



International Cooperation in Combating Terrorism: Review of 2011 and Outlook for 2012

February 2, 2012

Published by



Inter-University Center for Terrorism Studies,
Potomac Institute for Policy Studies
901 N Stuart Street, Suite 200
Arlington, Virginia, USA 22203
TEL (703) 525-0770; FAX (703) 525-0299

Copyright © 2011 by the Inter-University Center for Terrorism Studies, at the Potomac Institute for Policy Studies. All rights reserved. No part of this report may be reproduced, stored or distributed without prior written consent of the copyright holder.

14th Annual Seminar on

International Cooperation in Combating Terrorism: Review of 2011 and Outlook for 2012

Date:

Thursday, February 2nd 2012

2:00PM to 4:00PM

Place:

The National Press Club
529 14th Street NW, 13th Floor, Holeman Lounge
Washington, D.C. 20045
(Metro Center Station, Orange/Blue/Red Line)

Co-Sponsors:

Inter-University
Center for Terrorism
Studies

International Center for
Terrorism Studies, at the
Potomac Institute for
Policy Studies

Inter-University Center
for Legal Studies, at the
International Law Institute

Program

Opening Remarks:

Michael S. Swetnam

Chairman and CEO, Potomac Institute for Policy Studies

Moderator:

Prof. Yonah Alexander

Director, International Center for Terrorism Studies, and Senior Fellow, Potomac Institute for Policy Studies

Speakers:

The Honorable Charles E. Allen

Former Under Secretary for Intelligence and Analysis, U.S. Department of Homeland Security, and Former Assistant Director of Central Intelligence for Collection, Central Intelligence Agency

Daniel A. Rosen

Director, Plans and Policy, Bureau of Counterterrorism, U.S. Department of State

Ambassador Arun K. Singh

Deputy Chief of Mission, Embassy of India

The Honorable Timur Soylemez

Deputy Chief of Mission, Embassy of Turkey

The Honorable Mahmoud Hmoud

Deputy Chief of Mission, Embassy of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan

Seminar Report

International Cooperation in Combating Terrorism: Review of 2011 and Outlook for 2012

February 2, 2012

Michael Swetnam, Chairman and CEO of the Potomac Institute for Policy Studies:

I'll ask everyone to kindly silence or turn off their phones, we hold a session at the Smithsonian last month in a room that had been shielded so that the phones wouldn't work, and I think that could become more of a common thing ...

I'm Mike Swetnam and I'd like to welcome you to the 14th annual Terrorism Review sponsored by the Potomac Institute, it has been our pleasure at the Potomac Institute for the last decade and a half to be involved in the study of terrorism and in particular the study of the use by terrorist and terror organizations and the use of technology to ferment evil. Every year we gather here in the press club to discuss the events surrounding terrorism and the issues as they have developed over the past year. This past year, I think many people can agree it's been a very, very, positive year with the death of Osama bin Laden and most of the leaders of AQ around the world in fact its becoming hard to find anyone left who would call themselves a leader of AQ because it immediately pins a target on their back that doesn't seem to be very long until a predator aircraft is following them around and knocking them off. So it's been a very, very, positive year. I would note however, that as we note and celebrate the success in eliminating those who have practiced terror over the last decade, we have not eliminated, or not diminished too greatly, the ideas or movements that have spurred these terrorists to attack us and others; and in fact the use of the method of terror as weapon of war is as prevalent today as it has ever been more and more regimes like Iran are tempted to use terror as a tool against us and others in the free world, for a variety of reasons. So, as we celebrate a "banner year" in the war against terrorism, it's worthy to note that the battle is long from over, and in fact we'll probably be engaging in this battle during the time of our children and grandchildren.

We've assembled a panel, as we do every year, of true experts to talk about terrorism not just as it has challenged the United States, but as it has threatened the world. With us today are some of the representatives of countries around the world who have fought this cause with us and we're very happy to receive their reports and their assessments.

I would like to note the publication, yesterday actually I believe, of a 10 year anniversary book by Professor Yonah Alexander and myself on Al Qai'da that is out and available and we'll be glad to provide copies to those who'd like to have them today. We're very proud of the work that Professor Alexander and his students and the center at the Potomac Institute have engaged in in studying a number of terror groups, but particularly AQ and long before 9/11. And with that, I'd like to introduce the man who has probably given more, and done more, in the academic study of terrorism worldwide than any individual today, in fact he has published over 110 books, has led thousands of seminars and has been a world leader in the academic study of every form and every type of terrorism that we have experienced in the history of mankind, it's my great privilege to be partnered and associated with Professor Yonah Alexander.

Professor Yonah Alexander, Director, International Center for Terrorism Studies, and Senior Fellow, Potomac Institute for Policy Studies:

Thank you very much Mike, for your very generous introduction. I just received on the iPhone before we turn it over from a colleague who I invited to come here and participate with us unfortunately he's on international travel. But, he said, in essence, "ten years after 9/11, I'm so glad that you and not bin Laden are around". Basically, I think, not to be immodest about this, we do certainly have a safer world and the problem is many challenges and we're going to discuss them today with our very distinguished panel. I would like to welcome the panel, I would like to welcome also the audience, and those who are going to be the next scholars in the field, those who contributed work on this particular book, as well as another study that we're going to launch today related to the Arab spring, and the Maghreb, north Africa, west Africa, central Africa, because after all, as Mike indicated, that bin Laden was killed, but the idea still survives and those affiliates are all over the world, alive, well and kicking and one of the most troublesome areas is of course as we can see in north Africa, central Africa, west Africa, and particularly the AQIM that has links with other groups around the world, all the way in Africa, in Nigeria for example, in terms of narco-trafficking, weapon trafficking, recruitment, attacks, as well as mercenaries for example those from the Polisario working together with Gadhafi before the Arabian Spring situation there.

Now what I would like to do because of the interest of time and we have a very distinguished group, I would like to simply mention again, and I see many faces of people that we do know from previous years, actually since 9/11 I tried to count and we had 20 sessions right here at the National Press Club in fact in this very room, I recall, Mike, that several years ago we had, at that time, the Ambassador of Saudi Arabia, Al-Turki, who was also the chief of intelligence, and he expressed his concern about sub state as well as state sponsored terrorism. In fact, last week he came out with a statement that the international community should consider a military sanction, he didn't name it, but we know exactly what he meant, in terms of development of nuclear weapons. But again, we have to be concerned not only about the nuclear, but weapons of mass destruction in general, for example, great concern now about the proliferation of weapons after Gadhafi, including empty aircraft missiles of chemical weapons and the same thing about Syria. So again, there are many, many, concerns but we are not going to give in or give up. It is up to the international community to respond; and with this in mind I would like to introduce our very distinguished panel, actually they do not need any introduction and in the interest of time, I am not going to go into their bios, but again you can look at this [panel bios] at your leisure. But the only thing I would like to say, we do have a very distinguished panel, experts as well as diplomats, and we're very grateful that the diplomatic community right here in Washington has supported our academic work over the years.

So our first panelist, if you look at the program, is Honorable Charlie Allen, the former under-secretary for intelligence and reconnaissance in the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, and the former Assistant Director of Central Intelligence for Collections and the CIA. And the bottom line is that Charlie is a legend, please...

Charlie E. Allen, Former Under Secretary for Intelligence and Analysis, U.S. Department of Homeland Security, and Former Assistant Director of Central Intelligence for Collection, Central Intelligence Agency:

Thank you Professor Alexander for that very generous introduction and it is great again to be back and part of a Potomac Institute function. My hat is off to Mike Swetman and the great work he does. Professor Alexander requested I speak for about 10 minutes so I will try to do this. I think to some degree what Mike Swetman said; [he] summarized it in a short few sentences. The world is changed. Al Qai'da, the world jihadist movement, has changed. In many respects it has been for the good – the death of bin Laden and the death of many of his followers. To be a leader in al Qai'da, especially to be in charge of external operations does not seem to be a healthy thing.

