

December 16, 2009
Contact: DHS Press Office, (202) 282-8010

**TRANSCRIPT OF SECRETARY NAPOLITANO'S REMARKS AT THE
WOMEN'S FOREIGN POLICY GROUP "WOMEN IN POWER" LUNCHEON**

MS. BUMILLER: Secretary Janet Napolitano.

[Applause]

SECRETARY NAPOLITANO: Well, thank you, Elizabeth. And it's wonderful to be here with you today. I'm going to keep my prepared remarks somewhat brief so that we have lots of time for questions.

You know, I'm often asked – when I say I'm going to speak briefly, somebody will look at me and they'll say, you know, "Well, Janet, you know, you've been in politics and you are a lawyer. So what exactly does 'briefly' mean to you?" And I love to repeat a story told to me by then-Governor of Arkansas Mike Huckabee about the writing teacher at the University of Arkansas who said he would give the highest grade to the student who could write the shortest story containing four fundamental elements of fiction. And the four fundamental elements were described as: religion, royalty, sex, and mystery. Religion, royalty, sex, and mystery.

And the highest grade went to the following story: "Oh God,' said the queen. 'I'm pregnant and I don't know who did it.'"

[Laughter.]

SECRETARY NAPOLITANO: You all can use that, too. I love that story.

Anyway, when President Obama asked me to lead the Department of Homeland Security, one of the things I went to look at, well, what is the enterprise of homeland security? What all does it entail? I was, of course, as the Governor of Arizona, familiar with the immigration and border security aspects. I was familiar with FEMA. But what were some of the other elements?

And it is, as you know, an amalgam of 22 separate agencies. It is the third largest department of the federal government now, with 230,000, roughly, employees, plus another quarter of a million

contractor employees. So it is a huge enterprise. And when you boil it down, it really has, in my view, five major mission areas.

One is, of course, the counterterrorism mission. That's why we were formed. We were formed in the wake of 9/11 out of the desire by the Congress to have one placed seated within the federal government where lots of different entities that had certain points in the intelligence process could be located.

The second, of course, is securing of the borders of the United States. And it's not just the land borders, but the air and sea borders as well. Hence, TSA and all of the elements that go into securing the air environment. Hence the Coast Guard, which is part of the department and a very important part indeed.

A third major mission area is the enforcement of the nation's immigration laws while we craft a pragmatic and fair process and legislation moving forward on immigration that really positions the country for the 21st century where immigration is concerned.

The fourth area, and I've just now begun talking about it as its own area, is the cybersecurity area. This is quickly evolving. It is different today than it was yesterday. If we're even talking at it in this audience – I'm looking around – we're probably already too old because it is a very young area. But under the President's cyber review, the department is the lead operational entity for securing the civilian side of government, the dot gov sites, protecting them from attack. But also, this is a critical part of our protection of the homeland and our intersection with the private sector and the protection of them from attack because 85 percent or so of the nation's infrastructure is in fact in private hands.

And then the fifth major mission area is the mitigation, preparation for response to disasters, primarily natural disasters of any type. We didn't have a major hurricane this year, but we had ice storms and earthquakes and forest fires, and in the fall, a tsunami in American Samoa.

So that in a nutshell – I can talk about administratively we are working on creating one department out of many. We call that the One DHS mission. I can talk about how we are strengthening our science and technology directorate because I think technology is the way forward in a lot of the elements that we deal with. I can talk about our increasing use of partnerships – international, state, local, tribal, territorial. But I wanted to give you that brief overview because today what I really want to focus on is the terrorism part of the department.

And this is an area, of course, as I mentioned, that was the genesis of the department. And it is an area in which we deal both internationally and within the country, domestically, because homeland security does not begin at the physical borders of the United States. The threats or the threat streams that connect into the United States oftentimes emanate not only overseas, but the information about them emanates from overseas as well.

So many people think because of the name, in part, homeland security, that we are a domestic agency. We are in fact a large department that straddles, and that by our very existence recognizes that in this day and age, terrorism itself is a globalized phenomenon that comes home to roost right here.

