

NANCY WINTERS MULLINS

1909 N. 73rd Terrace, Apt. 6, Kansas City, KS 66112

cell: 913-530-8318

Email: nancymullins@nethere.com

December 22, 2016

Nikki R. Haley
Nominee for Ambassador to the United Nations
Office of the Governor
1205 Pendleton Street
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

Dear Governor Haley:

I am writing to you because I would like to share some of my hopes for our country and I hope you might be willing to talk to Mr. Trump about some of these.

I believe we have to strengthen America by being socially liberal and fiscally conservative (as I believe Mr. Trump is); and we have to develop clear, realistic, coherent policy messages that are truthful. I believe the American people are very sick of simplistic, divisive soundbites that do not address the whole truth about issues that are very complex.

I believe we need a single payer health care system and quality education. I believe we must protect our environment and stand strong for human rights and social justice. AND I believe we need to operate with a balanced budget that generates a surplus that can begin to pay down our national debt.

I believe there are ways we can do this, by doing efficiency studies in every area of our budget/government. If Mr. Trump is serious about "draining the swamp," we should start with the inefficiency, ineffectiveness, and unaccountability of the federal government and order a forensic audit of the federal budget, including the military-industrial and intelligence complexes, going line by line, program by program, through the thousands of pages, so we can cut huge unnecessary costs, and spend what we need to spend on keeping our military strong, our education strong, and expanding Medicare to all (a single payor health care system).

Thomas Friedman has stated that he believes both parties have to have to respond to *technology and the acceleration of globalization and the acceleration of climate*. He states *that to get the best out of them and cushion the worst*, we have to be *to the left of Bernie Sanders on some issues (single payer health care and a stronger safety net)*, and *to the right of the Wall Street Journal editorial page*, by being *radically entrepreneurial so that we can afford that safety net*.

Our national debt was quadrupled in the 12 years before President Clinton and doubled in the 8 years after President Clinton, with astronomical spending under President George W. Bush

The largest areas of government are:

1. The Military
2. Veterans Affairs
3. Homeland Security

I would like to address some issues specifically:

THE MILITARY: I am committed to having a strong military AND reducing unnecessary costs. However, President Eisenhower warned us about the military-industrial complex. Robert Gates has great insight into how costs and waste in the military can be reduced. Many Republicans say they want to reduce the size of government, but they seem to want to increase expenditures for the military and for intelligence, and decrease expenditures for health care, social security and education. I think we need to be honest and realistic. I have read that military leaders know how to cut military budgets but Congress people will not vote for any cuts that affect their constituents. Does that mean you **(or our legislators)** would rather be re-elected than make the hard decisions that are right for our economy and our future?

I believe we would have a very different world if Al Gore had become president instead of George W. Bush. He would have responded to 9-11 very differently, probably building an international coalition to address the causes of terrorism, rather than saying, *We will smoke them out of their holes at a time and place of our choosing; they are the evil-doers; they are an axis of evil*, and attacking Afghanistan and Iraq. The Bush Wars have cost us trillions of dollars that I wish could have been invested in education, health care, and social security.

We do NOT need to “expand our nuclear capability.” That is another wasted cost. Russia and the U.S. have 95% of the world's nuclear weapons; and we need to continue to reduce this number (as all presidents have done since Ronald Reagan). If Mr. Trump is a great deal-maker, I would like to see him negotiate with Mr. Putin a further reduction of nuclear weapons.

THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY—HOMELAND SECURITY: I would like to refer you to the enclosed article, *Top Secret America: A Hidden World, Growing Beyond Control (A Washington Post Investigation)*, by Dana Priest and William Arkin, July 19, 2010). The waste and duplication and lack of oversight here is horrifying.

A SINGLE PAYER HEALTH CARE SYSTEM: Every person in the military, every federal employee, and every Senator and Congress person loves his single payer health care system.

There are many ways to cut the costs of health care and deliver excellent health care. The Cleveland Clinic and the Mayo Clinic are doing this and could be consulted. It might be cost efficient to merge VA and non-profit hospitals.

What people pay for Medicare (or their single payer health care) should be based on their income.

I would like to refer you to *Be the Change: Transforming Health Care from the Inside Out* (by Jane Murray, M.D.)

In the spirit of President John F. Kennedy when he said, *Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country*. It is very important we talk about citizen responsibility to cut costs in at least 3 areas of health care:

1. Take good care of our own health (and prevent disease): We all have to make our own health a high priority and take responsibility for being as healthy as possible, including making the life-style choices that contribute to our health and well-being. We spend the most money in health care today on chronic diseases (diabetes, arthritis, high blood pressure, asthma, heart disease, some kinds of cancer, irritable bowel syndrome, chronic fatigue, fibromyalgia, chronic back pain, depression, etc.). **We know that many chronic diseases can be prevented by keeping one's body weight normal, eating a healthy anti-inflammatory diet (because inflammation underlies many diseases), exercising, and managing stress.**

Our biggest health care epidemic today is obesity and the serious health problems that accompany obesity—diabetes, hypertension, heart disease, and stroke. Good nutrition is a mainstay of excellent health.

I want to refer you to *The Abascal Way to Quiet Inflammation for Health and Weight Loss* (by Kathy Abascal)

Norman Cousins has written about the science of psycho-neuro-immunology (the science of the mind-body connection, and biofeedback). We can teach children about the marvelous nature of their own mind-body, and nurture in them ways to connect to their own innate healing power.

Michelle Obama and organized medicine are working with school systems and hospitals to provide more nutritious food.

Some people have proposed a tax on sugar, high fructose corn syrup, and cigarettes, all of which are very detrimental to our health and drive up health care costs.

Some people have proposed eliminating all government subsidies for tobacco and crops like corn. Most corn that is grown in this country is not eaten off the cob; most of it goes to make high fructose corn syrup that is added to most processed foods and to make refined carbohydrate products. These are poor in nutrition and high in calories, but they are cheap to consumers because they are subsidized. If we want the government to subsidize anything in agriculture, we could subsidize healthy, organic whole foods (fruits, vegetables, whole grains).

2. Wait to have children until we are financially and emotionally able to support them: I would like to see a national ethic (really an international ethic) for responsible parenting, an ethic that would strongly encourage all of us to postpone having children until we have completed our education and job training and until we are emotionally and financially capable of taking care of children.

When any one of us is overwhelmed by poverty, illiteracy, emotional immaturity, or drugs, or if we have no skills for earning a living, or if we are consumed by hostility and rage at the injustices or abuse we have endured as young people, we are incapable of being responsible parents. We are incapable of giving to an infant or child what we have not developed within ourselves. If we become parents under any of these circumstances, we and our children often become economic and emotional burdens on our society.

I would like to see this ethic being commonly taught in all school grades.

This would mean that every one of us needs easy access to information about contraception, family planning, and abortion. These services should be provided at no charge to anyone who cannot afford them. That would include funding for Planned Parenthood and other organizations that provide these services.

I believe such responsible family planning is one of our nation's and our world's most pressing problems. In only 5 years, it would have a significant effect on many other social concerns--poverty, malnutrition, infant mortality, family violence, abuse and neglect of preschool children, and the myriad of other medical, legal, and social costs of supporting overwhelmed parents and their children. Global warming and the population explosion is encroaching on our environment and overwhelming our natural resources, and it is a driving force behind emigration especially from Africa.

I believe the goal of temporary welfare support and foreign aid has to be to empower people, and this support must include birth control and family planning. 100 million women around the world cannot obtain or are not using family planning services because they are poor, uneducated, or lack access to care.

