

Date: Sat, 13 Mar 2010 17:52:21 -0500

To: "Dr. Baruch Fischhoff - Chair, National Academy Committee on Improving Intelligence" <baruch@cmu.edu>

From: Lloyd Etheredge <lloyd.etheredge@policyscience.net>

Subject: Better anti-terrorist effectiveness measures: Illegal immigration (N=12 million) as a surrogate test

Dear Dr. Fischhoff and Colleagues:

In addition to using the war on drugs (memorandum # 16 on 9/24/2009) as a realistic testbed to evaluate the capability of national security/domestic security/law enforcement agencies to monitor and control people, physical products and/or money crossing US borders, the National Academy of Sciences also could evaluate such systems by looking at illegal immigration.

The current Wikipedia entry [citing the Pew Hispanic Center] says that, five years ago, 11.5 - 12 million foreigners were in the United States illegally. It also cites a history of numerous crack-downs and "tougher law enforcement" initiatives and estimates that tougher law enforcement has increased US costs/arrest from \$300 in 1992 to \$1700 in 2002 but adaptive strategies (e.g., shifting to more rural crossing points) have meant that the increased US expenditures were ineffective in reducing the net inflow.

The prospect of "tougher law enforcement" - that the Obama Administration suggested last week in announcing a new initiative for immigration reform - has been heard before. But without better databases, analysis methods, and theories of effectiveness the DNI and homeland security systems may not know how to operationalize "toughness" and which specific changes will improve government effectiveness, and at what cost.

Mueller's Null Hypothesis?

One interpretation of these comparisons - that the National Academy of Sciences might wish to evaluate scientifically - is Mueller's null hypothesis: I.e., the American people are not being kept secure from terrorist attack by spending \$75 billion/year. The principle cause of observed US security from terrorist attacks is that - by contrast with the illegal drug and immigration challenges - there are only a relatively small number of terrorists in jihadist death cults and, of these, most are

not attempting, with a high priority, to enter the US. (And they are being used against higher priority targets in Afghanistan, Pakistan, the Middle East, Mumbai, and other sites).

One further hypothesis that occurs to me:

1.) The ineffectiveness of US government [drug enforcement and illegal immigration] databases and analytic methods and other programs to secure US borders against the unwanted, substantial, transit of people, physical products, and money imply that even the current \$75 billion/year system will not be effective if it must face growing challenges of anti-terrorism protection. Huge N's of 9-5 government employees, with college degrees and advanced foreign language/ cultural statistical training, sitting at computer screens and analyzing all of the cell telephone, Internet, and bank transaction databases in the world may not solve a growing problem. Thus, for national security, political prevention must work, and [if the National Academy of Sciences Report can evaluate the intelligence and analysis methods required] it probably is more cost-effective.

I will look forward to reading your views -

Lloyd Etheredge

Dr. Lloyd S. Etheredge - Director
Government Learning Project
Policy Sciences Center Inc.
127 Wall St., Room 322 - Box 208215
New Haven, CT 06520-8215
URL: www.policyscience.net
301-365-5241 (v); lloyd.etheredge@policyscience.net (email)