

USA HOMELAND SECURITY: A MODEL FOR THE UNITED ARAB EMIRATES

BY

COLONEL SUHAIL M. ALSERAIDI
United Arab Emirates

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A:

Approved for Public Release.
Distribution is Unlimited.

USAWC CLASS OF 2009

Only a work of the United States Government is not subject to copyright. Based upon the nature of a particular student-author's employment, a paper may not be a work of the United States Government and may, in fact, be protected by copyright.

This SRP is submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the Master of Strategic Studies Degree. The views expressed in this student academic research paper are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of the Army, Department of Defense, or the U.S. Government.



U.S. Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, PA 17013-5050

The U.S. Army War College is accredited by the Commission on Higher Education of the Middle State Association of Colleges and Schools, 3624 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104, (215) 662-5606. The Commission on Higher Education is an institutional accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE				Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing this collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number. PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.					
1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY) 24-03-2009		2. REPORT TYPE Strategy Research Project		3. DATES COVERED (From - To)	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE USA Homeland Security: A Model for the United Arab Emirates				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S) Colonel Suhail M. Alseraidi – International Fellow – United Arab Emirates				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Colonel Frank E. Blakely Department of Distance Education				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army War College 122 Forbes Avenue Carlisle, PA 17013				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Distribution A: Unlimited					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Only a work of the United States Government is not subject to copyright. Based upon the nature of a particular student-author's employment, a paper may not be a work of the United States Government and may, in fact, be protected by copyright.					
14. ABSTRACT The September 11, 2001 terrorist attack on the United States shattered the image of a secure homeland, not only for the United States but also for many nations throughout the world. If terrorist attacks could be so successful against the most powerful nation in the world, what could other nation's leaders anticipate against their own countries? The people of the world waited for the U.S. reaction, the expected offensive strikes and, more importantly, the plans and methods for protecting and securing the homeland. To date, the United States has spent over 318.5 billion dollars and established a vast new national organization, the Department of Homeland Security.1 This new organization has been given responsibility for protecting the homeland from attack, reacting to national emergencies, and recovering from natural disasters. This paper informs on the development of the DHS to the present and addresses its praises and criticisms. Finally, this research project seeks to determine the effectiveness of this new DHS model and its applicability to the United Arab Emirates.					
15. SUBJECT TERMS Security, Strategy, Terrorists, U.A.E.					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT UNLIMITED	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 30	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT UNCLASSIFIED	b. ABSTRACT UNCLASSIFIED	c. THIS PAGE UNCLASSIFIED			19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (include area code)

USAWC STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

USA HOMELAND SECURITY: A MODEL FOR THE UNITED ARAB EMIRATES

by

Colonel Suhail M. Alseraidi
United Arab Emirates

Colonel Frank E. Blakely
Project Adviser

This SRP is submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the Master of Strategic Studies Degree. The U.S. Army War College is accredited by the Commission on Higher Education of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, 3624 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104, (215) 662-5606. The Commission on Higher Education is an institutional accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation.

Only a work of the United States Government is not subject to copyright. Based upon the nature of a particular student-author's employment, a paper may not be a work of the United States Government and may, in fact, be protected by copyright.

The views expressed in this student academic research paper are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of the Army, Department of Defense, or the U.S. Government.

U.S. Army War College
CARLISLE BARRACKS, PENNSYLVANIA 17013

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: Colonel Suhail M. Alseraidi
TITLE: USA Homeland Security: A Model for the United Arab Emirates
FORMAT: Strategy Research Project
DATE: 24 March 2009 WORD COUNT: 5,838 PAGES: 30
KEY TERMS: Security, Strategy, Terrorists, U.A.E.
CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

The September 11, 2001 terrorist attack on the United States shattered the image of a secure homeland, not only for the United States but also for many nations throughout the world. If terrorist attacks could be so successful against the most powerful nation in the world, what could other nation's leaders anticipate against their own countries? The people of the world waited for the U.S. reaction, the expected offensive strikes and, more importantly, the plans and methods for protecting and securing the homeland.

To date, the United States has spent over 318.5 billion dollars and established a vast new national organization, the Department of Homeland Security.¹ This new organization has been given responsibility for protecting the homeland from attack, reacting to national emergencies, and recovering from natural disasters. This paper informs on the development of the DHS to the present and addresses its praises and criticisms. Finally, this research project seeks to determine the effectiveness of this new DHS model and its applicability to the United Arab Emirates.

USA HOMELAND SECURITY: A MODEL FOR THE UNITED ARAB EMIRATES

The right organization will not guarantee success, but the wrong organization will guarantee failure.