Melinda Gates is making family planning her signature issue and primary public health a priority. In early 1960's, **Dwight Eisenhower called for foreign aid for birth control. Harry Truman was honorary chairman of Planned Parenthood. In 1965, President Lyndon Johnson implored the UN to face forthrightly the multiplying problems of multiplying populations...Less than \$5 invested in population control is worth \$100 invested in economic growth.**

Ewing Kaufman, owner of the Kansas City Royals, has adopted two Kansas City high schools promising to pay for the college education of all students who do not become pregnant prior to graduation!!

No one is pro-abortion. No one advocates abortion as a method of birth control or family planning. It is a painful and agonizing decision for a woman to make. **I would use the term, *anti-choice*, not *pro-life*,** because many people who say they are Pro-Life are actually Anti-Choice, not Pro-Life. They may be Pro-Fetus, but they are usually not pro the support services that would make it possible for an unwanted child to grow up to be a healthy and productive adult. **Actually being Pro-Choice is a conservative position in the best sense of limited government intervention or intrusion. Being conservative does not mean being a right wing religious Christian extremist.**

One way I look at this question is that while a fetus is totally dependent on and cannot live apart from the mother, the mother has rights. Once a fetus is viable and could survive outside the mother, we need to consider the rights of the fetus. We need to avoid using inflammatory terms like "partial birth abortions," which distort reality. Planned Parenthood and most physicians perform abortions only in the first trimester. Later term abortions are only done when the life or health of the mother is at stake and **only 1.2 % of all abortions in the USA take place after 20 weeks gestation.**

3. Facing the end of our lives with courage, and planning for the quality we want at the end of our lives, so we do not spend 75-95% of our lifelong medical expenses in the last 6 months of our lives: Each of us needs to come to terms with the fact that we will die eventually. There will come a time for each of us when there will be no hope for an ongoing useful life, but there will be hope for a dignified, pain-free death. We must make our wishes known to our family. Jane Murray, M.D., writes about the important things to do at the end of one's life (forgiveness, gratitude, legal papers, etc.) so we can die in a state of peace and completion. She writes, *Understanding and accepting death with grace may be one of the last frontiers of our medical and cultural development. Perhaps we can find guidance from other cultures that seem to realize that every day of life is a step closer to death, not in a morbid fearful sense, but in rejoicing over each new day given to us.*

If you and others speak about this citizen responsibility often, it will become part of our national consciousness.

Also, the government/Medicare needs to be able to negotiate drug costs. Drugs cost 40% less in Canada. **I would like to refer you to the article, *On the Take*, by Dr. Jerome Kassirer, about the undue influence of the pharmaceutical industry on American medicine.** Many doctors have taken the No Free Lunch Pledge, vowing not to accept any pharmaceutical industry gifts, money, or hospitality. The argument is often made that drug companies need their revenue for research; however 30% of their revenue is spent on marketing and only 11% on research and development. Most drug company "research" actually originates with basic science work done by government funding through the National Institutes of Health. Another driving force in drug costs is the patent protection pharmaceutical companies are granted for years. Are you and our other public officials willing to put the welfare of the public above the interests of the pharmaceutical industry and force drug costs to be reasonable, or are your own political aspirations more important to you?

We also need medical malpractice reform.

We also must speak the truth about Health Care Rationing: Jane Murray, M.D., writes, *While many of us feel health care should be a right, we have never been willing to define how much is a right and which health services are "luxuries." At the extreme ends of the spectrum, the distinction is easy. Prenatal care and immunizations are necessities, and the costs are clearly beneficial to society as well as to the individual. Face-lifts and refractive surgery are luxuries that no government program should be required to provide. What gets very difficult is the multitude of possibilities closer to the center: organ transplants, expensive*

intensive care for terminally ill persons, unproven expensive treatments for cancer, etc. As a society we have not yet been able to confront these gray zones very well. We want to avoid the word "rationing" and unfortunately resources actually are finite, and some kind of rationing will always occur.

Jane Murray, M.D., writes that, *Open, public discussion, debate and articulation of values and fiscal realities is the only ethical way to ration care*—to talk about about what can be afforded and what cannot and why. As a society, we need to state what will be covered in any system of payment (be it public, universal health care, or private insurance) and what will not. It is not the individual doctor's role to ration care, nor is it the insurance company's role. It is the public's role and responsibility to determine our society's priorities in health care, and then be willing to face the fiscal obligation to pay for those priorities. Jane Murray, M.D. states that she would *like to know that the denial of care is not because the executive of the health care company needs a bigger raise or the shareholders need an increase in the stock value of the company.* These are very tough realities; but denying that these realities exist and believing society can afford everything for everyone is a belief we each must change.

THE SUPREME COURT: I support a Supreme Court that interprets the intent of the Constitution, rather than supporting Citizens United and imposing its moralistic anti-choice and anti-LGBTQ values.

I support thorough vetting of anyone nominated. Clarence Thomas' appointment to the Supreme Court was rushed without proper vetting. Do we need to reverse Citizens United and push for public financing of elections and demand full disclosure of all private sources of campaign funding?

I believe the Supreme Court should consist of 4.5 men and 4.5 women. That would mean, that over the years, that the Supreme Court would alternate between 5 men-4 women and 4 men-5 women. I am hoping the Million Women who may march January 21st will speak about wanting an equal balance of men and women on the Court. If Merrick Garland, who is an outstanding and eminently qualified centrist judge, is not re-nominated, I hope we will all stand up for a woman to be nominated.

HUMAN RIGHTS and SOCIAL JUSTICE: I would like to remind Mike Pence that research cannot yet definitively identify the causes of being homosexual or transgender; but since many people state they knew these things about themselves by age 4 or 5, we cannot say that being homosexual or transgender is an immoral choice that can be cured by conversion therapy. We need to preserve all our civil rights, including our LGBTQ rights.

THE ECONOMY—JOBS—OUR ENVIRONMENT—CLEAN ENERGY—PRIVATE BUSINESS:

Time Magazine (December 12, 2016) covered the Global Forum at the Vatican that brought together the world's top CEO's (executives), investors, academics, labor and church leaders, and philanthropists to try and bridge the gap between ideology and action—to brainstorm possible solutions to the world's most pressing problems—climate change, rising inequality, technological disruption, education reform, poverty reduction, universal health care, etc. Solutions to these issues will require coordinated, multilateral cooperation among government institutions, corporations, not-for-profit organizations (NGO's), etc. The market alone will not solve this problems; we need collaboration across business, government and civil society. Our individual and collective welfare will depend on whether unity can be forged out of disruption and turmoil. To try to make the right hard decisions we need to enlist all vested interests and try to balance profits with what is right. The global economy is not creating prosperity for everyone. Economic globalization has run ahead of political globalization, resulting in isolationism, nationalism, and a fragmenting of the old world order.

Robert Reich (Secretary of Labor during the Clinton administration, professor of public policy at Berkeley, and senior fellow at Blum Center for Developing Economies) states that *the large Wall Street banks, big*

corporations, and the richest Americans have been responsible for the largest upward redistribution of income and wealth in modern American history.

Part of the upward redistribution has involved excessive risk-taking on Wall Street, which padded the nests of executives and traders but required a tax-payer-funded bailout when the bubble burst in 2008. It has caused millions of working Americans to lose their jobs, savings, and homes. Its lobbyists are busily rolling back the Dodd-Frank Act intended to prevent another crash, when we probably need to resurrect the Glass-Steagall Act, separating Investment and Commercial Banking.

