

though some may have been associated with the September 11 hijackers. He also cited the fact that there are 650,000 law enforcement officers nationwide and they should be viewed by the federal intelligence and law enforcement agencies as force-multipliers. However, this can only happen if information flows in both directions. The Police Commissioner also testified that, domestically, the local police force is the “biggest collector” of information, not the federal government. To illustrate his point that information must flow in both directions, he added, “we can tell when people move from one cave to another in Afghanistan, but we can’t tell when they move from one row house to another in Baltimore.”

By contrast, former FBI Director Louis Freeh testified that information sharing with federal, state and local authorities was a priority for the FBI. In his Joint Inquiry testimony on October 8, 2002, he said: [page 93]

We doubled and tripled the number of Joint Terrorism Task Forces [JTTFs] around the United States so we could multiply our forces and coordinate intelligence and counterterrorism operations with the FBI's federal, state, and local law enforcement partners. Thirty-four of these JTTFs were in operation by 2001. . . . We were also tasked to set up the National Domestic Preparedness Office to counter terrorist threats and to enhance homeland security.

Mr. Freeh added that counterterrorism was such a high priority that the FBI instituted a national threat warning system in order to disseminate terrorism related information to state and local authorities around the country and organized national, regional and local practice exercises to help the country prepare for terrorist attacks.

Further, FBI Director Mueller explained in his October 17, 2002 testimony before the Joint Inquiry the changes that had been made in this regard by the FBI since September 11, and added that:

As a result of these initiatives and despite some of the testimony that this [Inquiry] has heard, we have received numerous letters of support and gratitude from state and local officials and most particularly from the International Association of Chiefs of Police [IACP]. . . . Our agents must work closely with our local and state law enforcement partners. . . . I don't believe that [the testimony of the Baltimore Police Commissioner] is representative of the feeling in the field. Does his testimony surprise me? I would say probably not. But I will tell you every time that I have . . .