—General Dwight D. Eisenhower²

On September 10, 2001, the government bureaucracy responsible for the protection of the American nation involved over 100 major cabinet departments and agencies, 650 major separate computer systems and 18 different unions.³ This huge bureaucracy made it difficult for effective coordination and never produced a coherent strategic defense for the nation's homeland. Each separate organization had their own areas of concern but none had the responsibility of compiling all the information, assigning missions, responsibilities, providing supervision or producing a coordinated strategic plan. The thought of non-state actors causing mass casualties against the nation's center of gravity - its people - seemed to have been lost among the daily chores of the 100 agencies. Yet, the warning signs were there.

On October 23, 1983, Shiite suicide bombers exploded a truck near the U.S. military barracks at the Beirut, Lebanon airport killing 241 U.S. Marines. A Pan Am 747 bound for New York in 1988 exploded in flight from a terrorist bomb and crashed into a Scottish village; all 259 aboard and 11 on the ground were killed. Al-Qaeda involvement was suspected in the February 26, 1993 bomb explosion in a basement garage of the World Trade Center in New York City; six were killed and 1,040 were injured. April 19, 1995, a car bomb exploded outside a Federal building in Oklahoma City killing 168 people and damaging 220 buildings; two American citizens were convicted in an anti-government plot and one was executed. A truck bomb exploded outside the Khobar

Towers military complex on June 25, 1996 in Dhahran, Saudi Arabia killing 19 American service members and injuring hundreds of others. Fourteen members of the Hezbollah organization were indicted on charges. October 12, 2000, in the port of Aden, Yemen, the USS Cole was heavily damaged when a small boat loaded with explosives detonated along side; seventeen sailors were killed and the Al-Qaeda terrorist network was blamed. September 11, 2001, hijackers crashed two commercial jets into each of the twin towers of the World Trade Center, another crashed into the Pentagon and a fourth in a rural field in Pennsylvania. United States casualties totaled 2,992.⁴ The crescendo of 9/11 finally awoke America to the fact that its homeland was vulnerable and “things” had to be done. The events of September 11, 2001 made homeland security the primary public concern and top priority for national planning.

This paper examines one of the major accomplishments of the U.S. government in its efforts to prevent and protect the homeland. On November 25, 2002, the U.S. Congress created a vast new Federal organization, the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). This new department is now in its sixth year, has over 200,000 employees and a \$52 billion budget for 2009. This paper will research the DHS organization from its conception to the present to determine the effectiveness of this new model and make recommendations as to whether the new model or its parts are applicable to the United Arab Emirates.

The Birth of the Department of Homeland Security

On September 20, 2001, nine days after the shock of 9/11, President George W. Bush addressed a joint session of Congress. In this address he identified the enemy as a “loosely affiliated terrorist organization know as al-Qaeda and identified them as being

“to terror what the Mafia is to crime but its goal is not making money; its goal is remaking the world-and imposing its radical beliefs on people everywhere.” The address also attempted to avoid blaming all Muslim people.

I also want to speak tonight directly to Muslims throughout the world. We respect your faith. It's practiced freely by many millions of Americans, and by millions more in countries that America counts as friends. Its teachings are good and peaceful, and those who commit evil in the name of Allah blaspheme the name of Allah. The terrorists are traitors to their own faith, trying, in effect, to hijack Islam itself. The enemy of America is not our many Muslim friends; it is not our many Arab friends. Our enemy is a radical network of terrorists, and every government that supports them.

This address also recognized the need and importance of the nation's security and the confusion among the dozens of Federal departments and agencies as well as among the state and local governments. To rectify this situation, the President announced the creation of a new Cabinet-level position, the Office of Homeland Security (OHS), that would report directly to him.⁵ To lead it, he called upon the governor of Pennsylvania, Tom Ridge, and assigned him the mission to lead, oversee, and coordinate a comprehensive national strategy to safeguard the country against terrorism, and respond to any attacks that may come. Finally, after 35 years of terrorist attacks the U.S. had a leader and office, to begin addressing the issue of creating a national strategy for homeland security.⁶

On October 29, 2001, the President issued Homeland Security Presidential Directive-1,⁷ which established the organization and operation of the Homeland Security Council (HSC) within the White House. Its purpose was to coordinate homeland security affairs throughout all levels of departments and agencies, and to promote all homeland security policies. Thus, the HSC, consisting of eleven policy coordination committees, became the first federal organization to oversee all homeland security related matters.⁸

The President also asked Congress for emergency funding to deal with the crisis. Congress authorized and appropriated a \$40 billion emergency response fund to wage war against Al Qaeda, help reconstruction in New York and Virginia, compensate victims and strengthen homeland defense.⁹