Another part of America's upward redistribution of wealth has come in the form of "corporate welfare"--tax breaks and subsidies benefiting particular companies and industries (oil and gas, hedge-fund and private-equity, pharmaceuticals, big agriculture) for no reason other than they have the political clout to get them.

This upward redistribution has also come under the guise of patents and trademarks that extend far beyond what's necessary for adequate returns on corporate investment, resulting, for example, in drug prices that are higher in America than in any other advanced nation.

It has taken the form of monopoly power, generating outsize profits for certain companies (Monsanto, Pfizer, and Comcast, for example) along with high prices for consumers.

Desmond Lachman (a resident fellow at the American Enterprise Institute, former deputy director in the International Monetary Fund's policy development and review department, and chief emerging market economic strategist at Salomon Smith Barney) stated in the *NY Times*, December 20, 2016: ***One of the basic themes of Donald J. Trump's election campaign was that the United States was being ripped off by foreign countries and that his administration would reduce our trade deficit.***

Yet the budget policies he is now proposing would be sharply at odds with that goal. By advocating an expansive budget through tax cuts and infrastructure spending, Mr. Trump's plan would most likely lower national savings and propel the United States dollar ever higher, creating the very conditions to widen rather than to narrow the trade deficit.

Mr. Trump seems to be overlooking a matter of basic arithmetic. While a country's trade balance is the difference between a country's exports and imports, it is also the difference between the amount it saves and invests, as can be derived from rearranging the components of a country's aggregate demand equation. If a country saves more than it invests, it will run a trade surplus. Conversely, a country that saves less than it invests will run a trade deficit.

Seemingly oblivious to this basic math, Mr. Trump is proposing far-reaching and seemingly unfunded cuts in both corporate and household tax rates. Worse yet, he is simultaneously proposing large increases in both public infrastructure and military spending. He is doing so in the unrealistic hope that these policies will cause the economy to accelerate from its present 2 percent growth rate to between 3 and 4 percent. And he is counting on such faster economic growth to generate additional tax revenue.

Although it has been a Republican position to unleash middle class' entrepreneurial energies by reducing taxes and regulations, we know that tax breaks do not stimulate anything but budget deficits, and we need to refrain from tax increases on middle class.

Thomas Piketty (professor at Paris School of Economics, and author of *Capital in the Twenty-First Century*) states that ***to combat global inequality, we might institute a global wealth tax--a tax on overall net worth, which would capture capital wealth, because economic growth/salaries do not keep pace with return on capital wealth.*** Corporate profits now account for the largest percentage of the total economy in more than 8 decades, with wages accounting for the smallest percentage of the total economy in more than 6 decades. **He also states we should increase capital gains tax and close corporate tax loopholes.**

Robert Reich states we need to do away with "corporate welfare"--tax breaks and subsidies benefiting particular companies and industries (oil and gas, hedge-fund and private-equity, pharmaceuticals, big agriculture), along with excessive intellectual property protection. We need tougher antitrust enforcement

NANCY WINTERS MULLINS

1909 N. 73rd Terrace, Apt. 6, Kansas City, KS 66112

cell: 913-530-8318

Email: nancymullins@nethere.com

December 22, 2016

Nikki R. Haley
Nominee for Ambassador to the United Nations
Office of the Governor
1205 Pendleton Street
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

Dear Governor Haley:

I am writing to you because I would like to share some of my hopes for our country and I hope you might be willing to talk to Mr. Trump about some of these.

I believe we have to strengthen America by being socially liberal and fiscally conservative (as I believe Mr. Trump is); and we have to develop clear, realistic, coherent policy messages that are truthful. I believe the American people are very sick of simplistic, divisive soundbites that do not address the whole truth about issues that are very complex.

I believe we need a single payer health care system and quality education. I believe we must protect our environment and stand strong for human rights and social justice. AND I believe we need to operate with a balanced budget that generates a surplus that can begin to pay down our national debt.

I believe there are ways we can do this, by doing efficiency studies in every area of our budget/government. If Mr. Trump is serious about "draining the swamp," we should start with the inefficiency, ineffectiveness, and unaccountability of the federal government and order a forensic audit of the federal budget, including the military-industrial and intelligence complexes, going line by line, program by program, through the thousands of pages, so we can cut huge unnecessary costs, and spend what we need to spend on keeping our military strong, our education strong, and expanding Medicare to all (a single payor health care system).

Thomas Friedman has stated that he believes both parties have to have to respond to *technology and the acceleration of globalization and the acceleration of climate*. He states *that to get the best out of them and cushion the worst, we have to be to the left of Bernie Sanders on some issues (single payer health care and a stronger safety net), and to the right of the Wall Street Journal editorial page, by being radically entrepreneurial so that we can afford that safety net.*

Our national debt was quadrupled in the 12 years before President Clinton and doubled in the 8 years after President Clinton, with astronomical spending under President George W. Bush

The largest areas of government are:

1. The Military
2. Veterans Affairs
3. Homeland Security

I would like to address some issues specifically:

THE MILITARY: I am committed to having a strong military AND reducing unnecessary costs. However, President Eisenhower warned us about the military-industrial complex. Robert Gates has great insight into how costs and waste in the military can be reduced. Many Republicans say they want to reduce the size of government, but they seem to want to increase expenditures for the military and for intelligence, and decrease expenditures for health care, social security and education. I think we need to be honest and realistic. I have read that military leaders know how to cut military budgets but Congress people will not vote for any cuts that affect their constituents. Does that mean you **(or our legislators)** would rather be re-elected than make the hard decisions that are right for our economy and our future?

I believe we would have a very different world if Al Gore had become president instead of George W. Bush. He would have responded to 9-11 very differently, probably building an international coalition to address the causes of terrorism, rather than saying, *We will smoke them out of their holes at a time and place of our choosing; they are the evil-doers; they are an axis of evil*, and attacking Afghanistan and Iraq. The Bush Wars have cost us trillions of dollars that I wish could have been invested in education, health care, and social security.

We do NOT need to “expand our nuclear capability.” That is another wasted cost. Russia and the U.S. have 95% of the world's nuclear weapons; and we need to continue to reduce this number (as all presidents have done since Ronald Reagan). If Mr. Trump is a great deal-maker, I would like to see him negotiate with Mr. Putin a further reduction of nuclear weapons.

THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY—HOMELAND SECURITY: I would like to refer you to the enclosed article, *Top Secret America: A Hidden World, Growing Beyond Control (A Washington Post Investigation)*, by Dana Priest and William Arkin, July 19, 2010). The waste and duplication and lack of oversight here is horrifying.

A SINGLE PAYER HEALTH CARE SYSTEM: Every person in the military, every federal employee, and every Senator and Congress person loves his single payer health care system.

There are many ways to cut the costs of health care and deliver excellent health care. The Cleveland Clinic and the Mayo Clinic are doing this and could be consulted. It might be cost efficient to merge VA and non-profit hospitals.

What people pay for Medicare (or their single payer health care) should be based on their income.

I would like to refer you to *Be the Change: Transforming Health Care from the Inside Out* (by Jane Murray, M.D.)

In the spirit of President John F. Kennedy when he said, *Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country*. It is very important we talk about citizen responsibility to cut costs in at least 3 areas of health care:

1. Take good care of our own health (and prevent disease): We all have to make our own health a high priority and take responsibility for being as healthy as possible, including making the life-style choices that contribute to our health and well-being. We spend the most money in health care today on chronic diseases (diabetes, arthritis, high blood pressure, asthma, heart disease, some kinds of cancer, irritable bowel syndrome, chronic fatigue, fibromyalgia, chronic back pain, depression, etc.). **We know that many chronic diseases can be prevented by keeping one's body weight normal, eating a healthy anti-inflammatory diet (because inflammation underlies many diseases), exercising, and managing stress.**

Our biggest health care epidemic today is obesity and the serious health problems that accompany obesity—diabetes, hypertension, heart disease, and stroke. Good nutrition is a mainstay of excellent health.

