On the morning of April 19, 1995, an ex-Army soldier and security guard named Timothy McVeigh parked a rented Ryder truck in front of the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building in downtown Oklahoma City. He was about to commit mass murder. Inside the vehicle was a powerful bomb made out of a deadly cocktail of agricultural fertilizer, diesel fuel, and other chemicals. McVeigh got out, locked the door, and headed towards his getaway car. He ignited one timed fuse, then another. At precisely 9:02 a.m., the bomb exploded.

Within moments, the surrounding area looked like a war zone. A third of the building had been reduced to rubble, with many floors flattened like pancakes. Dozens of cars were incinerated and more than 300 nearby buildings were damaged or destroyed.

The human toll was still more devastating: 168 souls lost, including 19 children, with several hundred more injured.

It was the worst act of homegrown terrorism in the nation's history.

Coming on the heels of the World Trade Center bombing in New York two years earlier, the media and many Americans immediately assumed that the attack was the handiwork of Middle Eastern terrorists. The FBI, meanwhile, quickly arrived at the scene and began supporting rescue efforts and investigating the facts. Beneath the pile of concrete and twisted steel were clues. And the FBI was determined to find them.

It didn’t take long. On April 20, the rear axle of the Ryder truck was located, which yielded a vehicle identification number that was traced to a body shop in Junction City, Kansas. Employees at the shop helped the FBI quickly put together a composite drawing of the man who had rented the van. Agents showed the drawing around town, and local hotel employees supplied a name: Tim McVeigh.

A quick call to the Bureau’s Criminal Justice Information Services Division in West Virginia on April 21 led to an astonishing discovery: McVeigh was already in jail. He’d been pulled over about 80 miles north of Oklahoma City by an observant Oklahoma State Trooper who noticed a missing license plate on his yellow Mercury Marquis. McVeigh had a concealed weapon and was arrested. It was just 90 minutes after the bombing.

From there, the evidence began adding up. Agents found traces of the chemicals used in the explosion on McVeigh’s clothes and a business card on which McVeigh had suspiciously scribbled, “TNT @ $5/stick, need more”. They learned about McVeigh’s extremist ideologies and his anger over the events at Waco two years earlier. They discovered that a friend of McVeigh’s named Terry Nichols helped build the bomb and that another man—Michael Fortier—was aware of the bomb plot.
The bombing was quickly solved, but the investigation turned out to be one of the most exhaustive in FBI history. No stone was left unturned to make sure every clue was found and all the culprits identified. By the time it was over, the Bureau had conducted more than 28,000 interviews, followed some 43,000 investigative leads, amassed three-and-a-half tons of evidence, and reviewed nearly a billion pieces of information.

In the end, the government that McVeigh hated and hoped to topple swiftly captured him and convincingly convicted both him and his co-conspirators.
WASHINGTON, D.C. Attorney General John Ashcroft today issued the following statement regarding the execution of Timothy McVeigh:

- "Our system of justice requires basic fairness, even-handedness and dispassionate evaluation of the evidence and the facts. These fundamental requirements are essential to protecting the Constitutional rights of every citizen and to sustaining public confidence in the administration of justice. It is my responsibility as Attorney General to promote and protect the integrity of our system of justice.

- "The ultimate sentence in the federal system of justice is the death penalty. The last death penalty imposed by the federal courts under the federal law occurred in 1963. The United States Congress and the President of the United States reinstated the death penalty by law in the 1980s and expanded capital sentencing in 1994 for 60 new and existing federal offenses, including the most violent and brutal crimes imaginable.

- "Before the death penalty can be imposed, a special hearing is required to determine whether a sentence of death is justified in the particular case. Following a conviction for a major crime eligible for the death penalty, a jury must determine whether a sentence of death is justified, based on evidence and arguments presented by each side and instructions from the court.

- "On June 2, 1997, a federal district court jury convicted Timothy McVeigh of bombing the Alfred P. Murrah Building in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma. That bombing took place on April 19, 1995. His savage crime was the largest terrorist attack within the United States in our history, killing 168 innocent people, including 19 children, injuring hundreds more, and shattering the lives of thousands of Americans.

- "On June 13, 1997, a jury recommended that Timothy McVeigh be sentenced to death for his crime, and that sentence was imposed by a federal judge on August 14, 1997. McVeigh's convictions were affirmed on direct appeal and his post-conviction challenges have been rejected by the courts, including the United States Supreme Court. The Bureau of Prisons, which has been granted discretion by the district court over the imposition of the sentence, scheduled McVeigh's execution for May 16, 2001."
"Yesterday, I was notified that documents in the McVeigh case which should have been provided to his defense attorneys during the discovery phase of the trial, were not given to Justice Department prosecutors by the FBI.

"In most criminal cases, these FBI documents would not be required to be given to defense counsel during the discovery process. However, in the McVeigh case, the government agreed to go beyond the documentation required between prosecution and defense teams. While the FBI provided volumes of documents in this case, it is now clear that the FBI failed to comply fully with that discovery agreement that was reached in 1996. Today I have asked the Inspector General of the Justice Department to investigate fully the FBI's belated delivery of documents and other evidence created during this investigation.

"When Justice Department prosecutors received the documents from the FBI, they notified District Court trial judge, Richard Matsch, and Timothy McVeigh's defense lawyers. These FBI documents were delivered to defense attorneys yesterday. The FBI is continuing to review its files to ensure full compliance with the court's discovery requirements.

"Career attorneys at the Department of Justice are confident that these documents do not create any reasonable doubt about McVeigh's guilt nor do they contradict his admission of guilt for the crime.

"Over the past twenty-four hours, I have carefully considered the facts of this situation. Timothy McVeigh, by his own admission, is guilty of an act of terrorism that stole life from 168 innocent Americans and these documents do not contradict the jury's verdict in the case.

"However, I believe the Attorney General has a more important duty than the prosecution of any single case, as painful as that may be to our nation. It is my responsibility to promote the sanctity of the rule of law and justice. It is my responsibility and duty to protect the integrity of our system of justice.

