

C-SPAN COMBATING TERRORISM

[BEGIN FILE]

[BACKGROUND VOICES]

FRANK GAFFNEY:

Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Thank you very much for joining us for what I hope will be a very memorable as well as consequential conversation about the war we're in and what we're going to need to prevail in it. My name is Frank Gaffney. I am the president for the Center for Security Policy, which is sponsoring this event and is very, very proud to have sponsored the production of a new study, I guess is one way of describing it, that is a prescription for waging and winning what we've come to call the war for the free world. We use that term because it seems best to describe what's at stake, which is truly nothing less than our lives, our liberties, and those of others who share our values. They are under assault by an enemy we have for most of the past fourteen years for sure, and arguably going back to 1979, refused pretty much to name – certainly to name in a consistent and authoritative way, and more to the point to understand what animates it and therefore what it will take to defeat it. So that is the purpose of this new product. We call it the Secure Freedom Strategy. It's been put together by a remarkable group of people, a number of whom you will be seeing and interacting with in the course of this program. It has been my pleasure to get to know and work with them over many years, in most cases, and to see in them something that was really needed to help generate such a strategy, such a winning program for this war for the free world. Because they bring to it unique and necessary skill sets. We think of it as kind of a tiger team – a term that has been made, of course, famous by the Special Forces over the years, that has as their concept of operations pulling together as needed people with the relevant skill sets to do a particular mission. In this case, we wanted warriors, people who had been at the pointy end of the spear, particularly in some of the more unconventional and asymmetric ways. Because that is, of course, part of the enemy threat we confront and it is part of what it is going to take us to mount to defeat it. We wanted people with extensive and varying expertise in national security policy and practice. Some of it having to do with the high order policy, some of it having to do with technology, some of it having to do with the law and the like. And then we also wanted people with specialisations in particularly important skill sets, economic warfare, for example, influence and information operations, counter-ideological programs, because at the end of the day, that's what this is about. We confront, to put it simply, a global jihad movement. It has, of course, varying forms and organisational structures, ranging from nation-states to proto nation-states to organisations, to groups, to individuals. But all of them are doing one thing. They are waging jihad. And they wage it in varying ways, which we will talk about in the course of this program. Violent and not so much non-violent as pre-violent. And they've waged it largely against us, as I say, going back at least to 1979 when, with the help of the then Carter administration, the government of Iran was overtaken by these jihadists. Underlying this jihad, animating it, demanding it and making it particularly toxic is the ideology that its adherents call shariah. We make very clear at several points in this strategy, we're not talking about Muslims who think of their practice of Islam in a personal, pietistic, non-threatening fashion when we discuss this term shariah. Instead we're using it as it has come to be known, practiced, and imposed by not just radicals as we're endlessly told, not just extremists, not just fundamentalists, but by the authorities of Islam. Our purpose today is to help inform a debate that has to begin as to how we are going to counter this jihad as it is not only happening in far reaches of the world, but increasingly in our allied capitols as well as we saw last week and indeed as was narrowly avoided apparently in our own. I'm very pleased to be able to present – unfortunately, it's kind of a Cecil B. DeMille production here, we have, I think, [LAUGHTER] eight or nine of the contributors to this sixteen member tiger team with us. I've asked each of them to make brief remarks because we want to basically expose you to pieces of this comprehensive strategy in which they are particularly expert and to which they have particularly contributed. But because it is a comprehensive strategy, there's a lot of those pieces. I'm hoping that General Jerry Boykin will join us. I know that he has some conflicts and if he does, we'll just fit him in where we can. But I'd like to start with the man you see on the screen via Skype. David Yerushalmi, one of the country's preeminent litigators, most especially on behalf of freedom. He is the co-founder and one of the driving forces behind a very important public interest law firm, the American Freedom Law Center. I'm proud to say he is a general counsel for our Center for Security Policy and an extraordinary authority on shariah and what kinds of steps this country can take to counter it. I'm very pleased to have him with us. David, if you'll take a couple of minutes to describe the enemy threat doctrine and why it is so important for us to understand it as part of being able to address it.

DAVID YERUSHALMI:

Well, thank you, Frank, and thank you all for being here. We begin with the fundamental [UNCLEAR] that we can only defeat the jihadist enemy if we understand their motivating doctrine and their strategic goals. If we listen to them, the jihadists, they all tell us – whether they're speaking Arabic, Pashtu, Farsi, Urdu, French, Russian, Chinese, or English for that matter, that they are merely carrying out the dictates of shariah or Islamic law. Given that shariah is the enemy's threat doctrine, we choose to orient on that threat to understand the enemy's strategy, strategic endgame, and even his tactical methodology. So what is shariah? Well, to begin, shariah is a very sophisticated and institutionalised jurisprudent and legal system developed from effectively the death of Mohammed and continues to this day. It of course

has been practiced and employed by empires, nation-states, tribes, informal communities, families and individuals differently over the years and in varying degrees of adherence. From the purely jurisprudential vantage, shariah is not very different from other legal systems. It has a constitutional core. That is, fundamental legal principles set out in the Koran and the Sunnah. The Koran, of course, is the scriptural text of Islam and the Sunnah are the oral traditions handed down from the generation that lived during the life of Mohammed. These oral traditions were memorialised in written form and literally graded as to authenticity and reliability. Providing a basis for the legal scholars, tools that some Sunnah traditions were sacred and others less so. Thus, the Sunnah operates as an authoritative gloss on Koranic scripture, both for explaining scripture and modifying it. Finally, there is the jurisprudence of the authoritative legal scholars who typically operated within recognised legal schools. So at the end of the day, you have a legal system that has a constitutional core, the Koran, and a canonised or authoritative Sunnah. None of which, according to the scholars, can be changed. However, lost unto this constitutional core, like any legal system – you have hundreds of years of interpretation by the legal elite. Referred to as the ulimah [PH]. And like any interpretive body they must play by the rules they themselves have set down. And one rule that exists in every legal system ever created is the rule of conservatism. That is to say, no legal system could exist, at least not for very long, if it could be amended or altered constantly and by fiat. If any individual could come along and change core constitutional principles and longstanding jurisprudential rules, you would have anarchy, not a legal system. That is why every legal system resists radical changes or reform –

FRANK GAFFNEY:

[OVERLAP] David, I'm afraid we're having quality control problem with the Skype at the moment. If you might suspend – I'm afraid some of that was being garbled, but I think the key piece of it that you may express is, this is not something that is a product of some people hijacking a religion. This is central to and developed over a great period of time by, as I said, the authorities of the faith. Would you just make a concluding statement so we can see if we can capture that?

DAVID YERUSHALMI:

Okay. So the fundamental difference, though, between a shariah system and any other legal system is that the adherents understand shariah to be fundamentally divine. And any time you have a legal system that is fundamentally divine, it creates two real problems. One is, men cannot change the divine word. So the fundamental core principles of shariah, the establishment of a global caliphate, jihad, these cannot be modified by men. The second problem is that it creates a recruitment base based not upon patriotism, but religious zealotry. And martyrdom. Those two problems, the fact that a system can't be changed if it's the divine word of God and, two, that its adherents are motivated by something more than a secular patriotism for their country creates two critical problems in dealing with the threat from shariah.

