

TRANSCRIPT

A VICTORY COALITION BRIEFING

Prevent “Civilization Erasure” in America: Start by Banning the Brotherhood

December 12, 2025

<https://victoryco.org/prevent-civilization-erasure-in-america/>

Media File: Webinar_Civilization_Erasure.mp4

BEGIN TRANSCRIPT:

[00:00:00] **Frank Gaffney**: Welcome to today’s briefing by the Victory Coalition. It is an ad hoc team of American patriots and freedom-fighters who’ve come together to ensure, if we possibly can, the decisive victory of Western civilization—led by the United States of America—over Sharia supremacism.

There are many terms that can be used to describe those who seek to impose this Islamic operating code of Sharia on us, with the absolutely clear purpose of destroying our constitutional republic, yes, but Western civilization more generally—in favor of a new totalitarian world order dominated by the ideology of Sharia and ruled brutally, repressively, in a totalitarian way by its adherents.

This program is informed by a number of recent developments. They include a National Security Strategy issued by President Trump roughly a week ago, in which, among other things, he characterized what is facing Europe at the moment as “*the prospect of civilization erasure*.” That is a quote. While a number of factors were identified as contributing to that prospect, clearly immigration—with the purpose, or at least the practical effect, of transforming the continent and “creating strife,” as the strategy put it—is very ominous indeed.

Even more ominous, though, ladies and gentlemen, is the fact that the prospect of civilization erasure is operating inside the United States as well. It is, after all, the purpose of the Muslim Brotherhood and those like it, who seek to achieve the triumph of Sharia in this country every bit as much as elsewhere—including, by the way, the Middle East.

This prospect of civilization erasure, or at least concerns about the leading element in trying to bring it about—the Muslim Brotherhood—has given rise to a policy process. The President inaugurated it on the 24th of November in an executive order somewhat

misleadingly, frankly, described as designating the Muslim Brotherhood. It did not do that, but it did inaugurate a process that could give rise to such a designation.

Our question today is: *Will that designation occur?* And if so, what of the Muslim Brotherhood, if any of its elements, will be designated as an international or foreign terrorist organization? Something that, as this audience I'm sure knows, the Governor of Texas, Greg Abbott, and the Governor of Florida, Ron DeSantis, have in recent days done on their own authority within their states with respect not only to the Muslim Brotherhood itself, but to the preeminent front group for the Muslim Brotherhood: the Council on American–Islamic Relations, better known as CAIR.

We have assembled today—what I call an “all hands on deck” moment—some of the best hands, or quite a number of them, in this country, and in one case from Great Britain, to address this topic frontally, candidly, and with authority: namely, *Is the Muslim Brotherhood—the enterprise writ large, not just its chapters and subdivisions—a terrorist organization? Can it be described as such legally? And indeed, must it be so identified?*

And to use a phrase from a speech that Donald Trump, as candidate Trump, gave on August 15, 2016—memorably including a discussion about the threat of what he called “*the ideology of radical Islam*” and what a Trump presidency would do about it—one of the things he committed to in that speech was that the support networks for radical Islam would be “stripped out and removed one by one.” That’s a direct quote. It is a promise made that has yet to be a promise fulfilled. We hope it will be in the very near future.

To help inform that process, and to help assure that outcome, we are delighted to present this very timely and, I hope, very impactful program.

We’ll begin with a man who has just returned from the Holy Land, where the Muslim Brotherhood was inaugurated in 1928. I wanted Dr. David Wurmser—a man who has served in very senior positions in the United States State Department, the National Security Council, and in the office of the Vice President of the United States, as well as a Naval Intelligence officer, and who now directs the Middle East Program at the Center for Security Policy—to be our leadoff batter. He has, in the course of his recent travels, talked with people who are at the very pointy end—the wrong end, I might add—of the spear of radical Islam, or Sharia supremacism as I think it should be called: this ideology of jihad and Sharia.

In the course of his visit to Israel and discussions with Syrian minorities, he has heard what they’ve been experiencing and what they think is coming—not only to them and their communities, but to the Middle East more generally, to Europe, to the United States, indeed to all of Western civilization.

Dr. Wurmser, welcome back. It's good to have you with us, sir. Over to you.

[00:07:26] **Dr. David Wurmser:** Thank you, Frank.

If you go back thirty or forty years, to the beginning of the Oslo process, you, I, and a number of others felt we lived in a kind of dissonance with Washington. There was a certain euphoria that things were headed in a particular direction—an era of peace—and yet for us, the situation on the ground suggested that just wasn't the case.

Now, thirty years later, I think the verdict on Oslo is generally in. We're in a similar situation now: you go to Israel and see one reality, and then you come here and Washington is living in a different reality. That Washington reality seems to be grounded in hope, which is always good, but not necessarily in sobriety, which of course is bad.

So that takes me to what I did when I was in Israel. I didn't do the usual itinerary. I went up north and met with the heads of various communities up there which have parallel communities across the borders in Jordan, Syria, and Lebanon—specifically the Eastern Orthodox and Greek Catholic churches, members and leadership of the Syriac Church, the head of the Druze community in Israel, the head of the Alawite community in Israel—yes, there actually is an Alawite community in Israel—and several others.

The picture you get up there is stark. The Israelis are aware of it, maybe not as attuned as they need to be, but they're definitely onto it: something is brewing in Syria. And if it were only Syria, we might say, "Okay, Israel will eventually face it and deal with it, perhaps others will as well." But it isn't only Syria.

When you talk to the heads of these communities, the feeling you get—there's really no other way to describe it—is that, for those who follow Tolkien, it's like coming back from Osgiliath and you're back in Gondor, looking at the front line against Mordor. Something is brewing in Damascus: a civilizational confidence far beyond Syria. It is invigorating the Sunni Islamist world, the Muslim Brotherhood world, profoundly—into a sense of confidence and going on the offensive.

What are the evidences of this? Let me give you a few.

One quote: *"In all the schools"—and this is as of last March—"in all the schools, the children chant in the morning: Allah is our victory, the Prophet is our role model, the Qur'an is our guide, jihad is our way, and death for the sake of Allah is our pleasure for our Prophet."* We sing "God Bless America" and say the Pledge of Allegiance—I hope we still say that in our schools. That's what they say in theirs.

Then you have marches. On December 8th, just a few days ago—the first-year anniversary of the revolution—you had ISIS, al-Qaeda, and HTS (Hay'at Tahrir al-Sham,

the al-Nusra forces) marching together in Raqqa and in a township called Ma'an. That shows they're working together. Yes, a few are rounded up here and there and handed over to us to give the impression that they're working against each other, helping us—but they're not.