"Therefore, I have decided to postpone the execution of Timothy McVeigh for one month from this day, so that the execution would occur on June 11th in order to allow his attorneys adequate time to review these documents and to take any action they deem appropriate in that interval.

"I know many Americans will question why the execution of someone who is clearly guilty of such a heinous crime should be delayed. I understand that victims and victims' family members await justice.

"But if any questions or doubts remain about this case, it would cast a permanent cloud over justice - diminishing its value and questioning its integrity. For those victims and for our nation, I want justice to be carried out fairly. And I want a criminal justice system that has the full faith and confidence of the American people."

###
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

ATTORNEY GENERAL STATEMENT REGARDING TIMOTHY MCVEIGH

"Thirteen days ago, I directed the Bureau of Prisons to delay the scheduled execution of convicted mass murderer Timothy McVeigh until June 11. I took this step because it is my responsibility as Attorney General to promote and protect the integrity of our system of justice.

"Timothy McVeigh was convicted by a jury of bombing the Alfred P. Murrah Building in Oklahoma City on April 19, 1995, and sentenced to death. He has admitted to executing this savage crime, the largest terrorist attack within the United States in our history. Even today, he shows no remorse for killing 168 innocent people, including 19 children, injuring hundreds more, and shattering the lives of thousands of Americans.

"His execution was not delayed because of any doubt that he is guilty of this heinous crime, but because we must have a system of justice that is above question. Our system of justice requires fidelity to the rule of law to protect every American's constitutional rights. We must protect and sustain public confidence in the administration of justice. In this instance protecting that system of justice required turning over approximately 3,100 pages of documents from the FBI that should have been produced to McVeigh's attorneys during the original discovery period. Fair process dictated giving his attorneys a reasonable opportunity to review the documents and to consider their options. They have had those documents for almost two weeks, and there are still more than two weeks intervening between now and June 11.

"On Friday May 11, the same day I announced the one month delay in the execution, I directed the Federal Bureau of Investigation to issue a world-wide alert to all their offices. This world-wide alert ordered every FBI office to identify and produce any and all documents required under the broad discovery agreement in the McVeigh case. Even though 11 previous searches had been done, I wanted the FBI to make a final, thorough conclusive search to identify and produce any other potentially relevant documents in this case. Justice required that McVeigh's defense attorneys have an opportunity to review any documents that should have been produced -- even though they do not affect the outcome of this case. Our system of justice demands nothing less.

"Today, the Department of Justice completed a report that has been submitted to me documenting the FBI's comprehensive efforts over the last 13 days to identify any remaining documents. The report explains the content and the nature of the newly-produced documents, and outlines the efforts the Department has made to
allow McVeigh's attorneys a fair opportunity to review this material. Today I am releasing the complete report to the McVeigh attorneys and, consistent with the district court’s protective orders, a redacted report to the American public.

"As this report explains, the American people can have confidence that all documents now have been identified and produced, and that nothing in any of the documents undermines McVeigh's admission of the murder of 168 of his fellow American citizens, or nothing in these documents undermines the justice of his sentence.

"FBI Director Louis Freeh has certified to me that the FBI has completed its search and produced every relevant document in its possession. Clearly, also at my request, every Special Agent in Charge of every FBI office has certified that all documents pertaining to the McVeigh case have been produced by that Special Agent's office.

"Following the production of the new documents 13 days ago and pursuant to Director Freeh's final worldwide alert, the FBI, working with federal prosecutors, engaged this methodical process designed to find and identify any documents that could have been - but were not - turned over during the extraordinarily broad discovery process. Each FBI office was searched exhaustively for any potentially relevant documents. When such documents were identified by an office, they were immediately sent to Oklahoma City for review. There, an FBI team and attorneys, conducted a two-step review process. First, the team determined whether any of the documents were covered by the unusually broad discovery agreement. Most of the documents were not.

"Additionally, the smaller group of documents that were covered under the agreement were reviewed against the OKBOMB computer databases to determine whether each document already had been produced or made available during discovery. Again, the overwhelming majority of documents reviewed had already been turned over during discovery.

"Under this process over the last nine days, we have identified and produced to the defense 898 additional pages of documents. These include 103 pages of Baltimore documents produced on May 15; 327 pages of Denver documents produced on May 18; 405 pages of documents from various offices produced on May 23; and 63 pages of Oklahoma City documents produced today. These items were sent to the Denver operation immediately upon discovery, where the prosecution produced them to defense counsel as they were processed. The defense team has had ample time to review these documents.

"I would like to make two points. First, we are talking about a relatively small amount of information, particularly in comparison to the incredible volume of documents produced in this case. This particular investigation produced millions of records, including millions of pages of hotel, motel or phone records, over 238,000 photographs, over 28,000 reports of interviews and more than 23,000 pieces of evidence. The new documents represent only a small fraction of one percent of the total number of produced documents in this case.

"Second, and more importantly, it is essential that people understand the substance of the material we are talking about. All of these newly-produced documents have been reviewed by attorneys familiar with the case. This item-by-item review has revealed that none, none of these new documents raises any doubt about the proven and admitted guilt of Timothy McVeigh. Indeed, the review reveals that most of the documents have little or no evidentiary value, and that much of the information was disclosed to the defense through other documents that were already produced in the discovery process.

"While the court's protective order prevents us from publicly releasing the documents or describing them in detail, I thought it would be useful to share a few generalized descriptions of the types of documents that were belatedly produced.
"For example, a lengthy collection of newspaper and magazine clippings, including photos from a swimsuit calendar, was received from a person under psychiatric care, received in one of our offices and not forwarded initially. Most of these clippings did not pertain to the bombing.

"Another example is a long, handwritten letter offering unspecified information in return for an enormous cash reward, in return for release of someone from prison, and in return for a trip to Europe to meet with royalty.

"Other documents include various letters involving information about non-physical beings and offers by psychics to contact the dead victims for information about the bombing.

"Now, in addition to these kinds of documents, some of the new items involve nothing more than information about service of a subpoena or receipt of records, and are only discoverable because an agent happened to document the information in an FBI-302 interview report or insert, which by definition, according to the trial agreement, made it discoverable.

