



# The Bradley Public Diplomacy Project

The Department of Social Sciences  
and the Combating Terrorism Center

The United States Military Academy

**“Answering the Terrorist Message”**

Roundtable Discussions  
14 October 2005  
West Point, New York

Conference Report

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

---

Table of Contents	2
Executive Summary	3
Detailed Notes	7
Appendixes	
Conference Agenda	12
Speaker Biographies	13
List of Participants	15

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

---

The United States responded to the terrorist attacks of 9/11 with diplomatic, legal, and military initiatives that have severely limited the ability of the terrorists to gather in large groups. Terrorists have been forced to rely on various forms of strategic communication as a substitution for personal contact. Groups such as al-Qaeda and its offshoots are increasingly dependent on their communications strategies to maintain recruitment, and therefore the “media battalions” of terrorist groups carefully calibrate their communications to reach multiple target audiences composed of both potential recruits and sympathizers. To date, the United States has not fully understood the importance of countering the violent jihadist message on comparable levels of sophistication. Reducing global support for anti-Western political sentiment would decrease the ability of terrorist and insurgent networks to regenerate through recruitment. This would have an immediate, positive impact on U.S. national security as the center of gravity in the war on terror is not individual terrorists or groups; rather it is the ability of Salafist jihadi groups to attract new supporters. Success in the global nation security policy requires that public diplomacy be as responsive and as effective as military, economic, law enforcement, diplomatic, and other elements of national power.

To meet this need, the Department of Social Sciences at the United States Military Academy has selected Public Diplomacy as the topic for this year’s June 2006 Senior Conference. This annual conference engages key military and interagency leaders in a frank, off-the-record discussion of critical national security issues. The Lynne and Harry Bradley Foundation has generously funded this project so that we can not only hold the conference in June but undertake a year long effort to address this critical issue. It is our hope that the Bradley Public Diplomacy Project will provide a catalyst for innovative solutions for interagency policy development and planning on the subject of public diplomacy.

Throughout the summer we have been scoping the project and consulting with experts who have been working with a variety of aspects of the issue of public diplomacy. We determined that there are many people and agencies working different aspects of the issue which is variously regarded as public diplomacy, strategic information, information operations, psychological operations, and other terms. On 14 October 2005 we held a small roundtable conference that brought together a group of experts to examine the current content, form, and intended audiences of Anti-American messages and explore those messages in the context of the concerns of global Muslim communities. After analyzing the factors that shape Muslim perceptions of American values and American foreign policy, participants were able to identify several insertion points where there is potential for U.S. strategic communications to re-orient Muslim perceptions toward a more positive view of America and its citizens, thereby reducing the capability of the terrorist groups to attract new recruits. A second roundtable will tentatively follow in February of 2006. These two initial roundtables will inform planning for the larger Senior Conference on 1-3 June 2006. We expect to produce a conference report immediately after the conference, and we hope to be able to distill some of the best information that we have developed into a book project.

**Roundtable #1.** The first roundtable examined the need for U.S. public diplomacy programs to posit a credible “counter- narrative” to challenge the logic underlying the terrorists’ call to arms and present a positive vision for America’s role in the world. To be effective, public diplomacy initiatives should address the legitimate grievances of the Muslim community while simultaneously de-legitimizing the elements of the terrorist narrative that run counter to the interests of the global Muslim population. We had both faculty members and other experts discussing the difficulty of conveying the U.S. message, especially to Islamic cultures. The complete list of participants may be found in Appendix C.

**Roundtable #1 Presentations.** Some of the key presentations at the roundtable were:

- a. Dr. Borik Zadeh, from Battelle Memorial Institute, opened the discussion with a presentation entitled “Communicating with the Muslim World.” His presentation examined common sources of cultural misunderstanding and greatly helped frame our conversations for the remainder of the day.
- b. Mr. Afshon Ostovar provided the group with some background on Salafi ideology before analyzing a series of images drawn from terrorist propaganda.
- c. Mr. Josh Rushing discussed his experiences working with Al Jazeera since the beginning of OIF.
- d. COL (Retired) Jack Jacobs provided his insights on the nature of media coverage, reminding the group that media entities are for-profit businesses that have to watch the bottom line.
- e. Dr. Donald Sexton, a branding expert from Columbia University, outlined the process for developing a successful branding strategy.
- f. Ms. Cari Eggspuehler discussed her experiences working with private sector executives who seek to engage in public diplomacy, and also brought insights from her time working at the Department of State.

