

CONFRONTING VIOLENT WHITE SUPREMACY
(PART III):
ADDRESSING THE TRANSNATIONAL
TERRORIST THREAT

JOINT HEARING
BEFORE THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY
AND THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON CIVIL RIGHTS AND CIVIL
LIBERTIES
OF THE
COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND
REFORM

ONE HUNDRED SIXTEENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

SEPTEMBER 20, 2019

Serial No. 116-63

Printed for the use of the Committee on Oversight and Reform



Available on: <http://www.govinfo.gov>
<http://www.oversight.house.gov> or
<http://www.docs.house.gov>

U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE

37-975 PDF

WASHINGTON : 2019

COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND REFORM

CAROLYN B. MALONEY, *Acting Chairwoman*

ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, District of Columbia	JIM JORDAN, Ohio, <i>Ranking Minority Member</i>
WM. LACY CLAY, Missouri	PAUL A. GOSAR, Arizona
STEPHEN F. LYNCH, Massachusetts	VIRGINIA FOXX, North Carolina
JIM COOPER, Tennessee	THOMAS MASSIE, Kentucky
GERALD E. CONNOLLY, Virginia	MARK MEADOWS, North Carolina
RAJA KRISHNAMOORTHY, Illinois	JODY B. HICE, Georgia
JAMIE RASKIN, Maryland	GLENN GROTHMAN, Wisconsin
HARLEY ROUDA, California	JAMES COMER, Kentucky
KATIE HILL, California	MICHAEL CLOUD, Texas
DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Florida	BOB GIBBS, Ohio
JOHN P. SARBANES, Maryland	RALPH NORMAN, South Carolina
PETER WELCH, Vermont	CLAY HIGGINS, Louisiana
JACKIE SPEIER, California	CHIP ROY, Texas
ROBIN L. KELLY, Illinois	CAROL D. MILLER, West Virginia
MARK DESAULNIER, California	MARK E. GREEN, Tennessee
BRENDA L. LAWRENCE, Michigan	KELLY ARMSTRONG, North Dakota
STACEY E. PLASKETT, Virgin Islands	W. GREGORY STEUBE, Florida
RO KHANNA, California	FRANK KELLER, Pennsylvania
JIMMY GOMEZ, California	
ALEXANDRIA OCASIO-CORTEZ, New York	
AYANNA PRESSLEY, Massachusetts	
RASHIDA TLAIB, Michigan	

DAVID RAPALLO, *Staff Director*

CANDYCE PHOENIX, *Minority Staff Director*

DAN REBNORD, *Staff Director*

AMY STRATTON, *Clerk*

CHRISTOPHER HIXON, *Minority Staff Director*

CONTACT NUMBER: 202-225-5051

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY

STEPHEN F. LYNCH, Massachusetts, *Chairman*

JIM COOPER, Tennessee	JODY B. HICE, Georgia, <i>Ranking Minority Member</i>
PETER WELCH, Vermont	
HARLEY Rouda, California	PAUL A. GOSAR, Arizona
DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Florida	VIRGINIA FOXX, North Carolina
ROBIN L. KELLY, Illinois	MARK MEADOWS, North Carolina
MARK DESAULNIER, California	MICHAEL CLOUD, Texas
STACEY E. PLASKETT, Virgin Islands	MARK E. GREEN, Tennessee
BRENDA L. LAWRENCE, Michigan	CLAY HIGGINS, Louisiana

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CIVIL RIGHTS AND CIVIL LIBERTIES

JAMIE RASKIN, Maryland, *Chairman*

WM. LACY CLAY, Missouri	CHIP ROY, Texas, <i>Ranking Minority Member</i>
DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Florida	THOMAS MASSIE, Kentucky
ROBIN L. KELLY, Illinois	MARK MEADOWS, North Carolina
JIMMY GOMEZ, California	JODY B. HICE, Georgia
ALEXANDRIA OCASIO-CORTEZ, New York	MICHAEL CLOUD, Texas
AYANNA PRESSLEY, Massachusetts	CAROL D. MILLER, West Virginia
ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, District of Columbia	FRED KELLER, Pennsylvania

C O N T E N T S

Hearing held on September 20, 2019	Page 1
WITNESSES	
Dr. Kathleen Belew, Research Fellow, Center for Advanced Study in Behavioral Sciences, Stanford University Oral Statement	6
Dr. Joshua Geltzer, Director, Institute for Constitutional Advocacy and Protection, Georgetown Law Oral Statement	8
Ms. Katrina Mulligan, Managing Director, National Security and International Policy, Center for American Progress Oral Statement	10
Ms. Candace Owens, Founder, Blexit, Host, Candace Owens Show Oral Statement	12

INDEX OF DOCUMENTS

The documents listed below are available at: <https://docs.house.gov>.

* Unanimous Consent: National Review article, "How to Combat White Supremacist Gun Violence While Protecting the Second Amendment; submitted by Rep. Roy.

**CONFRONTING VIOLENT WHITE SUPREMACY
(PART III):
ADDRESSING THE TRANSNATIONAL
TERRORIST THREAT
Friday, September 20, 2019**

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY, JOINT WITH
SUBCOMMITTEE ON CIVIL RIGHTS AND CIVIL LIBERTIES,
COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND REFORM
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittees met, pursuant to notice, at 9:11 a.m., in room 2154, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Jamie Raskin [chairman of the Subcommittee on Civil Rights and Civil Liberties] presiding.

Present: Representatives Raskin, Lynch, Maloney, Clay, Welch, Wasserman Schultz, Rouda, Kelly, Plaskett, Pressley, Norton, Roy, Hice, Meadows, Green, Higgins, and Jordan (ex officio).

Mr. RASKIN. The subcommittee will come to order. Good morning, everyone. Without objection, the chair's authorized to declare a recess of the committee at any time. This joint hearing of the National Security and Civil Rights and Civil Liberties Subcommittees is entitled, "Confronting Violent White Supremacy (Part III): Addressing the Transnational Terrorist Threat." I am delighted to be joined by Mr. Lynch, who is the chair of the National Security Subcommittee, and I will turn it over to him for his opening statement.

Mr. LYNCH. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and to the ranking member. Good morning. I want to thank the chairman for calling this hearing, and I also want to thank our witnesses for your willingness to help the committee with its work. Unfortunately, with scheduling, I have to say in advance, that I have a competing committee just down the hall that's having roll call votes on a markup, so I'm going to have to depart and then come back, but I will be present for most of the hearing.

Today, we will discuss the urgent need for the United States to treat white supremacist violence as a transnational terrorist threat to our national security. As Chairman Raskin will detail in his opening statement, far right nationalist ideologies are spreading and reverberating across the world. In recent years, we've seen white supremacists increasingly resorting to the use of violence to achieve their ideological objectives. And today, for the first time since September 11, 2001, more people have been killed in racially motivated or right-wing terrorist incidents in the United States than in attacks perpetrated by Islamic extremists.

This brings me to an important distinction that we must make absolutely clear when framing the parameters of today's hearing:

Not all right-wing extremists, white supremacists, or white nationalists are terrorists. The First Amendment grants Americans the freedom of speech, and the Supreme Court has repeatedly found that political or ideological speech requires the highest level of protection, even if the content of that speech is abhorrent, or contrary to American values.

However, the point at which violence is used or suggested, or threatened, to advance those political objectives, is the threshold at which counterterrorism and law enforcement officials must be empowered to intervene in order to maintain the peace and to save lives.

This is a difficult task that requires striking a delicate balance, but it is a challenge the U.S. Government became intimately familiar with in the aftermath of the September 11 attacks. Many Americans will recall that as the United States exerted overwhelming military and counterterrorism pressure on Al-Qaeda, and later, the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria. These terrorist organizations increasingly turn to homegrown violent extremists to carry out terrorist attacks without specific direction or financial support from their organizational leadership.

These homegrown violent extremists often radicalized on the internet, sometimes in virtual chat rooms with other sympathizers, creating an ideological echo chamber that would ultimately inspire them to carry out acts of terrorism in pursuit of their political objectives. White supremacists and right-wing terrorists have taken a page from the jihadi playbook. Today, right-wing extremists are radicalizing on the internet, absorbing hate-filled propaganda on sites like the Daily Stormer, and in digital chat rooms, such as Achan.

There, they find common ideological cause with other white supremacists, and are sometimes moved to take violent action. This latest wave of white supremacist terrorism thus closely resembles that of the jihadi homegrown violent extremists as both lack explicit direction or financial support from a fixed, specific terrorist organization, thereby making it exceedingly challenging for counterterrorism and law enforcement officials to collect intelligence on potential plots, terrorist networks, and attackers.

Nevertheless, in the aftermath of September 11, the U.S. intelligence community and national security agencies, as well as those of our allies and partners, mobilized to address the global jihadi terrorist threat.

In 2004, Congress passed the Intelligence Reform and Terrorist Prevention Act, which created the office of the Director of National Intelligence, to lead the U.S. intelligence community, as well as the National Counterterrorism Center, to analyze and integrate terrorist-related intelligence and to conduct strategic operational planning for U.S. counterterrorism activities.

In the fall of 2014, the United States created a global coalition to counter ISIS, which today includes 81 countries and international organizations to improve information sharing and to counter ISIS financing and propaganda. Most recently, in December 2017, the United States Security Council—excuse me—the United Nations Security Council passed Resolution 2396, which re-

quires U.N. States to develop watch lists or data bases of known or suspected terrorists, including foreign fighters.

We need to start treating violent white supremacy with the same urgency as we do violent Islamic extremism, and with the whole-of-government approach. Unfortunately, for too long, U.S. counterterrorism efforts had focused almost exclusively on the jihadi terrorist threat, and I look forward to today's hearing to discuss how best the U.S. should address the growing threat of white nationalist terrorism.

Mr. Chairman, thank you again for your courtesy and for holding this hearing.

I yield back.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and thanks for that splendid opening statement. I turn now to the ranking member, Mr. Roy of Texas.

Mr. ROY. I thank the chairman, and appreciate all the witnesses for being here today for this important topic. We've had a number of hearings on this, and I know that we got some votes this morning that may be taken up—I don't intend to make a long opening statement, but I do want to make a couple of points because these are important issues.

I do think it is important for us to keep in mind, you know, the perspective here of what we're dealing with and the overall context of crime in our Nation. I've talked about that before, as the chairman knows. The number of murders, 17,000 murders in the United States, and kind of looking at the root of that, and then how many of these murders are focused on this particular problem.

I think if you put that in context, right, we've got a lot of issues we need to deal with. And importantly here, you know, one of my good friends is a guy named Andy McCarthy, who many of you probably know, was a prosecutor who prosecuted the World Trade Center bombings in New York in 1993 as one of the assistant U.S. attorneys there in New York, and the Southern District of New York. Andy has a piece in National Review that was dated, let me see here, August 5, 2019, in which he suggests, and I think it would be a good potential future hearing, he suggests that one of the problems that we face right now is that we don't have the kind of focus on ideology-based crimes in the Department of Justice. His contention is, is that under the Obama Administration, the Obama Department of Justice, we backed away from sort of anti-jihad crimes, and in doing so, we kind of backed away from focusing on ideology.

So, as a former Federal prosecutor, I look through the lens of, I don't care where somebody comes from, what their race is, what their background is, anything else, I want to go find the bad guys, and I want to make sure that the Department of Justice and the FBI have the tools to go find the bad guys, regardless of persuasion, but at the end of the day, making sure we got a targeted effort to do that so I would ask that Andy's article be put in the record because I think he raises an important point, and I think it would be something we should focus on in the future if we could have a hearing along those lines and, you know, his point is just saying—

Mr. RASKIN. Without objection. What's the name of the article?

Mr. ROY. Oh, sorry. That would be helpful, would it not? “How to Combat White Supremacist Gun Violence While Protecting the Second Amendment.”

Mr. RASKIN. Without objection.

Mr. ROY. And I think it’s an important point for the conversation, and I think at this point, I’ll just move on and turn it over to you, Mr. Chairman. I just think it would be something to put in the record. Thanks.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you very much for your opening statement, Mr. Roy. And now, I will present mine.

Good morning to everyone. Welcome to all of our witnesses. Thank you for being part of this. Welcome to all of our honored guests out there and members of the committee who got up bright and early this morning to join us. Welcome to the third in a series of hearings that our Subcommittee on Civil Rights and Civil Liberties is conducting on the problem of confronting violent white supremacy. I’m delighted that we’re holding this one with the National Security Subcommittee, and the question of how to reconcile political liberty with public safety is one that we’ve dealt with for a long time, and I look forward to the contributions of the National Security Subcommittee, the discussion.

