

Remarks by  
Assistant to the President for  
Homeland Security and Counterterrorism  
Frances Fragos Townsend  
Center for Strategic and International Studies

The Renwick Gallery  
March 22, 2006

Thank you for your kind introduction. I'd like to thank Dr. John Hamre for inviting me to speak with you tonight.

And I'd like to thank CSIS, the Smithsonian, and Deloitte & Touche for establishing the new Homeland Security Strategy Forum and for organizing this important event.

I am delighted to be here with so many distinguished guests --- current and former government officials, academics, and industry leaders. You represent the broad range of policy innovation, leadership, and intellectual

thinking that is critical to advancing the security of the Homeland. And it has been my privilege to have worked with many of you.

As part of the Forum's theme "Homeland Security 2010: Strength and Resiliency in the Face of Global Terrorism," what I would like to do this evening is discuss our strategy for defeating the terrorist enemy confronting the United States today, and then outline a vision and way forward for achieving a truly transformational, national state of preparedness for all catastrophic threats and hazards. Ultimately, these continuing homeland security challenges will benefit from your deliberations and analysis.

The enemy we face today in the War on Terrorism is not the same enemy we faced when the war began on September 11<sup>th</sup>. In the aftermath of 9/11, the US, along with our partners, has been relentless in its efforts to defeat

al-Qaida, its terrorist associates, and the deadly scourge of terror and intimidation more broadly.

Through our relentless actions and those of our partners:

- Al-Qaida has lost its sanctuary in Afghanistan
- Its network has been significantly degraded
- Numerous countries that were part of the problem before 9/11 are increasingly becoming part of the solution
- And there is a broad and growing consensus that the deliberate killing of innocents is never justified by any calling or cause

At the same time, our enemy has evolved. Today, terrorist networks are more dispersed and less centralized. They rely more on smaller cells

inspired and bound by a common ideology. We have witnessed the disturbing trend of “homegrown terrorist” cells around the world – most recently in London. We understand that we are not immune from this.

Even as we continue our efforts to defeat al-Qaida and its supporters, the broader enemy we confront today is a transnational movement of extremist organizations, networks and individuals – and their state and non-state supporters – which have in common that they exploit Islam and use terrorism for ideological ends.

The enemy has both a vision of what it wants to achieve and a strategy to achieve. The bloodshed of Islamic radicals – on display from Baghdad to Bali and beyond – is meant to serve a violent political vision: the establishment of regimes that govern according to their own radical and absolutist interpretation of Islam. For some among the movement,

especially al-Qaida, the objective is even bolder: the establishment of a totalitarian empire over a large part of the world that denies all political and religious freedom.

But the regimes envisioned and pursued by the enemy would not only deny political and religious freedom. In sharing common cause with terrorists, they would serve as bases from which terrorists would plan and prepare for additional attacks against the Homeland, our allies and the Muslim world itself.

But a vision of a world darkened by hate, fear, and oppression fails against our strategy of freedom, hope, and democracy.

Last week, we published the President's National Security Strategy. The document outlines the strategic underpinning of America's foreign policy: seek and support the growth of democratic movements and institutions in every nation and culture, with the ultimate goal of ending tyranny.

The President's strategy recognizes that the War on Terrorism is both a battle of arms and a battle of ideas -- a fight against the terrorists and their murderous, radical, and intolerant ideology. And in the battle of ideas, freedom and democracy directly oppose and frustrate the beliefs and tactics of our terrorist enemies:

- The enemy manipulates feelings of alienation. Democracy provides the opportunity to shape one's own future.

- The enemy exploits historical grievances. Democracy offers the rule of law and the peaceful resolution of disputes.
- The enemy manipulates sub-cultures of conspiracy and misinformation. Democracy offers freedom of speech, an independent media, and the marketplace of ideas.
- And while our terrorist enemies depend on an ideology that justifies the murder of innocents, democracy offers respect for human dignity that rejects the deliberate targeting of innocents.

The President's strategy recognizes that America is at war, and that protecting the American people remains his first and most solemn duty.

