote that she “had the privilege of hearing one of Mr. Awlaki’s presentations in November and was impressed by both the extent of his knowledge and by how he communicated that information and handled a hostile element in the audience.”

According to records and surveillance logs obtained through a FOIA lawsuit against the FBI by Judicial Watch, the bureau issued a bulletin at 10:40 AM the day before the Pentagon luncheon (February 4, 2002) that declared Aulaqi to be a terrorist. The Aulaqi warning notice reads: “Warning – approach with caution . . . Do not alert the individual to the FBI’s interest and contact your local FBI field office at the earliest opportunity.”[Emphasis added.]

Nonetheless, according to the FBI surveillance log for February 5, 2002 at 11:30 am, “Aulaqi boarded the Metro train, blue line north for the Pentagon.” At 11:32 am, “Aulaqi exited the Metro train, walked through the turnstile [sic] and
greeted two unidentified white females.” At 11:40 am, “Aulaqi and the two unidentified females walked through the train station, onto the escalator, walked southwest and west adjacent to the Pentagon, up the steps and walked northeast towards the entrance to the Pentagon.” And at 12:00 pm, “Surveillance discontinued at the Pentagon.” In short, the FBI followed this terrorist literally to the front steps of the Pentagon.

Within days of the Pentagon luncheon, Aulaqi left the United States. Eight months later, he returned to the United States under mysterious circumstances. Aulaqi was stopped and detained by Customs officers at JFK International Airport because of an outstanding warrant for his arrest, until FBI Special Agent Wade Ammerman ordered Aulaqi’s release, even though the warrant was still active. Records obtained by Judicial Watch in September 2013 suggest that Aulaqi may have been an agent of the U.S. government, or that perhaps Aulaqi was manipulating the U.S. government to achieve his own goals. The records show that then-FBI Director Robert Mueller appears to be more deeply involved in the post-9/11 handling of Aulaqi than previously known.

One memo from Mueller to then-Attorney General John Ashcroft on October 3, 2002 – seven days before Aulaqi re-entered the United States and was detained at JFK airport – is marked "Secret" and titled "Anwar Aulaqi: IT-UBL/AL-QAEDA." The substance of the memo is redacted in full. Interestingly, the memo is one of at least three FBI reports, whose primary subject is Aulaqi, in the nine days leading up to his return to the United States in October 2002. Another FBI memo marked "Secret," on October 22, 2002, 12 days after the cleric’s return, includes the subject line "Anwar Nasser Aulaqi" and "Synopsis: Asset reporting."

Other records Judicial Watch uncovered show that on October 1, 2002 - before Aulaqi returned to the United States -- a memo marked "Secret" and "Priority" was faxed from the FBI’s Washington Field Office to FBI headquarters. On October 3, the FBI director’s memo was sent to Ashcroft. And on October 10, the day Aulaqi entered the United States, there was a heavily redacted fax from the FBI resident office at JFK International Airport that included the cleric’s plane ticket, customs form, passport and Social Security card.

Aulaqi left the United States before the end of 2002, and spent the following years in the United Kingdom (2002 – 2004) and Yemen (2004 – 2011). Aulaqi was killed in Yemen by a Hellfire missile fired from a Predator drone on September 30, 2011.
Aulaqi seems to be the perfect example of an active measures operative. By means of deception, he conducted himself publicly as a supposedly “moderate” Muslim cleric, while engaged in clandestine operations supporting the 9/11 hijackers. While lecturing Pentagon officials on their need to be “sensitive” to the Muslim community (an influence operation), he secretly plotted traitorous, Jihadist attacks against his fellow citizens. He appears to have manipulated and/or deceived, at least for a time, the FBI and perhaps the CIA. Having fled the country, he went on to drop the cover of deception, and then openly advocated for Jihadist attacks against his country of birth. He radicalized, inspired and directed terror attacks as the head of al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula until his death.

