

## —ORGANIZING the GOVERNMENT to COMBAT TERRORISM—

*AMERICAN SECURITY IN A CHANGING WORLD: REMARKS AT GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY, WASHINGTON, DC, AUGUST 5, 1996.* U.S. Department of State. President William J. Clinton. *Dispatch*. Vol. 7, No. 32, August 5, 1996. Washington, DC: Office of Public Communication, Bureau of Public Affairs, 1996. p.401-404. [Text of Remarks].

SuDoc# S 1.3/5: 7/32

“Most dramatically, our personal, community, and national security depend upon our policies on terrorism at home and abroad. We cannot advance the common good at home without advancing the common good around the world. We cannot reduce the threats to our people without reducing the threats to the world beyond our borders. That’s why the fight against terrorism must be both a national priority and a national security priority. We have pursued a concerted national and international strategy against terrorism on three fronts: first, beyond our borders, by working more closely than ever with our friends and allies; second, here at home, by giving law enforcement the most powerful counterterrorism tools available; and, third, in our airports and airplanes by increasing aviation security.”

### Online

<http://dosfan.lib.uic.edu/ERC/briefing/dispatch/1996/html/Dispatchv7no32.html>

*ANNUAL PERFORMANCE PLAN, OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL, FISCAL YEAR 2003.* U.S. Department of Homeland Security. Washington, DC: Office of the Inspector General, 2003. 40p. [Report].

SuDoc# HS 1.1/2-2: 2003

“Since the horrific terror attacks on the United States on September 11, 2001, securing our nation against another terror incident on American soil has become the most important challenge facing our nation today, and creating DHS was one of the most important steps toward meeting that challenge. The primary mission of DHS is, simply put, the protection of the American people. The fulfillment of that mission, however, cannot be put into simple terms. It is a challenge of monumental scale and complexity. It involves the consolidation of border and transportation security functions, the merger of preparedness, mitigation, and response activities, the creation of a central point to map terrorist threats against vulnerabilities in our critical infrastructure, and the coordination of homeland security research and development efforts. In addition, DHS must ensure that non-homeland security activities, such as responding to natural disasters or saving lives at sea, are not neglected.”

***CAN THE USE OF FACTUAL DATA ANALYSIS STRENGTHEN NATIONAL SECURITY?  
PART ONE.*** U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Government Reform. Subcommittee on Technology, Information Policy, Intergovernmental Relations and the Census. 108<sup>th</sup> Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> Session, 6 May 2003. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2004. 72p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. G 74/7: D 26/6

“In an effort to prevent future terrorist attacks and enhance law enforcement efforts, deputies and agencies throughout the Federal Government have begun developing strategies that will assist in the identification of potential risks through the use of technology and information sharing ... In particular, since September 11, 2001, it has been imminently clear that we must do a better job of compiling and sharing information that will provide, enhance the opportunities for law enforcement and national security officials to identify potential risks in advance.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS46117> (PDF)

***COAST GUARD: CHALLENGES DURING THE TRANSITION TO THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY: STATEMENT OF JAYETTA Z. HECKER, DIRECTOR, PHYSICAL INFRASTRUCTURE.*** U.S. General Accounting Office. 1 April 2003. Washington, DC: U.S. General Accounting Office, 2003. 25p. [Testimony].

SuDoc# GA 1.5/2: GAO-03-594 T

“Data on the most recent levels of effort for the Coast Guard’s various missions show clearly the dramatic shifts that have occurred among its missions since the September 11, 2001, attacks. Predictably, levels of effort related to homeland security remain at much higher levels than before September 11<sup>th</sup>. Other missions, such as search and rescue, have remained at essentially the same levels. In contrast, several other missions—most notably fisheries enforcement and drug interdiction—dropped sharply after September 11<sup>th</sup> and remain substantially below historical levels. Continued homeland security and military demands make it unlikely that the agency, in the short run, can increase efforts in the missions that have declined. Further, the fiscal year 2004 budget request contains little that would substantially alter the existing levels of effort among missions.”

Online

<http://www.gao.gov/cgi-bin/getrpt?GAO-03-594T> (PDF)

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS36504> (PDF)

<http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d03594t.pdf> (PDF)

***COMBATING TERRORISM: ACTIONS NEEDED TO IMPROVE DOD ANTITERRORISM PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION AND MANAGEMENT.*** U.S. General Accounting Office. 19 September 2001. Washington, DC: U.S. General Accounting Office, 2001. 36p. [Report].

SuDoc# GA 1.13: GAO-01-909

“The effectiveness of the antiterrorism program has been limited because the Department of Defense (DOD) has not (1) assessed vulnerabilities at all installations, (2) systematically prioritized resource requirements, and (3) developed a complete assessment of potential threats. The services and individual installation commanders are taking steps to reduce their vulnerabilities, but overall progress is difficult to measure because tracking systems are not in place.”

***COMBATING TERRORISM: DEPARTMENT OF STATE PROGRAMS TO COMBAT TERRORISM ABROAD.*** U.S. General Accounting Office. September 2002. Washington, DC: U.S. General Accounting Office, 2003. 31p. [Report].

SuDoc# GA 1.13: GAO-02-1021

“Specifically, this report identifies the State Department’s programs and activities intended to (1) prevent terrorist attacks, (2) disrupt and destroy terrorist organizations, (3) respond to terrorist incidents, and (4) coordinate efforts to combat terrorism.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS31757> (PDF)

***COMBATING TERRORISM: FEDERAL RESPONSE TEAMS PROVIDE VARIED CAPABILITIES; OPPORTUNITIES REMAIN TO IMPROVE COORDINATION.*** U.S. General Accounting Office. 2000. Washington, DC: U.S. General Accounting Office, 2000. 77p. [Report].

SuDoc# GA 1.13: GAO-01-14

“Eight agencies have 24 types of teams that can respond to a terrorist incident involving chemical, biological, radiological, or nuclear agents or weapons to assist state and local governments. The characteristics of these teams vary. Specifically, teams vary in their size, composition of personnel, equipment, geographical coverage, transportation needs, and response time.”

***COMBATING TERRORISM: FUNDING DATA REPORTED TO CONGRESS SHOULD BE IMPROVED.*** U.S. General Accounting Office. November 2002. Washington, DC: U.S. General Accounting Office, 2002. 74p. [Report].

SuDoc# GA 1.13: GAO-03-170

“GAO calculated, on the basis of OMB’s data, that there was a 276-percent total increase in funds designated to combat terrorism during the fiscal years 2001 and 2002 (as reported in OMB’s annual reports to Congress for 2001 and 2002, respectively). This increase includes a 106-percent increase from the post-September 11 redefinition of combating terrorism to include homeland security activities such as aviation and transportation security, and a 170-percent increase due to funding increases. Difficulties in coordinating budgets to combat terrorism stem from the variety of missions involved and the fact that activities related to combating terrorism are often funded through budget accounts that also provide funding for other activities.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS31087> (PDF)

*COMBATING TERRORISM: IMPROVING THE FEDERAL RESPONSE*. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Government Reform. Subcommittee on National Security, Veterans Affairs and International Relations; Subcommittee on the Civil Service, Census and Agency Organization. 107<sup>th</sup> Congress, 2<sup>nd</sup> Session, 11 June 2002. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2003. 149p. [Joint Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. G 74/7: D 84/52

“In the course of twenty-seven hearings on terrorism, this Subcommittee has traveled the twisted bureaucratic byways and dead ends of our current homeland security structure. We saw duplication in research programs and a proliferation of narrowly focused counterterrorism efforts. We heard testimony on a crippling lack of coordination between more than one hundred federal departments, agencies, offices, task forces, steering committees and working groups attempting to protect America’s people and property from catastrophic harm.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS33548> (PDF)

*COMBATING TERRORISM: IN SEARCH OF A NATIONAL STRATEGY*. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Government Reform. Subcommittee on National Security, Veterans Affairs and International Relations. 107<sup>th</sup> Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> Session, 27 March 2001. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2001. 159p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. G 74/7: T 27/14

“While some interagency cooperation and information sharing has begun, substantial barriers, including legislative mandates, still prevent a fully coordinated counterterrorism effort. As the organizational charts get more complex, the effort inevitably becomes less cohesive ... According to our witnesses this morning, the fight against terrorism remains fragmented and unfocused, primarily because no

overarching national strategy guides planning, directs spending, or disciplines bureaucratic balkanization. They will discuss recommendations for reform of counterterrorism programs that the new administration would be wise, very wise, to consider.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS17320>

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS17321> (PDF)

***COMBATING TERRORISM: ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED TO IMPROVE COUNTERTERRORISM OPERATIONS.*** U.S. General Accounting Office. May 1999. Washington, DC: U.S. General Accounting Office, 1999. 28p. [Report].

SuDoc# GA 1.13: NSIAD-99-135

“During the last 3 years, federal agencies have worked together in many operations and special events and have generally coordinated their activities. However, issues of interagency guidance and command and control that need to be addressed to enhance the federal government’s ability to effectively respond to terrorist incidents.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS17819> (PDF)

***COMBATING TERRORISM: OBSERVATIONS ON CROSSCUTTING ISSUES: STATEMENT OF RICHARD DAVIS, DIRECTOR, NATIONAL SECURITY ANALYSIS, NATIONAL SECURITY AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS DIVISION.*** U.S. General Accounting Office. 23 April 1998. Washington, DC: U.S. General Accounting Office, 1998. 8p. [Testimony].

SuDoc# GA 1.5/2: T-NSIAD-98-164

“The need for effective interagency coordination—both at the federal level and among the federal, state, and local levels—is paramount. The challenges of efficient and effective management and focus for program investments are growing as the terrorism issue draws more attention from the Congress ... The United States is spending billions of dollars annually to combat terrorism without assurance that federal funds are focused on the right programs or in the right amounts.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS16362> (PDF)

***COMBATING TERRORISM: OBSERVATIONS ON FEDERAL SPENDING TO COMBAT TERRORISM.*** U.S. General Accounting Office. 11 March 1999. Washington, DC: U.S. General Accounting Office, 1999. 20p. [Testimony].

SuDoc# GA 1.5/2: T-NSIAD/GGD-99-107

“Annual and supplemental agency appropriations have continued to fund a growing number of programs, initiatives, and activities to combat terrorism. For example, for fiscal year 1999, the Congress authorized \$9.7 billion for combating terrorism, including \$2.1 billion in an emergency supplemental following the bombings of two U.S. embassies.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS17222> (PDF)

***COMBATING TERRORISM: OBSERVATIONS ON GROWTH IN FEDERAL PROGRAMS: STATEMENT OF MARK E. GEBICKE, DIRECTOR, NATIONAL SECURITY PREPAREDNESS ISSUES, NATIONAL SECURITY AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS DIVISION.*** U.S. General Accounting Office. 9 June 1999. Washington, DC: U.S. General Accounting Office, 1999. 20p. [Testimony].