FRANK GAFFNEY:

David, thank you very much. This is important context and just emphasizing, again, we believe this is the fault line between Muslims who are a problem and those who are not. There are many who will espouse shariah as this code David has described, its objectives, its purposes, but may not be personally prepared to go engage in the jihad to impose it on others. But they may well be prepared to support – in material or other fashions, that effort. So we focus on shariah, that ideology, and the need to counter it as a centerpiece of this Secure Freedom Strategy. Let me call next on my colleague Clare Lopez. Now a senior vice-president with the Center for Security Policy, responsible for our research and analysis activities. She was instrumental to helping herd these many cats in getting this tiger team's work together, and I'm very grateful to you for that. She brings to the tiger team and the work more generally she does extraordinarily deep knowledge on matters involving intelligence, its tradecraft as well as its purposes. And I was hoping she would share with us some of her insights into how the various parts of this ummah, as it calls itself, interact and are prepared to overlook differences they may have on points of theology and ethnic, other considerations, in furtherance of this agenda.

CLARE LOPEZ:

Well, thank you, Frank. Thanks to all of you for being here today. We really appreciate that you've come to join us as we roll out this new strategy. I'll take just a couple of minutes, perhaps, then, to discuss why we're calling this a global jihad movement. As Frank alluded to it, we are talking about a movement that is worldwide and it has various different aspects that define it as worldwide, as global. Number one, because of the way that David Yerushalmi just described the shariah, the law of Islam that unites the ideology under a corpus of law, all Muslims who hold themselves to be faithful to the shariah, therefore are compelled, are impelled to pursue jihad. They are obligated to do that every bit as much as Christians and Jews are obligated to follow the Ten Commandments. Whether all do so or not is another question. So you have this unifying ideology that makes it global. And indeed, as David also said, those who are our enemies on the field of battle, every one of these groups that we name so openly, like al-Qaeda, like the Islamic State, when they make their videos and they publish their online magazines, *Inspire* in the case of al-Qaeda, *Dabiq* in the case of the Islamic

State, they make very clear that what they do is in obedience to the shariah. They don't mince words on that. Neither do some of the imams that you might see on local media, Anjem Choudary comes to mind as one who frequently talks about this. But what they are all admitting is that they are unified by this ideology. So in that sense, it is a unified ideology that we face. Secondly, because Muslims look at the world, those who are faithful to shariah look at the world as having two parts. One is the dar al-Islam. Those are the places where Islamic law is enforced. Shariah is enforced. Dar al-Harb are those places where it is not. Therefore, under the law, Muslims who follow jihad are obligated to try to conquer the dar al-Harb, the part of the world that is not under Islamic law and to bring it forcibly or by stealth, by guile, under that unified law. And that means that enemies we sometimes perceive as discreet and separate, the Sunnis and the Shiites, for example, on this issue and at the macro level, really can be unified. They do work together. Obviously, we know, for example, that Iran, a jihadist state by its own constitution, was instrumental in assisting al-Qaeda in the attacks of 9-11. So was Hezbollah, Iran's Shiite terrorist proxy. And so we see the Shiites and the Sunnis coming together even though they have differences that are particular within the shariah, they come together at the macro level when it is a question of opposing non-Muslims and working together to force them under the rubric of Islamic law. So that is the Sunni/Shiite. Now groups as well at the lower level, al-Qaeda works with Hezbollah. Hezbollah is at least a tacit and a kind of ally with Hamas when it comes to opposing Israel. These are Shiites, these are Sunnis. And yet they work together towards these same objectives because they share the same ideology, the ideology of jihad. Now I wanted also to mention just very quickly in terms of our perception of the global jihad movement that while this alliance is sometimes formalised and sometimes looser or opportunistic, it is consistent and has been consistent over a period of centuries. Thirteen hundred plus years since we are told the death of Mohammed occurred. And so they may not in every case, every instance, every battlefield, be working together – and indeed, we see in places like Syria and Iraq, that they oppose and fight one another at a certain level, but again, at the macro level and opportunistically, they will work together against the West and all of those who believe in individual liberty and the things that we hold dear in this country. Finally, I wanted to mention that there is a broader alliance not just of terrorist organisations, but this goes all the way down to the individual jihad level, too. There are many individuals as we're now seeing, unfortunately, in places like the United States included, but Western countries, Australia, Canada, Western Europe, where individuals who may not even have ever belonged to any military, ever trained with al-Qaeda or the Islamic State, or perhaps maybe they did receive some training from them but are not formal members of those organisations properly speaking, and yet, as with Alton Nolen, for example, in Moore, Oklahoma, we saw last year, a Muslim convert converted to Islam in prison, who had never been to a battlefield, never participated in a military, and yet he saw himself as a member of the ummah. Ummah is an Arabic word meaning the international global Muslim community. He saw his allegiance to that ummah more than he felt himself to be a citizen with allegiance to the United States of America and our constitution. And what this individual did, as we all know, was to attack and kill two women at his food processing plant in Oklahoma there and behead one of them before he was killed. So you have individuals throughout the world who answer the call to shariah and answer the call to jihad whether or not they are identified as a member of a group or an organisation. And then finally we have others who aren't even affiliated with Islam and we address some of these in the paper, too, who are perhaps within certain functional spheres, you might call them financial spheres – cyber world is something we pay a lot of attention to in the paper, the cyber warfare aspect, which is brand new. So there are functional members of this who ally themselves, again, on an opportunistic basis with the international global jihad, who might not even be Muslim. But some of them and many of them are. So macro level, the jihad, individual jihad level, and then this broader global level. These are the threats we face. These are the different things that we're addressing in the paper. And thank you very much.

FRANK GAFFNEY:

Thank you, Clare. I neglected to mention, I'm afraid, that Clare is a career intelligence officer who served in the clandestine services of the United States Central Intelligence Agency and, again, brings a wealth of expertise. I think this point about whether these are self-radicalising folks or lone wolves is something that you really very nicely dispatched. These are people who've embraced, as many have, this fundamental shariah doctrine and are acting on its call to jihad. Next, we have on Skype – I hope with a somewhat better connection and I do apologise for the one that David was subjected to there, Tommy Waller, a combat Marine force recon veteran, now reservist, very, very pleased to say he's a new addition to the Center for Security Policy's team as the director of our state outreach efforts. Tommy has some insights as a man who has been not only at the pointy end of the spear, but very recently confronting this problem we've been discussing, the lack of clarity about the threat, the enemy and its doctrine. Tommy Waller, welcome. Glad to have you with us.