**Roundtable #1 Observations.** While many more questions were raised than there were answers confirmed, a few recurring themes were discussed among all participants:

**a. Global Audience—need for a comprehensive message.** Participants discussed the fact that companies that try to segment their message for different markets – to have one message for market A and a different one for market B – rarely succeed. If consumers perceive multiple messages from one agent, they will question the credibility of any message that is not constant across audiences. The same is particularly problematic when national leaders speak; they may have a domestic audience in mind, but, with nearly instantaneous global communication, their message will be heard by an international audience.

**b. Resources and long-term commitment.** Comparisons with both historical examples (e.g. the Cold War) and business examples (e.g. major multi-national consumer brands) indicated

that any coherent public diplomacy campaign would require significant organizational and budgetary resources over a long period of time. As a trite but telling example, Dr. Sexton mentioned that it took seven years to reposition Mountain Dew as an urban brand. Several participants observed that it would take 15-20 years to establish a new U.S. “brand.” This underscores the importance of a long-term commitment to public diplomacy that cannot waver with the partisan tides.

**c. Organizational commitment.** Participants mentioned the difficulty of distinguishing public diplomacy from public affairs in the current globalized media environment. All participants agreed that a strong public diplomacy effort must be supported at the highest levels of government in order to coordinate the multiple agencies that have opportunities to positively affect perceptions of America abroad. This would seem to imply the need for improvement in U.S. organizational structure to coordinate public diplomacy by all parts of the government.

**d. Actions speak louder than words.** It was clear that public diplomacy is a crucial component of a comprehensive strategy, but military, economic, and diplomatic actions can frequently dominate perceptions of the United States. For example, perception of the United States in South Asia significantly improved because of actual physical assistance after Typhoon Iniki far more than any public diplomacy actions.

**e. Critical for U.S. policy.** All participants were tremendously pleased to participate in the project and felt that it was absolutely essential for this kind of project and discussion to take place. They also commented that it was particularly appropriate for this project to be at the U.S. Military Academy as it has both academic, educational, and policy implications.

**Next Steps.** We will continue with the project, building on the issues that were raised at the roundtable, and addressing other aspects of public diplomacy in several different ways:

- a. Targets of opportunity.** As we have opportunities, we will continue the discussion with both individuals and groups who are visiting West Point. For example, in November, we discussed the project and gained insights from both MG (ret.) Perry Smith, the 2006 class of White House Fellows, and others.
- b. Roundtable.** Tentatively scheduled for February, our second roundtable where we will concentrate on the “roles and missions” of the organizations involved in U.S. public diplomacy.
- c. Other conferences.** We are continuing to have faculty members participate in other conferences, including the International Studies Association Convention and USC Center for Public Diplomacy Conference in March 2006.
- d. Senior Conference.** The capstone of this project will be the 1-3 June 2006 Senior Conference which will bring to West Point approximately 70 of the key policy makers, academic scholars, and other leaders in the arena of public diplomacy.

The 14 October 2005 roundtable conference was organized and directed by Ms. Lianne Kennedy-Boudali of the Combating Terrorism Center in the Department of Social Sciences at West Point. Additional questions about the roundtable or this report can be directed to her at 845-938-2801 or Lianne.Kennedy@usma.edu.

This is an ambitious project, but one that is both urgent and important. We will continue to reach out to policymakers, academics, and practitioners to improve our research, thoughts, and progress. We are convinced, even more than when we started this project, of its importance and potential contribution to U.S. national security.

