

Welcome Home ISIS! The Obama Administration's Plan to Reintegrate Foreign Terrorist Fighters

By [Dr. John Andrew Morrow](#)

Global Research, December 19, 2016

Region: [USA](#)

Theme: [Terrorism](#)

In-depth Report: [Nuclear War](#)

Allegations of US-support for pseudo-Islamist terrorists around the world often fall on deaf ears and are dismissed as the mad ramblings of conspiracy theorists.

According to numerous scholars, including Noam Chomsky, Michel Chossudovsky, and many others, the United States has a long and well-documented history of supporting mass murderers around the world, both covertly and overtly.

As many researchers have reported, the Government of the United States has supported genocidal military dictators around the globe as well as violent extremists, ranging from death-squads in Latin America to MKO terrorists in Iran as well as acts of aggression in other parts of the world.

US-support for the Mujahidin, al-Qaeda, and the early Taliban has been widely reported as has American support for the internationalist terrorists who overthrew Qaddafi and those who have exceeded all bounds in their attempt to annihilate Iraq and Syria.

Despite the clear and present danger that so-called Radical Islamist terrorists pose to the Western world, political and intelligence analysts report that the US administration has continued to use them as “useful geopolitical tools” to weaken and destabilize nation-states.

And while the United States government finally appeared to take a moral stance against ISIS by passing the Fortenberry Resolution on March 15, 2016, and holding the terrorist group responsible for genocide, war crimes, and crimes against humanity, it has no intention of actually prosecuting any returning terrorists, and never had the intention of bringing any of them to justice.

As FBI Director James Comey indicated in an interview with “60 Minutes” on October 7, 2014, American citizens who are fighting with ISIS are “entitled” to return to the US. Such a position, however, is in blatant violation of United States Code, Section 1481, which states that:

A person who is a national of the United States whether by birth or naturalization, shall lose his nationality by voluntarily performing any of the following acts with the intention of relinquishing United States nationality—
...(3) entering, or serving in, the armed forces of a foreign state if (A) such armed forces are engaged in hostilities against the United States, or ... (7) committing any act of treason against, or attempting by force to overthrow, or bearing arms against, the United States, ... , or to levy war against them, if and when he is convicted thereof by a court martial or by a court of competent

jurisdiction.

What is more, current US law also states that it is a crime to provide material support to a terrorist organization which includes joining or attempting to join a terrorist group. Finally, the US Neutrality Act also makes it a crime for American citizens or residents to fight against a government with which the US is not officially at war.

Under the Obama administration, however, the law did not apply. Rather than arrest, prosecute, and punish war criminals and traitors, James Comey, the FBI Director, reported that returning ISIS terrorists were merely being “tracked.” In fact, on November 13, 2015, the FBI admitted that it was engaged in nearly 1,000 active probes involving ISIS members, sympathizers, and supporters on US soil. Typically, however, whether it is in Europe or the United States, we only learn that a person was “under surveillance” after they have committed mass murder.

Over a year earlier, on September 22, 2014, President Obama admitted that American ISIS fighters had returned to the United States. Rather than have them detained, charged, and convicted, he reported that they were being tracked closely. That is like telling parents that the State is simply keeping violent pedophilic sexual predators under surveillance rather than holding them accountable for their crimes.

On September 30, 2014, the Brookings Institute published an article by Daniel L. Byman and Jeremy Shapiro that argued that “the danger posed by returning fighters is both familiar and manageable.”

A policy briefing, titled, *Returning Foreign Fighters* was published by the Brookings Institute on August 15, 2015, argued in favor of reintegration of foreign fighters as opposed to criminalization.

In May of 2016, the US Department of State and US Aid published their *Joint Strategy on Countering Violent Extremism* which calls for the “rehabilitation and reintegration” of violent extremist radicals “back into society.”

In a study titled *ISIS in the West*, published by the New America Foundation in November of 2015 and updated on March 22, 2016, Peter Bergen, Courtney Schuster, and David Sterman, described the threat of returning terrorists as “low” and “likely ... manageable.”

Apparently, the US administration also had its Obama-Muslims on board who supported the suicidal plan to reintegrate returning terrorists fighters.

