

Talking Points on Combating Terrorism

The Honorable Lee H. Hamilton

October 2, 2001

- The horror of the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon hangs like a dark cloud over our nation. The tragedy, which was the most deadly terrorist attack in world history, is one of America's greatest calamities and saddest moments.
- The attacks have changed forever the way we look at the world. We have learned that we are far less secure than we believed ourselves to be. This knowledge has the potential to transform our lives and our society.
- **Reaction of the American people:** One of the bright spots of the events of the past few weeks has been the reaction of the American people. We have seen:
 - an astonishing outbreak of patriotism among all Americans;
 - extraordinary attendance in houses of worship of every faith;
 - remarkable understanding of our diversity and civil liberties;
 - tremendous gratitude to our police, firefighters, armed forces, and many other responders;
 - a surge in charitable giving, blood donations, and other acts of volunteerism;
 - increased interest in public affairs;
 - greater trust in government;
 - and a remarkable display of unity and bipartisanship in the country and in Washington.
- **Bush:** For President Bush this is a defining moment of his presidency. It is both a stiff test and an important opportunity. Americans of all stripes are rallying around him and want him to succeed.
- The president's crucial task is to unite the country and the world around an effective response and a plan to prevent further attacks from occurring. He must lift our spirits and build consensus around a multifaceted response. His rhetoric must not be too belligerent, too optimistic, or too cautious. It must strike a delicate balance between confidence, strength, and sensitivity to the views and concerns of other nations.

- The president's principal achievement has been to hold the country together behind a careful and patient approach. His response has been firm and measured. He understands the importance of getting it right -- and the cost of getting it wrong.
- **Congress:** This is also a defining moment for the Congress. Their challenge is to manage the difficult tension between serving as a partner and a critic of the president. Those two roles are not easily reconciled.
- They must disentangle themselves from emotions and political pressures. They must act wisely, not rashly.
- They should generally defer to the president and give him the benefit of the doubt on national security issues, but they also have a responsibility to offer independent advice and judgment. The Constitution did not intend for the president to make foreign policy by himself. Rather, it intended for Congress and the president to work together to develop a foreign policy that both branches and the American people support.
- The joint resolution passed by Congress authorizing the use of force was a responsible exercise of Congress' war-making powers. The resolution did not give the president unlimited authority to act militarily, but it did give him sufficient authority to go after the perpetrators of the terrorist attacks and to prevent and deter further acts of terrorism.

How to respond?

- There are several things the United States should do in response to the September 11 terrorist attacks.

1) Military response: First, we should plan a measured but, if necessary, deadly military response.

- Americans want to hit back hard to retaliate for the vicious attacks. Public support for military action is very strong (87%), as it is for President Bush (90%).
- Indeed, our nation must respond to this terrorist act. To fight back successfully will be hard, but not to fight back would be worse. Doing nothing would make us look weak and would encourage the terrorists to strike again with more devastating weapons.
- Law enforcement is part of the answer, but it has been tried for decades and is insufficient. We have been unsuccessful in apprehending many of the terrorist leaders that have been indicted, including Osama bin Laden. Law enforcement also does not deal with the state sponsors of terrorism.
- Our response should aim not just to punish the terrorists who carried out the attack, but also to destroy the capacity of the terrorist networks to function. Any nation,

group, or individual that protects or supports international terrorists should be a potential target for military action. We must aim to take out the terrorist infrastructure in order to reduce the capability for additional terrorist attacks.