Michael J. Meese, Ph.D.  
Colonel, U.S. Army  
Professor and Head  
Department of Social Sciences  
U.S. Military Academy

---

*This October roundtable was made possible by the generous support of the Lynne and Harry Bradley Foundation and the USMA Association of Graduates. It was directed by the Department of Social Sciences and the Combating Terrorism Center at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. The opinions expressed are those of the participants in the Public Diplomacy project are not necessarily those of the Bradley Foundation, the Association of Graduates, the Department of Social Sciences, or any other agency of the U.S. government.*

## **DETAILED NOTES FROM 14 OCTOBER 2005 CONFERENCE**

---

### **Dr. Borik Zadeh, Battelle Memorial Institute**

Dr. Zadeh began his discussion by suggesting that there is no clear meaning of the term “moderate Muslim,” but that there is a difference between extreme behavior and extreme ideas within Islam. This difference could be characterized as a difference between the means and the ends. According to Dr. Zadeh, most Muslims would likely agree with the terrorists’ *ends*, if not the means. Among Muslims, there is a range of active to passive support for terrorist goals, wherein the quality of daily life and the availability of social programs in areas affected by terrorism determine the success of jihadi movements. Therefore, if the U.S. public diplomacy message targets the terrorists’ *ends* rather than their *methods*, it will fail.

Dr. Zadeh told the group that western opinion leaders should not postulate on subjects such as Muslim aspirations or characterizations of “extremist” and “moderate” Muslims. He further suggested, and that it is a mistake to presume that we can put ourselves in their shoes. It is essential to understand that the Western experience is not transferable. As an example, many Muslims oppose the imposition of women’s’ rights upon the Muslim people, which is taken to be proof of Western ignorance about Islam, as well as an affront to the religion itself. And even the intelligentsia in Muslim-majority countries sees American democracy as an imperfect institution, and often finds Western ways of interaction to be inappropriate. For example, the ability to communicate via email is efficient yet it cannot substitute for human interaction in diplomacy.

In Islam, justice and lack of justice are far more important than political representation. Islamic tradition and jurisprudence contain concepts of justice and equal treatment, but these are not directly equivalent to the concepts of fairness and equal treatment that are the foundation of Western liberal standards. American public diplomacy should not focus on questions about interpretations of Islam; rather the emphasis should be on living with Islam as it is.

Dr. Zadeh reminded the group that to most Muslims, security and justice are more important than Western-style political participation. Establishing a functional judicial system is more important than personal rights to many Muslims. Humanity is common among all peoples. What *is* different is the historical layers that come from different experiences. There is a tendency toward conspiratorial interpretation among Muslims – an automatic assumption that the CIA or the MI5 must be behind it, whatever it is. For example, the United States must have rigged oil prices in 1973 in order to start an energy crisis that would hurt Japan.

Dr. Zadeh concluded by informing the group that this is not a “winnable war” in the normal way that Americans think of winning and losing. Diplomacy and communication will enhance American objectives, but the United States must also understand what Muslims are saying. Therefore, creating a successful public diplomacy program is not just a matter of language, and it is not just a matter of hiring someone who speaks fluent Farsi, Arabic, or Pashto. It is a matter of the quality of communications that the United States puts forth, and a matter of saying things that do not reinforce the Muslim’s negative perception of the West. It is generational issue in that we must design messages that will be palatable ten, twenty, and thirty years from today, and that will resonate with present and future generations of Muslims.

## **Afshon Ostovar, University of Michigan**

Mr. Ostovar reviewed the intellectual and historical development of the Salafi movement, beginning with its intellectual roots and illuminating its contemporary linkages. Salafism is a conservative Islamic movement that advocates a return to the pure practice of Islam as exemplified by the companions of the Prophet (al-salif al-salih) and a rejection of the orthodox traditions of Islamic scholarship and jurisprudence. It must be understood that not all Salafis are militant or violent.

Salafis believe that sharia is the only form of law acceptable to God, and therefore any legal system that draws on Western secular legal traditions is unacceptable. Any ruler or government that enforces “man-made” law is therefore illegitimate and illegal. This in turn leads to a contestation over legitimate rule wherein the more radical Salafis find justification for overthrowing rulers or regimes that they find to be corrupt, or heretical.