My view is that AQ reached its high-water mark in 2006-2007. At that stage you had Ubaida al Masri as head of external operations. He appeared to want to bring in people from the West who found their way to the Federally Administered Tribal Areas in Pakistan (FATA). They weren't really recruited in the West, but found their way to the FATA, and after vetting and training planned to go back to the West. And there are dozens of them, and they were from Europe and North America. They understood the culture of the West, they had the language, and they understood Western customs.

The view was at that stage that it was a great way to insert operatives in here who could conduct another major attack on the U.S. but also conduct another major attack on Western Europe if necessary. Well, that didn't work out that way, starting in July 2008 with the death of Abu Khabab al Masri, AQ's master bomb maker, and since then, as Mike said, most of the AQ senior leaders have died – they simply died. There are some left; we do have Ayman al-Zawahiri, who is certainly an interesting individual, if you've read some of the books about Al Qai'da, you will know this is a man who has great dedication and fanaticism, but he is not charismatic – he is not a bin Laden, not in any sense. He is a rather dour individual. The view as stated publically by the National Counterterrorism Center is that maybe there are only 300 AQ members still in the Federally Administered Tribal Areas, and less than 100 actual operatives inside Afghanistan.

Now just because Al Qai'da central or its core is having great difficulty doesn't mean we do not face a dangerous situation – because we do – there are affiliated networks in Pakistan, particularly in the FATA area in the North West Frontier Province. There is Tehrik-i-Taliban, led by Hakimullah Mehsud who had promised vengeance on the United States because of the death of his brother Baitullah Mehsud back in 2009, we saw TTP train Faisal Shahzad, a Pakistan born U.S. citizen who tried to set off a bomb in Times Square. Fortunately he didn't know how to make a bomb and no one was killed, there was not even an explosion.

We also have the Haqqani network, which has been written about a great deal in the press. With Shiraz Haqqani leading the organization, it trains a lot of operatives to go into Afghanistan. U.S. forces reportedly have killed a lot of Haqqani-trained operatives. There are also, of course, questions of how to deal with these affiliates. Does the Haqqani network groom people for suicide operations? I tend to think it probably does. So this network remains dangerous like the TTP but is a regionally-based and tribally-based group, not the kind of group that is going to sustain a global jihad.

Then there's Lashkar-e-Taiba, which is operationally active in north west Frontier Province. It led the attack on Indian parliament back in 2001. After many months of training, it unleashed the attacks on Mumbai, which occurred on 26-30 November 2008. I know Ambassador Singh may have something to say about it. That was a devastating attack, and it demonstrated [that] a small group of people can do a great deal of damage and cause human

causalities, damaging both critical infrastructure and the psyche of the people where the attack occurs.

But there is good news out there; Jamaah Islamiya down in South East Asia remains dormant. We could talk about the Abu Sayyaf group over in the Philippines, Cofer Black, who once ran CIA's Counterterrorism Center, always said it was more a group of thugs than ideologically oriented individuals, and I think that's true. But Professor Alexander also talked about dangerous affiliates remaining. He talked about AQIM which is very active. AQIM is an umbrella group with a number of movements which was organized and recognized back in 2007. AQIM controls a great deal of the desert areas in Mali, it conducts attacks on what it calls apostate governments, in North Africa, it conducted the attack on Marrakech where 15 or so people were killed, mostly westerners. So it's quite active.

The most active group, however, is al Qai'da in the Arabian Peninsula (AQAP), which was until his demise led, by Anwar-Al-Awlaki in its international operations. AQAP is active and controls parts of the rather ungoverned areas of Yemen, and, from my perspective, AQAP on its international operations is in a little bit of disarray, with the death of al-Awlaki as well as Samir Khan, who happened to be killed with al-Awlaki. Khan was the editor of *Inspire*. With eight editions in circulation, is an electronic journal which reached across the world and was inspiring young people toward violent action. So I think we have to remain deeply concerned about AQAP even though it does not seem to be internationally active right now, but it will regroup.

Then we have al-Shabab in east Africa which remains quite active. It has a top American operative who has interests in attacking the United States and has said so. The great danger, of course, is Somali Americans who have gone there and trained there and some have martyred themselves there. And in west Africa, we have probably one of the more interesting and most dangerous groups with which we must deal with is Boko Haram, which has already attacked an international target. On the 26th of August, 2011, it attacked UN compound in Abuja, Nigeria, killing nine UN members, 23 persons, and wounding many dozens others. Now it is conducting a wave of attacks throughout northern Nigeria.

So when you look at all of al Qa'ida and its affiliates, where does this leave us? It leaves us with a global jihad in great decline. But it also leaves us with a powerful communications device known as the Internet, where there are hundreds of websites that spawn jihadist and extremist messages. While the core of al Qai'da is in atrophy, there has been a growth in North America of persons who are listening, listening to the siren call of the jihad. The new national strategy for counterterrorism recognizes that we have to worry about extremism here in the United States.

First, to a large extent we have to continue the international attack, led by the United States, with its allies against extremist ideologies. It has been successful, but the Internet is the primary means by which al Qai'da globally communicates. We do find that some people have listened to this, planned attacks, and have been arrested. Most of their attempts have been rudimentary, they have not been sophisticated. However it only takes one attack, as we saw in Mumbai, to really traumatize a nation and create great damage. Thus, we have a hollowed out al Qai'da core, we have a global jihad that's had its problems. Professor Alexander spoke a bit about the Arab Spring, al Qai'da has been left behind in that, will it be left behind in long term? I think these are issues where we have to speak candidly about political Islam. Will political Islam dominate some of the new states in the Middle East? It appears that will be the case, so we must reconcile and deal with this phenomenon while still supporting democracy.

Thus in the final analysis, we have to be very serious in accepting that a weakened al Qai'da globally does not mean that it is not capable and determined to strike blows at the United States, or that there will not be further attacks on our soil. Al Qai'da has not successfully attacked inbound since 9/11, although we've disrupted big plans, including the aviation plot in 2006, and the Hewlett Packard jet cartridges plot in 2010. Homegrown terrorism in this country is a reality, but it is small. I think the administration recognizes this and has put forth a strategy for combating radicalization construct. It is a strategy that we have to pay attention to and follow. Americans have to recognize what we have is a sustained global effort to combat extremism and that it is going to continue for decades to come. It has been a "banner year" with the death of al Qai'da and continuing atrophy of al Qai'da globally but there are still additional chapters left to be written in the struggle against extremism. Thank you.

Mike Swetnam:

Please let me give you a copy of our book, and thank you for writing the foreword.

Charlie Allen:

Thank you, thank you very much.

Professor Yonah Alexander:

Thank you very much Charlie, you raised a lot of important questions.

Our next speaker according to the program is Dan Rosen, currently he's director of Plans and Policy at the new bureau of Counter terrorism at the US Department of State. He worked at the counterterrorism office before and prior to that you worked at NDU (National Defense University) in this area; Dan.

Dan Rosen

**Director, Plans and Policy
Bureau of Counterterrorism
U.S. Department of State:**

Thank you Dr. Alexander, I want to thank you for this series of events that our office has been extremely active in and we've tried to be a great supporter of Potomac Institute and your events and I'm glad to be a part of that group now. I'm also happy to see on the platform and share the platform with some of my colleagues from some of our most valuable CT partners, and we cooperate will all of them, all of the countries represented here on a very regular basis. I also really in some ways want to echo what Chuck said and what Mike said, I think it was a very good summary of where we've been.

This past year was quite a good year in some ways, but the resilience of al Qai'da's ideology continues to be a vexing problem. I want to talk a little bit about where we've been the last year and where we think we're going from the State Department perspective, and specifically from the CT perspective in the State Department. There is really no question that bin Laden's departure from the scene was the most important milestone in the fight against al-Qai'da – he was an iconic figure and an irreplaceable figure in many ways, and had a profound attraction in terms of his personal story. Even when he had to spend many years limiting his contacts with the organization he was really more deeply involved in directing its operations and its strategy than

even we expected. His loss and the loss of others, such as Abdul Rahman, Harun Fazul, Anwar al-Awlaki, puts the group on a path of decline that we really think will be hard to reverse.