"There also are photographs, fingerprint cards, and criminal history reports involving persons who ultimately turned out to have no connection whatsoever to the case. Many documents concern investigations into whether other persons - in addition to or instead of McVeigh and Nichols - were involved in the bombing, a fact that McVeigh himself denies. While thousands of leads were pursued in this endeavor, nothing in any of the documents links anyone else to this bombing.

"Let me summarize this report's findings. No document creates any doubt of McVeigh's guilt let alone establishes his innocence - which is the legal standard an appeal must overcome. Most of the documents could not have qualified as evidence.

"Finally, the quantity of documents is minuscule compared to the number of documents already provided to McVeigh's lawyers.

"I delayed this execution by a month to give McVeigh's lawyers sufficient time to exercise his legal rights. I will not delay the sentence of a confessed mass murderer - I will not delay his sentence further on the basis of documents which cast no doubt about his guilt.

"We reviewed these documents carefully, we wrote a thorough report, and we are prepared to defend McVeigh's conviction and the sentence that has been imposed. The lawyers in the Department of Justice have already had the time to prepare to defend the interests of the United States in this case, and have done so while reviewing large volumes of material that has been irrelevant. We are prepared, we have had ample time to prepare, and we believe this demonstrates clearly, that the defense team has had ample time to defend Mr. McVeigh. The first delay in this case was necessary for this review by lawyers for the defense and the prosecution; a second delay of this case would ignore this evidence and the facts of the case.

"We also need to be sensitive to the victims of this ruthless attack. Throughout this legal process, we've been keenly mindful of the pain that careful judicial proceedings sometimes cause victims to endure. I again extend my sympathy again to the victims of this assault and the assault on America and I will not add to their pain.

"To have proceeded on the initial execution date would have discredited the fairness and completeness which due process demands and deserves. Failure to carry out the sentence after such thorough and careful compliance has been achieved would thwart justice and deny victims' closure and would discredit our judicial system.
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ATTORNEY GENERAL ASHCROFT'S STATEMENT

REGARDING THE EXECUTION OF TIMOTHY MCVEIGH

"In 1988, the federal death penalty was reinstated by the United States Congress and the President with the enactment of the Anti-Drug Abuse Act. In 1994, Congress and the President expanded capital sentencing in the Federal Death Penalty Act. Under these two legislative acts, the federal statutes allow the death penalty for some of the most heinous and violent crimes imaginable. These include the intentional killing; espionage and treason; a kidnapping or conspiracy that results in a murder; killing a law enforcement officer; or committing a major drug-trafficking crime.

"Under both laws, before the death penalty can be imposed, a special hearing is required to determine whether a sentence of death is justified. A jury, following a death-eligible conviction, must determine whether a sentence of death is justified, based on evidence and arguments presented by each side and instructions from the court.

"On June 2, 1997, a jury convicted Mr. Timothy McVeigh of the April 19, 1995, bombing of the Alfred P. Murrah Building in Oklahoma City. This brutal act of terrorism killed 168 innocent people, including 19 children, and injured hundreds more. Its savagery stole parents from 219 children and made 30 children orphans in a single act. This cowardly crime against our nation was the largest terrorist attack ever within the United States of America.

"On June 13, 1997, the jury that heard the case of the Oklahoma City bombing made a recommendation of death for Mr. McVeigh, and the sentence was imposed by a federal judge on August 14, 1997. Mr. McVeigh's convictions were affirmed on direct appeal and his post-conviction challenges have been rejected by the courts. Mr. McVeigh has exhausted his right to any further appeals, and he is scheduled to be executed on May 16, 2001.

"The last death penalty imposed by federal courts under federal law occurred in 1963. The policies the Justice Department outlines today will provide the basis for handling future federal executions ordered by federal courts. These policies will be written into the appropriate documents and made available to the public, including the final Execution Protocol. The Bureau of Prisons has been preparing to fulfill its responsibilities under the law for years now, and we have consulted closely and thoroughly with them in establishing these policies.
"As you know, I also met with about 100 survivors and victim family members on Tuesday to hear their stories and to try to understand their loss. The magnitude of this case is certainly stunning. My time with these brave survivors changed me. What was taken from them can never be replaced nor fully restored. Their lives were shattered, and I hope that we can help them meet their need to close this chapter in their lives.

"I also hope that their experience in Oklahoma City is unique in our American experience. Obviously this case has many unique elements and it is a unique set of circumstances that confront us. The Oklahoma City survivors may be the largest group of crime victims in our history, so the Department of Justice must make special provisions to assist the needs of the survivors and victims' families in accordance with our responsibilities to carry out justice.

"Current Bureau of Prisons' regulations allow for eight witnesses. This is plainly inadequate. As Attorney General, I authorize the following measures for victims of this crime.

"First, we have decided to allow two additional citizen witnesses to be present at the execution in Terre Haute. This will bring the total number of citizen witnesses to ten and will equal the number of media witnesses. These witnesses will be selected by lottery, as was done for the trial.

"Second, under these special circumstances, we will arrange for a closed circuit transmission of these events to Oklahoma City, just as was done during the trial, pursuant to the Congressional authorization. The closed circuit transmission will take place at a facility in Oklahoma City that is yet to be determined. The Bureau of Prisons will work with the FBI's Crisis Response Unit to provide a highly reliable and secure closed-circuit audio and video transmission from the United States Penitentiary in Terre Haute to the designated site in Oklahoma City. The broadcast will use the latest encryption technology integrated with state-of-the-art video conferencing over high speed digital telephone lines.

"Federal regulations prohibit any recording of the execution; therefore, any closed-circuit transmission will be instantaneous and contemporaneous. Because of our concerns about attempts to steal or disrupt the transmission signal, we are not able to provide any further details about the transmission process.

"The transmission to the victims in the Oklahoma City area will begin at the same time the curtain is opened for viewing by the victim witnesses in the execution facility. All witnesses will see Mr. McVeigh on the execution table and they will be able to hear any final statement Mr. McVeigh makes.

