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Introduction

Dawud Walid, assistant imam of Masjid Wali Muhammad in Detroit, currently serves as Council on American-Islamic Relations (CAIR)-Michigan’s Executive Director. CAIR IRS filings show Walid has held this title with CAIR-Michigan since at least 2005.

As a CAIR representative, Walid has staunchly defended the organization against allegations that its founding members were tied to Hamas, criticizing the government for naming it an unindicted co-conspirator in a Hamas financing trial and the FBI for ending formal relationships with CAIR. Additionally, Walid has argued that Hamas should be brought into Middle East peace talks.

In response to FBI raids, arrests and prosecutions, Walid has repeatedly responded with virulent comments alleging FBI misconduct. The best example of Walid’s FBI criticism is the case of Luqman Abdullah, a Detroit imam who was shot and killed by FBI agents after resisting arrest and firing off three shots at an FBI dog in the direction of agents. Walid led a year-long campaign to cast the shooting as excessive and unjust, but three separate reviews found no wrongdoing whatsoever.

The Islamic Resistance Movement (HAMAS)

Walid’s organization, CAIR, was listed as an unindicted co-conspirator in the Holy Land Foundation (HLF) Hamas financing trial. The co-conspirator designation, which CAIR unsuccessfully challenged, was based upon exhibits in evidence placing CAIR and its founders in a Hamas-support network in America.

4. “CAIR has been identified by the Government at trial as a participant in an ongoing and ultimately unlawful conspiracy to support a designated terrorist organization, a conspiracy from which CAIR never withdrew,” U.S. vs. Holy Land Foundation for Relief and Development, et al., 3:04-CR-240-G, “Government’s Memorandum in Opposition to Council on American-Islamic Relations’ Motion for Leave to file a Brief Amicus Curiae Instanter and Amicus Brief in Support of the Unindicted Co-Conspirators’ First and Fifth Amendment Rights,” pg.15 (N.D. Tx. 2007).
HLF and five of its executives were convicted on all counts for funneling money to Hamas in November 2008. Appeals in the case are pending.

Earlier that year, the FBI suspended formal relationships with CAIR, citing evidence from the HLF trial “that demonstrated a relationship among CAIR, individual CAIR founders (including its current President Emeritus and its Executive Director) and the Palestine Committee.” The Palestine Committee, as revealed in internal memos and documents, was created by the Muslim Brotherhood with “a designed purpose to support Hamas.” Walid posted his thoughts on why the FBI made this decision on his blog:

“[T]he FBI during the Bush administration scaled back cooperation for public relations purposes driven by politics, not tangible proof of criminal wrong doing.”

Walid later erred in his defense of his organization in light of the FBI’s move. Discussing the history of the organization before his involvement, he wrote about a 1993 conference in Philadelphia that was wiretapped by the FBI. The meeting, as transcripts reveal, was attended by Hamas supporters hoping to develop strategies to oppose U.S.-led peace efforts between Israel and Palestinians and to grow the already present support network for Hamas in the U.S. Two of the attendees, Omar Ahmad and Nihad Awad, would go on to found CAIR. Additionally, Ahmad and Awad were listed on a Palestine Committee list of “important phone and fax numbers” admitted into evidence in the trial.

Walid, in trying to distance the meeting, and thus the CAIR officials, from Hamas claimed that:

“Hamas was never mentioned in this 1993 meeting by name according to the government.”

Yet, government transcripts from this meeting show attendees mentioning Hamas several times, though, as instructed, they often used a coded reference to “Samah,” or Hamas spelled backward instead. As Holy Land Foundation CEO Shukri Abu Baker advised:

“Please don’t mention the name Samah in an explicit manner. We agree on saying it as ‘sister Samah.’”