Despite all that, AQ has shown resilience and continues to operate in worrisome ways and pose a continuing threat to our national security. The activity of AQ affiliates which Chuck talked quite a great deal about is really where a lot of our concerns lie. Obviously the AQ core is still somewhat active and we're concerned there. But what AQIP is doing, what AQIM is doing and what al-Shabab is doing continues to concern us. Your AQIM report is particularly timely; it's an issue that has grown in prominence over the last year particularly as AQIM fills its coffers with ransom money being paid from kidnappings. Those resources really do take AQIM to the next level in some ways and we're seeing worrisome trends there. The other worrisome trend of late of course is in Nigeria; while Boko Haram is not an AQ affiliate, we have seen in some of their tactics and in particular the UN headquarters bombing in Abuja, tactics that signal a turn toward the type of targeting and the type of operations that AQ has been engaged in for a long time.

That's kind the bad news, I would say over the past year, but I think on the good news side of the ledger one of the mostly unsung successes has to do with really the extraordinary level of cooperation we have achieved in counter terrorism. Behind those very public milestones that I mentioned early on I think we had another better year of quiet continued cooperation on things that have become very routine in the areas of law enforcement, intelligence, military and diplomatic fronts; our cooperation in these areas has been almost routinized and I think as it continues to grow there's just a great amount of value there. We have, I think, through those cooperative ventures – while we haven't prevented all of the attacks – we have disrupted conspiracies and taken bad actors off the streets and put a real dent in some networks.

The challenge that violent extremism presents is not really fading, though – even given these successes, the factors that make some populations vulnerable to AQs world view are still present in too many places. I think there are three things that we're really focused on to get at this problem as we continue and as we go forward. And I want to outline those three briefly.

First, is really our bilateral and multilateral partnerships, and here I'm really talking about the diplomatic work we do within the State Department on counterterrorism; second for us, creating more capable partners essentially by building their capacity; and third, countering violent extremism and getting at some of the ideological issues that underpin AQ and its affiliates.

Let me talk first about our partnerships, and you'll forgive me for saying that word so many times, but it really is at the heart of a lot of our success. Much of the success over the past decade just would not be possible without the strong partnerships that we built and the effort to create a more common world view about the challenge that's posed to all of us. I think the National CT Strategy that Chuck mentioned went a good ways toward recognizing that partnerships are at the heart of a lot of our success, and it's really the first time that the CT strategy has explicitly talked about our partnerships and our cooperation with other countries, and the need to further build capacity with partners to help them get at this problem.

We have formal bilateral consultations with too many countries to list really, those are primarily aimed at looking for ways that we can build commonality, ways to discuss and hopefully get a

more common view of the problem. And I do think talking looking at the past year of course there has been quite a bit of diplomatic activity on the CT front as well around the developments in the Arab world. While a lot of those things are not generated from a CT standpoint I think what's going on in the Arab world over the last year has gone a good ways toward discrediting the extremist arguments that only violence can produce change. And we hope these movements result in durable and democratically elected governments, and should they, I think that Al-Qa'ida's focus on terrorism as an instrument of as an instrument of political change would be irretrievable delegitimized. That's a strategic blow that would be very hard for them to recover from.

We are not blind to the attendant perils of what has happened last year in the Arab world. As the political turmoil has in some ways distracted security officials, weapons have gone lose. Some of my colleagues, including Chuck mentioned that the type of civil strife that's gone in some countries has created an environment that terrorists are inevitably drawn to and tempted to exploit. So we are working with some of those countries, some of whom are already strong counterterrorism partners. As they go through transitions, difficult transitions, we are looking at ways we can assist them to meet the security side of their challenges.

I also want to mention here, a relatively recent initiative known as the Global Counterterrorism forum. And it's a fairly big initiative for us within the administration; an effort to really build up the international architecture for dealing with 21st century threats. The GCTF is really focused on civilian security, and rule of law institutions. It's focused on building capacity among its 30 members and beyond the 30 members. Those 30 members are really countries that have a great interest or stake or challenge with terrorism, and I should say 29 plus the European Union. Its aim is to increase the number of countries capable of dealing with the threats within their borders and regions.

Just a few words if I might about some of the countries represented here and the work we are doing with them. India for one, works very closely with the US on counterterrorism, on a wide variety of topics ranging from threat finance to things like rail security. India has certainly suffered its share at the hands of terrorists, as we saw in 2008. Groups like LET regularly cite both Indian and American interests as legitimate targets. Last year, starting in 2010, our two countries signed the Counter terrorism cooperation initiative, an MOU (memorandum of understanding) indicative of our good cooperative efforts in this area.

Jordan is also one of our closest, steadfast and longtime counterterrorism partners. Training and capacity building with the Kingdom has increased many over in the last decade, and Jordan has not only become one of the most competent countries in the region and Arab world in confronting terrorist threats, but really has become a regional model and a host and training platform for a number of other states, primarily through their International Police Training Center, but through other efforts as well. I just want to note and congratulate them for last week announcing their intention to train 10,000 Libyan security forces members.

Turkey, another great ally in Counterterrorism, from cooperation in Afghanistan to missile defense, radar agreements. In talking about the GCTF, I think it's a great symbol of our partnership that Turkey is the co-chair of this initiative launched last year in New York by

Secretary Clinton and Foreign Minister Davutoglu. Turkey has worked very hard to build support for the GCTF, providing support to the Secretariat and hosting major international conferences in this area. Turkey faces its own challenges from the PKK of course. We and the EU have designated the PKK as FTO, foreign terrorist organizations, and we have condemned PKK and their attacks in the strongest possible terms, but there's an ongoing challenge certainly.

Let me now talk a little bit about our capacity building efforts. We, I think, very much see as one of the central challenges to our security, our partner's security, the challenge of weak states, and really in some ways 'insufficient' states. And when there is recognition that there are gaps there, we can help. Through a wide variety of programs, we are working to build law enforcement capacity, justice programs, and the rule of law, and good governance in a lot of places. Too many, again, to list. The real overarching objective there is to increase the ability of our partners to address a wide array of threats to public security, and not just in the security sector, but also in the justice sector.

We do spend a fair amount of effort training law enforcement officials and police, but this extends to prosecutors, to prison officials, and the judiciary in an effort to make those capacity building programs more far reaching, more systematic. It doesn't do a lot of good to arrest people if the system then can't prosecute them and adjudicate them and incarcerate them properly, so we're spending more of our time in those latter areas, and I think we see a continuation of that going forward.

I think we've seen in at least a couple cases, that sustained attention from donors, and this includes all the parts of the US interagency that are involved, combined with sufficient political will on the part of our partners and ultimately enough dollars, make a difference in those efforts. We would certainly point, while not perfect, to efforts in Indonesia and Columbia over the last decade or more as fairly successful. People always ask us for success stories in capacity building, and there are lots of little success stories. Big success stories take a long time. We also are encouraging our partners, including those seated here, to take the lead in many ways within their region when it comes to capacity building, and training efforts of other less capable partners, and I think that's been very successful.

Finally, I just want to talk briefly about efforts to more successfully counter violent extremism, and this really gets to the ideology. In some ways what really sustains the movement more than it's financing is the flow of new recruits. We've become very adept over the last decade at what Ambassador Benjamin likes to call tactical counterterrorism; we've been very good at taking people off the battlefield, at disrupting networks, at making the environment more hostile. But, at the strategic level we simply have to interrupt recruiting in a more systematic way.

This is kind of my bumper sticker. I think a lot of people mean a lot of different things when they say counter violent extremism. But, my short version of this is to stop recruiting. Ultimately this is what a lot of our efforts in the CVE area come down to.

