

Al-Qaeda: The Many Faces of an Islamist Extremist Threat

Report of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence June 2006

“The call to wage war against America was made because America has spearheaded the crusade against the Islamic nation, sending tens of thousands of its troops to the land of the two Holy Mosques over and above its meddling in its affairs and its politics, and its support of the oppressive, corrupt and tyrannical regime that is in control. These are the reasons for singling America out as a target (August 23, 1996).”¹

“It is a duty for the Umma [nation] with all its categories, men, women and youths, to give away themselves, their money, experiences and all types of material support....Jihad today is an imperative for every Muslim. The Umma will commit sin if it did not provide adequate material support for jihad (April 24, 2006).”²

“The battles that are going on in the far-flung regions of the Islamic world, such as Chechnya, Afghanistan, Kashmir, and Bosnia, they are just the groundwork for the major battles which have begun in the heart of the Islamic world....If our intended goal in this age is the establishment of a caliphate in the manner of the Prophet and we expect to establish its state predominantly according to how it appears to us in the heart of the Islamic world, then your efforts and sacrifices, God permitting, are a large step towards that goal (July 9, 2005).”³

“As for similar operations taking place in America, it is only a matter of time. They [the terrorists] are in the final stages, and you will see them in the heart of your land as soon as the planning is complete (January 20, 2006).”⁴

Statements made by al-Qaeda leader Usama bin Laden and Ayman al-Zawahiri



¹ Usama bin Laden. “Declaration of War Against the United States,” August 23, 1996.

² Usama bin Laden. “Bin Laden accuses the West,” April 24, 2006.

³ “Letter from al-Zawahiri to al-Zarqawi,” Office of the Director of National Intelligence, Press Release 3-05, October 11, 2005.

⁴ Usama bin Laden: “There is No Shame in This Solution,” <http://www.jihadunspun.com>, January 20, 2006.

Summary

Almost five years after the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks, the United States remains a nation at war. Al-Qaeda and Islamist extremist terrorist groups with like-minded goals and ideologies remain one of the most immediate strategic threats to the national security of the United States. Nonetheless, the threat we face today is quite different from the terrorist threat that we faced prior to September 11, 2001. America's intelligence agencies are in agreement that:

- Al-Qaeda leaders and their terrorist affiliates remain committed to global jihad against the West. Currently, this is the single most important terrorist threat to U.S. national security.
- Al-Qaeda's terrorist campaign has attracted a global support and recruitment network. Despite the loss of key lieutenants, Jihad retains its global appeal.
- Al-Qaeda leaders wait patiently for the right opportunity to attack.
- Al-Qaeda has metastasized its scale of influence by reaching out to like-minded Islamist extremist groups and inspiring new groups and individuals to emerge and carry out independent attacks.
- Iraq has become the front line for the global war on terrorism. Prior to his death in June 2006, Abu Musab Zarqawi aligned his group with Al-Qaeda.
- The United States must be concerned about the threat of homegrown terrorism.
- The Islamist extremist threat will continue to grow through the exploitation and use of the Internet.

The United States has taken positive steps to enhance our national security against the threat of future terrorist attacks. However, the threat of terrorism is still very real, and in many ways more alarming than the threat that existed prior to September 11, 2001. There are a growing number of groups building the capability to attack the United States, our allies, and our interests abroad. The United States must remain vigilant in the face of these threats and provide our intelligence, law enforcement and military personnel the necessary legal authorities, resources and tools to protect our national security.

Understanding the Strategic Threat

Today, the remnants of al-Qaeda and radical Islamist terrorist groups with like-minded goals and ideologies remain the single most important threat to the national security of the United States. Although al-Qaeda has suffered significant setbacks since 9/11, the organization is constantly evolving, and its leaders patiently wait for the right opportunity to direct another attack against the United States. As evidenced by Usama bin Laden's statement from January 2006, al-Qaeda's leadership still possesses the desire to carry out further attacks. Breaking a fourteen-month silence, bin Laden said:

“As for similar operations taking place in America, it is only a matter of time. They (the terrorists) are in the final stages, and you will see them in the heart of your land as soon as the planning is complete.”⁵

The enemy we face today is not the same enemy that attacked the United States in 2001. Al-Qaeda has been forced to adapt to its changing environment and has relinquished some of its operational control to an extended network of like-minded terrorist groups to ensure the movement's longevity. Today, the war on terrorism is being fought on multiple fronts. First, we are fighting al-Qaeda, the terrorist organization led by Usama bin Laden. Usama bin Laden formally declared war against the United States in a 1996 letter urging Jihad against America. In his 1996 letter, and subsequent statements, Usama bin Laden cites the United States and its allies for their military presence in the Middle East, support for Israel and the occupation of Iraq. His 1998 statement expanded on the 1996 fatwa to sanction attacks on all Americans, including civilians. Usama bin Laden justified attacks against the American people because “they are the ones who pay the taxes which fund the planes that bomb us in Afghanistan, the tanks that strike and destroy our homes in Palestine, the armies which occupy our lands in the Arabian Gulf, and the fleets which ensure the blockade of Iraq.” He further states, “The American people are the ones who employ both their men and their women in the American Forces which attack us.”⁶

Successful operations against al-Qaeda's core have created new problems in the sense that al-Qaeda is no longer a hierarchical organization run by bin Laden. Rather, the terrorist threat has evolved into what some experts refer to as “franchised” terrorism. In this new phase, previously identified al-Qaeda leaders serve as examples and provide ideological rather than organizational and material support to terrorist operatives around the world. Al-Qaeda acts as an inspiration to groups from Chechnya to the Palestinian territories, as well as to individuals in Canada, Australia and the United Kingdom that have minimal contact with the network.⁷

Al-Qaeda's ability to export its ideology to terrorist organizations around the world has created a second front in the war on terrorism. In addition to the central group, “al-

⁵ Usama bin Laden: "There is No Shame in This Solution," <http://www.jihadunspun.com>, January 20, 2006.

⁶ Usama bin Laden, “Usama bin Laden's Letter to the America,” *Observer Worldview*, November 24, 2002.

⁷ Raymond Whitaker, “Bin Laden Hunt Stepped Up,” *Canberra Times*, March 22, 2004.


Qaeda” has become a network of loosely affiliated assembly that subscribe to its ideology, but have little, if any, contact with its core leaders and sometimes differ on end goals and agendas.⁸ In Iraq, Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, who was killed by Coalition forces on June 8, 2006, declared allegiance to bin Laden, al-Qaeda and an extreme interpretation of Islam. Although bin Laden and al-Zarqawi’s supporters in Iraq have their differences, they share the same end goal and are willing to put these disagreements aside as they work to create a Muslim state under a new Caliphate.⁹ Al-Qaeda has also benefited from the rise of homegrown terrorist cells in Europe and North America, as well as its ability to exploit the Internet to increase support among Muslims and other sympathizers worldwide.

We are no longer fighting a war against just al-Qaeda. Rather, we are now fighting a war against various entities inspired by al-Qaeda and radicalized in various areas around the world, including in the United States. Al-Qaeda’s ability to recruit large support networks should not be overlooked. As long as al-Qaeda can spread its ideology to other groups, the movement will continue to grow and threaten to change the way the Islamic world is governed. To win the war on terrorism, the United States and our allies will have to not just kill and capture key terrorist operatives, but also identify ways to discredit the radical ideology that supports these groups. Organizations like Jemaah Islamiyah, the Libyan Islamic Fighting Group and the Salafist Group for Preaching and Combat have shown willingness to support al-Qaeda’s global operations. Although the core element of al-Qaeda is still dangerous, it may increasingly look to leverage support from affiliates to carry out attacks against the United States. Today, al-Qaeda and al-Qaeda associated groups maintain a presence in dozens of countries worldwide, including the United States (See Figure 1).

⁸ Kenneth Katzman, “Al-Qaeda: Profile and Threat Assessment,” Congressional Research Service, February 10, 2005, pp. 7-8.

⁹ James Phillips, “The Evolving Al-Qaeda Threat,” The Heritage Foundation, March 17, 2006. The Caliphate is the system of succession in Islam that combined both religion and state under the rule of one Caliph (the term or title for the Islamic leader of the Umma, or community of Islam). The dissolution of the Ottoman Caliphate in Turkey in 1924 by the British signaled the end of the pan-Islamic Caliphate system.

Figure 1:



Map provided by the Investigative Project

Of particular concern is a relatively new phenomenon—the rise of homegrown Islamist extremism. In London, Casablanca, Madrid, the Netherlands and elsewhere, homegrown terrorist cells comprised of second and third generation radicalized Muslims have proven difficult for authorities to track or preempt their activities.¹⁰ Such homegrown cells have been able to train and prepare in secrecy, escaping detection even from the local community. Although the United States has not yet seen this phenomenon on the same scale as our European allies, the potential for America to face homegrown terrorism is real. This threat calls for a more robust, capable, and empowered Intelligence Community.

Islamist extremism, as it is discussed throughout this report, refers to the political philosophy that says that, in order to defend a carefully defined vision of Islam and protect pious Muslims around the world, one has to impose, essentially, a 7th century political structure over the people of the Islamic world, and that this political structure must be implemented by violent Jihad, or Holy War. We are not looking at Muslims who practice Islamic faith fundamentally—there is nothing wrong with practicing religion in a fundamental way.¹¹

¹⁰ Bruce Hoffman, Testimony before the Committee on Armed Services Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities, February 16, 2006.

¹¹ Ambassador Francis Taylor, Assistant Secretary for Diplomatic Security, “Emerging Threats to Homeland Security,” May 10, 2004.

In preparing this report the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence held numerous hearings (both open and closed), briefings and meetings with representatives from the Intelligence Community, academia, and the private sector to enable Members and staff to better understand the threat presented by Islamist extremist groups. Due to the unclassified nature of this report, the Committee has only drawn from publicly available sources. In no way does this undermine the threat facing the United States—the Committee would reach the same findings and conclusions using classified information.

Al-Qaeda

AL QAEDA'S ROOTS IN SALAFI ISLAM

Most Sunni Islamist extremist movements follow a conservative Islamic tradition known as Salafism. Salafism is rooted in the belief that the Koran and the teachings of the Prophet Mohammed and his companions are the most legitimate sources of religious conduct and reasoning, and as such should be emulated and put into practice in contemporary Islamic communities. The movement has a long and varied history, and there are notable methodological differences among today's Salafis and those we might call Salafis from generations past. However, active opposition to Western encroachment in the Muslim world remains a constant.¹²

Some contemporary Salafists believe that violence is a legitimate means of reasserting control of the world's Islamic community. Salafi Jihadists represent a small percentage of the overall Salafi population, but they are very influential and al-Qaeda's distorted interpretation of Salafi Islam has attracted Muslims from around the world.¹³

Usama bin Laden's message is taken from the Salafi Jihadist tradition that calls for a global Islamic state under the control of the Muslims and the teachings of Mohammed. When al-Qaeda's message is interpreted in light of an extremist's intentions, such words are intended to polarize the Islamic world into two clearly delineated factions: one that is against the West and the other that is closely tied to the United States and its allies. Usama bin Laden has called for a war against the United States and the West to remove their presence from Muslim territories as the first step to restoring the Muslim Caliphate, ruled by one Caliph (See Figure 2).¹⁴ Bin Laden urged Muslims to find a leader to unite them and establish a "pious caliphate" that would be governed by Islamic law and follow Islamic principles of finance and social conduct.¹⁵ Bin Laden repeatedly argued that Afghanistan had become a model Islamic state under his Taliban hosts and used religious rhetoric to solicit support for the Taliban and al-Qaeda.¹⁶

¹² "Who Wages Terror and Jihad: Pros and Cons of Frequently Used Terms," DCI Counterterrorist Center and Political Islam Strategic Analysis Program, May 31, 2005.