When an unidentified speaker used the word Hamas, Baker quickly interjected, “Didn’t we say not to mention that term.” The man corrected himself, “Is it against the Movement…”

---

8. Letter to Senator Jon Kyl from Richard C. Powers, Assistant Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Federal Bureau of Investigation, April 28, 2009.; Letter to Muslim Community Outreach Program (MCOP) Invitees, from James E. Finch, Special Agent in Charge, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Oklahoma City Field Office, October 8, 2008.
15. U.S. vs. Holy Land Foundation for Relief and Development,
Another speaker joked about the use of the code word “Samah.” The unidentified speaker says, “What Movement?” Another participant, identified by the government as Gawad, answers, “Hamas…., the Samah Movement [laughter]. I mean Samah.”

Walid’s blog post also took issue with allegations from CAIR opponents that the 1993 meeting was evidence that “CAIR was established to be a front group for Hamas.” Walid made no effort to address comments made by future CAIR leaders at the meeting expressing the need for a new organization and their desires to spread the Hamas viewpoint in the U.S.

Future CAIR co-founder and current executive director Nihad Awad talked about spreading Hamas’ viewpoint when asked what he wanted out of his proposed media campaign:

“If there is a political issue, a Samah’s (Hamas) input, for instance, about this or that, we inform people to contact their representatives, I mean the …UI and others, print circulations and send them to them. I have a long list of circulations which I didn’t mention.”

Future CAIR co-founder Omar Ahmad talked about media support for the Islamic Association for Palestine (IAP), a Hamas propaganda arm identified in court documents as a component in the Palestine Committee:

“In regards to the media field…er, this form of activism seeks to make the tools of the Islamic Association for Palestine such as Al Zaytouna and the Muslim World Monitor …the main and popular source of information about Palestine.”

Ahmad described a similar goal for political activism and public relations, which he said was to:

“make the position of the [Islamic] Association [for Palestine] in regards of issues relating to Palestine the adopted position.”

Ahmad pointed out during the meeting that there was a need for an “an organization which conducts research for us on how to address the American society, how to deal with the U.S. organizations.” Ahmed added that “the existing organizations…do not negate the need for research or a research center which we direct for activism in America.”

When other group members worried about getting the new organization registered, Ahmad said:

“Registering an organization is easy. I can register 100 organizations in 100 cities.

in one day. Registration is not important. Here in America you begin working first and then you then go register. It is not a problem here.”

Less than a year after making these comments, Awad and Ahmad signed off on CAIR’s Articles of Incorporation, becoming two of CAIR's founders.

In testimony during the HLF trial, FBI Agent Lara Burns said that result of some of the discussion during the meeting was the formation of CAIR. Burns was read a portion of the FBI transcripts from the Philadelphia Meeting:

“So, our brother had a suggestion to form an organization—the format he suggested was somewhat controversial, I didn't discuss it with him, but I believe its concept is sound—that we should start right now, my brothers, begin thinking about establishing alternative organizations which can benefit from a new atmosphere, ones whose Islamic hue is not very conspicuous.”

Burns was then asked by federal prosecutor Barry Jonas if “the organization that was started as a result of that was CAIR, C-A-I-R?”

Burns replied, “That was an organization that was created after the Philadelphia meeting as a result of this.”

In the same blog discussing the 1993 Philadelphia meeting, Walid pointed out that the meeting took place two years before Hamas’ official U.S. designation as a terrorist organization. Though true, Walid leaves out the fact that conference attendees knew their support for Hamas was problematic, even before the designation. Baker even warned those attending of a then proposed U.S. law to make Hamas support illegal:

“Samah..., Samah is classified as a terrorist [organization]. By constitution, by law, if I wanted to adopt its work, they kick me out, they kick me out of this country, my brother. By God, they would take away my U.S. citizenship and tell me ‘Go away’. I’m telling you ...”

At another point during the meeting Baker commented:

“The other issue..., not necessarily now, the other issue my brother is the legality and security situation.”

“No doubt, there will be legal obstacles,” he added.