TOMMY WALLER:

Thank you, Frank. Ladies and gentlemen, the first thing I have to tell you is that I'm addressing you as Tommy Waller, an employee of the Center for Security Policy. And not as Major Waller, a commissioned officer in the reserve component of the Marine Corps. Now why is it that I have to make that distinction? Well, it saddens me to say that if I were currently in an active duty status, I would have to refrain from speaking about factual information about this ideology, shariah. The very ideology that threatens our way of life. Because my words might be offensive. Ladies and gentlemen, I took an oath to the Constitution of the United States to defend it against all enemies, foreign and domestic.

And when those that take an oath cannot be taught about the threat to our constitution, which is both foreign and domestic, our nation is in grave peril. Now I've deployed, as an active duty Marine, to numerous theatres of operations. I've faced the global jihad movement on their turf. And yet I was never taught what animated those jihadists. Still to this day, if you attend a formal military school, you'll find that there's never mention of the ideology that animates our enemies. We speak in terms like violent extremist organisations. We never nail down the facts about what animates these organisations or, as Clare mentioned, individuals that subscribe to the ideology. I recently attended a school that was nearly a year long, a formal military school for commissioned officers, at the field grey level. And in ten plus months, we covered information operations for less than an hour. And our case study was the communist insurgency and how we conducted propaganda operations against it in Vietnam. I mean, you know, it's mind-boggling to me how our enemies maintain absolute information dominance. But it makes sense if that's the curriculum that we have in our military's formal schools. I've been, up until this point, shocked and saddened by – and almost bewildered by the absolute void in factual analysis of our enemy on behalf of the national security community. And what we face today is tantamount to the military of the Cold War being prevented from studying communism. You know, being prevented from studying the ideology that they face on a battlefield. And so it's my sincere hope that my generation and those that follow it can recover the courage that our previous generation had to study the ideology of the enemy. And like I say, I've been saddened and shocked and bewildered, although I have to say that the Secure Freedom Strategy gives me hope. I think it's the first step in our generation to doing a major course correction. And my personal request on behalf of the men and women who have given the ultimate sacrifice to that constitution, in defense of that constitution, on behalf of them, my request is that we embrace this strategy. Because we owe it to the generations that went before us and those that will follow us.

FRANK GAFFNEY:

Tommy, thank you. That was very moving. And deeply appreciated as is your service to the country in both your uniform capacity and to the Center. I want to turn – speaking of some of the points that Tommy's just made, to one of the people who I think is truly a national resource on questions of ideology, information operations, the influence activities of our enemies, particularly in that domestic sphere but also overseas. He is Dr. J. Michael Waller. Mike is a senior fellow at the Center for Security Policy and deeply knowledgeable from a period going back to the Reagan years about counter-ideological warfare. How hostile ideologies operate against us and how we can do a needed job of countering them. Mike Waller? Do you want to come up to the mike? Thank you for joining us.

J. MICHAEL WALLER:

Thank you, Frank. Thank you. This is the fight that really we're going to lose until we hit the ideology at its core. Just like we were not going to win the Cold War against the Soviets until the Soviet leadership itself lost confidence in its own ideology. And that happened when Alexander Yakovlev, the ideology chief of the Soviet communist party central committee, himself lost complete confidence in their ideology and proved to be our – one of our most important, if unsung, allies in the Cold War victory. He could not have and would not have been motivated to do what he did had we not on our side had a system and a leadership that was committed to fighting this ideological battle on a national strategic level because he needed to know that he was – that his nation and his government was being pushed from the outside and was going to lose unless they managed their own descent properly. And that was the advent of glasnost and perestroika. Which, as imperfect as they were, were decisive for the whole security of the world. And it ended up essentially doing away with the Moscow sponsored communist subversion going around the world. You can draw a very similar parallel to things today where you do have ideological cores, you have al-Azhar University in Egypt, you have various places in Iran and Saudi Arabia, you have financial support centers like the government of Qatar and the al-Thani family who have a huge global propaganda apparatus to discredit us, cause us not to believe what we believe in about ourselves, set ourselves against one another, and give moral support to the enemy. You have various bankers and members of royal families of other Gulf states and so forth that continue to be the command and control of this ideological jihad worldwide. But we don't really want to think of it that way. We don't want to look at it. We don't want to tackle it. After all, we have a big military presence in Qatar, so they're actually our friends. Right? So we look at it that way. Meanwhile the – some of the other Gulf states are seeing these ideologies that they supported and funded or at least sympathised with, are realising that these jihad movements are a threat to them and to their material well being and that their heads are going to roll soon. So you had the current ailing king of Saudi Arabia, recently fired the whole ideological leadership of jihad in the Saudi government. These ministers had been in place since the 1990s, many of them. Where this is going to go, we don't know. But we do see something happening within the heart of the funding aspects of the global jihad movement. You have a lot of hostility now between Saudi Arabia and the UAE and others on one hand, against the al-Thani family and Qatar and whose side is the United States really generally on? We're there, seen as the military defenders of the command and control of at least Sunni jihad in Qatar. You have the president of Egypt now who has done more to smash the Muslim Brotherhood than any other person alive. And he has – imagine, he's arrested and successfully imprisoned the whole leadership of the Brotherhood, hundreds of their supporters, the former president of the country who was a Brotherhood agent, who took advantage of the disorganised, US backed revolution against Mubarak and so forth. So are we – what kind of support or encouragement is the United States giving people like this? Zero. Zero. And he – even on two weeks ago, went to al-Azhar University and told the leading

theoreticians and trainers of the global jihad movement at al-Azhar University, knock it off. You're creating a worldwide backlash against us all. You're making the whole world fear and hate all of us Muslims. Knock it off and start reversing it. We'll see how that goes, but he's actually literally marked himself and his whole family for death with this kind of activity. Yet we're not there, giving any kind of support here and we don't have the trained and motivated intellectual and professional base here in the State Department or the intelligence community or DOD or wherever else. Because ideological warfare is something that we're uncomfortable with. Anyway, it's a low cost, high impact strategic solution to a lot of our problems. It should not be delegated to the battalion level in Army PSYOP, because that's not where it belongs. Yet that's where the most trained and motivated and informed people are and a lot of them are trained and motivated that way because they trained themselves in learning about this ideology. So you have some intellectual ferment within the Army and military overall, mainly in the Special Operations area, but not at the national strategic level. And certainly we don't have Muslim leadership in this country like, say, the mayor of Rotterdam, who has been very strongly and colourfully defensive about freedoms for immigrants and people in traditionally secular or Christian and Protestant countries like the Netherlands. So this is a solution that we have. We have – we still have the people alive who designed the program against the Soviet Union, who know how to do it, who have done it, some folks even at the operational level against the Nazis in World War Two. So there's a strong, strong support base as well as a lot of alliances that we can make, both tactical and strategic, within the Muslim world that we have simply been ignoring.