Salafi theorists consider non-Salafi lay-Muslims, Sufis and Shiites as polytheists, and thus infidels. At the most radical end of the spectrum, these ideas lead to a conviction that jihad is required to bring about change in Muslim society. Salafi thinkers such as Sayyid Qutb, Safar al-Hawali, and Mustapha al Souri believe that given the current situation, jihad is an individual duty for all Muslims.

## **Colonel Jack Jacobs, U.S.A. Retired**

Colonel Jacobs reminded the group that media organizations, being businesses, have an inherent bias. He stated that there are plenty of unbiased views that do not see light of day because they do not “fit.” There is not necessarily a bias in the media itself, but news is filtered through the need to make a living by attracting both viewers and advertisers.

Colonel Jacobs suggested that the main problem with public diplomacy is that the United States is not clear about its own intentions for public diplomacy. Mr. Jacobs quoted Lewis Carroll, who wrote, “If you don’t know where you’re going, any road will get you there.” Further more, he suggested that it would be unwise to do anything unless there is broad understanding of the goals. He asked, “What is the mission? Is it stable source of oil? Is it democracy in Southwest Asia?”

Colonel Jacobs said that the administration needs to do better in managing expectations, as the worst thing to do in any endeavor is to promise and then not deliver. In short, actions speak louder than words.

## **Josh Rushing, Al Jazeera International**

Mr. Rushing began his talk by explaining the importance of Al Jazeera to Middle Eastern audiences. Al Jazeera is the single most significant source of public opinion, yet Americans have a lot of misperceptions about Al Jazeera. According to Mr. Rushing, the key to engaging Middle Eastern audiences is to pick the right battles. There are responsible anchors and reporters at Al Jazeera, but it is critical to identify people such as American government officials and people in uniform who can appear on the right shows to represent American views to Al Jazeera's audience.

Mr. Rushing suggested that people in the Middle East have a tough time understanding that the American government does not support the American media, and does not dictate stories to the media as is the case in many other countries. During his time in CENTCOM, Mr. Rushing saw that the accepted way of doing things was not working, so he took a different approach by listening and acknowledging the level of anger surrounding U.S. policy. Despite the anger, he found a lot of hope, and heard Middle Easterners talking about the "American dream" more frequently than most Americans. Mr. Rushing met a father who said that his hope is to turn away from the Islamic nightmare so that his kids could realize the American dream and go to school in America. To Mr. Rushing's way of thinking, the American dream is still a key message, and still reflects the hope that younger generations will be able to realize great opportunities in America. Although it may not be feasible to transmit this message in a government-wide way, it can happen on an individual level if a small group of people get things rolling and provide the "tipping point."

During his time abroad, Mr. Rushing encountered a widespread conviction that American foreign policy is fundamentally hypocritical in its support for autocratic governments. Although every state recognizes the importance of maintaining relations with strategically important allies, Americans come out with high-minded rhetoric that does not match our policies. Mr. Rushing went on to say that in some way, there is little difference between a policy and the perception of the policy. Given this, the United States has two choices. One option is to change the policies that are driving anti-Americanism, such as support for countries like Saudi Arabia that are not democratic and do not uphold human rights. The other option is to "come clean" by acknowledging that the United States supports countries that are strategically important to us, and the world community can just get over it. At least this would take the accusations of hypocrisy in foreign policy off the table.

## **Donald Sexton, Columbia University**

Dr. Sexton reviewed the elements of successful branding for corporations, emphasizing that companies have a very hard time building any sort of brand identity as the process takes a long time. A good brand can constitute about 50% of the value of a company, and so for most corporations, it is the single most valuable asset they have. However, if the brand is synonymous with a message that no longer matches the company's goals or message, it takes a significant amount of time to reposition the brand.

Brands are composed of identifiers – such as a logo, name, color, symbol- attributes, and associations. Building a brand is a matter of repeating a consistent message over and over. It is difficult for companies to partition a market, that is to say, to have two different messages for two different markets. This is not possible in today’s world, so companies attempt to look across markets and find a common voice.

