

# **THE NATIONAL WAR COLLEGE**

**ELECTIVE COURSE 5994**

## **Homeland Security**

**ACADEMIC YEAR 2002-2003**

**Fall 2002**

***This document contains educational material designed to promote discussion by students of the National War College. It does not necessarily reflect the views of the National Defense University or the Department of Defense.***

*The contents of this document are the property of the U.S. Government and are intended for the exclusive use of the faculty and students of the National War College (NWC) or the National Defense University (NDU). No further dissemination is authorized without the express consent of the NWC Commandant.*

**CAPT (Ret) Ted Laven  
COL Jim Rabon  
Col (Ret) Randy Larsen**  
*Course Directors*

**Colonel John Zielinski**  
***Chairman, Department of  
Military Strategy and  
Operations***

<b>TOPIC</b>	<b>SUBJECT</b>	<b>DATE</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	18 Sep/1535
<b>2</b>	<b>Terrorism and Asymmetric Warfare</b>	25 Sep/1535
<b>3</b>	<b>National Security or a Criminal Act?</b>	2 Oct/1535
<b>4</b>	<b>Protecting the Homeland</b>	9 Oct/1535
<b>5</b>	<b>Nuclear Terrorism</b>	16 Oct/1535
<b>6</b>	<b>Bioterrorism</b>	23 Oct/1535
<b>7</b>	<b>Critical Infrastructure and Cyber Security</b>	30 Oct/1330
<b>8</b>	<b>Organizing for Homeland Security</b>	6 Nov/1330
<b>9</b>	<b>DoD and Homeland Security/Defense</b>	13 Nov/1330
<b>10</b>	<b>Combating Terrorism</b>	20 Nov/1330
<b>11</b>	<b>Student Presentations</b>	27 Nov/1330
<b>12</b>	<b>Where Do We Go From Here?</b>	4 Dec/1330

*"Toto, I've a feeling that we are not in Kansas anymore."*

**--Dorothy, *The Wizard of Oz***

### **COURSE OVERVIEW**

This course in homeland security will help the student explore the new boundaries of the nation's 21st century national security mission by examining the threats, the actors, and the organizational structures and resources required to defend the American homeland. The syllabus and reading material reflect policies, perceptions, realities and thinking since 9/11. Since the threat to our security remains high and responsive policies continue to be refined and structures developed, course content and possibly structure may be modified, as needed. The purpose of this course is not to provide answers. The purpose is to provide a framework for analysis of homeland security in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century.

Few terms currently used in the national security lexicon are more misunderstood than "homeland security" or "homeland defense." Despite the fact that both terms have been used in numerous DoD and other national security documents since first introduced in the *1997 Report from the National Defense Panel*; there is no "official" definition of either homeland security or homeland defense. From 1997 through late 2000, homeland defense was the most frequently used term, however, the term most frequently used today in the White House, on Capitol Hill, in OSD, and the majority of think tanks is homeland security. In general, we might consider "homeland security" to encompass policies, actions and structures designed to protect the rights and freedoms inherent in the US Constitution, and "homeland defense" a subset of homeland security with policies, activities and actions designed to defend against extra-territorial threats, to include preemptive operations.

### **METHOD:**

Course topics will be addressed through a variety of media, to include faculty lead seminars discussions, guest lectures, readings from distributed books, articles and press reports, current events, classified presentations, and student presentations. Ideally and as available, topics will be introduced by guest speakers, principals both in government and the private sector responsible for homeland security policies and operations, during the first hour of seminar followed by student discussion during the second hour.

### **TEXTS:**

***National Strategy for Homeland Security***, Office of Homeland Security, The White House, July 2002.

***How Did This Happen?: Terrorism and the New War***, James Hoge and Gideon Rose Editors, Nov 2001

***Unholy War: Terror in the Name of Islam***, John L Esposito, Oxford University Press 2002

***Protecting the American Homeland***, Brookings Institute, Apr 2002

***21<sup>st</sup> Century Complete Guide to Bioterrorism, Biological and Chemical Weapons, Germs and Germ Warfare, Nuclear and Radiation Terrorism – Military Manuals and Federal Documents with Practical emergency Plans, protective Measures, Medical Treatment and Survival Information***, US Government CD-ROM, 2002

***The Constitution of the United States***, Twentieth edition (reprint, pocket edition), US GPO, 2000.

### **INTERNET LINKS:**

White House Office of Homeland Security: <http://www.whitehouse.gov/homeland/>

US Department of State: <http://usinfo.state.gov/topical/pol/terror/homeland.htm>

US Department of Defense: <http://www.defenselink.mil/specials/homeland/>

ANSER Institute for Homeland Security: <http://www.homelandsecurity.org>

Federal Bureau of Investigation: <http://www.fbi.gov/terrorinfo/terrorism.htm>

US Government Information: <http://www.firstgov.gov/Topics/Usresponse.shtml>

National Defense University Library: <http://ndunet.ndu.edu/lib/homedefense.html>

***COURSE REQUIREMENTS: Either/or:***

***A. Student Presentation:***

Student presentations (either individually or in teams of two) tightly focused on a policy or specific challenge of homeland security of approximately 20 minutes in length, including Q&A led by the presenter(s). All topics must be approved by the faculty not later than 16 Oct.

***B. Student Paper:***

Student paper of approximately 8-10 pages. This may be either a research paper or a supported "op-ed" position paper. All NWC student papers qualify for consideration for ANSER Institute's annual NWC Homeland Security writing award. All topics must be approved by the faculty not later than 16 Oct.

## Topic One

### INTRODUCTION

Wednesday  
18 September 2002  
1535-1730

"Bastards"

**--Banner Headline, San Francisco Examiner, 12 September 2001**

*All these crimes and sins committed by the Americans are a clear declaration of war on God, his messenger, and Muslims. On that basis, and in compliance with God's order, we issue the following fatwa to all Muslims: The ruling to kill the Americans and their allies -- civilians and military -- is an individual duty for every Muslim who can do it in any country in which it is possible to do it, in order to liberate the al-Aqsa Mosque and the holy mosque [Mecca] from their grip, and in order for their armies to move out of all the lands of Islam, defeated and unable to threaten any Muslim. This is in accordance with the words of Almighty God, "and fight the pagans all together as they fight you all together," and "fight them until there is no more tumult or oppression, and there prevail justice and faith in God." We -- with God's help -- call on every Muslim who believes in God and wishes to be rewarded to comply with God's order to kill the Americans and plunder their money wherever and whenever they find it. We also call on Muslim ulema, leaders, youths, and soldiers to launch the raid on Satan's U.S. troops and the devil's supporters allying with them, and to displace those who are behind them so that they may learn a lesson.*

**--Usama Bin Laden as cited in London Al-Quds al-'Arabi in Arabic  
Text of Fatwa Urging Jihad Against Americans, 23 Feb 98,**

*"Deliverable weapons of mass destruction in the hands of terrorists would expose this nation and the civilized world to the worst fears of wars, and we will not allow it. We will not live at the mercy of terrorists or terror regimes."*

**--Vice President Richard Cheney  
Commissioning Day Ceremonies, US Naval Academy, 24 May 2002**

*"What are the threats that keep me awake at night?"*

*"International terrorism, both on its own and in conjunction with narcotics traffickers, international criminals and those seeking weapons of mass destruction. You need go no further than Usama Bin Ladin...."*

**--George J. Tenet, Director of Central Intelligence  
Georgetown University, 18 October 1999**

### **Discussion**

*"We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, **provide for the common defence...**" While the*

preamble to the Constitution of the United States discusses the need for "homeland defense," the US's relative isolation from Europe and Asia by large oceans, relatively weak neighbors north and south, and preoccupation on internal stability and expansion permitted the development of a uniquely American belief that wars were something which were fought "over there." That belief was shattered somewhat on December 7, 1941 when Japanese Admiral Yamamoto's carrier battle force attacked the US Navy's Pacific Fleet at Pearl Harbor. However, that was still "over there" in a then US administered territory and not against the "continental" United States.

Wars, including all the wars fought by Americans during the 20<sup>th</sup> Century, were fought on foreign soil. The exception was the Cold War. Although never evolving into a "hot" war, since the 1963 Cuban Missile Crisis Americans lived with the reality that the United States itself was vulnerable to unimaginable conflict on its soil. One could certainly argue that this was homeland defense. However, the feasibility of defense against Soviet missiles became so problematic that the best defense became no defense. In theory, a balance of terror became the most effective means of protecting the American homeland. "Mutual Assured Destruction" meant that the superpowers could hold each other's populations' hostage during the Cold War confrontation.

The American myth of relative isolation was broken at 1218 February 26,1993 when a high explosive bomb ripped through the underground parking garage of the World Trade Center in New York City, resulting in 6 dead, thousands injured and \$1 billion in damage. It was designed to be worse – the twin towers toppled and a crippling blow to the US economy. Shortly after the blast the perpetrators issued a statement proclaiming themselves an army and promising more attacks if the United States did not disengage from the Middle East and end all support for Israel. This domestic attack on possibly the most visible icon of US economic power and global strength rekindled 200-year old thinking for the need for "homeland defense."

Since the 1997 QDR, there have been frequent discussions in the press and in military circles about the idea of "homeland defense." Often, this term has been used interchangeably with national missile defense, counter-terrorism, domestic security, "consequence management" or the response to the use of a weapon of mass destruction, military support to civil authorities, and information warfare. Such mixing of terms has political/legal repercussions because to some, the discussion connotes "the military" being intimately involved in the country's domestic affairs.

In the Spring of 1999, Senator John Warner (R-VA), Chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, and Secretary of Defense William Cohen were openly discussing the idea of a "CINC Homeland Defense." A strong and well-coordinated response from civil libertarians, supported by many on Capitol Hill, quickly killed this idea. Instead, in November 1999, Joint Forces Command created Joint Task Force-Civil Support. The dramatic change in less than a year from serious discussion of a four-star command to a National Guard brigadier general with a small staff and a narrowly defined mission demonstrated the sensitivity of the American public to the role of "the military" in domestic affairs. In less than 7 months following the attacks on 11 September, the President proposed and Congress approved a change in the Unified Command Plan which establishes Northern Command, essentially a four-star "homeland joint forces commander" with defense responsibilities out to 500 miles offshore, as well as combining US strategic warfare and space operations responsibilities under another four-star officer, both with initial operating capability starting 1 October 2002.

The Soviet Union no longer exists, but the Russian Federation maintains the very large remnant of its nuclear, chemical and biological arsenals. Today's threats, including massive levels of destruction, can also come from smaller, less technologically sophisticated, less predictable nations, and in some cases from non-state actors. Unconventional attacks, such as the suicidal use of wide body, fully fueled aircraft can serve as weapons of mass destruction. Additionally, anonymous operations, such as cyber, biological and even nuclear attacks, can now be conducted, or even made to look like an attack from a third party (so called "false flag" operations).

Detection of threats has also become more difficult. In the past 40 years, the intelligence community has had difficulty assessing intentions of hostile nations, but has had considerably better success in accessing capabilities. In the 21st Century assessing capabilities may become as difficult as assessing intentions. Even after four years of the most intrusive arms control inspections ever implemented, the United Nations Special Commission did not learn of Iraq's extensive BW program until a key official (Saddam's son-in-law) defected. Likewise, the International Atomic Energy Agency had certified Iraq to be in compliance with all treaties and guidelines just months before their invasion of Kuwait. Following the Gulf War, a UN inspection team discovered that Iraq was well down the road to becoming a nuclear power. The disturbing result of their discovery was that Iraq was not building one or two nuclear weapons; the Iraqi program was designed to build more than 100.

The proliferation of nuclear and biological weapons, and the means to deliver them, combined with the United States' increased dependence (hence increased vulnerability) on information systems, has renewed the debate on homeland security. But what is homeland security? Our first priority will be to define the term. It has many definitions. Some definitions range from ballistic missile defense to the war on drugs and illegal immigration. Others use a very narrow definition focusing on terrorist use of weapons of mass destruction. Some say it only applies to foreign threats, while others say, "all enemies, foreign and domestic." Some say homeland security should only apply to political acts against the U.S while others say modern transnational criminal organizations pose a serious threat to national security and should be included. American corporations say it should include protecting American citizens and companies in overseas locations. Should it include our satellites in space and our embassies abroad? Embassies are considered to be on American soil. What are the boundaries of homeland security?

One might begin to define homeland security in terms of national interests. What is it we are trying to defend: the survival of our constitutional government, our territory and population, our economy, our values, our prestige, our ability to deploy military forces? Is America's homeland security in the 21st Century still limited by its geographic borders? Is space part of our homeland? Or has our globalized economy and superpower status changed these 19th and 20th Century concepts of national security? And what are the military implications of our definition? How do the potential threats and the concept of homeland security bear on the problems of national and theater military strategy? Should we focus our discussions on crisis management and consequence management or should we take a more holistic approach including deterrence, detection, preemption, crisis management, consequence management, attribution, and retaliation?

Surprisingly, the term homeland security is not even listed in the Department of Defense Dictionary of Military and Associated Terms--Joint Pub 1-02. (As of 1 Apr 01, neither are homeland defense, cyber war nor asymmetric war.) The good news is that there has been progress since this course was first taught in the Fall of 1999. At the time, the term of choice was homeland defense. Since September 2001 there has been a migration to the term, homeland security. Many organizations and institutions inside the Beltway now refer to homeland security as the overall mission. From the DoD perspective, homeland security is further divided into two missions: homeland defense and civil support. Homeland defense includes deterrence, prevention, preemption and retaliation. Civil support focuses primarily on the consequence management phase, where civil authorities would have the lead, augmented by DoD when necessary. But there are many institutional fault lines and bureaucratic challenges to overcome.

