AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

PREPARING FOR THE WAR ON TERRORISM

HEARING

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED SEVENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

SEPTEMBER 20, 2001

Serial No. 107–37

Printed for the use of the Committee on Government Reform

Available via the World Wide Web: http://www.gpo.gov/congress/house
http://www.house.gov/reform

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

77–229 PDF WASHINGTON : 2002

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Internet: bookstore.gpo.gov Phone: toll free (866) 512–1800; DC area (202) 512–1800
Fax: (202) 512–2250 Mail: Stop SSOP, Washington, DC 20402–0001

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM

DAN BURTON, Indiana, *Chairman*

BENJAMIN A. GILMAN, New York
CONSTANCE A. MORELLA, Maryland
CHRISTOPHER SHAYS, Connecticut
ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, Florida
JOHN M. MCHUGH, New York
STEPHEN HORN, California
JOHN L. MICA, Florida
THOMAS M. DAVIS, Virginia
MARK E. SOUDER, Indiana
STEVEN C. LATOURETTE, Ohio
BOB BARR, Georgia
DAN MILLER, Florida
DOUG OSE, California
RON LEWIS, Kentucky
JO ANN DAVIS, Virginia
TODD RUSSELL PLATTS, Pennsylvania
DAVE WELDON, Florida
CHRIS CANNON, Utah
ADAM H. PUTNAM, Florida
C.L. "BUTCH" OTTER, Idaho
EDWARD L. SCHROCK, Virginia
JOHN J. DUNCAN, Tennessee

HENRY A. WAXMAN, California
TOM LANTOS, California
MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
EDOLPHUS TOWNS, New York
PAUL E. KANJORSKI, Pennsylvania
PATSY T. MINK, Hawaii
CAROLYN B. MALONEY, New York
ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, Washington, DC
ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS, Maryland
DENNIS J. KUCINICH, Ohio
ROD R. BLAGOJEVICH, Illinois
DANNY K. DAVIS, Illinois
JOHN F. TIERNEY, Massachusetts
JIM TURNER, Texas
THOMAS H. ALLEN, Maine
JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY, Illinois
WM. LACY CLAY, Missouri
DIANE E. WATSON, California

BERNARD SANDERS, Vermont (Independent)

KEVIN BINGER, *Staff Director*
DANIEL R. MOLL, *Deputy Staff Director*
JAMES C. WILSON, *Chief Counsel*
ROBERT A. BRIGGS, *Chief Clerk*
PHIL SCHILIRO, *Minority Staff Director*

CONTENTS

	Page
Hearing held on September 20, 2001	1
Statement of:	
Netanyahu, Benjamin, former Prime Minister of Israel	65
Zinni, General Anthony, U.S. Marines, retired; Dr. Christopher Harmon, professor, U.S. Marine Corps Command and Staff College; and Dr. Jessica Stern, Harvard University	111
Letters, statements, etc., submitted for the record by:	
Barr, Hon. Bob, a Representative in Congress from the State of Georgia, prepared statement of	45
Burton, Hon. Dan, a Representative in Congress from the State of Indiana, prepared statement of	53
Harmon, Dr. Christopher, professor, U.S. Marine Corps Command and Staff College, prepared statement of	113
Lantos, Hon. Tom, a Representative in Congress from the State of California:	
Article dated September 19, 2001	94
Prepared statement of	6
Maloney, Hon. Carolyn B., a Representative in Congress from the State of New York, prepared statement of	35
Netanyahu, Benjamin, former Prime Minister of Israel, prepared statement of	73
Ose, Hon. Doug, a Representative in Congress from the State of California, prepared statement of	24
Ros-Lehtinen, Hon. Ileana, a Representative in Congress from the State of Florida, prepared statement of	15
Shays, Hon. Christopher, a Representative in Congress from the State of Connecticut, prepared statement of	63
Stern, Dr. Jessica, Harvard University, prepared statement of	127
Watson, Hon. Diane E., a Representative in Congress from the State of Calilfornia, prepared statement of	169
Waxman, Hon. Henry A., a Representative in Congress from the State of California, prepared statement of	59
Weldon, Hon. Dave, a Representative in Congress from the State of Florida, prepared statement of	32

PREPARING FOR THE WAR ON TERRORISM

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 20, 2001

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM,
Washington, DC.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 11 a.m., in room 2154, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Dan Burton (chairman of the committee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Burton, Barr, Gilman, Morella, Shays, Ros-Lehtinen, Horn, Mica, Tom Davis of Virginia, Ose, Lewis, Jo Ann Davis of Virginia, Platts, Weldon, Cannon, Putnam, Otter, Schrock, Duncan, Waxman, Lantos, Owens, Kanjorski, Mink, Sanders, Maloney, Norton, Cummings, Kucinich, Blagojevich, Davis of Illinois, Tierney, Turner, Schakowsky, Clay, and Watson.

Also present: Representative Jones of North Carolina.

Staff present: Kevin Binger, staff director; Daniel R. Moll, deputy staff director; James C. Wilson, chief counsel; David A. Kass, deputy chief counsel; Mark Corallo, director of communications; M. Scott Billingsley, Chad Bungard, John Callendar, Pablo Carrillo, and Randall Kaplan, counsels; Thomas Bowman and Marc Chretien, senior counsels; S. Elizabeth Clay, Caroline Katzin, Gil Macklin, and John Rowe, professional staff members; Robert A. Briggs, chief clerk; Robin Butler, office manager; Josie Duckett, deputy communications director; Toni Lightle, legislative assistant; Leneal Scott, computer systems manager; Danleigh Halfast, assistant to chief counsel; Corinne Zaccagnini, systems administrator; Michael Layman, staff assistant; Joshua E. Gillespie, deputy chief clerk; Elizabeth Crane, legislative aide; Phil Schiliro, minority staff director; Phil Barnett, minority chief counsel; Kristin Amerling and Michael Yeager, minority deputy chief counsels; David Rapallo, minority counsel; Ellen Rayner, minority chief clerk; Jean Gosa and Earley Green, minority assistant clerks; Kate Harrington, minority staff assistant; and Nancy Scola, minority computer information manager.

Mr. BURTON. Good morning. A quorum being present, the committee will come to order.

Let me start off by saying former Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu is on his way. He probably won't be here for about 45 minutes or so, so what we are going to do is we are going to go ahead and start with our opening statements and have that completed and then, when he gets here, we will go right to former Prime Minister Netanyahu.

I ask unanimous consent that all Members' and witnesses' written and opening statements be included in the record; and, without objection, so ordered.

I ask unanimous consent that all articles, exhibits and extraneous or tabular material referred to be included in the record; and, without objection, so ordered.

Before our opening statements, I also wanted to have the committee fill the vacant chairmanship of the Civil Service and Agency Organization Subcommittee. As you know, our colleague, Joe Scarborough, retired on September 6th of this year. The vice chairman of the subcommittee, Dr. David Weldon, has agreed to serve as chairman of the subcommittee, and we are looking forward to having you chair that subcommittee, Dr. Weldon. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that Congressman Weldon be appointed as chairman of the Subcommittee on Civil Service and Agency Organization; and, without objection, so ordered.

We will now start with opening statements, and we will recognize the chairman emeritus of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. Gilman.

Mr. GILMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to thank Chairman Burton for conducting this very timely hearing. As you know, we had a prior terrorism hearing under Mr. Shays' chairmanship in our subcommittee, and I think that was appropriate at that time, and I hope we will take another look at the testimony of that hearing.

As the dean of New York delegation in my congressional district adjoining New York City, I personally witnessed the horrible devastation of the recent barbaric terrorist attacks first hand. In my congressional district just north of New York City, more than 86 Americans are missing, many of whom are firemen and police officers.

While there has been an unprecedented outpouring of charitable donations by our fellow Americans and our community organizations and our corporations and a tremendous outpouring of volunteer work in both the Pentagon and the World Trade Center and with the Congress and our Nation standing united in support of the victims and their families and our President, regrettably, we are all well aware that on last Tuesday, September 11th, our lives have changed. Terrorism has become a common enemy of the entire civilized world.

Few world leaders have more experience in dealing with international terrorism than today's leading witness, former Israeli Prime Minister Bibi Netanyahu, and we look forward to his testimony. Before thinking systematically about terrorism, as was current, he wrote the text, Terrorism, How the West Can Win. More recently, he wrote, "Fighting Terrorism, How Democracies Can Defeat Domestic and International Terrorists." I recommend this book as good, important reading for our entire committee.

Moreover, Bibi Netanyahu carried on that fight for his own nation and collaterally for the rest of the civilized world when he was Israeli prime minister.

These recent attacks on our own Nation were targeted, coordinated acts of terrorism and were of a character beyond what Prime Minister Netanyahu had to deal with. The devastating kind of ter-

rorism attack that a well-educated country can plan over the course of years with the explicit intention of committing suicide after living in the target country for years is something that is hard for us to believe, and we have not seen it before.

Our traditional profiles of suicide bombers are no longer reliable. In fact, even Israelis were recently shocked when an older married man with children, a Palestinian Israeli citizen, blew himself up in a marketplace. The fact that suicide bombers are coming from different sectors of society makes it even more difficult to defend against such attacks, even in the State of Israel.

In a broader sense, I know that neither Israel nor our own Nation is inclined to making our war on terrorism a war between cultures. Not a war between Islam and the West. Nor is this necessarily a war between democracies and nondemocracies. Even people living under authoritarian regimes have the right to be free of terror, and even authoritarian regimes can be recruited to help stamp out terrorism. Mr. Netanyahu, I am certain, shares our views that the appropriate characterization of our struggle is a war between civilization and barbarianism and not one against my religion or any ethnicity.

We look forward to hearing the witnesses' thoughts today and particularly Mr. Netanyahu's thoughts on how we can reach the men on the street among whom terrorists operate and encourage vigilance on their part. How can we deal with the hatred of the West and what kind of compromises can we accept on our freedom of movement today and what can we do about the state's and powerful private sources that provide assistance to terrorist organizations? We look forward to hearing our witnesses today on these most important topics.

So, again, I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for conducting this very timely hearing.

Mr. BURTON. Thank you, Mr. Gilman.

I think it is extremely important that the American people really have a thorough knowledge of what we are up against, and that is why it is so important that we have these experts here today.

We will pass on Mr. Waxman right now. We will give his opening statement, along with Mr. Shays, myself a little bit later.

I now recognize the gentleman who knows a little bit about war firsthand, Mr. Lantos.

Mr. LANTOS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I think it is important that we hold this hearing today, and you put together a stellar list of witnesses.

A week ago, Mr. Chairman, our Nation lost its innocence, but it has found a new sense of unity and purpose. This new sense of unity comes from the sudden realization that our democratic way of life is under attack. It must be and it will be defended. This awakening came at a terrible cost—the devastation of thousands of innocent American lives and the destruction of our national symbols of strength and prosperity.

It is precisely because we paid such a heavy price for this awakening that it is so valuable. We are at the hinge of history. We can bemoan the tragedy, or we can draw the appropriate lessons from it and move forward. I believe it is critical we learn from the tragic experience, not only to ensure that such events don't happen again

but that we take intelligent and thoughtful and sweeping actions to deal with the crisis.

It is also critical of Prime Minister Netanyahu's appearance that we learn from those such as our friend and ally, the State of Israel, who have been confronting terrorism on a daily basis and who have succeeded in reconciling security with democracy.

The world is watching, Mr. Chairman, our Nation's military preparations and the deliberations here in Congress; and it is asking, is the United States up to the challenge? Are we, the greatest democracy on Earth, capable of mounting a sustained, costly and concerted global campaign against international terror?

Mr. Chairman, I am confident that we are. Throughout our history the American people have risen to the challenge of coming together and mobilizing all of our Nation's strength, our formidable military might, our dynamic economy and our indomitable spirit, and we will do so again this time. But in committing to this fight, Mr. Chairman, let us not delude ourselves. We are embarking on a costly, painful, difficult struggle like none other in our Nation's history. It will demand resolve. It will demand patience, and it will demand sacrifice.

On the subject of sacrifice, allow me to expand on this a bit. For many years now we have been conducting military operations with a firm commitment to have zero casualties. That is a noble goal, but the events of September 11 demonstrate that debate is now behind us. We will have had probably over 6,000 casualties, and I think the Vietnam syndrome with respect to casualties will have to be rethought. Every single American life is precious beyond words, but it is absurd for a society to tolerate thousands of civilian casualties and still believe, as we did in the Kosovo engagement, that no military casualties can be accepted. This issue will be a subject of protracted and serious debate, but those who claim that no casualty is acceptable better talk to the families of the 6,000 innocent Americans who were casualties just this past week. This debate is over, and the price we paid is over 6,000 innocent lives. It is a return to the reality of living in a dangerous world.

Mr. Chairman, in this struggle, we are not alone. All Americans deeply appreciate the many expressions of sympathy and support from our friends and allies across the globe. We trust that now these words will be translated into action. I welcome our European friends' expressions of sympathy. I look forward to our European friends' actions vis-a-vis their policies of trade and investment in Iran, Libya and elsewhere. We have been debating these issues in this Congress in a very lonely fashion, and it is long overdue that our European friends who are so strong in their expressions of condolences should be equally strong in falling in line with respect to policies.

In this fight against international terrorism there can be no neutrals. Those who are not with us are against us, and I welcome the decision of Pakistan in this moment of historic crisis, that they have chosen to be with us. This will serve them well.

As our military commanders and the brave servicemen and women they lead prepare to wage war against the perpetrators of last week's terrorist strikes, our sights are trained on Osama bin Laden and his Taliban protectors and with good reason. But I

think it is critical that we don't personalize and trivialize this war. If Osama bin Laden is turned over tomorrow morning, the international war against terrorism must continue unabated. Defeating or capturing or eliminating Osama bin Laden will not spell the defeat of terrorism unless we broaden our efforts and eradicate terrorism wherever it lurks. If we personalize and trivialize this struggle and limit our focus to the perpetrators of these acts, we may win some battles, but we risk losing the war.

I am encouraged, Mr. Chairman, by the administration's efforts to target not just Osama bin Laden but terrorists throughout the Middle East and beyond. I applaud Secretary Powell's efforts in the midst of this week's war planning to pressure Syria and Lebanon to surrender Hezbollah terrorists operating in their territories, a policy I recommended in sanctions legislation that was adopted by this body by a vote of 216 to 212 just a few months ago. As my friends will recall, at that time the State Department issued two letters opposing my amendment. By this week's action, I welcome them on board; and I have no doubt that if this amendment would be up on the floor today it would not squeeze by with a vote of 216 to 212 but we would get well over 400 affirmative votes.

Secretary of State Powell has affirmed the administration's commitment to eradicate terrorism root and branch, a worthy and necessary goal the American people passionately and seriously support, but in the framing of this struggle, it is critical that we focus on the forest, not just some of the trees. Osama bin Laden must go, but so must all the terrorists in the Middle East, in Colombia, in Indonesia and elsewhere who share the evil goals and operational methods of terrorists.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BURTON. Thank you, Mr. Lantos.

[The prepared statement of Hon. Tom Lantos follows:]

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN TOM LANTOS
Government Reform Committee Hearing on Counter-Terrorism
September 20, 2001

A week ago, our Nation lost its innocence - but it has found a new sense of unity and purpose. This new sense of unity comes from the sudden realization that our democratic way of life is under attack - and it must be, and will be, defended. This awakening came at a terrible cost: the devastation of thousands innocent American lives and the destruction of the national symbols of our strength and prosperity. It is precisely because we paid such a heavy price for this awakening that it is so valuable.

It is critical that we learn from this tragic experience, not only to ensure that it is never repeated, but also to ensure that we able to take intelligent, thoughtful, and swift action. We are at a hinge on history. We can either bemoan the tragedy or learn its painful lessons. It critical that we learn from those, such as our ally Israel, who have been confronting terrorism on a daily basis and who have successfully reconciled security with democracy.

The world is watching our Nation's military preparations and the deliberations of Congress and asking: Is the United States up to the challenge? Are we, the greatest democracy on Earth, capable of mounting a sustained, costly and concerted campaign against international terror?

Mr. Chairman, I am confident that we are. Throughout our history, the American people have risen to the challenge by coming together and mobilizing all of our Nation's strengths: our formidable military might, our dynamic economy, our indomitable spirit. And we will do so again.

But in committing to this fight, let us not delude ourselves. We are embarking on a long, costly, difficult, painful struggle like none other our Nation has undertaken. It will demand resolve. It will demand patience. It will demand sacrifice.

Sacrifice will mean the further loss of American life. For many years, the U.S. military has made a firm commitment to minimize American casualties. It has been a noble goal. But the events of September 11th have put the debate behind us. We may have already suffered 6,000 American casualties in this war. It is time to abandon the Vietnam syndrome of minimizing casualties and come to grips with the new reality. Every American life is precious beyond measure. But it is absurd to advocate zero military casualties when we have sustained so many civilian casualties so far. Those that adhere to this belief should speak to the families who lost loved ones in last Tuesday's terrorist attacks. The price we paid on that day has put the debate regarding American casualties to rest.

In the struggle against terrorism we are not alone. All Americans deeply appreciate the many expressions of sympathy and support from our friends and allies across the globe. We trust that these words will be followed by actions, actions that may prove

painful, costly, and dangerous. This requires that our European allies join us in imposing economic sanctions against Iran, Libya and other state sponsors of terrorism. Their opposition to the Iran Libya Sanctions Act is no longer tolerable. In the fight against international terrorism, there can be no neutrals. Those who are not with us are against us.

As our military commanders and the brave servicemen and -women they lead prepare to wage war against the perpetrators of last week's terrorist strikes, our sights are trained on Usama bin Laden and his Taliban protectors - and with good reason. But I believe it is critical that we not personalize and trivialize the war on terrorism by focusing on the perpetrators of last week's attacks alone. If Usama bin Laden were delivered to us tomorrow, the war against terrorism would be far from over. If we personalize this struggle, we may win some battles, but we risk losing the war.

I am encouraged by the Administration's efforts to target not just Usama bin Laden, but terrorists throughout the Middle East and beyond. I applaud Secretary of State Powell's efforts in the midst of this week's war planning to pressure Syria and Lebanon to surrender Hezbollah terrorists operating in their territories, a policy recommended in sanctions legislation I sponsored and which this body approved in a 216-214 vote. As my friends will recall, the State Department at the time issued two letters opposing this legislation. I am pleased they are now on board. And I would venture to guess that if a vote were again taken in the House of Representatives on this measure, it would not be approved by a razor-thin margin, but by a near-unanimous majority.

Secretary of State Powell has affirmed the Administration's commitment to eradicate terrorism "root and branch" - a worthy and necessary goal the American people passionately support. But in framing this struggle, it is critical that we focus on the forest, not just some of the trees. Usama bin Laden must go - and so must all terrorists who share his evil methods and goals.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BURTON. Let me say to my colleagues, because we have an important schedule here with Mr. Netanyahu, and he ought to be here in about half an hour, I would like to have our Members limit their comments to 5 minutes, if it is possible.

Mr. Horn.

Mr. HORN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

In defense of terrorism, it is not simply weapons. It is language, knowledge, writing and getting within the psychology of particular languages and particular people.

Back in the 1980's, when Caspar Weinberger was Secretary of Defense, he made a real point that America is way behind in terms of educating our students. We do a good job with the military academies but not so much with the civilian side. And the people in great areas of the world, be it Indonesia, be it Russia, be it the Middle East, Latin America, so forth, and Weinberger said we have got to invest money in educating these people in the secondary schools, even the elementary schools, and we ought to, frankly, start in kindergarten and first grade in some of these languages, because at that point it is sort of fun, but when you do it later, the brain says, gee, I can't do that. Well, we can do it, and we ought to put more emphasis on that in the United States.

When this chaos of the last week started, all four networks talked about an Arabic newspaper in London where columns were in Arabic, and they wondered why wasn't somebody looking at that. I have asked the question of a number of people that should have known, and they say, oh, well, we just don't have the Arabic skills that we ought to have.

So that is part of our problem. We do very well with the Voice of America, but we don't do very well in some of our basic intelligence agencies, and we could do a lot better. The Department of Defense has a marvelous language school at Monterrey, CA. They do teach people how to read, write, speak in very complicated languages; and I think, Mr. Chairman, that we ought to get from—all of these agencies into this committee and see just where we are in doing those things. It is a little late now, but maybe it won't be late again.

Thank you.

Mr. BURTON. Thank you, Mr. Horn; and we will be talking with various agencies about making sure the coordination is there.

Mr. Cummings.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

The events of the past week have had a profound effect on this Nation and the world. We all saw the events unfold before our eyes on national television. Our cities, the Nation's transportation infrastructure, including subways and airports, nuclear power plants, national monuments and landmarks became and still are vulnerable.

With weapons of mass destruction and biological weaponry, it has become very clear that there is an increased need to protect not only the citizens within our borders but also those who defend our country against outside threats.

With that said, I am pleased that this committee is the first in Congress to ask the question, how does America prepare for the war on terrorism?

First, I believe we must come to an understanding of what terrorism means. It is defined as the systematic use of terror, and terror is a state of intense fear. America must work hard to combat this fear.

Then we must ensure that our local firefighters, police departments and emergency medical personnel are properly trained and have the available supplies to respond in a crisis. As we saw in New York and at the Pentagon, these groups were the first to respond.

Next, the country must prepare our public health infrastructure. We must assess the Nation's long-range capabilities to respond not only to those weapons that are physically visible and threatening but also biological and chemical weapons. Are there vaccinations and antidotes available if the need arises?

Furthermore, America must continue to build coalitions with Nations around the world. The fight against terrorism will be a long and difficult one, requiring the cooperation of many nations.

Finally, America must stay prepared by being alert. We must focus on enhancing our national security by ensuring that emergency plans and procedures are set. U.S. citizens and facilities have been targets for years and will continue to be targets.

This was not just an attack on America but an attack on freedom and democracy. Not only were Americans affected by the terrorist attacks but citizens from more than 80 countries worked at the World Trade Center.

During this crisis, America will be defined by how we react and respond to terrorism. Our response must be carefully balanced. On one side, we place our commitment to spare no effort in eradicating terrorism and punishing those responsible for this heinous crime. On the other hand, we balance the responsibility to hold true to our Nation's principles, to be cognizant of innocent life and to use military force only when necessary. This is a difficult scale to balance, but I believe that we have a duty to reach the appropriate equilibrium that justice requires.

We are all living through this day by day and must stand together as Americans. I would urge all Americans not to target Arab-Americans or Muslims. Racial profiling and hate crimes cannot be tolerated. Tolerance is the glue that has held this diverse country together.

This is not a war against people from different cultures or who practice a different religion. This is a war on terrorism. We cannot trade in our civil rights and liberties.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I thank you for holding this hearing and yield back the balance.

Mr. BURTON. Thank you, Mr. Cummings.

Mrs. Morella.

Mrs. MORELLA. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I want to thank you and Ranking Member Waxman for holding the hearing.

Protecting Americans and determining who is responsible for the tragedy of September 11th have become the most important issues for every Member of this Congress. I appreciate the quick action by this committee in raising the issue today.

In many of the comments uttered after the terrible assault, we heard people note that all of us woke up on September 11th to a

nightmare, and that couldn't be more true. But then we found the nightmare became a reality. Last Tuesday's attack was the single most calamitous day in terms of loss of life in our Nation's history. And sadly, for many of us, though, the nightmare we spoke of has worsened. But now we realize just how vulnerable we are. Those who wish to do us harm are not only willing to sacrifice their lives but have the resources to wreak terrible violence upon our shores. We see violence as the means of violence. Therefore, it must be the focus of this committee, this Congress, this country to do everything possible to prevent another tragedy. Today is the first step.

Among our responses, we should include coordination among agencies, one office to oversee terrorism in this country. Presently, we have the FBI, the CIA, FEMA, Department of Transportation, Department of Defense, all with separate offices to combat terrorism in different ways. We need one office with representatives from each of the agencies to come up with the cohesive strategy. So, Mr. Chairman, we have expert witnesses that you have assembled to detail our present vulnerabilities to terrorism and to describe what can be done.

We are honored also to expect the arrival of the former prime minister of Israel, Benjamin Netanyahu, who has both written about terrorism and unfortunately experienced it.

I look forward to the testimony of all the witnesses in learning how to best prepare ourselves for the new realities that face us. The age of innocence is lost. The age of anxiety is upon us.

I yield back the balance of my time; and, again, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BURTON. Thank you, Mrs. Morella.

Mr. Owens, do you have an opening statement, sir?

Mr. OWENS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman; and I would like to commend you for having these hearings.

It is another opportunity for me to thank the Members of Congress and the people of the United States in general for the way in which they have come to the aid of people of New York and Washington. We are all mourning together those who died.

We also would like to together salute the bravery of the firemen and the policemen who went in to rescue people while others were coming out to safety. Firemen in my district suffered a tremendous loss in one of the companies, and we of course are struggling to deal with that in many ways.

I would like to take advantage of this particular forum, however, to talk about the fact that so many of my constituents have emphasized to me the fact that they would like to hold me as a Member of Congress responsible for national security, regardless of what committee I serve on. I have said over and over again, there is a limited role I play. I am not on the Permanent Select Committee for Intelligence. I am not on the Foreign Affairs Committee. Certainly I think it is our responsibility, but we play a limited role. They are saying every Congressman and the institution as a whole must take greater responsibility for national security.

There are too many comments being made about things that probably could have been avoided or things that are not being done that should have been done and should be done rapidly if they are not being done. People take note of the fact that our intelligence

agencies have suffered some tremendous embarrassments. They tell me. I don't have to tell them. They read. They remember better than I do the Aldrich Ames disaster with the CIA when the top person in charge of counterintelligence with respect to the Soviet Union is on the payroll, the—Hoffman—the recent FBI top intelligence person, counterespionage person, being found to be on the payroll of the Soviet Union. They bring up these things and they say, well, why can't you tell us if they have taken steps to make sure this never happens again?

The intelligence community, they know it is kind of an incestuous community, and they don't like to have open forums and discussions, and not many Members of Congress really discuss those things that go on there. There are some basic and simple questions that we can all ask without in any way jeopardizing the security of the Nation. If the people don't want to answer them and find that they are jeopardizing the security and the operations of the intelligence community, they don't have to answer it.

But basic questions like, how many high-level people do you have in decisionmaking positions who have background and understand Islamic culture? Are there people at top places who are making these decisions who really understand? If they are there, what kind of resources do they draw on? Is there a think tank? Is there a resource pool that they can steadily draw on of people that are currently monitoring and can really monitor because they understand the language, they understand the culture, they have background?

These are basics that surely the answer ought to be in the affirmative, but we don't know until we ask.

What about the language situation? Mr. Horn has just said we have the school out West who teaches all kinds of languages. I have no doubt about their ability to do this, but what kind of recruits are they getting? How rapidly are they taking in recruits? And are we back to the basic problem of education in America where the pool of young people who are coming out of college who can tackle some of these positions—because these are positions that will require a great deal of training. Just as the terrorists show that they have a great deal of training and education, the people who are going to be involved in counterterrorism are going to have to have the same kind of training and education. So we have the situation where there is a great shortage in every profession in America. Law enforcement is suffering greatly, as is teaching and other areas in recruiting people to go into these professions.

So we need for take a look at the long run—and this is a long-term battle. We all agree. The long-term needs of our education system in terms of making certain that the pool of people are always there so that you can recruit for doctors, lawyers and other folks. At the same time, law enforcement, teaching and other professions don't suffer, that we have the very best that can be made available.

There was an advertisement on a station in New York a few days ago by the FBI. They want people who speak Farsi. I said, well, you know, that is great that they are doing that now. How much of a deficit do we have in people who speak Farsi that has to be made up? I am glad that it is being done now, but we should ask

the basic questions of, how many people are there being recruited and what kind of process is there to guarantee that the system is always in place?

I have served on this committee for a long time. At one point I served on the Transportation Subcommittee, and we had several hearings on safety. I am afraid that in the records of those hearings you will find recommendations about airport safety which included guaranteeing that the cockpit is always secure and that nobody can get into it, and I am sure that many other government reports over the last 10 years have repeated the need for this guarantee with respect to the cockpit. And yet we are now talking about, yes, this is a good idea. Well, why is it that these things are not done?

The Federalization of airport safety, the security of our airports has been recommended on several occasions. I don't think that violates the private sector's rights to do certain kinds of things. Some form of Federalization is needed, and we should go forward.

I just want to repeat what my constituents are saying to me. Security of the Nation, security of the airlines, all aspects of security is everybody's job now. They hope that the Congressmen, every Member, will understand it that way and that the institution will understand it and all America will understand it. It is all of our problems, and we should all not be afraid to take part in the dialog and deliberations to make things better.

Thank you.

Mr. BURTON. Thank you, Mr. Owens.

Ms. Ros-Lehtinen.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

As President Bush has underscored, the terrorist attacks of September 11th were not just against the United States. They were against freedom and democracy, against the integrity and essence of our Republic. It was an attack against the free world and the moral precepts which guide human relations. It was an act of barbarism born of wanton disregard for the value of human life, born out of a desire to terrorize the global community of nations into submission.

Those behind these terrible acts sought to change our American way of life. They hoped that fear would lead to a transformation of our character and our society. They obviously do not know what we are made of. Much like the attack on Pearl Harbor, the terrorist acts of September 11th had served as a catalyst, a call to action, a demand for the United States to exert our leadership role and to use all available means to confront this threat.

The United States is being called upon, as it did during the cold war, to create conditions under which our free and democratic system can live and prosper. As we did during the cold war, we must take the necessary steps in terms of policy and resources, offensive and defensive strategies to ensure that this century will see the triumph of freedom and the vindication of our democratic principles, to ensure that the aftermath of this new war that we have embarked upon is global stability, to ensure that we may again live without fear.

Fortunately, President Bush and his national security team have learned this lesson of history. They understand the mistakes of the

past so we are not condemned to repeat them. They have deciphered the elements leading to our victories over totalitarianism and tyranny so that we may build upon them.

While the nature or manifestation of the terrorist threats may differ from any we have encountered in the recent past, the principles of Realist political theory, the tenets outlined in the landmark cold war document now known as NSC–68, and the Reagan doctrine of peace through strength still hold true.

The President and his advisers understand this reality. President Bush and his national security team understand that the dream and the hope of containing the cold war enemy and deterring attacks against U.S. interests was converted into the "long peace" through the implementation of a policy firmly rooted in U.S. military superiority and overwhelming strength.

The United States won the cold war and ensured peace and stability by stating its resolve and demonstrating its commitment to make good on these threats. Some would argue that when the United States abandoned this principle in the closing decade of the last century that instability and new forms of conflict began to grow.

President Bush and his advisers realize this. They hear the echoes of the drafters of NSC–68 who underscored that, without superior aggregate military strength, a policy of containment is no more than a policy of bluff.

Thus, the resources and funding we allocate for the war against terrorism must match our commitment and our resolve. We may not be able to deter the suicide bombers and the kamikaze tactics. However, the threat of unleashing American power in response to those terrorist attacks will have a sobering effect on those who harbor these terrorists, who provide them with the financial support and training facilities to execute these attacks.

The military component of our strategy must provide for a flexible but comprehensive response which includes many options available to us in the United States.

Further, the application of the doctrine of peace through strength to the war on terrorism requires the United States to possess an extraordinary amount of intelligence, using not just sophisticated technology but also expanding the human intelligence capabilities. We must follow every lead and use every method to uncover the network of individuals, groups and sponsors which have empowered and enabled these terrorists to commit such deplorable acts. In doing so, we should remember that Realism contends that nation states are engaged in the never-ending struggle to improve or preserve their relative power position and that in the global system force is the final arbiter.

Thus, based on this premise, we must look at both emerging powers who seek to challenge the current global structure and the U.S. leadership, as well as those declining powers who seek to retard or halt their diminishing role. We must investigate whether the terrorist acts on the United States were tools employed by a state or regime to exert its position with its neighbors and of the world stage. Is the approach of the terrorist groups based on the same power and political considerations which determine the be-

havior of nation states? What are the geopolitical or strategic objectives of terrorist groups?

Whatever the answers, we must not limit ourselves. As the attacks of September 11th clearly demonstrate, anything and everything is possible. For this reason, our response must include a defensive posture that prepares for the possibility that these new aggressors can obtain nuclear materials and weaponry.

What if free people could live secure in the knowledge that their well-being did not rest exclusively upon the threat of U.S. retaliation? What if we could intercept and destroy these missiles before they reached American soil and American interests? It will not happen overnight, but is it not worth every investment necessary to free the world from this threat?

Former President Ronald Reagan believed that it was worth it. President Bush knows it is worth every investment. We in Congress should know this as well. That is why, as part of the coordinated U.S. response to these attacks and to the broader threat of terrorism, the Congress should support the Bush administration's missile defense program. Ultimately, it will be the strength of character and the moral fiber of the American people and our unity of purpose which will help the United States and the free world triumph over evil.

As Thomas Jefferson wrote in 1811, it is impossible to subdue a people acting with an undivided will. We have that will. The terrorists will soon know this, also.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BURTON. Thank you, Ms. Ros-Lehtinen.

[The prepared statement of Hon. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen follows:]

COMMITTEES:
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
GOVERNMENT REFORM
CHAIR:
SUBCOMMITTEE ON
INTERNATIONAL OPERATIONS
AND HUMAN RIGHTS
VICE CHAIR:
SUBCOMMITTEE ON
WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN
18TH DISTRICT, FLORIDA

PLEASE RESPOND TO:
2160 RAYBURN BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515-0918
(202) 225-3931
FAX (202) 225-5620

DISTRICT OFFICE:
9210 SUNSET DRIVE
SUITE 100
MIAMI, FL 33173
(305) 275-1800
FAX (305) 275-1801

Statement by Hon. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen on "Preparing for the War on Terrorism"
Committee on Government Reform, U.S. House of Representatives
September 20, 2001

Mr. Chairman, as President Bush has underscored, the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, were not just against the United States. They were against freedom and democracy – against the integrity and essence of this Republic.

It was an attack against the free world and the moral precepts which guide human relations. It was an act of barbarism born of a wanton disregard for the value of human life; born out of a desire to terrorize the global community of nations into submission.

Those behind these heinous acts sought to change the American way of life. They hoped that fear would lead to a transformation of our character and our society. They obviously do not know what we are made of.

Much like the attack on Pearl Harbor, the terrorist acts of September 11th have served as a catalyst – a call to action – a demand for the United States to exert its leadership role and use all available means to confront this threat.

The U.S. is being called upon, as it did during the Cold War, to create conditions under which our free and democratic system can live and prosper.

As we did during the Cold War, we must take the necessary steps, in terms of policy and resources, offensive and defensive strategies; to ensure that this new century will see the triumph of freedom and the vindication of democratic principles; to ensure that the aftermath of this new war we have embarked upon, is global stability; to ensure that we may again live without fear.

Fortunately, my dear colleagues, President Bush and his national security team have learned the lessons of history. They understand the mistakes of the past so we are not condemned to repeat them. They have deciphered the elements leading to our victories over totalitarianism and tyranny so that we may build upon them.

While the nature or manifestation of the terrorist threat may differ from any we have encountered in the recent past, the principles of Realist political theory; the tenets outlined in the landmark Cold War document known as NSC-68; and the Reagan doctrine of "peace through strength" still hold true.

The President and his advisors understand this reality.

President Bush and his national security team understand that the dream and hope of containing the Cold War enemy and deterring attacks against U.S. interests was converted into the "long peace" through the implementation of a policy firmly rooted in U.S. military superiority and overwhelming strength.

The U.S. won the Cold War and ensured peace and stability by stating its resolve and then demonstrating its commitment to make good on these threats.

Some would argue that when the U.S. abandoned this principle in the closing decade of the last century, that instability and new forms of conflict began to grow exponentially.

President Bush and his advisors realize this. They hear the echoes of the drafters of NSC-68 who underscored that: "Without superior aggregate military strength...a policy of 'containment' is no more than a policy of bluff."

Thus, the resources and funding we allocate for the war against terrorism must match our commitment and resolve. We may not be able to deter the suicide bombers and kamikaze tactics. However, the threat of unleashing American power in response to these terrorist attacks, will have a sobering effect on those who harbor these terrorists; who provide them with financial support and training facilities to execute these attacks.

The military component of our strategy must provide for a flexible but comprehensive response which includes the panoply of options available to the U.S.

Further, the application of the doctrine of "peace through strength" to the war on terrorism requires the U.S. to possess a preponderance of intelligence, using not just sophisticated technology but also expanding our human intelligence capabilities.

We must follow every lead and use every method to uncover the network of individuals, groups, and sponsors which have empowered and enabled these terrorists to commit such deplorable acts.

In doing so, we should remember that Realism contends that nation states are engaged in a never-ending struggle to improve or preserve their relative power positions, and that in the anarchic global system, force is the final arbiter.

Thus, based on this premise, we must look at both emerging powers who seek to challenge the current global structure and U.S. leadership, as well as those declining powers who seek to retard or halt their diminishing role.

We must investigate whether the terrorist attacks on the U.S. were tools employed by a state or regime to exert its position vis-a-vis its neighbors and the world stage.

Is the approach of the terrorist groups based on the same power and political considerations which determine the behavior of nation-states? What are the geopolitical or strategic objectives of terrorist groups?

Whatever the answers, we must not limit ourselves. As the attacks of September 11th clearly demonstrated, anything and everything is possible.

For this reason, our response must include a defensive posture that prepares for the possibility that these new aggressors can obtain nuclear materials and weaponry.

What if free people could live secure in the knowledge that their well-being did not rest exclusively upon the threat of U.S. retaliation? What if we could intercept and destroy these missiles before they reached American soil and interests?

It will not happen overnight but is it not it worth every investment necessary to free the world from this threat? Former President Reagan believed it was worth it.President Bush knows it is worth every investment. We, in the Congress, know it is worth it.

This is why, as part of the coordinated, unified U.S. response to these attacks and to the broader threat of terrorism, the Congress should support the Bush Administration's missile defense proposal.

Ultimately, it will be the strength of character and moral fiber of the American people and our unity of purpose which will help the U.S. and the free world triumph over evil.

As Thomas Jefferson wrote to William Duane in 1811: "It is impossible to subdue a people acting with an undivided will."

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Tierney.

Mr. TIERNEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman; and thank you for conducting these hearings this morning.

I want to start just by saying to my colleague, Mr. Owens, that we took to heart your words a moment ago, and it was with some pride that I was with 73 men and women from New England who were the first to respond as assistance from outside the city of New York. We all suffer for the loss of everybody that was involved in that act, and their families and their friends and everybody wants to do as much as they can possibly do. As I say, we are proud that some from New England got the opportunity at least to go directly there and contribute in a very direct manner.

When a tragedy like this occurs, I think everyone naturally wants to know what it is that they can do, and that doesn't stop with this body. It is not a sentiment that is entirely alien to the Members of Congress. We feel the same way, and this particular committee and the Subcommittee on National Security, Veterans Affairs and International Realtions in particular has a unique role to play in making sure that our government works as efficiently as is possible.

I want to take just a moment to acknowledge my colleague and chairman of the Subcommittee on National Security, Veterans Affairs and International Realtions, Chris Shays, who, as many of us will recall, has over the last several years conducted 19 or 20 hearings on related issues alone. He has shown leadership and has identified in fact that this was a major concern of this country. We are proud on that subcommittee to work with him in a nonpartisan way over and over again to address this and try to focus this government and the American people's attention on what we thought was in fact the primary risk.

I think there are four things we have to look at here. We have to look at assessing what the risks to this country are, prioritizing those matters, coordinating what our response is going to be, and then allocating the resources and executing our plans to deal with them.

We have a refreshingly unified outlook of late amongst committee members here, amongst Congress as the whole. We are going to pursue our affirmative goals, and we are going to avoid accusations of fault. We are being called together to examine the system of our government and decide how to improve it with respect to the issues that confront us today.

In hearings in that subcommittee in particular we have heard the GAO tell us that we don't have the proper focus and we have not prioritized the issues relating to terrorism. We have to evaluate all the actions and all the threats together and in a comprehensive way. Then we have to address our resources, our spending to counter those threats in a way that is linked to our priorities. We haven't necessarily been doing that.

In 1995, President Clinton issued a Presidential Decision Directive No. 39, and he set forward three goals that we had: reduce our vulnerabilities, deter terrorist attacks before they occur, respond to terrorism by preparing for consequences, managing the crises and prosecuting offenders. Chris Shays and the committee are trying to focus on those three areas to see where we were, to see what it is

we had to do and in what order and how we would apply our resources to it and whether or not we were doing an effective job.

We have had legislation filed attempting to address the issue of how these roles are being coordinated across various agencies of government, and we continue to try and move in that direction. Obviously, with the events of recent days we will see that this is expedited. It has now come to the full attention of all American people the concentration that subcommittee has had on this issue.

We have heard numerous witnesses. We have been to a number of different trials and demonstrations of how it is that we would respond to these particular types of situations or crises. We have reviewed the Rudman-Hart Commission's reports and heard testimony from the members of that Commission and others on the issue, and now we need to go to work.

When I talk about prioritizing, let me give you an example. You know, over the past several administrations we have focused on the national missile defense as being a top priority. I, for one, have opposed that, as have others, based on serious concerns with the technical feasibility of that proposal. But all of us can understand certainly the fear of the rogue state ostensibly launching an intercontinental ballistic missile at one of our major cities. The effects, obviously, would be devastating, and we have to protect against that threat. But we have to make sure that the technical feasibility is there before we start spending money wastefully on that. There is some $8.3 billion next year alone being addressed not just to researching and trying to develop a system but to actually deploying a system that so far has shown that it cannot work.

In our assessment of priority threats, none of our intelligence agencies lift that threat above the one of terrorism. So we have to ask ourselves, why is it that we are projecting $100 billion in that direction and, according to the Office of Management and Budget, across all of our various agencies in this government only $10.3 billion to counter all forms of terrorism threats combined?

Now, I do that not because I want to start a political discussion here but only because I want to start a comprehensive discussion of policy here. Let us start to focus on those four things. Let's assess the threats, and then let's prioritize them in the order that we need to address. Let's coordinate and work on legislation that will allow this government to coordinate responses across all of those agencies in a comprehensive way, and then let us put together a plan of execution that will let us apply the resources where they need to be applied at a particular point in time. That will be the patriotism that this committee has to work for. That will be the patriotism that this country has to work for, the serious, serious look at this and the way we go about our business.

I am looking forward to working further with Mr. Shays on the subcommittee. I am sure our work will be pointed in that direction, but, as Mr. Owens says, the entire Congress will have to address legislation that lets us do those four things.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BURTON. Thank you, Mr. Tierney.

Mr. Mica.

Mr. MICA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to depart for a second from the regular order and take a moment to recognize the memory of one of our staffers, Ned Lynch. Ned worked for me and others on the Civil Service Subcommittee. He fought a courageous battle with cancer. He died during the recess, and I want to thank the chairman for his support. He left five children behind; and, Chairman Burton, I publicly thank you for what you did in support of that family.

Also, I would be remiss if I didn't take a moment to remember Barbara Olson. I lost many friends on Tuesday, September 11th, as many of you have. Barbara was very special to me. She worked for this committee as well. Our heartfelt sympathies go to Ted and her family, and I must say she was a patriot and a dedicated American right to the very end. So we remember her today.

Mr. Chairman, I also want to thank you for holding this hearing. It couldn't be more timely, and it certainly is within our purview and responsibility as the oversight committee of the House of Representatives.

Obviously, the events of September 11th indicate that we did have a substantial failure in some of our systems, particularly our intelligence system. It is incredible to realize that our intelligence capability could not identify and even today we are having difficulty really gaining the true identity of the terrorists.

It is also difficult that a Federalized system and under the control of our U.S. Embassies and consular officers would issue visas to the vast majority of those terrorists who entered our country and used our borders as almost a swinging door to enter, leave, and have their family come and go, almost at will.

Something has gone wrong, and maybe it is our quest in this country for political correctness, but we have got to really examine what went wrong.

There are easy scapegoats. I chair the Aviation Subcommittee of the House, and I have heard that the Federalization of the screening process is a simple answer. Ladies and gentlemen, the screening process did—those screeners did not fail. Federal regulations allowed box cutters, and the equipment that has been deployed was not able to detect the material such as plastic and knives, and that is partly due to our quest for political correctness. We have machines that have been tested and deployed and then also withdrawn because some said they were invasions of our civil liberties. So we have the technical capability to correct the screening process.

The rules for screeners—this is the Gore Commission report which came out September 9, 1996, and some of it was a knee-jerk reaction to TWA Flight 800, which turned out to be in fact a defect in the electrical system and fuel tanks aboard the aircraft. We spent billions of dollars to buy detection devices, and we went off on various tangents. If they failed, we failed, because we never instituted any measures until the—Congress did not act until 2000 on some of these recommendations. Some of them. Again, not very prudent, but we did pass the Airport Security Improvement Act of 2000.

As of the week before the incidents of September 11th, here are the proposed rules by FAA as a real result of this law, which is 4 years after this Commission report. This set of rules for enhancing screening still isn't in place. So talk about Federalization. Their

folks are examples of Federalization having failed, starting again with intelligence, visa distribution and the screening process.

What must we do? First of all, we have heard that we know what the recommendations are. We must penetrate the terrorist organizations. We must penetrate their communications. We must penetrate their finances. To do that, the Attorney General has come forth with several maybe not politically correct but several things we need to do, and we must adopt the Attorney General's recommendations.

Additionally, you have heard, and Mr. Horn alluded to it, of the stunning lack of qualified linguists, the stunning lack of intelligence analysts. We have tons of information. We don't have the people who can interpret it or even understand the language that it has been relayed in.

The problem has been described—and I will conclude with saying this—as lack of the proper response.

Khobar Towers, I spoke at the graduation of the young man, Brian McVeigh, in my district. I spoke at his funeral when he was blown to pieces at Khobar Towers, and we still have no response. The U.S. Embassy attacks, no response. The *USS Cole* attack, no response. Now I should say no meaningful response. What we have done is retaliate and on a limited basis and not eliminate, and that is what our goal must be.

So, hopefully, Mr. Chairman and my members of the committee and Congress will have learned from these expensive lessons and do a better job.

Thank you. I yield back.

Mr. BURTON. Thank you very much, Mr. Mica.

Mr. Kucinich.

Mr. KUCINICH. Thank you very much.

I want to thank the Chair for holding these hearings, and I agree with my fellow colleagues that we need to support increased efforts to deal with terrorism. These hearings I think will be productive in doing that.

I also know that I share with many of my colleagues concern over the resources that the American people have already spent to deal with terrorism, vast amounts of money to support intelligence efforts all around the world. This hearing isn't the forum to ask the question, but people still want to know, what do we get for the money, and why didn't we have better notification for the money that we are paying? Because if we are going to now advocate more resources to fight terrorism, wouldn't it be good to find out what the failures of the present system have been? Because, obviously, there have been failures.

While I appreciate everyone who chooses to serve our country, whether they are in the uniformed service or they are in the service of the Central Intelligence Agency, I think that we are at a time when it is going to be very important to establish measures of accountability for those who are in the Central Intelligence Agency so that when they come before Congress and try to brief us or explain to us what the conditions are that we feel a certain level of comfort and a certain level of satisfaction in the integrity of the information that we are being given; and I think that every Member

of Congress knows what I am talking about. I don't need to elaborate on that any further.