- **What sort of war will we be waging?** The war against terrorism is unlike any of the military wars we have fought in the past. It is a new kind of war against a new kind of enemy. It is not surprising that we are still wondering how to fight it. There is no territory to be won, no enemy capitals to capture, and no D-Day on the horizon.
- As Secretary Rumsfeld has said, it is easier to say what the war will not be than to say what it is. The war will not be waged by a grand alliance, by a massive invasion, or by bombing many prominent targets. It will not be waged against a single person, group, or country.
- The war against terrorism may be most similar to the war on drugs -- or the Cold War. It is likely to be long, complex, nasty, and brutish. It will be waged with constantly shifting coalitions against a global network of terrorists. Diplomats, bankers, customs officers, spies, security guards, and the military will all play important roles.
- It will be difficult to measure “victory” -- or even success -- or to determine when the war is over. Victory will come when Americans are no longer fearful. There will be no V-E Day, no one grand moment of victory.
- Military action will come in phases, and will likely start in Afghanistan. But, as President Bush has said, military operations will not be “the primary piece” of the campaign.
- Dismantling the terrorist networks will be difficult because they are well-hidden and far-flung. While Osama bin Laden’s network is based in Afghanistan, most of the hijackers came from other nations, including Egypt and Saudi Arabia. (The Middle Eastern nations that do not have many terrorists -- Jordan, Morocco, Oman, and Qatar -- are nations that have opened up some political and civic space.)
- **How should we proceed in this military campaign?** We should act with: 1) determination; 2) caution; 3) accuracy; 4) patience; 5) a broad international coalition; 6) and with the objective of minimizing civilian and U.S. casualties.
- **Evidence:** We must avoid haste in responding so that we can identify with certainty the source of the attacks.
- There is a growing global chorus calling for proof. Providing that proof is especially important to gain support in the Middle East. We should aim to provide overwhelming evidence that points to the perpetrators of the attacks. President Bush is still debating how much information to make public.

- We should stop, think, and consult before leaping into action. Our objective must be justice and security, not revenge, but when we know who is culpable, and who is supporting them, we should hunt them down aggressively with measured and deadly resolve.
- Total victory against terrorism is not possible, but we can certainly reduce the threat of terrorism and strengthen our security. We can put the terrorists on the defensive and remove some of their sanctuaries and support systems.
- **Bush's goals:** The goals President Bush has stated are: 1) to get the terrorists and dismantle their networks; and 2) to punish governments and other entities that shelter or support them.
- Bush has said the war on terrorism “will not end until every terrorist group of global reach has been found, stop, and defeated.”
- He has also said that “any nation that continues to harbor or support terrorism will be regarded by the U.S. as a hostile regime”.
- His approach to the war thus far is to go slowly. He is taking his time to chart his strategy, as he should.
- One wonders at this point if he has a well-defined plan of action, or if he is still trying to develop one.
- Afghanistan is clearly his initial target, but it is difficult to decide what to do there. Bush has said he does not want to engage in “nation building” in Afghanistan.
- The administration has said replacing the Taliban is not its goal, but it has also said that if the Taliban does not turn over the terrorists it will share their fate, and it has provided new covert support for the Afghan resistance.
- One of the big debates within the administration is whether to attack Iraq. Rumsfeld and Wolfowitz seem to want to go after Iraq, but Powell has argued that that would shatter the international coalition. Bush has apparently set that question aside for now while focusing on Afghanistan.
- Bush has declared that every nation is either an ally or enemy in the fight against terrorism. This demand is too simplistic. Some nations, such as Pakistan and Russia, may help in some ways but resist us in other ways. Iran can help by remaining neutral. Saudi Arabia will want its military cooperation to be tacit.
- If the U.S. effort is focused on Osama bin Laden's network, we will gain stronger international support. If we go after all terrorism our coalition will weaken.