FRANK GAFFNEY:

Thank you. I failed to mention that Michael is a professor by training and he is, as he said, he could have gone on all day and very usefully so. I'm sorry to keep it short. Can I just make one point on the basis of what he said? When the president of Egypt wanted to disavow and suppress those who are creating in the world the image of Islam as a jihadist enterprise seeking the destruction of everybody else, he did not go to seek out radicals in various groups that we hear so much about. He went to al-Azhar University. Some call it the Vatican of Islam. Because the authorities of Islam are those who embrace this shariah program and are promoting it and it is they who must be countered as well, unless and until they heed his admonitions and hopefully change course. We have another combat veteran, I'm very pleased to say, on the staff of the Center for Security Policy. Another senior fellow of ours is Jim Hanson, a former technical weapons sergeant in the Army Special Forces. Jim has many skill sets and attributes that have been brought to bear on behalf of this project. Specifically, I wanted him to speak to this point about Peace Through Strength. Which of course, was the hallmark of President Reagan's strategy in National Security Decision Directive 75. But also is a centerpiece of what we're proposing as part of the Secure Freedom Strategy. Jim Hanson.

JIM HANSON:

Thank you, Frank. Hello, everyone. As Frank introduced me and as my background might suggest, I am a strong proponent of killing terrorists anyplace we can find them anywhere on the planet. No apologies made. And I think we're not doing a good enough job of it. I think anyone who flies the black flag and kills innocents to further an ideology or a political cause should be declared *hostis humani generis*, enemies of all mankind. Having said that and having watched and done a happy dance every time a terrorist gets returned to their component molecules [LAUGHTER] that's a tactic, not a strategy. That's not enough. They need to know we're going to do it. They need to know in no uncertain terms that if you decide that your religion compels you to kill innocents, to force them to submit, to force them to live under your law, we will oppose you. And that is a fundamental piece that we can bring to the puzzle. But it's just a piece. Everyone else at this table and the rest of the co-authors of this have brought was is absolutely necessary and that is a recognition that we cannot simply kill our way to victory. We need to counter ideas. It is a war of ideas. It is a war for the free world. And we need to be able to stand up and say, their ideology is wrong and ours is right. Freedom, liberty, the fundamental principles that the United States was founded on. The reason we are the exceptional nation. We need to stand up and say that. And unfortunately, as Tommy mentioned, when we fought the Cold War – and I spent a couple of years serving under Ronald Reagan, we studied communism. We knew how to oppose them. We knew why our system was better than theirs. And the difference between Ronald Reagan standing up and telling Gorbachev to tear down that wall and president Obama standing in the White House and saying that the Islamic State is not Islamic could not be more stark. The first thing you have to do, it's in every twelve-step program, admit you have a problem. [LAUGHTER] We have a problem. It's radical Islam. They've declared war on us. And until we do the same thing, we need to fight their ideology and we need to fight their foot soldiers. Until we do that, we accomplish nothing. That's why we have a strategy. Killing terrorists is a tactic. This is a strategy. We have the right minds, economic warfare, information operations, cultural warfare, we need to enlist Hollywood, we need to give them a reason to believe that our way is better and that maybe their next generation won't put their women in potato sacks. Won't oppress them. Won't sell them into slavery. Won't do all the things that are being done in the name of that radical ideology right now. Because they can see they'd rather live like us than in the poverty and oppression that every Islamic state brings right now. So we got a plan. Pay attention.

FRANK GAFFNEY:

Indeed. Next we have a man who can speak to a part of this strategy that I think is every bit as important as the ones that

we've discussed so far. It's certainly proved to be in President Reagan's National Security Decision Directive 75 and its execution. The economic warfare element. Kevin Freeman is a characterized financial analyst. He is a man with great background and skill sets in the business of finance, understands the economy better than just about anybody I know and certainly understands the extent to which our economy is being subjected to, today, and has in the past been subjected to economic warfare by, among others, these folks adhering to shariah. Kevin is the author of two bestselling books. *Secret Weapon: How Economic Terrorism Attacked the US Stock Market and Why It Can Happen Again*. And *Game Plan: How To Protect Yourself From the Coming Cyber Economic Attack*. I commend both of them to you. And I'm delighted to have Kevin as a senior fellow at the Center for Security Policy also and the founder of the new National Security Investment Consultants Institute. Kevin Freeman, welcome and thank you for your contributions to this effort.

KEVIN FREEMAN:

Thank you, Frank. I'm happy to be here. We are in the midst of a global economic war. Everything else that's been described so far at this conference is accurate, but it goes beyond that. Our economy is under direct assault. It's under assault in five different ways. General economic disruption, currency, oil, cyber, and market manipulation. And all five of those areas have been named and targeted by radical jihadists. Jihad is involved in *Resurgence* magazine, which was published in October of this year – or last year, describes specifically the intent to target Western infrastructure. To target our oil industry, to target our economy. It is a direct assault. And 9-11 was nothing more than an economic attack. It killed three thousand people, but they were selected because of their importance to the economy. Currency. Al-Qaeda has called for revoking the dollar as the global reserve currency. And they've made efforts, including those mentioned in the 2005 timeline that was given to Fouad Hussein that outlined all of the things they wanted to do, one of them was to start the Arab Spring and shortly thereafter, they wanted to hit the American dollar and they wanted to do electronic attacks against our infrastructure. So we're in the midst of an economic war from a currency standpoint. The oil standpoint, we're also – if you pick up the papers, you see comments from the Saudi Arabian oil minister where he says, we must break the US shale industry. Oil pricing is manipulated, has been since the early 1970s. OPEC has conducted embargoes. We used this as a tool against the Soviet Union. It is currently being used as a tool against Russia, Iran, and perhaps the United States shale industry. ISIS has plans to capture and – either capture and control or burn the Arab oil fields. The fourth area is cyber. It's also robust and serious. It is beyond cyber graffiti, which was the description that was applied when CENTCOM had their social media hacked. This was a huge PR coup for ISIS. It showed our ineptness and it showed their capabilities. They used it for recruiting and they've used it to cause mayhem. It also shows that we haven't been taking the cyber element as seriously as we should. And if you think that capturing the Twitter account is meaningless, all you have to look is back a year ago when the Syrian electronic army captured the AP Twitter feed and when they did that, they sent out a tweet that the White House had been hit and the stock market lost a hundred billion dollars of value in a matter of a minute. And the fifth area is market manipulation. And that's an area I've specialised in. There are dark pools, there is cyber, there is naked short selling, there are derivatives, and there is shariah compliant finance, which is particularly troublesome because in shariah compliant finance, essentially people are giving money to a shariah scholar. They have no idea how they're – how they're investing that money or what they're doing with that money because it's a big black box. And that's not me saying this. This is the Arab press complaining about the international shariah compliant finance industry. By the way, there's 1.6 trillion dollars of shariah compliant finance today. If they were to manipulate or use that money to attack our markets, which I believe some of that took place in 2008 and was part of the explanation for the stock market crash that we had. So we have to have a response. It's outlined in the report. We realise it's a global economic war. We create a national energy policy, we mobilise resources, and it created – which includes repatriating foreign tax earnings from American corporations, simplifying the tax code, all those things that would improve and could enhance our economy. Make it a national priority and develop offensive capabilities. And among those, we need to do national briefings like this one to the social media, to Twitter, to Google, to the national banking systems, the major banks. Bottom line, we are in a global economic war, it's a component of a jihadist war being waged against us. It's time we got into the war and recognised the economic side of it.