Humera Khan, the Executive Director of Muflehun, a think tank specializing in preventing radicalization and countering violent extremism proposes four intersecting strategies to combat extremism:

preventing radicalization, intervening on behalf of individuals who have radicalized, interdicting or finding and prosecuting those who have engaged in criminal behavior, and reintegrating into society those offenders who are in prison, have served their term, or are returning from conflict zones.

While reasonable people agree with prevention and intervention, the notion of rehabilitating

terrorists who are guilty of genocide, war crimes, and crimes against humanity is morally and ethically objectionable.

It is one thing when a naïve, idealistic youth, who was brain-washed by some manipulative Salafi / Wahhabi / Takfiris, goes to Syria, sees that he has been lied to, realizes that the “Islamic” State is actually a “Satanic” State, repents, returns home, and atones. Such a youth could eventually be completely de-radicalized and prove useful in preventing the radicalization of others.

It is another thing altogether when a committed person, who is fully aware of the criminal actions of ISIS, joins them eagerly, torturing, mutilating, and murdering people, beheading babies, exterminating Christians, Shiites, Sufis, traditional Sunnis, and Kurds, as well as raping, enslaving, and trafficking women, returns to the Western world.

Despite endorsing the Fortenberry Resolution, which finds ISIS guilty of war crimes, genocide, and crimes against humanity, the US Government, under Obama, has had no intention of bringing ISIS terrorists to justice, either here or abroad.

Like the European governments, who feel that prosecuting returning terrorist fighters is “impractical” and “difficult,” the American administration argues that the International Human Rights Tribunal does not have jurisdiction over Syria and Iraq. Ironically, the US administration has no qualms about jurisdiction when they attack, bomb, invade, and occupy sovereign nations.

Through statements from government officials, policy recommendations from think-tanks, as well as reports from a number of sources close to the White House, it was US policy, under Obama, not to arrest and prosecute ISIS fighters returning to the United States, but to attempt to “reintegrate” them into US society, thus putting all Americans at risk. First the Cuban Exiles, next the Contras, and now this.

The same policy has been in place in Saudi Arabia for some time, where returning terrorists are “re-educated” to view this or that foreign enemy, rather than the Saudi regime itself, as the proper objects of their “jihad” against unbelievers. It has met with little success.

By embracing the “Countering Violent Extremism Strategy,” the Obama Administration betrayed an incredibly naïve view of the threat posed to the West by Takfiri terrorists. In fact, it leaves some to suspect that “reintegration” may be part of the deal the US made with certain ISIS fighters, either as a sort of retirement package or a way of putting valuable assets on ice for possible future reactivation. And the Feds may fear if they do not keep their end of that bargain, ISIS will respond with large-scale attacks inside the US.

Readers should definitely search “War College Counter-Insurgency Policies” plus “Salvadoran Death-Squads,” since it appears that the US plan for ISIS may incorporate elements of the model that was used with both the death-squads and the Contras. The BIG DIFFERENCE here is that the death-squads and the Contras did not ultimately declare war on the US, which would make ISIS the greatest foreign policy debacle in US history.

All Americans should be shocked that such policies have been proposed and even more scandalized that they have been implemented. In March of 2016, the House of Representatives declared by a unanimous vote the actions of ISIS to be genocide; this conclusion was echoed by Secretary of State John Kerry. Yet the plan appears to be not to

arrest and prosecute these war criminals and ship them to Guantanamo, but to attempt to *reintegrate them into society* — perhaps after a short “vacation,” perhaps not.

We are still tracking down and punishing the last Nazis, now in their 90’s, and the actions of ISIS are certainly as barbaric as anything the Nazis ever dreamt up. Anyone who thinks that a young terrorist with the blood still moist and fragrant on his hands poses less of a threat to US society than some 90-year old ex-Nazi should have his or her head examined. Have the laws against treason been suspended? Apparently so.

If Obama’s White House appears to have been sanitized of sanity, the United Nations still seems to have a head on its shoulders. Contrary to the US government, that downplays the danger, the UN recently reported that foreign terrorist fighters “pose a “significant and evolving” global threat.

The US Government, under Obama, has continued to live in la-la land, urging Muslim communities to help reintegrate and rehabilitate returning ISIS combatants. If the administration had its way it would be time to welcome home ISIS to the USA!