His death leaves many unanswered questions: How much of his terror support network is intact in the United States? What was Aulaqi’s relationship with the U.S. government? Was there a recruitment attempt by the FBI or the CIA? Was Aulaqi a double or, perhaps, a triple agent? What value or importance did Aulaqi have that the FBI was willing to waive arrest warrants to get him back into the country? Was Aulaqi successful in recruiting and placing Islamist operatives in the U.S. government? Aulaqi ran an aggressive “cyber-Jihad” from Yemen, using YouTube for proselytizing and recruiting Islamists to wage Jihad around the world. Those techniques are increasingly important for influence operations and broader active measures campaigns. Why did the U.S. government allow Aulaqi years of unfettered access to the Internet and YouTube? The public was told that Aulaqi was a terrorist, when it appears that he was, at least, a U.S. government informant. Did President Obama know about Aulaqi’s status when he ordered his death by drone strike?

B. Active Measures Campaign

As referenced above, in 2007 and 2008, the United States charged the Holy Land Foundation (HLF) of Richardson, TX (and related persons) with material support of terrorism through laundering millions of dollars for use by Harakat al-Muqāwamah al-ʾIslāmiyyah, (“Islamic Resistance Movement” – HAMAS). In November 2008, the HLF and five men were found guilty by unanimous verdicts of 36 counts of unlawfully funding terrorism. HLF records introduced as key evidence in the trials included “An Explanatory Memorandum” dated May 22, 1991 detailing the relationships and activities of the “Muslim Brotherhood” and the “Islamic Movement” in North America. “Attachment number (1)” of the Memorandum listed 29 “friendly” organizations including: the Islamic Society of North America; Muslim Students’ Association; United Association for Studies and Research; Mercy International Association; International Institute for Islamic Thought; and others.
The Explanatory Memorandum described in detail a “Civilization-Jihadist Process” that stated, “Their [Islamists] work in America is a kind of grand jihad in eliminating and destroying the Western Civilization from within and ‘sabotaging’ its miserable house by their hands and the hands of the believers so that it is eliminated and God’s religion is made victorious over all other religions.”

The Explanatory Memorandum documents how Islamists are waging jihad on the West by a variety of means and on a number of fronts. There is nothing new about the jihad phenomenon – it has been carried out to one degree or another since AD 632, although its current politicized manifestation traces its roots to the first half of the 20th century. The Koran demands jihad. We ignore that fact at our peril. Dr. Patrick Sookhdeo, an expert in jihadist ideology and a Visiting Professor at the Defence Academy of the UK, has stated, “Islamism has replaced communism as the most significant ideological opponent of the Western liberal world order. Radical Islamist movements have declared war on the West as well as on other Muslims.”

Even Senator Diane Feinstein (D-CA) has identified, “a real displaced aggression in this very fundamentalist jihadist Islamic community, and that is that the West is responsible for everything that goes wrong and that the only thing that’s going to solve this is Islamic sharia law and the concept of the caliphate.”

Current jihadist operations are conducted under the umbrella, direction and coordination of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC), the MB, as well as al Qaeda (AQ) and its affiliates. The MB’s motto provides perspective on their ideology and operations: "Allah is our objective; the Koran is our law, the Prophet is our leader; jihad is our way; and dying in the way of Allah is the highest of our aspirations." The arsenal of jihad includes the weapons of terrorism and acts of war, as well as influence campaigns, propaganda and active measures.

Since 2009, at least seven (7) Islamists (the Tsarnaevs, Muhammad, Zazi, Hassan, Abdulmutallab, Shahzad) have attempted to conduct attacks in the United States – undetected by either the law enforcement or intelligence communities. Likewise, Muslim political pressure and community groups have failed to identify, warn authorities or interdict these terrorists. In 2011, as the Obama administration was carrying out the training curricula purge demands of groups like CAIR, the Russian government was, without success, warning the FBI about Boston Bomber Tamerlan Tsarnaev.
Controlling language is essential for effective influence operations, as part of a broader active measures campaign. An example of the radical purging of certain terms and phrases from government lexicons can be found by comparing language used in the 9/11 Commission Report to that used in both the 2009 National Intelligence Estimate and the 2008 FBI Counterterrorism Analytical Lexicon.