I should also say that there is parallel work going on in the Homeland Security Subcommittee on Intelligence and Counterterrorism, and I’ve benefited from the thoughts of Congressman Rose, who’s the chair of that subcommittee.

Look, the problem of violent white supremacy in America is obviously not newly minted, it is the Nation’s original sin, and its forms have changed over the years. In recent years, we’ve seen the convergence of traditional violent racism with a global terror network that poses a clear and present threat to free societies all over the world.

White supremacy’s been a part of the American story since the Nation’s founding, of course. In our prior hearings, we’ve recited the list of U.S. cities and towns that have been recently traumatized by white supremacist terror—Charleston, Charlottesville, Pittsburgh, and Poway, and so on.

In August, a gunman motivated by hatred of Latinos, murdered 22 people with an assault weapon at an El Paso, Texas Walmart. Here’s a map of white supremacist attacks between 2011–2017.

Over the last few years, we’ve seen a spike in such attacks around the world and a deepening of the relationship between the perpetrators of those attacks and the perpetrators of those taking place in other countries.

The El Paso gunman’s manifesto exemplifies the intricate new web of global white supremacy. The manifesto celebrated another infamous white supremacist attack in Christchurch, New Zealand, where a gunman, loaded up on race hate, assassinated 51 people at two mosques earlier this year.

The Christchurch killings inspired the murder in Poway. The Christchurch shooter himself took inspiration from racist mass murderers in Charleston, in London, in Quebec City, and in Sweden. Most recent perpetrators of white supremacist violence cite as inspiration the 2011 attack in Oslo, Norway, which killed 77 people, many of them children.

Indeed, since 2011, at least one-third of white supremacist attacks have been modeled on an earlier deadly attack somewhere else in the world. The manifestos and tactics reveal that these are not isolated episodes. To the contrary, these incidents of spectacular violence are committed by embittered men who self-radicalize online, and see themselves as participating in the launch of a global race war.

They believe the wrong side won in World War II, and they are determined to resurrect Nazism and to bring genocide. The specific ideology unifying this transnational movement is known as the great replacement. Adherence to this philosophy claimed that a so-called white genocide is being perpetrated by nonwhite people. This was the meaning of white supremacists in Charlottesville chanting, “You will not replace us. Jews will not replace us.”

This paranoia is the common thread uniting these attacks motivated by hatred of immigrants, Muslims, Jews, and other nonwhite, Christian people. The rise of the internet has allowed this ideology to spread like wildfire today, and as it spreads, bloodshed is following in its wake.

Another key philosophical link is that of acceleration, the notion that the quickest way to ensure the preservation of the white race is to spark a war by committing mass murder. Manifestos from around the world, including the El Paso and Christchurch massacres, make clear that the concept of acceleration is inspiring many to kill.

The Trump administration has completely failed to recognize the threat that violent white supremacists pose to our public safety and to national security, and it must realign our counterterrorism strategy to confront this reality. After the savage attacks of 9/11 in 2001, our national security apparatus refashioned itself into a robust counterterror framework focused on Al-Qaeda, but as quick as we were to recognize the threat of violent Islamic extremism, we’ve been correspondingly slow to recognize the threat of global violent white supremacy.

The results have been unsurprising. Testimony before this subcommittee in May established that from 9/11/2001 until today, 71 percent of violent Islamist inspired extremists in the United States were stopped in the terror planning phase, but with far-right extremists, the inverse is the case, and over 70 percent managed to successfully commit violent acts.

Our failure to properly allocate resources to target racial terror is costing lives. Our prior hearings have called both the FBI and DHS to task for failing to develop a plan to address white supremacy, and I worry that recent developments have demonstrated that neither agency has successfully pivoted to face this threat.

In August, we learned from late 2018 FBI documents that the FBI considered black identity extremists to be as high a priority as white supremacy extremists, but there’s no data to support the FBI’s baffling threat categorizations; indeed, quite the opposite. FBI Director Wray testified earlier this year that the vast majority of racially motivated violent attacks in this country are committed by white supremacists.

Furthermore, before this very subcommittee, DHS vowed to have a strategic plan to address white supremacy by the summer’s end.

Late last night, after repeated inquiries from our committee, we learned that DHS is finally planning to release a strategy at some point today. It is long past due, and I hope it reflects the seriousness and the magnitude of the threat. In addition to the FBI and DHS, other national security agencies, like the National Counterterrorism Center, must treat transnational white supremacy as a global national security threat. This is what it is.

In rising to the challenge of the moment, we obviously must not trade our civil liberties for our security, and we must ensure that we are leveraging our current law enforcement tools before rushing to create new ones. In the wake of the El Paso massacre, there has been a call for a domestic terror statute that would put domestic terror on the same legal footing as international terror. That debate is an important and a complicated one. It is not our focus today.

Instead, we are here to discuss whether and how existing counterterrorism tools can be effectively mobilized to address the problem of white supremacy, and if so, what civil liberties protections will limit the potential for any overreach.

I thank Mr. Roy and Mr. Lynch and Mr. Lynch for the partnership of his subcommittee on this issue. I look forward to a lively conversation today on addressing the serious new terror threat of global violent white supremacy.

With that, I'm delighted to—let's see—and I should say that Mr. Hice is not here right now so we will proceed directly to witness testimony. I welcome the witnesses. We are joined today by Dr. Kathleen Belew, who's a research fellow at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences at Stanford; Dr. Joshua Geltzer, who's the Director of the Institute for Constitutional Advocacy and Protection at Georgetown Law School; Katrina Mulligan, the managing director of the National Security International Policy Program at the Center for American Progress; and Candace Owens, who's the minority witness, who's the founder of Blexit and the host of the Candace Owens show.

I'm going to ask all of the witnesses to please rise and raise your right hand if you would. Do you swear or affirm the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God? Let the record show that the witnesses all answered in the affirmative. Thank you. Please be seated. The microphones are sensitive, so please speak directly into them as you go. Without objection, your written statements will be made part of the record, and with that, Dr. Belew, you are now recognized to give an oral presentation of your testimony for five minutes.

STATEMENT OF DR. KATHLEEN BELEW, ASSISTANT PROFESSOR OF U.S. HISTORY AND THE COLLEGE, THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Ms. BELEW. Thank you. As one of the only scholars who has studied this troubling phenomenon deeply, and who has historical knowledge of its patterns and drivers as well as the gaps in our knowledge, I hope I can be of use in helping you understand this threat, and how it might be effectively contained. This is a dark and troubling history that leads to grave concern about the present

moment, but also gives us reason to hope we'll be able to find solutions. I have spent more than a decade studying the white power movement from its formation after the Vietnam War to the 1995 Oklahoma City bombing and into the present. This movement connected Neo-Nazis, Klansmen, Skinheads, radical tax protesters, militia members, and others. It brought together people in every region of the country. It joined people in suburbs and cities and on mountain tops. It joined men, women, and children; felons and religious leaders; high school dropouts and aerospace engineers, civilians and veterans and active duty troops.

It was a social movement that included a variety of strategies for bringing about social change, both violent and nonviolent; however, its most significant legacies have evolved from a 1983 revolutionary turn when it declared war against the Federal Government and racial and other enemies. The first of these strategies is the use of computer-based social network activism, which began in this movement in 1984, and has only amplified in the present. The second is an operational strategy called leaderless resistance, also from 1983–1984. This is most easily understood today as cell-style terrorism meant to bring about race war in which a network of small cells and activists could work in concert toward a commonly shared goal with no communication with one another and with no direct ties to movement leadership.

Now, this was designed to foil prosecution, but leaderless resistance has had a much more catastrophic impact in clouding public understanding of white power as a social movement. It's allowed the movement to disappear, making the violence these activists commit seem to be the work of quote/unquote, "lone wolf actors and errant madmen." Those kinds of designations leave very little room for enacting policy beyond mental health initiatives which will not address the scope of this problem.

Indeed, understanding these acts of violence as politically motivated, connected, and purposeful represents a crucial first step toward a different response. The white power movement was and is a transnational movement characterized by the movement of ideas, people, weapons, money, and violent action across national boundaries. Furthermore, this is a movement that is dedicated to the violent overthrow of the United States. This is not just overzealous patriotism or the claim that whiteness should be integral to the American Nation or the American character.

Indeed, after 1983, white nationalism in the United States is not interested in the United States when it talks about the Nation, but rather, the Aryan Nation. It hopes to unite white people around the world in a violent conquest of people of color. The interests of white nationalism were and are profoundly opposed to those of the United States. It is furthermore critical to understand the acts of mass violence carried out by this movement were not meant as end points in and of themselves, but were, instead, meant to awaken other activists to join in race war. They also represent more than individual crimes in an aggregate crime rate, because these actions worked not only to impact individuals, but to terrorize entire targeted communities.

Despite this clear and present danger to American civilians, at no point in our history has there been a meaningful stop to white

power organizing. Even in the wake of the Oklahoma City bombing, which was a white power plot and the largest deliberate American mass casualty between Pearl Harbor and 9/11, there was no durable shift in public understanding, no major prosecution that hobbled the movement.

We have utterly failed to understand what this is or how to contain it. I can detail several attempts to do so by various entities, but the historical archive does offer us another possible response, which is truth and reconciliation projects that allow local communities to discuss racial tensions, identify areas of discord, and propose alternative interpretations of history and social inequality and more. Truly grappling with white power violence would involve a long look at the racial inequality foundational to many American communities.

However, such a process could not hope to succeed in the absence of real changes to our surveillance of white power activity and the prosecution of domestic terrorism. Because white power activity relies on fundamental misunderstandings at every level, ranging from the individual to the media to the courts to the law, the response would have to be broad and multifaceted. An interagency collaboration could address the many scales, including the global, at which white power violence currently operates. I find great hope in our conversation about violent domestic terror now under way in these chambers and in our Nation and I hope to be of service in resolving this. Thank you.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you very much, Dr. Belew.

Dr. Geltzer, you're now recognized for five minutes.

STATEMENT OF DR. JOSHUA A. GELTZER, DIRECTOR, INSTITUTE FOR CONSTITUTIONAL ADVOCACY AND PROTECTION, ON BEHALF OF GEORGETOWN LAW

Mr. GELTZER. Thank you, Chairman Raskin, Ranking Member Roy, distinguished members of the subcommittees. Thank you for this opportunity to address the threat posed by violent white supremacy. We are here to discuss a new type of transnational terrorist threat that's posed by violent white supremacists, but it's helpful to begin by considering a familiar type, that posed by jihadists, like ISIS. Consider an astonishing achievement by ISIS, forging a transnational community of followers, and how white supremacists are emulating it. ISIS drew on its claim to have established a physical caliphate to build, largely through the internet, a global following. ISIS preyed on those vulnerable and detached from their communities by offering them the false promise of something bigger: ISIS's global community.

Violent white supremacists are now doing something similar. They have used the same modern technologies ISIS exploited to create their own global community. And they've similarly done so with deadly consequences. There are key lessons we must learn from fighting one type of transnational terrorist threat and apply to this new type. The first, know thy enemy. The enemy Americans are seeing from Pittsburgh to El Paso has long been characterized in the United States as domestic terrorism, but that term has become largely outdated. The violence Americans are experiencing, like the ideology underlying it, is not really domestic any way; it's

transnational. Consider, as Chairman Raskin indicated before, this sequence: Brenton Tarrant, the Australian, who killed 51 mosque worshippers in Christchurch, New Zealand, who cited as ideological inspiration the Norwegian, Anders Breivik, who killed 77 in 2011, as well as the American, Dylann Roof who killed nine in 2015. Tarrant was not a purely domestic terrorist of Australia or of New Zealand, he was inspired by a global movement of racially motivated violence.

Then look at American Patrick Crusius, the El Paso shooter. Before his attack, Crusius announced online, in general, I support the Christchurch shooter and his manifesto. Then came Norwegian Philip Manshaus, who would have killed mosque worshippers in a city west of Oslo had he not been stopped by them. His online posting praised both Tarrant and Crusius. This simply is not terrorism domestic to any one nation alone. It's a global surge in violence inspired by white supremacy. And it's not only that the inspiration for each new act of violence transcends national borders, it's also the very structure of online communication today that facilitates a transnational network of those espousing and consuming this world view.