Our research, and a lot of research, has shown that radicalization and recruitment is often driven by factors that occur at the 'hyper-local' level. Really, the street and the neighborhood level. Not the provincial level, not the national level certainly, not the international level. And I think that

means for us, CVE work has to be driven by local needs, has to be informed by local knowledge on the ground, and has to be responsive to the immediate concerns of the community, using the word community to mean really almost the neighborhood. It's a top priority for us at the State Department, and I think it's increasingly becoming a top priority for other parts of the US government.

There are a few things that we're trying to do in this area. The first part of that really emphasizes micro-level strategies, customized for specific communities and neighborhoods that are aimed at providing alternatives to communities at risk. And I'm not talking about risk of radicalization – you know attitudes are one thing, but I'm talking about people that are at risk of recruitment, mostly young people. Those efforts, we're convinced, have to be owned by local civil society, or local government, partners, and I think they have a chance of success. But until we address the very specific drivers that are going on in very local places, I think we don't have a chance here.

The second part is of course the narrative. The drivers are one thing, the narrative is what people who have some sort of cognitive opening, some sort of drivers in this direction, the narrative is kind of what pulls them in. And it's not about public diplomacy, it's not about improving the US image. It's about reaching out to a pretty well defined and pretty narrow audience, and that's people that could be persuaded into crossing the boundaries between sympathy and action. Last year, for this purpose our office helped set up the center for Strategic Counterterrorism Communication known as the CSCC inside the State Department. It's an interagency effort to push back against AQ's online presence, and AQ's media activities, and to contest that online space, whether its traditional media or websites, new media, forums, chat rooms where extremists spread lies and recruit followers.

Last, in this area, we are very focused on strengthening our partner's ability and our partner's capacity in engagement in this area. Propagating what we see as some of the best practices – I don't think there's a lot out there right now, but I think there are some small things that have worked in some small places. And trying to build more of an international consensus behind the need to address recruiting.

That's an overview, I think, and what we have seen over the last year points to some innovative and new strategies on the part of our adversaries. And that obviously requires some creative strategies on our own part. Just about a month ago, as Dr. Alexander mentioned, Secretary Clinton recognized that we were in a little different place now in counterterrorism. A decade after 9/11, she upgraded the Office of the Coordinator to a Bureau within the State Department. This was one of the recommendations of the QDDR that was published about a year ago, and I think for us it's really about strengthening civilian led diplomacy in this area – in many of the areas I mentioned, in capacity building, in countering violent extremism and in engaging with our partners and with the international community on CT, and strengthening the role of the civilian side of the US government on all of those fronts. I think we have made some good progress, not just over the last year, but over the last several years. Thank You

Professor Yonah Alexander:

Thank you very much Dan for your overview, particularly it is significant to see the elevation of your office which really underscores the commitment of the United States for a strategic partnership with the international community. Now we are going to move on to specific

countries and activities on counterterrorism. We are delighted to have a number of distinguished diplomats. The first one is Ambassador Arun Singh who currently is the Deputy Chief of Mission. The ambassador has a very distinguished and experienced career, serving both headquarters in Delhi, as well as embassies abroad, such as Moscow and his last post was as Ambassador of India to Israel. Mr. Ambassador, please:

Prof. Yonah Alexander, ladies and gentleman,

It is great privilege for me to have this opportunity to share India's views on the issue of international cooperation to combat terrorism.

This is a very topical issue. Despite the successes that were achieved last year, the killing of Osama Bin-laden and several other top leaders of Al-Qaeda, terrorism still constitutes among the most serious challenges to international peace and security. Not just India, but the US and many other countries have been victims of this scourge for several decades. There is hardly any region in the world that has not been scarred by terrorism. The heinous terrorist attacks in New York, Bali, Kabul, London, Madrid, Moscow, and in Mumbai repeatedly are some of the examples of the ugly imprints of terrorism.

The wanton acts of terrorism, killing of innocent civilians, on one hand leads to a direct human cost – the loss and the void which the immediate family members and close friends have to face. And at another level, such acts put stress on the fabric of the society, especially open, pluralistic and democratic societies and undermine peace, democracy and freedom. This in the longer run is the more dangerous threat.

It is against this backdrop I would like to take a few minutes to briefly describe what we in India have attempted over the last several years to deal with the challenge of terrorism. I would also give a brief idea of how India and the US are now pooling their resources to fight this common threat.

It is a truism to say that India lives in perhaps one of the most difficult neighbourhoods in the world. Most of you here would be aware of the terrorism that emanates from the region to the immediate west of India and which poses a threat to peace and stability not just of India, or the region but the entire world.

For policy makers in India the question thus is how to deal with terrorism that emanates outside our borders but that targets us very directly. For a strategy to be effective, it would need to have several components – first is obviously strengthening domestic capabilities to prevent such attacks from happening. This involves upgrading our defensive capabilities including through the use of latest technologies and strengthening intelligence gathering capabilities. The second is to foster greater international cooperation, as today terrorist groups collaborate seamlessly and it is hard to make distinctions between them. Finally the third component would be to facilitate such an environment which would discourage misguided youth to choose the path of terrorism.

In India we have tried to develop a comprehensive strategy that includes domestic steps, measures to promote peace and stability in the region and also encourage international cooperation.

In our neighbourhood for instance, we have tried to follow a strategy that is based on political engagement with all our neighbours; assistance for economic development; and, improved connectivity and market access for our neighbours to the Indian economy. We realize that a stable, peaceful and prosperous neighbourhood is vital for the security of the people of India. While we have certainly progressed in developing healthy and normal relations with most of the countries in the neighbourhood, our relations with Pakistan have been complicated by the issue of terrorism. We desire friendly and cooperative relations with Pakistan and believe that a stable Pakistan which acts as a bulwark against terrorism and extremism is in its own interest as much it is in India's interest and in the interest of our region.

At the National level, especially after the Mumbai terror attack of November 26, 2008, we have taken several steps to develop comprehensive and integrated national counterterrorism strategies that fully comply with the rule of law; fully respect the dignity and human rights of all; and reach out to, and actively involve all parts of society and all communities. We have also tried to ensure that such strategies also effectively address the conditions conducive to the spread of terrorism including radicalization and recruitment for terrorism.

As part of this strategy we have for instance recently decided to set up a National Counter-Terrorism Centre, akin to the US, which will collate all intelligence inputs from various agencies, analyse them and disseminate to operational agencies. Apart from strengthening our strategic and operational framework to combat terrorism effectively, we have also amended and strengthened our domestic legislation. The new legislation that was adopted in 2004 incorporates provisions dealing with all aspects of terrorism including conspiracy and incitement to terrorism. It criminalizes raising of funds for terrorist activities, holding of proceeds of terrorism, harbouring of terrorists, unauthorized possession or use of any bomb, dynamite or hazardous explosive substance or other lethal weapons. The Weapons of Mass Destruction (Prevention) Act, 2005 provides detailed measures preventing the falling of weapons of mass destruction or dual use materials in the hands of terrorists and non-state actors.

The role of in combating terrorism is indeed vital if we are to deal effectively with terrorism. Today, terrorists are not only truly globalised, but are also waging an asymmetric warfare against the international community. They recruit in one country, raise funds in another and operate in others. They have global logistical and supply chains; they have developed transnational financial systems; they use the latest and most sophisticated technologies and have command and control mechanisms that are able to operate across continents on a real-time basis. To give an example of this global inter-linkages; you would all perhaps be aware of the Mumbai terror attack of November 2008, in which close to 200 persons lost their lives. In 2010, in Chicago the FBI had apprehended US citizens who had been recruited by Lashkar-e-Taiba (LeT) for scouting the sites where the attacks later took place. We feel therefore that in addition to taking national measures, countries across the globe need to take steps to enhance their cooperation to deal with the menace of terrorism.

India has concluded so far forty bilateral treaties on extradition and mutual legal assistance in criminal matters, so as to enhance international cooperation for the investigation,

prosecution and extradition of persons involved in terrorism, organized crime, money laundering, terrorist financing and illicit drug trafficking. India is also an active member of the Financial Action Task Force (FATF) and to effectively monitor and cooperate with international partners we have set up a Financial Intelligence Unit.