Now, earlier this month President Obama spoke at West Point to outline our strategy to disrupt and dismantle the forces – radical extremism in Afghanistan and Pakistan – in order to prevent threats to the United States. And I wanted to just pause a moment here because while that conflict is occurring overseas, thousands of miles away, and while the men and women who will fight in that conflict will be deployed thousands of miles away, one of the major reasons, if not the major reason, they are being so deployed is because of safety right here in the homeland, the transnational nature of what is emanating to the world and to the United States out of the AfPak arena.

It's a complex set of threats and circumstances, you know, more complicated than any short luncheon speech can entail. It involves military issues. It involves diplomatic issues. It involves cultural issues. It involves development issues. But the plain fact of the matter is that we have seen that threat, and I have seen those threats, ping more frequently over the course of the last year.

And one of the developments that has occurred or that we have actually been able now to – it may have been happening and we didn't know about it; it may have been under the radar – but one of the developments, unhappy ones, that has occurred is that we now have American citizens, people raised here, who have become radicalized to the extent of violence, who now leave the United States, travel to that area, to the camps, learn trade craft, become – this is a word I never used before I moved here – they become operationalized –

[Laughter.]

SECRETARY NAPOLITANO: But it's a word that encapsulates exactly what is happening – and then return to the United States. Or they may receive training abroad and stay abroad because their major concern is abroad. An example of that, perhaps, are some of the young Somalis, Somali-Americans, who have left and gone to join Al-Shabaab and fight in that conflict.

But recent events, I think, demonstrate that we can't simply sit comfortably at home and talk about terrorism as if it is something that happens overseas, or that it is about people from other countries who somehow enter the United States. We have to recognize that the paradigm has shifted somewhat, and that we have to deal not only with the former but with the latter.

For example, recently we saw the arrest and indictment of an individual, Najibullah Zazi. He's been charged with conspiracy to carry out bomb attacks in the United States. He is reported to – these are allegations, but according to the allegations, he went to the Afghanistan/Pakistan theater to receive training, then returned home.

So what does that mean for us? Well, one of the things it means is that we have to put a premium on sharing intelligence and information, not just among federal departments – and that has its own challenges sometimes – but also we need to make sure that we can effectively exchange or share information across the nation to state, to local, to tribal, to territorial, law enforcement and others.

So that is our job, in a way, because you have to think – we have to think in our shop, well, what is the value added that we bring to the counterterrorism mission? You know, you have the international intelligence agencies that already help inform our position in the world and diplomatically and militarily. You have the FBI, which is focused through joint terrorism task forces on actual cases and investigations.

So what does DHS bring to this issue? And the answer is that what we bring to it is not only the ability to gather or collect the information about threat streams – and I'm using a precise phraseology here; threat streams, not cases, threat streams – but also then to transform them into products that can be shared across the country at various levels of security classification, from TSSCI all the way down to unclassified.

And the way we are doing that is by supporting something called fusion centers, where we are supporting – there are 72 of them in the country now. They are federal/state/local law enforcement colocated – more importantly, their databases are colocated – so that information can be shared and gathered and sent back here, and done so in a very pragmatic way.

For instance, if you have an individual that you are investigating, and the threat stream is that explosive devices are going to be made, and they are going to be explosive devices that use hydrogen peroxide and acetone as two of their major building blocks, then at the local level you can check with your beauty supply sellers and ask them to be on the lookout for anybody making unusual purchases and large amounts of hydrogen peroxide.

That is the kind of information-sharing architecture that we are building for the safety and security of the United States. It's the architecture that includes something called the SARS initiative. SARS stands for suspicious activity reports. We have to be careful. We don't want to turn this into a nation of tattletellers or Big Brother or whatever you want to use. But we also want to make sure that everybody in the country understands that our security is a shared responsibility. And properly collected and manifested and communicated, eyes and ears on the ground, either law enforcement or otherwise, collected, analyzed, and so forth can overall improve the security of the nation.

So that initiative, SARS, we've piloted in several major cities now. It has been extraordinarily successful, and will be, along with the fusion centers, part and parcel of how we move forward on the counterterrorism front and on the information-sharing front moving forward. And that is, as I said earlier, part of our value added to the security enterprise of the United States.