SuDoc# GA 1.5/2: T-NSIAD-99-181

Focuses on the “foreign-origin and domestic-origin terrorism threats as understood from intelligence analyses,” issues concerning the “emerging threat of CBRN terrorism,” “observations on the growth in federal programs to provide training and equipment to first responders,” and “some steps the executive branch has taken to better manage federal efforts against terrorism.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS24400> (PDF)

***COMBATING TERRORISM: OBSERVATIONS ON NATIONAL STRATEGIES RELATED TO TERRORISM: STATEMENT OF RAYMOND J. DECKER, DIRECTOR, DEFENSE CAPABILITIES AND MANAGEMENT.*** U.S. General Accounting Office. 3 March 2003. Washington, DC: U.S. General Accounting Office, 2003. 25p. [Testimony].

SuDoc# GA 1.5/2: GAO-03-519 T

“In GAO’s past work, we have stressed the importance of a national strategy to combat terrorism. We stated that such a national strategy should provide a clear statement about what the nation hopes to achieve. A national strategy should not only define the roles of federal agencies, but also those of state and local governments, the private sector, and the international community. A national strategy should also establish goals, objectives, priorities, outcomes, milestones, and performance measures. In essence, a national strategy should incorporate the principles of the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993, which requires federal agencies to set strategic goals, measure performance, and report on the degree to which goals are met.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS32304> (PDF)

<http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d03519t.pdf> (PDF)

*COMBATING TERRORISM: OPTIONS TO IMPROVE FEDERAL RESPONSE.* U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings, and Emergency Management; Committee on Government Reform. Subcommittee on National Security, Veterans Affairs and International Relations. 107<sup>th</sup> Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> Session, 24 April 2001. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2002. 183p. [Joint Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. T 68/2: 107-11

“Since the bombings of the World Trade Center in 1993 and the Murrah Federal Building in 1995, Federal spending for terrorism programs has increased without control. More than \$11 billion will be spent in fiscal year 2001 by at least 40 departments and agencies administering counter-terrorism and preparedness programs. This figure is nearly double the amount spent 3 years ago. And yet, there is no single Federal entity in charge of this effort, no single person who can be brought before Congress to discuss an overall approach to combating or responding to terrorism, and no comprehensive strategy to guide this massive spending effort. In fact, the Federal Government does not even know what programs exist or what they are designed to accomplish.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS23814> (PDF)

*COMBATING TERRORISM: A PROLIFERATION OF STRATEGIES.* U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Government Reform. Subcommittee on National Security, Emerging Threats and International Relations. 108<sup>th</sup> Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> Session, 3 March 2003. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2003. 182p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. G 74/7: T 27/22

“Just as reorganizing the Federal Government to counterterrorism will take time, reorienting the U.S. long-term strategic mindset will require sustained effort and hard choices. Some fundamental elements of a fully integrated preparedness and response strategy are not yet evident. State officials and local first responders are still waiting to know how much will be expected of them in the event of a major incident. What capabilities in terms of training and equipment should be resident at the local level? When and how should Federal capabilities be brought to bear?”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS41605> (PDF)

***COMBATING TERRORISM: PROPOSED TRANSFER OF THE DOMESTIC PREPAREDNESS PROGRAM.*** U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Government Reform. Subcommittee on National Security, Veterans Affairs, and International Relations. 106<sup>th</sup> Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> Session, 26 May 1999. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1999. 67p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. G 74/7: T 27/3

“The central question, does the consolidation of domestic preparedness programs in DOJ ignore the clear, necessary distinction between crisis management and consequence management ... Unless ... Federal effort properly structured and targeted, local planning may be inadequate, local preparations may be hazard, and critical assets may be misallocated.”

***COMBATING TERRORISM: SPENDING ON GOVERNMENTWIDE PROGRAMS REQUIRES BETTER MANAGEMENT AND COORDINATION.*** U.S. General Accounting Office. December 1997. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1997. 40p. [Report].

SuDoc# GA 1.13: NSIAD-98-39

“The amount of federal funds being spent on programs and activities to combat terrorism is unknown and difficult to determine. Identifying and tracking terrorism-related governmentwide spending with precision is difficult for several reasons, such as the lack of a uniform definition of terrorism and the inclusion of these expenditures within larger categories that do not readily allow separation. For example, building security measures protect against criminals as well as terrorists.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS14312> (PDF)

***COMBATING TERRORISM: THE PROLIFERATION OF AGENCIES' EFFORTS.*** U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Government Reform and Oversight. Subcommittee on National Security, International Affairs, and Criminal Justice. 105<sup>th</sup> Congress, 2<sup>nd</sup> Session, 23 April 1998. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1998. 78p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. G 74/7: T 27/2

“In the aftermath of the World Trade Center bombing in 1993, combating terrorism became a top priority for the Federal Government. As a result, there has been tremendous growth in the number of agencies involved in efforts to combat terrorism and the number of terrorism-related programs, as well as the funding for such efforts. There are over 40 Federal agencies, bureaus, and offices involved in U.S. efforts to fight terrorism, spending nearly \$7 billion on dozens of programs and activities. For example, FBI resources increased fivefold from 1994 to 1997. The FBI now has 2,500 agents assigned to conduct counterterrorism work.”



***COMBATING TERRORISM: THREAT AND RISK ASSESSMENTS CAN HELP PRIORITIZE AND TARGET PROGRAM INVESTMENTS.*** U.S. General Accounting Office. April 1998. Washington, DC: U.S. General Accounting Office, 1998. 40p. [Report].

SuDoc# GA 1.13: NSIAD-98-74

“The Defense Against Weapons of Mass Destruction Act of 1996 established the Nunn-Lugar-Domenici (NLD) domestic preparedness program. The program is intended to enhance federal, state, and local emergency response capabilities to deal with a domestic terrorist incident involving weapons of mass destruction (WMD). Congress established the NLD program in response to a perceived significant and growing threat of WMD terrorism directed against American cities and shortfalls in U.S. cities’ WMD emergency response capabilities.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS14522> (PDF)

***COMBATING TERRORISM: USE OF NATIONAL GUARD RESPONSE TEAMS IS UNCLEAR.*** U.S. General Accounting Office. May 1999. Washington, DC: U.S. General Accounting Office, 1999. 48p. [Report].

SuDoc# GA 1.13: NSIAD-99-110

“Because of the differing views on the role and use of the RAID teams, the numerous organizations that can perform similar functions, and the potential operational issues that could impact the teams, we are recommending that the appropriate federal agencies determine the need for the teams. If it is determined that the teams are needed, we further recommend that the RAID team concept be tested to determine how the teams can effectively perform their functions.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS17220> (PDF)

***CONPLAN: UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT INTERAGENCY DOMESTIC TERRORISM CONCEPT OF OPERATIONS PLAN.*** Federal Emergency Management Agency. January 2001. Washington, DC: Federal Emergency Management Agency, 2001. [Manual].

SuDoc# FEM 1.2: 2002000140

“The ability of the United States Government to prevent, deter, defeat and respond decisively to terrorist attacks against our citizens, whether these attacks occur domestically, in international waters or airspace, or on foreign soil, is one of the most challenging priorities facing our nation today. The United States regards all such terrorism as a potential threat to national security, as well as a violent criminal act, and will apply all appropriate means to combat this danger. In doing so, the United States vigorously pursues efforts to deter and preempt these crimes and to apprehend

and prosecute directly, or assist other governments in prosecuting, individuals who perpetrate or plan such terrorist attacks.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS14932>

<http://www.fema.gov/rrr/conplan/>

***COORDINATED INFORMATION SHARING AND HOMELAND SECURITY TECHNOLOGY.*** U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Government Reform. Subcommittee on Technology and Procurement Policy. 107<sup>th</sup> Congress, 2<sup>nd</sup> Session, 7 June 2002. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2003. 140p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. G 74/7: H 75/11

“Today’s hearing continues the Subcommittee’s oversight of the barriers to robust information sharing both within and between agencies...how programmatic changes, management initiatives, and technology acquisitions can contribute to the better sharing of information and the achievement of the homeland security mission.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS31787> (PDF)

***COUNTERMEASURES AGAINST TERRORISM: THE FEDERAL EFFORT.*** U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Governmental Affairs. 102<sup>nd</sup> Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> Session, 26 February 1991. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1992. 186p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. G 74/9: S.HRG.102-670

“The first finding is that the interagency technical support working group on counterterrorism has been experiencing severe funding problems ... If terrorism is considered to be a major threat to the security of the United States, R&D aimed at combating it should, we feel, receive a higher profile, greater support, and meaningful interagency coordination ... Finding three states that we find the mass acquisition of a thermal neutron analysis explosives detection device for installation at airports is inadvisable at this time for technical reasons ... Our fourth finding is that there is a strong need to develop test protocols for proposed explosive detection systems if large acquisitions are to be required ... Our final finding, No. 5, is that effective airline security will require a systems approach that does not rely solely on any particular technology by instead uses several technologies, the capabilities of each complementing the shortcomings of the others.”

***COUNTERTERRORISM—EVALUATING THE 5-YEAR PLAN.*** U.S. Congress. Senate Committee on Appropriations. Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary, and

Related Agencies. 105<sup>th</sup> Congress, 2<sup>nd</sup> Session, 1998. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1998. 53p. [Special Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. AP 6/2: S.HRG.105-711

The Federal Government's 5-year counterterrorism plan, current response to terrorist attacks, the Strategic Information Operations Center, domestic emergency support team, training exercises, encryption, cybercrime, overseas terrorist acts, nature of the terrorist threat, improving the Government's capabilities to prevent and respond to terrorism, history of counterterrorism, counterterrorism threats, counterterrorism coordination, role of the National Security Council, role of the National Guard and Department of Defense, domestic preparedness program, infrastructure protection, Israeli hacker case, international cybercrime, anthrax threat in Las Vegas, Pan Am bombing, and improving response to terrorism.

*COUNTERTERRORISM RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT: FUNDING, PRIORITY-SETTING, AND COORDINATION.* Library of Congress. Genevieve J. Knezo. 1 October 2002. Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress, 2002. 6p. [Online Report].

SuDoc# LC 14.19/3: RS21270

“The basic R&D issues concern the adequacy of planning/coordination mechanisms, including those in the Office of Science and Technology Policy and Office of Homeland Security; which counterterrorism R&D should be transferred to a new department; and how other R&D counterterrorism activities that are not transferred should be coordinated.”

Online

<http://www.fas.org/irp/crs/RS21270.pdf> (PDF)

*CREATING A DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.* U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Science. 107<sup>th</sup> Congress, 2<sup>nd</sup> Session, 27 June 2002. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2003. 148p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. SCI 2: 107-73

“The hearing will explore a number of overarching questions, including: How should R&D be organized in the Department? ... What is the rationale for transferring some federal R&D functions ... while not transferring others? ... How will the transferred R&D functions be integrated into the Department? ... How will the transfer of these organizations affect the departments from which they are taken?”

*CREATING THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY: CONSIDERATION OF THE ADMINISTRATION'S PROPOSAL.* U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Energy and

Commerce. Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations. 107<sup>th</sup> Congress, 2<sup>nd</sup> Session, 25 June; 9 July 2002. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2002. 368p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. C 73/8: 107-113

“...while the President’s bill is a useful blueprint, many important questions remain to be resolved. For example, what is the scope of the new Secretary’s authority over HHS’s public health preparedness programs and how might it alter the current focus on important dual-use programs? Why are some of the agencies’ preparedness and response programs transferred completely, others transferred partially and others left unchanged in their respective departments? And for those assets or functions not fully transferred to the new Secretary, but under his authority, how does the administration plan to ensure a workable model with one Secretary directing the assets or programs of another?”