In addition in the United Nations we have been playing an active role to strengthen the international legal framework. We are a party to the 13 sectoral conventions on terrorism adopted by the UN. India also supports the anti-terrorism mechanisms established by UN Security Council Resolutions, including Resolutions 1267 and its successors 1988 and 1989 related to sanctions against Al-Qaeda/Taliban, 1373 (which, inter-alia, established the Counter Terrorism Committee), 1540 (which addressed non-proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction in this context), and subsequent resolutions that renewed, strengthened or amended these three original resolutions.

With the objective of providing a comprehensive legal framework to combat terrorism, India took the initiative to pilot a draft Comprehensive Convention on International Terrorism (CCIT) in 1996. Largely as a result of India's active pursuance, a text for the CCIT was advanced to the 6th Committee of the UN General Assembly in 2010 with most of the issues resolved and legal language suggestions to overcome a remaining few matters. We hope to continue working with the international community to resolve these issues.

As a member of the Security Council, India's Permanent Representative to the UN presently chairs the Security Council Committee on Counter-Terrorism [CTC], the Working Group concerning threats to international peace and security by terrorist acts.

Let me say a few words about our cooperation with the US in countering terrorism. In a world of complex challenges, including new and emerging forms of threats, terrorism remains a principal challenge for our two countries. Despite extraordinary efforts and significant successes against the forces of terrorism, its threat remains strong. One of the key elements of the India-US strategic partnership therefore is our deepening engagement on the issue of terrorism and counter-terrorism cooperation and our leaders have on numerous occasions highlighted the vital nature of our counter-terrorism cooperation in our strategic partnership. In fact there has always been great public and political expectation about India-US cooperation on counter-terrorism. This is because of our shared values, the growth of strategic partnership between our two countries, and acknowledged US expertise and capabilities. We have, therefore, agreed to expand collaboration through intelligence sharing, information exchange, operational cooperation, and access to advanced counter-terrorism technology and equipment.

We have also over the years established several mechanisms to strengthen our cooperation in counter-terrorism. These include the Joint Working Group on Counter-terrorism, established in 2000. Our two countries signed a Counter-terrorism Cooperation Initiative in July 2010. The Initiative seeks to further enhance the cooperation between two countries by:

- strengthening capabilities to effectively combat terrorism;
- promotion of exchanges regarding modernization of techniques;
- sharing of best practices;
- development of investigative skills; promotion of cooperation between forensic science laboratories;

- establishment of procedures to provide mutual investigative assistance; and
- enhancing liaison and training between specialist Counter Terrorism Units including National Security Guard with their US counter parts.

There are other institutional forums, such as the Working Group on Aviation Security, Working Group on Information and Communication Technology and the Defence Policy Group, which provide avenues for enhancing cooperation in specific areas. India's membership of FATF has strengthened our ability to work with each other on the financial aspects of terrorism.

An important milestone was added when President Obama visited India in November 2010. The two leaders announced a new Homeland Security Dialogue between the Ministry of Home Affairs and the Department of Homeland Security to deepen operational cooperation, counter-terrorism technology transfers and capacity building. This Dialogue was formally launched in May last year, when Secretary Napolitano visited India. The Homeland Security Dialogue focuses on a program of cooperation in global supply chain management, megacity policing, combating counterfeit currency and illicit financing, cyber security, critical infrastructure protection, and capacity building and technology upgrading.

We are also partnering with the US in the Global Counter Terrorism Forum, which was launched last year, to foster practical cooperation among states for capacity-building.

Overall therefore today we have created a good edifice for fostering and strengthening our cooperation in counter-terrorism in all its aspects. This along with the strong political support that exists in both our countries, we are confident that our cooperation in this vital area will only grow in the future.

Thank you.

Professor Yonah Alexander:

Thank you very much Mr. Ambassador for your overview, I would be remiss if I'm not going to mention our academic cooperation with India. In fact, I recall very vividly indeed that Mike Swetnam and I had the opportunity to do some field work in India for this book, the first book on al-Qa'ida, before 9/11. We developed some very strong links with the Universities and scholars in India. Our next speaker, according to the program as you can see is the Honorable Timur Soylemez of Turkey, who is the Deputy Chief of Mission and he has a very rich background in Ankara as well as the United Nations. I recall vividly going all the way back to 2002 and you were in the embassy at that particular time, also with the current ambassador, Namik Tan about the same time. Again, as far as the academic work, I would like to mention to you that currently we have a special relationship with the Center of Excellence Defense Against Terrorism in Ankara which is a NATO body, as well as seminars and conferences and so forth. We provide academic support as well as the partnerships for this center in Ankara, and we publish a journal together through the Potomac Institute, the Inter University Center, which is being published in Ankara, and those who might be interested can be provided with copies.

Timur Soylemez, Deputy Chief of Mission, Embassy of Turkey:

Thank you very much, first of all, Professor Alexander, really for, not only to bring this important seminar together but also keeping the discussion going on what is really an existential and incredibly important issue. Before I proceed to my remarks, I will try to give you a perspective on how we, in Turkey, see the whole fight against international terrorism and in particular the international cooperation. I mention, and do take note that I have been given about ten to fifteen minutes, so I must recollect a meeting I was in at the UN. It was on the decolonization and about one hundred and eighty members had spoken, so one of the representatives of a larger countries took the floor and said: “Mr Chairman, everything important that needs to be said, has been said, but not everyone has said it.” So, in the view of time, I will try not to repeat a lot of the things, a lot of the very important things that have already been said and most of which we already subscribe.

The truth is that 2011 was a very important year, a banner-year, as was said. A lot of significant development did happen, but the reality is that the challenge is still very much present and it also evolving. It is changing shape and adapting, just like we are adapting to the threat and the ways in which we combat it. So there is, as was the case thirty-four years ago, as was the case ten years ago: there is no room for complacency, there is no room for moral-relativism. We have to continue to fight and discourage it in all of its manifestations and in all the ways it presents itself.

At the same time of course, Turkey has long suffered from terrorism, we have suffered from different forms of it. From the seventies to the eighties we had ~~ASALA Al-Salah~~ terrorism, November 17th, we had extreme political terrorism during the early eighties and today we suffer from PKK terrorism. Not to name some other extreme groups as well. The reality is in our fight against terrorism we have to be decisive. There is no room for flexibility, there is no room for negotiation. We have to make sure that we are successful in our fight otherwise the smallest window of opportunity that is out there will be used to the fullest extent.

At the same time, of course, our fight against terrorism has to be legitimate. It has to be based on democratic principles, it has to be based on the rule of law. So those are incredible, I think, important tendencies as we look in the fight in general, especially from an international approach. When we look at our fight against PKK terrorism we try to take a comprehensive approach to security components, obviously it is indispensable, but not alone sufficient in the long term. So you have to look at the social, political, cultural and economic aspects also and how as a method terrorism is not only manifesting itself, getting a different support from the different dimensions that it does. But again at the same time, not forgetting that the **continuous** efforts to enhance democratic standards, democratic right and fundamental freedoms also are important elements of the whole.

When we look at the international situation, I think, as we have been saying for a very long time, and as we will continue to say consistently: international solidarity and cooperation is absolutely essential. I can not overstate the importance of this.

Ambassador Singh, I think, very importantly eluded, mentioned the fact that there are efforts in the UN for a convention, the reality, the sad story is, we do not have a convention on terrorism, an international convention. And we do not have a definition. At the UN there are endless meetings and I think it is very important for a country like India to be **spearheading** ~~spiriting~~ this effort and we certainly will give that effort our full support, because all nations have to agree on a definition and we have to proceed with working together effectively across the board to fight and discourage. There are already very important instruments in place at the UN that helps us

fight international terrorism, we have to make sure that all countries live up to their obligations. This is not always the case. From our own experiences we can say, that, for example PKK finds safe-haven in neighboring countries. We understand the difficulties involved, but at the same time the solidarity, again, the cooperation has to be one hundred percent. And if we do not have that cooperation, then obviously we have problems. Again similarly we have the PKK finding elaborate support structures in Europe, this continues to be a problem from the aspect of financing, extortion activities, recruitments, propaganda and of course drug trafficking. These are all different measures in which terrorist organizations find the means to perpetuate their activities.