Then you had the December 8th march of the army, which started with their famous chant that we've seen over and over again about Jabbar Hud: *"We are coming to kill you, Jews. We're going to finish off the massacres of Jabbar. We're coming to Gaza, we're coming to Jerusalem."* And there are other recurring quotes, again and again.

One of them is about Gaza. I don't have the exact text in front of me, but it basically says: *"We are coming to you, O Gaza. We will save you, O Gaza. We will liberate you, O Gaza."* Then you have speeches by Erdogan relitigating the end of World War I and trying to redraw the empire's borders, claiming areas for Turkey, including Greek islands and other territories.

What's going on here? Two forces are acting like adrenaline shots for the Muslim Brotherhood and are leading them to make what is essentially a civilizational lurch forward.

First is the taking of Damascus. This is the first time in a thousand years that Sunni Arabs are in control of Damascus. It is the symbolic reinvigoration of the Umayyad Empire, which is really the heart and soul of Sunni Islam. It's seen as a signal from Allah that history now resumes on behalf of the Muslims, under Allah's encouragement. That's why He "gave them back" Damascus—to lead and resume where they left off in the global expansion of Islam.

The second factor is their supreme confidence that Europe is falling—that Europe is becoming Muslim. Among the Muslim Brotherhood in the Middle East, anchored to Syria and Damascus, it is a given that the West has lost its will. The evidence is how Europe is failing to respond effectively to the Muslim Brotherhood on its own soil.

This is giving the Brotherhood such a sense that the age of having to navigate, cooperate, accept dhimmi arrangements and non-Muslim "protected" minorities is over. Now, the *non*-protected have to be eliminated. There are only two protected communities under Islam: Christians and Jews. The rest, like Yazidis and others, are heretics and so forth. Those are to be eradicated. Even the *dhimmis*—Christians and Jews—are only temporarily tolerated until Islam resumes its march. Then they also have to convert.

Right now, when you talk to the heads of these various communities, you keep hearing the same thing: *"What has worked for us for a thousand-plus years isn't working and won't work."* What worked for them as minorities under Islamic control were three basic principles: keep your head down, grovel, and be "holier than the Pope" in adapting to

the dominant ideology. So when there was Arab nationalism, they were more Arab nationalist than the Arabs.

They're saying: *That won't work anymore*. The forces they face want forced conversion or forced elimination. There is no appeasing this monster anymore.

This is the civilizational strength, the civilizational confidence—the volcano—that is erupting in Damascus. And the fact that Assad or others may wear suits and navigate somewhat cautiously doesn't impress any of the minorities. They feel it. They are on that front line, like I mentioned, in Osgiliath facing Mordor. They know it. They're not guessing.

What's striking is that even some Christian communities that were most anti-Israeli in the region—for example, elements of the Greek Orthodox Church in Syria, which were once epicenters of Arab nationalism and anti-Israel sentiment among Christians—have now said, *"That's it, we're done. We can't cooperate with this regime; we can't obey this regime."* One leading figure came out recently and said they have no hope dealing with this anymore.

The implication is what their flocks are saying—which I heard speaking to them on the phone from Israel, using Syrian phones to reach these communities. Their people say they now have two options, which really amount to one: they need an alliance among minorities, and that alliance has to come under Israeli protection. That is a complete sea change.

This has tremendous impact. What's going on in Europe is integrally linked to what's happening in the Middle East. The sense of civilizational confidence and offensive coming out of Syria and Damascus is going to invigorate Islamist forces inside Europe and ultimately in the United States.

Who's behind this? The Muslim Brotherhood, anchored to Qatar and Turkey. They're using this fervor to invigorate Muslims in Europe and America, while at the same time trying to disarm us from within—causing confusion and division inside the West, which I believe some of the other panelists will address.

By and large, this is what we're facing, and you can feel it when you're on the ground in the region.

[00:16:58] **Frank Gaffney**: David Wurmser, thank you. That was extraordinarily important level-setting.

On your point about "civilization jihad," if I can use that expression, I do want to refer briefly to this book: the playbook of the Muslim Brotherhood for its operations in North

America. A critical passage says that, in terms of the mission of the Muslim Brotherhood, it is a “*civilization jihadist process*”—a kind of “*grand jihad in eliminating and destroying Western civilization from within by their hands*” (meaning the hands of the non-believers) “*and the believers, so that Allah’s religion is made victorious over all other religions.*” That is a direct quote.

A man who has studied this matter extraordinarily closely, and who has done more than practically any human being—certainly in the non-Muslim world—to chronicle, analyze, and expose it, is our next presenter. We’re very proud to have with us Robert Spencer, the Executive Director of JihadWatch. You can follow his work at JihadWatch.org—I encourage you to do so. He’s the author of, I believe, thirty-plus books; one of the most recent is *Intifada on the Hudson: The Selling of Zohran Mamdani*.

We’ve asked Robert to address what Sharia commands—jihad—and how the Muslim Brotherhood engages in various forms of jihad. That’s a very important point in terms of terrorism and its component parts.

Robert Spencer, welcome back, my friend. Over to you.

[00:18:47] **Robert Spencer:** Thank you, Frank.

I thought I would start today by speaking a little bit about terrorism, because we’re talking about designating the Muslim Brotherhood as a terrorist organization. What exactly *is* a terrorist organization?

Most people assume it’s a violent group that pursues mayhem and destruction for some fanatical goal, and that the means overshadow any rational end. In practice, the U.S. government tends to understand the Islamic world and its various organizations—including the Muslim Brotherhood—as either “terrorist” or “moderate.” If an organization isn’t blowing things up, the assumption is that they’re the “good guys,” moderates we don’t need to be concerned about, and indeed should encourage.

The Muslim Brotherhood has taken tremendous advantage of this distinction. Through its proxy organizations in the United States—notably the Council on American–Islamic Relations (CAIR), as well as the Islamic Society of North America, the Muslim American Society, and others—they have convinced law enforcement and intelligence organizations that the Brotherhood and its various groups are benign, and that the U.S. government should actually work with them.

This has been the policy of the U.S. government since at least the Obama administration, and in key ways since the Bush administration. The thinking has been: “Because they’re not violent, they must be harmless.” No serious understanding has

ever been displayed of the overall goals of the Brotherhood and its proxy groups, or of the reality that terrorism is a *means to an end*, not an end in itself.