I want to refer you to *The Abascal Way to Quiet Inflammation for Health and Weight Loss* (by Kathy Abascal)

Norman Cousins has written about the science of psycho-neuro-immunology (the science of the mind-body connection, and biofeedback). We can teach children about the marvelous nature of their own mind-body, and nurture in them ways to connect to their own innate healing power.

Michelle Obama and organized medicine are working with school systems and hospitals to provide more nutritious food.

Some people have proposed a tax on sugar, high fructose corn syrup, and cigarettes, all of which are very detrimental to our health and drive up health care costs.

Some people have proposed eliminating all government subsidies for tobacco and crops like corn. Most corn that is grown in this country is not eaten off the cob; most of it goes to make high fructose corn syrup that is added to most processed foods and to make refined carbohydrate products. These are poor in nutrition and high in calories, but they are cheap to consumers because they are subsidized. If we want the government to subsidize anything in agriculture, we could subsidize healthy, organic whole foods (fruits, vegetables, whole grains).

2. Wait to have children until we are financially and emotionally able to support them: I would like to see a national ethic (really an international ethic) for responsible parenting, an ethic that would strongly encourage all of us to postpone having children until we have completed our education and job training and until we are emotionally and financially capable of taking care of children.

When any one of us is overwhelmed by poverty, illiteracy, emotional immaturity, or drugs, or if we have no skills for earning a living, or if we are consumed by hostility and rage at the injustices or abuse we have endured as young people, we are incapable of being responsible parents. We are incapable of giving to an infant or child what we have not developed within ourselves. If we become parents under any of these circumstances, we and our children often become economic and emotional burdens on our society.

I would like to see this ethic being commonly taught in all school grades.

This would mean that every one of us needs easy access to information about contraception, family planning, and abortion. These services should be provided at no charge to anyone who cannot afford them. That would include funding for Planned Parenthood and other organizations that provide these services.

I believe such responsible family planning is one of our nation's and our world's most pressing problems. In only 5 years, it would have a significant effect on many other social concerns--poverty, malnutrition, infant mortality, family violence, abuse and neglect of preschool children, and the myriad of other medical, legal, and social costs of supporting overwhelmed parents and their children. Global warming and the population explosion is encroaching on our environment and overwhelming our natural resources, and it is a driving force behind emigration especially from Africa.

I believe the goal of temporary welfare support and foreign aid has to be to empower people, and this support must include birth control and family planning. 100 million women around the world cannot obtain or are not using family planning services because they are poor, uneducated, or lack access to care.

Melinda Gates is making family planning her signature issue and primary public health a priority.

In early 1960's, **Dwight Eisenhower called for foreign aid for birth control. Harry Truman was honorary chairman of Planned Parenthood. In 1965, President Lyndon Johnson implored the UN to face forthrightly the multiplying problems of multiplying populations...Less than \$5 invested in population control is worth \$100 invested in economic growth.**

Ewing Kaufman, owner of the Kansas City Royals, has adopted two Kansas City high schools promising to pay for the college education of all students who do not become pregnant prior to graduation!!

No one is pro-abortion. No one advocates abortion as a method of birth control or family planning. It is a painful and agonizing decision for a woman to make. **I would use the term, anti-choice, not pro-life,** because many people who say they are Pro-Life are actually Anti-Choice, not Pro-Life. They may be Pro-Fetus, but they are usually not pro the support services that would make it possible for an unwanted child to grow up to be a healthy and productive adult. **Actually being Pro-Choice is a conservative position in the best sense of limited government intervention or intrusion. Being conservative does not mean being a right wing religious Christian extremist.**

One way I look at this question is that while a fetus is totally dependent on and cannot live apart from the mother, the mother has rights. Once a fetus is viable and could survive outside the mother, we need to consider the rights of the fetus. We need to avoid using inflammatory terms like "partial birth abortions," which distort reality. Planned Parenthood and most physicians perform abortions only in the first trimester. Later term abortions are only done when the life or health of the mother is at stake and **only 1.2 % of all abortions in the USA take place after 20 weeks gestation.**

3. Facing the end of our lives with courage, and planning for the quality we want at the end of our lives, so we do not spend 75-95% of our lifelong medical expenses in the last 6 months of our lives: Each of us needs to come to terms with the fact that we will die eventually. There will come a time for each of us when there will be no hope for an ongoing useful life, but there will be hope for a dignified, pain-free death. We must make our wishes known to our family. Jane Murray, M.D., writes about the important things to do at the end of one's life (forgiveness, gratitude, legal papers, etc.) so we can die in a state of peace and completion. She writes, *Understanding and accepting death with grace may be one of the last frontiers of our medical and cultural development. Perhaps we can find guidance from other cultures that seem to realize that every day of life is a step closer to death, not in a morbid fearful sense, but in rejoicing over each new day given to us.*

If you and others speak about this citizen responsibility often, it will become part of our national consciousness.

Also, the government/Medicare needs to be able to negotiate drug costs. Drugs cost 40% less in Canada. **I would like to refer you to the article, *On the Take*, by Dr. Jerome Kassirer, about the undue influence of the pharmaceutical industry on American medicine.** Many doctors have taken the No Free Lunch Pledge, vowing not to accept any pharmaceutical industry gifts, money, or hospitality. The argument is often made that drug companies need their revenue for research; however 30% of their revenue is spent on marketing and only 11% on research and development. Most drug company "research" actually originates with basic science work done by government funding through the National Institutes of Health. Another driving force in drug costs is the patent protection pharmaceutical companies are granted for years. Are you and our other public officials willing to put the welfare of the public above the interests of the pharmaceutical industry and force drug costs to be reasonable, or are your own political aspirations more important to you?

We also need medical malpractice reform.

We also must speak the truth about Health Care Rationing: Jane Murray, M.D., writes, *While many of us feel health care should be a right, we have never been willing to define how much is a right and which health services are "luxuries." At the extreme ends of the spectrum, the distinction is easy. Prenatal care and immunizations are necessities, and the costs are clearly beneficial to society as well as to the individual. Face-lifts and refractive surgery are luxuries that no government program should be required to provide. What gets very difficult is the multitude of possibilities closer to the center: organ transplants, expensive*

intensive care for terminally ill persons, unproven expensive treatments for cancer, etc. As a society we have not yet been able to confront these gray zones very well. We want to avoid the word "rationing" and unfortunately resources actually are finite, and some kind of rationing will always occur.

Jane Murray, M.D., writes that, *Open, public discussion, debate and articulation of values and fiscal realities is the only ethical way to ration care*—to talk about about what can be afforded and what cannot and why. As a society, we need to state what will be covered in any system of payment (be it public, universal health care, or private insurance) and what will not. It is not the individual doctor's role to ration care, nor is it the insurance company's role. It is the public's role and responsibility to determine our society's priorities in health care, and then be willing to face the fiscal obligation to pay for those priorities. Jane Murray, M.D. states that she would *like to know that the denial of care is not because the executive of the health care company needs a bigger raise or the shareholders need an increase in the stock value of the company.* These are very tough realities; but denying that these realities exist and believing society can afford everything for everyone is a belief we each must change.