Once we recognize violent white supremacy has gone global, the importance of adopting a transnational approach to addressing the threat becomes clear. For example, designating groups as foreign terrorist organizations facilitates criminal prosecution of those who provide material support to them and freezes financial accounts associated with such groups. Yet not one of the 68 entries on the State Department's list of foreign terrorist organizations is a white supremacist group. It's time for the U.S. Government to take a hard look at designating foreign white supremacist groups.

Embracing the transnational approach would bring to bear another asset critical to the effort against jihadism, the intel work of NCTC, the National Counterterrorism Center. NCTC's fusion of terrorism-related intelligence has enabled analysis of jihadists groups that has, in turn, informed U.S. policymakers as they weigh tough choices in counterterrorism. NCTC's mandate has generally been understood to require it to focus on international terrorism, not so-called domestic terrorism. But we need NCTC fully in the game with respect to violent white supremacy.

Understanding today's white supremacist threat as transnational would seem to facilitate NCTC'S greater involvement. And if intelligence community lawyers determine that a statutory amendment is needed for NCTC to take on a larger role, I would respectfully urge Congress and the President to provide that update to Federal law. Adopting a transnational perspective also means the intelligence community and law enforcement can bring to bear tools proven to help against international terrorism, like robust intelligence sharing with foreign partners and preventive law enforcement tools like sting operations. It means rejuvenating efforts to work with local communities to prevent radicalization in the first place.

And for tech companies, it means policing their platforms to remove not just incitement to violence, but also, the ideological foundations that spawn such violence.

There are also lessons to be learned about what not to do in confronting white supremacy, and I'll hit three very quickly: First, there's reason for caution against taking the aggressive step of creating a domestic analog to the foreign terrorist organization designation regime. That would raise tough constitutional questions and invite potentially fraught determinations about which groups should be listed.

Second, augmenting efforts against violent white supremacy must not be used as an excuse for interfering with the lawful expression of political advocacy.

It is the pursuit of political goals through violence that distinguishes terrorism, and preventing that violence must be the mission, not infringing on protected expression. Third, and finally, we must enhance efforts to address violent white supremacy, but we must not think that this is the only ideology that will attract global adherence through modern technologies and spur some to violence. Instead, we must anticipate that other ideologies are being preached in the dark corners of the internet, just as white supremacy was until it broke free.

So as we update counterterrorism laws, policies, and activities, we should prepare to address all forms of politically motivated violence. Thank you.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you very much for your testimony. And Ms. Mulligan, you're recognized for five minutes.

**STATEMENT OF KATRINA MULLIGAN, MANAGING DIRECTOR,
NATIONAL SECURITY AND INTERNATIONAL POLICY, CENTER
FOR AMERICAN PROGRESS**

Ms. MULLIGAN. Thank you for the opportunity to testify before you today. I want to align myself with the comments already made regarding the transnational nature of violent white supremacy, but once we recognize the international dimensions of this threat, we need to think about what should be done about it. In my written testimony, I lay out several specific ways the national security tools can be brought to bear against this problem, but before I describe some of those solutions, I will first say a few words about the central role that protecting civil liberties and civil rights should play in any solutions considered by this committee. Put simply, the government's efforts to counter domestic terrorism should not harm the communities we are trying to protect, or the civil liberties of Americans.

The counterterrorism policies over the last two decades have unquestionably made us safer, and as I will argue, some of those efforts may prove useful in the counterterrorism fight ahead, but they have not been without flaws. In the name of protecting the homeland, some government approaches have been wrongly shaped by stereotypes and ethno-religious prejudices, and others have been ineffective and constitutionally problematic.

Because of this legacy, the idea of using national security tools to counter this threat understandably concerns many in Muslim communities, communities of color, and in the civil liberties and privacy community. We should learn from them, not only because these are the communities that are most often suffering from the violence committed by white supremacists, but also because they

have lived experiences with government counterterrorism efforts and have perspectives on what has and has not made us safer.

We should also closely adhere to established limits on the domestic use of counterterrorism efforts and national security tools, including surveillance. In the recommendations I will make today, I am not advocating for the expansion of the government's law enforcement or intelligence authorities, and that's because much can be accomplished by creatively leveraging the tools and authorities these agencies already have. I would like to highlight just a few examples. First, the Department of Justice and the Departments of Homeland Security should lead an effort to develop a national strategy to counter the threat posed by domestic terrorism. I'm pleased to hear that DHS will be releasing a strategy today, but I will be looking to see whether that strategy acknowledges that violent white supremacy is currently the leading domestic threat to the homeland, as it should.

DOJ should also expand and resource the office of the domestic terrorism coordinator. In addition, the U.S. intelligence community should explicitly identify and distinguish violent white supremacists as threat actors, and increase the priority assigned to them in the national intelligence priorities framework. As my colleague, Josh Geltzer, has argued, there's also much that the National Counterterrorism Center can do. First, they should work with international partners to investigate global links to white supremacist violence and provide a coordinated assessment of the threat posed by the movement, including any possible state sponsorships.

Second, NCTC should produce an unclassified report drawing from the lessons learned over the last 18 years, identifying the drivers that move extremists beyond radicalization to commit acts of violence. The report should include an examination of how our political leaders can avoid enflaming politically motivated violence and play a constructive role in countering the threat. No political leader wants their words twisted to justify violence, and NCTC's work can help us establish empirical benchmarks so that we can enlist our political leaders in avoiding the kind of political rhetoric that leads to violence.

Finally, I'd like to reflect on the subject of the hearing, and why violent white supremacy is worthy of the attention it is receiving. Republican lawmakers who survived a horrifying attack at a baseball practice a few blocks from my residence know well that politically motivated violence comes in all varieties and is no less murderous when it is inspired by the far left than when it is inspired by the far right. Politically motivated violence is worthy of serious attention whenever it occurs, regardless of whether the perpetrator is on the left or on the right.

What distinguishes violent white supremacy from other acts of violence, though, is that it is inspired by an ideology that transcends national borders. It's conducted by attackers who situate their actions in a transnational context. It is global, and because of that, the Federal Government can and should prioritize it as a national security concern. Thank you.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you very much, Ms. Mulligan.

And Ms. Owens, you're recognized for five minutes.

**STATEMENT OF CANDACE OWENS, FOUNDER, BLEXIT, HOST,
CANDACE OWENS SHOW**

Ms. OWENS. Thank you, Chairman, for the opportunity to testify. I just want to testify just as a black American today, and I want to first start off by saying that white supremacy is indeed real, but despite the media's obsessive coverage of it, it represents an isolated, uncoordinated, and fringe occurrence within America. It's a fringe occurrence that is being used, in my opinion, by Democrats to scare Americans into giving up their votes to a party that can no longer win based on simple ideas, which is why we're seeing so many of these hearings back-to-back despite other threats that are facing this Nation. I want to reiterate that point.

White supremacy is real, just as racism is real, but neither of these ideologies are real in this room. They have become mechanisms for the left to continue to call these hearings and to distract from much bigger issues that are facing this country, and which threaten minorities, much bigger issues that they are responsible for.

White nationalism sounds a lot better as a threat than father absence. When are we going to call a hearing on the 74 percent of single motherhood rate in black America today? My guess is probably never. Since Democrats are the author of that epidemic which leaves us, black Americans, 20 times more likely to end up in prison, nine times more likely to drop out of high school, and five times more likely to lead a life in poverty and to commit crime. White nationalism also sounds a lot better than illiteracy rates. I'm assuming we're never going to call a hearing on that, which is a real epidemic that is facing black Americans and minority Americans today; an epidemic, which by the way, has a lot closer of a tie to our Nation's history of white supremacy.

Slave codes in the early 19th century made it illegal for black Americans to learn to read. Why? Because if slaves could read, they could access information. I don't believe that much has changed. On the most recent national assessment of educational progress, just 17 percent of black students scored proficient in reading at a 12th grade Level. 83 percent of blacks in America were not found proficient in reading at a 12th grade level. Are we going to have a hearing on that? Probably not.

White nationalism also sounds a lot better than abortion as a threat, which has resulted in the slaughter of 18 million black Americans since 1973, and points to a bigger crisis, which is the fact that the black population growth has stagnated in this country. The crisis and the major cities, like in New York, we have more black babies that are being aborted than born alive. If we're talking about preserving lives and we're talking about white supremacy, we should probably have a conversation about that. But today in this room, we're going to see Democrats try to connect the dots to white supremacy on the internet. So the question is why? So that people who have absolutely nothing to do with propagating white supremacy are censored, silenced, and controlled. What they are actually after is our permission to censor and silence and control any dissenting voices that go against the mainstream narrative that they wish to propagate.

To give a glimpse into just how absurd and expansive a definition of white supremacy has become, I offer to the committee that I have been libeled and smeared by Democrat media cohorts as someone who supports white supremacy. You need but look at me to determine that that just isn't true. Why? Because I routinely say black people don't have to be Democrats. I am now considered somebody that is radicalizing people on the internet. What a radical idea? Black people waking up to the abuses in the Democrat Party, which has been instigated upon black America over the last 60 years.

There have been sincere attempts, just so everybody knows, to censor me on social media because I am radical. YouTube once censored me for criticizing Black Lives Matter. They reversed the censorship and they apologized, and they called it a mistake. Facebook once censored me for calling out liberal supremacy as a threat facing black America. What I said specifically was that in any community where liberal policies reign supreme, you will find that black America is hurting. I stand by that assessment. Facebook reversed my censorship, apologized, and claimed it was a mistake.

Of course, I'm fortunate that I have a big enough platform that when I get branded something extreme, I can reverse it, but the majority of Americans don't have that platform. The majority of Americans with dissenting opinions are silenced forever.

Many words, which have once held very serious meanings, have come to take on a different definition over the last couple of years as Democrats have desperately tried to grapple with the fact that they are no longer able to manipulate Americans with broad claims and broad strokes of racism, sexism, misogyny, and the like. Words like "racism," which today most nearly means anything or anyone that disagrees with a liberal, and terms like "white nationalism," which today, and in this room and upon this floor, most nearly means that its election time, America. It's time for the left to do what they do best: Divide, distract, and hope to keep their most important voting bloc to their party, which is black Americans, angry and emotional and reactive enough to keep voting for the same party that has systematically destroyed our families, sent our men to prison, and deferred all of our dreams.

I will close out by telling you that this is not going to work. America, and more importantly, black America, is waking up to the ploy. The bad acting, the faux concerns, these hearings. It's not going to stop black America from breaking the chain of victimhood, and it's certainly not going to stop me from being one of the loudest voices against it. Thank you.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you so much for your testimony.

Dr. Belew, let me start with you. I'm going to recognize myself for five minutes.

In your prepared testimony, you stated that the perpetrators of white supremacist violence in a lot of the recent episodes are often portrayed as bad apples, or mentally ill or so on. And this gets us to a very difficult problem. I'm thinking about two relatively analogous episodes, one is of Omar Mateen, who was an admirer or a follower of ISIS, but he wasn't a member of ISIS, and apparently, he had no contact with them that anybody could determine. He

hadn't been trained by them; he hadn't plotted with them, but he followed them online, and then he went to the nightclub—the Pulse Nightclub in Orlando and assassinated 49 people.

Then the terrorist who killed 11 people at the Tree of Life Synagogue in Pittsburgh, he also radicalized on the internet as essentially a follower of different white supremacist groups, but I don't think he was a member of any of those groups. I don't think he was trained by any of those groups, and so—and we're far more inclined to describe someone like that as a loner, isolated, mentally ill, and I think Mateen was pretty quickly assimilated to the categorization of terrorists, but they were sort of in similar situations. What is the best way to think of people who self-radicalize, as you put it, online? They follow a terrorist organization or movement internationally, but they don't have formal membership ties, and then they go out and commit an act. Are they best seen as single, unstable individuals, or as part of a terrorist movement?

Ms. BELEW. So I think it actually helps to think about a different example if you'll permit me, but to go back to the example of Dylann Roof, who was the gunman at the church shooting in Charleston. He's another one who we could think of as having self-radicalized or radicalized online, but from his self-presentation, it's really clear that even if he never had, in real life, contact with these groups, he was using their symbols, their ideology, and their core texts to motivate his violence. Part of how we know that is he posed for pictures wearing a Rhodesian flag patch. Now, the Rhodesian flag was not a live entity during Mr. Roof's lifetime. That was a government that had switched over to Zimbabwe before his birth, but Rhodesia was enormously important to an earlier movement. It was the subject of a ton of activity at Aryan nations, a flurry of publication in white power presses, and it points to the way that Mr. Roof's ideology was informing his action. So what we have to do is understand the context in which these people operate and read the acts of violence as meaningful and purposeful to what they are trying to carry out.