So when we look at the problem, not only from our own perspective, but from an international perspective, we at least in Turkey come to the realization that you need a very comprehensive approach, a comprehensive approach that includes lots of different elements that are being used together and all of them must be equally effective. So we are looking at, obviously, military and security measures, but this can only be one part of the puzzle. We are talking about targeting financial support structures, border management is incredibly important, narcoterrorism, ransom, extortion, kidnapping activities, these of course have a law enforcement and prosecution aspect to them. Recruitment and propaganda of terror organizations is something that we have to deal with, which of course brings us to cyberspace, a very important area where international cooperation and national capabilities are very important.

And also of course we have to remember as people working for governments that bureaucracies are by definition very cumbersome and ill-equipped to adapt to threats which are based essentially on very loose networks. So we have to think on those terms as well, we cannot function within a bureaucratic hierarchical regime, when we are looking at threats that are much more agile than the ones that we are used to dealing with. But at the same time I mention that there is no convention or no definition. This is important also, because there is always tendencies, and politics of course comes into play at an international level, to be selective. To look at one terrorist organization and say: "well you know that is their problem, it is not our problem". But the reality is that all terrorist organizations collaborate in one way or another and use similar networks and similar means. And more often than not their existence fade and they are not able to target cross-border operations, they start targeting in the country that has given them safe-harbor. We have seen this in the past and I think we will see this in the future. And this is again another compelling reason why international cooperation continues to be of paramount importance.

The UN framework as was mentioned is crucial and we will continue to work in that framework. The global counter-terrorism strategy, agreed to by the UN general assembly, is very important. The resolutions agreed to by the UN security council are very important, they have very important mechanisms. And the committees that have been established, Turkey had the privilege to chair the committee that India now chairs and have seen the challenges and also the opportunities that are in the UN to advance this agenda. In this regard, I think, capacity building comes across as a very important priority, because while there might be political will and the part that a lot of countries wants to help, they do not necessarily have the means institutionally and capacity-wise to deliver a support. And in that regard the global forum that we have the honor to co-chair with the US, it is a very new initiative, but the global counter-terrorism forum, I think, is incredibly important in realizing the strategy we have at the UN and exchanging information,

because the reality is that a lot of different countries have a lot of different experiences - similar experiences but also different experience. And the truth is that governments and those in bureaucracies make mistakes. We have to learn from those mistakes, we have to have our lessons learned. We have to compare our notes so that collectively we can tackle these incredibly important threats. In this regard I have to say, and this is very important to us from a Turkish perspective, that the US is our leading partner in our counter-terrorism efforts. They have been for a very long time. I think that the motto "a friend in need is a friend indeed" applies to no-one else internationally than the United States and we are ever grateful for that and we will continue to be. We will work together, we will look to expand that cooperation, but obviously the PKK is just one aspect of that cooperation. There is a lot of bad people out there, with a lot of bad intentions.

There is another threat that is rearing its head and one that we believe we have to be very careful about and that is driven by xenophobia. We are seeing this, the manifestation of this in Europe, what we saw in Norway was an attempt at terrorizing a community, terrorizing a region and a people. We have seen, it has just been uncovered in Germany, extreme far-right groups using terror activities against ethnic minorities. These are very very dangerous new emerging phenomena that we have to pay attention to, because if history and past experiences have taught us anything it is that these organizations will also go in the same direction.

There is much debate about the Arab Spring, much debate about the transformation in this region. There were some mentioning of it in the very beginning. We have a saying in Turkey that "wolves like foggy weather." The fact is that while there is a lot of promise and a lot of excitement about the aspirations that are manifested in the region, the transformation and the events that are going on in all of these countries, do allow a lot of people with ill intentions to operate in very dangerous ways, so that is something we all have to look at very carefully as well.

So to wrap up, I would just say, that this is, like I said in the very beginning, an existential problem, it is a very serious threat for all countries around the world. And international cooperation and international solidarity and effective cooperation is absolutely paramount, so we have to keep working at it. It is a work in progress, it is never perfect, but to the extent that we work together I think, as we have seen in the past and we will continue to see in the future, we will gain more successes. Thank you.

Professor Yonah Alexander:

Thank you again. After our last panelist, we will have the opportunity for Q & A. I would like to introduce the honorable Mahmoud Hmoud who is the Deputy Chief of Mission. On a personal level I was honored to attend the peace treaty between Jordan and Israel that Mahmoud contributed to in terms of his role as legal advisor to the Hashemite Kingdom in Amman and at the United Nations, particularly the contributions at the UN to advance the clause of international law with justice and what is most interesting is that just in the past few weeks Jordan tries to bring together the Palestinians and the Israelis to renew the discussions and negotiations. And to advance the clause of peace in different ways. Mahmoud.

Mahmoud Hmoud

First of all, I would like to thank the Potomac Institute and Professor Alexander for their invitation to participate in this important discussion on the international efforts in combating terrorism. I also want to thank my colleagues on the panel for their important comments that they have just made.

Terrorism is an issue which has challenged the international community for centuries, although it came under the spotlight only in recent decades and became a priority in foreign relations and international cooperation in the wake of the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks in the United States.

Despite the huge progress in the international, regional and bilateral efforts to fight the phenomenon, there remains an inherent element of difficulty in dealing with terrorism, which is the different perceptions of nations of what constitutes terrorism and the use of the term for political purposes. Again this is not a new problem. As far back as the negotiations of the 1906 Hague Accords on Land Warfare, the then superpowers were not able to agree on the elements of the act that would be prohibited under the Accords. Of course for political reasons: what some negotiating states considered as terrorism, others considered as legitimate freedom fighting. Nevertheless, the law of armed conflict, including the Geneva Conventions and their protocols, prohibit acts of terrorism during armed conflict by the parties. Despite the lack of definition, IHL makes it clear that attacks by any party which aims at spreading terror among the civilians is prohibited.

Due to the political difficulties, there were no serious efforts to adopt any international instrument to combat terrorism during the time of peace, until the phenomenon of aircraft hijacking became a serious international concern. This is when the 1963 Tokyo convention on Offences and Certain Other Acts on board aircraft was adopted. Since then, another 13 –so called- “sectoral conventions” to combat terrorism were adopted. Such instruments dealt with only specific crimes of terrorism; and some of them provided definition of the terrorist act/crime for the specific purposes of the each convention and not a general definition that would serve as a cornerstone for combating terrorism. They also provided for efforts of cooperation and minimum national standards that need to be applied –again- only for the specific purposes of each convention. The United Nations has been for over a decade trying to adopt a comprehensive convention on combating international terrorism, but has failed to do so due mainly to disagreement on what constitutes a terrorist crime and on the scope of application of the convention. Due to the deadlock over such issues, several states, on both sides of the debate, are questioning whether there is ever a need to adopt the draft instrument, considering that there are more than a dozen international sectoral conventions and many more regional and bilateral instruments to combat terrorism. I would argue otherwise for several reasons, but most importantly that a comprehensive convention would provide a general definition of terrorist acts that has the legitimacy and which can

be used to effectively combat the phenomenon. The Security Council, in 2004, adopted resolution 1566 which -can be argued- provides for elements of definition of a terrorist act. The problem here is the body which adopted the so called definition and its authority to impose a definition on the international community. Despite the abundance of international, regional and bilateral legal instruments combating terrorism, such instruments were only used when all the relevant states found it appropriate to resort to an instrument to deal with a specific case of terrorism i.e. the legal aspects were only used to serve the common political interest in a certain situation. This has changed in the wake of the September 11 terrorist attacks. This is when the Security Council adopted the first of several decisions requiring states to take effective national and international measures to combat terrorism and cooperate amongst each other in this regard (I would like to note here that resolution 1267 was adopted by the Council in 1999 but it was al-Qaida -specific sanctions regime and not a comprehensive international counter terrorism approach). The adoption of resolution 1373 following the September 11 attacks has been considered a landmark for the transformation of international efforts to combat terrorism on all levels- legislative, judicial and executive. It also was the beginning of serious UN efforts to monitor compliance and assist states in building and consolidating their counter-terrorism infrastructure. Thus, combating terrorism was no longer an intellectual legal debate and states started feeling compelled to act, whether through the adoption of robust measures to limit financial support to terrorism to effective border measures to prevent terrorism-related activities and support. Such measures have yielded considerable success in preventing terrorist activities, tracking down their perpetrators and bringing them to justice and tightening the circle around those who resort or intend to resort to terrorism.