But, moving on, let's look at what the World Trade Center represented: international cooperation, international communication, international finance, international spread of democratic values. It countenances a view of the world as an interconnected whole. What the World Trade Center has stood as the symbol of, and not just an important marker in the skyline of our country and of New York, is this view that the world is together, that we are connected, that what affects one nation affects us all. Indeed, we know that 60 nations lost brothers and sisters in this tragedy.

The destruction of September 11th has a different message, too, that we are aware of today. It is a message about American unity, but it is also a message about world unity to combat terrorism. And I would say, Mr. Chairman, that what we see in the world uniting to address the issue of terrorism is basically the precondition for the end of unilateralism in the United States. Because the United States, while we have the power and the strength and certainly the courage to go it alone, we do not need to do so anymore. We have nations around the world waiting to cooperate with us in addressing the issue of terrorism.

And, the truth be told, we have to have their help. We cannot do it alone. We need international cooperation in the same way that the World Trade Center symbolizes international cooperation. We need to have symmetry in that cooperation in dealing with the issue of terrorism.

So we must prepare for a new world that has already been unfolding, working cooperatively with all nations for democratic rights and democratic values, with security sufficient to protect those rights. In this new world, go-it-alone strategies are insufficient, which is why my good friend, Mr. Tierney, when he speaks of the inadequacies of the national missile defense system, his remarks are well taken.

In the year 2000, annual spending to combat terrorism among various Federal agencies crept up to just over $10 billion from an estimated $4 billion at the start of the Clinton administration's term. In contrast nearly $60 billion has been spent on a ballistic missile system since 1983.

Now, nonproliferation treaties have great promise. The ABM Treaty as a model has great promise for the future, global cooperation on antiterrorism efforts, great promise for the future because they symbolize a belief that the world while it can be a very dangerous place also holds out hope for cooperation, not just militarily, but in economics, in the environment, in human rights, in addressing those issues which give terrorists opportunities to gain a hold.

I am confident that the United States has the resources, the strength, the courage and the intelligence to lead the world in addressing the issues of terrorism. I am hopeful that the United States will do everything it can to aid those families who have suffered as a result of terrorism, because this Nation certainly needs a period of healing and the healing is going to take a long time for those who have lost loved ones. But we have an opportunity to recreate the world again here, and not just to address terrorism as it exists, as it must be rooted out, but to look at what it means to

have the world working together on a problem that vexes all free people but in a manner that gives us an opportunity to envision a world where we are working cooperatively for peace.

Thank you very much.

Mr. BURTON. I thank the gentleman. Let me just remind the members that the reason we have that clock up there is it shows when their time is expired. I understand everybody has a great deal of concern about what happened, but we have Mr. Netanyahu coming and we don't want to keep him from coming too long or the other members of the panel who are going to be testifying.

Mr. Ose.

Mr. OSE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I can see the clock from here and I will be attentive.

In the aftermath of Tuesday's events, I want to pass my compliments to you and to Mr. Waxman, because what things really boiled down to was a measure of the leadership on both sides of our aisle. And the chairmen and the ranking members of the committees on this Hill basically had pushed on their shoulders a tremendous burden. It is a measure of the resilience of our country that the people who are in positions of leadership from both sides of the aisle last Tuesday and since were up to the task, and I want to thank both of you for the roles you played quietly or otherwise. I thought that it was an affirmation of our system to see the committee chairs and the committee ranking members coalesce as they did, and I want to thank you both for that.

I want to associate myself with the remarks of Mr. Lantos. I met Shimon Perez last month and he is a gentleman with what I would call no illusions about the world as it lays. And I think Mr. Lantos' remarks this morning reflect to a great degree Mr. Perez' perspective.

I also want to point out Mr. Owens spoke about accountability among our voters, people we represent, and he indicated that there was some degree of distress in his district. Well, there was a degree of distress in my district too, and I think what the voters ultimately end up looking at is what we do, not what we talk about but what we do. What we do is post votes pro or con on this or that issue. One of the things we post votes on is the intelligence authorization bills. Most often they go through on a voice vote, but on occasion they go through on recorded votes, and I think it will be interesting for someone to go back and do the research on who voted for or against intelligence authorization bills 3 or 4 or 5 years ago because last Tuesday's actions were consequences of votes taken 3 or 4 or 5 years ago.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to submit the balance of my statement for the record. I just thank you and Mr. Waxman for the leadership you have shown in the last week. I know you guys have differences. I mean I know you do. But I am just—I have to tell you I am extremely proud to be associated with both of you, particularly in the last week. So I thank you.

Mr. BURTON. Thank you, Mr. Ose.

[The prepared statement of Hon. Doug Ose follows:]

Committee on Government Reform
Preparing for the War on Terrorism
Statement of Congressman Doug Ose (R-CA03)
September 20, 2001

Mr. Chairman, let me begin by thanking you for holding this valuable, and timely hearing.

As of Tuesday, September 11th, we live in a different America. We have seen that the liberties we hold so dear are the subject of attack by those who would disrupt our way of life. We have seen that the security we so carefully craft is subject to penetration by those who will risk life and limb to put us in harm's way. Yet, we also have seen that the spirit which makes us the greatest nation in the history of the globe is immune to acts of terror even when perpetrated against us at home.

While we are a strong and clever nation, Mr. Chairman, we are still a nation at risk. Four airplanes were commandeered and destroyed in the most sophisticated and intricately executed hijacking in history. These planes were used as bombs against American citizens in civilian places of business. These planes served as tombs for the passengers who boarded them that fateful morning. If these animals can use our own commercial airlines against us, to what other monstrous fate are we at risk of succumbing?

This risk must be assessed by the federal government, and we, as the elected officials, must make the necessary adjustments to ensure that the risk is eliminated and these tragic events never occur again.

These terrorist lived among us, Mr. Chairman. They held jobs in our communities, they studied at our universities, and possibly even at our military installations.

A local Nurse practitioner once provided health care services for one of the hijackers. Her comments best sum up the confusion and incredulity we all feel: "how could someone mask such disdain for their neighbor?" How can someone live here for so long while plotting daily to commit such heinous attacks?

Mr. Chairman, I have read that the risk extends beyond physical attack. The Boston Globe on Tuesday reported that the terrorist organizations may have actually profited by selling stocks short, betting that the havoc they were about to wreak would cause a decline in stock price. As I understand it, the US Securities and Exchange Commission is engaging in an international investigation with regulators in Germany, Italy, and Japan to determine whether the terrorist network hoped to profit through the trading of reinsurance contracts.

What cunning did these terrorists demonstrate if they were able to profit by their actions. I would submit, Mr. Chairman, that any attack on the integrity of our financial markets is also terrorism, and it too demands the full attention and reprisal of our law enforcement agencies.

States have already begun to enact more stringent anti-terrorism laws. Tuesday, the New York State Legislature passed a bill that Governor Pataki signed to make it a felony to help terrorists with financial or other material support before an attack, or to hide or abet them after they have struck. Attorney General Ashcroft is calling on us in Congress to broaden the wire tap jurisdiction for law enforcement and to strengthen penalties for harboring terrorists. I am quite interested in hearing from our panelists today regarding where we are and what more we need to do.

Like everyone else here today, I agree that we are at war. In the past we waged wars against visible enemies on battlefields of common agreement. Today, we fight shadows on our own soil. Are we prepared to wage this war? How is it going to be different than those of the past? What must we do to prepare? And finally, how do we ensure victory? These are the questions I put to our panelists today.

Again, Mr. Chairman, thank you for your leadership in calling today's hearing. I extend my gracious welcome to the experts that have joined us to lend their thoughts, and without further delay, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURTON. Ms. Schakowsky.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The horrific acts of September 11th have deeply affected all of us as a Nation and as individuals. We find ourselves taking stock of those things that are really important in our lives. Yesterday I was at the birth of my fourth grandchild William, and I want his world to be safe like all other grandparents and parents do. And now we are going to be deciding on the specific actions to take to guarantee our safety and security in the future, to help a faltering economy that has been made worse by this terrorist attack and to bring justice to the perpetrators.

As we make those decisions, we must ask one question again and again: Will this action achieve our goals of safety, security and justice? We need to move cautiously and consider all the consequences. The might of the United States is great and we must use it carefully and to eliminate terrorist threats, making sure that those who are responsible, and only those, pay the price. We must allocate all necessary resources to restore the lost sense of security that has been such an important part of American life without violating the freedoms that make us proud to be Americans.

Security measures at airports, on airplanes and public buildings may be irritating but in my view both acceptable and necessary. Intrusions into private communications, however, must be thoughtfully debated and caution taken before we expand the government's right to step in. This is a time for Americans to come together, not to turn on each other. There have been disturbing acts of bigotry and violence against Muslims, Arab Americans, Sikhs and Jews. We must all take a strong stand against this in our own communities. Last Sunday I sponsored a solidarity walk in my district that drew hundreds of people of all races and religions and national origins who joined hands and sang God Bless America. We should also move quickly to pass the Hate Crimes Protection Act as an expression of our tolerance as Americans. We need to reevaluate how easily we want potential criminals as well as law-abiding citizens to be able to access firearms, flight training and other potential tools that can facilitate acts of terror.

We must ensure that those who might endanger our security never make it inside our borders, but we must never forget that this country was built by the contribution of immigrants from all over the world. Many of those who perished at the World Trade Center and the Pentagon were immigrants or the sons and daughters of immigrants who have come here seeking a better life and who made this country a better place. We must continue to insist on an immigration policy that welcomes people who make such valuable contributions to our diversity and our strength.

We must make the proper investments in our public health system so that we can prevent and probably address the threat of bioterrorism.

There are many economic consequences of this disaster. There are many industries and businesses that have been affected and may legitimately be coming to the taxpayers for help. But as we rethink our national funding priorities we must remember that senior citizens still need relief from the high cost of prescription

drugs, children still need us to invest in their education. Social Security and Medicare still need to be protected.

In the National Security Subcommittee under the chairmanship of Chris Shays, we have had many hearings in the last few years on antiterrorism policy. We have heard from scores of witnesses and members and have had numerous discussions about the need to do more in this country to prevent and respond to terrorist attacks.

I am glad today that we have with us experts in the field who can help us determine appropriate policy responses to recent events. I want to extend a particularly warm welcome to Benjamin Netanyahu, the former Prime Minister of Israel, a country that is a great ally of the United States and one that has the unfortunate distinction of expertise in responding to terror.

Mr. Netanyahu's expertise in this field predates his service as Prime Minister and we are fortunate to have him here with us today.

Mr. Chairman, we will stand together in this country and with our allies around the world and all those who consider themselves civilized, and we will have justice. Thank you.

Mr. BURTON. Thank you, Ms. Schakowsky. We have a vote on the floor. What I would like to do is keep moving ahead with our opening statements. Those who want to go ahead and vote can do that and then come back as quickly as possible. I will remain here in the chair.

Mr. Weldon, I think are you next.

Mr. WELDON. I believe I am.

Mr. BURTON. If you want to go ahead, and I know you have something you want to show the panel as well.

Mr. WELDON. Yes, Mr. Chairman. As we all know, commandeering a passenger jetliner and converting it into a weapon of mass destruction by flying it into an office building filled with civilians is a terrorist act that we all prior to September 11th would have never imagined. Nonetheless, today it is the new modus operandi of a network of radical Islamic fundamentalists who have for years been able to make the United States their home.

Elements of this terrorist network, what I would call the evil empire of the 21st century, has been operating in the United States for years. I would like to use the balance of my time to just show some clips from a video called Jihad in America, and I am going to be showing or sending a copy of this video to all the Members of the House and the Senate for them to see. I don't know if the staff are able to do this, but I would like to go ahead and show some of the clips from this video.

Mr. BURTON. I hope everybody will pay particular attention to this video. I think it is very important.

[Video shown.]

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Chairman, I will just yield back. I am delivering this to every Member. I just want to underscore one important point of the enemies of these people are not only Israel and United States but moderate Muslims who oppose their agenda. I would encourage every Member and their staff to view this video in its entirety.

This video is about 5 years old. But I spoke to the producer of this video yesterday. He told me they just had another meeting in July. One of the key radicals just came into the country in July. INS was trying to keep him out, State Department said go ahead and let him in. They are using our freedoms to put forward their agenda, which includes a desire to take away the freedom of speech, freedom of religion.

[The prepared statement of Hon. Dave Weldon follows:]

News From
DAVE WELDON

Florida's 15th District -- *Serving Brevard, Indian River, Osceola, and Polk Counties*

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
September 20, 2001

CONTACT: Brendan Curry (202) 225-3671
http://www.house.gov/weldon

Weldon Draws Attention to Militant Muslim Extremist Operations within U.S.

Concerns Raised by *Jihad in America*, A 1994 Documentary, Ignored For Years

Washington, D.C. - Known terrorists have been able to come and go in the U.S. at will over the last two decades. Militant extremists have held conferences here in the U.S.. Militant leaders who have called for jihad or "holy war" against the United States and all American citizens. At today's House Government Reform Committee hearing on terrorism, Rep. Dave Weldon, M.D. (R-FL) presented footage from a 1994 Public Broadcasting Service documentary, *Jihad in America.*

"This video footage of Muslim extremist bases of operation right here in our own nation from which they launch acts of terror against America and the world is most troubling," said Rep. Weldon after viewing the PBS documentary. "Well-known terrorists and their organizations have been holding international terrorism conferences, not in the Middle East, but in places like Missouri, New Jersey, New York, Texas and Georgia."

The PBS documentary, released in 1994, documents a concerted effort by Muslim extremists to train children to engage in violence and to divert money from dozens of tax-exempt charities to fund acts of terror. Former FBI agent Oliver Revell states, "Coming to the United States give them a platform that they can use for the rest of the world. They can produce their films, their videos, and their publications. They can collect money..." Many of these militant groups have set up networks throughout the United States. Mr. Revell adds, "We in the.... law enforcement communities cannot collect public information unless they have an ongoing criminal investigation. So those things that you as a journalist... may know... law enforcement will not necessarily and probably will not know."

"Clearly things have got to change. The destruction of the World Trade Center is a wakeup call to America. We have been asleep at the switch as these very terrorists practice their militant ways right under our noses. Terrorism is the new evil empire of the 21st century. If we fail to take action to end terrorism, we will subject our children and grandchildren to future acts of violence," said Rep. Weldon. "Today is the day for real action."

###

For the Latest Regarding Congressional Action on the Terrosts Attacks :
www.house.gov/weldon

Mr. BURTON. I will be glad to assist you in any way to make sure every Member gets a copy of that tape so they can look at it.

Mr. Kanjorski.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. After seeing that tape I would caution Americans everywhere that this is not a war against Islam. The religion of Islam is very peaceful. There are, however, fanatics in every religion of the world. To excite the American people to react against the Islamic religion is a certainty for defeat for this country.

I would like to raise some important issues with the committee. This weekend we had several meetings on the Democratic side to analyze the effects of the attack on the American people from the standpoint of security. We also discussed the possible negative effects the attack may have on the economy by exacerbating the slowing of economic growth that existed even before the attack. I urge that this committee exercise its jurisdiction in every way to not only facilitate the needs of the executive branch to provide for the security requirements on the airlines, the transportation field, and other vital industries but also to anticipate those needs. As a Nation, we will indeed mobilize but in a different way. It will not be simply calling up troops. Rather, it will include getting the best people to reactivate themselves and the various Federal services to provide the manpower necessary for the security and protection of the American people.

The second area to facilitate mobilization within the jurisdiction of this committee is the granting of permission to allow retired marshals, FBI agents and other law enforcement officials to be reactivated without going through a long process that would delay their reactivation.

Mr. BURTON. Would the gentleman yield real briefly?

Mr. KANJORSKI. Yes.

Mr. BURTON. I would be happy to cosponsor any legislation necessary to do that because a lot of them would also lose retirement benefits, and so in this time of tragedy we probably ought to suspend some of those rules. I will be glad to work with you on that.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Very good, Mr. Chairman.

Of utmost importance is the outcome of this battle. America will win this battle and this war. The economy, however, is probably the most important element to achieve this goal. As legislation is being prepared, those of us in Congress must be overly sensitive to the needs of the airline industry and be certain that we help. We must also consider helping other major important segments of the American economy to provide support so that they will not deteriorate further but instead, that they will rebound. Matched with the strong security protections this government can afford to provide to the American people, we can allow them the opportunity to display their courage and patriotism through consumer spending as they all indicated a willingness to do.

I urge this committee to act as quickly as possible and exercise extraordinary jurisdictions which it has the right to do in such emergency situations to facilitate the best response to this attack. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BURTON. As I said, Mr. Kanjorski, I would be glad to work with you on any aspect of the issue you just raised. Mrs. Maloney.

Mrs. MALONEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for calling this hearing and for your expressed cooperation. I also want to thank Mr. Netanyahu for advising us during this time of great need. As a New Yorker who has been to Ground Zero many times, I have seen the tremendous need for relief and support because of this tragedy. And on behalf of many, many New Yorkers I want to thank my colleagues and the President for responding swiftly and substantively with the $40 billion relief and support package and antiterrorist initiatives package. Today we will be reviewing how prepared or unprepared our government was to detect and deter this disaster. And more importantly, we will be reviewing what we need to do in the future to make sure that it doesn't happen again.

I join my colleagues in calling for better intelligence, better security in our airports, financial support, the tools to track the financial movement of money for the terrorist organizations. In the past we have used a variety of diplomatic and economic tools to combat terrorism. In this instance it did not work. We need a broad coalition around the world, and we especially need the support and participation of peace loving Muslim countries.

Millions of Muslims in our own country and around the world are appalled by the evil terrorist act of depraved extremists.

I am especially appreciative to Pakistan, which has come forward with the world community to combat terrorism. Our enemies would like us to think that we are at war with Islam. Nothing could be further from the truth. We are at war against terrorism, against terrorists, against their organizations and support systems, and any country or organization that harbors and supports them.

Believe me, the tragedy may have broken our hearts but our spirit is strong and unbroken. We are united as a country behind our President in whatever needs to be done to make sure this doesn't happen again.

Thank you for calling the hearing.

[The prepared statement of Hon. Carolyn B. Maloney follows:]

14th District • New York

Congresswoman

Carolyn Maloney

Reports

2430 Rayburn Building • Washington, DC 20515 • 202-225-7944
1651 Third Avenue • Suite 311 • New York, NY 10128 • 212-860-0606

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSWOMAN CAROLYN B. MALONEY

Committee on Government Reform
Full Committee Hearing
"Preparing for the War on Terrorism"
Thursday, September 20, 2001

Mr. Chairman and Ranking Member, thank you for holding this hearing today.

We must, as a nation, prepare for the war on terrorism. Tragically, on September 11th, my vibrant home of New York City, along with four commercial flights, the Pentagon and rural Pennsylvania, became the targets of international terrorism.

I spent the last several days at home, visiting ground zero and offering assistance to my constituents in this time of great tragedy. On Tuesday, I visited many of the fire houses on the East Side of Manhattan. Many of our City's firefighters lost their lives while trying to save the lives of others – my own local station is missing nine of their brothers from their company. Walking through New York City, I can tell you that the pain is very deep and very real but so is the resolve to rebuild and ***not*** to give into terror.

The men and women of our national security community have been battling terrorism for many years. While many acts of terror have been thwarted by these experts, I am concerned that we may have made mistakes in evaluating the threats of terrorism. In the past few days, we have learned to carefully measure reports in the media, but I am concerned by news that Israeli military intelligence may have warned the U.S. six weeks ago of the possibility of a major attack and that Iraq may have provided support and assistance for the September 11th attacks. I am also concerned by recent reports that the Philippines may have warned the U.S. of a similar plot as early as 1995. I hope this hearing will reveal what the experts knew and for how long so that we can figure out what went wrong. Clearly, this is not a time to fix blame or find a scapegoat, it is a time to learn from our mistakes in order to prevent another attack of this magnitude from ever happening again.

I look forward to the testimony of today's distinguished witnesses. Former Prime Minister Netanyahu has been at the forefront of combating international terrorism for many years. Mr. Netanyahu's own brother, Yoni, gave his life fighting international terrorism in Entebbe, Uganda. As Prime Minister, he lead his country through truly hard times and will likely give

insight into the role Israel can play in the current situation in order to help stamp out international terrorism.

As public servants and policy makers, we must focus on obliterating any capability that current or budding terrorist groups may have to carry out another attack. Terrorism -- in any form -- has such a tremendous psychological and physical impact on a nation. But I say this: if the purpose of the terrorists actions of September 11th was to divide and cower our great country, then the terrorists failed miserably.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BURTON. Thank you, Mrs. Maloney.

Mr. Sanders.

Mr. SANDERS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I don't have to repeat many of the important points made by my colleagues over the morning and I also on behalf of the people of the State of Vermont want to express my horror at the terrible deed perpetrated on September 11th and the terrible loss of life and offer our condolences to the loved ones of those who were killed.

As you have heard this morning, Mr. Chairman, clearly I think we are united in saying that people who commit mass murder have got to be caught and they have got to be punished and that we have got to as a Nation working with other nations around the world do everything that we can to stamp out the horror of international terrorism. Clearly within our own country we have got to take a hard look at reevaluating our own security systems and I think make some very monumental changes in that.

I think the only point I would like to add—I came a little bit late but I haven't heard it made earlier—is that while we wage the struggle against international terrorism, we have got to be mindful of a fact which is very, very distressing to me and I think to the people of this country and people all over the world, and that is that for a variety of reasons which we must understand, somebody like an Osama bin Laden is apparently being regarded as a hero in various parts of the world. I was just reading in the paper today that T-shirts with his picture on it and his videotapes are selling wildly in some parts of the world. People see him as somebody who is standing up for their rights. I think that as a Nation we have got to make it very clear to the Muslim people throughout the world, to poor people throughout the developing world, that international terrorism and gangsters and murderers do not reflect their interests and should not be supported by them.

On the other hand, as a Nation, as the wealthiest and most powerful Nation in the world, we have got to be mindful about the need to address many of those terrible economic problems that fester in developing countries that give rise to support for people like bin Laden.

There is discussion about military action in Afghanistan, and one of the problems is the military doesn't know what to bomb because this country is so poor, is so desperate that there is virtually nothing there. One-third of the people, adults can't read. People are hungry. Girls are not going to school, etc. So I would suggest that as part of our long-term strategy in dealing with international terrorism, in apprehending, capturing the terrorists and doing everything that we can to prevent other acts of terrorism in this country or other countries around the world, we have also got to pay attention to the very difficult and long-term issues of how the rest of the developing world sees us as their friend, somebody who is trying to provide decent jobs for their people, health care, education, housing, all the things that every human being and every mother and father in this world wants to see for their children.

We must not allow millions and millions of people to see this country as their enemy and people like bin Ladin as their allies and their friends. So it is going to be a long hard struggle. It is going to have to be fought in many ways. And I just wanted to

mention that I think that is an additional area that I think we are going to have to look at.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BURTON. Thank you, Mr. Sanders.

Mr. Otter.

Mr. OTTER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I appreciate you very much calling this meeting. It is too bad we had a vote because all my colleagues are going to miss these great words of wisdom to hear from a freshman. But I do appreciate you calling this meeting.

There could not be a more important subject facing Congress in a generation or in fact for years to come. It seems more now than ever that the weight of what our witnesses have to say holds a true relationship to the direction that we as a committee and as a Nation must take to defend our fellow citizens. For a long time we have been sheltered from terrorism in the United States, and I want to thank the chairman for inviting Prime Minister Netanyahu to share with the United States his experience and knowledge of dealing with terrorists on a daily basis in Israel. Not long ago, we could only imagine how the Prime Minister dealt with the terrorists. Unfortunately, today we know too well and understand this ongoing struggle.

Without question, many causes led to this tragic event of September 11th. While we could spend this and many other hearings assigning blame, this would be wasted time. Instead, we need to assess past policies and readiness and do what needs to be done to decisively fight to win this war on terrorism.

I hope that we as a committee will discover and address the areas of our national security that not have received adequate funding. Moreover, we must encourage witnesses here today and in the future to speak freely about their knowledge of any weakness and provide recommendations on what we as Congress can do in aiding in combating this new war on America.

We were told many generations ago, Mr. Chairman, that Americans were warned that each generation would be called upon to polish, sustain and then improve this great Republic. We were also told that these occasions would come disguised in many ways. The events of September 11th have delivered the occasion to this generation. We now have to begin anew the establishment of policies and enhanced collaboration between agencies and States and businesses and, yes, even Members of Congress of both parties so that together, working closely with our allies, we will vanquish these terrorists.

I am hopeful through the testimony today and in the future that we will be able to shed light on the breakdowns learned from past mistakes and make sure that the appropriate changes and preparations are instituted into this war.

However, Mr. Chairman, there is equal importance that must be given to identifying who the terrorists are. We must also identify who they are not. Terrorists do not share a national, racial, political nor religious DNA. They don't just look alike.

They are as correctly defined by the testimony we will hear today of the author, Netanyahu, in his book Terrorism and How the West Can Win. In defining terrorism he said, the author, "Terrorism is

rooted in the political ambitions and design of expansionist states and the groups that serve them."

Again, on the day of the tragedy, in an interview, Mr. Netanyahu identified terrorists, said they typically misunderstand and underappreciate the resolves of free societies. But amid the smoking ruins of the Twin Towers you could see the silhouette of the Statue of Liberty holding the torch of liberty very high and very proud. It is that flame of liberty that these people want to extinguish.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I would say that we Americans chose neither the time nor the place for these events and these devastating events of September 11th, but we must convince those soulless terrorists who have made their choice known by these acts that they have once again grossly underestimated the sterling resolve that historically visits this Nation during our time of need.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BURTON. Thank you very much, Mr. Otter.

Ms. Norton.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate how quickly you have called this hearing. All of us are still, I think, trying to absorb what war by terror means. I am not yet sure what it means, but I think I know what terror is. It was spelled out devastatingly for us on September 11th.

I went last night to the Pentagon and asked to go close to the building. Members of Congress are going out, and they normally stand some distance away.

I have lost many constituents. Three children were on the plane that crashed into the Pentagon, the three teachers with them. These were honor students who had won a prize from the National Geographic magazine.

When I went out to the schools yesterday, there were two children whose father cannot bring himself to tell them that the mother naval officer is dead.

I wanted to see the Pentagon. I wanted to understand what it means for a plane to plow into a building. We have seen from afar how the great towers of a great city could be taken down, and we know that there is no city that is a greater target than the Nation's Capitol. We feel enormously fortunate that there was no harm done to this Capitol, to the 2 million people who work here, to the 600,000 people who live here.

But, Mr. Chairman, there is something of a temporary victory in the closing of National Airport. The hearing you have today is very important because the closing of National Airport tells us we don't even know how to keep the airport of the Nation's Capitol open. When you close the airport, you come pretty close to closing the Nation's Capitol itself.

We have lots to learn from Israel and other countries. Mr. Netanyahu you have had the wisdom to invite, and others. Because the attack of September 11th drives home that we are starting at the basics. We have got to open National Airport but certainly not recklessly. We don't want to fling it open. But we have certainly got to open it. We can't let this monument to the terror of September 11th remain much longer.

So I am hoping that the Congress and the administration will give greater priority to making National Airport perhaps a pilot for

the rest of the country. Because if we can keep National Airport, so close to official buildings and monuments and the Congress and the White House, open, then we can protect any city in the United States.

I am pleased that the Congress is now moving forthwith. There was an important aviation hearing. Our airlines must be saved. No great power can remain a great power if it is left with one airline or airlines in bankruptcy. I hope that bill will go to the floor no later than Friday or Monday.

At 2 today I am going to another of my subcommittees to mark up a bill on domestic preparedness. Fortunately, the Transportation Committee was working on this bill. Our Subcommittee of Economic Development and Public Buildings was working on this bill.

I have inserted an amendment to put the District of Columbia at the table of domestic preparedness. Because if there is an attack on the District of Columbia, the first responder is the police department of the District of Columbia, the fire department of the District of Columbia. And yet, they knew nothing. There was no communication with them when in fact the attack occurred last Tuesday.

Finally, let me say, Mr. Chairman, that I appreciate what I believe is going on in the administration. I believe that the administration understands that some of the talk we are hearing is not the kind of talk that a great power can respond to.

We have got to be both strong and delicate. If you have any doubt about that, look at what is happening in Pakistan. Pakistan wants to do the right thing, and its leaders have had the guts to stand up and say they want to do the right thing and to go around the country and try to indicate to their own people that they want to do the right thing. Yet, at the same time, there is the same kind of internal politics in Pakistan that we have here. We saw that when we refused to turn the Shah over and, as a result, we had hostages taken.

People have got to deal with the domestic politics and with their external politics. We have got to help them deal with both. They have internal divisions.

There are, of course, in Pakistan some of the very same people out of the very same schools that we had in Afghanistan. So I want to commend the administration for what I believe is a far more careful way of approaching this than some of the bombast that I heard sometimes on the House floor last week and that we are hearing from the American people. I believe that the President's talk this evening offers an important occasion to educate us about all of the factors that have to be taken into account as we do what we have to do, and we know what we have to do.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BURTON. Thank you, Ms. Norton.

Mr. Putnam.

Mr. PUTNAM. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

As a member of a slightly different generation that has not been exposed to many of the great wars of the last century, I attempt to bring a little bit of a different perspective to this debate; and I approach this debate about war with great humility and respect,

not having been exposed to the horrors of war that many of those who served in Congress have. Unlike many of our colleagues, not having been exposed to Pearl Harbor, not having been a part of that greatest generation, that World War II generation, not living through the tumult of the United States during the Vietnam era, there are many in my generation whose only exposure to the horrors of war was seemingly through the eyes of CNN in a very brief and fortunately relatively low casualty war in the Persian Gulf.

As we have debated in the Shays subcommittee over the course of this year on terrorism, we have delved very deeply into the causes and the impacts and the consequences and our ability to be prepared and our ability to respond. And that is no longer an esoteric discussion buried in the subcommittee. It is now on the front page and in the front of the minds of all Americans and the world.

So while it is with great trepidation and humility that we approach this debate about the war, it is an appropriate debate to have. Because we are now committed. The Nation is resolved to respond to this network of terror that is around the world and in our own country.

As we approach this debate and we have these very important discussions about the balance of the American way of life, of the civil liberties, the freedoms that all of us enjoy and to what extent we are willing to sacrifice some of those for security, the debate is about our preparedness, the debate is about the proper use of force, the debate is about unilateral versus multilateral responses.

We approach those in a very new way. There is no historical precedent for a war of this magnitude with an enemy that has no assets and nothing to lose in the traditional sense. We have to go back to the Indian wars of the American West for a similar comparison of American troops fighting rock by rock, cave by cave, canyon by canyon after this type of a network of an enemy.

I would encourage this committee and this Congress to take into consideration and not squander the political and the popular will that is out there for us to make the necessary sacrifice and make the necessary commitment now and henceforth to eradicate these networks to the greatest extent possible. This is not the time to be timid. This is not the time to ask others permission for us to respond to what was an attack on American soil to American civilians. It is our mandate to respond to that attack in the best sense and in the best way for the United States of America.

I look forward to the debate in this country and in particular some expertise from our good friend, the former Prime Minister of Israel.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate you calling this hearing.

I particularly appreciate Chairman Shays of the subcommittee for the work, the groundbreaking work that he has done in Congress on the terrorist threat.

Mr. BURTON. Thank the gentleman.

Mrs. Mink.

Mrs. MINK. I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for calling this hearing and giving us a specific opportunity to sit and weigh in the very serious consequences with regard to what happened on September 11th. There is no doubt that we are faced with a national crisis. There is no doubt that we have to take extreme actions. But there

is also a considerable amount of knowledge and information that we need to sort out and ferret out and come to a better understanding of why it was that our intelligence agencies in this country were not able to learn in advance these terrible things that happened to us on September 11th.

There is a tremendous amount of confusion and certainly a tremendous amount of uncertainty in the body politic. Pick up the morning paper and see that Waikiki Beach has nary a soul where it would be wall to wall people on any day during any year of the past decade. Suddenly, people are so overwhelmed by grief, by a lack of knowledge and information, about how these things could have occurred to so many thousands of our people; and I think that the tragedy has overwhelmed a very, very large percentage of our people.

It is not that we are immobilized. It is not that we are uncertain about what we ought to do. We know what we have to do. But the first thing I think that this committee can elaborate on and help this Nation to come to an understanding is to engage us in a debate and discussion as to how this happened, what our intelligence consists of, exactly what these terrorist units are within this country, where they are located, who they are led by and also the worldwide network.

My own situation in Hawaii, we lost eight people, some of whom are still missing and unreported from the World Trade Center. Others—I actually have no words to express the depth of my sympathy and condolences to those families because they were on flight 93 that crashed in Pennsylvania. To know of the heroism that must have been demonstrated on that aircraft, the decisions that were made undoubtedly to try to take command of that airplane which ultimately led to its crash—I am convinced that airplane was headed to the Washington, DC, area; and our lives were spared as a consequence of the heroism expressed and demonstrated by these passengers.

So every time I think of September 11th and I think of the World Trade Center, I end up focusing on the sacrifice that these individuals made on flight 93, the end result being that they lost their lives and others were saved.

And I think in debating what we must do in this kind of circumstance, we know it must take action, but we always have to think of the presence of necessary facts. Are we being told enough? Are we acting based upon the best knowledge that our government can provide us? And are we making every possible assurance that the basic liberties of our people are not being unduly hampered?

All of us have got to endure enormous inconveniences. That is not what I am talking about. Inconveniences are temporary. What we have to safeguard are the basic personal liberties that have been so much a part of our Nation.

So the burdens upon Congress, Mr. Chairman, are enormous. We have to understand the threat, need to understand what we must do and in the process save the fabric of our Nation to make sure that our liberties are preserved.

I thank the chairman.

Mr. BURTON. Thank the gentlelady.

The vice chairman of the committee, Mr. Barr.

Mr. BARR. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Even in times such as these, the silliness of some of the media is unbelievable—and the silliness of some in academia. There is an article here dated September 15th by Jessica Stern that seems to indicate that what happened last week, particularly if it turns out Osama bin Laden is behind this or people like him, that somehow it is our fault because we didn't pay enough attention to the humanitarian and refugee needs in Afghanistan, that somehow we are responsible for this. And I suppose, you know, we will always have to put up with silly notions like that.

Thank goodness here in this committee, Mr. Chairman, we have your leadership, not people like Ms. Jessica Stern. You understand the nature of the problem. You understand the complexities of it. You understand what needs to be done, as does subcommittee chairman Chris Shays.

As Members of both sides of the aisle today have indicated and in the past week other Members have indicated, we certainly understand that there were intelligence failures with which we must contend with and resolve, but there have been no failures of leadership in this committee or in Mr. Shays' subcommittee.

You have held a number of hearings focusing on key elements of the war against terrorism and the terrorist problem out there. Even though one could say, well, it is better late than never, certainly it is good that people are starting to focus on what you, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Shays have been telling Americans and the rest of us in Congress for so many months.

You also understand, Mr. Chairman, the differences between the conduct of foreign affairs and the conduct of our domestic affairs and the problems presented to us. The situation presented to us by the acts of war committed against us last week present that very clear dichotomy.

As the gentlelady from Hawaii just indicated and others have also, how we deal with this problem domestically and internationally is very, very different. Internationally, we want our President to have maximum flexibility, maximum authority so that he does not have to worry about reading Miranda rights, he can read them their last rites. He can take care of this problem the way it needs to be taken care of without worrying about all of the panoply of civil liberties that are very important to us and which necessarily come into play in determining how we address this problem at home domestically.

The Attorney General has put forward a number of proposals that we are starting to digest. There are some concerns. There are some concerns because we have a very carefully crafted Bill of Rights that we must contend with here in this country domestically when we address problems of terrorism or other heinous crimes. We have statutes and case law that have been very carefully crafted over 200 years that we cannot, no matter what foreign crisis we face, throw out the window and treat cavalierly.

So I and others and I know you, Mr. Chairman, will be taking a very careful look at these proposals to grant the Federal Government what necessary powers it might need, what necessary changes there might need to be to domestic laws, very narrowly focused, very narrowly crafted and going no further than our Bill of

Rights allows and no further than is absolutely essential to fill gaps in whatever legal armor there might be with which we can fight and defend ourselves against terrorism, but being very mindful of the fact that we do not want to engage in a wholesale unraveling of the fabric of our Bill of Rights. That would accomplish in a different way but the net result would be the same as the goal of the perpetrators of these terrorist acts against us.

So I appreciate, Mr. Chairman, your balanced approach to this. I appreciate your previous work and the work of Mr. Shays in focusing attention on this and now moving us to the next phase. And I would ask unanimous consent to include a more expansive statement in the record.

Mr. BURTON. Thank you very much, Mr. Barr.

[The prepared statement of Hon. Bob Barr follows:]

Opening Statement
The Honorable Bob Barr, Vice Chairman
Committee on Government Reform
Hearing on "Preparing for the War on Terrorism"
September 20, 2001

Last week, a majority of Americans ceased to view terrorism as violence perpetrated by unknown individuals on other people in far off nations. The perpetrators of last week's acts of terror have brought our nation face to face with the startling realization that such despicable acts of unprovoked war can happen here at home, at anytime.

While the events of last week have changed our view of terrorism and its immediate threat to our nation, it has not fundamentally changed us as a nation. No act of violence or evil can diminish our confidence in our own capabilities to triumph over such evil, and our commitment to democracy and freedom. I have full faith and confidence in President Bush's ability to respond swiftly, appropriately and strongly.

The shock we all have experienced over this tremendous tragedy has lead to the inevitable, appropriate and understandable cries for a military response. Many have also called for an immediate legislative response, calling on the Congress to enact a whole host of news laws to enable the government to respond to existing and emerging terrorist threats.

The grief and mourning felt by all Americans however, must be balanced by our resolve to not move precipitously or without focus, in our desire to achieve justice.

These were not simple acts of terrorism. They were acts of war, committed by terrorists. We should not fool ourselves into believing we can properly adequately respond with a single military attack or a hodgepodge of legislative efforts. In both cases, we must move forward only after careful deliberation involving our military, intelligence, law enforcement and policy leaders, as well as the American public at large.

First and foremost, I disagree with those who believe we must bring these perpetrators "to justice." Both the terrorists and those who harbor them should be destroyed, and their infrastructure crumbled. Frankly, for terrorists abroad, we should be less concerned about reading them their Miranda rights, and focus instead on reading them their Last Rites.

Secondly, we must all work together to untie the hands of our military and intelligence leaders to deal swiftly with serious and recognized threats to our national security. When terrorist leaders, such as the ones who directed, supported, or caused these attacks, take the lives of American civilian and servicemen, I believe it is entirely appropriate for us to remove them by any means necessary, without arbitrarily limiting our options. To that end, I introduced legislation, H.R. 19, the "Terrorist Elimination Act," to repeal those portions of executive orders purporting to prohibit the government from directly eliminating terrorist leaders.

Furthermore, we must understand how and why our intelligence community failed to have knowledge or warning of such a well-planned, multi-faceted strategic attack. The Congress provides billions of dollars each year to ensure the safety of our country and its citizens. For us to have had no knowledge ahead of time is simply

unacceptable, and I fully expect -- and we must demand -- steps be taken to understand the source of these problems and immediately correct them.

Above all, what we must avoid, however, is the impulse move hastily on wholesale changes to search and seizure laws, and other constitutionally protected civil liberties, in an understandable but misguided attempt to thwart future attacks. Our immediate reaction must not be to blindly expand law enforcement's investigative authority, but to examine how and why execution of current authority was not successful. Before we begin dismantling carefully crafted, constitutionally protected safeguards and eradicating fundamental rights to privacy, we should first examine why last week's incidents occurred.

The Congress and the American people should be afforded the opportunity to discuss fully the implications of any proposed legislative change. Our national security and our most valued civil liberties are far too important to be rushed through the Congress without the benefit of public hearings or debate. It would be entirely inappropriate to move such important legislative initiatives without serious deliberation. Let us not rush into a vast expansion of government power in a misguided attempt to protect freedom. In doing so, we will inevitable erode the very freedoms we seek to protect.

Mr. Chairman, we are living in a new era, where we no longer face a single, powerful enemy. How the United States responds to this week's terrorist attacks in New York and Washington will define who we are as a nation not just for the immediate future, but for the foreseeable future. I am confident we will all rise to the occasion, and come out stronger and more united as a people and as a nation.

Terrorism poses a serious threat, requiring a serious response. Now is the time for us to thoughtfully examine the long-term, fundamental way in which the United States intends to combat the forces of terror.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Davis.

Mr. DAVIS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman; and I join with other members of this committee in expressing to you our appreciation for the fact that you have had the insight to hold this hearing and to help us try and sift through, look at, and better understand what led to these terrorist attacks and also make some assessment and evaluation of where we are today and where do we go from here as a Nation.

Since the attack, I have held several town hall meetings, and I have observed very carefully what people were saying. One of the things that they were saying is that, while we all express our grief and our anger and our feelings of despair, one of the things that we have to do is be cognizant of the fact that what we are looking for is something more than revenge, that we are not simply seeking to go and find the culprits, although they must be found and everything in our power must be done to make sure that we find them and that they are brought to justice.

But, in addition to that, as we try and figure out how do we prevent these occurrences from taking place, we need to look seriously at our Central Intelligence Agency and all of the intelligence apparatuses that we have and figure if there are ways to make them more effective than what they currently are.

And I agree with my colleague from Georgia that while we are doing that we must make sure that we carefully guard the civil liberties and civil protections that our country has become famous and known for. That is that each and every person must be protected in a real kind of way.

I have never thought of myself as being any kind of expert on security, but it appears to me that if we were able to make sure in terms of transportation that those who were in control of vehicles were absolutely safe and could not be approached, that there were entry-free, entry-proof doors or access to the cockpits of airplanes or to other vehicles where whoever is in charge of directing the path could not be molested in any kind of way—then if we could find detection methodology that would detect even the ingredients that are used for the formulation of explosive devices. That is, if we could detect bombmaking material through the equipment, then we could have a certain level of assurance that individuals, once they had gained access to vehicles, were not able to assemble something that did not exist as they were going up or as they were entering.

More importantly than any of that or just as importantly as any of that, I think we need to chart a course of diplomacy that at all times is focused on movement toward peace. And I think that comes as a result of the way in which we interact with others, the way in which we interact with ourselves, the kind of policies and programs that we develop for implementation.

Whenever I think of peace I am always reminded of something that John Kennedy was supposed to have said at one time, and that is that peace is not found in treaties, covenants and charters but in the hearts of men. And I would imagine that if he was alive today he would say "men and women." And we have to, I think, continue to move in that direction.

We have to teach tolerance, we have to teach unity, and we have to teach equal justice and equal opportunity across the globe.

So, Mr. Chairman, I thank you again for the opportunity for these hearings and trust that we will find, if not solutions, certainly directions that will make not only America but the world in which we live a safer place to be. I thank you and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURTON. Thank the gentleman very much.

We will take a 5-minute break. I would like for everybody to be back promptly at 1. At that time Mr. Netanyahu will join us, and we will get started with his part of the hearing.

[Recess.]

Mr. BURTON. The committee will reconvene. We have three statements to conclude the opening statements, and then we'll go directly to Prime Minister Netanyahu.

For years we watched the turmoil in Israel from a safe distance. We watched suicide bombers, snipers and car bombs. We saw the terror, but we didn't really feel it. It was all happening on the other side of the world. Even when Americans were targeted, most of the time it was a long way from home. Twelve Americans were killed when our Embassies in Africa were bombed. Seventeen sailors were killed on the *USS Cole* in Yemen. And those were terrible losses, but they were far from home.

Now that's over. Today we know that no place is safe. Terrorists can reach us anyplace. We're now faced with the greatest challenge to our safety and security since the end of the cold war. If we're going to be successful, it's going to take the same kind of commitment we had then. At least during the cold war we knew exactly who the enemy was and where to find them. Our enemies today are almost invisible. They could be walking among us at any time. In many ways the fight against terrorism will be much more difficult than the fight against communism.

When Ronald Reagan stood in West Berlin and said, "Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall," we were on the verge of winning the cold war, but it didn't happen overnight. It was the culmination of a fight that lasted for decades. We invested hundreds of billions of dollars in a strong deterrent. We lost many lives, but we prevailed. If we're going to defeat terrorists like Osama bin Laden, it's going to take the same kind of commitment.

One of the things that concerns me is this, and that's why I asked the Prime Minister to be with us today. I'm afraid the American people don't realize how long it might take. They might be thinking about a quick fix. I think people are hoping that we can fire a bunch of missiles into Afghanistan, kill Osama bin Laden, and it will be over with. We tried that before, and it didn't work. After our Embassies were bombed in 1998, we fired dozens of cruise missiles into Afghanistan. Osama bin Laden is still there hiding in the mountains.

Terrorists are not easy targets. They strike, and then they disappear into the woodwork. And even if we can get to bin Laden, that's not going to be the end of it. The State Department lists 28 major foreign terrorist organizations around the world. If we're going to defeat the terrorist threat, it's going to take years. We need to have the political will to strike hard even when it's not pop-

ular. We may not be able to do it from a distance with missiles. We have to cutoff their financial support. We have to punish countries that give them safe haven. We have to have much better intelligence than we've had in the past. Our intelligence agencies and law enforcement agencies must do a better job working together. Most of all, we cannot become complacent. The terrorists won't, and they haven't, and we can't either.

This is going to be a fight that's not going to take months. It's probably going to take years. The price of freedom is still eternal vigilance. That's more than ever true today.

We're relative newcomers to this fight. We have a lot to learn about how to fight modern terrorists. While other countries have lived with terrorists and terrible tragedy, we watch from a distance.

No other country has been confronted by the evils of terrorism like the State of Israel. Today we're very fortunate to have with us someone who has been leading the fight against terrorism most of his life. Former Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu was elected Israel's ninth Prime Minister in 1996. Earlier in his career, he served in the Knesset. He was Deputy Foreign Minister, and he was Israel's Ambassador to the U.N. He served his country as an officer in the elite antiterror unit in the Israeli Defense Forces, and his brother was tragically killed during the raid on Entebbe.

Mr. Netanyahu is a world-renowned expert on terrorism. He's written several books on the subject, and we're very happy, Mr. Netanyahu, to have you here with us today.

We're also going to have a distinguished panel of experts assembled on our second panel, General Anthony Zinni, retired from the U.S. Marine Corps last fall after 39 years of service. His last assignment was as Commander in Chief of the U.S. Central Command. His command included 25 countries making up the Middle East and north Africa, including Afghanistan and Pakistan. Until his retirement, General Zinni was the Pentagon's top authority in that region.

Jessica Stern is a professor of public policy at Harvard University. She worked on the National Security Council in the White House. She's the author of a book entitled, The Ultimate Terrorist.

Christopher Harmon is a professor of international relations at the Marine Corps University. His most recent book is entitled, Terrorism Today.