This course will not provide the student with a "school solution" to these issues. Instead, it will challenge the students to engage in a comprehensive analysis of what President Bush has called his "most important job."

### **Issues for Consideration**

*What is Homeland Security? For instance, does homeland security include National Missile Defense, the war on drugs, large-scale illegal immigration, HIV or the West Nile Virus, proliferation of technology, and/or transnational criminal organizations?*

*Is homeland security just another term for counter-terrorism?*

*What are we protecting? Does it include protection of cyber space, satellites, and American citizens living overseas?*

*What about the next "surprise?"*

### **Required Readings**

***National Security Strategy for Homeland Security***, Office of Homeland Security, The White House, July 2002, *Introduction*, pp 1-5, student book. On the web at: [http://www.whitehouse.gov/homeland/book/nat\\_strat\\_hls.pdf](http://www.whitehouse.gov/homeland/book/nat_strat_hls.pdf)

***Homeland Security: New Mission of a New Century***, M. Thomas Davis, Analysis Center Papers, January 2002, pp 1-17 (Reprint). On the web at: [http://www.capitol.northgrum.com/files/new\\_mission\\_new\\_century.pdf](http://www.capitol.northgrum.com/files/new_mission_new_century.pdf)

***Homeland Insecurity: In Pursuit of the Asymmetric Advantage***, Ruth A. David, President and CEO ANSER, CNSS 2002 Annual Conference, 9-11 April 2002, pp 1-9 (Reprint). On the web at: <http://www.homelandsecurity.org/Hls%2Ffeatures/CNSSConf%2Edoc>

***The War and the West***, James Kurth, Foreign Policy Research Institute, Newsletter Volume 3, Number 2, 2002, pp 1-8 (Reprint). On the web at: <http://www.fpri.org/ww/0302.200202.kurth.warandthewest.html>



***Protecting the American Homeland: A Preliminary Analysis***, Michael E. O'Hanlon and others, Brookings Institution Press, 2002, Introduction, pp1-11, student book.

***The Organization Men: Anatomy of a Terrorist Attack***, "How Did This Happen?: Terrorism and the New War," James F. Hoges Jr. and Gideon Rose, editors, Nov 2001, pp 1-14, student book.

***The Uneasy Imperium: Pax Americana in the Middle East***, Fouad Ajami, "How Did This Happen?: Terrorism and the New War," James F. Hoges Jr. and Gideon Rose, editors, Nov 2001, pp 16-29, student book.

-

## Topic Two

### TERRORISM AND ASYMMETRIC WARFARE

Wednesday  
25 September 2002  
1535-1730

*"In 1989, some American military experts predicted a fundamental change in the future form of warfare... They predicted that the wars of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century would be dominated by a kind of warfare they called 'the fourth generation of wars.' Others called it 'asymmetric warfare...'*

*"With the September 11 attacks, Al-Qaida entered the annals of successful surprise attacks, which are few in history – for example, the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor in 1941... Moreover: In the pain it caused, (Al Qaida) surpassed these surprise attacks, because it put every individual in American society on (constant) alert for every possibility, whether emotionally or practically. That has an extreme high economic and psychological price, particularly in a society that has not been affected by war since the America Civil War..."*

*"Deterrence: This principle is based on the assumption that there are two sides (fighting) that seek to survive and defend their interests – but it is completely eliminated when dealing with people who don't care about living but thirst for martyrdom."*

**--Abu 'Ubeid al-Qurashi  
Aide to Usama bin Laden, Fourth Generation Wars**

*"For much of the last century, America's defense relied on the Cold War doctrines of deterrence and containment. In some cases, those strategies still apply. But new threats also require new thinking. Deterrence -- the promise of massive retaliation against nations -- means nothing against shadowy terrorist networks with no nation or citizens to defend. Containment is not possible when unbalanced dictators with weapons of mass destruction can deliver those weapons on missiles or secretly provide them to terrorist allies."*

**--President George Bush  
Graduation Speech, U.S. Military Academy, 1 June 2002**

*"The Asymmetric Threat: Make no mistake, we are the target. Our adversaries believe they must derail the emerging world order or be overcome by it. They also understand the singular importance of the United States in shaping that order..."*

*"Asymmetric approaches involve acting in unexpected ways, to present your enemy with capabilities and situations he is unable or unwilling to respond to before you are able to achieve decisive results. While asymmetric concepts are as old as warfare itself, they are important today because they are virtually the only means our enemies have for coping with US power."*

**--Vice Admiral Thomas R. Wilson, USN, Director, Defense Intelligence Agency  
Statement for the Record, Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, 6  
February 2002**

*"Terrorism is an instrument, not a movement. It is an immoral means employed by groups, some of which have just causes, some of which don't. To reduce its occurrence, it must be internationally delegitimized and the conditions under which it thrives minimized."*

**--Shibley Telhami, Sadat Chair for Peace and Development, University of Maryland  
Los Angeles Times, 19 April 2002**

Guest Speaker

**Discussion**

The United States Government describes terrorism as the *use of force or violence against persons or property in violation of the criminal laws of a country for purposes of intimidation, coercion or ransom. Terrorists often use threats to create fear among the public, to try to convince citizens that their government is powerless to prevent terrorism, and to get immediate publicity for their causes.* The Federal Bureau of Investigation categorizes terrorism in the United States as one of two types: **domestic terrorism** or **international terrorism**. **Domestic terrorism** involves groups or individuals whose terrorist activities are directed at elements of our government or population without foreign direction. **International terrorism** involves groups or individuals whose terrorist activities are foreign-based and/or directed by countries or groups outside the United States or whose activities transcend national boundaries.

While the definition of international terrorism clearly fits the events of 11 September, as well as near-daily events in the Levant, it does not offer an explanation of the causes of terrorism nor provide an explanation of suicide terrorism – "martyrdom." As Dr. Shibley Telhami suggests, terrorism is an immoral instrument of action and, more importantly, is not a movement in and of itself. Terrorism is immoral in that most societies reject attacks on non-combatants as a legitimate means for social or political change. However, when two societies clash and one views terrorist actions, to include "martyrdom," as a legitimate instrument of coercion there is no way to unilaterally de-legitimize terrorism. The only solution is to destroy groups who profess its use **and** to eliminate the "demand side" of terrorism.

Poverty alone does not spawn terrorism. More often, the conditions that lend themselves to terrorism reflect societal or group hopelessness and the perceived inability to bring about change in its social and/or political condition through legitimate means. This perception by many Palestinians is a driving force in Middle East terrorism. As more and more Palestinians support terrorism and more and more Israelis support the destruction of the Palestinian Authority – which they see as the engine of terrorism – the cycle of violence seems unstoppable, descending into a merciless clash between the two cultures. Prime Minister Sharon's objective is to

destroy Palestinian ability to conduct terrorism, thereby eliminating the short-term supply of terrorists... However, the demand for terrorism on behalf of the Palestinians continues to grow. Similarly, Islamic fundamentalists view globalization and the spread of western culture, as epitomized by the United States, as impeding their mission to restore the califate – true Islamic society – to its 7<sup>th</sup> Century glory and preeminence.. Eliminating known al Qaeda leadership and operating cells does not eliminate the perceived cultural and religious “demand” for empowerment through terrorism.

Suicide bombings are an incredibly lethal weapon – virtually impossible to defend against. It works most efficiently against a powerful enemy, where conventional means of warfare, to include guerilla attacks against military and police forces (as distinct from terrorism’s deliberate targeting of non-combatants) might be less effective. Suicide bombings seem to level the David-Goliath imbalance of power. “Martyrdom,” – death in the cause of Jihad, or Holy War-- is the highest form of bearing witness to and carrying out Allah’s divine plan. While Islam is used as an instrument of recruitment and motivation, many suicide bombers are secular in origin and conduct. Witness the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PLFP), with its Marxist roots, use of young women as suicide bombers.

The Middle East is not synonymous with terrorism. While terrorism in the Israeli-Palestinian context is a near daily headline and the region has witnessed numerous spectacular terrorist attacks against both Israel and the US (recall the suicide bombings of the US Embassy and the Marine Barracks in Beirut, Kobar Towers, and the USS Cole), it is useful to remember that between 1995-2000 Latin America, rather than the Middle East, suffered the greatest frequency of terrorist attacks. Moreover, the first terrorist use of WMD took place in Tokyo, where the Japanese Aum Shinriko released Sarin gas in a crowded subway. If so, why attack the United States? Usama bin Laden, having failed to topple the al Saud regime in Saudi Arabia – which he perceives as an apostate reign, beholden to the US – was nonetheless very successful in empowering and financing those with similar beliefs. Fresh from a successful Jihad against the “infidels” in Afghanistan, convinced that he has single handedly defeated a superpower (the Soviet Union), angered by continued Western presence in Islamic “holy-lands” and committed to the restoration of Islamic glory by the sword, he declared war on America and its regional “lackeys.” He garnered grass root support, exploiting the negative impression of the U.S. as a corrupt, materialistic, violent, and decadent society that many Muslims have. He also successfully exploited the Arab World’s sense of victim hood dating back to the Crusades, and reinforced through grievances over colonialism (British and French), military defeats, exploitation and societal decline.

Nothing is more humiliating to the Arabs than the establishment of the State of Israel in 1948 (an event still referred to as “naq’fa” – catastrophe – in Arab literature) and the ensuing series of losing wars against a much smaller but better trained and equipped opponent.. Today, the conflict has become a Palestinian identity issue for the Arabs and the survival of a Jewish state for the Israelis. Sensationalized by international and the radical Islamic media (e.g., al Jazeera), Arabs can daily see U.S.-supplied tanks and airplanes shooting at Palestinians. Successes against Israelis are raised to mythical proportions, fueling hopes for ultimate victory, and producing a seemingly endless supplies of willing “shahids” (martyrs). Through this lens, Arabs and Palestinians perceive the U.S. as the key – if not the only – impediment to their success.

As mentioned in Topic One, the term "asymmetric warfare" is not listed in Joint Pub 2-01. Asymmetric warfare is, in a sense, irregular or non-linear confrontation with an adversary. In December 2001, Jason Vest writing in the Atlantic Monthly, offered his definition: *Asymmetric operations – in which a vast mismatch exists between the resources and philosophies of the combatants, and in which the emphasis is on bypassing an opposing military force and striking directly at cultural, political, or population targets – are a defining characteristic of fourth generation warfare. The United States will face decentralized, non-state actors who understand just how big an impact attacks on markets, communications, and cultural icons can have on the American people.*

While not equating fourth generation warfare completely with terrorism, the October 1989 Marine Corps Gazette article mentioned by al-Qurashi offers: *Terrorism must seek to collapse the enemy from within as it has little capability (at least at present) to inflict widespread destruction... Terrorism...attempts to bypass the enemy's military entirely and strike directly at his homeland at civilian targets. Ideally, the enemy's military is simply irrelevant to the terrorist.*

An excellent example of asymmetric concepts of operations was discovered after the end of the Cold War. The Soviets had been very concerned about the Swedish Air Force. It was not large, but it was well trained and equipped. If the Soviets had moved into Western Europe, the Swedish Air Force would have caused problems with the Soviets' lines of communications. One simple answer would have been for the Soviets to use their Air Force to defeat the Swedes. This would have been a sure thing, based on numbers, but it would have pulled Soviet aircraft off of the front lines. The Soviets therefore decided to use an asymmetric concept of operations. KGB personnel located the homes of the pilots in the Swedish Air Force and Spetnaz operatives would have been dispatched to kill the pilots as they left their homes ... a great way to defeat an air force – don't let it take off.

Today, if a nation – or terrorist group – wanted to prevent B-2s from dropping GPS guided bombs on their homeland, they might find it far more cost effective to send a small team of assassins to the community surrounding Whiteman AFB than to stop the B-2s with a more traditional air defense system.

Obviously, the most recent example of asymmetric concepts of operations was the use of wide body, fully fueled airliners as weapons of mass destruction. In this case, the new concept was not the use of blast, heat and fragmentation ... it was the use of suicide attacks. But then again, were suicide bombers something really new?

Technology is another dimension of asymmetric warfare. The use of biological, cyber, radiological, and electromagnetic pulse weapons definitely can provide disproportionate effects, especially when used in combination with more conventional high explosives. We have all witnessed what two junior college dropouts from the Philippines can do with the "I Luv You" virus. Imagine what 1,000 Stanford and MIT trained Chinese computer engineers could accomplish? We have seen what a few envelopes of anthrax can do. Imagine what havoc a large-scale bio attack would produce. EMP weapons could also be used to neutralize or reduce the technological advantages US forces currently enjoy.