The emergency response fund also gave monies for the largest criminal investigation in U.S. history. This investigation resulted in Congress passing the Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism Act (Patriot Act). The President signed this Act into law on October 26, 2001. The new law primarily enlarged the powers of federal law enforcement and intelligence gathering agencies when terrorist's crimes and some criminal acts were committed. Changes were made especially in private information sharing and in the use of wiretaps. The lessons learned by the hasty approval of the Patriot Act was that governments, in times of crises, felt obligated to quickly do something. They fear the possible blame of not doing anything or for causing further crises. As a result of the poorly drafted Patriot Act, the U.S. government later spent millions of dollars in legal fees for courts to interpret contents of the Act. In addition, citizens became concerned and angry over their perceived loss of rights.¹⁰

The OHS produced the first National Strategy for Homeland Security; a comprehensive National strategy."¹¹ Thus, the purpose of this Strategy was to mobilize and organize the entire nation to protect the homeland. The 90-page document required "coordinated and focused effort from our entire society – the Federal government, state and local governments, the private sector and the American people."¹² The document became a foundation and framework for all concerned. For the federal government it

was direction; for all local governments, business firms, organizations and citizens it provided suggestions and help in training and equipping; and for Congress recommendations. Communication among all these levels became a key ingredient to secure the homeland. Thus, enhanced cooperation among all at government and private levels became a priority.¹³

The Strategy defined homeland security as “a concerted National effort to prevent terrorist attacks within the United States, reduce America’s vulnerability to terrorism, and minimize the damage and recover from attacks that do occur.”¹⁴

“Concerted National effort” acknowledged the critical role of the federal government, but required a share of partnership and responsibility with Congress, all government and private organizations and each American individual. “Preventing terrorist attacks” is the first priority of homeland security and the intent is that the nation must detect terrorists before they attack, deter all forms of terrorist attacks, defeat any attack and take decisive actions to eliminate threats both at home and abroad. Special attention was needed for catastrophic threats from weapons of mass destruction, and attacks on information systems, critical infrastructure, and on the highest level of government. To accomplish this the strategy explained how the government is to work with local governments and the private sector to identify and protect key assets and important infrastructure. The strategy also cautioned that the nation must accept some amount of terrorist risk, the possibility that despite all efforts, terrorist attacks may still occur. In these instances, the strategy directed the nation to be prepared to minimize damages and respond to the emergency. The strategy acknowledged that local first responders – police, firefighters, emergency medical and emergency management officials have the

best chance to lower life and property losses. The intent of the word “recover” was to ensure the nation is prepared to protect and restore all government, financial, legal and social systems in order to rebuild the institutions and confidence.

The strategy also identified six critical mission areas.¹⁵ The first three focused on preventing terrorists’ attacks---intelligence and warning, border and transportation security and domestic counter terrorism. Two areas were critical to reducing the nation’s vulnerabilities---protecting critical infrastructure and defending against catastrophic terrorism. The final mission area, emergency preparedness and response, was aimed at minimizing damage and recovering from attacks.

The U.S. homeland security is based on four unique American strengths, which were defined in the strategy. The first, law, promotes and safeguards the American concept of liberty and security. The second, science and technology, provides new technologies that secure the land. The third, information sharing and systems, links the huge amounts of information and knowledge of the entire American establishment with the understanding that privacy was to be respected. The fourth, international cooperation, acknowledges that terrorists pay no attention to traditional borders putting U.S. strategy of forming and maintaining international relationships at risk. To further understand the strategy one must recognize these strengths along with the characteristics of innovation, determination, and commitment to the democratic doctrine of freedom and equality. The strategy was shaped by this doctrine and designed with eight principals. They are:

- responsibility and accountability which focuses on results;

- mobilize the entire society which calls on all national, local institutions and people to secure the homeland;
- manage risk and allocate resources judiciously which identifies priorities for homeland security programs;
- seek opportunity out of adversity which focuses on improving security programs that also improve public needs;
- foster flexibility which enforces the need for flexible responses to terrorism;
- measure preparedness which calls for accountability from all responsible for homeland security;
- sustain efforts over a long term which emphasizes that protecting the homeland from terrorist attack is a permanent mission;
- constrain government spending which recognizes that more money spent does not equate to more security earned.