*CREATION OF HOMELAND SECURITY DEPARTMENT.* U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Ways and Means. 107<sup>th</sup> Congress, 2<sup>nd</sup> Session, 26 June 2002. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2002. 75p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. W 36: 107-74

“The President proposes to create a new Homeland Security Department, the most significant transformation of the Federal Government in over a half-century by transforming and realigning current government activities into a single department whose primary mission is to protect our homeland...The hearing will focus on details of how this realignment will affect Customs and its core functions such as collection of duties and trade facilitation.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS22919>

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS22920> (PDF)

*THE CUSTOMS SERVICE: ALLOCATION OF INSPECTIONAL PERSONNEL.* U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Government Reform and Oversight. Subcommittee on Government Management, Information, and Technology. 105<sup>th</sup> Congress, 2<sup>nd</sup> Session, 14 August 1998. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1999. 86p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. G 74/7: C 96/5

“...the trade in goods has also been accompanied by the trade in ‘bads’—illegal narcotics and herbs; pirated fakes of intellectual property, including video and music cassettes; and illegal weapons designed for use by international terrorists and domestic nuts. The primary Federal agency with responsibility in these areas is the U.S. Customs Service.”

***DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES BUDGET PRIORITIES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004.*** U.S. Congress. House. Committee on the Budget. 108<sup>th</sup> Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> Session, 26 February 2003. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2003. 82p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. B 85/3: 108-5

“...the last 2 years have underscored the critical services that this department provides when it comes to the well-being of our citizens, especially in the event of a bioterrorist attack. Since September 11, we have become increasingly aware of the possibility of these types of attacks. Health and Human Services is at the forefront of ensuring America that we are ready by overseeing that there exists and appropriate supply and stockpile of vaccines and immunizations, an appropriate number of trained health care providers and first responders, hospitals and facilities that are properly outfitted and equipped, appropriate funding for vaccine research and development, and improved information networks so that key personnel can act appropriately in the even of an emergency.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS33536>

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS33537> (PDF)

***DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES FISCAL YEAR 2003 BUDGET PRIORITIES.*** U.S. Congress. House. Committee on the Budget. 107<sup>th</sup> Congress, 28 February 2002. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2002. 77p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. B 85/3: 107-25

“The purpose of this hearing is certainly as the lead agency for addressing Bioterrorism, the Department of Health and Human Services plays a crucial role in enhancing homeland security. How the President’s budget addresses this issue obviously will be a major focus of this hearing ... There is no doubt that the world changed on September 11 and that the budget needs to reflect these new priorities.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS20818>

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS20819> (PDF)

***THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY: STATE AND LOCAL PREPAREDNESS ISSUES.*** Library of Congress. Ben Canada. 5 May 2003. Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress, 2003. 16p. [Online Report].

SuDoc# LC 14.19/3: RL31490

“Both H.R. 5005 and S. 2452 propose a new Department of Homeland Security (DHS), which would have a number of responsibilities relating to state and local preparedness for potential terrorist attacks. This report discusses selected state and

local preparedness issues that specifically pertain to the proposed Emergency Preparedness and Response Division of the new department.”

Online

<http://www.thememoryhole.org/crs/RL31490.pdf> (PDF)

[http://www.usembassy.at/en/download/pdf/homelandsec\\_prepared.pdf](http://www.usembassy.at/en/download/pdf/homelandsec_prepared.pdf) (2002 PDF)

***DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY TRANSITION: BUREAU OF IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT.*** U.S. Congress. House. Committee on the Judiciary. Subcommittee on Immigration, Border Security, and Claims. 108<sup>th</sup> Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> Session, 10 April 2003. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2003. 76p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. J 89/1: 108-11

“When Homeland Security Act of 2002 abolished the INS, its enforcement functions were moved into the Border and Transportation Security Directorate. The interior enforcement functions of INS merged with the interior enforcement functions of Customs, and the Federal Protective Service (FPS) to form BICE [Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement], which deals with interior enforcement and investigations.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS42201> (PDF)

<http://www.house.gov/judiciary/86409.pdf> (PDF)

***DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY BUDGET PRIORITIES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004.*** U.S. Congress. House. Committee on the Budget. 108<sup>th</sup> Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> Session, 5 February 2003. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2003. 65p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. B 85/3: 108-2

“We must provide for and enhance the security of our homeland. This is not a one-time job; it is a permanent and ongoing task especially when we are trying to protect ourselves against evil minds who spend all their time calculating ways to terrorize and kill.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS31491> (PDF)

***DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION BUDGET PRIORITIES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004.*** U.S. Congress. House. Committee on the Budget. 108<sup>th</sup> Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> Session, 12 February 2003. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2003. 49p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. B 85/3: 108-3

“With the terrorist attacks still fresh in our minds and the possibility of war on the horizon, we remember the critical role of the Transportation Department and its many components ... these past several months. The attacks of September 11, 2001, made it crystal clear that our Nation’s transportation system is on the front line in this global war on terrorism ... The administration bases its request on the need to ‘create a safer, simpler and smarter transportation system for all Americans.’ To accomplish this, the Department is focusing on five performance goals: improved safety, increased mobility in the support of the Nation’s economy, protect human and natural environment, and achieve organizational excellence while at the same time supporting homeland and national security issues.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS32022>

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS32023> (PDF)

*DIPLOMATIC SECURITY*. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. 99<sup>th</sup> Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> Session, 16 & 24 July 1985. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1985. 100p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: D 62/32

“Over 10 years now steadily Americans have been the No. 1 target for terrorist attacks around the world. And over the last 4 years we have witnessed a steady increase in state support of terrorism, moving to attack embassies. A great many countries are either incapable or unwilling to provide the kind of protection for diplomatic facilities that were intended back beyond conventions that have governed diplomatic relationships around the world for so many years. In looking on ahead, we believe that this danger is going to increase ... This is one area where we found unanimity, that the threat of terrorist attacks against Americans and American facilities is going to continue to grow.”

*DIPLOMATIC SECURITY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM*. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on International Operations. 100<sup>th</sup> Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> Session, 1 & 8 October 1987. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1989. 137p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: D 62/35

“Today, we meet to hold the first of two hearings to review the implementation of the Diplomatic Security Program authorized under the Omnibus Diplomatic Security and Anti-Terrorism Act of 1986 ... Thirteen months ago, the President signed into law the landmark Diplomatic Security Act, authorizing \$2.7 billion for a new diplomatic construction program. In the past year, over \$1 billion has been appropriated for the program.”

*DIPLOMATIC SECURITY IN BEIRUT.* U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. Subcommittee on International Operations. 99<sup>th</sup> Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> Session, 13 June 1985. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1985. 31p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: D 62/31

“Fortunately, no incidents of the horrendous proportion of the September 1984 Beirut embassy bombing have occurred since we last heard testimony from Department witnesses on the subject of overseas physical security. Nevertheless, terrorists have not given up their efforts to attack and destroy official and private U.S. installations or harm American citizens in order to make their political points known to the world. Most of the terrorist efforts to damage U.S. interests around the globe are relatively unsuccessful. But this does not mean that the United States can—or should— relax its guard.”

*THE DIPLOMATIC SECURITY PROGRAM.* U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on International Operations. 99<sup>th</sup> Congress, 13 & 20 November 1985; 5 & 6 March 1986. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1986. 340p. [Hearing & Markup].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: D 62/33

“The grim fact is that this country is going to have to prepare for and combat international terrorism for years to come. The purpose of the Inman Panel recommendations is to establish a new security ethic and apparatus within the Department of State. The Department of State must better cope with the security threats of today. But it must also give the kind of prominence and priority to security concerns that will keep us ahead of the curve as future threats develop: we must be active, no reactive, to changes in the international security environment.”

*ENSURING COORDINATION, REDUCING REDUNDANCY: A REVIEW OF OMB'S FREEZE ON IT SPENDING AT HOMELAND SECURITY AGENCIES.* U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Government Reform. Subcommittee on Technology and Procurement Policy. 107<sup>th</sup> Congress, 2<sup>nd</sup> Session, 1 October 2002. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2003. 67p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. G 74/7: R 24/12

“In the past, the subcommittee has been concerned that there has been tremendous push for additional IT spending in homeland security agencies without assuring appropriate management or accountability for these projects. This temporary freeze should allow the Federal Government to ensure spending will yield the necessary return on investment for the taxpayers who are paying the bills. Systems integration and consolidation among the agencies moving into the newly established Department of Homeland Security is a critical lynchpin for the overall success of the agency.”



Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS31552> (PDF)

***ENSURING DOMESTIC SECURITY: ISSUES AND POTENTIAL COSTS.*** U.S. Congress. House. Committee on the Budget. 107<sup>th</sup> Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> Session, 7 November 2001. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2002. 49p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. B 85/3: 107-18

“The hearing today will in part examine the extensive work on the part of the General Accounting Office in reviewing the U.S. Government’s antiterrorism programs, outlining the agency’s findings and presenting some specific recommendations for organizational efficiencies and management improvement. In addition, representatives of the United States Commission on National Security/21<sup>st</sup> Century will be present and will present Commission findings and recommendations on defending the United States against terrorism.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS18771>

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS18772> (PDF)

***ERRATA: A REVIEW OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN A DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY AND THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.*** U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Governmental Affairs. 107<sup>th</sup> Congress, 2<sup>nd</sup> Session, 26 & 27 June 2002. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2002. 279p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. G 74/9: S.HRG.107-562

“Today, we are going to hold the second of four hearings designed to take an intense look at the Homeland Security reorganization plan proposed by President Bush and how best to merge it with legislation reported out of this Committee a little over a month ago. As we create this new Department of Homeland Security, one of our priorities clearly has to be to address what was the single biggest security shortcoming of our government before September 11, and that was the way in which our government coordinated, or failed to coordinate, intelligence. Suffice it to say that a few infamous memos and warnings, now notorious, and the picture they may have painted if they had been understood in relationship to one another are now a perplexing part of American history. And so our challenge is to build a more focused, more effective, more coordinated intelligence system that synchronizes information from the field, analyzes it, converts it, and then turns it into action that can prevent future attacks against the American people here at home.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS22539>

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS22541> (PDF)

***FBI INTELLIGENCE INVESTIGATIONS: COORDINATION WITHIN JUSTICE ON COUNTERINTELLIGENCE CRIMINAL MATTERS IS LIMITED.*** U.S. General Accounting Office. July 2001. Washington, DC: U.S. General Accounting Office, 2001. 43p. [Report].

SuDoc# GA 1.13: GAO-01-780

“The main purpose of a foreign counterintelligence investigation is to protect the U.S. government from the clandestine efforts of foreign powers and their agents to compromise or to adversely affect U.S. military and diplomatic secrets or the integrity of U.S. government processes. At the same time, however, many of the foreign powers’ clandestine efforts may involve a violation of U.S. criminal law, usually espionage or international terrorism, which falls within the federal law enforcement community’s mandate to investigate and prosecute.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS15351> (PDF)

***FBI REORGANIZATION: PROGRESS MADE IN EFFORTS TO TRANSFORM, BUT MAJOR CHALLENGES CONTINUE.*** U.S. General Accounting Office. 18 June 2003. Washington, DC: U.S. General Accounting Office, 2003. 61p. [Testimony].