THE SUPREME COURT: I support a Supreme Court that interprets the intent of the Constitution, rather than supporting Citizens United and imposing its moralistic anti-choice and anti-LGBTQ values. I support thorough vetting of anyone nominated. Clarence Thomas' appointment to the Supreme Court was rushed without proper vetting. Do we need to reverse Citizens United and push for public financing of elections and demand full disclosure of all private sources of campaign funding?

I believe the Supreme Court should consist of 4.5 men and 4.5 women. That would mean, that over the years, that the Supreme Court would alternate between 5 men-4 women and 4 men-5 women. I am hoping the Million Women who may march January 21st will speak about wanting an equal balance of men and women on the Court. If Merrick Garland, who is an outstanding and eminently qualified centrist judge, is not re-nominated, I hope we will all stand up for a woman to be nominated.

HUMAN RIGHTS and SOCIAL JUSTICE: I would like to remind Mike Pence that research cannot yet definitively identify the causes of being homosexual or transgender; but since many people state they knew these things about themselves by age 4 or 5, we cannot say that being homosexual or transgender is an immoral choice that can be cured by conversion therapy. We need to preserve all our civil rights, including our LGBTQ rights.

THE ECONOMY—JOBS—OUR ENVIRONMENT—CLEAN ENERGY—PRIVATE BUSINESS:

Time Magazine (December 12, 2016) covered the Global Forum at the Vatican that brought together the world's top CEO's (executives), investors, academics, labor and church leaders, and philanthropists to try and bridge the gap between ideology and action—to brainstorm possible solutions to the world's most pressing problems--climate change, rising inequality, technological disruption, education reform, poverty reduction, universal health care, etc. Solutions to these issues will require coordinated, multilateral cooperation among government institutions, corporations, not-for-profit organizations (NGO's), etc. The market alone will not solve this problems; we need collaboration across business, government and civil society. Our individual and collective welfare will depend on whether unity can be forged out of disruption and turmoil. To try to make the right hard decisions we need to enlist all vested interests and try to balance profits with what is right. The global economy is not creating prosperity for everyone. Economic globalization has run ahead of political globalization, resulting in isolationism, nationalism, and a fragmenting of the old world order.

Robert Reich (Secretary of Labor during the Clinton administration, professor of public policy at Berkeley, and senior fellow at Blum Center for Developing Economies) states that *the large Wall Street banks, big*

corporations, and the richest Americans have been responsible for the largest upward redistribution of income and wealth in modern American history.

Part of the upward redistribution has involved excessive risk-taking on Wall Street, which padded the nests of executives and traders but required a tax-payer-funded bailout when the bubble burst in 2008. It has caused millions of working Americans to lose their jobs, savings, and homes. Its lobbyists are busily rolling back the Dodd-Frank Act intended to prevent another crash, when we probably need to resurrect the Glass-Steagall Act, separating Investment and Commercial Banking.

Another part of America's upward redistribution of wealth has come in the form of "corporate welfare"--tax breaks and subsidies benefiting particular companies and industries (oil and gas, hedge-fund and private-equity, pharmaceuticals, big agriculture) for no reason other than they have the political clout to get them.

This upward redistribution has also come under the guise of patents and trademarks that extend far beyond what's necessary for adequate returns on corporate investment, resulting, for example, in drug prices that are higher in America than in any other advanced nation.

It has taken the form of monopoly power, generating outsize profits for certain companies (Monsanto, Pfizer, and Comcast, for example) along with high prices for consumers.

Desmond Lachman (a resident fellow at the American Enterprise Institute, former deputy director in the International Monetary Fund's policy development and review department, and chief emerging market economic strategist at Salomon Smith Barney) stated in the *NY Times*, December 20, 2016: *One of the basic themes of Donald J. Trump's election campaign was that the United States was being ripped off by foreign countries and that his administration would reduce our trade deficit.*

Yet the budget policies he is now proposing would be sharply at odds with that goal. By advocating an expansive budget through tax cuts and infrastructure spending, Mr. Trump's plan would most likely lower national savings and propel the United States dollar ever higher, creating the very conditions to widen rather than to narrow the trade deficit.

Mr. Trump seems to be overlooking a matter of basic arithmetic. While a country's trade balance is the difference between a country's exports and imports, it is also the difference between the amount it saves and invests, as can be derived from rearranging the components of a country's aggregate demand equation. If a country saves more than it invests, it will run a trade surplus. Conversely, a country that saves less than it invests will run a trade deficit.

Seemingly oblivious to this basic math, Mr. Trump is proposing far-reaching and seemingly unfunded cuts in both corporate and household tax rates. Worse yet, he is simultaneously proposing large increases in both public infrastructure and military spending. He is doing so in the unrealistic hope that these policies will cause the economy to accelerate from its present 2 percent growth rate to between 3 and 4 percent. And he is counting on such faster economic growth to generate additional tax revenue.

Although it has been a Republican position to unleash middle class' entrepreneurial energies by reducing taxes and regulations, we know that tax breaks do not stimulate anything but budget deficits, and we need to refrain from tax increases on middle class.

Thomas Piketty (professor at Paris School of Economics, and author of *Capital in the Twenty-First Century*) states that *to combat global inequality, we might institute a global wealth tax--a tax on overall net worth, which would capture capital wealth, because economic growth/salaries do not keep pace with return on capital wealth. Corporate profits now account for the largest percentage of the total economy in more than 8 decades, with wages accounting for the smallest percentage of the total economy in more than 6 decades. He also states we should increase capital gains tax and close corporate tax loopholes.*

Robert Reich states we need to do away with "corporate welfare"--tax breaks and subsidies benefiting particular companies and industries (oil and gas, hedge-fund and private-equity, pharmaceuticals, big agriculture), along with excessive intellectual property protection. We need tougher antitrust enforcement

42% globally. **Smart and sustainable energy policy becomes a matter of global competitiveness.**

Andrew Liveris (CEO of Dow Chemical) stated in *Time Magazine*, December 12, 2016, that *no nation can address its greatest challenges without the expertise, scale, and innovation of private business. To achieve prosperity for all, we must embrace a more inclusive capitalism, and redefine the role of business in society.*

GLOBAL SECURITY DEPENDS NOT ONLY ON ALLIANCES AND ARMIES BUT ALSO ON MAKING SURE CHILDREN, GIRLS AS WELL AS BOYS, CAN GET TO SCHOOL

U.N. Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon said: The world will never realize 100% of its goals if 50% of its people cannot realize their full potential.

EDUCATION: Both political parties promise help for education, but they do not deliver. There is money but it goes to defense. Research documents the benefits of early childhood education. Many of my friends are teachers and they see clearly what could make our education competitive. **Research shows that the 2 most important factors for school success are class size and a connection with 1 adult.** We should have a maximum class size of 15 in elementary school, 20 in middle and high school.

Children of poverty are traumatized, often abused, hungry and scared, and not able to learn, and the pattern repeats itself generation after generation. They need the special support of at least 1 committed adult to succeed.

Research documents the value of the humanities-music, art, literature, history, and the value of exercise and physical fitness.