The protection and defense of the Homeland and U.S. interests abroad is an enduring responsibility. Toward this end, the President -- through his relentless approach in the War on Terror -- is committed to:

- Preventing attacks by terrorist networks before they occur;
- Denying WMD to rogue states and terrorist allies who would use them without hesitation;
- Denying terrorist groups the support and sanctuary of rogue states;
- Denying the terrorists control of any nation that they would use as a base and launching pad for terror; and
- Denying our terrorist enemies future recruits by advancing democracy and hope.

We are working toward a War on Terror and Homeland Security vision for 2010 and beyond through committed action on each of these five pillars.

But underlying our success along each of these five pillars – underlying our ability to attack terrorists as well as denying them what they need to operate and survive – are the actions that we must take to increase our own capacities even as we attack the capacity of our enemies. In other words, we must create enduring institutional and even transformational platforms to carry the fight forward to ensure our ultimate success.

As part of this approach, the President has enhanced our government architecture and interagency collaboration in the War on Terror by setting clear national priorities and transforming the government to meet those

goals and objectives. The President's transformation agenda has been felt government wide. In law enforcement both the FBI and DOJ have new National Security Divisions which give focus and priority to their CT work. And with the PATRIOT Act they have a necessary tool to get the job done. In the Intelligence Community we now have the DNI who looks across the intelligence community to set priorities and budget and has the NCTC which looks at the terrorism threat across the community. Secretary Rumsfeld is transforming our military and Special Operations Command leads the fight in the Global War on Terror. Finally, the President established the Department of Homeland Security to provide the Nation with a single, integrated cross government effort to prepare for and respond to a domestic crisis.

We must continue to build upon this transformational foundation of national and homeland security. Strength and resiliency in the face of global terrorism – and from all catastrophic threats and hazards confronting the United States today – will come, in part, from steeling ourselves through transformation and recognizing this as a long term commitment.

I recently had the privilege of leading the review of the Federal Response to Hurricane Katrina. One of the lessons we learned is that we as a Nation – Federal, State, and local governments; the private sector; as well as communities and individual citizens – have not developed a shared vision of or a commitment to preparedness: what we must do to prevent, protect against, respond to, and recover from the next catastrophe. Without a shared vision that is acted upon by all levels of our nation and

encompasses the full range of our preparedness and response capabilities, we will not achieve a truly transformational national state of preparedness.

While the lesson grew out of our examination of the Federal Response to the most destructive natural disaster in U.S. history, preparedness is intertwined with our national security, counterterrorism, and homeland security strategies. It is an essential part of the framework for what we need to do for better homeland security in 2010 and beyond.

There are two immediate priorities for a transformational national state of preparedness:

- Define and implement a comprehensive National Preparedness System; and
- Foster a new, robust Culture of Preparedness

I'd like to walk you through key points in each of these priorities.

First, we must implement a comprehensive National Preparedness System to make sure we have an integrated system that ensures unity of effort in preparing for and responding to both natural and man-made disasters.

This will require the Federal government to transform the way it does business.

The most important objective in this transformation will be to build and integrate operational capability. Virtually all elements of the Federal government must be operational – to respond to catastrophic events with unified effort. There are three key requirements to achieve this goal:

- Strengthen DHS institutions to manage the Federal response as well as enhance DHS regional and field elements;
- Reinforce the Secretary of Homeland Security's position as the President's manager of the Federal response; and
- Strengthen the response capabilities – management and field resources – of other Federal departments and agencies.

Within DHS, it is essential to enhance the headquarters element to direct the Federal response while also providing appropriate resources to field elements so they can make an impact on the ground. And we must structure DHS headquarters to support the Secretary's incident's management responsibilities. One key effort would be a new National Operations Center to coordinate and integrate the national response and

provide a common operating picture for the entire Federal government.

DHS headquarters must also possess a robust capability for deliberate operational planning that applies lessons learned and develops plans that anticipate requirements for future responses just as our U.S. military colleagues do. Below the headquarters, we must help to build up the department's regional structures and develop field personnel with the necessary resources, training, and national support.

