

“So What Can We Do?”
A Counter- Jihad Op
Design Model

LTC Matthew A. Dooley, July 2011


Why Discuss this Now?

- Rise of “Militant Islam/ Islamist Resurgence” in the world compels us to examine the issues, unconstrained by fears of political incorrectness- **How do we define the threat if we aren’t allowed to talk about it?**
- AQ has been defeated in Iraq- **(I/O opportunity)**
- AQ is being beaten (again) in Afghanistan- **(I/O opportunity)**
- “Arab Spring” unrest in North Africa and Middle-East has opened a vacuum into which either liberal democracy or the Islamists will prevail (e.g. Muslim Brotherhood)
- “Cordova Project” in NYC necessitates exposure of financing, leadership track record, and long term intentions of those involved:
 - Why the name Cordova?**
 - Why timed to 10Yr Anniv of 9/11?**
 - Is this a 1st Amendment issue or really an Article 6 Issue?**

Why Discuss this Now (cont)?

- Schisms still exist between the Islamists and the rest of the Muslim world, all within the context of a Muslim world in turmoil (Tunisia, Egypt, Bahrain, Jordan, Libya, Saudi-Arabia, etc.) **Can we articulate and subsequently force a choice on 1.4 billion people?**
 - Option 1- transition to 21st Century, representative, democratic, “globalist” values
 - Option 2- a trade-off of subjugation under despots for subjugation under Islamists
- Islamists continue to use the concept of Abrogation, where Mohamed’s more hostile/intolerant teachings in Medina cancel out the earlier more tolerant Mecca guidelines, to gain traction in radicalizing moderates.
- Organizations like the Muslim Brotherhood, CAIR, American Muslim Council are often caught in between incidents of speaking one message to Muslims and quite another to “non-believers” (CAIR is an unindicted co-conspirator in a Hamas funding case involving the Holy Land Foundation.)
- With Bin Laden dead and contempt for Al-Qaeda’s brand/ ideology growing, ***now may be the time to ask those common folk in the Muslim Umma to openly decide/declare where they stand.***

In war, “intelligence” must first begin with an assessment of the enemy’s doctrinal template- not what we say they are, but what THEY say they are:



Political Correctness is Killing Us:
How can we properly identify the enemy, analyze his weaknesses, and defeat him, if we are NEVER permitted to examine him from the most basic doctrinal level?



Soviet Division Level Defense DOCTEMP
(the basis of how *they* said they would fight)

Islamic DOCTEMP sources
(the basis how *they* say they will fight)

The issue at hand is both of an emergent and professional concern:

- If, by the most conservative estimates, only 10% of all Muslims are what the West defines as “radical”, that is still a staggering 140 million people. By their own stated doctrine, they are motivated and unified under one ideology and one goal. They hate everything you stand for and will never coexist with you, unless you submit.
- As a professional soldier, you have a Constitutional obligation- by law and by oath, to assess all threats, and if necessary confront and defeat all enemies, foreign and domestic.


Article 6 of the U.S. Constitution:
“This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof.... shall be the supreme Law of the Land”

Sha'ria: Defines itself as “The comprehensive **Muslim law** derived from two sources, a) **the Quran** b) **the Sunnah** or traditions of Muhammad. It covers every aspect of daily individual and collective living.”

- **Your oath as a professional soldier forces you to pick a side here.** The 1st Amendment offers no protection to anyone actively working to impose a system of laws that subverts our Constitution.

Course Title:

Perspectives on Islam and Islamic Radicalism



- q Current media images (filtered)
- q Individual experiences/perspectives
- q Dr. Fatua history Lessons #1 and #2
- q Stephen Coughlin- Doctrinal threat analysis and legal perspectives
- q John Gandolo- Global jihad and law enforcement threat perspectives
- q Faculty- Counter-Jihad Op Design Discussion
- q Other guest speakers

Important Perspectives to Consider

When Viewing this Model:

- The purpose of this model is to generate dynamic discussion and thought. The concepts considered herein are not the Official Policy of the United States Government or the DoD, nor are they in any part listed within the current NSS, NDS, QDR, QDDR or any official DoD document.
- This model calls for a direct ideological and philosophical confrontation with Islam (as it is self-defined, in Islam's own words). This confrontation will likely make anyone who sees the world in morally equivalent and/or religiously equivalent terms very uncomfortable.
- This model presumes that Islam (as it currently defines itself) is an **ideology** rather than solely a religion, with the normally associated protections we afford such beliefs.
- This model asserts Islam has already declared war on the West, and the United States specifically, as is demonstrable with over 30 years of violent history. It is, therefore, illogical to continue along our current global strategy models that presume there are always possible options for common ground and detent with the Muslim Umma without waging near "total war."