¹³ According to the recent Gallup Organization World Poll, only 8% of Muslims consider themselves to be militant or sympathetic to military.

¹⁴ Michael Scott Doran, "Somebody Else's Civil War," *Foreign Affairs*, January/February 2002.

¹⁵ "Pakistan Interviews Usama Bin Laden," (Islamabad, Pakistan), Mar. 18, 1997.

¹⁶ "Website Publishes Bin Laden 'Speech'" *Internet Supporters of Shariah*, June 22, 2000; and "Al Jazirah Program on Bin Laden" *Al Jazirah Television* (Doha, Qatar), June 10, 1999.

Figure 2:



A NEW GENERATION OF AL-QAEDA OPERATIVES

Al-Qaeda has suffered significant setbacks since the start of the war (See Figure 3), but the organization is extremely resilient and remains a major threat to the United States homeland, our allies and U.S. interests abroad. Although Coalition forces have killed or captured several of al-Qaeda's top leaders, these vacancies have been filled by a new generation of extremists. Most of these new leaders have obscure backgrounds, and we lack adequate knowledge about their particular methods of operating. As a result, our understanding of the evolving network is incomplete. There are concerns that we could see a new-generation of terrorists that are more willing than their predecessors to act autonomously. They may also look to capitalize on experience gained in Afghanistan



and Iraq to lead subsequent attacks against the United States and our interests abroad. In addition, al-Qaeda's core elements, including Usama bin Laden and his key deputy Ayman al-Zawahiri, continue to elude capture and claims to prepare terrorist strikes against the West.¹⁷

Picture provided by the National Counterterrorism Center

¹⁷ Director of National Intelligence John D. Negroponte, "Annual Threat Assessment of the Director of National Intelligence," Statement before the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, February 2, 2006.

Al-Qaeda understands the importance another attack on the United States would mean for its movement. The importance of such a strike cannot be overstated. For Islamist extremist groups, 9/11 was the “shot heard around the world.” Al-Qaeda looks to capitalize on this attack to further undermine and challenge western ideals and the United States position as a world power. In addition, successful attacks against Western countries aid recruiting and ensure financial support by keeping al-Qaeda’s message relevant and in the news. Al-Qaeda uses these attacks in its propaganda to show disempowered and rudderless youth throughout the Middle East that they too can strike a powerful blow for the global Jihad.

A weakened al-Qaeda still presents a greater threat to our security than most other terrorist groups. Its remaining members still has the ability to reach the United States and Europe and has repeatedly demonstrated the capacity to recruit on a global scale.¹⁸

Figure 3:

Key al-Qaeda Members Killed or Captured since September 11, 2001

Coalition forces have killed or captured hundreds of al-Qaeda members and associates. This list represents some of al-Qaeda’s key operatives who can no longer participate in terrorism.

Captured:

*Abu Faraj al-Libi—Senior Operational Manager
Khalid Shaykh Muhammad—Senior al-Qaeda External Operations Chief
Riduan bin Isomuddin—Senior al-Qaeda and Jemaah Islamiyah Operational Planner
Abd al-Rahim al-Nashiri—Al-Qaeda Operational Chief for Arabian Peninsula
Issa al-Hindi—Western al-Qaeda Operative
Abu Bakr al-Azdi—Al-Qaeda Operational Planner and Saudi Arabian Cell Leader
Abu Zubaydah—Al-Qaeda-associate Logistics Coordinator
Sharif al-Masri—Facilitator and Operational Manager
Mustafa Setmariam Nasar—Jihadist theorist*

Killed:

*Muhammad Atef—Al-Qaeda Deputy
Hamza Rabia—Senior al-Qaeda External Operations Chief
Abu Hajir al-Najdi—Senior Operations Planner in the Persian Gulf
Yusif al-Uyayri—Facilitator and propagandist in Saudi Arabia
Abu Musab al-Zarqawi—Al-Qaeda leader in Iraq*

¹⁸ James Phillips, “The Evolving Al-Qaeda Threat,” The Heritage Foundation, March 17, 2006.

DISRUPTED AL-QAEDA PLOTS

Although there has not been a successful al-Qaeda attack in the United States since 2001, there is corroborated information that al-Qaeda continues to plan attacks, in particular against the U.S. homeland. President Bush reported that the United States has helped disrupt ten al-Qaeda attacks since 2001, including three against targets inside the United States.¹⁹ One of the disrupted plots was devised by Khalid Sheikh Mohammad (KSM), the mastermind of the 9/11 attacks. KSM's plan involved flying a hijacked plane into a target in California.²⁰ Interrogations of KSM in July 2003 indicate that there were at least two potential attackers: Abderraouf Jdey (a.k.a Faruq al-Tunisi) and Zaini Zakaria (a.k.a Mussa). This plot most likely was part of KSM's plan to carry out a "second wave" of attacks after September 11, 2001. The Committee is aware of other credible plans by al-Qaeda members to attack the United States, but cannot discuss these plans in an unclassified report.

The disruption of these plots, the President reminded America, "means the enemy is



Picture provided by the Federal Bureau of Investigation

wounded, but the enemy is still capable of global operations."²¹ Where the American public tends to have a relatively short time horizon and want results right away, al-Qaeda has never lacked patience in both the operational planning and execution of its attacks. Recall, for example, that the first, moderately successful al-Qaeda-associated attack against the World Trade Center (WTC) occurred in 1993. Rather than an immediate second attempt, al-Qaeda waited almost a decade before striking the U.S. homeland again. Even after Khalid Sheik Mohammed formulated the plan in 1998, al-Qaeda leaders were willing to wait patiently as operatives received the necessary training and resources. The United States cannot afford to assume that the absence of another terrorist act means al-Qaeda has lost either the will or the ability to attack—terrorist operatives might simply be in the planning phase of their next strike.

AL-QAEDA PLANS FOR A "SPECTACULAR" ATTACK

So long as al-Qaeda is capable of hitting the United States, it may look to carry out another "spectacular" attack of 9/11 proportions. Past threat alerts suggest al-Qaeda may

¹⁹ President George W. Bush, "President Discusses War on Terror at National Endowment for Democracy," October 6, 2005.

²⁰ Peter Baker and Susan B. Glasser, "Bush says 10 Plots by al-Qaeda Were Foiled," *Washington Post*, October 7, 2005.

²¹ President George W. Bush, "President Discusses War on Terror at National Endowment for Democracy," October 6, 2005.

favor attacks that meet certain criteria, including high symbolic value, mass casualties, severe damage to the U.S. economy and maximum psychological trauma.²² However, a battered and weakened al-Qaeda, new counterterrorism laws, and heightened security at our borders and ports of entry have made it more difficult for al-Qaeda's core elements to carry out a large-scale attack. As a result, there are ongoing discussions of what al-Qaeda's leadership considers "spectacular." Today, target vulnerability and likelihood of success may be as important to al-Qaeda as the target's prominence.²³ Major subway systems, nuclear plants, and national landmarks could be attractive targets if they are perceived as "soft." Regardless of the target, any plan by al-Qaeda will look to achieve at least one of the following: mass casualties, damage to the U.S. economy and maximum psychological trauma on the American public.

If for nothing else, another attack against the United States or our allies would help the group to recruit new supporters. Islamist extremist groups use terrorist attacks to propagate the organization's ideology among its supporters and potential recruits. If al-Qaeda can no longer effectively recruit supporters from around the world, it will cease to exist as the dangerous network that we know today.

AL-QAEDA'S SEARCH FOR WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION

Any successful attack with weapons of mass destruction (chemical, biological, or nuclear) would, in addition to causing mass casualties, have an impact on both the U.S. psyche and the U.S. economy. As an example, the still unsolved anthrax attacks that occurred in the wake of 9/11 produced only a limited number of deaths, but disrupted mail and sowed fear throughout the country.

The Intelligence Community continues to be concerned about al-Qaeda's efforts to acquire weapons of mass destruction. In a December 1998 interview with Time, Usama bin Laden was asked whether he, as the U.S. had alleged, was attempting to obtain chemical or nuclear weapons. In his response he stated:

*"Acquiring weapons for the defense of Muslims is a religious duty. If I have indeed acquired these weapons, then I thank God for enabling me to do so. And if I seek to acquire these weapons, I am carrying out a duty. It would be a sin for Muslims not to possess the weapons that would prevent the infidels from inflicting harm on Muslims."*²⁴

There is a detailed public record of al-Qaeda's interest in obtaining chemical and biological weapons. According to the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon

²²FBI Director Robert Mueller, "War on Terrorism," Testimony before the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, February 11, 2003.

²³ FBI Director Robert Mueller, "War on Terrorism," Testimony before the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, February 11, 2003.

²⁴ Rahimullah Yusufzai, "Wrath of God: Osama bin Laden Lashes Out Against the West," Time, January 11, 1999.

the United States, also known as the 9/11 Commission, al-Qaeda sought to obtain nuclear, chemical and biological weapons and “remains interested in using a radiological dispersal or dirty bomb, a conventional explosive designed to spread radioactive material.”²⁵ In addition, in 2004, then-Director of the Central Intelligence Agency George Tenet warned Congress that “al-Qaeda’s effort to produce deadly anthrax is one of the most immediate terrorist threats.”²⁶ There is little doubt that if Usama bin Laden were successful in acquiring WMD, he would use these weapons against the West.

AL-QAEDA’S METHODS OF RAISING MONEY

Prior to September 11, 2001 al-Qaeda built a vast, sophisticated and elusive network to raise money to support itself, terrorist operations and its supporters around the world. Trailing Usama bin Laden’s funds was complicated and al-Qaeda was able to move money around the world without compromising its security and secrecy. One reason it was so difficult to track terrorist finances was because Usama bin Laden preferred not to operate with banks that charged interest since usury is prohibited by the Koran. Al-Qaeda did, however, use banks that operate according to Islamic principles, such as the Dubai Islamic Bank in the United Arab Emirates (it was not until after September 11, 2001 that the United Arab Emirates enforced tighter restrictions on its banking system). In addition, al-Qaeda relies on couriers and the venerable hawala system of interlocking money changers--it would not be uncommon for money to switch hands several times before the delivery reached its final destination.²⁷ The result was a layered system that kept the United States in the dark, unable to determine how, and more importantly to whom, al-Qaeda was providing funds.

