

TRANSCRIPT OF *NEW YORK TIMES* INTERVIEW WITH FRANK GAFFNEY

CONDUCTED BY IN PERSON BY MATTHEW ROSENBERG

December 8, 2016

[Unrelated prefatory banter deleted.]

MATT ROSENBERG:

So let's get on to the people who are trying to do us harm. Give me the pitch. Pretend I'm a skeptic. I probably am. Let's be honest. [LAUGHS] I once told a general that I was interviewing, I'm going to just – it was quite a tactical subject, but I said, I did the whole like, yeah, I don't know anything about this, I'm like really, start with the basics. And the guy looked at me and said, every time a reporter tells me he doesn't know anything, I reach for my wallet. This other guy. And before I started laughing, I told him I actually knew quite a lot.

FRANK GAFFNEY:

Oh, I'm just a country lawyer.

MATT ROSENBERG:

Yeah. The Columbo routine. But yeah, so when you're in front of skeptics, how do you kind of – what's the case you need to say that this is why I think I'm right and these are the facts I've got to back me up and this is where I think we are? I'm curious to hear.

FRANK GAFFNEY:

Well, I appreciate you asking. Because it's generally my experience that people aren't interested in knowing the facts. They're more comfortable with just assessing them or assessing my view on them. Look, as I think I said to you last week, I've learned a lot about this subject from people who are a lot more knowledgeable about it than I am. And I say that right up front.

I have become satisfied that the facts about specifically what goes by different names and I think Islamic supremacism is a pretty good term for it, are knowable. This is not something that you have to be a Muslim or you have to speak Arabic to know or you can't know it at all or it's really whatever anybody wants it to be. It's not any of [those].

You know, if you – if you actually pay attention to what the authorities of the [Islamic] faith say, what they draw from the sacred texts, the Koran and so on, you can pretty clearly approximate what it is we're up against in terms of a threat that is kind of defined by – it goes by different terms – a doctrine, theology, program, way of life that its adherents call Sharia.

And we did a [study](#) of this, about [seven] years ago now, the short form of which is here, in a group we call Team B-II. A kind of homage to a group that did a second opinion on the old Soviet Union in the run-up to – basically to Jimmy Carter's administration. It was convened, interestingly enough, by of all people, George Herbert Walker Bush when he was CIA director. And that Team B gave a much more hard-nosed, realistic assessment of what the Soviets were up to than what was being pursued at the time and even more so by Jimmy Carter when he came to office. And it really became, I think, in a way, [UNCLEAR] it really became a template that Ronald Reagan subsequently based his strategy for defeating the Soviet Union.

So we took a fresh look at Sharia. And if you're interested, I'll give you the larger version of it, but it was a distinguished group of, as I recall, nineteen folks. And the conclusion that we came to was that – contrary to the orthodoxy of the time, which was that of the Bush years, which has become more true under Obama, [i.e.,] that the doctrine or the ideology or the program that we're confronting has

nothing to do with Islam – it actually has *everything* to do with what the authorities of Islam say is the faith, namely, Sharia.

Having said that, we very directly acknowledge in the book, and I do in every opportunity that we have, that there are lots of Muslims who don't practice their faith in accordance with Sharia. But they're not the problem, by and large. At least not yet. The ones who do are unmistakably. And that manifests itself in what Sharia compels them to do.

Again, I may be repeating some of the stuff we talked about the other day, but just in the interest of completeness, it's their God-directed duty to impose it on everybody else, Muslim and non-Muslim alike. Sharia, that is. And the way to do that is through jihad, which is not about personal struggle or about being a better Muslim or any of the other things we're often told. Again, some Muslims may feel that way, but that's not what Sharia is really requiring of them.

By the way, when I talk about Sharia, and I don't know if you have seen it, my colleague may have it next door, what we've used as kind of our reference text is [*Reliance of the Traveller*](#). Which is a book that I think was first written about thirteen hundred years ago. It has been translated into English –

MATT ROSENBERG:

What was the title again?

FRANK GAFFNEY:

Reliance of the Traveller. It has been described as authoritative in terms of its rendering of Sharia by al-Azhar and House of Saud and Jordanian royals and so on. And when you look at the jihad as it is describe there, it is clearly about holy war.

And the holy war is, as a practical matter, pursued by those who believe this is God's will in different ways. The preferred way, the most efficient way, is terrifying violence. And where you're strong enough to do that and where you can succeed at it, you go for it. Some say you should do it whether you can succeed at it or not, just because that's the right way and, you know, you got your Islamic States and your Talibans and your – the folks you've been hanging with – al-Qaeda and so on, lovely people.

But as important, I think, are the other kinds of jihad that are also perfectly legitimate and in fact the responsibility of Muslims to engage in, especially where they're not strong enough to use violence, and that runs the gamut from the hijra – migration, colonization, whatever you want to call it.

Zakat, at least a portion of which is supposed to go to jihad, [including] the people who engage in it [and] their families.

Or what the Muslim Brotherhood calls civilization jihad. And this [pointing to a Center for Security Policy Press edition of [*An Explanatory Memorandum on the General Strategic Goal of the Group in North America*](#)] is the single most important book as far as I'm concerned on the subject because it is a secret plan that the Muslim Brotherhood's leadership here in America wrote in 1991 as a report back to the mothership in Egypt. Never meant for our eyes, but it lays out both what their mission is, which is described as “destroying Western Civilization from within by their hands, meaning ours, and the hands of the believers so that God's religion is made victorious over all other religions.”

And then it proceeds to say in the way of a report as to how they're coming, some twenty-five years after they began, with this stealthy, subversive kind of jihad. By which they essentially, like termites, hollow out, you know, the structure of civil society and other institutions, government institutions included, for the purpose of creating conditions under which the jihad will succeed, perhaps through a violent phase or perhaps otherwise. So we have that document, which providentially came into our

hands because it was found in a house in Annandale, Virginia after a traffic stop on the Chesapeake Bay Bridge.

MATT ROSENBERG:

When was it found?

FRANK GAFFNEY:

2004. It wasn't until 2007, 2008 when it was introduced into evidence in the Holy Land Foundation trial that the public became aware of this document.

MATT ROSENBERG:

So this was found – whose house was it found in?

FRANK GAFFNEY:

Ismail Elbarasse, who at the time was wanted on a material witness arrest warrant out of Chicago for fundraising for the designated terrorist group called Hamas.

MATT ROSENBERG:

Yeah, you got to wonder about the guys who they wanted on warrants. Any – all the warrants, not just the – and it's just on doing things like running red lights and stupid traffic violations.

FRANK GAFFNEY:

On this case, what he was doing was driving across the bridge with his wife, photographing not the beautiful seascape of the Chesapeake Bay, but the structural supports of the bridge.

MATT ROSENBERG:

They were actually stopping and taking pictures of it?

FRANK GAFFNEY:

No, I think they were just driving, but a cop happened to observe them doing it and pulled them over and ran the IDs and established that they were who they were. And that gave rise to the search warrant which found eighty banker boxes worth of documents in the Elbarasse home in Annandale.

MATT ROSENBERG:

I was once very – totally not paying attention, cause I really do know better, and I just got a Go Pro camera, keep buying them and returning them, but this was like in the five days before I returned it, and I had been fly fishing north of New York City, driving back and I had this mount so you could – I had it mounted on the sunroof, pulled up to the tollbooth at George Washington Bridge and the MTA guy, they were, what the hell is that? Oh, it's a Go Pro. He said, you can't have that. And like he pulled me out of my car. I had like – it was about thirty minutes of explaining before they let me get on my way. And I'm like, look, I really get it. I'm not going to argue.

FRANK GAFFNEY:

I'm glad to see [they're] that alert.

MATT ROSENBERG:

Yeah, they looked [UNCLEAR] Sorry I interrupted.

FRANK GAFFNEY:

Well, this is basically what happened. Without the Go Pro and at an earlier time.

