



**Press Conference with Congressman Lee H. Hamilton & Governor Thomas H. Kean**

**Bipartisan Policy Center – State of Intelligence Reform Conference**

**Willard InterContinental Washington  
Washington, DC**

**April 6, 2010**

---

*Video of this event is available online at [www.dni.gov/video](http://www.dni.gov/video).*

GOVERNOR THOMAS KEAN: Okay. You've been to the conference, most of you. We're delighted, I think – Lee and I just talking about the number of very able people who are going to get here to exchange views. We hope it's been helpful. And Lee and I would be glad to answer any questions that you may have.

QUESTION: DNI Blair said that there are still gaps which were exposed by the Flight 253 incident. Just wondering your assessment on how the intelligence community has been reformed. What other gaps still need to be filled? And if the recent aviation security measures are enough – that have been put in place now.

CONGRESSMAN LEE HAMILTON: I don't know what Director Blair had in mind. When you think of intelligence, you think of two things, basically. One is collection and the other is analysis. Our collection capabilities are just extraordinary. I mean they are amazingly good. And from my point of view, at least, when you're speaking of gaps, it's not so much in the collection side – it is to some extent – but it is much more on the analytical side.

Every intelligence agency in this town, now, is seeking highly trained analysts and the analyst drives policy in many respects because what they determine is what the policymakers will pay attention to and will build policy upon. So my answer would be the gap still exists in – on the analysis side.

Some gaps on the intelligence side, for example, human intelligence is clearly not as strong as we would like it to be – has not been for many, many years. It's a very, very tough business – human intelligence.

GOVERNOR KEAN: Just – he emphasized again what has been emphasized over and over again for five years now and that is information sharing. It's much better, but he emphasized the fact, still, a lot of it stays within these agencies and it's not strong, yet, as it should be and he's working on it, he says, every day.

And that's great because, I think from the time we looked in that report, information sharing is just about number one – if all these agencies don't have the information, can't put it together, then – well, it could go anywhere, but that's a very important gap that still needs to be worked on.

QUESTION: Given your expertise, what do you think the attack of the future is going to look like in the United States?

CONGRESSMAN HAMILTON: I'm sorry, if what'll happen?

QUESTION: What do you believe the attack of the future may look like in the United States? Is Christmas Day a good example of how the threat is evolving?

CONGRESSMAN HAMILTON: It's future –

GOVERNOR KEAN: What's the next attack going to look like? I don't think we can answer that very intelligently, but – because nobody knows – but you've got two kinds of attacks. One is the Christmas Day bomber kind of thing, which is an individual, probably backed by an organization, but an individual trying to do individual damage.

And then you have the 9/11-kind of thing, a massive plot to try and hurt a lot of people. In the worst kind of circumstances, it could involve biological or chemical or nuclear weapons. And we don't know. Al-Qaida, in the past, has tried to do something big, but now, it's morphed into all these different organizations around the world and we may get hit with these small suicide bombers or whatever.

CONGRESSMAN HAMILTON: I think most of us feel that the efforts we have made to degrade al-Qaida and the other extremist groups have been quite successful. And therefore, they do not have the capabilities to pull off a 9/11, in all likelihood. But as Tom says, there's a lot of guesswork here.

I think the major concerns of the intelligence community today are the lone wolf and more and more, homegrown terrorism. That involves the FBI more than it does the CIA, but of course, they have to work together on that. So what is the most likely source of attack? We have to be prepared against all kinds of attacks, obviously. But more and more, the focus of the intelligence community is coming on the small group, homegrown. And we do know that al-Qaida is recruiting Americans, people who speak English well.

QUESTION: On the DNI's authorities, you heard the previous DNI say he needs more authority, suggested a department of intelligence, a tenured position. You heard the current director it wasn't about authority, it was about getting support. And then you also heard other panelists make comments about it's too personality driven and that could be its downfall. How do you evaluate the DNI now and are there any changes you'd recommend?

GOVERNOR KEAN: First of all, personality's always going to be important. There always is in government. I mean, when you have to do things together, the idea of people that get along well together is enormously important. We got along very well together in the 9/11 Commission. If we

hadn't as individuals, we probably couldn't have done the job. The same is true of people at any level of government.

But having said that, a strong DNI is, I believe, and I think Lee does also, absolutely essential to this whole effort. And whatever we have to do to strengthen the DNI, I think we ought to do. Now, whether it can be done internally with the authority of the president, whether there need to be some tweaks in the law, I just don't know at this point. But it's one of the questions, I think, we should examine following this conference.

CONGRESSMAN HAMILTON: I think you've got an ambiguous law and an ambiguous executive order. And particularly with regard to the law, it's a struggle for power. That is, each agency, since the law is not clear and the executive order is not as clear as we'd like it to be, will interpret the law and the executive order to their own advantage. And so you have a real turf war going on in the intelligence community.

You're not going to amend that law in the near term. It took us a long time to get a law passed. I don't see any evidence in the executive branch or the Congress that they are considering an amendment to the basic law. When you have that sort of a situation, you have – the only solution is the one Tom suggested. It has to be resolved by the president.

The president must resolve the ambiguity to the extent that it exists. And you can have a big argument about that. And he must make it, we hope, very clear that the DNI is the chief spokesman for the intelligence community, is the chief intelligence advisor in that he has the authority to get the job done. And that authority, principally, must be budget authority. There are other aspects to authority, but the key is budget.