SuDoc# GA 1.5/2: GAO-03-759 T

“...the FBI continues to face challenges in critical staffing areas including: (1) utilizing staff resources from other criminal investigative programs to address counterterrorism; and (2) a lack of adequate analytical and technical assistance and administrative support personnel.”

Online

<http://www.gao.gov/cgi-bin/getrpt?GAO-03-759T> (PDF)

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS39613> (PDF)

<http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d03759t.pdf> (PDF)

***FEDERAL INTERAGENCY DATA-SHARING AND NATIONAL SECURITY.*** U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Government Reform. Subcommittee on National Security, Veterans Affairs and International Relations. 107<sup>th</sup> Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> Session, 24 July 2001. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2002. 83p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. G 74/7: D 26/4

“During our hearing last April on protecting American interests abroad, witnesses said they saw a need for more frequent, more accurate and more timely data exchanges between Federal agencies to keep pace with the dynamic criminal and terrorist

threats to U.S. citizens and corporate facilities. In this hearing, we ask whether ADNET/NCI or a program like it can meet that need. And we ask what legal organizational and fiscal barriers stand in the way of broader, more effective data-sharing.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS24609> (PDF)

***FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AT THE BORDERS AND PORTS OF ENTRY: CHALLENGES AND SOLUTIONS.*** U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Government Reform. Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy, and Human Resources. 107<sup>th</sup> Congress, 2<sup>nd</sup> Session, July 2002. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2003. 129p. [Report].

SuDoc# Y 1.1/8: 107-794

“Border security—the protection of the American homeland at its land boundaries, coasts, and ports of entry—presents two overriding challenges. The first and most important of them lies in striking the right balance between effective law enforcement at the border and preserving valuable trade and travel. This country has benefited tremendously from our openness to international commerce and tourism—indeed our prosperity, our freedom, and our very way of life depend on it. That openness, however, has left the U.S. vulnerable to increasingly global criminal organizations, who take advantage of porous borders and ports of entry. Crafting a policy that can intercept these enemies without undermining America’s preeminent role in the world economy is the key dilemma facing the U.S. today. The second challenge lies in setting the priorities of border law enforcement itself. The threats facing our nation are often interrelated, but they are not the same, and each of them requires a somewhat different strategy.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS30780> (PDF)

***FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT: LONG-TERM IMPLICATIONS OF HOMELAND SECURITY NEEDS.*** U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Government Reform. Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy, and Human Resources. 107<sup>th</sup> Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> Session, 5 December 2001. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2003. 107p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. G 74/7: L 41/10

“Our hearing will examine three primary issues: First, what has been the immediate impact of the redeployment on law enforcement assets on critical areas such as drug addiction and other criminal enforcement? Second, what is the current status of long-term planning within Federal agencies to ensure the continuation of vigorous law enforcement while simultaneously addressing the additional demands of homeland security? Third, what impact would proposals to consolidate certain functions into a

new agency have on the ability of existing agencies to carry out their conventional missions?”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS26844> (PDF)

***FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT PERSONNEL IN THE POST SEPTEMBER 11 ERA: HOW CAN WE FIX AN IMBALANCED COMPENSATION SYSTEM?*** U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Government Reform. Subcommittee on Civil Service and Agency Organization; Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy, and Human Resources. 108<sup>th</sup> Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> Session, 23 July 2003. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2004. 283p. [Joint Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. G 74/7: L 41

“On one hand, it is impossible to address adequate compensation for people who put their lives on the line for the American public every day. There’s no proper monetary reward for such work. But, at the same time, we must recognize that members of the FBI, Border Patrol, Customs and Immigration, Secret Service and all our other Federal law enforcement agencies do not live and work in a monetary vacuum. There are thousands of local and State police forces and sheriff’s offices out there, and there is a market for skilled officers, agents and criminal investigators. In this area, as in so many others, we must make sure that the Federal Government is not falling behind in the race for talent.”

***HOMELAND DEFENSE: SHARING INFORMATION WITH LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT.***

U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on the Judiciary. Subcommittee on Administrative Oversight. 107<sup>th</sup> Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> Session, 11 December 2001. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2002. 31p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. J 89/2: S.HRG.107-719

“One of the worst kept secrets in law enforcement is the chronic lack of communication between federal and local law authorities...Most experts point to two primary reasons for this gaping failure in communication. First, there are legal and procedural obstacles to sharing certain information. Second, some say that the culture within federal law enforcement discourages cooperation with local officials. Neither of these reasons is acceptable. More importantly, both are eminently fixable.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS24805>

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS24808> (PDF)

***HOMELAND SECURITY: A RISK MANAGEMENT APPROACH CAN GUIDE PREPAREDNESS EFFORT.*** U.S. General Accounting Office. 31 October 2001. Washington, DC: U.S. General Accounting Office, 2001. 17p. [Testimony].

SuDoc# GA 1.5/2: GAO-02-208 T

The security of U.S. Mail and postal workers, focusing on recommendations advocating a risk management approach to federal programs. Defines “risk management” as a systematic process to analyze threats, vulnerabilities, and the criticality of assets to better support key decisions linking resources with prioritized efforts for results.

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS16040> (PDF)

***HOMELAND SECURITY: ASSESSING THE NEEDS OF LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT.*** U.S. Congress. Senate. Subcommittee on Crime and Drugs. 107<sup>th</sup> Congress, 2<sup>nd</sup> Session, 21 March 2002. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2003. 80p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. J 89/2: S.HRG.107-889

“The nation is embarking upon a new and vigorous fight against terrorism and local police agencies must be full partners in these efforts. While local law enforcement has always had a role in first response and critical incident management, they will be asked for the first time to assume new and uncertain responsibilities. They welcome this challenge, and believe they can make a valuable contribution to the nation’s anti-terrorism efforts. However, they cannot assume these responsibilities without significant federal support.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS31015> (PDF)

***HOMELAND SECURITY: CHALLENGES FACING THE COAST GUARD AS IT TRANSITIONS TO THE NEW DEPARTMENT: STATEMENT OF JAYETTA Z. HECKER, DIRECTOR, PHYSICAL INFRASTRUCTURE.*** U.S. General Accounting Office. 12 February 2003. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2003. [Testimony].

SuDoc# GA 1.5/2: GAO-03-467 T

“The Coast Guard faces major challenges in effectively implementing its operations within the Department of Homeland Security. GAO has identified critical success factors for reorganizing and restructuring agencies, and its recent work in reviewing the Coast Guard has focused on challenges dealing with six of these factors—strategic planning, communications and partnership-building, performance management, human capital strategy, information management and technology, and acquisition management.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS32355> (PDF)

<http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d03467t.pdf> (PDF)

***HOMELAND SECURITY: CHALLENGES FACING THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY IN BALANCING ITS BORDER SECURITY AND TRADE FACILITATION MISSIONS: STATEMENT OF RICHARD M. STANA, DIRECTOR, HOMELAND SECURITY AND JUSTICE ISSUES.*** U.S. General Accounting Office. 16 June 2003. Washington, DC: U.S. General Accounting Office, 2003. 16p. [Testimony].

SuDoc# GA 1.5/2: GAO-03-902 T

“Achieving the balance between security and commercial needs is greatly affected by BCBP’s (Bureau of Customs and Border Protection) commercial and border and immigration control workload. Regarding commercial workload, in fiscal year 2002, the former U.S. Customs Service processed 24.9 million trade import entries valued at over \$1.1 trillion and collected \$23.8 billion in duties and fees; it also process about 6 million cargo containers arriving at U.S. sea ports. While the cargo workload has stabilized somewhat as a result of the recent global economic slowdown, it is likely to begin growing again when an economic recovery is underway at some point in the future, thus exacerbating the challenges BCBP faces. Regarding border and immigration control workload, in fiscal year 2002, inspectors at over 300 ports of entry inspected nearly 960,000 aliens trying to enter the U.S. illegal between ports of entry.”

Online

<http://www.gao.gov/cgi-bin/getrpt?GAO-03-902T> (PDF)

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS37418> (PDF)

<http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d03902t.pdf> (PDF)

***HOMELAND SECURITY: CHALLENGES TO IMPLEMENTING THE IMMIGRATION INTERIOR ENFORCEMENT STRATEGY.*** U.S. General Accounting Office. 10 April 2003. Washington, DC: U.S. General Accounting Office, 2003. 12p. [Testimony].

SuDoc# GA 1.5/2: GAO-03-660 T

“INS’s interior enforcement strategy was designed to address (1) the detention and removal of criminal aliens, (2) the dismantling and diminishing of alien smuggling operations, (3) community complaints about illegal immigration, (4) immigration benefit and document fraud, and (5) employers’ access to undocumented workers. These components remain in the BICE (Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement) strategy. INS faced numerous challenges in implementing the strategy. For example, INS lacked reliable data to determine staff needs, reliable information technology, clear and consistent guidelines and procedures for working-level staff,

effective collaboration and coordination within INS and with other agencies, and appropriate performance measures to help assess program results. As BICE assumes responsibility for strategy implementation, it should consider how to address these challenges by improving resource allocation, information technology, program guidance, and performance measurement.”

Online

<http://www.gao.gov/cgi-bin/getrpt?GAO-03-660T> (PDF)

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS36553> (PDF)

<http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d03660t.pdf> (PDF)

***HOMELAND SECURITY: DEPARTMENT ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT.*** Library of Congress. Harold C. Relyea. 25 February 2003. Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress, 2003. 45p. [Online Report].

SuDoc# LC 14.19/3: RL31493

“...primary issues for Congress and the President are what should be the program composition, administrative organization, and management arrangements of the new department. Other issues include what to do with non-homeland security programs proposed for transfer to the department, personnel costs that may arise from pleas for pay equity among investigative and inspection positions within the department, reconsideration of the relationship of intelligence entities to the department, intelligence analysis by the department, and implementation of the transition to the new department.”

Online

<http://www.thememoryhole.org/crs/more-reports/RL31493.pdf> (PDF)

***HOMELAND SECURITY: EFFORTS TO IMPROVE INFORMATION SHARING NEED TO BE STRENGTHENED.*** U.S. General Accounting Office. August 2003. Washington, DC: U.S. General Accounting Office, 2003. 53p. [Report].

SuDoc# GA 1.13: GAO-03-760

“GAO surveyed federal, state, and city government officials on their perceptions of the effectiveness of the current information-sharing process. Numerous studies, testimonies, reports, and congressional commissions substantiate our survey results. Overall, no level of government perceived the process as effective, particularly when sharing information with federal agencies. Information on threats, methods, and techniques of terrorists is not routinely shared; and the information that is shared is not perceived as timely, accurate, or relevant. Moreover, federal officials have not yet established comprehensive processes and procedures to promote sharing. Federal respondents cited the inability of state and city officials to secure and protect

classified information, the lack of federal security clearances, and a lack of integrated databases as restricting their ability to share information.”