"Third, at the request of the victims I met with on Tuesday, we will show those who are watching from Oklahoma City a video with footage of the site in Terre Haute, including the execution room. In addition, we will have representatives of the Bureau of Prisons on site to help prepare these witnesses for what they will see on the closed circuit transmission.

"Finally, I realize after visiting with survivors and victims' families that there are some people who, in the event that they are not one of the ten citizen witnesses, still want to be present in Terre Haute, even if they cannot view the execution on via closed circuit television. For those victims we will provide an area in Terre Haute near the prison facility.

"To those of you here, I am aware that several media outlets have requested access to interview inmate McVeigh. As an American who cares about our culture, I want to restrict a mass murderer's access to the public podium. On an issue of particular importance to me as Attorney General of the United States, I do not want anyone to be able to purchase access to the podium of America with the blood of 168 innocent victims.

"Media access to Special Confinement Unit Inmates will be limited to each
Inmate's ordinary allotment of telephone time. Inmates in the special confinement unit in Terre Haute are allowed a 15-minute personal telephone call each day. Inmates can use those calls in any way they choose, including interviews with the media. Requests for interviews may be made to the Warden. Should an inmate agree to an interview, the Warden will coordinate the setting up of the interview.

"If the news media conducts an interview with Timothy McVeigh, I would ask them for self-restraint. Please do not help him inject more poison into our culture; he has caused enough senseless damage already.

"We are already being sued to provide more publicity for this execution. I would ask that the news media not become Timothy McVeigh's co-conspirators in his assault on America's public safety and upon America itself.

"Finally, unless a Court intervenes, the execution is expected to proceed as scheduled at 7:00 a.m. on May 16, 2001.

"I would now like to introduce Kathleen Hawk Sawyer, the Director of the Bureau of Prisons. The Bureau of Prisons has done a great deal of work in preparation for this execution and I want to commend the Director and her staff for a job well done."

###
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As we pause to commemorate the tenth anniversary of the tragic events of September 11, 2001, I hope you will also remember the most deadly terrorist attack in United States history prior to September 11, 2001 – the bombing of the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City on April 19, 1995. Although the reasons and motivations of the perpetrators were markedly different, the Oklahoma City bombing, like the tragedies in New York, Virginia, and Pennsylvania, shocked the conscience of every American. The plot to kill innocent people in Oklahoma in 1995 was carried out by domestic terrorists, while those responsible for September 11 were radicalized foreigners. Although fundamentally different in philosophy, purpose and cause, Timothy McVeigh, Terry Nichols, and the September 11 co-conspirators were all intent on destroying our American way of life.

Their absolute failure to accomplish this objective is profound and palpable. Instead of tearing our country apart, these senseless tragedies were followed by a renewed American spirit, a galvanizing unification of our country in purpose, and a vivid portrayal of our resilience and mutual support. To see this spirit one must look no farther than at the remaining fence near the Memorial, where over 16 years later people from all over the globe still leave mementos to honor the lives lost.

We in Oklahoma are very proud of how we dealt with the Oklahoma City bombing and how we have prospered in the years since. Most importantly, how we reacted has become known internationally as the “Oklahoma Standard.” In the minutes after 9:02 a.m. on April 19, 1995, Oklahomans began to rescue, investigate, supply, heal, and comfort. Just like the morning of September 11, brave Oklahoma firefighters, medical personnel, and peace officers risked their lives by going into a burning, unstable building in selfless acts of heroism to rescue survivors. Indeed, one first responder gave the ultimate sacrifice, becoming one of the 168 casualties of the bomb.

These brave Oklahomans were quickly supplemented, reinforced, and relieved by rescue workers from all over the great nation who came to Oklahoma City to help in any way they could. Indeed, some of these great heroes were among the first responders on September 11. When the call came to return the favor in the days after September 11, Oklahomans proudly responded with a steeled determination drawn from the vivid and unenviable experience of terrorism.
The effects of the bombing in Oklahoma City are still felt very profoundly. The Oklahoma City National Memorial and Museum is a beautiful and fitting tribute to these victims of terrorism. In the sacred land where the Murrah building once stood, there are 168 empty chairs that constantly remind us that these were real individuals with families and friends who were taken from us that day. Of these chairs, there is a section of smaller chairs for the children whose young lives were lost that spring morning. The Memorial Museum is an amazing place that allows visitors to experience what happened, to understand how we responded, and to discuss what we must do to prevent this from happening again.

In the corner of the Memorial is the Survivor Tree, an American elm that was just across the street from the truck, yards from the epicenter of the blast. Quite simply, this tree should not have lived. But, in true rugged Oklahoma frontier fashion, the Survivor Tree refused to give up and has flourished in subsequent years. It is a symbol to all that we will press on, prosper and not be defeated. Saplings from the Survivor Tree have been planted all over the State of Oklahoma.

In a community of this size, most of us knew victims. That was especially true for the United States Attorney's Office for the Western District of Oklahoma. This office lost family members, countless friends, and many colleagues that morning. In the months following the bombing, our dedicated public servants worked tirelessly in the investigation, prosecution, and ultimate convictions of McVeigh and Nichols. Many of those employees remain in the office and continue to work on behalf of the citizens of the Western District of Oklahoma. To say that I am proud to be their United States Attorney is a monumental understatement.

So, please remember the victims of terrorism in Oklahoma City during any discussion of terrorism in the United States. As we reflect on terrorism in the United States, whether domestic or foreign, the words inscribed on the Oklahoma City National Memorial relay it best:

"We come here to remember those who were killed, those who survived and those changed forever. May all who leave here know the impact of violence. May this memorial offer comfort, strength, peace, hope and serenity."
Remarks on the Execution of Timothy McVeigh
June 11, 2001

This morning the United States of America carried out the severest sentence for the gravest of crimes. The victims of the Oklahoma City bombing have been given not vengeance but justice. And one young man met the fate he chose for himself 6 years ago.

For the survivors of the crime and for the families of the dead, the pain goes on. Final punishment of the guilty cannot alone bring peace to the innocent. It cannot recover the loss or balance the scales, and it is not meant to do so. Today every living person who was hurt by the evil done in Oklahoma City can rest in the knowledge that there has been a reckoning.