Important Perspectives to Consider


When Viewing this Model:

- Some actions offered for consideration here will be seen as not “politically correct” in the eyes of many, both inside and outside the United States (Examples: Decision Points considered in PH III where *Saudi Arabia threatened with starvation, Mecca and Medina destroyed. Islam reduced to cult status*).
- This model presumes Geneva Convention IV 1949 standards of armed conflict and the pursuant UN endorsements of it are now, due to the current common practices of Islamic terrorists, no longer relevant or respected globally. This would leave open the option once again of taking war to a civilian population wherever necessary (the historical precedents of Dresden, Tokyo, Hiroshima, Nagasaki being applicable to the Mecca and Medina destruction DP in Phase III).
- This model presumes we have already failed at *Phase I* - “Deterrence” therefore Phase I is not shown as a part of this OP Design framework.
- This model restates previous internationally accepted Geneva Conventions for protections afforded to combatants captured in uniform and *reiterates* removal of protections for those who are caught fighting/operating out of uniform (spys, *terrorists*, criminals).
- **Against “non-state actors” do the Geneva conventions of 1949 now need redefinition / clarification?**

Why are We so Culturally Vulnerable to This Threat?

- This nation was founded under a “judeo-christian” ethic of reason and tolerance. Intolerance is usually marginalized and compromise often celebrated.
- The 1st Amendment is a manifestation of the above cultural norm and reflects an enshrinement of both free-speech and protection of religious practice.
- The deconstructionist philosophies (popularized in the 1960s) have given rise to a cultural willingness to accept moral equivalency in all matters. According to deconstructionalism, one person’s meaning (or religion, or ideology) is equal in truth and validity to any other. By extension then Islam and its ideology/politics of hate/violence are just as legitimate as Christianity, capitalism or representative democracy. Ergo, “the West” can make no philosophical claim to be “better” and have no legitimacy in demanding any compromise from the Islamic community.

Influences Within The Conflict




Al Qaeda

A Center-of-Gravity Analysis Theory

AQ Organizational Strategy

- Become a leading player in a loose coalition of *takfiri* extremist movements, to become vanguard of the world's Muslim population (the *ummah*), and to act as a propaganda hub and center of excellence from which other movements can draw expertise, while exploiting their actions and aggregating their effects into a unified propaganda offensive against the United States and the broader international community.
- Inciter-in-chief- Bin Laden?
- Provoke a global uprising against the world order and sustain that uprising over decades in order to ultimately transform the relationship between the ummah and the rest of global society, but does not seek to directly control or systematically command the other movements within this coalition.
- Aggregate effects
- Creating a global takfiri coalition with AQ at its head.



AQ Military Strategy

Strategy of: EXHAUSTION

- Bleed the US to exhaustion and bankruptcy, forcing America to withdraw in disarray from the Muslim world so that its local allies collapse
- Simultaneously to use the provoking and alienating effects of US intervention as a form of provocation to incite a mass uprising within the Islamic world, or at least to generate and sustain popular support for AQ.
- Provoke America into actions across the Muslim world that will destroy its credibility and that of the "apostate" regimes it supports
- Inciting the ummah to rise up and reject these regimes, create a neo-Salifist caliphate.
- Restore Islam to its rightful place within the Islamic world, and then
- Launch an offensive jihad to subjugate all non-Muslim people in accordance with Muhammad's command to "fight them until they say 'There is no God but Allah'"

Are there other CVs that can be exploited?