One thing I want to pause on, and then I'll conclude, and that is this. Even as we do all of this work, I think we have to be very, very careful that we are not engaging in profiling. There's a big

difference between having an intelligence-based case or investigation or initiative or threat stream versus one that is a racial profile, a religious profile, et cetera. And also, we need to make sure that in this huge, diverse, and wonderful country of ours, we don't have populations that are feeling like they're under siege because they happen to be from a minority group or a particular religious group.

And so we have, through our Office of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties, really worked to expand outreach. And we're working with nonprofits and other groups throughout the country to really reach out and help understand that all of this is a shared responsibility, but it's not a shared burden.

Let me close there, and just add one more point. And that is, you know, this is a great big department. It's got many excellent men and women. One of the pleasures of leaving Arizona and coming to Washington, D.C. – it was 72 in Phoenix today, by the way – but one of the pleasures about jumping into the federal level, at this level, was the men and women that are at DHS.

But I don't care how excellent these men and women are or how they do their job. No one federal department can now protect the security enterprise of the United States. It is individual. It is family. It is community. And the notion of shared responsibility, which I think heretofore has not been discussed or made a part of a core component of our own safety, now indeed needs to be one.

Thank you very much.

[Applause]

MS. BUMILLER: Okay. I am now going to lead off the questioning. I have two questions of my own, real quickly, and then I have a big stack of questions from the audience that have been selected by people at the head table. So don't blame – not me.

The first question I want to ask is about – you alluded to it earlier – immigration. And as you know, President Obama has said he thinks he can get immigration reform through Congress next year. But obviously, you still have a lot of problems within your own ranks, especially among conservative Democrats up for reelection on 2010. So what has changed on the ground since the Bush administration tried this in its second term, since 2006/2007?

SECRETARY NAPOLITANO: Well, I think there are a couple of changes. One is the Southwest branch has really changed dramatically. And I've been working border and border crime-related issues since 1993, when I became the United States Attorney for Arizona. But every benchmark that Congress has set in terms of physical infrastructure, manpower, and all the rest, have all been met. And you see it in the numbers and how that's going down.

The second thing that's changed is we have a much more aggressive interior enforcement initiative where immigration violations are concerned, particularly at the worksite.

But the third thing, I think, that has changed now is – and they just didn't have this luxury in 2007 the last time they tried to pass immigration – and that is we have now worked through, operationally, the nuts and bolts of really what it would take to bring millions of people – estimates vary; 9 million, 12 million, whatever – out of the shadows, get them registered, get their biometrics, get them to pay a sanction of some sort and commit to learn English. Make sure that they've paid their taxes. And then be able to, over the course of time, look at not just giving them temporary legal status but putting them on a – giving them the right to earn their citizenship in our country.

So the nuts and bolts have been worked out. Now, here's the other thing, and then I'll get off this. The President has made this a commitment. A number of members of the Cabinet are now working on immigration. Myself, Ken Salazar, Hilda Solis, Tom Vilsack, Gary Locke, are meeting regularly on this, along with members of the President's staff. Members of the Senate and the key committees are committed to dropping a bill in early 2010. The Senate leadership has said, we need to take this up. It's not as if the Congress is unfamiliar with the issues here, and it's not as if they don't understand, on a bipartisan way, that we simply cannot continue ad infinitum with the system that we have. It just doesn't position us well, and it's not – it's just not right for a number of law enforcement reasons, security reasons, and economic reasons.

And so we will be ready to go in 2010. And while, you know, everything's so easy in D.C. and in the Congress.

[Laughter.]

SECRETARY NAPOLITANO: But this is one of the major areas that I think will be taken up.

MS. BUMILLER: Okay. Now, DHS oversees the Secret Service. You know where this is about to go. Right? And because we haven't heard from you publicly on this. And so my question to you is: How did the Salahis get into the White House? How did that happen? And as you may have seen today, there's another couple who seems to have gotten into a party who were not on the invitation list.

So I guess the question is: How did it happen? And secondly, how common are these security breaches, and what will change as a result?

SECRETARY NAPOLITANO: Well, I think the second one is actually a misreporting. But look. I think the Director of the Secret Service was very up-front and said, this should never have happened, obviously. And there are several things that have occurred as a result.