Terrorism is a transnational issue that has engaged US national security policymakers and strategists for more than two decades. Today's terrorists are less dependent on state sponsorship. Yet, they've become more lethal

and more elusive, forming fluid, global affiliations based on religious or ideological affinity and a common hatred of the United States. Terrorism has evolved in its characteristics, scale, and shape over the past two decades. What remains constant, however, is the threat terrorism continues to pose to US most vital interests, both at home and abroad. The threat remains in the new millennium and will continue, in the words of George Tenet: *because the fundamental causes of the phenomenon - poverty, alienation, disaffection and ethnic hatreds deeply rooted in history... remain.*

### **Issues for Consideration**

*What are the characteristics of the threat posed by terrorism to US national security today and what are its likely future dimensions? Is the threat to US national security interests posed by terrorism growing or receding?*

*What is the probability that terrorists will acquire the technology, munitions and delivery systems for weapons of mass destruction during the next ten years?*

*Is 9/11 a result of the "clash of civilizations?"*

*Do we need new laws and new organizations to ensure that all the resources of the US government are effectively used to deny to terrorists the opportunity to carry out operations on US soil and overseas?*

*Is terrorism synonymous with religious fundamentalism?*

### **Required Readings**

***National Security Strategy for Homeland Security***, Office of Homeland Security, The White House, July 2002, *Threat and Vulnerability*, pp 7-10, student book. On the web at: [http://www.whitehouse.gov/homeland/book/nat\\_strat\\_hls.pdf](http://www.whitehouse.gov/homeland/book/nat_strat_hls.pdf)

***Unholy War: Terror in the Name of Islam***, John L. Esposito, Oxford University Press 2002, Chapter 1: The Making of a Modern Terrorist, pp 3-25, student book.

***Somebody Else's Civil War: Ideology, Rage, and the Assault on America***, Michael Scott Doran, "How Did This Happen?: Terrorism and the New War," James F. Hoge Jr. and Gideon Rose, editors, Nov 2001, pp 1-14, student book.

***Was It Inevitable?: Islam Through History***, Karen Armstrong, "How Did This Happen?: Terrorism and the New War," James F. Hoge Jr. and Gideon Rose, editors, Nov 2001, pp 54-69, student book.

***Left, Right and Beyond: The Changing Face of Terror***, Walter Laqueur, "How Did This Happen?: Terrorism and the New War," James F. Hoge Jr. and Gideon Rose, editors, Nov 2001, pp 71-82, student book.

### **Supplemental Readings**

***Unholy War: Terror in the Name of Islam***, John L. Esposito, Oxford University Press 2002, Chapter 2: Jihad and the Struggle for Islam, pp 26-70, student book.

***Global Threat and Challenges***, VADM Thomas R. Wilson, Director, Defense Intelligence Agency, Statement for the Record, Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, 6 February 2002, pp 1-31 (Reprint). On the web at:  
[http://www.dia.mil/Public/Press/testimony\\_ssci\\_2002.pdf](http://www.dia.mil/Public/Press/testimony_ssci_2002.pdf)

*or*

***Worldwide Threat - Converging Dangers in a Post 9/11 World***, Testimony of Director of Central Intelligence George J. Tenet before the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, 6 February 2002, pp 1-13 (Reprint). On the web at:  
[http://www.cia.gov/cia/public\\_affairs/speeches/dci\\_speech\\_02062002.html](http://www.cia.gov/cia/public_affairs/speeches/dci_speech_02062002.html)

### Topic Three

#### **NATIONAL SECURITY OR A CRIMINAL ACT?** *Intelligence or Law Enforcement?*

Wednesday  
2 October 2002  
1535-1730

*"In terms of whether or not the FBI and the CIA were communicating properly, I think it is clear that they weren't. Now, we've addressed that issue, and the CIA and the FBI are now in close communications. There's better sharing of intelligence. And one of the things that is essential to win this war is to have the best intelligence possible and, when we get the best intelligence, to be able to share it throughout the government."*

**--President George W. Bush, 4 June 2002**

*Two essential elements of any successful national security strategy, our intelligence and law enforcement capabilities, are both in the process of adjusting to the post-Cold War situation. We cannot afford a lapse in either.*

**--Senator Sam Nunn**

*"It would have been very nice if...you put into our computer system a request for anything relating to flight schools, for instance, and have every report in the last 10 years that...mentions flight schools or flight training and the like kicked out."*

*"We do not have that capability now. We have to have that capability."*

**--Robert S. Mueller, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, June 2002**

*"Those who give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety."*

**--Benjamin Franklin**

*"The USA Patriot Act is an insult to Americans. The Name, itself, is insulting, given what the Act contains and what it will someday be know for: its complete abdication of democratic law and principles. It should be called the Constitution Shredding Act."*

*"In particular, it utterly relinquishes any semblance of due process, violates the First, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth and Eight Amendments, and unacceptably mixes aspects of criminal investigations with aspects of immigration and foreign intelligence laws."*

*"Let me state it even more bluntly. This law is dangerous. It's a travesty."*

**--Jennifer Van Bergen, truthout, 1 April 2002**



Guest Speaker

### **Discussion**

Presidential Decision Directive (PDD) Thirty Nine (1995), U.S. Policy on Counterterrorism, states that *the United States regards all such terrorism (terrorist attacks on our territory and against our citizens, or facilities, whether they occur domestically, in international waters or airspace or on foreign territory) as a potential threat to national security as well as a criminal act and will apply all appropriate means to combat it.* In the United States the Director of Central Intelligence (DCI) has the responsibility for intelligence while the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) has the primary responsibility for investigation of terrorism. The regulations, operating guidelines and oversight for intelligence and law enforcement differ. US law enforcement officials are restricted in how they can obtain, track, interrogate and use electronic surveillance against a suspect who is a US citizen anywhere, or a non-citizen resident in the United States, by the Fourth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. The U.S. intelligence community is prohibited from collecting information on any U.S. "person" (which includes US groups, entities and businesses), but generally operates without restriction against non-citizens, groups, entities outside the U.S., and is charged with the responsibility to use all-source information to "bring terrorists to justice" wherever possible worldwide.

These complimentary, but sometimes incompatible, responsibilities and authorities are viewed by some as one reason the attacks on 11 September were able to occur. Law enforcement agencies obtain, categorize and maintain a custody trail on information used for criminal prosecution in the US legal system. Information obtained inconsistent with the civil liberties guaranteed to US citizens under the Bill of Rights are inadmissible in court. The intelligence community collects and analyzes foreign information supporting national policy and military action, and is generally not restricted by US laws when operating outside the U.S. In part due to these differing responsibilities, coordination and information sharing between the CIA and FBI suffered from bureaucratic politics and "turf wars." Pre-9/11 the FBI's structure was designed to maximize local authorities and operations with little information centralized at the national level. For its part, the CIA has a highly centralized structure limiting information exchange and operational flexibility at local levels. Citing their different charters, the agencies would squabble over whether source information was "intelligence" or "criminal," and many times not inform each other of sensitive data. As President Bush stated, the country needs both intelligence and law enforcement to counter terrorism.

Both the President's Office for Homeland Security and the proposed Department for Homeland Security (DHS) include centers for merging intelligence and law enforcement data, in essence a node where *all* information pertinent to the security of the nation would be analyzed and shared with those who need the resulting intelligence, from senior decision makers to first responders. At this writing, the scope of this national threat analysis center's authorities and eventual structuring remain under debate in Congress, as does whether elements of CIA and FBI would be merged and placed under the proposed Department of Homeland Security. Unless the analysis center within the proposed DHS has the authority to task and direct the CIA and FBI for information, and whether CIA and FBI provides DHS with the "raw" information needed for analysis, the new structure may not resolve the coordination challenge between intelligence and law enforcement. Today the only

official with authority over both intelligence and law enforcement efforts is the President.

The Patriot Act, signed into law on 26 October 2001, is designed to help both intelligence and law enforcement agencies collect and share information on security and counter terrorism matters. It expands the FBI's ability to search for evidence of criminal activity based on intelligence, emigration or other data previously inadmissible in court, as well as expanding the agency's ability to conduct searches without challenge, and some say without probable cause. It expands the intelligence community's access to personal criminal records and court proceedings previously "confidential."

As PDD-39 states, a terrorist act against the U.S. is both a threat to national security and a criminal act. This dichotomy facilitates the prosecution of terrorists and those engaged in planning acts of terrorism using either intelligence or law enforcement evidence, or both. Terrorists and suspected terrorists classified as combatants are subject to trial by military commissions consistent with Geneva Conventions. As combatants, they can be detained, and questioned, for the duration of the conflict. Since there is no law of terrorism – no crime of terrorism – it is not illegal to be a terrorist or belong to a terrorist organization. However, terrorists are criminals – planning violent crime and murder, kidnapping and arson, and can be subject to criminal penalties for bombing, hijacking, assault, murder, theft and sabotage, as well as illegal use of explosives and conspiracy. These activities, especially if committed in areas of US jurisdiction, fall under the purview of national, state and local law enforcement organizations and U.S. criminal courts.

### **Issues for Consideration**

*Is the terrorism threat on US soil a law enforcement or intelligence challenge?*

*Are terrorists criminals or combatants?*

*If necessary, should civil liberties of Americans be curtailed to provide for greater security of the nation?*

*Do those who plan or conduct terrorist attacks against the U.S. anywhere in the world, including U.S. citizens, be subject to military tribunals or civil courts?*

*Does the Patriot Act go too far in curtailing the civil liberties guaranteed in the Constitution?*

*Do we need a national identification card? Is such a card constitutional?*

-

### **Required Readings**

- ***National Security Strategy for Homeland Security***, Office of Homeland Security, The White House, July 2002, *Intelligence and Warning*, pp 15-19, and *Domestic Counterterrorism*, pp 25-28, student book. On the web at: [http://www.whitehouse.gov/homeland/book/nat\\_strat\\_hls.pdf](http://www.whitehouse.gov/homeland/book/nat_strat_hls.pdf)

***Intelligence and Law Enforcement: Countering Transnational Threats to the U.S.***, Richard A. Best, Jr., Congressional Research Service, The Library of Congress, 3 December 2001, pp 1-32 (Reprint). On the web at:  
<http://www.fas.org/irp/crs/RL30252.pdf>

***USA Patriot Act of 2002: Summary of Selected Provisions***, student handout, 2 pages

***How the USA Patriot Act enables Law Enforcement to use Intelligence Authorities to Circumvent the Privacy Protections Afforded in Criminal Cases***, American Civil Liberties Union, 23 October 2001, pp 1-5 (Reprint). On the web at:  
<http://www.aclu.org/congress/l102301i.html>

***The Constitution of the United States: Amendments IV, V and VI***, student book, page 22.

***Syllabus for Terrorism: Criminology of Terrorism***, Dr. Tom O'Connor, North Carolina Wesleyan College, Spring 2002, pp 1-6 (Reprint). On the web at:  
<http://faculty.ncwc.edu/toconnor/415/415lect01.htm>

***Intelligence Test: The Limits of Prevention***, Richard K. Betts, "How Did This Happen?: Terrorism and the New War," James F. Hoge Jr. and Gideon Rose, editors, Nov 2001, pp 145-161, student book.

### **Supplemental Readings**

***USA Patriot Act of 2001*** officially known as "Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism, June 2002. On the web at: <http://www.epic.org/privacy/terrorism/hr3162.pdf>

***Repeal the USA Patriot Act***, Jennifer Van Bergen, "truthout," 1 April 2002, 18 pages. On the web at: [http://www.truthout.com/docs\\_02/04.02A.JVB.Patriot.htm](http://www.truthout.com/docs_02/04.02A.JVB.Patriot.htm)

***Presidential Decision Directive-39: U.S Policy on Counter Terrorism***, The White House, 21 June 1995, 5 pages equivalent (Reprint). On the web at:  
<http://www.fas.org/irp/offdocs/pdd39.htm>

## Topic Four

### PROTECTING THE HOMELAND

Wednesday  
9 October 2002  
1530-1730

*"The message is that there are no knowns. There are things we know that we know. There are known unknowns; that is to say there are things we know we don't know. But there are also unknown unknowns – things we do not know we don't know. So when we do the best we can and we pull all this information together, and we then say, 'Well, that's basically what we see as the situation,' that is really only the known knowns and the known unknowns. And each year we discover a few more of these unknown unknowns."*

*"There is another way to phrase that, and that is that the absence of evidence is not evidence of absence."*

**Donald Rumsfeld, Secretary of Defense  
NATO Ministerial, Brussels, May 2002**

Guest Speaker

#### **Discussion**

What is it that we are trying to protect? Is it the U.S. Constitution and the American way of life namely the freedoms and civil liberties, or the economic system and our standard of living, or is it our icons and landmarks? Is it everything? Once we understand what it is that we need to protect, we can assign value, estimate risk, determine cost and execute a plan. The President has called us a *strong and tough nation*. And we are. We are also vulnerable as we saw on 11 September. Nineteen terrorists with a \$400,000 bankroll used the vulnerabilities of our open society to turn 4 commercial aircraft into weapons of mass destruction resulting in nearly 3,000 deaths, \$120 billion in direct costs and an estimated \$7 trillion in equity loss. So how are we going to protect our freedoms and economic well being and how are we going to pay for it?

A strong offense provides for a good defense. We are on the offensive in Afghanistan and other countries that either harbor and/or support terrorist groups or sponsor terrorism themselves. The President's National Security Strategy is expected in Fall 2002 and is reportedly centered on preempting terrorism in its cradle before it has a chance to occur. A threat-based strategy might include 3 elements: stopping terrorists we know about, stopping terrorists we don't know about, and stopping people from becoming terrorists. The greatest challenge with this approach is knowing who the state and non-state terrorists are, a pre-requisite to understanding the threat. A capabilities approach, understanding what our vulnerabilities are and eliminating or reducing those vulnerabilities, offers a framework for defending the homeland irrespective of who the bad actors are. Make a potential attack too risky or forcing a potential terrorist to consider a target of

significantly lower "value" may thwart a potential attack in and of itself. This also requires planning and a security strategy.