One man, identified in FBI transcripts as Gawad, echoed Shukri Abu Baker’s concern:

“You must formulate the position of the Palestinians and the Muslims here in America to support the resistance. Work must be in that direction. Ok. That’s a problem by itself. In the same time, not

---

falling under the accusations of terrorism and those who harbor terrorism…”34

In addition to defending CAIR, Walid has also had to defend his own statements regarding the foreign terrorist organization.

He spoke at a September 23, 2010 rally outside of Dearborn City Hall. A local organization, the Jewish Community Relations Council, criticized Walid’s rally comments, saying that he called for Hamas to be invited to take part in Middle East peace talks going on at the time.

Walid’s response when questioned by the media was, “I didn’t even mention the word Hamas.”35

Walid didn’t say the word “Hamas” during the speech, but he did directly talk about the group:

“Now how in the world can there be a realistic discussion about peace talks when the entity which represents the elected government of the Palestinian people during a fair election that was monitored by international inspectors, including former president Jimmy Carter is not at the peace table?”36

Hamas won the 2006 Palestinian elections, so when Walid asserted that “the entity which represents the elected government of the Palestinian people” needs to be involved in the talks, his reference could not be to any other party.

At the rally, Walid continued talking about Hamas:

“Whether you agree with their politics or not, and there are certain things that the government in Gaza has done that I do not agree with, but we know that Mahmoud Abbas is not voted in as the legitimate president of the Palestinian people, and we know that these talking points that even the Obama administration is repeating which is Bush administration talking points, that somehow there was a coup d’états and the government in Gaza actually took over Gaza from Fatah. We know this is complete nonsense. We know this is nonsense, so therefore how can there be real peace talks?”37

In January 1995, President Bill Clinton signed an executive order designating Hamas as a terrorist organization that threatens to “disrupt the Middle East peace process.”38 Yet, Walid insisted Hamas must be at the table for peace talks:

“You don’t sit down with someone who is not even the representative of the people to sit down to make peace with the people. This is complete rubbish.”39

In addition to arguing that Hamas must be included in Middle East peace process talks, Walid has also legitimized suicide bombings and downplayed the threat of Hamas rocket fire.

A December 2008 Associated Press article quoted the CAIR Michigan Executive Director downplaying the threat of Hamas rockets fired at Israel in attempting to delegitimize Israel’s defensive attacks:

“Today’s attack – which amounts to a massacre - was definitely a disproportionate response to a few cheap, homemade, makeshift rockets being fired across the border.”

The previous year, in June of 2007, Walid was quoted in an internet video khutbah (sermon) speaking about a survey which found that some Muslim American youth supported suicide bombings. Rather than condemning the results, Walid explained them away:

“Now of course, we know as an organization and you and I know what they’re referring to. The youth that do agree with this [suicide bombings] don’t believe for the most part of doing anything in America. They’re referring directly to what is going on overseas and the resistance and suicide bombings going on in Palestine, they’re not talking about doing this here in America they’re talking about overseas particularly in Palestine. But let me say this to you and to remind myself. Just because the people who oppress Muslims take certain means and do certain things that are totally unacceptable in our religion, and we feel like we have no other choice but to defend ourselves and this may be the only choice.”

**Discrediting the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI)**

A U.S. Navy veteran, Walid identifies himself as a supporter of U.S. law enforcement. During a 2010 CAIR banquet, Walid said:

“But to the FBI, I say – as your friend, I reiterate to you what I’ve told you numerous times – I do not object to the FBI coming to the front door of our mosque…Let me also make this point clear – we are not anti-law enforcement at CAIR. We are pro-law enforcement at CAIR, but we are anti-law enforcement misconduct.”

During a 2009 radio interview Walid made sure to add that, “the FBI should use all lawful means to get information in regards to any possible threats that may face this nation. There are times when informants are needed for credible threats.”

Such comments stand in conflict with his frequent accusations that the FBI is a conniving organization out to accuse innocent Muslim Americans of terrorist activity and the rare instances in which he accepts FBI information at face value.