One, of course, appropriate personnel action is underway. Secondly, really re-looking at training procedures, all of the things – when you have an obvious – a mistake, but particularly one as obvious as this one, you need to go back and say, what happened here, really focus people on training mission and the like. The third is looking at and bringing in some others who are not active duty right now but who have experience in the protection area to also assist, and making sure we're taking a fresh and rigorous look.

It is true that from time to time there are unauthorized persons. I think it's important to say that from a physical safety standpoint, the individuals – the President, the First Lady, and so forth – were never at risk. But nonetheless, this was something that – it was a wakeup call for the Secret Service, and they are doing a lot of work now to make sure it doesn't happen again.

MS. BUMILLER: So long lines going into the Christmas parties at the White House, I would gather?

SECRETARY NAPOLITANO: I think – my count is that now if you go into one of the Christmas parties, it's three ID checks.

MS. BUMILLER: All right. Here's a question from a fellow journalist from the audience. Will the department pursue criminal action against the blogger who leaked the TSA screening manual procedures?

SECRETARY NAPOLITANO: It wasn't a blogger and it wasn't a leak, so the answer is no, not in that sense. Here's what happened. We put out things for bid, and one of the things we're always encouraged to do is to make some of those materials public so that lots of people can compete. You don't just get the same old bidders all the time because they have the inside track.

And what happened here was that a contractor posted – who was involved in a bid – posted part of a manual and didn't properly redact some of it. And that is the TSA thing. We have gone line by line, you know, what was released versus – it was actually a six-version-old manual, but nonetheless, gone line by line. We have mitigated any area where there could even possibly be an infringement on security procedures. And we have instituted department-wide, again, refreshers on how properly to redact.

I mean, but I'm looking around this room and I'm thinking, some of you are nodding like your own agencies or institutions have similar issues where – or you yourself have had an issue where you thought you had erased something and you hadn't really. And the NSA has procedures by which we should properly be doing this. They were not followed in this instance. In addition, personnel actions are underway.

MS. BUMILLER: Okay. Another one. Please comment on the status of the 100 percent cargo scanning requirement. How can workability be reconciled with the bumper sticker, "I'm for 100 percent scanning"?

SECRETARY NAPOLITANO: Yes. Well, let me define – what we're talking about is basically inspection of every container that leaves for the United States before it leaves for the United States. And these are millions of containers a year. And that means you have to have international agreements at around 700 ports. You have to have the geography of every port a certain way so that every container at every port goes through one area. So when you actually get to know this field,

you understand that the bumper sticker and reality don't match because it turns out that it doesn't add to your security at all. There are other things that are much better done.

And so I've been pretty up-front. I was up-front in my confirmation hearing and I'm up-front now that that needs to be retooled and rethought. And we need to be doing our inspections and those sorts of things on a risk-based basis as opposed to something that physically can't be done, would be very expensive to do, interfere with commerce, and doesn't add to our security.

[Applause]

SECRETARY NAPOLITANO: Write your congressman.

MS. BUMILLER: Okay. And in the area of commerce, with economic recovery as the top issue for the administration, how do you view DHS's role in facilitating commerce with our largest trading partner, Canada?

SECRETARY NAPOLITANO: Well, one of the things that we want to have is a – our land borders, Canada and Mexico, those are our two largest trading partners, really. And those need to be – I always call them 21st century borders. You need to be able to get lots of cargo back and forth. You need to be able to get lots of people back and forth. You need to get vehicles, tourists, and all the rest.

And so what we are doing on the Canadian border, as we are doing on the Mexican border, is really looking at how our ports are designed; the greater use of technology, which I mentioned earlier; different types of identification cards and biometrics to go back and forth; so that we don't get this historical inconsistency between security and trade and commerce. There needs security and trade and commerce. And so that's what we have set as our goals.

MS. BUMILLER: Okay. I have a travel screening question here. Will the process of going through airport security become less time-consuming and less difficult? That's the first part. And the second part is: Will we be able to keep cosmetics in our carry-on?

[Laughter.]