Terrorism is an *instrument* of jihad. There are many other instruments of jihad. The point of jihad is, as has already been discussed here, the hegemony of Islamic law—Sharia—over the world. That involves the forced subjugation of non-Muslims to second-class status within an Islamic society. Non-Muslims are required to conform to a series of humiliating and discriminatory regulations that remind them every day of the earthly price of rejecting Muhammad and Islam.

If they would accept Muhammad and Islam, those humiliating and discriminatory regulations would immediately cease for them. They would join the larger Islamic community and have full equality of rights. But because the Qur'an teaches that non-Muslims will suffer in this world as well as in the next—and that Muslims are the executors of Allah's punishment against unbelievers—it is a fundamental duty of Islamic society to ensure that those unbelievers do indeed suffer in this world. The deprivations Islamic law prescribes are the mechanism for that suffering.

So the goal of terrorism is not simply to sow random mayhem. It is not destruction for its own sake. It is designed to destabilize an infidel society so that it is ultimately destroyed and replaced by an Islamic society. That's the whole idea behind terrorism.

There are many other ways to pursue that goal, and the Muslim Brotherhood, in its own words—as Frank just quoted and I'll quote again—says it is pursuing in North America what it calls a *“civilization jihadist process.”* They write that *“the brothers must understand that their work in America is a kind of grand jihad in eliminating and destroying the Western civilization from within and sabotaging its miserable house by their hands and the hands of the believers.”* That is just as much of a jihadi enterprise as terrorism.

Therefore, we must understand that the U.S. government's distinction between “terrorists” and “moderates” is entirely false and based on fantasy. It rests on a wrong understanding of what Islam and jihad are about.

The first step toward truth and reality that the U.S. government can and should take is to understand that groups such as CAIR, ISNA, MAS, and others are pursuing—by peaceful means—the *same* goal that al-Qaeda, ISIS, and similar groups are pursuing by violent means.

When they befriend politicians, when they gain influence and power within intelligence organizations, including the FBI, when they build relationships with law enforcement through “outreach” programs and offer to explain Islam so officials can “understand these new communities”—all of that is in pursuit of this civilization-jihadist process. It is designed to ensure the ultimate fall of the U.S. government and its replacement by an

Islamic government. It is *not* a gesture of friendship. It is not mutual cooperation. It is not “good-faith outreach.” It’s all part of this program.

This is extraordinarily difficult for many American officials to grasp. They’ve been completely gulled—fooled—by the idea that CAIR and other groups are offering good-faith help to stop terrorism and “build bridges” with Muslim communities.

Sayyid Qutb, the foremost Muslim Brotherhood theorist of the twentieth century, wrote that Muslims must build “bridges” with non-Muslims across the West, but that they must understand it is a *one-way* bridge: the bridge is for converting the non-Muslims to Islam. It is not to build mutual understanding, or to help people of different faiths become friends, or to live together in coexistence and mutual respect. It is designed for the hegemony of Islam—nothing more, nothing less.

When you say this to American officials, however, they’ve been conditioned by these same groups—and their allies on the left—to believe that you’re being bigoted, racist, and “Islamophobic.” They’re told that you’re trampling on an olive branch, that instead of meeting a gesture of friendship with friendship, you’re rejecting it. That’s naïve in the extreme.

It shows a lack of understanding of the Muslim Brotherhood’s own program—as outlined in the explanatory memorandum—and of Islamic theology itself, which is supremacist and expansionist to its core. It does *not* envision, under any circumstances, Muslims and non-Muslims living together as equals in a society in which the rights of both are respected.

Until that is understood, whether the Muslim Brotherhood is designated this or that really doesn’t matter. It *is* a terrorist organization and should be designated as such. But it also must be understood at all levels of the U.S. government that there is more to terrorism than violence—that the supremacist agenda is much broader than just blowing things up. It is indeed a civilization jihad for civilization *erasure*, as President Trump said, and that is the goal of the entire constellation of Muslim Brotherhood groups in the United States.

Until that’s understood, we haven’t even gotten to square one.

Thank you.

[00:28:47] **Frank Gaffney:** Thank you, Robert Spencer. What a magnificent treatment of this very important subject.

It bears repeating: terrorism is a *means* to an end. It’s one facet of jihad, and not even a particularly enlightening facet at that—any more than another euphemism introduced

after 9/11: “violent extremism,” which divorces the violence even further from its perpetrators.

To be sure, there are other kinds of terrorists. But the ones at our throats at the moment are those who are using terrorism in pursuit of jihad and the triumph of Sharia. Terrorism is just one tool.

Robert, thank you again. This particular edition of the *Explanatory Memorandum* is, I believe, still available as a free downloadable PDF on the Center for Security Policy’s website, CenterForSecurityPolicy.org. In addition to the passage Robert and I have both quoted about the mission of the Brotherhood, there is, at the end of this booklet, a very helpful list of twenty-nine different organizations, with their acronyms, under the heading “A list of our organizations and organizations of our friends.” It adds, “Imagine if they all march according to a single plan.”

That list provided feedstock for the Holy Land Foundation prosecution—the largest terrorism-financing trial in U.S. history—into which this memorandum was introduced into evidence. It was helpful in the conviction of five jihadists working for the Holy Land Foundation, and it set the stage for what was supposed to come next: the prosecution of some 300 unindicted co-conspirators.

Perhaps our next speaker will speak to why that didn’t happen.

His name is Major Stephen Coughlin, United States Army (Retired). He served as the duty expert for the Joint Chiefs of Staff on matters involving terrorism, jihad, and Sharia. He was a principal author of another book published by the Center for Security Policy—also available, I believe, for free on the Center’s website—called *Sharia: The Threat to America*. Steve was incredibly helpful in pulling together that content, written by a team we called “Team B II,” about fifteen experts in all.

I strongly commend that work, as I do his masterwork, *Catastrophic Failure: Blindfolding America in the Face of Jihad*.

Steve, thank you so much for your incredible service to our country, both in uniform and now at Unconstrained Analytics. We deeply appreciate your insights into this history of failure—failure to understand jihad and the group at the vanguard of promoting it, the Muslim Brotherhood.

Over to you, sir.

[00:32:42] **Maj. Stephen Coughlin:** Thank you, Frank.

What I’d like to do is throw a degree of skepticism over what’s going on. I’m not sure we’re not seeing a certain amount of theater.

I base that on the idea that, for me, going back to October 2023, our group at Unconstrained Analytics classified the October 7th Hamas attack as a *color revolution* operation—Israel in black. And reading into it, we see the role of the left in everything we're seeing.

So I'd like to start with that alliance, because these forces are interoperable. "Everything, everywhere, all at once"—that's the phrase that's often used. We talk about "civilization erasure," which could be translated into cancel culture, which could be translated into "destroy the culture," or the Marxist concept of "ending culture." We're seeing this happen across the board.