---

Walid was quoted summing up his feelings towards FBI investigations in a 2009 article:

“There are people of various ethnicities and religions who have grievances against the government, and we would hope that the FBI would place proper focus on potential threats ... instead of giving the appearance that the Muslim community is public enemy No. 1.”

The Case of Luqman Abdullah

The most aggressive campaign Walid has launched to discredit the FBI’s actions relates to a 2009 FBI warehouse raid that ended in the death of Detroit Imam Luqman Abdullah.

A criminal complaint charged Abdullah and ten of his followers with conspiring to sell stolen goods. It also identified the imam as a highly placed leader of a nationwide radical fundamentalist Sunni group which aims to establish an Islamic state in the U.S.

According to the complaint, Abdullah encouraged members of the mosque, many of whom are convicted felons, to carry a firearm, and preached that “every Muslim should have a weapon, and should not be scared to use their weapon when needed.” The complaint states that members and former members of the mosque have stated they are “willing to do anything Abdullah instructs and/or preaches, even including criminal conduct and acts of violence.”

The FBI moved in to arrest Abdullah and his followers on October 28, 2009. According to a report by the Michigan office of the Attorney General, Abdullah did not comply after he and his followers were given “loud, verbal, repetitive commands” to lie down on the ground, with their hands showing. Abdullah then fled to a nearby semitrailer, while his followers all complied with the commands. Agents followed Abdullah to the trailer. Once they approached him, he laid down on his stomach inside one of the trailers with his hands under his body. Agents gave repeated orders to show his hands and warned Abdullah that the FBI K-9 would be released if he did not. The dog was then released and began biting Abdullah’s upper body, forcing him to roll over and reveal a handgun in his right hand. At this point Abdullah fired three times at the dog, which was “positioned in the same direction of the agents.” Four FBI agents returned fire on Abdullah, shooting him 20 times in a period of only 4 seconds. Abdullah died immediately.

The Attorney General report and a subsequent Department of Justice Civil Rights Division report concluded that the agents were justified in their actions out of self defense. Both eye witnesses and the shooters

51. “Report RE Death of Imam Luqman Ameen Abdullah,” Civil Rights Division, United States Department of Justice, October 13,
stated that they feared for their lives and the lives of others when Abdullah started shooting at the FBI K-9.\textsuperscript{52}

In a sworn statement, one of the agents present at the scene stated that he believed Abdullah was shooting at the K-9 handler.\textsuperscript{53} The K-9 handler, in another sworn statement, said that once Abdullah began shooting, he was “focused on self-preservation and not his dog’s safety.”\textsuperscript{54}

A Department of Justice report on Abdullah’s death noted that “none of the agents who fired his weapon had ever been the subject of a civil rights complaint nor had any previously fired his weapon at another person.”\textsuperscript{55}

Before the Attorney General and Department of Justice reports, Walid made many conjectures to the media as to what may have happened during the shooting. In some instances, he offered erroneous versions of the events that transpired as fact—versions that questioned the integrity of the agents, alleging excessive force and invoking a history of police brutality in Detroit.

Walid has alleged that the FBI unleashed several FBI K-9s on Abdullah without reason, forcing the imam to shoot one of the dogs in self-defense.

On the radio show \textit{True Talk} on WMNF Tampa, Walid told host and former CAIR official Ahmed Bedier that, “FBI agents came in with guns drawn at that time the gentlemen were going to lay down on the floor the FBI released dogs, not one dog, but plural FBI canines at which they began to attack the Imam, suffered marks on his hands, his forearms and even on his face. Then the FBI purports that he pulled out a handgun inside of his coat and shot the FBI dog and upon shooting the dog, they shot him numerous times.”\textsuperscript{56}

In November 2009, Walid was quoted again speaking about multiple dogs in the \textit{Michigan Citizen} asking, “Was Imam Abdullah forced to pull a gun on the dogs that were attacking him? Was he lying down when he was shot? Did the FBI agents say ‘sic em’ to the dogs?”\textsuperscript{57}