The CIA estimates that al-Qaeda spent about \$30 million a year to sustain its activities.²⁸ Contrary to popular belief, Usama bin Laden did not use his personal wealth that he inherited from the Bin Laden construction company when his father passed away. Instead, al-Qaeda’s activities were supported largely through various fundraising efforts worldwide, including contributions from mosques, non-governmental organizations, the Internet, wealthy donors and charitable foundations.

Members of the Intelligence Community have reported, and we have no reason to believe otherwise, that al-Qaeda has not used the United States as a primary source of its funding. It is difficult to determine how much funding has been channeled from the United States to al-Qaeda. However, intelligence experts agree that the funding to al-Qaeda amounts to

²⁵ The National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States, Twelfth Public Hearing, June 16, 2004.

²⁶ Director of the CIA George Tenet, “The Worldwide Threat 2004: Challenges in a Changing Global Context,” Testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee, February 2004.


²⁷ Peter L. Bergen, *Holy War Inc. Inside the Secret World of Osama bin Laden*, The Free Press, 2001, p. 103-104.

²⁸ The National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States, Staff Monographs, “Al-Qaeda’s Means and Methods to Raise, Move, and Use Money,” August 21, 2004.

much less than is raised by other terrorist groups, such as Hamas and Hezbollah.²⁹ We will look at some U.S.-based charities with links to al-Qaeda later in this report.

Since September 11, 2001, al-Qaeda’s fundraising network has been damaged by new laws and increased efforts to disrupt the international terror finance network. However, terrorism does not require a huge sum of money. The estimated cost of the bomb used to attack the World Trade Center in 1993 was \$3,000. This attack killed six people, injured a thousand more, and caused more than a half a billion dollars in damage. Further, estimates suggest the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001 cost somewhere from \$200,000 to \$500,000.³⁰ This amount of money can be raised from al-Qaeda supporters and sympathizers around the world (See Figure 4).

Figure 4:



Map provided by the Investigative Project

²⁹ The National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States, Staff Monographs, “Al-Qaeda’s Means and Methods to Raise, Move, and Use Money.” August 21, 2004.

³⁰ Peter L. Bergen, *Holy War Inc. Inside the Secret World of Osama bin Laden*, The Free Press, 2001, p. 104.

The Growing Insurgency in Iraq

THE FIGHT FOR IRAQ

In 1998, Usama bin Laden laid out his reasons for formally declaring war against the United States. In addition to the United States' continued support for Israel, bin Laden said:

“for over seven years the United States has been occupying the lands of Islam in the holiest of places, the Arabian Peninsula, plundering its riches, dictating its rulers, humiliating its people, terrorizing its neighbors, and turning its bases in the Peninsula into a spearhead through which to fight the neighboring Muslim peoples.”³¹

In subsequent statements, Usama bin Laden repeatedly returns to the issue of America's military presence in Muslim countries. These statements suggest al-Qaeda feels obligated to confront Western forces present in the region. Al-Qaeda also felt compelled to engage the 200,000 coalition forces entering Iraq, which it considers part of the sacred Muslim world. Usama bin Laden said, “terrorizing you, while you are carrying arms on our land, is a legitimate and morally demanded duty.”³² Al-Qaeda views a ground war in Iraq, similar to the Jihad in Afghanistan in the early 1980's, as a critical opportunity to drive Western forces from the region.

In his July 2005 letter to the late Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, Ayman al-Zawahiri discussed al-Qaeda's goals in Iraq, which he believes can be accomplished in four stages. First, expel the Americans from Iraq. Second, establish an Islamic authority, then develop it and support it until it achieves the level of a caliphate-over as much territory as you can to spread its power in Iraq. Third, extend the jihad wave to the secular countries neighboring Iraq. And finally, eliminate Israel and the possibility that an Israeli state would challenge any new Islamic entity.³³

If Islamist extremist groups are successful in preventing a legitimate government from flourishing in Iraq, the country could become a permanent base for al-Qaeda to recruit, train and conduct operations against non-Islamic governments in the region, and eventually the United States. It would be seen as a tremendous success for Islamist extremist groups and boost terrorists ability to recruit new members far beyond the current rate.


³¹ Usama bin Laden. “Jihad Against Jews and Crusaders,” February 23, 1998.

³² Usama bin Laden. “Declaration of War against the Americans Occupying the Land of the Two Holy Places,” August 1996.

³³ Ayman al-Zawahiri. “Letter from al-Zawahiri to al-Zarqawi,” Reprinted by the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, October 11, 2005.

ABU MUSAB al-ZARQAWI'S TERRORIST NETWORK

In December 2004, Usama bin Laden named Abu Musab al-Zarqawi as emir in charge of al-Qaeda operations in Iraq.³⁴ Zarqawi rose from the ranks of mediocrity to become the most dangerous terrorist in Iraq, and subsequently the leader of Tawhid and Jihad



(Monotheism and Holy War) in Iraq. Zarqawi's group is responsible for a number of attacks against Westerners in Iraq. Abu Musab al-Zarqawi was killed on June 7, 2006 by Coalition forces. This is a tremendous success story for Coalition forces. Abu Musab al-Zarqawi was a committed terrorist, who was planning further attacks against innocent Iraqis, as well as Western civilians. However, Zarqawi's death will not affect the long term fight in which we are involved. In fact, it did not take al-Qaeda in Iraq much time to name Abu Hamza al-Muhajir as al-Zarqawi's replacement.

Although Abu Musab Zarqawi and Usama bin Laden shared a similar ideology, the two differed on how to remove U.S. and Western influence from Muslim territories and restore a Caliphate in the region. In September 2005, Zarqawi declared an all out war on Shia Muslims in Iraq, and is believed to be responsible for masterminding suicide attacks targeting Shias across Iraq. This drew criticism from core al-Qaeda officials and other Sunni Muslims. In his July 2005 letter, Usama bin Laden's chief lieutenant Ayman al-Zawahiri warned al-Zarqawi that his actions were eroding support for al-Qaeda in Iraq. Al-Zawahiri questioned whether it was a wise decision to open another front, especially with over 100 al-Qaeda personnel being held by the Iranians, who are predominantly Shia.

Although he declared an all out war against Shia Muslims in Iraq, al-Zarqawi apparently listened to advice and showed a willingness to change some of his tactics to retain his stature and influence as the leader in Iraq. Prior to his death, Zarqawi apparently directed his supporters to change certain tactics to deflect negative press from al-Qaeda and other extremist groups. For example, al-Zarqawi created a Mujahideen Shura Council (MSC) in Iraq to downplay al-Qaeda's role in these attacks and put an Iraqi face on the insurgency. In addition, he directed his supporters not to indiscriminately attack Shias, but only to target Shia who support the Iraqi government. With Zarqawi dead, it is unclear how his followers will treat Shia Muslims.

Regardless, Usama bin Laden continues to capitalize on the popularity of the insurgency in Iraq to muster further support for al-Qaeda and the defeat of the Coalition. With the loss of its major training camps in Afghanistan the war in Iraq became a major rally point and a fertile recruiting ground for al-Qaeda.³⁵

In addition, Usama bin Laden may use Islamist extremists fighting in Iraq to launch attacks outside of the country. A memo from bin Laden to Zarqawi in 2005 indicates that

³⁴ Usama bin Laden, Audio Tape, December 2005.

³⁵ James Phillips, "The Evolving Al-Qaeda Threat," The Heritage Foundation, March 17, 2006.

bin Laden was encouraging Zarqawi and his group to consider plotting terrorist attacks in the United States.³⁶ Although there is nothing to suggest Zarqawi's supporters currently are preparing attacks within the United States, they eventually may look to target the United States, or our interests abroad. In August 2005, al-Qaeda supporters claimed responsibility for firing three missiles from a Jordanian port that missed a U.S. Naval ship in the area. Then, in November 2005, three suicide bombers conducted simultaneous attacks in Amman, Jordan that left sixty dead. Jordanian officials report that Zarqawi's group in Iraq is responsible for the attacks.³⁷

THE FOREIGN FIGHTER NETWORK

Besides Zarqawi's group, al-Qaeda benefits from the support it receives from foreign fighters who have traveled to Iraq to destabilize the region and prevent Coalition forces from spreading democratic values to Iraq and its neighbors. Foreign fighters use Iraq to gain battle experience before returning home to conduct terrorist attacks against governments and civilians. They appear to be working to make the insurgency in Iraq what Afghanistan was to the earlier generation of jihadists—a melting pot for jihadists from around the world.³⁸ Unlike the mujahideen who returned home from Afghanistan in the 1980's trained in rural guerilla warfare, the fighters who leave Iraq will have acquired first-hand experience in urban warfare—including the use of improvised explosive devices. Upon returning home, they have the potential to use their knowledge, credibility and popularity to recruit and train younger generations to fight against the United States and our allies.

At this time, there is no reason to believe foreign fighters are ready to withdraw from Iraq. Iraq continues to provide al-Qaeda and its supporters the best opportunity to attack the United States and our interests. Although the death of Abu Musab Zarqawi represents a huge symbolic victory, the insurgency is still very dangerous and terrorist attacks continue. These terrorist groups continue to present a considerable threat to coalition forces, Iraq's new government and neighboring countries.

Other Sunni Islamist Extremist Groups

THE GLOBAL TERRORIST NETWORK

Coalition success in the global war on terrorism has forced al-Qaeda's core elements increasingly to reach out to other Sunni Islamist extremist groups for support. Historically, these "other" groups have focused their efforts against local targets, but there is growing evidence that these groups are more willing to work with bin Laden. This is especially true when working with al-Qaeda serves their own particular interests.

³⁶ Bret Baier and Nick Simeone, "Officials: Bin Laden Urges Zarqawi to Hit U.S.," www.foxnews.com, March 1, 2005.

³⁷ James Phillips, "Zarqawi's Amman Bombings: Jordan's 9/11," The Heritage Foundation, November 18, 2005.

³⁸ State Department, "Country Reports on Terrorism 2004," April 2005, p.7.

Some of these groups have received training, weapons and funding from al-Qaeda.³⁹ Others have received only ideological inspiration while remaining organizationally and operationally distinct. Although these groups pose less danger to the U.S. homeland than al-Qaeda's core elements, they are increasingly a threat to our interests abroad. Such groups also could look for an opportunity to attack the United States in the future.⁴⁰ Even if Usama bin Laden is captured or killed tomorrow, Sunni extremist groups may seek to attack U.S. interests for decades to come.⁴¹

Open source information has identified at least nineteen Sunni extremist organizations that both share al-Qaeda's ideology and have the capability to reach the United States and our interests overseas.⁴² However, the likelihood that all nineteen groups will look to carry out independent attacks against the United States is believed to be low. It is likely that most of these groups will continue to focus their efforts on launching attacks in their respective regions. There are, nonetheless, certain groups the Intelligence Community monitors with increasing scrutiny because they have demonstrated the capacity to carry out successful terrorist attacks. This list is not exclusive of other Sunni extremist groups, such as Hamas or the Palestinian Islamic Jihad. We offer this list as an example to show the public how certain groups that were "off the radar screen" of many intelligence analysts just a few years ago have become more dangerous under the influence of al-Qaeda's ideology.