Online

<http://www.gao.gov/cgi-bin/getrpt?GAO-03-760> (PDF)

<http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d03760.pdf> (PDF)

***HOMELAND SECURITY: EPA’S MANAGEMENT OF CLEAN AIR ACT CHEMICAL FACILITY DATA.*** U.S. General Accounting Office. John B. Stephenson. 14 March 2003. Washington, DC: U.S. General Accounting Office, 2003. 7p. [Report].

SuDoc# GA 1.13: GAO-03-509 R

“The events of September 11, 2001, triggered a national re-examination of the security of many of the nation’s critical infrastructures. Following these events, government agencies have struggled to find the right balance between the public’s ‘right to know’ and the dangers of inappropriate public disclosure of sensitive information. Professional and trade groups representing critical infrastructure sectors including the chemical industry generally oppose the release of information regarding the vulnerability of such facilities. These groups argue that terrorists could use this information to target the chemical facilities that are most vulnerable or located near population centers. Other groups support communities’ right to information about hazards to which they might be exposed. Federal, state, and local governments have weighed these factors in reassessing the information publicly available in their publications and on their Web sites. For this reason, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is currently reviewing its management of the chemical facility information it has obtained under Clean Air Act provisions.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS32263> (PDF)

<http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d03509r.pdf> (PDF)

***HOMELAND SECURITY: THE FEDERAL AND REGIONAL RESPONSE.*** U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Science. Subcommittee on Environment, Technology, and Standards. 107<sup>th</sup> Congress, 2<sup>nd</sup> Session, 10 June 2002. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2002. 103p. [Field Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. SCI 2: 107-76

“The Subcommittee will examine wide-ranging federal anti-terrorism efforts at the National Institute of Standards and Technology and the National Institutes of Health as well as local and regional responses developed through the Department of Defense, the Technical Support Working Group (TSWG), and the Washington Metropolitan Council of Governments (COG). Topics will include computer and technology



security, bioterrorism and medical response, regional coordination, public and private research and development, and first responder needs. The Subcommittee is especially interested in how the various agencies work with private entities and entrepreneurs to maximize both speed and efficiency in dealing with new terrorist threats.

***HOMELAND SECURITY: INFORMATION SHARING RESPONSIBILITIES, CHALLENGES, AND KEY MANAGEMENT ISSUES: STATEMENT OF ROBERT F. DACEY, DIRECTOR, INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ISSUES, [AND] RANDOLPH C. HITE, DIRECTOR, INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ARCHITECTURE AND SYSTEMS ISSUES.*** U.S. General Accounting Office. 11 April 2003. Washington, DC: U.S. General Accounting Office, 2003. 49p. [Testimony].

SuDoc# GA 1.5/2: GAO-03-715 T

“GAO has made numerous recommendations related to information sharing. Although improvements have been made, more efforts are needed to address the following challenges, among others, that GAO has identified: Developing a comprehensive and coordinated national plan to facilitate information sharing on critical infrastructure; Developing productive information sharing relationships between the federal government and state and local governments and the private sector; Providing appropriate incentives for nonfederal entities to increase information sharing with the federal government and enhance other critical infrastructure protection efforts.”

Online

<http://www.gao.gov/cgi-bin/getrpt?GAO-03-715T> (PDF)

<http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d03715t.pdf> (PDF)

***HOMELAND SECURITY: INS CANNOT LOCATE MANY ALIENS BECAUSE IT LACKS RELIABLE ADDRESS INFORMATION.*** U.S. General Accounting Office. November 2002. Washington, DC: U.S. General Accounting Office, 2002. 46p. [Report].

SuDoc# GA 1.13: GAO-03-188

“Recent events have shown that INS’s alien address information could not be fully relied on to locate many aliens who were of interest to the United States. For example, the Department of Justice sought to locate and interview 4,112 aliens who were believed to be in the country and who might have knowledge that would assist the nation in its anti-terrorism efforts. However, as shown below, almost half of these aliens could not be located and interviewed because INS lacked reliable address information. The reliability of INS’s alien address information is contingent, in part, on aliens’ compliance with the requirement that they notify INS of any change of address. However, lack of publicity about the requirement that aliens should file change of address notifications, no enforcement penalties for noncompliance, and

inadequate processing procedures for changes of address also contribute to INS's alien address information being unreliable.”

Online

<http://www.gao.gov/cgi-bin/getrpt?GAO-03-188> (PDF)

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS31137> (PDF)

<http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d03188.pdf> (PDF)

*HOMELAND SECURITY: INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT*. Library of Congress. Richard A. Best. 6 August 2003. Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress, 2003. 6p. [Online Report].

SuDoc# LC 14.19/3: RS21283

“Legislation establishing a Department of Homeland Security (DHS) ... included provisions for an information analysis element within the new department. It did not transfer to DHS existing government intelligence and law enforcement agencies but envisioned an analytical office utilizing the products of other agencies—both unevaluated information and finished reports—to provide warning of terrorist attacks, assessments of vulnerability, and recommendations for remedial actions at federal, state, and local levels, and by the private sector.”

Online

<http://www.fas.org/irp/crs/RS21283.pdf> (PDF)

*HOMELAND SECURITY: JUSTICE DEPARTMENT'S PROJECT TO INTERVIEW ALIENS AFTER SEPTEMBER 11, 2001*. U.S. General Accounting Office. April 2003. Washington, DC: U.S. General Accounting Office, 2003. 32p. [Report].

SuDoc# GA 1.13: GAO-03-459

“Between September 11 and November 9, 2001, the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) compiled a list of aliens whose characteristics were similar to those of the hijackers. DOJ searched its databases for aliens that fit certain characteristics relating to type of visa, gender, age, date of entry into the United States, and country that issued the passport, and identified 7,602 names for interview. According to law enforcement officials, attorneys for interviewees, and immigration advocates in six U.S. Attorney districts, law enforcement officers who conducted the interview adhered to DOJ guidelines for the project. The guidelines stressed that the project's objective was information gathering, not criminal investigation, and that participation was to be voluntary ... Firm and complete information on the project's status is unavailable. As of March 2003, law enforcement officers had interviewed 3,216 aliens—about 42 percent of the names on the list.”

Online

<http://www.gao.gov/cgi-bin/getrpt?GAO-03-459> (PDF)

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS32463> (PDF)

<http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d03459.pdf> (PDF)

***HOMELAND SECURITY: KEY ELEMENTS TO UNIFY EFFORTS ARE UNDERWAY BUT UNCERTAINTY REMAINS.*** U.S. General Accounting Office. 7 June 2002. Washington, DC: U.S. General Accounting Office, 2002. 35p. [Report].

SuDoc# GA 1.13: GAO-02-610

“The homeland security efforts of public and private entities do not yet represent a unified approach, although key supporting elements for such an approach are emerging. Due to uncertainty about national priorities, roles, responsibilities, and funding, both public and private sector organizations either embarked on their own initiatives without assurance that these actions support the overall effort or are waiting for further guidance before undertaking new initiatives of a substantial nature...State and local governments want to know how they can contribute beyond their traditional mission of managing the consequences of an incident.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS34934>

***HOMELAND SECURITY: MANAGEMENT CHALLENGES FACING FEDERAL LEADERSHIP.*** U.S. General Accounting Office. 20 December 2002. Washington, DC: U.S. General Accounting Office, 2002. [Report].

SuDoc# GA 1.13: GAO-03-260

“Since September 11, 2001, the federal government has invigorated the homeland security activities of many departments and agencies, more than doubled the amount of federal funds devoted to homeland security, enacted new legislation to integrate some homeland security agencies and strengthen transportation security and law enforcement activities, leveraged existing and new relationships with state and local governments and the private sector, and begun to establish a framework for planning the multiplicity of activities existing within the nation’s homeland security goals. While a new homeland security emphasis is under way throughout the federal government, the response is still evolving. Additional actions to clarify missions and activities will be necessary, and some agencies will need to determine how best to support both homeland security and nonhomeland security missions.”

Online

<http://www.gao.gov/cgi-bin/getrpt?GAO-03-260> (PDF)

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS30742> (PDF)

<http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d03260.pdf> (PDF)

***HOMELAND SECURITY: MANAGEMENT POSITIONS FOR THE PROPOSED DEPARTMENT.*** Library of Congress. Henry B. Hogue. 3 September 2002. Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress, 2002. 30p. [Online Report].

SuDoc# LC 14.19/3: RL31492

“Congress is currently considering proposals, H.R. 5005 and S. 2452, to create an executive department that will address the national need for homeland security. The proposals would transfer organizational units, functions, and personnel from several departments and agencies. A hierarchy of positions would be established to manage the department and its activities. Some would be newly created, and some would be drawn from those transferring agencies. This report analyzes the proposals in light of the provisions for appointment of that managerial hierarchy. It identifies the positions to be created and the apparent effect on current positions in the transferring agencies.”

Online

<http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/13388.pdf> (PDF)

***HOMELAND SECURITY: PROGRESS MADE; MORE DIRECTION AND PARTNERSHIP SOUGHT: STATEMENT OF HENRY L. HINTON, JR., MANAGING DIRECTOR, DEFENSE CAPABILITIES AND MANAGEMENT.*** U.S. General Accounting Office, 12 March 2002. Washington, DC: U.S. General Accounting Office, 2002. 17p. [Testimony].

SuDoc# GA 1.5/2: GAO-02-490 T

“...will discuss progress in enhancing homeland security through legislative and executive action prior to and after September 11 ... the preliminary results of the work ... on integrating the efforts of all levels of government and the private sector into overall homeland security efforts ... an approach that could be helpful in integrating governmental and private sector organizations into the Office of Homeland Security’s planned national strategy.”

Online

<http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d02490t.pdf> (PDF)

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS38375> (PDF)

***HOMELAND SECURITY: REFORMING FEDERAL GRANTS TO BETTER MEET OUTSTANDING NEEDS: STATEMENT OF PAUL L. POSNER, MANAGING DIRECTOR, FEDERAL BUDGET ISSUES AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS, STRATEGIC***

*ISSUES.* U.S. General Accounting Office. 3 September 2003. Washington, DC: U.S. General Accounting Office, 2003. 20p. [Testimony].

SuDoc# GA 1.5/2: GAO-03-1146 T

“The federal grant system for first responders is highly fragmented, which can complicate coordination and integration of services and planning at state and local levels. In light of the events of September 11, 2001 and the establishment of the Department of Homeland Security, the 108<sup>th</sup> Congress faces the challenge of redesigning the homeland security grant system. In so doing, Congress must balance the needs of our state and local partners in their call for both additional resources and more flexibility with the nation’s goals of attaining the highest levels of preparedness. Given scarce federal resources, appropriate accountability and targeting features need to be designed into grants to ensure that the funds provided have the best chance of enhancing preparedness.”

Online

<http://www.gao.gov/cgi-bin/getrpt?GAO-03-1146T> (PDF)

<http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d031146t.pdf> (PDF)

*HOMELAND SECURITY: THE PRESIDENTIAL COORDINATION OFFICE.* Library of Congress. Harold C. Relyea. 10 October 2001. Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress, 2001. 9p. [Online Report].