Walid alleged inhumane treatment of the imam at the time of his shooting. “Is this reality that the FBI shot an imam 18 times and handcuffed after he shot their DOG and didn’t point a gun at agents? Is this reality that they shot a human being and handcuffed him without airlifting him to the hospital but airlifted their DOG to an animal hospital?” Walid asked on his blog.\textsuperscript{58}

According to the DOJ report, it was determined that Abdullah died instantly when shot by FBI agents and was handled respectfully by SWAT medic agents.\textsuperscript{59} The DOJ report notes Abdullah was handcuffed, as it is standard procedure for the FBI to “handcuff an arrestee who has been shot until an official determination of status is completed.”\textsuperscript{60}

CAIR-MI even hired their own pathologist to do a second autopsy of the body. CAIR’s autopsy, which was based only on pictures and not an exhumation of the body, concluded that Abdullah’s jaw was broken due to a dog attack and that marks on his arms and face

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{59} “Report RE Death of Imam Luqman Ameen Abdullah,” Civil Rights Division, United States Department of Justice, October 13, 2010, pg.10.
\textsuperscript{60} “Report RE Death of Imam Luqman Ameen Abdullah,” Civil Rights Division, United States Department of Justice, October 13, 2010, pg.10.
\end{flushleft}
were dog bites. However, the Wayne County Medical Examiner disputed these claims.

Walid has also claimed the FBI unjustly labeled Abdullah a radical. During the same WMNF radio interview mentioned above, Walid was asked if the media played a major role in portraying Abdullah as a radical Muslim. He responded, “In this situation I put the primary blame on the DOJ and the FBI because their criminal complaint and their press conference is what helps shape how the media reports things. So when they came out and had their press conference they called the imam a radical, they called him that.”

Walid told the Baltimore Chronicle that, “The very incendiary rhetoric that the FBI alleges, I never heard that from (Abdullah). There was nothing extraordinary about him…. I knew him as a respected imam in the Muslim community…I knew him to be charitable.”

In another news article, Walid said, “There is a lot of frustration in the community. People are asking themselves ‘did he really do what they say he did?’”

The CAIR Executive Director has even insinuated that Abdullah’s death could be the result of police brutality against African Americans. “Is this the kind of excessive force that we black Americans are all too familiar with?” Walid asked after Abdullah’s death.

“There is a long history in our nation, in Detroit in particular, of African American men being subjected to unnecessary and sometimes lethal force by law enforcement,” he said.

According to Walid, the government has purposely withheld information regarding the raid and Abdullah’s death.

In September 2010, Walid challenged the FBI to release any video footage of the raid, “I say to law enforcement and especially to the Federal Bureau of Investigations—if they feel they have nothing to hide, if they’re saying the imam is this bogeyman—release the footage to the media. It will show exactly what happened.”

The DOJ report notes that the camera positioned on the area where Abdullah fired at the FBI dog and agents returned fire was blocked by television packages stacked on a partially loaded pallet placed by Abdullah’s associates right before the arrest began.

In December 2009, before the medical examiner’s autopsy had been released, Walid questioned why it wasn’t yet public. “If the autopsy is being suppressed to media and advocates, this would be very disturbing indeed and will raise even more suspicion in regards to the shooting of the imam.” He added, “the unfortunate...
and perhaps unintended consequence is that the failure to release the autopsy report and the very exorbitant amount for the (autopsy photos) is raising in the minds of some people in the community that there’s a potential cover-up.”

In an online interview in April 2009, Walid told the story of what happened in the warehouse during the raid, claiming that, “As the individuals were laying down and as we have been told the imam was not brandishing a firearm, dogs were let loose.” When asked if the imam had a gun, Walid responded, “We’re not even sure if the imam even had a gun.”