- In practice, it will be impossible to go after all terrorism because some of the partners we are seeking, such as Pakistan and Saudi Arabia, have been supportive of some terrorist groups themselves. Pakistan has helped “freedom fighters” in Kashmir and Saudi Arabia has dragged its feet on pursuing the perpetrators of terrorist attacks on U.S. military installations.
- **Military options:** There are several military options for going after the terrorists and their supporters: 1) a massive air campaign; 2) large-scale ground attack; 3) targeted air and ground strikes; 4) support for the Afghan resistance; 5) covert action; or 6) a combination of several strategies.
- 1) **Massive air campaign:** Bombing Afghanistan into the stone age will not be an effective policy because the country is practically in the stone age already. It is hard to find 25 targets in Afghanistan that are worth bombing. Massive bombing would also create huge resentment toward the U.S. that would undermine our international coalition.
- 2) **Ground attack:** A major ground attack on Afghanistan is not a promising option either. We would suffer large numbers of U.S. casualties and international support for us would diminish.
- 3) **Targeted air and ground strikes:** Targeted strikes, both by ground and by air, may be an effective way to go after Osama bin Laden and his associates if we have good intelligence on them. They may be useful not just in Afghanistan but also in other nations that harbor terrorists. In all likelihood, some ground operations, possibly using special forces, will be necessary. Some U.S. casualties in these operations should be expected.
- 4) **Covert action:** Covert action to go after the terrorist leaders and their networks may achieve some good results. The U.S. has already begun secret efforts to strengthen an array of anti-Taliban groups who can stir up resistance to the Taliban, but covert action alone is insufficient to get the terrorist leaders and break apart their networks.
- 5) **Support for Afghan rebels:** Training the Afghan resistance and supporting them, possibly with air power, could help us put pressure on the Taliban and on the terrorists. The Northern Alliance has the will and capability to be an effective opposition to the Taliban, but it needs more resources.
- 6) **Combination of strategies:** The best course of action is to pursue a combination of strategies, including strategic and tactical air and ground strikes, covert action, police work, and support for the Afghan resistance.
- We must put aside our long-standing insistence on using overwhelming force to vanquish an enemy. Instead, we should focus on commando raids and limited air

strikes. This strategy does not exclude conventional forces, but they probably will not be used.

- We should try to build internal and external coalitions that will pressure and, if necessary, fight Osama bin Laden and the Taliban. We should be mindful, however, that the Afghan resistance is fractious and unstable.
- Our targets should be Osama bin Laden and his associates; his sanctuaries; the Taliban government; Taliban fighters; and the Taliban air force (12 or so Soviet-era fighters).
- We must aim to hit these targets without killing large numbers of innocent people.
- Ousting the Taliban from Afghanistan may not be too difficult. Support for the Taliban within Afghanistan seems to be waning. We must make common cause with a wide range of anti-Taliban groups.
- The administration seems to have ruled out becoming involved in nation building in Afghanistan, but we must be involved in the effort to stabilize Afghanistan. Credible alternative leadership must be developed. Building a stable, post-Taliban government is not a task for the U.S. alone, but we must support those groups seeking to establish a peaceful and forward-thinking new government.
- **Risks:** Before taking military action, we must be aware of the risks. They are not inconsiderable. Among the risks are:
 - hitting the wrong targets;
 - fueling anti-American hatred;
 - setting off an uncontrollable spiral of violence;
 - diminishing our international support;
 - destabilizing the moderate Arab and Pakistani regimes;
 - and failing to get bin Laden and severely damage the terrorist networks.
- Excessive and inaccurate force could do more harm than good by creating misery and chaos in Afghanistan, producing millions of refugees, fueling anti-American sentiment, and weakening our international coalition.
- We also must be careful not to inflame political conditions in countries like Pakistan, where a pro-Western government faces the danger of being replaced by a militant and radical regime.

- **States that harbor terrorists:** We also must be aware that a commitment to go after all states that support or harbor terrorists could potentially put us at war with a large group of countries, including Afghanistan, Iran, Iraq, Syria, and Lebanon.
- **Coalition:** It is very important that we gain broad international support for our response. We must build a broad international coalition to disrupt and destroy terrorist operations.
- Terrorism is a global danger, and we need a global approach to combat it. We need help from our allies and friends to catch terrorists and bring them to justice, and to isolate nations that provide them with safe havens.
- We must be sensitive to the interests and concerns of our friends and allies. When crises come, we need favors and help from them, but we also have to do favors in return. This is the key stuff of diplomacy and negotiation.
- Bush's diplomatic performance thus far has been first-class. He is developing an extraordinary coalition, ranging from Russia to Saudi Arabia. The coalition is evolving constantly and will be a floating, not a permanent, coalition.
- The crucial test is: Can we maintain worldwide support for our anti-terrorism campaign?
- We must also be aware of the risks of coalition building:
 - 1) If the coalition is too broad its effectiveness can be diluted. The larger the coalition, the lower the common denominator. How much should we moderate our response to maintain broad international unity?
 - 2) There is also the risk of piggybacking. Many nations want to join on the condition that we give them something. For instance, Russia wants us to show support for its campaign in Chechnya, and China wants us to refrain from criticizing its policies in Tibet and western China. What deals are we cutting today that will give us major problems in the years ahead?