At every point, from the morning of April 19, 1995, to this hour, we have seen the good that overcomes evil. We saw it in the rescuers who saved and suffered with the victims. We have seen it in a community that has grieved and held close the memory of the lost. We have seen it in the work of detectives, marshal, and police, and we’ve seen it in the courts. Due process ruled: The case was proved; the verdict was calmly reached; and the rights of the accused were protected and observed to the full and to the end. Under the laws of our country, the matter is concluded.

Life and history bring tragedies, and often they cannot be explained. But they can be redeemed. They are redeemed by dispensing justice, though eternal justice is not ours to deliver. By remembering those who grieve, including Timothy McVeigh’s mother, father, and sisters, and by trusting in purposes greater than our own, may God in his mercy grant peace to all—to the lives that were taken 6 years ago, to the lives that go on, and to the life that ended today.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:44 a.m. in the James S. Brady Briefing Room at the White House. Timothy McVeigh was tried, found guilty, and sentenced to death for the murder of 168 people in the April 19, 1995, bombing of the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City, OK.

Remarks on Global Climate Change
June 11, 2001

Good morning. I’ve just met with senior members of my administration who are working to develop an effective and science-based approach to addressing the important issues of global climate change.

This is an issue that I know is very important to the nations of Europe, which I will be visiting for the first time as President. The Earth’s well-being is also an issue important to America, and it’s an issue that should be important to every nation in every part of our world.

The issue of climate change respects no border. Its effects cannot be reined in by an army nor advanced by any ideology. Climate change, with its potential to impact every corner of the world, is an issue that must be addressed by the world.

The Kyoto Protocol was fatally flawed in fundamental ways. But the process used to bring nations together to discuss our joint response to climate change is an important one. That is why I am today committing the United States of America to work within the United Nations framework and elsewhere to develop with our friends and allies and nations throughout the world an effective and science-based response to the issue of global warming.

My Cabinet-level working group has met regularly for the last 10 weeks to review the most recent, most accurate, and most comprehensive science. They have heard from scientists offering a wide spectrum of views. They have reviewed the facts, and they have listened to many theories and suppositions. The working group asked the highly respected National Academy of Sciences to provide us the most up-to-date information about what is known and about what is not known on the science of climate change.

First, we know the surface temperature of the Earth is warming. It has risen by .6 degrees Celsius over the past 100 years. There was a warming trend from the 1890s to the 1940s, cooling from the 1940s to the 1970s, and then sharply rising temperatures from the 1970s to today.

There is a natural greenhouse effect that contributes to warming. Greenhouse gases
Statement by U.S. Department of Homeland Security Secretary Janet Napolitano on the Threat of Right-Wing Extremism

Release Date: April 15, 2009

For Immediate Release
Office of the Press Secretary
Contact: 202-282-8010

The primary mission of this department is to prevent terrorist attacks on our nation. The document on right-wing extremism sent last week by this department’s Office of Intelligence and Analysis is one in an ongoing series of assessments to provide situational awareness to state, local and tribal law enforcement agencies on the phenomenon and trends of violent radicalization in the United States. I was briefed on the general topic, which is one that struck a nerve as someone personally involved in the Timothy McVeigh prosecution.

Let me be very clear: we monitor the risks of violent extremism taking root here in the United States. We don’t have the luxury of focusing our efforts on one group; we must protect the country from terrorism whether foreign or homegrown, and regardless of the ideology that motivates its violence.

We are on the lookout for criminal and terrorist activity but we do not – nor will we ever – monitor ideology or political beliefs. We take seriously our responsibility to protect the civil rights and liberties of the American people, including subjecting our activities to rigorous oversight from numerous internal and external sources.

I am aware of the letter from American Legion National Commander Rehbein, and my staff has already contacted him to set up a meeting next week once I return from travel. I will tell him face-to-face that we honor veterans at DHS and employ thousands across the department, up to and including the Deputy Secretary.

As the department responsible for protecting the homeland, DHS will continue to work with its state and local partners to prevent and protect against the potential threat to the United States associated with any rise in violent extremist activity.
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Countering Violent Extremism (CVE) Working Group

Homeland Security Advisory Council
Spring 2010
Secretary’s Tasking of HSAC

Recognizing that there have been many successful cases of local law enforcement working with communities to fight violent crime, at the February 2010 HSAC Meeting Secretary Napolitano tasked the HSAC to “…work with state and local law enforcement as well as relevant community groups to develop and provide to me recommendations regarding how the Department can better support community-based efforts to combat violent extremism domestically — focusing in particular on the issues of training, information sharing, and the adoption of community-oriented law enforcement approaches to this issue.”
Secretary’s Tasking (Con’t.)

Specifically, the initial recommendations will focus on the following issue areas:

- **Best Practices:** What are some best practices that demonstrate how information driven, community-based efforts can be effective in reducing violent crime within a community?

- **Information Sharing:** What type of information and intelligence should DHS be providing state and local authorities so that they are better able to leverage existing community-oriented policing efforts to identify and address ideologically-motivated violent crime?

- **Training and Other Support:** What type of training, technical assistance and funding support is required so that local authorities are better able to integrate information driven, community-oriented policing activities into overall efforts to establish safe and secure communities?
Development of Recommendations

- Recommendations were developed through a series of telephonic and face to face meetings that included working group members, state, county and local government officials, and representatives from community organizations.

- Discussions of the Working Group were organized around four major themes:
  - Every day, across the Nation, local, state, and tribal law enforcement agencies work with community members to prevent violent crime – what are some of the best examples of how police/community partnership can lead to significant reductions in violent crime?
  - Does this approach lend itself to preventing violent crime that is motivated by extreme ideological beliefs – and how does this effort to counter violent extremism impact the police-community partnership?
  - If local law enforcement were to incorporate efforts to counter violent extremism into pre-existing, community-oriented violent crime reduction efforts – what information would these local entities need from the Federal Government – specifically DHS.
  - If local law enforcement were to incorporate efforts to counter violent extremism into pre-existing, community-oriented violent crime reduction efforts, what type of training would front line officers, investigators and management personnel require?
General Findings

- Community-Oriented Policing works in preventing violent crime – The Working Group found that information-driven, community-oriented policing efforts have proven effective in reducing and/or preventing violent crime in numerous jurisdictions across the Nation.