This Strategy was the first of its kind in U.S. history. While it presented a challenge of complexity, scale and cost, it has succeeded in its purpose of mobilizing and organizing the American nation to secure the U.S. homeland from terrorist attacks

President Bush, due mainly to the concerns of Congress, decided to replace the OHS with a federal agency. He submitted a request to Congress proposing,

To create a new Department of Homeland Security, the most significant transformation of the United States government in over half-century by largely transforming and realigning the current confusing patchwork of government activities into a single department whose primary mission is to protect our homeland.¹⁶

Congress agreed and passed the Homeland Security Act of 2002, creating the new department whose purpose was to,

- Prevent terrorist attacks within the United States;
- Reduce the vulnerability of the United States to terrorism;
- Minimize the damage, and assist in the recovery, from terrorist attacks that do occur within the United States;
- Carry out all functions of entities transferred to the Department, including by acting as a focal point regarding national and manmade crises and emergency planning;
- Ensure that the functions of the agencies and subdivisions within the Department that are not related directly to securing the homeland are not diminished between illegal drug trafficking and terrorism, coordinate efforts to sever such connections, and otherwise contribute to efforts to interdict illegal drug trafficking.
- Ensure that the overall economic security of the United States is not diminished by efforts, activities, and programs aimed at securing the homeland; and
- Monitor connections between illegal drug trafficking and terrorism, coordinate efforts to sever such connections, and otherwise contribute to efforts to interdict illegal drug trafficking.¹⁷

The Act incorporated 22 agencies and over 100 organizations into a single cohesive department. The merger resulted in a department with the most diverse federal functions and responsibilities within the government. The new organization aligned border and transportation security functions, merged response activities, created one central point to track terrorist threats and merged all security research and development efforts. The department was configured around four major organizations.¹⁸

Intelligence, a critical area concerning security was not added to the DHS structure until Congress passed the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Act of 2004.¹⁹

To address some of the challenges of complexity and scale in protecting the homeland, President Bush, issued two presidential directives.²⁰ On February 5, 2003, Homeland Security Presidential Directive (HSPD)-5 established a policy to manage domestic incidents. To insure that all involved could work together efficiently and effectively a single, comprehensive National Incident Management System (NIMS) was formed. With standard procedures, common language and focus, the incident responders could put all their efforts on the incident – whether terrorists or a national disaster. The key features of NIMS are:

- Incident Command System (ICS) which is a standard incident management organization in the area of command, operation, planning, logistics and finance/administration;
- Communication and information management, which standardizes communications for incidents and information management.
- Preparedness which is a number of measures, actions, processes and procedures that are planned, trained and exercised before an incident occurs;
- Joint Information System (JIS) provides the public with timely and accurate information;
- NIMS Integration Center (NIC) which maintains the NIMS as an accurate and effective management tool by proposing changes, evaluate lessons learned, and establishing and developing national standards for NIMS education and training.

HSPD-8, released on December 17, 2003, established policies concerning national preparedness. The directive required a domestic all-hazard preparedness goal, procedures for Federal preparedness assistance to state and local governments and outlined actions to improve the preparedness capabilities of Federal, state and local governments.

In 2004, the DHS released the National Response Plan (NRP) whose purpose was to integrate all plans for Federal domestic prevention, preparedness response and recovery into one all-discipline, all-hazards plan. The NRP was supported by the NIMS that had standardized incident management processes, proposals, and procedures.

On July 13, 2005, Homeland Security Secretary Michael Chertoff announced a six-point agenda to ensure that Department policies, operations and structures were providing the instruments needed to address both present and future threats. This agenda was the result of a review, commissioned by the Secretary, which studied every aspect of the department. The agenda's six points were:

- Increase overall preparedness, particularly for catastrophic events;
- Create better transportation security systems to move people and cargo more securely and efficiently;
- Strengthen border security and interior enforcement and reform immigration processes;
- Enhance information sharing with our partners;
- Improve DHS financial management, human resource development, procurement and information technology; and
- Realign the DHS organization to maximize mission performance.²¹

The first post 9/11 test of the DHS started on August 29, 2005 when Hurricane Katrina struck the United States gulf coast. Damage totaled \$896 billion, the costliest tropical cyclone in history, with fatalities of 1,836 confirmed and 705 missing. Over 60,000 people were stranded in New Orleans without food, water or shelter. The televised images of these people, the overall damage, and the arguments between the frustrated political leaders quickly brought criticism. The mismanagement, lack of leadership and overall response of the city, state and federal government brought an outcry that resulted in a Congressional investigation. The investigation determined that FEMA was not capable of managing the disaster and placed responsibility for the disaster on all three levels of government. The result of the investigation was the Post-Katrina Emergency Management Reform Act, which directly and indirectly affected the functions and structure of DHS. It also resulted in the replacement of the NRP by the National Response Framework (NRF), which clarified roles and responsibilities. The NRF provides the principals for a united national response to all types and levels of incidents, integrates key concepts and clarifies terminology.

The Growth Of DHS

The Secretary's six point agenda and the Post-Katrina Emergency Management Report realigned the structure of the Department. The major changes were:

- A new Directorate of Policy was established to conduct Department-wide coordination and act as a single point of contact for internal and external members of the homeland security community.
- Seven agencies -- Transportation and Security Administration, Customs and Border and Protection, U.S. Secret Service, Citizenship and Immigration

Services, Immigration and Custom Enforcement, U.S. Coast Guard and the Federal Management Agency (FEMA) -- now reported directly to the Secretary.