Bush has said that he is offering nothing in exchange for support, but our rhetoric on Chechnya has already changed, and Pakistan has seen its sanctions lifted and new aid provided by us and the IMF.
- The key question for the coalition is the use of force. Many nations are wary of a disproportionate U.S. military response. If we focus our military action on al Qaeda, our support will be broader.
- Bush seems to be narrowing his aims to keep the coalition broad.

- There are encouraging signs that key nations are offering strong support for U.S.-led military action to go after al Qaeda. The U.S. drive to build the coalition is bearing fruit because so many governments confront terrorism in their own countries, and so many Middle East nations know first-hand how destabilizing radical terrorist groups can be.
- But most countries are waiting to see what we propose before stating their position on any specific types of action.

-- **Europe:** Many European leaders have voiced strong support for U.S. action in response to the terrorism. Tony Blair has been the strongest supporter. NATO invoked Article 5 of its treaty for the first time, declaring the attacks on the U.S. an attack on all NATO nations, but some European leaders have expressed concern that the U.S. may respond too harshly and aggressively.

-- **Russia:** Russia has expressed strong support for U.S.-led action to counter and thwart terrorism. It has promised intelligence support, support for the Northern Alliance, and support for using territory in its neighborhood as a launching ground for missions into Afghanistan.

-- **Japan:** Japan has expressed strong support for U.S.-led action, and has offered to participate militarily, possibly with rear-guard support.

-- **China:** China has expressed support for a forceful response to the attacks, but wants such a response to be authorized by the UN Security Council. It would like to see the campaign against terrorism weaken some of the Islamic groups operating in western China. However, it is surely reluctant to see the U.S. get involved militarily in its own backyard. It has a history of condemning U.S. interventions overseas.

The common U.S. and Chinese commitment to fighting terrorism could provide a dramatic opening for U.S.-China relations. China would like to see U.S.-China relations improve.

-- **Pakistan:** Pakistan has agreed to some forms of cooperation -- for instance, granting the U.S. access to its airspace and intelligence information. The U.S. has expressed appreciation for Pakistan's assistance by lifting sanctions and promising substantial aid, but Pakistan has not declared support for U.S. ground operations from Pakistan and the extent of its support for U.S.-led action remains unclear. Pakistan is opposed to U.S. support for the anti-Taliban Northern Alliance.

-- **Central Asia:** Several Central Asian countries have offered to help us go after the terrorist networks in Afghanistan and have offered to allow us to use their territory as launching pads for military operations. Uzbekistan may be the most important among these countries for military operations.

Several Central Asian countries, including Uzbekistan, would like us to offer them greater economic and military assistance, and to stop criticizing their human rights records, in exchange for their cooperation. These countries all have terrible human rights records and are ruled by autocrats. We must not reward them in ways that encourage further repression.

-- **Middle East nations:** One of the president's great challenges is to coax a majority of Middle East nations into joining the coalition and fighting terrorism within their territories.

Key Middle East nations, including Saudi Arabia, Egypt, and Jordan, have strongly condemned the terrorist attacks and expressed general support for action to combat terrorism, but they seem reluctant to support U.S.-led military action, and they are especially concerned about military action outside of Afghanistan.

Saudi Arabia has reportedly agreed to share intelligence information, block terrorist access to banks and finances, and allow U.S. troops and planes stationed on its soil to participate in military action in Afghanistan, but the Saudis are extremely reluctant to publicly support military action against another Muslim state because they fear internal opposition from radical fundamentalists.

Iran expressed remorse over the terrorist attacks, and it strongly opposes the Taliban, but it has been hardening its opposition to U.S. military action against Afghanistan, and it has rejected a role in the U.S.-led coalition. Nevertheless, we should explore possibilities for some forms of anti-terrorism cooperation with Iran.

Syria, like Iran, is opposed to a U.S.-led campaign against terrorism.

-- **Sudan:** Sudan, surprisingly, has expressed support for forceful action against al Qaeda. We have lifted sanctions on air travel by Sudanese officials in response to their support.