JEMAAH ISLAMIYA

Jemaah Islamiyah (JI) is a Southeast Asia-based radical Islamist group that began plotting violent attacks against regional targets in the 1990s. JI's stated goal is a pan-Islamic state across much of the region. JI is not a stranger to violence, and has shown the willingness



Picture provided by the Government of Australia, Office of Emergency Management

to inflict mass casualties against innocent civilians and those it believes to be allied with Western interests.⁴³ JI is responsible for recent attacks in Indonesia, including the Bali bombing in 2002 that killed 202 people and wounded some 300 others, the J.W. Marriott bombing in 2003, the 2004 bombing of the Australian Embassy and the second attack on Bali in 2005. In addition, we know through information received from Khalid Sheikh Mohammad that JI operatives were supporting al-Qaeda attacks against U.S. interests after 9/11, including plans to attack sites in California using a hijacked plane.⁴⁴

³⁹ James Phillips, "The Evolving Al-Qaeda Threat," The Heritage Foundation, March 17, 2006.

⁴⁰ Director of National Intelligence John D. Negroponte, "Annual Threat Assessment of the Director of National Intelligence," Statement before the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, February 2, 2006.

⁴¹ James Phillips, "The Evolving Al-Qaeda Threat," The Heritage Foundation, March 17, 2006.

⁴² "Al-Qaeda," GlobalSecurity.org

⁴³ "Jemaah Islamiya," MIPT Terrorism Knowledge Base, www.tkb.org/Group.jsp?groupID=3613.

⁴⁴ President George W. Bush, "President Discusses War on Terror at National Endowment for Democracy," October 6, 2005.

The Indonesian Government has successfully disrupted terrorist operations since the 2002 Bali bombing. Of noteworthy success, Indonesian courts have convicted at least 100 members of JI or affiliated groups on terrorism charges. Indonesian forces killed Azahari bin Husin, JI's chief bomb-maker. In addition, JI operations chief Hambali, was arrested in Thailand in 2003. Hambali is tied to several of the major attacks, and was thought to be Jemaah Islamiyah's main link to al-Qaeda.⁴⁵

The death of JI's chief bomb-maker and arrest of Hambali are major breakthroughs in the battle against terrorism in Southeast Asia, but the network is still robust. JI operatives Noordin Top, Dulmatin and Umar Patek remain at large and have the capability and experience to carry out large-scale attacks against U.S. interests in the region.⁴⁶

Two events have the potential to further escalate JI's militancy in the region and against the United States. First, JI's spiritual leader, Emir Abu Bakar Bashir (also Abubakar Ba'asyir), recently was released from prison. Bashir was serving thirty-three months for his involvement in the 2002 Bali bombing. It is unclear what role Bashir will take now that he has been released, but in the past he has expressed support for bin Laden's struggle. Bashir once said, "His is the true struggle to uphold Islam, not terror—the terrorists are America and Israel."⁴⁷

Second, depending on what takes place in Iraq, al-Qaeda members and other terrorist operatives could migrate to Indonesia. As the world's most populous Muslim country, Indonesia appears to be an obvious place for al-Qaeda to migrate. Indonesians traditionally have practiced a more moderate interpretation of Islam, but an increasingly militant element has emerged in some local schools. The country's porous maritime borders, weak central government, separatist movements and loosely regulated financial system make it a fertile ground for terrorist activities.⁴⁸

The threat of a JI attack against U.S. interests is greatest in Southeast Asia. In the past, JI assisted al-Qaeda with attacks outside Southeast Asia and continues to share al-Qaeda's ideology.⁴⁹ As was the case with al-Qaeda's plot to attack the United States using JI operatives, some terrorists increasingly are tied to the ideology rather than the group. These individuals are willing to support terrorist attacks that support their particular beliefs regardless of the affiliation to any specific organization.

⁴⁵ "Hambali Captured," <http://www.ict.org.il/spotlight/det.cfm?id=924>.

⁴⁶ "Jemaah Islamiya," Council on Foreign Relations, October 3, 2005.

⁴⁷ "Profile: Abu Bakar Bashir," Council on Foreign Relations, www.cfr.org, June 14, 2006.

⁴⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁹ Director of National Intelligence John D. Negroponte, "Annual Threat Assessment of the Director of National Intelligence," Statement before the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, February 2, 2006.

LIBYAN ISLAMIC FIGHTING GROUP

The Libyan Islamic Fighting Group (LIFG) emerged in the early 1990s among Libyans who fought against Soviet forces in Afghanistan. Initially organized to overthrow the Qadhafi regime and install a Shari'a-based government, the LIFG subsequently has embraced the global jihadist agenda of al-Qaeda. Some LIFG members still strictly adhere to the original cause (anti Libyan/Qadhafi activities), while others have aligned themselves to Bin-Laden causes. Some senior members of LIFG are believed to be or have belonged to al-Qaeda's senior command structure. The LIFG itself calls upon Muslims inside and outside of Libya to take part in what it terms the fight of Islam against its enemies.⁵⁰ Evidence suggests that the LIFG provided guidance in the planning of the 2003 bombing in Casablanca, Morocco.⁵¹ LIFG maintains a presence in Asia, Africa and Europe, primarily in the United Kingdom.⁵²

The LIFG constitutes the most serious threat to potential U.S. investment and business in Libya. In addition, LIFG has called on Muslims everywhere to fight against the U.S. in Iraq.⁵³ In response to this threat, President Bush signed Executive Order 13224 freezing the assets of the LIFG in the U.S. citing the group as a threat to America's national security. The LIFG has been added to the terrorism exclusion list and in December 2004, the U.S. designated the LIFG as a foreign terrorist organization.⁵⁴ Most recently, on February 8, 2006, the U.S. Department of the Treasury designated five individuals and four entities for their role in financing the Libyan Islamic Fighting Group. The individuals were supporting LIFG's activities through a sophisticated charitable front organization. According to the Department of the Treasury, "the Libyan Islamic Fighting Group threatens global safety and stability through the use of violence and its ideological alliance with al Qaeda and other brutal terrorist organizations."⁵⁵

SALAFIST GROUP FOR PREACHING AND COMBAT

The Salafist Group for Preaching and Combat (GSPC) is an extremist group based in Algeria. The organization was formally created in 1996 when it broke away from the Armed Islamic Group (GIA), which was the primary terrorist organization in Algeria. It has been linked to an external network of extremists in Western Europe.⁵⁶

Some GSPC members favor a global Jihad, and look to expand the group's reach beyond its current area of focus. The GSPC issued several communiqués on its website

⁵⁰ Moshe Terdman, "The Libyan Islamic Fighting Group (LIFG)," The Project for the Research of Islamist Movements (PRISM), Volume 3, Number 2, June 2005.

⁵¹ US Department of State, "Libya," Country Reports on Terrorism, April 2005, p. 89.

⁵² "Libyan Islamic Fighting Group," Dudley Knox Library Naval Postgraduate School, May 11, 2005.

⁵³ Director of National Intelligence John D. Negroponte, "Annual Threat Assessment of the Director of National Intelligence," Statement before the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, February 2, 2006.

⁵⁴ US Department of State, "Foreign Terrorist Organizations Designation Table," December 2004.

⁵⁵ The United States Department of Treasury, "Treasury Designates UK-Based Individuals, Entities Financing Al Qaida-Affiliated LIFG," Press Room, February 8, 2006.

⁵⁶ "Salafist Group for Preaching and Combat," MIPT Terrorism Knowledge Base, December 2005.

threatening foreigners in Algeria and pledged renewed allegiance to al-Qaeda and global Jihad.⁵⁷ Kamel Bourgass, a GSPC member convicted in April 2005 in the United Kingdom (where he already is serving a life sentence for murdering Detective Constable Stephen Oake in 2003) for “conspiracy to cause public nuisance by use of poisons and/or explosives,” was connected with London-based GSPC leader Abu Doha, a known Jihadist linked with the foiled plot to blow up Los Angeles International Airport.⁵⁸ There also are financial links between GSPC cells in Europe and Algeria.⁵⁹

LASHKAR-E-TAIBA

Lashkar-e-Taiba (LET) is a Pakistani-based militant group seeking a pan-Islamic state in South Asia. Although the group is focused primarily on the secession of Jammu and Kashmir, an ambitious sect of the group is calling for a worldwide Jihad.⁶⁰ There are several reports that al-Qaeda used LET to fill some of its operational gaps after the United States successfully targeted al-Qaeda members following the attacks on September 11, 2001. The State Department annual terrorism report states that a top al-Qaeda-associate Abu Zubaydah was captured at a Lashkar-e-Taiba safe house in March 2002.⁶¹

Pakistani President Pervez Musharraf has made the difficult and potentially regime threatening decision to support the global war on terrorism. The Pakistani Government has targeted militant Islamic groups and apprehended or detained a number of important al-Qaeda supporters. At the same time, Pakistan historically has been supportive of Kashmiri separatist movements such as LET. There is strong popular support for LET’s activity in Jammu and Kashmir.⁶² This support has provided an opening for LET to continue operations in Pakistan.

Since 9/11, the United States has been concerned about the reportedly large number of LET members in the United States and Canada. In 2003, U.S. officials charged eleven men, nine of whom are Americans, with preparing to wage Jihad combat overseas on behalf of Lashkar-e-Taiba. Muhammad Aatique, one of the eleven men charged, told the federal judge hearing the case that he and his co-conspirators may have taken up arms against the United States had they not been arrested.⁶³ In addition, Canadian officials arrested Raja Ghulam Mustafa, a Pakistani national and suspected LET captain with links to al-Qaeda and Usama bin Laden.⁶⁴ Still, the Intelligence Community lacks a clear understanding of the group’s activities in the United States.

⁵⁷ US Department of State, “Algeria,” Country Reports on Terrorism, April 2005, pp. 58-9.

⁵⁸ “Salafist Group for Preaching and Combat,” MIPT Terrorism Knowledge Base, December 2005.

⁵⁹ US Department of State, “Algeria,” Country Reports on Terrorism, April 2005, pp. 57-58.

⁶⁰ “Kashmir Militant Extremists,” Council on Foreign Relations, October 2005.

⁶¹ U.S. Department of State Global Pattern of Terrorism 2002, April 30, 2003.

⁶² “Lashkar-e-Taiba,” MIPT Terrorism Knowledge Base, March 10, 2006.

⁶³ Jerry Markon and Mary Beth Sheridan, “Indictment Expands “VA. Jihad” Charge,” Washington Post, September 26, 2003.

⁶⁴ Sarah Kennedy, “Anti-terror Bust Targets T.O. Home,” The Calgary Sun, March 31, 2006.

