



DANIEL MORGAN GRADUATE SCHOOL  
*of*  
NATIONAL SECURITY

*presents*

“Inside Jihad: How Radical Islam Works, Why  
It Should Terrify Us, How to Defeat It”

*Dr. Tawfik Hamid*

*Islamic thinker, reformer, and  
one-time Islamic extremist from Egypt*

Our war with the Islamic radicals is not about how to exist together. Our war is about who will exist. I'll give an example, if you and I would like to move forward at the speed of 100 kilometers per hour and another wants a speed of 200 kilometers per hour, there is common ground to move forward, there is a common ground, a common solution—we can move forward at 150 kilometers per hour. But, if one wants to move forward, and another wants to move backward, then it is either you or me. And that is the situation with radical Islam. We cannot live with it, it is either we destroy it or it will destroy us.

Let me start with the topic of the classification of Islamic culture. Putting some parameters to understand any topic is crucial to helping us understand. I see the Islamic culture as five circles, the first group of Muslims are "culture Muslims"—they believe in Muhammad, *fatwah*, and they don't know much about theology or religion, or fanaticism. They are just 'okay' in terms of religion.

Next, you have 'ritual Muslims'—they care about doing the rituals; five prayers, the *haj*, the fasting, and they don't care about *Sharia* or stoning people to death or amputations or implementing slavery again, they just want to do the five pillars of Islam.

The third group is called 'theological Muslims'—who study theology and want to implement *Sharia* without using force. They can do this gradually via demography, increasing in numbers, until they reach a certain threshold in certain societies, like what's happening in Europe, for example. In a few years, their numbers can reach a level that influences and affects politics. We can start to see civil frictions. These people don't use violence at the theological level, but because they want to implement *Sharia* rules within the local society, this can start civil frictions within any civilized nation.

Then we have what we can call 'radical Muslims'—people who want to use violence to enforce you upon their belief system. They commonly use tactics where you are not allowed to drink alcohol and you must wear the hijab, for example. This kind of using force and violence was used to implement your value

---

*This article has been adapted from his book Inside Jihad: How Radical Islam Works; Why It Should Terrify Us; How to Defeat It, (Mountain Lake Press, 2015) and remarks delivered at the Daniel Morgan Graduate School as part of the 2016 National Security Lecture Series on February 3, 2016.*

system on others. Then you have the terrorists or suicide bombers, and I typically even examine these wide circles.

Imagine if we have a party tonight and we are inviting someone called Mohammed and Fatima to the party. If Mohammed and Fatima celebrated everything, drinking some wine, danced, and just enjoyed like anyone else—likely they are cultural Muslims. If Mohammed or Fatima said, “Excuse me, I am going to pray for five minutes” and will come back to enjoy everything, typically it’s a ritual Muslim. If Mohammed said, “How come you invite me when there is wine here? I am so offended” and he left with anger, then he is a theological Muslim. If Mohammed took the bottle of wine and destroyed it, then he is a radical Muslim. If he exploded the whole area, then ‘up there’ he would realize he was a radical Muslim.

This is the seed of radical Islam and I try to classify it because, understanding these points, helps us understand society moving towards the center or the periphery and allow us to evaluate the systems we are using to fight radical Islam. Is it increasing? Is it decreasing? Which part of the society is going more in, or more out?

After that, we will discuss the phenomena of radical Islam at three different levels. I see it initially at the macroscopic level. I’m a medical professor, forgive me, I’ve used many medical terminologies. The macroscopic level, the big picture level, and then I will go to a smaller level, the microscopic level, and explore the specific groups. Then I will explore the individual and what happens to an individual within radical Islam.

At the macroscopic level, the level of society, let us study together what are the factors that brought Islamic societies toward the same turn. What happened? What went wrong? I remember one of my meetings with Professor Bernard Lewis in Washington, and the first question he said, “Tell me what went wrong?” He wanted to hear it from me. I told him that I see it, the phenomena, at three simple, basic steps. I visualize what happened in our societies. Years ago, the Muslim world, as it was, was known to be a relatively tolerant religion. There was not much friction within these societies. You never hear that seventy or eighty years ago, that Muslims in Iraq, Syria, or Egypt would go to burn churches or burn someone who is just a Christian.

So what went wrong? What happened in these few decades? First thing to understand, was, if we look geographically at this part of the Muslim world, called Hijaz—or now Saudi Arabia, there was a form of Islam that is extremely intolerant to the other, to the existence of the other. In Saudi Arabia, they don’t have churches. The concept does not exist. You don’t have Saudi Christians. You don’t have art or music. I mean, women cannot contribute to the society, they are suppressed completely. Stoning of women, slavery, everything here was a literal understanding of the religion. The culture created some form of understanding of the religion—some people refer to this as Wahhabism. The culture was rooted far before Wahhabism in this part of the world.