At the political-warfare level, Marxist intersectional attacks have been joined by the Muslim Brotherhood and the broader Islamic movement. The explanatory memorandum makes it clear that the Brotherhood is the leader of the Islamic movement inside the United States.

So I think we need to assess what we're seeing with the idea of declaring the Muslim Brotherhood a terrorist organization *in the context of its larger ongoing alliance with the left*, with intersectionality as their common point of attack.

On the left, "hate speech" is completely interoperable with the term "Islamophobia." That is not accidental; it has been deliberately constructed that way.

So, for me, I look at the current situation and ask: What has me greatly concerned?

You have key leaders of this administration, including family members, raking in hundreds of millions—if not billions—of dollars in "relationships" with Persian Gulf countries, notably including Qatar and Saudi Arabia. You have the current administration's closeness to Qatar, which essentially hosts and funds the Muslim Brotherhood. Qatar has oversight of the International Union of Muslim Scholars (IUMS), which issues calls that ripple through the global network.

This past summer, for example, you could literally see IUMS issue a statement, and then the Saudi-based Muslim World League back it up with more neutral language—calling for "defensive jihad," which in classical doctrine creates a mandatory obligation wherever you are. That's Monday or Tuesday. Then Friday you see events on U.S. college campuses and European campuses, tied to events in Gaza. You can trace the messaging back through Turkey, Qatar, and beyond.

Turkey, meanwhile, is running the Diyanet (its religious affairs apparatus) and effectively exercising operational control over parts of the Brotherhood, especially in the United States. Turkey has its "vassal" militia leaders in Syria and elsewhere—forces we might label ISIS-aligned—doing what ISIS does, but under Ankara's umbrella. And you see

the administration's closeness to people like Zohran Mamdani and others ideologically aligned with this network.

What greatly concerned me this weekend was a meeting in Doha where administration leaders went, and the U.S. ambassador to Syria basically said the greatest model for governing multi-cultural entities was the Ottoman Empire. We saw a memorandum of understanding signed with Turkey. Turkey is effectively encircling Israel right now with diplomatic and military moves.

We've seen the administration bring pressure to bear against Israel in a unilateral way *on behalf of* the Muslim Brotherhood's interests in Gaza. So the question I have is: with all that going on, how do we understand language about "declaring the Muslim Brotherhood a terrorist organization"?

I have to confess I've seen similar language before—about designating the Brotherhood—drafted in ways that didn't really affect anything real. My concern is that the same people who are "lining up at the trough" or getting backslapping kudos at events are the ones running the organizations that are engaged in the terrorism. It feels Orwellian.

So for me, I worry that, when we look at the larger picture, something is grossly out of balance. Two contradictory things can't both be true. On the one hand, we see all this deep integration with Qatar and Turkey; on the other, we see talk about designating the Brotherhood, but perhaps in a way that's more symbolic than real.

Alongside Qatar and Turkey, we have the Pakistani ISI's presence, well-known inside the United States within these Islamic movement groups. I'm concerned about how CARE (CAIR) is joined at the hip with the U.S. Council of Muslim Organizations (USCMO), which functions as an umbrella group. Within that structure is an entity that represents Muslim organizations in hiring employees at state, local, and federal levels—including within national law enforcement and the national security and intelligence apparatus.

When I see all that, then hear language about the Brotherhood being declared a terrorist organization, I worry it might be more theater than reality.

We saw, forty-five to sixty days ago, a public warning that terrorism in the United States was "imminent," and then a rash of incidents and protests. Then things went quiet again. There's a part of me that thinks the Islamic movement is running the table on us—and running it big-time.

So I don't mean to be a wet blanket. But looking at the larger picture—the investments, the influence, the alliance with the left—I question whether designating the Brotherhood will be done in a way that really affects U.S.-based activity.

On one hand, you could name a few entities that don't truly impact the Brotherhood's core operations and build slowly toward something that would matter. That could be a win if it's real. On the other hand, you could end up doing essentially nothing.

Alongside Hamas running wild under the banner of "Unity of the Fields," fully interactive with the left on street actions, I'm concerned that what we're seeing is highly coordinated. When we talk about declaring the Muslim Brotherhood a terrorist organization, I want to make sure we're not dealing with more theater.

I'll leave it there for now.

[00:39:54] **Frank Gaffney**: This is really why we're having this conversation, honestly. I think we're determined to make sure this *isn't* theater. This is deadly serious stuff, folks—*no drill*, as they say in the military.

We believe—speaking for the Victory Coalition team—that this moment, this opportunity the President has created could change the trajectory of what Steve has described as a history of epic failure: a failure to understand the enemy; a failure to stop their penetration of our government; a failure to counter their influence operations. Those operations are arguably now at an operational tempo and level of impact unseen in our history.

It is therefore a particularly important moment for us to be having this stock-taking: this analysis, this clarity about what must be done, as well as *why*.

A further contribution to that threat assessment and situational awareness, I'm pleased to say, will be provided by a member of our BanTheBrotherhood.org initiative from across the pond, as they say. His name is Peter McElvenna. He is a very courageous and impressive freedom-fighter in the United Kingdom. He works with another such individual, Lord Malcolm Pearson, in the House of Lords. The two of them co-host a marvelous podcast called *Hearts of Oak*.

Peter has been having an outsized influence, I think, of late in our own country, having come here on a couple of occasions recently to warn of what is happening in his own land and what he sees taking place here. We wanted him to share some of those insights with us—particularly how the Muslim Brotherhood and its "company" (the groups spawned by it, the groups that work with and for it, and the groups influenced and enabled by it) are performing and waging jihad of the kind Robert Spencer has described: the kind that seeks to take down Western civilization in Great Britain.

Peter, thank you so much for finding time to do this. The floor is yours, sir.

[00:42:47] **Peter McElvenna:** Thank you, Frank.

I don't come to this as an expert in the way your other illustrious panelists do. I come as someone living in a country—in a city—that has become Islamized very quickly.

I share the concerns many of you in the U.S. have: that things aren't moving fast enough; that there are statements being made which are contradicted by events. I understand all that. But I've looked back at what we've talked about in the U.K. regarding the Muslim Brotherhood, which is completely free to operate here with no restrictions.

In fact, London and the U.K. are really a base of operations not only for Britain but into Europe. We've had only one Member of Parliament who has seriously raised the issue: Nigel Farage. I've always had concerns about Nigel addressing Islam directly, but he recognizes the threat of the Muslim Brotherhood.