Building a brand involves selecting a target audience, understanding that audience, evaluating the current brand position, determining the desired brand position, designing and implementing a communications strategy, and then maintaining relentless consistency over time and across audiences. If the strategy does not contain an element of truth, then the whole effort falls apart, as great advertising will quickly expose a lousy product.

Dr. Sexton estimated that it could take twenty to twenty-five years to “reposition” the American brand, and wondered whether or not the United States has the will to commit to a twenty to twenty-five year public diplomacy effort.

### **Cari Eggspuehler, Business for Diplomatic Action**

Ms. Eggspuehler began her presentation with a discussion of the current decline in global public opinion of the United States. She stated that in the past, the United States has always had a bank of good will from other peoples and nations based on longstanding historical and cultural ties, and that this goodwill usually survived episodes of unpopular foreign policy. Businesses that conduct market research have noticed a recent depletion in the “goodwill bank.” Much of this decline stems from demographic changes in foreign countries. Older generations have positive associations with the United States and with Americans, but younger generations may have no such positive associations. This is clearly a great concern to the private sector.

Ms. Eggspuehler’s organization, Business for Diplomatic Action (BDA), has conducted extensive research in markets around the world in order to gather data that was subsequently broken down by age brackets and then analyzed country by country. Although variation exists within and among regions, four key concerns were common to every region:

1. American foreign policy
2. America’s global presence
3. Pervasiveness of American culture
4. Negative aspects of globalization

Based on these research findings, BDA created the following strategic framework for business leaders to begin to minimize the growing anti-American sentiment that has begun to negatively impact their operations:

1. Sensitize Americans to the level of anti-American sentiment abroad.
2. Change or modify those behaviors that reinforce anti-American sentiments around the world.
3. Amplify awareness of the qualities for which America is respected and valued.
4. Build bridges between cultures.

Business leaders recognize that the U.S. Government is very limited in what it can do, and therefore, individual private sector leaders are seeking opportunities to reverse the rise in anti-Americanism. The private sector knows how to do communications well, as their success depends on it. Companies like Exxon build relationships in the Middle East every day.

Ms. Eggspuehler suggested that the private sector can play a unique role by providing valuable tools for countries that need assistance. Rather than simply donating cash, the private sector can facilitate skill development through better access to technology and English language training. Businesses can sponsor unique initiatives such as sponsoring some number of foreign students to study at the best business schools in America. In short, the private sector has the resources and the interest to make a uniquely powerful contribution to improving America's image abroad.

## **Group Discussion**

*The final group discussion produced as many questions as answers:*

- What is the definition of public diplomacy? Have we lost the differentiation between public diplomacy and public affairs? Public diplomacy is long-term strategic relationship building.
- Is there a consensus on who we are as Americans, and what we want to accomplish with public diplomacy?  
Is it the worth of every individual? Is it the American dream?
- Is the point of public diplomacy to restore our image, and make people love us? A more appropriate question is how to keep terrorists from killing us, and how we can help Islamic societies suffering from political and socio-economic despair to help themselves.
- The key to refuting the terrorist message is indigenous change, and that criticism from "outsiders" will not be accepted.

It would seem that there is no single silver bullet solution that will counter anti-Americanism in general, let alone terrorist rhetoric and propaganda. The tide of America's global unpopularity may be slowed by a number of initiatives combining public and private sector knowledge and capabilities. It is clear that a combination of efforts is necessary to reach the variety of audiences in question. Before designing a strategy for public diplomacy, however, the first step must be to raise awareness among all Americans on the nature and causes of anti-Americanism. We must listen to the grievances of others, and recognize these grievances before we can reasonably expect to design a communications strategy that may better explain our vision and our goals for ourselves and the world.