Homegrown Terrorism

The National Consortium for the Study of Terrorism and Responses to Terrorism (START), a University of Maryland database has compiled information on worldwide terror incidents since 1970, reports that one of every seven terrorist attacks is carried out by a homegrown extremist.⁶⁵ The July 2005 bombings in London support this trend, and may provide further insight into the future of terrorist activities. These terrorists were homegrown, born or raised in the United Kingdom. Although their ties to al-Qaeda remain unclear, they were willing to conduct attacks to support al-Qaeda's global jihad.

London is not the only place where homegrown terrorists have carried out attacks against innocent people. In 2004, the murder of Dutch filmmaker Theo Van Gogh brought this issue to the forefront. Van Gogh was murdered by Mohammed Bouyeri, a Dutch citizen of Moroccan decent, who belonged to the Hofstad Group, a radical extremist group made up of mainly Dutch citizens of North African decent. Attacks in Casablanca, Morocco and Madrid, Spain were also the work of homegrown terrorist cells. On November 4, 2005, Pakistani security forces captured Mustafa Setmariam Nasar (aka Abu Musab al-Suri), a jihadist theorist suspected of planning the 2004 and 2005 bombings in Madrid and London. Whether it is an individual assassination or a large scale attack, both represent religious-inspired terrorism as propounded by al-Qaeda since the late 20th Century.⁶⁶

Next-Generation Jihadist: A Case Study


Mustafa Setmariam Nasar, aka Abu Musab al-Suri, is a Syrian native who fought against the Soviet Union in Afghanistan. He later became an acquaintance of Usama bin Laden, but remained an independent minded ideologue. Nasar spent several years living in Europe and is believed to be the architect for terrorist cells operating in Europe. After September 11, 2001, Nasar called for a "third generation" of Salafi Jihadists—one that works primarily on its own with guidance from roving operatives acting on behalf of the broader movement. Nasar published thousands of pages on the Internet, using lessons learned from past conflicts, on how small independent groups of Islamist extremists can effectively conduct operations against the West. He authored a 1,600-page document titled, "The Call for a Global Islamic Resistance," which was posted on the Internet and is believed to be used by some terrorist groups worldwide.

⁶⁵ Statistic provided by the Study of Terrorism and Response to Terrorism (START), Gary LaFree, www.start.umd.edu/.

⁶⁶ *Violent Jihad in the Netherlands: Current trends in the Islamist terrorist threat*, Report produced by the Ministry of the Interior and Kingdom Relations, The Hague: Netherlands, March 2006, p.7.



De Telegraaf



Associated Press

Dutch filmmaker Theo Van Gogh was killed by Mohammed Bouyeri, who is a member of a radical terrorist group in the Netherlands called the Hofstad Group (Left).

On March 11, 2004 devastating terrorist attack in Madrid, Spain killed 191 people (Right).

The presence of “homegrown” Islamist extremist cells in Europe is of particular concern to the United States. Most Western European countries participate in the Visa Waiver Program, which allows citizens of those countries to visit the United States without a visa. There is concern that Islamist extremists who have citizenship in these countries could now gain entry to the United States with relative ease.

Recent events demonstrate that Europe is not the only location where Islamic militants can establish themselves. There are legitimate concerns about the terrorist threats orchestrated by cells in Mexico or Canada, countries with whom we share some 5,000 miles of border. For many reasons, security along the border with Mexico has been a primary focus. However, the border to the north, which in many places is porous and unattended, must also be addressed. Disturbingly little attention has been paid to this 3,100 mile border despite the fact that terrorist groups have made previous attempts to enter the United States from Canada (the Millennium Plot). A Customs and Border Protection spokeswoman recently stated that “fewer than ten percent—approximately 1,000—of the nation’s border patrol agents are deployed to the Canadian border.”⁶⁷

On June 4, 2006, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police arrested 17 Canadian suspects on terror charges. The group, which ranged in age from 19-43, is charged with purchasing three tons of ammonium nitrate for the manufacture of bombs to attack Canadian government buildings. The group also appears to have links with Islamic militants in the United States. The people involved seem to meet the criteria of the growing homegrown

⁶⁷ “Homegrown Terrorists Under Close Watch in the U.S.” Associated Press, June 22, 2006.

terrorism threat that we in America may not be following as closely as we should. The individuals arrested by the Canadian police are educated, come from well-established families and have no criminal record—there is nothing in their past to draw the attention of law enforcement officials. This group met in relative anonymity and was able to spread support for violent Jihad. The fact that it was able to do so is a fundamental national security threat.

The Dutch intelligence agency, AIVD, recently conducted a study that found certain Muslim youth groups in the Netherlands are not only receptive to radicalization, but perceive violent Jihad as positive and “cool.”⁶⁸ The study found several factors associated with the radicalization of Muslims. First, Western nations have struggled with only limited success to integrate Muslim immigrant communities into the rest of society. This lack of integration leaves some Muslims feeling disenfranchised and alienated from Western society. This is particularly true among second and third generation Muslims in Europe who feel discriminated against and rarely leave their Muslim enclaves. The international community is also seeing a Muslim youth that is becoming keenly aware of his heritage and is equally interested in Muslim affairs globally. The increasing use of the Internet allows Muslim youth to communicate with other Muslims worldwide. They see what is happening to fellow Muslims in the Middle East, Afghanistan and Iraq and are angry and frustrated at what they consider to be Western policies toward Muslims. Usama bin Laden continually speaks along these lines when he says, “Muslims are being humiliated, tortured and ruthlessly killed all over the world, and its time to fight these satanic forces with the utmost strength and power.”⁶⁹ Islamist extremists have capitalized on events like the Abu Ghraib prison abuse scandal and Guantanamo Bay to rally Muslim support against the West. Other factors that may lead Muslims to feel a sense of cultural alienation include their social status, lack of employment opportunities and imprisonment.



Associated Press

The July 2005 attacks in London killed 52 people. Subsequent investigations discover attacks were the work of homegrown terrorists.

It should be noted that homegrown cells aligning their beliefs with al-Qaeda or radical Islam are not unique to Europe. While the United States has not seen a major attack by homegrown terrorists, it does not mean we are immune from such an attack. Following

⁶⁸ Violent Jihad in the Netherlands: Current trends in the Islamist terrorist threat, Report produced by the Ministry of the Interior and Kingdom Relations, The Hague: Netherlands, March 2006, p.8.

⁶⁹ Usama bin Laden, “Message to Muslim Youth,” Markaz al-Dawa (Internet), December 13, 2001.

the July 2005 bombings in London, FBI Director Robert Mueller admitted, “The United States could face attacks from homegrown terrorism very similar to bombings in London that killed 52 people and wounded another 700.” The plot carried out by four men in London may be a “likely model for future U.S. attacks.” The bombers, all British citizens, had no criminal records, weren't on any watch lists and had no extremist pasts.⁷⁰

U.S. prisons and universities continue to be used as potential recruitment centers for Islamist extremists. In addition, some mosques have been used by extremist groups to recruit new members. The radicalization of Islamic inmates in prison is not a recent phenomenon. Prison systems throughout the world have been and continue to be breeding grounds for radicalism and facilities for the planning and training of radical activities. Concerns regarding the radicalization of Muslim inmates were heightened after former inmates Richard Reid and Jose Padilla were arrested for allegedly attempting to commit terrorist acts against the United States.

In July 2005, law enforcement officials uncovered a California-based homegrown Islamic terrorist cell, known as Jamiyyat Ul Islam Is Saheeh (JIS). This group was planning attacks against military facilities, religious institutions and other facilities in the United States. Kevin James (a.k.a. Shakyh Shahaab Murshid), the founder of JIS, recruited fellow prison inmates to join JIS. The group preached it was the duty of members to target for violent attack any enemies of Islam, including the U.S. Government and Jewish and non-Jewish supporters of Israel. Upon release from prison, JIS members sought to establish cells of JIS members outside of prison who were willing to plot terrorist acts and commit armed robberies.⁷¹ While the group did not actively work on behalf of Usama bin Laden, it did swear allegiance to al-Qaeda.

SUNNI EXTREMIST GROUPS IN THE UNITED STATES

Sunni extremist organizations that have expressed an interest in attacking the United States have maintained a presence here for years. These groups use America's openness to establish roots in our communities and focus on training, recruiting and fundraising, rather than carrying out terrorist attacks. For these groups, the value of fundraising and recruiting far outweighs the benefit of an attack.

Since September 11, 2001, Federal authorities have raided and shut down at least twenty-five charities contributing to terrorist activities, including some that served as front companies for al-Qaeda. For example, on October 13, 2004, the U.S. Treasury Department designated the Islamic African Relief Agency (IARA), also known as the Islamic American Relief Agency, as a supporter of terrorism. The designation froze all accounts, funds and assets of IARA, a charity that belongs to a larger network with headquarters in the Sudan. According to the Treasury Department, the charity funneled

⁷⁰ Charlotte Sector, “Experts Say Suicide Mission in the U.S. is Inevitable,” ABC News, July 18, 2005.

⁷¹ “Four Men Indicted on Terrorism Charges Related to Conspiracy to Attack Military Facilities, Other Targets,” U.S. Department of Justice, www.usdoj.gov, August 31, 2005.

hundreds of thousands of dollars to Usama bin Laden and al-Qaeda.⁷² In addition, in 2002 U.S. authorities raided the offices of the Benevolence International Foundation (BIF). The Government charged various people tied to the organization with trying to obtain chemical and nuclear weapons on behalf of al-Qaeda.

Since the 1980s, terrorist organizations have developed a sophisticated and diverse financial infrastructure within the United States. It is widely known that almost every terrorist organization from Hamas to al-Qaeda has accessed America's financial resources and institutions to their benefit. They have leveraged magazines, mosques and charities as front organizations to support terrorist activities overseas. Although these groups do not share all the same objectives, they have shown the willingness to work together in the United States to raise money for terrorist activities (See Figure 5).⁷³

Terrorists also exploit various venues to raise funds and spread their violent message to a wider audience, most unwitting of the source. For example, at the 1996 annual convention of the Islamic Association for Palestine (IAP) in Chicago, Abdurahman Alamoudi told the audience, "once we are here, our mission in this country is to change it. There is no way for Muslims to be violent in America, no way. We have other means to do it."⁷⁴ Alamoudi, who has been a guest at the White House on several occasions under the Clinton and Bush Administration's, pleaded guilty to smuggling money into the country, as well as to participating in a plot to kill the then-crown prince of Saudi Arabia. Not all people who speak at these conventions are radical or favor violence against the United States. In fact, extremists account for only a very small percentage of the people who attend these functions, but the events also attract the worst of terrorists. In the past, these Muslim conferences have even hosted the likes of Ayman Zawahiri, who is believed to have attended a fundraising conference in Santa Clara, California for the Egyptian Islamic Jihad sometime after the first World Trade Center attack⁷⁵ This would have been al-Zawahiri's second visit to the United States since 1989.