- We should work hard to gain the broadest possible international support for our response. It is especially important that we have backing from moderate Arab nations so that it does not seem like we are waging a war against the Muslim world. If we act without broad international support there is a danger that we will fuel greater anti-American sentiment and a harsh backlash against us.
- Our response must be robust enough to satisfy Americans and protect our security, and targeted enough to satisfy key European and Muslim friends.
- **United Nations:** The United Nations has been very supportive of the developing U.S. campaign against terrorism. It passed a unanimous resolution to crack down on the

financing, training, and movement of terrorists, and to cooperate in a campaign against them, including a campaign that uses force.

- Many nations want us to go to the United Nations to get approval for any military action, but the Bush administration does not want the UN to get in the way. While the U.S. should not go to the UN Security Council for specific approval of military action, it should continue to recognize that the UN can be an important forum for coalition building.

2) Sustained and multifaceted effort: Second, we should lead a sustained and multifaceted campaign to root out terrorism and address the underlying issues that fuel it.

- We must fight with terrorism with tools of peace, as well as tools of war.
- We must understand that our response cannot be carried out solely by military means. Bombs and ground troops alone will not destroy fanaticism; they are likely even to fuel it. Our killing of terrorist leaders, including Osama bin Laden, may turn them into martyrs and enable a new generation of terrorists to take their place.
- So our effort to retaliate must be sustained over a long period of time and include political, economic, and military strategies. We must summon the will and fortitude to wage a broad campaign against terrorism for many years.
- The campaign must include police investigations, international law enforcement, greater monitoring of immigration and financial transactions, economic sanctions and aid, and new peace talks between the Israelis and Palestinians.
- Part of the campaign must include bold economic, political, and legal steps to gain backing from nations and to place pressure on the terrorists and those that support them. We should use some of the various carrots and sticks available to us.

-- We should offer trade, loans, and aid as inducements to some countries whose support we seek.

-- We should use sanctions to punish those nations that continue to harbor or support terrorists.

-- We should cut off the financing of terrorists -- by freezing their assets and shutting down their front companies. Key to this effort will be persistence, patience, and international cooperation -- to identify, track, and block the flow of funds in support of terrorism.

-- We should give prosecutors more legal weapons to pursue and crack down on international terrorist activity.

- **Root causes:** We should also address the underlying issues that lead many people to turn to terrorism. There must be a long-term effort to ease the misery, despair, and hopelessness in poor nations.
- **Why terrorists hate us:** We must try to understand why terrorists hate us. There are many contributing factors, though none of them excuse or justify terrorism.
- Many terrorists in Muslim and Arab countries:
 - oppose American power;
 - resent the spread of American culture;
 - reject our secular, open society;
 - resent our prominent role in the Middle East and our support for authoritarian regimes;
 - despise our support for Israel;
 - are angered by our military strikes on Iraq and Afghanistan and our economic sanctions on Iraq, Iran, Libya, and Afghanistan;
 - and feel frustrated that the Arab world is not powerful geopolitically.
- The widespread poverty, economic inequality, and despair in many Muslim countries further fuels radical movements.
- Some elements of U.S. policy that fuel anger in the Muslim world should not be changed. For instance, we should not abandon our secular open society. Neither should we abandon Israel.
- However, we should aim to reduce the hardship, political oppression, and despair that help to breed terrorism. We should give a much higher priority to the promotion of economic development, free markets, democracy, health, and education in poor nations.
- We should support political and economic reforms and oppose corrupt and dictatorial behavior from Saudi Arabia to Algeria. Many Arabs blame the West for most of their problems, but that attitude ignores the failure of Arab leadership to create accountable political institutions, ensure civil liberties, and provide social justice and economic opportunity.
- We also must do everything we can to bring the Israelis and Palestinians back to the peace table. Like it or not, Arab states link their support for the U.S. to progress on helping the Palestinians. The Israeli-Palestinian conflict fuels the anger of Islamic

radicals and is manipulated by terrorists to advance their purposes. Progress on the Israeli-Palestinian front will make it easier for us to gain backing from moderate Arab nations and will mitigate one of the major irritants in our relations with the Muslim world.