SuDoc# 14.19/3: RL31148

“The success of this office as a coordinator of a comprehensive national strategy to safeguard the nation against terrorism may be guided by past experience with similar such entities. This report reviews past experience—principally with the Office of War Mobilization and its successor, the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion—and its possible significance for OHS; it will be updated as events recommend.”

Online

<http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/6209.pdf> (PDF)

*HOMELAND SECURITY OFFICE: ISSUES AND OPTIONS.* Library of Congress. Rensselaer Lee. 20 May 2002. Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress, 2002. 26p. [Online Report].

SuDoc# LC 14.19/3: RL31421

“Whether the Office will continue to exist in its present form is by no means assured; ultimately, its future character may well be influenced less by its ability to coordinate the federal terrorism response than by its ability to create a new dialogue on anti-terrorism coordination between federal authorities and their state and local counterparts.”

Online

<http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/10925.pdf> (PDF)

***HOMELAND SECURITY REORGANIZATION: WHAT IMPACT ON FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AND DRUG INTERDICTION?*** U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Government Reform. Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources. 107<sup>th</sup> Congress, 2<sup>nd</sup> Session, 17 June 2002. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2003. 98p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. G 74/7: H 75/13

“Often in response to significant events there is a rush to propose organizational and bureaucratic solutions as an expedient rather than implement new policy and strategy that counters threats to our national interests ... The lessons of history have taught us to rationally and carefully focus our policy, strategy and resources to eliminate threats to our national security.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS33547> (PDF)

***HOMELAND SECURITY: SHOULD CONSULAR AFFAIRS BE TRANSFERRED TO THE NEW DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY?*** U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Government Reform. Subcommittee on the Civil Service, Census and Agency Organization. 107<sup>th</sup> Congress, 2<sup>nd</sup> Session, 26 June 2002. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2003. 61p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. G 74/7: H 75/12

“Common sense tells us that the best way to protect Americans from foreign terrorists is to prevent terrorists from entering the United States in the first place ... we must keep terrorists, deadly weapons in and of themselves, from reaching our homeland. A security-focused visa issuance program is essential to achieve that objective. We are all too aware of the fact that 15 of the 19 September 11<sup>th</sup> terrorists had obtained ‘appropriate’ visas.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS33168> (PDF)

***THE IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE: HOW SHOULD IT BE RESTRUCTURED?*** U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on the Judiciary. 107<sup>th</sup> Congress, 2<sup>nd</sup> Session, 2 May 2002. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2003. 59p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. J 89/2: S.HRG.107-887

“On the enforcement side, it is clear that our immigration laws are being applied inconsistently. Some of the September 11 terrorists were here legally, others had overstayed their visas, and the status of others is still unknown. Improving the structure of the agency will help ensure greater accountability and consistent and effective enforcement of our immigration laws.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS30158> (PDF)

*IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE PERFORMANCE ISSUES*. U.S. Congress. House. Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims. 107<sup>th</sup> Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> Session, 17 October 2001. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2001. 52p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. J 89/1: 107/44

“One of the most alarming features of what we do and are doing in this Subcommittee—and indeed the whole country is alarmed—the report that we received on the 19 terrorists who engaged in the September 11<sup>th</sup> tragedies indicates that six of them are completely unaccounted for in any formal way or informal way available to us through the INS, through the FBI, or any other agency or local authority.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS42575> (PDF)

<http://www.house.gov/judiciary/75762.pdf> (PDF)

*IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE'S (INS'S) INTERACTIONS WITH HESHAM MOHAMED ALI HEDAYET*. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on the Judiciary. Subcommittee on Immigration, Border Security, and Claims. 107<sup>th</sup> Congress, 2<sup>nd</sup> Session, 9 October 2002. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2002. 126p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. J 89/1: 107/110

Hesham Mohamed Ali Hedayet [was] the Egyptian immigrant who shot and killed two people at Los Angeles International Airport on July 4, 2002 ... “The Hedayet case raises a number of critically important questions about our asylum system ... although his asylum application indicated that the Egyptian Government thought he was a terrorist, the INS seems never to have investigated this connection. The case is eerily reminiscent of one involving Gazi Ibrahim Abu Mezer, who tried to bomb the Brooklyn subway system in 1997. Mezer indicated on his asylum application that the Israeli Government thought he was a terrorist, and again, like Hedayet his possible connection to terrorism was never adequately investigated.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS42566> (PDF)

<http://www.house.gov/judiciary/82238.PDF> (PDF)

***IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE'S (INS) INTERIOR ENFORCEMENT STRATEGY.*** U.S. Congress. House. Committee on the Judiciary. Subcommittee on Immigration, Border Security, and Claims. 107<sup>th</sup> Congress, 2<sup>nd</sup> Session, 9 June 2002. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2002. 49p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. J 89/1: 107-85

“The INS Interior Enforcement Strategy is symbiotic to our Border Control Strategy established in 1994. The strategies envision a seamless web of enforcement from the interior of the United States to the nation’s borders and out to the farthest reaches of source and transit countries that will impact the flow of illegal immigrants to the United States...The Interior Enforcement Strategy includes the following strategic priorities: Identify, apprehend, and remove alien criminals; Deter and diminish smuggling and trafficking of aliens; Respond to community needs as they relate to illegal immigration; Minimize immigration benefit fraud and other document abuse; and Block employers’ access to unauthorized workers.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS42939> (PDF)

<http://www.house.gov/judiciary/80319.PDF> (PDF)

***IMMIGRATION REFORM AND THE REORGANIZATION OF HOMELAND DEFENSE.*** U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on the Judiciary. Subcommittee on Immigration. 107<sup>th</sup> Congress, 2<sup>nd</sup> Session, 26 June 2002. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2003. 138p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. J 89/2: S.HRG.107-931

“Today, our Subcommittee considers the many immigration issues relating to homeland security reform. Immigration is a central part of our heritage and history, and essential to who we are as Americans. In defending the Nation, we cannot lose sight of our tradition as a Nation of immigrants and a safe haven for the oppressed.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS32582> (PDF)

***INS'S MARCH 2002 NOTIFICATION OF APPROVAL OF CHANGE OF STATUS FOR PILOT TRAINING FOR TERRORIST HIJACKERS MOHAMMED ATTA AND MARWAN AL-SHEHHI.*** U.S. Congress. House. Committee on the Judiciary. Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims. 107<sup>th</sup> Congress, 2<sup>nd</sup> Session, 19 March 2002. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2002. 84p. [Hearing]



SuDoc# Y 4. J 89/1: 107/63

“Then to add insult to injury, on March 11, 6 months to the day ... at that precise time the ghost of Mohammed Atta and his conspirator, co-conspirator, strike the Nation again through the revelations made by the flight instruction company in Florida to the effect that the student visas for these two terrorists have now been approved ... Following these revelations, we have determined almost conclusively that the Immigration and Naturalization Service is broken, and that we must take giant steps together to try to reconstruct it. The thought that strikes everybody and everyone takes to heart is if the Immigration and Naturalization Service had difficulty and actually an impossibility of identifying the terrorists whose acts were complete, and in the part of the notorious history of the United States, how can we believe that future terrorists will be detected in time to prevent other similar tragedies?”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS42570> (PDF)

<http://www.house.gov/judiciary/78298.PDF> (PDF)

***INTELLIGENCE AND LAW ENFORCEMENT: COUNTERING TRANSNATIONAL THREATS TO THE U.S.*** Library of Congress. Richard A. Best. 3 December 2001. Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress, 2001. 32p. [Online Report].

SuDoc# LC 14.19/3: RL30252

“...looks at the separate roles and missions and distinct identities of intelligence and law enforcement agencies ... also addresses congressional oversight of the law enforcement—intelligence relationship that is spread among a number of House and Senate committees, each of which has only partial jurisdiction.”

Online

<http://www.fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/7942.pdf> (PDF)

***IRS AND TERRORIST-RELATED INFORMATION SHARING.*** U.S. General Accounting Office. 21 October 2002. Washington, DC: U.S. General Accounting Office, 2002. [Report].

SuDoc# GA 1.13: GAO-03-50 R

“Events preceding and following the attacks of September 11, 2001, spotlighted ineffective information sharing, particularly related to intelligence and law enforcement activities, as a serious weakness. Poor information sharing hinders effectively identifying vulnerabilities and coordinating efforts to detect attacks. GAO monitored the Internal Revenue Service's (IRS) efforts to enhance the security of the tax filing process, to study how terrorist-related threat information is shared with IRS. The Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) uses task forces and electronic means to share terrorist-related threat information with the Treasury

Inspector General for Tax Administration (TIGTA). More specifically, it shares information through its involvement with TIGTA and others in Joint Terrorism Task Forces and through electronic arrangements such as the National Threat Warning System. For its part, TIGTA uses formal communications to disseminate threat information to IRS. TIGTA and IRS officials were satisfied with the FBI's and TIGTA's information-sharing procedures, respectively.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS31560>

***JUS POST BELLUM: THE IMPORTANCE OF WAR CRIMES TRIALS.*** U.S. Department of Defense. Davida E. Kellogg. *Parameters: US Army War College Quarterly*. Vol. 32, No. 3, Autumn 2002. Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania: U.S. Army War College, 2002. p.87-99. [Article].

SuDoc# D 101.72: 32/3

“The international law of war has barely begun to deal with the question of where to try cases in which the aggressor is a diffuse political or religious entity rather than a nation. But there are precedents on which to draw, and the task is no more impossible than the development of the law of war to this point has been. Whatever is decided to be a properly convened, constituted, and conducted court for such cases, the high moral purpose of jus post bellum—to do justice in the wake of war—must be well and truly served by them, and must be seen to be so.”

Online

<http://carlisle-www.army.mil/usawc/Parameters/02autumn/kellogg.htm>

<http://carlisle-www.army.mil/usawc/Parameters/02autumn/kellogg.pdf> (PDF)

***JUSTICE DEPARTMENT: BETTER MANAGEMENT OVERSIGHT AND INTERNAL CONTROLS NEEDED TO ENSURE ACCURACY OF TERRORISM-RELATED STATISTICS.*** U.S. General Accounting Office. January 2003. Washington, DC: U.S. General Accounting Office, 2003. 20p. [Report].