Mr. RASKIN. All right. Ms. Mulligan, do you agree with that approach that we should see people in this situation as part of a broader movement, even if they don't belong to an organization?

Ms. MULLIGAN. I believe we should, and I believe that's what we have done in other contexts.

Mr. RASKIN. That's basically the way we've treated people who've been inspired by ISIS or Al-Qaeda or any of the jihadist movements that can be found online.

Ms. MULLIGAN. That is correct.

Mr. RASKIN. Is that right? And Dr. Geltzer, do you agree with that too?

Mr. GELTZER. I do. I think the phrase "lone wolves" is dangerously misleading, because part of what attracts these individuals is the sense that signing up for this ideology, acting in its name makes them precisely not alone. It makes them part of this following that they join via the internet, first they follow it on open social media, then they sometimes move into encrypted more direct chats, and in some cases, they ultimately take up arms in the name of that.

Mr. RASKIN. So what have been the most effective techniques then of trying to address the problem of people who, in a psychological sense, might be described as isolated, antisocial, apart from the world, but who go online and then use the existence of all of the propaganda online to self-radicalize and to self-motivate to go out and kill? How do we deal with that problem while respecting the basic freedom of discourse that's on the internet?

Mr. GELTZER. One of the major findings of law enforcement and the intelligence community is that even as these sorts of individuals consume this material alone, there is, more often than not, somebody in their lives—a parent, a teacher, a community member who sees some sort of change. They may not understand exactly what the change is, but they see something and it worries them. And to have an open channel where those in the community understand what to do about that, that can be crucial at taking this in a different direction other than ultimately violence.

Mr. RASKIN. Great. Dr. Belew, I remember when there was a bit of a controversy several years ago about people using the phrase “radical Islamist terror.” I don't see why anybody had any problem uttering that. Today, though, it seems a lot of people have the problem uttering the phrase “violent white supremacy” or “violent white nationalism.” Is it important for public figures and Members of Congress, is it important for people in academia and journalism to identify and to name the problem?

Ms. BELEW. Yes. And I think part of it is something that my copanelist was mentioning about these kind of diffuse definitions of racism and white supremacy. The definitions are actually really important, because what we're talking about is not just kind of the broader canvas of race relations that we all inhabit from day-to-day, we're talking about a small group of fringe actors who is intent on violence against their local communities, against the United States, and against the world at large. These actors are not simply kind of run-of-the-mill ideologues. They're violent actors who are intent on taking action. Now that is not the same thing as freedom of speech. I think reasonable people can agree that violent action against civilians represents an enormous social problem for every political persuasion.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you. My time's expired. I'm going to recognize Mr. Roy for his five minutes of questioning. Oh, I'm sorry. Forgive me. I'm going to go to Representative Wasserman Schultz from Florida and then I'll come back to you, Mr. Roy.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Ms. Mulligan, you testified that we need to know more about how inflammatory rhetoric by political leaders can influence radicalization and white supremacist violence and, you know, for me, that brings up more recent current, what I consider potential incitement, like when the President of the United States insisted that there were good people on both sides at a deadly Neo-Nazi rally in Charlottesville.

I think about the President smiling at a rally in Florida when an attendee suggested border patrol should shoot immigrants crossing the border, and the President's nearly daily rhetoric and policy that demonizes and dehumanizes immigrants and people of color. What does the academic research show us, and this is actually ei-

ther for—either or both of Ms. Mulligan or Dr. Belew, what does the academic research tell us about the impact of inciting social divisions and how that can impact radicalization?

Ms. MULLIGAN. Would you like to take that one first?

Ms. BELEW. Go ahead.

Ms. MULLIGAN. Well, I can speak—I will, of course, defer to Dr. Belew on the academic research, but one of the things that I've been recommending is that we've learned a lot over the last 18 years of looking at the terrorism problem, about what causes people to move along the spectrum from becoming radicalized to them being mobilized to actually committing acts of violence. And there's a group at the National Counterterrorism Center called the radicalism and extremist messaging group that does fantastic work on this that's helped policymakers better understand the nature of this problem.

We can and should, within existing authorities, leverage that work to understand more about the extent to which the activities of our political leaders can or are influencing a rise in violent white supremacy, and we ought to learn more about the extent to which it agrees with, or not, the academic research on this topic, which certainly suggests that that's the case.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you. Dr. Belew?

Ms. BELEW. So the history of the KKK, which is the organization for which we have the longest, kind of, historical data, shows that all of this activism really profits from opportunistically mobilizing whatever existing scapegoats are available in a given time and place. So if you think about the Klan in the 1920's, which is the biggest one, right? That's the one that had 4 million people, 10 percent of the state of Indiana and the one that was sort of seen as mainstream and pro-American.

That Klan we remember as being antiblack and anti-Semitic, but it was also anti-Mexican on the border, it was anti-immigrant in the northeast where there are a lot of immigrants, it was antilabor in the northwest where there was a lot of labor dispute, and anti-Catholic in Indiana where Notre Dame University was. So what we have to remember is that this is the kind of activism that works by inflaming local tension, and kind of riding the wave of prevailing public perception.

So any time we see these moments of broadly accepted anti-immigration, broadly accepted calls to violence, there's going to be ramifications within these fringe groups.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you.

For Dr. Geltzer and Ms. Mulligan, you both mentioned the growing influence of foreign powers, including, and especially Russia, in promoting white supremacist ideologies.

Dr. Geltzer, can you describe a bit further how Russia is fueling white supremacist ideologies around the world? And Ms. Mulligan, can you share your perspective on what you think their objective is? We had Russia obviously interfere in our elections in 2016, in part, by drawing on deep-seated racism in our country and using that to sow division and spread misinformation.

Mr. GELTZER. So Russia is fueling this movement in at least two ways: One is actually on the ground, especially in a place like Ukraine, where Russian groups, like the Russian imperial move-

ment, and its paramilitary unit, the imperial legion volunteer unit, are actually training foreign fighters to fight in the mantle of white supremacy. That's on the ground.

Then you have what's happening online, where Russian disinformation efforts, which happen in all forms, but in this area are deliberately stoking anti-immigrant sentiments, not just here, but in countries across Europe. It has been particularly well-documented in Sweden. And for more on this, I would commend Ali Soufan's recent testimony before House Homeland where he laid out some of these connections to Russia, in particular, and the state role in driving this.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you. And should we consider weaponized white supremacy, Ms. Mulligan, or any of the three of you, weaponized white supremacy a key threat to our election security?

Ms. MULLIGAN. Absolutely. To the extent that what Russia or any other foreign actors attempting to do by sowing division within our society, we should absolutely consider it a threat, and I, you know, commend some of the technology companies for beginning to take that threat seriously, but obviously much more needs to be done.

In the end of the day, this is not a problem that any one part of the Federal Government or the private sector or civic society can solve on its own. We're going to have—much as we did in the last 18 years since 9/11, we're going to have to work together with those communities and enlist those partners in finding solutions.

Mr. RASKIN. The gentlelady's time is expired. Thank you very much. I go to Representative Green for his five minutes.

Mr. GREEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is obviously very poignant for me, for those of you who know about Chattanooga, and the terrorist attack that happened there. The young man was born, I believe, in America, and radicalized online, and then, you know, basically targeted our recruiting station and the Navy Reserve station killing six great American patriots.

This is, obviously, very important subject, but very near and dear to our heart, because it's happened in Tennessee. You mentioned, Ms. Belew, about understanding the scale of this, and I'd be interested to hear from you, and I know these are hard questions to answer, but, you know, this is just sort of my knee-jerk, well, how big is the problem? And I'd like for you, if you could, to comment both on white nationalism and on what struck Tennessee, which was Islamic terrorism. In the white supremacist groups, how many people are actually willing to do a terrorist attack? What's that percentage? And then what's the percentage that is okay with it if they do? Because that's kind of how we look at the Muslim terrorists. What is the percentage that would actually put a suicide vest on, and then what's the percentage who thinks that's okay, if you could comment on those four, I guess, scales?

Ms. BELEW. Sure. Well, first, I think it's helpful to think about what this movement is and how it works when we're thinking about its size. So in the period that I focused on in my research, we're talking—which is the 1980's, we're talking about a movement that's organized kind of in concentric circles. In the middle are what we would think of sort of as hard-core activists who, like, live

and breathe this movement. Those are the people who can, under the right circumstances, be pulled into a cell and then carry out violent action. That's only like 10,000 to 25,000 people. It's a very small group.

Outside of that, though, there's another 150,000 people. They do things like purchase newspapers, subscribe to the literature, come out for public rallies, stuff like that. And outside of that, there's another 450,000 people. They don't, themselves, buy the newspaper, but they regularly read the newspaper.

Then outside of that is the number that scholars don't have. That's the number of people who would never read a newspaper that says, you know, official newspaper of the Knights of the KKK, but who might agree with the ideas that are presented in it, especially if they come in through social relationships.

So that model of organizing does two really important things: First, it moves people from the mainstream into the center; meaning, into the more fringe, more violent capacity. It also pushes ideas from the center out. So when we're thinking about that aggregate number, we're talking about something that's as big as some fringe movements that are much better understood, like the John Birch society. Similar numbers, but John Birch, at no point, was, you know, carrying guns and attempting to overthrow the government.

Now, this question about the percentage that are violent and the percentage that are okay with it and the relative comparison with jihadism is a really interesting question. The thing is, we don't have the data. So one of the things that's really important to do is collect and aggregate that information. I can tell you that the historical archive shows that in the aftermath of the Oklahoma City bombing, which a lot of people, even in the white power movement, thought was an abhorrent act of violence, mostly because of the death of the white children there in the daycare center, even still, there was an increase in militia group membership and numbers in the immediate aftermath of that attack. Now that would signal to me as a historian that people were not decrying it at that moment, but actually were okay with that violence in some capacity, and many people were outright supportive in their own writings.

Mr. GREEN. Thank you. I yield the remainder of my time to Congressman Roy.

Mr. ROY. I thank my colleague from Tennessee and appreciate those comments, Dr. Belew.

Dr. Geltzer, I was intrigued by a few of your statements as well, and would like you, if you would not mind, to shed a little light on—you talk about focusing on the foreign terrorist organization. I think you answered the question to my colleague from Florida a little bit on this. Quickly, is there an organization that you would say there are adherents here in the states to organizations that are specifically calling for action and what that looks like? That's question one. Question two is, on your point about constitutionally protected statements and thoughts regardless of how hideous they are, and the difficulty that we have—so, it is a lot easier for us to go after organizations and entities, right, and I think that's what's be-

hind going after ISIS, Al-Qaeda, et cetera, and any of the affiliated organizations, and we're pretty good at that.

But in identifying lone wolves, regardless of whether you think it's a good idea to define a category of lone wolves, when we go after lone wolves, it's hard, right? We're not as good at figuring that out an adherent to an ideology, whether it's white supremacy or whether it's jihad or anything else, right? Finding the lone wolf out here that is clearly carrying out some of these horrible acts, can you just comment on that balance of constitutionally protected speech and how we can encourage law enforcement to go after bad guys regardless of their ideology, but how ideology feeds into that action? Sorry. I went too long.

Mr. GELTZER. Two hard but important questions. Let me take a stab at the first initially. When I think about white supremacist entities that might qualify as foreign terrorist organizations, the place that I actually look is the current national strategy for counterterrorism, which I think is a very strong document overall issued by the Trump administration last year, and it names two particular groups: a Scandinavian group called the Nordic Resistance Movement; a British group called the National Action Group. And it talks about them in the context of the transnational network of white supremacy we've been discussing here today, and it points to them as having links to Americans, including potentially threatening Americans.

Now, the criteria for foreign terrorist organization designation is particular, we could go through what it is. It seems to me that language in an official government document, at least, suggests that those two might qualify, and it's worth designating them if they do because then financial institutions create a blinking red light around assets to the extent anyone in America or anyone in law enforcement can get its hands on, is trying to provide material support to them. It allows prosecutors to have that tool in the tool kit.

So we'd know more, in other words, if we went down the road of designating only groups that actually qualify and then empowered those using financial and law enforcement tools to make use of that.

Quickly, if I may, on the idea of individuals, this is the hardest form of counterterrorism in any context, whether it's ISIS-inspired, white-supremacist-inspired. Those individuals, especially like an Omar Mateen, who seem to sit and stew in front of a computer and then act. That is why I turn to my earlier answer to the idea of ensuring the communities have a place to turn when they see something changing.