- We must find ways to give the many millions of young people in the Muslim world a message of freedom and hope. There are ways to engage these people before their hatred turns lethal. In many Muslim nations people do not have good access to outside media. We must find creative ways to get independent sources of information to them.
- Telling America's story, spurring economic development, and promoting democracy should all be part of our non-military response.

3) Homeland defense: Third, we must strengthen dramatically our defense of the homeland.

- Despite the more than \$300 billion we spend on defense, we remain -- as last week's attacks showed -- extremely vulnerable to hostile attacks on our own soil. We must invest far more resources in strengthening the security of our borders, airports, and cities, and in protecting the crucial infrastructure of our economy, financial systems, energy supplies, and computer networks.
- The core of our national defense strategy must be defense of the homeland. The national security commission I served on over the past few years recommended the creation of an independent National Homeland Security Agency that would have responsibility for planning, coordinating, and integrating various U.S. government activities involving homeland security.
- Two schools of thought on a homeland security agency are emerging. One school envisions a "czar" whose job would primarily be coordinating the activities of others. Another school envisions a cabinet official with direct control over a department, a budget, and a staff. President Bush has yet to resolve this debate.
- My view is the head of this agency should be a cabinet member reporting directly to the President. Bureaucracies do not cooperate with each other easily unless they are forced to do so by White House-level authority. Political leaders, especially the President, must force bureaucrats to meet political goals.
- The homeland security agency could be built upon the Federal Emergency Management Agency, with the three organizations currently on the front line of border security -- the Coast Guard, the Customs Service, and the Border Patrol -- integrated into it. The agency would be responsible for protecting American lives and overseeing the protection of the nation's critical infrastructure.

- For such an agency to be effective, the various federal agencies involved in homeland security -- from the FBI to the Department of Defense -- must cooperate. Federal officials must work closely with local officials to coordinate and divide responsibilities.
- Cross-border traffic must be made more secure. Last year 489 million people, 127 million cars, and 211,000 boats passed through our borders. For years, efficiency has been trumping security. More policing, inspection, and international cooperation are needed.
- We also need more research into effective anti-terrorism strategies and regular exercises to prepare us to respond to any kind of terrorist attack.
- Congress should reorganize itself to accommodate the new environment. It should form a special select committee for homeland security to provide congressional support and oversight.
- **Defense priorities:** We must ask ourselves whether terrorism is now the most serious threat to our security. Are we more likely to be attacked by an army, by airplane hijackers, by a ballistic missile, by computer hackers, or by a chemical, biological, or nuclear weapon smuggled into the U.S.? We may need to make major changes in the allocation of our defense resources.
- The Department of Defense is reviewing the creation of a command for homeland defense. It is restructuring not only to fight terrorists, but to defend the country at home, which has not been a major worry since the height of the Cold War.
- The national security commission I served on recommended giving the National Guard greater responsibility for homeland security. The Guard could be reorganized, trained, and equipped to undertake that mission.
- We should invest in programs to protect against the wide range of serious threats that we face. That may mean spending less on conventional weapons and on missile defense, and spending more on programs to protect against terrorism and chemical, biological, or nuclear attack.
- **Chemical and biological warfare:** Rapid advances in technology have created new opportunities for people to develop weapons of mass destruction at relatively low cost. Al Qaeda and Saddam Hussein have been trying to get biological or chemical weapons, but it is difficult to gauge what they have and know.
- Biological weapons pose the biggest threat because they can be extremely deadly. They are relatively easy to produce, but it is very difficult to disperse them effectively. It requires a high level of technical proficiency to turn harmful biological agents, such as anthrax and smallpox, into weapons.

- There have been five known efforts to disperse biological toxins on people, but none of them has been successful.
- Chemical weapons are easier to disperse, but they cannot do as much damage as biological weapons. There was a successful chemical attack that killed 12 people in the Tokyo subway system.
- The best defense against chemical and biological weapons is good surveillance and preparations for rapid response. Currently we are far from prepared for a coordinated response to these weapons.
- As we move forward with initiatives in homeland security, we should be mindful that our security will never be perfect, no matter how much we invest in it. Vigilance is welcome, but we cannot protect all targets. There are simply too many of them. We will have to accept some level of risk.
- But we should try to make ourselves as secure as we can be without imposing excessive costs and burdens upon us or restricting our liberties.