⁷² "Islamic African Relief Agency," U.S. Department of Treasury, Office of Terrorism and Financial Intelligence, October 13, 2004.

⁷³ Richard Clarke, "Testimony before the United States Senate Banking Committee," October 22, 2003.

⁷⁴ "United States of America v. Abdurahman Muhammad Alamoudi," United District Court, Eastern District of Maryland (www.findlaw.com), September 30, 2003.

⁷⁵ "Egyptian Doctor Emerges as Terror Mastermind," Profile of Ayman al-Zawahiri, www.cnn.com

Exploitation of the Internet

The art of terrorist strategic communication has evolved to a point where the terrorists themselves can now control the entire production process.⁷⁶ In recent years, the Internet has become the primary tool used to project their extremist message. The increasing use of technology, especially the use of the Internet, by Islamist extremist groups has led to a new phenomenon known as “glocal” issues, whereas global issues are now becoming local issues. Usama bin Laden could not have his current, and increasing, level of success if Muslims did not believe their faith, brethren, resources, and lands to be under attack by the United States and, more generally, the West.⁷⁷ The Internet has helped al-Qaeda reach Muslim communities around the world with this very message.

The Internet has provided al Qaeda a tool to proselytize its message to an international audience and convince Muslim communities that they are being threatened by their local government.⁷⁸ Today, almost all terrorist organizations use the Internet in some capacity, and the majority of them maintain one or more websites. Easy access, lack of regulation and the ability to shape the message are all too alluring for terrorist groups to bypass.

Terrorist groups increasingly are reliant on the Internet to accomplish several of their key objectives. First, the Internet provides a means for terrorists to reach out to a larger audience. The Internet allows terrorist groups to communicate not only with their supporters and members, but also to influence the opinion of the general public. The Internet also provides terrorist groups a new means to spread its propaganda and increase publicity. Through propaganda, terrorist seek to communicate a particular message to a particular audience.⁷⁹ In certain circumstances we have come to learn that terrorists are targeting children as young as seven years old, sometimes younger. Young adults of the Muslim world rely less on the television, cable, or radio to get their news—but exclusively get their information from the Internet.⁸⁰

Terrorist groups will continue to use the Internet to shape their image and the image of their enemies. They also will use the Internet to raise money for terror activities. In the past, terrorists have used their Websites to advertise bank account numbers that supporters can send money.

The Internet is an ideal vehicle for recruitment. Although terrorists have experienced difficulty penetrating the United States since 9/11, the ability to recruit new members through the Internet poses new challenges for the Intelligence Community and law enforcement officials. Terrorists now can use the Internet to pass along operational

⁷⁶ Bruce Hoffman. “The Use of the Internet by Extremists,” Testimony before the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, May 4, 2006.

⁷⁷ Michael Scheuer, *Imperial Hubris*, Potomac Books, 2005, p. xi.

⁷⁸ Ambassador Francis Taylor, “Emerging Threats to Homeland Security,” May 10, 2004.

⁷⁹ Bruce Hoffman. “The Use of the Internet by Extremists,” Testimony before the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, May 4, 2006.

⁸⁰ Bruce Hoffman. “The Use of the Internet by Extremists,” Testimony before the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, May 4, 2006.

guidance. Terrorist groups post messages on their websites letting potential terrorists know that they do not have to travel to other lands to join terrorist organizations or receive training.⁸¹ New recruits can now become radicalized without leaving the home.

Finally, terrorists exploit the Internet for intelligence-gathering and targeting. Today, anyone can go on the Internet and collect information against key infrastructure and sensitive components. Terrorists use these sites to conduct reconnaissance on potential targets without ever having to put feet on the ground to conduct surveillance. During raids in Afghanistan, U.S. forces came across computers in the homes of known terrorists that held information on important U.S. landmarks, such as the Hoover Dam, the New York financial sector and government buildings in Washington, D.C.

Conclusion

We remain a nation at war. The United States is not safe simply because we have not seen an attack on U.S. soil since September 11, 2001. The loss of key personnel, training camps and lines of communication have had a significant impact on al-Qaeda's near-term operational capabilities, but the group still remains the single, greatest threat to America, our allies and our interests abroad. Al-Qaeda has bridged some of these gaps by increasingly reaching out to other Sunni extremist organizations, as well as homegrown terrorist cells, to support local attacks against the United States and our allies. In addition, its ability to exploit the Internet has enabled the group to communicate with its followers, recruit new supporters and spread its message to a wider audience. These groups continue to plan for horrific attacks. The Intelligence Community is fighting a daily war against Islamist extremism—this can not be stressed enough. Just because terrorists are not conducting attacks does not mean they are not recruiting, fundraising, training and planning future attacks. Unfortunately, there are still gaps in our understanding of Islamist extremist groups, which leaves America vulnerable to future attacks.

Since the September 11th terrorist attacks there have been numerous commissions, reports and studies to identify shortfalls in the Intelligence Community and recommend ways to improve the capabilities and effectiveness for all intelligence components to prevent future attacks against the United States. Some of the most noteworthy recommendations acted on by the Congress and the Bush Administration include the creation of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence who serves as head of the Intelligence Community and acts as the principal adviser to the President. In addition, the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act created the National Counterterrorism Center (NCTC) to integrate all intelligence possessed by the United States Government pertaining to terrorism. Finally, the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) established a National Security Branch (NSB) that integrates intelligence collection and analysis capabilities addressing the domestic terrorist threat.

⁸¹ Bruce Hoffman. "The Use of the Internet by Extremists," Testimony before the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, May 4, 2006.

These reforms have strengthened America's stance against Islamist extremist terrorist groups, and without question we are a safer nation than we were before 9/11. However, there are still significant shortfalls within the Intelligence Community.

Recognizing this War is Different – The global war on terrorism is not a war of our choosing. America did not seek out this conflict, but it is upon us and must be won. It is a new type of war – one where the enemy is not a nation, but a movement. Our enemy seeks to inflict massive civilian casualties. We must be willing to use force when necessary, and the command and control of our forces must be sufficiently nimble to strike when the opportunity presents itself. In this war, intelligence and information are as important as military capability. Losing control of information can cost American lives.

Understanding Your Enemy—A successful U.S. strategy will therefore ultimately depend on our ability to counter the ideological appeal of al-Qaeda and other Islamist extremist groups. However, to be successful, we first need to better understand the animosity and arguments that underpin al-Qaeda and the wider radical Jihad movement, and the region of the world from which its struggle emanated and upon which its argument still rests.⁸² Understanding the Islamist extremist ideology will not allow us to influence the terrorists—these extremists cannot be reasoned with. We cannot expect to win the hearts and minds of those who have already been indoctrinated into the jihadist cause. We, however, can look to influence younger generations that may be vulnerable to recruitment.⁸³

The Central Intelligence Agency created an office in September 2004 to look at political Islam and brief senior policy makers on the issue, as well as organize academic outreach programs around the world. These types of efforts are essential to help people better understand the terrorist, and how they use religion to justify and rationalize their actions. Still, this is not enough. This one program at the CIA can only reach a finite number of people. In the years ahead, the Committee would like to see the Intelligence Community dedicate additional funding and resources to standing up similar offices to help people understand the challenges of Islamist extremism. Otherwise, we will continue to make the same mistakes.

Domestically, we need a better understanding of the threat posed by homegrown terrorist groups. One of the things we have learned from the attacks in the Netherlands, Madrid, Casablanca and London is that there is not a one size fits all reason to answer why these individuals chose to adopt this violent form of Islam. The Department of Homeland Security should look to address the issue of radicalization, not just among Islamist extremist groups, but all terrorism groups within the United States. We need a better idea

⁸² Bruce Hoffman. "The Use of the Internet by Extremists," Testimony before the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, May 4, 2006.

⁸³ Richard Perle, Testimony before the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, February 2, 2005.

of who is vulnerable, where are people becoming radicalized and to what extent the threat already is ingrained in our communities.

Winning the War of Ideas—The global war on terrorism is different than any other war in America’s history. However, as in most wars, America has been forced to engage in a “War of Ideas” against the enemy. This war against Islamist extremism can only be partially won through the use military, the rest must be accomplished with soft power, or diplomacy. The terrorists understand the importance of this tactic and are extremely adept at waging a war of ideas. Through the use of the Internet and other means, terrorists have had considerable success in spreading an anti-American message throughout the Muslim community. Terrorists utilize Internet websites to post comments and pictures that will incite their target audience—the younger Muslim population. They are distorting the truth to recruit new supporters. For the most part, they do this uncontested. America, with the help of our allies, in particular our Muslim partners, must increase its efforts to counter these anti-Western messages.

Responding to the Enemy Presence within the United States—The Islamic Jihadist war against the West is a war without borders. Since 9/11, a number of jihadist cells have been identified within the United States, and terrorist plots have been thwarted in their initial phase of planning. Prudence demands that we remain alert to the very real possibility of terrorist attacks on the Homeland. U.S. law enforcement authorities must utilize all legal and constitutional tools to aggressively prevent domestic terrorist activity. Successfully combating terrorists or would-be Jihadists who are already located within the United States will require the cooperation of all Americans. It is quite possible that the local police or highway patrol may get the first inklings of some terrorist activity. As a result, it is also absolutely essential that the FBI, the Department of Homeland Security, and other federal agencies work very closely with state and local authorities. The Joint Terrorism Task Forces that have been established throughout the country now serve an important coordination and communication function.

The JIS case in California illustrates the importance of law enforcement partnerships and cooperation between state, local and federal authorities. In this particular case, local police officials uncovered critical information that they then shared with the FBI, and all levels worked together to protect our country from the threat of terrorism.⁸⁴ We should continue to look for creative ways to capitalize on the expertise and knowledge of local law enforcement.

The Internet—The Internet has become a key enabler for Islamist extremist groups to recruit, train, raise money and propagate their message. Although the United States has done an adequate job of creating venues to reach and influence moderate Muslims with a pro-Western message, these same forums have proven ineffective at influencing persons

⁸⁴ “Four Men Indicted on Terrorism Charges Related to Conspiracy to Attack Military Facilities, Other Targets,” U.S. Department of Justice, www.usdoj.gov, August 31, 2005.

who may already have been radicalized by the Internet.⁸⁵ The Committee impresses upon the United Government the need to do a better job in this realm to counter terrorists' unchallenged use of the Internet. We need to increase efforts to challenge the propaganda, distorted truths, messages of hate and calls for violence on the Internet.

⁸⁵ Bruce Hoffman. "The Use of the Internet by Extremists," Testimony before the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, May 4, 2006.

Appendix 1

al-Qaeda: In Their Own Words

Since Usama bin Laden officially declared jihad on America in his August 23, 1996 message entitled: “Declaration of Jihad Against the Americans Occupying the Land of the Two Holy Mosques; Expel Heretics from the Arabian Peninsula,” there have been numerous comments made by al-Qaeda leaders outlining their reason for jihad and calling for continued attacks against America and our interests abroad.