Certain terms and phrases – rooted in basic Islamic history, as well as the language/publications of the terrorists themselves – have been removed from U.S. government law enforcement and intelligence records. Why? Whose interests are served by not using accurate language to describe the actions of persons attacking U.S. persons and property? Who wishes the historical record to be revised in such a way as to deny facts? Why would America’s leadership seek to ignore almost 1,400 years of history? If “sensitivity” to Islam is a concern, why would we seek to deny the teachings of Islam and its historical conquests – from medieval Spain to Indonesia, and beyond? Isn’t such a denial “insensitive”?

If a decision was made that the law enforcement and intelligence agencies of the United States would be better served by not using historically accurate descriptive terms, then which government official made that decision? Who? How was that order – to “scrub” vocabulary – conveyed to the agency(ies)? What review and editing process was used – and who were the editors/reviewers?

It appears that the U.S. government has elected to deny reality. The compulsion for the U.S. government, its political leaders and the public at-large to deny reality is not new. Having documented U.S. national “amnesia” towards the brutality of the Soviet Union in her book, American Betrayal, author and syndicated columnist Diana West reminds us that:

“. . . throughout the 1970s and beyond, Red terrorists from Europe and the Islamic world struck at civilian targets from Italy to Sweden to Japan to Israel. Not that we ever thought of that world as Islamic; it was always described as “Arab.” Often directed by Cubans, Arabs, and Czechs, these forces were clandestinely bankrolled, trained, and supported by Moscow to destabilize the West . . . Once again, the response of Western leaders to this Soviet assault on Western society was an “official flight from reality,” as [The Terror Network author Claire] Sterling put it. She describes what was by then the familiar mode of Western behavior: a mass avoidance of all the densely accumulating evidence that led to the
conclusion that the Soviet Union was the culprit behind the chaos and terror. This led to a group hug around delusion."\(^{62}\)

The denial and avoidance has manifested itself as official government policy. Dr. Sebastian L. v. Gorka, professor of irregular warfare at the National Defense University, explains that the confusion of our policies stems from two obstacles:

"The first is a misguided belief that the religious character of the enemy’s ideology should not be discussed, and that we need not address it, but instead should use the phrase, “Violent Extremism” to describe our foe and thus avoid any unnecessary unpleasantness. The second is that even if we could demonstrate clear-headedness on the issue and recognize the religious ideology of al Qaeda and its associated movements for what it is, a form of hybrid totalitarianism, we still drastically lack the institutional ability to analyze and comprehend the world view of this enemy and therefore its strategic mindset and ultimate objectives."\(^{63}\)

If government officials are forbidden to use terms such as jihad and Islamist, how can they ever hope to conduct the fact-driven analysis required to comprehend and act upon threat information? President George W. Bush’s declaration on September 17, 2001 to the Islamic Center of Washington, DC that, “Islam is peace,”\(^{64}\) is a good example of how we have disconnected facts of the 9/11 attacks from conclusions (“Islam is peace.”).

The Obama administration has also taken strong action to combat anything deemed insensitive to Muslims. Whatever the broader motives of the Obama political operatives, this desire to eliminate “insensitivity” is, in large part, rooted in fear – fear of terror attacks, violence, provocations, “days of rage,” burned consulates and protests. American leaders engage in self-censorship out of fear – pretending it is “tolerance” and “respect.” They ironically proclaim that “intolerance” is intolerable and must be eliminated. Consistent with this fear-based approach, in December 2011, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton hosted a three-day, closed-door, international “Istanbul Process” conference on measures to combat religious “intolerance, negative stereotyping and stigmatization.”

The conference was intended to “implement” UN Human Rights Council Resolution 16/18, a victory for the OIC in advancement of its goal that “defamation of religion” should be punished criminally worldwide. A 10-year goal of the OIC was
accomplished. The Resolution, titled: “Combating Intolerance, Negative Stereotyping and Stigmatization of, and Discrimination, Incitement to Violence and Violence Against, Persons Based on Religion or Belief,” implements two steps for UN member states: 1) prohibiting discrimination based on religion or belief; and, 2) training government officials, including on how to implement effective outreach to religious communities. Participants included experts from invited countries and international organizations, as well as personnel from the U.S. Departments of Homeland Security and Justice. By hosting this conference Secretary Clinton directly and indirectly advanced the agenda of the OIC and validated oppression.