On December 6, 2016, the OECD (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development) which coordinates PISA (The Programme for International Student Assessment, which provides comprehensive world education rankings based on international tests taken by 15-year-olds every 3 years in math, reading and science in 72 countries) published its more recent findings: **The United States ranked 25th in science, 36th in math, and 24th in reading. Wendy Kopp (Founder of Teach for America and CEO of Teach for All) stated that *we need to send our educators out into the world to see what is working, to expand our vision of what is possible. #1 ranked Singapore has become rich because of education.*** In the highest-ranked countries, education has been made a priority; top talent is attracted into teaching; teachers are respected and paid as part of a professional system; and there are high national standards. Most educators value our **Common Core Standards**, but they have been attacked in a partisan way for being “federal,” even though they were developed by educators from all across the United States. **We need some broad national standards, that can be flexibility carried out at the local and state levels, and we need accountability.**

There are many constructive suggestions for creating excellent education in the United States.

Marcelo Claure (CEO of Sprint) stated in *Time Magazine*, December 12, 2016, that 5 million families with school-age children in U.S lack broadband internet access at home. Wireless providers have the ability to provide free service to these students.

We need strong technical/vocational training beginning in middle school. The 9th grade is the year with the highest school drop-out rate. Many students want to go on to 2-year or 4-year programs, but many students are discouraged by middle school and high school. A great way for them to learn the English, math, and history skills they need is through vocational training, so they leave school with skilled job training. They can go on to college later if they want to. We need all students to stay in school or technical training until they are 17/18 and graduate. **Every young person should leave high school, either trained in a skilled job or headed for 2 or 4-year college.**

I would encourage a great expansion of the apprentice programs in the private sector.

By 2020, U.S. universities won't be able to fill 2 out of 3 of the 1.4 million of computer positions in the

U.S. One great program is "Girls who Code" summer classes, to learn the algorithms that tell computers what to do.

We can support debt-free post-secondary public college or technical education for people whose income is under \$125,000. We have strong community college programs. We need to build a skilled work force.

John Rice (Vice-Chairman of GE) stated in *Time Magazine*, December 12, 2016, that *we must build work forces business need; we must focus on training and "upskilling." Businesses can support those whose jobs are impacted by technology; workers displaced by technology can learn to operate robots and become comfortable with automation. Businesses can develop work-study programs based on company-tailored curricula or provide essential machines to universities or vocational programs so students can learn to use them.*

Ginni Rometty (CEO of IBM) stated in *Time Magazine*, December 12, 2016, that *The future of job creation is no longer white collar vs blue collar. It's new collar. New jobs are being unleashed by technology: jobs in cybersecurity, data science, artificial intelligence, and cognitive business. There are more than 5 million jobs open in the U.S., many of which are high-skill and higher-paid, but don't require a 4-year degree.*

We need new educational models. IBM has championed 6-year public high schools that combine traditional education with the best of community colleges, mentoring and real-world job experience. There will soon be 100 such schools across the U.S. and around the world.

Artificial intelligence can help by enhancing and accelerating skill development of employees or trainees, and by bridging the gap between employers with unfilled vacancies and prospective employees who have the potential but not the traditional qualifications.

SOCIAL SECURITY: We need to preserve social security in a fiscally responsible way. A very good friend of mine, **Leanne Abdnor**, was a member of the Presidential Commission to Strengthen Social Security (under President George W. Bush, in 2000-2001). Some of their recommendations were to lower expected social security for higher wage earners and increase benefits paid to low-income workers (to continue to provide a safety net for low wage workers). The truth is that above some annual income, maybe \$200,000, people should receive no social security.

They recommended that any reform package should include voluntary, individually-controlled personal retirement accounts, allocating 2% or 4% of payroll taxes to be put into 1 of 5 governmentally regulated funds, modeled after Thrift Savings Plan for Federal Employees.

They recommended that the formula for calculating future retirees benefits be changed from wage indexing to progressive inflation/price indexing for middle and high income earners; and continue wage indexing for low wage earners.

They recommended a minimum benefit of 120% of poverty level.

They recommended a gradual raising of the retirement age to age 70.

Why can't we implement these recommendations immediately. As I listened to the discussions that followed the release of this report, I felt all speakers distorted the truth except for **Leanne Abdnor**. We need the whole truth spoken and we need vested interests to come together to make humane and fiscally sound decisions.

GUN SAFETY: Here again we need to tell the truth and address gun violence, and stand up to the NRA. 85% of gun owners want gun safety. Democrats do NOT want to take away everyone's guns and 2nd amendment rights.

Can anyone rationally argue against universal background checks that eliminate any loopholes for gun shows and internet sales, and a 30-day waiting period to reduce gun use in the heat of emotion against oneself or others? 92% of Americans are in favor of this.

Can anyone rationally argue that, without affecting hunting and self-protection, we can limit the calibre of

guns, the number of automatic rounds, and the size of magazines? 92% of Americans are in favor of this. No private citizen needs assault weapons; and the reality is no citizen can defend himself with larger weapons against the capabilities of our police and military.

I want to refer you to *Justice and Forgiveness Are the Answer to Gun Violence: Together, They Let us Abandon Hatred to Heal* (by Jim Liske, President of Prison Fellowship, USA Today, January 10, 2014).

He asks, *What is the "appropriate" response to unimaginable acts of violence that upend our sense of security? He states there are 2 warring opinions after the guns go silent:*

One voice demands cold, swift justice against the offender, who is painted as a monster; the other advises us to "forgive and forget," brushing away the hurt and moving forward as though it had never happened, as though no one bore responsibility.

*Both these approaches fail to deal with the wounded hearts and fractured relationships. **We cannot move forward without justice; and we cannot heal without forgiveness.** To be restored, we must learn to hold justice and forgiveness together in a single, restorative tension.*

CRIMINAL JUSTICE REFORM—JUVENILE JUSTICE REFORM—PRISON REFORM:

I believe we can stop incarcerating people for non-violent crimes and we can apply the wonderful constructive aspects of Restorative Justice.

I want to refer you to a program on Iowa Public Radio, *Black Lives and Blue Lives* (with Terry Gross, on Fresh Air, July 21, 2016). She stated that we often react to complexity by scapegoating, and her panel spoke honestly about issues that need to be addressed in both black communities and in our police forces.

I am sorry my letter is so long. I appreciate your reading and considering what I have said and speaking about some of it with Mr. Trump. I hope you will help him lead our country forward with integrity and openness, and I hope you will encourage him to apply fiscal conservatism to all areas of our government, including the military and intelligence complexes. I hope you will help teach us all to face the complexities of the issues before us with knowledge, humility and respect.

With all good wishes,



Nancy Mullins

Variations of this letter sent to:

Donald Trump

Melania Trump

Ivanka Trump and Jerrod Kushner

Many of Mr. Trump's nominees

Some Republican and Democratic leaders

TOP SECRET AMERICA: A HIDDEN WORLD, GROWING BEYOND CONTROL (A WASHINGTON POST INVESTIGATION, by Dana Priest and William Arkin, July 19, 2010) (Staff researcher Julie Tate contributed to this report)

The top-secret world the government created in response to the terrorist attacks of Sept. 11, 2001, has become so large, so unwieldy and so secretive that no one knows how much money it costs, how many people it employs, how many programs exist within it or exactly how many agencies do the same work.

These are some of the findings of a two-year investigation by The Washington Post that discovered what amounts to an alternative geography of the United States, **a Top Secret America hidden from public view and lacking in thorough oversight. After nine years of unprecedented spending and growth, the result is that the system put in place to keep the United States safe is so massive that its effectiveness is impossible to determine.**

The investigation's other findings include:

- * Some 1,271 government organizations and 1,931 private companies work on programs related to counterterrorism, homeland security and intelligence in about 10,000 locations across the United States.
- * An estimated 854,000 people, nearly 1.5 times as many people as live in Washington, D.C., hold top-secret security clearances.
- * In Washington and the surrounding area, 33 building complexes for top-secret intelligence work are under construction or have been built since September 2001. Together they occupy the equivalent of almost three Pentagons or 22 U.S. Capitol buildings - about 17 million square feet of space.
- * Many security and intelligence agencies do the same work, creating redundancy and waste. For example, 51 federal organizations and military commands, operating in 15 U.S. cities, track the flow of money to and from terrorist networks.
- * Analysts who make sense of documents and conversations obtained by foreign and domestic spying share their judgment by publishing 50,000 intelligence reports each year - a volume so large that many are routinely ignored.