Thanks to the help of dedicated analysts at the Open Source Center and the National Counterterrorism Center we have included several comments taken from statements released by al-Qaeda. For a better understanding and to put the comment in appropriate context, we recommend looking at the full statement.

“Its [Saudi Government] failure to protect the country, opening it to the nation’s enemy, the American crusader forces who have become the main cause of all aspects of our plight (Usama bin Laden, Declaration of Jihad Against the Americans Occupying the Land of the Two Holy Mosques, August 23, 1996).”

“Muslims burn with anger at America. For its own good, America should leave [Saudi Arabia.] ... There is no more important duty than pushing the American enemy out of the holy land. ... The presence of the USA Crusader military forces on land, sea and air of the states of the Islamic Gulf is the greatest danger threatening the largest oil reserve in the world (Declaration of War Against the Americans Who Occupy the Land of the Two Holy Mosques, August 23, 1996).”

“Destruction of the oil industries, because the presence of the crusader and American military forces in the Islamic Gulf states, on land, in the air, and at sea, represents the greatest danger and harm and the greatest threat to the largest oil reserves in the world. That presence is a provocation to the people and an affront to their religion, feelings, and dignity, and has driven them toward armed struggle against the occupying invaders (Usama bin Laden, Declaration of Jihad Against the Americans Occupying the Land of the Two Holy Mosques, August 23, 1996).”

“Your brothers in the land of the two holy mosques and Palestine seek your help and ask you to participate with them in their jihad against their enemies and yours, the Israelis and the Americans, with everything that would drive them out of the Islamic holy places, defeated, with each of you doing what he can (Usama bin Laden, Declaration of Jihad Against the Americans Occupying the Land of the Two Holy Mosques, August 23, 1996).”

“We declared jihad against the US government, because the US government is unjust, criminal and tyrannical. It has committed acts that are extremely unjust, hideous and criminal whether directly or through its support of the Israeli occupation (CNN interview with Osama bin Laden, March 1997).”

“For this and other acts of aggression and injustice, we have declared jihad against the US, because in our religion it is our duty to make jihad so that God's word is the one exalted to the heights and so that we drive the Americans away from all Muslim countries (CNN interview with Osama bin Laden, March 1997).”

“For over seven years the United States has been occupying the lands of Islam in the holiest of places, the Arabian Peninsula, plundering its riches, dictating to its rulers, humiliating its people, terrorizing its neighbors, and turning its bases in the Peninsula into a spearhead through which to fight the neighboring Muslim peoples (Usama bin Laden, February 22, 1998).”

“All these crimes and sins committed by the Americans are a clear declaration of war on God, his messenger, and Muslims. And ulema have throughout Islamic history unanimously agreed that the jihad is an individual duty if the enemy destroys the Muslim countries (Usama bin Laden, Jihad against Jews and Crusaders, February 1998).”

“On that basis, and in compliance with God's order, we issue the following fatwa to all Muslims: the ruling to kill the Americans and their allies—civilians and military—is an individual duty for every Muslim who can do it in any country in which it is possible to do it, in order to liberate the al-Aqsa Mosque and the holy mosque [Mecca] from their grip, and in order for their armies to move out of all the lands of Islam, defeated and unable to threaten any Muslim (Usama bin Laden, Jihad against Jews and Crusaders, February 1998).”

“Hostility toward America is a religious duty, and we hope to be rewarded for it by God. To call us Enemy No. 1 or 2 does not hurt us. Osama bin Laden is confident that the Islamic nation will carry out its duty. I am confident that Muslims will be able to end the legend of the so-called superpower that is America (Time interview, December 23, 1998).”

“As for the United States, I tell it and its people these few words: I swear by Almighty God who raised the heavens without pillars that neither the United States nor he who lives in the United States will enjoy security before we can see it as a reality in Palestine and before all the infidel armies leave the land of Muhammad, may God's peace and

blessing be upon him (Usama bin Laden, Speech following September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks, Al-Jazirah TV).”

“Our message to our enemies is this: America and its allies should know that their crimes will not go unpunished, God willing. We advise them to hasten to leave Palestine, the Arabian Peninsula, Afghanistan, and all Muslim countries, before they lose everything. We addressed some messages to America’s allies to stop their involvement in its crusader campaign. The mujahid youths have addressed a message to Germany and another to France. If the measures have not been sufficient, we are ready, with the help of God, to increase them. As for America, it should expect to be reciprocated for its actions and for the Jews’ use of American weapons to destroy Palestinian homes with the residents inside. It should expect to be reciprocated for the Jews’ killing of Muhammad al-Durrah and his peers with American weapons. Then, the American people will curse Bush and his Administration, while they are alive and after their death, for the grave scores that will be settled. God willing, we will continue to target the key sectors of the U.S. economy (Ayman al-Zawahiri, October 8, 2002).”

“America and its allies have become aware of this reality and the earth has trembled under them. And they now know that the winds of jihad will wobble their thrones and shake their structures. They, therefore, have gathered themselves and formed a union to face the coming enemy: it is Islam under the true jihad banner . . . Now that jihad has raised its flag, and the arms of Islam’s heroes in Iraq have gotten more powerful, the hearts of the Islamic nation are beating with joy, awaiting a hopefully better morning, which will take away the long and heavy darkness of the humiliation, by the Jews, the Crusaders and their agents from our renegade leaders (Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, October 28, 2004).”

“This is in addition to our having experience in using guerrilla warfare and the war of attrition to fight tyrannical superpowers, as we, alongside the Mujahideen, bled Russia for ten years, until it went bankrupt and was forced to withdraw in defeat . . . So we are continuing this policy in bleeding America to the point of bankruptcy (Usama bin Laden, November 1, 2004).”

“You tried to deny us the decent life, but you cannot deny us a decent death. Refraining from performing jihad, which is sanctioned by our religion, is an appalling sin. The best way of death for us is under the shadows of swords. Do not be deluded by your power and modern weapons. Although they win some battles, they lose the war. Patience and steadfastness are better than them. What is important is the outcome. We had patiently fought the Soviet Union for 10 years with our few weapons and we managed to drain their economy. Thus, they became a history, with God’s help. You should learn lessons from that. We will remain patient in fighting you, God willing, until the one whose time

has come dies first. We will not escape the fight as long as we hold our weapons in our hands (Usama bin Laden, January 2006).”

“Look at what the mujahidin did for the Russians in Afghanistan and then in Chechnya. Look at what the mujahidin are doing for the Jews in Palestine. Look at what the mujahidin did to the Americans in Somalia and what the mujahidin are doing to them in Iraq and Afghanistan today. Look at what your 19 brothers did to America—which claimed that it can hear the crawling of ants, see what is inside the earth, and monitor its enemies day and night—in both the New York and Washington “raids”. Nineteen honest men exposed America’s incompetence and weakness (Ayman al-Zawahiri, December 2005).”

“I would like to tell you that the war is for you or for us to win. If we win it, it means your defeat and disgrace forever as the wind blows in this direction with God’s help. If you win it, you should read the history. We are a nation that does not tolerate injustice and seek revenge forever. Days and nights will not go by until we take revenge as we did on 11 September, God willing, and until your minds are exhausted and your lives become miserable (Usama bin Laden, January 19, 2006).”

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF PETE HOEKSTRA, CHAIRMAN

Since the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, the United States has been a nation at war. Our enemy is not a nation, but a political movement that remains determined to destroy our country and kill as many Americans as possible. Followers of Usama bin Laden do not wear uniforms, and seek to remain as inconspicuous as possible until they strike. And, despite suggestion to the contrary, our enemy is in many ways a highly sophisticated adversary that utilizes technology and understands our legal system.

Some months ago I began to observe what I felt to be an alarming trend in the media reporting on the Global War on Terrorism. Journalists and former political officials have begun in increasing numbers to suggest that our nation is not truly at war with terrorism, and that terrorism should more properly be considered a law enforcement matter. Given the absolute commitment of al Qaeda and its affiliates to launch new attacks on America, I find this view to be disturbing, dangerous, and fundamentally incorrect. The fact that the United States has not been successfully attacked since 9/11 does not mean that Usama bin Laden and his followers have surrendered. Quite the opposite, the failure of follow-on attacks reflects our success in a very aggressive war against terrorism. Our nation is blessed with outstanding military and intelligence personnel who, empowered with expanded authorities, have taken the battle to the enemy. We have successfully disrupted much of al Qaeda's support structure and eliminated many of their key figures. Despite our successes in the Global War on Terrorism, the enemy remains quite capable of launching additional attacks on the homeland. It is worth repeating -- we remain a nation at war.

How then, can the Committee best convey this concern? Preparing an unclassified document that highlights the continuing terrorist threat requires a delicate balancing act. While the attached report is based on unclassified sources, the data collected by the various elements of the Intelligence Community support its findings. As stipulated by the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee is routinely apprised of many possible threats to the United States. From entities such as the National Counterterrorism Center (NCTC) and the CIA's Counterterrorism Center (CTC) we receive information regarding the plans and actions of terrorists. But to reveal these threats would be to disclose classified information, and could provide our enemy with valuable insights into our collection capabilities. The Intelligence Community already has sufficient problems with the unauthorized leaking of classified information, and the Committee has no wish to compromise sources and methods of intelligence collection.

As a result, the staff drew upon information that has previously been made public by the Executive branch, and is corroborated by information that we have received in the normal course of our oversight activity. For example, the report draws heavily upon information released in the public hearings of the Director of National Intelligence, as

well as the annual unclassified worldwide threat testimony of former DCIA Goss and DCI Tenet. The National Counterterrorism Center has also released important and useful information, including key strategic details such as the captured letter from Ayman Al-Zawahiri to Abu Musab al-Zarqawi. For information related to domestic terrorist threats, the report utilizes the annual testimony of Director Mueller and other senior FBI personnel. The Department of Justice also has released important information regarding cases that they are prosecuting. The Committee also drew upon the Department of State publications such as the annual Patterns of Global Terrorism as well as speeches by senior officials from the Departments of State and Treasury. Where appropriate, the report cites official reports compiled by key allied partners.

The Committee conducts regular closed-session intelligence updates, at least on a bi-monthly basis, where Members are briefed by NCTC and CTC on the latest information related to the terrorist enemy. The Committee receives annual classified testimony on the worldwide threat, a responsibility that Director Negroponte has now assumed. As was the practice with his predecessors, DCIA Hayden continues to regularly brief the Committee on terrorist activity. In addition, we receive similar briefings on domestic terrorist threats and radicalization within the U.S. prison system from Federal law enforcement officials. The Committee has conducted closed-door hearings on the changing nature of the terrorist threat and the presence of domestic terrorism. The Committee also receives daily intelligence reporting, including detailed reporting on terrorist and counterterrorist activity. We receive lengthier intelligence products on specific aspects of the threat, as well analyses prepared by the National Intelligence Council. And, in a break with past tradition, the Committee has held several public hearings in the 109th Congress, including hearings on the Jihadist use of the Internet for strategic communications, and hearings on global threats to U.S. interests in the 21st Century.