Rather than strongly defending the First Amendment, Secretary Clinton gave the impression to the 57 member states of the OIC and to the rest of the UN that the United States would fall in behind most of Western Europe, Canada and Australia, with some sort of Sharia-compliant speech code. If the Secretary of State would internationally compromise the Constitution through compliance with a criminal blasphemy code, surely some use of “offensive” language could, and would, be curtailed at the FBI. “Violent extremist” became the euphemism for jihadist, militant Islamist or terrorist.

On May 10, 2012, Rep. Louis Gohmert (R-TX) went to the floor of the House of Representatives and discussed “disappearing language” about the jihadist threat using a chart to display the frequency of use of descriptive terms in government law enforcement and intelligence documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Violent extremism</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enemy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>jihad</em></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islam</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Takfir</em></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim Brotherhood</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hizbollah</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al Qaeda</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caliph</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How does one identify, study and plan for a defense to a militant Islamist terror threat if one is not permitted to examine the doctrine, organization, history, ideology and conduct of the opposition?

Islam is a religion that also expresses itself as an ideology and as a system of governance that requires compliance and submission. Just like the structure and organization of the Soviet Union and its Communist Party apparatus, Islam offers an entire intellectual and ideological structure and process. Examination of Islamist ideology is critical to thwarting the threat posed to our country. Studying ideology is the means by which we understand man’s relationship to mankind, the nation and community.

From March 2011 through June 2012, Rep. Peter King (R-NY), chairman of the House Committee on Homeland Security, held a series of hearings on radicalization within the Muslim-American community. The hearings focused on: the radicalization in the Muslim-American community and that community’s response; radicalization in prisons; recruitment within the Muslim-American community by Al-Shabaab; and, the threat to American military communities in the United States as well as the “Insider Threat” from radicalized Muslims in the military. The hearings were controversial and drew condemnations from CAIR and the ACLU. The hearings did not uncover or reveal any new information, but the overreaction to them by the American Islamist network was revealing. This may be because the most important finding came as a result of the first hearing: “There is a Need to Confront the Islamist Ideology Driving Radicalization.”

Twelve years after 9/11, many Americans are woefully ignorant of the militant Islamist terror threat. Just as many Cold War-era Americans were not conversant in the “dialectical materialism” of Karl Marx, nor could they recite from memory the names of the members of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union – likewise, they are not familiar with the ideology of the Muslim Brotherhood or the writings of Sayyid Qutb (the leading member of the Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood in the 1950s and 60s). Many Americans believe the rest of the world should respect and admire the individual liberties guaranteed in our Constitution. They wrongly assume that, if only given a fair hearing and consideration, a Western-style Jeffersonian democracy would be embraced throughout the Islamic world. Obviously, those Americans are gravely mistaken.

The mistake is not new. An example from the Cold War demonstrates the parallels between the struggle against Communism and today’s struggle against the
Islamists. In *Global Psychological Conflict*, an analytical volume compiled and published by the Industrial College of the Armed Forces in 1961, the following is offered concerning “The Importance of History”:

“There flows from American humanism and humanitarianism, a belief, almost an article of faith, that human beings all over the world are very much alike, that their basic aspirations, interests, fears and hopes are not really too different. We instinctively de-emphasize in our thinking the extraordinary differences that exist in the system of values and mentality of even such closely related nations as the French and Italian. Thus we come, not in theory perhaps but in actual fact, to the conclusion that it cannot really be so very important whether in dealing with the Frenchmen or the Italians, we do know their history and literature, their peculiar social stratification, their special philosophy of life – in short, their true national individuality. Americans are also more “modern” than almost any other national group, in the sense that we live in the present and look into the future. This also leads to a natural nonconcern with the underlying historical developments that have shaped those foreign nations that constitute our audience today.”