A comprehensive domestic homeland security plan will include elements of prevention, protection and response. Preventing an attack from occurring through diplomacy and policy actions to reduce or eliminate factors which spawn terrorism, and through "perfect" intelligence on the potential threat, is ideal. Conceptually easy, it is, however, difficult to accomplish. We need to protect all kinds of infrastructure – critical infrastructure from the national level, such as airports and airways, to local levels, such as water supplies, reservoirs, bridges and buildings. We also need the ability to respond to any attack in order to minimize loss of life and further damage to our infrastructure.

ANSER Institute and Brookings Institution, among a number of others to include the soon to be published strategy from the President's Office of Homeland Security, have studied this issue and offer ways to think about protecting the homeland. In general, their plans center on prevention, protection and response. Brookings suggests a defense-in-depth concept beginning with border security and ending with consequence management (domestic response), while ANSER considers it to be an interrelated "strategic cycle" beginning with deterrence through crisis and consequence management, to attribution and then response to deter further attacks. Both are right.

The U.S. economy depends on international trade of goods and commodities. The U.S.-Canada border is 5,000 miles long (7,000 miles including Alaska) and consists of 130 crossing points of which 20 handle 95 percent of all commerce. \$1.4 billion in goods transit that border daily and 38 U.S. states count Canada as their largest trading partner. Ninety percent of Mexican exports are to the U.S. and Mexico is the U.S.'s #2 trading partner behind Canada. The cross border free flow of goods is critical to all 3 economies. 1.1 million 40 ft by 8 ft by 8 ft shipping containers arrive in U.S. ports from Hong Kong and Singapore each month, 200,000 through the port of Long Beach alone. It costs approximately \$1,500 to ship a container from Hong Kong to Long Beach, one of 3,300 on a container ship. To inspect all commerce at the physical border is not only impractical, but also economical infeasible. Protection of our borders – stopping a weapon of mass destruction from entering the U.S., today begins at the point of origin and includes good government-to-government cooperation and good intelligence. In FY 2002 the USG budgeted \$200 million a *month* for screening passenger luggage and \$93 million for the *year* for port security.

The funding of homeland security will have a significant economic impact. Who pays? Options include federal spending (via tax increases) or subsidies, legislation to force the private sector to fund, and private insurance. For government owned property – Washington Monument or Mount Rushmore – the question centers on what do you want to protect and how much are you willing to spend. Which level of government should do the spending is also a consideration: benefits to the country as a whole are obviously funded at the federal level, but cops on the beat provide local security and should therefore be funded locally. The insurance industry will play an increasingly important part in homeland security funding. Companies and organizations with increased self-protection against terrorism will pay lower insurance premiums. Risk management vs. cost thresholds.

The Department of Homeland Security (DHS), along with the President's Homeland Security Advisor and other newly formed elements such as the Defense

Department's Northern Command, are manifestations of our homeland security strategy centered on prevention, protection and response. The DHS will be responsible for national threat information analysis, chemical, biological and radiological (CBR) countermeasures, border and transportation security, emergency preparedness and response, and related coordination with federal, state and local government agencies and the private sector. Transferring existing agency budget authorities to the new DHS creates an agency with a \$40 billion annual program. Improvements to border and airport security, CBR response, increased local security operations to include a modern technology for rapid data-basing and sharing, and needed improvements to the U.S. public health system alone will likely drive that over \$50 billion or higher by 2004.

### **Issues for Consideration**

*Will the American people have the will to sustain and continue to support what appears to be escalating costs to protect the homeland and the long lines at the increasing number of security checkpoints?*

*What will it take to protect our borders? What are our borders?*

*What do you think the chances are of a weapon of mass destruction entering the U.S. in a shipping container? How do we detect and protect against that occurrence.*

### **Required Readings**

***National Security Strategy for Homeland Security***, Office of Homeland Security, The White House, July 2002, *Border and Transportation Security*, pp 21-23, student book. On the web at: [http://www.whitehouse.gov/homeland/book/nat\\_strat\\_hls.pdf](http://www.whitehouse.gov/homeland/book/nat_strat_hls.pdf)

***The Unguarded Homeland: A Study in Malign Neglect***, Stephen E. Flynn, "How Did This Happen?: Terrorism and the New War," James F. Hoges Jr. and Gideon Rose, editors, Nov 2001, pp 183-197, student book.

***Protecting the American Homeland: A Preliminary Analysis***, Michael E. O'Hanlon and others, Brookings Institution Press, 2002, Chapters 2, 3, and 5, pp13-50 and 67-76, student book

- ***Homeland Security: The Strategic Cycle***, ANSER Institute for Homeland Security, May 2002, pp 1-3 (Reprint). On the web at: <http://www.homelandsecurity.org/hls/strategycycle.doc>

-

-

-

-

### **Supplemental Readings**

***Stirred But Not Shaken: The Economic Repercussions***, Martin N. Baily, "How Did This Happen?: Terrorism and the New War," James F. Hoges Jr. and Gideon Rose, editors, Nov 2001, pp 269-282, student book.

***The All-Too-Friendly Skies: Security as an Afterthought***, Gregg Easterbrook, "How Did This Happen?: Terrorism and the New War," James F. Hoges Jr. and Gideon Rose, editors, Nov 2001, pp 163-181, student book.

***Strangling The Hydra: Targeting Al Qaeda's Finances***, William F. Wechsler, "How Did This Happen?: Terrorism and the New War," James F. Hoges Jr. and Gideon Rose, editors, Nov 2001, pp 129-143, student book.

***Global Trade: America's Achilles Heal***, James M. Loy and Robert E. Ross, Defense Horizons, National Defense University, February 2002, 8 pages (Reprint). On the web at: <http://www.ndu.edu/inss/DefHor/DH7/DH07.pdf>

## Topic Five

### NUCLEAR TERRORISM

Wednesday  
16 October 2002  
1530-1730

*"All the world faces the most horrifying prospect of all: These same terrorists are searching for weapons of mass destruction, the tools to turn their hatred into holocaust. They can be expected to use chemical, biological and nuclear weapons the moment they are capable of doing so."*

**--President George Bush  
United Nations General Assembly, 10 November 2001**

*"...acquiring (chemical and nuclear material) weapons for the defense of Muslims is a religious duty."*

**--Osama bin Laden  
ABC News Interview 1999**

*"The chances that chemical, biological or nuclear terrorism will occur on U.S. soil over the next ten years is 100 percent."*

**--Richard Clark  
National Security Council Coordinator for Infrastructure Protection and  
Counterterrorism**

*"The security guards at half the nuclear power plants in the United States have failed to repel mock terrorist attacks against safety systems designed to prevent a reactor meltdown. These are so-called "force-on-force" exercises supervised by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. The NRC refuses to take enforcement action in response to the failures, and is in the process of weakening the rules of the game in response to industry complaints. Sabotage of nuclear power plants may be the greatest domestic vulnerability in the United States today. This is the time to strengthen, not weaken, nuclear regulation."*

**--Paul Leventhal  
Commencement Address Franklin & Marshall College 2001**

Guest Speaker

#### **Discussion**

There is no credible evidence that terrorist groups have nuclear weapons.



Nuclear weapons in the hands of terrorists is a frightening prospect. The detonation of a small nuclear device, on the order of several kilotons, in a major city would destroy most buildings within a quarter-mile radius, extensive destruction (uninhabitable) out to one mile, and people at that distance receiving severe radiation and burn injuries. Al Qaeda agents are known to have attempted the purchase of highly enriched uranium in the mid-1990s in Russia, Europe and Africa. With enough enriched uranium, Al Qaeda is likely capable of building a crude nuclear device. While building even a crude fissile device is difficult, building a radiological dispersal device, so called "dirty bomb," depends on access to radioactive material. Any type of radioactive material could be used in a dirty bomb, and while it is unlikely that radioactive material in a dirty bomb would kill anyone – there is an increased long-term risk of cancer – it could have a serious psychological impact, causing fear, panic and disruption.

Since 1944 approximately 130,000 nuclear weapons have been produced by the world's nuclear powers, with the United States leading the way with approximately 70,000 weapons and the former Soviet Union with 55,000. The Center for Defense Information estimates that, as of July 2002, approximately 22,000 are held in "active" status by the 8 nuclear countries (includes Israel with 200 weapons). The fissile material in the 108,000 weapons no longer active has been reprocessed into new weapons, stored (as nuclear waste or weapons) or converted into commercial use. On a different scale, the world has produced, and holds in storage in one form or another, approximately 248 tons of weapons grade plutonium and 1,665 tons of weapons grade uranium.

The security of nuclear weapons and the nuclear weapons program in the U.S. is generally considered good. However, there are vulnerabilities. The department of Energy (DOE) stores weapons grade material at 10 sites in quantities sufficient to make a nuclear device. DOE routinely moves weapons grade material between these facilities, to include the sites located near major population centers, such as Lawrence-Livermore in the San Francisco Bay area. DOE requires that nuclear facilities be able to defend against theft of nuclear materials or sabotage by *a few terrorists using surprise and readily available weapons and explosives, as well as against theft of nuclear secrets*. Investigations by government oversight groups, such as the "Project on Government Oversight – POGO," indicate that exercises by trained military elements have successfully "stolen" enough material to make multiple nuclear weapons. Additionally, computers containing nuclear secrets remain vulnerable to "hacking" and theft.

The situation is less rosy outside the U.S. The collapse of the former Soviet Union ended a direct threat of deliberate nuclear war but brought with it economic and social upheaval and the resulting challenges of controlling nuclear warheads and fissile materials. Beginning in 1992, the U.S. provided funding to Russia (Nunn-Lugar Program) to prevent nuclear weapons, materials and technology transfer to other countries or terrorist groups. While successful, a 28 February 2001 GAO report to Congress reported that further enhancements are necessary, identifying 252 buildings at 40 sites in Russia that require nuclear security systems. As of February 2001, DOE had installed security systems in 115 buildings protecting about 32 percent of Russian weapons grade nuclear material identified as being at risk of theft or diversion. Hundreds of tons of nuclear material remain unprotected. By 2020, DOE projects that it will have in place in Russia a nuclear material accounting database enabling tracking and inventory of nuclear material, regulations for effective security operations, and an inspection and enforcement system at a cost of

about \$2.2 billion. Nuclear material security programs in countries such as Pakistan and India, ...or Iraq, ...or Iran, are unknown.

The most likely nuclear device for any terrorist would be the dirty bomb consisting of the waste products from nuclear reactors, medical laboratories, scientific instruments and other sources. In the U.S. radiological waste from commercial nuclear reactors is stored at 70 locations. Enormous quantities exist overseas, especially in Europe and Japan. This type of waste is generally not as well guarded as weapons grade material. The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) estimates that radioactive materials are used in 22,000 machines worldwide and that more than 100 countries have no minimum standards for controlling radiation sources. Since 1993 the IAEA has recorded 263 incidents of illicit trafficking of dirty bomb materials. A recent study by the European Union found 30,000 used radiation devices in "storage" in Russia at risk of being lost. In the U.S., the Nuclear regulatory Commission reported that companies have "lost" 1,500 radiation sources since 1996 with more than half not being recovered. While only a small percentage of these small commercial devices have true dirty bomb potential, the psychological impact of such a device exploding in a large metropolitan city most likely would result in panic and serious commercial disruption. Witness the October 2001 anthrax terrorism in Washington, DC.

On Wednesday, 17 October 2001, three F-16 fighters orbited the Three Mile Island nuclear power plant because of a reported threat that an attack would occur by air or by land. On 22 September 2001 the Nuclear regulatory Commission conceded that nuclear power plants were not designed to withstand an attack using a 180-ton commercial airliner. *The possibility of loss of coolant and significant release of radiation is very real* estimates the Nuclear Control Institute. Potentially more of a threat to nuclear power plant security is an attack using an explosives laden truck or other large vehicle, similar to the bomb at the Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City. Nuclear power plants in eight states have experienced serious damage from sabotage, ranging from reactor "excursion" (drawing fuel rods out too far) destroying the reactor (and killing the saboteur), to disabling the reactor cooling system to cutting safety and security wiring.

The National Missile Defense (NMD) program is designed to protect the U.S. from the threat of a limited strategic nuclear ballistic missile attack from a rogue nation. The system could also provide some defense against the accidental launch of a ballistic missiles from a more traditional nuclear power. From this perspective, NMD needs to be considered when discussing nuclear terrorism. NMD will be neither cheap nor easy. Estimates range upwards of \$100 billion for partial deployment by 2008-10 and full deployment/protection estimates are as high as \$245 billion. However, the NMD plan does not include protecting against cruise missiles..., or other lower technology threats.

### **Issues for Consideration**

*It takes about 18 pounds of plutonium or 55 pounds of highly enriched uranium to make a nuclear bomb. Would we know if this amount of material were missing?*

*What can be done to improve detection of nuclear material crossing our borders?*

*How do we protect against low technology nuclear threats: a nuclear device in a refrigerator on a cruise ship or delivered by a small low flying airplane or air-breathing missile?*

*Should a comprehensive nuclear defense program be part of homeland security?*

### **Required Readings**

***National Security Strategy for Homeland Security***, Office of Homeland Security, The White House, July 2002, *Defending Against Catastrophic Threats*, pp 37-40, student book. On the web at:

[http://www.whitehouse.gov/homeland/book/nat\\_strat\\_hls.pdf](http://www.whitehouse.gov/homeland/book/nat_strat_hls.pdf)

***The New Security Mantra: Prevention, Deterrence, Defense***, William J. Perry, "How Did This Happen?: Terrorism and the New War," James F. Hoges Jr. and Gideon Rose, editors, Nov 2001, pp 225-240, student book.