SECRETARY NAPOLITANO: Okay. Now, here's something really funny. Here's what I find funny. Okay? DHS, the TSA is part of our department. But the Secretary, by law, always flies in a secure plane. So I'm actually never in a commercial flight. I think it's funny, you know. Ironic.

[Laughter.]

SECRETARY NAPOLITANO: But here's the deal. We are – first of all, I want to go back to the words I used, shared responsibility. When travelers understand why it is that we ask that you take your shoes off, why it is that we ask that you limit your liquids, they are very understanding. And

what we need to do is to continue to remind people. And also the "see something, say something" rule, particularly at places like airports, train stations, bus stations, and the like.

Secondly, we are engaged in some projects researching whether the limitation on whether liquids can be lifted because there'll be ways, through screening, to identify whether and what is being brought into an aircraft. And we were hopeful to be able to announce something by the end of this year. We will not achieve that. But the research is – and that work is underway.

And thirdly, I think you'll be taking your shoes off for a while. But I actually worked a screening line the Wednesday before Thanksgiving out at Reagan Airport. It was fascinating. There are very interesting shoes that go through that airport.

[Laughter.]

SECRETARY NAPOLITANO: But, you know, the Shoe Bomber was and is a real deal. And so until we can eliminate that threat for the air environment, what we're going to be working on is just making sure that process at the airport is as convenient as possible.

MS. BUMILLER: This question is from John Bellinger of Arnold & Porter, formerly of the State Department. I didn't know he was here. Would DHS support the resettlement of some Uyghurs in the United States? This is a man who was working on Guantanamo policy in the last administration.

SECRETARY NAPOLITANO: Well, let me – I'm not going to answer that question because I don't think you can answer those questions in a non-case-specific way. We're not resettling without knowing the facts about safety and security and the rest.

But I can say this. I can say, with great confidence, that to the extent inmates at Gitmo are brought into the United States for purposes of trial, that we can handle them in a safe and secure manner, as we handle others who have been violent, are violent, are terrorists, and the like. So I'll just leave it at that.

MS. BUMILLER: That's a careful answer.

This country is looking – this is more about immigration – the country is looking to the administration to lead on immigration reform. How will you ensure that the country understands the role of openness to foreign talent as part of ensuring our national security? In other words, how well – this is similar to this question, which is: How do you distinguish between the bad guys and allowing some of the good guys to get in, like students and people on exchanges?

SECRETARY NAPOLITANO: Well, I think a couple of things. One is that the federal government – we can speak out about the value here, about that. But others need to be speaking out as well. And the fact of the matter is that we need an immigration policy that recognizes the add-on

to the talents within the United States when you have an effective way of bringing in students, and of keeping students here once they've earned their degrees and the like.

So that to me is part and parcel of what we're trying to do. And, you know, immigration, it is – as I said earlier, it is a law enforcement matter. It is a security matter because under the current law, it's very difficult sometimes to ascertain who's supposed to be in the country and who not and for how long and all the rest because we haven't set up the mechanisms by which to police that. And then an economic matter, and that talent, those skills, that have helped our economy evolve of the last hundreds of years, are things that would be beneficial now.

MS. BUMILLER: This is another question that I'm sure a lot of people have. Will you continue to keep the color-coding system? We always seem to hear about it at the airports. It's always at the same level, also.

[Laughter.]

SECRETARY NAPOLITANO: Yes. And here's what we have done there. I formed a group this summer co-chaired by William Webster, former head of the FBI, and Fran Townsend, who was President Bush's homeland security advisor. But it included a number of other experts. And I said, let's take a fresh look at the color code because it's either ignored or it is fodder for comedians. And neither one of those things is helpful.

And they have come back to me with a set of recommendations. I have gone through those recommendations, and we're now in the process of evaluating. And then it will ultimately have to go into what's called the interagency process because everybody else has – a lot of other agencies have equities in this all the way to the White House.

My philosophy, however, is that what we're really about is sharing information. In other words, it does no good for you to know the color code is orange if you don't know either what it means or what you're supposed to do or where you find out information about what you're supposed to do. And so what we want is a system for the country that provides individuals and families, in a very easy-to-understand way, what they're supposed to do under different sets of circumstances.