QUESTION: Thank you. I'm sorry I've got to change my question on something I heard earlier. In light of the fact that you said that there's a growing concern with homegrown organizations or those who have entered into our shores but now are operating domestically.

Are we really looking at a situation where we're going to see far more domestic intelligence gathering than we've seen in the past? And do you two gentlemen have reservations? Where would you draw the line in terms of domestic intelligence gathering on our own citizens?

GOVERNOR KEAN: Well, I think as we become more concerned with homegrown terrorists, yes, we're going to be more focused on those groups, whether they be the – fall to the right, fall to the left, or whatever.

Having said that, one of the recommendations we made on the commission which we feel very, very strongly about, which was not implemented, is for a civil liberties commission that would be vested in the White House and with congressionally appointed – congressionally approved members and Senate confirmations.

And that group is supposed to look at every one of the proposals to strengthen internal surveillance, particularly, and judge it as to where the balance is. Are we still protecting civil liberties? Do we have to give away a little bit on civil liberties because of the nature of the threat? And if so, how

much? But we need a spokesman out there for civil liberties. We have a lot of spokesmen for security.

QUESTION: (Inaudible, off mike.)

GOVERNOR KEAN: No, and that's one of the things that bothers us because the law is there, but the White House has yet to make any appointments for the civil liberties board. As soon as they make those appointments, the board will be in effect and start functioning, but it can't function without members.

CONGRESSMAN HAMILTON: I think the integration is the key between domestic and foreign – there's a very easy and mistaken analysis that domestic is here, intelligence and foreign intelligence is there. That's in part because we have the CIA that focuses on foreign and the FBI focuses on domestic.

The fact of the matter is, with terrorism today, you have to integrate the domestic and the foreign and that's the whole purpose of the DNI and the National Counterterrorism Center, to integrate that information coming from foreign sources and domestic sources and to be able to assure that the policymaker has information from both sources that is fully integrated.

QUESTION: Congressman Hamilton, could you clarify – you said you thought that the DNI should be the chief spokesman for the intelligence community? Does that mean that in the case of incidents like the Northwest flight incident or any terrorist incidents that might take place in the future, you would have preferred to see Dir. Blair out publicly explaining what the government and what the government had done and what the government had failed to do rather than the other various officials we saw during the latest incident?

CONGRESSMAN HAMILTON: It's really the official that has the most information at the time. I would think – I would describe the DNI as a chief spokesman. I don't know that I'd say he's the only chief spokesman. There could be many possible spokesmen. Look, his major role is the chief intelligence advisor to the president. Whether or not he's the spokesman in any given situation, I think, would depend upon the facts and who has the information.

In the case of the bomber that came into Detroit – potential bomber – the people who had the information initially were the people that apprehended him. And I think they have to be the spokesman at that point in time. If you're talking about what went wrong in that case, than perhaps the DNI would be the chief spokesman. But being the chief spokesman, I don't think, means the only spokesman, in my view. It might vary from case to case.

GOVERNOR KEAN: We didn't get a question, so it's going to be statement – (chuckles) – I think Lee agrees with – it came up several times today and it just wasn't – we didn't follow up, but we still feel very, very strongly about the need to reform congressional oversight. We do not think this will work – the whole system will work – since you can't find out about it because it's secret.

But Congress has the right to ask the questions. Congress has the oversight. When you have Homeland Security reporting to over 80 committees and you have no budget authority given to the

intelligence committees, oversight is dysfunctional. And this intelligence operation and the success or lack of success of the DNI and the evaluation is too important. It's got to be done right and it will only be done right, in our opinion, when you get some kind of reform with congressional oversight.

CONGRESSMAN HAMILTON: And one of the fascinating things this afternoon – or this morning – was to hear Mike Hayden say that. He wanted stronger congressional oversight. And one or two of the other witnesses, panelists, said the same thing, in effect. The intelligence community is going to be stronger if it has strong congressional oversight. It's the only source of independent oversight of the intelligence community. And the intelligence community, as they attest better than we can attest – need it.

GOVERNOR KEAN: Just one last question, I guess somebody – one more, one more question, yes, sir.

QUESTION: You may have answered this already and I missed it – so I apologize for that – but is it this budget authority that's going to – we keep hearing these stories about different agencies keep squirreling away information and not sharing, et cetera, et cetera. Is it – do you think having budget authority is the fix for that? Because someone with budget authority can punish these agencies for withholding information?

CONGRESSMAN HAMILTON: What's the situation today in the Congress on oversight of the intelligence community? The situation today is it's in the hands of the defense subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. The defense subcommittee has a responsibility for fighting two wars and a \$700-billion budget.

They can't get to the intelligence community and give it the time and the depth of review that it needs. It has, as was mentioned today, a \$50-billion budget. So money speaks and the intelligence community understands that if they want to get something done, they go to the appropriators. That's where the money is.

Now, I'm not suggesting that other authorities are unimportant. Personnel is important. Acquisition is important. Training and education is important. But in this town, if you want to get somebody's attention, you control their budget. And that's where the key lies with regard to the authority of the DNI.

GOVERNOR KEAN: I think Lee's got it just right. (Chuckles.) Thank you all, very, very much.

(END)