

Such information-hoarding thus goes deeper than simply being “policy,” often reaching the level of simple reflex. For instance, the FBI for years monopolized the processing of information obtained from surveillance under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA) – even though it fell hopelessly behind in processing FISA “raw data” and accumulated vast backlogs of untranslated tapes that were of no use to anyone. Thus also does the NSA insist that only *its* employees can be trusted with handling “raw” signals intelligence (SIGINT) data under the standards prescribed by U.S. Signals Intelligence Directive (USSID) 18. And the CIA’s Directorate of Operations usually refuses even to let *CIA analysts* see its own operational cable traffic.

Reading the DCI’s authority to protect intelligence “sources and methods” as barring the disclosure of source information not simply to the public or to U.S. adversaries but also to *anyone else in the U.S. Intelligence Community*, the CIA has proven unwilling to permit others a window upon the context that source information can occasionally provide. CIA information-hoarding is hardly a problem unique to the al-Mihdhar and al-Hazmi story. The CIA also refused requests by U.S. Navy intelligence officers to turn over highly relevant information about the source of an intelligence warning that might have prompted the Navy to direct the *USS Cole* away from Yemen in October 2000.

As the Senate and House Intelligence Committees have seen repeatedly, the Intelligence Community shares information poorly and reluctantly, at best. Especially since September 11, Community representatives have assured us on innumerable occasions that their coordination and information-sharing problems have been fixed: it has become their mantra that such cooperation is now “seamless” and “unprecedented.” Even today, however, these sharing