And finally, Dr. Bruce Hoffman is the vice president at the Rand Corp. He studied terrorism around the world for many years, and his latest book is entitled, Inside Terrorism. I want to thank them all for being here today.

We're going to have many, many questions. We don't have many answers. I hope that during the course of our hearing today we can air some of these issues, and these are things that I think are extremely important to be answered. Mr. Netanyahu can help us with this.

Are there more terrorists among us waiting to strike again? How do we dismantle the infrastructure of the terrorist organization? Do terrorist organizations have access to chemical and biological weapons? And do they have access to small nuclear devices, like those

which have been missing from some of the arsenals in other parts of the world?

Before I finish, I want to make one final comment, and that is I want to thank Mr. Shays for the hard work he's been doing on this issue. Many of us are focusing seriously on this issue for the first time. Mr. Shays has been laboring in the trenches in his subcommittee for years. He's held, I think, at least, what, 17 hearings on terrorism, Chris? Seventeen hearings on terrorism and counterterrorism strategy, domestic preparedness and medical stockpiles, all of the critical issues that we face. Hopefully this hearing will build on that record that he's established, and I look forward to working with Mr. Shays on this issue in the future.

And with that, that concludes my statement.

[The prepared statement of Hon. Dan Burton follows:]

Opening Statement
Chairman Dan Burton
Committee on Government Reform
"Preparing for the War on Terrorism"
September 20, 2001

Good morning. Today, we face the specter of international terrorism in a way we never have before.

For years, we've watched the turmoil in Israel from a safe distance:

- Suicide bombers.
- Snipers.
- Car bombs.

We saw the terror, but we didn't really feel it. It was all happening on the other side of the world.

Even when Americans were targeted, most of the time it was a long way from home. 12 Americans were killed when our embassies in Africa were bombed. 17 sailors were killed on the U.S.S. Cole in Yemen. Those were terrible losses, but they were still far from home.

Now that's over. Today we know that no place is safe. Terrorists can reach us anywhere.

We are now faced with the greatest challenge to our safety and security since the end of the Cold War. If we're going to be successful, it's going to take the same kind of commitment.

At least during the Cold War, we knew exactly who the enemy was and where to find them. Our enemies today are almost invisible. They could be walking among us at any time. In many ways, the fight against terrorism will be much more difficult than the fight against communism.

When Ronald Reagan stood in West Berlin and said, "Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall," we were on the verge of winning the Cold War. But it didn't happen overnight. It was the culmination of a fight that lasted for decades. We invested hundreds of billions of dollars in a strong deterrent. We lost many lives. But we prevailed.

If we're going to defeat terrorists like Osama bin Laden, it's going to take the same kind of commitment. One of the things that concerns me is this: I'm afraid that the American people are looking for a quick fix. I think people are hoping we can fire a bunch of missiles at Afghanistan, kill Osama bin Laden, and be done with it.

We tried that before and it didn't work. After our embassies were bombed in 1998, we fired dozens of cruise missiles into Afghanistan. Osama bin Laden is still there -- hiding in the mountains. Terrorists aren't easy targets. They don't have aircraft carriers or hundred-story buildings. They're not easy targets. They strike and then disappear into the woodwork.

And even if we can get to bin Laden, that's not going to be the end of it. The State Department lists 28 major foreign terrorist organizations around the world.

If we're going to defeat the terrorist threat, it's going to take years. We need to have the political will to strike hard even when it's not popular. We may not be able to do it from a distance with missiles.

- We have to cut off their financial support.
- We have to punish countries that give them safe haven.
- We have to have much better intelligence. Our intelligence agencies and law enforcement agencies must do a better job working together.

Most of all, we cannot become complacent. The terrorists won't. We can't either. This is a fight that's not going to take months, it's going to take years. The price of freedom is eternal vigilance. That's more true today than ever.

We're relative newcomers to this fight. We have a lot to learn about how to fight modern terrorists. While other countries have lived with terrorists and terrible tragedy, we've watched from a distance.

No other country has been confronted by the evils of terrorism like the state of Israel. Today, we're fortunate to have with us someone who's been leading the fight against terrorism most of his life -- former Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu. Mr. Netanyahu was elected Israel's 9th Prime Minister in 1996. Earlier in his career, he served in the Knesset, he was Deputy Foreign Minister, and he was Israel's Ambassador to the U.N. He served his country as an officer in an elite anti-terror unit in the Israeli Defense Forces. His brother was tragically killed during the raid on Entebbe.

Mr. Netanyahu is a world-renowned expert on terrorism. He's written several books on the subject. Mr. Netanyahu, thank you for being here today.

We also have a distinguished panel of experts assembled on our second panel.

General Anthony Zinni retired from the U.S. Marine Corps last fall after 39 years of service. His last assignment was as Commander in Chief of the U.S. Central Command. His command included 25 countries making up the Middle East and Northern Africa -- including Afghanistan and Pakistan. Until his retirement, General Zinni was the Pentagon's top authority on that region.

Jessica Stern is a Professor of Public Policy at Harvard University. She worked on the National Security Council at the White House. She is the author of a book entitled "The Ultimate Terrorist."

Christopher Harmon is a Professor of International Relations at the Marine Corps University. His most recent book is entitled, "Terrorism Today."

Dr. Bruce Hoffman is a Vice President at the Rand Corporation. He has studied terrorism around the world for many years. His latest book is entitled "Inside Terrorism."

Thank you all for being here today.

We have many, many questions. We don't have many answers. I hope that during the course of our hearing today, we can air some of these issues:

- Are there more terrorists among us, waiting to strike again?
- How do we dismantle the infrastructure of terrorist organizations?
- Do terrorist organizations have access to chemical or biological weapons?
- Do they have access to small nuclear weapons?

Before I finish, I want to make one final comment. I want to thank Mr. Shays for the hard work he's been doing on this issue. Many of us are focusing seriously on the issue of terrorism for the first time, for obvious reasons. Mr. Shays has been laboring in the trenches for the several years. He's held hearing after hearing -- on counter-terrorism strategy, domestic preparedness, medical stockpiles -- all of the critical issues that we face. Hopefully, this hearing will build on the record that he's established, and I look forward to working with Mr. Shays on this issue.

That concludes my opening statement. I now yield to Mr. Waxman for his statement.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Waxman, do you want to make yours?

Mr. WAXMAN. Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend you on your statement, and thank you for holding this hearing. When any of us think about the horror, the tragedy of last week, no words can adequately express how sickened we all are.

Congress is trying to do what we can to respond. We've appropriated $40 billion in emergency relief, and we have given the President authority to find and punish those who are responsible for this atrocity, and the President will be addressing a joint session of the Congress of the United States tonight, and I'm looking forward to hearing what he has to say and to working with him to address the threat from terrorism.

Terrorism is an incredibly difficult issue to confront. It's multifaceted. The perpetrators are often anonymous. Their victims are defenseless men, women and children in an open society like ours. There are a seemingly endless number of targets and types of threats, and fighting terrorism is nothing like fighting a conventional war.

No country knows about fighting terrorism as well as Israel. In the last 5 years alone, Israel has faced over 100 terrorist attacks that resulted in fatalities, and for this reason, I'm very pleased that you've invited former Prime Minister Netanyahu to testify today, and I'm very pleased that he has agreed to be here.

I've known Prime Minister Netanyahu for a number of years. I have a very high regard for him. He is a genuine expert on confronting terrorism. I'm looking forward to what he has to say. He can tell us what he has dealt with on a practical basis as the Prime Minister of a country which is every day faced with terrorist threats, but he also has written a number of books on the subject of terrorism. He has spoken out about a network of terror that includes not just Osama bin Laden, but it also involves Hezbollah, Hamas, Islamic Jihad, as the chairman pointed out, maybe 28 other groups in this network, and they're sponsored by countries such as Iraq and Iran and Afghanistan and other Middle East regimes. They operate worldwide, and a lot of their funding comes from within—the U.S. operations.

I'm also looking forward to hearing from the experts on our second panel. In assembling the hearing today, the chairman has chosen people who have expertise in some of these areas, and, after consulting with us, invited them to come and make their presentations to us. All of these witnesses ought to be given respect, even if a Member might disagree with a part of what they have to say or all of what they have to say. No witness ought to be attacked before the witness even has a chance to make a presentation by any Member of Congress. I think that is completely out of line.

We're going to look at how our intelligence agencies handle issues of terrorism in this hearing today. Many experts think there is insufficient oversight of these agencies. Some are recommending that we appoint a terrorism czar to oversee all of the decisions across agency lines. Other experts are critical of our lack of a national strategy for addressing terrorism. The U.S. Commission on National Security, which is a bipartisan group headed by former Senators Warren Rudman and Gary Hart, earlier this year reached

the conclusion, "Most critically, no overarching strategic framework guides U.S. national security policymaking or resource allocation."

Experts sponsored by RAND and headed by Governor James Gilmore reached a similar finding last December, stating, "The United States has no coherent, functional national strategy for combating terrorism." Other experts were absolutely appalled that our intelligence agencies last week seemed not to have any warning of the attacks that we suffered. Senator Richard Shelby, who chaired the Senate Intelligence Committee, for example, said that we experienced a, "massive intelligence failure."

Well, now is not the time just to bemoan the past. It's also time to look forward to the future. In a time of crisis, Congress has learned from our experiences and moved forward, but we're also going to be asked to deal quickly with many issues, and we need to respond to these issues, but we also need to make sure that we are not stampeded in decisions without careful, thoughtful analysis. And this role of giving an opportunity for airing issues and different points of view is an area where our committee can play a unique role as the main oversight committee in the Congress.

For example, Congress is considering providing immediate relief to the airline industry. I'm sympathetic to the airlines' plight, and I'm prepared to support providing assistance to this important part of our economy, but we should be sure that what we're doing is appropriate and effective. News accounts say that the airline industry may be facing losses of up to $7 billion this year, $2 billion of which occurred before last week's attack. But last Friday on the floor of the House, a relief package of $15 billion, far above the amount of the reported losses, was presented.

As the committee with primary jurisdiction over the GAO, we should ask the Comptroller General of the United States, David Walker, to analyze the airline industry and provide us with independent advice about what is the appropriate Federal response. We can also make an important contribution if we carefully evaluate the merits of other proposals, such as those to stimulate our economy. Some are suggesting doing it by tax cuts. Some are suggesting other means.

I'm pleased that Chairman Greenspan has urged that we go slow in this effort. I think we need sometimes to go slow, sometimes to move quickly, but at all times to do whatever we're going to do with the most careful and thoughtful analysis. Now is the time for considered bipartisan decisionmaking and national unity. We need to come together on a bipartisan basis to confront the new challenges and the world—the new world we now face at home and abroad.

Thank you again, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BURTON. Thank you, Mr. Waxman.

[The prepared statement of Hon. Henry A. Waxman follows:]

DAN BURTON, INDIANA,
CHAIRMAN

BENJAMIN A. GILMAN, NEW YORK
CONSTANCE A. MORELLA, MARYLAND
CHRISTOPHER SHAYS, CONNECTICUT
ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, FLORIDA
JOHN M. McHUGH, NEW YORK
STEPHEN HORN, CALIFORNIA
JOHN L. MICA, FLORIDA
THOMAS M. DAVIS, VIRGINIA
MARK E. SOUDER, INDIANA
JOE SCARBOROUGH, FLORIDA
STEVEN C. LaTOURRETTE, OHIO
JOB BARR, GEORGIA
DAN MILLER, FLORIDA
DOUG OSE, CALIFORNIA
RON LEWIS, KENTUCKY
JO ANN DAVIS, VIRGINIA
TODD RUSSELL PLATTS, PENNSYLVANIA
DAVE WELDON, FLORIDA
CHRIS CANNON, UTAH
ADAM H. PUTNAM, FLORIDA
C.L. "BUTCH" OTTER, IDAHO
EDWARD L. SCHROCK, VIRGINIA
JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR., TENNESSEE

ONE HUNDRED SEVENTH CONGRESS

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM

2157 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING

WASHINGTON, DC 20515–6143

MAJORITY (202) 225–5074
FACSIMILE (202) 225–3974
MINORITY (202) 225–5051
TTY (202) 225–6852

www.house.gov/reform

HENRY A. WAXMAN, CALIFORNIA,
RANKING MINORITY MEMBER

TOM LANTOS, CALIFORNIA
MAJOR R. OWENS, NEW YORK
EDOLPHUS TOWNS, NEW YORK
PAUL E. KANJORSKI, PENNSYLVANIA
PATSY T. MINK, HAWAII
CAROLYN B. MALONEY, NEW YORK
ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON,
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS, MARYLAND
DENNIS J. KUCINICH, OHIO
ROD R. BLAGOJEVICH, ILLINOIS
DANNY K. DAVIS, ILLINOIS
JOHN F. TIERNEY, MASSACHUSETTS
JIM TURNER, TEXAS
THOMAS H. ALLEN, MAINE
JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY, ILLINOIS
WM. LACY CLAY, MISSOURI
DIANE E. WATSON, CALIFORNIA

BERNARD SANDERS, VERMONT,
INDEPENDENT

STATEMENT OF HENRY A. WAXMAN
HEARING ON "PREPARING FOR THE WAR ON TERRORISM"
September 20, 2001

There are not words to express the sorrow and pain that I am feeling -- and that all Americans are feeling -- after last week's attack.

We in Congress are trying to do all we can to respond. We have appropriated $40 billion in emergency relief. And we have given the President authority to find and punish those who are responsible for this atrocity.

The President will be addressing us in a joint session of Congress tonight. I am looking forward to hearing what he has to say -- and to working with him to address the threat of terrorism.

Terrorism is an incredibly difficult issue to confront. The perpetrators are anonymous. Their victims are defenseless men, women, and children. In an open society like ours, there are a seemingly endless number of targets and types of threats. Fighting terrorism is nothing like fighting a conventional war.

If any country knows about fighting terrorism, it's Israel. In the last five years, Israel has faced over 100 terrorist attacks that resulted in fatalities. For this reason, I am very glad that former Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu has agreed to testify today.

I have known Prime Minister Netanyahu for many years. He is a genuine expert in confronting terrorism. I am looking forward to hearing what he has to say.

I am also looking forward to hearing from the experts on the second panel.

Chairman Burton has approached this hearing on a completely bipartisan basis. He has consulted with me about witnesses and the structure of the hearing. I thank him for this approach and I want to work with him as our Committee moves forward on this issue.

Today, we will look at how our intelligence agencies handle issues of terrorism. Many experts think that there is insufficient oversight of these agencies. As a result, some are recommending that we appoint a "Terrorism Czar" to oversee these agencies and make decisions across agency lines.

Many other experts are critical of our lack of a national strategy for addressing terrorism. The U.S. Commission on National Security is a bipartisan group headed by former Senators Warren Rudman and Gary Hart. Earlier this year, this bipartisan group reached this conclusion: "Most critically, no overarching strategic framework guides U.S. national security policymaking or resource allocation."

Another group of experts, sponsored by RAND and headed by Governor James Gilmore, reached a similar finding last December, stating "the United States has no coherent, functional national strategy for combating terrorism."

Other experts were appalled that our intelligence agencies did not provide any warning of last week's attacks. Senator Richard Shelby, for example, said that we experienced a "massive intelligence failure."

Now is not the time to bemoan the past, however. It is the time to look toward the future.

In a time of crisis, Congress will be asked to deal quickly with many issues. We need to respond to these issue, but we also need to make sure that we are not stampeded into decisions without careful, thoughtful analysis. And this is an area where our Committee can play a unique role.

For example, Congress is considering providing immediate relief to the airline industry. I'm sympathetic to the airlines' plight and am prepared to support providing assistance to this important part of our economy. But we should be sure that what we are doing is appropriate and effective. News accounts say that the airline industry may be facing losses of up to $7 billion this year, $2 billion of which occurred before the attacks last week. But last Friday, on the floor of the House, a relief package of $15 billion -- far above the amount of the reported losses -- was presented.

As the Committee with primary jurisdiction over GAO, we should ask the Comptroller General of the United States, Dave Walker, to analyze the airline industry and provide us with independent advice about what is the appropriate federal response.

We can also make an important contribution if we carefully evaluate the merits of other proposals before Congress, such as proposals for further tax cuts to stimulate the economy.

Now is the time for considered, bipartisan decision making and national unity. We need to come together on a bipartisan basis to confront the new challenges and the new world we now face at home and abroad.

Mr. BURTON. And finally, Mr. Shays, once again, thanks for all the hard work you've put forth on this issue. Mr. Shays.

Mr. SHAYS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to first thank Adam Putnam, the vice chairman of our subcommittee, and Mr. Kucinich, the ranking member, and the members on our subcommittee, and then in particular to thank you for your extraordinary support to our committee, and to your vice chairman, Mr. Barr, and to Mr. Waxman for his support as well.

The cold war is over, and the world is a more dangerous place. On September 11th, we were forced to view the unimaginable, to ponder the unthinkable and to face what some among us deem the inevitable, a mass casualty terrorist attack on American soil. This episodic, seemingly far-off threat of international terrorism shattered monuments to our economic and military strength, taking thousands of precious lives and burying forever any illusion that barbaric scourge could not strike here.

The nature and scope of the terrorist threat have changed. In the post-cold war world, the rise of radical nationalists, apocalyptic sects and religious extremists merged with the increasing availability of the technologies of terror: toxic chemicals, biological agents, nuclear material and computer viruses. Loosely organized but firmly guided by fanatic ideology, terrorism today eschews predictable political goals in favor of random, increasingly deadly acts of violence against vulnerable civilians.

In this new war, our first task is to define the enemy, to pierce the distortions and shadowy obscurity that camouflage terrorism. As the President has indicated, our foe is not just Osama bin Laden or any terrorist organization, but includes the states that sponsor terrorists and tolerate the inhumane ideology that animates them.

We can no longer indulge the tidy, familiar mechanics of solving the crime and punishing individuals when the crime offends humanity and the individuals are actually eager to be martyred. That approach has been compared to battling malaria by swatting at mosquitoes. To stop the disease of modern terrorism, the swamp of explicit and tacit state sponsorship must be drained and disinfected. The threat must be confronted with the same focus, intensity and vigilance with which the terrorists pursue their malignant cause.

In the course of our subcommittee hearings on terrorism and domestic preparedness issues, we heard the General Accounting Office and other experts call for more frequent, more dynamic and more broadly based national threat and risk assessments upon which to base counterterrorism policy. A naive or blurred perception of the threat fragments our defenses and leaves us vulnerable to the deadly plans we must now assume are being implemented as we speak. Our national security demands a clear-eyed view of the threat, a strategic vision to address the threat and a restructured, reformed Federal Government effort to combat terrorism in all forms.

Our witnesses this afternoon understand the motives and dimensions of the terrorist threat that plagues the world and changed our Nation that Tuesday morning in September. So we join with

the President in forging an effective Federal effort to combat terrorism and be prepared to respond to terrorist acts.

All those testifying today bring impressive experience and credentials to our discussion, but none more than former Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu. We are grateful for his time and patience, and we value his unique perspective. And we thank all our witnesses for their participation as well.

Mr. BURTON. Thank you again, Chris, for all the work you've done on this.

[The prepared statement of Hon. Christopher Shays follows:]

DAN BURTON, INDIANA,
CHAIRMAN

BENJAMIN A. GILMAN, NEW YORK
CONSTANCE A. MORELLA, MARYLAND
CHRISTOPHER SHAYS, CONNECTICUT
ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, FLORIDA
JOHN M. McHUGH, NEW YORK
STEPHEN HORN, CALIFORNIA
JOHN L. MICA, FLORIDA
THOMAS M. DAVIS, VIRGINIA
MARK E. SOUDER, INDIANA
JOE SCARBOROUGH, FLORIDA
STEVEN C. LATOURETTE, OHIO
BOB BARR, GEORGIA
DAN MILLER, FLORIDA
DOUG OSE, CALIFORNIA
RON LEWIS, KENTUCKY
JO ANN DAVIS, VIRGINIA
TODD RUSSELL PLATTS, PENNSYLVANIA
DAVE WELDON, FLORIDA
CHRIS CANNON, UTAH
ADAM H. PUTNAM, FLORIDA
C.L. "BUTCH" OTTER, IDAHO
EDWARD L. SCHROCK, VIRGINIA
JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR., TENNESSEE

ONE HUNDRED SEVENTH CONGRESS

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM

2157 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING

WASHINGTON, DC 20515–6143

MAJORITY (202) 225–5074
FACSIMILE (202) 225–3974
MINORITY (202) 225–5051
TTY (202) 225–6852

www.house.gov/reform

HENRY A. WAXMAN, CALIFORNIA,
RANKING MINORITY MEMBER

TOM LANTOS, CALIFORNIA
MAJOR R. OWENS, NEW YORK
EDOLPHUS TOWNS, NEW YORK
PAUL E. KANJORSKI, PENNSYLVANIA
PATSY T. MINK, HAWAII
CAROLYN B. MALONEY, NEW YORK
ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON,
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS, MARYLAND
DENNIS J. KUCINICH, OHIO
ROD R. BLAGOJEVICH, ILLINOIS
DANNY K. DAVIS, ILLINOIS
JOHN F. TIERNEY, MASSACHUSETTS
JIM TURNER, TEXAS
THOMAS H. ALLEN, MAINE
JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY, ILLINOIS
WM. LACY CLAY, MISSOURI
DIANE E. WATSON, CALIFORNIA

BERNARD SANDERS, VERMONT,
INDEPENDENT

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY, VETERANS AFFAIRS,
AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
Christopher Shays, Connecticut
Chairman
Room B-372 Rayburn Building
Washington, D.C. 20515
Tel: 202 225-2548
Fax: 202 225-2382
GROC.NS@mail.house.gov
http://www.house.gov/reform/ns/

Statement of Rep. Christopher Shays
September 20, 2001

On September 11th, we were forced to view the unimaginable, to ponder the unthinkable, and to face what some among us deemed the inevitable: a mass casualty terrorist attack on American soil. The episodic, seemingly far-off threat of international terrorism shattered monuments to our economic and military strength, taking thousands of lives and burying forever any illusion the barbaric scourge could not strike here.

The nature and scope of the terrorist threat have changed. In the post-Cold War world, the rise of radical nationalists, apocalyptic sects and religious extremists merged with the increased availability of the technologies of terror: toxic chemicals, biological agents, nuclear material and computer viruses. Loosely organized, but firmly guided by fanatical ideology, terrorism today eschews predictable political goals in favor of random, increasingly deadly acts of violence against vulnerable civilians.

In this new war, our first task is to define the enemy, to pierce the distortions and shadowy obscurity that camouflage terrorism. As the President has indicated, our foe is not just Osama bin Laden or any terrorist organization, but now includes the states that sponsor terrorists and tolerate the inhuman ideology that animates them.

We can no longer indulge the tidy, familiar mechanics of solving the crime and punishing individuals when the crime offends humanity and the individuals are eager to be martyred. That approach has been compared to battling malaria by swatting mosquitoes. To stop the disease of modern terrorism, the swamp of explicit and tacit state sponsorship must be drained and disinfected. The threat must be confronted with the same focus, intensity and vigilance with which the terrorists pursue their malignant cause.

In the course of our Subcommittee hearings on terrorism and domestic preparedness issues, we heard the General Accounting Office and other experts call for more frequent, more dynamic and more broadly based national threat and risk assessments upon which to base counter terrorism policy. A naïve or blurred perception of the threat fragments our defenses and leaves us vulnerable to the deadly plans we must now assume are being implemented as we speak. Our national security demands a clear-eyed view of the threat, a strategic vision to address the threat, and a restructured, reformed federal government effort to combat terrorism on all fronts.

Our witnesses this morning will help us understand the motives and dimensions of the terrorist threat that plagues the world, and changed our nation on September 11, so we can join the president in forging an effective federal effort to deter terrorism and be prepared to respond to terrorist acts.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Netanyahu, first of all, I want to publicly apologize for calling you in the middle of the night and waking you up when you were asleep and asking you to come over here. I forgot about the time difference, and I think I woke him up at 3 a.m., but he was very kind, and he realized the gravity of the situation, and he consented to come over. And I also want to apologize for the mix-up at the airport today, but thank goodness you're here, and we're all very anxious to hear your testimony. So, Mr. Netanyahu, proceed.

STATEMENT OF BENJAMIN NETANYAHU, FORMER PRIME MINISTER OF ISRAEL

Mr. NETANYAHU. Well, thank you.

Chairman Burton, distinguished Representatives, I want to thank you for inviting me to appear here today. I feel a profound responsibility addressing you in this hour of peril in the capital of liberty. What is at stake today is nothing less than the survival of our civilization. Now, it might have been some who would have thought a week ago that to talk in these apocalyptic terms about the battle against international terrorism was to engage in reckless exaggeration or wild hyperbole. That is no longer the case. I think each one of us today understands that we are all targets, that our cities are vulnerable and that our values are hated with an unmatched fanaticism that seeks to destroy our societies and our way of life.

I am certain that I speak today on behalf of my entire nation when I say, today we are all Americans, in grief and in defiance. In grief, because my people have faced the agonizing horrors of terror for many decades, and we feel an instant kinship, an instant sympathy with both the victims of this tragedy and the great Nation that mourns its fallen brothers and sisters. In defiance, because just as my country continues to fight terrorism in our battle for survival, I know that America will not cower before this challenge.

I have absolute confidence that if we, the citizens of the free world, led by President Bush, marshal the enormous reserves of power at our disposal, if we harness the steely resolve of free peoples, and if we mobilize our collective will, we'll succeed at eradicating this evil from the face of the Earth.

But to achieve this goal, we must first answer several questions. First, who is responsible for this terrorist onslaught? Second, why? What is the motivation behind these attacks? And, third and most importantly, what must be done to defeat these evil forces?

The first and most crucial thing to understand is this: There is no international terrorism without the support of sovereign states. International terrorism simply cannot be sustained for any length of time without the regimes that aid and abet it, because, as you well know, terrorists are not suspended in midair. They train, arm, indoctrinate their killers from within safe havens in the territory or territories provided by terrorist states. Often these regimes provide the terrorists with money, with operational assistance, with intelligence, dispatching them to serve as deadly proxies to wage a hidden war against more powerful enemies, which are very often, by the way, democracies, and these regimes mount a worldwide

propaganda campaign to legitimize terror, besmirching its victims, exculpating its practitioners, as we witnessed in this farcical spectacle in Durban the other week.

I think that to see Iran, Libya and Syria call the United States and Israel racist countries that abuse human rights, I think even Orwell could not have imagined such a grotesque world.

Take away all the state support, and the entire scaffolding of international terrorism will collapse into the dust. The international terrorist network is thus based on regimes, in Iraq, in Iran, in Syria, in Taliban Afghanistan, Yasser Arafat's Palestinian Authority, and several other Arab regimes such as the Sudan. These regimes are the ones that harbor the terrorist groups; Osama bin Laden in Afghanistan, Hezbollah and others in Syria-controlled Lebanon, Hamas, Islamic Jihad and the recently mobilized Fatah and Tanzim factions in the Palestinian territories, and sundry other terror organizations based in such capitals as Damascus, Baghdad and Khartoum.

These terrorist states and terror organizations together constitute a terror network whose constituent parts support each other operationally as well as politically. For example, the Palestinian groups cooperate closely with Hezbollah, which in turn links them to Iran and Syria, and to bin Laden. These offshoots of terror also have affiliates in other sates that have not yet uprooted their presence, such as Egypt, Yemen, Saudi Arabia.

Now, the question is, how did this come about? How did this terror network come into being? The growth of this terror network is the result of several crucial developments in the last two decades. Chief among them is the Khomeini revolution, which established a clerical Islamic state in Iran. This created a sovereign spiritual base for fomenting a strident Islamic militancy, a militancy that was often backed by terror.

Equally important was the victory in the Afghan war of the international mujaheedin brotherhood. I suppose that the only way I can compare it is to say that the international mujaheedin is to Islam what the International Brigade was for international communism in the Spanish Civil War. It created an international band of zealots. In this case, the ranks include Osama bin Laden, who saw their victory over the Soviet Union as providential proof of the innate superiority of faithful Muslims over the weak infidel powers. They believed that even the superior weapons of a superpower could not withstand their superior will.

To this should be added Saddam Hussein's escape from destruction at the end of the Gulf war, his dismissal of U.N. monitors, and his growing confidence that he can soon develop unconventional weapons to match those of the West.

And finally, the creation of Yasser Arafat's terror enclave centered in Gaza gave a safe haven to militant Islamic terrorist groups, such as Islamic Jihad and Hamas. Like their mujaheedin cousins, they and their colleagues drew inspiration from Israel's hasty withdrawal from Lebanon, glorified as a great Moslem victory by the Syrian-backed Hezbollah.

Now, under Arafat's rule, the Palestinian Islamic terrorist groups made repeated use of the technique of suicide bombing, going so far, by the way, as to organize summer camps, for Palestinian chil-

dren, beginning in kindergarten, to teach them how to become suicide martyrs.

Here is what Arafat's government-controlled newspaper—he controls every word that appears there. Here is what his newspaper, his mouthpiece, Al Hayat Al Jadida, said on September 11th, the very day of the suicide bombing in the Twin Towers and the Pentagon, "The suicide bombers of today are the noble successors of the Lebanese suicide bombers, who taught the U.S. Marines a tough lesson in Lebanon. These suicide bombers are the salt of the Earth, the engines of history. They are the most honorable people among us."

Suicide bombers, so says Arafat's mouthpiece, are the salt of the Earth, the engines of history, the most honorable people among us.

Distinguished Representatives, a simple rule prevails here. The success of terrorists in one part of the terror network emboldens terrorists throughout the network.

This, then, is the who. Now, then, for the why. Though its separate constituent parts may have local objectives and take part in local conflicts, the main motivation driving the terror network is an anti-Western militancy that seeks to achieve nothing less than the reversal of history. It seeks to roll back the West and install an extreme form of Islam as the dominant power in the world, and it seeks to do this not by means of its own advancement and progress, but by destroying the enemy. This hatred is the product of a seething resentment that has simmered for centuries in a certain part of the Arab and Islamic world.

Now, mind you, most Moslems in the world, including the vast majority of Moslems in the growing Moslem communities in the West, are not guided by this interpretation of history, nor are they moved by its call for a holy war against the West. But some are, and though their numbers are small compared to the peaceable majority, they nonetheless constitute a growing hinterland for this militancy.

Militant Islamists resented the West for pushing back the triumphant march of Islam into the heart of Europe many centuries ago. Its adherents, believing in the innate superiority of Islam, then suffered a series of shocks when in the last two centuries, beginning with Napoleon's invasion in Egypt, by the way, that same hated, supposedly inferior West came back and penetrated Islamic realms in north Africa, the Middle East and the Persian Gulf. For them, the mission was clear and defined. The West had to be first pushed out of these areas. So pro-Western Middle Eastern regimes in Egypt and Iraq, these monarchies in Libya, were toppled in rapid succession, including in Iran. And indeed Israel, the Middle East's only democracy and its purest manifestation of Western progress and freedom, must be wiped off the face of the Earth.

Thus, the soldiers of militant Islam do not hate the West because of Israel. They hate Israel because of the West, because they see it as an island, an alien island of Western democratic values in a Moslem-Arab sea; a sea of despotism, of course. That is why they call Israel the Little Satan, to distinguish it clearly from the country that has always been and will always be the Great Satan, the United States of America.

I know that this is not part of normal discourse on TV, where people think that Israel is guiding Osama bin Laden. Well, nothing better illustrates the true order of priorities of the militant Islamic terror than Osama bin Laden's call for Jihad against the United States in 1998. He gave as his primary reason for this Jihad not Israel, not the Palestinians, not the peace process, but, rather, the very presence of the United States, "occupying the land of Islam in the holiest of places." What do you think that is? Jerusalem? Temple Mount? No. "The Arabian Peninsula," says bin Laden, where America is, "plundering its riches, dictating to its rulers and humiliating its people." Israel, by the way, comes a distant third, after the, "continuing aggression against the Iraqi people."

So for the bin Ladens of the world, Israel is merely a sideshow. America is the target. But reestablishing a resurgent Islam requires not just rolling back the West, it requires destroying its main engine, the United States. And if the United States cannot be destroyed just now, it can be first humiliated, as in the Tehran hostage crisis 20 years ago, and then ferociously attacked again and again until it is brought to its knees. But the ultimate goal remains the same: Destroy America, win eternity.

Now, some of you may find it hard to believe that Islamic militants truly cling to this mad fantasy of destroying America. Make no mistake about it. They do. And unless they are stopped now, their attacks will continue and become even more lethal in the future.

The only way I can explain the true dangers of Islamic militancy is to compare it to another ideology bent on world domination: communism. Both movements pursued irrational goals, but the Communists at least pursued theirs in a rational way. Any time they had to choose between ideology and their own survival, as in Cuba or in Berlin, they always backed off and chose survival.

Not so for the Islamic militants. They pursue an irrational ideology irrationally with no apparent regard for human life, neither their own lives nor the lives of their enemies. The Communists seldom, if ever, produced suicide bombers, while Islamic militancy produces hordes of them, glorifying them, promising them for their dastardly deeds a reward in a glorious afterlife.

This highly pathological aspect—I can use no other words—this highly pathological aspect of Islamic militancy is what makes it so deadly for mankind. But in 1996, I wrote in my book about fighting terrorism, I warned about the militant Islamic groups operating in the West with the support of foreign powers, serving as a new breed of what I called domestic international terrorists; that is, basing themselves in America to wage Jihad against America. Such groups, I wrote then, nullify in large measure the need to have air power or intercontinental missiles as delivery systems for an Islamic nuclear payload. They, the terrorists, will be the delivery system. In the worst of such scenarios, I wrote, the consequences could be not a car bomb, but a nuclear bomb in the basement of the World Trade Center.

Well, ladies and gentlemen, they didn't use a nuclear bomb. They used two 150-ton, fully loaded jetliners to wipe out the Twin Towers. But does anyone doubt that given the chance, they will throw

atom bombs at America and its allies; and perhaps long before that, they'd employ chemical and biological weapons?

This is the greatest danger facing our common future. Some states of the terror network already possess chemical and biological capabilities, and some are feverishly developing nuclear weapons. Can one rule out the possibility that they will be tempted to use such weapons openly or secretly through their terror proxies, seemingly with impunity, or that their weapons might fall into the hands of the terrorist groups they harbor?

We have received a wake-up call from hell. Now the question is simple: Do we rally to defeat this evil while there is still time, or do we press a collective snooze button and go back to business as usual? The time for action is now. Today the terrorists have the will to destroy us, but they do not have the power. There is no doubt that we have the power to crush them. Now we must also show that we have the will to do so, because once any part of the terror network acquires nuclear weapons, this equation will fundamentally and irrevocably change, and with it the course of human affairs. This is the historical imperative that now confronts us all.

And now to my third point. What do we do about it? First, as President Bush said, we must make no distinction between the terrorists and the states that support them. It is not enough to root out the terrorists who committed this horrific act of war. We must dismantle the entire terrorist network. If any part of it remains intact, it will rebuild itself, and the specter of terrorism will reemerge and strike again. Bin Laden, for example, has shuttled over the last decades from Saudi Arabia to Afghanistan to the Sudan and back again. So we cannot leave any base of this terror network intact.

To achieve this goal we must first have moral clarity. We must fight terror wherever and whenever it appears. We must make all states play by the same rules. We must declare terrorism a crime against humanity, and we must consider the terrorists enemies of mankind, to be given no quarter and no consideration for their purported grievances. If we begin to distinguish between acts of terror, justifying some and repudiating others based on sympathy with this or that cause, we will lose the world clarity that is so essential for victory. This clarity is what enabled America and Britain to wipe out piracy in the 19th century. This is how the allies rooted out Nazis in the 20th century. They didn't look for the root cause of piracy, nor for the root cause of nazism, because they knew that some acts are evil in and of themselves and do not deserve any consideration or any, "understanding." They didn't ask if Hitler was right about the alleged wrong done to Germany at Versailles. They left that to the historians. The leaders of the Western Alliance said something entirely different. They said, nothing justifies nazism, nothing.

Well, we must be equally clear-cut today. Nothing justifies terrorism, nothing. Terrorism is defined not by the identity of its perpetrators nor by the cause they espouse. Rather, it is defined by the nature of the act. Terrorism is the deliberate attack on innocent civilians. In this it must be distinguished from legitimate acts

of war that target combatants and may unintentionally harm civilians.

When the British Royal Air Force bombed the Gestapo headquarters in Copenhagen in 1944 and one of their bombs unintentionally struck a children's hospital nearby, that was a tragedy, but it was not terrorism. When Israel a few weeks ago fired a missile that killed two Hamas archterrorists, and two Palestinian children who were playing nearby were tragically struck down, that is not terrorism, because terrorists do not unintentionally harm civilians. They deliberately murder, maim and menace civilians, as many as possible.

No cause, no grievance, no apology can ever justify terrorism. Terrorism against Americans, against Israelis, against Spaniards, against Britons, against Russians or anyone else is all part of the same evil and must be treated as such. It is time to establish a fixed principle for the international community. Any cause that uses terrorism to advance its aims will not be rewarded. On the contrary, it will be punished, severely punished, and placed beyond the pale.

Ladies and gentlemen, armed with this moral clarity in defining terrorism, we must possess an equal clarity in fighting it. If we include Iran, Syria and the Palestinian Authority in the coalition to fight terror, even though they currently harbor, sponsor and dispatch terrorism—as we speak, terrorists struck innocent people, murdered a woman this morning, from Yasser Arafat's domain against Israel. If we include these terrorist regimes in the coalition, then the alliance against terror will be defeated from within. We might, perhaps, achieve a short-term objective of destroying one terrorist fiefdom, but it will preclude the possibility of overall victory. Such a coalition will necessarily melt down because of its own internal contradictions. We might win a battle, but we will certainly lose the war.

These regimes, like all terrorist states, must be given a forthright demand: Stop terrorism, not temporarily for tactical gains, stop terrorism permanently, or you will face the wrath of the free world through harsh and sustained political, economic and military sanctions.

Now, obviously, some of these regimes today will scramble in fear and issue platitudes about their opposition to terror, just as Arafat, Iran and Syria did, while they keep their terror apparatus intact. Well, we shouldn't be fooled. These regimes are already on the U.S. list of states supporting terrorism; and if they're not, they should be.

The price of admission for any state into the coalition against terror must be first to completely dismantle the terrorist infrastructures within their realm. Iran will have to dismantle the worldwide network of terrorism and incitement based in Tehran. Syria will have to shut down Hezbollah and a dozen other terrorist organizations that operate freely in Damascus and in Lebanon. Arafat will have to crush Hamas and Islamic Jihad, close down their suicide factories and training grounds, rein in his own Fatah and Tanzim terrorists and cease the endless incitement of violence.

To win this war, we have to fight on many fronts. Well, the most obvious one is direct military action against the terrorists them-

selves. Israel's policy of preemptively striking at those who seek to murder its people is, I believe, better understood today and requires no further elaboration.

But there's no substitute for the key action that we must take: imposing the most punishing diplomatic, economic and military sanctions on all terrorist states. To this must be added these measures: Freeze financial assets in the West of terrorist regimes and organizations. Revise legislation, subject to periodic renewal, to enable better surveillance against organizations inciting violence. Keep convicted terrorists behind bars. Do not negotiate with terrorists. And train special forces to fight terror. And, not least important, impose sanctions, heavy sanctions, on suppliers of nuclear technology to terrorist states.

Distinguished Representatives, I've had some experience in pursuing all of these courses of action in Israel's battle against terrorism, and I'll be glad to elaborate on any of them if you wish, including the sensitive questions surrounding intelligence. But I have to be clear: Victory over terrorism is not at its most fundamental level a matter either of law enforcement or intelligence. However important these functions are, they could only reduce the dangers, not eliminate them. The immediate objective is to end all state support for and complicity with terror.

If vigorously and continuously challenged, most of these regimes can be deterred from sponsoring terrorism, but there is a possibility that some will not be deterred, and those may be the ones that possess weapons of mass destruction. Again, we cannot dismiss the possibility that a militant terrorist state will use its proxies to threaten or launch a nuclear attack with a hope of apparent immunity and impunity. Nor can we completely dismiss the possibility that a militant regime, like its terrorist proxies, will commit collective suicide for the sake of its fanatical ideology. In this case, we might face not thousands of dead, but hundreds of thousands and possibly millions.

This is why the United States must do everything in its power to prevent regimes like Iran and Iraq from developing nuclear weapons and to disarm them of their weapons of mass destruction. This is the great mission that now stands before the free world. That mission must not be watered down to allow certain states to participate in the coalition that is now being organized. Rather, the coalition must be built around this mission.

It may be that some will shy away from adopting such an uncompromising stance against terrorism. If some free states choose to remain on the sidelines, America must be prepared to march forward without them, for there is no substitute for moral and strategic clarity. I believe that if the United States stands on principle, all democracies will eventually join the war on terrorism. The easy route may be tempting, but it will not win the day.

On September 11th, I, like everyone else, was glued to a television set, watching the savagery that struck America, but amid the smoking ruins of the Twin Towers, one could make out the Statue of Liberty holding high the torch of freedom. It is freedom's flame that the terrorists sought to extinguish, but it is that same torch so proudly held by the United States that can lead the free world to crush the forces of terror and to secure our tomorrow. It

is within our power. Let us now make sure that it is within our will.

[Applause.]

[The prepared statement of Mr. Netanyahu follows:]

Statement of former Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu before the Government Reform Committee, September 20, 2001.

Chairman Burton,
Distinguished Representatives,

I want to thank you for inviting me to appear before you today. I feel a profound responsibility addressing you in this hour of peril in the capital of liberty.

What is at stake today is nothing less than the survival of our civilization. There may be some who would have thought a week ago that to talk in these apocalyptic terms about the battle against international terrorism was to engage in reckless exaggeration. No longer.

Each one of us today understands that we are all targets, that our cities are vulnerable, and that our values are hated with an unmatched fanaticism that seeks to destroy our societies and our way of life.

I am certain that I speak on behalf of my entire nation when I say – Today, we are all Americans - in grief, as in defiance.

In grief, because my people have faced the agonizing horrors of terror for many decades, and we feel an instant kinship with both the victims of this tragedy and the great nation that mourns its fallen brothers and sisters.

In defiance, because just as my country continues to fight terrorism in our battle for survival, I know that America will not cower before this challenge.

I have absolute confidence that if we, the citizens of the free world, led by President Bush, marshall the enormous reserves of power at our disposal, harness the steely resolve of a free people, and mobilize our collective will - we shall eradicate this evil from the face of the earth.

But to achieve this goal, we must first however answer several questions: Who is responsible for this terrorist onslaught? Why? What is the motive behind these attacks? And most importantly, what must be done to defeat these evil forces?

The first and most crucial thing to understand is this: There **is** no international terrorism without the support of sovereign states. International terrorism simply cannot be sustained for long without the regimes that aid and abet it.

Terrorists are not suspended in mid-air. They train, arm and indoctrinate their killers from within safe havens on territory provided by terrorist states. Often these regimes provide the terrorists with intelligence, money and operational assistance, dispatching them to serve as deadly proxies to wage a hidden war against more powerful enemies.

These regimes mount a worldwide propaganda campaign to legitimize terror, besmirching its victims and exculpating its practitioners --- as we witnessed in the farcical spectacle in Durban last month.

Iran, Libya, and Syria call the US and Israel racist countries that abuse human rights?

Even Orwell could not have imagined such a world.

Take away all this state support, and the entire scaffolding of international terrorism will collapse into the dust.

The international terrorist network is thus based on regimes – Iran, Iraq, Syria, Taleban Afghanistan, Yasser Arafat's Palestinian Authority and several other Arab regimes such as the Sudan.

These regimes are the ones that harbor the terrorist groups: Osama Bin Laden in Afghanistan, Hizballah and others in Syrian-controlled Lebanon, Hamas, Islamic Jihad and the recently mobilized Fatah and Tanzim factions in the Palestinian territories, and sundry other terror organizations based in such capitals as Damascus, Baghdad and Khartoum.

These terrorist states and terror organizations together form a terror network, whose constituent parts support each other operationally as well as politically.

For example, the Palestinian groups cooperate closely with Hezbollah, which in turn links them to Syria, Iran and Bin Laden.

These offshoots of terror have affiliates in other states that have not yet uprooted their presence, such as Egypt, Yemen and Saudi Arabia.

Now, how did this come about? The growth of this terror network is the result of several developments in the last two decades: Chief among them is the Khomeini Revolution and the establishment of a clerical Islamic state in Iran.

This created a sovereign spiritual base for fomenting a strident Islamic militancy worldwide – a militancy that was often backed by terror.

Equally important was the victory in the Afghan war of the international mujaheedin brotherhood.

This international band of zealots, whose ranks include Osama Bin Laden, saw their victory over the Soviet Union as providential proof of the innate supremacy of faithful Moslems over the weak infidel powers.

They believed that even the superior weapons of a superpower could not withstand their superior will.

To this should also be added Saddam Hussein's escape from destruction at the end of the Gulf War, his dismissal of UN monitors, and his growing confidence that he can soon develop unconventional weapons to match those of the West.

Finally, the creation of Yasser Arafat's terror enclave gave a safe haven to militant Islamic terrorist groups such as Hamas and Islamic Jihad.

Like their mujaheedin cousins, they drew inspiration from Israel's hasty withdrawal from Lebanon, glorified as a great Moslem victory by the Syrian-backed Hizballah.

Under Arafat's rule, these Palestinian Islamic terrorist groups made repeated use of the technique of suicide bombing, going so far as to run summer camps in Gaza that teach Palestinian children how to become suicide martyrs.

Here is what Arafat's government controlled newspaper, Al Hayat Al Jadida, said on September 11, the very day of the suicide bombing of the World Trade Center and the Pentagon:

"The suicide bombers of today are the noble successors of the Lebanese suicide bombers, who taught the U.S. Marines a tough lesson in [Lebanon]... These suicide bombers are the salt of the earth, the engines of history... They are the most honorable people among us... ".

A simple rule prevails here: The success of terrorists in one part of the terror network emboldens terrorists throughout the network.

This then is the Who. Now for the Why.

Though its separate parts may have local objectives and take part in local conflicts, the main motivation driving the terror network is an anti-Western hostility that seeks to achieve nothing less than a reversal of history.

It seeks to roll back the West and install an extremist form of Islam as the dominant power in the world.

It seeks to do this not by means of its own advancement and progress, but by destroying the enemy. This hatred is the product of a seething resentment that has simmered for centuries in certain parts of the Arab and Islamic world.

Most Moslems in the world, including the vast majority of the growing Moslem communities in the West, are not guided by this interpretation of history, nor are they moved by its call for a holy war against the West.

But some are. And though their numbers are small compared to the peaceable majority, they nevertheless constitute a growing hinterland for this militancy.

Militant Islamists resented the West for pushing back the triumphant march of Islam into the heart of Europe many centuries ago.

Its adherents, believing in the innate supremacy of Islam, then suffered a series of shocks when in the last two centuries that same hated, supposedly inferior West penetrated Islamic realms in North Africa, the Middle East and the Persian Gulf.

For them the mission was clear: The West had to be first pushed out of these areas. Pro-western Middle Eastern regimes were toppled in rapid succession, including in Iran.