In order to create robust homeland security response capabilities, we must transform our interagency process and, most important, eliminate the extraordinary bureaucratic red tape. We must transform our approach for catastrophic incidents from one of bureaucratic coordination to proactive unified command that creates true unity of effort. At the Federal level, the most urgent step in creating unity of effort will be to reinforce the Secretary

of Homeland Security as the Federal government's preparedness and incident manager.

One model for the command and control structure for the Federal response is our successful defense and national security framework. In that framework, there is a clear line of authority that stretches from the President, through the Secretary of Defense, to the Combatant Commander in the field. When a contingency arises, the Combatant Commander in that region executes the missions assigned by the Secretary of Defense and the President. Although the Commander might not control forces on a day-to-day basis, during a military operation he controls all military forces in his theater – exercising command authority and accessing the resources needed to affect outcomes on the ground. While homeland security and defense operations models do diverge in

important ways, we must ensure that the President's incident manager – without infringing upon the statutory responsibilities of the Cabinet department and agencies – is able to call upon the full range of the Federal government's response assets and aggressively orchestrate, lead, and coordinate their use in response operations.

Beyond changes to DHS and the structure of Federal response, there is still a compelling need to strengthen operational capabilities across the Federal government. Those departments and agencies that have a responsibility to respond to a catastrophic event must build up their crisis deployable capabilities as well as their effective operational management.

HHS had the National Medical Disaster System. Well, it should go back and be managed by experienced public health professionals, and in addition, HHS needs to make the public health commissioned officer corps

crisis deployed. EPA needs crisis deployable teams and the this is likewise true across the Federal government.

An effective National Preparedness System requires that we build at all levels of government a leadership corps that is fully educated, trained and exercised in our plans and doctrine. And beyond current plans and doctrine, we require a more systematic and institutional program for homeland security professional development and education that extends to all personnel with a responsibility to prevent, prepare for, respond to, and recover from natural and man-made disasters. DHS should establish a National Homeland Security University – analogous to NDU – for senior homeland security personnel as a capstone for training and education opportunities.

Our programs must integrate State and local government officials as well as the private sector, NGOs, and faith-based organizations. As in every homeland crisis, all of our homeland partners will come together to respond, and therefore, to draw from an old military adage, it is important that we “train as you fight; fight as you train.”

Over the long term, our professional development and education programs must break down interagency barriers to build a unified team across the Federal government. Again, drawing on the experiences of DOD which succeeded in building a joint leadership cadre, so too must the rest of the government have interagency and intergovernmental assignments to build trust and familiarity among diverse homeland security professionals. These assignments will break down organizational stovepipes and advance the exchange of practices and ideas. In essence, we need a Goldwater-

Nichols for the civilian side of the federal government that mandates “joint” assignments as a condition of advancement.

To ensure the success of the National Preparedness System over time, it must possess the means to measure progress towards strategic goals and capability objectives. It must systematically identify best practices and lessons learned and have an effective process for conducting corrective or remedial actions when a system challenge is identified.

And the System must be dynamic. We must routinely revisit our plans and reassess our capabilities in order to account for evolving risks, improvements in technological capabilities, and preparedness innovations.

An age-old question for national security and, now, homeland security planning, is how much is enough? In particular, at what level of preparedness do we feel confident that we have adequately accounted for the threats we face, our vulnerabilities, and the means we have to manage them?

Recognizing that we cannot anticipate every threat, we as Nation must rely on a capabilities-based planning approach. While our National Planning Scenarios are a good start, we must not shy away from creating scenarios that stress the current system of response to the breaking point and challenge our Nation in ways that we wish we did not have to imagine.

They must reflect both what we know and what we can imagine about the ways our enemies think – that they will not hit us hard just once, but that they will seek to cause us damage on significant scale in multiple locations

simultaneously. We must not again find ourselves vulnerable to the charge that we suffered a “‘failure of imagination’ and a mind-set that dismissed possibilities.”