SuDoc# GA 1.13: GAO-03-266

“Beginning in fiscal year 2001, DOJ switched from using the FBI’s terrorism-related conviction statistics to using those of the Executive Office of U.S. Attorneys (EOUSA) for its annual performance report. This change was in response to concerns raised by a newspaper article’s allegation that DOJ had inflated terrorism statistics in its *Fiscal Year 2000 Performance Report*. It was also part of an effort to report conviction statistics that would be less likely to be misinterpreted, according to DOJ officials. The FBI historically classified more convictions than EOUSA as terrorism-related because it used a different classification system and included convictions obtained in international, federal, and state courts. EOUSA only included federal convictions. Our

review of a sample of cases investigated and classified by the FBI as terrorism-related, including U.S. Attorney Office (USAO) cases covered by the article, found documentation to support the terrorism-related classifications of these cases.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS32124> (PDF)

<http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d03266.pdf> (PDF)

***LAW ENFORCEMENT: ARE FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL AGENCIES WORKING TOGETHER EFFECTIVELY?*** U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Government Reform. Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources; Subcommittee on Government Efficiency, Financial Management and Intergovernmental Relations; Subcommittee on National Security, Veterans Affairs and International Relations. 2002. 146p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. G 74/7: L 41/9

“We are here today to discuss the efficiency and effectiveness of the flow of information between federal, state and local law enforcement agencies. Interagency cooperation has always been an important factor in protecting the safety and security of this nation. But the unimaginable events of September 11 and the ensuing biological attacks involving Anthrax have drawn unparalleled attention to the need for a timely interchange of meaningful law enforcement information. Our mutual concern about this matter is why our three subcommittees are holding this hearing jointly.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS24856> (PDF)

***LESSONS LEARNED—THE INSPECTOR GENERAL’S REPORT ON THE 9/11 DETAINEES.*** U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on the Judiciary. 108<sup>th</sup> Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> Session, 25 June 2003. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2004. 111p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4.J 89/2: S.HRG.108-257

“Although our Nation remains a target of terrorists we now have the ability and resources some 20 months after 9/11 to assess our performance and to institute needed reforms. The time has come. As noted in the IG report, the Departments of Justice and Homeland Security need to develop a crisis management plan that clearly identifies their respective duties should another national emergency occur. Now, specific standards should be adopted that will improve the ability of our law enforcement officials, and of course, our immigration and intelligence agencies to classify subjects of terrorism investigations appropriately, and to process and complete clearance investigations expeditiously; and most certainly, corrective action should be taken to ensure that all detainees are treated with appropriate respect and restraint.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS44062> (PDF)

**MANAGEMENT OF THE NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION.** U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Armed Services. Special Oversight Panel on Department of Energy Reorganization. 107<sup>th</sup> Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> Session, 4 April 2001. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2003. 53p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. AR 5/2 A: 2001-2002/21

“We still have an aging stockpile. We still have a prohibition on nuclear testing. We still have a 1950s production complex which has not been maintained. We still have problems with an aging work force. We have a track record of management failures related to security and project management. We have a lack of confidence. We have concerns among those who work in the complex, and we still have resistance to change.”

**MARITIME STRATEGY FOR HOMELAND SECURITY.** U.S. Department of Transportation. December 2002. Washington, DC: U.S. Coast Guard Headquarters, 2002. 38p. [Report].

SuDoc# TD 5.2: H 75

“For homeland security the Coast Guard serves as: (1) the lead federal agency for Maritime Homeland Security when responses require civil authorities; (2) the Federal Maritime Security Coordinator in U.S. ports as designated by the Maritime Transportation Act of 2002; (3) a supporting agency to the Federal Emergency Management Agency for declared disasters or emergencies under the Federal Response Plan; (4) a supporting agency to the lead federal agency for specific events under the provisions of the current *U.S. Government Interagency Domestic Terrorism Concept of Operations Plan*; and (5) as a supporting or supported commander of military operations conducted under Title 10.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS29412> (PDF)

[http://www.uscg.mil/news/reportsandbudget/Maritime\\_strategy/USCG\\_Maritime\\_Strategy.pdf](http://www.uscg.mil/news/reportsandbudget/Maritime_strategy/USCG_Maritime_Strategy.pdf) (PDF)

**MODEL MARITIME OPERATIONS GUIDE.** U.S. Department of Homeland Security. Washington, DC: U.S. Coast Guard, 2003. [Manual].

SuDoc# HS 7.8: M 72

“The U.S. Coast Guard’s Homeland Security mission is not new to the Coast Guard. It is more visible today than it was prior to the tragic events of September 11, 2001, but it is just as important as it was when we first began protecting our national

sovereignty over 200 years ago. After the September 11 terrorist attacks, the Coast Guard immediately made changes, refocused efforts, and developed new tools and policies to protect the American people and our valuable ports and waterways.”

***NOMINATION OF FRANK LIBUTTI TO BE UNDER SECRETARY FOR INFORMATION ANALYSIS AND INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.*** U.S. Congress. Senate. Select Committee on Intelligence. 108<sup>th</sup> Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> Session, 17 & 18 June 2003. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2003. 48p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. IN 8/19: S.HRG.108-182

“The Homeland Security Act established a Directorate for Information Analysis and Infrastructure Protection, to create the direct links between intelligence analysts and those responsible for protecting critical U.S. infrastructure. Now, in plain English, critical infrastructure means agriculture, food, water, public health, banking, financial institutions, transportation and probably a few others. Timely and reliable intelligence must play an integral role as the Department of Homeland Security assesses the threat posed to these important sectors by terrorists. If confirmed—or, rather, when confirmed—General Libutti will be responsible for sharing threat information with state and local authorities and others.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS41851> (PDF)

***ORGANIZATION OF FEDERAL EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES.*** U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Governmental Affairs. June 2003. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2003. 26p. [Committee Print].

SuDoc# Y 4. G 74/9-10: 2003

“Agencies and functions of the Federal Government established, abolished, continued, modified, reorganized, extended, transferred, or changed in name by legislative or executive action during the calendar years 2001 and 2002.”

***ORGANIZING FOR HOMELAND SECURITY.*** U.S. Department of Defense. Michael J. Hillyard. *Parameters: US Army War College Quarterly*. Vol. 32, No. 1, Spring 2002. Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania: U.S. Army War College, 2003. p.75-85. [Article].

SuDoc# D 101.72: 32/1

“While homeland security as an enduring institution may take years to mature, there is no excuse to delay the difficult thinking, planning, and political decision making associated with laying an enduring foundation. The citizenry should not have to suffer through bizarre configuration of temporary arrangements before being

provided with an institution for their security in which they will play a leading role. The time to build that structure is now.”

Online

<http://carlisle-www.army.mil/usawc/Parameters/02spring/hillyard.htm>

*ORGANIZING FOR NATIONAL SECURITY*. U.S. Department of Defense. Douglas T. Stuart, ed. November 2000. Carlisle, Pennsylvania: U.S. Army War College, Strategic Studies Institute, 2000. 304p. [Online Monograph].

SuDoc# D 101.146: 2001034855

“This volume will be published shortly before the election of a new U.S. president. The next president will enter the White House at a time when the United States is enjoying unprecedented power and influence throughout the world, and at a time when no nation in the world poses a direct military threat to America’s survival. The new administration would be well advised to take advantage of this fortuitous situation to address fundamental problems in our national security bureaucracy. Hopefully, this book will provide some valuable guidance about what works and what does not work in the existing system.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS11758> (PDF)

<http://www.carlisle.army.mil/ssi/pubs/2000/organizg/organizg.pdf> (PDF)

*OUT OF MANY, ONE: ASSESSING BARRIERS TO INFORMATION SHARING IN THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY*. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Government Reform. 108<sup>th</sup> Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> Session, 8 May 2003. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2003. 146p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. G 74/7: B 27/2

“DHS needs to develop and implement a strategic plan ... including the ability of the new department to obtain, analyze, and timely distribute essential and actionable information for Federal, State, and local government and private sector use. DHS must also develop and implement security and privacy safeguards, a capital planning and investment control process, programming, performance management, and risk management. If a strategic plan to integrate information systems is effectively and efficiently implemented, we not only will achieve economies of scale, but also be better prepared to protect the Nation’s physical and cyber infrastructure, secure our borders, counteract chemical and biological attacks, and respond to terrorist and natural disaster incidents.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS39037> (PDF)

***OVERSIGHT HEARING ON THE COAST GUARD'S MOVE TO THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.*** U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Infrastructure. Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation. 108<sup>th</sup> Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> Session, 1 April 2003. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2003. 87p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. T 68/2: 108-17

“Expanded responsibilities within the Department of Homeland Security and the need to sustain core mission effectiveness has resulted in significantly higher operation tempos and severe strain on the Coast Guard’s aging assets. Therefore, the recapitalization of the Coast Guard’s inventory of major cutters, aircraft, and their supporting systems is a very near-term national priority and is now more critical than ever.”

***OVERSIGHT OF MANAGEMENT CHALLENGES AT THE U.S. CUSTOMS SERVICE.*** U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Government Reform. Subcommittee on Government Management, Information, and Technology. 106<sup>th</sup> Congress, 2<sup>nd</sup> Session, 20 April 2000. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2001. 110p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. G 74/7: C 35/2

“The purpose of today’s hearing is to examine a variety of challenges facing the U.S. Customs Service ... This year it is estimated that \$2.6 trillion in merchandise will be imported into and exported from the more than 300 ports in the United States. In addition, close to half a billion people will enter the country through U.S. border crossings this year. The Customs Service is responsible for processing those people, their baggage, and all cargo and mail that crosses the Nation’s borders. Customs collects the appropriate duties, excise taxes, and fees on all merchandise entering the country ... Customs also has a major enforcement role. The staggering growth in world trade over recent years has been accompanied by an equally dramatic increase in the smuggling of illegal drugs, weapons, printed, intellectual or pirated intellectual property, and in some instances, human cargo.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS12040>

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS12041> (PDF)

***OVERSIGHT OF THE FBI.*** U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on the Judiciary. 107<sup>th</sup> Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> Session, 20 June; 18 July 2002. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2002. 164p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. J 89/2: S.HRG.107-447

“The question at the center of our first hearing is this: Who polices the FBI? Our focus is the mechanisms that currently exist for overseeing the activities of the FBI, and we intend to identify any gaps and problems that currently exist in FBI oversight, determine the status of oversight investigations that are currently underway and begin to formulate ways that oversight can be improved.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS19929>

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS19930> (PDF)

***PROBLEMS IN THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION'S PERSONNEL SECURITY CLEARANCE PROGRAM.*** U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Government Operations. Subcommittee on Environment, Energy, and Natural Resources. 101<sup>st</sup> Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> Session, 15 March 1989. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1989. 188p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. G 74/7: N 88/15

“...it was found that many of the individuals holding the Department's 218,000 clearances had no need for access to classified information; that over 5,500, or more than one-third of the individuals holding security clearances from DOE headquarters, no longer had any affiliation with the Department; and that 76,000 of the 121,000 clearance holders in four DOE field offices had not been reinvestigated within 5 years, as required by DOE policy.”

***REDUCE THE THREAT: STRATEGIC PLAN 2003.*** U.S. Department of Defense. Washington, DC: Defense Threat Reduction Agency, 2003. 19p. [Report].

SuDoc# D 15.2: ST 8/2003

“On October 1, 1998, the Secretary of Defense combined five organizations into a single, integrated agency, dedicated to reducing the threat of weapons of mass destruction ... DTRA has become the go-to agency for the warfighter in combating weapons of mass destruction threats.”