It should also be recognized that Members and staff of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence have the privilege to travel to frontline locations in the Global War on Terrorism, where we meet with those exceptional military and intelligence officers whose task it is to ensure American security. Each Member of the Committee has traveled to hazardous locations and discussed various aspects of the counterterrorism mission. We meet with key liaison partners to solicit the views of our allies and to convey messages that support the Executive branch. All of this activity feeds our general understanding of the terrorist threat.

In preparing this report, staff met with various elements of the Intelligence Community, and coordinated closely with the NCTC. Meetings were held to elicit the views of outside experts at the RAND Cooperation and other organizations. In a number of instances, the report cites press reports of on the record briefings provided by senior government officials. For example, the White House briefed the press on ten terrorist events that had been interdicted prior to execution – events the Committee know to be accurate.

Every effort was made to ensure that the report was a bipartisan product. Regardless of party affiliation, interested staff with appropriate security clearances were invited to participate in briefings, visits, and inquiries. Drafts were circulated to staff at various stages, and Members were provided with two weeks to review and comment upon the document. Minority staff provided valuable input in the drafting phase, and Minority Members offered specific guidance that was incorporated into the report. I thank those who offered their constructive observations, and would like to recognize the efforts of professional staff member Jacob Abel, whose initial effort served as the basis for the report.

Questions have been raised as to why the Committee should be releasing an unclassified report on a matter upon which we all agree. The reason is quite simple – because a significant portion of the American public seems to have forgotten that the threat remains. We, as a nation, will be at greater risk if the utter sincerity of our enemy is forgotten.

Pete Hoekstra
Chairman

MINORITY VIEWS
on
“Al-Qaeda: The Many Faces of an Islamic Extremist Threat”
issued by
The House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence

This paper is not a report of the Committee’s work. It is merely an assemblage of press clippings. It is a product of staff, not a bipartisan work product of the full Committee. It does not represent effective congressional oversight.

One of the most critical roles of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence is to conduct oversight. In overseeing the Intelligence Community (IC), the Committee ensures that intelligence agencies have effective strategies, produce results, operate within the law, and make efficient use of the resources at their disposal.

It is clear that al-Qaeda and Islamic extremists pose a serious threat to U.S. national security. The American people do not need the House Intelligence Committee to remind them of this fact. But this “threat assessment” adds no new information to the nation’s understanding of the challenges or to the U.S. government’s ability to address them.

A valuable, bipartisan oversight report would be based on hearings and briefings that address the threat of Islamic extremism and the capabilities employed by the IC to counter that threat. The Committee could then have issued a report of findings and recommendations that the Director of National Intelligence could use as a road map to improve the Community’s performance.

To better understand the Islamic extremist threat and the Intelligence Community’s collection, analysis, and operational response to that threat, the Committee should evaluate:

- I. The Intelligence Community’s efforts to track and disrupt terrorist finance. The Committee must hold hearings on the Administration’s terrorist financing programs to assess whether the programs are legal, effective in thwarting al-Qaeda and other terrorists, and adequately protective of innocent citizens’ privacy rights.
- II. The implementation of the NCTC *National Strategy to Combat Terrorist Travel*. The Committee should assess the execution of directives designed to constrain and detect terrorists’ mobility, including hindering travel facilitators, building capacity of partner countries, and improving information-sharing.
- III. IC efforts to identify and undermine “homegrown” terrorists. The Community works to identify “homegrown” terrorists who can operate under the radar in their home countries, including the United States. The Committee should assess the effectiveness of these initiatives, focusing on the collection and analysis of information and on collaboration across the U.S. government and with foreign partners.

- IV. The value of the President's Domestic Surveillance Program. The Committee has exercised too little oversight of this program to date. While the legality of the program is itself a matter for debate, other issues also merit aggressive congressional oversight: Has the program produced results? Are the private communications of innocent Americans adequately protected?
- V. Intelligence support to counterterrorism initiatives. The Committee should assess the Intelligence Community's support to counterterrorism analysis and operations and offer the IC recommendations for improvement.
- VI. The impact of intelligence reforms. The Committee must continue to evaluate the stand-up of the DNI to ensure that reforms enhance, rather than complicate, the management of the Intelligence Community as it pertains to counterterrorism.

To date, the Committee's examination of these issues has not been adequate. We urge the Majority to embark upon a serious oversight effort. We are eager to join an effort to produce a public report which accurately and seriously reflects the bipartisan conclusions we reach.

Jane Harman
Ranking Democrat

Alcee L. Hastings

Silvestre Reyes

Leonard L. Boswell

Robert E. (Bud) Cramer

Anna G. Eshoo

Rush D. Holt

C.A. (Dutch) Ruppersberger

John F. Tierney

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIVE HASTINGS

Though I was present for the debate on this report, I was away from the hearing room on Rules Committee business when the vote was taken to adopt the report. Had I been present for the Committee vote, I would have voted “no.”

Alcee L. Hastings
Member of Congress

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIVE ESHOO

June 29, 2006

This paper tells us nothing new. It reminds the American public that terrorists and religious extremists are a threat. The paper offers no constructive recommendations or solutions, nor is it a tool for the Intelligence Community.

Furthermore, as my Minority colleagues have asserted, this paper does not reflect the Committee's work. We are not intelligence analysts. Our job is not to produce threat assessments for the American public, as we cannot be experts on all subjects. Our job is to legislate and conduct oversight.

Committee Members and staff have traveled to all corners of the globe and met with representatives of every American intelligence agency to ensure that the U.S. intelligence apparatus functions effectively. Yet the Majority's paper fails to incorporate information about the Intelligence Community's capabilities that the Committee has learned in the course of its oversight efforts. For example:

- The paper asserts that counterterrorism initiatives and improved U.S. border security have made it more difficult for al-Qaeda to attack the United States. To some extent, this may be true. But no lessons from the Committee's oversight of Intelligence Community counterterrorism capabilities are reflected in the paper.
- The paper notes in passing that prison extremism represents a security threat. Committee Members and staff have held several hearings and briefings with the FBI, Bureau of Prisons, and other agencies on the threat of prison inmates who become radicalized while incarcerated. Yet the paper addresses none of the issues examined by the Committee.
- Simply repeating Abu Musab al-Zarqawi's rhetoric provides no insight into the United States' ability to address the insurgency in Iraq. The Committee has been repeatedly briefed on terrorist and insurgent activities in Iraq, yet this paper incorporates none of the Intelligence Community's insights about the strength, composition, and financing of the insurgency; the selection of Zarqawi's successor; the disputes between Osama bin Laden and Abu Musab al-Zarqawi; and the extent to which U.S. policy failures and missteps – such as the decision to suspend the Geneva Conventions, the policy of endless detention at Guantánamo Bay, and the abuse of prisoners at Abu Ghraib – have contributed to the success of insurgents' recruiting and propaganda.

On a positive note, I am pleased the meeting at which the Committee considered this report was held in open session. However, the meeting was noticed as a closed session, precluding the public from attending. Measures to improve the transparency of the Committee's business are welcome, but they should not stop halfway.

Anna Eshoo
Member of Congress

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIVE RUPPERSBERGER

June 29, 2006

I concur with the Minority Views submitted by my colleagues.

I would like to emphasize that the best way for this Committee to exercise its oversight responsibilities would be for both Majority and Minority Members to agree on a plan of action, convene a series of hearings and briefings, and issue a joint, bipartisan report that thoroughly analyzes the threat and offers concrete recommendations to the Intelligence Community.

This report, while interesting, is not the product of a thoughtful, bipartisan, collaborative effort.

C.A. (Dutch) Ruppertsberger
Member of Congress

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIVE TIERNEY

June 29, 2006

I agree with the views expressed by my Minority colleagues, but I wish to add the following additional thoughts.

First, the Majority made very clear to the Committee that its purpose in drafting this report is to remind the American public that Islamic extremists and terrorists continue to pose a threat to our security. But to repeat platitudes that “the United States must remain vigilant” or that “we remain a nation at war” is to oversimplify the issue. The Majority makes it appear as if the Committee is panicked that the United States will be overcome by a global wave of Islamic extremism, that Iraq will become a terrorist safe haven, or that Osama bin Laden is on the verge of acquiring weapons of mass destruction. The real threat is indeed significant but it is our charge to lead a rational, realistic response – not to lead into panic.

Second, the paper offers far too many conclusions based on an unsophisticated analysis of the facts; in some cases, information presented is simply incorrect. In the section on “The Growing Insurgency in Iraq,” for example, the majority demonstrates a shallow understanding of the relationship between Osama bin Laden and Abu Musab al-Zarqawi.

- The Majority states that while Osama bin Laden and Abu Musab al-Zarqawi “shared a similar ideology,” they had “some differences.” In fact, they had major differences. Bin Laden focused on the “far enemy” (the United States), while Zarqawi’s attention was fixed on the “near enemy” (infidels in Iraq and those who collaborated with the U.S.-installed government). Bin Laden also objected to Zarqawi’s targeting of Shi’ites, and his deputy, Ayman al-Zawahiri, strongly criticized Zarqawi’s gruesome beheadings of Westerners.
- The Majority presents Osama bin Laden and Abu Musab al-Zarqawi as fast partners. Yet bin Laden only jumped on the bandwagon in Iraq when he realized that Zarqawi was having a direct, violent impact on the United States for which he would not receive credit.

The same section exhibits an incomplete and unimaginative analysis of the insurgency in Iraq.

- The Majority describes the threat posed by battle-hardened foreign jihadis who gain combat experience in Iraq, but it fails to note that foreign fighters represent a small percentage of the insurgents fighting Coalition forces in Iraq. Furthermore, while these foreign fighters might use their training to fight against the United States, as the paper asserts, they are more likely to turn their vitriol against regional governments which they view as insufficiently Islamic.
- The Majority proposes that extremists could prevent the emergence of a successful democratic government in Iraq and turn the country into “a permanent base for al-Qaeda to recruit, train, and conduct operations.” But not all Members of the Committee are such Cassandras. Ordinary Iraqis may eventually tire of the chaos caused by Islamists and foreign fighters and turn against them, as has already

happened in parts of western Iraq. The ultimate end state may lie somewhere in between these two outcomes, yet the paper fails even to consider the more optimistic scenarios.

Finally, the paper demonstrates that the Majority's views of the terrorist threat is out of touch with the perspective of mainstream national security experts. The Majority asserts in its paper, for example, that the reorganization of the Intelligence Community has "without question" made the nation more secure; yet in a recent survey (dubbed "the Terrorism Index) published by *Foreign Policy* magazine, more than half of 100 highly respected national security experts said that "creating the Office of the Director of National Intelligence has had no positive impact in the war against terror." Perhaps the Committee should consult some of these leading experts to develop a more realistic assessment.

In the course of our oversight work, this Committee has developed a sophisticated appreciation of the nature of the Islamic extremist threat and the Intelligence Community's considerable abilities to address it; neither are effectively characterized in this report.

John Tierney
Member of Congress