		<p>Campaign Goals</p> <p><u>Near Term</u> –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • End to “Politically Correct” information environment that precludes open, public discussion of Islam as it truly defines itself • Unambiguous STRATCOM warning to terror net financial support actors and nation-state colluders prevents potential US escalation (Branch #1: destruction of Islamic capital cities and major Islamic “holy sites”) • Each nation-state agrees to a clearly defined UN standard for VEO accountability as a means to achieving a political option for resolution of GWOT <p><u>Intermediate Term</u> –</p> <p>The establishment of negotiated political agreements that lead to sustainable security in Middle-East, Africa, and the Far-East focused on “staking in” Islamic countries on accountability to suppress radical Islam.</p> <p><u>Long Term</u> –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Islam undergoes a fundamental transformation to something that it currently is not. Islam then achieves peace with other religions and systems of governance, with no accepted doctrinal adherence to “lesser jihad” (war) as a requirement • Representative governments throughout the world that respect the human rights of all people (HR not defined by Sha’ria) • Law enforcement and military forces globally sufficient to maintain domestic order and to deny safe havens for VEOs.
<p>POLITICAL</p>	<p>LOO Goal – Political accommodation agreement leading to a sustainable global security situation, marked by a significant reduction in aggregate political/religious violence</p>	
<p><i>COMMUNICATION & ENGAGEMENT</i></p>		
<p>SECURITY</p>	<p>LOO Goal - End large scale global violence and conflict, as it relates to GWOT against Al-Qaeda; defeat irreconcilable “radical Islamists”; develop leverage to bring reconcilable “moderate” Muslims to the table</p>	
<p><i>COMMUNICATION & ENGAGEMENT</i></p>		
<p>Governance</p>	<p>LOO Goal - Progress in key sectors of Arab liberal democratic movements and economies support and reflect movement towards sustainable stabilization and political accommodation</p>	
<p><i>COMMUNICATION & ENGAGEMENT</i></p>		
<p>DIPLOMATIC</p>	<p>LOO Goal – “First World” governments brought to sober understanding of what is at stake (accurate view of Islam) and made willing to seek/support aggressive measures necessary to halt spread of Islam.</p> <p>Ability of Islam to suppress open, true dialogue among UN and in media terminated. I/O dimension of the fight redefined</p>	

Phases II- Current Phase (International and DOJ/HHS)

Lines of Operation

Diplomatic

Political Actions, Treaties, International Efforts

Information

Int'l Strat Comm

Military

Saudi Arabia

Afghanistan

Iraq

Indonesia, Pakistan, India

Iran

North Korea

Homeland Security/ Law Enforcement

Economic

Sustain Economic Growth/Preserve Western Capitalism models

Desired Effects

1 Coordinated coalition response D.J.M, E, Ed, Law

2 Deter Al-Qaeda from performing offensive ops D.J.M, E, Ed, Dom

3 Critical infrastructure protected & secured M, Law

4 Options in place for Total War against non compliant state actors, D.J, M,E, Ed, Law

5 Preserve/restore int'l borders D.J.M

6 HA functions provided D.J, M,E, Ed, Law

7 Improve US credibility as serious actor, enduring Superpower D.J,M,E

8 ROL restored and enhanced globally D.J,M,E

9 Islam redefined among Umma to atone demands for Jihad D.J, E, Ed

10 Phased transition of security to int'l forces in Islamic crisis D.J.M, Law

11 Essential goods and services capes restored in allied nations D,E, Law

12 European Militaries' security forces capabilities restored D.J, M, E, Ed, Law

13 International pop. does not support VEOs D.J,M, E, Ed, Law

(A) 11 SEP2001- Present (B) Present- (Local and National Efforts) 2-Seize Initiative

UN resolution proposed defining Islam for what it actually is- citing Islamic tenants as evidence (E1,2,4,7,8,9,13)

STRATCOM Message Issued Upon Death of UBL-Branch #1 1May 2011. (E1,2,4,7,8,9,13)

STRATCOM Message Issued to both US and UN audiences simultaneously with congressional hearings (E1,2,4,7,8,9,13)

Saudi Arabia confronted with financing evidence-offered chance to account for/reconcile/ terminate support for AQ (E1,2,4,7,8,9,13)

Campaigns for OEF and OIF continue as ongoing GWOT efforts. Terminate as planned- OIF 2011, OEF 2014 (E1 through 13)

Moderate Muslim fissures and gaps sustained/ exploited to sustain Asian disconnect from Islamists (E1,2,3,4,7,8,9,13)

Containment policy continues for NK and Iran (E1,3,4,5,6,7)

DHS, DOJ, Federal, State, and Local Law Enforcement receive Counter-jihad briefings and evolved NSS policy guidance. 1st Amendment protections for radical Islam dissolved (E1,2,3,5,7,8,9)

US Constitution Article 6 enforced against domestic Islamist threats. Non-compliance results in arrest/prosecution for Seditious Conspiracy (18 U.S.C. § 2384 (E1,2,3,5,7,8,9))