In this part, north of Africa, Syria, and Iraq, there was another form of Islam that I can say was relatively tolerant. I cannot say it was absolutely tolerant, because non-Muslims lived as second class citizens for years here. However, it was relatively tolerant compared to this form of Islam, here. The second type of Islam was influenced by Sufism and was influenced by Judeo-Christian cultures that existed and for several reasons it allowed churches and synagogues. So, it was a form of Islam that allowed the existence of the other. So what happened in the last few decades since the late 1970’s when the oil prices started to rise after the Cold War? The oil went from twelve dollars a barrel to forty-two or forty-four barrels.

This created what huge amount of money is now in the hands of these Arab countries, or the *Hijazi* or *Wahhabi* Islam. Since then, we started to say, in this part of the world, that “Allah has blessed the Saudis

with oil, money, wealth because they implement this kind of Islam.” It is because they stone women and have them wearing the *hijab*. So we started to ask about *Sharia*, thinking that this is what will bring us blessing...I’m glad to say nowadays its different because there are many examples of *Sharia* that are failing; like ISIS, Somalia, and Taliban. Back then, Saudi Arabia was a model for the success of the Islamic model in front of us. So what happened? It simply was a replacement because of the ‘paid through Islam’ dollars; it was a replacement of our relatively moderate understanding of the religion that allowed the existence of the other interpretation that does not allow the existence of the other. This gradually infiltrated our societies. Then, in Egypt, we did the worst thing ever. We changed the radical groups and scholars. I was young. They changed the level of *jihad*. *Jihad*, according to *Sharia* law, Wahhabism, and traditional, mainstream is essentially to declare war against non-Muslims. The objective is to defend yourself or to spread your religion after offering the opponent one of three options; to convert to Islam, pay humiliating taxes, or you will be killed. These are the three options ISIS is implementing today. They did not invent these values. This is what is being told in the mainstream Islam, today.

What happened to the concept of *jihad*? It has become the declaration of war against other nations. This was the level of *jihad* that one, like I as a young Muslim, was supposed to join. The movement was supposed to declare war on the Roman Empire. So what happened in the late 1970’s was the following; we changed the level of *jihad* from a nation responsibility to an individual responsibility. So, instead of me waiting for the war on Islam to join together, I will take the responsibility on my shoulders to attack you in person. This is the root cause of what you see today in the form of suicide bombings.

This change can be seen from a nation level, to a group level ( Hamas, and others), to an individual level of *jihad* yields the belief that people can go to paradise for martyrdom. This was a crucial thing that happened, based on certain theologies, seen in verses that say things like “fight for the cause of Allah and be responsible for yourself.” It changed jihad, not from peaceful to violent, but from a violent principle to a barbaric one.” *Jihad* and *Sharia* are composed of violent principles and do not have to wait for traditional warfare to occur between nations.

This was the first step at the macroscopic level, the second step changing the level of *jihad* to extend it to an individual level, then the spread of the phenomena throughout the world by way of the wonderful immigration policies of the West. Also, with the internet now, the ideology that was once dormant and localized has spread globally.

These are the three fundamental steps that led to where we are now with Islam; the faith of Islam, the change of the level of jihad, the spread of the phenomena. After that, let us talk about the brainwashing tactics when you go inside a radical group. I’ll tell you personally what happened to me in my personal experience. The first day I was going to pray in a mosque and I was invited by them to join, and they were very excited to be accompanied. They took me to the mosque of the radical mosque.

He said, “Tawfik, the lesson you need to learn is to not think like an infidel.” He said, “your brain is just like a donkey,” and it’s insulting, but he wanted to convey a message that the “donkey can help you reach the palace of the King.” Once you’re into it or at the door of the “palace,” do you bring the brain inside or leave it outside? The very first step of their strategy was the suppression of my own critical thinking. They use different tactics to suppress critical thinking. They asked us to stand in a strange way, shoulder to shoulder. They asked that the feet must touch the feet of other people, and this was very awkward, because I had to stand like a duck, my heels were outward. The Imam, the leader of the mosque, made us do this for twenty minutes. I was surprised why this was. I’ve prayed in many mosques and they never did this. The Imam’s rationale was that “God loves all” and that “we should all be cemented together as one.”