***Beyond Missile Defense***, Michael E. O'Hanlon, Brookings Institution, August 2001, 8 pages (Reprint). On the web at:

<http://www.brook.edu/dybdocroot/comm/policybriefs/pb86.pdf>

***What if Terrorists Go Nuclear***, Dr. Bruce G. Blair, President, Center for Defense Information, 1 October 2001, 6 pages (Reprint). On the web at:

<http://www.cdi.org/terrorism/nuclear-pr.cfm>

***Bin Laden and the Bomb***, David Albright and others, Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, January/February 2002, 2 pages (Reprint). On the web at:

<http://www.thebulletin.org/issues/2002/jf02/jf02albright.html>

***Testimony of Dr. Henry Kelly, President, Federation of American Scientists***, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, 6 March 2002, 10 pages (Reprint). On the web at:

[http://www.nci.org/pdf/kelly\\_testimony\\_030602.pdf](http://www.nci.org/pdf/kelly_testimony_030602.pdf)

***The Reality of Dirty Bombs***, MSNBC animation by Michael Levi, Federation of American Scientists. On the web at: <http://www.msnbc.com/modules/dirtybomb/>

***Dirty Bombs***, The Nuclear Regulatory Commission, July 2002, pp 1-2 (Reprint). On the web at: <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/fact-sheets/dirty-bombs.html>

**Topic Six**  
**BIOTERRORISM**

Wednesday  
23 October 2002  
1530-1730

*The one that scares me to death, perhaps even more so than tactical nuclear weapons, and the one we have the least capability against, is biological weapons.*

**--General Colin Powell, 1993**

*Today one man can make war. A lucky bio buffoon could kill 400,000 people.*

**--Dr. Joshua Lederberg  
Nobel Laureate**

*Bioterrorism is the single most dangerous threat to U.S. national security in the foreseeable future.*

**--R. James Woolsey  
Director of Central Intelligence 1993-95**

*"I was honored to play the part of the President in the exercise **Dark Winter**.... You often don't know what you don't know until you've been tested. And it's a lucky thing for the United States that - as the emergency broadcast network used to say: 'this **is just a test**, this is not a real emergency.'*

*But Mr. Chairman, our lack of preparation is a real emergency."*

**--The Honorable Sam Nunn  
Testimony before the House Government Reform Committee  
Subcommittee on National Security, Veterans Affairs and International  
Relations, July 23, 2001**

Guest Speaker: Col Robert Kadlec, MD, USAF, Office of Homeland Security

**Discussion**

The initial report from the National Security Studies Group/21st Century (aka Hart-Rudman Commission) concluded that the two most likely and most serious threats to the American homeland will come from cyber and biological attacks. Even though biological agents (naturally occurring) have plagued the human race throughout history and cyber attacks are an entirely new threat resulting from recent advances in information technology, these two threats have many similarities. Of the types of asymmetric threats currently available for use against a super power, biological and

cyber are the only two capable of self-replication. They are also the only two weapons of mass effect capable of being "delivered" across international boundaries in a small brief case with little or no chances of detection. Scores of highly disruptive computers viruses can be carried in a Palm Pilot, and a few ounces of smallpox virus or even worse, a genetically altered virus could be sufficient to launch a catastrophic attack on American citizens.

One of the most significant challenges of the biological threat is that it is all too often lumped together with weapons of mass destruction (nuclear and particularly chemical). This failure to understand the fundamental differences of the biological threat leads to inappropriate policies, resource allocations and responses ranging from the comical to the catastrophic.

Biological warfare is not a new concept of warfare. It has been practiced in rudimentary forms dating back to the 14<sup>th</sup> Century when corpses of plague victims were catapulted into the city of Kaffa. The British employed similar simplistic techniques during the American Indian Wars of the 1700's, when they gave gifts of blankets from smallpox hospitals to Indians who were susceptible to that Old World disease. These examples predate the understanding of the microbiological etiology of infectious disease in the late 1800's.

Modern biological warfare was founded during World War II, when Allies (US, UK and Canada) feared that Germany was preparing to use biological weapons. The US embarked on a program second only to the Manhattan Project in size and scope. Under the direction of George Merck, the government enlisted the best American minds in microbiology and related sciences to develop a crash program to develop, produce and deliver a wide range of microorganisms against humans, plants and animals. One of the best known results of this program, begun as research in crop destruction, was Agent Orange used as a defoliate in Vietnam between 1965-70. In 1978 the Veterans Administration established a registry program to track the now over 300,000 veterans, of the estimated 2.6 million who served in Southeast Asia, suffering from Agent Orange related cancers, including Hodgkin' disease, respiratory and prostate cancers, as well as medical care for veterans offspring with congenital birth defects of the spine (spina bifida). The U.S. biological weapons program was halted in 1969.

Following the breakup of the Soviet Union the extent of their biological and chemical weapons program became know and the threat of proliferation grown dramatically. In many ways, the danger of proliferation of biological weapons and technology is significantly greater than that from nuclear proliferation: they are easier to acquire, manufacture, conceal, move and deploy than nuclear weapons. A 10 cubic centimeter glass vial of anthrax or smallpox virus can be carried in a pocket and is undetectable by existing airport screening and security measures. The Soviet biowarfare program, halted in 1992, included the research and production of biogenetic weapons to which antidotes were unknown or nor developed. Soviet program testing in the 1970's resulted in accidental civilian deaths up to 50 miles from the research center in Yekaterinburg/Sverdlovsk. International experts have found evidence of *four* different strains of anthrax being developed, each one 100-percent lethal. The surety of the former Soviet biological program remains unknown – it is not included in the Nunn-Lugar program for the surety of nuclear weapons and is likely much less secure. In 1994 the U.S. began funding (\$20 million total between 1994 and 1999) collaborative research program with Russian

microbiologists because it was feared that these scientists would sell their skills to countries of proliferation concerns or terrorist groups. There were an estimated 15,000 microbiologists and up to 50,000 people involved in Soviet bio-weapons program. An estimated 20 countries, including China, North Korea, Iraq and Israel, have active research programs or were formerly involved in biological research and weapons programs.

In October 2001 a letter containing anthrax spores was mailed from New Jersey addressed to Senator Daschle. Opened in the Senate Hart Office building in mid-October, the mailing resulted in 5 confirmed cases of inhalation anthrax and 2 deaths. Up to 5,000 cross-contaminated letters are blamed for the deaths of 2 additional people. The mailing(s) closed the Hart office building for 6 months where cleanup costs were estimated as approximately \$20 million, caused widespread fear among government and postal workers, and disrupted Senate operations for an extended period. As of July 2002, the Brentwood postal processing facility still hadn't been cleaned-up and returned to operation. The Center for Disease Control, in a 1997 study, estimated that a bioterrorist attack on a suburb of a major city, with 100,000 people exposed in the target area, would result in 50,000 deaths, disrupt 500,000 people and cause and cost up to \$26.2 billion, not counting any loss in the equities markets.

Played in June 2001, the bioterrorism exercise *DARK WINTER* centered on the release of the smallpox virus in Oklahoma City using former senior government officials playing principal leadership positions. Set over 3 three successive National Security Council meetings and 13 game-days, the disease spread to 25 states and 15 other countries. The leadership discussions focus on public health response, roles and missions of federal and state officials, civil liberties associated with quarantine and isolation, the role of DoD and (then) inadequate supplies of smallpox vaccine. Lesson learned included the unfamiliarity of leadership (those responsible for decisions) with the nature of the threat, available policy options and their consequences, lack of sufficient vaccine, inability of the U.S. healthcare system to surge, and unclear federal-state, as well as state-to-state, authorities and possibly conflicting policies. In summary, the disease spread faster than could be managed through information lag, public confusion and unprepared leadership.

Now as we enter the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, the revolution in biotechnology and genetic engineering and its global diffusion courtesy of the information technology revolution empowers both states and individuals alike. The October 2001 anthrax mailings only highlight the possible range of perpetrators from states like Iraq, terrorist groups like al-Qaeda or individuals like Ted Kasczinski.

### Public Health System

The anthrax mailings to national media offices and Congressional leaders highlighted this country's physical and psychological vulnerability to biological warfare and bioterrorism. Since these incidents, there has been a growing public and official sentiment that public health must be part of the U.S. national security organization as we enter the 21<sup>st</sup> Century.

The integration of public health into security deliberations is not a new concept or requirement. The military has long understood and operationalized the value of keeping soldiers, sailors or airmen fit to fight. Historically, the occurrence of Disease Non-Battle Injuries (DNBI) has plagued military commanders inflicting more casualties than enemy fire.

While it is apparent to those who serve in uniform that military preventive medicine, a highly specialized subspecialty of occupational medicine, serves both humanitarian and operational imperatives. It may be less clear how this same logic has empowered private and public sectors. The public health community monitors the health of the general population through statistics that are both direct and indirect measures of economic strength and social stability. Infant mortality rates and life expectancy are but just two examples of how policy makers assess the health of a society. Traditionally, infant mortality rates have been a standard of comparison between wealthy and advanced countries versus those that are not. Industries monitor workers health and adhere to safety standards not only because it is required by law but because it increases their profit margin not having to pay for injury related costs or disability. A healthy worker is not only more productive but costs less than one who is not.

In the era of globalization, economic competitiveness may serve as the more important future measure of a nation's power than its military. Worker productivity and workers' health figures prominently in this calculation. From this perspective, the US has been tremendously successful in eliminating needless work related injuries and illness through the discipline of occupational medicine.

Considering US public health in the current context represents a different kind of paradox. Infectious disease has historically been a major source of needless morbidity and mortality. The advent of aggressive US public health and sanitation campaigns during the 20<sup>th</sup> Century eliminated major sources of infectious disease such as polio, smallpox, measles etc. Over time, through childhood vaccination and improvements in treatment and prevention of infectious diseases, the US public health community became a victim of its own success. Monies that were traditionally committed to infectious disease research and control were shifted to other pressing medical problems such as chronic diseases like cancer and heart disease.

The AIDS epidemic of the 1980's was one of several wake up calls for the US public health community. The AIDS epidemic began the renewed appreciation how infectious diseases can have a significant impact on security related issues. The terrible toll of HIV on the African continent reacquainted policy makers with the potent effects of having the most productive portions of several African nations society die off and its impact on economic and social stability.

Despite a greater appreciation for the challenges of AIDS and the risks of emerging and re-emerging diseases like Ebola virus, the investment of significant funds did not necessarily follow. In the mid to late 1990's, the specter of biological warfare and bioterrorism crystallized following the Gulf War and revelations from the former Soviet Union BW program and efforts of the Aum Shinryko. The momentum was building but had not yet achieved critical mass before the events of 11 September.

On 12 June 2002 President Bush signed the *Public Health Security and Bioterrorism Response Act of 2002* into law providing \$4.6 billion for:

- Enhancing prevention and detection of bioterrorist attacks, to include the U.S. food supply
- Strengthening communications links between health care providers and public health officials to improve detection and response
- Improving timeliness of response and treatments across the country, and

- Incentives for developing better medicines for the future by combining federal and private sector research on vaccines, to include increasing vaccine stockpiles.

### **Issues for Consideration**

*What is the greater threat and greater probability: nuclear or biological attack?*

*What are the intentions and capabilities of state and non-state actors to conduct a biological attack?*

*What role does arms-control play, if any, in the control of proliferation or use of biological weapons? Or, or that matter, infectious diseases?*

*What kind of national strategy should be developed to counter the threat of biological weapons?*

*What are the possible ways to control the spread of "bad science" both domestically and internationally?*

*What domestic role will the military have in the event of a biological attack?*

### **Required Readings**

***National Security Strategy for Homeland Security***, Office of Homeland Security, The White House, July 2002, *Emergency Preparedness and Response*, pp 41-45, student book. On the web at: [http://www.whitehouse.gov/homeland/book/nat\\_strat\\_hls.pdf](http://www.whitehouse.gov/homeland/book/nat_strat_hls.pdf)

***Germ Wars: The Biological Threat from Abroad***, Richard Butler, "How Did This Happen?: Terrorism and the New War," James F. Hoge Jr. and Gideon Rose, editors, Nov 2001, pp 211-215, student book.

***Countering Bioterrorism: Who's in Charge?***, Laurie Garrett, "How Did This Happen?: Terrorism and the New War," James F. Hoge Jr. and Gideon Rose, editors, Nov 2001, pp 217-224, student book.