But anyway, the point is that since 2008, we have known what the Brotherhood's purposes are – excuse me, 2004, what the Brotherhood's purposes are. We've actually known and I don't know if you've noticed this, but you know the line about you can't tell the players without a scorecard. They helpfully attached [to the *Explanatory Memorandum*] under the heading "Our Organizations and Organizations of Our Friends" a list of twenty-nine groups.

Now in 1991, that's probably a fair rendering of what they had. It's now orders of magnitude larger now. But it's all about the game plan. And what is, frankly, alarming and appalling is that we've gone all this time with both Republican and Democratic administrations not only ignoring this evidence – which was used, by the way, in successfully prosecuting five figures associated with the Holy Land Foundation – but actually, you know, meeting with, engaging, embracing, legitimating, taking advice from, allowing them to dictate policy, some of the people on that list.

So it's one of these things where, again, if you approach it as I've tried to – and my colleagues, from a factual basis, not a polemical, not an ideological, but "just the facts, ma'am," you'll keep stumbling across things that are pretty compelling, if inconvenient, facts.

Two others of which are these: And this is part of what we call our archival series. This is a little [monograph](#) of a speech by one of the top Muslim Brothers talking about their mission in America. This is the [newest book](#). This is basically a highlighted and annotated version of transcripts of surveillance that was conducted – back in the day when the FBI did this sort of thing – [of the organizational meeting of what came to be known as the Council on American-Islamic Relations.

MATT ROSENBERG:

When was that published?

FRANK GAFFNEY:

1993. In Philadelphia. And the thing about that is, much of the stuff is an FBI agent on the stand in the Holy Land Foundation explaining what you just heard to the jury. And, you know, what you just heard at the end of the day was Nihad Awad, [who is] still the executive director of this organization, and others, describing how, in the service of "Sister Samah," as they called it – an impenetrably opaque term for Hamas, namely sister and Hamas is spelled backwards – they were going to create a political warfare instrument and a fundraising arm for what would be, a year later, a designated terrorist organization. At the time, it hadn't been. But the FBI knew these were terrorists and so they were surveilling what they were up to. And what they found was a group that is, by your newspaper among others, treated as this "civil rights organization" that it claims to be and ignoring what it actually is, which is a jihadist operation.

MATT ROSENBERG:

Is there a possibility it could be both?

FRANK GAFFNEY:

No.

MATT ROSENBERG:

Why not?

FRANK GAFFNEY:

Because the character of the people, the character of the doctrine they adhere to, the character of the operations they engage in, [they] are not interested in promoting civil rights. They are anti-constitutional in the sense that civil rights – or human rights, for that matter – are defined for Muslims very differently than we do here in the United States.

For example, I believe it was [1990], the Organization of Islamic Cooperation promulgated a counterpart to the UN Declaration of Human Rights. Which is essentially asserting that you can have all of the human rights, civil rights, and so on that you want provided [they're] consistent with Sharia. And that's basically, I think, the purpose of CAIR and the Islamic Society of North America and the Muslim Students Association, the Muslim-American Society and all the rest on that list. CAIR was not on that list, by the way, because it was written in '91 and those guys didn't get into business until '93. But the Islamic Association of Palestine was on that list. It was the sort of feedstock of CAIR.

So, look, if – if you attend their events, if you listen to what they say to one another, most especially, and then what they say to us is usually, as you know, having spent time in this world, calculated to at best obscure the true agenda and at worst it's downright deceptive and manipulative. Taqiyya being a term associated with it.

And so, you know, our view is just look at what they do, not at what they say – particularly [that they] say for our purposes. Which is really the – what we monitor closely here.

And again, you don't have to take any or all of these [pointing to various products of the Center for Security Policy's Civilization Jihad Readers Series] if you want, but I just would walk you through them, because what we've tried to do – again, interested as we are in the facts – is to discuss what it means when the OIC is going after [freedom of speech](#) [offering a copy of the CSP Press monograph by Deborah Weiss entitled *The Organization of Islamic Cooperation: The Jihad against Free Speech*]. And, you know, to the extent that your newspaper or Members of Congress or others think that, you know, they need to help suppress those of us who are using our freedom of speech to make warnings of this, that is, whether intended or not, it is –

MATT ROSENBERG:

I mean, it's hard to have any illusions about the OIC.

FRANK GAFFNEY:

Pardon?

MATT ROSENBERG:

It's hard to have any illusions about the OIC. The people they represent, I mean –

FRANK GAFFNEY:

People do. You look at Hillary Clinton. I mean, one of the major topics of this book is what Hillary Clinton was doing with the OIC in Istanbul, for example, July of 2011. And she said, in furtherance of what the OIC promulgated with our help in the UN Human Rights Council four months before, we will – because of that petty little problem of the First Amendment – we will use “old-fashioned techniques of shaming and peer pressure” to destroy that which we abhor.

You're right. You shouldn't have any trouble [understanding] these people at all, let alone [having] personal envoys of the president that are there to try to, you know, cultivate their favor.

MATT ROSENBERG:

We've spent half a century talking about too many of them. [UNCLEAR]

FRANK GAFFNEY:

Big time.

Anyway, so, [handing Rosenberg a copy of the CSP Press monograph entitled *Refugee Resettlement and the Hijra to America* by Ann Corcoran] who's coming in is a concern because [hijra](#) is, in fact, a facet of jihad. We can talk about Trump and others in this connection in a moment, but just to get, again, ground truth, how is it that they are coming into this country? And again, I'm not talking about Muslims who are just coming here to be part of the American dream. There have been lots of them over the years. I think many of them have come here to get away from Sharia because they know what a nightmare it is.

Unfortunately, thanks to the Muslim Students Association, a lot of their kids are being turned into people who think they ought to bring Sharia here whether their parents want it or not. So this is an important data point as to how that's being done. This [pointing to the CSP Press monograph *The Red-Green Axis: Refugees, Immigration and the Agenda to Erase America* by James Simpson] is about how the Left is, in fact, enabling this kind of practice.

[OVERLAPPING VOICES] Well, it's a matter of fact. Unfortunately, people look at this and say how can that be? To have, you know, as pillars of the left, feminists. You have homosexuals. You have Jews, you have apostates, or atheists or what have you. How could it possibly be that these people could make common cause? Whether you can get your head around it or not, it's indisputable that they're doing it.

MATT ROSENBERG:

It's impossible. I always, when I talk about this stuff, describe it as late stage – it's late stage of any intellectual movement. The kind of [UNCLEAR] side of it where, you know, after forty, fifty years of kind of left wing thought being dominant in the stream of intellectual thought, [UNCLEAR] standing up, you see the lens from everything from oppression of race, therefore, you know, if you're brown and you're not as rich as us, you're therefore oppressed and the media will side with you even though you act like you obey people, you can't speak up for your own country, I mean, I've lived in this country and it's bizarre when you come back here. [UNCLEAR] colleges campuses, guys, come on, like you can – there are ways to split the difference on this one without pretending you aren't who you're dealing with here. Your Jeremy Corbyn is one of the best examples.

FRANK GAFFNEY:

Well, but we've got bunches of them here, too. Look, you know, they're entitled to their inconsistencies, their hypocrisies, their self-delusions. It's just that to the extent that they wind up aiding and abetting enemies of our country, perhaps for a common purpose, which is that they don't much like this country the way it is and they'd like it to be something else.

But you know, I'm – whenever I get an opportunity, I point out, as I'm sure you know very well, a similar kind of axis helped overthrow the Shah [of Iran]. And what did Khomeini do the moment he came to power? He put to the sword the communists and the secular democrats who helped him come to power. It is ever thus, I am afraid.