FRANK GAFFNEY:

Kevin, thank you very much. I just want to say a particular word of thanks for your efforts to help us think this through and the energy piece of it, most especially, I think some of the recommendations here that talk about countering the Saudis ongoing explicit war against our energy sector are especially important as part of both understanding where they line up and also what we need to do to assure our security, part and parcel of the Secure Freedom Strategy. Next up, we have Fred Fleitz. You may have seen him on Bill O'Reilly last night and heard about this press conference as a result of him being there. But Fred is another of our very esteemed colleagues, another career intelligence professional with twenty years of service in the Central Intelligence Agency. He is an analyst, worked for then-undersecretary of State, Ambassador John Bolton, and then served as a member of the professional staff of the House Intelligence Committee under former chairman Pete Hoekstra. Fred has been instrumental in the piece of this that is the intelligence part, a very important aspect of President Reagan's strategy back in 1983. And very much a part of what we need to be doing to counter the global jihad movement and its shariah doctrine. Fred Fleitz.

FRED FLEITZ:

This strategy we have here is based on NSDD-75, signed by President Reagan in 1982 to help us defeat a totalitarian threat. The threat from the Soviet Union. And it was a strategy that engaged all elements of the United States government, the State Department, the Pentagon. We had economic strategy and we had intelligence. And I just want to talk briefly about the intelligence arm of this and why it's important. I was on the House Intelligence Committee for five years. And I remember a very strange briefing by the director of national intelligence in 2010. When James Clapper – it was an open hearing and you probably heard about this – James Clapper came to the hearing and he said that the Muslim Brotherhood was not a serious threat to the United States. And was mostly a social welfare organisation. [LAUGHTER] The members were stunned. The members were stunned on a bipartisan basis. Now, we need to engage all elements of the US intelligence community to fight the global jihad movement. Now this just doesn't mean better analysis and better collection. Of course it does. It also means reversing the damage done to our government, specifically to the intelligence community. We have an annual report issued by the intelligence community on worldwide threats. It's usually issued every February. Big, unclassified press conference that the director of national intelligence, CIA director, other officials come, it's a big deal, in front of several congressional committees. Read that report. Try to find the term homegrown terrorist. You won't find it. Because we now use the politically correct term, homegrown radical extremist. Now this type of perversion of terms is affecting the ability of the intelligence community to identify the threat and make recommendations on how to counter the threat. If the intelligence community doesn't recognise the Muslim Brotherhood as a threat, if it won't be honest about homegrown terrorism – and we could go on whether there really is such a thing, whether they're really being directed by radical Islamists abroad – they're not going to provide the information that the president needs to defeat this threat. We need objective analysis. We need analysts to call it like they see it. That's how I was trained to be an analyst when I joined the Central Intelligence Agency under the directorship of William Casey. And finally, we have to look at intelligence collection methods and how we can step them up to gather better intelligence against the jihadist enemy. Leaks hurt us severely. Because when a key intelligence system is leaked, we may never be able to replace it. A system that we spent billions of dollars developing, we may be able to spend billions to replace, but in many cases, it will never be replaced. We have to assess the damage done by leaks, especially since this administration came into office. We also have to take an honest look at the surveillance methods that were leaked by Edward Snowden. I know that these methods have saved lives and have stopped terrorist attacks. And I think that there's much less interest in rolling back most of those programs because of what's happened in France and because of what's happened in Iraq and Syria over the last few months. But there's still a struggle to gain the confidence of the American people in these methods. But also maintain them so they can continue to keep us safe against the radical jihadist movement. So we have a lot of work ahead of us. This program has a lot of recommendations on how we can fix the intelligence side of things and let's hope we make some progress on it.

FRANK GAFFNEY:

I am trying to establish whether General Boykin is going to be able to make it and if he can't, then our last presenter will be a distinguished military officer of great renown, former four star Navy admiral, James “Ace” Lyons. Admiral Lyons has been the chairman of the Center's military committee for five or six years now, I think it is. And I never cease to be amazed at his industry, his energy, his clarity of thought, and particularly how he understands – in part, on the basis of hard experience, the nature of this challenge we face today and the kinds of things laid out with his help in this strategy that need to be undertaken to address it. I've asked him to sort of be the cleanup batter for this set of presentations. I appreciate everyone's brevity and hopefully we'll give you some time for questions before we have to break. But I did just want to say that he has been there, truly, going toe to toe with these jihadists way back from the beginning of this phase of the war for the free world and I've asked him to illuminate some of that for us as well. Admiral Lyons, welcome, sir. Thank you for being here.

JAMES “ACE” LYONS:

Okay, Frank, thank you. Well, first, I want to thank you all for being here today. I got to tell you, never in my lifetime did I believe I would be witness to this great country being taken down and withdrawn from our world leadership position by our own administration. The transformation of America has been in the full swing ever since 2008. President Obama's no-show in Paris was an embarrassment for all Americans. But it also was a signal to the Islamic jihadis. It's one of many signals he's sent over the years while he's in office. Now there's no question, we got a hell of a job ahead of us. With the Muslim Brotherhood, penetration in every one of our national security agencies, including all of our intelligence agencies, and as has been reported by some, our lead intelligence agency headed by a Muslim convert, this is not going to be an easy task. Now we've had many opportunities over the years to change the course of history. And as Frank had mentioned, starting with Jimmy Carter, when the Iranians took over our embassy. We could have cut off Islamic fundamentalism on the knees. But we did not act. He rejected what could have been a very dramatic action with minimum involvement and it would have been dead. We've had other opportunities. Such as the Marines barracks bombing. Everybody wondered why we never responded. You know, I won't go into all those details in the interest of brevity – and Frank's shaking his head, he's getting ready to give me the hook. But I have to tell you, we could have changed the course of history then. But it became Osama bin Laden's rallying cry. So here we are today.

Political correctness has neutralised all our military leadership. You know, I don't know how many of you saw Les Gail's [PH] article yesterday, any of you see it? He called for the entire firing of the entire executive branch of government. Unheard of. Including Valerie Jarrett. Of course, he left one person out. The one man who really determines the policy. Now we have a new congress. They were elected to stop the transformation of America. Not to see how they could work with the president. This is pure nonsense. You know, we've been saying – people describe the threat, the threat is Islam. Let's make no mistake about that. There is no such thing as radical Islam. Because I'd like somebody to give me a definition of moderate Islam. There ain't any. So and I think it was Erdogan of Turkey who said it best. Islam is Islam. There are no modifiers. We've looked for a leader to come stand up and try to modify Islam and it was previously mentioned here, on New Year's Day, President el-Sisi, standing before all the leading Sunni clerics called for a reformation of Islam. Monumental. He then went to celebrate Christmas Mass at a Coptic church. And pledged to rebuild all the churches. Clearly, he better bring his insurance policies up to date. But this is momentum. And the administration didn't even give it the tip of the hat. Absolutely no acknowledgment. So it certainly tells you where their sympathies lie. It is up to this congress, they've been given the mantle, we are giving them the game plan on how to proceed and prevent the transformation of this great country. Thanks very much.