And Israel, the Middle East's only democracy and its purest manifestation of Western progress and freedom, must be wiped off the face of the earth.

Thus, the soldiers of militant Islam do not hate the West because of Israel, they hate Israel because of the West -- because they see it is an island of Western democratic values in a Moslem-Arab sea of despotism.

That is why they call Israel the Little Satan, to distinguish it clearly from the country that has always been and will always be the Great Satan – The United States of America.

Nothing better illustrates this then Osama bin Laden's call for Jihad against the United States in 1998. He gave as his primary reason not Israel, not the Palestinians, not the 'peace process', but rather the very presence of the United States 'occupying the Land of Islam in the holiest of places' – and where is that? – 'the Arabian peninsula' says Bin Laden, where America is 'plundering its riches, dictating to its rulers, and humiliating its people'. Israel, by the way, comes a distant third, after 'the continuing aggression against the Iraqi people'. [Al Quds al Arabi – February 23, 1998]

For the Bin Ladens of the world Israel is merely a sideshow. America is the target.

But reestablishing a resurgent Islam requires not just rolling back the West; it requires destroying its main engine, the United States. And if the US cannot be destroyed just now, it can be first humiliated -- as in the Teheran hostage crisis two decades ago -- and then ferociously attacked again and again, until it is brought to its knees.

But the ultimate goal remains the same: Destroy America and win eternity.

Some of you may find it hard to believe that Islamic militants truly cling to the mad fantasy of destroying America. Make no mistake about it. They do. And unless they are stopped now, their attacks will continue, and become even more lethal in the future.

To understand the true dangers of Islamic militancy, we can compare it to another ideology which sought world domination – communism. Both movements pursued irrational goals, but the communists at least pursued theirs in a rational way.

Anytime they had to choose between ideology and their own survival, as in Cuba or Berlin, they backed off and chose survival.

Not so for the Islamic militants. They pursue an irrational ideology irrationally - with no apparent regard for human life, neither their own lives nor the lives of their enemies. The Communists seldom, if ever, produced suicide bombers, while Islamic militancy produces hordes of them, glorifying them and promising them that their dastardly deeds will earn them a glorious afterlife.

This highly pathological aspect of Islamic militancy is what makes it so deadly for mankind.

When in 1996, I wrote a book about fighting terrorism, I warned about the militant Islamic groups operating in the West with the support of foreign powers--serving as a new breed of "domestic-international" terrorists, basing themselves in America to wage Jihad against America:

Such groups, I wrote then, nullify in large measure the need to have air power or intercontinental missiles as delivery systems for an Islamic nuclear payload. *They* will be the delivery system. In the worst of such scenarios, I wrote, the consequences could be not a car bomb but a *nuclear* bomb in the basement of the World Trade Center.

Well, they did not use a nuclear bomb. They used two 150 ton fully fueled jetliners to wipe out the Twin Towers. But does anyone doubt that given the chance, they will throw atom bombs at America and its allies? And perhaps long before that, chemical and biological weapons?

This is the greatest danger facing our common future. Some states of the terror network already possess chemical and biological capabilities, and some are feverishly developing nuclear weapons. Can one rule out the possibility that they will be tempted to use such weapons, openly or through terror proxies, or that their weapons might fall into the hands of the terrorist groups they harbor?

We have received a wake up call from hell. Now the question is simple: Do we rally to defeat this evil, while there is still time, or do we press a collective snooze button and go back to business as usual?

The time for action is now.

Today the terrorists have the will to destroy us, but they do not have the power. There is no doubt that we have the power to crush them. Now we must also show that we have the will to do just that.

Once any part of the terror network acquires nuclear weapons, this equation will fundamentally change, and with it the course of human affairs.

This is the historical imperative that now confronts all of us.

And now the third point: What do we about it?

First, as President Bush said, we must make no distinction between the terrorists and the states that support them. It is not enough to root out the terrorists who committed this horrific act of war. We must dismantle the entire terrorist network.

If any part of it remains intact, it will rebuild itself, and the specter of terrorism will reemerge and strike again.

Bin Laden, for example, has shuttled over the last decade from Saudi Arabia to Afghanistan to the Sudan and back again. So we must not leave any base intact.

To achieve this goal we must first have moral clarity. We must fight terror wherever and whenever it appears. We must make all states play by the same rules. We must declare terrorism a crime against humanity, and we must consider the terrorists enemies of mankind, to be given no quarter and no consideration for their purported grievances.

If we begin to distinguish between acts of terror, justifying some and repudiating others based on sympathy with this or that cause, we will lose the moral clarity that is so essential for victory.

This clarity is what enabled America and Britain to root out piracy in the nineteenth century. This is how the Allies rooted out Nazism in the twentieth century.

They did not look for the "root cause" of piracy or the "root cause" of Nazism – because they knew that some acts are evil in and of themselves, and do not deserve any consideration or "understanding".

They did not ask if Hitler was right about the alleged wrong done to Germany at Versailles. That they left to the historians. The leaders of the Western Alliance said something else: Nothing justifies Nazism. Nothing!

We must be equally clear cut today: Nothing justifies terrorism, Nothing!

Terrorism is defined not by the identity of its perpetrators nor by the cause they espouse. Rather, it is defined by the nature of the act.

Terrorism is the deliberate attack on innocent civilians. In this it must be distinguished from legitimate acts of war that target combatants and may unintentionally harm civilians.

When the British bombed a Gestapo headquarters in 1944, and one of their bombs unintentionally struck a children's hospital that was a tragedy, but it was not terrorism.

When Israel fired a missile that killed two Hamas arch-terrorists, and two Palestinians children who were playing nearby were tragically struck down, that is not terrorism.

But terrorists do not unintentionally harm civilians. They deliberately murder, maim, and menace civilians -- as many as possible.

No cause, no grievance, no apology can ever justify terrorism. Terrorism against Americans, Israelis, Spaniards, Britons, Russians, or anyone else, is all part of the same evil and must be treated as such.

It is time to establish a fixed principle for the international community: any cause that uses terrorism to advance its aims will not be rewarded. On the contrary, it will be punished and placed beyond the pale.

Armed with this moral clarity in defining terrorism, we must possess an equal moral clarity in fighting it.

If we include Iran, Syria, and the Palestinian Authority in the coalition to fight terror -- even though they currently harbor, sponsor and dispatch terrorists --- then the alliance against terror will be defeated from within.

Perhaps we might achieve a short-term objective of destroying one terrorist fiefdom, but it will preclude the possibility of overall victory. Such a coalition will melt down because of its own internal contradictions.

We might win a battle. We will certainly lose the war.

These regimes, like all terrorist states, must be given a forthright demand: Stop terrorism, permanently, or you will face the wrath of the free world – through harsh and sustained political, economic and military sanctions.

Obviously, some of these regimes will scramble in fear and issue platitudes about their opposition to terror, just as Arafat, Iran and Syria did, while they keep their terror apparatus intact. We should not be fooled. These regimes are already on the US lists of states supporting terrorism – and if they're not, they should be.

The price of admission for any state into the coalition against terror must be to first completely dismantle the terrorist infrastructures within their realm.

Iran will have to dismantle a worldwide network of terrorism and incitement based in Teheran.

Syria will have to shut down Hizballah and the dozen terrorist organizations that operate freely in Damascus and in Lebanon.

Arafat will have to crush Hamas and Islamic Jihad, close down their suicide factories and training grounds, rein in his own Fatah and Tanzim terrorists and cease the endless incitement to violence.

To win this war, we must fight on many fronts. The most obvious one is direct military action against the terrorists themselves. Israel's policy of preemptively striking at those who seek to murder its people is, I believe, better understood today and requires no further elaboration.

But there is no substitute for the key action that we must take: Imposing the most punishing diplomatic, economic and military sanction on all terrorist states;

To this must be added these measures:

Freeze financial assets in the West of terrorist regimes and organizations;

Revise legislation, subject to periodic renewal, to enable better surveillance against organizations inciting violence;

Keep convicted terrorist behind bars. Do not negotiate with terrorists;

Train special forces to fight terror.

And Not least important, impose sanctions on suppliers of nuclear technology to terrorist states.

I've had some experience in pursuing all these courses of action in Israel's battle against terrorism, and I will be glad to elaborate on any one of them if you wish, including the sensitive questions surrounding intelligence.

But I have to be clear: Victory over terrorism is not, at its most fundamental level, a matter of law enforcement or intelligence. However important these functions may be, they can only reduce the dangers, not eliminate them.

The immediate objective is to end all state support for, and complicity with, terror. If vigorously and continuously challenged, most of these regimes can be deterred from sponsoring terrorism.

But there is a real possibility that some will not be deterred– and those may be ones that possess weapons of mass destruction.

Again, we cannot dismiss the possibility that a militant terrorist state will use its proxies to threaten or launch a nuclear attack with apparent impunity.

Nor can we completely dismiss the possibility that a militant regime, like its terrorist proxies, will commit collective suicide for the sake of its fanatical ideology.

In this case, we might face not thousands of dead, but hundreds of thousands and possibly millions. This is why the US must do everything in its power to prevent regimes like Iran and Iraq from developing nuclear weapons, and disarm them of their weapons of mass destruction.

This is the great mission that now stands before the free world. That mission must not be watered down to allow certain states to participate in the coalition that is now being organized. Rather, the coalition must be built around this mission.

It may be that some will shy away from adopting such an uncompromising stance against terrorism. If some free states choose to remain on the sidelines, America must be prepared to march forward without them -- for there is no substitute for moral and strategic clarity.

I believe that if the United States stands on principle, all the democracies will eventually join the war on terrorism. The easy route may be tempting, but it will not win the day.

On September eleventh, I, like everyone else, was glued to a television set watching the savagery that struck America. Yet amid the smoking ruins of the Twin Towers one could make out the Statue of Liberty holding high the torch of freedom.

It is freedom's flame that the terrorists sought to extinguish.

But it is that same torch, so proudly held by the United States, that can lead the free world to crush the forces of terror and secure our tomorrow.

It is within our power. Let us now make sure that it is within our will.

Mr. BURTON. I have to tell you, Mr. Prime Minister, that in the 5 years I've been chairman of this committee, it's the first time I've heard spontaneous applause for a statement by a person who participated in our hearings.

I think you've covered everything very, very well, but we do have a few questions, and I hope you wouldn't mind answering them.

You indicated in your book that there might be the possibility of a nuclear device put in the basement of the World Trade Center, and we had some hearings earlier a couple of years ago about some briefcase-type nuclear devices about this big that were produced by the Soviet Union when they were in existence, and by the United States, and we were told that some of those devices have disappeared, have evaporated. Do you have any information or indication that those devices may have found their way into the terrorist enclaves?

Mr. NETANYAHU. Not specifically about those devices, but as far as the general flow of nuclear technology that flows, I regret, primarily from Russia, there is a steady and continuous and unchecked flow of nuclear weapons technology from Russia to Iraq and to Iran, from the Russian, quote, scientific organizations that work semi-independently, but under the umbrella of the Russian Government. I have tried many times, including in conversations with President Clinton, to—and with some of you, to get a message sent to Russia to clamp down on this because of the dangers not only to the United States, but to Russia as well.

There is also ballistic technology that goes—I shouldn't say technology. Technologists who are onsite in both countries. It's important to understand that the goals of these countries is to have—they already have ballistic missiles. Iran is more ambitious than Iraq in terms of the reach. Iraq wants a regional—Iraq is—Saddam Hussein is a regional bully with great danger if he acquires nuclear weapons, obviously, enormous danger, and that could happen, according to our defense ministers, within 3 to 5 years.

In the case of Iran, Iran already has missiles that can reach—overreach Israel, can reach into Europe, but they are working on a plan, a 10 to 15-year plan, to develop intercontinental missiles that could reach the eastern seaboard of the United States. They want to be a global power, and Iran in many ways is not only the spiritual center of fomenting this strident militancy, it also sees itself as the physical power to marshal the forces to get the strategic change in historical terms.

So I think it's important to understand that the terror network merely facilitates the ambitions of regimes, but those ambitions are far flung, and they definitely include, without any question, the acquisition of nuclear material, nuclear technology, ballistic technology and possibly the compression of these weapons into smaller devices. They certainly would be more able to do so, if you're talking about chemical and biological weapons, because the physics of it are simpler.

We have had an instance, by the way, in another part of the world, in Japan, in Tokyo, of sarin gas, which is very deadly and could kill an untold number. It was apprehended very quickly in the subways, fortunately apprehended, but you could have had there a massive catastrophe.

So terrorists have already used chemical weapons. This is not a projection into the future. We've already been warned. I said we've been given a wake-up call from hell. It's a variegated hell, and some of it has already been here and is here.

Mr. BURTON. Regarding the chemical and biological weapons, do these terrorists states and organizations have these now, or does the free world have some time to deal with them?

Mr. NETANYAHU. At least three regimes in the Middle East have chemical and biological weapons. None of them, to the best of my knowledge, have nuclear weapons, but they are working very hard to get them and very fast.

Mr. BURTON. And these chemical and biological weapons, they're easily transportable?

Mr. NETANYAHU. The chemical and biological weapons are a great deal simpler to manufacture and to transport than nuclear weapons.

Mr. BURTON. In these terrorist training camps, are they training people how to assemble and make these biological and chemical weapons? I mean, we think we have terrorists, a large number of them, possibly, in the United States. Would they be capable of making those?

Mr. NETANYAHU. I cannot tell you in the most recent intelligence, because I can only talk about things that I was intimate with 2 years ago when I was Prime Minister, but there's no question that the terrorist groups around us, bin Laden and others, are seeking ways to increase, by an order of magnitude, the destructive power of the weapons—the lethal power of the weapons that they seek to employ against us, and, therefore, I think you have to expect that they are perfectly aware of what happened in Japan. They're perfectly aware of what their supporting regimes have, and they're also perfectly aware that it's not that difficult—certain weapons of this kind are not that difficult to assemble.

So I think we've been warned. We've been fairly warned, very painfully warned, but if bin Laden conceived of this idea of taking two airplanes, 150-ton airplanes, loaded with fuel and launching them into the middle of New York and a third one here in Washington, then you have to assume that he's aware of everything that we're talking about and that he's working on it. I don't have the specifics of it, but would any of you assume differently?

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Waxman.

Mr. WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Netanyahu, I, too, have never seen the kind of response to your statement that we just witnessed, where Members on both sides of the aisle and the audience gave you an ovation, which was well deserved. I thought your statement was an outstanding one. It clarified, if anyone had any doubt, what we're facing in the world today. As the President of the United States seeks to pull together a coalition to fight terrorism, all of our allies must keep clearly in mind what's really at stake.

The line you gave which left a real impression on me is that intelligence and law enforcement surely can help reduce the violence, but they're not an answer unless we stop the terrorist network from operating and stop those countries that are supporting it. Israel, however, is way ahead of the United States in dealing on

a tactical basis, on a day-to-day basis, with terrorism. What do you suggest to us; from your own experience in Israel. If terrorism is a fact of life, how do we deal with it on that day-to-day basis? What recommendations would you make to us?

Mr. NETANYAHU. Congressman Waxman, I'd say first that Israel has been living under bouts of terrorism, but indeed it's been bouts, because we've had the ability to stop terrorism from certain corners for specified periods. For example, we had state-supported terrorism from Nasser's Egypt, and we took very decisive action against not only merely the individual terrorist, but against Nasser's regime, and the punishing power of those military actions stopped terrorism from Egypt years before we had a peace process or let alone a peace treaty with Egypt.

The same is true of terrorists that implanted themselves from Jordan in the 1970's. We struck very, very strongly against them, and King Hussein, who was also concerned that they would topple his regime, took action against them, and that was the end of it. So we had no terrorism from Jordan many years before we had a peace process with Jordan or a peace treaty with Jordan.

And during my own tenure, we were able to reduce the terrorism not only from 100 percent to zero, but practically to zero. The terror rate dropped very precipitously, because I made it clear to Arafat that I would take very, very strong action under the policy of reciprocity against his regime, and I think he considered that his regime might be in danger of tottering. So the terror dropped almost to nothing. In fact, we had a record number of tourists and record number of growth in the economy and, by the way, record economic prosperity in the Palestinian areas, because there was no terrorism. We didn't close our job markets with the Palestinians, so they were having nightclubs in Ramallah and you name it.

So it is perfectly possible to deter most of these regimes. It is important—and I add it again parenthetically, because I think it is not a parenthetical remark—it is not clear that deterrence alone will work for some of the main players in this terror network.

Now, the question you asked about Israel's experience, I think the domestic day-to-day experience, I think the role of leadership is to educate the public to withstand precisely as Congressman Burton said, a sustained battle. This is a war. It is not a single skirmish, and it requires that the citizens of a free society in a certain sense see themselves as soldiers in the same war. They have to be prepared to absorb the pain, even the casualties. They have to have this moral outrage in them but not to crumble when those attacks take place. They have to be prepared to muster their will and resolve to see it through the long haul for victory, nothing short of victory.

I must say that what I see in the United States, what I see in the city of New York, what I see in the leadership provided by President Bush and Mayor Giuliani and may I say what I see in this city from all of you is that kind of resolve. I think that is what has to be repeated again and again. This has been Israel's experience. No one in Israel will back off and surrender to terrorism. No one in America will back off and surrender to terrorism. I am sure of that.

Mr. WAXMAN. As the President puts together this international coalition, we know that some of our European allies have been cooperative with terrorist regimes because it was in their economic interest to do so. We know there are going to be not democracies but some of the so-called modern Arab countries that are going to say to the United States if only the United States would put pressure on Israel to accommodate the Palestinians that would help them be part of the coalition.

What would you tell the President of the United States when he hears these kinds of claims from our allies, or when those who would claim to be our allies put these conditions in their place?

Mr. NETANYAHU. Well, I think this is fundamentally wrong on every count. Yasser Arafat has been called Israel's Osama bin Laden. But there is a difference between the two. You see, Osama bin Laden wants to destroy America. Yasser Arafat is more modest in his goals: He just wants to destroy Israel. That is why he founded the PLO in 1964, the Organization for the Liberation of Palestine. 1964. That is 3 years before the Six Day War. What was the Palestine that he set out to liberate? Couldn't have been the West Bank, that was in Arab hands. Couldn't have been Gaza, that was in Arab hands, too. Couldn't have been East Jerusalem, that was in Arab hands. The Palestine that he set out to liberate was in fact Israel; that is, Tel Aviv, Haifa, Jerusalem and so on. And that goal has not changed.

Many hoped, I think out of good will and good intentions, that he had changed his goals when he entered the Oslo process. But I think those hopes have been dashed in this city not far from here in the Camp David conference just a year ago when he was offered everything he says in the West that he wants; namely a West Bank state with half of Jerusalem as its capital. He always says that, he or his spokesmen and spokeswomen. When they come to the West, they say this is what we want. Of course when he was offered it, he chucked. He threw it out. He said that's not what I want. What I want is the ability to flood Israel with millions of Palestinians, effectively bringing about the end of Israel.

So it is important to understand that what he says in Arabic to his people is very different from what he and his spokesmen say in English to America or to the Western media. He in Arabic tells them very clearly he is not looking for a state next to Israel, he is looking for a state instead of Israel. He is willing to back that with what he calls the armed struggle, which is another word for terrorism. That is what he does.

In other words, Arafat is not an engine for peace, is not a partner for peace. He is in fact, I would say, pursuing the illegitimate goal of policide, the destruction of a state, using the illegitimate means of terror.

Now in this he is not different from the others except he has got exceptional PR. Exceptional PR. He has got a lot of people bamboozled. But all you have to do is read those quotes just like the one I read from the organs of the press that he controls, glorifying suicide bombers, hatred against the West, his own appointed mufti, Palestinian appointed mufti. In Jerusalem on the Temple he said just a few weeks ago we will paint the White House black. And you

know what he meant by that, he didn't mean a coat of paint. And so on. This goes on and on and on.

Now, you may say, well, these are things that are said like the newspaper quote that I gave you. It is a free press there. That reminds me of a play of Tom Stoppard I once saw in which an Idi Amin like dictator struts across the stage and he boasts we have a relatively free press in my country. And someone asks him what's that? And he says, it's a press run freely by my relatives. Well, Arafat has a relatively free press, too. Every word, every image, every picture that he shows on that television on the radio he controls.

Now, admittedly he is now scrambling to distance himself from this bombing. But the joyous celebration that broke out in Palestine, joyous, couldn't hide it in the beginning, people were celebrating all over the place, well, then they started terrorizing the news media, using terror to hide the terror.

I have here an AP cable, APTN. "APTN regrets that the clients are unable to use the 35 seconds of the Ramallah march showing one protester carrying a picture of Osama bin Laden. This material was shot by a Channel 9 Australian crew who have now withdrawn their permission for APTN to use it. They say that their decision has been taken on, quote, safety grounds. This is 4 days ago.

He is terrorizing people to hide the terror. Then he goes on to donate blood for America. Did you see that? Donate blood for America. This is the father of modern terrorism. This is the man who invented—first, we had the bombing of airplanes. He did. He bombed American aircraft in the Jordanian desert. He murdered American diplomats in Khartoum and elsewhere. He hijacked people, killed people, killed innocent people. Taken them hostage. Murdering Americans as recently as a week ago, 2 weeks ago in the bombings in Jerusalem, American citizens. He has shed an awful lot of American blood. And now he is donating blood to America.

Well, I think in the long history of hypocrisy, and it is a very long history, this surely has to top the list. So I don't think anyone should be fooled. We have here a classic component of the terror network. Now we are waiting for a cease-fire. Cease-fires are very, very welcome. I hope we have them because people stop getting killed. But if you asked your research department, Mr. Chairman, to have a printout of all the cease-fires that Arafat has violated, it would stretch all of Pennsylvania Avenue. And the question you really need to see is not a tactical cessation of terror but a complete dismantling of the terror infrastructure, and indeed a complete disavowal, a formal disavowal of all those aspects of the Palestinian creed that effectively calls for Israel's destruction like the demand for the so-called right of return, and so on.

I say that because the assumption that some of our European colleagues have, that if they give Arafat and his terrorist regime, with the goal of destroying Israel, if they give him the hills above Tel Aviv, that he will stop is absurd. He not only will not stop, just as he has used any territory that he has received to continue to wage the unchanging goal, he will continue from there as well. What must be done is exactly the opposite. What must be done is to stand before Arafat and say enough is enough. Terror is not going to be tolerated anywhere for real or imaginary purposes or

grievances. You are practicing terror, you will get no support. You will get sanctions. If Israel has to take action to defend itself, we will support it. Terror will stop in a very, very short time.

And that is the lesson that has to be taught not only to Arafat but to everyone. And the battle against terrorism has to be universal. Terrorism is indivisible in its pernicious effects, and the war against terrorism has to be indivisible. It cannot be that the Palestinian terrorists are OK, but the Basque terrorists are not. It cannot be that the Kurdish terrorists are bad, but the terrorists that fight for them in another part of the world are good. Terrorism is always bad whether it is Palestinian or anyone else's and it must be treated as such. I think that is the message that the Europeans have to place before Arafat and the entire world. If they don't, terror will come back to haunt them as surely as the light of day.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Shays.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Prime Minister, when you addressed Congress it was one of the most refreshing statements before Congress, and your statement here is extraordinary as well. I would hope that every Member of Congress will get to read it and everyone in the administration as well.

Mr. NETANYAHU. Thank you.

Mr. SHAYS. When you were before Mr. Hume in an interview you said some of what you said today, "The terrorists today have the will to destroy us, but they don't have the power. We have the power to eradicate them but must now show that we have the will. This is the test of time."

I want to ask you how will we know when we have destroyed the terrorist network? I mean, I don't know how you ever know.

Mr. NETANYAHU. Well, you know if you monitor what is happening inside the regimes. You know if the regimes take action—for example, simple test in Syria: There are a dozen, I think, maybe I'm wrong, maybe it is 15, but more than a dozen. I haven't counted them recently. They keep growing. There are over a dozen offices, formal offices, with addresses of terror organizations. They operate there.

Mr. SHAYS. So when they go that is an indication?

Mr. NETANYAHU. Well, closing them down is a minimal, it is not the only indication. But the fact they are there operating with impunity, with the support of the regime, is one thing that you can demand to stop. You can also know through other means whether there is—you know, there is only a cosmetic action and not a real action. It is possible we know. It is not that we don't know. Our joint intelligence capabilities know very well. What we don't do is we don't call the bluff often. I think it is time that the U.S. Congress places everyone, including Arafat's terrorist groups that are carrying out terrorism today, the Tanzine, or the Fatah—I'm sorry—Yasser Arafat's own group, claimed responsibility for murdering a mother. Today.

Mr. SHAYS. Let me ask you another question if I could while I still have time. The Mossad is universally recognized as one of the best, if not the best intelligence organization. What could we learn from this intelligence organization? What could the United States learn? Not the information in it but how they get their information and so on.

Mr. NETANYAHU. Congressman Shays, I am going to be naturally reticent about this subject, but I want to say that the nature of terrorism is such that even though you need to bolster intelligence, even though we need to bolster the sharing of intelligence between us, we often don't do that because of the concern of burning out sources. Although I think that the sharing between some countries, America and Britain, United States and Israel, and a few others, is exceptional, there is more certainly that we can do in the realm of intelligence. But the nature of terrorism is such that it is a war by proxy, it is a war by stealth that regimes use primarily.

So you cannot anticipate every single action nor could you always find it. This is the nature of the beast. What you have to do is go back to the home base. It is like, you know, trying to intercept the kamikazi pilot or sinking the aircraft carrier. You certainly want to intercept the kamikazi pilot but what you really want to do is get the carriers, sink the carriers, and you will probably get rid of this problem.

Mr. SHAYS. One of your strong messages seems to be, and tell me if I am hearing you right, that if we get the terrorist states we basically pull apart the terrorist organizations. So would one of the indications be that we see a major toppling of some terrorist states?

Mr. NETANYAHU. Well, I want to define the problem. I am not sure that it is appropriate here to define the exact solution. There is a balance, depending on effectiveness, between deterrence and other actions that have to be taken in case deterrence fails. One thing that is absolutely clear because of the enormous dangers inherent now in this terror network and its coupling with unconventional weapons, we cannot leave this network intact. How to make sure that it is neutralized will be, I would say, apportioned by the nature of the regimes and their response to the measures, the punishments that are meted out to them. But I think the important thing is to dismantle the regime before it dismantles us; that is, dismantle the network before it dismantles it. Neutralize it or dismantle it. I cannot tell you right now which is which because there is a sequence of actions that can be taking place over time. And I am sure there are very smart people and very concerned people in this city who are now thinking precisely about those questions.

What I can tell you is that I would definitely not think that it is a one shot action. Suppose you get rid of bin Ladin, which you should—and, by the way, dispense with the legalisms. I mean dispense with the legalisms. This is an act of war. This guy just sent almost 2 dozen killers to wipe out thousands of Americans. This is not a court of law. This is an act of war. You don't go into the middle of a war and say let me try this—general, let me have enough proof that this general produced this particular action against us and only when we have this judicial proof will we take action against him. Get rid of these legalisms. We are not talking about American citizens. We are not talking about action in your own country. We are talking about something beyond your borders.

We in Israel make that clear distinction. When it comes to Israeli citizens, all the rules of law subject to our reviews and our laws apply. But when it comes outside of our borders, this is what we have governments for. This is what we have a Prime Minister for. This is what you have a President for, a Commander in Chief for.

And unless you give that power, the terrorist will always hide behind this so-called lack of sufficient proof. It is not a court of law. It is a field of war, and it must be done.

Mr. SHAYS. Thank you.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Lantos.

Mr. LANTOS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to commend you for holding this hearing, for inviting our distinguished guest. I want to commend you for one of the most powerful statements I have heard as a Member of Congress. This is not an inappropriate time, Mr. Prime Minister, to pay a moment's tribute to your brother, who is the symbol of the international fight against terrorism. On July 4, 1976, he gave his life in that struggle and he will stand as the singular example of human sacrifice in defense of freedom and liberty and the need to fight international terrorism.

I very much hope that the speech writers who are preparing tonight's address of the President that he will give to a joint session of Congress have been listening to your comments, because your comments are now in the public domain, there is no copyright, and I hope many of these thoughts will find their way into the President's speech at 9 this evening.

It has been stated many times, Prime Minister, that September 11 was a wakeup call. Well, I think it was a little more than a wakeup call. It probably provided us, all of us, with a moment that we can describe as a hinge of history, because the dialog, the focus, the attention is so different today than it was just 2 short weeks ago. This is as true of the Congress as it is of the country, as it is of many of our allies.

It was also a wakeup call for our own Department of State. Earlier I mentioned, Mr. Prime Minister, that some months ago I introduced a piece of legislation calling for the Government of Lebanon to secure its entire border with Israel, not allowing Hezbollah to engage in cross border terrorist raids. The Department of State saw fit just a few months ago to send two letters to all of my colleagues urging them to oppose my amendment and not to vote for it. It passed by the narrowest of margins, 216 to 212. And I so strongly welcome the new attitude of the Department of State and I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that yesterday's Wall Street Journal article entitled, "U.S. Presses Lebanon on Suspects: Bush Seeks Action on Hezbollah," be inserted into the record.

Mr. BURTON. Without objection.

[The information referred to follows:]

WALL STREET JOURNAL.

© 2001 Dow Jones & Company, Inc. All Rights Reserved.

EE/WO ★★★★ WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 19, 2001 WSJ.com

U.S. Presses Lebanon On Suspects

Bush Seeks Action On Hezbollah, Putting Beirut in a Quandary

By JAMES M. DORSEY
Staff Reporter of THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

BEIRUT, Lebanon– The U.S. has asked Lebanon and Syria to extradite Palestinians and Lebanese Shiites suspected of terrorism in the past 20 years, according to Lebanese officials and people close to Lebanese Prime Minister Rafik Hariri.

The officials and people close to the prime minister said the Bush administration was also calling for the disarmament, if not disbanding, of Hezbollah. The group is a Shiite Muslim militia believed responsible for the 1983 suicide bombings of the U.S. Embassy and a U.S. Marine peacekeeping mission in Beirut as well as the 1980s kidnapping in Lebanon of Westerners, including 18 Americans. The U.S. demands are part of seven requests presented this week to Lebanese and Syrian officials.

The Lebanese officials cautioned that meeting the demands could tear apart the country's fragile social fabric unless it is carried out properly.

A Hezbollah spokesman, in his Beirut office sitting below portraits of the late Iranian leader Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini and current Iranian religious leader Ayatollah Sayed Ali Khamenei, expressed confidence that Lebanon and Syria would reject the U.S. demands. "I rule out the Lebanese government doing anything against the Lebanese resistance that liberated Lebanon from Israeli occupation. The Lebanese government knows how to protect innocent people," spokesman said.

A spokeswoman for the U.S. Embassy in Beirut, Ann O'Leary, said the Bush administration "is asking the Lebanese government for its complete cooperation in the war against terrorism." Ms. O'Leary declined to comment on the specific list of demands.

The officials and people close to Mr. Hariri said the U.S. demands included the prosecution or extradition of terrorists, stopping their movement in and out of Lebanon and Syria, intelligence sharing and banning organizations that support terrorism.

Whether the demands bring any result depends largely on Syria, and possibly Iran, because of their support for Hezbollah and other radical groups, these people said. Syria has an estimated 30,000 troops based in Lebanon.

"Hezbollah is a major political party here. It represents a major segment of society. They are regarded as heroes. Now, they've become a hot potato and everybody is looking at what the Syrians will do," said one person close to Mr. Hariri.

Mr. Hariri in the past year has allied himself with Hezbollah, seeking to benefit from its popularity after the group's successful military campaign that last year forced Israel to end its 22-year occupation of southern Lebanon. The officials said Mr. Hariri had aided the Hezbollah campaign by granting Hezbollah access to military intelligence, licensing its arms and securing access roads to southern Lebanon. Hezbollah earlier this week offered its condolences to the victims of last week's bombings in New York and Washington.

Signaling that Lebanon wouldn't simply comply with the U.S. demands, Lebanese President Emile Lahoud said in a statement that "it is very important to differentiate between those acts [of terror] and national resistance, which aims at liberating occupied lands." The statement argued that the international community throughout history has viewed resistance to occupation as legitimate.

Syrian endorsement would be essential to cracking down on Hezbollah without disrupting the fragile communal balance established in Lebanon after the end of that country's civil war in 1991, people close to Mr. Hariri said. Syria is likely to drive a hard bargain, they said, possibly demanding that the U.S. pressure Israel to withdraw from the Golan Heights conquered from Syria in 1967 and create a platform for a negotiated end to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

"Anything less than Madrid Two will not be acceptable. Syria will not relinquish its tools in its struggle against Israel for less," said one person close to the Syrian government. Madrid Two refers to a 1991 conference organized by the U.S. that launched the Mideast peace process; the U.S. role in calling for the peace talks helped it win Syrian and other Arab support for its military campaign a year earlier to force Iraq's withdrawal from Kuwait.

Among those the U.S. wants extradited, people close to Mr. Hariri said, are former Hezbollah leader Imad Mughniyeh and the Damascus-based head of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine, General Command Ahmed Jibril, who is believed to be responsible for a series of attacks in the 1980s.

Authorities in the U.S., Israel and some Arab states suspect Mr. Mughniyeh of involvement in the April 1983 bombing that destroyed the U.S. Embassy in Beirut and killed 63 people, including 17 Americans. Other attacks he is believed to have masterminded: the suicide bombing six months later that destroyed a U.S. Marine base in the Lebanese capital and killed 241 Marines; and a 1984 attack on the current U.S. Embassy compound in Beirut, in which a vehicle packed with explosives rammed the embassy, killing 15 people. Mr. Mughniyeh is also thought to be behind the kidnapping of foreigners in Lebanon in the 1980s, including former Associated Press correspondent Terry Anderson.

Israeli and Argentine officials hold Mr. Mughniyeh responsible for the 1992 bombing of the Israeli Embassy in Buenos Aires as well as a 1994 attack on a Jewish social center. About 124 people were killed in the two incidents. Argentina's Supreme Court earlier this year issued a warrant for Mr. Mughniyeh's arrest.

Mr. LANTOS. What we now have, Mr. Prime Minister, is the Department of State at long last calling on Damascus and Beirut to put an end to all terrorist activities, something that just a few months ago our own Department of State was fighting. This I think is an index of the seismic change that occurred a week ago Tuesday which I think will focus our attention for many coming years on this issue.

It was not long ago that many in our government at the highest levels were issuing pious calls for restraints when Israel struck back at terrorists. I remember one specific instance when a terrorist chief was with surgical accuracy terminated by an Israeli helicopter pilot and the Department of State was calling piously for restraint. Just imagine what an American pilot would get in the form of decorations if he would find Osama and put an end to him in his cave someplace. He would get the Congressional Medal of Honor in record time.

Now, I would like to ask you to comment on two concepts, Mr. Prime Minister. The first one relates to the issue of why the international terrorist movement hates us so much. Many argue that they hate us for our policies. It is my judgment that they don't hate us for what we do, but they hate us for what we are. We are open, tolerant, accepting of others, and this is diametrically opposed to what the fanatic terrorists believe in and for which they clearly are prepared to sacrifice their lives.

The second issue I would like you to comment on relates to a statement by the President of Pakistan. I very much welcome the fact that Pakistan at long last has chosen to stand with the civilized world and not with the barbarism of the Taliban. I publicly want to commend the President of Pakistan for his action. Yet in his statement he offered a caution; namely, that India and Israel not be part of the coalition. And I find it so outrageous that a military dictator should tell the two democracies which in many ways have been the most severely subjected to international terrorism to stay away.

Isn't it long overdue that we not only tell all the countries of this world that the time to choose is here, not just in terms of actions, but also in terms of moral and intellectual clarity? I think it would be outrageous if Syria would be invited to join the international struggle against international terrorism while India and Israel and perhaps other democracies would be excluded. I would be grateful for your comments.

Mr. NETANYAHU. Thank you very much, Congressman Lantos, and thank you, too, for your kind words about my late brother. He fell in the war against terrorism. But it is interesting that even though he devoted all of his adult life—he fell at the age of 30; from the age of 18, with the exception of a short stint in Harvard, he had been in the Army fighting terrorism—he never viewed the problem as strictly a military one. He viewed it centrally as a political and moral one because of the confusion that existed in the democracies that allowed terrorist regimes and terrorist organizations to grow and expand their activity. And I agreed with him completely and devoted a good part of my adult life to making that clear. I know you and so many others in this committee have taken part in the political and moral battle against terrorism and its poli-

tics as in South Africa and in Durban, where the American delegation did the right thing.

Why do the Islamic militant terrorists hate us so much? It is a collective us. I tell you it is a collective us in the sense if Belgium were in the Middle East or Holland were in the Middle East instead of Israel, the same thing would still be there. And if Israel, by the way, didn't exist, the same thing would be there. This is centuries, centuries of antipathy of a particular virulent strain of Islam, to distinguish from the vast majority that does not recognize modernity. What it especially rejects is the idea of plurality and individual choice. It is a very rigid conception of life, I think a very forlorn and dark one. But it cannot tolerate the idea that we are having this conversation right now, that we can have genuine disagreements, that we can have a genuine parliament. That is why they have these farcical parliaments in Tripoli or in the Sudan, but they are not real parliaments because what they want to have is a certain uniformity. They reject our respect for life, for individual rights. They reject our conception of personal choice in the way we dress and the way we educate our children and our choice of music and art—choices I should say.

It is a completely different world outlook, and therefore you are absolutely right when they say that they hate the West, not for what it does, but for what it is. It is a fundamentally opposed view of the way human life and civilization should be constructed. And make no mistake about it, ours is better. Ours is right. Theirs is wrong. That is why they use barbaric methods to try to stamp out ours. They cannot stand free competition. They cannot stand free choice on the international scene or in their own societies. That is why they are closed, because they know just given the choice—just give the choice to the citizens of Iran, you know what they will choose.

I once said to the head of the CIA that the best way to induce a change in Iran was not standard CIA tactics but to get very, very strong transponders and to beam into Tehran Beverly Hills 90210 and Melrose Place and all that stuff because—I don't think it is high art, but it is its uses, because this is subversive stuff. What it does is it gives the young people in particular the ability to see a different life, that they could have a nice house, a nice car, nice clothes and so on. And this is precisely the kind of competition that these militants not only want to avoid but hate so much. They want their uniform idea based on, again, many centuries of a slithering and simmering hate.

I think this has been written about perhaps most profoundly and cogently by Professor Bernard Lewis. There are others. There are Arab writers like Professor Fouad Ajami at Johns Hopkins and a number of other Arab professors whose books I have read who have written about this probably more honestly and more courageously than any Western writer that I can cite. So it is absolutely correct. They hate us for what we are in the first instance, not for what we do. I cannot add a single thing to what you said about Pakistan.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Prime Minister, you have heard from the ranking member of the International Relations Committee. Now I recognize the former chairman of the committee, Mr. Gilman.

Mr. GILMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and, Mr. Former Prime Minister, we welcome you to our committee. Thank you for taking the time and the trouble to travel so far, and again we apologize for the State Department's inability to meet a leading member of another state.

We hope that you will continue to be a leading member throughout the world. We hope you will have the opportunity to meet with our President before you go back to recite to him the same things you have recited to our committee.

Mr. Netanyahu, what do you think is the most important initiative that our Nation should now undertake in our war against terrorism? What is the most significant thing we can do right now?

Mr. NETANYAHU. It should form a coalition of those democracies that are willing to take on an uncompromising battle against terrorism everywhere and especially against the terrorist regimes that make international terrorism possible. This coalition could consider both military and economic as well as diplomatic actions against these offending states. The nature of this action could go so far as to military engagement and military punishment. It can go short of that, depending on the response of these regimes and how quickly and how comprehensively they dismantle the terrorist apparatus within them. This is the first thing that has to be done.

The second thing is until the scaffolding collapses to intercept as many of the terrorists organizations, especially those now that have already dispatched killers en route to our societies, and root them out. Root them out means to eliminate them, to kill them if necessary, with no consideration for undue legalisms if they are citizens, foreign citizens and not U.S. citizens.

Mr. GILMAN. You mentioned some of the countries that are harboring terrorism. Who do you feel are the most active supporters of terrorism? Who are the greatest threat to us in harboring terrorists?

Mr. NETANYAHU. Congressman Gilman, there is a distinction I think should be made between many countries in which now terrorist cells exist in the West. Including in the West, Europe has militant Islamic centers just dotted throughout the continent. America too. These terrorists have taken and made use of the freedom of democracies to work against democracies. But invariably they all come back to a handful of regimes in the Middle East from which the headquarters are launched.

It is very difficult, very difficult to sustain a terror effort when you don't have this international—these bases, these home bases. Invariably, free societies are able to—this you may be happy to hear—free societies faced with terrorism that does not have an international base can almost always, not always but almost always, root out such terrorists. So, for example, in Germany they rooted out the Red Army, their Red Army. In Italy they rooted out the Brigada Rosa. In France they eliminated the Action Directe, and so on.

By the way, some of that was made possible because of the fall of communism. So the Eastern European communist countries that were, basically the havens collapsed. Even though this action took place before they collapsed they were already weak, they were already exposed. Merely exposing them and putting the sanctions on

them worked. We have the power, the enormous technical power of surveillance against groups that don't have foreign support. Eventually you can overcome them.

Now the question is what do we do about civil liberties. Well, I think that the experience of Israel and Britain and Italy and Germany and others, all vibrant democratic societies, have shown that as they were fighting terrorism they were able to maintain their guard and vigil to protect civil liberties. Usually there is an oscillation. The pendulum oscillates between tougher measures in times of crisis to reduced measures in times of tranquility. And obviously the pendulum has to shift now. If it doesn't shift we are in trouble. But as it shifts, the responsibility of Congressmen, of parliamentarians like you, provide alongside the judiciary the necessary oversight on domestic actions.

So I am very confident in the power of democracies, certainly the power of the American democracy, the greatest democracy of them all, to toughen up domestic measures against the groups here without endangering American democracy.

But again it will not suffice. So you have to go back to the regimes. Who are the regimes? Again I listed them. They are very clear. They are Iran, Iraq, Taliban of Afghanistan, the Palestinian enclave headed by Arafat, the Sudan. This is the nexus. Syria of course. This is the nexus of countries that operate openly without even any need to disguise the basis for these terrorist organizations. And again there are subsidiary countries that themselves have simply not taken action to root out these pockets. They have taken some action.

Some of them have not taken any action. Egypt has taken some action, but it still has a very large and very active offshoot of terrorism there. Saudi Arabia has been a haven for financing and other activities. They think they would buy them off. They don't buy them off. You know, they support the Taliban, probably not only the Taliban. OK, but they don't buy them off. I don't think they do it with a view that the Taliban would attack the United States or that bin Laden would attack the United States. They think they will purchase immunity, but they don't.

So we have to be very clear. I think you have to take varying degrees of action between sanctions and deterrence and much tougher action depending on——

Mr. GILMAN. Just one last query.

Mr. SHAYS [presiding]. May I interrupt the gentleman. I would extend that courtesy to you, given Mr. Lantos' long extension, but I have members who have said they would like us to keep more on time, so a quick question with a short answer would be appreciated.

Mr. NETANYAHU. Maybe I will give some shorter answers.

Mr. SHAYS. Your answers are excellent, sir. You answer the way you want.

Mr. GILMAN. Should we be treating Mr. Arafat as a terrorist in our dealing?

Mr. NETANYAHU. He is a terrorist. Treat him as such.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Tierney.

Mr. TIERNEY. Thank you for your testimony and coming over today. I think we all appreciated hearing your comments on that.

For one thing I can tell you that you have re-enforced what has been my understanding for some time that our greatest fear, if we were to take a look and assess our threats and prioritize, you know, them in terms of risk, that we certainly are more at risk for the type of event that happened on September 11th or, as you stated earlier, from somebody carrying over some sort of nuclear device and detonating it here than we are in spending hundreds of billions of dollars on a national defense system that hasn't been shown it can work yet on that basis.

So I look at the programs we have, like the nonnuclear program, in trying to prevent nuclear materials and nuclear technology from coming from Russia and out. And I wonder what you think about that program and what else we might do to try to prevent that type of dissemination of technology as well as materials from Russia or other countries.

Mr. NETANYAHU. Well, I think that there were some initiatives in Congress about taking action, Congressman, against regimes or governments that allow the diffusion of nuclear and ballistic technology from their midst. I have to say I won't shock you when I tell you that I am not a communist and never was.

Mr. TIERNEY. That is tomorrow's headline.

Mr. NETANYAHU. But I will say that there is one thing that I can say for Soviet communism, for the Soviet Union, they kept that technology, ballistic and nuclear technology, under wraps. They didn't give it to any of their allies. They always controlled it. They didn't let it seep anywhere. One of the consequences of the collapse of the Soviet Union was that this technology hasn't actually leaked out; I mean it flows like a river to these militant regimes and actually for little money. It is not big money. But it is flowing as we speak.

Now, it is true, as I said, that this could end up giving terrorists the use of more primitive weapons of mass destruction. Do we really care what the extent of the yield is and how accurate these weapons are? No, not if they are in the proverbial suitcase. But it is true that they are developing at the same time missiles. So you know, the fact that you might die of cholera doesn't mean that you have to accept cancer. What I would suggest is that you build defenses against both the terrorist variety and the state terrorist variety that could be employed using ballistic missiles.

You don't want to be in a position where Iran—and I specifically say Iran because it is the most advanced in the building of ballistic missiles. Iran in 10 or 12 years will have, according to their plans, if they are not stopped, will have a missile that can reach this building. Now, you can leave it and hope that deterrence will operate. It may, or it may not. And you are not going to have a hermetic defense precisely because as long as this terror network exists they might have other ways of delivering the payload. But I think we should do everything in our power while we have the time to do so. I think that is what our people, our peoples, the free peoples of the world, can demand of us, to do everything within our power while we have the time.

And I would look at all these questions from a fresh perspective, and I would say there has been a hinge of fate here, there has been a change. There has been something that forces us to rise above

the previous divisions that divided us. I say that in Israel because in Israel, for example, there was a sea change of opinion when Arafat was exposed as not wanting peace and seeking to destroy us and all of a sudden it merged into one great united people. I sense that after this enormous calamity here, enormous catastrophe, that the same is happening. And I would only hope that spirit animates your deliberations in this Capitol to forge as many defenses and all the defenses and all the offenses that we can have while we have the time. We don't have much time.

Mr. TIERNEY. I thank you for that. Of course I hope we are all looking at defenses that will actually work and spending money only on those and testing them before we start building things that don't work, which unfortunately has been our history.

Is it your opinion that individual terrorists who up to date have sort of worked without really acknowledging any particular regime and regimes that may have let them work within their borders without saying they are associated with him, do you think that is going to change? Do you think there is any nation that is going to overtly state they have a connection with these terrorists? Can you expect them to work without a return address and sort of stay beneath the radar?

Mr. NETANYAHU. Right now, Congressman Tierney, they will stay beneath the radar.

Mr. SHAYS. Thank you, Mr. Tierney.

Mrs. Morella.