It also leads to law enforcement respecting speech, but also doing what it has done effectively in the context of jihadism, which is using informants and sting operations. They're sometimes controversial, but there are limiting principles in DOJ and FBI guidance for how they can be used and where it's appropriate to use them in this context. I do think that they have prevented attacks in that other context. I hope that's helpful.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you very much.

Mr. Rouda, you're recognized for five minutes.

Mr. ROUDA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you for convening this meeting.

It was just a few months ago that I was here at a committee meeting, and during a break, I had the opportunity to meet Sydney Walton, who's a hundred years old, a World War II vet, who fought with many other Americans to defeat Nazism, and many did not come back and paid the ultimate price to our country. And it's outlandish to think that we are here almost 75 years later from the defeat of Germany in World War II, fighting white supremacy once again.

And this is a bipartisan issue. It certainly should be a bipartisan issue, and I'm glad to see that it is. And it's not just white supremacy; it's extremism, period. We need to fight it on all fronts, but we have seen growth in white supremacy. There's approximately a thousand hate groups located in the United States, spurring out defamatory information, and unfortunately, a lot of that is affecting our kids.

In my district, in Orange County alone, we've had numerous incidents, from an African American student in my community who has periodically had watermelons thrown on the driveway, to a group of students having a party with a swastika made out of beer cups, to Nazi posters being posted at the schools, to graffiti on temples, to students that are doing goose-stepping and salutes while on school grounds and having it filmed and sharing it. So we know that the radicalization is happening. And I think the big concern we have for many of us is how the internet is playing into that process. In fact, The Daily Stormer has stated publicly that, quote, my site is mainly designed to target children, unquote.

Dr. Belew, can you describe how white supremacists are using the internet and social media to radicalize our children?

Ms. BELEW. Absolutely. So this is one of the interesting places where what seems very new to us in the current moment is actually something with deep historical roots. So this movement started getting online on the proto-internet in 1983, 1984, with a series of coded message boards called Liberty Net. Now, those message boards included the things that they needed for immediate race war, like assassination lists, infrastructure target lists, and ideological content, but it also included things like recipe exchanges and personal ads. So, effectively, this movement has been using social network activism to move people around and organize this for decades before Facebook. We are several—

Mr. ROUDA. And this is a movie we've seen before. It's the same thing that ISIS did as well, correct?

Ms. BELEW. Yes, absolutely. My only argument with that is that I don't think they took this from ISIS. I think they've been doing this since the early 1980's completely on their own.

Mr. ROUDA. But what's the answer to address it? How do we address the use of social media to stop the radicalization of our children?

Ms. BELEW. I think that's a really great question. I think that one of the things that would help is broadening the interagency conversation around this issue, because it occurs to me that the place where the conversations about social network content are happening is at the FTC. And I'm on fellowship at Silicon Valley this year, so I've been talking to a lot of the tech people. There's all kinds of algorithmic tools, language detection tools, and other

kinds of things we can do to get into those internet chat rooms and to look at the person who's by themselves in front of the computer.

But the stuff you're talking about is bigger than that, because when we're talking about the stuff like postering campuses, white student union, all of that is from the earlier playbook. And what we know from the history is that that kind of public-facing stuff that's targeting children has been matched historically by a big paramilitary underground that includes things like taking those children to paramilitary training camps, outfitting them with weapons, and that's how they turn people into soldiers for this movement. People in their teens are enormously recruitable, and I think it's absolutely an area of focus.

Mr. ROUDA. And, Dr. Geltzer, let me—thank you for your answer.

Dr. Geltzer, let me ask you, look, we know that some radicalization literally happens at home. And for some, though, many times the parents are—and family members are extremely surprised to find that their brother, their sister, their child, has been radicalized. Are there signs that we should be looking for? Are there ways that we can interject as parents or siblings to try and prevent the radicalization of a loved one?

Mr. GELTZER. I do think there's a broader role for digital literacy in our society that would at least be somewhat helpful with respect to this and, frankly, other problems that our Nation faces. There are other countries that have invested in this idea—Estonia, France is now catching up—in trying to ensure at an early age that young people, who inevitably are using digital devices already, have some sense of what not to believe, at least what to be skeptical of. Because the internet is never going to be a totally curated place. It's going to have some disinformation, misinformation, and even exhortations to violence.

But to empower, especially the youth, to at least be skeptical, to treat that skeptically and to take it from their digital experience to their parents, to their real-world connections and ask about it, and engage in a conversation, I think that's an important direction to go in.

Mr. ROUDA. Thank you. And I—

Ms. BELEW. May I add something?

Mr. RASKIN. The gentleman's time is expired, but you can answer the question if you want to say a word.

Ms. BELEW. Thank you.

I just wanted to add that another place that this dovetails, there's a conversation about general sort of—general mass attacks and the role of young teen boys particularly in being drawn into kind of mass shootings, partly through internet activity. Health and Human Services might consider doing something like giving grants to nonprofits like Life After Hate and the Free Radicals Project, which are staffed by people who have left the movement after their own radicalization and know firsthand how it works and how to reach people who are right now in these groups or who might be pulled in.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you.

Mr. ROUDA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you again for convening this meeting.

Mr. RASKIN. And thank you, Mr. Rouda.

I recognize the ranking member, Mr. Roy, for five minutes.

Mr. ROY. I thank the chairman very much.

One quick question for Dr. Geltzer or Dr. Belew. Do we have a number of people that we believe have been killed as a result of something that you could define as white nationalism or so forth, say, in 2019 or 2018? I've looked at the—you know, ADL's got some stats, like 50, or whatever. It depends on how you define it. Do you all have an answer for that, just quickly?

Mr. GELTZER. I don't have the exact number. I know some who keep these stats recently indicated, as I think the chairman mentioned, that post-9/11 the number in this category recently exceeded the number that we generally think of as in the jihadist category. But even those stats, the numbers are difficult. Certain motivations for attacks are difficult to categorize.

Mr. ROY. Yes. And that's, I think—I wanted to come back to you, Ms. Owens, about some of my concerns here in terms of perspectives. So we all share a desire to go fight that, right? But then perspective, in terms of what we're talking about, in terms of crimes, right, if we look at what's going on in Chicago right now, right, and, Ms. Owens, I wanted your perspective on this. I mean, some of the numbers are pretty astounding, right? I mean, we've had 300 and something murders in Chicago this year. The number varies and it changes literally by the day, sadly and tragically. And I'm looking at some data here—I don't know if it's a hundred percent accurate—that black victims of the murders are 291 murders in Chicago just this year alone. And you can go through, you know, different data points, black homicide victimization. I've got a stat here, 13 percent of the U.S. population, yet 51 percent of homicide victims.

Can you speak a little bit about that and about the reality of that and some of the policies that lead to that and your perspective on that element of crime?

Ms. OWENS. Certainly, which is why I wanted to bring that up, because presumably, if we're going to be having a hearing on white supremacy, we are assuming that the biggest victims of that would be minority Americans, and presumably this hearing would be to stop that and to make sure that we can preserve the lives of minority Americans, which—and based on the hierarchy of what's impacting minority Americans, if I had to make a list of 100 things, white nationalism would not make the list. And we don't see hearings on those bigger issues.

You brought up the inner city communities, which is a huge issue, black-on-black crime, the breakdown of family, I think, is the No. 1 thing that's contributing to that, and we never hear anybody talking about what happens when you remove a father from the home. In fact, I would argue that right now, we have a social environment that is hostile toward men and does not inspire masculinity or being a man and what it means to be a father figure in a household. Black Americans are definitely suffering from the breakdown of the family.

And when I say that liberal policies inspire that, what I mean to say is that via the welfare system, we are quite literally seeing the incentivization of bad behavior. When you know that your fam-

ily gets more money—as a single mother, you will get more money if you don't marry the father of your children, you're not going to marry the father of your children. I've seen this firsthand.

And black-on-black crime is a huge issue in America right now, but people don't like to talk about that. It seems, well, let's talk about the smaller issues and not the big issues that are facing black America. We saw this same sort of a narrative in 2016 when police brutality became at the forefront of the discussion. And if you were paying attention to politicians, you would have thought that if you were a black American, you couldn't walk outside without being shot by a police officer, when, in fact, you had a higher chance of being struck by lightning as a black American in 2016 than being shot unarmed by a police officer.

The truth is that leftists and Democrats don't want to see these issues fixed in black America because then they can't stump on those issues. You know, we see this rhetoric every four years, ahead of an election cycle, get drummed up. We heard—Chairman Raskin in his opening statement mentioned the Trump administration is doing nothing, and that really is the nucleus of what we're seeing here today. We are trying to see—we're seeing an attack on an administration, an attack on conservatism ideals ahead of an election cycle. There's no real effort to fix the issues that are in black America, the things that are hurting minority America because, believe me, they don't want those issues to be fixed.

Mr. ROY. Ms. Owens, you said that this issue that we're talking about here today, which we all agree obviously is an important issue, to root out crime and root out criminal organizations and activities and figure out how to target criminals, bad actors, et cetera. You said it wouldn't make the top 100 of the things that you're concerned about as a black American, concerned about black communities in America. What would? You can't rattle off all 100, but in the time I've got—

Ms. OWENS. Father absence, the education system, and the staggering abortion rate, as well as illegal immigration, which, you know, the United States Commission of Civil Rights, when they were actually doing work in 2008, came out with a report and told the truth, which is that illegal immigration harms black Americans first and foremost. We are the ones that are meant to compete with illegals for jobs, and they are flooding our communities with crime and violence. Black American men between the ages of 18 and 22 are harmed by illegal immigration, but just saying that perspective is considered racist, and it's not.

Mr. RASKIN. The gentleman's time is expired. Thank you very much.

And I recognize the gentlelady from the Second District of Illinois, Ms. Kelly.

Ms. KELLY. Before I ask my questions, I have to—my mic's on. Before I ask my questions, I just have to make a comment about where I represent, Chicago. And there are many reasons why there is gun violence. So we do need to invest more, you know, in various communities, but the other reason is because we don't have the laws that we need. Chicago, as people like to say, oh, they have strong gun laws, but most of our guns don't come from the Chicago—from Chicago. It's because of the lack of national trafficking

laws, straw purchasing, we can't even get a background law passed. So I just want to clear the record there. There are many—

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you, Ms. Kelly. Will you just speak directly in your microphone? We seem to be having some kind of sound difficulty. If you would.

Ms. KELLY. Okay. Now to my questions.

Mr. RASKIN. Apparently that one is sort of dysfunctional. So if you could talk into Mr. Rouda's. And thank you, we'll account for the time, yes.

Ms. KELLY. Do I need to repeat what I just said or just go to my questions?

Mr. RASKIN. If you want to just restate the point that you were making about gun violence generally so we can all hear it.

Ms. KELLY. Yes, just that we've—I've been here going into my seventh year, and it's been very difficult to get any legislation passed about gun violence. And, yes, Chicago has strong laws, but no one else around us does. The majority of our crime guns come from Indiana and Wisconsin. And until we pass some national laws to deal with this, there are going to be those issues. And, yes, we do need to invest in the communities. There's not one reason, you know, why it happens, but I have to make that clear, and that we are having hearings, finally, about gun violence, about maternal mortality, and on and on and on. So we are doing those things now.

So to my questions. Ms. Mulligan, what concerns do you have about white supremacists, extremism, in the ranks of law enforcement and intelligent communities? And I will add that I come from a law enforcement family, so nothing against law enforcement.

Ms. MULLIGAN. So it's clear that the threat of violent white supremacy is not limited to those who are outside of our law enforcement and national security communities. You mentioned, you know, law enforcement and police departments. I think another place where we see signs of radicalization that are troubling is actually in our Active Duty and returning members of the military. And I think one of the things that makes it, you know, that makes it quite difficult to address is that those are the people who are supposed to be making—you know, keeping us safe. And we should have absolutely no tolerance for those types of ideologies in law enforcement, in the intelligence community, in any part of the Federal Government, to include the military.

And I do believe that most of those types of employment situations have rules and regulations that prohibit it. The question is whether they're being adequately enforced. And I think that more should be done in that arena.

Ms. KELLY. Thank you. I ask just because of the Plain View Project that we heard so much, you know, on the news about. Which agencies specifically have a role to play in helping address this problem, and what should they be doing? Ms. Mulligan, Dr. Belew?