FRANK GAFFNEY:

Let me just say for myself and I think perhaps for others on our tiger team, the formulation that I personally prefer over characterising all of Islam as one thing or another is that it is this shariah program within Islam that is the heart of the problem. Because we certainly know of people who believe they're practicing their faith in a manner that is consistent with the teachings of Islam that don't follow shariah. So I personally am inclined to eschew the idea that it is all of Islam, but it is important to say, as I indicated earlier – and David Yerushalmi may wish to join in on this again if we've still got him and the sound is okay, it is the authorities of Islam, like those that the admiral just mentioned at al-Azhar who are insistent that shariah is Islam. So if fault is to be found on this count, I would urge the mirror be held up to them. With that, we will pause in further remarks by us and take any questions that you all may have. If you would be so kind as to introduce yourselves and any organisational affiliation you may have, that would be a help to us. If you wish to direct the question to one of us, that would also be welcome. If not, we'll just see who has the best answer. Yes, sir? Stand by for the mike if you would, please.

PAT SPANN:

Hi, Pat Spann [PH], just myself. I was wondering what the opinion of the panel is on – I see, once their donors were threatened, Duke backed down on having the call to prayer today at one o'clock. Amazing how that works with colleges. But the – I'm curious, is that, now is that viewed just as some Islamophobic victory or, I mean, how do you view that? Is that a positive thing for our cause? Or is that a negative that Duke backed down?

FRANK GAFFNEY:

Clare is grabbing a mike, so we'll start with you.

CLARE LOPEZ:

Yeah, thank you for the question. That refers to, as you may have heard, the decision earlier by Duke University to allow Muslim students on campus to chant the Muslim call to prayer today, Friday, jummah prayers from the bell tower of the chapel, the Christian chapel on campus at Duke. And then after the outcry and especially a statement from Frank Graham – is that, Franklin Graham, and a lot of other public opinion was negative about that. It's really important that they did not allow that to happen. And here's why. When a Muslim prayer, especially the Friday prayers, are said, are chanted, are spoken on the grounds of another faith's place of worship, in this case a Christian chapel, in the mind of Islam, in the doctrine and certainly the history of Islam, that claims that place, that church, that temple, that synagogue, whatever it may be, for Islam. You may recall that a short time ago, a couple of months, the Friday prayers were said at the National Cathedral in downtown Washington, DC. Clearly, the leadership of that cathedral thought that they were being open, inviting and tolerant. What that did, though, was allow Islamic prayers, which, by the way, in the Friday prayers are spoken lines, verses, that distinctly criticise, condemn the followers of Christianity and Judaism as those who have followed the wrong path, those who have angered Allah, and those prayers spoken in a place like that traditionally – and this goes back for centuries upon centuries, claims that place for Islam. It didn't happen at Duke and that's a good thing.

FRANK GAFFNEY:

May I just make one point on this? Because I don't think in what we've said today we adequately addressed it. There is, in addition to this violent jihad aimed at imposing upon us shariah blasphemy laws or, more broadly, the second class status that has come to be known popularly as dhimmitude. But one other facet of what is afoot here, notably as a prime purpose of the Muslim Brotherhood inside our country, dating back to 1963 when they started the first front

organisation here called the Muslim Students Association, but also this organisation, supranational organisation called the Organisation of Islamic Cooperation, is to impose through stealth or a civilization jihad as the Brotherhood calls it, this broader shariah agenda. And my view is that this campaign, Duke's just being the most recent example, the National Cathedral being another, to penetrate and subvert under their rubric of interfaith dialogue and bridge-building with non-Muslim communities of faith, is part and parcel of the larger program the admiral touched on of subverting all of our civil society institutions as well as our governing agencies. In fact, we are rolling out now – we just published the first edition at the Center for Security Policy, something we're calling our civilization jihad reader series. The first was on the court system. Something that David Yerushalmi has been instrumental in helping us understand and counter with a piece of legislation he helped devise called American Laws for American Courts to counter the effort to subvert us from within by bringing shariah into American courts as we now see in Britain where there are actually eighty-seven shariah law courts operating side by side with British common law ones. So I just wanted to make this point why this is important to my way of thinking, is any time we see people learning about and pushing back against this effort very skillfully, very seditiously, really, to penetrate and subvert us from within. They say in their own doctrinal, well doctrinal but strategic plan that was introduced into evidence in the Holy Land Foundation, their mission in America – the Muslim Brotherhood – is to destroy Western Civilization from within by our hands and the hands of the believers. David, did you want to add anything to this point? No, we can't hear you.

DAVID YERUSHALMI:

Am I on?

FRANK GAFFNEY:

You're on. And clear.

DAVID YERUSHALMI:

Okay. I don't want to add an awful lot. But the point that Clare made and that you're making now is that there is subtlety at work and that is the underlying principle –

FRANK GAFFNEY:

Well, David, the sound is just terrible, I'm sorry to say. We could read your lips, but not very well, so I think we'll just let it go at that. Anybody else on the panel who wanted to add anything? If not, we'll go to the next question. Yes, ma'am. If you would identify yourself.

PENNY STARR:

Penny Starr, CNS News, I have two quick questions. One is, we've heard a lot of terms, jihad and terrorist and Islam –

FRANK GAFFNEY:

– and shariah.

PENNY STARR:

– and shariah. And I want to know, then, you know, to defeat the enemy you have to know your enemy, what do we call the enemy specifically? And the second quick question, is that there's a lot of talk about terror cells, both in Europe and now even in the United States and I wondered if you could address that, thank you.

FRANK GAFFNEY:

Mike, would you like to take that?

J. MICHAEL WALLER:

Yeah, it's not something that our whole group has agreed on, so I'm just speaking for myself, but for me, fighting a political warfare, you find, you have to find where your tactical allies will also go along with something that you can all agree on. And in this case, you have senior Islamic leaders around the world who finally are calling these enemies jihadists. So I think we can at least begin on that common point of agreement. And then force these others to, you know, put them on the defensive, but as long as we beat around the bush, we're not going to get anywhere.

FRANK GAFFNEY:

And again, terror, as I think Jim was saying, is a tactic and if it's jihad that they are about, calling them that rather than terror cells is to clarify and enable you to do something about it. Admiral? Did you have –

JAMES “ACE” LYONS:

Yeah. The first thing is [BACKGROUND VOICES] stop calling Islam a religion of peace. I mean, that would be a great first step. I mean, it's a totalitarian ideology for world conquest under one religion. It's a political movement masquerading as a religion. And until you can come to grips with that, you're not going to defeat the enemy.

FRANK GAFFNEY:

Anybody else? Jim?