He asked the government, in a question in January, whether they were going to proscribe the Muslim Brotherhood. Of course, the response was no. He has said twice this year, at different conferences, that when Reform UK comes into government, they will ban the Muslim Brotherhood. So credit to Nigel—but he's the only MP we have talking this way.

I watch many of your figures in the States who speak boldly, with courage, and who seem to understand the problem. There does seem to be a wave behind what many of you have been doing in the U.S., and I think that's why the Ban The Brotherhood initiative fits this current moment. There is public appetite. There is media engagement. There are at least political statements. We'll see whether the political will lies behind them.

We have very little political pushback here. At least you have *some*. We have virtually none. We have no media. Despite all the conversation in the U.S., I don't think I've seen a single newspaper article in the U.K. discussing this. It simply isn't on our agenda. I think the last government report on the Brotherhood was in 2015, under David Cameron.

That 2015 report concluded that the organization exerted significant influence in the U.K. It talked about a network of possibly hundreds of different groupings—national Muslim organizations, student bodies, charities, mosques, and so on. And although the Brotherhood directly controls only a relatively small number of mosques—somewhere between ten and forty out of about two and a half thousand—there are these hundreds of entities we haven't really mapped in the U.K.

The report said the Brotherhood had significant influence and noted extremist elements, but concluded that because it wasn't carrying out acts of terrorism itself on U.K. soil, it

was essentially acceptable. So it was given a kind of clean bill of health and has barely been mentioned since 2015. Nigel Farage may be the only one in the last couple of years to mention it in Parliament.

The Brotherhood has significant sway over the largest U.K. Muslim student organization, the Federation of Student Islamic Societies, and influence over many others. They operate quietly, through front organizations most people don't recognize.

One public-facing group people might know is Islamic Relief Worldwide. You see their adverts all over the London Underground. It's an international organization but based in Birmingham, the U.K.'s second city—which has changed beyond recognition from its English roots.

Islamic Relief has a budget of around \$350 million a year. Many have raised concerns about it. Israel banned it in 2014. The United Arab Emirates banned it in 2014. The U.S. has had numerous reports questioning it. In 2021, many financial ties were cut. Germany has expressed concerns, and so on. Yet it's allowed to operate freely here, with a third of a billion dollars in yearly revenue, and with impunity. They're not only allowed to operate; they're heavily advertised as a charity.

On the state level, Qatar has enormous sway in the U.K. in terms of property and business investments. Qatari assets in the U.K. exceed £100 billion—about \$130 billion. Qatari-owned businesses generated roughly £53 billion in turnover in 2022 and employ about 160,000 people. Qatar has embedded itself deeply in London and across industries. There are big military sales: Qatar has bought 24 Typhoon aircraft and is due to buy more, plus LNG deals, and so on.

But my frustration, and this is what I want to leave you with, is that I see utter silence on the Brotherhood issue here. Some of it may be related to "Islamophobia" narratives. We talked earlier about an "Islamophobia" definition, which in effect tries to legalize Muslim blasphemy law by the back door. That creates fear about discussing these issues. It fits into the grooming-gang issues and other scandals—the whole difficulty of engaging Islam in public debate.

I think that's why we have complete silence on the Muslim Brotherhood. Germany, France, and the U.K. have expressed concerns about extremism, but they haven't gone as far as Austria, which banned the Brotherhood in 2021.

So I'm just glad you're actually voicing this issue in the U.S. As Frank has said many times, at least you have politicians putting themselves on record that they're concerned. I hope many more states follow Texas and Florida in announcing bans—and that this continues to apply pressure on the Trump administration.

That's my bit from the U.K.: you are streets ahead in actually engaging this problem. We won't even grasp the nettle here.

[00:50:58] **Frank Gaffney**: It's a sign, I think, of how far gone the U.K. actually is, and it goes to that question Donald Trump raised in his strategy about "civilization erasure." *Is this what we're witnessing?*

You touched lightly on one aspect you've discussed at length in previous briefings: the rape-gang scandal. By one Labor parliamentarian's estimate, there have been up to a million young British girls who have been raped—in many cases gang-raped, systematically raped, groomed, effectively sold into sexual slavery—with scarcely any action taken by the British government about it.

There have been some recent convictions. Tommy Robinson and you, Peter, have been tremendously effective in raising the alarm. Elon Musk has rolled in to help as well. But this is a symptom of a civilization being erased—and it's beginning to happen here, we're told, as well.

We need to stop that.

Among those who have long been on the front lines of this fight is David Yerushalmi, a longtime friend and colleague in the counter-jihad cause. He has been at the forefront of efforts to expose what's taking place in our own country in this regard, including undercover work showing Sharia being practiced in American mosques and the correlation between such practice and support for jihad.

He has also been a leader in warning about, and trying to prevent, the insinuation of Sharia over American law. He's the architect of the model legislation and campaign—substantially successful across the country—called *American Laws for American Courts*.

He has also been very much alive to, and warning about, the danger of Sharia-compliant finance.

David, it's great to have you with us, sir. Your experience as a litigator and student of the law—as well as a practitioner—is very much valued in this context, especially because it's a matter of law as to what the Muslim Brotherhood is up to.

Please speak to the point as to whether it constitutes a terrorist organization.

[00:53:25] **David Yerushalmi**: Thank you, Frank, and thank you to all the panelists.

I'd like to fit a kind of rudimentary legal analysis of this question into what's been said, especially Dr. Wurmser's comments about momentum and Steve Coughlin's concerns about theater.

Let's begin by looking at President Trump's executive order—the one that sets out to designate the Muslim Brotherhood or parts of it as a foreign terrorist organization. Let's move CAIR aside for a moment, because the Council on American–Islamic Relations and other domestic Brotherhood entities fall under a somewhat different rubric. President Trump seeks to designate under three basic authorities.

The first—and more ambiguous, but perhaps more plenary—is his authority as Commander in Chief. Under the Constitution, the President has enormous authority over the military and foreign policy. There are things he *cannot* do—he can't enter into treaties or declare war—but he can act quite robustly in this space.

There are also two particular statutes that authorize the executive branch—the President, the Secretary of State, the Treasury Department—to designate foreign terrorist organizations. One is in 8 U.S.C. §1101 and subsequent sections—the Immigration and Nationality Act. Under that, you have the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act (AEDPA), which authorizes the Secretary of State, in consultation with Treasury and others, to designate foreign terrorist organizations. That's the key statute we're talking about.

The other is the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA), which allows designations that affect the financing of foreign terrorist organizations.