Ms. MULLIGAN. Yes. Thank you for the question. There's actually quite a lot that many departments and agencies can do, but I actually will start with the White House. The National Security Council staff should actively implement last year's National Strategy for Counterterrorism, which Dr. Geltzer earlier mentioned. It identifies

domestic forms of violent extremism as terrorist threats, and in driving department and agency action, it really ought to have the leading role.

Some of the other departments and agencies that have a role to play include the Department of Justice, the Department of Homeland Security. Unfortunately, DHS, notwithstanding the strategy that apparently is being released today, has recently decreased funding and resourcing for this problem.

The FBI, obviously, has a very large role to play, as does the U.S. intelligence community, particularly where the transnational threats are involved. The National Counterterrorism Center, as we previously mentioned, can and should do more within existing authority, and there are questions that ought to be explored about whether more is necessary there as well. But even the Department of State has a role to play.

Thank you.

Ms. KELLY. And, Dr. Belew, in your research, did you find any links between white supremacist groups or ideologies and individuals serving in official law enforcement roles?

Ms. BELEW. So I don't have the archive to talk about law enforcement, but one thing that did come up is that if you track the surges in clan activity, it's a group that has big ebbs and flows over time. It always aligns with the aftermath of warfare. And let me be really clear about this. I'm not saying that that means the clan is made of veterans or that veterans are, you know, more likely to anything related to this. We're talking about a tiny, tiny, tiny, tiny percentage of returning vets and Active Duty troops. But what we do find is that this movement is misusing those servicemembers in order to augment its violent capacity against civilians.

I study things like, one of these groups obtained tons—literal tons—of stolen military weapons and material from the Army post at Ft. Bragg. They carried out paramilitary training camps all around the country using the expertise of Active Duty troops. And after 1983, participation in this movement is fundamentally opposed to the oath of induction, because you cannot be serving to protect the United States from enemies foreign and domestic at the same time that you are trying to overthrow it. It's a fundamental problem within the services, and the DOD absolutely needs to be part of monitoring and reporting this activity. I think its reporting efforts probably are either miscounting or misreporting what's happening.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you.

Ms. KELLY. Thank you.

Mr. RASKIN. The gentlelady's time is expired.

I recognize our friend from Louisiana, Mr. Higgins, and I think votes may be called after that.

Mr. Higgins.

Mr. HIGGINS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thank the panelists for appearing before us today.

We all condemn any form of supremacy, white supremacy, all forms of domestic terrorism, and hate crimes. I was born in 1961, seventh of eight children. I was in the second grade, public school, when our school was integrated. I am a 58-year-old product of the American generation that has struggled to transcend racism in

America. I believe in our country. I wear a band upon my wrist that says "redemption." It doesn't say perfection. Redemption is a journey, not a destination. All of us are on that journey, and I believe that our Nation is on that journey. I believe that our Lord created this in his own image. On a spiritual level, we are one, and yet as a Nation, we've largely rejected traditional American values: family unity, discipline, and prayer.

As a street cop for many years, prior to becoming a Congressman, I dealt with white supremacists on the street level. I dealt with black supremacists on the street level. I dealt with racism and bigotry in every conceivable manifestation. It was a common thread amongst those children of God that I interacted with. They were broken inside. They were broken inside. This is what we must address. America suffers a generational deterioration of spirit. Only by courageous interaction, by discarding extremist reaction to extremist action, by embracing humility and honest, candid communication can America heal itself.

Ms. Owens, I'll be speaking at the NAACP annual state convention in Louisiana one week from tomorrow. Could be argued that I'm a quite unlikely keynote speaker at that gathering, but I shall deliver a candid and unscripted message from my heart and from bended knee, as an American that recognizes that our Nation has suffered a failure of spirit, that our Nation is on a journey.

I would ask you, madam, in my remaining time, what message would you hope to hear me deliver to my brothers and sisters in Louisiana one week from tomorrow, an address which I believe should be reflective of our effort as a Nation, to bridge the divides that falsely separate us, to embrace the fact that we're created in God's own image? What message would you have me share, good lady, and I shall listen?

Ms. OWENS. That's a beautiful question. I would say if I was in that audience, what I would want to hear is just a message of hope. I think that what's been taken away from black America is our sense of pride. We've allowed rhetoric and policies to tether us to the government. And I love that you opened your statement talking about God and the family, because those are the things that we used to value first and foremost in the black American community, and as government grew in the 1960's, all of that was pretty much taken away from us.

I would remind them to consider who is really the author—who are really the authors in society today of trying to separate us as a society. I personally believe it's the media. I believe it's when somebody sitting in—a Congress Member sits down and perpetuates the lie that our President said there were good people on both sides without mentioning that he said, and I'm not talking about white nationalists. It's important for black America to begin thinking rationally and not emotionally and to no longer allow ourselves to be used and abused and lied to by a party and policies that have not served us for the last six decades.

And I would ask you to ask the one question, what do they have to lose, and I think the answer is nothing.

Mr. HIGGINS. Thank you for your counsel, ma'am. I shall take it to my heart.

Ms. Mulligan, Dr. Belew, Dr. Geltzer, thank you for appearing today.

Mr. Chairman, thank you for allowing me to speak. I yield back.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you, Mr. Higgins, and please be sure to share your address with us after you give it.

We're going to call a recess, subject to the call of the chair. We will return immediately after final floor votes are called, and that should be in about 45 minutes. I know that Mr. Hice is here for his questioning, as the ranking member of the National Security Subcommittee, and I know that Mr. Lynch is coming back and wants to question everyone. And there are several other members who will be joining us then. So everybody stay tuned, and the committee will now stand in recess.

[Recess.]

Mr. RASKIN. All right. The subcommittees' hearing will come to order and resume.

It is my pleasure to recognize Chairman Lynch for five minutes.

Mr. LYNCH. Thank you again, Mr. Chairman. And let me apologize again for the other committee activity that's been going on at the same time.

So I was elected on September 11, 2001. The day of the attacks, I was elected in a special election in a Democratic primary in Massachusetts. And I remember how the whole of government was refocused on a response to those attacks, both offshore and here at home. We created the National Counterterrorism Center to improve the fusion and analysis of terrorist-related intelligence among our 16 intelligence agencies, to better connect the dots, to prevent future terrorist attacks.

I know, Dr. Geltzer, you discussed the NCTC, the National Counterterrorism Center, during your opening remarks. Did you, in fact, work with the NCTC prior with your work on the National Security Council?

Mr. GELTZER. I did, Mr. Chairman. I got to work with NCTC quite a bit.

Mr. LYNCH. Now, just to flesh that out a little bit, the National Counterterrorism Center is outward facing, is it not, partly because of the response of that day and our activities thereafter? Is it suited and structured to deal with white nationalism, white supremacist terrorism?

Mr. GELTZER. I think there's room to get much more of NCTC's help in this aspect of—

Mr. LYNCH. How would we do that? You know, I know that many of our privacy folks get very nervous, as do I, when we—when we retarget domestic activity because, you know, the American people, we have an obligation to make sure privacy rights are protected. And this surveillance sort of and intervention protocol makes a lot of people nervous in that regard. And I was hoping that you might be able to help us approach this with existing resources and structures so we're not expanding, you know, the rights of law enforcement or counterterrorism agencies to actually, you know, spy on the citizens of the United States.

Mr. GELTZER. Yes, Mr. Chairman, so that's part of why I think this framing that this hearing has adopted of emphasizing the transnational nature of today's violent white supremacist threat is

particularly helpful. Because the statutory language on NCTC's mandate is not crystal clear, but it's generally been understood to focus them or perhaps overwhelmingly direct NCTC toward international terrorism. But what you've heard today from me, from fellow panelists, is that this actually is a form of international terrorism. And that would seem to, within existing statutory authorities, activate NCTC and allow it to play the role in this area that I saw firsthand it play when it came to jihadism.

That role included everything from very big picture strategic analyses, looking at trends and trajectories of ISIS, Al-Qaeda, Al Shabaab, where they were headed, what their new online recruitment tactics were, to more granular issues, such as fusing intelligence across the community about particular threats, which informed policymakers as they deliberated about how to respond to those threats. And if this is the transnational threat that it seems to be, that seems to invite NCTC's participation in understanding it and addressing it.

Mr. LYNCH. Would we have to prove that nexus is there? Because many of these individual actors have no organizational connection, but they have an ideological connection.

Mr. GELTZER. It is difficult, and I believe that intelligence community lawyers should be cautious, for many of the reasons you indicated before. They are one piece of the structure of safeguards to protect Americans and others against an overreach on the part of our intelligence community. If those lawyers being cautious feel that the current statutory language does restrict them from looking at least at key aspects of the picture we're talking about today, then I think there would be a valid basis for considering getting NCTC, through statutory amendment, into the game on even domestic terrorism. And to be clear, that's no new collection authorities.

Mr. LYNCH. Right.

Mr. GELTZER. That's no new ability to surveil. It's instead about NCTC being able to take what is already collected under existing authorities and analyze it in the way NCTC has done, to my mind, quite effectively since 9/11 for other types of terrorist threats.

Mr. LYNCH. Very good. So it's a matter of deploying resources as opposed to seeking new powers?

Mr. GELTZER. I think that's right.

Mr. LYNCH. Yes. Dr. Belew, would you like to add anything to that?

Ms. BELEW. I think I would just underscore that, the fact that leaderless resistance is a mode of organizing that appears not to have connections within it, it is still a mode of organizing. It's not that there is not an organizational connection between these actors; it's that we have to recalibrate and understand how it works, much like the intelligence community did around jihadism.

So I think the correction that needs to happen is within our own thinking and speaking about this to recognize that as strategic. It's deliberate on the part of the movement to obfuscate what they're doing and to make it really difficult to prosecute and surveil.

Mr. LYNCH. Yes. We see that on Achan.

Ms. BELEW. Yes.

Mr. LYNCH. Ms. Mulligan?

Ms. MULLIGAN. So what I would add to what my colleagues have already contributed is that our law enforcement—our existing law enforcement tools really aren't well situated to investigate groups. They typically are individualized crimes that are being investigated. And so the value add of bringing the authorities that NCTC has to bear on this problem—and to be clear, there's a lot that can be done within their existing statutory framework. What they can bring to bear is the group dimension, the potential links to state sponsors, and a better ability to engage with our foreign partners about the trends and dynamics and statistics that they're seeing in their own countries.

Mr. LYNCH. I see. Is that happening now, Dr. Geltzer, in terms of, you know, the cross-pollination among local agencies? I know we have the Joint Terrorism Task Force and that does some of that, but is that happening generally?

Mr. GELTZER. I think we've built structures for it, but I think those structures have, since 9/11, overwhelmingly been directed toward other forms of violent extremism, in particular jihadism. And to activate that with respect to this form of a threat, obviously a threat that's growing and concerns us all, I think that's an important recalibration of our resources and our priority.

Also, to pick up on Ms. Mulligan's point, in terms of NCTC's director engaging with foreign counterparts, which is a critical part of that job, those conversations, as I understand it from people who've held that role, have really been about jihadism, because that's what NCTC has been focused on. If this becomes part of what NCTC analyzes and helps us all to understand, it then allows the person in that very, very important role to have meaningful conversations with foreign partners about this violent white supremacist threat.

Mr. LYNCH. Very good. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, I notice my time is expired. I yield back.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you very much, Mr. Lynch.

Congresswoman Eleanor Holmes Norton from the District of Columbia is recognized now for five minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I really thank you for your focus on this set of hearings.

As we have seen the frightening rise of white supremacy in a way we had, many of us, particularly from the civil rights movement, thought we would never again see in our country. You look at the Charlottesville rally, the Proud Boys rally in Portland, and you see people openly proclaiming white supremacist ideas. So your hearing is very well placed.

First, I'd like to know—perhaps Dr. Belew can answer this question—we look at existing counterterrorism strategies and have to wonder whether they take into account the rise of white supremacy in—as we see white supremacy further penetrating the American consciousness of some in our country. Doctor—I guess it is really Dr. Geltzer who I should direct this question to. How does the fact that white supremacy is so much more mainstream—if I can use that word. I don't want the American public to think we think that they have bought into this, but I'll use that—more mainstream at least than Islamic jihadism, how does that change the way we think about it in national security terms?

Mr. GELTZER. Thank you for the question, Congresswoman. I think the emergence of white supremacy, as you say, not at all as a mainstream view, but instead as something of increasing significance as a threat, and a national security threat, I think that needs to get reflected in the strategies that ultimately guide resources and priorities for the counterterrorism pieces of the U.S. Government.

Ms. NORTON. Do you see it reflected yet?