One of the most insidious aspects of the civilization jihad is the so-called [interfaith dialogue business](#). Or bridge-building [presenting a copy of Stephen Coughlin's CSP Press monograph, *Bridge-Building to Nowhere: A Study of the Catholic Church's Case Study in Interfaith Delusion*]. Because what it entails is, bringing people of faith, not the Muslim faith but other faiths, to provide sort of protective cover for what these guys are up to. And I think the vast majority of those bridge-builders, who are

Christians or Jews or whatever else are authentically committed to ecumenicalism and tolerance and so on. And again, it's just as you were saying about the red-green axis: you are ignoring that you are providing in the name of tolerance protection to the most intolerant operation on the planet.

MATT ROSENBERG:

So why do you think the Muslims are involved [UNCLEAR]

FRANK GAFFNEY:

Why do I think the Muslims what?

MATT ROSENBERG:

-- genuinely ecumenical and genuinely kind of coming into it from a stance where they too want to --

FRANK GAFFNEY:

Because of their doctrine. And, you know, I'm sure you're familiar with [Sayyid Qutb's Milestones](#), which is pretty much the definitive sort of operating code of contemporary jihadism. And he says -- and this is paraphrased, but it's pretty close, the chasm between the infidel and the believer is so vast that no bridge can be built to span it except for the purpose of bringing the infidel to Islam. That's -- that's what this is all about.

I mean, again, going back to how I defined the problem, if it's Islamic supremacism, these people are not about everybody being equal and getting along. It's about there being a dominant program and everyone, especially Jews, basically everyone, being at best [enslaved] and even at worst, dead if they don't convert. And again, I mean, this isn't me asserting it. This is what their own text, their own doctrine, their own practice describes [it.]

And I spoke recently out at an event in Loudoun County and no sooner was I done than several people came up and got in my face. Three of them were associated with the [All Dulles Area Muslim Society] ADAMS Center -- which is one of the most, I believe, jihadist mosques in America -- by Dulles. [It's] associated with both the number one group on this roster. Its imam is Mohamed Magid, until recently [the president of] the Islamic Society of North America.

And I believe its financing comes from number eight [on the Brotherhood's *Explanatory Memorandum* list of "Our Organizations"], which is the North American Islamic Trust. Which is a funding mechanism for purchasing mosques' mortgages via funding from the Saudi Arabians through the Muslim World League.

This particular operation's representatives, however, were not nearly as aggressive, I have to say, as were the rabbi and the Jewish layperson and the Catholic who were there to demonstrate interfaith solidarity. And [they] criticized me as being terrible to their guys.

Then [pointing to a CSP Press monograph entitled [Offensive and Defensive Lawfare: Fighting Civilization Jihad in America's Courts](#) by David Yerushalmi, Esq. and Robert Muise, Esq.], there's lawfare, which is another instrument being aggressively used by Muslim Brotherhood folks, notably, but not exclusively, the Council on American-Islamic Relations, which uses suits to try to shut down people like me or otherwise to see what they can do to, you know, divide and suppress their opponents.

And I think to some extent, you know, encourage government acquiescence if they can get, better yet, the Justice Department to help them, which they [have done under the Obama administration]. All the better. To maximize the chances that they can actually enjoy political influence, they've started a political party.

MATT ROSENBERG:

What's it called?

FRANK GAFFNEY:

[Handing Rosenberg a copy of the CSP Press monograph entitled *Star-Spangled Sharia: The Rise of America's First Muslim Brotherhood Party*,] [US Council on Muslim Organizations](#). It is a relatively new entity. It has very ambitious goals for doing here what they have begun to do in some places in Europe, which is of course mostly governed by parliamentary systems, therefore more susceptible to sort of king-making factions. But, as I think you may have seen in the course of the campaign, they were all in for Hillary. They were using mosques to have registration drives and bus people to the polls, had polls in the mosques and so on. And none of which is illegal. It's just to say if you see it in the context that I think we have to look at it, this is indeed a problem.

[Presenting a copy of the CSP Press monograph entitled *The Gulen Movement: Turkey's Islamic Supremacist Cult and Its Contribution to Civilization Jihad in America*,] this is just one cut at the angle of the attack on education. This is Fethullah Gulen, I'm sure you know. He's much in the news these days because Erdogan has blamed him for the coup and wants him extradited.

MATT ROSENBERG:

Me and some colleagues were actually talking about this yesterday. He's gotten way too much of a free pass.

FRANK GAFFNEY:

He has.

MATT ROSENBERG:

You know, Erdogan ain't great. But because Erdogan is not good, nobody bothers to look at Gulen. But Gulen is not exactly, you know, a political democrat, let's sing Kumbaya, and all hang out together either.

FRANK GAFFNEY:

No, look, this is – this is one of those things where you, you can loathe both of them because what they've really got going on is their shared Islamic supremacism. And until fairly recently, they were all, you know, thick as thieves. Trying to convert Turkey from a secular Muslim state with, you know, a democratic tradition to an Islamic republic. But like the Mafia, they got greedy and they've gone after each other to divide the spoils differently.

Where are we? That's a repeat. This is what I consider to be a singularly important book [pointing to the CSP Press' *See No Sharia: 'Countering Violent Extremism' and the Disarming of America's First Lines of Defense* by Frank Gaffney and Clare Lopez], not because I [co-]wrote it, but because I think [of] the story that it tells. And again, what we've tried to do is just render the facts to make [them] accessible to people, but not go off on conspiracy theories, just give people the facts and let them make up their own minds as to what they feel conclusions should be drawn from.

The documentation in this book about how we have been disarmed in terms of, first of all, our awareness of the nature of the threat and, therefore, what we are allowed to say about it, what we're allowed to even *know* about it – let alone what we're allowed to do about it. And, you know, it made me cry, truthfully, writing it and I think it has that effect on other people. Because you just realize that this country is being put in jeopardy because we have largely succumbed to influence operations that have made people who are putting their lives on the line in many cases – whether it's in the military

or intelligence community or law enforcement, DHS – needlessly at risk, to say nothing of the country they are supposed to defend. Because we’ve not actually understood the danger being posed to us and we are not taking steps to protect against it.

So again, this is the sort of serious work that I think serious people do if you’re going to raise alarms about the nature of a danger to your country. And, you know, to have it all sort of written off, let alone ignored, is a little frustrating.

[Passing along the CSP Press-published [*Catastrophic Failure: Blindfolding America in the Face of Jihad*](#) by Stephen Coughlin], one of the great resources on this – and this is a terrific bookstop if nothing else, a doorstop – [is] a colleague of ours by the name of Steve Coughlin. And Steve is one of those guys who was purged from the Defense Department by a fellow by the name of Hesham Islam, who at the time was working for the Deputy Secretary of Defense under – this was under Bush, and – it will come to me, I can’t remember his name off the top of my head a former defense industry guy [Gordon England].

And the precipitating cause was Hesham Islam had been given kind of the responsibility to try to manage Pentagon outreach to the Muslim community. And guess who Hesham Islam was reaching out to? Here’s the book [pointing to the *Explanatory Memorandum*’s list of “Our Organizations” listing showing the Islamic Society of North America as the first entry]. The guy down there I introduced to you to [Mohamed Magid]. Number one.

And Steve Coughlin, who at the time was working as the duty expert on sort of the enemy threat doctrine for the Joint Chiefs of Staff, was pointing out that those guys are actually playing for the other team and they’re a problem. And that became a problem for Hesham and the influence operation inside the Pentagon and he had to go.

What [Steve has] chronicled here is the story of what this kind of willful blindness has meant and what it is likely to lead to. Another fellow who has done a similar book – different and a little bit more for the popular market, is another of our colleagues by the name of Phil Haney, who had a very similar kind of experience inside the Department of Homeland Security, where he was working for the Customs and Border Patrol folks and was not only kept from doing his job repeatedly, when he was doing investigations of jihadist elements coming and going inside this country. But he was actually serially investigated and subjected to job actions for doing it.

So what all of this is meant to say, Matt, and forgive me for going on so long –

MATT ROSENBERG:

No, no, no –

FRANK GAFFNEY:

But what all of it is meant to say is when you are national security-minded and you approach the kind of complex, multifaceted, to say nothing of politically charged problem that we’re contending with, you have to stick with the facts. And that’s what we’ve tried to do.