Ballistics evidence shows that Abdullah used a 9mm Glock that was stolen during a home invasion in Canton, Michigan in 2005 to shoot and kill the FBI dog. Three 9mm casings were found near Abdullah after the shooting and the remains of a 9mm bullet were recovered from the FBI K-9.

In November 2009, CAIR sent a letter to the Department of Justice, asking for clarification on specific issues regarding the imam's death including, “Whether Imam Luqman Ameen Abdullah surrendered before the FBI K-9 was unleashed to attack him.”

CAIR filed Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests for any information regarding the events that lead up to Abdullah’s death. When the FOIA request was denied, CAIR filed FOIA lawsuits against the Michigan State Police. Shortly afterwards, CAIR filed additional FOIA lawsuits against the Dearborn Police and the Detroit Police. Most recently, CAIR filed a lawsuit against the Wayne County Sheriff’s Office for similar reasons. Those lawsuits are pending.

Even though the DOJ and Attorney General reports debunked Walid’s theories about the FBI’s behavior during the raid, Walid continues his criticism.


“We reiterate our calls to U.S. Attorney General Eric Holder to launch an immediate robust investigation into the nationwide concern regarding the misusage of informants in mosques. We also call on the DOJ to review current FBI protocols regarding their usage of military-type raids and attack K-9s in charges that do not relate to terrorism, violent crimes or kingpin drug charges.”

Later that night, Walid appeared on television saying that, “We believe (the DOJ report) is insufficient and incomplete and that they concluded their investigation prematurely.”

Walid added, “We have a situation where the four

shooters are the primary witnesses to the shooting of Imam Luqman. There is no forensic evidence to corroborate that he had a gun to begin with. There’s not paraffin test on his hands. There was no DNA test on the gun. The video surveillance footage that was in the trailer, all it shows is him standing up—it doesn’t show a gun in his hand—and then going down. Even if he did have a gun, we do know that dog was basically on top of him and biting him. If he did shoot him, it was at point blank.”

September 2010 FBI Raids

In late September 2010, the FBI raided the homes of several individuals in Illinois and Minnesota. Minneapolis FBI spokesman Steve Warfield explained that the warrants sought “evidence in support of an ongoing Joint Terrorism Task Force (JTTF) investigation into activities concerning the material support of terrorism.” Dawud Walid said the following a protest against the raids in Detroit on September 24, 2010:

“I’m here to defend the 1st Amendment and for the freedom of speech and of association. The recent raids that took place on peace activists are basically amounting to a witch hunt to chill the 1st amendment rights of Americans.”

He offered no information explaining why he thought the searches, sanctioned by a federal judge, were unjustified. However, Walid added, “Now, ironically, one week ago the Department of Justice Inspector General released a report saying the FBI had been improperly targeting and surveilling peace activists. And we see that the FBI are attempting to intimidate and chill the activities of peace activists that are against the mainstream status quo in terms of the U.S.’ policy, in terms of Palestine and Colombia. The diminishing of the constitutional rights of one group of people places a danger on the rights of all Americans. That’s why I’m out here today.”

The “Bronx Four”

The “Bronx Four,” James Cromitie, David Williams, Onta Williams and LaGuerre Payen, were arrested in May 2009 and indicted in June on charges they plotted to attack two targets in New York: a synagogue and New York Air National Guard Base in Newburgh. During a radio interview after the arrests, Walid accused the FBI of “manufacturing their own terrorism suspects to give the appearance that they’re actually doing something tangible in the so called ‘War on Terrorism.’” The FBI is “cultivating and inciting people towards extremism,” he said.