Really they hate you because of freedom. It is the sole aspect of freedom that they loathe about the west. Some examples are the fact women have rights and freedom (in the West). Because it is opposite of ours (the West), they hate us. You want the freedom of religion, we want restriction. We want to implement slavery, you ended slavery. Therefore, you are the enemy and are infidels. They utilize prayer itself to brainwash you. They use hellfire in a way that makes you frightened. They use verses that will frighten you to no end, saying that their skins will be cooked and barbecued and their skins will be replaced with new skins, be tortured. They'll iterate that an impending doom will meet you if you do not abide. You become willing to do anything to avoid this possibility. The metaphor of "French fries" was used, where if you didn't obey, you will become a French fry for the rest of your life.

Their intention is not here, not in this life, but the next life, the second life. Muslim Brotherhood group and other groups tried to convince people that the solution is in Islam, and that all troubles would be alleviated if Islamic *Sharia* was implemented, including what you see from ISIS.

The sex deprivation syndrome played a crucial role. It was very difficult to marry in these societies. It is strongly prohibited to have any extra-marital relationship. There's an inability to marry for 10-15 years until you build yourself financially, then you can't even touch the hand of a woman. Most Islamic scholars prohibited any physiological release of sexual desires. So you have extreme suppression on one hand, and on the other hand, you say you have virgins waiting in paradise. It is as if it is pornography in writing, it is really what is in the big Islamic texts.

All this level of suppression and fantasies and this concept of having sex in paradise are what comprise the sexual deprivation. You become captivated by this concept. It is not just imagination but the reality they are told. There is evidence supporting this. The majority of suicide bombers are males, and this makes sense with the sexual deprivation. It cannot just be coincidence. The difference between *Shia* and *Sunni* Islam is the rate of suicide bombing.

The *Shia* and the *Sunni* major difference is marriage can last for one hour of enjoyment. The *Shia* allows marriage for one hour of enjoyment. Sunnis do not allow this at all. Young *Sunni* are suicide bombers because young *Shia* people have some way of sexual release, but the Sunnis do not. The phenomenon can be analyzed because of this fact. It is clear that the Sunnis have many more suicide bombers compared to the Shias. It doesn't mean that *Shia* will never have suicide bombers, but this dynamic is clear and ordered.

Then, we'll go to the individual level. Why do people join? Remember we talked about the three steps, the group and brainwashing tactics, and then at the individual level. Why do people join? What are the psychodynamics that change a human being from an innocent being to a barbaric being?

How could someone like me, who had a father who was a communist and Marxist, while my mother was a liberal, French teacher, be subjected to the dynamic of radical Islam? It makes one wonder. Many if not most, believe they are serving the religion by joining *Al-Qaeda* or ISIS. Poverty plays a role in the initial step of why people join some groups. But I will explain in more details the relationship between poverty and terrorism. Many people think poverty leads to terrorism. The reality could be the other way around, that terrorism actually damages the quality of civil nations, and makes tourism and industrial interests go down, and this aggravates poverty. This is ultimately used by terrorists to bring about more recruits.

These people sometimes feel that the only thing that can give them privilege or advantages in an Islamic society is by joining an Islamic radical group. It gives them a feeling of super unity that they have been longing for and dreaming to have. Some people join the groups to combat this feeling of inferiority in their groups because they gain high respect once they become religious.

Political factors play some role in recruitment tactics, occasionally, but are not that strong. Also the desire for revenge plays a part, like the black widows in Russia. The Black Widows wanted revenge from what the Russian soldiers did to them. They want revenge so they join a radical group to exact revenge on their enemies. Sex plays a role as well, because, also the ability to have sexual relationships attracts recruits by helping them get marriage and helping them get relationships without much cost—because marriage is very costly in the Middle East, generally speaking.

There are several factors that play the role, but serving Islam is the most fundamental motive. Think about all the motives. If the dream and the motive of the opponent is not something materialistic, it is very hard to negotiate. If their dream is to die as a jihadi and martyr, and enter paradise, then how can one negotiate with them? One of their dreams, too, is to bring pain to the infidels. When Osama Bin Laden released a video after 9/11, he was laughing. Did he gain any territory, materials, or money out of 9/11? No, he gained nothing but the fact of bringing pain to infidels. Suicide bombing gains nothing as an action. They gain nothing. So what do they gain? Their motive is not simply materialistic or negotiable. Their motive is to die as a jihadi.