Mrs. MORELLA. Thank you. Mr. Netanyahu, we are honored that you came today to discuss a situation that we now have in common with Israel, and during this time of Rosh Hashana we certainly can feel kindred souls as we always have with Israel.

I am curious about whether my perception of the changing characteristics of terrorism are accurate in your point of view. For instance, it seems to me that now terrorism is manifesting itself with these small cells, really throughout the world, predominantly in the countries that you have mentioned, where you have sometimes pockets of individuals that have very little in common with the major organization to which they say they are a member. Therefore, it makes it even more difficult to ascertain who they are, where they are, and what damage they may want to be involved in for kind of the credibility, the accolades, the prestige they may get from doing that.

Then compounding the problem, it almost seems as though they don't truly have a political goal or focus as such, they have gone from not so much political or national but maybe a touch of so-called religious, which is certainly not the way we see religion. And it is almost like violence for the sake of violence, not violence really for a goal. If this in fact is true, then some of the techniques they would employ would be even far more dangerous. This could lead to the chemical, biological warfare. I wondered, have you seen a change in that regard as change for the worse in the whole concept of terrorism?

Mr. NETANYAHU. Well, I do see, Congresswoman Morella, a change for the worst because we see the terrorists have gone from killing, murdering isolated individuals to mowing down groups with machine guns to blowing up entire buildings and now blowing

up huge structures, and the weapons grow increasingly more lethal and that will continue. But I do think this violence has a goal. If there is something I want to stress to you today, it is that it is a very purposeful and not in that sense senseless violence; it is a violence that is aimed at destroying our values and our civilization. It is fantasy, it is madness, but that is what they do. This is what they think. That is what they aim at achieving. It is important to read what they say; it would be equally instructive to read the inner teachings of untold number of clerics in some of these terrorist states.

All hatred, certainly I can get from the history of my people, the Jewish people, there never was a great program, a great massacre of our people that was not preceded by well springs of hate; that is, by systematic incitement. The Jews were the well poisoners of the world, the Jews in the Middle Ages were accused of bleeding to death Christian children and using their blood to bake our matzos for Passover and sundry other hatreds, hateful lies that were part of this dissemination of hate.

By the way, this began 500 years before the Christian era in the Hellenistic world. Always the great massacres of the faithful, so to speak, were preceded by campaigns of hate and inculcation of hate. That is much the same case in the kind of massacres that we are witnessing today. The only reason these massacres are done using the techniques of terror is that the sources that inspire the hate, the ideological sources implanted in the terrorist regimes, are simply too weak. The West is too strong. Otherwise it would be much more out in the open. It is fairly out in the open if you just examine what they say, what they read, what they say to their own people; not what they say in the West when they occasionally speak, but what they actually say to their own people, and you will see how this cauldron of hate is constantly boiling over and somebody is always stoking that fire.

So understand that there is an assault on our civilization. It is very hard to accept it, and I know that Samuel Huntington's book stirred much debate. I must tell you that I read Francis Fukuyama's book, The End of History, with a chuckle. I thought it was actually—I thought it was tongue in cheek. Then I read a brilliant article, just a brilliant article, I mean brilliantly written, in a magazine that I occasionally read. It won't shock you either when I tell you that it is called Commentary Magazine, and that article said that—I won't mention the author, but it said Allah Fukuyama, that's it, history is over. Capitalism and democracy won, its obvious advantages to the life of mankind was proven and it's all over. It's all going to be now downhill. There are not going to be any more great conflicts and no more surges of wars and violence.

I got very mad. So I called up my old friend Norman Podhoretz—maybe he was still editor at the time, maybe he was just moving out—and I said, Norman, how did you allow Commentary to publish this brilliant piece of nonsense? He said, what do you mean? I said, look, this is militant Islam. It is here. And now with a collapse of communism it has got weapons that they never dreamed they could get their hands on. And it is coming, those attacks. I guess it must have been 8 years ago or something like that. He

said he would have a revised edition. Well, I hope he does one now. This is not senseless violence. It is purposeful and a purposeful assault on our values and our civilization.

And it is only when we understand that you can mobilize the greatest democracy of them all, which we are fortunate to have as leading the world. I think our great fortune is that in the second half of the 20th century the United States led the world against Nazism. I am quite confident if the United States had led the world in the first half of the 20th century things would have turned out very differently for mankind and for my own people. It so happens that it didn't. It so happens that it does now.

I think because of the moral clarity and the basic firmness of the American people and their ability and their courage—there is a lot of courage in this, in the citizenry of the United States. I was enormously impressed with the fire fighters. I was enormously impressed with the haunting and moving records of the conversations of those citizens, ordinary American citizens, on that aircraft headed toward Washington, DC. And as soon as they understood what it is that this plane was going to do, even though they knew in a certain sense that they are doomed, they did something that is very difficult to do. We knew in concentration camps it was very difficult for people to rise up and act even though they knew. Well, these people got up, these Americans got up, and they did something absolutely remarkable, and they saved a lot of lives. And they lost their lives. This is a brave people.

I have no doubt that looking at the truth, seeing the unvarnished picture, not prettying it up, not rounding the edges but calling it exactly as it is, the American people, the American President, the American Congress will rise to the occasion and defeat this evil. It is a purposeful evil, and we must be determined to wipe it out.

Mr. SHAYS. Ms. Schakowsky, you have the floor.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Thank you so much, Mr. Netanyahu, for being here today. Let me just say, first of all, that if one purpose of the despicable act of September 11th was to deter in any way our commitment to freedom and our support for democratic allies like Israel, then it failed miserably. I am just really gratified with your saying that today we are all Americans. I am hoping that it is not just Israel, but all of the civilized world feels that when that attack occurred that we, all civilizations, we are all Americans and in grief and defiance. I appreciate that.

Let me ask you this as part of our coalition now against terrorism. If you can, what are the ways that Israel is going to be—what role do you see Israel playing with us?

Mr. NETANYAHU. Israel has been leading the battle against international terrorism for a long time because we have been on the front line. We have simply been on the geographic cutting edge, facing this militancy in geographic terms. So we have had to fight to stay alive. We have had to roll back the tide of terrorism. And I think that in this we continue to do so. We have been sharing our experience, our knowledge and our intelligence with the United States, and undoubtedly this is being done as we speak. That was a matter of course.

I can tell you that in my tenure as Prime Minister there was never a day, I don't think a single day, in which Israel did not pass

on to the United States intelligence of substance. And may I say that it worked the other way around, too. Always. So I think you have that. But also in times of action, Israel is there. We are if you will, the Western position, the reliable Western position in the Middle East. We cannot have any coups. We have, as you know, periodic changes of government. People actually vote in the heart of the Middle East and we change governments, but this doesn't change. Israel stands behind America, and I am quite sure and I am happy to hear from you, Congresswoman, that America will continue to stand behind Israel. I think that we have to neutralize the terror attack that comes from that part of the terror network that is directed at us. We can do so pretty much on our own, but we need your understanding, your understanding in the international scene and unfortunately until recently your understanding and support in such forms as the Security Council, which often had supporters of this very terrorism directed against us, seeking not to punish the terrorists but Israel that defends itself.

As far as Israel's role, precise role in the international battle against terrorism, I believe that is something that should be discussed between the leaders of our two countries, the governments of our two countries right now, in concrete terms. It is not something that I think would be wise to discuss here except to formulate the principles that I said earlier; namely, that obviously all the democracies that agree that they must take a stand and fight against terrorism should be part of that coalition. Others will join later. Of that I have no doubt. But also that we must ensure that the terror sponsoring regimes that are not part of this coalition, we must demand that they dismantle their terrorist apparatus.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Let me ask you this: What are the limits to our use of force? Are there? For example, would you rule out the offensive use of nuclear weapons, for instance?

Mr. NETANYAHU. Congresswoman Schakowsky, I don't think that we are faced with as powerful an enemy as the Axis powers in World War II. In other words, it is equally fanatic. There is no difference as far as I am concerned with this militant Islamic terrorism and Nazism. It is, by the way, different from communism, as I said before. Communism didn't have an after life to offer the adherents, as you know. Here they not only have an after life but they use it in a twisted way to reward the most dastardly deeds. You get this paradise. I won't describe to you what they are offered in paradise. We will dispense with that but inquire on your own. It is quite astounding what they do to these people, and so you have here this mad fanaticism that like Nazism knows no bounds. But if I have to compare the power of Nazi Germany and Imperial Japan with the power of the terrorist networks it is well, well, well below their power today. Tomorrow it could be different if they acquire nuclear weapons. But today they are much weaker. And therefore while there has to be a global war of the democracies and certainly led by the United States, by the democracy, the largest democracy of them all, the effort that is required is, I would say, not as encompassing as that previous world war. It does not bring us to quite those levels if we act today.

If we act today, it is within our power to use means that we have available and not necessarily all the means we have available. If

we don't act today, and they acquire nuclear weapons, then I cannot tell you what will happen. Then the clock will stop. Then something that is unfathomable could happen. Unfathomable. When I described the bombing of the Trade Center a few years ago, it was seen as this, you know, rantings of irresponsibility. Every one of us can imagine what would happen, or maybe we can't imagine what would happen if a terrorist state or one of its proxies would drop nuclear bombs on New York or in Washington. It is not about to happen, it is not right around the corner. But inexorably it probably will happen. It will happen if we don't stop it now or it certainly could happen. We have to remove that "could."

I would say this is the main message that I give you today, is that we could witness horrors that would make the heartbreaking carnage in New York and not far from here seem pale by comparison. And that is a sober and realistic assessment of where we stand today. So we don't require quite the effort that we needed against Nazi Germany and Imperial Japan. But we will require untold efforts if the enemies of freedom acquired nuclear weapons, and we must not let that happen.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Horn, you are recognized.

Mr. HORN. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. It is a pleasure to see you again. Sorry I haven't been in the questioning before. I was going to put the question to you. You have Arabs within the boundaries of Israel that have worked there over the years. There are Arabs represented in the Knesset.

You go to find Hamas and Arafat, who just plain lie, and they get this complete misuse of children—and we saw that on the television of the United States when they're all saying, isn't it wonderful that the towers are coming down and thousands of people are going down? And I'm just curious, how are you going to handle that when you've got Arabs, which I'm sure some of them would like to be within Israel and might well have jobs and professions there, and how will you handle that to separate the terrorists and the people that could easily be swayed one way or the other?

Mr. NETANYAHU. Congressman Horn, I think that Israeli democracy, like American democracy, is sufficiently strong to strike a balance between our need for security and our respect for our—all our citizens, Arab and Jews alike. I think the danger is that when terrorism is unchecked and fanaticism is unchecked, it starts affecting other populations.

We had a warning signal the other day when an Israeli Arab, who had been in the Palestinian Arabs—an Israeli Arab citizen had been in the Palestinian area, which as you know is a separate regime, is not—by the way, you understand that Israel no longer occupies, quote, any Palestinians. 100 percent—maybe I'm wrong—maybe it's 99.9 percent of the Palestinians are governed by Arafat. Israel doesn't govern Ramallah or Gaza or any place else. They live, for better or worse—some say for worse, but that is not my point right now—they live under Arafat. We have a dispute about territories that are empty of Palestinians, the disputed territories. That is, Arafat controls all the areas where the Palestinian population lives, 100 percent of it.

The areas that are contested in the normal course of diplomatic negotiations, for example, the ones I had in the Wye River Con-

ference, are the areas which are empty of Palestinians, virtual uninhabited, but they are replete with historical significance for us as part of our homeland historically for thousands of years, and they're replete with security significance in Israel that would otherwise be 10 miles wide, facing the likes of Syria, Iraq and the entire eastern militant front.

I stress that point because that problem, as difficult as it is, would probably have been resolved if it had been a territorial one. I believe it could be solved if it's not an existential problem. But what we've discovered in the past few years, virtually all of the people of Israel, is that the reason the conflict with the Palestinians doesn't get solved is because it is not a territorial problem but an existential problem, that is, basic opposition to Israel's very existence and that is fermented from within the Palestinian areas by this mentality of, among other things, that prepares suicide bombers.

The Israeli Arab community has been immune to this. The Arab citizens of Israel for very long were immune to it, but the other day we had an Israeli Arab who had gone and crossed over to the Palestinian areas, had been inculcated there, came back and became a suicide bomber. By the way, not a young man. I think 55, 56-year-old person. And that's very disturbing. And in fact, it is—I think it tells you something larger and significant for our battle against terrorism.

Terrorism and the terrorist militancy has the unfortunate quality of expanding when it thinks it identifies weakness. And, by the way, it contracts accordingly. So one of the things we have to do, we in Israel, you in the United States, all of us together, along with the rest of the democracies, what we have to do, having now been faced with the awful horrors of today, of the present and those that can confront us in the future, what we have to do is, above all, show strength, show strength.

If we show weakness and vacillation, if we hesitate, if we start—forgive me, if we start pussyfooting, if we're not clear about the complete, absolute rejection of terrorism everywhere and our absolute willingness to take very, very strong action against everyone who practices terrorism, then the terrorists will continue. If we don't take this action, then the terrorists and the Islamic militancy that backs them up will see this as weak, and if it's weak, they can do more and more and more.

The thing that we can do about terrorists is to take action against their bases. The thing that we can do against Islamic militancy is to show them that this madness that America is weak, that western civilization is weak and will collapse the way the Soviet rule in Afghanistan collapsed—that is their model they have in mind. We have to tell them it's not true. America is strong. The democracies are strong. Israel is strong. You will never defeat us, and we will continue to forge a new future for the entire world.

When they understand that, for America, for the other western countries, for Japan, for Israel, then you will see this danger recede from without and indeed from within as well.

Mr. SHAYS. I recognize Mrs. Maloney, actually from the city of New York. Mr. Owens is here, too, from the city of New York.

Mr. NETANYAHU. Congressman Shays, I must thank you for this tremendous hospitality, and I'd love to take these questions, and I will, but I want to say that because of the somewhat tardy arrangement of schedules, I'm going to have to leave shortly. Normally, I say this in a speech. I say, you can ask me all the questions you have, but in 3 minutes I'm leaving. It is not 3 minutes, but——

Mr. SHAYS. Give us your time, sir. Do you have 10 more minutes?

Mr. NETANYAHU. Yes, I do, and I apologize for bringing up the problem of the schedule.

Mr. SHAYS. Well, then we're going to—Mrs. Maloney, you're going to start, and we'll see about—you have the floor. Let's get to it.

Mrs. MALONEY. Thank you so much for coming and sharing your unique experiences. You've certainly been at the forefront of studying international terrorism, and thank you for sharing this story of your brother Yoni who lost his life fighting international terrorism.

I really am concerned about press reports that were in Reuters and in the L.A. Times that stated that Israeli military intelligence may have warned the United States 6 weeks ago of the possibility of a major attack and that Iraq may have provided support and assistance for the September 11th attack. And I'd like to know if you are familiar with the reports that the Mossad, the intelligence agency, allegedly to our FBI and CIA that we were, quote, large-scale targets, that Americans would be vulnerable. And what, in your sense, is—why our intelligence, the American intelligence, did not respond like they have been responding now to this great threat of terrorism in our own country and soil, and your comments and your wisdom?

Mr. NETANYAHU. Congresswoman Maloney, I'm familiar with the press reports, but I couldn't comment on their accuracy.

Mrs. MALONEY. You cannot comment on it?

Mr. NETANYAHU. I'm simply not in a position to know of the transfer of intelligence in the last few weeks. I haven't looked into that.

Mrs. MALONEY. Could you give us some understanding of what is the current threat or capability of terrorist organizations, including Osama bin Laden's group, to use biological and chemical warfare here in the United States, and how are we prepared to counteract this type of terrible attack?

Mr. NETANYAHU. Chemical and biological weapons are by several orders of magnitude easier to produce than nuclear weapons. They're just in a different league altogether. There's no requirement for very complex engineering and physical—knowledge of physics and other things that simply are not—do not stand in the way of producing these weapons, some of which are fairly easy to assemble. So we have to assume that sooner or later, possibly sooner rather than later, the Osama bin Ladens of the world will get their hands on this, either by being volitionally offered such weapons by regimes that have them or by—and having the ingenuity to make them.

If we learn one thing from the experience of this attack, it was meticulously, rigorously planned as a military act of war, a military operation par excellence. It was timed with a ghoulish perfection.

It was done by a mind or minds that are able to overcome the difficulties—eventually are able to overcome, I'm sure, the difficulties of assembling much more potent weapons.

Mr. SHAYS. Prime minister, we have four more members. They're going to try to accommodate you so you get out at 15 after.

Mr. NETANYAHU. I'll try to accommodate, as I said, with shorter answers, yes, sir.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Mica will be recognized, and then we're going to go to Mr. Davis and then Mr. Blagojevich and then Mr. Clay.

Mr. MICA. I just have actually two short questions. One you can answer, if you recall. I was just curious as to how many Israelis have been killed in terrorist attacks over the last, say, decade.

The other question is, you're familiar, of course, with your whole network of dealing with terrorism, and I understand it's pretty much—there's some central control and coordination. You're probably familiar with the United States' efforts, and we have some 30 agencies spread out. What would be your advice to us on organization and how we might improve our approach, based on, again, what you've operated—of course, you have a smaller country, been under great threat. We have a larger country, larger agencies but sort of a disorganized effort.

Mr. NETANYAHU. Well, the number roughly is about 400 since the Oslo process began. This was the process that was supposed to end all terror, and it ended up producing the greatest terror that we've seen. Israel is about 1/60th the population of the United States, so that would be equal to 24,000 Americans dead in a country that is 6 million strong.

It's been a very heavy price indeed, but, as you see, Israel stands strong, and the people are united, just as they're united in the United States, to ward off this evil.

As far as the complexity of counterterrorism or intelligence organizations as a whole, this is an interesting problem. If you have one central repository of intelligence, which you normally should have, then you run into the risk that additional sources of information or the—I would say additional points of view will be lost by one conception.

For example, Israel, after the Yom Kippur War, came to the conclusion that it had one fixed conception by the main agent of our intelligence, and so we actually went around to the other side of diversifying the intelligence and letting the leaders receive a lot of our intelligence. I spent at least an hour and a half each day, each day of the 3 years that I was prime minister, going over raw material of intelligence that came from all the various arms of intelligence just so that they would not be lost.

So I think you have to strike a balance here between the number of gathering agencies that you have and the sifting of information upwards. It is a very delicate balance.

I'm not sure I could give you a better formula than the one we have, but, in any case, I want to tell you that, whatever you do about intelligence, don't pin on it the hopes to deliver what it cannot. You know, if you look for a pin in a haystack, it's gong to be very hard. It's much better to remove the haystack, and there are lots of haystacks of terrorism. Get rid of them as best you can.

Because looking for the pin—you know, if you play their game, it's going to be very hard. It is not quite true that we don't know who does it. We do know. Especially we know—we know this. We know that terrorists can hide, but we know the regimes cannot hide, and once they know that you know and you're willing to take action, you'll see how quickly the equation changes.

Now, they're going to threaten you. The minute you take action, they will threaten you. They will even maybe take action against you and you'll have an inevitable exchange of blows and counterblows. But as they see over time—first of all, your blows are a lot harder, a lot. As they see over time that you're prepared to take out the haystack, they will stop, and if they don't stop, then you have to go from deterrence to something else.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Netanyahu, they're in your hands. You have three final questioners. They will just ask a question or two, and then your answers will be to their questions. We have Mr. Davis, then Mr. Blagojevich and then Mr. Clay, all from Illinois and from Missouri.

Mr. DAVIS OF ILLINOIS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Prime Minister, let me thank you for coming. I know the difficulty that you may have had getting here. I was actually in Tel-Aviv at the time the terrorists struck, and on my way to Dimonia, meeting with members of the Black Hebrew Israelites. I've always been amazed at the ability of people in the Middle East, both Arabs and Israelis, to cope with the level of terrorism, violence, constant threat of violence. We have not experienced that to this level in this country. We've been most fortunate. We've not had an actual war in a long time. None of us have had that experience.

What would you say to the American people, relative to their ability to cope in this stressful period, as we try to find solutions and work our way out?

Mr. NETANYAHU. Mr. Davis, I would be as short as I can. Not for the sake of brevity, but because I think this is the most concise answer I can give you. I would read to them the book of Joshua, which says, be strong and of good courage, and you shall win the day. That is what is required today of America and of all free societies.

Mr. DAVIS OF ILLINOIS. Well, I would certainly agree and thank you very much. And I must confess that Joshua is one of my favorites, too.

Mr. NETANYAHU. Thank you.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Blagojevich.

Mr. BLAGOJEVICH. I'll make this brief, Mr. Prime Minister.

Just as you were finishing with Congressman Mica's question, if you remove the haystack and they still persist—and then you were interrupted. What were you going to say?

Mr. NETANYAHU. I'm saying you have gradations of action. One is to deter by the application of sanctions. The second is to actually go in and take out terrorist bases. The third is to act militarily against an offending regime and act to the point of dismantling the regime. This is more or less the gradations that you have.

You have taken that action, for example, in Yugoslavia. You acted, by the way, without ground force. You induced a change of

the regime and that stopped the aggressive action and you induced the change of the regime.

I'm saying that there are a variety of things that you can do, and whether or not you want to go the whole gamut depends really on what you're facing, what kind of behavior results in the action that you take, and you should monitor that.

And, by the way, you have enough intelligence to monitor that. It's much easier to monitor a regime than to monitor one of the foot soldiers of that regime. It's a totally different issue. So our intelligence is good enough to address the home base always. It's good enough for that.

Mr. BLAGOJEVICH. In your experience, when you address the regime that is harboring the terrorist cell and you're successful, by and large——

Mr. NETANYAHU. By and large, yes, by and large, yes.

Mr. BLAGOJEVICH [continuing]. Then you find that the terrorist activity decreases or——

Mr. NETANYAHU. It stops.

Mr. BLAGOJEVICH. It stops?

Mr. NETANYAHU. Yeah.

Mr. BLAGOJEVICH. Great. Thank you.

Mr. NETANYAHU. There were many instances in which it stopped, but I think what has happened is that over the last decade—well, I'll give you one example of how it stopped, because this is not a one-shot deal, but all of you are familiar with a form of terrorism that was totally based on international support and state support that was eliminated. I had a big argument on this in the 1970's, and I would say happily some of the people in this city did the right policy and eliminated terrorism.

Remember, we used to have airline hijackings as a matter of course, I mean, every day. Not suicide bombings, every day. A plane was hijacked here and there, would fly to Libya. It would fly to Algeria and so on.

The minute you took action against the offending states and they knew that their citizens couldn't take off anywhere or they could suffer much worse actions and did, then it stopped. And until this last bout of suicide bombers, we had close to 20 years of relative quiet, relative tranquility in the skies, simply because the home base of terrorism could not be used to accept the hijackers—or to launch them. See, the cost was too heavy, so it stopped.

Now we're faced with a more strident militancy, again, that seeks to work ostensibly in the shadows. But make no mistake about it, if you go after the home states, if you apply the measures that I discussed, you might see an exchange of blows initially, but you will see a decline, and a rapid one.

Mr. BLAGOJEVICH. Thank you.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Clay is your last questioner.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, very quickly.

Mr. Netanyahu, in Israel it seems like terrorism is a fact of life. Can we expect suicide bombers here in this country, and is there any way to end this for Americans to fight it?

Mr. NETANYAHU. Suicide bombers are only the tip of the iceberg. There is a system that is manned by people, who by the way generally don't want to die. They want to live in order to kill another

day. So there is a whole system that prepares the suicide, that takes care of its family, that arms them, that plots the attack.

We in Israel, for example, see them giving them TNT, taking them to the target, preparing them mentally, psychologically for this, giving all sorts of promises, theological promises to them about the afterlife and so on. So there's a whole network, a whole system behind this, just as there is a whole system behind this. And that system, again, is not—at this point, at least—suicidal. It wants to—at least it wants to dispatch more and more. It wants to live to kill. So I think that—and it is based on the states that give shelter to the system. So you have to go to the base of the pyramid and not only to the top.

Can you expect more suicide bombers? You have to, if you're logical, because it's still out there. It's still out there. It's not finished. Whether or not they will strike, I don't know, but I'm sure—this is just a guess—I'm guessing that whoever planned this anticipated—must have anticipated—must have anticipated today that the United States will respond and probably has in the cartridge, so to speak, more attacks.

That is there. That we have to—you have to realistically assume that. Although I have no information whatsoever about that specifically at this time, but I can say that over time they cannot reload the cartridge without states. They just cannot do that. Now, they can shoot what they have, but they cannot overtime reload the magazine. And that is what really is expected to take away the capacity, to launch terrorists over time, and that can only be done if, in addition to the terrorist organizations, you target the states that support them.

I want to thank you, Mr. Shays, and I want to thank each of you, Congresswomen and Congressmen, for giving me this opportunity to speak to you. It's a great honor, and I appreciate it. Thank you.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Prime Minister, we want you to be safe, and there are many of us—I'm certainly one of them—who considers you, frankly, the Winston Churchill of our times. Thank you for being here.

Mr. NETANYAHU. Thank you very much.

Mr. SHAYS. We'll have, like, 3 or 4 minutes just to enable the Prime Minister to say good-bye to people, and then we will call our next—so we'll have just a slight recess of 3 to 5 minutes.

[Recess.]

Mr. SHAYS. I'd like to call the hearing to order. I'd like to welcome General Anthony Zinni, Dr. Christopher Harmon, Dr. Jessica Stern to our panel. I'm going to ask all three of you to stand. We do—if you're a former Prime Minister of a country, we probably won't swear you in, but why don't you move over, Dr. Stern, and raise your right hands.

[Witnesses sworn.]

Mr. SHAYS. I would note for the record that all of our witnesses have responded in the affirmative. And please be seated.

Let me say to you that you won't have the latitude that the Prime Minister had, but we don't have a lot of members here, so that gives us a little more latitude.

We have a 5-minute clock. We roll it over 5 minutes, but, after 10, we would stop you. The clock is right in front, that little light

that will be green, and it goes to—but, at any rate, you have a total of 10 minutes, but 5 is the first time it goes through.

All right. Welcome. General, we'll start with you.

STATEMENTS OF GENERAL ANTHONY ZINNI, U.S. MARINES, RETIRED; DR. CHRISTOPHER HARMON, PROFESSOR, U.S. MARINE CORPS COMMAND AND STAFF COLLEGE; AND DR. JESSICA STERN, HARVARD UNIVERSITY

General ZINNI. Well, Mr. Chairman, I will dispense with an opening statement. I think the questions will bring out all the points I'd like to bring out. So I'll defer to my colleagues.

Mr. SHAYS. Dr. Harmon, we do want a testimony if you'd like to give it, so don't be reluctant.

Mr. HARMON. Thank you. I'm very honored to be here with you today.

I'm a professor of international relations——

Mr. SHAYS. We're going to have you pull the mic a lot closer. Move that in front.

Mr. HARMON. Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I'm a professor of international relations. I work for the Marines, but I think really I've been asked here, and I'm coming here to speak, as an individual scholar and author of a book on terrorism.

I think that Americans now are very well aware of how varied a phenomenon terrorism is. They understand that some of it's been rooted here in our country. Some of it's born overseas and stays there. Some of it's transnational, and that's the main problem with September 11th.

We do seem to be facing something like a militant Muslim international. It's not precisely like the Bolshevik international of the 1920's or 1930's, because its motivations are different and so is its degree of centralization. But it is akin, I would say, to the less formal coalition of international Communist groups of the 1960's and 1970's and 1980's. That is, a coalition of front groups, terrorists, radical states and some powerful central governments.

This new militant Muslim international is wide in its appeal and global in its operations. It seems feverish in its faith. It is profoundly angry at its enemies and, of course, those begin not with Americans but with moderate Arab regimes and others. And it seems well versed in ideology. It's versed in ideology, not mere momentary heat or inspiration. It's so combative that some within it defy all sense of self-preservation, and it's well-financed, well-educated and so forth.

Let me add a few words about some of those.

Religion should be a source of enlightenment and soothing spirits, but, in some cases, it's been twisted into blood lust. If we think about the 1993 case that precedes the recent tragedy of September, we remember Sheik Abd al-Rahman, who arrived here from Egypt and the Sudan, who put together a multinational coalition of persons and did all the damage they could to the city of New York. Militarized religion was one of the motives there. Ramzi Yousef said himself his group that did that act in 1993 was an "international movement concerned with affairs of the world's Islamic armed movement."

A second major problem is our foreign policy—not for me but for those who perpetrate these acts. We can read the charter of Hamas, which almost no one does. We can look at the new training manual of the bin Laden organization, which is called, Military Studies in the Jihad Against Tyrants, and we can see the way in which our foreign policy is damned by these groups.

One of the 1993 New York City bombers, Nidal Ayyad, sent a letter explaining his motives, "the American people are responsible for the actions of their government . . ." and so, "Americans will be the targets of our operations."

A third major feature is the willingness of these groups to kill a large number of civilians. That's true of the Algerian group, Armed Islamic Group, it's true of Hamas, which means Islamic Resistance Movement. It's true of Osama bin Laden, who tells us as much in his 1998 fatwa, which explicitly threatens all Americans, both military and civilian. And to go back to the 1993 case in New York, one of the plotters there said his purpose was, to, "demoralize the enemies of Allah by destroying and blowing up the pillars of their civilization."

On the operational level, these groups are remarkably mobile. They have very fine communications sometimes. They use everything from couriers with computer disks, to cell phones, to encrypted data on the Internet, to flight on airplanes and transit. Many men have been available to do bin Laden's work in many different places. They operate well in Europe, which is rich, which has many media outlets, which is generous to them and gentle in most of its immigration laws.

Now, they use a cell structure which has never been better explained publicly than in the famous film, "The Battle of Algiers," in which is shown the way in which a clandestine organization can form and operate and, while never impenetrable, reduce some of its counterintelligence problems.

This front has been well funded. I admire Judith Miller's work in the New York Times and some of the others who have looked into the financing of the Muslim militant movement.

And the last point I want to make is of sovereign states, so much dwelled upon by the Prime Minister. This movement is extremely diverse, and it does have state backers. They include Afghanistan and Pakistan, but they also have included Iran and the Sudan. Iran doesn't really like the Taliban. There may be some inclusion by of Iraq. Certainly there are some independent operators, like those who showed up in Bosnia quite unrequested.

There are differences within this movement. It encompasses Sunni versus Shia, or Sunni and Shia. It encompasses Iran and Libya. It includes the Palestinians of Hamas, but also the Lebanese of Hezbollah. I think there is, therefore, an evident movement which requires our attention; and I would agree with what Representative Lantos said this morning, which is that if bin Laden goes away or is done away with, that will only be the beginning of the effort that's required.

Thank you, sir.

Mr. SHAYS. Thank you, Dr. Harmon.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Harmon follows:]

Oral Testimony of 9/20/01 House Committee on Govt. Reform

Characteristics of the Militant International

Christopher C. Harmon

Mr. Chairman, I am honored to be with you and the committee today. My name is Dr. Christopher C. Harmon, professor of international relations; I was asked to join the panel as the author of a new book, *Terrorism Today* (London: Frank Cass Publishers, 2000). With your permission, and to honor timelines set by staff, I'll keep my testimony brief and attach to the printed record one very short excerpt from that book.

Americans are well aware that terrorism is a varied phenomenon. We've been embarrassed to see some of it rooted in our country. Some of it is born and raised overseas, and stays there. Some terrorism is transnational. The latter is our special problem just now; we are facing up to the damage inflicted on Sept. 11, while still analyzing the many other transnational terrorist threats.

We seem to be facing, among other forms of terrorism, a militant Moslem international. It is not precisely like the Bolshevik international of the 1920s and 1930s, because its motivations differ and because it is less centralized. But it may be akin to the less formal Communist international of the 1960s or the 1970s or the 1980s, a coalition of front groups, terrorists, radical states, and powerful central governments in the Soviet Union and China. The new militant Moslem international may be similar to that. It is wide in its appeal and global in its operations and aspirations. It seems feverish in its faith. It is profoundly angry at its enemies—whose numbers are long; the enemies list may *not* begin with Americans, and it certainly includes many moderate Arab regimes. The international seems versed in ideology--not mere momentary heat or inspiration. It is so combative that some within it defy all sense of self-preservation. It is often well-educated, well-trained, well-financed, and well-armed. Most disturbingly, it is on the move. It appears to have very high morale, if very twisted morals. It seems to sense that its time has come, that its opportunities have never been better.

I should say a word or two more about several of these main characteristics.

Religion, which should be a source of enlightenment, and soothing spirits, can also be made the source of blood lust. Federal prison now holds the spark who detonated the first bomb at the World Trade Center towers, in February 1993. Sheik Abd al-Rahman, arrived here via Egypt and the Sudan, and put together a multinational coalition of persons of adherence to him and the faith he says he speaks for. They then did all they possibly could to take down the buildings. Militarized religion was a moving force in that attack: Ramzi Yousef declared his group to be "an international movement concerned with affairs of the world's Islamic armed movement."

Equally evident in that 1993 attack was hatred of U.S. foreign policy for the Middle East. Here is a second constant of the new militant international, equally visible in the Charter of Hamas, or the training manual of the Bin Laden organization, "Military Studies in the Jihad Against the Tyrants." The movement damns Americans for supporting the Israelis. Yousef said that his group aimed to make the U.S. administration "stop its aid for Israel." Another of the 1993 New York City bombers, Nidal Ayyad, sent a letter to the press explaining the attack: "The American people are responsible for the actions of their government..." and so they "will be the targets of our operations...."

The ruthless willingness to kill large numbers of civilians is another characteristic. The 1993 bomb plot in New York was the kin, in this way, with operations of the Algerian GIA (Armed Islamic Group), or Hamas (Islamic Resistance Movement), or others. The Osama Bin Laden group's Feb. 1998 fatwa specifically threatened all Americans, civilian or military. The 1993 bombers did not even bother to pretend there was military utility to their target. The papers of ~~plotter~~ associate El-Sayid Nosair, found after that New York attack, state coldly that they wished "to demoralize the enemies of Allah...by destroying and blowing up the pillars of their civilization and blowing up the tourist attractions they are so proud of and the high buildings they are so proud of."

cuts

"associate" replaces "plotter"

shd read "state coldly the wish "to

In the microcosm of the initial New York attack we thus see religious motive; a sharp political determination; and decisions about targeting that disregard all decency and any deference to nonbelligerents.

On the operational level, appearances suggest that the new international uses mobility, varied communications, and safe-havens to direct terror attacks. We have no

evidence that Bin Laden set foot in East Africa before his teams blew up two embassies, murdering many Africans and some Americans too. He probably did not return to Yemen, the homeland of his father, when he was directing the attack on the sailors of the *USS Cole*. He need not come to America to see the murder of thousands in the Trade Towers. He used cell phones, or couriers with computer diskettes, or airplanes, or encrypted data on the Internet, and perhaps other means. Men from dozens of different countries have been doing Bin Laden's work.

Operations in Europe, especially our NATO ally Germany, seem to be particularly important. North western Europe is wealthy, indulgent of foreign cultures, and rife with trade schools, institutes and good universities. There are media outlets to appeal to, and cultural societies and academic circles of similar potential. Support groups are easily formed in these free societies. Many in Europe are foreigners: guest workers, or new residents, or students, and they may wish to help, or can be pressed to do so. Europe's immigration laws never please all critics, but they are far more liberal than those of many other countries in the world. The region also offers excellent varieties of communications. A well-chosen base in western Germany, for example, is a geographical bridge reaching into four other countries, all with airports, good highways, rental cars, etc.

For tactical actions, covert cells have sufficed well. This cell structure was precisely and publicly explained to the world by the actor/paratroop commander in the classic film—quite an accurate film-- "The Battle of Algiers." Individuals know only a very few compatriots, and only one boss. Section bosses know only some of those in the lower ranks—their own subordinates; section bosses also know relatively few persons in the structure above them—even as few as one. Thus when a blunder is made, or a whole cell is arrested, the damage is easily contained. Even if one chooses to defect, or breaks under torture, the member may have little to disclose about others in the organization.

The organizations are diversely funded. *New York Times* journalist Judith Miller has done a book on this movement but also many superb investigative articles on how it funds itself. U.S. court proceedings show that radical Moslems with international connections have supported themselves here, or earned funds for the movement, by selling cars, or smuggling cigarettes between states to take advantage of tax laws, or even

setting up think tanks or institutes which cover for the garnering and export of funds. Hundreds of thousands—if not millions--of dollars have been gathered here and sent to the Middle East. Other individual patrons live abroad, contributing from personal fortunes. Bin Laden's money was inherited from his Saudi father's construction business, but the son has not only spent; during his years in the Sudan, for example, he was directing construction projects and engaging in agricultural business.

All the above has occurred, or still goes on. This movement certainly is far wider than the Bin Laden organization and certainly was not created by the Bin Laden organization. Indeed, the wider movement of which we see glimmers includes established governments, probably including Afghanistan and Pakistan. Iran has run its own teams, supported in the past by Sudan. Secular Iraq may be involved. The movement appears to include rather independent operators, like the self-declared Mujahideen who traveled to Bosnia to join the fight. The movement involves people who strongly disagree about some things, and may even dislike or hate Bin Laden. The movement has apparently been able to include Sunni as well as Shia, Iran as well as Libya, and the Palestinians of Hamas as well as the Lebanese of Hizbollah .

It thus apparent that we must act against the Bin Laden network without expecting that success there will end the broader international militant Moslem movement. The movement existed before him and will outlive him and will for some time be a challenge to all nations which decline to submit to it.

For the Printed Record of 9/20/01

Two Misconceptions about Terrorism

Excerpts from *Terrorism Today* by Christopher C. Harmon
(London: Frank Cass Publishers, 2000, pages 201-212.

Terrorism is Not Mindless, but Calculated. It is mostly on the surface that terrorism appears to be madness, or mindless. Immediately below the level of screaming and the color of blood there ordinarily lies a controlling purpose, a motive, usually based in politics or something close to it, such as a drive for political and social change inspired by religion. However complex is human psychology, most terrorist crimes are comprehensible. The perpetrator is part of an organization, a political unit with publicly-declared purposes; actions taken and bodies counted are intended to advance those purposes. The terrorist is not usually insane; he or she is more usually 'crazy like the fox'.

In June 1985, during the infamous hijacking of TWA flight 847, nothing must have seemed more completely irrational to the terrified passengers than the fact that one of the hijackers ranged up and down the aisle striking and abusing passengers, while another was later described by witnesses as soft-spoken. Nine years earlier there had been two other cases of exactly this sort. At Entebbe, Uganda, where international terrorists opposed to Israel had taken an Air France flight from Tel Aviv, a German female hijacker came across as a wild animal, the open enemy. When one passenger was beaten, it was she who threw the most blows. In contrast, one of her male German counterparts struck people only by his pleasantness and reasonability. He told jokes, and made promises that there was nothing to worry about. A few months later, in a TWA flight originating in Chicago, early advocates of a free Croatia seized the aircraft. While one man apparently wired himself up as a suicide bomber and stalked the aisles acting insane, a pretty young woman on his Croatian team was equally active--assuring passengers in a warm tone that all would be right. The explanation for such a mix of dangerous and reassuring behavior is the aim of producing disorientation and despair in terror victims. Those debilitating psychological conditions lead rapidly to submission, and submissive passengers are the only safe kind, from the hijackers' point of view.

There are other cruel techniques. Passengers or hostages are separated by state of origin, as they were in three different actions over two decades: Entebbe in 1976, Beirut in 1985, and Lima in 1996. In all cases, the terrorists calculated that they would enhance the sense of isolation of a particular group--Jews at Entebbe and Beirut, Japanese in Lima. At Entebbe, all persons with Israeli passports or dual nationalities were held in a separate area of the airplane hanger the German-Palestinian team chose for staging the last act of its drama. But Israeli commandos arrived to prevent it from happening. In Lima in 1996-97, the Japanese hostages were confined on the second floor of the embassy, instead of the lower floor from which groups of hostages were periodically

released unharmed. Even the 'safer' group in such separations is the toy of the terrorists; they feel profound guilt at being vulnerable yet spared, while others on the same plane or at the same embassy party are singled out for murder. Psychologists are familiar with such guilt among survivors of natural disasters or lethal street crimes. Yet it is outside the scene of the crime--in the wider audience of public opinion and government circles--that the terrorists intend that the more important crisis will occur. Terrorism has rightly been called 'theater', and the public and government are the main audience, not the actual victims. When news of racial or religious separation is broadcast during the hostage situation, the fears, divisions, and hatreds engendered inside the barricades spread outward. The psychological divisions in the microcosm behind the barricades are intended to create parallel fracture lines in the macrocosm of the public and the government responsible for ending the disaster.

Consider the burdens placed on America and Israel by the TWA 847 hijacking of 1985. When seizing their prey--153 innocent international travelers--the Shiite hijackers made a broadcast blaming their actions on American aid to Israel and US approval of the 1982 Israeli incursion into southern Lebanon. Their demands were closely related: they wanted freedom for hundreds of Shiite prisoners imprisoned for terrorism in Israeli jails. Their tactics in turn mirrored these policy claims and demands: they separated out all passengers with Israeli passports or Jewish-sounding names. They also drove home their willingness to kill by murdering an American aboard the plane. The net effect was exactly as calculated: prisoners were eventually released in Israel, in part because of tremendous pressures generated against the Washington-Tel Aviv relationship. News reports on the protracted crisis carried stories of the rise in those pressures. The number of American citizens favoring distancing US policies from Israel's rose to nearly half; poll results also showed that those who felt Israel had not done enough to resolve the crisis leapt to nearly two-thirds. Media referred to the 'clouds' and 'strains' appearing in American-Israeli relations. Ultimately, a small gang proved that, with proper calculations, it could publicly murder a US citizen, terrorize a plane full of hostages, cause a mild rift in the relations of two sovereign democratic peoples, and force release of hundreds of Shiites from Israeli jails--all before escaping totally unharmed beneath the noses of the most anti-terrorist minded administration in US post-World War Two history.

The December 1996 Lima case ended better, but not before opening similar rifts, some within Peru, and some between Peru and foreign allies. MRTA used an embassy party guest list to separate the hostages. Then they confined most Peruvian civilians on the first floor of the embassy, and sent government officials, counterterrorism experts, and Japanese up to the second floor. Having already fired its weapons in the seizure, MRTA now could play the other side of the psychological game: now they were warm, gentle partisans of the people. There was almost no shouting, or waving of guns. The terrorists chatted, joked, and permitted hostages such remarkable freedoms as use of cellular phones. In extended political discussions and speeches, they repeatedly underscored supposed differences between themselves--as 'politicians'--and the more violent, apocalyptic Shining Path, famed for its mass-murders of villagers and its use of dynamite. By such words and actions, and by frequent releases of some of the hundreds

of hostages, the group conveyed 'reasonability' and established an air in which negotiations might succeed, making MRTA the diplomatic equal of the elected government of millions of Peruvians. This solicited some embarrassingly generous remarks from hostages grateful to MRTA for being freed early.

By singling out the Japanese Embassy, the terrorists also sought to drive a wedge between Peruvians and their tiny Japanese minority of 80,000 of which President Fujimori is the symbol. It was as in 1985: two democracies were the targets; both Japan and Peru found themselves in a crisis. Once again, playing the race card was the key to both the tactic of hostage separation and the larger strategy that aimed at terminating a wealthy country's aid to a poorer one. Japanese aid to Peru has been generous, despite its denunciation by an MRTA spokesman to Japanese television as 'ignoring the plight of thirty million hungry Peruvians'. Japan, dogged by a deserved reputation for giving in to terrorists, worked hard not to criticize Fujimori's hard line on the embassy seizure. Only twice in the entire first month did Tokyo put distance between its views and those of Lima; otherwise Japan forestalled trouble with its Latin ally and waited. Peruvian voters were similarly stalwart. Polls repeatedly showed support for their president and the shallowness of approval levels for Tupac Amaru. This rendered empty many of the terrorists' arguments about being a meaningful political force.

Ironically, it was in American newspapers that MRTA saw the most progress in its declared desire to improve conditions for its comrades in Peruvian jails--where some 400 members are confined as compared to less than a hundred still active in Peru. Stories by American columnists blossomed, especially in January 1997 in the third week of the siege, describing dungeon-like conditions and freezing cold in which several thousand MRTA and Sendero convicts are held. Readers' letters printed by a major US paper said that Peru's prison conditions were evidence of 'state-sponsored terrorism'. Renewed media attention was also devoted to imprisoned MRTA member Lori Berenson of New York; an effort to get her a new trial drew many scores of supporters in the US Congress. Apparently displeased by the effect of such sympathetic coverage on public opinion, a Lima weekly magazine entered the debate. It published photographs of an underground brick cell in which Tupac Amaru had held kidnap victims, and wrote that since MRTA rebels ordered and carried out such illegal kidnappings, they have little to say now about the 'harshness' of lawful imprisonment.

The selective holding (or murder) of a few, paired with the sparing or release of others, is a quintessential terrorist method of spreading disorientation and influence. It recurs repeatedly among villagers facing the members of a rural insurgency of the kind well-known since World War Two. A small team--sometimes called an 'armed propaganda squad'--singles out victims. The death of the immediate victim, and the terrorization of the village audience, serve the same purpose. Victim and audience are both expected to recognize the purpose of the drama, a demonstration of the guerrillas' organizational and lethal power, enhancing the submissiveness of the audience in the quaking aftermath and darkness. The same logic guides practice among insurgent groups world-wide. As with the more confined tactical situation of the hijacker, there is always

more than the obvious ability to kill; there is an implied reasonability--a willingness to negotiate something, or refrain from killing if behavior changes. A moral burden for righting a wrong situation is somehow transferred to the passengers, the villagers, or their government. There is a kind of choice, closely controlled. Choosing to resist the wrong of the situation will probably lead to death; yet choosing to submit and 'go along' leads to a kind of moral death, a death of spirit.

For all the differences in their political objectives, pro-state terrorists rely upon much of the same psychology. Death squads, such as those which ravaged Argentina from 1976 to 1983, may strike after warnings, or only with surprise. They may act at night to accentuate their fearfulness. They select their victim for his or her status as 'enemy of the state', but the political purpose goes well beyond that murder on that night. It is usually aimed at, and touches, a wider circle of related groups, be they labor unions, political parties, newspaper staffs, or violent revolutionary organizations. The single murderous act by pro-state terrorists thus 'terminates one problem' while sending a menacing message to the larger enemy groups. In realization of the old aphorism, with such a murder you 'kill one, frighten ten thousand'.

In India today, when there are occasional multiple murders of Sikh civilians, the killers are sometimes Hindu nationalists, perhaps in the extremes of the BJP (Bharatiya Janata Party) or sometimes zealous government security forces. Either way, the illegal killings drive more wedges between the Sikhs and Hindus, already religiously and ethnically divided. The political center is deeply harmed; the main beneficiaries are the advocates of Hindi power, on the one hand, and the advocates of Sikh independence on the other, no matter which did the murder. Extremists of both sides are satisfied by the fight and the socio-political polarization it yields.