MATT ROSENBERG:

I guess, you know, one of the things you often hear – I guess what I want to ask is, how big of a problem do you think this is? I mean, how many American-Muslims do you think subscribe to this? Anybody who tells you there’s just no radicalism at all among any religious group is an idiot. Total moron. You’d think they’d never met a religious person in their life. A lot of them. Some more than others. Right now I think there are certainly Muslims out there who want to destroy the West. I’m not going to argue that point. I know them, met a number of them. I personally haven’t seen a lot of it in the US. I’ll say that up front. So I’m predisposed to think, law enforcement issue, let it be that and

move on. And not make too big a thing of it. But you seem to think it's a bigger problem. That there's more out there than I'm seeing or others are seeing.

FRANK GAFFNEY:

Well, yeah, I do. Because I have the feeling you're looking for this, as the old line used to go about the drunk trying to find his keys, looking under the lamp because that's where the light's better. Even though he dropped them up the block. Let me see if I can find something for you that I just – I've tried to sort of illustrate what I think is at work here and I won't dig too hard, but let me just see if I can find it. Two slides that tell the story.

MATT ROSENBERG:

And that also we would have to look at the numbers of Muslims in America would have to grow so dramatically before they represented anything but a part of a percentage point of the population. I mean, what is it now? Maybe a percent? Less than that?

FRANK GAFFNEY:

It depends on who you talk to. I mean, they claim that there's six to seven million of them, so it's more than two percent I would guess. But I don't know if that's right or not.

[Pointing to **PowerPoint slide** entitled "The Official U.S. Government Paradigm"] This is your model, I would expect. That small group of people that we have been encouraged, particularly in the late Bush years and throughout the Obama years to describe as "violent extremists," as the enemy. And Muslims are not. You don't have to worry about them because they "eschew violence" because it's a "religion of peace."

MATT ROSENBERG:

I don't think it's – I actually don't think it's a religion of peace –

FRANK GAFFNEY:

Well, no, but I'm just saying, this is the government paradigm of the moment [and] has been now for the better part of eight years. [Bringing up the **next slide**, "The Official U.S. Government Paradigm" showing the Muslim Brotherhood among the "Muslims, Who Eschew Violence"] And the Muslim Brotherhood is on what you might call the "right side" of that fault line. Because they supposedly are eschewing violence and as Jim Clapper famously, *falsely* testified to Congress back in 2011, I think it was.

[Showing **third slide** entitled, "The *Actual* Paradigm"], I think this is a more accurate paradigm. If you understand that Sharia is the genetic code of a violent ideology that is animating a population, some of whom will practice violence, and some of whom, when violence is inexpedient will use other techniques like hijrah, like material support for terrorism or zakat, like civilization jihad. But that group of people, by virtue of adherence to this doctrine, I think, really do represent implacable enemies.

Now again you will have people, Muslims among them, but others as well, say, no, I mean, "Sharia is really anything you want it to be" or at least "there are different kinds of Sharia." And again, I refer you to *Reliance of the Traveller*. Which says, no, actually there isn't. This is it. And that's what al-Azhar says and that's what the House of Saud says and so on.

And to the extent that you are practicing some kind of Sharia *other than the authoritative kind*, you know what those are, I mean, we might call those "good Muslims," the Muslims who adhere to Sharia call them jihadists – excuse me, "apostates." Which is, as you know, a capital offense under Sharia.

But anyway, what I'm saying – and I emphasize it at every opportunity, is there is some number of people, I have no idea what it is, I think it's a rather larger percentage here than in lots of the hellholes you've been living in, who don't know from Sharia. Or at least, if they know about it, don't want to live under it. Don't want to practice it themselves and certainly aren't about imposing it on other people. And I think they're potentially not just our friends, but they may be actually decisive to this outcome.

So to get to your question, if you don't see this here [pointing to a fourth slide, entitled “The *Actual* Paradigm” and showing the Muslim Brotherhood on the wrong side of the Sharia fault line], is that because these guys aren't a problem as the official paradigm says? Or, is it because they are actually pursuing the jihad in a different way that isn't what you're looking for?

And I just have to tell you that, based on the study that we've done of it, I don't know how you can arrive at a different conclusion other than the goals of the Muslim Brotherhood – as they say in their creed, as they say in their various writings, including al-Banna, including, you know, the Qutbs and the Mawdudis and the Qaradawis – is exactly the same as the Islamic State, exactly the same as the Taliban, exactly the same as, you know, al-Qaeda, Boko Haram, al-Nusra Front, on and on, al-Shabaab.

It's about Islamic supremacism. It is about achieving the end state that is their due. So are there Muslims in America who are engaged in a kind of jihad that you might not be sensitive to or you're not aware of – and I don't mean to single you out, I'm saying this is —

MATT ROSENBERG:

Yeah, fair enough. I'm not sensitive to it.

FRANK GAFFNEY:

-- our government is embracing these people. So *they* aren't sensitive to it, how should *you* be? How should, you know, those nice Jews and Catholics who are hanging with the ADAMS Center guys –

MATT ROSENBERG:

I guess, how big a group do you think it is?

FRANK GAFFNEY:

I have – I honestly have no idea. But here's what worries me, I have to say. Whatever the number is, it's a problem. And it's a problem for a couple of different reasons. It's a problem because, most obviously, if guys who are not violent, at least up until a time, hang in these NAIT-run mosques, like the Islamic Society of Boston, for example, until such time as they decide they are called to jihad of the violent kind, then – boom – suddenly, somebody's dead. Or maybe a number of somebodies are dead.

Whether it's in Orlando or, you know, San Bernardino or Boston itself or Chattanooga or New York City or any number of other places. So, we're told those are lone wolves. We're told we can't figure out what their motivation could possibly be. We certainly don't have a clue how many of them are out there. I mean, we know the ones that have popped off, obviously, but we don't know how many more are in the queue. I surely don't.

And we're not getting much help from the mosques that they hang in. In fact, what we typically get is: They never saw them before. They were such nice people. They were very quiet. There was no reason to think that they would do this. They are certainly not getting any of this from us. You know, all of that stuff.

I believe – and it's just a matter of conviction as much as anything, that because a lot of Muslims came here to get away from Sharia, because a lot of them came because they wanted actually to live the American dream, and their religious tradition isn't actually a Sharia tradition, they may have come from, you know, East Asia where that's not so prevalent, at least it hasn't been until recently, for example. I think it's the case that most Muslims in this country aren't into Sharia.

But again, what worries me most is if you look at all of this, if you look at the agenda of the Muslim Brotherhood, if you look at the trajectory of it over the past fifty-odd years, since they started it here with the MSA's initiative, Muslim Students Association, it's clear that they're trying very hard to build within this population [pointing to the fourth slide's block titled "Muslims who don't (adhere to Sharia)"] showing more on [the Sharia adherent] side of the line than on [the non-Sharia adherent] side of the line.

And I'll just tell you a quick anecdote if I can, cause it's relevant. I participated in a project, a competition with two other colleagues of mine. It was announced by the Corporation for Public Broadcasting back in, I think, 2006. And it was a competition that had, as its explicit purpose, trying to give new filmmakers a chance to make documentary films for the Public Broadcasting Service.

And they launched this competition called America at the Crossroads. And it went, I don't know, for about a year or so, I think. Four hundred and forty or so filmmaking teams offered proposals. We offered one to address a question I think really goes to the heart of what you just asked. If there are lots of Muslims, this isn't exactly your question, but it gets to it, if there are lots of Muslims who are on [the non-Sharia adherent] side of the line, how come we don't ever hear from them? With very few exceptions.

So we made a film proposal. We called it *Islam Versus Islamists*. The object of which was to examine with care a number, I think nine ultimately, Muslims here and abroad who were prominently standing up for and giving expression to this kind of sentiment. And what their life experience was like in the face of this kind of pressure emanating from the other group.