Preferred trade programs for compliant nations, allies who adopt and openly advocate identical STRATCOM and active countermeasures against Islam (E1-13)

Note: This model presumes we have already failed at Phase I- "Deterrence" therefore Phase I is not shown as a part of this OP Design framework

Symbol Key: ☆.....Decision Point/Branch Plan
 ◆.....Key Event Node

Phases II-V (International and DOJ/HLS)

Lines of Operation

Diplomatic

Political Actions, Treaties, International Efforts

Information

Int'l Strat Comm

Military

Saudi Arabia

Afghanistan

Iraq

Indonesia, Pakistan, India

Iran

North Korea

Homeland Security/ Law Enforcement


Economic

Sustain Economic Growth/Preserve Western Capitalism models

Desired Effects

- 1 Coordinated coalition response DJ, M, E, Ed, Law
- 2 Deter Al-Qaeda from performing offensive ops DJ, M, E, Ed, Dom

- 3 Critical infrastructure protected & secured M, Law
- 4 Options in place for Total War against non compliant state actors DJ, M, E, Ed, Law
- 5 Preserve/restore int'l borders DJ, M
- 6 HA functions provided DJ, M, E, Ed, Law
- 7 Improve US credibility as Superpower DJ, M, E
- 8 ROL restored and enhanced globally DJ, M, E
- 9 Islam redefined among Ummah to abrogate demands for jihad DJ, E, Ed
- 10 Phased transition of security to int'l forces in Islamic crisis DJ, M, Law
- 11 Essential goods and services capes restored in allied nations DJ, E, Law




Note: This model presumes we have already failed at Phase I- “Deterrence” therefore Phase I is not shown as a part of this OP Design framework

Symbol Key: Decision Point/Branch Plan
 Key Event Node

Phases II-V (Detailed Domestic)

Lines of Operation

Domestic (U.S.)



Measures put in place to protect Muslims have to be ensured throughout campaign. Effort is against Jihadism/Islam, as currently defined- not Muslims who seek a peaceful reformation of their religion. Hate Crime measures must bear additional weight to protect against public overreaction in PH II-III. 1st Amendment protections for radical Islam are dissolved to counter Sha'ria Law subversion; however religious freedom -of-worship must remain conspicuously protected (E1,2,3,5,7,8,9)

Coordinated coalition response D.I, M, E, Ed, Law

Deter Al-Qaeda from performing offensive ops D.I, M, E, Ed, Dom

3 Critical infrastructure protected & secured M, Law

4 Options in place for Total War against non compliant state actors D.I, M, E, Ed, Law

5 Preserve/restore int'l borders D.I, M

6 HA functions provided D.I, M, E, Ed, Law

7 Improve US credibility as serious actor, enduring Superpower D.I, M, E

8 ROL restored and enhanced globally D.I, M, E

9 Islam redefined among Ummah to atavistic demands for Jihad D.I, E, Ed

10 Phased transition of security to int'l forces, in Islamic crisis D.I, M, Law

11 Essential goods and services caps restored in allied nations D, F, Law

12 European Militaries/ security forces capabilities restored D.I, M, E, Ed, Law

13 International pop. does not support VEOs D.I, M, E, Ed, Law

Defining and Seeking a Partner for Peace: The “Moderate” Muslim

Our adversaries will often use the term “Islamophobe” to describe anyone who might deny “the active existence, in the contemporary world, of a moderate Muslim majority.” Unfortunately, whether a moderate Muslim majority actually exists depends, in no small part, on how one defines a “moderate”:

1.4 billion


- q One who **never** engages in terrorist acts?
- q One who **sincerely disapproves** of those who commit terrorist acts? (as we define them- not Islam defines them)
- q One who **actively speaks out and works against** the jihadists?
- q One who **actively engages the jihadists in a theological battle**, trying to convince Muslims that terrorism is wrong on Islamic grounds?



Ultimately, we can do very little in the West to decide this matter. It is up to the Muslim Umma itself that must feel compelled to affect change. Our only realistic option in the interim is to defend ourselves. “moderate Islam” to come from within.

Does this algorithm change, if a jihadist detonates a WMD in another “capital event” like 9/11?