***Nuclear Blindness: An Overview of the Biological Weapons Programs of the Former Soviet Union and Iraq***, Christopher J. Davis, Johns Hopkins Center for Civilian Biodefense Studies, published in *Emerging Infectious Diseases*, Vol. 5, No. 4, July-August 1999, Center for Disease Control, 4 pages (Reprint). On the web at: <http://www.cdc.gov/ncidod/EID/vol5no4/pdf/davis.pdf>

***Testimony***, Dr. Kenneth Alibek, President Advanced Biosystems, Inc., before the Committee on International Relations, 5 December, 2001, pp 1-5 (Reprint). On the web at: <http://www.fas.org/bwc/news/testimony/CT2001Dec05Alibek.htm>

### **Supplemental Readings**



***DARK WINTER Exercise Script***, Center for Civilian Biodefense Strategies, Johns Hopkins University, 44 pages (Reprint). On the web at: <http://www.hopkins-biodefense.org/DARK%20WINTER.pdf>

***Biological Weapons: The Effort to Reduce Former Soviet Threat Offers Benefits, Poses New Risks***, USGAO Report to Congress, April 2000, 46 page (Reprint). On the web at: <http://www.gao.gov/new.items/ns00138.pdf>

***Bioterrorism: Preview of Public Health Preparedness Programs***, USGAO Testimony before the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, Committee on Energy and Commerce, House of Representatives, 10 October 2001, 26 pages (Reprint). On the web at: <http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d02149t.pdf>

## Topic Seven

### CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE AND CYBER SECURITY

Wednesday  
30 October 2002  
1330-1530

*"It is very important to concentrate on hitting the U.S. economy through all possible means...look for the key pillars of the U.S. economy. The key pillars of the economy should be struck..."*

**--Usama bin Laden, 27 December 2001**

*Our national defense, economic prosperity, and quality of life have long depended on the essential services that underpin our society. These critical infrastructures-energy, banking and finance, transportation, vital human services, and telecommunications-must be viewed in a new context in the information age. The rapid proliferation and integration of telecommunications and computer systems have connected infrastructures to one another in a complex network of interdependence. The interlinkage has created a new dimension of vulnerability, which, when combined with an emerging constellation of threats, poses unprecedented national risk.*

**--The Report of the President's Commission on Critical Infrastructure Protection, October 1997**

*"Today, the cyber economy is the economy... Corrupt those networks and you disrupt this nation."*

**--Condoleeza Rice  
United States National Security Advisor, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, 23  
March 2001**

*"There is no worse a blind person as the one who does not want to see."*

**--Unknown. Spanish parable.**

*". . . attaining one hundred victories in one hundred battles is not the pinnacle of excellence. Subjugating the enemy's army without fighting is the true pinnacle of excellence."*

**--Sun Tzu, The Art of War**

*"Information warfare is the offensive and defensive use of information and information systems to deny, exploit, corrupt, or destroy, an adversary's information, information-based processes, information systems, and computer-based*

*networks while protecting one's own. Such actions are designed to achieve advantages over military or business adversaries."*

**--Dr Ivan Goldberg  
Director of the Institute for the Advanced Study of Information Warfare  
(IASIW).**

Guest Speaker

### **Discussion**

In the Spring of 1942 a small team of engineers and scientists were asked to assess the critical nodes in the German industrial complex. The purpose of the assessment was to develop target lists for the strategic bombing campaign. What were the critical links? Their study concluded that ball bearing factories and petroleum refineries should be at the top of the targeting list. During their briefing to senior government officials, someone, almost in jest, asked if the Germans or Japanese might be conducting the same study on the US. What began as a flippant remark, turned into a second study. This time the team assessed American vulnerabilities. Their conclusions were shocking, and certainly not intuitively obvious.

In July 1996 Presidential Executive Order 13010 established a commission and tasked it to formulate a comprehensive national strategy for protecting America's key infrastructures from physical and cyber threats. The Presidential Commission on Critical Infrastructure Protection (PCCIP) defined critical infrastructures as: *systems whose incapacity or destruction would have a debilitating impact on the defense or economic security of the nation*. These include telecommunications, electrical power systems, gas and oil, banking and finance, transportation, water supply systems, government services and emergency services.

Some individuals criticized the commission for its almost exclusive focus on information infrastructures (vulnerable to cyber attacks) and the virtual exclusion of physical attacks. According to the PCCIP's Executive Director, there were two reasons for this. First, even though the Executive Order was signed in July 1996, it was early 1997 until a Chairman and Commissioners were assigned. Because of the limited time available, the decision was made to focus on the cyber aspects of infrastructure protection, since all infrastructures appeared to be as vulnerable to a 486 computer and modem as they were to traditional attacks. Anything that an adversary could do with a bomb, could also be accomplished with bits. The September 11 attacks make it clear that we need to be better aware of our vulnerabilities and develop viable strategies to detect, deter, and counter both physical and cyber-based to our infrastructures.

In October 1997, the commission submitted its final report. The most striking (but not surprising) conclusions were that America's critical infrastructures were highly vulnerable, the majority of these infrastructures were owned by the private sector, and there was no coordinated strategy or plan to protect them. The Critical Infrastructure Assurance Office (CIAO) was created in response to a Presidential Decision Directive (PDD-63) in May 1998 to coordinate the Federal Government's initiatives on critical infrastructure assurance. The CIAO's primary areas of focus are to raise issues that cut across industry sectors and ensure a cohesive approach to achieving continuity in delivering critical infrastructure services. CIAO's major initiatives are to: coordinate and implement the national strategy, assess the U.S.

Government's own risk exposure and dependencies on critical infrastructure, raise awareness and educate public understanding and participation in critical infrastructure protection efforts, and coordinate legislative and public affairs to integrate infrastructure assurance objectives into the public and private sectors. In January 2000 CIAO released a national plan for approaching critical infrastructure and cyber-related issues in the federal government. The plan for the private sector's contribution to critical infrastructure protection is due out in Summer 2002. The fundamental issues remain:

- America cannot go to work or to war without its information infrastructure
- No one is in charge of protecting America's information infrastructure.
- A successful strategy requires a partnership between the public and private sectors
- The business community is hesitant to build this partnership with the public sector

A true national infrastructure assurance strategy, by extension national security and economic security strategies, need to be developed, programmed and executed with central leadership and management.

The National Infrastructure Protection Center (NIPC) was established in February 1998 to serve as the U.S. government's focal point for threat assessment, warning, investigation, and response for threats or attacks against our critical infrastructures. It is the principal means of facilitating and coordinating the federal government's response to an incident, mitigating attacks, investigating threats, and monitoring reconstitution efforts. It is linked with the rest of the federal government, including the intelligence community and warning and operations centers, and provides information to state and local law enforcement and private sector Information Sharing and Analysis Centers (ISACs).

To a large degree, in the private sector the system relies on the voluntary cooperation of the private sector owners and operators of the critical infrastructures with the government agencies tasked to assist in protecting them. Critical infrastructure protection poses substantial challenges to policymakers because it involves protecting decentralized, privately owned assets. It also risks infringements on individual privacy, especially because it focuses on information and communications systems. This federal-private relationship works since the infrastructures are vital to national security and commerce, and subject to vulnerabilities due to their reliance on cyber systems.

The responsibility for critical infrastructure protection and cyber security will be incorporated into the Department of Homeland Security.

### **Issues for Consideration**

*Following 9/11, should the U.S. public health care system be considered an element of national security strategy?*

*What role will the military play in this partnership?*

*Who should be in charge? Federal, state, local governments? Northern Command in the event of a nuclear or biological attack?*

*Is the idea of a public-private partnership possible?*

What impact will e-commerce (wireless) have on these vulnerabilities?

What about privacy issues?

### **Required Readings**

**National Security Strategy for Homeland Security**, Office of Homeland Security, The White House, July 2002, *Protecting Critical Infrastructure and Key Assets*, pp 29-35, student book. On the web at:

[http://www.whitehouse.gov/homeland/book/nat\\_strat\\_hls.pdf](http://www.whitehouse.gov/homeland/book/nat_strat_hls.pdf)

**Protecting the American Homeland: A Preliminary Analysis**, Michael E. O'Hanlon and others, Brookings Institution Press, 2002, Chapters 4 and 6, pp 51-66 and 77-97, student book

**"Critical Infrastructure Protection: Who's in Charge?"** Statement by John S. Tritak, Director Critical Infrastructure Assurance Office, Senate Committee on Government Affairs, 4 October, 2001, 7 pages (Reprint). On the web at:

<http://www.ciao.gov/News/100401printer.html>

**Protecting the Homeland: FY2003 Budget of the United States**, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, 12 pages (Reprint). On the web at:

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/budget/fy2003/bud05.html>

**The All-Too-Friendly Skies: Security as an Afterthought**, "How Did This Happen?: Terrorism and the New War," James F. Hoges Jr. and Gideon Rose, editors, Nov 2001, pp 163-181, student book.

**Information Age State Security: New Threats to Old Boundaries**, Uri Fisher, Journal of Homeland Security, ASNER Institute, November 2001, 11 pages (Reprint). On the web at:

<http://www.homelandsecurity.org/journal/articles/displayArticle.asp?article=25>

**Statement of John S. Tritak, Director, Critical Infrastructure Assurance Office U.S. Department of Commerce Before The House Committee on Science**, 24 June 2002, 7 pages (Reprint). On the web at:

<http://www.ciao.gov/publicaffairs/tritak6.24.02.html>

### **Supplemental Readings**

**National Infrastructure Protection Center**, Website: <http://www.nipc.gov/>

**Critical Infrastructure Assurance Office**, Website at: <http://www.ciao.gov/>

**The Wireless Web Goes to War**, Rick Mathieson, mpulse, Cooltown Magazine, December 2001, 3 pages (Reprint). On the web at:

<http://cooltown.hp.com/mpulse/1201-military.asp>

***Executive Order: Critical Infrastructure Protection in the Information Age,***  
The White House, 16 October 2001, 13 pages (Reprint). On the web at :  
<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/10/print/20011016-12.html>

***Presidential Decision Directive 63: Policy on Critical Infrastructure Protection,***  
The White House, May 1998 (Reprint). On the web at:  
<http://www.ciao.gov/resource/paper598printer.html>

## Topic Eight

### ORGANIZING FOR HOMELAND SECURITY

Wednesday  
6 November 2002  
1330-1530

*"We've...taken a look and analyzed how the federal government and the agencies have worked since 9/11. We've taken a look at the reports that you've talked about - Brookings, ANSER, Hart Rudman, the Gilmore Commission. We've consulted with members of Congress. But there is an evolutionary process here that as a result of which comes the centerpiece, the Department of Homeland Security."*

**Governor Tom Ridge, Advisor to the President for Homeland Security  
Meet the Press, 9 June 2002**

Guest Speaker

#### **Discussion**

Shortly following the attacks on 11 September it became clear to President Bush and seniors members in his Administration, as well as members of Congress, that the federal government was not organized and structure to efficiently collect, analyze and disseminate information and direction regarding the security of the nation. Two options quickly emerged to fulfill that need: appoint someone in charge of homeland security or by executive order restructure elements of the Executive Department to process information and manage security operations. The latter being an overwhelming prospect which would likely initiate an inter-agency bureaucratic struggle at the time when focus was needed on shoring up security at borders and airports, as well as fighting terrorism overseas, President Bush opted to establish the position of Advisor to the President for Homeland Security and the Office of Homeland Security within the White House Staff. This position, envisioned as similar to that of National Security Advisor, would establish one "person in charge" of homeland security reporting directly to the President. Governor Tom Ridge of Pennsylvania was selected to head the new White House office.

The key question was how do you make this work? With a small staff, a significant level of responsibility and no authority to "direct" any existing Executive Department agency into action or even to provide information. However, there is precedent. The National Security Advisor and National Economic Advisor operate through councils which bring together agency chiefs for planning and decisions, and "advising" agencies on recommended courses of action. The power of the "advice" originated with Governor Ridge's close association with and authority from the President. The new Office of Homeland Security was designed to coordinate, lead and mobilize resources from the White House. Governor Ridge viewed Secretaries Rumsfeld, Thompson and Ashcroft as partners in this effort - a team with Presidential mandate and influence, working for the American people, to make things work. Despite the early success of this structure, many members of Congress and others continued to believe that some form of operational consolidation was needed to bring together

diverse executive Department elements which appear to be overlapping in some areas and leaving gaps in others. Border security was signed out as an example: the US Border Service, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Customs Service, Department of Defense, Treasury and Department of State all had some aspect border responsibility and all functioned under different chains of command reporting to different agency chiefs.

The earliest manifestation for the need for some consolidation, despite the President's early reluctance to restructure, was clearly border security and the CIA-FBI failure to coordinate and share information. Five hundred million people annually cross into the U.S. – only 300 million of which are U.S. citizens. Over one million shipping containers transit U.S. borders each month – tracking containers prior to 9/11 was done mostly for import tax purposes, after the fact, and not for security. To improve border security, and tracking foreign nationals entering and leaving the U.S., some form of statutory authority was needed, not just coordination, between Justice, INS, State (Counselor Affairs) and Treasury (to include the U.S. Coast Guard). By late winter the President became convinced for the need of both a senior advisor, the function being performed by Governor Ridge for policy and coordination, and a single department to direct and manage the execution of the diverse homeland security functions being performed across the Executive Branch. He was also sure that a "ground-up" effort in developing a Department of Homeland Security would result in extensive bureaucratic haggling and take too long to formulate. On 6 June the President announced his decision, developed in secret by 4 close confidants, to consolidate 22 Executive Branch elements into a proposed Department of Homeland Security.

In the largest and most significant federal government restructuring since President Truman's 1945 proposal to create the Defense Department, National Security Council and the C.I.A., resulting in the National Security Act of 1947. As envisioned, this new department will consolidate the efforts of 170,000 government employees in 22 "agencies" with an existing FY2002 program authority of approximately \$40 billion, a level expected to rise to near 225,000 employees and \$50 billion by FY2004 as new or modified requirements, communications and operations are identified. The White House Office of Homeland Security will maintain its NSC-like responsibilities providing coordinated advice to the President regarding homeland security and likely some deconfliction and oversight issue.