Going back to the Commander in Chief authority: in 2001, following 9/11, President Bush issued Executive Order 13224, which addresses designating terrorist entities for purposes of interdicting their financing. Those are the three sources that are actually cited in President Trump's order about designating the Muslim Brotherhood.

What's interesting about President Trump's EO is the language of its purpose. Let me read a key line from Section 1:

“This order sets in motion a process by which certain chapters or other subdivisions of the Muslim Brotherhood shall be considered for designation as foreign terrorist organizations...”

Then it lists three particular chapters: in Egypt, Jordan, and Lebanon. It does *not* mention the Muslim Brotherhood in Turkey. It does *not* mention the Muslim Brotherhood in Qatar. That speaks directly to Steve Coughlin's point: we know the influence Qatar is trying to exert on the current administration—and Turkey's efforts as well. Jordan has already designated the Brotherhood as a terrorist organization. It used to operate there as a political party, but when it set out to assassinate the King, it was outlawed. We see

similar patterns in Egypt, where the Arab Spring led to a Brotherhood government and then a military takeover.

Now, turning to the actual statutory definition in AEDPA: What is a “foreign terrorist organization”?

There’s been a lot of hand-wringing—claims that you can’t designate the Muslim Brotherhood because it’s a loose network, that each chapter is separate and distinct. But the statute’s definition of “organization” is very broad. It says the term *organization* means—but is not limited to—a corporation, company, partnership, association, trust, foundation, or fund, and includes:

“...a group of persons whether or not incorporated, permanently or temporarily associated together with joint action on any subject or subjects.”

That’s incredibly broad. *Any* group of persons temporarily associated together for “joint action on any subject”—that’s enough to qualify as an “organization.”

The statute also uses the term *affiliate* when it wants to indicate a closer relationship—someone who provides material support, financial or otherwise, to a designated organization. That’s distinct from mere association.

So if you have any organization abroad that voices support for Hamas, or for Brotherhood operations, or participates in joint actions, it can fall under the umbrella of the foreign terrorist organization. Merely voicing support for jihad activities can create an association; providing material support creates an affiliation.

Now, if we go back to President Trump’s memo, and you look at the various “chapters and subdivisions” of the Muslim Brotherhood, the moment you become a chapter or subdivision of the Brotherhood, you are, by definition, part of that organization for statutory purposes. There is really no serious argument against designating the Brotherhood as such, given how broadly Congress defined “organization.”

Now, turning to the domestic side: many of us are concerned about the civilizational jihad taking place here, conducted by Muslim Brotherhood organizations such as CAIR, ISNA, MAS, and others. Under the EO, we are not designating domestic organizations themselves as foreign terrorist organizations. Foreign terrorist organizations have *no* constitutional rights as such. They cannot claim First Amendment protections. They can seek judicial review of their designation in the D.C. Circuit under specific statutory procedures, but they cannot claim First Amendment association rights.

Domestic organizations like CAIR do have constitutional rights. However, if we designate the Muslim Brotherhood abroad as a foreign terrorist organization, that triggers material-support prohibitions. The FBI and other domestic agencies can then examine whether groups like CAIR have provided material support to designated

Brotherhood entities. If they have, then those groups are in violation of 18 U.S.C. §2339B, which criminalizes providing material support to a foreign terrorist organization.

So the structure is there. The question of whether we designate Brotherhood chapters beyond Egypt, Jordan, and Lebanon should be answered by virtue of the statute and the President's EO. If that happens fully and robustly, then this is real. If it doesn't—if we limit it to a token few chapters and avoid the core hubs in Turkey and Qatar—then we're likely dealing with political co-option.

If the administration says, "Look, we've designated the Brotherhood: see, we've labeled Jordan, Lebanon, Egypt," and stops there, that would be more about quieting criticism from Trump's base than about addressing the actual threat network. It would be a way to give supporters "something" and then argue they shouldn't "ask for the whole pie."

So that's the legal analysis, fitted into what we've heard earlier today.

Thank you, Frank.

[01:04:20] **Frank Gaffney:** David, thank you. This is incredibly important.

In your legal analysis, there's really no doubt: we are dealing with domestic *as well as* international elements of the Muslim Brotherhood as terrorist organizations. That's a foundational point we will be using in the Victory Coalition's efforts to make sure people are clear as this process moves along.

The end of the first thirty-day period for review by the Secretaries of State and Treasury will be Christmas Eve. I just want to announce here that our purpose, the Victory Coalition's purpose—and that of our BanTheBrotherhood.org campaign—will be to provide a *second opinion*, informed by what we've heard today and much else, to ensure the President has the benefit of another perspective.

The official sources have been deeply compromised, penetrated, subverted—perhaps rendered so co-opted as to be unreliable in the extreme. We will do our part.

We've got a couple more presentations that are vitally important, and we're going to ask your indulgence to allow us to continue with them.

We're going to hear next from a man who has worked behind enemy lines for decades on behalf of this country. Much of his work has been in the Middle East, much of it engaged with jihadists—Muslim Brotherhood operatives and others working in alignment with them or under their influence, in some cases paid for by Qatar, Turkey, and related sources.

His name is Charles “Sam” Faddis. He served for twenty years undercover as a Central Intelligence Agency case officer, a spy. He has also served as an officer in the United States Army and as an Assistant Attorney General in Washington State. So he knows a lot about law as well as the security of our country.

These days he is a tremendously important contributor to our awareness of these problems, and to our taking corrective action, through his work at *And Magazine* on Substack.

Let’s go to a video of an interview I did with Sam earlier today for our show *Securing America* on Real America’s Voice.

[01:07:02] **Sam Faddis:** Thanks, Frank.

My reaction when anybody asks me about the Brotherhood and whether it’s a threat—speaking broadly—is always a little bit of puzzlement. I understand the question, but I don’t really understand why it *needs* to be asked, because the Brotherhood’s entire purpose is the destruction of Western civilization and the subjugation or assimilation of anybody who does not adhere not just to Islam, but to its particular interpretation of Islam.

Going back to its genesis in the years following World War I, all of its leaders, from day one, have framed this as a struggle. This is not about freedom. It’s not, “Leave me alone and let me worship in my own way,” or any of these quintessentially American ideas.

For them, the world exists in two pieces: the lands they already control—the “lands of Islam”—and the lands they describe as “lands of war,” which is everybody else. In the lands of war, they are waging war to assimilate, subjugate, or destroy those who are non-believers—non-believers according to their interpretation.

That has been their mission from day one.