With the election of Donald Trump, the pendulum appears to have shifted from a policy of aiding and abetting ISIS terrorists, while simultaneously pretending to fight them, to a policy of blowing the shit out of them with the support of Vladimir Putin who has suddenly shifted from being an enemy to an indispensable ally.

Nuclear War with Russia

As disappointing as Hillary Clinton’s defeat may be to half of the US population, it appears to have averted a nuclear war with Russia and China. The Obama-Clinton policy of antagonizing Russia and China was playing with nuclear fire. Hillary’s threat to impose a no-fly zone over Syria and her willingness to shoot down Russian aircrafts could have escalated into a conflict of cataclysmic proportions.

The major build-up of nuclear bombers on Diego Garcia, a US military base in the Indian Ocean, no fly zones over Montana’s nuclear silos, and the movement of refueling tankers to the Middle were also ominous signs in October of 2016.

Under-reported or entirely ignored in the United States, the Russians organized massive nuclear attack drills involving 40 million citizens in October of 2016. In the same month, Putin requested that Russian students, officials, and their loved-one return to “the Motherland.” These unprecedented actions coincided with the upgrading of the DEFCON Warning System to Level 3.

The DEFCON alert system has five different levels with level 1 indicating an impending nuclear war. To put things into perspective, the last time the alert was raised so high was on September 11, 2001. During the Cuban Missile Crisis, the US Armed Forces were ordered to DEFCON 3 while Strategic Air Command was ordered to DEFCON 2.

If most inhabitants of planet earth were oblivious to the fact that the world was on the brink of nuclear war in October of 2016, they also ignored that the risk was directly related to the potential election of Clinton. Not only did Hillary intend on following the failed foreign policy of her predecessor, she intended to assume an even more belligerent stance.

While many people were shocked at the election of Donald Trump, and many were

convinced that the world would come to an end, they failed to realize that the DEFCON warning level immediately dropped down to 5, namely, "There are currently no imminent nuclear threats against the United States at this time." In other words, the world almost came to an end: not because of Trump but rather because of Clinton.

And while it is true that the DEFCON alert system "is not affiliated with any government agency... and does not represent the alert status of any military branch," it serves as a barometer that gages the risk of nuclear war involving the United States. Relying on publicly available information as well as contacts within government and military agencies, it provides, in my estimation, an informed analysis of current political conditions.

As President-Elect, Donald J. Trump's first accomplishment was saving the planet from nuclear doom. His second accomplishment was his promise to stop all US-support for the terrorists operating in Syria, Iraq, and beyond. And rather than sending ISIS veterans home to the United States, we can only hope and pray that Trump's re-set toward a reasonable foreign policy and a multipolar worldview will send Takfiri terrorists to their eternal home in Hell.

As much as I have criticized Mr. Trump for all the outrageous statements he has made and the scandalous policies he has proposed, and as much as I will continue to denounce any declarations that he makes and any actions that he takes that violate the Constitution of the United States, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Geneva Convention, and international law, I will praise and support any positive efforts on his part.

Mr. Trump, as President, 1) promise us that American imperialism and exceptionalism will become part of the past; 2) promise us that the United States will no longer employ "Islamist" terrorists as part of overt and covert military actions against sovereign nations; 3) promise us that plans to reintegrate and rehabilitate returning terrorist fighters will be permanently halted and that the war criminals in question will be brought to justice; and, finally, 4) promise us that you will make a distinction, not between "moderate" Muslims and "extremist" Muslims but between true Muslims and false Muslims. If you fulfil these four promises, you will go a great way in reassuring the American Muslim community, discouraging Islamophobia, and lowering the spike in anti-Muslim hate crimes.

President-Elect Trump, it is time to act Presidential and be a President for all Americans, including us, the millions of Muslims who are proud to be citizens of this great nation.

Dr. John Andrew Morrow is the author of The Covenants of the Prophet Muhammad with the Christians of the World and the Director of the Covenants Initiative, an international movement devoted to protecting persecuted Christians as well as Shiites, Sufis, traditional Sunnis, and Yazidis. His websites include www.covenantsoftheprophet.com and www.johnandrewmorrow.com. His Twitter account is @drjamorrow. He can also be followed on his various Facebook pages: @johnandrewmorrow and @covenantsoftheprophet

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Dr. John Andrew](#)
[Morrow](#)

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca

www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca