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Is the U.S. prepared to deal with future terrorist attacks on American soil? Gary Hart offered his appraisal to the Global Executive Forum, and it was not an optimistic one, given the state of security in the country today.

The alarm was first sounded on Sept. 15, 1999, when the U.S. Commission on National Security in the 21st Century, cochaired by Hart and Warren Rudman, issued the first of three reports, "New World Coming." Hart summarized the conclusions of this report.

"We said America will become increasingly vulnerable to terrorist attacks using weapons of mass destruction; America's military superiority will not necessarily protect the country; Americans will lose their lives on American soil, possibly in large numbers."

The alarm got scant notice before Sept. 11, 2001, but a lot of attention afterwards as it was predictive of the attacks that resulted in the loss of 3,000 lives.

The second report, issued April 2000, laid out the framework for a new national security policy post-Cold War and through 2025. The third report was published Jan. 31, 2001 and delivered to President Bush days after he entered office. Hart and other members of the commission briefed Secretary of State Colin Powell, Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, and National Security Advisor Condoleeza Rice, urging action on the commission's 50 recommendations.

So what has changed?

"The bottom line is that we're not a lot more secure today than we were six months ago. And for that, shame on our leaders and shame on us," said Hart.

"Prevention and response to a terrorist attack isn't just a federal obligation; it's also a state and city obligation," he added, challenging Forum members and guests to learn what, if any, new security measures have been put in place by their local governments.

The commission uncovered weaknesses in the national government's structure that hinder its effectiveness in coordinating matters related to domestic security. "There are 45 or more pieces of the national government related to the security of this homeland, and all of them are scattered throughout the federal bureaucracy." President Bush took a step in the right direction when on Oct. 8, 2001, he created the Office of Homeland Security and appointed Tom Ridge as director.

But, said Hart, more steps need to be taken, and Ridge needs to be given statutory authority that will allow him to command the arms of government that are so vital to homeland security, such as the coast guard, border control and customs.

"This country isn't going to be secure until we reorganize it the way we did after the end of World War II to prepare to defend ourselves in this new age."
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A new age

In the last two decades, four revolutions have crept up on the world, one feeding on the other and creating new divisions among people and nations.

Globalization was the first revolution. "Almost overnight, without anybody planning it, the global marketplaces were beginning to integrate: finance, commerce, all of it." At the same time, the information technology revolution was burgeoning, aiding globalization by making national borders irrelevant in the conduct of business.

"These two revolutions have led to the third and fourth revolutions, one of which is political. "Nation states, which haven't existed forever, are beginning to erode. People in Europe and Asia and elsewhere have begun to identify with their ethnic nationality more than their geographic nationality, and they want to resurrect old customs and old traditions."

Along with customs and traditions, old grievances get dug up, which is what happened between the Serbs and Croatians among others. "As nations were losing control of their national economics to globalization, they were also losing control of their politics to ethnic nationalism and fundamentalism."

Ethnic groups didn't have armies, so they resorted to guerilla warfare. "This led to the fourth revolution, the nature of conflict. From nation state wars between armies to guerilla warfare, it is a natural progression to terrorism." The various ethnic groups do have one thing in common, however: resentment of the United States.

What now?

As devastating as the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon were, Hart believes the worst is yet to come. We're going to get hit again, he said, possibly in different ways. A biological hit tops the list in the commission's ranking of the threats, followed by chemical, nuclear and cyber.

"We're worried about that fourth one because we don't hear much about it."

The cyber threat pertains to the country's critical infrastructure, its energy, financial and transportation systems. They're all interrelated by computers and potentially vulnerable to a determined hacker. Imagine, said Hart, the loss of lives and the chaos that would result if the air traffic control system on the eastern seaboard were violated at 5:00 o'clock on a Friday night.

In two separate scenarios, Hart described what a terrorist attack might look like.

**Biological** - "Twenty terrorists inject themselves with smallpox and fan out into every public forum they can get into, breathing heavily all the way. By the time their symptoms show up in two to three weeks, they will have infected thousands of other people, who in turn will infect tens of thousand of others."

**Nuclear** - "A nuclear device can be concealed in a shipping container originating in a foreign port and tagged for Chicago, via the Port of Long Beach. Ten to 15 thousand containers a day come through the Port of Long Beach and only one to two percent is inspected by the Coast Guard or Customs. The device, which has a global positioning trigger on it, is put on a train to Chicago and somebody somewhere sets it off, devastating a good part of Chicago," said Hart.
"We are no more ready for that today than we were six months ago. The coast guard, border patrol and customs service still do not have a common database or a common communication system. It's a scandal."

Q & A

Since Sept. 11, there haven't been any more attacks. Why do you think this is? Have we been successful in disrupting terrorists' plans?

HART: I do think, in spite of my grim talk, that our quick response to the events of last September did disrupt at least parts of the al-Qaeda network sufficiently to have prevented any quick follow-on attacks and put the leadership on the run.

At what cost and in what order do we prioritize security needs in relation to other national policy agenda items, such as the environment, such as auto safety?

HART: The greatest power in the history of the world doesn't have to decide between auto safety and homeland security, or the environment and homeland security. It's not either/or. We will have to spend more money, but the threat won't be solved just by throwing more money at it. We have to think differently.

How do we understand and evaluate the policy decisions we've made that are creating the resentments you talked about?

HART: First of all, analyze the resentment. Some of it is real and some of it is hypocritical. Egypt is second on the list of countries that receive U.S. assistance, but they complain that we don't understand the Arab world, that all we care about is Israel. They say the money has gone into the wrong pockets, the wrong project, and so on. Some of the Egyptians who complain the loudest have kids at Harvard or Berkeley, have second or third homes in Vail. They resent that the kids are watching Schwarzeneger movies, wearing their ball caps backward, eating at McDonald's. And they hate us for it.

The answer lies in addressing the problems of refugees, beginning in Palestine and working outward, and giving particularly young people hope in concrete terms. But we're up against real political barriers here and we can only do so much.

It seems we're the only ones supporting Israel. If the rest of the world is not empathetic with what we're trying to do, how do we reposition it?

HART: The UK is supporting us in this and we get support from the NATO countries in varying degrees. Basically, they share our values, they share our agenda, but they expect us to lead. Leadership means, among other things; defining the agenda, finding and allocating the resources, directing those resources at the objective, and building a consensus and coalition.

Does Iraq have weapons of mass destruction and do they have the capability of delivering them in some form or other?

HART: There's no doubt in my mind that if Saddam Hussein had a missile capable of delivering a warhead and they began to fuel that missile, we would knock it out. We're not going to wait till they fire and then respond. You can't launch an intercontinental missile without a warning, so the idea of a surprise attack, either by them or by us, doesn't exist. An invasion of Iraq is the only practical way to take out
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Saddam. But my guess is that this would involve 10,000 American casualties and probably 250,000 Iraqi casualties, a lot of them civilians.

I would urge you not to watch this like a ping-pong match, but to ask your members of Congress for their views. Don't let them get by with saying, "I want to get rid of Saddam." How? At what cost? Those are questions citizens should ask, particularly if you've got a son between 18 and 25.

A national security strategy for the next 25 years

The U.S. Commission on National Security in the 21st Century was created July 1998 by President Clinton and charged with a three-pronged mandate:

- describe the world emerging in the first quarter of the 21st century;
- design a national security strategy appropriate to that world;
- propose necessary changes to the national security structure in order to implement that strategy effectively.

With two-and-a-half-years to fulfill its mandate, the commission retained a permanent staff of 50-75 experts, and sent research teams to some 25 different countries in Europe, Asia, Latin America and Africa.

"While most analyses of national security have focused on U.S. military capabilities and on our diplomatic efforts, we looked at things a bit differently," explained Gary Hart, who co-chaired the commission.

"We think that technological advances, the education of America's youth, and commercial relationships are all crucial to America's security. When we looked at alternative futures for the United States and the world through 2025, we explicitly considered these nontraditional components.

The commission issued its reports in three phases. The most recent, "Road Map for National Security: Imperative for Change" addresses a broad range of issues, from securing the national homeland to redesigning government institutions and examining human requirements for national security, including the role of Congress.

To review all the reports, log on to www.nssg.gov.

Government, education

Following are two of the commission's 50 recommendations to ensure the continued status of the U.S. as a superpower:
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- Reorganize the government to respond to new internal and external threats in the post-Cold War period. This would apply to the departments of State, Defense and the National Security Council. Congress, too, needs to be reorganized, because its committee structure stems from the Cold War.
- Recapitalize the nation's investment in education, particularly science education. "America's ability in learning about science is going down and we've got to boost that up, and we also have to attract the best people to teach science in our public schools."