And we were one [team] of thirty-five out of the four hundred and forty that were selected to make a film – to make a treatment of a film, rather, including a sort of short beta version. We were subsequently down-selected to one of twenty to actually make the film. And then have it broadcast on the corporation – excuse me, on the Public Broadcasting System. And at the – at pretty much the last moment, the whole project was turned over from the Corporation for Public Broadcasting to the Public Broadcasting System and we were suddenly in the hands of editors who thought this was a terrible film. Saying to us, very explicitly, we think you're not doing justice to the Islamists. And we said, well, that's kind of not the point of the film. This is about –

MATT ROSENBERG:

[UNCLEAR] editors –

FRANK GAFFNEY:

Well, they were very insistent. And they said, you have to remake this thing in significant ways and we said "No" and in the end, they said we're not going to [air] it. Which became a story in its own right which I won't bore you with, but the reason I mention it is, suddenly, there was a hole in the line-up. And what they did to fill the hole was the Public Broadcasting Service gave to Robert MacNeil, of MacNeil/Lehrer fame, on a sweetheart-deal basis, no competition, just a straight contract, to go make his own film. And it turned out that his film, I can't remember what it was called, *Muslims in America*, something like that [the actual title was *America's Muslims*]. It was a complete paean to these guys [pointing on the fourth slide to the Sharia-adherent Muslims and the Brotherhood].

One of the clips – and I think it was the last of several vignettes where they were profiling the struggles that Muslims have in this country – was the story of a couple as I recall from Syria who epitomized what I’m talking about here. People who had come here, they were both professionals, they were Muslims in the “tradition” sense and maybe some of the practice, but they were more secular than not.

And the drama that MacNeil focused on was they had two daughters, one as I recall in college and the other in high school, who had “gotten in touch with their faith” and had decided to wear the hijab. And the mother was horrified. The father was horrified. And so the yin and yang of it was they were trying to talk the girls out of doing this and Robert was, you know, obviously very touched by this story and how horrible the parents were and how great the kids were. And in the background – as I’m sure was not mentioned but pretty sure it was happening – the Muslim Students Association was helping these girls get in touch with their faith and getting them back to Sharia.

The closing clip of that particular sequence – and I think of the film – was the mother, this assimilated professional, Sharia-opposing woman, deciding that she should wear the hijab as well.

So what worries me about this story, and in response to your question in a roundabout way, is this is a dynamic situation. It is not static. And the biggest danger – and you’ve, I’m sure, seen this first-hand given where you’ve been, bin Laden called it “the strong horse.”

I believe some portion of this population [pointing to the fourth slide’s block of non-Shariah adherent Muslims] – and, again, I have no idea whether these are to scale or not – but let’s just say for the purposes of discussion that there’s kind of a parabola here, some portion of which are actually full-on jihadists, some portion of which are completely secular, unalterably patriotic Americans.

And the group in the middle, the boa constrictor [that swallowed] the hippopotamus, is up for grabs. [They’re] drawn, as the faith tradition says and as human behaviour typically is, to the strong horse, you know. And, to the extent that we have demonstrated for at least fifteen years, more or less, that these guys [pointing on the fourth slide to the Muslim Brotherhood] are the *leaders* of the Muslim-American community. They say they are. They have the organizations. They have the money. They claim to have votes. These are people that our government, our press, our academic institutions, the media, on and on, tend to regard –

MATT ROSENBERG:

I actually didn’t know – I learned about something new here, I didn’t know that about CAIR [looking at CSP Press monograph [*CAIR is Hamas: How the U.S. Government Proved in Court that the Council on American Islamic Relations is a Terrorist Front*](#)].

FRANK GAFFNEY:

-- tend to regard as their go-to people, if you want to reach out to Muslims, if you want to understand what Muslims are about, what they think, if you’re looking for a spokesperson to tell you the sentiments of that community.

Well, you know, you are being, first of all, played by an influence operation and at worst you are actually *submitting* – and this is my last point and then I’ll shut up. The critical piece of this is doctrinally. As I said, some portion of the Sharia-adherent folks are going to be violent jihadists at every turn. Most are not. The question is: Is there a tipping point at which the calculation is it’s time to go violent?

And my concern is, again, doctrinally what Sharia tells them is that you are to make the infidel “feel subdued.” That’s the Koran. And when you see them feeling subdued, when you see them behaving subdued, and you see them appeasing or accommodating or acting like *dhimmis* [enslaved peoples],

you must make them *feel* subdued. You must make them understand that there's no other way to exist going forward. At which point the violent option becomes practicable. And that's what I really fear we're ignoring in this pandering and accommodation to these characters

MATT ROSENBERG:

I have to wonder, though, as I'm reading this – [SKYPE DIALING OBSCURES PASSAGE BRIEFLY]

FRANK GAFFNEY:

-- I don't know who it is, but they don't need to be calling me. Sorry. Go ahead.

MATT ROSENBERG:

You know, actually [UNCLEAR] synagogue in many, many years, was this past weekend, my nephew's Bar Mitzvah.

FRANK GAFFNEY:

Was what?

MATT ROSENBERG:

The first time I set foot in a synagogue in many, many years for my nephew's Bar Mitzvah this weekend. And his family was probably indifferent to Israel growing up. Really just [UNCLEAR] didn't give it much thought. The only time I get at all kind of pro-Israel is when I look around and think maybe they had a point. And that comes from both the left and the right these days. Certainly from the left in Europe. I spent a lot of my life around European and kind of ex-pats who inhabit the really – they are the ones who, the kind of lower end of the Oxbridge set. They're smart, but they're not as smart as they think they are. They tend to see the world in black and white terms and I know where I stand with them. My people. And it comes from the right, not just the left –

FRANK GAFFNEY:

But it's changing.

MATT ROSENBERG:

It is changing.

FRANK GAFFNEY:

Where you stand is getting worse.

MATT ROSENBERG:

Oh, it's getting worse. Yeah, it wasn't very good when I first met them. But it keeps getting worse.

FRANK GAFFNEY:

Can I just make that point? Cause I think I said it before but just, again, when one listens to this, it's horrifying. And I will stipulate to the fact that as I said, I think, the last time that we talked, I would really much rather be wrong about everything. This isn't that I've got so much invested in it, but if the facts were otherwise, that I would say, no, I'm clinging to my line.

It's just that the facts, unfortunately, are becoming more clearly apparent, I think, to anybody with a lick of sense. And to the extent, as you say yourself, that what is most dramatically coming into focus

is that the trajectory that Europe is on – is this stuff [pointing to the assorted CSP Press books] on steroids.

MATT ROSENBERG:

Europe.

FRANK GAFFNEY:

It may be done.

MATT ROSENBERG:

Parts of Europe are done.

FRANK GAFFNEY:

It may be done.

MATT ROSENBERG:

The Netherlands? Forget it, they're done.

FRANK GAFFNEY:

As a continent, may well –

MATT ROSENBERG:

I mean, they've lost a sense of their own idea of themselves. The Germans actually might not.

FRANK GAFFNEY:

The question is, Matt, are we on the same trajectory? I think we are.

MATT ROSENBERG:

Well, this is the question. Is that – in terms of policy prescriptions, let's assume that there is that group in the middle that is up for grabs. You know, people tend to retreat to their safety places or places [UNCLEAR] confident. When they feel under attack. So why not welcome people in, say, go to your mosques, do what you want, but make it clear and just repeatedly clear, like, we don't care. And when the other doesn't care, the majority doesn't care, the minority tends to stop caring, too.

FRANK GAFFNEY:

We don't care about what?

MATT ROSENBERG:

We don't care about what you do at all. You know, and you kind of like – look, it's a great example that you use, you know, the more assimilated you get, the less they become observant. The more they intermarry, it just – the less the majority cares about them, the less they tend to care about their own religion. And why not apply that to Islam, too? You know, you use law enforcement to keep an eye on them, too. Why the policy prescription is for limited immigration. You know, think about it. You would have to have an overwhelming number of people coming here to change the dynamic in a meaningful way and we're not anywhere close to that. Far from it.