JIM HANSON:

One thing I'd like to add, there's been a lot of attacks recently by “lone wolves”. Better known as known wolves. And the bottom line is, it doesn't matter what flag they fly, it's not like al-Qaeda is handing out union cards. If they fly the black flag of jihad, they're the bad guys. If we call them jihadis, I don't care. But they're all working for the same thing. So let's quit pretending that somehow these people just popped up out of nowhere. They have a motivational force. They say it out loud. Let's take them at their word.

FRANK GAFFNEY:

When – this bears emphasis, they are working towards the same thing being basically two prime goals. The imposition of shariah worldwide. And the creation of some kind of governing entity, it's become best known by the Sunni term caliphate, to rule the world according to shariah. And whether it's al-Qaeda or the Islamic State or Boko Haram or al-Shabaab or the al-Nusra Front or Jamaat Islamiyah or the Muslim Brotherhood, that is the shared purpose of these global jihadists. And that is what makes this such a really toxic threat and must be addressed, we hope in the ways that we've described. Yes, sir? In the back?

MEYER COSTA:

Meyer Costa [PH], ABM News Agency. Most of the speakers spoke about – about political correctness as the problem. I know it's a very, very, very broad question, but is there anything that can be done about political correctness?

J. MICHAEL WALLER:

We get to vote every four years. That's helpful. [LAUGHTER]

FRANK GAFFNEY:

That's a political corrective. [LAUGHTER]

JAMES “ACE” LYONS:

Well, yeah, the one thing you can do, you can make military leadership live up to their oath of office. That's a good first step. And, of course, facing this – we didn't really touch on it, but the unilateral disarmament of our military just didn't happen by chance. The economic meltdown that Kevin talked about, you know, really was the perfect storm for Obama to implement the unilateral disarmament of our military. And that's what's been going on. All this faculty lounge crap about how we're going to handle future disputes through negotiations, they forgot one important element. The only thing that makes diplomatic negotiations work is a strong military. Cause they know if they don't conform, we're going to hammer them. Right now, we've been put on the defensive of that. All of that has to be turned around by this congress. The social engineering that has gone on with our military forces. Undercutting morale and the fundamental will to win, this has to change. And – I'll stop there or I'll get wound up.

FRANK GAFFNEY:

Thank you. [LAUGHTER] Clare?

CLARE LOPEZ:

Yeah, just really quickly, the best way to counter political correctness is simply to refuse to abide by it. And thanks to

all of you who are here from the media and others as well, think tanks and others who are here just as individuals, by using the proper language, by identifying the enemy as all forces of Islamic jihad and shariah and those who support them, by refusing to use anodyne and euphemistic terms like violent extremists and instead saying, no, these are Islamic jihadis, all of us can participate in helping to defeat – to counter political correctness.

FRANK GAFFNEY:

Can I just mention something? I, as some of you may know, have a radio program that we do as a product of the Center for Security Policy each weeknight. Nationally syndicated. Called Secure Freedom Radio. And I had the privilege of interviewing just today, for tonight's program, Neil Munro, who is a very highly regarded journalist. For many years was with the *National Journal*, is today the White House correspondent for *The Daily Caller*. And I was interviewing him about a piece that he had written earlier this week about the White House press operations' stated determination to prevent reporters from covering stories in a way that might give offense to, well, the jihadis. And it was such a palpable example of what we might try to dress up as political correctness. And, in fact, Josh Earnest, president's spokesman tried to dress it up further by saying he was doing it for the troops. So as to protect them from these jihadis. Well, ladies and gentlemen, in the wake of what's happened in the past seven or eight days, let's be clear. This isn't political correctness. This is not multiculturalism. This is not being sensitive to diversity. In the eyes of the enemy, at the very least, this is submission. And submission means specifically to shariah blasphemy laws. And under the code that we're talking about here, the doctrine, the ideology that we believe is animating the enemy that we must confront, that we must defeat or submit to indefinitely under horrific circumstances, we cannot let them think we are submitting because shariah tells them the appropriate response to that is to redouble the effort to make us feel subdued. That's Koranic language for more jihad, more violence, more horrors. So the question of whether we are going to continue this political correctness is simply one of whether we are going to persist in a self-destructive course of action that in fact will result in more of us being killed, more of us being subdued, more of us being enslaved. Tommy Waller, you've come up on the net. Did you want to say something?

TOMMY WALLER:

I did, Frank. I think what I'd like to do for the audience is just ask everybody to bring it back to the basics. In this environment where we have so many things that we have to decide upon for the future of our nation, we need to remember that our constitution was not founded on accident. We need to remember that, you know, when Christopher Columbus was commissioned to sail west, it was after 781 years of struggle by the Spaniards to rid that peninsula of jihadis. In 1491, with the Treaty of Granada, when they finally established that peace, they still couldn't sail to the east through the Mediterranean, because of that hostile ideology. When the Marines landed at Tripoli, it was against not pirates, the Barbary pirates, it was against jihadis. And so we have to remember that the very establishment of this nation, the discovery of this nation by Columbus, was in the way caused by that same movement. And when we think about that and when we think about our constitution, how it was founded, if we root ourselves with a love of that document and the flag that stands for it, I think we'll start to be able to figure out exactly how to defeat the enemy. The last thing I would ask is for everybody in the room, that we take a moment to think about that flag. The one that's behind me in this room was deployed with me on every deployment. And I only unfolded it in combat environments. It's been flown over the mountains of Afghanistan. Over the city of Fallujah on September 11th, 2005. Over palaces that Saddam once inhabited. And I never unfolded it on my deployments that were not combat tours. And I've learned something in the last year. That the fight is here. Like Frank said, civilization jihad is here. And that's why that flag is unfurled. And I would just ask, before this thing closes, that everybody in the room take the opportunity to pledge allegiance to the flag that's in that room. In remembrance that we're here in defense of the constitution that protects us from this hostile ideology. And that's all I have to say. Thank you, Frank.

FRANK GAFFNEY:

Tommy, thank you very much. We may close with that gesture. I think it's a very good idea. I do want to make sure there aren't any other questions. Yes, sir?

MICHAEL GOLDSTEIN:

Yeah, Frank. Michael Goldstein. Thirty year Navy naval intelligence retiree. And utility attorney. And now working in the nuclear energy space. First, Clare, I want to tell you what I heard in the news last night, which is although the amplified call to prayer is not going to occur, the prayer service still is. Yeah. Anyway, I'm going to want to talk to Kevin about this offline at some point. But our private foundation is supporting a technology, a new nuclear technology, it's not so new – we created it here in the 1960s, but it's an American technology that hasn't been developed, which will create enough process heat to turn our tremendous coal fields into liquid transportation fuels, gasoline and diesel, enough to satiate world demand and make Middle East oil irrelevant. And I think that point is very important for the team.

FRANK GAFFNEY:

Thank you very much. You're talking about thorium as I recall?

MICHAEL GOLDSTEIN:

Well, molten salt reactors –

FRANK GAFFNEY:

Molten salt reactors in general. Yes, ma'am? Stand by, stand by. Microphone, please.