- FEMA was removed from the Emergency Preparedness Directorate and assigned the responsibilities of response and recovery only.
- The Coast Guard, the U.S. Secret Service and the Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Service became part of the DHS structure as distinct entities with their own commanders/directors.
- A new Domestic Nuclear Detection Office (DNDO) was established and assigned to the DHS.
- A new Office of Intelligence and Analysis led by a Chief Intelligence Officer was established and assigned to the DHS.
- The Office of the Secretary was enlarged to include a Chief of Staff, Executive Secretary and Military Liaison.

On October 27, 2007, the White House released its updated National Strategy for Homeland Security. It built on the 2002 strategy and “complements” both the National Security Strategy of March 2006, and the National Strategy for Combating Terrorism of September 2006.²² It reflects the increased understanding of the threats, lessons learned from exercises, real-world catastrophes, and prioritizes ongoing and future homeland security efforts. It provides a framework through which the entire nation - federal, state, local and tribal governments, private and non-profit sectors, communities and individual citizens can focus its homeland security efforts on the following four goals:

- Prevent and disrupt terrorist attacks,

- Protect the American people, our critical infrastructure and key resources,
- Respond to and recover from incidents that do occur,
- Continue to strengthen the foundation to ensure our long-term success.

The mission statements of the 2002 and 2007 documents best explain their strategic differences.

2002 Strategy

- Homeland security is a concerted national effort to prevent terrorist attacks within the United States, reduce America's vulnerability to terrorism, and minimize the damage and recover from attacks that do occur.

2007 Strategy

- Homeland Security is a concerted national effort to prevent and disrupt terrorist attacks, protect against manmade and natural hazard, and respond to and recover from incidents that do occur.

The new strategy speaks of not only preventing but also disrupting attacks. It adds protection against manmade and natural hazards as well as terrorist attacks and it not only minimizes the damage and recovery but also responds to and recovers from all incidents. Additionally, it adds the task of preventing and disrupting terrorist attacks without mentioning "within the United States." It describes the global war on terror. The 2007 strategy displays the evolving model and depicts the present realities of shared responsibility, challenges of present threats and hopes for long-term success.

On September 24, 2008, the Department released the U.S. Department of Homeland Security Strategic Plan Fiscal Years 2008-2013. It restated its mission of securing the country, preparing for and responding to all hazards and disasters. It

acknowledged “the challenge of strengthening the components to function as a unified Department,”²³ and states that the key to obtain strategic goals is sound and cohesive management. The goals and objectives of this restructured DHS and the new strategic plan are:

- Protect the nation from dangerous people,
- Protect the nation from dangerous goods,
- Protect critical infrastructure,
- Strengthen the Nation’s preparedness and emergency response,
- Strengthen and unify DHS operations and management.²⁴

On January 20, 2009, Barack Obama was sworn in as the 44th American President. On the 22nd, the White House issued a Homeland Security Agenda paper stating that the new President would provide “leadership and strategies to strengthen our security at home.”²⁵ It confirmed that his strategy for securing the homeland would be focused on preventing terrorists’ attacks, preparing and planning for emergencies, and having strong response and recovery capabilities. He plans to strengthen the homeland against all hazards, including terrorists, natural and accidental disasters and will ensure that the federal government will work with the states, localities and the private sector “as a true partner in prevention, mitigation and response.”²⁶ The statement appears to mirror the previous administration’s policy, which should allow the DHS time to continue its growth as a unified department. One of the topics that President Obama stated that he would address in the homeland security area is the question of merging the HSC and the National Security Council (NSC) into one council.

Assessment Of The DHS

To address the effectiveness of this new DHS model of protecting the nation's homeland one must be nonjudgmental and look at both the praises and criticisms to arrive at some conclusion. Research reveals much discussion on both sides. The criticisms are based mainly on too big, too bureaucratic, too slow, too costly, too federal and too new (i.e., experience takes time, and time is short). The praises argue that the model has been successful since the nation has not been attacked successfully since 9/11. The model has also been successful in that it took over 200,000 people, and 100 organizations and within eighteen months had a functioning DHS with a national strategy.

Advocates accuse the critics of being too impatient, and not understanding the gigantic problem of protecting a huge democratic nation. A sampling from a DHS fact sheet that shows one day's activities demonstrates the scope of the problem. Over 1.2 million passengers arriving in air and seaports, 57,006 trucks and containers, 580 vessels, 2,459 aircraft and 323,622 vehicles entering the country are inspected; 4,639 pounds of narcotics, \$715,652 in currency, \$23,083 in arms and ammunition and \$467,118 in merchandise are seized; 1.5 million passengers boarding aircrafts are screened and millions of dollars are disbursed to states and cities across the nation.²⁷ The criticisms continue in that the model has one individual responsible for managing over 200,000 people, a budget of \$50.5 billion (fiscal 2009 budget), and anticipate, prepare for, handle and follow- up the lengthening list of terrorist attacks and national disasters; all suggesting that the model is too big and bureaucratic.