Their ideology, their doctrine, their written statements are indistinguishable from those of al-Qaeda. In fact, they are foundational to al-Qaeda. In that sense, al-Qaeda was an offshoot of Brotherhood ideology. I mention al-Qaeda not because it’s the only group we should worry about, but because most Americans know what al-Qaeda is—they’ve seen it kill thousands of Americans here at home.

Ideologically, there’s no difference. That’s the Muslim Brotherhood. And it’s not just ideology. The Brotherhood, in a pragmatic, concrete way, is lashed up with Islamic terrorist groups around the globe.

The other element is that the Brotherhood, like a lot of Islamic groups, is very good at deception and misdirection. They play on the fact that many people in the West,

because they have a secular mindset, are reluctant to view things in religious or ideological terms.

In essence, the Brotherhood will lie to you, deceive you, say whatever serves their goals at a given moment. One of the ways they do that is by having a central hub, broadly speaking, and then chapters or groups in various countries. The chapters will adopt whatever form or tactic seems most productive and advantageous in that environment. All of that is tactical. It doesn't change the goal.

Their goal is not coexistence. It's not "let's all get along and do our own thing." Their goal is to destroy you. Whatever lies they need to tell to your face, whatever spin they need to put on it, they will. They do it very effectively. And they're helped by having folks with deep pockets, like the Qataris. It's one thing to put spin on things; it's another to show up with millions and millions of dollars and have leaders of supposedly secular countries like Turkey aligned with you as well.

It's a really dangerous organization. It boggles my mind that they're still allowed to operate, that they haven't been designated long ago. A significant number of our allied nations in the Middle East banned them quite some time ago—they had the guts to come out and say, "These guys are terrorists," and designate them as such.

[01:11:31] **Frank Gaffney:** A former Director of National Intelligence, General James Clapper, famously testified before Congress—under oath or otherwise—that the Muslim Brotherhood is "a largely secular organization" that has "eschewed violence."

What would you say about that characterization?

[01:11:56] **Sam Faddis:** I'd say it is either the most ignorant statement one could possibly imagine—which I think is far too charitable—or it's one of the most bald-faced deliberate lies you can imagine.

First, there is absolutely *nothing* secular about the Muslim Brotherhood. That's insane. It is an expressly radical Islamic organization. Its purpose, again, is spreading Islam and subjugating people. If the Brotherhood takes over, there isn't going to be anything secular, because by definition they don't believe in it. Everything is subject to Sharia.

So, from the start, that statement makes no sense. I have to assume it's deliberate deception.

When I worked the street running operations, our approach when dealing with people like the Brotherhood, al-Qaeda, or any of these groups was: we're at war. If I'm sitting in a room with a member of al-Qaeda trying to get him to work with us, the bedrock of that

conversation is: “You can work with us, or we can kill you.” That’s the reality. We both understand we’re in a war, and only one of us can win.

There is no possibility of compromise. There is nothing secular about their agenda. Statements like Clapper’s suggest, unfortunately, that he’s effectively playing for the other side in this context.

As for the idea that they’re “non-violent”: Islam was spread at the point of a sword. There is no serious repudiation of violence in Brotherhood doctrine. None. You don’t have to hunt for subtleties in their theology. Foundationally, they are about subjugating, assimilating, converting, or destroying you. Whatever method they’re using in a particular place at a particular time is driven only by tactical advantage. If tomorrow they need to shift tactics, they will. The goal remains the same.

This is not about coexistence or even voluntary conversion. You will either be subjugated, or you will be eliminated. Go back to their founding documents. It’s all there.

[01:15:12] **Frank Gaffney**: Sam, thank you. This is incredibly important. I so appreciate, as usual, the directness, clarity, and authoritative content you provide. We’ll be drawing heavily on this in the days to come as we work to ban the Brotherhood and enlist the American people in doing so.

We have two more presenters.

Trevor Loudon is a man who knows intimately the nature and extent of the penetration of our country by enemies foreign—now doing business as enemies domestic. *The Enemies Within* is the title of one of his many books, as well as a film. He’s written volumes describing the corruption by jihadists and communists—in some cases both—of members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives: the first in a multivolume set called *Security Risk Senators*, the second in a multivolume set called *House Un-Americans*. I commend both to you.

Trevor, I could go on about all that you do to raise the alarm about the threats we’re facing. I’d ask you simply to speak about the Muslim Brotherhood as one of those threats, the role it’s playing, whether in your estimation it does rise to the level of a terrorist organization deserving that designation—and also, if you would, in somewhat truncated form, how we can root them out and remove them, “one by one,” as Donald Trump promised.

[01:17:00] **Trevor Loudon**: Thanks, Frank.

The Muslim Brotherhood, at its inception, was partially founded by Egyptian army officers who were also members of the Egyptian Communist Party. So from the beginning there's been intertwining between the Brotherhood and the communist movement. We still see that today in America.

Nihad Awad and CAIR work very closely with Democratic Socialists of America, with the Communist Party USA, with the Party for Socialism and Liberation, with Freedom Road Socialist Organization, and others. Nihad Awad himself, before he founded CAIR and became an open Hamas supporter, was a leader of the General Union of Palestinian Students, which was affiliated with the World Federation of Democratic Youth—a Soviet front.

So we have to understand: they use communist tradecraft. They use front groups. They use cut-outs. They use information operations and influence operations. They know how to ingratiate themselves and to lie successfully to achieve their ends.

They have deeply penetrated our system. Through CAIR, they are allied with many members of Congress and the U.S. Senate—mainly Democrats, but one or two on the other side as well.

We should regard them as a major subversive threat *on a par* with the Communist Party, Democratic Socialists of America, and similar organizations—which, again, they work closely with.

So how do you deal with them?

You treat infiltration like an organized-crime problem. You do what Thomas Dewey did in the 1930s going after Murder Inc. He set up an “untouchable” squad. He interviewed about 1200 young men to get a small elite team that went after that Mafia murder gang that nobody could touch.

They arrested low-level guys and offered them immunity if they would rat on those above them. They worked their way up the chain, and in two years they had the leaders of Murder Inc. in the electric chair. It was over.

That's what we need: an elite unit set up, either in the FBI or outside it—preferably people not tainted by the FBI's or CIA's recent past. Bring in people from the IRS, sheriff's departments, special forces, and so on, and give them a mandate to go after all foreign infiltrators. It doesn't matter where the chips fall; you just keep going up the chain.

Start catching low-level people and getting them to roll on those above them.

Meanwhile, the President could issue an executive order offering a three-month amnesty to all foreign and domestic enemies of the United States. Meaning: if you leave

the country within three months, we won't pursue you; we won't seize your assets; you can go and never come back.