***For questions, inquiries, or further information, please contact the conference organizer, Lianne Kennedy Boudali, at [lianne.kennedy@usma.edu](mailto:lianne.kennedy@usma.edu) or by telephone at (845)938-2801.***

## Appendix A: Conference Schedule

---

<b>8:30- 9:00</b>	<b>Welcome by COL Meese</b> Introductions
<b>9:00-10:15</b> <i>Discussion Leader</i>	<b>Dr. Borik Zadeh: Communicating With The Muslim World</b> Jarret Brachman
<b>10:15-10: 30</b>	<b>Break</b>
<b>10:30-11:30</b> <i>Discussion Leader</i>	<b>Afshon Ostovar: Salafi Jihadiyya Ideology and Message</b> Jarret Brachman
<b>12:00 – 1:30</b>	<b>Lunch in Washington Hall Cadet Mess</b>
<b>1:30 – 2:30</b> <i>Goals</i>	<b>Session Two: Putting the Pieces Together</b> Discuss public perceptions of US policy and communications; identify the “missing pieces” or blind spots in our understanding of the situation; identify audiences that could be swayed.
<i>Speakers</i>	Jack Jacobs, MSNBC Josh Rushing, Al Jazeera
<i>Discussion Leader</i>	Lianne Kennedy Boudali
<b>2:30 -2:45</b>	<b>Break</b>
<b>2:45-4:00</b> <i>Goals</i>	<b>Session Three: Policy Recommendations</b> Drawing on speaker’s experiences identify specific opportunities to re-orient our dialogue with Muslim communities and discredit the Salafi jihadi message; identify opportunities to establish message authority and credibility; identify future needs for research and publications.
<i>Speakers</i>	Don Sexton, Columbia University Cari Eggspueller, Business for Diplomatic Action
<i>Discussion Leader</i>	Lianne Kennedy Boudali
<b>4:00-5:30</b>	<b>Reception</b>

## Appendix B: Speaker Biographies

---

**CARI EGGSPUEHLER** received her BA in Political Science and Public Administration from the University of Texas at Dallas in 1997 and a Masters of Public Affairs in 1998. Eggspuehler has traveled extensively to every region of the world working on State systems, developing threat perspectives and briefing thousands of Ambassadors, Chiefs of Mission, and senior US Government officials to include Secretary Albright and Secretary Powell as well as heads of US based corporations on cyber terrorism and related threats. In the summer of 2003, Eggspuehler was hired by Keith Reinhard, Chairman of DDB Worldwide to lead his *Taskforce to Mobilize American Business for Public Diplomacy*. Incorporated last January as Business for Diplomatic Action, the effort has received extensive coverage and support most notably for testimony in response this past August to the 9/11 Commission Report and their launch of a World Citizens Guide for young Americans traveling abroad. Eggspuehler serves as the taskforce's Executive Director guiding the activities of a global Board and senior advisory council spearheaded by preeminent global communications, marketing, political science, research and media professionals.

**JACK JACOBS:** Colonel Jack Jacobs, who entered military service through Rutgers ROTC, earned the Medal of Honor for exceptional heroism on the battlefields of Vietnam. He also holds three Bronze Stars and two Silver Stars. Jacobs served on the faculty of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point and the National War College in Washington, D.C. After retirement, he founded and was chief operating officer of Auto Finance Group. As a managing director of Bankers Trust Co., he led Global Investment Management to \$2.2 billion in assets and later co-founded a similar business for Lehman Brothers. He is a member of the Council on Foreign Relations and is a director of the Medal of Honor Foundation. He is also a military analyst for NBC/MSNBC.

**AFSHON OSTOVAR** is a Ph.D. student in the Department of History at the University of Michigan. He is trained in both the premodern and modern fields of Islamic history, and has lived and worked throughout the Middle East and Central Asia. Currently, his research focuses on the intellectual and cultural history of political Islamic movements and Jihadist visual propaganda.

**JOSH RUSHING** will host a show for Al Jazeera International, a 24-hour, English-speaking, news network set to launch in the Spring of 2006. Rushing spent 14 years as a Marine media liaison. The Texas native became an accidental media star in the film "Control Room", a documentary about Al Jazeera's coverage of the US invasion of Iraq. Since Rushing's resignation from the Corps, he has appeared on every major news network and spoken across America. As a host on Al Jazeera International, he has recently been featured on the Today Show, The Factor with Bill O'Reilly, 360 with Anderson Cooper, among others.