Since Sept. 11, 2001, the top-secret world created to respond to the terrorist attacks has grown into an unwieldy enterprise spread over 10,000 U.S. locations. These are not academic issues; lack of focus, not lack of resources, was at the heart of the Fort Hood shooting that left 13 dead, as well as the Christmas Day bomb attempt thwarted not by the thousands of analysts employed to find lone terrorists but by an alert airline passenger who saw smoke coming from his seatmate.

They are also issues that greatly concern some of the people in charge of the nation's security. "There has been so much growth since 9/11 that getting your arms around that - not just for the CIA, for the secretary of defense - is a challenge," Defense Secretary Robert M. Gates said in an interview with The Post last week.

In the Department of Defense, where more than two-thirds of the intelligence programs reside, only a handful of senior officials - called Super Users - have the ability to even know about all the department's activities. But as two of the Super Users indicated in interviews, there is simply no way they can keep up with the nation's most sensitive work.

"I'm not going to live long enough to be briefed on everything" was how one Super User put it. The other recounted that for his initial briefing, he was escorted into a tiny, dark room, seated at a small table and told he couldn't take notes. Program after program began flashing on a screen, he said, until he yelled "Stop!" in frustration.

"I wasn't remembering any of it," he said.

Underscoring the seriousness of these issues are the conclusions of **retired Army Lt. Gen. John R. Vines**, who was asked last year to review the method for tracking the Defense Department's most sensitive programs. Vines, who once commanded 145,000 troops in Iraq and is familiar with complex problems, was stunned by what he discovered.

"I'm not aware of any agency with the authority, responsibility or a process in place to coordinate all these interagency and commercial activities," he said in an interview. "The complexity of this system defies description."

The result, he added, is that it's impossible to tell whether the country is safer because of all this spending and all these activities. **"Because it lacks a synchronizing process, it inevitably results in message dissonance, reduced effectiveness and waste,"** Vines said. **"We consequently can't effectively assess whether it is making us more safe."**

The Post's investigation is based on government documents and contracts, job descriptions, property records, corporate and social networking Web sites, additional records, and hundreds of interviews with intelligence, military and corporate officials and former officials. Most requested anonymity either because they are prohibited from speaking publicly or because, they said, they feared retaliation at work for describing their concerns.

The Post's online database of government organizations and private companies was built entirely on public records. The investigation focused on top-secret work because the amount classified at the secret level is too large to accurately track.

Today's article describes the government's role in this expanding enterprise. Tuesday's article describes the government's dependence on private contractors. Wednesday's is a portrait of one Top Secret America community. On the Web, an extensive, searchable database built by The Post about Top Secret America is available at washingtonpost.com/topsecretamerica.

Defense Secretary Gates, in his interview with The Post, said that he does not believe the system has become too big to manage but that getting precise data is sometimes difficult. Singling out the growth of intelligence units in the Defense Department, he said he intends to review those programs for waste. "Nine years after 9/11, it makes a lot of sense to sort of take a look at this and say, 'Okay, we've built tremendous capability, but **do we have more than we need?**' " he said.

CIA Director Leon Panetta, who was also interviewed by The Post last week, said he's begun mapping out a five-year plan for his agency because the levels of spending since 9/11 are not sustainable. "Particularly with these deficits, we're going to hit the wall. I want to be prepared for that," he said. "Frankly, I think everyone in intelligence ought to be doing that."

In an interview before he resigned as the director of national intelligence in May, **retired Adm. Dennis C. Blair** said he did not believe there was overlap and redundancy in the intelligence world. "Much of what appears to be redundancy is, in fact, providing tailored intelligence for many different customers," he said.

Blair also expressed confidence that subordinates told him what he needed to know. "I have visibility on

all the important intelligence programs across the community, and there are processes in place to ensure the different intelligence capabilities are working together where they need to," he said.

Weeks later, as he sat in the corner of a ballroom at the Willard Hotel waiting to give a speech, he mused about The Post's findings. "After 9/11, when we decided to attack violent extremism, we did as we so often do in this country," he said. "The attitude was, if it's worth doing, it's probably worth overdoing."

Outside a gated subdivision of mansions in McLean, a line of cars idles every weekday morning as a new day in Top Secret America gets underway. The drivers wait patiently to turn left, then crawl up a hill and around a bend to a destination that is not on any public map and not announced by any street sign.

Liberty Crossing tries hard to hide from view. But in the winter, leafless trees can't conceal a mountain of cement and windows the size of five Wal-Mart stores stacked on top of one another rising behind a grassy berm. One step too close without the right badge, and men in black jump out of nowhere, guns at the ready.

Past the armed guards and the hydraulic steel barriers, at least 1,700 federal employees and 1,200 private contractors work at Liberty Crossing, the nickname for the two headquarters of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence and its National Counterterrorism Center. The two share a police force, a canine unit and thousands of parking spaces.

Liberty Crossing is at the center of the collection of U.S. government agencies and corporate contractors that mushroomed after the 2001 attacks. But it is not nearly the biggest, the most costly or even the most secretive part of the 9/11 enterprise.

In an Arlington County office building, the lobby directory doesn't include the Air Force's mysteriously named XOIWS unit, but there's a big "Welcome!" sign in the hallway greeting visitors who know to step off the elevator on the third floor. In Elkrige, MD., a clandestine program hides in a tall concrete structure fitted with false windows to look like a normal office building. In Arnold, MO., the location is across the street from a Target and a Home Depot. In St. Petersburg, FL., it's in a modest brick bungalow in a run-down business park.

Each day at the National Counterterrorism Center in McLean, workers review at least 5,000 pieces of terrorist-related data from intelligence agencies and keep an eye on world events.

Every day across the United States, 854,000 civil servants, military personnel and private contractors with top-secret security clearances are scanned into offices protected by electromagnetic locks, retinal cameras and fortified walls that eavesdropping equipment cannot penetrate.

This is not exactly President Dwight D. Eisenhower's "military-industrial complex," which emerged with the Cold War and centered on building nuclear weapons to deter the Soviet Union. This is a national security enterprise with a more amorphous mission: defeating transnational violent extremists.

Much of the information about this mission is classified. That is the reason it is so difficult to gauge the success and identify the problems of Top Secret America, including whether money is being spent wisely. **The U.S. intelligence budget is vast, publicly announced last year as \$75 billion, 2 1/2 times the size it was on Sept. 10, 2001. But the figure doesn't include many military activities or domestic counterterrorism programs.**

At least 20 percent of the government organizations that exist to fend off terrorist threats were established or refashioned in the wake of 9/11. Many that existed before the attacks grew to historic proportions as the Bush administration and Congress gave agencies more money than they were capable of responsibly spending.

The Pentagon's Defense Intelligence Agency, for example, has gone from 7,500 employees in 2002 to 16,500 today. The budget of the National Security Agency, which conducts electronic eavesdropping, doubled. Thirty-five FBI Joint Terrorism Task Forces became 106. It was phenomenal growth that began almost as soon as the Sept. 11 attacks ended.