It is not only the average American who lacks a clear understanding of the Islamist threat. Journalist and author Diana West describes the national information gap on the challenges facing the United States, and the purges of the available information:

“Years of battle—even worse, years of battle planning—have passed without our leadership having studied, or even having become acquainted with, the principles and historic facts of Islamic war doctrine. Four years into the so-called war on terror, then–Joint Chiefs Chairman Peter Pace even pointed this out in a speech at the National Defense University on December 1, 2005.

Notwithstanding Pace’s concern, the study and analysis of Islam and jihad remained de facto forbidden in policy-making circles inside the Bush White House, which even codified a lexicon in 2008 to help government officials discuss Islamic jihad without mentioning “Islam” or “jihad.” The Obama administration would carry this same
see-no-Islam policy to its zealous limit, finally mounting a two-front assault on the few trainers and fact-based training materials that were sometimes (sparingly) used by law enforcement agencies and the military to educate personnel about Islam and jihad. What history should remember as the Great Jihad Purges of 2012 began at the Justice Department, affecting domestic law enforcement agencies, and spread to the Pentagon, affecting the entire U.S. military.71

This “see-no-Islam” policy was recently on display in Seattle, when the Puget Sound Joint Terrorism Task Force, in conjunction with the U.S. Department of State’s Rewards for Justice program, bought advertisements for 46 public buses as part of a public education and awareness campaign in June 2013. The advertisement featured 16 photos of wanted terrorists and the wording: “Faces of Global Terrorism” and “Stop a Terrorist. Save Lives. Up to $25 Million Reward.” The 16 terrorists featured are from around the world. Three were born in the United States, seven are from African countries, four are from the Philippines, with one Malaysian and one Chechen. These facts detailing wanted terrorists did not deter Representative Jim McDermott (D-WA) from writing a letter of complaint to the Director of the FBI concerning the advertisements, and further stating: “When you start saying that this is the face of terrorism, you are really stigmatizing a whole group of people.”72 As we have now come to expect, the FBI apologized for and discontinued the advertisements immediately.

Islamists engaged in influence operations leverage the powers of our own Constitution’s Bill of Rights back against us in an active measures form of ju-jitsu. The First Amendment becomes a weapon to curtail “offensive” speech; freedom of religion becomes either freedom “from” religion, or a demand for state-sanctioning of Islamic religious practices, while excluding and suppressing Christian expression. While Lenin believed we would sell him the rope by which he would hang us, the Islamists dream of us shackling ourselves in a dhimmitude (accepting a condition of subservient, second-class status) that will help achieve the goals of the Islamists’ “Civilization – Jihadist Process.”

Active measures campaigns seek to bring social and political pressure to bear against the targeted institution(s) and government(s) to arrive at a desired result. Pressure is exerted through subtlety and deception. Active measures are designed to influence behaviors, decisions and outcomes. Bearing this in mind, it is interesting to note that as Spencer Ackerman launched his reporting on the FBI anti-terror training curriculum in Wired (September 2011), nearly simultaneously, Matt
Apuzzo, Adam Goldman, Eileen Sullivan, and Chris Hawley from the Associated Press began their Pulitzer Prize-winning probe into NYPD intelligence operations (August 23, 2011).73

It is not unreasonable to ask if these reporters were manipulated through an orchestrated program to bring substantial negative publicity against the two leading counterterrorism law enforcement agencies in the country at virtually the same moment. Certainly, exactly that sort of discrediting and crippling action is exactly the desired outcome of an active measures program seeking to thwart the operations of major law enforcement agencies. Similar operations by other enemies of the United States have been carried out for decades through journalists, both wittingly and unwittingly.

Islamists will offer that jihad (“war”) is a creative force.74 The Communists believed and said the same thing concerning war. Marx said that “war was a creative source of social development, ‘the last word of social science on the eve of each general reconstruction of society’ . . . Lenin voiced the opinion that ‘great historical questions can be solved only by violence.’”75 The Soviet Union lasted decades. From the Battle of Tours (AD 732) to the attacks of 9/11, the historical record is dense with factual information on the Islamists’ jihadist efforts against the West.

C. Chronology of Recent Developments in Influence Operations

A chronological examination of the Islamists’ influence campaign and other active measures helps provide context and perspective.76

December 2005: The OIC establishes 10-year plan of action that includes international criminalization of “Islamophobia” through the United Nations (UN).77

April 2011: OIC Secretary-General Ekmeleddin Ihsanoglu meets with President Obama at the White House.

July 2011: State Department and OIC meetings on “Istanbul Process,” Secretary Hillary Clinton tells OIC that U.S. government will use “old fashioned techniques of peer pressure and shaming” against “Islamophobia.”78
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August 2011: The Associated Press begins a series of articles attacking the New York Police Department’s intelligence operations.79

September 2011: Wired magazine’s Spencer Ackerman begins series of articles attacking individuals within U.S. government for “Islamophobia.”80

October 2011: 57 Muslim groups send a letter to White House demanding “purge” of all counterterrorism training materials and “re-education” of all FBI agents exposed to “Islamophobic” training.81

October 2011: DOJ Civil Rights Division meeting with Islamic groups to discuss criminalizing criticism of Islam as “discrimination.”82

October 2011: Joint Chiefs of Staff issues action directive to screen trainers for military intelligence and psychological operations based solely on Ackerman’s Wired report.93

November 2011: White House responds to Muslim groups’ “purge” demand letter, agrees to set up inter-agency task force, including extremist Muslim groups, to oversee FBI counterterrorism training development.84

December 2011: Secretary of State Hillary Clinton holds closed door meeting with the OIC to advance the “Istanbul Process.”85

December 2011: Passage of UN Resolution 16/18 drafted by the OIC and backed by the U.S. The resolution sought limits on speech deemed “discriminatory” or defaming religion.86

January 2012: U.S. Military Academy at West Point cancels an address by a highly decorated founding member of Delta Force and former Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence, Jerry Boykin, after complaints from the Hamas front group CAIR.87

February 2012: Islamic groups meet with FBI to ensure compliance with demanded “Islamophobia” purge.88
March 2012: Judicial Watch files FOIA requests seeking records pertaining to FBI Director Mueller’s secret meetings with Islamists and the curricula purges.

July 2012: Judicial Watch files a FOIA lawsuit against the Department of Justice and the FBI in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia for records of Director Mueller’s secret meetings.

July 2012: Top DOJ Civil Rights official refuses to vow to Congress not to push Saudi-style blasphemy laws.

September 2012: Obama administration blames attacks on U.S. Embassy Cairo and the “Special Mission Compound” in Benghazi on a YouTube movie trailer.

September 2012: Encouraged by the Obama administration’s denunciation of a YouTube movie trailer, the OIC vows to push through a blasphemy resolution at UN, claiming that the film is part of a larger anti-Muslim conspiracy.

September 2012: In U.N. General Assembly speech, Obama repeats the YouTube movie trailer lie and goes on to say, ”The future does not belong to those who slander the prophet of Islam.”

D. Islamists and the Obama Administration

On Wednesday, October 19, 2011, activists and advocates from Islamist pressure groups met with officials from the Obama Justice Department, including the then-chief of the Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department, Thomas Perez, at George Washington University in Washington, DC. Islamist advocates demanded that the Justice Department reduce anti-terror priorities and funding; change agents’ training materials; restrict investigators from looking into certain Muslim-related subjects; and create a new legal declaration that any U.S. citizens’ criticism of Islam constitutes the crime of racial discrimination. Mr. Perez warmly received the Islamists demands and promised action.

Where the FDR administration had Harry Hopkins, Lauchlin Currie, Harry Dexter White and Alger Hiss – among others – to engage in espionage, subversion and influence operations as agents, “fellow travelers,” dupes and “useful idiots” for the
Soviet Union, so too, does the Obama administration have this generation’s agents of influence who would advance the interests of the Islamists.