To give you pain, just giving you pain, is the motive. They justify this through certain parameters. They use certain verses, like a verse that they craft to state “cause pain to the infidels that have gone against *Allah*”, using theological reasoning for everything they do. A feel of victory for Islam, just giving you pain and seeing the Towers collapse, gives them the feeling of victory over infidels. They cannot survive without the strong feeling of victory. All that collapsed of the Turkish Empire immediately after their defeat, the Muslim world started to leave and create their own sect of religion and politics. You have a phenomena here that needs to be understood, because, in the Cold War for example, you have the Russians who wanted to leave, and they have certain motives about wanting to leave, in the Nazis, people wanted to leave, so you had negotiations on the table lending the opportunity for someone to surrender.

But if your dream is bound by all non-materialistic aspects that are theologically bound, it presents an entirely different dynamic and story. You’re dealing with someone who wants to die and not live. The psychodynamics of the phenomenon, what happened in the case of a normal human being becoming terrorists, suicide bombers? I’ll tell you personally—it happened to me, as a normal child whose only desires were to listen to music, run behind butterflies, play soccer and chess, a very ordinary child. Yet, I became radicalized. So, one must ask, “how can this happen? How are they brought to that level?”

Initially, the very first step to bring you to that level, if you want to change someone to make them a killer, the first thing is to make one hate the other group, religion, or individual. Number one, you must convince someone to hate another. Otherwise, why would I be convinced to do anything against the individual? The second thing is, if I move one step toward the process, the human conscience will question what I’m doing. Therefore, you need to teach one how to suppress the human conscience. Then, if I move forward to kill the guy, at the last moment my head may shake at the thought of violence, so you need to desensitize the subject to the use of violence. This kind of sequential thought and process is what drives radicalizing a subject. First thing and most importantly, they make you hate the other religion. Why join? The hatred for your opposition is key to the radicals’ mission. What motives drive the radicals’ behavior? The suppression of the human conscience helps carry out their motive. What are the psychodynamics of the motives? A kind of desensitization to the use of violence is key to the success of the radicals’ plan.

Then, let us talk about the aggravating factors that make things worse and more dangerous. For any phenomena, it is vital to understand the aggravating factors. In medicine, if someone's diabetes is increasing you may be thinking he's gaining weight so obesity is making insulin not work properly or

medication is impeding the insulin action, or he might have an infection. There are several possibilities so it's important to know how it can be treated. The same applies to the phenomena of radical Islam.

The aggravating factors I see are: weakness, concessions, justifications, passive terrorism, theological deception, political correctness, incorrect analysis, inefficient solutions, underestimating hijab, and a lack of distinct parameters.

One of them is weakness. If you remember after the attack of Kenya and Tanzania, on the American embassies by the Al-Qaeda, I'm sure many of you remember how the response was very weak. It was a failed attempt to get Bin Laden and did not even succeed. It was, in view of many, very weak. This gave them the feeling that the United States was weak and it eventually encouraged them to commit 9/11. The weak characteristics of the United States helped bring about 9/11. If you don't use antibiotics, your body will be depleted against a virus, but when you do, you have ample strength for a response that will combat the virus. Because the Kenya and Tanzania response was ineffective, it helped bring about 9/11 because there was a weak response.

Next, concessions, what is meant by concessions? It is not what most in the West consider to be a concession. For example, if you remember the cartoons of the prophet Muhammad, the Danish cartoons, they were published on September 30, 2005. In a four month period, the reaction to the Danish cartoons was a very peaceful reaction. It was all just reactions, peaceful talks, polite complaints via social media, etc. So what happened? The Magazine eventually apologized on January 31, 2006. Within 48 hours, violence erupted all over the world. The apology was supposed to be seen in a positive way, but was actually seen as a concession. The concession was interpreted in their mind as weakness and lent itself to the idea to attack these people more—that they will show more concessions if we attack them here. Only within 48 hours of the apology, the violent action erupted. This can tell by itself the story and the way radical Islamists think. They didn't see the West in a positive way but used it as a reason to attack the West.

Also, justifications contribute to the radicals' and their mission. After 9/11, many people said it is all about poverty, the lack of education, lack of democracy, and the Arab-Israeli conflict. If these social and economic factors were the true cause of the problem, why did they not affect people who live under these same social, political, and economic circumstances? If poverty was the cause of the problem, why wouldn't poverty in Brazil or South America create suicide bombers? The justifications give the Middle East a free pass in creating and using radical Islam as a popular activity. The justifications create false understandings for why radical Islam and suicide bombers are prevalent in Muslim society.