Only a few days after Walid gave the above interview, he authored a blog post on the “Bronx Four.” In what Walid believed to be a “so-called terror plot” he said that the “agent provocateur was the real mastermind.” “Three of these men were petty criminals, who were enticed by money, not extreme ideology,” said Walid.86

On October 18, 2010 all four defendants were convicted on seven counts related to the plot to bomb a New York synagogue and shoot stinger missiles at military planes, including attempting to use weapons of mass destruction within the United States, attempting to acquire and use anti-aircraft missiles and conspiracy to kill officers and employees of the United States.87 Cromitie and David Williams were both convicted on one additional count—attempting to kill officers and employees of the United States.88

The “Liberty City Seven”

Walid has argued entrapment in other cases, including that of the “Liberty City Seven.” The “Liberty City Seven,” Narseal Batiste and six others, were indicted for allegedly plotting to attack the Sears Tower in Chicago and the FBI building in North Beach, Florida.89 Two defendants were acquitted, but Batiste was convicted on all counts including agreeing to provide material support to al-Qaeda, conspiring to destroy buildings and to levy war against the government of the United States.90 Four others were convicted on multiple counts.91 Several defendants were seen on tape taking a bayat, or oath of allegiance, to al-Qaida.92 In a 2009 interview with Dawud Walid on Detroit Public radio, Walid was asked, “Did you really think they [FBI agents] are really trying to incite violence?”

He replied:

“Well, I wouldn’t say incite violence, I would say entrap people to perhaps say things or entrap people towards playing off people’s emotions to get them to do something and frame it in a certain way where they could then charge people. A prime example is that a couple of years ago there were a group of people called, they were labeled the “Miami 7” down in Miami and the FBI went and sent some informants to this organization posing as an extremist, I mean these guys weren’t even Muslims.”94

In another radio interview, Walid excused the actions

88. Ibid.
89. One original defendant was acquitted in an initial trial, prompting subsequent references to the “Liberty City Six” during a later retrial.
93. In the first trial there were seven defendants. The trial was declared a mistrial for only six of the seven defendants. The seventh was found not guilty of all terror conspiracy counts. Thus the “Liberty City Six” are also referred to by some as the “Liberty City Seven” or the “Miami 7”; “Judge Declares Mistrial for Six of Liberty City 7: Seventh Defendant Found Not Guilty by Jury,” WPLG Local 10, December 13, 2007, http://www.justnews.com/news/1484243/detail.html (Accessed October 14, 2010).
of the “Liberty City Seven,” instead accusing the FBI of “going around with a Neo-COINTELPRO type of strategy.” Of the men involved in the plot, he said, “I mean they’re convicted felons, very hard for them to try to get employment, be able to get a decent job…I mean anyone with a little bit of money could go into Appalachia Mountains around some poor white folds and get some with mental health problems or some substance abuse problems and offer then $25,000 to do something.” 95 The FBI targets not only Muslims, but African Americans, said Walid. 96 Walid’s distrust for the FBI has led him to advise U.S. Muslims against providing information to the FBI unless they must absolutely do so by law.

In 2007, Walid told an audience at Dix Mosque in Dearborn that, “you still have no obligation to speak to the FBI if they come to your home. If they come to your workplace, even if you’re not a citizen, let’s say you have green card, you’re here on a work visa, student visa, you’re a legal resident even if you’re not a citizen, you are under no obligation whatsoever if the FBI comes to you and says – let me come and talk to you for a moment, you have no obligation to talk with them.” 97

In an April 2009 speech made in Ohio by Walid called “Enjoining Good in Society” he said:

“We should not be scared of challenging injustices, even from the FBI. If any acts of extremism we think are coming in the community, yes we should contact them. If there’s a hate crime against Muslims or the masjid, the masjids, yes we should contact them. But at the same time they are not above reproach.”

Indicative of Walid’s suspicion towards the FBI, he once said that he wouldn’t be surprised if every major U.S. Muslim organization and mosque had “agent provocateurs and informants spying or trying to cause disruption of organizational activities.” 99

---

**Misrepresentation Regarding 9/11 Hijackers and World Trade Center Bombers**

Walid denied that the 9/11 hijackers were affiliated with any U.S. mosques during an interview on Detroit Public Radio in March of 2009:

“...moreover the 9/11 Commission Report and terrorism experts, counterterrorism experts have all said that the 9/11 attacks, those attackers weren’t part of the mainstream Muslim community and they weren’t even affiliated with any mosque.” 100

This statement ignores close interactions several hijackers had with mosques and members of the Muslim community which were detailed by the 9/11 Commission.