While Congress is expected to approve the new department by early Fall 2002 with the President's desire for Initial Operating Capability by 1 January 2003, completion of the restructuring, or Full operational Capability, will likely take years. Additionally, issues of law enforcement and intelligence community coordination and even possibility of restructure, cooperation and information sharing; federal-state-local coordination and jurisdictional authorities; resourcing state and local activities supporting critical infrastructure protection; specific responsibilities of national guard elements; and coordination, cooperation and funding of private sector aspects of homeland security remain to be resolved.

There are already plenty of skeptics. *"This does nothing to...fix anything,"* according to one Washington commentator, *"instead we have a woeful secretary heading a pickup squad with few resources and no power to compel cooperation... (from the FBI or CIA)."* Business leaders have similarly voiced concern over the mechanics of consolidating 22 diverse elements and cultures into one large department considering the inability of the private sector to consolidate even when the profit



motive is paramount. Some, including several members of Congress, are also expressing options that the proposed department doesn't go far enough and that a broader governmental restructuring should be considered.

### **Issues for Consideration**

*What impact, if any, will the Department of Homeland Security have on the National Security Act of 1947?*

*Homeland security is, in effect, national (to include federal, state and local) security. With the creation of the new security department does the White House Office of Homeland Security duplicate responsibilities inherent in the existing National Security Council? Is it still needed?*

*Power in Washington stems from 2 factors: closeness to the President and the size of the agency/budget. Are the Department of Homeland Security and Office of Homeland Security naturally in conflict?*

*Without a "restructuring" of FBI and CIA responsibilities, keeping in mind civilian liberties guaranteed under the 4<sup>th</sup> Amendment to the Constitution, will the proposed new department preclude a recurrence of an attack on the U.S.?*

### **Required Readings**

**Government's Challenge: Getting Serious About Terrorism**, Joseph S. Nye, Jr., "How Did This Happen?: Terrorism and the New War," James F. Hoge Jr. and Gideon Rose, editors, Nov 2001, pp 199-209, student book.

**National Security Strategy for Homeland Security**, Office of Homeland Security, The White House, July 2002, *Organizing for a Secure Homeland*, pp 11-14, student book. On the web at: [http://www.whitehouse.gov/homeland/book/nat\\_strat\\_hls.pdf](http://www.whitehouse.gov/homeland/book/nat_strat_hls.pdf)

**The Department of Homeland Security**, President George W. Bush, June 2002, pp 1-18 (Reprint). On the web at: <http://www.whitehouse.gov/deptofhomeland/book.pdf>

**Protecting the American Homeland: A Preliminary Analysis**, Michael E. O'Hanlon and others, Brookings Institution, 2002, Chapter 7, *Organizing for Success*, pp 99-124, student book.

**Reorganizing for Homeland Security: Lessons From Fifty Years of Organizing and Reorganizing the Department of Defense**, BG Joseph R. Barnes, U.S. Army (Ret), *Journal of Homeland Security*, ANSER Institute, June 2002, pp 1-4 (Reprint). On the web at: <http://www.homelandsecurity.org/journal/Commentary/displayCommentary.asp?commentary=16>

**Pressure to Create New Agency by 11 September Pits Politics vs. Policy**, Siobhan Gorman, *National Journal* reprinted in *Government Executive*, 28 June 2002, pp 1-3 (Reprint). On the web at: <http://www.govexec.com/dailyfed/0602/062802nj.htm>

**Supplemental Readings**

***The Homeland Security Act of 2002***, A Bill to establish a Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes, June 2002, pp 1-35. On the web at:  
<http://www.whitehouse.gov/deptofhomeland/bill/hsl-bill.pdf>

***The Department of Homeland Security***, Website:  
<http://www.whitehouse.gov/deptofhomeland/>

## Topic Nine

### DOD AND HOMELAND SECURITY/DEFENSE

Wednesday  
13 November 2002  
1330-1530

*"The war the nation fights today is not a war of America's choosing. It is a war that was brought violently and brutally to America's shores by the evil forces of terror. It is a war against America's way of life. It is a war against all that America holds dear. It is a war against freedom itself."*

**--Donald Rumsfeld  
Secretary of Defense, Quadrennial Defense Review 2001, 30 September  
2001**

*"... The Department of Defense really has two roles to play in providing for the security of the American people where they live and work. The first is to provide forces to conduct those traditional military missions under extraordinary circumstances ... . The second is to support the broader efforts of the federal domestic departments and agencies and indeed the state and local government(s) ... ."*

**--Donald Rumsfeld  
Secretary of Defense, 7 May 2002**

Guest Speaker

#### **Discussion**

With all due respect to the Secretary of Defense's comment above, the Department of Defense's responsibilities regarding *domestic* homeland security may be better described in 5 mission areas: domestic preparedness and civil support, continuity of government, continuity of military operations, border and coastal defense, and national missile defense. These missions are articulated in the 2001 Quadrennial Defense Review: *The highest priority of the U.S. military is to defend the Nation from all enemies. The United States will maintain sufficient military forces to protect the U.S. domestic population, its territory, and its critical defense-related infrastructure against attacks emanating from outside the U.S. borders, as appropriate under U.S. law. U.S. forces will provide strategic deterrence and air and missile defense and uphold U.S. commitments under NORAD (as of 1 October 2002 Northern Command). In addition, DoD components have the responsibility, as specified in U.S. law, to support U.S. civil authorities as directed in managing the consequences of natural and man-made disasters and the CBRNE-related events on U.S. territory. Finally, the U.S. military will be prepared to respond in a decisive manner to acts of international terrorism committed on U.S. territory or the territory of an ally.*

For the military, homeland defense has been the first priority since the founding of the Republic. In 1789 "common defense" implied protecting the new nation from foreign invasion and defending the settlers along the frontier against Native Americans. Military forces and state militias defended the country against England, France and Spain. Britain was the main enemy and a second war was the greatest threat. French and British navies preyed on American merchantmen. Congress authorized the Army to build fixed defenses and the Navy to build blue water ships to defend the sea lanes. Fort McNair is an example of this early homeland defense effort. However, these efforts did not preclude the British from overrunning Washington during the War of 1812. One result of the 1898 Spanish-American War was the realization of thousands of miles of undefended coastline around U.S. ports, resulting a building new defenses manned by the coastal artillery branch of the Army. The Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor was the first foreign attack against U.S. territory since the War of 1812. During World War II the Army Air Corps and the Navy patrolled the approaches to ports against possible attack by Japanese and German submarines. The expansion of air power following the war resulted in the creation of the North American Air Defense Command (NORAD) in conjunction with Canada responsible for air warning, control and defense, and later missile warning, of North America. With the advent of terrorism in the 1960s in the form of airplane hijackings and attacks on Americans and American interests overseas, homeland defense became synonymous with "civil defense" (air raid drills) while the military mission became perceived as being forward deployed against the Soviet Union and protecting U.S. interests in Berlin, Vietnam, Lebanon and eventually the Persian Gulf and Southeast Europe. Domestically, the defense response became centered on law enforcement, FBI investigations and the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), with the military standing by, if needed. Following the tragic events of 11 September it is clear that the U.S. military is back to playing a major role in homeland security and national defense. Combat Air Patrols over major cities and special security operations during major public events are a few examples of the military's "new" responsibilities.

Domestic use of the military is guided by the 1878 *Posse Comitatus Act* which proscribed the use of the Army (later amended to include the Air Force while Navy and USMC personnel are covered via regulation) to "execute the laws"-- acting as a domestic police force -- except where expressly authorized by Congress or the Constitution. The Act was clarified in 1981 legislation which permitted military assistance to civilian law enforcement agencies, to include the U.S. Coast Guard, especially to authorize technical assistance and use of facilities (including ships, aircraft and intelligence/surveillance) in combating drug smuggling into the United States. National Guard troops under the control of state governors are excluded from *Posse Comitatus* restrictions. Since 11 September, several members of Congress and selected officials in the Executive Department have suggested that the Act should be reviewed and maybe changed to permit, in certain cases, military involvement in domestic homeland security activities due to the special capabilities inherent in the military not available in the civil sector. To date, this discussion continues without formal action by either the executive or legislative branches. *Posse Comitatus* does not apply to military forces outside the United States permitting direct military and law enforcement (FBI) cooperation and coordination overseas.

Domestic Preparedness and Civil Support

The most likely need for domestic military operations resulting from a terrorist attack on U.S. territory is civil support. In current parlance this is considered an aspect of consequence management along with aspects of crisis management and attribution. The fundamental principle is that DoD personnel would not be in the lead, rather would provide support to lead federal (Army, Air Force), state and local (National Guard) agencies in the event of a domestic contingency. Mass casualty events resulting from a nuclear event or a chemical/biological release are events which likely would result in military units providing security, medical, fire fighting and potentially law enforcement (martial rule) support under the cognizance of a national agency, such as FEMA, pending the restitution of civil authority and control. Another, maybe less obvious area where the military might be directed to support the civil sector is responding to a cyber or other attacks effecting transportation, such as airspace security, and large-scale refugee flows which impact critical infrastructure. In anticipation of the possible need for military support during civil emergencies, Executive Order 12938 issued 14 November 1994 in advance declared a "national emergency" to deal with the threat of a NBC weapon of mass destruction (WMD) event. Similarly, Congress in the FY1997 Defense Authorization Act directed DoD to establish a program to provide training and expert advice to federal, state and local agencies regarding emergency responses to WMD events.

Continuity of Government (COG) ensures the integrity of constitutional authority at all levels of government and facilitates the quick restoration of civil authority and essential functions in the event of a crisis. Article IV of the Constitution guarantees federal protection to states for COG in the event of an invasion or domestic violence. Since government centers offer terrorists a highly visible target, military support to maintain COG, to include the use of military facilities, is a likely requirement. The requirement for the continuity of military operations, distinct from civil COG, is another area of potential military interface with civil government and facilities at all levels. Shortly after 11 September the President authorized the deputization of 1,600 national guardsmen as border security officials to enhance security activities preventing the smuggling of WMD and other weapons, as well as potential terrorists, into the U.S. In the Fy2003 Defense Appropriations Act the President requested and Congress provided \$7.8 billion specifically to enhance DoD's ability to assist, train and support (including intelligence) domestic homeland security preparedness.

On 17 April 2002 Secretary Rumsfeld announced the formation of the Northern Command (NORTHCOM) to assume responsibility for the defense of the continental United States. Schedule to become operational 1 October 2002, NORTHCOM will exercise command over all forces operating within the U.S. in response to external threats and in support of civil authorities. NORTHCOM will also help DoD deal with natural disasters and other civil difficulties. The expectation is that this will enhance DoD coordination and support with other federal agencies, such as FEMA and FBI, in times of emergencies.

### **Issues for Consideration**

*The Posse Comitatus Act was created to prevent the abusive use of Northern troops during reconstruction in the South following the Civil War. Has this Act outlived its usefulness in light of terrorist attacks on U.S. territory?*

*The "Revolution in Military Affairs" is designed to transform the military from 3<sup>rd</sup> Generation Warfare to 4<sup>th</sup> Generation Warfare with the ability to strike at an enemy*

anywhere in the world on short notice. Does this conflict with the increasing need for military support in homeland security? Can the military do both missions?

Do we really need a Northern Command for homeland defense?

What role, if any, do the individual Services have in homeland security?

### **Required Readings**

**Testimony on Homeland Security and the Role of the Department of Defense**, Donald R. Rumsfeld, Secretary of Defense, Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate, 7 May 2002, 7 pages (reprint). On the web at: <http://www.defenselink.mil/cgi-bin/dlprint.cgi?http://www.defenselink.mil/speeches/2002/s05072002-secdef.html>

**Statement on the Relationship Between the Department of Defense and a Department of Homeland Security**, Dr. Stephen Cambone, Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, Committee on Armed Services, United States House of Representatives, 26 June 2002, 4 pages (Reprint). On the web at: <http://www.defenselink.mil/dodgc/lrs/docs/test02-06-26Cambone.rtf>

**Waging The New War: What's Next For The U.S. Armed Forces:** Wesley K. Clark, "How Did This Happen?: Terrorism and the New War," James F. Hoges Jr. and Gideon Rose, editors, Nov 2001, pp 241-253, student book.

**Homeland Security: The New Role for Defense**, Colonel Steven J. Tomisek, Institute for National Strategic Studies, National Defense University, February 2002, pp 1-8 (Reprint). On the web at: <http://www.ndu.edu/inss/strforum/sf189.pdf>

**Quadrennial Defense Review Report 2001**, Department of Defense, 30 September 2001, *Forward*, 3 pages, and *Defend the United States*, pp 18-20 (Reprint). On the web at: <http://www.defenselink.mil/pubs/qdr2001.pdf>

**National Security Strategy for Homeland Security**, Office of Homeland Security, The White House, July 2002, *Law*, pp 47-50, student book. On the web at: [http://www.whitehouse.gov/homeland/book/nat\\_strat\\_hls.pdf](http://www.whitehouse.gov/homeland/book/nat_strat_hls.pdf)

### **Supplemental Readings:**

**Homeland Security DoD Directives**, RAND Corporation Website site: <http://www.rand.org/publications/MR/MR1251/MR1251.AppC.pdf>

## Topic Ten

### COMBATING TERRORISM

Wednesday  
20 November 2002  
1330-1530

*"Americans are asking: How will we fight and win this war? We will direct every resource at our command – every means of diplomacy, every tool of intelligence, every instrument of law enforcement, every financial influence, and every necessary weapon of war – to the disruption and to the defeat of the global terror network".*

**--President George Bush  
20 September 2001**

-

*"In the world we have entered, the only path to safety is the path of action. And this nation will act. We will not leave the safety of America, and the peace of the planet, at the mercy of a few mad terrorists and tyrants."*

*"The war on terror will not be won on the defensive. We must take the battle to the enemy, disrupt its plans, and confront the worst threats before they emerge."*

**--President George Bush  
Graduation Speech, U.S. Military Academy, 1 June 2002**

-

Guest Speaker from the DoD Joint Intelligence Task Force – Combating Terrorism or JCS J-3/5.