In Sri Lanka, where terrorism burned all through the 1980s, an elected government was pitted against insurgents of the same majority ethnic-religious group: the democratic authorities and the revolutionaries were both Sinhalese (Sri Lankan Buddhists). The JVP, or People's Liberation Front, revolutionaries faced the somewhat ineffectual government and its all too effective death squads. The latter were largely from the army and police, serving at night in civilian clothes. By one account, these death squads killed at least 20,000 suspected militants, mostly between 1988 and 1990. They did so most often by execution-style shooting, burning the bodies with kerosene, decapitating them, or throwing them into the river so that the next day they would float slowly through the capital of Colombo.

Terrorists are More Educated Than We Think. The foregoing illustrate not mere fanaticism but the calibrated use of fanaticism for political ends. Another proposition is now added: terrorists' formal and informal educations belie the popular impression, fostered by politicians and journalists and academics alike, that they do not know what they are doing. To take the Sri Lankan JVP example, many following Rohan Wijeweera were unemployed, but they were educated well--in a system befitting a nation tutored by

Britain. The JVP leader had made further studies--of history and Marxism, during years in the USSR. He read the works of Third World revolutionaries, and took a role in the inter-communist debate between Moscow and Beijing, ultimately declaring himself a Maoist. He declared himself an enemy of capitalism and a violent proponent of socialism. He justified his mass murders--which were to incite the Sri Lankan state death squads into lethal campaigns of their own--by declaring that 'Counterrevolutionaries resort to violence. Therefore to ensure the safe delivery of the new social system it becomes necessary to resort to revolutionary violence against the violence employed by the capitalist class.'

Modern American terrorists of the left wing illustrate this. Unlike their skinhead or neoNazi counterparts in extremism, the left has consistently been led by adults with college education and often even graduate schooling, law degrees, and professorships. This has made their political arguments rational and often well-delivered, if not always successful, or truthful. It has assured them ready access to the media. And, in some cases, it has placed the would-be terrorist, former terrorist, outspoken ally of terrorism, or apologist for terrorism in the university classroom, where he or she can influence students.

It is well enough known that in the Vietnam War era it was the universities which were the main source for not only peaceable opposition to the war but leftist militancy. The Students for a Democratic Society, and their terrorist offspring The Weathermen, were highly educated, including Chicago School of Law's Bernadine Dohrn, and Colombia University's Katherine Boudin and Mark Rudd. What has gone less noticed is that *most* of the leftist terrorist groups of that day and of successive decades have also been led by highly educated and professional people whose ideas can not be casually dismissed. Exemplars of this pattern include the Palestinians, the Basque ETA, and a dozen other groups of then and now.

Some Puerto Rican independence militants of the time, especially FALN, operated from Puerto Rican communities in Chicago and east coast cities where many had been full or part-time students in reputable schools. In the 1980s, with the FALN members jailed or dispersed, the movement passed to Los Macheteros, or 'Machete Wielders'. They were dominated by a strong Cuban connection (fugitive Filiberto Ojeda Rios) and also by Juan Segarra Palmer, some of whose illegal activities were ongoing as he dropped out of Harvard, where he had held a scholarship. Segarra Palmer masterminded the $7.2 million robbery of Wells Fargo that landed many Macheteros in federal court in Hartford Connecticut in the late 1980s. The second tier of the Macheteros also had notable educational backgrounds; they were political activists, social workers, graduate students, etc., a pattern which was played up in oral arguments and formal submissions by defendants and their witnesses and defense attorneys. The explicit argument--easy to make--was that the defendants were political activists for Puerto Rican independence from the US. The implicit argument--utterly without basis--was that one could not be so well educated and active in the community and also be a terrorist.

In fact, Ivonne H. Melendez Carrion, though president of a local parent-teacher association, was charged with possession of pistols and machine guns. Elias Castro-Ramos, alleged to a member of the Macheteros' Central Committee, is a former biology teacher whose wife holds an MA in counseling. Another Central Committee member, according to authorities, is Hilton Eduardo Fernandez Diamante, a writer for a leftist political magazine. Segarra Palmer's girlfriend, who laundered part of the stolen money, was Anne Gassin, a Harvard graduate, a teacher, and a performance artist. And Segarra Palmer's common-law wife, who also handled stolen cash, is a college graduate in occupational therapy who had devoted ten years of work to that admirable profession.

Court proceedings of the last three decades indicates how well schooled have been many terrorists in such social sciences and professional fields as psychology, sociology, history, law, and journalism. The roster of Baader-Meinhof activists and supporters was full of lawyers, graduate students, and others of considerable learning, and so have been the ranks of subsequent leftist German terrorist groups. The pattern in America has been so similar that there is little peculiar about the education level of 'Unabomber' Theodore Kaczynski, who held a doctorate and a prestigious teaching post. He read widely, twice completing all the novels of Joseph Conrad (whose true name was Josef Teodor Konrad Korzeniowski, strikingly alike to that of the Unabomber). In the Conrad novel The Secret Agent, a professor turns terrorist out of hatred for modern science. Both the novel and its modern reenactor are indicators that liberal education is no guarantor of a gentle spirit. Instead it may be twisted into better arguments for violence.

Even religious education may be twisted towards terrorists' purposes, on occasion. Many of the recent international terrorist strikes by calculating individuals of *compos mentis* have been perpetrated by students or graduates of religious institutions which aim to blend the political with the more holy. A list of the well-educated Jewish militants with a record of terrorist attacks must include the Jewish rabbi Meir Kahane, who founded the Jewish Defense League and Kach, banned as a terrorist organization by Israel; Kahane's son Benjamin, founder of 'Kahane Lives', also banned; practicing physician Baruch Goldstein, who managed to kill 30 Palestinian Moslems in a Hebron mosque before being bludgeoned with a pipe; and student Yigal Amir who assassinated Israel's Prime Minster Yitzhak Rabin. There are many more examples on the Moslem side. And security analysts and journalists in the region can readily point to the schools which often 'graduate' new militants. For example, Gaza City's Islamic University has been called a breeding ground for Hamas, one of the two most violent anti-Israeli groups in the region.

Religious institutions are very powerful in the countries of Southwest Asia as well. A range of schools and school systems combine study of the Koran with the strongest forms of political mobilization and propaganda. Afghanistan, embroiled in clan warfare since the expulsion of the Soviet Red Army, has suddenly been swept by men for whom clans are tertiary concerns, well behind adherence to the Koran and political unification of the Moslem world. 'Taliban' is a militia named from the Pushtun word for 'student'. From its base in Sunni religious schools educating Afghan refugees in Pakistan,

Taliban emerged in 1994 and took Kandahar, and then stretched its rule outward until holding nearly all of Afghanistan by the end of 1998. There is evidence the insurgents have inherited, rather than stopped, Afghanistan's thriving drug trade. Taliban is also doing nothing about the Afghans' training of international Islamic terrorists.

Iran offers a similarly hot mix of religion, politics, education, and violence. This sovereign state of Shiite faith is also the world's leading supporter of international terrorists. Despite hopes that President Ali Hkbar Hashemi Rafsanjani might permit pragmatism a place within the mullah-dominated regime, trends in Iran ran along normal channels through the end of his term. June 1997 elections yielded new speculation and homes for successor Mohammed Khatemi, hopes rewarmed in June 1998 when the US Secretary of State proffered a hand to Tehran. But an early cabinet appointment by the new president was Ms. Massoumeh Ebtekar, two decades before the spokeswoman for militants holding hostages at the American Embassy. The religious schools remain central to the continuing cultural revolution, whether from their own inclination or pressures from above; they are fostering the harder ideological lines. Campus publications have closed and publishers are fearful of releasing books--other than the safest of religious texts. There are ideological tests for graduate students, segregation of classes according to sex, and new examples of persecution of non religious or liberal professors by such radical organizations as Ansar Hezbollah, linked to the infamous Pasdaran Revolutionary Guards. Such schools will invariably alienate some; just as inevitably they will produce students amenable to internationalist political organizing and possibly terrorist *jihad.*

Another, wholly different sort of education helps terrorists. The hard sciences have useful, direct application to explosives, communications, and other logistics required for making a clandestine movement a practical success. The backgrounds of Middle Eastern and South West Asian terrorists, for example, often include specialized technical training or advanced scientific schooling. Metallurgical engineer Marvam Rajavi of the People's Mujahideen is a good example. So are those responsible for the Luxor Egypt November 1997 attack. All six were students: several studied agricultural science at the university, while two others pursued medical and veterinary sciences. Terrorists know that engineering, chemistry, and computer science are all of use, and such schooling has been a common characteristics of captives interrogated by authorities in recent years for terrorism.

In 1994 and 1995 Israel was rent by the bomb blasts of a Palestinian Hamas agent, Yahya Ayyash, head of the military wing and chief bomb maker. Dubbed 'The Engineer' for his skills, he ran a shop that inflicted scores of casualties in Israeli public places until his death in early January 1996 in Gaza. The education of another such engineer is known precisely: international Moslem and terrorist Ramzi Youssef of Pakistan, now jailed in New York, graduated in electrical engineering from Swansea University in Wales. This skilled technician was at the center of the band that carried out the New York Trade Towers bombing, plotted similar attacks in that city, and had other enterprises in the Philippines, including sophisticated airline bombings. Youssef could build a variety of

explosive devices, some of which he disguised to pass through inspection points; he also build nitroglycerine bombs like the one that blew up inside a Philippines Airlines flight headed for Japan in 1994. He kept notebooks of chemical formulas and diagrams and directions to aid in his work. Capable in three languages, Ramzi Youssef defended himself in federal court in New York, even demonstrating knowledge of legal jargon.

Finally, there are terrorist movements or insurgencies using terrorism which have risen wholly from university grounds. This occurred in the early 1970s and did not die with Ulrike Meinhof, who committed suicide in German jail. Before Abimael Guzman became Peru's most famous captive, he built Sendero Luminoso from the ground up by organizational work in Peruvian universities. His first base was at Ayacucho where he was director of personnel, and thus able to influence hiring and ensure that his professorial colleagues were recruiting as enthusiastically as was he. When there were Shining Path organizations in many major upper schools, Guzman began organizing secondary schools. Sendero at its height was some 20,000 strong. It was led almost exclusively by educated adults, though its membership ranks included many workers and peasants. Peru's second terror group, Tupac Amaru, follows a different brand of communism but is also dominated by well-educated cadres.

The most celebrated contemporary movement in Mexico is the Zapatistas, whose 'Commandante Marcos' is thought to be a former university professor. After an introductory use of violence, which the Zapatista web site vehemently denies constituted 'terrorism', the group has spent its next years using skills that require education much more than arms. They committed no terrorist attacks in 1996, for example, but they were negotiating, publishing communiqués, and posting verbose documents on the Internet. Another Mexican violent group is organized along nearly opposite lines: it is small and clandestine, as against the press-hungry Zapatistas. It is deeply enmeshed in violent ways of attracting attention, such as assassinations and hostage-taking. But there is one similarity, beyond its leftist ideology: it was founded by radical students led by a senior university administrator. Felipe Martinez Soriano was rector at the university in Oaxaca, on the Pacific Ocean side of southernmost Mexico. He was among the founders of the Clandestine Revolutionary Workers Party-People's Union (Procup), which now two decades later is become the Popular Revolutionary Army, EPR. Felipe Martinez Soriano had to be moved to a higher security jail in the Fall of 1996 as his gunmen carried out attacks against power stations, public buildings, and security forces across Mexico.

Clearly, terrorism is not mindless. Two striking patterns displayed above support this conclusion. First, a consideration of the psychology of hostage-taking shows how apparent disorder and insanity may be calibrated to produce certain psychological and political effects. Second, the high education level of leading terrorists indicates that the violence against the innocent on which terrorism relies is well-considered violence, deployed in the service of a political purpose.

Mr. SHAYS. Dr. Stern. Put it nice and close to you.

You'll have to bring it closer than that. Thank you.

Ms. STERN. Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of the committee, it is a great honor to be able to appear before you today to discuss this important subject. Let me begin by expressing my deep sorrow to the victims and families impacted by the tragic events of September 11th. My thoughts are with them.

Mr. Chairman, a war on terrorism must be fought on many fronts, using every tool at government's disposal—diplomacy, intelligence, and when we identify the perpetrators, military strikes. But force is not nearly enough. Our goal should be to drain the swamps where extremists thrive, and that implies a combination of measures: stopping the flow of money to these groups, intelligence cooperation and military force. But most importantly, it implies understanding that failed and failing states are important sanctuaries, as well as sources of recruits for extremist movements. When we talk about Pearl Harbor, we should also be thinking of the Marshall Plan.

Several surprising facts about bin Laden's group came to light during the trials of the men informed in the 1998 attack against U.S. Embassies in Africa, and those facts reveal how well-organized, sophisticated and elusive a network we're up against. Government officials estimate that bin Laden's organization has thousands of operatives who are active or suspected to be active in 34 countries, including in the United States.

But the threat doesn't come from bin Laden's group alone. Many groups, such as the Egyptian Islamic Jihad, Algerian Islamic Group, are closely affiliated with al Qaeda. They train at his camps and carry out bin Laden's objectives. Bin Laden is probably correct that if the U.S. Government kills him, hundreds of Osamas are prepared to take his place. The al Qaeda and others like it that I've studied have wings that handle finance, documents, public relations and intelligence. They run businesses. They conduct surveillance of enemy targets. They cultivate journalists to ensure favorable coverage in the press.

And by the way, they also cultivate me. They have sophisticated Web sites for both fundraising and recruiting. Clerics teach operatives that killing civilians is allowed.

Like any conventional business, the group includes both skilled and unskilled labor and money can be an important component. A former Sudanese member of al Qaeda, Jamal Ahmed Al-Fadl, said that he was paid a monthly salary of $500, while Egypt's members made up to three times as much. When he asked bin Laden, why are the Egyptian members making so much more money, bin Laden responded, well, they have passports and other job opportunities. In other words, bin Laden is paying these guys the opportunity costs for their time, like a CEO.

Like other business managers, bin Laden also needed to recruit unskilled labor. K.K. Mohamed, for example, received no monetary compensation for his efforts, which involved acquiring a truck and acquiring explosives; and given his role in the Embassy bombing in Tanzania, he'll spend the rest of his life in jail.

But the group also reported undergoing training in engineering and to pilot planes. One talked about purchasing the plane with a

goal of transporting equipment, including Stinger missiles from Peshawar to Khartoum.

This group, and others like it that I have studied, has thought carefully about evading law enforcement detection. And if you're interested in that, I urge you to take a look at that manual—I won't go into details—the manual that Dr. Harmon just mentioned.

The most important aspect of training militants is, actually, mental training. It takes relatively little time and effort to learn to fly a plane; many people can do that. But training someone mentally to carry out suicide mass casualty attacks is more difficult.

The Taliban were actually born out of extremist madrassahs in Pakistan. These schools function as orphanages. Families that cannot afford to feed their children send them to these schools where—send them to these schools where they are educated, but also fed and housed. Madrassahs I have visited have children from Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Burma, Chechnya, Kuwait, Mongolia, Nepal, Russia, Tajikistan, Turkey, Uzbekistan, and Yemen. This helps to give us a sense of what we're talking about here. In a school that purportedly offered a broad curriculum, a teacher I questioned could not multiply 7 times 8.

Pakistan is prepared to assist the international coalition on the basis of principle. It does not expect a quid pro quo according to its officials. But, still, now would be a good time to offer assistance because it is in U.S. national security interests to do so. If we inadvertently turn Pakistan into a second Afghanistan, the results would be disastrous not only for India, but for the entire world.

How can we help Pakistan? Pakistan has long been seeking market access for its textiles. Opening our markets would translate into $300 to $400 million according to the Pakistani Embassy, which could make a crucial difference to Pakistan's economy. We should also be considering debt relief.

We need to help Pakistan especially in the areas of health care and education. It may even make sense to make some of these efforts visible. The extremists groups that I interview are unlikely to change their minds, but we can reduce their ability to mobilize others, and that is really critical.

We need to think about how to undermine these groups' appeal. Islam strictly prohibits targeting innocent civilians. Religious scholars need to get out the message, loud and clear, that bin Laden's version of Islam is a grotesque distortion of their faith. Those scholars should be speaking out, not just in America, but all over the world.

Finally, we have to learn to dictate less and listen more, as Joseph Nye argues in a forthcoming book on America's soft power. We have a stake in the welfare of other peoples and need to devote a much higher priority to health, education and economic development, or new Osamas will continue to arise.

I have some additional material that I would like to give you for the record.

Mr. SHAYS. Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Stern follows:]

Preparing for a War on Terrorism

Testimony before the Committee on Government Reform
U.S. House of Representatives
September 20, 2001

Jessica Stern
Kennedy School of Government
Harvard University
617 496 3623

A war on terrorism must be fought on many fronts, using every tool at governments' disposal: diplomacy, intelligence and, when we identify the perpetrator, military strikes. But force is not nearly enough. Our goal should be to drain the swamps where extremists thrive, and that implies a combination of measures: stopping the flow of money to these groups, intelligence cooperation, and military force. But most importantly, it implies understanding that failed and failing states are important sanctuaries as well as sources of recruits for extremist movements. When we talk about Pearl Harbor, we should also be thinking of a Marshall Plan.

The desire for revenge at a moment like this is perfectly understandable: We are traumatized as a nation. But our goal must be to prevent future strikes by our enemies. We cannot afford to allow an emotional desire for quick retribution to override our long-term national security interests. It would not be difficult to make things worse rather than better -- through hasty, emotional or ill-planned military reaction or even through bellicose rhetoric.

We should be careful about rhetoric. We should avoid calling this battle against terrorism a crusade. The word crusade implies a war against Islam. Other than those who were killed in the strikes and their loved ones, the victims hit hardest in last week's attacks are peace-loving Muslims around the world. Through rhetoric of this kind, we could turn ordinary Afghans into Taliban fighters; and heretofore peaceful Islamists into terrorists. Already the religious parties in Pakistan are calling for a jihad against both Pakistan and the United States.

Several surprising facts about bin Laden's group came to light during the trials of the men involved in the 1998 attack against U.S. embassies in Africa. And those facts reveal how well organized, sophisticated and elusive a network we're up against. U.S. government officials estimate that bin Laden's organization, al Qaeda, has thousands of operatives who are active, or suspected to be active, in 34 countries, including in the United States. But the threat doesn't come from bin Laden's group alone. Many groups, such as the Egyptian Islamic Jihad and the Algerian Islamic Group, are closely affiliated with al Qaeda. They train at his camps and carry out his objectives. Bin Laden is probably correct that if the U.S. government kills him, hundreds of "Osamas" are prepared to take his place.

The al Qaeda organization, and others like it that I've studied, have wings that handle finance, documents, public-relations and intelligence. They run businesses. They conduct surveillance of enemy targets. They cultivate journalists to ensure favorable coverage in the press. They have sophisticated websites for both fund-raising and recruiting. Clerics teach operatives that killing civilians is allowed. A former member of al Qaeda explained how charismatic teacher taught him not to fear killing non-combatants. If the innocent victim is "a good person," his teacher said, "he go to paradise." If he's a bad person, "he go to hell."

Like any conventional business, the group includes both skilled and unskilled labor. A former Sudanese member of al Qaeda, Jamal Ahmed Al-Fadl, said that he was paid a monthly salary of $500, while Egyptian members of the group were earning up to three times as much. He said that he received a $10,000 bonus for arranging a deal to purchase uranium. Still, his anger about his monthly compensation led him to steal $110,000 from the organization and eventually, to become a witness for the U.S. government in the trial against the embassy bombers.

When he complained to bin Laden about the Egyptians' higher salaries, Al-Fadl said that bin Laden told him that the Egyptians traveled more, worked harder, and had alternative employers in their own country. "That's why he try to make them happy and give them more money," he said. In other words, bin Laden paid operatives based in part on their earning power in alternative positions.

Like other business managers, bin Laden also needed to recruit unskilled labor. K. K. Mohamed, for example, received no monetary compensation for his efforts, which involved acquiring a truck and grinding explosives, and given his role in the embassy bombing in Tanzania, will spend the rest of his life in an American prison. Other operatives reported undergoing training in engineering or to pilot planes. One talked about purchasing a plane with the goal of transporting equipment, including stinger missiles, from Peshawar to Khartoum.

This group and others like it that I have studied, has thought carefully about evading law-enforcement detection. A manual that came to light in the trial instructed operatives living in enemy territory to dress in such a way that they could not be identified as Muslims. They were told to shave their beards, to rent apartments in newly developed areas where people do not know one another; and not to chat too much, especially to cab drivers. The manual says that destroying the places of amusement and sin is less important than attacking embassies and vital economic centers.

Not surprisingly, what we know of last Tuesday's hijackers is that they followed these general instructions. They had no beards. They wore Western clothing. One business traveler, Roger Quirion, who flew on the first leg of a flight with two of the hijackers, told a Washington Post reporter that the "two men struck him as clean-cut, wearing slacks, dress shoes and causal shirts, and carrying dark shoulder bags. Their hair was closely cropped. They had no facial hair. In short, they looked like typical businessmen."

These hijackers also spoke little to their neighbors and moved frequently. Neighbors noticed only one thing unusual about them: meetings in the middle of the night involving up to a dozen participants.

The most important aspect of training these militants is actually mental training. It takes relatively little time and effort to learn to fly a plane; many people can do that. But training someone mentally to carry out suicide mass-casualty attacks is more difficult. The Taliban were actually borne out of extremist madrassahs in Pakistan. These schools function as orphanages. Families that cannot afford to feed their children send them to these schools where they are not only educated but also clothed and fed. In the most extreme of these schools, which Pakistani officials estimate to comprise 10-15 percent of its religious schools, children are taught to a distorted version of jihad. A child should be taught that jihad means doing your homework, helping the poor, and purifying the self. At these schools, children are taught about hate. Madrassahs I have visited had children from Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Burma, Chechnya, Kuwait, Mongolia, Nepal, Russia, Tajikistan, Turkey, Uzbekistan, and Yemen. In a school that purportedly offered a broad curriculum, a teacher I questioned could not multiply seven times eight. Children that graduate from these schools are trained to be mullahs, but many of them can't find jobs. They are thus susceptible to their teachers' message that the best way to fulfill their religious duty is to fight on behalf of the Taliban or to join so called *jihadi* groups. The children are also taught that Osama bin Laden is a hero.

Pakistan is prepared to assist the international coalition on the basis of principle; it does not expect a quid pro quo, according to its officials. But still, now would be a good time offer assistance – because it is in US national security interests to do so. If we inadvertently turn Pakistan into a second Afghanistan, the results would be disastrous not only for India but also for the entire world.

How can we help Pakistan? Pakistan has long been seeking market access for its textiles. Opening our markets would translate into 300-400 million dollars, according to the Pakistani embassy, which could make a crucial difference to its Pakistan's economy. We should also be considering debt relief. We need to help Pakistan especially in the areas of health care and education. Extremist religious parties and jihadi groups are already mobilized to fight the Pakistani government. It may make sense to make some of these efforts visible. The extremist groups are unlikely to change their minds, but we can reduce their ability to mobilize others.

The situation in Afghanistan is even worse. According to a UN report issued in April, "The life expectancy is less than 43 years, the literacy rate is around 25%, the mortality rate is the highest in the world and the GDP per head is estimated to be less than $700. Only a small minority of Afghans has access to safe water, sanitation, health care, and education. In addition, Afghanistan is one of the most mine-infested countries in the world."[1] Things have gotten worse since then, in part because of the worst drought in 30 years. If we attack Afghanistan, the situation is bound to get worse.

[1] "The Battlefield," *Economist*, 21 September 2001.

How can we fight this scourge, which is now spread, in tiny packets of fury and pain, around the world? Military might alone cannot win this war because we are fighting a movement, not a state, not even just a network. We may discover that bin Laden is not directly responsible, but instead, one of the groups he funds or inspires, perhaps together with a state or states. Thousands of so-called mujahideen have trained in Afghanistan, and they are now spread throughout the world. For example, 100 mujahideen from Afghanistan recently joined Laskar Jihad, a new jihadi group fighting in Indonesia. What is the target list in a situation like this?

Last Tuesday's tragic incident makes clear that we can no longer afford to allow states to fail and conflicts to fester. Extremists thrive when the state is no longer able to provide basic services, such as healthcare, education, and law and order. They also thrive on lingering conflicts, such as those in the Middle East, Afghanistan, Indonesia, and Kashmir.

We need to think about how to undermine these groups' appeal. Islam strictly prohibits targeting innocent civilians. Religious scholars need to get out the message loud and clear that bin Laden's version of Islam is a grotesque distortion of their faith. Those scholars should be speaking out, not just in America, but all over the world.

It is also important for religious leaders to come to terms with the fact that religion has often been used to justify conflicts. Religion has two sides: One is spiritual. It unifies people, transcending national and religious boundaries and promotes tolerance. The other side is all about boundaries: to be Catholic is to be not Protestant, to be Christian is to be non-Muslim, to be Muslim is to be not Jewish. Us vs. Them. Religious leaders should also come forward to make clear that respect for human life is the most important aspect of religion. Extremists focus on the divisive aspect of religion, on the parts that divide us one from another, ignoring the spiritual, universalist aspects. Let's not fall into the same trap by calling for crusades.

Finally, we have to learn to dictate less and listen more, as Joseph Nye argues in a forthcoming book on America's soft power. We have a stake in the welfare of other peoples and need to devote a much higher priority to health, education and economic development, or new Osamas will continue to arise.

Jessica Stern Wash Post 9/15/2001 A27

Being Feared Is Not Enough to Keep Us Safe

Americans are eager to retaliate quickly for Tuesday's brutal attacks in New York and Washington. Nearly 90 percent of those surveyed supported taking military action against those responsible even if it led to war, according to a Tuesday-night Washington Post poll.

The desire for revenge at a moment like this is perfectly understandable: We are traumatized as a nation. But striking back quickly is far less important than discouraging future strikes by our enemies, and the two are not the same. We cannot afford to allow an emotional desire for quick retribution to override our long-term national security interests.

When seeking to deter, compel or appease their adversaries, smart leaders first learn about their enemies' desires and fears. It is not clear that quick retaliation is what suicide bombers fear most. We cannot punish the perpetrators; they are already dead. And the organizers of these attacks obviously care more about taking revenge on us than they do about their own security. Osama bin Laden, for example, is reported to have said on Tuesday that he is ready to die, and that if the U.S. military manages to kill him, hundreds more "Osamas" will take his place.

I have met some of these "Osamas." They appear in many countries and subscribe to many religions. They are usually drawn to extremist movements out of a feeling of severe deprivation—whether socioeconomic, political or psychological. Inside extremist groups, the spiritually perplexed learn to focus on action. The weak become strong. The selfish become altruists, ready to make the ultimate sacrifice of their lives in the belief that their deaths will serve the public good.

Operatives I've interviewed describe the emotional satisfaction of their work and the status they earn in their community. "One becomes important due to his work. Successful operations make a militant famous and glamorous among his fellow men," a trainer for a Pakistani group told me.

BY OLIPHANT

Militants describe fighting as becoming a way of life. Jamal Al-Fadl, a member of al Qaeda who became a witness for the U.S. government, said that after the Soviet Union was defeated in Afghanistan, there were a number of men who had been fighting so long that it was "the only thing they really knew how to do." One long-term operative told me, "A person addicted to heroin can get off it if he really tries, but a mujahed cannot leave the jihad. I am spiritually addicted to jihad," he said.

Islamic scholars explain that the jihad doctrine actually delineates acceptable behavior in war and, like the Western "just war tradition," explicitly outlaws terrorism. But in the extremist schools I have visited, clerics, often barely trained themselves, preach a virulent version of Islam, teaching their charges that murder is morally sanctioned and that innocent people are fair prey.

Islam is not the only religion that produces such extremists. A Christian militant who is now on death row for murder told me he was not trying to appeal his death sentence. "The heightened threat, the more difficulties forced on [me as] a Christian, the more joy I experience," he said. Jewish extremists have repeatedly attacked the Dome of the Rock, despite knowing that their actions could cause massive casualties or even war.

Terrorism's greatest weapon is its popular support. When we attack with inadequate intelligence and hit the wrong target or the right ones at the wrong time, as we probably did when we retaliated for bin Laden's 1998 attacks, we play right into our enemies' hands. We look ineffectual. And we strengthen our adversaries' public relations and fundraising strategies.

After the American attacks in 1998, the head of a Pakistani militant group that trains militants in Afghanistan immediately held a press conference pronouncing, "Osama's mission is our mission. It is the mission of the whole Islamic world." The attacks did not enhance America's image with the mujaheddin I've interviewed, who describe Tomahawk missiles as weapons for cowards too afraid to risk their lives in combat or to look their enemy in the eye.

What does this mean for our national security strategy? Our leaders need to commit themselves to a long, hard fight. We need to rely less on high-tech intelligence and more on the old-fashioned kind. But this is a war that must be fought on many fronts, using every tool at governments' disposal: diplomacy, intelligence and, if we identify the perpetrator, military strikes.

But force is not nearly enough. We need to drain the swamps where these young men thrive. We can no longer afford to allow states to fail. Afghanistan's humanitarian and refugee crisis, which profoundly affects Pakistan as well, has become a national security threat to the entire world. We have a stake in the welfare of other peoples and need to devote a much higher priority to health, education and economic development, or new Osamas will continue to arise.

It matters what other people think of us. We need to think much more seriously than we have about whether we are perceived by people in other parts of the world as malevolent or benevolent. Being feared for our military strength alone is not sufficient to guarantee our security.

Jessica Stern is a lecturer on terrorism at Harvard University's Kennedy School of Government. She is the author of "The Ultimate Terrorists."

Being Feared Is Not Enough to Keep Us Safe

By Jessica Stern

Saturday, September 15, 2001; Page A27

Americans are eager to retaliate quickly for Tuesday's brutal attacks in New York and Washington. Nearly 90 percent of those surveyed supported taking military action against those responsible even if it led to war, according to a Tuesday-night Washington Post poll.

The desire for revenge at a moment like this is perfectly understandable: We are traumatized as a nation. But striking back quickly is far less important than discouraging future strikes by our enemies, and the two are not the same. We cannot afford to allow an emotional desire for quick retribution to override our long-term national security interests.

When seeking to deter, compel or appease their adversaries, smart leaders first learn about their enemies' desires and fears. It is not clear that quick retaliation is what suicide bombers fear most. We cannot punish the perpetrators; they are already dead. And the organizers of these attacks obviously care more about taking revenge on us than they do about their own security. Osama bin Laden, for example, is reported to have said on Tuesday that he is ready to die, and that if the U.S. military manages to kill him, hundreds more "Osamas" will take his place.

I have met some of these "Osamas." They appear in many countries and subscribe to many religions. They are usually drawn to extremist movements out of a feeling of severe deprivation -- whether socioeconomic, political or psychological. Inside extremist groups, the spiritually perplexed learn to focus on action. The weak become strong. The selfish become altruists, ready to make the ultimate sacrifice of their lives in the belief that their deaths will serve the public good.

Operatives I've interviewed describe the emotional satisfaction of their work and the status they earn in their community. "One becomes important due to his work. Successful operations make a militant famous and glamorous among his fellow men," a trainer for a Pakistani group told me.

Militants describe fighting as becoming a way of life. Jamal Al-Fadl, a member of al Qaeda who became a witness for the U.S. government, said that after the Soviet Union was defeated in Afghanistan, there were a number of men who had been fighting so long that it was "the only thing they really knew how to do." One long-term operative told me, "A person addicted to heroin can get off it if he really tries, but a mujahed cannot leave the jihad. I am spiritually addicted to jihad," he said.

Islamic scholars explain that the jihad doctrine actually delineates acceptable behavior in war and, like the Western "just war tradition," explicitly outlaws terrorism. But in the extremist schools I have visited, clerics, often barely trained themselves, preach a virulent version of Islam, teaching their charges that murder is morally sanctioned and that innocent people are fair prey.

Islam is not the only religion that produces such extremists. A Christian militant who is now on death row for murder told me he was not trying to appeal his death sentence. "The heightened threat, the more difficulties forced on [me as] a Christian, the more joy I experience," he said. Jewish extremists have repeatedly attacked the Dome of the Rock, despite knowing that their actions could cause massive casualties or even war.

Terrorism's greatest weapon is its popular support. When we attack with inadequate intelligence and hit the wrong target or the right ones at the wrong time, as we probably did when we retaliated for bin Laden's 1998 attacks, we play right into our enemies' hands. We look ineffectual. And we strengthen our adversaries' public relations and fundraising strategies.

After the American attacks in 1998, the head of a Pakistani militant group that trains militants in Afghanistan immediately held a press conference pronouncing, "Osama's mission is our mission. It is the mission of the whole Islamic world." The attacks did not enhance America's image with the mujaheddin I've interviewed, who describe Tomahawk missiles as weapons for cowards too afraid to risk their lives in combat or to look their enemy in the eye. What does this mean for our national security strategy? Our leaders need to commit themselves to a long, hard fight. We need to rely less on high-tech intelligence and more on the old-fashioned kind. But this is a war that must be fought on many fronts, using every tool at governments' disposal: diplomacy, intelligence and, if we identify the perpetrator, military strikes.

But force is not nearly enough. We need to drain the swamps where these young men thrive. We can no longer afford to allow states to fail. Afghanistan's humanitarian and refugee crisis, which profoundly affects Pakistan as well, has become a national security threat to the entire world. We have a stake in the welfare of other peoples and need to devote a much higher priority to health, education and economic development, or new Osamas will continue to arise.

It matters what other people think of us. We need to think much more seriously than we have about whether we are perceived by people in other parts of the world as malevolent or benevolent. Being feared for our military strength alone is not sufficient to guarantee our security.

Jessica Stern is a lecturer on terrorism at Harvard University's Kennedy School of Government. She is the author of "The Ultimate Terrorists."

© 2001 The Washington Post Company

Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists

Meeting with the Muj

By Jessica Stern

Last June I visited Jamia Manzoor ul Islamiya, a radical religious school (madrisa) in Lahore, Pakistan. Pakistan is a poor country whose plight has been worsened by a series of corrupt regimes. In many rural areas free government schools are not available. By educating, clothing, housing, and feeding the poorest of the poor for free, the madrisas fill a desperate need.

Pakistan has tens of thousands of madrisas. Often the students learn only the Koran. They will not be taught much math and probably no science or literature--or any other secular subject regarded in the West as important for functioning in modern society. Many of these schools preach jihad--holy war--with varying degrees of militancy. Pakistani officials estimate that 10 to 15 percent of the country's madrisas promote extremist ideologies.

The principal of Jamia Manzoor ul Islamiya is Pir Said ulla Khalid. He met me in a large receiving room lined with bookshelves, but the shelves were devoid of books. Four hundred and fifty students lived at the school and another 100 were day students. Most of them, Pir Khalid said, came from families so poor they could not feed their children.

I asked Pir Khalid how he had come to be the principal of a school. He had studied in a madrisa, he said. Did he have a favorite book? The Koran is the best novel, he replied.

I mentioned a popular Sufi singer, Nusrat Fatah Ali Khan, and asked whether he knew of him. "I don't need music. Music is for those who have an addiction within them."

We moved to science. Had he heard of Albert Einstein? No, he told me, he saw no need for science.

"I want to talk to you as I would talk to my own daughter," he suddenly said. "You believe too much in science. Science turns a cheap thing like a piece of metal into something valuable, like an airplane.

"Have you ever thought that you could become precious yourself? The way for a human being to become precious is to obey the principles of the one who created us. The way to become precious is through jihad. Nobody knows when he will die, so you must start the journey toward Islam," he told me kindly.

I found two students at Pir Khalid's madrisa who wanted to be doctors rather than mujahideen. Pir Khalid was embarrassed. They had only been there a few months. "By the time I've worked on them for a year, they will want to be mujahideen too." I believed him; he was an intense man with near-hypnotic power. A poor child might do anything to please him.

Although some madrisas claim to offer a broader curriculum than Jamia Manzoor ul Islamiya, the teachers are often barely educated. One teacher I interviewed at another school was able to add but unable to multiply seven times eight.

Decades ago, Maulana Abul Ala Maududi, Pakistan's most important Islamist and founder of the political party Jamaat i Islami, warned of the disadvantages of a system of education that focused exclusively on religious subjects. "Those who choose the theological branch of learning generally keep themselves utterly ignorant of [secular subjects, thereby remaining] incapable of giving any lead to the people regarding the modern political problems," he argued in First Principles of the Islamic State, published in 1960.

Although Maududi's observations seemed sensible to me, several principals of madrisas scolded me for being so picky, for having an "obsession" with science and math. Sami ul-Haq, the chancellor of Darul Uloom Haqqania, said Pakistani critics of madrisas, who frequently call for a broadening of the curricula, were simply playing "a game of diplomacy with the West." Besides, the chancellor added, "America has assessed Pakistan's army wrongly. The army is now Islamic. It is committed to the madrisas."

"This is the first time," he added giddily, "that I am revealing the truth to a foreigner."

The supply line

As part of a research project on violent religious extremism, I have been interviewing Christian, Jewish, Hindu, and Muslim militants around the world for the last two years. Last June I returned to South Asia to visit the Line of Control, the always tense and often bloody border between Indian-held and Pakistan-held Kashmir. I wanted to meet with mujahideen and to learn more about Pakistan's radical madrisas, which churn out so many of the mujahideen, boys who court death in the name of god.

I also met with families of "martyrs," Pakistani boys who have lost their lives fighting in Kashmir. I had been communicating with a few mujahideen over the past two years, trying to understand what motivates them to become cannon fodder in what appears to be a losing battle.

Mujeeb-ur-Rehman Inqalabi, a leader of Pakistan's Sunni sectarian party, Sipah e Sahaba Pakistan, told me that the United States had finally figured out that madrisas comprise the base for jihad. Because of that, the United States was pressuring Pakistan to shut them down. It won't work, he said.

"Madrisas are the supply line for jihad. Where the state controls madrisas, as in Egypt and Jordan, the voices for jihad are shut down. Pakistan and Afghanistan are now the only countries where it is possible to preach jihad in the schools. The terrorist activities in America, like the World Trade Center bombing and Mir Amal Kansi's attack at the CIA, are a reaction to the U.S. attempt to impose a new world order on the rest of the world.

"America is trying to crush jihad, but this will only lead to more terrorism. We are also training foreigners to preach Islam and fight in jihad in their own countries. It would be against Islam for us not to teach them. We have no intention of giving in to the whims of the U.S. government by expanding our curricula."

Donating sons

What happens to families whose children become martyrs? Most of the mothers I interviewed said they were happy to have donated their sons to jihad because their sons could help them in the next life--the "real life."

Syed Qurban Hussain, the father of a martyr, said, "Whoever gives his life in the way of Allah lives forever and earns a place in heaven for 70 members of his family, to be selected by the martyr."

Families of martyrs become celebrities after their children die. "Everyone treats me with more respect now that I have a martyred son," Hussain added. "And when there is a martyr in the village, it encourages more children to join the jihad. It raises the spirit of the entire village."

Foundations have been set up to help the families of martyrs. For example, the Shuhda-e-Islam Foundation, founded by Jamaat i Islami, claims to have disseminated 13 million rupees in Pakistan since 1995.

One family I visited lived on a street lined with open sewers. But the house, which is made of unpainted concrete, was partly paid for by the foundation. It is a large improvement over their earlier home, a mud hut. After son Zafar Iqbal died in Kashmir, the foundation helped pay the family's substantial debts, and it helped Habeeb Iqbal, the martyr's father, to start a business. He now owns two shops in the village.

When Zafar Iqbal died, 8,000 people attended his funeral in Kashmir, his mother told me. "God is helping us out a lot," she said, pointing to her home and smiling. They also plan to donate their youngest "to God," her husband added, pointing to their 10-year-old son.

After completing fifth grade in a government school, the boy will study in a madrisa full time to prepare himself mentally and physically for jihad. I asked the boy what he wants to do when he grows up. "Be a mujahed," he said.

Afghan roots

A jihadi culture is forming in Pakistan, the roots of which are entangled in the Afghan civil war in the 1980s, when the United States set up camps in Pakistan to train mujahideen to fight Soviet troops in Afghanistan.

"The Soviet forces left Afghanistan in 1989 . . . but the idea of jihad--an armed struggle of Muslim believers that had all but died out by the twentieth century--had been fully resuscitated," the late Pakistani scholar Eqbal Ahmad explained.

By financing and training the Afghan mujahideen, the United States created what it now regards as a major threat to its own security. "Sensing its enormous opportunity, traders in guns and drugs became linked to the phenomenon, creating an informal but extraordinary cartel of vested interests in guns, gold, and god," Ahmad wrote in 1999.

Since the 1980s, jihad has become a way of life for unknown numbers of Pakistanis and Arab-Afghans. Smuggling weapons has become big business, now fueled largely by the war in Kashmir. Through negligence more than active intervention, the Pakistani government allows the jihadi culture to grow. Despite government warnings of the dangers of "religious exploitation" of public sentiment, Pakistan's Chief Executive Pervez Musharraf continues to allow the jihadi groups and madrisas to indoctrinate Pakistani youth, sending them to fight in a losing war in Kashmir (see "Moderate Jihad?" July/August 2000 *Bulletin*).

It is not possible to promote jihad in Kashmir without inadvertently promoting sectarian violence within Pakistan, because the two movements--jihad against the Indians in Kashmir and jihad against the Shia in Pakistan--are inextricably linked. Sectarian terrorists have killed or injured thousands of Pakistanis over the last 10 years, even attempting to murder then-Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif last year.

Sipah e Sahaba Pakistan, the Sunni sectarian party, has a "profound influence on all Deobandi madrisas," according to Mujeeb-ur-Rehman Inqalabi, one of the party's leaders. Deobandi madrisas provide "mental training" to a significant fraction of the mujahideen in Kashmir.

Pakistan's most wanted sectarian terrorist, Riaz Bazra, spends at least part of his time hiding out at an Afghan camp that trains mujahideen for Kashmir, according to Pakistani officials. The sectarian terrorists arrested in connection with the plot to assassinate Sharif had reportedly been trained at a camp at Khost, which the jihadi group Harkat-ul-Mujahideen used to train mujahideen for Kashmir. In June, I met militants who had moved from Sipah e Sahaba Pakistan to groups fighting in Kashmir, without any apparent ideological or political difficulty.

Estimates of the size of the jihadi groups vary widely, but most U.S., Pakistani, and Indian experts believe there are tens of thousands of trained mujahideen ready, if necessary, to go to Kashmir. Indian officials claim to have a slightly better handle on the number of trained mujahideen already inside Indian Kashmir: between 2,000 and 4,000.

The Indian government claims that the jihadi groups have become more violent and more sophisticated in recent years. They have switched from guns and bullets to remotely detonated explosives. They communicate with encrypted wireless systems, changing signals and locations constantly. (I first learned of this system from the fathers of two mujahideen, who had to travel to Muzzaferabad to speak to their sons.)

The sources of guns and explosives, which are smuggled in, are often unknowable, Indian officials say, because AK-47s are made in 19 different countries, and because there are no taggants in the explosives to identify their origin.

A leader of one Pakistani group active in Kashmir told me how his organization recycles men from active fighting to undercover work.

"Our troops swim across the river Ravi from Azad Jammu into Indian-held Jammu. A typical mujahed will kill nine or 10 Indian border policemen. Then we make him a 'sleeper.' He takes an apartment in a residential colony in Jammu, takes a job, and tries to disappear."

After staying in Jammu for some time, my source said, the sleepers "often move to Delhi, where they try to pass as Punjabi Hindus." The number who actually make it to Delhi depends on how much help the Pakistani Interservice Intelligence Agency provides, he added. "The movement of our sleepers is so scientific that no Indian agency can even smell them."

Once they get to Delhi, he said, "they seek out the poorest Kashmiri Muslims in India to teach them about their constitutional rights. Some laborers, for example, live in small rooms fitted with eight beds. Each tenant gets one eight-hour shift per day, so that 24 people sleep in each room.

"My sleepers help these people. Some of them are ignorant of Urdu. Some of them were converted to Hinduism or Sikhism. We provide them with religious literature, we help them come back to Islam."

It is a difficult process, he says, because worldly temptations are everywhere. "Young Rajasthani girls and alcohol are available [for small amounts of money]. They think they are in heaven. They don't want to go back to Kashmir and face the poverty there. We want them to support Kashmir, to earn money, and to send some of it back to help Kashmiris.

"When [Hindu nationalist organizations] announced their plan to build a temple in place of the destroyed Babri Mosque, my sleepers were involved in organizing Muslims."

Jihad or terrorism?

Pakistani Chief Executive Pervez Musharraf's ambivalent attitude toward fundamentalism is nowhere more evident than in his government's relationship with the mujahideen. The Pakistani government denies supplying material support to the jihadi groups, a claim challenged by the U.S. State Department in its most recent annual report on terrorism.

But Pakistani officials do admit, at least privately, to "facilitating" the activities of jihadi groups, including assisting them in crossing the Line of Control into Indian-held Kashmir. If Musharraf intends to ensure that a "moderate Islam" guides Pakistan's future, as he claimed in his first speech after coming to power last October (see "Moderate Jihad?"), he will have to start by ending this assistance.

So far, there is little evidence that he plans to do so. He will also have to persuade the radical madrisas to change their curricula and stop preaching violent jihad. Although officials claim to be cracking down on the madrisas, especially when speaking to Western reporters, few of the radical principals I talked to had any intention of complying with the government's demands.

More important, Pakistani officials admit privately that Pakistan needs the mujahideen to persuade the Indian government that a military solution to the Kashmiri conflict is impossible.

Although India's conventional forces vastly outnumber those of Pakistan, Indian security forces "suffer from a siege mentality," according to a Pakistani commander at the Line of Control. That makes their spirit "weak."

Meanwhile, the mujahideen, he says, have a just cause and a stronger spirit. Although they are far less numerous than the Indian Army at the Line of Control, man for man they are much stronger. The idea that the Indian Army fears the "muj" is common not only among boastful mujahideen, but also in Pakistani military circles.

Musharraf calls the mujahideen "freedom fighters," not terrorists, castigating the West for confusing jihad with terrorism. But there are problems with this line of argument. To begin with, incursions by the mujahideen are not lessening India's determination to hold on to Kashmir. On the contrary, they have hardened India's views toward Pakistan. Indian Prime Minister Atal Behari Vajpayee has repeatedly stressed his refusal to hold talks with Musharraf until Pakistan curbs the violence of the mujahideen.

The jihad promoted by Pakistani radicals is a misinterpretation of the term, a senior Pakistani official conceded to me in June. Mainstream Islamic scholars interpret the Prophet Muhammad's teachings as emphasizing that spiritual jihad--the inner struggle to follow God's will--as the "greater jihad"; holy war is the "lesser" one. Islamic scholars argue further that the Koran prohibits killing civilians under any circumstances, including in a defensive jihad. Human rights organizations claim that both parties to the Kashmiri conflict--the Indian security forces and the mujahideen--have increasingly targeted civilians in random attacks since the early 1990s.

Several Pakistani operatives, when captured, have confessed to carrying out operations inside India, according to Indian interrogation reports. Tufail Rashid Rajput was reportedly caught trying to explode a bomb at the Bombay Central Railway Station in 1993. Abdul Matin, captured in 1997, reportedly confessed to the bombing of the Jaipur Stadium in January 1996, as well as to the murder of a Swedish tourist at Agra at about the same time.

Matin also disclosed a plot by Harkat-ul-Ansar, a mujahideen organization, to blow up the Taj Mahal to draw attention to the Kashmiri issue. Human rights organizations report that jihadi groups also carry out random attacks inside Kashmir, bombing buses, stores, and other public places.

Is this terrorism? When jihadi groups attack noncombatants, the answer is "yes," according to both Islamic and Western just-war traditions. Under *jus ad bellum* criteria, war is permissible when there are no better means for securing the peace--if the cause is just and if the good achieved by the war would exceed the unavoidable harm caused by fighting it. Both Islamic and Western traditions also require decisions made by the right authority. Maulana Abul A la Maududi argued in the late 1940s that as individuals, mujahideen could not legitimately declare jihad.

Similarly, *jus in bello* requires that the belligerents' methods be proportional to their ends and that they not directly target noncombatants. Islamic just-war theory implies similar requirements.

The mujahideen have a far broader definition of legitimate targets. They consider Indian government officials to be combatants and they also target Kashmiris whom they consider to be "collaborators." This is clearly at odds with international law. Moreover, when alleged collaborators are attacked in markets or on buses, innocent bystanders often die in large numbers, a predictable outcome.

The *jus in bello* criteria apply equally to Indian security forces, however. By these standards, terrorism is being perpetrated by both sides in Kashmir.

Tragic cycle

Terrorism thrives in much of the world--not only in lingering conflicts, but in areas where the state fails to provide basic services, especially education. Solving this problem will therefore require a lot more than resolving the conflict in Kashmir. It will require curbing the jihadi culture that took root in Afghanistan in the 1980s and is now spreading to Pakistan. That culture is fueled by money from all over the world.

There are winners and losers in this jihad. For the winners--the gun-runners, the leaders of militant groups, and the managers of the training camps--jihad is, at least in part, a profit-making business.

The mujahideen "believe their bosses are motivated by pure religious principles," a disillusioned mujahed explained to me. "They expect their followers to live by strict moral standards, but they have a different set of standards for their own behavior."

The countries--particularly the United States--that planted the seeds of the jihadi culture in the 1980s ought to be thinking seriously about how to promote its end. Helping to educate Pakistani youth might turn out to be among the wisest investments the United States could make.

Meanwhile, the Pakistani conflict with India continues, deepening an already tragic cycle. Pakistan feels it must spend more than a quarter of its budget on defense, leaving little money for educating the poor. The poor, in turn, send their children to the free madrisas, where they learn a dangerously virulent version of jihad.

"The rich donate money," a disenchanted mujahed told me, "and the poor donate their sons."

SIDEBAR: Meet the players

Last spring the U.S. State Department announced in its annual report on terrorism that South Asia had replaced the Middle East as the leading "locus of terrorism." Yet very little is known in the West about the Pakistani mujahideen, in part because many of the groups have only recently emerged and, in part, because attention has been focused elsewhere.

Further, leadership crises, mergers, and splits are regular occurrences, making the accuracy of any typology short-lived. Even Pakistani intelligence officials have difficulty keeping the groups straight. Given those caveats, here is a brief description of the major groups.

Deobandism arose in British India in 1867 as an anti-colonial, reformist, intellectual branch of Sunni Islam. Its aim was to harmonize classical texts with the demands of secular life in pre-partition India. It is now, Pakistani journalist Ahmed Rashid explains, the most orthodox branch of Sunnism.

The movement has its own political party in Pakistan, the Jamiat-ul-Ulema-e-Islam (JUI). The party promotes the enforcement of Hanafi (Sunni) law under the guidance of the righteous *ulama*, religious scholars. Anti-Shia *fatwas* (religious decrees) and texts are promoted by Deobandi madrisas, and students coming out of Deobandi schools are often virulently sectarian. The sectarian party Sipah e Sahaba Pakistan (SSP) is an offshoot of JUI

Personality clashes have split JUI into three camps: JUI-F, run by Fazlur Rahman; JUI-S, run by Sami ul-Haq; and JUI-Q, run by Ajmal Qadri. The rival camps now compete as to which is the most anti-Shia and anti-American.

Harkat-ul-Mujahideen (HUM)--the "Holy Warriors Movement"--is Deobandi, and it is currently the only Pakistani jihadi group listed by the U.S. State Department as a foreign terrorist organization. The movement has been highly successful in guerrilla operations against Indian security forces in Kashmir, and it allegedly cooperated with the Pakistani Army in the 1999 Kargil incursion.

Some of HUM's activities, including the training of militants in Afghanistan, are widely believed to be partly funded by Osama bin Laden, the Saudi-born radical with whom the group maintains open ties. Fazlur Rahman Khalil, founder of the group--and until recently its leader--told me in June that he met bin Laden early in the Afghan war.

At least seven HUM operatives died in August 1998, when U.S. cruise missiles and bombers struck bin Laden's camps in Afghanistan. Shortly after the attacks, Khalil said: "Osama's mission is our mission. It is the mission of the whole Islamic world."

Khalil was a signatory to bin Laden's 1998 *fatwa* against the United States and a member of bin Laden's international network known as the "International Islamic Front for Jihad Against the Jews and Crusaders."

Early this year, Farooq Kashmiri, formerly head of HUM's Kashmir operations, assumed leadership. Other militants told me that a Kashmiri was given the job because of pressure to look more like an indigenous group than a Pakistani-based organization. There is growing recognition that the Pakistani jihadi groups have usurped the indigenous movement which, in 1989, was both secular and Kashmir based. Some observers believe that the Kashmiris are victimized by aggression from both sides.

Harkat-ul-Mujahideen claims to be active in Bosnia, Chechnya, India, Myanmar, the Philippines, and Tajikistan. U.S. government officials allege that HUM has targeted Western military officials in Bosnia, and India accuses HUM of carrying out "dirty tricks," including murders in India on behalf of Pakistan's Interservice Intelligence Agency (ISI). (In turn, the ISI accuses India's intelligence agency of similar activities in Pakistan, usually in connection with sectarian or ethnic violence.)

Before 1997, HUM was known as Harkat-ul-Ansar or HUA, an organization formed in 1993 with the merger of two smaller groups. After the State Department listed HUA as a foreign terrorist organization, the group took the name of one of its earlier subsidiaries, Harkat-ul-Mujahideen. One of HUM's predecessor organizations, Harkat ul Jihadi-I-Islami (HUJI), is reportedly still active and thought to be particularly violent.

The various Harkat groups are suspected by the State Department of carrying out a series of kidnappings and killings of Western tourists in Kashmir, as well as killing two American diplomats in Karachi in 1995 and four American oil company workers in 1997, also in Karachi.

The hijackers of Indian Airlines Flight IC814 in December 1999 demanded the release of the group's chief ideologue, Maulana Masood Azhar, who was being held in an Indian prison, in exchange for freeing the hostage passengers and crew.

After his release, Azhar formed a new Deobandi group, Jaesh e Mohammad, which is more openly sectarian than HUM. Jaesh e Mohammad reportedly relies on the SSPparty to assist it in raising money. It competes with HUM for operatives, funding, and official support. A leader of a rival group told me in June that the Interservice Intelligence Agency supports HUM, but Military Intelligence supports Jaesh e Mohammad.

Other Deobandi groups include Tehriq e Jihad and Jamiat-ul-Ulema Mujahideen (JUM). Tehriq e Jihad was founded in 1997 by three small groups: Insar-ul-Islam, Hizb-ul-Jihad, the Muslim Mujahideen, as well as by disaffected members of HUA.

Jamiat-ul-Ulema Mujahideen is reportedly less active than some of the other groups, although it is still training and launching mujahideen, according to its leader.

Ahle Hadith is another branch of Sunni Islam. Ahle Hadith (Wahhabi) theology stresses literal belief in the Koran and the Hadith (traditional reports of the actions and beliefs of Muhammad). Like Deobandis, Wahhabis are highly conservative and deeply resentful of the "corrupting" influences of the Western world.

Lashkar-e-Taiba ("Army of the Pure") was founded in 1993 from a small Afghan group as the militant wing of an Ahle Hadith organization known as Markaz-Dawa-Wal-Irshad (MDI). Hafiz Mohammed Saeed, a retired engineering professor, runs MDI.

The Indian government views Lashkar-e-Taiba (LET) as the most important jihadi group because of its extraordinary growth in size, wealth, and popularity. Its annual convention, held every November at its headquarters in Muridke, attracts several hundred thousand visitors.

LET claims to train 40,000 youth per year, many of whom do not become full-time mujahideen, and it boasts of having 2,500 recruiting offices throughout Pakistan. It has 125 of its own madrisas, a senior member told me. More than 80 percent of the graduates are sent to mujahideen training camps, he said.

When I asked how LETmanages to send such a high percentage of graduates to training camps, when JUI-Q, for example, sends only 10-15 percent, LET told me that funding is not a problem for them, unlike other militant groups. LET will train anyone who requests it.

(Although many of the militant groups are heavily funded by individuals in the Persian Gulf,LET appears to be particularly successful at fundraising. LET and its parent organization have reportedly raised so much money they are planning to open their own bank.)

Recently LET released this announcement: "In our jihad camp we impart training for three weeks in which newcomers are introduced to the Kalashnikov up to the missile. Then we train them for three weeks more for Da'wa, which is called 'Suffah Tour.' Following this there comes the 'Special Tour' comprising of three months in which they are trained for guerrilla war and mine blast, fighting, and firing the missiles and rockets. After the completion of guerrilla training, a man is enabled to be launched in Kashmir. . . . After this practice, some of the boys are selected for specialization in making remote control bombs and missiles. In the course of guerrilla war, weather as well as the Indian Army's move[ments] are also observed. There is no restriction to go for jihad training. We observe that a boy must possess strong muscles and body because the same are required [for] performing hard exercises. Presently boys of eight years of age are mostly taking part in jihad."

Lashkar-e-Taiba literature encourages youth to fulfill their religious duty by becoming mujahideen in Burma, Chechnya, Kashmir, Kosovo, Palestine, and the Philippines, where Muslims are "not free." Defensive jihad is "obligatory" in all these countries, according to the literature. Women are also encouraged to go door-to-door to convince other women "to send their brothers and sons for the cause of jihad."

The organization is also active on the Internet. Computer literacy is emphasized at its madrisas, although no other secular subjects are taught. (LET members have e-mailed me their press releases and other literature regularly over the past couple of years.) The group's bank account numbers are listed on its web sites, which has greatly enhanced its fundraising, a senior LET member told me.

The organization advertises its high-tech prowess to attract youth to join the cause. "Mujahideen have got access to the Indian army web site where they worked against the Indian forces," says its literature. "Lashkar-e-Taiba also made a remote control airplane that was caught in Occupied Kashmir. We are developing the modern technology. We can make modern devices."

Jamaat i Islami, led by Qazi Hussein Ahmad, is neither Wahhabi nor Deobandi. It is non-sectarian and the most mainstream Islamist party in Pakistan. According to Vali Nasr, an American political scientist who has studied the party extensively, Jamaat i Islami's militant wings were key players during the Afghan war. Money and guns were funneled into the wings, now known as Hizb-ul-Mujahideen and al-Badr. An al-Badr member estimated that the two groups have a combined membership of about 10,000, only a fraction of which are active in Kashmir at any given time.

Last July, Hizb-ul-Mujahideen announced a three-month cease-fire in Kashmir. But a few days later that cease-fire was broken, with a series of attacks that killed more than 80 people.

Secular Kashmir-based groups, such as the Jammu and Kashmir Liberation Front (JKLF), which promote Kashmiri independence rather than accession to Pakistan, are no longer as active in Kashmir as the Pakistan-based groups, according to the Indian government.

One reason for this, explains prominent Pakistani journalist Ahmed Rashid, is that the Liberation Front is not supported by Pakistan's Interservice Intelligence Agency. But a Liberation Front splinter group known as al Umar Mujahideen is likely to reemerge now that its leader, Mushtaq Ahmed Zargar, has been released from prison.

Zargar was one of three militants freed in exchange for the release of the hostages on the hijacked Indian airliner in December 1999. Indian government officials describe Zargar as unusually cruel, claiming he has been observed blowing up the bodies of men already killed by his group.

Jessica Stern is a lecturer at Harvard UniversityÍs Kennedy School of Government and an adjunct fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations. She is the author of The Ultimate Terrorists *(1999) and a* Bulletin *board member.*

©2001 *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*

Op-eds

Execute Terrorists at Our Own Risk

by Jessica Stern
February 28, 2001
Reprinted from the New York Times

press releases
news stories
op-eds
public service
Q&As

CAMBRIDGE, Mass. — As a nation, we have decided that terrorism that results in loss of life should face the possibility of the death penalty. But is this wise?

This question is worth asking, now that four men are being tried in New York for their alleged participation in the 1998 bombings of American embassies in Kenya and Tanzania, which killed 224 people and wounded thousands. Two defendants, Mohamed Rashed Daoud al-'Owhali and Khalfan Khamis Mohamed, who allegedly worked for Osama bin Laden, could face the death penalty if convicted.

Another terrorist, Timothy McVeigh, is scheduled for execution on May 16 for his role in the bombing of the federal building in Oklahoma City. Mr. McVeigh has refused to appeal his death sentence, preferring, he now says, to have his execution broadcast live on television. Some of his victims worry that Mr. McVeigh will become a martyr, inciting further violence.

One can argue about the effectiveness of the death penalty generally. But when it comes to terrorism, national security concerns should be paramount. The execution of terrorists, especially minor operatives, has effects that go beyond retribution or justice. The executions play right into the hands of our adversaries. We turn criminals into martyrs, invite retaliatory strikes and enhance the public relations and fund-raising strategies of our enemies.

Moreover, dead terrorists don't talk, while a live terrorist can become an intelligence asset, doling out much- needed information.

Of course, imprisoning, rather than executing, terrorists is not risk-free. Supporters could try to kidnap Americans, and refuse to release them until their colleagues are released. Still, other countries with far more experience in counterterrorism have concluded that imprisoning terrorists
is the better option in the long run.

For instance, the United Kingdom in 1973 debated whether to repeal the death penalty in Northern Ireland. By a margin of nearly three to one,

the
House of Commons decided that executing terrorists, whose goal is often to martyr themselves, only increased violence and put soldiers and police
at greater risk. In a highly charged political situation, it was argued, the threat of death does not deter terrorism. On the contrary, executing terrorists, the House of Commons decided, has the opposite effect: It increases the incidence of terrorism.

The Israeli government unwisely creates martyrs with what it calls preventive attacks, in which military or intelligence operatives kill those suspected of terrorism. By contrast, judges in Israel have never sentenced terrorists to death; capital punishment would be dangerous and counterproductive.

Terrorism's greatest weapon is popular support. We've already seen this dynamic at work. After Mr. bin Laden's 1998 embassy bombings, the United States retaliated by striking a purported chemical weapons facility
in Sudan and a few crude camps in Afghanistan. The result? In the extremist religious schools I visited in Pakistan after the attack, Mr. bin Laden had become a hero. Parents named their children after him. Schools and businesses were renamed in his honor.

Does anyone believe that executing his minions will deter Mr. bin Laden from future terrorist attacks? The opposite is far more likely: the United States could become more frequently targeted.

Our most powerful weapon against terrorists is our commitment to the rule of law. We must use the courts to make clear that terrorism is a criminal act, not jihad, not heroism, not holy war. And then, we must not
make martyrs out of murderers.

Jessica Stern, a lecturer at Harvard's Kennedy School of Government, served on the National Security Council from 1994 to 1995.

Pakistan's Jihad Culture

By Jessica Stern

Foreign Affairs (November/December 2000).

FREE AGENTS

This spring the U.S. State Department reported that South Asia has replaced the Middle East as the leading locus of terrorism in the world. Although much has been written about religious militants in the Middle East and Afghanistan, little is known in the West about those in Pakistan -- perhaps because they operate mainly in Kashmir and, for now at least, do not threaten security outside South Asia. General Pervez Musharraf, Pakistan's military ruler, calls them "freedom fighters" and admonishes the West not to confuse jihad with terrorism. Musharraf is right about the distinction -- the jihad doctrine delineates acceptable war behavior and explicitly outlaws terrorism -- but he is wrong about the militant groups' activities. Both sides of the war in Kashmir -- the Indian army and the Pakistani "mujahideen" -- are targeting and killing thousands of civilians, violating both the Islamic "just war" tradition and international law.

Pakistan has two reasons to support the so-called mujahideen. First, the Pakistani military is determined to pay India back for allegedly fomenting separatism in what was once East Pakistan and in 1971 became Bangladesh. Second, India dwarfs Pakistan in population, economic strength, and military might. In 1998 India spent about two percent of its $469 billion GDP on defense, including an active armed force of more than 1.1 million personnel. In the same year, Pakistan spent about five percent of its $61 billion GDP on defense, yielding an active armed force only half the size of India's. The U.S. government estimates that India has 400,000 troops in Indian-held Kashmir -- a force more than two-thirds as large as Pakistan's entire active army. The Pakistani government thus supports the irregulars as a relatively cheap way to keep Indian forces tied down.

What does such support entail? It includes, at a minimum, assisting the militants' passage into Indian-held Kashmir. This much Pakistani officials will admit, at least privately. The U.S. government believes that Pakistan also funds, trains, and equips the irregulars. Meanwhile, the Indian government claims that Pakistan uses them as an unofficial guerrilla force to carry out "dirty tricks," murders, and terrorism in India. Pakistan, in turn, accuses India's intelligence service of committing terrorism and killing hundreds of civilians in Pakistan.

Pakistan now faces a typical principal-agent problem: the interests of Pakistan (the principal) and those of the militant groups (the agent) are not fully aligned. Although the irregulars may serve Pakistan's interests in Kashmir when they target the Indian army, they also kill civilians and perform terrorism in violation of international norms and law. These crimes damage Pakistan's already fragile international reputation. Finally, and most important for Pakistanis, the militant groups that Pakistan supports and the Sunni sectarian killers that Pakistan claims it wants to wipe out overlap significantly. By facilitating the activities of the irregulars in Kashmir, the Pakistani government is inadvertently promoting internal sectarianism, supporting international terrorists, weakening the prospect for peace in Kashmir, damaging Pakistan's international image, spreading a narrow and violent version of Islam throughout the region, and increasing tensions with India -- all against the interests of Pakistan as a whole.

PAKISTAN, TALIBAN-STYLE?

The war between India and Pakistan over the fate of Kashmir is as old as both states. When Pakistan was formally created in 1947, the rulers of Muslim-majority states that had existed within British India were given the option of joining India or Pakistan. The Hindu monarch of the predominantly Muslim state of Jammu and Kashmir chose India, prompted partly by a tribal rebellion in the state. Pakistan responded by sending in troops. The resultant fighting ended with a 1949 cease-fire, but the Pakistani government continued covertly to support volunteer guerrilla fighters in Kashmir. Islamabad argued then, as it does now, that it could not control the volunteers, who as individuals were not bound by the cease-fire agreement. (On the other hand, Maulana Abul A'la Maududi, the late founder of the Islamist party Jamaat-e-Islami, argued that as individuals, these "mujahideen" could not legitimately declare jihad, either.)

Pakistani officials admit to having tried repeatedly to foment separatism in Kashmir in the decades following the 1948 cease-fire. These attempts were largely unsuccessful; when separatist violence broke out in the late 1980s, the movement was largely indigenous. For their part, Indian officials admit their own culpability in creating an intolerable situation in the region. They ignored Kashmir's significant economic troubles, rampant corruption, and rigged elections, and they intervened in Kashmiri politics in ways that contradicted India's own constitution. As American scholar Sumit Ganguly explains, the rigged 1987 state-assembly elections were the final straw in a series of insults, igniting, by 1989, widespread violent opposition. By 1992, Pakistani nationals and other graduates of the Afghan war were joining the fight in Kashmir. What began as an indigenous, secular movement for independence has become an increasingly Islamist crusade to bring all of Kashmir under Pakistani control. Pakistan-based Islamist groups (along with Hizb-ul-Mujahideen, a Kashmir-based group created by Jamaat-e-Islami and partly funded by Pakistan) are now significantly more important than the secular Kashmir-based ones. The Indian government estimates that about 40 percent of the militants in Kashmir today are

Pakistani or Afghan, and some 80 percent are teenagers. Although the exact size of the movement is unknown, the Indian government estimates that 3,000 to 4,000 "mujahideen" are in Kashmir at any given time.

Whatever their exact numbers, these Pakistani militant groups -- among them, Lashkar-i-Taiba and Harkat-ul-Mujahideen -- pose a long-term danger to international security, regional stability, and especially Pakistan itself. Although their current agenda is limited to "liberating" Kashmir, which they believe was annexed by India illegally, their next objective is to turn Pakistan into a truly Islamic state. Islamabad supports these volunteers as a cheap way to keep India off balance. In the process, however, it is creating a monster that threatens to devour Pakistani society.

SCHOOLS OF HATE

In Pakistan, as in many developing countries, education is not mandatory. The World Bank estimates that only 40 percent of Pakistanis are literate, and many rural areas lack public schools. Islamic religious schools -- madrasahs -- on the other hand, are located all over the country and provide not only free education, but also free food, housing, and clothing. In the poor areas of southern Punjab, madrasahs funded by the Sunni sectarian political party Sipah-e-Sahaba Pakistan (SSP) reportedly even pay parents for sending them their children.

In the 1980s, Pakistani dictator General Mohammad Zia-ul-Haq promoted the madrasahs as a way to garner the religious parties' support for his rule and to recruit troops for the anti-Soviet war in Afghanistan. At the time, many madrasahs were financed by the zakat (the Islamic tithe collected by the state), giving the government at least a modicum of control. But now, more and more religious schools are funded privately -- by wealthy Pakistani industrialists at home or abroad, by private and government-funded nongovernmental organizations in the Persian Gulf states and Saudi Arabia, and by Iran. Without state supervision, these madrasahs are free to preach a narrow and violent version of Islam.

Most madrasahs offer only religious instruction, ignoring math, science, and other secular subjects important for functioning in modern society. As Maududi warned in his 1960 book, First Principles of the Islamic State, "those who choose the theological branch of learning generally keep themselves utterly ignorant of [secular subjects, thereby remaining] incapable of giving any lead to the people regarding modern political problems."

Even worse, some extremist madrasahs preach jihad without understanding the concept: They equate jihad -- which most Islamic scholars interpret as the striving for justice (and principally an inner striving to purify the self) -- with guerrilla warfare. These schools encourage their graduates, who often cannot find work because of their lack of practical education, to fulfill their "spiritual obligations" by fighting against Hindus in Kashmir or against Muslims of other sects in Pakistan. Pakistani officials estimate that 10 to 15 percent of the country's tens of thousands of madrasahs espouse such extremist ideologies.

Pakistan's interior minister Moinuddin Haider, for one, recognizes these problems. "The brand of Islam they are teaching is not good for Pakistan," he says. "Some, in the garb of religious training, are busy fanning sectarian violence, poisoning people's minds." In June, Haider announced a reform plan that would require all madrasahs to register with the government, expand their curricula, disclose their financial resources, seek permission for admitting foreign students, and stop sending students to militant training camps.

This is not the first time the Pakistani government has announced such plans. And Haider's reforms so far seem to have failed, whether because of the regime's negligence or the madrasahs' refusal to be regulated, or both. Only about 4,350 of the estimated 40,000 to 50,000 madrasahs in Pakistan have registered with the government. Some are still sending students to training camps despite parents' instructions not to do so. Moreover, some chancellors are unwilling to expand their curricula, arguing that madrasahs are older than Pakistan itself -- having been "designed 1,200 years ago in Iraq," according to the chancellor of the Khudamudeen madrasah. The chancellor of Darul Uloom Haqqania objects to what he calls the government's attempt to "destroy the spirit of the madrasahs under the cover of broadening their curriculum." Mujibur Rehman Inqalabi, the SSP's second in command, told me that Haider's reform plan is "against Islam" and complains that where states have taken control of madrasahs, such as in Jordan and Egypt, "the engine of jihad is extinguished." America is right, he said: "Madrasahs are the supply line for jihad."

JIHAD INTERNATIONAL, INC.

If madrasahs supply the labor for "jihad," then wealthy Pakistanis and Arabs around the world supply the capital. On Eid-ul-Azha, the second most important Muslim holiday of the year, anyone who can afford to sacrifices an animal and gives the hide to charity. Pakistani militant groups solicit such hide donations, which they describe as a significant source of funding for their activities in Kashmir.

Most of the militant groups' funding, however, comes in the form of anonymous donations sent directly to their bank accounts. Lashkar-i-Taiba ("Army of the Pure"), a rapidly growing Ahle Hadith (Wahhabi) group, raises funds on the Internet. Lashkar and its parent organization, Markaz ad-Da'wa Wal Irshad (Center for Islamic Invitation and Guidance), have raised so much money, mostly from sympathetic Wahhabis in Saudi Arabia, that they are reportedly planning to open their own bank.

Individual "mujahideen" also benefit financially from this generous funding. They are in this for the loot, explains Ahmed Rashid, a prominent Pakistani journalist. One mid-level manager of Lashkar told me he earns 15,000 rupees a month -- more than seven times what the average Pakistani makes, according to the World Bank. Top leaders of militant groups earn much more; one leader took me to see his mansion, which was staffed by servants and filled with expensive furniture. Operatives receive smaller salaries but win bonuses for successful missions. Such earnings are particularly attractive in a country with a 40 percent official poverty rate, according to Pakistani government statistics.

The United States and Saudi Arabia funneled some $3.5 billion into Afghanistan and Pakistan during the Afghan war, according to Milt Bearden, CIA station chief in Pakistan from 1986 to 1989. "Jihad," along with guns and drugs, became the most important business in the region. The business of "jihad" -- what the late scholar Eqbal Ahmad dubbed "Jihad International, Inc." -- continues to attract foreign investors, mostly wealthy Arabs in the Persian Gulf region and members of the Pakistani diaspora. (As World Bank economist Paul Collier observes, diaspora populations often prolong ethnic and religious conflicts by contributing not only capital but also extremist rhetoric, since the fervor of the locals is undoubtedly held in check by the prospect of losing their own sons.)

As the so-called jihad movement continues to acquire its own financial momentum, it will become increasingly difficult for Pakistan to shut down, if and when it tries. As long as "Jihad International, Inc." is profitable, those with financial interests in the war will work to prolong it. And the longer the war in Kashmir lasts, the more entrenched these interests will become.

ADDICTED TO JIHAD

As some irregulars are financially dependent on what they consider jihad, others are spiritually and psychologically so. Many irregulars who fought in Afghanistan are now fighting in Kashmir and are likely to continue looking for new "jihads" to fight -- even against Pakistan itself. Khalil, who has been a "mujahid" for 19 years and can no longer imagine another life, told me, "A person addicted to heroin can get off it if he really tries, but a mujahid cannot leave the jihad. I am spiritually addicted to jihad." Another Harkat operative told me,

We won't stop -- even if India gave us Kashmir. ... We'll [also] bring jihad here. There is already a movement here to make Pakistan a pure Islamic state. Many preach Islam, but most of them don't know what it means. We want to see a Taliban-style regime here.

Aspirations like these are common among the irregulars I have interviewed over the last couple of years.

The "jihad" movement is also developing a spiritual momentum linked to its financial one. Madrasahs often teach their students that jihad -- or, in the extremist schools, terrorism under the guise of jihad -- is a spiritual duty. Whereas wealthy Pakistanis would rather donate their money than their sons to the cause, families in poor, rural areas are likely to send their sons to "jihad" under the belief that doing so is the only way to fulfill this spiritual duty. One mother whose son recently died fighting in Kashmir told me she would be happy if her six remaining sons were martyred. "They will help me in the next life, which is the real life," she said.

When a boy becomes a martyr, thousands of people attend his funeral. Poor families become celebrities. Everyone treats them with more respect after they lose a son, a martyr's father said. "And when there is a martyr in the village, it encourages more children to join the jihad. It raises the spirit of the entire village," he continued. In poor families with large numbers of children, a mother can assume that some of her children will die of disease if not in war. This apparently makes it easier to donate a son to what she feels is a just and holy cause.

Many of these families receive financial assistance from the militant groups. The Shuhda-e-Islam Foundation, founded in 1995 by Jamaat-e-Islami, claims to have dispensed 13 million rupees to the families of martyrs. It also claims to provide financial support to some 364 families by paying off loans, setting them up in businesses, or helping them with housing. Moreover, the foundation provides emotional and spiritual support by constantly reminding the families that they did the right thing by donating their children to assist their Muslim brethren in Kashmir. Both Lashkar-i-Taiba and Harkat have also established charitable organizations that reward the families of martyrs -- a practice common to gangs in inner-city Los Angeles and terrorist groups such as al Qaeda and Hamas. Although these foundations provide a service to families in need, they also perpetuate a culture of violence.

BAD BOYS

The comparison to gangs and terrorist groups is particularly apt because the irregulars often hire criminals to do their dirty work -- and sometimes turn to petty or organized crime themselves. Criminals are typically hired to "drop" weapons and explosives or to carry out extreme acts of violence that a typical irregular is reluctant or unable to perform. For example, members of the Dubai-based crime ring that bombed the Bombay stock exchange in March 1993 later confessed that they had been in Islamabad the previous month, where Pakistani irregulars had allegedly trained them to throw hand grenades and fire Kalashnikov assault rifles. Law-enforcement authorities noted that the operatives' passports contained no Pakistani stamps, suggesting the complicity of the Pakistani government.

Criminals joining supposed jihad movements tend to be less committed to the group's purported goals and more committed to violence for its own sake -- or for the money. When criminals join private armies, therefore, the political and moral constraints that often inhibit mass-casualty, random attacks are likely to break down. Criminal involvement in the movement also worsens the principal-agent problem for Pakistan: pure mercenaries are even harder to control than individuals whose goals are at least partly aligned with those of the state.

EXPORTING HOLY WAR

Exacerbating the principal-agent problem, Pakistani militant groups are now exporting their version of jihad all over the world. The Khudamudeen madrasah, according to its chancellor, is training students from Burma, Nepal, Chechnya, Bangladesh, Afghanistan, Yemen, Mongolia, and Kuwait. Out of the 700 students at the madrasah, 127 are foreigners. Nearly half the student body at Darul Uloom Haqqania, the madrasah that created the Taliban, is from Afghanistan. It also trains students from Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, Russia, and Turkey, and is currently expanding its capacity to house foreign students from 100 to 500, its chancellor said. A Chechen student at the school told me his goal when he returned home

was to fight Russians. And according to the U.S. State Department, Pakistani groups and individuals also help finance and train the Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan, a terrorist organization that aims to overthrow secular governments in Central Asia.

Many of the militant groups associated with radical madrasahs regularly proclaim their plans to bring "jihad" to India proper as well as to the West, which they believe is run by Jews. Lashkar-i-Taiba has announced its plans to "plant Islamic flags in Delhi, Tel Aviv, and Washington." One of Lashkar's Web sites includes a list of purported Jews working for the Clinton administration, including director of presidential personnel Robert Nash (an African American from Arkansas) and CIA director George Tenet (a Greek American). The group also accuses Israel of assisting India in Kashmir. Asked for a list of his favorite books, a leader of Harkat recommended the history of Hitler, who he said understood that "Jews and peace are incompatible." Several militant groups boast pictures of burning American flags on their calendars and posters.

INTERNAL JIHAD

The "jihad" against the West may be rhetorical (at least for now), but the ten-year-old sectarian war between Pakistan's Shi'a and Sunni is real and deadly. The Tehrik-e-Jafariya-e-Pakistan (TJP) was formed to protect the interests of Pakistan's Shi'a Muslims, who felt discriminated against by Zia's implementation of Sunni laws governing the inheritance and collection of zakat. Iran helped fund the TJP, probably in hopes of using it as a vehicle for an Iranian-style revolution in Pakistan. Five years later, Haq Nawaz Jhangvi, a Jamaat-ul-Ulema-e-Islam (JUI) cleric, established the SSP to offset the TJP and to promote the interests of Sunni Muslims. The SSP was funded by both Saudi Arabia and Iraq. Since then, violent gangs have formed on both sides.

After Lashkar-e-Jhangvi, a Sunni sectarian gang, attempted to assassinate then Prime Minister Muhammad Nawaz Sharif in early 1999, Sharif proposed to expand the special military courts that try terrorist crimes from Karachi to the rest of the country. Pakistan's Supreme Court later deemed the special courts unconstitutional. Musharraf has continued Sharif's attempt to rein in the terrorist groups by implementing, among other things, a "deweaponization" plan to reduce the availability of guns to sectarian gangs and criminals.

The problem for Musharraf is that it is difficult to promote the "jihad" in Kashmir and the Taliban in Afghanistan without inadvertently promoting sectarianism in Pakistan. The movements share madrasahs, camps, bureaucracies, and operatives. The JUI, the SSP's founding party, also helped create both the Taliban and Harkat. Deobandi madrasahs issue anti-Shi'a fatwas (edicts), and boys trained to fight in Kashmir are also trained to call Shi'a kafirs (infidels). Jaesh-e-Mohammad, an offshoot of Harkat and the newest Pakistani militant group in Kashmir, reportedly used SSP personnel during a fundraising drive in early 2000. And the SSP's Inqalabi, who was recently released after four years in jail for his alleged involvement in sectarian killings, told me that whenever "one of our youngsters wants to do jihad," they join up with the Taliban, Harkat, or Jaesh-e-Mohammad – all Deobandi groups that he claims are "close" to the SSP.

Sectarian clashes have killed or injured thousands of Pakistanis since 1990. As the American scholar Vali Nasr explains, the largely theological differences between Shi'a and Sunni Muslims have been transformed into full-fledged political conflict, with broad ramifications for law and order, social cohesion, and government authority. The impotent Pakistani government has essentially allowed Sunni Saudi Arabia and Shi'a Iran to fight a proxy war on Pakistani soil, with devastating consequences for the Pakistani people.

NEITHER PAKISTAN?

Pakistan is a weak state, and government policies are making it weaker still. Its disastrous economy, exacerbated by a series of corrupt leaders, is at the root of many of its problems. Yet despite its poverty, Pakistan is spending hundreds of millions of dollars on weapons instead of schools and public health. Ironically, the government's "cost-saving" measures are even more troubling. In trying to save money in the short run by using irregulars in Kashmir and relying on madrasahs to educate its youth, Pakistan is pursuing a path that is likely to be disastrous in the long run, allowing a culture of violence to take root.

The United States has asked Pakistan to crack down on the militant groups and to close certain madrasahs, but America must do more than just scold. After all, the United States, along with Saudi Arabia, helped create the first international "jihad" to fight the Soviet Union during the Afghan war. "Does America expect us to send in the troops and shut the madrasahs down?" one official asks. "Jihad is a mindset. It developed over many years during the Afghan war. You can't change a mindset in 24 hours."

The most important contribution the United States can make, then, is to help strengthen Pakistan's secular education system. Because so much international aid to Pakistan has been diverted through corruption, both public and private assistance should come in the form of relatively nonfungible goods and services: books, buildings, teachers, and training, rather than money. Urdu-speaking teachers from around the world should be sent to Pakistan to help. And educational exchanges among students, scholars, journalists, and military officials should be encouraged and facilitated. Helping Pakistan educate its youth will not only cut off the culture of violence by reducing ignorance and poverty, it will also promote long-term economic development.

Moreover, assisting Pakistan will make the world a safer place. As observers frequently note, conflict between India and Pakistan over Kashmir is one of the most likely routes to nuclear war in the world today. The Pakistani militants' continued incursions into Indian-held Kashmir escalate the conflict, greatly increasing the risk of nuclear war between the two countries.

Although the United States can help, Pakistan must make its own changes. It must stamp out corruption, strengthen democratic institutions, and make education a much higher priority. But none of this can happen if Pakistan continues to devote an estimated 30 percent of its national budget to defense.

Most important, Pakistan must recognize the militant groups for what they are: dangerous gangs whose resources and reach continue to grow, threatening to destabilize the entire region. Pakistan's continued support of religious militant groups suggests that it does not recognize its own susceptibility to the culture of violence it has helped create. It should think again.

Jessica Stern is a lecturer in public policy at Harvard University's Kennedy School of Government and Adjunct Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SHAYS. I'm going to recognize our chairman first, but I will tell you the question I'm ultimately going to ask, so if the others of you could think about it when the chairman is asking his questions, I'd like to know where you would agree and disagree with what you heard the Prime Minister say and what you would emphasize about what he said and so on.

So I'm just looking for the extremes—where you really strongly agree, where you would possibly disagree and where you would put the emphasis on what he said, because he said a lot. I think you all know that. And maybe that's one reason, General, why you're a man of few words at this moment.

But, Mr. Chairman, you have as much time as you'd like to consume.

Mr. BURTON. I'll try not to abuse the privilege, Mr. Chairman.

Let me just start off by saying, as I understand it, Dr. Stern, you're saying that there ought to be some kind of a Marshall Plan up front for allies like Pakistan, so that we can dissuade some of the people who might be swayed by economic matters to joining the terrorists?

Ms. STERN. Well, I think that we really ought to be helping Pakistan educate its youth. I think that those madrassahs are an important component of the Jihad International Inc., and what else we've got to be doing initially before we go forward is—it does seem to me that Pakistan is ready to assist us, and, therefore, we have to have that Marshall Plan. We would need to develop that Marshall Plan right now. It's not that we need to pour money into Pakistan instantly, but we need to be ready. We don't want to turn Pakistan into Afghanistan. It's a real danger.

Mr. BURTON. So you think we ought to start moving that direction right away?

Ms. STERN. We ought to start planning it.

Mr. BURTON. OK.

General, you worked with Pakistan, and you were with them, I guess, during the problems we had in Somalia. You were the commander in chief of CENTCOM at that time. What was your assessment of the Pakistanis in that conflict?

General ZINNI. Well, they were truly heroic. The Pakistanis suffered—I think it was 135 killed, more than any other force. When we were bringing in coalition partners and, of course, trying to give coalition partners some of the tough duty, like the city of Mogadishu or some of the difficult outlying areas, Pakistani brigade voluntarily took on the heart of the city, and they paid a big price for it.

I also commanded the force that covered the withdrawal of the U.N. Forces, and the Pakistani brigades were the last ones on the beach, except for our forces. We conducted nine tactical maneuvers, all at night, extremely difficult, passage of lines, release in place; doing it with an ally that doesn't even operate under the same doctrine is extremely difficult. They were highly professional, and they're greatly appreciative of what we did.

I would also say, Congressman, that after the millennium bombings or alleged preparations for attack were in Jordan, the Jordanians coughed up a number of terrorists ready to attack a number of civilians, and we picked up the terrorists trying to come

through the Canadian border to LAX. I was asked, because of my relationship with General Musharraf, to call him and ask him to apprehend the leaders of this effort who were identified as being in Pakistan along the Afghan border. He said, Of course, and he immediately apprehended them all.

I was then asked to call him again to ask if he would allow our lawful and other agencies to have access to them, and he said, of course, send them right away.

I was then asked to call him again and see if he would give up computer disks and other things that were confiscated, and he said, Of course.

To make a long story short, I have asked to make five calls and he delivered under everyone of them. He wasn't under pressure and he knew he wasn't going to get anything for this. As a matter of fact, I said, this ought to be motivation for us to improve our relations. He said, I don't want anything for this. He said, it's the right thing to do.

So that's been the kind of individual he's been. He leans toward the West. I think he wants more Western influence. His No. 1 concern in his army is that 70 percent of his officers have not been outside of Pakistan. Traditionally, it's been an international officer corps, educated offshore in many of our institutions, but now cutoff from that; and he worries about an army that has to turn inward and the influences of extremists.

I think he's someone that we should help, as Dr. Stern says, and the country, not because we get something out of it, because as Dr. Stern says, we can't afford a Pakistan that becomes another Afghanistan.

Mr. BURTON. Very good.

Let me just ask one more question. I see the red light came on, and I appreciate the generosity of the chairman.

One of the questions that has not been asked, and I'm not sure you'll want to answer this question in open forum, but I'd like to pose it to you anyhow, and that is, I think—I can't remember whether it was Dr. Harmon or Dr. Stern commented about a truckload of Stinger missiles.

Was it you, Dr. Harmon?

Mr. HARMON. It was Dr. Stern.

Mr. BURTON. And the concern I have is the Stinger missiles are shoulder-fired surface-to-air missiles that can bring down a plane.

Do these terrorists have these kinds of weapons or access to them, and should we be concerned about that right now here in the United States?

General ZINNI. We have had reports that the terrorists do have Stinger missiles or their equivalent, Soviet model, I believe it's SA–7. As a matter of fact, as I mentioned, when we covered the withdrawal of the U.N. Forces out of Somalia, rumors of Stinger-like missiles caused us to have to do an all-surface. In other words, we had to withdraw the entire force by sea for fear of bringing in heavy-lift air and the problems around Mogadishu airport.

Obviously, during the Afghan war, the Afghans were provided with surface-to-air hand-held missiles, and there's been an attempt to account for all of those. I've never seen anything that absolutely confirmed, but I would strongly believe that they have those mis-

siles, or have access, or could certainly buy them on the weapons market.

Mr. BURTON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'll have some more questions later.

Mr. SHAYS. Thank you very much.

At this time the Chair would recognize Mr. Waxman.

Dr. Harmon, I want you to put your mic a little closer. Move that, if you would, and get it a little closer.

Mr. Waxman, you have the floor for at least 10 minutes and more if you need it.

Mr. WAXMAN. Well, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I want to greet the three witnesses and apologize that I wasn't here for your testimony, but I had a conflict that I had to attend to.

This is probably the most important issue before us I think, far above any other. There are all the other issues that are still pending, like what do we do with energy and electricity deregulation, what do we do with compensating health providers and things like that.

We heard from former Prime Minister Netanyahu. I don't know if you were here to hear what he had to say, but he described the need to have a clear policy of sanctioning any state that allowed terrorism to operate within its borders, or gave support to terrorism.

Now, he made a convincing case that terrorism, which is the intentional attack on innocent civilians, should not be acceptable under any circumstance. But how practical is such a policy as we now try to bring together a broad international coalition to deal with this problem and to strike back at those who attacked us last week?

General Zinni, do you have any views on that?

General ZINNI. Well, I think there's the obvious problem of one man's terrorist is another man's freedom fighter. You're going to run into that. Certainly not in the case of Osama bin Laden. I think you'll find very few people who describe him as a freedom fighter or the kind of terrorist that we're talking about, that Dr. Stern, Dr. Harmon mentioned, who are directly informed in these sorts of activities.

But if it becomes a blanket policy, I think it's going to be difficult on the fringes as we get into areas where it's unclear as to who is a terrorist or how we define them. I do think the Prime Minister's statement about terrorism as an attack on innocent civilians is not acceptable in any case, and I do think we ought to——

Mr. WAXMAN. Terrorism is unacceptable, not his statement is unacceptable.

Mr. ZINNI. No. Terrorism is unacceptable; I'm sorry—that we should sanction any country that advocates or condones attacks on innocent civilians as a means of responding to whatever their political problems are.

Mr. WAXMAN. Dr. Harmon, did you want to comment?

Mr. HARMON. May I add something?

I think that sanctioning states which harbor terrorist groups is quite practical for at least a couple of reasons. One is that all traditional law and modern international law, to the limited degree I understand them, bar a state from allowing its territory to be used

as a refuge and as a base for operations against foreign states. Since that's a bedrock principle of international law and our U.S. foreign policy, I think we should use it and rely on it and push others to live up to it. And I think the Prime Minister's arguments do point in that direction.

The second thing, as to this notion of just how well we can recognize terrorism, I was struck in 1997, December and also in 1994, at two great summit meetings involving many dozens of Arab states, that they published the most extreme condemnations of terrorism, especially the kind committed in the name of Islam.

I think Americans have heard so many commentators talk about the difference between real Muslim faith and Muslim militancy that would kill innocent people, that I think we understand that, and think we can rely on it. I think we can turn to a moderate Arab state and make every reasonable insistence that they help us in fighting terrorism. It's in their interest as much as ours.

Hosni Mubarek went to Addis Ababa on a state visit in 1995 and was nearly murdered by terrorists who came from the Sudan. It was completely reasonable that Egypt, after that, was infuriated by Sudanese behavior. It was reasonable that the United States and Egypt both joined in sponsoring sanctions in the U.N. against the Sudan, which I think have had some effect; and so I think it is practical, and I think it must be pursued.

Mr. WAXMAN. We're now trying to bring together an international coalition to fight terrorism. I think the President is doing exactly the right thing, and I certainly support him. But prior to this time, we were resisting some international efforts—for example, the Biological Weapons Convention in 1972 which prohibits the development and stockpiling of biological weapons for 6 years. Negotiations have been ongoing to add to the treaty a protocol containing provisions that will allow inspectors to obtain information about and go to sites of expected biological weapons production, development or use.

Earlier this year, the United States rejected this protocol and failed to offer an alternative proposal.

In addition, the U.N. is in the process of negotiating a treaty to counter small arms proliferation. In these negotiations, the U.S. has been supporting civilian ownership of military weapons in trying to block proposed restrictions on trading arms with rebel groups.

Do you think that we ought to change course and support the Biological Weapons Convention to be expanded to allow inspectors to proceed to get this information, and do you think we ought to reverse course and work within the U.N. in trying to negotiate a treaty to counter small arms proliferation?

Do any of you have any comments on those two areas?

Ms. STERN. I think what we've learned in the last week is that this is very much a globalized world, and there is a dark side to globalization, and that we need other countries to help us fight a variety of threats, not just terrorism, but also reemerging antibiotic-resistant disease. There are going to be certain kinds of threats that we can absolutely not fight alone.

I think that certainly the Bush administration should put forward some kind of alternative if it can't accept the Biological Weap-

ons Convention itself. I understand that there are some kinds of experiments, which seem to be reasonable experiments, ongoing in what our adversaries might have planned for us in the area of biological warfare, and it's understandable that we would want to—not to reveal exactly what is going on. So we need to come up with a good alternative.

The bottom line, I think you're absolutely right, is that we cannot go it alone. In a way, we are declining, our power is declining. We need the world; that's become very, very clear.

Mr. WAXMAN. Thank you very much. I appreciate your testimony and your answer to my questions, and I wanted to say to you, Dr. Stern—I don't know if you were here or where—one of our colleagues I thought was very unfair to you, and I just want to apologize on behalf of the overwhelming majority of this committee that, I'm sure, disagreed with a Member of Congress acting in such an unprofessional way.

Ms. STERN. Thank you.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Platts, you have the floor. You've been very patient, and you are a very valued member of our Subcommittee on National Security, Veterans Affairs and International Realtions. Thank you for staying and being here.

Mr. PLATTS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just one question for the panel.

Given your knowledge of the broad issue of terrorism, in this region in particular, and how we're clearly looking to Pakistan to be of assistance—and we're aware of their assistance in the past, General, and appreciate your insights into that assistance. Earlier, with the Prime Minister, there were some questions regarding how we build the coalition against terrorism and the issues of Israel and India being included in that terrorism and how that affects the coalition, and our ability to stay united and go forward.

And I'd welcome your comments on both of those nations being included in the coalition.

General ZINNI. I would echo what Dr. Harmon said. This threat affects Islamic countries as well as non-Islamic countries.

If you look at the bombings in Nairobi and Dar es Salaam, Muslims were killed. In the case of Dar es Salaam, 11 Tanzanians were killed. 10 were Muslim. It's obviously destroyed countries, made them incapable or failed states, the cases of Afghanistan, Somalia.

We have countries out there that have tried to turn this around. Yemen is a good example. Yemen has a lot of problems, but Yemen asked for help. They asked for help in intelligence sharing, in training counterterrorism forces, in helping develop a coast guard, a border security force. We were involved, in my time there, in trying—because it was in our interest—to also help them secure their borders and not become a transit point for terrorists.

Unfortunately, the Cole was bombed in their harbor, and it set us back a considerable way and even brought questions from Congress about why we should even do this. Well, I think now those questions are pretty well answered.

I'd like to just make one statement about—most of the things that have been said here have to do with what I would call "the first phase" of this. The first phase is, get better intelligence, fuse it better, go after the money, get the leadership, take care of the

infrastructure and take it down. We may need some legal help in terms of computer network attack and information operations, changing some of our own laws.

There will be military action. It should be done in the appropriate way with the appropriate targets.

All that is short-term, tactical first phase.

You have a second phase that really, I think, gets to your question, Congressman. What do we do after that? We can leave a lot of broken china in this region, a lot of people that will not understand our motivations and intentions. Eventually you have to ask the question, how do we get at the center of gravity of this problem, radicalized young men who are willing to destroy things for this?

How do they get there? It isn't just religious fanaticism that suddenly struck them. That's the rationale, and that's the means by which they're cultivated. But there are economic and political problems; there are cultural conflicts out there that we need to work to resolve. It's in our interest and the interest of those in the region.

Those members of the coalition, beyond Israel and beyond India, I think basically the Islamic countries, will join us in this, but they want a long-term commitment and they will want us to help them address these issues that go beyond just the immediate tactical attacks or fixes that we need to do.

Mr. PLATTS. Would either of the other panelists like to address it as well?

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I appreciate all three of our panelists being here today and giving their time; and, certainly, your leadership and the full committee chairman's leadership on this issue.

Mr. SHAYS. Thank you, Mr. Platts.

You are all very gracious to allow one member to proceed, but I have a number of questions, and I consider you a phenomenal resource. I would like you to tell me where you agree the most with the Prime Minister, or where you might have been a little uneasy, if you were at all; and what would you have wanted to emphasize about what he said?

And, General, I'll start with you.

General ZINNI. I didn't find anything in particular that I would disagree with.

I understand we have a strong relationship with democracies around the world, and we have special relationships with countries, but I think it's clear to us that the coalition that we need to build, what we need in the international community to fight this, has to be broad; and we have to make sure that what we do includes countries that may not be democracies, countries that may be struggling toward democracies, even countries that have a lot of problems that need to be fixed and need to perform a lot better to measure up to our standards and to receive our support. Because the immediate problem is dealing with this.

As I mentioned, the first phase of this problem is to eliminate this cancer that's out there, but then in the second phase to eliminate the causes.

I don't want my son facing this. He's a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, by the way. But we will create generational problems if we only go at the tactics of this, if we only view this as a war, if we only view this as attacks.

Dr. Stern mentioned the Marshall Plan. General Marshall defeated Nazi Germany and then found a way to make sure we didn't face that again. Douglas MacArthur certainly helped in the defeat of Japan and then made decisions on rehabilitating Japan, to bring it around to where we never had to face that again. As distasteful as that seems now, as much as that runs against our emotions at this moment, when we finish the job of getting Osama bin Laden and breaking his network and destroying other terrorist networks—which I'm convinced we can do; we now have the will and the popular support, unfortunately through this tragic incident, that we hadn't had before. But we need to take it that step further, and we need to prevent the conditions that allow this to grow, from happening again. We are the only power left in the world that can cause this not to become a future problem.

Mr. SHAYS. I'm going to pursue a question with you before we ask the others to respond to the same question.

It seems to me that the Prime Minister was giving us a recipe that makes it easier for us to fight terrorism and to have our—and to use our military, because he's making it very clear we have to hold the harboring states accountable as if they committed the act, instead of—in that sense, we're not looking for the needle in the haystack. I mean, we know it's there. We know who the leaders are, and we hold them accountable.

Tell me, though, what that means.

General ZINNI. I've been in this business for 18 years. I was the Marine Corps's counterterrorism officer, appointed after the Beirut bombs. Every time you tried to generate the resources or the attention to deal with this issue, you never really could get everything you felt you needed.

I think we're going to find in the intelligence community, for example, we're woefully inadequate in the number of analysts, in the fusion center, in the kinds of things we need to bring that together.

The comment would always be that more Americans die from bee stings each year than they do from terrorists. Well, that's not true anymore. We've crossed into a new era, and I think that we have now, unfortunately because of this tragedy, the public support and the political will to do something.

Any nation-state that promotes, supports or condones terrorism, we must consider it as an act of war against us, and we must go after that nation-state and, I believe, remove the regimes that advocate this, that support it or direct it. In that sense, I completely agree with the Prime Minister.

I think there are going to be nonstate entities that are going to require a different approach, and of course, Osama bin Laden is the classic case, where they do have the wherewithal, the financing, the network, the support structure to do things that only nation-states were able to do just a short time ago.

There is going to be a third category of nations, incapable and failed states that are used and abused. They are not going to look pretty. They are going to be states where maybe in some cases, the

government is supportive of the kinds of things we want to do, but there is mixed reactions from the population. We push the governments very hard, we could lose the state. So we are going to have to be very careful how we handle that category of state. We have to help them out of this more as in many ways and we have to help them come out when they make the hard decisions in ways that their people can see they benefited from making the right decision.

So we have to look at those three categories, Mr. Chairman. States that fully condone it and we have to go after them as we would any nation that has committed an act of war upon us.

Non state actors. This is going to be the strange new war, the war of computer network attack, of high degree of intelligence, of selected military strikes, of all the things you have heard testimony about.

And then the third category, failed or incapable states that will need our help. I would give one caution in that third area, because I have lived this when I attempted to do the engagement in my region. We have a number of people in this body who honestly believe, as they should very strongly, about certain principles. And when they look at these nation states, they see a principle that isn't fully the way they would like it to be, be it human rights, non proliferation, democratization. Because of this one flaw or one fault, we totally become incapable or we become prohibited from engaging in any way.

I conducted military to military connections with countries that I was turned off because their police committed a humanitarian or human rights violation. The military people that were clean told me how does this affect me. I am trying to do the right thing. This happened right after an incident in New York. How does it affect you in the military? I made the case back here that I often felt like someone charged to provide medical assistance, but the patient had to be completely healthy to qualify. We are going to have to change the rules a little bit and understand that we have a long way to go with some of these nations. It may not be perfect but we have got to help them along the road or they will degenerate into what Dr. Stern and Dr. Harmon have described here, especially in cases like Pakistan and Yemen and other places.

Mr. SHAYS. Sir, you almost accomplished the impossible. Behind you are two Marines that haven't cracked a smile all day and they almost started to smile.

General ZINNI. And they haven't been ordered to, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHAYS. I will have you think about it now, that is, I thought human intelligence required us to be in the various countries we are not at and I saw the conflict of our treating these countries as enemies, and yet we need to be good diplomats or military people, our businessmen and women to interact, to learn things. But you seem to suggest that, you know, we were woefully inadequate on human intelligence by not maybe having analysts. So I need you to come back to that to flesh that a little better. Dr. Harmon, Dr. Stern, one of you would respond to the thing you agreed most with Mr. Netanyahu and maybe the area have you some caution.

Mr. HARMON. I would like to reply. Thank you. Benjamin Netanyahu help set the terms for debate on forcible counterterrorism in the mid 1980's when this was such an impor-

tant issue. His first book appeared, and everyone in the building—and I had the privilege of having a small desk in a distant part of the building—everyone here was struck by the intelligence of the book, by its emphasis on clear thinking and good logic and its insistence that morals play a role in this debate, that it is not just a question of morale, but of the fact that in democrat societies, a moral position is part of morale. He did, in short, a great duty with his publications.

And his last word today, if I recall correctly, was an emphasis on will. I think that as our distance from September 11th grows, that will be something we all really need to remember.

I would like to underscore General Zinni's emphasis that certain threats we face don't necessarily have a good home address, that there are failed states, there are individuals that need dealing with in ways that we can't only take through capitals, state capitals in these cases.

Let me mention something that is sort of controversial. The United States strategy has included for years the matter of forcible rendition in the case of an individual who may be stateless, like Osama bin Laden's case, or a narco-trafficker or something who is abroad from his own country, they have used a combination of law and force to seize these people, bring them here for trial. There is no reason that this country can't contemplate careful and intelligent use of force in a military vein while also doing far more of that kind of thing, such as forcible rendition. All administrations, Democrat and Republican, have done it. Our courts uphold it. If we are willing particularly to use lethal force, if need be, when the case demands it, this is a very practical thing we can do in the difficult war, in the difficult world between war and peace that counterterrorism involves.

And so, that is an attempt to—reasonable countries can deal with particular individuals of the kind that General Zinni was discussing in that way. Otherwise, I think that the Prime Minister's testimony is a good lesson for Americans and something well worth retaining.

Mr. SHAYS. Thank you.

Dr. Stern.

Ms. STERN. I would just like to talk a little bit about what I have seen about how some of these groups raise money.

Mr. SHAYS. Let me ask you this though, could you first respond to what you comment on Mr. Netanyahu's.

Ms. STERN. Yeah. It is closely related because I think that—what I want to emphasize is that these groups don't really need states for—they need states, obviously they have to live somewhere; they are not going to live on Mars. But they are getting a lot of what they need from other entities than states. And I think it is very important to realize how they are doing that. They are wealthy individuals, and I want to talk about the Jihadi groups that I have interviewed in Pakistan. You will see something similar in other parts of the world.

Mr. SHAYS. May I ask you parenthetically, if you continue to interview people who are potential terrorists, are you put in the awkward position of being able to say what you need to say?

Ms. STERN. Actually, I have already published. They don't really like what I publish and I probably will not be able to continue doing this kind of research.

Mr. SHAYS. I would like to have you back a few more times.

Ms. STERN. I think my husband doesn't want me going back.

Mr. SHAYS. That is a good sign. It must mean he loves you.

Ms. STERN. Right. I don't think I am about to tell you anything.

Mr. SHAYS. If your husband wanted you back, I think you need to consult someone.

Ms. STERN. Well, I will just put——

Mr. SHAYS. For the record, the two Marines smiled for the second time.

Ms. STERN. I think it is very important to realize that there are wealthy individuals around the world that are supporting these movements. And governments may be able to control them, but we have to pressure those governments a lot more.

Mr. SHAYS. So that implies the Swiss or whomever that don't harbor terrorists, if they are enabling someone to be harbored and they are aware of it in any way, they need to step forward.

Ms. STERN. That is right. I think that may be a good way of saying this is—we should be going after terrorism enablers, and obviously we are not going to impose sanctions on every terrorism enabler.

Mr. SHAYS. OK. What else would you like me to know?

Ms. STERN. There is a lot of money. There is a lot of money in this world, the Jihadi world. Without going into details, since it obviously makes you nervous, I will say on my behalf, and thank you very much, I will say that one group, for example, told me they had so much money they didn't know what to do with it. They are also getting donations in kind of these groups are donating operatives for particular operations. So groups are acting together. They are loaning operatives to one another. That is another way—I mean, there a way that is another—you can think of that as a kind of support for the group that really has nothing to do with states.

Mr. SHAYS. General, maybe you could respond to the issue of human intelligence. You heard the assumption I made. How would you respond?

General ZINNI. I think there is two issues regarding intelligence. I am sure more, but two issues that jump out at me, Mr. Chairman, one is human intelligence. I can't remember a testimony that I gave as a commander in chief where, when asked what my deficiencies were, especially in intelligence, that I didn't say it was the lack of human intelligence.

Mr. SHAYS. The question, though, is how is that curable?

General ZINNI. It is curable but not in the short term. It takes a long time to buildup a network and it takes resources and money, and it obviously takes the authority, the legal basis for it in some cases, which may not be there now as a result of some legislation. To buildup the kind——

Mr. SHAYS. So we are not speaking in tongues here, are you referring to legislation that says we can't deal with bad people?

General ZINNI. Yes.

Mr. SHAYS. You would knock that out quick.

General ZINNI. I think in this case we have to. I would be careful. I wouldn't advocate blanket authority to do things. I think certainly oversight is necessary. I wouldn't want that as an American citizen. But I do think we have to look carefully. This is a new and different kind of war. How many times have we heard that? It is going to require tactics some times that require us to take measures like that in order to get the intelligence.

But the intelligence problem doesn't stop there. We will find out in this, I am afraid that there were bits and pieces out there, that if somebody could have pulled it together we might have seen this coming. I think that in the intelligence world the terms that always used is fusion.

After the Beirut bombings of the Marine barracks, we created a terrorist fusion center here, interagency in Washington. And everything regarding terrorism, any report, any call-in, any information we received went in there. And they were given the proper resources, the proper number of people and analysts so they could quickly turn it around and put the pieces of that puzzle together. I am concerned about, at least at first blush, what I see that the INS had a bit of information, the FBI may have had a bit, the CIA, whoever. How is this coming together? Do they have the resources in people, in money, to turn this around? In the intelligence area it is collection, it is processing and analysis and it is quick dissemination so you can act.

I lived in an AOR, an area of responsibility that had Osama bin Laden and many other terrorists for 4 years. And we tried to protect our forces. 99.9 percent of the times we were successful. There were times when we weren't, or our State Department wasn't or NGO's weren't or our businessmen weren't or our tourists were not. The only way we can counter that to be better is to have the intelligence. And it is going to require a big investment, I think, to get us there.

Mr. SHAYS. In one way, I am encouraged because I have been going under the assumption that we couldn't do some of this human intelligence because we certainly weren't there and didn't have the network. The sad news is maybe this information was available and we didn't have the people to analyze it and to collect it all and analyze it and make the process of knowing what it said, which is sad but that seems to me to be something we can remedy pretty quickly.

General ZINNI. I think so. And I think we need to question the intelligence community about what their needs are to make this happen. I should add one other point, and that is intelligence sharing. The program is very difficult in a formal sense because obviously we have to vet nations in their ability to handle the intelligence. But I do think we need to make the connections as soon as possible. And in some cases, we may actually have to waive some of the obviously important bureaucratic things that we put in to protect information in order to get access. The best information I ever received is when I sat down over tea with the intelligence chief of some nation who gave me his views of things. That was the best intelligence.

Mr. SHAYS. But the implication is you got to be there.

General ZINNI. Yes. Absolutely.

Mr. SHAYS. One of the things that I have been impressed with in my travels overseas for the work in any national security subcommittee is the amazing contacts that our military personnel that all branches have overseas with very powerful military people in those other countries. And I think I learned more almost from those interagencies where our military invited me to meet the military personnel of France, Great Britain or other countries than I have learned, frankly, from briefings that I have had in my own country.

General ZINNI. I agree, sir.

Mr. SHAYS. It is very impressive. This is a book that, by the way, whenever I ask one witness a question, I am happy to give you an idea. I am going to limit myself to 10 to 15 more minutes because I could go on for hours, but—unless I care to go on longer, then I will just use that authority. So the point is if you have a comment to a question I asked the General, I am happy to have you jump in, either one of you.

This is from the Department of Health and Human Services and it is fiscal year 2002 to fiscal year 2006 plan for combating bioterrorism. And it said, "During the year that small pox was eradicated, the Soviet government embarked on an ambitious program to grow smallpox in large quantities and adapted for use in bombs in intercontinental ballistic missiles. The successfulness of that project has the U.S. very concerned about the intentional use additionally." Then it says, "the WHO, the World Health Organization, has expressed concerns that smallpox might be freeze-dried to retain virulence for prolonged periods. The technology and intellectual capacity exists for a well-funded, highly motivated terrorist group to mount such an attack." That's just you know from our own HHS. Does that surprise any of the three of you?

General ZINNI. It doesn't surprise me. It is in line with all the intelligence reporting I saw while on active duty.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Harmon.

Mr. HARMON. It is my understanding that it does not take much sophistication to make a small biological weapon which could be useful in a terrorism case. There is a major new study of considerable interest of some of the cases in which either chemical or biological weapons have been tried. It is edited by Jonathan Tucker and done by MIT press recently. And some of the major cases have been studied about American groups, foreign groups, attempting to use and make weapons of mass production. The general conclusion, and then Dr. Stern, I think, contributed to that, so she will doubtless want to comment. I think the general conclusion could be two things: one is that they haven't come as close as people feared to success; but on the other hand, it is evident that they sure are trying. And I think all of us——

Mr. SHAYS. You don't have any doubt given that they were willing to destroy potentially the lives of 50,000 people that they would be hesitant at all.

Mr. HARMON. The kinds of groups we are discussing today don't, I think, hesitate on that basis. 25 years ago, Mr. Chairman, there was a strong argument advanced that particularly with nuclear weapons, that terrorists don't want lots of bodies, they want lots of attention. The author of that line of argument, and it is a fine

article, has backed off a little bit. He did a new version of his own. He is a——

Mr. SHAYS. Before Tuesday or after Tuesday.

Mr. HARMON. This was before. About a year ago, he published a new examination of that issue. He said essentially I hope it is still true that they won't go to weapons of mass destruction but I am less sure than I used to be. I think Aum Shinrikyo's activities in Tokyo should divest us of any hope we have that they are unwilling to work with this kind of material to try to make it effective. We have been somewhat lucky, frankly, so far, that some of these cases have not worked out for the groups which——

Mr. SHAYS. The terrorists developed a new smart bomb. They just got on a plane and they became the guiding guidance systems, and they were just willing to blow themselves up in the process. So we know if they haven't handled, how do they expose the general public to a biological or chemical agent without hurting themselves? We can learn now that they may not care.

Ms. STERN. I would like to add something to here. I think it is very important to point out that very few groups are interested in mass casualty attacks, but the kind of group we would be worried about would be of the sort that we have now seen. And regarding your question about smallpox, I did contribute to that volume that was just referred to, actually I wrote a couple chapters in that MIT press book, and one of the individuals that I have studied extensively is a guy named Larry Harris, who had actually successfully acquired Yersinia pestis from the American Type Culture Collection. That is the bacterium that causes bubonic plague. With smallpox, if someone acquires it, we are in trouble.

Mr. SHAYS. We have about 24 million doses—12 million doses, and I hope we are starting to make more of them. General, I am going to kind of see if I can end up in this area. It seems to me—first off, in terms of I hope we don't look for blame right now, because I have never known our country in a type of crisis when to get it right. But it seems to me that it is almost unfair to affix blame on anyone right now. Because everybody was shouting and later we are—we can say later that person shouted and that person shouted and that person shouted, but there were so many others who were warning things too. It would seem to me is part of our problem is knowing which shout to listen to. It may be that we can go back and say they should have known this or they should have known this or they should have known this. But then what was the environment that it came in? I mean, you know what I am trying to express.

General ZINNI. Yes. I couldn't agree more Mr. Chairman. You know, in recent years I have seen us punish good people. We have ended careers of fine military officers because they were 99.9 percent perfect. And there was a moment when there was a vulnerability, there was a pattern set that they weren't aware of, an attack came at them from a direction they didn't expect. And we have a tendency to frankly, immediately look inward and find accountability becomes the main issue. I think we ought to think about lessons learned as the main issue.

There is probably enough blame to go around for everyone. And all agencies and many people that tried their best but didn't quite

get it 100 percent perfect. I testified before this body and the other body many times on terrorism and made the same statement. I made it in 1996 when I was first appointed. We are being stalked every minute of every day. Someone is waiting for us to make a mistake to let down our guard. It is hard to ask our military, for example, to be completely 100 percent dedicated to force protection. If they did, they wouldn't accomplish their mission.

For example, I had hundreds of people in my region responsible to me for security assistance. They had to be out and about on their own in order to do their job. They had to expose themselves to danger. We ask commanders to carry out missions, like enforcing the sanctions against Iraq that are in positions and bases and places and have to do things that expose themselves.

Sometimes the mission becomes all consuming and sometimes the emphasis on force protection drops just a little bit. And it hurt me deeply to see that we were fast to punish and fast to look for accountability and fast to look for blame. And I would emphasize that is not the important part right now. It is to get the lessons learned and to fix the mistakes that we maybe have made, or the places where we have had gaps.

Mr. SHAYS. This relates to that. If your military forces are on alert constantly, how do we expect them to maintain operational capability?

General ZINNI. That is an excellent point. We have four threat conditions. Let me give you an example, Mr. Chairman. I had 25 countries for which I was responsible for American military involvement, influence, presence. Of those 25 countries, 24 in my entire time as a commander in chief and deputy commander in chief, 4 years, 24 were in a terrorist threat condition all the time. The only one that wasn't was the Sea Shell Island. Every other one was not even just in the minimum threat conditions, but one of the two higher threat conditions.

What that means is we ask our troops to be at this high state of alert when more intelligence comes in, when another threat comes in, one more reliable, one more specific, there is nothing left to ratchet up to. And the troops frankly can be worn down by that. There is no place to go. It is easy to cover yourself by constantly keeping them in that state of alert. If you do, you punish the troops. Many times I granted waivers or I made exceptions or I took the risk as the commander to ease it down because I knew my troops needed it. You can't keep them at that highest state of alert full time.

Mr. SHAYS. I had an opportunity, in my capacity as chairman, to land on the Theodore Roosevelt and stay there for a night. I was astounded at this. I mean it is a city with an airport on top of it. Basically run average age, 19-year-olds. And I was in awe. I even get teary eyed just thinking about it. I was in awe of what each of them did. But these are very young people as well. And the description of all the various countries that we may have to hold accountable and the implications of that are quite mind boggling, frankly.

I will end with this area, Dr. Harmon. And maybe Dr. Stern, and maybe General as well. We can't eliminate the fact that the media will become a platform for terrorists, especially after an attack.

What should we do to make the media less of an unaware participant?

Mr. HARMON. I think it is a superb question, Mr. Chairman. The other day one of the newspapers in the midst of a story about our current difficulties referred to the political offensive against terrorism by saying that the diplomatic effort includes reaching out to such countries as Cuba and Sudan with which the United States has had adversarial relationships.

What a simple little line which hides so much. The story of the 1990's was a story of amazing involvement by Sudan in terrorism worldwide and bin Ladin himself was there for about 5 years as his base. So that statement, which seems so objective and so simple, in fact, covers over many truths. And I think that the skill, therefore, of the reporters who are really good, who try to dig seriously and report honestly is even more impressive. Because that kind of blandishment leaves the typical reader, who doesn't know the Sudan well, with a sense that jeez, bilateral relations are tough between Khartoum and Washington. That just doesn't begin to tell the story. I guess one reason I mentioned Judith Miller of the New York Times, or I could mention Tim Weiner of the same paper or Steve Emerson, who help produce the film, some of which was shown here earlier—these are journalists who really do first-rate work, and they are out there. And so mention of them is helpful.

And I think that the U.S. Government's published position carefully put together by the State Department year after year and published in April, deserves good attention. I think our media should not assume that what one angry sheik says is the equal of what State puts together in this town with a great deal of honest work, with a great deal of weighing of intelligence after a great deal of deliberation about the verbiage.

And so the challenge I think for the people, for the citizens who don't—who are not experts in these areas, is to understand the truth. Because it takes us back to this issue of will. Sudan deserved strong measures during the 1990's when the Al-Turabi regime was in charge. You would never know that from some of the newspaper coverage of the Sudan.

Ms. STERN. I would also like to say a few words. I think we need to be very aware that our rhetoric can actually make a big difference. Words like "crusade" imply a war against Islam and make Muslims everywhere feel threatened. We need to remember that after the victims and their families, the other victims most hard hit by these attacks are peace-loving Muslims around the world. I think that you can do a public service by making clear that this is not a war against Islam. This is not a crusade, that Muslims are critically important Americans and that attacking them at a time like this is not only a violation of law, a violation of ethics, but also counterproductive. So you can use the media.

Mr. SHAYS. Those of us who have been here for 14 years remember legislation we had to vote on dealing with the incarceration of our Japanese citizens and we were all ashamed of that. So hopefully we will remember that in terms of our own real life experience and practice what we preached.

Is there any question that you would have liked me to ask that you would have liked to answer?

General ZINNI. If I could, Mr. Chairman, I would like to address one issue. It is sort of related to your last question. Last night there was a TV show that implied that justification for this act was based on the missile strikes in 1998. And I go back now to the point about the media. And I think it is important that we understand and we don't let the American people believe that was the case. In February 1998 Osama bin Laden put out his fatwa, his religious edict that says American citizens, civilians should be killed not just military, not just diplomats, but all Americans. It followed up about a month later where his council ratified that and put it out as a declaration and we were following this.

Immediately after that, in 1998, about a month later, he made a statement about acquiring, "an Islamic nuclear bomb," that it was, it should be their principal effort. They had a right to it and they should use it. He then attacked the Embassies in Nairobi and Dar es Salaam. He killed over 200 innocent Kenyans and Tanzanians, most of them Muslims. He killed 12 Americans. He killed three of my people at central command. We had intelligence reports that he was planning other attacks, very specific very reliable intelligence reports. As we will find in this business, there aren't good targets. There isn't the infrastructure you have in a nation state. There isn't a military force. There isn't a capital. It is hard to find things to attack. We had some intelligence.

We knew of some camps, a terrorist camp doesn't offer you much. It is remote. There are many facilities. We had to make a choice. There was a possibility that you could take the shot and get something. There was a possibility that even Osama bin Laden and his leadership might be there. But we couldn't bank on it. Or not take the shot and let it pass and suffer another attack. The best we could hope for is that we at least send a message that we can reach you behind those hills. We took the shot.

And I concurred in it. I mean, I was the commander in chief that launched the missiles. When directed, I felt it was the right thing to do. I had no illusions that we were going to score a great victory or hit anything. But to believe that this was the cause of this incident where these people were in place well before that ready to do this or we had no right to take that shot, based on the event that had happened just months before I think is erroneous. But we had media people that allowed that one-sided version to come out. I have no doubt that the American people certainly would not be deceived by that. But that may give rationalization and a sense of justification to those that are on the edge out there that suddenly are horrified what happened, and maybe are going to rethink their sympathies. That is why I think sometimes the sensationalism is out of order.

Having said that, I don't believe we should police the press. I think the first amendment is one of our strengths. Truth hurts these evildoers more than anything else. We just have to ask them to be responsible in their reporting.

Mr. SHAYS. I think that is a very nice way to end up. And I thank all of you. Just hold on 1 second. Before I ask unanimous consent, that the prepared statement of Dr. Bruce Hoffman of the Rand Corp. and a September 9th article from the Wall Street Journal entitled, "U.S. Presses Lebanon On Suspects" that Mr. Lantos

wanted to be inserted into the hearing record, that both be inserted into the record. And obviously without objection so ordered.

I would just say that to the three of you, you were very patient in waiting. It is important that you testify before this committee. It is important that my staff and other staff hear what you had to say as well as members. And I consider all three of you having made a valuable contribution to the work of our committee. I thank you very deeply. This hearing is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 4:40 p.m., the committee was adjourned.]

[The prepared statement of Hon. Diane E. Watson and additional information submitted for the hearing record follow:]

Government Reform Committee - "Preparing for the War on Terrorism"
September 20, 2001
Opening Remarks of Congresswoman Diane E. Watson

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for convening this hearing. The events of last Tuesday left an indelible impression on every American. Just as a previous generation measured their world from the date December 7th, 1941, I have no doubt that for this generation, September 11th, 2001, will be the date from which all things hereto forth are measured.

The people who committed the evil attack of last Tuesday took many things from America. They took thousands of innocent citizens away from their families. They took dozens of our best and brightest soldiers, sailors and airmen from the defense department. They even took the lives of many of the brave men and women who served their communities as police officers, firefighters, and rescue personnel.

But most insidiously, they took from every American their faith in their own security, their sense of safety, their sense of freedom. We here in Congress were elected to protect these freedoms.

Our national commitment to the task ahead of us will require vigilance and forbearance. It will also require that we remain mindful of the fact that the United States is an open society. We must be careful that our struggle to defeat terrorism does not too severely restrict the civil liberties that Americans cherish. In a war, great sacrifices are often necessary to achieve victory. Yet we must remember that any policy or action implemented by the U.S. government will ultimately fail if it does not have the support of the American people.

Protecting Americans' freedoms while pursuing a foe that exploits those freedoms will require a careful balancing act. I hope the experts we are to hear from today will give us some sense of how we should proceed in the months ahead.

PREPARING FOR THE WAR ON TERRORISM

Testimony of Dr. Bruce Hoffman

Vice President, External Affairs, and
Director, RAND Washington Office

Before the Committee on Government Reform
U.S. House of Representatives

September 20, 2001

The opinions and conclusions expressed in this written testimony are the author's alone and should not be interpreted as representing those of RAND or any of the sponsors of its research.

PREPARING FOR THE WAR ON TERRORISM

Statement of Bruce Hoffman,*
Vice President, External Affairs and
Director, RAND Washington Office

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the privilege and opportunity to testify before the Committee as it begins its important deliberations on this critical issue. As you know, I testified before the Subcommittee on National Security, Veterans Affairs, and International Relations of the House Committee on Government Reform in March 2001 on the need for a national strategy with which to combat terrorism.[1] Many of the same points I made then remain painfully germane to the topic I have been asked to address today. Accordingly, I hope that you will pardon the repetition of some of arguments and points that I previously raised in testimony before the Subcommittee. They are, however, sufficiently important and central to today's deliberations to warrant reiteration.

LAST WEEK'S TRAGIC EVENTS IN CONTEXT

The concept of proportionality has long governed American counterterrorist policy. Its American proponents argued, and our European and other regional allies expected, that our military response would be commensurate to the terrorist attack that provoked it. Thus, in 1986, when the Qaddafi regime was implicated in the bombing of a West Berlin discotheque frequented by American soldiers, the United States retaliated with airstrikes directed against Libyan military targets in Tripoli and Benghazi—including Qaddafi's living quarters—in an attempt to eliminate the Libyan leader himself. Similarly, in 1998, when Osama bin Laden, the renegade Saudi terrorist, was identified as the architect of the massive truck bombings of the American embassies in Kenya and Tanzania, the U.S. launched nearly 100 cruise missiles against his training camps in Afghanistan—also in

---

* The preparation of this testimony was supported entirely by RAND funds was neither funded nor supported by federal government grant nor monies. **It should also be emphasized that the opinions and conclusions expressed both in this testimony and the published work from which it is derived are entirely my own and therefore should not be interpreted as representing those of RAND or any of the sponsors of its research.**

[1] Bruce Hoffman, "Combating Terrorism: In Search of A National Strategy," 27 March 2001. This can be accessed at http://www.rand.org/publications/CT/CT175/CT175.pdf.

hopes of killing bin Laden—as well as against a pharmaceutical factory allegedly linked to bin Laden and believed to be manufacturing chemical weapons in the Sudan.

Two Americans had lost their lives in the discotheque bombing and twelve in Nairobi. In the latter case, the response may have been insufficient. But our situation today leaves no room for quibbling. By the time the rubble and debris is cleared from New York City's World Trade Center, the collapsed walls of the Pentagon are stabilized and the last of the bodies are retrieved from the field in rural Pennsylvania where a fourth suicide aircraft crashed, the death toll is likely to be exponentially higher. By contrast, until last Tuesday, a grand total of no more than 1,000 Americans had been killed by terrorists either in this country or abroad since 1968. The enormity and sheer scale of the simultaneous suicide attacks on September 11 dwarfs anything we have previously seen—either individually or in aggregate. It calls, unquestionably, for a proportionate response that will effectively harness the diverse and multi-faceted capabilities that the United States can bring to bear in combating this menace.

Clearly, military options are only one of many instruments at our disposal in the struggle against terrorism. Indeed, as the experiences of other countries enmeshed in such struggles have repeatedly shown, the failure to develop a comprehensive, fully coordinated strategy has often undermined, and even negated, their counterterrorism efforts. To be truly effective, a successful counterterrorist strategy must be sustained and prolonged—requiring commitment, political will and patience. It must have realistic goals and not unduly raise or create false expectations. And, finally, it must avoid cosmetic or "feel good" physical security measures. The solutions that we chose must have a lasting and demonstrably positive effect. Let us consider the various types of responses and the means necessary to ensure the achievement of the critical national security objectives defined by our leaders in recent days.

A CLEAR, COMPREHENSIVE AND COHERENT STRATEGY

It is inaccurate if not delusory, and to write off last Tuesday's tragic events simply as an intelligence failure. The problem is more complex and systemic than a deficiency of any single agency or component of our national security structure. Instead, it manifestly underscores the conspicuous absence of a national overarching strategy. As the Gilmore Commission noted in its first annual report to the President and the Congress in December 1999, the promulgation of a succession of policy documents and presidential

decision directives[2] neither equates to, nor can substitute for, a truly "comprehensive, fully coordinated national strategy."[3] In this respect, the variety of Federal agencies and programs concerned with counterterrorism still remain painfully fragmented and uncoordinated; with overlapping responsibilities, and lacking clear focus.

The articulation and development of such a strategy, as I observed to the Subcommittee in March, is not simply an intellectual exercise, but must be at the foundation of any effective counterterorism policy. Failure to do so historically has undermined the counterterrorism efforts of other democratic nations: producing frustratingly ephemeral, if not sometimes, nugatory effects and, in some cases, proving counterproductive in actually reducing the threat. Accordingly, as last week's attacks demonstrate, the continued absence of a national strategy seriously undermines our ability to effectively counter terrorism. What is now therefore clearly needed is a comprehensive effort that seeks to knit together more tightly, and provide greater organizational guidance and focus, to individual state and local preparedness and planning efforts within a national framework in order to minimize duplication and maximize coordination. Among the key findings of a 1992 RAND study that examined, through the use of select historical case studies,[4] other countries' experiences in countering terrorism was that the most effective structure is always one that is led by a specific, high-ranking individual with overall responsibility and authority over all elements and aspects of counter-terrorism operations.[5] This is a point that the Gilmore Commission has also made. Its second annual report, published in December 2000, unequivocally recommended the "establishment of a senior level coordination entity in the Executive Office of the President . . . with responsibility for developing domestic and international policy and for coordinating the program and budget of the Federal government's activities for combating terrorism."[6]

---

[2]e.g., the "Five Year Interagency Counter-Terrorism Plan" and PDDs 39, 62 and 63.

[3]The Advisory Panel to Assess Domestic Response Capabilities For Terrorism Involving Weapons of Mass Destruction, *I. Assessing the Threat*, 15 December 1999, p. 56.

[4]Among the cases examined were the counterterrorist campaigns prosecuted by Britain, West Germany, and Italy.

[5]See Bruce Hoffman and Jennifer Morrison Taw, *A Strategic Framework for Countering Terrorism and Insurgency* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND, N-3506-DOS, 1992)pp. 136-140.

[6] The Advisory Panel to Assess Domestic Response Capabilities For Terrorism Involving Weapons of Mass Destruction, *II. Toward a National Strategy for Combating Terrorism*, 15 December 2000, p. 7.

REGULAR FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC TERRORIST THREAT ASSESSMENTS

A critical prerequisite in framing such an integrated national strategy is the tasking of a comprehensive net assessment of the terrorist threat, both foreign and domestic, as it exists today and is likely to evolve in the future.[7] The failure to conduct such comprehensive net assessments on a more regular basis is palpable. For example, the last comprehensive national intelligence estimate (NIE) regarding foreign terrorist threats in the United States—a prospective, forward-looking effort to predict and anticipate future terrorist trends directed at this country—was conducted in 1997. In light of last week's events, it is clear that a re-assessment was long over-due. Indeed, the last, formal, comprehensive foreign terrorist assessment astonishingly was undertaken at the time of the 1990/91 Gulf War—nearly a decade ago. Although a new one was tasked this past summer and presumably was in the process of being finalized in recent weeks, given the profound changes in the nature, operations and mindset of terrorists we have seen in recent years, such an estimate was long over-due. Although the National Intelligence Council's wide-ranging *Global Trends 2015* effort, published in December 2000, was a positive step in this direction, surprisingly minimal attention was paid to terrorism, in the published open-source version at least.[8]

INTELLIGENCE REFORM AND REORGANIZATION

We also need to be much more confident than we are that the U.S. intelligence community is correctly configured to counter the terrorist threats of today and tomorrow rather than yesterday. Our national security architecture is fundamentally a cold war-era artifice, created more than half a century ago to counter a specific threat from a specific country and a specific ideology. That architecture, which is oriented overwhelmingly

---

[7]This same argument has been made repeatedly by Henry L. Hinton, Jr., Assistant Comptroller General, National Security and International Affairs Division, U.S. General Accounting Office, before the Subcommittee on National Security, Veterans Affairs, and International Relations, Committee on Government Reform, U.S. House of Representatives in (1) "Combating Terrorism: Observation on Federal Spending to Combat Terrorism," 11 March 1999; and (2) "Combating Terrorism: Observation on the Threat of Chemical and Biological Terrorism," 20 October 1999; as well as by John Parachini in "Combating Terrorism: Assessing the Threat" before the same House subcommittee on 20 October 1999; and the Hinton testimony "Combating Terrorism: Observation on Biological Terrorism and Public Health Initiatives," before the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs and Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee, Senate Committee on Appropriations, GAO/T-NSIAD-99-12, General Accounting Office Washington, D.C., 16 March 1999.

[8]National Intelligence Council, *Global Trends 2015: A Dialogue About the Future With Non-government Experts*, December 2000.

towards military threats and hence to gathering military intelligence, was proven anachronistic with last Tuesday's devastating attacks carried out by non-state/non-military adversaries. However, its structure remains fundamentally unchanged since the immediate post-World War II period. An estimated 60% of the intelligence community's efforts, for example, are still focused on military intelligence pertaining to the standing armed forces of established nation-states.[9] Eight of the 13 agencies responsible for intelligence collection report directly to the Secretary of Defense (whom also controls their budgets) rather than to the Director of Central of Intelligence.[10] It is not surprising therefore that American's HUMINT (human intelligence) assets have proven so anemic given a military orientation that ineluctably feeds on technological intelligence such as MASINT (measurement and signal Intelligence), ELINT (electronic intelligence) and SIGNINT (signals intelligence) collected by spy satellites orbiting the planet. Given the emergence of formidable, transnational, non-state adversaries, and the lethally destructive threats that they clearly pose, this balance is no longer appropriate.

Indeed the emergence of a range of new adversaries, with different aims and motivations, that operate on a flat, more linear basis involving networks rather than stove-piped, rigid command and control hierarchies, underscores the need for a re-distribution of our intelligence collection efforts traditional military intelligence threats to the spectrum of enigmatic, non-traditional, non-military and non-state adversaries who now clearly pose a salient threat to our national security. The U.S. intelligence community's roughly $30 billion budget is already greater than the national defense budgets of all but six countries in world.[11] Accordingly, a redistribution of emphasis, personnel, budgets and resources is needed to ensure that the U.S. is fully capable of responding to both current and future terrorist threats. At the very minimum, funding of key elements of our current counterterrorism efforts should be re-oriented towards providing sustained, multi-

---

[9]Richard Stubbing, "Improving The Output of Intelligence Priorities, Managerial Changes and Funding," in Craig Eisendrath (ed.), *National Insecurity: U.S. Intelligence After the Cold War* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2000), pp. 176 & 183.

[10] Reporting to Secretary of Defense: 1. Defense Intelligence Agency, J-2 (through the Joint Chiefs of Staff); 2. Nine Unified/Regional Commands intelligence units; 3. Assistant Secretary for the Air Force for Space; 4. National Reconnaissance Office; 5. National Security Agency; 6. National Imagery and Mapping Agency; 7.Individual services' intelligence divisions (e.g., Deputy Chief of Intelligence, US Army; Chief of Naval Intelligence; US Air Force Intelligence); and, 8.Assistant Secretary of Defense's Office for C(3) I (Command, Control, Communications, Coordination and Intelligence).

Reporting to Director, Central Intelligence: 1. CIA; 2. State Department's Bureau of Intelligence and Research; 3. Justice Department/FBI, National Security Division; 4. Treasury Department, Office of Intelligence Support; and 5. Energy Department, Office of Energy Intelligence.

[11]Stubbing, "Improving The Output of Intelligence Priorities," p. 172.

year budgets that will encourage the development of longer-term, systematic approaches, as opposed to the current year-to-year process.

The country's anachronistic intelligence architecture has also created a dangerous gap in our national defenses. The CIA, of course, is responsible for foreign intelligence collection and assessment and by law is prohibited from operating within the U.S. Domestic counterterrorism, accordingly, falls within the purview of the FBI. The FBI, however, is primarily a law enforcement and investigative, not an intelligence agency. Moreover, its investigative activities embrace a broad spectrum—perhaps too broad a spectrum—that includes kidnapping, bank robberies, counter-espionage, serial killings and other even more prosaic crimes in addition to countering terrorism. The time may be ripe for some new, "out-of --the-box" thinking that would go beyond simple bureaucratic fixes and embrace a radical re-structuring of our domestic counter-terrorism capabilities. For example, just as the narcotics problem is regarded in the U.S. as so serious a problem and so a great a threat to our national security that we have a separate, uniquely oriented, individual agency specifically dedicated to counter-narcotics—the Drug Enforcement Agency (DEA)—we should consider creating a similar organization committed exclusively to counter-terrorism.

AVIATION SECURITY

At the end of the day, all the above efforts will be for naught if we cannot be reasonably confident that the nation's physical security measures—the main breaches in our defenses as revealed last Tuesday—are redressed. The time for cosmetic or superficial fixes at America's airports is over. Henceforth, we must ensure that the processes in place, even if not foolproof, address the mistakes of the last week. To be effective these measures will have to go well beyond the stopgap measures currently proposed by the Federal Aviation Administration (which have been mostly limited to, for example, banning curb side luggage check-in and eliminating electronic tickets) and which now must show some real teeth.

This process should begin by ending the use of poorly paid, unmotivated, often inadequately screened contract private security staff who man the x-ray machines and metal detectors at the nation's airports. They must be replaced with sworn law enforcement officers, who would be part of a new uniform federal police force similar to the Federal Protective Service, who now guard America's public buildings. Members of this force would be subject to thorough background checks and be properly trained, paid and motivated to screen passengers before they are allowed to board their flights. They

would be expected to conform to high federal law enforcement standards, would be armed and would thus provide a meaningful first-line defense.

CONCLUDING THOUGHTS

Based on a firm appreciation of terrorism threats, both foreign and domestic, an overarching strategy should now be developed that ensures that the U.S. is capable of responding across the *entire* technological spectrum of potential adversarial attacks. The focus of U.S. counterterrorism policy in recent years has arguably been too weighted towards the "high end" threats from biological and chemical weapons and was based mainly on planning for extreme worst-case scenarios.[12] This approach seemed to assume that, by focusing on "worst-case" scenarios involving these more exotic weapons, any less serious incident involving a different, even less sophisticated weapon, could be addressed simply by planning for the most catastrophic event. Such an assumption ignored the possibility that these less catastrophic, though still high casualty incidents, might present unique challenges of their own. The consensus from a series of first-hand interactions I had last year with state and local first responders from three different regions of the United States strongly implied—as last week's events do—the shortcomings of this approach. At each of these training sessions, complaints were voiced repeatedly that state and local authorities were unable to use federal funds earmarked for the purchase of anti- and counterterrorism equipment to obtain essential life-saving equipment such as concrete cutters, diamond (glass) cutters, and thermal imaging, body-sensing devices that would aid in the rescue of victims in building collapses caused by bombings (or, for that matter, other man-made or natural disasters). Instead, these funds apparently could only be applied to orders involving a range of paraphernalia exclusive to addressing and handling "bioterrorism" situations.[13]

---

[12]This argument has similarly been expressed by Henry L. Hinton, Jr., Assistant Comptroller General, National Security and International Affairs Division, U.S. General Accounting Office, Before the Subcommittee on National Security, Veterans Affairs, and International Relations, Committee on Government Reform, U.S. House of Representatives in (1) "Combating Terrorism: Observation on Federal Spending to Combat Terrorism," 11 March 1999; and (2) "Combating Terrorism: Observation on the Threat of Chemical and Biological Terrorism," 20 October 1999; as well as by John Parachini in "Combating Terrorism: Assessing the Threat" and Brian Michael Jenkins in their respective testimony before the same House subcommittee on 20 October 1999.; and the Hinton testimony "Combating Terrorism: Observation on Biological Terrorism and Public Health Initiatives," before the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs and Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee, Senate Committee on Appropriations, GAO/T-NSIAD-99-12, General Accounting Office Washington, D.C., 16 March 1999.

[13]Discussions held with state and local first responders in Oklahoma (April 2000); Idaho (August 2000); and, Florida (August 2000).

Finally, it should be noted that none of the changes proposed in this testimony are quick fixes or magically conjured solutions to complex and longstanding problems. They all require time, resources and most of all political will and patience. Results will not come quickly. But by taking a comprehensive approach to the terrorist problem and fashioning a cohesive strategy to address it, the U.S. can avoid repeating the mistakes that facilitated last Tuesday's tragic events. The struggle against terrorism is never-ending. Similarly, our search for solutions and new approaches must be continuous and unyielding, proportional to the threat posed by our adversaries in both innovation and determination.

DR. BRUCE HOFFMAN

Dr. Bruce Hoffman is presently Vice President for External Affairs and Director of The RAND Corporation Washington, D.C. office. He was the founding Director of the Centre for the Study of Terrorism and Political Violence at the University of St Andrews in Scotland, where he was also Reader in International Relations and Chairman of the Department of International Relations. Dr. Hoffman is Editor-in-Chief of *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism*, the leading scholarly journal in the field, and a member of the advisory boards of both *Terrorism and Political Violence* and *Global Networks: A Journal of Transnational Affairs*. He holds degrees in government, history, and international relations and received his doctorate from Oxford University.

In November 1994, the Director of Central Intelligence awarded Dr. Hoffman the United States Intelligence Community Seal Medallion, the highest level of commendation given to a non-government employee, which recognizes sustained superior performance of high value that distinctly benefits the interests and national security of the United States. In recognition of his academic contributions to the study of political violence, in June 1998 Dr. Hoffman was awarded the first Santiago Grisolía Prize and accompanying Chair in Violence Studies by the Queen Sofia Center for the Study of Violence in Valencia, Spain.

Dr. Hoffman is Chairman of the International Research Group on Political Violence, a Washington, D.C.-based group, jointly sponsored by the U.S. Institute of Peace and the Airey Neave Trust in London, that seeks to find new approaches to countering terrorism. He was also a member of the Panel of Experts appointed by Argentina's National Congress, Special Bichamber Investigation Follow-Up Commission of the Attacks Against the Israeli Embassy and the A.M.I.A. Building, to advise the Argentine government and Supreme Court.

Dr. Hoffman's latest book, *Inside Terrorism*, is published by Columbia University Press in the U.S. and by Orion Books in Britain. Foreign language editions have been published in nine countries.