FRANK GAFFNEY:

Those are all good questions and to do justice to them it takes a little bit of clarification. Let me just try to hit the key points. A big part of the challenge we face is we approach this as *a religion*. And that

means it must be like the other religions we know. There is indisputably an aspect to all of this that is religious in character, don't get me wrong. Estimates vary. I've heard ten percent, I've heard sixteen percent, I don't know what it would be exactly or even if you could measure it exactly. But if, for example, you look at *Reliance of the Traveller*, there's no question that some of it is about pietistic practice, which is very similar in particular to some of [Jewish] practices –

MATT ROSENBERG:

[UNCLEAR] religion in a lot of ways.

FRANK GAFFNEY:

But there's the rest of it. Whether it's ninety percent or whether it's eighty-six percent or whatever number you choose, it's about power. It's about political arrangements – running from everything down to, you know, how you interact with your wife, including, as you know, approved ways to beat her. To how you interact with your children and who they belong to in case you and the wife part ways. To your relationship with your neighbors and your business associates. All the way up to, you know, the powers that govern the world, which, ideally, are going to be the caliphate.

Then there's the military piece, which is also very clearly articulated where jihad is, first and foremost, drawing on the experience of the perfect Muslim's life about holy war in the old-fashioned sense of the world.

Then there's the legal elements of it. How things are adjudicated. Notably, if you choose to divorce your wife, say you divorce her three times, you're done. You're out of it. [LAUGHTER]

MATT ROSENBERG:

You know [UNCLEAR] ex [UNCLEAR] [LAUGHTER]

FRANK GAFFNEY:

Trust me, as Richard Nixon famously said, "But it would be wrong."

Look, I think that the trouble is that there is simply no counterpart [to these elements of Sharia], certainly in modern Judaism and modern Catholicism, modern Christianity, Zoroastrianism, Hinduism.

For one to say that, let's just stick with eighty-six percent, that eighty-six percent is going to be given a pass because the top sixteen percent, that patina of religiosity, makes it all protected by our Constitution – when in fact, the eighty-six percent is essentially *anti-constitutional* and by, you know, statutory definition what you would call "sedition."

So, to the extent that we focus on this, we try to make it fit our norms, we try, especially our "interfaith dialogue" folks, try to make it sound as though it's really just like them and you have to treat them just like us and if you don't treat them just like us, then they won't treat us the way you're supposed to treat us and all that. It just isn't so.

As to the idea that you could simply let them come in, in whatever numbers they want and migrate as they typically would do to places, especially if they're coming from Sharia-adherent countries, where they find sustenance? In Europe, as you probably know, what they've done in overwhelming numbers is they've gone into mosques where they hear Arabic. And this has suddenly dawned on the Germans and the French and the Belgians and others that, holy shit, this is a problem. In this country, if they migrate to the mosques – and, again, I don't know what the right number is, I've heard numbers as high as eighty percent have their mortgages owned by NAIT. I don't know if that's right or if it's thirty percent or if it's some number in between. I do know a man I admire greatly, Zuhdi Jasser, has

had two mosques – in fact, he was one of the people we featured in that film – had two mosques that were taken over. He founded them and they were taken over by jihadists.

MATT ROSENBERG:

What's his name?

FRANK GAFFNEY:

Zuhdi Jasser. Z-U-H-D-I. Jasser. J-A-S-S-E-R. A Syrian ex-pat. But he's a marvellous man. If you don't know him, I would [urge you] to talk with him. He runs something called the American-Islamic Forum for Democracy. He's a naval commander, Navy commander, lieutenant commander in the Navy. Medical doctor based in Phoenix. And he is one of those guys who's been standing up, you know, and suffering for it.

But my point is this. If I'm right, and I think I am, based on the evidence, that what is happening in these mosques, as you see much more vividly in Europe, is the incubation of jihadism. The demand on the community that they not assimilate.

Now, not all Muslims go to mosques any more than Jews or Christians attend their houses of worship all the time, maybe the High Holy Days, but not the rest of the time. And thank God, because if more and more of them actually start following the strong horse and going there and get inculcated in this or find their kids getting inculcated in this, it becomes an even greater problem.

So just last point, I think that what Trump has said about migration – and he's evolved it as you know, but what I think he's essentially stuck with is, if you don't share our values, we really don't want you here. We don't have any obligation to bring you here. And if it's worse than just not sharing our values, but you believe your values must be supreme over ours, you know, it's suicide to bring more of them in.

Now, the numbers, which you raised the question about, it depends on what the problem is. Are you anticipating that you will suddenly be a Muslim majority country? Well, obviously, we're a long way from that. At the other end of the extreme, are you looking at what nineteen people did to lots of our countrymen and our economy?

Well, probably you're looking at something in between and what makes me so concerned about this civilization jihad business is the effort that's clearly being made to try to get to a tipping point, as I said. And, you know, if you look on the Internet, you'll find all kinds of theories on this, that, you know, at one percent of the population, the behaviour is such and such. Five percent of the population, at ten percent –

MATT ROSENBERG:

Ten percent is a very significant minority.

FRANK GAFFNEY:

Pardon?

MATT ROSENBERG:

Ten percent is a very significant minority –

FRANK GAFFNEY:

Well, especially if it's, you know, very directed in a sort of supremacist way. And look at France. They are facing it at the moment. So I guess my view of this is that whatever the number of jihadists we have in this country is at the moment – I have no idea what it is – it's too large. And adding to

their numbers, willy-nilly, or in the notion that, well, we just can't discriminate against anybody, is truly a formula for national suicide.

MATT ROSENBERG:

How much of a hearing do you expect you guys are going to have at the – I don't want to say at this, in terms of your influence on the Trump Administration, not just Donald Trump himself, but others around him, do you expect that you've had some influence and that you'll continue to have some or were you just one of many?

FRANK GAFFNEY:

I don't know. Honestly, I don't know. The – I think I walked you through this speech on the fifteenth of August.

MATT ROSENBERG:

Remind me again. It's been such a busy –

FRANK GAFFNEY:

Well, the fifteenth of August was [the date of] a speech that he made and I don't remember where he made it [Youngstown], Trump. But he laid out what I think of as the plan for Victory over Jihad. He didn't use that word, that term. He talks about "radical Islamic terrorism." But the elements of it, which are pretty much in alignment with what we've been arguing. Whether that's cause and effect, I can't say.

But he talked about the need: to stop importing jihadists – again, my words, not his. But that was the thrust of it. To undo the Iran deal. To end the practice of willful blindness. To defeat the Islamic State, by which I think he means not simply that as an entity, but the *violent* jihadists. And as important as anything, he talked about countering the "networks that are radicalizing Muslims" in this country.

A number of the people that he has tapped are people that I admire and, to varying degrees, have worked with over the years –

MATT ROSENBERG:

Who would you say are those?

FRANK GAFFNEY:

It's a matter of public record. I [don't want to] encourage you to make this the story [LAUGHTER] of all of the people.

MATT ROSENBERG:

Because [UNCLEAR]

FRANK GAFFNEY:

I'm quite sure of it. But I just want to say, I think that the kinds of appointments he's made so far are people who – who understand something that your newspaper in particular and most of the press, both the traditional and the new, have not.

And that is that there's a serious school of national security thought and practice that is behind or at least built upon the kind of work that I share with you today. And I think they're going to be represented in this administration. And I hope as a result we're going to get what Donald Trump promised on the fifteenth of August and before and since, which is a *course correction*. Because I think there's really very no – no disputing the fact that the public is very concerned about the course

that we've been on. Fifteen years of largely unsatisfactory and certainly costly and not terribly effective war.

MATT ROSENBERG:

That's fair enough. I would agree with you on that. I think our newspaper and you would agree on that point. The wars haven't been that effective.