The Secretary of DHS is a technician responsible for the security at the lowest community level and the nation's chief strategist for domestic security. In addition, the

borders and entry points are porous, allowing so many illegal people entry that the government doesn't even know how many, nor where they are and what they are doing. The Department is pulled in so many directions at once that it cannot present its case to Congress, the media or the public. Proof of this was the DHS readiness website "Ready.Gov" which appeared in February 2003. One of the first announcements was from then Secretary Tom Ridge in which he cautioned that in the case of a chemical attack, duct tape and plastic sheeting should be used by citizens to build a bunker or "shelter in place" for protection. As a result, duct tape and plastic sheeting prices skyrocketed and DHS was criticized for being too alarmist.²⁸

A presidential directive required that an information system be established to inform the nation of the risk level for terrorist acts. The Homeland Security Advisory System resulted as a color-coded terrorism risk advisory scale. It soon was ignored and became ineffective due to its constant warnings. The DHS is seen as a well-meaning but blundering giant.

The Department has been restructured and their operations and management systems strengthened. On border issues, 670 miles of fencing has been completed, 240,000 illegal aliens have been removed and over 750,000 port employees and truck drivers carry "credential" cards. It has built an emergency response system that has been effective in 58 major disasters, 10 emergencies and 60 management assistant calls. The Department also has implemented the requirements of the Post-Katrina Emergency Management Reform Act to focus U.S. effort on the greatest risks, to be disciplined in the use of resources and to meet challenges expediently and in

partnership with state and local leadership, first responders, private sector and the public.

Critics continued the discussion by relating the costs, to date of \$318.5 billion to fund the DHS. The Department has been faulted over excessive bureaucracy, waste and ineffectiveness. Congress estimated that the Department wasted roughly \$15 billion in failed contracts (as of September 2008).²⁹ A Government Accountability Office audit estimated approximately \$2 billion of waste and fraud due to the misuse of government credit cards.

The Department is also criticized for not placing sufficient funds into prevention, protection, responding and recovery issues. The United States has an old, worn infrastructure, shrinking public and health service, few resources to face a possible flu pandemic and national systems, such as electricity, water and cyber security need reconstruction. The government spends over a half trillion dollars on the Pentagon's budget and the war in Iraq, yet little government money is used to improve infrastructure. As the wealthiest nation in the world, the United States should be able to have the best military for protection and invest in items that make the nation more resilient.³⁰

Another area of criticism is that of civil rights. The claims are that while the Department is searching for undesirables and anti-terrorism data using a mining tool called ADVISE (Analysis, Dissemination, Visualization, Insight and Semantic Enhancement) the public right to privacy is violated. The Patriot Act not only decimated many civil liberties but also resulted in racial profiling; unfair treatment of immigrants, surveillance of citizens and expanded federal powers especially new wiretapping

provisions.³¹ Promoters countered that in the civil rights area the biometric system ADVISE, which was found to be unusable by the DHS own Inspector General, was scrapped in 2007 and replaced by US-VISIT. This new biometric system is in place in 115 airports, 14 seaports and 154 land ports of entry.³² Promoters continued with the fact that the budgets are open to all, posted on the web, approved by Congress and monitored by 86 congressional committees and subcommittees, while DOD has only four. DHS is in its fourth year of a five-year budget and planning process and is developing an integrated business and financial management systems that will consolidate 50 different budget execution systems, 43 different general ledgers and 30 different procurement systems inherited by the department.³³

In the infrastructure area, the Department has initiated a Critical Infrastructure and Key Resources (CIKR) program to identify and correct potential vulnerabilities and to stop any terrorist attempts. It includes the Chemical Security Compliance Project of the National Protection and Programs Directorate (NPPD) that established national standards to protect chemical facilities from attack and to prevent theft of chemicals. In 2008, the Department also conducted the third Top Officials (TOPOFF). This weeklong exercise, the largest full-scale terrorist simulation exercise to date, included participants from Canada and the United Kingdom. In 2008, the Department conducted over 400 exercises at the national, state, and local level.