There are many poor nations and many poor people who do not resort to suicide bombing, therefore it cannot be that much of a driving force. When you analyze a lack of education, you can look at Al-Zawahiri and other very bright people who became terrorists. These educated individuals are not influenced by a lack of education, but could be seen as using their advanced educations to propagate the doctrine of radical Islam even further. A lack of democracy, for example what happened in France with the shootings, is it really the cause of what happened? We have to be realistic in our analysis. I will never forget when I spoke in Michigan one day, and there was people from all kinds of groups and faiths—Muslims, Jews and Christians alike. When I began to speak about this topic, an Imam leader who was from Syria / Iran, interrupted me and said, "Dr. Hamid, why do you mention these radical things when I, a moderate Imam, have many Jewish friends and am not radical," and I said, "Look Imam, instead of telling me and the audience of how radical you aren't are, can you prove to us that the justifications do not

contribute to the conception of radical Islam?" Instead of telling us how moderate you are, I want you to stand in front of the congregation and say it clearly and unambiguously that "Jews are not monkeys." Would you do this Imam? And he did not say a word.

The issue is that it is so easy to claim one "as a moderate." Okay, you are a moderate, prove it. If you are not ready to denounce radical elements, then do not tell me you are a moderate. If you are not ready to put information on your website and say it clearly, that, you are against killing apostates, stoning women, slavery, calling Jews pigs and monkeys, etc. If you are not ready to stand against this value system, then do not expect me to call you a moderate. These justifications can go forever and provide an excuse for anti-moderate behavior.

Terrorism does actually cause poverty, conversely. Poverty aggravates terrorism because it facilitates recruitment, but it is not the primary factor. The more terrorism that occurs, the more poverty eventually ensues. If you eliminate terrorism, you can end the cycle and there will be less poverty. Without taking care of the causes of the problem, can really be just a waste. Imagine if Afghanistan and Iraq didn't have terrorism, there would be a lot less poverty and social issues.

Passive Terrorism acts as psychological support for the active terrorists. There have been no demonstrations against Bin Laden, jihadists, or ISIS. In turn, this gives the radical groups even more power and belief that their doctrine can overcome competing ideologies and beliefs. The deceptive fatwas are also part of passive terrorism because they can deter Muslims from following a more benevolent form of Islam. The fatwas issued instead propel Muslims to engage in radical behavior. Passive Terrorism manifests itself through these means; no demonstrations, denial of Bin Laden's involvement, and deceptive fatwas. All of these give psychological support to terrorists so that they can do more attacks. There is a lack of action within the Muslim world of people acting out against radical Islam. The passive people give more power to terrorists within radical groups. It is a process that must be cultivated correctly.

Theological Deceptions after September 11, also many mosques and Imams, showed the Westerners' interpretation of *Hadith* about *jihad*. There are levels to the *Hadith*. They will say that jihad is all about a peaceful phenomenon. The common understanding is a violent one, however. They choose *Hadith* to show the Westerners how they misunderstand *jihad* and that *Hadith* is all peaceful. If *jihad* was truly all peaceful, why have we not seen organizations speak out against it? If jihad was so peaceful, we would have found one or a couple organizations called 'jihad' explicitly that are peaceful groups. This is not the case; all the people that associate themselves with jihad are, in fact, violent. The current way of understanding jihad is only through its display of violence.

Political correctness annoys me as a doctor, because if someone comes to me with a question about cancer, I don't want to hurt someone's feelings—would you consider me an honest person? Would you consider me proficient? This is the problem when you're dealing with the security of nations. There is no chance for sugarcoating, you have to be honest and realistic, telling reality as it is. You lie to them about cancer and tell them that it may be something else, if it is cancer—it's cancer. If it is the ideology, then it is the ideology, but if it is not, then it is not. It is as clear as day. You cannot go starting the process by assuming that, "Oh, that cannot be the religion or ideology." In this sense, it is important to be honest and realistic about it. Political correctness can cause delusion about identifying radical Islam. Radical Islam must be identified as radical Islam. If every piece of evidence points to the ideology, then you must recognize the ideology.

Tolerance is another aggravating aspect. My wife once said, it is not correct that America is a tolerant society; America has become a beacon for freedom and liberty because it was intolerant. I asked her, how can this happen? “Had Americans been tolerant of slavery, slavery would still exist in America today.” Had America been tolerant of the discrimination against women, the discrimination against women would still exist today. They were not tolerant. These things disappeared because America was intolerant. That is the reality. Think about the history, your great history. The change was so significant, but it is a slow process, nothing is ever achieved that quickly. You must consider the great history of America and this attitude of intolerance of evils and inequalities.

Political decisions, some of them contribute, like the June 30 Revolution, as an aggravating factor of radical Islam. These politically motivated decisions and this delay has resulted in proliferation of terrorism in the Sinai area and peninsula. Many of them went to ISIS and to Syria. Part of it was a political decision to delay sending certain weapons to fight radicals in Sinai, to the Egyptian army. I’m not talking here as an Egyptian but observing, these are facts with solid ground. Some political decisions really aggravate the phenomena unintentionally, because here, the radicals started to govern in Sinai and started to struggle, and there was a real need for Apache helicopters to fight them. The delay in sending this limited the ability of the government to fight the radicals. Hence, the whole problem escalated in the area.

Another factor that contributes to the aggravation is “Incorrect Analysis.” Let me tell you, this is my example here, I like this example, but don’t get me wrong—this is a very real example. A lot of people say that a majority of Muslims are peaceful people, and that the ideology cannot be a piece of the problem, the ideology must not have any relation with this problem of (radicalization). There is a medical fact that a majority of cigarette smokers do not develop lung cancer, but this does not negate the fact that the cause of that lung cancer is smoking. Likewise, the fact that a majority of Muslims do not develop terrorism does not negate the fact it is the Islamist ideology that is the main cause of terrorism. I hope to make that clear. The fact cannot be negated that the Islamist ideology is a main cause of terrorism. So incorrect analysis, the analysis itself is defective. Many people built an assumption that because a majority of Muslims are peaceful, that the ideology cannot have a role in terrorism and radical efforts, this is simply irrational and illogical.

Insufficient solutions: recently, we have mainly relied on a military approach to fight terrorism. Our focus has been involved with the military. But if you think outside the box, momentarily, the sickness of polio was defeated, not because we tried to cure the sick ones, but by dealing with the normal people. By working at the level of the normal people and preventing the spread of the infection. Here, with radical Islam we must impede its growth and development. We can impede and weaken and eradicate the whole phenomena itself. It is the polio approach. Sometimes you have to use force, but you have to also include working at the periphery of the circle. Working on normal people and applying peripheral tactics that help prevent terrorism. It is just like polio, not by working on just those that are already sick, but by working at the level of normal people to prevent the spread by vaccination and promoting movements against terrorism and radicalization.

The *hijab* phenomenon plays a crucial role in aggravating the phenomena of radical Islam. The *hijab*, first of all, I have to be honest, I used to use it as an excuse to talk to women. I have to be honest. I used to convince them of how I felt about the *hijab* wearing, my wife used to wear the *hijab*. According to Sharia, the *hijab* is a dress code that expressed some form of supremacy. Slave girls were beaten if they dared to not wear that, because they are emulating the free women. This *hijab*, it is a dress code that encourages supremacy. If you think of human history, supremacy has caused many evils like Hitler and the holocaust. The feel of supremacy itself is a contributing factor to the phenomenon. It creates a form of hatred for



nations that do not wear the *hijab*. They look at the West and women deemed free and they start to judge them incorrectly. If their neighbor does not wear the *hijab*, they will see them as an evil and bad person because they simply do not wear the *hijab*. Many of the people do not think about this in a positive way. They will still see you as evil. Not only that, the *hijab* creates a feeling of the “*umma*” which simply means, a woman will “have more relation” than someone wearing a Hijab elsewhere (in another country). The *umma* is stronger than their nation country itself, this is problematic. The feeling of *umma* has been connected with the *hijab* for many nations and increases a kind of nationalistic pride of Islam. Once there is hatred towards the other individual or group, they have created a distinction that they are separate and different. I have to hate them because they don’t wear the *hijab*. This goes gradually in the mind of a culture and group, creating a situation that allows radical Islam to grow and spread.

Gamal Abdel Nasser, the former President of Egypt, was saying that the Muslim Brotherhood asked him to enforce one thing—and that was to wear the *hijab*. Because the Muslim Brotherhood tried years and years ago, and failed, because they didn’t focus on the Hijab. They didn’t create a system that changes everything and creates a distinction between a Muslim and a non-Muslim. It is the beginning of friction and beginning of hatred. In the past however, how can you have said who was a Muslim and a non-Muslim? You wouldn’t have been able to, we were all more the same back then.

There are a lack of parameters for radical Islam. Some of the characteristics include apostate killings, beating women and stoning them to death for adultery, calling Jews “pigs and monkeys”, and declaring war on non-Muslims to spread Islam after offering non-Muslims the three options; subjugating their lives to Islam, pay a humiliating tax, or be killed.

Now let us talk about solutions. Fighting terrorism begins in the “Brainstan”. Through the brain, through the mind. You need a mental impulse, you need the nerve to move your muscle, and then you need a weapon to use. There are people who should take care, I believe, of the final part that deals with the brain. The final step of terrorism is only the symptom of the disease, it's not the disease itself. The disease is hatred, radicalism, the disease is a desire to inflict harm upon others. So, talking about fighting terrorism in Brainstan can go into five basic categories.

The input of information that human beings receive; in their education, development of thinking and processes. Then, the processing of information in his brain. You may have people who have the same book in their hands, one of them becomes radicalized and one does not. What are the factors that can cause this? There are levels in the brain that can affect a person's interpretation that will determine whether or not they're radicalized. There are psychological influences that influence a person, the hatred toward people or groups affects them. Then, you need behavioral modifiers, like positive and negative reinforcement--like when a child touches something hot, they feel pain. The ability to appreciate beauty is the last component, and I will later explain how this relates to terrorism.

I remember one day, I was very young, and I was reversing the *Qur'an*. I was reading a verse that read “kill the infidels, wherever you find them.” I just couldn't take it. Believe me. I wondered how people, like my Christian neighbor, who would view this sort of dialogue. My conscience could not take it. So, I went to a friend of mine, a Salafist—a regressive way of thinking of Islam—and I said to him, “what do you think of this verse? About killing infidels.” And he said to me, “yes we have to fight them and there is this thing called *jihad* that explains how it works.” He filled my brain with literature and books that still left me unconfident about the verse.

So I later went to see this other guy, who was a sophist, and I asked him to explain it to me. I said that I didn't know what to do after reading this verse. He patted me on the shoulder and said, "My son, just love every human being and be good with every human being, and the Lord will be happy with you." I said to him, but it is written in the *Qur'an*. He said to me, "In the day of judgment, only then will you be able to understand the *Qur'an*." I have to tell you honestly, I was not that patient or ready to wait for the Day of Judgment to understand the *Qur'an*. I wanted it now. I summarize a problem for many Muslims; they have no defense against this violent verse and how to exactly interpret it.

What is the common theme of the actions of those people, and this connotation of infidels, back then? Is discrimination against a small religious minority because they believed in something different from them? What can we learn today? What we can learn is to not discriminate against any religious minority. Otherwise, we will be exactly like jihadists who call others "infidels." To understand the meaning, there are two to three ways. I must not discriminate against non-Muslims or I will be just like a jihadist. It is the level of interpretation.

I cannot deny that there is a problem with the Qur'anic text. I cannot deny. But there are different ways of thinking and interpretation that makes things different. The processing of information, you probably have noticed, many people become radical in different parts of the world. Radicalism can develop partially because of the process of thinking. If you have an ideology that teaches you the violence, then it resonates more. The way it can play a major role is through absolutism. You are convinced of a black and white senses, that you are either an infidel or you are with me. When I hate someone because I judge someone, first step, judging and hating them, and the last step is becoming very literal in your way of thinking, literalism, and it can be especially destructive with religious ideology.

So, I use certain tactics that are not theologically dependent, but theologically independent. It is cognitively psychology based. This is one example I use. For example, people fight over the reality of a photo. One person says that it is an older lady, another person states that it is a young man. Ultimately, when you look at it as it is, it is the same as it is presented--ambiguous. This teaches you how putting yourself in another's shoes makes you see things completely different. Both I and he can be right, but it is just different ways of looking at a certain thing, at the same moment.

I used this analogy when I spoke to other students, as well. We all looked at the photos and then compared the photos. My photo will be completely different from the next person's photo. Does this mean I am wrong? That he is wrong? That she is wrong? Our differences can be a positive energy if we put them beside one another. We would see things more clearly and from angles we had not seen before. We can use our differences in a positive manner and create positive structure.

How about that if we realize that a guy at point A, who is at 100, is moving backwards, and the guy at zero who is trying to move forward. Who is better? It teaches you how to stop being judgmental, because you don't know all the facts. I'll never forget my father, who was an orthopedic surgeon. One day, he had a very high panic in the health system as a doctor and manager, and some guy went to his office and asked "Are you Dr. Abdel Hamid?" My father said yes. The man swore bad words against him and not only that, he swore against Abdul Nassar (Muslim Brotherhood). My father got really angry and punished him with a one-month decline in his salary. Three months later, the guy came back with uremia and the metabolites of the kidney failure affected his way of thinking and made him become angry against my father, saying terrible things. My father's lesson was to not judge people, but judge actions. The action was wrong in principle. But still, do not be judgmental. He is one example I always give.

The most effective way of educating someone is not by giving them the answer but making someone think critically. In regard to being literal, I show someone 'water' and ask, is drinking this water *Halal* (permissible) or *Haram* (not permissible)? They will say, oh its *Halal*, drinking the water is permissible. But if I say that the water will kill someone upon drinking it, you can see their human conscience start to work. It is the opposite of the phenomenon of radicalism, it is the opposite. I use the critical thinking in education, in a way, that makes you think differently. Even if you have some radical attacks, you will be able to avoid radical interpretations and avoid it.

Psychological influences like hatred, you need to combine it, sometimes, with facts. Some people believe that America is against Muslims and Islam altogether, and then I show the simple fact of how many mosques and schools were built in America are in the hundreds of thousands. Would this be the attitude of a country at war with Islam? If they were at war with Islam, would they have allowed this number of mosques to be built in their nation? Let the person generate the answer. Don't even give it to them. It is the better form of educating someone. They are confronted with the fact that Americans are not that bad, as one might have imagined. If they were that bad, they wouldn't have allowed some of the things they already have in regards to Islam and Muslims.

Behavior modifiers must use negative reinforcement, because Islamic radicals do not care about death. They want to die. This is what the Nazis and Russians did during the war, or the Emperor of Japan. There is mutually assured destruction to some degree. We have to train the people radicalizing to not welcome death. I can assure you there are who are receptive to the reinforcement. They do not care about death, but they care about other things. I'll give you an example, if Bin Laden realized on the second day after 9/11 that America would destroy the whole Muslim world, he wouldn't have cared, and he would have continued the attack. If he found out that America was going to ban the use of a *Hijab*, he would have thought more than twice. He would not have liked that. So it's a completely different mindset. You think death is a deterrent, but it is not a deterrent. That is the problem.

There is a missing factor we must identify in the war on terror. An efficient deterrent to deter him or her from committing acts is what is necessary. The deterrent must be immediate, as if one hit their leg on a brick wall, their brain must register the deterrent immediately so that they learn the effects of death and learn to value life and death. The pain cannot wait for two years. If you conducted the psychological operation, in a way, that does not tell them that this action is degrading they will take your action independently and justify more attacks on you. But, if you relay this action to what they did, they will realize it is they that are causing the trouble. You need not just revenge, but you have to connect to their mind and relay the message. They have to relate the two things clearly. Immediately after what they do, negative reinforcement must be used.

The ability to appreciate beauty is missing in radical Islam. First thing they do, they suppress beauty in all forms; music, art, women are not allowed to put makeup—they must wear black, painting is not allowed. You never hear a concerto or symphony. They never have music like this. So what is the relationship? It is simple. When you come and deprive me from the ability to distinguish between different tastes, but if you damage my taste receptors, you can put mud in my mouth and I will not even have a problem with the mud. When you suppress the ability of human's to appreciate beauty, when they are brought up in a society with no art, no music, they gradually lose the ability to distinguish the good and the evil. Once this has happened, you can put any barbaric teaching in their mind and they will entertain it. It is because they have lost the ability to distinguish beauty and ugly things. My modern interpretation extends to Facebook and social media, this prevention continues to inhibit their ability to appreciate beauty.

The last thing, in three minutes, will deal with Covert Radical Islam. The speed of response to critical questions is crucial to understanding Covert Radical Islam. If you ask someone what they think about ISIS or Bin Laden, there are two options, they might say “Oh they are evil!” but if the person take some time and start to swallow, you can see the lie building within them. If I took some time to think, and swallow psychological nervous system sympathy, I may be lying. One should be able to answer quickly without hesitation. If you say “*Assalamu alaikum*” (Peace be to God), the usual response is supposed to be “And upon you too.” So if you say to someone, “*Assalamu alaikum*” and one day, he didn't say “peace be upon you, too” then that is very significant and telling of the man's perspective.

Thirdly, a beard or change of appearance can be very telling of Covert Radical Islam. The *Hadith* says grow the beard and shave the mustache to adhere to the Sunnis and Prophet Muhammad. If you are living in jihad, you are not supposed to do anything cosmetic to your facial hair--which is why Al-Zawhiri does not shave his mustache. All changes of appearance are significant and details reveal some motivation within radical Islamists. You have to take several things together and piece them hand in hand to understand. One aspect cannot be implemented by itself, you have to see this in the big context.

The last part, when someone allows their mustache and beard to connect, they might be a *Sufi*, they might not be religious, but they might be changing from a normal radical Islamist to a true jihadist ready to carry out the word of Allah. Radical Islamist's legs appearing close together during prayer is another sign that radical Islam is taking place. The feet and shoulders connected, as I spoke about earlier, this is a tradition that has withstood a good amount of time.