Defining and Seeking a Partner for Peace: The "Moderate" Muslim



Global Salafi-Islam Jihad and “Moderate” Islam: Subtle Difference

- **Subtle Differences:** Distinguishing between GSJI Islam and “moderate” Islam requires understanding the subtle, yet profound differences on their desires to implement:
 - **Sharia Law:** strict Islamic law (*sharia*)
 - **Islamic Caliphate:** reestablishment of the Islamic caliphate as a precursor to eventual world domination
 - **Violence:** advocacy of violence to achieve these ends
- **Points NOT Exclusive:**
 - The three subtle points DO NOT separate the GSJI ideology from “moderate” Islam by their inclusion in GSJI Islam and their exclusion from “moderate” Islam
 - “Moderate” Islam incorporates all three, but it is the scope in which it does that provides the nuanced difference

“Moderate” is not Mainstream!

- “Moderate” Islam does not mean “mainstream” Islam
- GSII within “mainstream” Islam

“Muslim fundamentalists...do not differ from the mainstream on questions of theology and the interpretation of scripture” ~

Bernard Lewis

“Moderates” not Majority

- Western Bias: Remove a Western bias of assuming “moderate” Islamic views equates to large majority or plurality views within the Islamic world
- Public Opinion Polls: Polls in the Arab world support the GSII:
 - 2007 World Opinion Poll on Muslim attitudes in Egypt, Morocco, Pakistan, and Indonesia demonstrates the GSII ideology bears prominence in “mainstream” Islam with, *“Many [Muslims] say they share some of al Qaeda’s attitudes toward the US and substantial majorities endorse many of al Qaeda’s goals”*
 - University of Jordan poll determined 66.8% of Jordanians considered Al Qaeda as a legitimate organization in 2004, although Jordanian AQ support fell dramatically after the November 2005 AQ attack in Amman, Jordan
- GSII Mainstream: These polls demonstrate, GSII is “mainstream” Islam on many accounts, specifically with respect to the implementation of *sharia* law and establishment of a caliphate

“Moderates” and Sharia Law

- Scope Differs: Both “Moderates” and GSII desire Sharia Law... scope differentiates

- 2007 World Opinion Poll:



- “Most respondents express strong support for expanding the role of Islam in their countries—consistent with the goals of al Qaeda... Large majorities in most countries support the goals of requiring a strict application of sharia, keeping out Western values, and even unifying all Islamic countries into a single Islamic state”

- 71% of the poll’s respondents endorsed implementation of sharia law

71% Supported Sharia Law

- 65% supported uniting the Islamic countries of the world under a Caliphate


- Islam in Government a “Good Thing”: Substantially large majorities of Islamic countries surveyed in 2005, with the exception of Jordan, felt Islam played a significant role in their countries; but more importantly, resounding majorities considered it a “good thing”, with the exception of Turkey (50% considered it a “bad thing”)

2010 Pew Poll: More of the same attitude...



Subtle Distinctions: Sharia and Caliphate

- **Sharia Difference:**
 - “moderate” Muslim would only apply *sharia* law to Muslims
 - GSII Islam would apply *sharia* law to ALL persons
- **Caliphate Difference: breadth of the caliphate**
 - Moderates would include only “historically” Muslim countries



- *GSII requires the entire world*



“Moderates” and Violence

- All Condone Violence for Islam: Both GSII and “moderate” Islam support violence in the name of Islam
- Defensive Violence: Unquestionably, both consider violence in defense of Islam legitimate
- Defining “Defense” Difference: Defining what is actually defense of Islam further differentiates the “moderate” and GSII Muslims
- World Opinion poll finding “support for attacks on US troops in the Muslim world [Iraq, Afghanistan, and the Persian Gulf region] [to drive the US from the region]”:
 - quite high in Egypt and Morocco
 - Pakistanis are divided about such attacks
 - Indonesians are opposed to them
- Essential Differences on Violence: What separates GSII and “Moderate” Islam with respect to violence:
 - Offensive Jihad
 - Use of terrorism



“Moderates” and Offensive Jihad

Osama Bin Laden and Offensive Jihad:

- **Obligation against Infidels: OBL admonishes “Muslims are obligated to raid the lands of the infidels, occupy them, and exchange their systems of governance for an Islamic system”**
- **For Global Caliphate: OBL espouses offensive jihad to achieve a global caliphate**

OBL's own arguments clearly describe those opposed to these concepts as “moderate” Muslims

“Moderates” and Terrorism


- GSII supports the use of terrorism
- “Moderate” Muslims renounce the method
- Terrorism is measured as attacks against civilians to achieve goals
- The 2007 World Opinion Poll findings:
 - “Large majorities in all countries opposes attacks against civilians for political purposes and see them as contrary to Islam”
 - “Majorities or pluralities surveyed opposed al Qaeda’s attacks on Americans”