The shocking events of September 11, 2001, quickly focused attention on the role and responsibility of government in preventing such an attack and responding to it. The words “war” and “retaliation” shaped the public’s expectations while the government searched for answers. The comparisons to Pearl Harbor, the government’s mobilization

in 1941 and eventual creation of the Department of Defense (DOD) was a quick comparison. The government had an enemy in the Taliban in Afghanistan and in the al-Qaeda terrorist organization. A “war against terror” was declared and it became reasonable to gather all those who had anything to do with homeland security and place them under a single authority. The pressure and shortage of time in which the DHS was born prevented cool and objective evaluation but with all the funds and political will expended it cannot be dismantled. The DHS model or something close to it will remain with the world and we must deal with it.

Applicability to the U.A.E.

To consider the DHS model applicability to the United Arab Emirates (U.A.E.) some facts concerning the nation are necessary. The U.A.E. consists of seven emirates, which became an independent nation on December 2, 1971. It is a small, dynamic, wealthy and tolerant state locked in the Arabian Gulf region.

The governmental system has features that combine traditional Arab Bedouin and modern western elements with a permanent constitution that follows the federal structure of a union and various governing bodies. It did not adopt the principal of separation of powers but is based on a two-tiered system of government. This means that the U.A.E. is governed by two distinct powers: the federal authority and the local authority where each emirate retains its own government.

The principles of their foreign policy include: non-interference in the internal affair of others, the promotion of conciliation, co-operation and consensus with all nations; and compliance with the rules of international law and the United Nations. They are a member of the Arab Gulf Co-operation Council (GCC), which promotes closer ties with

its immediate neighbors. It has a population of 4.33 million with a yearly growth rate of 79.6 %. The U.A.E. is strategically located and considered a bridge between the East and the West. The U.A.E. considers the three most critical threats to the nation as: terrorism, where Islamic-extremists are striking at Western interests in the Muslim world and Muslim nations that do business with them; illegal immigration, which presents a dissatisfied population that is being targeted by al-Qaeda and resulting in a demographic imbalance, making U.A.E. citizens a minority; and Iran, which has occupied three islands since 1971.

The U.A.E. is in the process of determining the best model to use for the homeland security mission. They have a National Emergency and Crisis Management Authority (NECMA) that falls under the authority of the National Security Council (NSC). It is responsible for managing and coordinating all efforts related to crisis and emergency. It is the federal organization responsible for developing national policies and procedures. Its mission is to “coordinate all national efforts to save lives, preserve national properties and assets by combining the effort of emergencies and crisis, and coordinate the national recovery efforts.”³⁴ The U.A.E. also has a National Recovery Plan (NRP) and has hosted the region's first Crisis and Emergency Conference.

In this quick study, the U.A.E. seems to have followed the DHS model with the NECMA. The applicability of the DHS model for U.A.E. is the lessons learned by the United States of which the U.A.E. can take advantage. A listing of learned lessons that might be useful to the U.A.E. is:

- Avoid terrorist threats blur the distinction between law enforcement and national security. Clarify duties, organize separate organizations but coordinate strategically,
- Avoid following the U.S. model of a separate Homeland Security Council – decisions become blurred –keep the HSC consolidated with the NSC,
- Develop a list of responsibilities that are shared by two or more organizations and insure that all understand the need for coordination,
- Create a local level regional structure model to insure communication and cooperation,
- Make Homeland Security a national effort and bring the effort down to the lowest level,
- Create an agreement with the GCC for common approaches to emergency response, improve border, maritime, aviation security and intelligence sharing,
- Sign a formal understanding of duties, responsibilities, communications and cooperation between the NEMC and the military forces. Do not combine the two.
- Establish priorities for all of the nation's resources.
- Recommend a National Director of Intelligence government position.
- Avoid using the term “war” in any form –the word implies that there is an enemy -keep terrorist attacks as a non- traditional threat.
- Have some form of oversight on the NCEMA, but do not over burden them with oversights or bureaucratic reports from other governmental agencies.

- Pay the employees of homeland security an above average salary and those who work in cyber activities a higher wage – the most qualified and professional personal must be employed in homeland security operations.
- Homeland Security is a continuing slow but steady process that should continually improve the prevention, preparation, protection, and recovery of the country – presently there is no end in sight.
- Prepare the people for terrorists' attacks using the methods of informational and strategy communication.
- The threat is real. Be alert and prepared at all times-terrorists strike when one becomes careless or overconfident.

Finally, this paper recommends that U.A.E. compare their homeland security plans and procedures with other friendly nations' plans, as well as experiences and lessons learned. The terrorists are not infallible and people of vigilance can bring this era of terror to an end.

Conclusion

Is America safer and has the DHS model been a success or failure? What is success or failure, and how do we measure it? Success could be claimed as preventing terrorist attacks in the country but then if there is a new attack, is the model a failure? How do we define safe? Is safe protecting everyone and everything from every possible attack or is safe an impossibility? These answers may be in the definition of the terms and how they are used.

