**Module 3 - Case**

**THE U.S. INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY RELATIONSHIPS WITH LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES**

**Assignment Overview**

**Why Can’t We Just Talk?**

Since the 9/11 attacks, the demands placed on officers have evolved to include more complex criminal activity, upswings in multi-jurisdictional criminal matters, and an increased realization that terrorist activity is not confined by neat boundaries on a map. As a September 2005 report by the Department of Justice’s Bureau of Justice Assistance noted, “a critical lesson taken from the tragedy of September 11, 2001, is that intelligence is everyone’s job,” and “everyone” now includes not only analysts within the federal government but also law enforcement officers hailing from the nation’s largest cities to its smallest towns and rural areas.

Indeed, the need for new and better ways to develop and share law enforcement intelligence was among the first realizations in the immediate wake of the attacks.

\*“In my mind, it [information sharing] comes down to two things,” FBI Director Robert Mueller stated later in Fall 2001. “First, giving you [local law enforcement] the information you need to make judgments about protecting your communities. And second, capitalizing on the ‘force multiplier’ effect that comes when we work together.”

The reality has been much different. As Senator Grassley commented in the wake of the Boston Marathon bombings, “Law enforcement and intelligence agencies tell conflicting stories. Bureaucracies are gearing up to do battle over who dropped the ball. They’re preparing their defenses. They’re leaking bits and pieces of information favorable to themselves.”

This situation is described well as the Intelligence Dilemma: “There are only two outcomes: an operational success and an intelligence failure.”

\*Mueller, R. (2001). *Address to the 108th Annual Conference of the International Association of Chiefs of Police*. Retrieved from [*http://www.fbi.gov/news/speeches/law-enforcement-cooperation-in-defeating-terrorism*](http://www.fbi.gov/news/speeches/law-enforcement-cooperation-in-defeating-terrorism)

**Case Assignment**

Look at a high profile case that involved local law enforcement and the intelligence community. Some choices you might want to look at include the Boston Marathon Bombing in April 2013, the Ft. Hood shootings in November 2009, the September 11, 2001, attacks on New York and Washington, the foiled Najibullah Zazi's plot to bomb the New York subways (No information seems to have been shared with local LE), or another case of your choosing. Indicate which case you are looking at, and provide a link to the story if needed.

1. Summarize the important points of the case, including when the IC seemed to have information that could have been shared, and which agency had the information.
2. Identify 3 reasons that the IC failed to share information. Indicate whether each is an admission of the IC, a charge made by the LE community (or another non-LE part of government), or a justified opinion on your part.
3. From the perspective of the LE community, rebut the 3 reasons, and summarize how local LE could have re-positioned its efforts to stop the attack.
4. Evaluate whether repositioning LE assets as a result of information sharing would have impacted the final outcome, and whether it would have been better to share information.
5. Properly cite your quotations that you use to support your statements.

**Assignment Expectations**

Assignments should be at least four pages double-spaced, not counting the cover or reference page. Paper format: (a) Cover page, (b) Header, (c) Body. Submit your assignment by the last day of this module.

* Relevance—All content is connected to the question.
* Precision—Specific question is addressed. Statements, facts, and statistics are specific and accurate.
* Depth of discussion—Present and integrate points that lead to deeper issues.
* Breadth—Multiple perspectives and references, multiple issues/factors considered.
* Evidence—Points are well-supported with facts, statistics and references.
* Logic—Presented discussion makes sense; conclusions are logically supported by premises, statements, or factual information.
* Clarity—Writing is concise, understandable, and contains sufficient detail or examples.
* Objectivity—Avoids use of first person and subjective bias.
* References—Sources are listed at the end of the paper (APA style preferred).