- Emphasis should be on building safe, secure, resilient, and crime resistant communities – In working with community members, law enforcement seeks to understand and proactively address factors which enable violent criminal activity to occur.
  
  - Effective public–private partnerships, designed to enable civic engagement, problem-solving, and violent crime mitigation provide the foundation for efforts to prevent, protect against and respond to violent criminal activity – including that which may be motivated by ideological objectives.
  
  - While acknowledging that information-driven, community-based law enforcement efforts hold great promise in preventing violent crime that is terrorism-related, that promise will be best realized when local authorities work with community members to understand and mitigate all threats facing local communities.
  
  - The current level of understanding regarding the sociology of “radicalization” and “extremism” is still immature. Accordingly, Working Group members believe that the concept of building safe, secure, resilient and crime resistant communities should be the priority and operationally, efforts should focus on stopping violent behavior regardless of the motivation.
  
  - Working Group members felt that discussions regarding how to improve local law enforcement crime reduction efforts should be delinked from the current academic and policy discussions on “radicalization” and “countering violent extremism” until such time that the understanding of these phenomena matures.
General Findings (Cont.)

- **All violent crime is local** – While there may be some common indicators of ideologically-motivated violence, each circumstance is unique, needs to be viewed individually, and viewed within the context of the specific community in which the suspect lives, works, and operates.

- **There can be tension between those involved in law enforcement investigations and those collaborating to establish local partnerships to stop violent crime** – Community policing can be impeded if other enforcement tactics involving a community are perceived as conflicting with community partnership efforts. Crime control efforts at the local level involve a variety of operational activities that can be – if properly coordinated – supportive and complementary. Roles and responsibilities of federal, state, local and tribal law enforcement, and the community need to be clearly defined and articulated. Law enforcement should be sensitive to the fact that perceptions regarding enforcement actions and intelligence gathering can impact community-oriented policing goals.
Best Practices of Local Law Enforcement/Community Partnerships Are Leading to Significant Reductions in Violent Crime

- Multiple examples exist of effective community/local government partnerships which have led to significant reductions in violent crime including:
  - Los Angeles, California
    Law enforcement joins communities and government agencies to improve quality of life issues and reduce violent crime.
  - Cincinnati, Ohio
    College professors collaborate with law enforcement and communities to lower crime.
  - Austin, Texas
    Law enforcement works with community on rapid response teams to mitigate tough issues and work in partnership to reduce violent crime.
  - Las Vegas, Nevada
    Grassroots community effort led by faith-based organizations that assist in reducing violent crimes and gangs.
  - Dearborn, Michigan
    Collaborative effort to engage the community in the identification and resolution of community issues to include combating violent crime.
  - State of Maryland
    Established an executive level coordinating office within the Governor's Office to work with community groups, ethnic groups, and faith-based organizations to address quality of life and other issues of concern.
  - State of Ohio
    Established a community engagement office which built a collaborative and cooperative relationship with the communities based on trust and mutual respect.
  - Minneapolis, Minnesota
    Designated crime professional specialists who are liaisons between the community and local law enforcement and have safety centers that are funded by the neighborhoods.

The Working Group recognized that these are only a few examples of best practices by community-oriented policing efforts across the country. The Working Group also noted that it should be a continuing priority to identify best practices as well as to document instances where partnerships have not worked well in order to identify and compile lessons learned.
Community-Oriented Policing

Community-oriented policing is a viable strategy to address crimes of violence if the approach involves:

- Developing meaningful partnerships between the government and communities in which all partners contribute to the identification of community issues and needs;
- Collaborative problem solving; and
- Law enforcement and other government agencies implement institutional and organizational changes to support the effort.
Key Elements of Community-Oriented Policing to Reduce Violent Crime

- **Partnerships** – Establishing advisory councils/focus groups to include civic and community organizations, faith based and education entities, private sector security, and the media. Encourage participation through these partnerships to draw involvement from all segments of the community.

- **Leadership** – Executive Leadership/Guidance of local law enforcement heads in taking the lead in outreach to communities.

- **Multidisciplinary** – Leverage all available public and private resources within a local environment including social services, medical, mental health and family/school counseling professionals to help build bridges to communities; an excellent example has been the outreach/athletic programs for community youth spearheaded by some local police departments as well as outreach programs for community youth to include enrichment, education, and participatory programs like Police Explorers and Internships, and other self esteem building initiatives.

- **Training** – Continuous training is key to both law enforcement and the community and should focus on:
  - Improving capacity of law enforcement and other government personnel to communicate and collaborate with individuals from diverse religious, ethnic and racial communities; and
  - Better understanding the threats facing a local community and recognizing behavior and indicators associated with those threats.
Key Elements of Community-Oriented Policing to Reduce Violent Crime (Cont.)

- **Consistency** – Maintaining a presence at community events year-round including religious events. Law enforcement is partnering with religious and community activists, community leaders and business leaders to hold community events (i.e. barbecues, park events, and rallies), where ideas to reduce or eliminate violence are discussed and relationships are established or enhanced.

- **Broad approach** – Work with community and government partners to reduce violence in all forms. Help design interventions to be included in a community or city anti-violence program.

- **Trust** – Effective partnership requires a relationship built on trust and two-way communication between government personnel and community members.

- **Collaboration/coordination** – Efforts should be proactive and designed to prevent crime, reduce fear, and improve the quality of life within a community.

- **Minimize harmful outside influences** – Local crime reduction efforts can be affected by events occurring outside the community.
  - Some localities have established “rapid response” teams to work with communities to better understand and place into context international, national, and local incidents that “raise the temperature” in terms of targeting the community may face (either for hate crimes or by ideologically-motivated recruiters).
Key Elements of Community-Oriented Policing to Reduce Violent Crime (Cont.)