And that goes – it's hard – you know, it goes again back into the notion of shared responsibility. And you're not a nation that lives in fear if you're a nation that lives in information. And then the question is, okay, do the color codes add to that or subtract from that, and if so, how? So that is the philosophy that is underlying now what is being worked on as recommendations to the interagency.

MS. BUMILLER: I have a couple questions here on human rights, respecting human rights. I guess this one here is phrased well. How will you address retaining respect for individual human rights as an important part of U.S. domestic and international security policy and practice, i.e. no torture?

SECRETARY NAPOLITANO: Well, the President has said it. There will be no torture. This is not something that is going to be done. And that's our values and that's our rules. And it's pretty straightforward. So, you know, we'll go from there.

MS. BUMILLER: I guess I'd just – I'm curious because you've talked so much about the homegrown terrorism in your speech, so I wanted to add a question of my own. You've looked at this very closely, obviously, in the last number of weeks and months. What would you say is the cause of it? Is it because we are, you know, sending 30,000 more troops to Afghanistan? Why now after all these years has it become an issue, you know, eight years after the 9/11 attacks, eight years after we first went into Afghanistan?

SECRETARY NAPOLITANO: You know, there are lots of different thoughts about that. Part of it is, you know, kind of the standard – you know, the economy is down. You know, some of the economic factors out there make it – not easier; that's not the right word – but slightly more likely than during good economic times that somebody will move from being interested on a theoretical level in violence to actually moving to becoming trained and violent.

I think the growing role of the internet – and I want to be very careful here – the internet brings – it is a great tool for our time. It has enabled people and empowered people to have access to knowledge they otherwise would never have access to. But there is a dark side, and part of that dark side is it does facilitate communications and other things that I think play into this and help globalize the terrorism phenomenon.

So I think those are some of the factors that are helping to contribute to this.

MS. BUMILLER: Okay. And I have a question here about diversity. Women often bring the talents of collaboration and inclusiveness to the table. Rising in male-dominated fields – law enforcement, defense, homeland security – often forces those talents to the background. How would you advise women to maintain those qualities, particularly in homeland security, where collaboration and inclusiveness is so sorely needed? This is from –

SECRETARY NAPOLITANO: Which qualities?

MS. BUMILLER: Well, this is from the president of Women in Homeland Security, Kristina – I don't want to –

MS. TANASICHUK: Tanasichuk.

MS. BUMILLER: Thank you. Okay. And she's asking, I guess, how would you advise women to maintain qualities that are traditionally associated with women – traditionally, I say – inclusiveness and collaboration? I wouldn't necessarily agree with that.

[Laughter.]

MS. BUMILLER: But – and how would you advise women –

SECRETARY NAPOLITANO: Well, that's an interesting story.

MS. BUMILLER: Well, would you agree with that? So how would you advise women to keep their talents of collaboration and inclusiveness in these male-dominated fields where, I guess, there are sort of macho fields, like homeland security, defense –

SECRETARY NAPOLITANO: Law enforcement, that sort of thing?

MS. BUMILLER: Law enforcement. Yes.

SECRETARY NAPOLITANO: I remember in 1998 I ran for and was elected Attorney General of Arizona. And after I made my announcement, I had a phone call from a reporter who asked me whether I intended to run as a female Attorney General.

[Laughter.]

SECRETARY NAPOLITANO: And I thought that was an interesting – I said yes. But underlying it, there was a serious point, which is: Are there differences in leadership? Are there different qualities in women as leaders than there are in men? And there's a lot of literature out there about that.

And, you know, my experience has been perhaps more in these areas than others. I can't say. But once people know that you are listening, working hard, trying to make good decisions, and so forth – once, in other words, you've established your credibility – some of these other things, these profiles, as it were, diminish in importance.

And so, for example, at DHS right now, I'm a woman.

[Applause]

SECRETARY NAPOLITANO: Thank you. Thank you. But the No. 2, the deputy secretary, is a woman. And there are women in leadership ranks throughout the department. So I think I would just say – and we will continue to make decisions and lead as we have always done. I don't know how better to answer that question.

MS. BUMILLER: Okay. Well, thank you all very much. And thank you.

SECRETARY NAPOLITANO: Thank you all.

[Applause]

[End]