JACQUELINE ROSE:

Jacqueline Rose, I'm a member of the National Press Club. I heard the same thing this morning and I believe they said that they would amplify it, but not from the big tower at a certain volume where the whole region heard it. It would be amplified at a lower volume within the quadrangle, etceteras, by mechanical means where people around that area would hear it.

CLARE LOPEZ:

Yes, that is true. But the important thing is the physical occupation of the Christian chapel for those prayers will not happen. That's what's important.

FRANK GAFFNEY:

Well, there seems to be some debate about this. But the point is, whether it's in this instance or not, you can take it to the bank that unless people of other faiths understand that what they're being duped by as a deliberate strategy of subversion from within is this notion that bridge-building and their participation in it is a matter of sort of ecumenicalism and solidarity in defense of First Amendment, specifically religious freedom rights, is actually a cynical act on the part of those that they're interacting with. We're reminded of a passage from one of the most influential jihadist ideologues in modern times. A man by the name of Sayyid Qutb. His book *Milestones* is required reading. In fact, they often find it on the battlefield, I believe, as a guidance. One of the things he says about bridge-building – this is a close paraphrase, is the chasm between Islam and the unbelievers is so vast that no bridge can be built to span it, except for the purpose of bringing the unbeliever to Islam. In other words, this is a one-way bridge, folks. And every pastor, every chaplain, every priest, every rabbi, and what have you, who is being subjected to this kind of, well, I think, come hither, we say, is actually being victimised by the civilization jihadists. I want to close this by bringing to the podium as a special and totally unexpected pleasure, a man that I've come to know – [BACKGROUND VOICES] No, I got to, no, I know, but I got to just give you one accolade [LAUGHTER] a man who is fighting me to come to the microphone, is the former 29th commandant – not former, he was the former commandant, the 29th commandant of the United States Marine Corps. A friend of the Center for Security Policy, the recipient in 2013 of our Freedom Shield Award, and one of the greatest Americans I've ever had the privilege of knowing, and a perfect capstone to this program – may I just say [OVERLAPPING VOICES] No, I was [LAUGHTER] I was going to keep going. General Al Gray.

AL GRAY:

Yeah, yeah, I want to give my personal thanks to the panel and to really the entire group for a tremendous idea, a tremendous effort, and one that we have to make work, we have to make it operate, we have to win this one. All of the people here that talked to us stressed directly and indirectly the need for a total government effort. All the elements of national power, all the elements of national influence, be it economic, societal, political, technology, military, whatever. All of it has to be pulled together in a super inter-agency human effort for this work. As Ace pointed out, clearly we must have a congress on our side. We must have an administration that understands what's going on. And we must have a judiciary capability that understands it as well. So this is going to be, I think, a mammoth undertaking. And a mammoth educational undertaking for all Americans. And really, for all of those in the free world that aspire to remain free. So one idea I would throw out to you is you got to make this not just US. If you'll recall, President Reagan had NATO and he was a strong believer in NATO and he also had other treaty alliances and organisations in the Pacific where Ace was and so on. So it's got to be a free world effort. And it does not have to hinge only on democracy. That's just a part of it. A lot of people are not interested in democracy. They're interested in security. First and foremost. And we have to remember that. So we don't want to go to areas and promote democracy when that's really not the issue here right now. The issue is for us to survive as a nation, to continue to lead the free world and perchance flourish in the totality of elements of national capability. I think that our intelligence community has been wounded severely by the traitorous act of Snowden. And we need to restore that and we need to restore that very, very quickly. The men and women who make up the intelligence community, all the parts of the intelligence community, be they military or

civilian are super American people. They have a few that do things wrong once in awhile, but generally speaking, you can take them to the bank. And we need to reinforce that kind of capability with our intelligence community. We are neophytes in the world of information operations. And we're losing the information war idea right now. And what Professor Waller says and others, we've got to regain that. We've got to regain what we had with the voice of Europe and the freedom and America, all those kinds of things. We don't do that very well. How do we educate the American people and the free world as we know it? Let's perhaps look at the younger people, the so-called Millennials and stuff, it's a different – they're learning differently. They learn by different means. And we've got to have an education program that's second to none. And it's not just the old fashioned idea of giving a lecture in university and that kind of thing. It's got to be a broad-based kind of educational effort that really attacks the problem. We have to be very clear on how we define certain things. I think that the radical jihadism is the right approach there. Not just jihad in total because of what it means. As you all know, the Koran has been interpreted and reinterpreted several times and so on and there are many similarities in all the great religions and stuff like this, so we don't want to make any more enemies than we already have. And we want to bring many of them over to our side. And so we have to be careful, I think, how we approach that. And you know this better than I do. But I think that we need to learn more about other countries and other people, other cultures. My favourite example of that, when I was privileged to be a joint chief of staff and every year, Admiral Lyons and the rest of us were ordered to go down and steam around Haiti. And every year, we would go down and steam around ever diminishing circles in Haiti. And every year, some Phi Beta Kappa in the joint chiefs of staff would announce that we're going to drop leaflets and every year I would remind them, that's a great idea, but they can't read. So finally [LAUGHTER] this time when we went to Haiti, we used loudspeakers and spoke Creole. So that's the point I want to make. We simply don't know what we're talking about here in a lot of areas. And we're not the most brilliant people in the world by a long shot. So we need to take all the help we can get. But again, I want to thank the panel. I hope you're on the right track. And somehow you failed to mention how we're going to – how we're going to take advantage of the world's greatest media. I'll put it that way. They're a big part of this. And somehow they've got to get on board. They've got to quite making heroes out of these people who are doing terrorist tactics and stuff like that. The war is not against terrorism. That's been made very clear by this panel. But how do we teach the American people that the war is not against terrorism. Terrorism, as it's been said, is a tactic. It's been around for a long, long time. It's in the Koran, it's in the Torah, it's in the Bible. And it's going to be there. And so that's not the issue. But anyway, thanks for bringing this to our attention.

FRANK GAFFNEY:

General, I can't thank you enough for both being here and for attesting to the importance of this and for hoping – I hope that you will help us bring it to the attention of a great many other people. In closing, let me just say my own personal view of this is that radical jihad is confusing. It's a pretty radical program for sure. But jihad is jihad, as you've heard others talk about here. And we have to prevent it from being waged against us. We encourage everyone to go to securefreedom.org. The website of the Center for Security Policy. You can download right now for free ninety-four pages of our Secure Freedom Strategy. It is meant to be a contribution to a debate that we believe is long overdue and hopefully we'll start getting serious now about what has to be done to secure freedom. With that, I would like to close by acting on Tommy Waller's suggestion and ask each of you, if you would, to join us in the Pledge of Allegiance.

ALL:

I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America. And to the republic for which it stands. One nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

FRANK GAFFNEY:

Thank you very much for being here. God bless you all. [BACKGROUND, OVERLAPPING VOICES]

ANNOUNCER:

And as this discussion comes to a close, if you missed any of it, it is available in the C-SPAN video library shortly. You'll be able to watch it at c-span.org. Check the video library. The –

[END OF FILE]