Mr. GELTZER. Probably insufficiently, but my hope is that we're moving and that we will—accelerate moving in a better direction. So going back to last year's National Strategy for Counterterrorism, there was at least explicit reference to it. And I give the administration strategy credit for including that acknowledgment—

Ms. NORTON. Last year's what? I'm sorry.

Mr. GELTZER. Last year's National Strategy for Counterterrorism.

Ms. NORTON. Yes.

Mr. GELTZER. Now, today, as I believe the chairman mentioned earlier, today, the Department of Homeland Security is anticipated to release its own strategy implementing, showing how that Department in particular will implement that broader whole-of-government strategy. And my understanding is that the Department of Homeland Security will be explicit about this nature of the threat, and I think that's an important step forward to do so, because 9/11 drove home, it was obvious after 9/11, the importance of acting against jihadism. Here we need something that drives that home not just to the American people, but also to the parts of government that answer to those strategy documents.

Ms. NORTON. I'm looking at law enforcement and counterterrorism agencies to see what they, in particular, are doing in white communities. For example, law enforcement agencies have often relied heavily on communities of color to police themselves and identify people who were exhibiting signs of potential extremism.

Dr. Geltzer, are law enforcement and counterterrorism agencies doing the same thing with white communities, calling on them to identify supremacists—white supremacist threats in their neighborhoods? Should they be doing so? Should we be doing more, relying on our own people, who we know don't generally embrace these extreme ideologies?

Mr. GELTZER. My basic answer is that, for whatever form of politically motivated violence, activating communities to be a source of help, a source of identifying the problem, that's important. That's critical. Because as I mentioned earlier, it's often someone in the community who sees at least some change. It's not obvious to them necessarily that the change is one pointing toward terrorism or some other form of violence, but they see some change in the sort of individuals whom we would probably describe here as going down a path of radicalization, potentially toward violent extremism.

And when I was in government, I remember community awareness briefings, CABs, that were offered by a couple of different departments and agencies, quite deliberately talked about different forms of violent extremism, so that there was no sense that any

one community was being picked on or that any one type of violence was the only kind the government cared about. Obviously, if you're a victim or family member of a victim, you don't care which political ideology motivates the attack that takes a life; you care about that awful consequence. And I think that should drive the government's response.

Ms. NORTON. Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairman, directing our national security efforts toward white extremism of this kind before it gets completely out of hand is very important. That's why this hearing is so important to us.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you very much, Representative Norton.

I turn now to Mr. Welch from Vermont for five minutes.

Mr. WELCH. Thank you.

Couple of questions. I want to ask Dr. Belew whether violent white supremacists, in your view, act purely out of individual hate or do they view themselves as carrying out a strategy of a larger social or ideological movement?

Ms. BELEW. So acts of mass violence in the white power movement are not imagined as the end point of this ideology. They're supposed to awaken other activists to join the movement and to carry out similar actions. So something like—we can see this in something like the Oklahoma City bombing, in which a white power activist carried out that activity not just to kill the people in the Federal building, although that's one of the outcomes of that action, but also it's meant to inspire others, and it did. People are hanging McVeigh's picture in their homes. They're talking about him online as a hero of the movement, and they're using that as a model for future violent activism.

Similarly, the manifestos that we're seeing in this most recent spate of attacks have inside of them things like tactical instructions for future gunmen about target selection, ammunition selection.

Mr. WELCH. So that stuff is on the internet?

Ms. BELEW. Oh, yes. This is all on the internet.

Mr. WELCH. Do we have some copies of that? I'd love to see that.

Mr. RASKIN. We can get that, yes.

Mr. WELCH. Continue.

Ms. BELEW. Sure. I think the other thing I would say is that it's important to remember that the key thing people often are missing about this ideology is the critical piece of information about how a tiny fringe movement of people thinks they possibly can do what they've set out to do—

Mr. WELCH. Right.

Ms. BELEW [continuing]. which is overthrow the U.S. Government, the most militarized super state in world history, right? And in order to understand that, we really have to take seriously this—the thing that answers that imaginative question is this dystopian novel from the late 1970's called "The Turner Diaries." You'll see it talked about a lot, because it's more than just a novel. It sort of becomes this cultural lodestar of the movement because it fills in this imaginative gap and explains how these actors think they could possibly accomplish this.

It lays out a series of steps, the first being guerrilla warfare and sabotage and mass attacks, like Oklahoma City or El Paso or

Charleston. But it escalates into seizing a white homeland and eventually overthrowing the United States and annihilating people of color around the world. So it's profoundly violent.

Mr. WELCH. So it's really important to put this—to acknowledge that these acts are not just acts of hate; they're political acts intended to have a political effect—

Ms. BELEW. Yes.

Mr. WELCH [continuing]. that will be magnified. So—

Ms. BELEW. Yes. And as I think one of your witnesses said in an earlier hearing, hate crimes and domestic terror are not mutually exclusive, but not every hate crime is an act of domestic terror. What we're talking about today is domestic terror.

Mr. WELCH. So how—what's an approach to deal with that? I mean, if it's an ideology, people believe what they believe, and it's generally very difficult to persuade someone who is ideologically committed to whatever it is they're committed to, that, quote, they're wrong.

Ms. BELEW. I think that's right, but I think we do have some organizations who are doing the very, very difficult kind of frontline work of reaching people in these groups and helping them leave the movement. So creating a grants program to fund those organizations would be enormously helpful to ratcheting down some of that activity and recruitment power in the short term.

Mr. WELCH. How? Just explain how that would work. I mean, if I had—let's say we had a program that wanted to address this, how would we do outreach to people that we need to talk to?

Ms. BELEW. Oh, I think you fund existing nonprofits that are already doing this, like Life After Hate and the Free Radicals Project, which are manned by people who used to be violent white power activists and who get more call volume than they can handle of people who are trying to leave this movement. It's very difficult to get out once you're in.

I think the other thing that's worth exploring is the public racial reconciliation process, which the United States has never undertaken in any major scale, but smaller ones, around actions like the 1979 Greensboro shooting, which was a neo-Nazi and clan massacre of leftist demonstrators, after which the gunmen were acquitted on State and Federal trial. Things like that truth in reconciliation process have really created opportunities for local communities to reach these people and have dialogs that can lead people out of this way of thinking.

Mr. WELCH. Okay. Thank you very much. I'm sorry I don't have time for more questions, but I really appreciate the panel.

I yield back.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you very much.

And we did have a witness in a prior hearing from Life After Hate who testified also about the budget cuts that they had experienced from the administration.

I come now to the gentlelady from Massachusetts, Ms. Pressley. She's recognized for five minutes.

Ms. PRESSLEY. There is concern—thank you, Mr. Chair.

There is concern amongst the civil rights community, that any new counterism authorities or resources could be used against vulnerable groups when defining violent white supremacy as inter-

national terrorism. We saw evidence of this in the aftermath of 9/11 when there was an overreach by U.S. counterterrorism and law enforcement agencies against Arab Americans, American Muslims, and South Asian Americans.

Ms. Mulligan, are civil rights leaders and communities of color right to be concerned about providing additional authorities to U.S. national security agencies?

Ms. MULLIGAN. They are right to be concerned. And I think those concern—oh, sorry to repeat myself. They are right to be concerned. And I think that we can and should listen to those communities in developing the solutions to the problem that we're seeing today, not only because those communities disproportionately suffer from violence at the hands of white supremacists, but also because, as you've mentioned, they have lived experiences with government counterterrorism efforts and have perspectives on what has and has not worked.

One of the reasons that, in my testimony today, I don't call for an expansion of authorities is for the reasons that you suggest, but the other reason is because there's quite a lot that we can do within the existing national security framework and set of authorities to improve our response to this problem. And we can do that in ways that don't involve increasing surveillance, adding to watch lists, or leveraging intelligence and information against Americans.

Ms. PRESSLEY. And that does not violate civil rights and civil liberties?

Ms. MULLIGAN. Absolutely.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Okay. In August, we learned from a leaked 2018 FBI document that the FBI considered BIE, black identity extremists, to be as high a priority as white supremacy extremists, this despite the fact that white supremacy extremists were responsible for 39 murders in 2018, while BIEs, black identity extremists, were responsible for approximately zero that same year.

Dr. Geltzer, do you agree with that FBI assessment?

Mr. GELTZER. I want FBI assessments to reflect reality and to reflect threats, and I don't know what drove that one, but I do think it's—there's a reason that having aggregate numbers like that shared with, for example, Congress, is important, because it allows Congress, in its important oversight function, to look at whether the work that the Bureau is doing actually reflects deaths that are being caused, attacks that are succeeding, or even attacks that are being attempted. That strikes me as not intruding on the prerogative of law enforcement to, in any particular investigation, do their job, but it does allow folks who sit in this body to check in the aggregate whether resources are being appropriately allocated. And it seems, in fact, that those numbers have caused questions to be asked, like the one you're asking today.

So that strikes me as important in facilitating oversight that law enforcement at that level needs.

Ms. PRESSLEY. And so further expounding upon that, Ms. Mulligan, given that the FBI's priorities, and again because of that aggregate data, are proven to be sort of seriously askew in alignment with what the actual threat is, what should Congress do to ensure that other counterterrorism agencies do not similarly and unjustly target minority communities?

Ms. MULLIGAN. Well, I think first and foremost, the strategies that are being developed, like the one that we're told is coming out today from the Department of Homeland Security, needs to identify violent white supremacy as the current serious domestic threat that it is. Part of what I think that Congress should also do is call on the Director of National Intelligence to increase the priority of violent white supremacists as a threat in the national intelligence priorities framework.

I think, in the end, what we're going to have to do is get better data to better document what is happening to stop undercounting the extent to which these crimes are being committed. And to do that, I think the FBI is going to have to get better than it currently is at enforcing its own regulations about how these things are counted.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Very good. And then, you know, for those that—for protesters, so, for example, after the J20 protests during Trump's inauguration, more than 200 people were arrested, even though the vast majority of those charges were dropped due to a lack of evidence. The civil rights community is also concerned about other progressive groups being the target of law enforcement overreach.

So, Dr. Geltzer, what protections can we put in place to make sure that efforts to counter white supremacist terrorists are directed at the right groups and are not unjustly expanded?

Mr. GELTZER. It's a critical question you ask, and it applies regardless of what authorities, of course, law enforcement might be invoking, whether it's existing terrorism laws, new terrorism laws, hate crime statute. Whatever the statute, I don't want to see, and I don't think colleagues I used to work with at the Justice Department want to see that abused or exploited to intrude on political advocacy that's protected. I think that's where you have internal checks within these entities, not only guidelines in place, like the DIOG that guides the FBI's work, but you have internal actors, like inspectors general. You then have the role of Congress, again at the aggregate level, not in particular investigations, but at the aggregate level, providing a check. And there might be a role for entities like the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board, an independent agency within the executive branch, to look at use of counterterrorism authorities to provide additional check and oversight.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. RASKIN. The gentlelady's time is expired. Thank you very much.

And the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. Jordan, is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. JORDAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I just want to thank our witnesses for being here today, especially Ms. Owens for coming. I apologize I couldn't be here for some of the earlier parts of the hearing. I had an amendment on the floor that we were managing. But I did walk in a few minutes ago, and Mr. Meadows and I were visiting in the back room, and noticed that, Ms. Owens, you hadn't spoke for a while. So if there's something you'd like to add to the discussion over the last few minutes, I'd be happy to yield my four minutes to you and let you comment.

But thank you again for your outstanding testimony, for being here as our witness today.

Ms. OWENS. Thank you for that. I appreciate that. I was just commenting back stage—I mean, back behind the chambers, that it is quite ironic that I'm the only black American that's sitting here, and yet the people that called this hearing haven't asked me a single question about my experience. I think that probably points to what I say the larger issue is, is that Democrats come up with the problems, they come up with the solutions, and black Americans are basically used as props for them to get out their narrative, and to ultimately control our vote using fear tactics.

I also found it quite hilarious that when asked for actual numbers, nobody here could actually provide them, because it's not actually a problem in America or a major problem or a threat that's facing black America. This is, again, just election rhetoric. This is, again, just attempt to assault an administration that is doing all that they can to help black America in every single regard, whether it's criminal justice reform, whether it's talking about real issues like school choice, which should be implemented to conquer some of these illiteracy rates that are actually harming the black community.

And I think it's unfortunate that we have this many hearings on something that is so small in America, and we aren't having real hearings. I actually don't think the Democrats have completed a single day of real work since Donald J. Trump went into office. This has just been about attacking his administration day in and day out with things that do not matter.