FRANK GAFFNEY:

We would disagree about why. And the point is, I think the reasons that your paper might conclude is where we've gone wrong would only make things worse. I mean, they would be taking us even farther down the trajectory we're already on.

Lastly, I'll give you this [passing along the Center for Security Policy's publication, [*The Secure Freedom Strategy: A Plan for Victory over the Global Jihad Movement*](#)] cause I think it's kind of, in some ways, the most important of the things that we've produced.

We took a cut, with what we call a "tiger team" of people, at trying to figure out what a strategy for victory over jihad would actually entail. And partly, frankly, thanks to, you know, the experience that I had had and a number of others with Reagan's strategy for defeating the last totalitarian ideology that explicitly wanted to destroy this country, namely Soviet communism, we used it as a template for what you might do against this one.

Because, while there are obvious differences, I think overwhelmingly there are things that are very similar between communism of the Soviet style and what I kind of think of as *communism with a god*. Of the Islamist style.

And, you know, there were some obvious places where things that Reagan didn't have to contend with like cyberspace that needed to be updated, but more or less it mapped pretty well. When you argue that if this truly [is] an existential threat to freedom, and I think it is, you need to utilize all instruments of national power to defeat it. And so that's basically the alternative we haven't tried yet.

I don't think your paper and I don't think any other paper in this town, for sure, would get their head quite around that. It remains to be seen whether the administration will or not, but I certainly get the sense from what I've seen so far that the sorts of people that have been tapped are people who intuitively get it, partly because, as I said at the beginning, they're national security-minded. And a fair amount of them very experienced. A fair number of them have had the kind of direct *mano y mano* contact with this threat that you've had. And I think they – they may in some instances at least have participated in Reagan's, you know, strategy. But at the very least, they understand that the kind of course that we're on now is simply unsustainable and a formula for defeat.

MATT ROSENBERG:

I think that about wraps it up. I'm sure I've got other questions I'm forgetting now because –

FRANK GAFFNEY:

Because I've worn you out.

MATT ROSENBERG:

Well, no, it's just one of those weeks. I had this – stuff to do and all this travel and then my iPhone cracked. And trying to get – it's harder to get an iPhone crack around Christmastime than you'd imagine. It's currently at the Apple store, hopefully getting fixed now. That's my old one, so –

FRANK GAFFNEY:

Good to have a backup.

MATT ROSENBERG:

Yeah, you kind of need them. But this is – look, this has been really fascinating for me, partly because I've been away from this for a long time and I always wondered what the kind of – from the outside, it looks like obsession with the Muslim Brotherhood is.

You see it coming from kind of the, say, call it the right, I don't know what to call it. And when you're not really thinking about it or looking at it, when you're doing other things – I was always kind of curious about the intellectual underpinnings were and this has actually been enlightening.

I think you probably also find there's more people than you'd imagine at the *Times* who'd probably agree with you on – at least the university stuff. And some of the, relative to the left, kind of – it's what makes it different from other immigrant experiences is that my grandparents came here, great-grandparents or grandparents. Nobody was growing up and going to college and being told, no, no, you should embrace this. The message you got the entire time was assimilate. Don't worry so much about that.

And that that – it's a weird alliance where suddenly, you know, the left supports groups that are incredibly intolerant and people come to colleges and are told to embrace things where – even when I went to school in the 90s, there was some of that. And, you know, as Jews, it's those crazy religious Jews, the critical mass of Jews who have assimilated is too big already. They're kind of – turned much of us into crazy religious ones. But you occasionally get it from, you know, Jewish Students Association, suddenly, we shall be more religious. It's like, why am I even here? Let it go.

And so, yeah, I think there's, you know – that's an interesting dynamic I actually haven't thought much about before. And the kind of taking parents and making their children into much more religious people. And how that's kind of, not just frowned upon, it's encouraged –

FRANK GAFFNEY:

Or taking children and making their parents –

MATT ROSENBERG:

That's right. Sorry, taking children and, yeah, going –

FRANK GAFFNEY:

I found that – that was such an interesting, I mean, I hated [MacNeil's] film. I hated what had happened to ours and what resulted. But that – I've told that story a number of times because I think that's such a perfect paradigm of what I'm describing here.

And just a last thought, if I may. I think what has to happen –

MATT ROSENBERG:

While you're talking, I'm going to put the email – [UNCLEAR]

FRANK GAFFNEY:

No, no, I'll be done in two minutes.

MATT ROSENBERG:

So I'm going to push it back anyway [UNCLEAR] get some lunch. Sorry. Continue, though, while I'm still kind of recording.

FRANK GAFFNEY:

I'm of the view that the ultimate outcome here will be determined by persuading that "hippopotamus," if you will, that the guys trying to draw them into non-assimilation, into, you know, Sharia-adherence, into anti-constitutional beliefs and values and practices, are *not* the winning side. And that's partly a kinetic thing. And, you know, I'm hopeful that the guys who do that will do it more effectively in the future than they've done to date under the rules of engagement and, you know, nostrums and COIN strategy and hearts and minds and all the rest of it.

MATT ROSENBERG:

I mean, you may well get the kind of father of all that in the government as well at this point.

FRANK GAFFNEY:

You might as well get what?

MATT ROSENBERG:

Father of all that in the government. Or the guy who claims to be the father of all of it. Petraeus.

FRANK GAFFNEY:

Oh, Petraeus. I don't think so. I don't think so. Partly for that reason, actually.

But anyway, it's not an obsession with the Brotherhood, truthfully. I mean, I –

MATT ROSENBERG:

But I say what looks like an obsession to the outside. That's why – actually the way you explain it isn't an obsession, but to the outside, it does look like it.

FRANK GAFFNEY:

I think the reason that we devote as much time and energy to it is that it has, to date, not been a focus like the kinetic side has. Not remotely the resources, not the intellectual effort. I mean, [Dr. Sebastian] Gorka often talks about the contrast between the level of effort that was made during the Cold War, particularly early in the Cold War, to understand Soviet ideology and doctrine and orders of battle and all of that. There's nothing remotely like that these days.

And to the extent that academic institutions are dabbling in this field at all, they're more often than not like my alma mater, Georgetown, which is, you know, in *literally* the pocket of al-Waleed bin Talal, for God's sake. Not helpful to the understanding of the enemy, needless to say.

But properly understood in terms of the actual threat to a free society like ours, it is the subversive inside-the-wire takedown that I believe is vastly more dangerous [than the violent kind].

Which really goes back to your last question, Matt. You said, how can this be that big a problem because there's so few numbers? If they actually are successful, either on their own or more likely in concert with leftists who have a similar kind of intermediate goal at least, to rot out and undermine confidence in our institutions and constitutional freedoms, I mean, just – I could go on all day, so I know I'm keeping you from lunch, but just a final point to yours.

At the end of the day, what is going on, on campus right now? It is the leading edge of the [Organization of Islamic Conference] effort. It just happens it's the plan of action of the OIC adopted in December of 2005. A ten-year plan of action. Supposedly ended in December of last year. [It] is about suppressing freedom of speech.

Which is an incredibly important technique if what you're trying to do is stealthily subvert a country from within. To the extent that you can suppress those who are saying, wait a minute, they're here, they are doing bad things, it's very dangerous, it infinitely improves your chances of success, right?

So that's what this is largely about. And I believe that, you know, the rather concerted efforts made to vilify me and marginalize this organization and others we work with has to be understood as an information operation, part and parcel of an influence war and the jihad of the civilization variety. And properly understood, you can actually do something about it. And I'm thinking that's what this administration is going to do. I pray.

MATT ROSENBERG:

Look, I really appreciate you taking the time to talk with me.

FRANK GAFFNEY:

I can't tell you how much I appreciate you taking the time.

MATT ROSENBERG:

I mean, you know, like you said when I asked my question, it's like – look, I'll be the first to say there are a lot of bad journalists out there.

FRANK GAFFNEY:

And editors.