***REFORMING THE FBI IN THE 21<sup>ST</sup> CENTURY.*** U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on the Judiciary. 107<sup>th</sup> Congress, 2<sup>nd</sup> Session, 21 March; 9 April; 8 May 2002. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2003. 268p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. J 89/2: S.HRG.107-971

“We are told that the conspirators were too clever to have been caught. We are being told the hijackers avoided detection because of meticulous planning and everything else. We hear that nothing short of a member of the inner circle turning himself in would have provided sufficient foresight to prevent the attacks. Now, these explanations may be actually right, but the American public has a right to ask if they



are. There may be more to the 9/11 story than the skill of the enemy ... Press reports say that the FBI failed to pursue pre-9/11 leads effectively, including warnings about two hijackers, and just last week a memorandum of concerns of the FBI's Phoenix office about the possibility of terrorists at U.S. flight schools months before the 9/11 attacks.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS36230> (PDF)

***RESPONDING TO HOMELAND THREATS: IS OUR GOVERNMENT ORGANIZED FOR THE CHALLENGE?*** U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Governmental Affairs. 107<sup>th</sup> Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> Session, 21 September 2001. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2002. 107p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. G 74/9: S.HRG.107-207

“...whether the Federal Government, and specifically the Executive Branch, is adequately organized to meet threats to the security of the American people...”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS20826>

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS20827> (PDF)

***RESTRUCTURING GOVERNMENT FOR HOMELAND SECURITY.*** U.S. Congress. House. Committee on the Budget. 107<sup>th</sup> Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> Session, 5 December 2001. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2002. 38p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. B 85/3: 107-19

“How the Federal Government organizes itself for fighting terrorism in ensuring domestic security ... Strengthening our national security against deadly criminals and terrorists, requires inner [sic] agency cooperation and coordination on an unprecedented scale.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS18664>

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS18665> (PDF)

***RESTRUCTURING THE INS—HOW THE AGENCY'S DYSFUNCTIONAL STRUCTURE IMPEDES THE PERFORMANCE OF ITS DUAL MISSION.*** U.S. Congress. House. Committee on the Judiciary. 107<sup>th</sup> Congress, 2<sup>nd</sup> Session, 9 April 2002. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2002. 76p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. J 89/1: 107/69

“In just the last few weeks, the INS issued student visas to two dead terrorists, and admitted four Pakistani crewmen erroneously. These INS mishaps have created strong and growing support for legislation to restructure the INS... We are overdue for a true reform of this beleaguered Agency that ends the existence of INS as we know it, replacing it with two independent bureaus that specialize in their own missions: enforcement and services.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS42799> (PDF)

<http://www.house.gov/judiciary/78609.pdf> (PDF)

*REVIEW OF DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE IMMIGRATION DETENTION POLICIES.* U.S. Congress. House. Committee on the Judiciary. Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims. 107<sup>th</sup> Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> Session, 19 December 2001. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2002. 61p.

SuDoc# Y 4. J 89/1: 107/55

“The INS is charged with both facilitating legal immigration and enforcing the Nation’s laws to prevent illegal immigration. That balance should be kept in mind as we explore possible changes to INS policy. It can be both tempting and comforting to err on the side of shutting our borders tight, locking up all those we think are dangerous. That is not the constitutional bedrock the country was built upon nor the strength of our Nation. However, it is the obligation and right of the Nation to protect its citizens and its sovereign rights.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS42573> (PDF)

<http://www.house.gov/judiciary/76810.PDF> (PDF)

*REVIEW OF INS POLICY ON RELEASING ILLEGAL ALIENS PENDING DEPORTATION.* U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Governmental Affairs. Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. 107<sup>th</sup> Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> Session, 13 November 2001. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2002. 140p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. G 74/9: S.HRG.107-261

“...current and past employees of the U.S. Border Patrol ... have come forward to express their concern and dismay at the Immigration and Naturalization Service’s practices, the INS practices, involving the release of persons arrested for trying to gain illegal entry into the United States. While the problems raised by the Border Patrol agents would be serious in normal circumstances, they carry particular weight since the attacks of September 11.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS19166>

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS19167> (PDF)

***A REVIEW OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN A DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY AND THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.*** U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Governmental Affairs. 107<sup>th</sup> Congress, 2<sup>nd</sup> Session, 26 & 27 June 2002. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2002. 279p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. G 74/9: S.HRG.107-562

“As we create this new Department of Homeland Security, one of our priorities clearly has to be to address what was the single biggest security shortcoming of our government before September 11, and that was the way in which our government coordinated, or failed to coordinate, intelligence. Suffice it to say that a few infamous memos and warnings, now notorious, and the picture they may have painted if they had been understood in relationship to one another are now a perplexing part of American history.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS22539>

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS22541> (PDF)

***SEMIANNUAL REPORT TO THE CONGRESS.*** U.S. Department of Homeland Security. Washington, DC: Office of the Inspector General, 2003. 49p. [Report].

SuDoc# HS 1.1/2: 2002-1

“The new department’s first priority is to protect the nation against further terrorist attacks. Component agencies will analyze threats and intelligence, guard our borders and airports, protect our critical infrastructure, and coordinate the response of our nation to future emergencies ... The 22 agencies have been reconfigured into the following nine divisions: Border & Transportation Security, Emergency Preparedness & Response, Information Analysis & Infrastructure Protection, Science & Technology, Management, Coast Guard, Secret Service, Citizenship & Immigration Services, State & Local Government Coordination, and Private Sector Liaison.”

***SHOULD THE OFFICE OF HOMELAND SECURITY HAVE MORE POWER? A CASE STUDY IN INFORMATION SHARING.*** U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on the Judiciary. Subcommittee on Administrative Oversight and the Courts. 107<sup>th</sup> Congress, 2<sup>nd</sup> Session, 17 April 2002. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2003. 71p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. J 89/2: S.HRG.107-912

“The backbone of homeland defense is good information sharing and coordination between Federal law enforcement and intelligence agencies. It is clear that we need some kind of body to coordinate government-wide policy on information sharing. We need an entity that can answer questions like: Where are we most vulnerable? Who can supply the right information about those vulnerabilities? Who needs to know about our weaknesses? And who is going to tell them?”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS31472>

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS31474> (PDF)

*TERRORISM AND THE LAW OF WAR: TRYING TERRORISTS AS WAR CRIMINALS BEFORE MILITARY COMMISSIONS.* Library of Congress. Jennifer Elsea. 11 December 2001. Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress, 2001. 48p. [Online Report].

SuDoc# LC 14.19/3: RL31191

“...will first present an outline of the sources and principles of the law of war, including a discussion of whether and how it might apply to the current terrorist crisis. A brief explanation of the background issues and arguments surrounding the use of military commissions will follow ... will then explore the legal bases and implications of applying the law of war under United States law, summarize precedent for its application by military commissions, and provide an analysis of the President’s Military Order of November 13, 2001.”

Online

<http://www.fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/7951.pdf> (PDF)

*TRANSFORMING THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO PROTECT AMERICA FROM TERRORISM.* U.S. Congress. House. Select Committee on Homeland Security. 107<sup>th</sup> Congress, 2<sup>nd</sup> Session, 11 July 2002. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2002. 60p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. H 75: 107-1

“The Select Committee is meeting today to hear testimony on transforming the Federal Government to protect America from terrorism...What will it take to defend freedom under such circumstances? As the greatest, most free nation the world has ever known, how do we protect our citizens and our culture from the forces that hate us? Do we lock up the doors and bar the windows? Are we perhaps in danger of sacrificing our liberty in the name of security? These are just some of the questions we will be compelled to address. But our purpose today is not to answer every question or to solve every problem. We must begin at the beginning. We must

understand the need for action as well as the price of inaction ... So this morning, let us focus on the problem rather than the solution.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS25758>

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS25757> (PDF)

***TRANSNATIONAL THREATS: BLENDING LAW ENFORCEMENT AND MILITARY STRATEGIES.*** U.S. Department of Defense. Carolyn W. Pumphrey. Carlisle, Pennsylvania: U.S. Army War College, Strategic Studies Institute, 2000. 256p. [Online Monograph].

SuDoc# D 101.146: 2001011847

“Transnational threats are major security threats for the 21<sup>st</sup> century. They are characterized by their global nature ... these threats straddle both the domestic and foreign spheres. Whereas responsibility for U.S. national security threats in the past clearly belonged to the military and responsibility for domestic security belonged to law enforcement, these clear-cut divisions no longer exist. This poses some profound constitutional and security challenges. On the one hand, institutions that have developed separately must now learn to work closely together and to blend their strategies in order to ensure our nation’s security. On the other hand, the division of military and law enforcement functions is closely linked to the preservation of our liberties, and the task of merging them is fraught with hazards. In the very act of preserving our security, we run the risk of forfeiting some of our liberties. Blending law enforcement and the military is thus a vital but dangerous balancing act.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS11404> (PDF)

<http://www.carlisle.army.mil/ssi/pubs/2000/blending/blending.pdf> (PDF)

***TREATMENT OF “BATTLEFIELD DETAINEES” IN THE WAR ON TERRORISM.*** Library of Congress. Jennifer Elsea. 11 April 2002. Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress, 2002. 44p. [Online Report].

SuDoc# LC 14.19/3: RL31367

“The U.N. High Commissioner on Human Rights (UNHCR) and some human rights organizations argue that all combatants captured on the battlefield are entitled to be treated as POWs until an independent tribunal has determined otherwise. The Organization of American States’ Inter-American Commission has ordered the United States to take ‘urgent measures’ to establish the legal status of the detainees.”

Online

<http://www.au.af.mil/au/awc/awcgate/crs/rl31367.pdf> (PDF)

<http://www.usembassy.it/pdf/other/RL31367.pdf> (PDF)

<http://www.fas.org/irp/crs/RL31367.pdf> (PDF)

***U.S. CUSTOMS SERVICE: PROSPECTIVE RULINGS MORE TIMELY, BUT DATABASE RELIABILITY QUESTIONS REMAIN.*** U.S. General Accounting Office. August 2003. Washington, DC: U.S. General Accounting Office, 2003. [Report].

SuDoc# GA 1.13: GAO-03-828

“GAO previously reported that the U.S. Customs Service Office of Regulations and Rulings (OR&R) headquarters was not timely in issuing most of its prospective rulings, which establish the duties importers pay on imported goods ... OR&R has taken corrective actions to improve accuracy and reliability of the database. However, these corrective actions do not provide assurance that OR&R has resolved the data reliability challenges because some of the actions lack specific procedures for their effective implementation.”

Online

<http://www.gao.gov/cgi-bin/getrpt?GAO-03-828> (PDF)

<http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d03828.pdf> (PDF)

***U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.*** U.S. Department of Defense. Bernadette Harris. *Military Intelligence Professional Bulletin*. Vol. 29, No. 2, April-June 2003. Fort Huachuca, Arizona: U.S. Army Intelligence Center & Fort Huachuca, 2003. p.27-29. [Article].

SuDoc# D 101.84: 29/2

“The mission of the Department of Homeland Security will be to develop and coordinate the implementation of a comprehensive national strategy to secure the United States from terrorist threats or attacks. To ensure achievement of this mission, the DHS will perform several functions necessary to carry out this mission to detect, prepare for, protect against, respond to, and recover from terrorist attacks within the United States.”

***WHO'S DOING WORK FOR THE GOVERNMENT?: MONITORING, ACCOUNTABILITY AND COMPETITION IN THE FEDERAL SERVICE CONTRACT WORKFORCE.*** U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Governmental Affairs. 107<sup>th</sup> Congress, 2<sup>nd</sup> Session, 6 March 2002. 181p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. G 74/9: S.HRG.107-465

“...post-September 11, Federal employees are playing an even more critical role in our homeland defense efforts than they have in the past. We are depending even more, for instance, on the Customs Service, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and the Coast Guard, to name just a few, to keep our country safe.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS22425>

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS22426> (PDF)