- **Conduct research** — A “best lesson learned,” is to ensure the up-front effort of proper research and the identification and inclusion of important under-represented communities is a foundational part of any Community Policing initiative. To that end, the inclusion of all representative sections of a community will lead to a safer and more secure country.

- **Remember the past** — An important facet to supporting and implementing Community Policing initiatives is to recognize that those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it. In analysis of previous major crimes and critical incidents, dating back to the 1960’s, a common theme can be developed. Law enforcement entities that properly researched all segments of the community and developed relationships based on elicited input and free exchange of information did much better in the detection, investigation, and mitigation of these situations.

- **Law enforcement personnel should come from the communities they serve** — Law enforcement should make a concerted effort to hire more individuals representative of the communities served by that agency.
Recommendations to DHS on Community Policing

- **Document and make available best practices** – DHS should work with external groups to (a) identify and document those information-driven, community-based violent crime reduction efforts that represent “best practices” AND making “best practices” resources available online for other law enforcement agencies and the community to be able to have access; and (b) identify challenges and unsuccessful practices so that best practices can be strengthened.

- Information-driven, community-based violent crime reduction efforts should be recognized as a critical element of national efforts to protect the homeland from terrorism and other threats.

- DHS should work closely with the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) at the Department of Justice (DOJ) to better incorporate the concept of community-oriented policing into programmatic and policy efforts associated with homeland security preparedness.
  - Increased resources should be made available (funding, training, technical assistance) to state and local authorities.
  - Establishing information-driven community-based violent crime reduction capabilities should be considered a preparedness priority by DHS.
  - Community-oriented policing costs should be included as an allowable expense within DHS grant programs.
Key Elements of Applying Violent Crime Prevention to Stopping Ideological-Motivated Crime

- Emphasis should be placed on supporting local efforts to establish safe and secure communities – this could mean securing them against all types of threats from outside as well as from within.
- Dealing with ideologically-motivated crime is done best when there is a pre-existing relationship between communities and local law enforcement and needs to be done in the broader context of dealing with all crimes.
- Information-driven, community based violent crime reduction efforts should emphasize stopping violent behavior regardless of the motivation.
  - Communities may be hesitant to enter in relationships with local, state, tribal or federal law enforcement if they perceive that they are viewed as incubators of violent extremism.
Key Elements of Applying Violent Crime Prevention to Stopping Ideological-Motivated Crime (Cont.)

- Information regarding specific threats should be shared with local law enforcement, who in turn should share with the community, so there is a shared understanding of the threat:
  - Work together to develop a plan to mitigate the threat;
  - Place police actions into context;
  - Be more aware of indicators and behavior associated with a specific threat; and
  - Define roles and responsibilities associated with threat mitigation. The federal government should ensure adequate safeguards for basic rights in cases of individuals about whom information is provided by communities. This is extremely important to maintain trust and cooperation among communities and local authorities.

- Offer the community a separate clear point of contact to open a regular channel of communication and gain information from the government to learn about new programs, initiatives and policies (Protective Security Advisors in the states).
Recommendations to DHS

- **Develop and use common terminology** – Use of various terms to describe ideologically-motivated violent crime (radicalization, violent extremism, etc…) causes confusion. DHS should work with the federal government, and state and local partners to establish common use lexicon and consistent use of terminology. This product should be made available to the public via the internet.

- **Expand CRCL engagement efforts separate from support of community-oriented policing** – Recognizing that policies implemented by DHS can affect local community partnerships, DHS Civil Rights Civil Liberties (CRCL) and other relevant DHS offices should continue and expand their engagement and grievance resolution efforts at DHS. DHS should also work with other federal agencies to come up with a verification process for groups it interacts with. This in turn will help establish a national environment conducive to the establishment of local partnerships.
Recommendations to DHS (Cont.)

• **Incorporate information-driven, community-based violent crime reduction into local preparedness efforts** – Efforts to increase support to local, community-based violent crime reduction should be viewed as a core element of preparedness programs as opposed to being part of national efforts to understand the phenomena of domestic violent extremism.

• **Support efforts to establish local dispute resolution capabilities** – DHS should provide resources and guidance to support local partnerships efforts to address community issues and grievances. These resources can be an empowering tool that generate a greater role for communities to extend themselves to law enforcement and have greater input in addressing violence and violent extremists. Moreover, it serves the long term objective of engaging the communities to view violence not only as a law enforcement concern but as society's concern.

• **Through Policy, DHS should utilize the philosophies based on communication, trust, and mutual respect to develop relationships with local law enforcement** – These are the same principles local law enforcement is using through Community Policing to build relationships in their respective communities. Relationships between local law enforcement and DHS must be broader than just communication at the executive level. Individual Agents and Individual Officers must form relationships at the “grassroots” level to effectively communicate and achieve mutual goals.
Information Partnerships Need from DHS

- To be effective, efforts to combat violent crime should be information-driven, which requires that local partnerships have a shared understanding of:
  - Specific threats facing an individual community;
  - Groups and/or individuals associated with a threat; and
  - Behavior and indicators associated with a threat.

- State and major urban area fusion centers play a critical role in local crime prevention efforts in that they receive intelligence/information from federal authorities regarding threats to the homeland and evaluate those threats from a local context. These fusion centers must share that knowledge with local law enforcement so that it can inform the community on violent crime reduction efforts.

- Knowledge regarding specific threats should be blended with awareness of societal and religious practices so that local authorities can place reported and observed behavior into context, thereby allowing them to distinguish legal behavior from criminal activity.

- The timely sharing of accurate threat-related information is an essential component of community-based efforts to combat violent crime.

- There can be an inherent tension between federal law enforcement investigations and local partnerships to stop violent crime. While this tension can be healthy or unhealthy, it must be managed by senior officials.
Recommendations to DHS on Information-Sharing

- **Generate threat-related information products** – DHS should increase the availability to local authorities of accurate, threat-related information in a format that allows broader sharing with community members. DHS should work with fusion centers to demystify the process for the community. This information should include:
  - Trends observed internationally regarding types of attacks and recruitment efforts;
  - Specific threats to the community; and
  - Behavior and indicators associated with such threats.