MATT ROSENBERG:

Yes. You can't really write about what somebody thinks if you've never asked them what they think.

FRANK GAFFNEY:

Well, you can. You can do it all day long. You can do it all day long if you're willing to simply say the SPLC says this is what they think and therefore – you know, you don't even need to ask them what they think because as long as you've got the SPLC certification, that passes for an authoritative rendering. I mean, this is outrageous. And it's, you know, as you say, it's I think a prime example of shoddy journalism.

MATT ROSENBERG:

I mean, I think it's, you know, kind of – I think it's, I see it more from the left, center-left, side of things where I tend to – to be honest, where I live and work. And I see it, though, on the right as well, where, you know, the big problem of people have stopped asking each other what they think. You know, and relying on things like, well, they say this or this group says they think this, which is a, you know, it devalues all the dialogue and it's how you end up with stuff like this.

It's how you end up with people not coming to share our values. It's what happened in Europe. Europe's like, you know, I have a good friend who's German, German intel guy who, maybe they got a chance. The Dutch are just a disaster. I mean, it's been so long and you just look at them like, guys, nobody's going to stand up for your own kind of what you want in your country if you don't do it yourselves. You know, I mean –

FRANK GAFFNEY:

But it's just one example of the larger problem in Europe. And, you know, what's interesting about this is, if you take a look at that, I think you'll find that particularly valuable, what is happening there and what now Google and Facebook and Twitter are all imposing here is the imposition of the OIC

Sharia blasphemy standards now enshrined in what's called UN Human Rights Council resolution 1618. It's – friends of mine, including Geert Wilders, are being prosecuted in the Netherlands by their government on the basis of that OIC standard. And not just there, but elsewhere. And so to the extent, again, those are now – I've had this conversation, I don't know if you have, but people who I work with are now very reluctant to say things on the phone or in emails in Europe lest they, too, have these folks coming down on them. And that's – that is a formula for, you know, submission, as I say.

MATT ROSENBERG:

The same way our freedom of speech and religion laws can be problematic at times, they're also our saving grace. Like, you know, I include this on stuff about Holocaust stuff. Europe's laws on this are ridiculous. I mean, I get why they thought maybe they were a good idea. I guess at the time, maybe it seemed like it. But they are a terrible idea.

FRANK GAFFNEY:

They are.

MATT ROSENBERG:

You know, if you can't convince people, you're not going to be able to legislate the solution very well either. There will be other ways around it. And the blasphemy – sorry, that's a classic case of it is where you let one part of a society define how everybody else should talk about it, rather than saying, you know what, everybody's going to talk about it any way they want, and what they say, we don't care. We care what they do. So they come and they burn down your house, they're going to go to jail and leave it at that.

FRANK GAFFNEY:

Right. In this case, and you saw it with Loretta Lynch, after the San – sorry, the Orlando attack, going to one of the Muslim Brotherhood's – not on that list [pointing to the *Explanatory Memorandum*'s list of "Our Organizations"] because they were relatively recent, Muslim Advocates, within a day, I think, of the attack. And saying in a speech, it was pre-organized, but it just happened she was doing the keynote address for the Muslim Advocates, [a] Muslim Brotherhood front group, very much involved with the – with the Justice Department's outreach and policy setting and so on. And she said, again, this is a paraphrase, I think, but it was essentially this, you know, I am most worried that people will be saying things that will result in attacks on Muslims. And we will basically be prosecuting people if they start moving in that direction.

I mean, it was clearly an erosion of that First Amendment right. And it's, you know, what is "hate speech"? Hate speech is something that tells you whether a specific action is motivated by "hate" or just a criminal activity. Well, once you start establishing that that's how you know, then you start prohibiting not just the action, but start prohibiting the speech. Once you start prohibiting the speech, you've got people arbitrating whether it is or it isn't. And I'll just tell you, you know, you look now at this whole fake news agenda, bullying, safe spaces, trigger warnings. I mean, you go right down the litany and it's amazing how well it at least will be, you know, exploited – I'm not saying it's all, you know, organized by [them] – but it will be exploited by enemies of freedom, for sure.

MATT ROSENBERG:

It's really depressing how quickly the fake news went from taking on things that were demonstrably bullshit to becoming anything you don't like it going to be labelled fake news. Well, that's obviously not true. And – but you will find a fellow traveller in the view of hate crimes, which I'm just like to the person that's a victim of the crime, whether it's motivated by prejudice or just plain old you wanted their money, you still got beat up or murdered, it's set a part of the standard –

[OVERLAPPING VOICES] yeah, there's like, your dignity's been violated in the same way, so why does it matter? Like we don't – and that intention matters inasmuch as it proves, you know, the severity of the crime, so, you know, you need intent for murder one.

But what the actual intent was, it shouldn't. That's like, what's in my, again, you know, what's in my head and heart is my business. What I do in my everyday life, how I treat other people, you know, that's different.

But when it comes to like the hate crime laws, I'm just like, you know, vandalism is vandalism. You know, we have laws for assault and we have laws for murder. You know, we absolutely have laws. Why the fact that it's a hate crime should matter more – I feel the same way when it's like, you know, it comes to police officers. If you attack a cop, it should be the same assault for everyone. Kind of creating different classes of people and laws is a little stupid. And detrimental in the end.

FRANK GAFFNEY:

Insidious.

MATT ROSENBERG:

Yeah, insidious. That's the word I'm looking for. Thank you.

FRANK GAFFNEY:

Thank you.

MATT ROSENBERG:

I'll give you your pen back.

FRANK GAFFNEY:

Thank you. I appreciate you –

MATT ROSENBERG:

I'm going to steal this bag that [UNCLEAR]

FRANK GAFFNEY:

Please do. There's more where that came from, needless to say. But –

MATT ROSENBERG:

And, you know, I'll tell you a quick anecdote myself, which is a David Petraeus anecdote. Call it – both, we're not huge fans of him either. For different reasons, but when I was in Afghanistan, I went to interview him and I was still at the *Journal*. And it was right before, what's the church where they keep burning Korans, what are they called? [Pastor Terry Jones' Dove World Outreach Center] I forget the name.

They were about to do one of the Koran burnings, whatever. Petraeus decides, we weren't going to ask about it, we didn't really care. It was just us, me and a colleague sitting at Army staff headquarters in Kabul. A quick statement kind of imploring this guy not to do it and, you know, saying it's going to be dangerous for our troops. And I thought to myself, what the fuck, dude? Are you kidding me? Like the guy's not burning a Koran in Afghanistan. Which is against the law. It's their country. It's the laws they want. Not my problem.

Like, you know, but if this whole thing here is for an idea, and if we're fighting for this idea, we can't stand up and say, look, I think it's a terrible, abhorrent thing to do. But our constitution protects it.

We're not going to stop it. And I hope you understand that and, you know, we would never do that here and we want to respect your laws, too. Why was that such a hard statement to make? And if he can't – and that's one thing we really do fall down on a lot of the time in this country, we spend too much time apologizing for normal things.

FRANK GAFFNEY:

But, no, but freeze that frame, Matt, because that's exactly what I'm talking about in microcosm is happening writ large where we've gotten to this point where we've been told by these guys – and this is where that Brotherhood piece comes in, they're very shrewd about saying, oh, we wouldn't come slit your throat if you published *Charlie Hebdo's* stuff, but they'll come slit your throat. So we'll tell you, don't think about doing it. And then they won't slit your throat.

You know, it's not actually that they're interested in our freedoms and our – and that's why I say, CAIR is not a civil rights organization promoting and protecting our freedoms. It's actually, you know, enabling that submission agenda. And that way, really, lies perdition, I think.

MATT ROSENBERG:

Look, I really appreciate you taking the time.

FRANK GAFFNEY:

I'll walk you out. I appreciate you.

MATT ROSENBERG:

So how many times did you get screwed by journalists who decided not to record everything?

FRANK GAFFNEY:

Daily. [LAUGHTER] Pretty much.