Terrorism and Defining Civilians

Defining “Civilian” Complex: Characterization becomes more complex when attempting to determine the difference between civilians within GSIJ Islam and “moderate” Islam, as Muslims place an ethnic distinction in determining civilians

- Example from Jordan responses to attacks on civilians:
 - University of Jordan Public Opinion Poll in 2005, fully 92% of respondents rejected the killing of civilians
 - Same poll determined only 48.5% considered attacks against Israeli civilians as terrorism, whereas 90.5% classified killing Palestinian civilians as terrorism

- In contrast to the 2005 University of Jordan poll, a Pew Poll conducted in the same year determined only 43% of Jordanians rejected violence against civilians (The subsequent AQ attack in Amman, Jordan, assuredly accounts for the Jordanian reconsideration of what constitutes terrorism between the beginning of 2005 and the end of 2005)



- Al Qaeda in Iraq claim responsibility
- nearly simultaneous suicide bombs at three hotels
- Grand Hyatt, Radisson SAS and Days Inn hotels
- killed at least 57 people and wounded more than 115 other people

Critical Distinction: *Violence Method and Application*

Clearly, the critical and most pronounced distinction between the GSJ and “moderate” Islam becomes their views on the method and application of violence to support Islam



Ka'ba Key
\$15.2 million auction (2008)



Ka'ba: Quran states built by
Abraham and his son Ishmael

Theoretical STRATCOM Message (Issued with the ‘Jihadist’ in Mind):

‘Throughout its history, the United States of America has stood for freedom, opportunity, and the democratic principles vital to the successful functioning of a representative republic. In most cases, where we have met conflict, it has been against those forces which would move in contravention to these principles of freedom. The United States has a proud tradition of confronting evil and defeating it, both on our behalf and for the benefit of others across the globe.

Given the uncompromising nature of the last 10 years of global conflict, Islam, though it may describe itself as an ideology of peace, as a means of ‘Taqiyā’ or deception, is not a religion of tolerance. Though some Muslims may profess adherence to the earliest, most tolerant teachings of Islam, the millions who follow Muhammed’s most violent teachings have abrogated peace in the name of fundamentalist ‘true Islam.’ Within any modern understanding of what defines a religion, Islam has clearly exceeded acceptable political boundaries, with its refusal to coexist with other ideologies and its repeated calls for extremist violence. In exploring Islam’s own stated doctrine, its own stated laws, and its own stated goals for the world, it is clear that Islam remains an ideology and system of governance that demands the extermination of anyone who does not subscribe to each and every one of its tenants. Given the factual basis of what ‘Islamists’ say they seek to impose in this world, the United States has come to accept that radical ‘true Islam’ is both a political and military enemy to free people throughout the world.

From Muhammed’s own words, we understand the meaning and intent of all who follow ‘true Islam.’ From the very words cited by those who follow all of the tenants of Islam, we understand their declaration of war against us and modern civilization at large. These hostile designs are inextricably embedded within Islamist doctrine as much as in their recent dialogue. One need look no further than the Qur’an, the Hadith, and their Sha’ria law guides to these self-evident truths. Where those of us in the United States and the civilized world, at the beginning of this conflict, might have presupposed some possibilities for moderation, we have now come to understand that there is no such thing as ‘moderate Islam’; only those Muslims who are brave enough to choose to follow its absolutist doctrinal path to destruction.

Whether the United States chooses to declare war or not is no longer a relevant question. The fact that the US, and the western world in general, are in a fight for our very survival is a matter now intuitively obvious to any who have observed the basic, undisputed elements of Islam. The Islamist community has made its true intent clear, through the direct actions of its jihadist membership, the ongoing complicit acceptance of radical views and actions by those who profess moderation, and the inability of this ideology to offer honest compromise. The well documented ongoing aggression of Islam, observed for over 1300 years and only gaining momentum, has left those who do not follow the Islamist view few realistic choices, other than death or submission.

It is therefore time for the United States to make our true intentions clear. This barbaric ideology will no longer be tolerated. Islam must change or we will facilitate its self-destruction. Let it be known that the United States remains, and will forever be, a beacon of freedom, self determination, hope, and representative democracy. The American people will not be converted. We will not submit. We will not be intimidated, and we will not be driven from this earth.”