Hundreds of thousands of operatives would leave the country—Chinese, Muslim Brotherhood, cartel operatives, and others. For those who remain, and any American traitors:

At the end of three months, if you haven't come forward, told everything you know, and applied for amnesty, we are coming after you—and we are not going to do any prisoner swaps or show mercy. You'll be prosecuted to the full extent of the law.

Give people a way out: let them leave the country, or let them repent and testify publicly. That would cause a massive meltdown of every foreign influence operation in the country. The Brotherhood operative paying off a senator wouldn't know if the senator had taken a deal and was wearing a wire; the senator wouldn't know if the Brotherhood operative had taken a deal and was wearing a wire.

We could cause a huge breakdown in these operations with the political will to do it. You wouldn't have to fire a shot. You wouldn't even have to jail that many people. But you would drive tens of thousands of enemies out of the country, and you would get enough evidence and court cases that the American public would finally understand the threat.

We have to use “organized-crime 101” against the Muslim Brotherhood and other infiltrators, because they are operating like organized crime: secret, covert, tightly knit, compartmentalized. You can only destroy them if you have a strong carrot for informants and a big stick for those who don't inform.

That's how you take down the Mafia, and that's how you have to take down the Muslim Brotherhood operating in this country.

[01:22:22] **Frank Gaffney**: What a superb presentation. Again, you've given us the answer to, “What do you do after you designate these guys?” It is vital that we do both, obviously—and do it urgently.

We're going to conclude—and I thank our final presenter profoundly, both for being willing to speak after such an incredible table has been set, and with the confidence that he will, as he always does, synthesize and summarize and close us out.

George Rasley is a polymath, a genius according to Mensa—a man whose service to our country, both on Capitol Hill and in the Office of the Vice President, as well as in some 300 campaigns, informs his profound intellect and helps us better understand the nature of this problem, politically and otherwise, and what we must do about it.

George, thank you so much for your patience. Over to you, sir.

[01:23:28] **Hon. George Rasley:** Thank you, Frank, for having me. And thank you to the rest of the panel for making my job both easy and hard at the same time.

I want to start by commending President Trump for *starting* this process. It's a process overdue by decades, if not a century. But let's all be honest and understand that it's a *political* process. We're not giving the Muslim Brotherhood the SAT here. It's a political process that will assess, based on political criteria, whether or not these designations are appropriate.

We have to recognize what a few others have mentioned about the necessity of political will, and that's where this audience comes in. It is absolutely crucial that our viewers communicate with their legislators—Members of Congress—about how important this is.

We have a model from the past. There's a tendency in our government now to say, "If you're not shooting at us, you're not a terrorist." That's a very recent way of thinking. At the beginning of the Cold War, and before, we paid great attention on Capitol Hill to *subversive organizations*. The House Un-American Activities Committee and a similar Senate committee conducted many hearings exposing subversive organizations. The Muslim Brotherhood and its affiliates and associates here clearly fall into that category.

We really should look at their goal in terms of what we're seeing, and what Peter talked about. It should be no surprise that Islamists targeted Great Britain as one of their first major targets for cultural jihad. It's the cultural fountainhead of the Anglosphere. Our laws, language, literature, art, music, and so forth largely originated there. And the British have been, frankly, very easily subverted—primarily because of what I'll loosely call "colonial guilt," which has severely weakened their leadership class.

We need to strengthen our own leaders and make sure—in this political decision-making process—that they have the spine and backbone that Governor Abbott and Governor DeSantis have displayed by designating the Muslim Brotherhood and CAIR in their states.

Looking at Texas, we see the same dynamic. Frankly that we saw in Great Britain: Texas is probably the country's strongest repository of traditional American values. If Texas falls, America falls. Texas does not, at its elite level, have quite the same weakness of leadership as Britain, but it does appear to have some who can be bent by greed. The mayor of Plano, Texas, seems to be an obvious example.

So at the political level, in addition to reinforcing the need for action, we need to make sure we *vote in* people who are attuned to this threat and *vote out* those who have been bent to the will of the jihadists. It's particularly dangerous to allow anyone who is tainted

with these associations into positions of power or authority. In my opinion, no one associated with these Islamic organizations should be trusted with a position in national security or anywhere else in our government.

Again, this is a political decision: don't hire these people.

We need to make sure viewers understand that the decision to preserve our culture—to win this fight with the jihadists—lies with them in their own communities. It's not just a government problem. We need to rally churches and Jewish leaders, many of whom have been missing in action. We see, for instance, the Pope saying "we can all get along" rather than leading the Church against this threat. He might profit from reading his predecessor Leo XIII's admonitions about battling pagans and Islamists.

So I'll close by saying: don't count on the government to do anything *unless you demand their action*. And don't count on the government to be your only line of defense. You need to talk to your fellow congregants at your church. You need to let your neighbors, your civic leaders, and your civic organizations know about this threat and get them into the battle.

[01:29:33] **Frank Gaffney**: George Rasley, thank you so much. This has been incredibly helpful in bringing this program to a close.

There is a mechanism for you to act—readily, easily, and impactfully—and that is to go to **BanTheBrotherhood.org**. We have an AlignAct feature there that will send, *from you*, a previously drafted letter to the President of the United States and to your members of Congress in the Senate and House.

Please take a moment—it's literally all that's required—to register, in your name, the concern that George has just expressed. That concern is urgently needed in those circles, but most especially among Executive Branch officials under the influence and leadership of the President.

The importance of this was underscored by something Laura Loomer reported the other day. She has been incredibly effective in educating us about what's going on. She mentioned that, among others, the Chief of Staff of the House Foreign Affairs Committee took a very elegant trip to Qatar over Thanksgiving—as did other members of the committee itself. And apparently, what came back afterwards was a watered-down, perhaps essentially eviscerated, resolution or bill coming through the House Foreign Affairs Committee—with a bipartisan majority vote, mind you—about designating the Muslim Brotherhood. Qatari influence there is again being impressed upon us.

We have our work cut out for us, especially over the next few days leading up to Christmas Eve. We're doing our part at BanTheBrotherhood.org. We urgently need your help.

If you care to support all of this, please visit the website of the **Institute for the American Future**, which is sponsoring our Victory Coalition. Please take action at BanTheBrotherhood.org, and please join me in thanking this amazing group of national-security practitioners and freedom-fighters:

David Wurmser, Robert Spencer, Stephen Coughlin, Peter McElvenna, Sam Faddis, David Yerushalmi, Trevor Loudon, and George Rasley. They're among the finest in the country, and we are proud to be associated with them and to present them to you.

Come back for more, if you will, in the near future at VictoryCo.org.

Over and out.