Nevertheless, the multiplicity of instruments and international and regional arrangements may also pose a risk on the effectiveness of efforts to combat terrorism. This is in addition to the fact that Security Council-led approach has posed difficulties to many countries, including the most ardent supporters of international counter-terrorism efforts. There no more obvious example than the struggle of EU countries to implement the terrorist designation and listing requirements by the relevant Security Council sanctions bodies. Their national, as well as the European courts, have in several instances considered individual rights prevalent over any measure they viewed to be inconsistent with such rights. One last point; the success achieved internationally in combating terrorism has been achieved by treating the act as a crime and not as an act of war. Despite the rhetoric, the internationally-led efforts that achieved such a success were law enforcement efforts, whether resulting from or directed by the Security Council or from another bilateral or multilateral arrangement. The war on terror is no more a

war than the war on poverty, the war against epidemics or the war on drugs! An armed conflict remains under international law a conflict between parties who satisfy the legal requirements to be considered so. Thus, an armed conflict cannot be between a party and a phenomenon. It has to be between at least two or more parties, including non-state actors, which fit the definition of a party to a conflict. And despite views of some who want the law to serve politics, the laws of armed conflict as well as the principles of state territorial integrity and sovereignty have not changed. The bottom line is that both international law and international humanitarian law remain capable of effectively dealing with the problem of terrorism as long as the international community is serious in confronting it.

Professor Yonah Alexander:

Thank you very much Mahmoud for dealing with the significance of the rule of law in the strategy to combat terrorism and the role of international organization. Now on the logistical level two of our distinguished speakers has to leave very shortly. Surely Allen and Ambassador Sing, so what I would suggest is that if you have a specific question directed to them now is them now is the time. And then we will have a little bit of time to ask the other panelist. Any questions to Charles Allen or to Ambassador Singh?

State your name please and state your question, and not a big statement.

After Q&A - Closing remarks:

Michael Swetnam:

I will only conclude by saying that, as you noticed today and throughout all of our ambassador forums for the last several years, the emphasis on the global nature of the threat and the emphasis on the need for global cooperation to deal with it. There is still many many parts of the world and many people who looks at terrorism and the fear that comes out of terrorism as a local thing that affects us.

As was said earlier by a couple of the distinguished gentlemen: an act of terror in anyone of our countries is a threat against all of us - it is a threat against the human race. And the cooperation that has been growing by leaves and bounds across the world and demonstrated in the comments here today I think it is something that should give us all encouragement that this is being dealt with in a way that can give us some faith that the future that our children and our grandchildren will face, will be better than the one that we have faced over the last couple of decades. So please join me in thanking these tremendous and honorable gentlemen, not just for their comments, but for the great work of their countries that they represent.

Speakers Biographies:

Michael Swetnam

CEO and Chairman, Potomac Institute for Policy Studies

Michael Swetnam assisted in founding the Potomac Institute for Policy Studies in 1994. Since its inception, he has served as Chairman of the Board and currently serves as the Institute's Chief Executive Officer. He has authored and edited several books and articles including: "Cyber Terrorism and Information Warfare," a four volume set he co-edited; "Usama bin Laden's al-Qaida: Profile of a Terrorist Network," co-authored with Yonah Alexander; "ETA: Profile of a Terrorist Group," co-authored with Yonah Alexander and Herbert M. Levine; and "Best Available Science: Its Evolution, Taxonomy, and Application," co-authored with Dennis K. McBride, A. Alan Moghissi, Betty R. Love and Sorin R. Straja.

Mr. Swetnam is currently a member of the Technical Advisory Group to the United States Senate Select Committee on Intelligence. In this capacity, he provides expert advice to the U.S. Senate on the R&D investment strategy of the U.S. Intelligence Community. He also served on the Defense Science Board (DSB) Task Force on Counterterrorism and the Task Force on Intelligence Support to the War on Terrorism.

From 1990 to 1992, Mr. Swetnam served as a Special Consultant to President Bush's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board (PFIAB) where he provided expert advice on Intelligence Community issues including budget, community architecture, and major programs. He also assisted in authoring the Board's assessment of Intelligence Community support to Desert Storm/Shield. Prior to forming the Potomac Institute for Policy Studies, Mr. Swetnam worked in private industry as a Vice President of Engineering at the Pacific-Sierra Research Corporation, Director of Information Processing Systems at GTE, and Manager of Strategic Planning for GTE Government Systems.

Prior to joining GTE, he worked for the Director of Central Intelligence as a Program Monitor on the Intelligence Community Staff (1986-1990). He was responsible for the development and presentation to Congress of the budget of the National Security Agency, and helped develop, monitor and present to Congress the DOE Intelligence Budget. Mr. Swetnam was also assigned as the IC Staff representative to intergovernmental groups that developed the INF and START treaties. He assisted in presenting these treaties to Congress for ratification. Collateral duties included serving as the host to the DCI's Nuclear Intelligence Panel and Co-Chairman of the S&T Requirements Analysis Working Group.

Mr. Swetnam served in the U.S. Navy for 24 years as an active duty and reserve officer, Special Duty Cryptology. He has served in several public and community positions including Northern United Kingdom Scout Master (1984-85); Chairman, Term Limits Referendum Committee (1992-93); President (1993) of the Montgomery County Corporate Volunteer Council, Montgomery County Corporate Partnership for Managerial Excellence (1993); and the Maryland Business Roundtable (1993). He is also on the Board of Directors of Space and Defense Systems Inc., Dragon Hawk Entertainment Inc., and the Governing Board of The Potomac Institute of New Zealand.

Prof. Yonah Alexander

Director, International Center for Terrorism Studies

Professor Yonah Alexander serves as a Senior Fellow at the Potomac Institute for Policy Studies and Director of its International Center for Terrorism Studies as well as a member of the Board of Regents. Concurrently, he is Director of the Inter-University Center for Terrorism Studies and Director of the Inter-University Center for Legal Studies. Both are consortia of universities and think tanks throughout the world. In addition, Professor Alexander directed the Terrorism Studies program (George Washington University) and the Institute for Studies in International Terrorism (State University of New York), totalling 35 years of service.

Dr. Alexander is founder and editor-in-chief of three international academic journals: *Terrorism*; *Minorities and Group Rights* and *Political Communication and Persuasion*. Since 2010, he serves as Editor-in-Chief of *Partnership for Peace Review*, under the auspices of NATO. He also has published over 95 books including *Terrorists in Our Midst: Combating Foreign Affinity Terrorism in America*; *Terrorism on the High Seas: From Piracy to Strategic Challenge*; *Evolution of U.S. Counterterrorism Policy* (three volumes); *Turkey: Terrorism and Civil Rights*; and *The New Iranian Leadership: Terrorism, Nuclear Ambition, and the Middle East Conflict*. His works were translated into more than two dozen languages and his personal papers and collection on terrorism are housed at the Hoover Institution Library and Archives, Stanford University.

Professor Alexander has appeared on many television and radio programs in over 40 countries. His numerous articles and interviews were published in both the United States and the international press.