**DONALD E. SEXTON** is Professor in the Business School and in the School of International and Public Affairs, Columbia University. Don received his B.A. from Wesleyan University and his M.B.A. and Ph.D. from the University of Chicago, all in the disciplines of mathematics and economics. He has been teaching for more than thirty-five years at Columbia in the areas of marketing, branding, and quantitative methods, served as chair of the International Business

Division, and is a recipient of the Business School's Distinguished Teaching Award. His publications concern branding and marketing and have appeared in journals such as the Journal of Business, the Journal of Marketing, and Management Science. Don served as a visiting professor at INSEAD for several years and has also taught at the Beijing Management Institute, the Australian Graduate School of Management, Jagiellonian University (Krakow), the U.S. Business School in Prague, the China Europe International Business School (Shanghai), the University of California-Berkeley, and the Indian School of Business. During the 1970's, he taught at the University of Tehran and also worked with the Iranian Ministry of Economy as an expert of the ILO. For many years he was a member of Columbia's Middle East Institute. He has provided services in the areas of branding and marketing to numerous organizations such as GE, IBM, Citibank, Kodak, Pfizer, and DuPont.

**Dr. BORIK ZADEH** was educated in Iran, England and the United States, and has worked and traveled in a number of Middle Eastern countries. He is conversant or familiar with several of the native languages of the region and is knowledgeable about the local cultural nuances of the Middle Eastern countries. He has over 34 years of domestic and international experience in planning and policy development and analysis in areas such as national defense, nuclear energy, nuclear materials management, R & D, communications, security policy and strategy, technology forecasting and vulnerability and threat assessment. Dr. Zadeh joined the Battelle Memorial Institute in 1979 and is currently a research leader concentrating in technical and cultural aspects of anti-terrorism. His education includes Ph.D. in Systems Engineering from the University of Pennsylvania; and M.S. in Operations Research from the University of Michigan; and a B.S. in Civil Engineering from the University of Toledo. Presently, Dr. Zadeh is writing a book on the cultural differences between the West and the Muslim World and War on Terrorism.

## Appendix C: List of Participants

---

MAJ	Matt	Abbruzzese	Department of Social Sciences, USMA
Ms	Bonnie	Baker	US Special Operations Command
Mr	Jarret	Brachman	Combating Terrorism Center, USMA
MAJ	Jeff	Bramlett	Department of Social Sciences, USMA
Cadet	Jon	Cheatwood	USCC
Ms.	Cari	Eggspuehler	Business for Diplomatic Action
LTC	Joe	Felter	Combating Terrorism Center, USMA
Mr	Brian	Fishman	Combating Terrorism Center, USMA
Dr	James	Forest	Combating Terrorism Center, USMA
2LT	P.	Georges	USCC/St. Cyr
MAJ	Chris	Hornbarger	Combating Terrorism Center, USMA
COL	Jack	Jacobs	Department of Social Sciences, USMA
COL	Cindy	Jebb	Department of Social Sciences, USMA
Ms	Lianne	Kennedy Boudali	Combating Terrorism Center, USMA
LTC	Kip	McCormick	Combating Terrorism Center, USMA
COL	Michael	Meese	Department of Social Sciences, USMA
MSG	Lilian	Mejia	US Special Operations Command
Cadet	Sean	Miller	USCC
MAJ	Dean	Newman	Department of Military Instruction, USMA
MAJ	Suzanne	Nielsen	Department of Social Sciences, USMA
Mr	Afshon	Ostovar	University of Michigan
MAJ	Jin	Pak	Department of Social Sciences, USMA
Mr	Josh	Rushing	Al Jazeera International
Dr	Donald	Sexton	Columbia University
Ms	Thalia	Tzanetti	Combating Terrorism Center, USMA
MAJ	Rick	Wrona	Combating Terrorism Center, USMA
Dr	Borik	Zadeh	Battelle Memorial Institute