The second element of our continuing transformation for homeland security perhaps will be the most profound and enduring – the creation of a Culture of Preparedness. This new culture must emphasize that the entire Nation shares common goals and responsibilities for homeland security. And just like our most important successes against al-Qaida and other terrorists abroad have been made possible through effective partnerships, so too must the full scope of homeland security be built upon a foundation of partnerships.

The first principle for a Culture of Preparedness must be a shared acknowledgement that creating a prepared Nation will be a continuing challenge. We must temper the sense of optimism that is fundamental to the American character with a sober recognition that future catastrophes will occur. Our Culture of Preparedness must emphasize the importance of flexibility and readiness to cope with a broad range of challenges.

Despite reforms that encourage a proactive, anticipatory approach to the management of incidents, the current culture of our response community has a fundamental bias towards reaction rather than initiative. Our new culture must stress initiative at all levels and encourage and reward innovation. To do so, our system must better align authority and responsibility – those who are responsible for a mission must have the authority to act. This also provides us the ability to assess our

performance. But performance assessment and accountability must not be blame. The current culture of blame threatens both individual and institutional initiative and enterprise throughout the homeland security profession.

Our preparedness culture also must emphasize the importance of citizen and community preparedness, which are among the most effective means of preventing terrorist attacks as well as protecting against, mitigating, responding to, and recovering from all hazards. Leadership at all levels will be essential in helping to transform citizens preparedness. Public officials and prominent national figures should begin a public dialogue that emphasizes common preparedness themes, and DHS should continue to build upon initiatives such as Ready.gov, public service announcements, and our efforts through Citizen Corps.

Public awareness messaging must shift to include more substantive information. We should follow the example of the “Stop, Drop, and Roll” campaign use so successfully in fire safety as part of the “Learn Not to Burn” program as well as the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration’s “Buckle Up America” campaign as models. And with so many of these successful campaigns, the Nation’s children will lead the way. How many of us with small children only remember to use seat belts when they are in the car with us because they demand it. Preparing our children will prepare the Nation.

Finally, other homeland security stakeholders must be fully brought into our efforts, namely the private sector, NGOs, and faith-based groups. Each of these groups plays a critical role in preparedness. To the extent that we

can incorporate them into the National effort, we will reduce the burden on other response resources.

Private sector companies own and operate 85 percent of our Nation's critical infrastructure, and these companies are responsible for protecting their own systems. Because of this, private sector preparation and response is vital to mitigating the national impact of catastrophes. To maximize the Nation's preparedness, all levels of government must join with the private sector to collaboratively develop plans to respond to major disasters. There are important initiatives in this area already underway by the Business Round Table and the Business Executives for National Security project. We must encourage and build upon these efforts. The private sector must be an explicit partner in and fully integrated across all levels of response.

And in times of crisis, NGOs, especially community groups, faith-based organizations, and relief groups play essential roles, providing essential human faces, helping hands and comfort and compassion to all American people. As such, they fill an essential need in the response system in ways far beyond the capacity of the government.

Our continuing transformation of national and homeland security is not a choice but an absolute imperative. Within the government, we are working to implement many efforts and initiatives that will facilitate this transformation. But we must have a national dialogue on shared responsibilities and expectations for the full range of counterterrorism and homeland security preparedness.

You can help with that dialogue through this Homeland Security Strategy Forum.

Also, your Forum can help with additional issues that I have not touched upon that will improve homeland security in 2010 and beyond, such as better State and local tie-ins to and partnerships with the intelligence community to foster intelligence sharing. And we can work together on the many important Homeland and National Security issues facing us: such as, port security, immigration and border security, CBRN preparedness and response, and pandemic flu preparedness.

Together, all homeland security stakeholders – Federal, State, and local governments; the private sector; communities; and individual citizens – can build a transformational homeland security system and culture. And from

this transformation will come the strength and resiliency to face all catastrophic threats challenging the security of the Homeland and the American people today.

Thank you. May God bless you.