The Honorable Charles E. Allen
Principal, Chertoff Group

The Honorable Charles E. Allen has held the following senior government positions: Under Secretary for Intelligence and Analysis, U.S. Department of Homeland Security (2007 – 2009); Assistant Secretary for Information Analysis and Chief of Intelligence, U.S. Department of Homeland Security (2005 – 2007); and Assistant Director of Central Intelligence for Collection, Central Intelligence Agency (1998-2005).

At The Department of Homeland Security, Charles E. Allen developed the department's intelligence architecture, integrated its intelligence activities and ensured that they were continuously aligned with the department's evolving priorities. He also accelerated and expanded the department's processes for sharing intelligence with state and local security and law enforcement officials.

At Chertoff Group, Mr. Allen will bring to bear his extensive experience in intelligence program management, analysis and production; intelligence collection management; system acquisition and warning intelligence.

During his more than 40 years at the CIA, Mr. Allen became as much a legend as a respected senior official. He earned a reputation for plain speaking, even when his opinions differed from those of senior officials.

Mr. Allen became the principal adviser to the Director of Central Intelligence (DCI) on collection management, where he revolutionized the way the various national intelligence agencies coordinate and target their activities. In the same vein, he chaired the National Intelligence Collection Board, which united all intelligence agencies under common collection strategies.

He also served as CIA's National Intelligence Officer for Warning, Director of the National Warning Staff, National Intelligence Officer for Counterterrorism and Deputy Chief for Intelligence of CIA's Counterterrorism Center. He also directed the DCI Hostage Location Task Force, which focused on locating American hostages held by Hezbollah in Lebanon.

Mr. Allen is a graduate of the University of North Carolina and a distinguished graduate of the Air War College; he also completed graduate studies at Auburn University.

Daniel A. Rosen

Director, Plans and Policy, Bureau of Counterterrorism, U.S. Department of State

Dan Rosen is the Director of the Office of Strategic Plans and Policy in the State Department's Bureau of Counterterrorism. Mr. Rosen is responsible for policy and strategic planning, oversight of CT programs, and budget planning for the CT Bureau. Prior to his current assignment, he served for two years as Senior Advisor for Strategy and Plans with the Office of the Coordinator for Counterterrorism.

Before joining the State Department, Mr. Rosen served as Chief of Programs and Plans at the Near East South Asia (NESAs) Center for Strategic Studies, National Defense University, Department of Defense. Mr. Rosen was responsible for all program planning, strategic planning, and new program development. He served nine years with the NESAs Center and was part of the team responsible for initial Center design and establishment in 1999.

Mr. Rosen has over twenty years experience in international security and foreign policy, with regional expertise in the Middle East, South Asia, and Southeastern Europe. His positions have included strategy and policy planning positions in government, non-governmental organizations, and private sector government consulting. He was also the Executive Director of a Washington based NGO that promoted conflict management and job skills training in Turkey and Cyprus. He previously worked on efforts to design and implement the Africa Center for Strategic Studies at NDU, and spent three years at the RAND Corporation as a Research Assistant supporting the Middle East Policy team. He has experience consulting for the Office of the Secretary of Defense on Southeastern Europe, and spent two years developing non-profit conflict resolution programs in the former Yugoslavia.

He received a Bachelor of Arts in Political Science and International Relations with Honors, University of California, Los Angeles (1993) and a Master of Arts in Law and Diplomacy, Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University (1997).

Ambassador Arun K. Singh

Deputy Chief of Mission, Embassy of India

Arun K. Singh joined the Indian Foreign Service in 1979, after completing his Masters Degree in Economics from Delhi University, and teaching at the University for two years.

His first assignment abroad was at the Embassy of India, Moscow from 1981-1982, where he learned Russian. Later, he served at the Indian Missions in Addis Ababa as Second Secretary from 1982-1985, and in Tokyo as First Secretary from 1985 – 1988.

On returning to Delhi at the Headquarters of the Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India, he served as Deputy Secretary / Director dealing with East Asia and Pakistan Divisions from 1988-1991. From 1991-1993, he headed the Offices of the Foreign Secretary and the External Affairs Minister of India.

Ambassador Singh served at the Permanent Mission of India to the United Nations Office, New York from 1993-1997 as Counsellor and handled multilateral social and economic negotiations. He served in the Indian Mission at Moscow again as Counsellor / Minister from 1997-2000.

During his assignment in Delhi from 2000-2005, he served in the capacity of Joint Secretary dealing first with the United Nations Policy, and then Pakistan, Afghanistan and Iran Divisions at the Ministry of External Affairs.

Ambassador Singh served as Ambassador of India to Israel from April 2005 to September, 2008. He assumed his new assignment as Deputy Chief of Mission at the Embassy of India, Washington D.C on October 9, 2008.

Ambassador Singh speaks Russian and Japanese and has some knowledge of French and Hebrew.

The Honorable Timur Soylemez
Deputy Chief of Mission, Embassy of Turkey

Timur Söylemez was born in Istanbul in 1969. He is married to Carla Jones Söylemez and has a daughter Mina Ruby. He is a graduate of T.E.D. Ankara High School. He holds a degree in Business Administration from Hacettepe University/Ankara.

Söylemez entered the Turkish Foreign Ministry in 1993. He was assigned as Attaché to NATO's Department of Military Affairs. In 1995, he was assigned as Third Secretary to the Turkish Embassy in Khartoum/Sudan. In 1997, he was assigned to the Permanent Delegation of Turkey to the European Union where he served as Third and later Second Secretary.

He returned to Ankara in 2000 and was assigned as Second Secretary and later served as First Secretary at the Deputy Directorate General for Multilateral Security and Defense Affairs. In 2002, Söylemez was assigned as First Secretary to the Turkish Embassy in Washington D.C. where he later served as Counselor.

Upon his return to Ankara in 2006, Söylemez was appointed as Chief of Section and later became Head of Department at the Deputy Directorate General for Policy Planning.

Söylemez was assigned as Counselor to the Permanent Mission of Turkey to the United Nations in 2008 during Turkey's tenure on the Security Council. He had been serving as First Counselor at the Turkish Mission to the UN until October 2011 when he was reassigned as Deputy Chief of Mission to the Turkish Embassy in Washington D.C.

Mahmoud Daifallah Hmoud
Deputy Chief of Mission, Embassy of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan

Mahmoud Daifallah Hmoud was appointed on February 15, 2009 handling the political, legal and Senate affairs at the Embassy. He also served as the Director of the Legal Department and Legal Advisor of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Amman, Jordan and is a member of the International Law Commission, serving as the 2nd Vice-Chairman in 2007.

Mr. Hmoud worked extensively on the UN matters, including as diplomat and legal advisor at the Jordanian Mission to the United Nations in New York from 2001-2006, and as Vice-Chairman of the Legal (Sixth) Committee during the sixtieth session of the United Nations General Assembly. From 1994-1999 he served as a legal advisor at the Office of HRH Prince El Hassan bin Talal and was a legal advisor to Jordan during the peace process negotiations. He has advised the Jordanian Government on issues related to the accession to the World Trade Organization, including issues relating to intellectual property and negotiated several of Jordan's bilateral and multilateral agreements, including investment, commerce, transportation, energy and international loan agreements. He also served twice as Counsel for Jordan during proceedings before the International Court of Justice, as well as in cases before tribunals of the International Center for the Settlement of Investment Disputes (ICSID).

Mr. Hmoud has participated in a vast array of conferences, including representing Jordan in the Legal Committee during several sessions of the UN General Assembly. He also represented Jordan in several sessions of the Preparatory Committee of the International Criminal Court, and the Assembly of State Parties to Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court. In December 2004, Mr. Hmoud was awarded with Jordan's Istiklal (Independence) Medal of the 3rd Order.

Mr. Hmoud holds a Masters of Law (L.L.M) from the George Washington University, National Law Center, Washington, DC, with specialization in International and Comparative Law and a second L.L.M from Franklin Pierce Law Center (currently the University of New Hampshire Law School) with specialization in Intellectual Property Rights. He also holds a Bachelor's Degree in Law from the University of Jordan Law School.