The Obama administration has been penetrated by Islamist influence operators, seeking to advance an ideological agenda completely at odds with our constitutional system. The penetration is, in many cases, by the Obama administration's invitation. Some of the more public and controversial figures associated with the Obama administration have included:

- **Rashad Hussain** – *A Hafiz* (literally meaning "guardian," a person who has memorized the entire Koran), and U.S. Special Envoy to the OIC. He has a history of participating in events connected with the MB.

- **Huma Abedin** – Long-time personal aide to former Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton. She worked as assistant editor for the *Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs*, the publication of her parents’ Institute of Muslim Minority Affairs, purportedly studying Muslims in non-Muslim nations. Her late-father, mother and brother are all connected to MB organizations or operatives.\(^95\) She obtained “special government employee” status to “consult” with private firms such as Teneo Holdings and the Clinton Foundation while serving at the State Department. Judicial Watch has filed a lawsuit to obtain records concerning her special employment waiver status.

- **Daliah Mogahed** – An advisor to the White House Office of Faith-Based and Neighborhood Partnerships. Mogahed is founder and executive director of Gallup Center for Muslim Studies. Described as: “The most important person shaping the Obama Administration’s Middle East message.”\(^96\) Her 2009 book *Who Speaks for Islam?* is viewed by many as an apologia for the growing power and influence of radical Islamists. Mogahed is an unapologetic defender of unindicted terrorist conspirator organizations such as CAIR and ISNA.

- **Momamed Elibiary** – A Texas-based security consultant and Islamic cleric who was named to President Obama’s Homeland Security Advisory Council in 2010. He has close ties to a convicted Hamas fundraiser and other radical Islamist causes, including a nonprofit that proclaims sharia is the only legitimate law according to Islam (Assembly of Muslim Jurists of America). Elibiary has regular access to classified information and is a prime mover behind two of the Obama administration’s most dangerous
policies: normalizing relations with domestic and foreign Islamist groups (including the MB) and arduous enforcement restrictions of laws related to material support for terrorism. Elibiary reportedly leaked highly sensitive intelligence documents to a media outlet as part of the “Islamophobia” influence campaign. Judicial Watch obtained records from the Texas Department of Public Safety documenting Elibiary’s efforts to access to classified information.

- Mohamed Magid – Executive Director of the All Dulles Area Muslim Society (ADAMS), outside Washington, DC and President of the ISNA, an unindicted terrorist conspirator organization. Magid was appointed by President Obama to the Department of Homeland Security’s Countering Violent Extremism Working Group. From that position, Magid was key in influencing and directing the purge of training materials and policies in the FBI and other federal agencies. Magid is a regular visitor to the White House, and extremely influential on Islamic issues in the Obama administration.

V. Conclusions

- The country is less safe when we allow Islamists to tell the FBI how to train its agents and do its job. The Obama administration needs to stop putting the tender sensibilities of radical Islamists above the safety of the American people.

- The FBI’s purge of so called “offensive” material is political correctness run amok and it puts the nation at risk.

- The FBI is rewriting history in order to help AQ, the MB and their affiliates. This shows that the law enforcement agency is in need of serious top-to-bottom reform.

- It is fair to say that not a single U.S. government employee goes to work each morning with the mission of identifying and defeating the Islamists’ active measures campaigns. The United States does not have a security service focused, as Britain’s MI-5, at “defending the realm.” The CIA is organized primarily for foreign intelligence collection, and the FBI remains chiefly an organization dedicated to criminal investigations (even treating “terrorism” as a crime instead of a form of combat). No federal agency spends much
time, if any, on countering deception campaigns. The agencies are reticent to vigorously pursue internal security reviews and routine counterintelligence programs. Large bureaucratic institutions are reluctant to “disturb” operations with examinations for deception and manipulation. Those same organizations are loathe to raise those subjects in congressional appropriations requests and hearings fearing any political criticism. Until there is someone with the job of defeating the Islamist active measures campaign targeting our nation – and resourced to roll back the Islamists and win – the United States and her citizens are in grave peril.
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