- **Establish communication platform to share threat-related information directly with faith-based or other communities** – DHS should explore expanding the Secure Community Network concept to other faith-based communities and put together a task force to look at best practices for faith-based communities.

- DHS should publicly welcome organized community-based engagement efforts on CVE policy development and best practices promotion around the country.
Recommendations to DHS on Information-Sharing (Cont.)

- **Increase public awareness regarding terrorism and other homeland security related trends so that they can be demystified and incorporated into local violent crime reduction efforts** – DHS should explore ways in which it can provide the public, particularly the more youthful segments of the population, with a better understanding of terrorism-related trends, and training so that communities are better able to recognize behavior associated with terror-related criminal acts, the variety of government offices that could play a role in a response, and the relationship between these offices. This process should also include education to communities on law enforcement processes and procedures to help demystify law enforcement.

  - DHS should consider building a website that “speaks to” parents, caregivers, educators, counselors, etc.. The website should take a holistic approach and include tools for schools and parents to keep an eye on behavioral traits, as well as the use of internet social networking sites, reporting hate crimes, human trafficking, child predators, and other security issues.

  - DHS should also work with the American Ad Council on public service announcements, which could be for awareness messages that indicate characteristics of individuals who engage in dangerous and anti-social behavior.
Recommendations to DHS on Information-Sharing (Cont.)

• **Develop case studies** – DHS, in partnership with other federal law enforcement agencies and community representatives, should package and release analytical reviews of major events of domestic violent extremism (Zazi, Holocaust museum shooting, Ft. Hood shooting, etc.) and develop case studies that can be used by local authorities as a learning tool for law enforcement personnel. The use of real life examples of the threats will better illustrate the dangers faced by specific local communities as well as the Nation. Involving community representatives in the development process will help build trust and engage the community in dialogue and greater cooperation that serves the common good.

• DHS should work with its federal partners to increase collaboration to ensure community partnerships and intelligence community (IC) are not undermined by each other but instead work in a complementarily effective manner.
• Continue efforts to ensure that fusion centers have the capacity to receive and understand threat-related information and to share that knowledge with local authorities. DHS should work with fusion centers so that fusion centers have a greater capacity to understand (a) the threat posed by ideologically-motivated criminal activity and share that knowledge with local law enforcement, and (b) cultural, societal, and religious customs so that intelligence is placed in context and legal behavior is distinguished from criminal activity.
Findings on Training

- Continuous training of government personnel is a key element of successful community-oriented policing efforts. Law enforcement officers must have the ability to have honest conversations with people in their community and must recognize the value that comes from effective, proactive problem solving.

- The capacity to interact with members of the public in order to address crime and quality of life issues needs to be a fundamental skill set of front line and management personnel. Effective and open communication by law enforcement officials provides the foundation for effective collaboration and partnership at both the organizational and individual levels.
Findings on Training (Cont.)

- Training should focus on:
  - Improving capacity of law enforcement and other government personnel to communicate, collaborate, and partner with individuals from diverse religious, ethnic, and racial communities; and
  - Better understand the threats facing a local community and recognizing behavior and indicators associated with those threats.

- Training should be provided to community members so they better understand how government, and in particularly law enforcement, operates. This will de-mystify and minimize tensions due to misperceptions.

- Members of the community should be invited to provide training to government personnel.

- Training is needed for school officials and parents on a variety of issues including: how to recognize behaviors consistent with criminal activity or specific threats; the use of internet social networking sites by sexual predators and extremist recruiters; recognizing hate crimes; human trafficking; child predators; gangs; and other security issues.
Findings on Training (Cont.)

- Current training programs should be re-evaluated and priority given to supporting those programs that introduce or support the community policing model. Good training is essential as bad training not only is ineffective – but can serve to escalate tensions between law enforcement and the community.

- Enforcing hate crimes is one way for law enforcement to build trust with minority communities.
  - Law enforcement and communities rarely reported hate crimes before they received hate crime training. Law enforcement personnel generally respond to crime rather than report it.

- Local law enforcement should train communities on what constitutes a hate crime and encourage them to report hate crimes. This will help strengthen the community-police relationship.
Recommendations to DHS on Training

- **Expand availability of training and technical assistance focused on the understanding, identifying and mitigating threats through community-oriented policing** – DHS, working in partnership with the COPS office, should explore how best to expand the training and technical assistance provided to state, tribal, and local personnel so that they are better able to:
  - Understand and mitigate threats facing their communities;
  - Identify behavior and indicators associated with ideologically-motivated crime;
  - Engage more effectively with communities; and
  - DHS and DOJ’s COPS should consider providing additional support for efforts that train law enforcement on community policing such as the Regional Community Policing Institutes and the National Counter-Terrorism Academy for State and Local Law Enforcement in Los Angeles.

- **Improve quality of training** – DHS should institute quality control processes to ensure that training provided through DHS, or paid for by DHS provided grant funding, meets minimum quality control.

- **Training should seek to instill greater understanding regarding the “us versus them” perspective** that many cultures have toward law enforcement and government and enable law enforcement personnel to better understand and address unrest or anger within the community (whether it be ideologically-based or not) in order to prevent violent activities.
Recommendations to DHS on Training (Cont.)

- **Expand availability of training for state, local and tribal law enforcement and DHS components** – Operational and law enforcement personnel including corrections personnel, should possess an understanding of cultural and religious practices so that they are better able to distinguish between criminal activity and lawful behavior. A collaborative effort comprised of community, academia, and law enforcement professionals should be involved in helping develop these trainings.

- DHS should fund efforts to expand Federal Law Enforcement Training Center’s hate crime training.

- DHS should explore expanding FLETC’s role to include training in the building of community capacity, partnerships, cultural knowledge awareness and development of specialized training modules for community leaders and non-governmental organizations.

- DHS should reassess its hate crime training to include understanding extremism and ideological violence.

- DHS should work with state and local partners to provide training for schools and parents on a variety of issues including: how to keep an eye on behavioral traits, the use of internet social networking sites, reporting hate crimes, human trafficking, child predators, gangs, and other security issues.
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