I am hopeful that we will come to a point where we actually have hearings about things that matter in America, things that are a threat to America, like illegal immigration, which is a threat to black America, like socialism, which is a threat to every single American, and I hope that we see that day. It's definitely not going to be today.

Fortunately, we have Republicans that are fighting every single day, day in and day out, and I will wrap this up by saying what I said at the beginning of my testimony, which is that for all of the Democrat colleagues that are hoping that this is going to work, and that we're going to have a fearful black America at the polls, if you're paying attention to the stuff that I'm paying attention to, the conversation is cracking. People are getting tired of this rhetoric. We're tired that we're being told by you guys to hate people based on the color of their skin or to be fearful. We want results. We want policies. We're tired of rhetoric.

And the numbers show that white supremacy and white nationalism is not a problem that is harming black America. Let's start talking about putting fathers back in the home. Let's start talking about God and religion and shrinking government, because government has destroyed black American homes, and every single one of you know that, and I think many people should feel ashamed for what we have done and what Congress has turned in to. It's Days of Our Lives in here, and it's embarrassing.

Mr. JORDAN. I thank the lady for her comments and Ms. Owens, thank you for being here today as our witness.

And with that, I would yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RASKIN. I thank the gentleman. Has everyone gone here, Mr. Meadows? Okay. Well, I definitely want to take a few more minutes and anyone else who has closing thoughts or questions. I'm going to invite them to do it. Obviously, I resist the suggestion that our hearing is something that doesn't matter, and that it's somehow a distraction from truly important business. The title of our hearing is "Confronting Violent White Supremacy, Addressing the Transnational Terrorist Threat." Let me just quickly ask the other witnesses to respond. Would you say that this is something that does not matter? I know that you are all professional experts on the subject and have devoted your careers to it. How do you respond to the idea that this is something that doesn't matter compared to God and religion, for example, which were offered? Dr. Geltzer?

Mr. GELTZER. Well, as somebody who once had counterterrorism in my title, I obviously think that any form of violence extremism matters, and part of what makes terrorism so distinctive is that whatever the numbers might be about those killed in particular attacks, obviously tragic for those people, but terrorism has an outside effect, it transcends those numbers. It leads to political backlash at times. It divides communities. It polarizes. That's why many of us who work on terrorism and counterterrorism think that it can't be reduced to the numbers killed. Those are acts of tragedy in and of themselves. But it's that idea that taking whatever your view of political goals and pursuing it through violence, that's disruptive to society as we know it, and that's why I think it's an important conversation we're having.

Mr. RASKIN. Well, thank you for that point. I mean, I suppose someone could look at the casualties that our Nation experienced at 9/11, and say that was smaller than the total number of people killed in gun violence or in drunk driving that year, but that doesn't capture the political, the social, the emotional, the interpersonal reality of an act of terrorism. Dr. Belew, what is your response to the idea that it's something that doesn't really matter?

Ms. BELEW. Well, we have a history of treating it like it doesn't matter, and the result of that has been death and destruction, and the disruption of all kinds of peoples' lives. I suppose I would point to kind of two historical examples to understand this a little bit better. One is this idea that it's hilarious, my co-panelist says that there are no numbers; that their numbers show, she says, that this is not a problem, and she points out that none of us give the numbers.

I'd like to talk for a minute about why we don't have the numbers, if I may. From the outset, surveillance in the United States has been a profoundly political project, so we can go all the way back to the 1960's and think about how things like the FBI counterintelligence program were unequally targeted. COINTELPRO, people in this room might know, was a project that sought to disrupt fringe activism on both the left and the right. But we know from the history that it was profoundly more focused on the left and on activists of color than on the right. So Klan groups were infiltrated, but there were no deaths of Klan activists in this period at the hands of FBI informants. Nor was there a cohesive effort to disrupt those groups the way that there was on the left.

Similarly, our resources have been overwhelmingly dedicated to confronting Islamic or international terror rather than white or domestic terror. The reason we don't have these numbers is because there hasn't been an aggregating data project within the Federal Government. The watchdogs that have been in charge of aggregating this data have had their own motivations and their own reasons for using different kinds of data collection practices.

I just have to say that I object strenuously to the use of your word "hilarious." To me, this feels a lot like your reaction to being named in one of these manifestos. Now, you're, of course, not responsible for the words of somebody writing that document, but I do think that laughing at it is a real problem, because these are real families that are impacted by this violence, and I think our efforts toward talking about this have to start from a place of mutual respect, which is what I've heard from this side of the table. Now the reason we don't have those numbers, I want those numbers as much as you do, but the number—to say the numbers don't show something is simply not supported by the data.

Mr. RASKIN. Okay. And I have 38 seconds left. Ms. Mulligan, if you can—if you want to respond within that time.

Ms. MULLIGAN. The only thing I would add is that it's in the name, terrorism, domestic terrorism. It terrorizes us. It terrorizes us in our homes, it terrorizes us in our schools, and to the points made by the other panelists, it is disproportionate to its impact on any individual life, and it's not—

Mr. RASKIN. You reject the idea it's something that doesn't matter or doesn't really matter?

Ms. MULLIGAN. Absolutely reject.

Mr. RASKIN. Okay. So here's where we are, every member now has had five minutes—

Mr. MEADOWS. I'll go ahead and claim my five minutes.

Mr. RASKIN. Okay. So we have two members who have not. So I'm going to go to the two members who have not yet and we'll give an opportunity for a closing thought to any member who wants before we go.

Mr. JORDAN. Am I next to respond or is Mr. Meadows?

Mr. RASKIN. I thought Mr. Meadows. Mr. Meadows is next, then Mr. Clay, then to you Mr. Jordan.

Mr. MEADOWS. Ms. Owens, obviously this is a gang-up on you, you know. We're giving these witnesses the ability to do a rebuttal on you, and so, you know, I find it unfair, Ms. Belew. I mean, candidly, for you to show mutual respect and then you to go after Ms. Owens is not appropriate. So Ms. Owens, you can have four minutes and 34 seconds to respond however you want.

Mr. JORDAN. Will the gentleman yield for a second?

Mr. MEADOWS. I'll yield.

Mr. JORDAN. Thank you. I believe, Ms. Owens, when you used the word "hilarious," it was referencing the fact that no one had asked you a question; it wasn't to the subject matter of the hearing. Is that right?

Ms. OWENS. That is correct.

Mr. JORDAN. And to have another witness insinuate something that is not accurate is just not appropriate, Mr. Chairman, for how witnesses are supposed to behave in front of this committee. I also

think you didn't say it doesn't matter about the subject matter of today's hearing. You said there are other subjects that matter as well, and maybe we should spend some time on those. Is that accurate?

Ms. OWENS. That is correct, and they matter much, much, much, much more, and I have said that. I said that in my opening and I will say it again. You know that white supremacy and white nationalism is nowhere near—ranks nowhere near the top of the issues that are facing black America, and the reason that you are bringing them up in this room is because it is an attempt to make the election all about race as the Democrats—

Mr. RASKIN. Not in my case, Ms. Owens.

Ms. OWENS. Please don't cut me off.

Mr. RASKIN. Please do not characterize my motives.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Chairman, it's my time.

Mr. RASKIN. You got your time, Mr. Meadows. I'll give you three more seconds.

Ms. OWENS. Every four years, you bring up race and you knew exactly what I meant when I said hilarious, and you just tried to do live what the media does all the time to Republicans, to our President, and to conservatives, which is you try to manipulate what I said to fit your narrative. Okay? I was not referring to the subject matter that is hilarious. I said it's hilarious that we are sitting in this room today, and I've got two doctors and a Mrs. and nobody can give us real numbers that we can respond to so we can assess how big of a threat this is, because you know that it is not as big of a threat as you are trying to make it out to be so you can manipulate.

And the audacity of you to bring up the Christchurch shooting manifesto and make it seem as if I laughed at people that were slaughtered by a homicidal maniac is, in my opinion, absolutely despicable, and I think that we should be above that. To try to assign reality or any meaning to a homicidal maniac writing a manifesto, which, by the way, let the record show also stated Spyro the Dragon, the child's cartoon, as a source of inspiration. He also cited Nelson Mandela as a source of information. I don't think that Nelson Mandela has inspired mosque shootings. You can correct me if you think I'm wrong.

You would rather assign meaning to a homicidal maniac than to actually address what I said—the things that I said today that are actually harming black America. No. 1, father absence. No. 2, the education system and the illiteracy rate. Illegal immigration ranks high, abortion ranks high. White supremacy and white nationalism, if I had to make a list again of 100 things, would not be on it.

This hearing, in my opinion, is a farce, and it is ironic that you're sitting here and you're having three Caucasian people testify and tell you what their expertise are. Do I know what my expertise are? Black in America. I've been black in America my whole life, all 30 years, and I can tell you that you guys have done the exact same thing every four years ahead of an election cycle and it needs to stop.

Mr. MEADOWS. I'll yield back.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you, Mr. Meadows. And now we go to Mr. Clay for five minutes.

Mr. CLAY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I have no questions for Ms. Owens, but I will ask the other witnesses who may be able to shed some light on this. Two months after the terrorist attack in Christchurch, which was live-streamed on Facebook for a full 17 minutes, New Zealand Prime Minister Jacinda Ardern, and French President Emmanuel Macron brought together heads of state and leaders from the private sector to adopt the Christchurch call.

The Christchurch call is a commitment by governments and technology companies to eliminate terrorist and violent extremist content online. It outlines collective voluntary commitments from governments and online service providers to prevent the abuse of the internet as occurred during and after the Christchurch attacks. Some of these commitments include government enforcement of applicable laws that prohibit the production or dissemination of terrorist and violent extremist content, and industry commitments to take transparent specific measure to prevent the upload of terrorist and violent extremist content onto social media platforms and to prevent its dissemination.

Australia, Canada, European Commission, France, Germany, Indonesia, India, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, Senegal, Spain, the United Kingdom, Amazon, Facebook, Google, Microsoft, Twitter, YouTube, Daily Motion, and Quant all signed on to the agreement. The United States did not. In a statement, the White House declared: While the United States is not currently in a position to join the endorsement, we continue to support the overall goals reflected in the call.

Dr. Geltzer, what message do you think it sends to white supremacists and the world that the United States would not sign on to the Christchurch agreement?

Mr. GELTZER. I think that was disappointing, Congressman Clay. I would urge the United States to take another look at that, especially with upcoming in New York at the U.N. General Assembly, upcoming conversations among the countries that did sign it. I think that would make for an excellent opportunity to show the United States' own commitment to that agreement.

In fairness, our country has a different Constitution. We do have a First Amendment, but by my read of that call, the keyword that you used, Congressman Clay, of voluntary interaction strikes me as falling on the constitutional side of what the government would be signing up to do, to urge, inform, but not demand of tech companies that certain content be taken down. That strikes me as within the realm that protects constitutional rights that I take very seriously. But at the same time, would show a commitment to addressing this issue.

Mr. CLAY. Thank you for that response. Ms. Mulligan, is there more that the United States as well as the private sector can do to prevent the internet from being an incubator for extremist content?

Ms. MULLIGAN. Thank you for the question, Mr. Clay. I think there's a lot more that the government can do, and as for the private sector, I both think that there's more that they can do, and I'm also a bit reticent to think that they are best positioned to

make the kinds of policy decisions and tradeoffs that need to be made. On the Federal Government side, I think that there's more that the Department of Justice, Homeland Security, the intelligence community, and the National Counterterrorism Center can do, and I would call on the National Security Council staff to actively implement last year's national strategy for counterterrorism, which identifies domestic terrorism as a major threat.

Mr. CLAY. Do you think the Christchurch call sufficiently protects First Amendment rights?

Ms. MULLIGAN. I agree with the comments that were made by my co-panelist, Dr. Geltzer, that there's an important tension there, and we ought to be mindful of it. I think whatever we do in the encountering violent white supremacy or any type of threat needs to be mindful of our Constitution and our First Amendment, but there is an important difference between the types of ideas that lead to violence, and the types of ideas that we're comfortable with people holding.

Mr. CLAY. Thank you for your responses.

And I yield back.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you, Mr. Clay. I want to thank all of our witnesses for coming and participating in an incredibly substantive and effective elucidation of the problem of the transnational terror threat. We learned a lot. This is going to be very useful to the deliberations of the committee, and it was a lively discussion, and I want to thank all of our guests who came with us and we are going to adjourn at this point. You have—there will be five days within which members can request followup questions from you. Is there anything else? And the meeting is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 12:14 p.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]