The word safe is difficult to define in this environment. The terrorists have numerous ways to attack the nation of a free society but no nation can protect itself from

every possible attack. The United States is making progress and is safer in many ways but problems exist and will continue. The enemy, Al Qaeda, has also changed. It is no longer a single group under one leader. It has become a movement with a purpose - that of destroying the United States. Thus, safety can be defined by the Homeland Security Strategy Plan, which applies risk assessments and risk management to the definition. There is no safety in the this world, and all nations within this earth must deal with this reality. Is the DHS model effective? It must be, for time is short and choosing other models may be long gone. The Department has and is making progress and is working tirelessly to protect the nation. It has been successful to date and with leadership and the support, hard work, vigilance, and strength of its people the Department will continue to be the guardian of the nation.

Endnotes

¹ Veronique De Rugy "Facts and Figures About Homeland Security Spending," American Enterprise Institute, December 14, 2006, 12.

² Jim A. Davis and Barry R. Schneider, "Combating Weapons of Mass Destruction," Praeger Security International, May 2006, 35.

³ Matthew Brzezinski, *Fortress America* (Bantam Books, 2004), 175.

⁴ Infoplease, "Terrorist Attacks" available from <http://www.infoplease.com/ipa/A0001454> (accessed December 7, 2008).

⁵ George W. Bush, "Address to a Joint Session of Congress and the American People" available from <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/release/2001/09/20010920-8.html> (accessed November 10, 2008).

⁶ *Ibid.*, 4.

⁷ Homeland Security Presidential Directive 1: Organization and Operation of the Homeland Security Council available from <http://www.dhs.gov/xabout/laws> (accessed November 10, 2008).

⁸ *Ibid.*, 2.

⁹ Bush, "Address to a Joint Session of Congress," 2.

¹⁰Wikipedia, "USA Patriot Act" available from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/usa_patriot_act; (accessed 11 January 2009).

¹¹George W. Bush, National Strategy for Homeland Security (Washington, D.C.: The White House, July 2002), 3.

¹²*Ibid.*, 6.

¹³*Ibid.*, 12.

¹⁴*Ibid.*, 15.

¹⁵*Ibid.*, 8.

¹⁶George W. Bush, The Department of Homeland Security (Washington, D.C., The White House, June 2002), 1.

¹⁷Homeland Security Act of 2002, Public Law 107-296, 107th Congress. (November 25, 2002).

¹⁸*Ibid.*, 17.

¹⁹Intelligence Reform & Terrorism Act of 2004, Public Law 108-458, 108th Cong., 2nd Sess. (December 17, 2004).

²⁰President George W. Bush, on October 29, 2001 issued a series of Homeland Security Presidential Directives (HSPD) that would record and communicate presidential decisions about the homeland security policies of the United States.

²¹Michael Chertoff "Announces Six-Point Agenda for Department of Homeland Security" July 13, 2005, http://www.dhs.gov/xnews/releases/press_release_0703.shtm (accessed January 24, 2009).

²²George W. Bush, National Strategy for Homeland Security (Washington, D.C.: The White House, October 2007).

²³Department of Homeland Security, U.S. Department of Homeland Security Strategic Plan Fiscal Years 2008-2013, (Washington, D.C.: US Government Printing Office, September 24, 2008).

²⁴*Ibid.*, 6.

²⁵Barack Obama, "The Agenda, Homeland Security" January 22, 2009, http://www.whitehouse.gov/agenda/homeland_security/, (accessed January 24, 2009).

²⁶*Ibid.*, 1.

²⁷Department of Homeland Security, "Fact Sheet: A Day in the Life of Homeland Security," http://www.dhs.gov/xnews/releases/press_release_0185.shtm (accessed November 14, 2008).

²⁸Wikipedia, "Duct Tape Alert," available from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/duct_tape_alert (accessed November 12, 2008).

²⁹Washington Post Investigations, "Congress; \$15 Billion in Failed DHS Contracts" Washington Post, September 17, 2008.

³⁰Flynn, Stephen, *The Edge of Disaster*, (New York, Random House, 2007), 239.

³¹Michael J. Sniffen, "Homeland Security Drops Mining Tool," *The Washington Post*, September 6, 2007.

³²Electronic Privacy Information Center, "United States Visitor and Immigrant Status Indicator Technology (US-VISIT)," <http://www.epic.org/privacy/us-visit> (accessed December 8, 2008).

³³U.S. Government Accounting Office, "Financial Management: Department of Homeland Security Faces Significant Financial Management Challenges," <http://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-04-774> (accessed January 10, 2007).

³⁴UAE-The Official Web Site, "About NCEMA," <http://www.cemc.ae/subindex.aspx?Id=104&Lid=1> (accessed November 12, 2008).