4) Intelligence: Fifth, we must upgrade our intelligence, especially human intelligence.

- The biggest failure of intelligence with respect to last month's attacks is that our intelligence community did not expect them.
- Why was there this intelligence failure?
 - 1) The intelligence community has been focused on other types of attack, such as attack by ballistic missiles.
 - 2) It has been focused on military, not terrorist, threats.
 - 3) It has been focused on advanced technology more than human intelligence.
 - 4) It has been focused on the collection, not the analysis or dissemination, of information.
 - 5) It has been riven by bureaucratic divisions and inadequate sharing of information.
 - 6) It does not have enough people with necessary language skills and expertise in foreign affairs.
- We must have a new commitment to putting people on the ground that can detect and alert us to potential terrorist plots. Technology alone will not make us secure.

- We have focused in recent years on intelligence technology because it is sophisticated and cleaner than human intelligence. Human intelligence is a dirty business. It requires us to develop relationships with extremely unsavory characters, but those relationships are essential to help us infiltrate and break-up terrorist networks.
- We must also develop closer intelligence relationships with other countries that can help us get critical information. With respect to the terrorist networks in the Arab and Muslim worlds, those countries include Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Jordan, the United Arab Emirates, and Yemen.
- **CIA regulations:** In the wake of the attacks, there has been criticism of CIA regulations. Many members of Congress have said the CIA has instituted too many restraints on its capacity to recruit agents abroad, but there are fewer restraints on the intelligence agencies than commonly thought.
- **1) Disreputable spies:** The CIA is not barred from recruiting foreign informants with criminal records or a history of involvement in terrorism. The recruitment of such people simply has to be approved by senior intelligence officials. It is proper to wonder if this regulation has made CIA case officers less aggressive, but it is unlikely that it has had a major impact on the CIA's capacity to collect intelligence information.
- **2) Assassinations:** There has also been criticism of the government ban on assassinations. This ban is not a law but an executive order by President Ford that has been maintained by subsequent presidents. I believe this ban should be revisited, but I do not think it is a serious obstacle to pursuing terrorists. There are ways to get around the ban. For instance, we can go after Osama bin Laden and his associates in self-defense. Moreover, the ban only applies to heads of government. There is no prohibition on killing terrorists -- or even on killing heads of state in war.
- The ban on assassination is a symbol of ethical conduct and the government should deliberate very carefully before changing it.

5) Maintain values and constitutional rights: Sixth, we must uphold our values and protect our constitutional rights.

- While retaliating for last month's attacks and upgrading our intelligence and national security we must be sure to maintain the important principles -- of civil liberty, ethnic and religious tolerance, and freedom of expression -- that are the foundation and strength of our nation. If we allow terrorists to alter our values or way of life, we hand them a victory.
- Our patriotism reinforces a sense of national community, but as we erect walls to comfort and protect those inside the United States we must be careful not to violate equal protection under the law or make life here seem scary to outsiders.

- In the months and years ahead we are likely to experience more restrictions on our personal freedoms, but we must maintain the rule of law in the face of terrorism. Where the law ends, tyranny begins.
- Our values and political system require that we use legal means to achieve legal ends within the confines of the Constitution. If we act too aggressively to tighten security we run the risk of becoming neither safe nor free.
- There should be no rush to adopt policies and laws -- for instance, on detaining aliens or wire-tapping -- that may threaten constitutional rights.
- The Justice Department must justify its requests and show that its counter-terrorism work has been harmed by the existing rules, and that the changes it seeks will fix problems that encumber investigations.
- We must draw a distinction between measures necessary for the current emergency and those desirable over the long term. Sunset provisions on some laws may make sense.

Conclusion

- Fighting terrorism is now the organizing principle for U.S. foreign policy, but it cannot be the sole prism through which we view international relations because we face many other challenges -- and dangers.
- Our crucial task is to ensure that this new era is not an era of fear and hatred, but rather an era of greater security and international cooperation to combat terrorism, protect democracy, and advance freedom and prosperity.
- If we act with foresight and resolve we can transform this moment, as we transformed Pearl Harbor, from one of our greatest tragedies to one of our finest hours.