#### **Discussion**

The war on terrorism is not only a defensive one. While we do need to enhance the security of the U.S. against terrorism, defending the country includes stopping attacks before they can occur and destroying the ability of terrorist groups and of countries which harbor and support terrorism to fund, plan, support and execute terrorist operations. The "Bush Doctrine," under development as of this writing, appears will be centered on preemption – eliminate the capability of terrorist organization to attack the U.S. before such an attack can occur: *"...our security will require all Americans to be forward-looking and resolute, to be ready for preemptive action when necessary to defend our liberty and to defend our lives."* Preemption will need to be more than special operations, precision bombs and cruise missiles against known terrorist base camps. The ultimate preemption is the removal or alleviation of the root causes of terrorism which likely cannot be achieved by military power alone. However, it is clear that terrorism cannot be *contained* as George Kennan proposed for Communism in the late 1940s. Terrorism must be abolished.

In order to abolish terrorism, the causes of terrorism must be first eliminated. PDD-39, U.S. Policy on Counterterrorism, offers one framework for accomplishing this objective. In part, PDD-39 calls for deterring terrorism through domestic security enhancements as well as international policy actions and cooperation.

Internationally, the use of terrorism to accomplish goals, usually illegitimate in nature when aligned with terrorism, must become an anathema for all societies. The "demand" for terrorism, the conditions which foster the perception of a societal or group humiliation and hopelessness, and the conditions which encourage extreme confrontations between cultures, must be reduced and eliminated. Venues for doing this include increasing foreign assistance to educate and improve living standards, diplomacy encouraging societal self-determination, and cooperative engagement with groups and societies offering economic benefits and most importantly jobs for workers. International peacekeeping and nation building are integral aspects of support to countries struggling with societal development.

While working towards the elimination of terrorism the U.S. must continue to build and maintain international coalitions so that terrorism has no place to hide. Intelligence capabilities must be improved to provide better, more timely knowledge of potential terrorist planning, capabilities and most importantly, intentions. This requires improvements both in domestic "collection" by the FBI, such as legal tapping into wireless systems, and developing better human source agents overseas. Appropriate data sharing between all government agencies and all levels of government, in "near real time," is technologically feasible and must be funded. The Visa and immigration process for temporary visits to the U.S., especially for schooling and time-limited work, and for permanent residency needs to be improved through more detailed screening and coordination with the intelligence community.

The U.S. cannot do this alone. Intelligence, diplomatic and military coalitions with historic allies, such as within NATO and the English speaking world, as well as forging connectivity with new allies who are also threatened by international terrorism, such as Russia and Syria, are necessary. Countries other than the U.S. have significant intelligence capabilities and experiences in areas of the world with which the U.S. is not familiar – or not welcome. Actionable intelligence, intelligence accurate enough to execute military or covert operations, is needed to eliminate and eradicate terrorist cells before they have the opportunity to execute an operation. This is especially true when the threat includes the possibility of a biological or chemical agent, or nuclear or radiological weapon. The proliferation of CBRN weapons technology through the international relocation of skilled scientists and technicians is a constant threat in countries, such as Russia, which can no longer offer adequate employment following the demise of many Soviet weapons development programs in the early 1990s. Proliferation of weapons technology through Internet communications, whether intentional or not, is a significant concern while not infringing on legitimate exchange of ideas in the scientific and policy communities.

There can be no safe harbors for terrorists and for countries which fund or support terrorist groups. Terrorism is illegitimate political warfare and is a threat to all civilized societies. Eradication of the root causes of terrorism, terrorist access to weapons of mass destruction and the capability to strike terrorist cells, either in the U.S. or overseas, needs to be included in future U.S. national and military security strategies.

### **Issues for Consideration**

*Can terrorism be eradicated?*



*Does the U.S. need to reevaluate its foreign policy and foreign aid programs to attack the causes of terrorism following the attacks of 11 September?*

*How secure are we in building coalitions with countries we have claimed are supporters of terrorism in the past, like Syria and Yemen, and maybe even Libya, in an effort to reduce or eliminate the terrorist threat to the U.S.?*

*Is a policy of preemption moral, ethical, and legal? Should the U.S. "strike first?"*

### **Required Readings**

**Remarks by the President at 2002 Graduation Exercise of the United States Military Academy**, West Point, New York, 1 June 2002, 5 pages (Reprint). On the web at: <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/06/print/20020601-3.html>

**Homeland Security Presidential Directive 2: Combating Terrorism Through Immigration Policies**, The White House, 29 October 2001, 4 pages (Reprint). On the web at: <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/10/print/20011030-2.html>

**Presidential Decision Directive 39: U.S. Policy on Counterterrorism**, The White House, 21 June 1995, 12 pages (Reprint). On the web at: <http://www.fas.org/irp/offdocs/pdd39.htm>

**Counterterrorism: A New Organizing Principle for American National Security?**, James B. Steinberg, The Brookings Review, Summer 2002, Vol. 20 No. 3, 6 pages (Reprint). On the web at: <http://www.brookings.edu/press/REVIEW/summer2002/steinberg.htm>

**Can Foreign Aid Help Stop Terrorism?: Not with Magic Bullets**, Carol Graham, The Brookings Review, Summer 2002, Vol. 20 No. 3, 6 pages (Reprint). On the web at: <http://www.brookings.edu/press/REVIEW/summer2002/graham.htm>

**National Security Strategy for Homeland Security**, Office of Homeland Security, The White House, July 2002, *International Cooperation*, pp 59-61, student book. On the web at: [http://www.whitehouse.gov/homeland/book/nat\\_strat\\_hls.pdf](http://www.whitehouse.gov/homeland/book/nat_strat_hls.pdf)

### **Supplemental Readings**

**Strategic Air Planning and Berlin (Kaysen Study)**, Memorandum for General Maxwell Taylor, Military Representative to the President, 5 September 1961, 36 pages. (reprint). On the web at: <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB56/BerlinC1.pdf>

**Legal Bases for Military Operations**, Operational Law Handbook, Chapter 4, The Judge Advocate General's School, United States Army, Charlottesville, Virginia, JA 422, 1977, 7 pages (Reprint). On the web at: <http://www.cdmha.org/toolkit/cdmha-rltk/PUBLICATIONS/oplaw-ja97.pdf>

**The Fighting Next Time**, Bill Keller, New York Times Magazine, 10 March 2002 (Reprint). On the web, via NDU Library Proquest account at: <http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?TS=1026830608&RQT=309&CC=1&Dtp=1&Did=00000110363708&Mtd=1&Fmt=4>



## Topic Eleven

### STUDENT PRESENTATIONS

Wednesday  
27 November 2002  
1330-1530

#### **Discussion**

Student presentations (either individually or in teams of two) tightly focused on a policy or specific challenge of homeland security should be approximately 20 minutes in length, including Q&A led by the presenter(s). All topics must be approved by the faculty not later than 16 Oct.

## Topic Twelve

### WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

Wednesday  
4 December 2002  
1330-1530

*"America will never be the same again. It has proved to itself and to others that it is in truth (not just in name) the only global superpower, indeed a power that enjoys a level of superiority over its actual or potential rivals unmatched by any other nation in modern times. Consequently, the world outside America should never be the same either. There will, of course, arise new threats from new directions. But as long as America works to maintain its technological lead, there is no reason why any challenge to American dominance should succeed. And that in turn will help stability and peace."*

*"How and when, not whether, to remove him (Saddam Hussein) are the only important questions."*

**--Margaret Thatcher  
11 February 2002**

*"Just as no enemy could drive us from the fight to meet our challenges and protect our values in World War II and the Cold War, we will not be driven from the tough fight against terrorism today. Terrorism is the enemy of our generation and we must prevail."*

**--President William Clinton,  
George Washington University, 5 August 1996**

*"Our enemy is smart and resolute. We are smarter and more resolute. We will prevail against all who believe they can stand in the way of America's commitment to freedom, liberty, and our way of life."*

**--President George Bush  
National Strategy for Homeland Security, July 2002**

- Guest Speaker

#### **Discussion**

The good news is that a major international terrorist attack has not occurred in the United States or against U.S. interests or persons overseas since 11 September. The bad news is that one is coming...

9/11 has done more than change the international world order and ushering in a new era in world affairs. It has changed the American way of life. Long lines (expected to grow longer as new security measures are implemented) at airports, eight-foot

fences around hospitals limiting public access, security screening at women's basketball games, closed streets, smaller crowds and more visible security at public events, and a proliferation of video cameras in public parks, traffic intersections and downtown streets are reflective of just some of the changes that are noticeable. It has also, once again, made the world smaller for Americans, just as the telegraph did in the 19<sup>th</sup> Century, and commercial jet travel and the Internet in the 20<sup>th</sup>. Today we are closer to those who wish us harm, and they can do it using our own freedoms and technologies, and do it from within our backyards. The challenge facing us, and all those who believe terrorism is an illegal and immoral mechanism to address grievances, is two-fold: reduce the opportunity for terrorism while eliminating its genesis. Both of these are local and simultaneously international challenges, and thus are bringing about a new world order at the start of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century.

The United States has begun a process for revising its national security system to address this new reality. For the first time in a half century the federal government is reorganizing itself to draw on its strengths to better manage and respond to the new challenges. State and local governments will follow suit. The military is also taking on added challenges and a revised strategy from that of the Cold War period, and one which will increase its domestic responsibilities while requiring it to quickly, efficiently and with utmost precision respond to threats, many times hidden, murky and in far away places, to the U.S. before they become apparent and visible to citizens. Internationally, new coalitions are being formed to enable governments and peoples to work together against the threat of terrorism and eventually, hopefully, improved security for the world's peoples.

While the end-game is better security and cooperation internationally, the process to get there is decades long, expensive, and will require perseverance from Americans and flexibility from America's political system. The United States will remain the world's primary economic and political force through the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. To secure that leadership we need to effect a national strategy which guides us through the vulnerable period ahead. Over the near-term we need to prevent terrorist attacks and reduce vulnerabilities to any attack. Considerable effort and progress has already been made in shaping revised government operations to protect our critical infrastructure and personal security consistent with the civil liberties guaranteed in the U.S. Constitution. Further efforts are being planned or in development. Not unlike the industrial revolution of the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20 Centuries, this "revolution" will result in insuring the safety of our water and agriculture, transportation and communications systems, and eventually security and living standards. This will likely be a generation-long transition and will not be without some trauma. It will result in advancing American standards and values worldwide. Even today, less than a year after 9/11, the world's peoples have increased their efforts to immigrate to the U.S. A generation from now we may be able to give them the freedoms and strengths we enjoy as Americans in their respective home towns, wherever that may be.

### **Issues for Consideration**

- *What are the near-term challenges facing us, as Americans, in insuring our civil liberties and economic strengths?*

*Some have called 9/11 inevitable – due to U.S. political and economic indifference to those less fortunate than Americans. As we adjust to the changes required to insure our future, can the world, or can we help the world, to change as well?*

*Is our aggregate strategy – national security, homeland security and defense – appropriate to meet the challenges facing the American people?*

*Are we in the initial stages of a “revolution” similar to that experienced by our forefathers?*

–  
**Required Readings**

***National Security Strategy for Homeland Security***, Office of Homeland Security, The White House, July 2002, *Priorities for the Future*, pp 67-69, student book. On the web at: [http://www.whitehouse.gov/homeland/book/nat\\_strat\\_hls.pdf](http://www.whitehouse.gov/homeland/book/nat_strat_hls.pdf)

***The Home Front: American Society Responds to the New War***, Alan Wolfe, “How Did This Happen?: Terrorism and the New War,” James F. Hoges Jr. and Gideon Rose, editors, Nov 2001, pp 283-293, student book.

***The Cold War is Finally Over: The True Significance of the Attacks***, Anatol Lieven, “How Did This Happen?: Terrorism and the New War,” James F. Hoges Jr. and Gideon Rose, editors, Nov 2001, pp 295-306, student book.

***The Return of History: What September 11 Hath Wrought***, Fareed Zakaria, “How Did This Happen?: Terrorism and the New War,” James F. Hoges Jr. and Gideon Rose, editors, Nov 2001, pp 307-317, student book.

***The Great American Gong Show: Woodrow Wilson Meets Dr. Strangelove***, Franklin P. (Chuck) Spinney, *Defense and the National Interest*, 23 February 2002, 13 page (Reprint). On the web at: <http://www.d-n-i.net/fcs/comments/c441.htm>

–  
***New World Coming: American Security in the 21st Century***, Major Themes and Implications, 15 Sep 1999, by U.S. Commission on National Security, Hart-Rudman Commission, 8 pages (Reprint). On the web at: <http://www.au.af.mil/au/awc/awcgate/hartrudman/hartrudman1.htm>