Two of the 9/11 hijackers, Khalid al-Mihdhar and Nawaf al-Hazmi, had close ties with members of the Islamic Center of San Diego. 101 In fact, mosque members helped the

---

two men find an apartment in San Diego,\textsuperscript{102} obtain Social Security numbers\textsuperscript{103} and driver’s licenses,\textsuperscript{104} buy a car\textsuperscript{105} and obtain funds from Khalid Sheikh Mohammed’s nephew through the Islamic Center of San Diego administrator’s bank account.\textsuperscript{106} Khalid al-Mihdhar and Nawaf Al-Hazmi also attended Rabat Mosque in California mosque where they met Omar Bakarbashat, who was retained as a material witness in the 9/11 Commission investigation and later deported.\textsuperscript{107} An Imam at this mosque in 2000, Anwar Al-Awlaki, is considered an important contact for the two 9/11 hijackers.\textsuperscript{108}

Additionally 9/11 hijackers had close ties to mosques even when they were not “affiliated” which gave them resources and influenced their thinking. Ramzi Yousef, the future mastermind of the 1993 World Trade Center bombing carried a fake identification provided by Al Bunyan Islamic Information Centre (AIIC) in Tucson when detained at an airport in 1992.\textsuperscript{109} The post office box number given on their badges for the Al Bunyan Center was the same as that on the letterhead of Islamic Society of Tucson’s Al Kifah Refugee Center.\textsuperscript{110} 9/11 associate Rayed Abdullah lived and trained with 9/11 pilot Hani Hanjour. Reportedly, Abdullah had been giving extremist speeches at the Islamic Cultural Center in Arizona.\textsuperscript{111}

During a 2009 radio interview Walid first said that “Christians who are white have been the biggest domestic terrorists” in the United States.\textsuperscript{112} He then claimed that:

“There has never been a terrorism attack committed by an American Muslim and Muslims in America know this. There has never been one terrorist attack that has been launched in the United States of America that was committed by a Muslim who’s an American citizen. That’s very important for your listeners to understand.”\textsuperscript{113}

However, some of the individuals convicted for their roles in the 1993 World Trade Center bombings were U.S. citizens. For example, El Sayyid Nosair, Nidal A. Ayyad, Clement Hampton-El and Victor Alvarez were all U.S. citizens at the time they tried to commit acts of terrorism. Nosair married a U.S. citizen in 1982 and was naturalized in 1989.\textsuperscript{114} In March 1991, Ayyad became a naturalized U.S. citizen.\textsuperscript{115} Clement Hampton-El and Victor Alvarez were both born in the United States.\textsuperscript{116}


\textsuperscript{103} Sarah Downey and Michael Hirsh, “A Safe Haven?” Newsweek, September 30, 2002.


\textsuperscript{111} The 9/11 Commission Report, Notes to Chapter 7: The Attack Looms, N.59 pg. 521.


Nosair, Hampton-El and Alvarez were convicted in relation to a “wide-ranging plot to conduct a campaign of urban terrorism,” including the 1993 World Trade Center Bombing. Nosair was convicted on multiple counts, including seditious conspiracy, two counts of attempted murder, one count of murder in furtherance of a racketeering enterprise, attempted murder of a federal officer and three counts of use of a firearm in relation to a crime of violence. Hampton-El was convicted of seditious conspiracy, bombing conspiracy and attempted bombing. Alvarez was convicted of seditious conspiracy, bombing conspiracy, attempted bombing and charges involving interstate transportation.

In a separate trial, Ayyad was convicted on nine counts in relation to the World Trade Center bombings including explosives and firearms charges and conspiracy to defraud the United States.