Nine days after the attacks, Congress committed \$40 billion beyond what was in the federal budget to fortify domestic defenses and to launch a global offensive against al-Qaeda. It followed that up with an additional \$36.5 billion in 2002 and \$44 billion in 2003. That was only a beginning.

With the quick infusion of money, military and intelligence agencies multiplied. Twenty-four organizations were created by the end of 2001, including the Office of Homeland Security and the Foreign Terrorist Asset Tracking Task Force. In 2002, 37 more were created to track weapons of mass destruction, collect threat tips and coordinate the new focus on counterterrorism. That was followed the next year by 36 new organizations; and 26 after that; and 31 more; and 32 more; and 20 or more each in 2007, 2008 and 2009.

In all, at least 263 organizations have been created or reorganized as a response to 9/11. Each has required more people, and those people have required more administrative and logistic support: phone operators, secretaries, librarians, architects, carpenters, construction workers, air-conditioning mechanics and, because of where they work, even janitors with top-secret clearances.

With so many more employees, units and organizations, the lines of responsibility began to blur. To remedy this, at the recommendation of the bipartisan 9/11 Commission, the George W. Bush administration and Congress decided to create an agency in 2004 with overarching responsibilities called the Office of the Director of National Intelligence (ODNI) to bring the colossal effort under control. While that was the idea, Washington has its own ways.

The first problem was that the law passed by Congress did not give the director clear legal or budgetary authority over intelligence matters, which meant he wouldn't have power over the individual agencies he was supposed to control.

The second problem: Even before the first director, Ambassador John D. Negroponte, was on the job, the turf battles began. The Defense Department shifted billions of dollars out of one budget and into another so that the ODNI could not touch it, according to two senior officials who watched the process. The CIA reclassified some of its most sensitive information at a higher level so the National Counterterrorism Center staff, part of the ODNI, would not be allowed to see it, said former intelligence officers involved.

And then came a problem that continues to this day, which has to do with the ODNI's rapid expansion.

When it opened in the spring of 2005, Negroponte's office was all of 11 people stuffed into a secure vault

with closet-size rooms a block from the White House. A year later, the budding agency moved to two floors of another building. In April 2008, it moved into its huge permanent home, Liberty Crossing.

Today, many officials who work in the intelligence agencies say they remain unclear about what the ODNI is in charge of. To be sure, the ODNI has made some progress, especially in intelligence-sharing, information technology and budget reform. The DNI and his managers hold interagency meetings every day to promote collaboration. The last director, Blair, doggedly pursued such nitty-gritty issues as procurement reform, compatible computer networks, tradecraft standards and collegiality.

But improvements have been overtaken by volume at the ODNI, as the increased flow of intelligence data overwhelms the system's ability to analyze and use it. Every day, collection systems at the National Security Agency intercept and store 1.7 billion e-mails, phone calls and other types of communications. The NSA sorts a fraction of those into 70 separate databases. The same problem bedevils every other intelligence agency, none of which have enough analysts and translators for all this work.

The practical effect of this unwieldiness is visible, on a much smaller scale, in the office of Michael Leiter, the director of the National Counterterrorism Center. Leiter spends much of his day flipping among four computer monitors lined up on his desk. Six hard drives sit at his feet. The data flow is enormous, with dozens of databases feeding separate computer networks that cannot interact with one another.

There is a long explanation for why these databases are still not connected, and it amounts to this: It's too hard, and some agency heads don't really want to give up the systems they have. But there's some progress: "All my e-mail on one computer now," Leiter says. "That's a big deal."

To get another view of how sprawling Top Secret America has become, just head west on the toll road toward Dulles International Airport.

As a Michaels craft store and a Books-A-Million give way to the military intelligence giants Northrop Grumman and Lockheed Martin, find the off-ramp and turn left. Those two shimmering-blue five-story ice cubes belong to the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency, which analyzes images and mapping data of the Earth's geography. A small sign obscured by a boxwood hedge says so.

Across the street, in the chocolate-brown blocks, is Carahsoft, an intelligence agency contractor specializing in mapping, speech analysis and data harvesting. Nearby is the government's Underground Facility Analysis Center. It identifies overseas underground command centers associated with weapons of mass destruction and terrorist groups, and advises the military on how to destroy them.

Clusters of top-secret work exist throughout the country, but the Washington region is the capital of Top Secret America.

About half of the post-9/11 enterprise is anchored in an arc stretching from Leesburg south to Quantico, back north through Washington and curving northeast to Linthicum, just north of the Baltimore-Washington International Marshall Airport. Many buildings sit within off-limits government compounds or military bases.

Others occupy business parks or are intermingled with neighborhoods, schools and shopping centers and

go unnoticed by most people who live or play nearby.

Many of the newest buildings are not just utilitarian offices but also edifices "on the order of the pyramids," in the words of one senior military intelligence officer.

Not far from the Dulles Toll Road, the CIA has expanded into two buildings that will increase the agency's office space by one-third. To the south, Springfield is becoming home to the new \$1.8 billion National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency headquarters, which will be the fourth-largest federal building in the area and home to 8,500 employees. **Economic stimulus money is paying hundreds of millions of dollars for this kind of federal construction across the region.**

It's not only the number of buildings that suggests the size and cost of this expansion, it's also what is inside: banks of television monitors. "Escort-required" badges. X-ray machines and lockers to store cellphones and pagers. Keypad door locks that open special rooms encased in metal or permanent dry wall, impenetrable to eavesdropping tools and protected by alarms and a security force capable of responding within 15 minutes. Every one of these buildings has at least one of these rooms, known as a SCIF, for sensitive compartmented information facility. Some are as small as a closet; others are four times the size of a football field.

SCIF size has become a measure of status in Top Secret America, or at least in the Washington region of it. "In D.C., everyone talks SCIF, SCIF, SCIF," said Bruce Paquin, who moved to Florida from the Washington region several years ago to start a SCIF construction business. "They've got the penis envy thing going. You can't be a big boy unless you're a three-letter agency and you have a big SCIF."

SCIFs are not the only must-have items people pay attention to. Command centers, internal television networks, video walls, armored SUVs and personal security guards have also become the bling of national security.

"You can't find a four-star general without a security detail," said one three-star general now posted in Washington after years abroad. "Fear has caused everyone to have stuff. Then comes, 'If he has one, then I have to have one.' It's become a status symbol."

Among the most important people inside the SCIFs are the low-paid employees carrying their lunches to work to save money. They are the analysts, the 20- and 30-year-olds making \$41,000 to \$65,000 a year, whose job is at the core of everything Top Secret America tries to do.

At its best, analysis melds cultural understanding with snippets of conversations, coded dialogue, anonymous tips, even scraps of trash, turning them into clues that lead to individuals and groups trying to harm the United States.

Their work is greatly enhanced by computers that sort through and categorize data. But in the end, analysis requires human judgment, and half the analysts are relatively inexperienced, having been hired in the past several years, said a senior ODNI official. Contract analysts are often straight out of college and trained at corporate headquarters.

When hired, a typical analyst knows very little about the priority countries - Iraq, Iran, Afghanistan and Pakistan - and is not fluent in their languages. Still, the number of intelligence reports they produce on these key countries is overwhelming, say current and former intelligence officials who try to cull them

every day. The ODNI doesn't know exactly how many reports are issued each year, but in the process of trying to find out, the chief of analysis discovered 60 classified analytic Web sites still in operation that were supposed to have been closed down for lack of usefulness. "Like a zombie, it keeps on living" is how one official describes the sites.

The problem with many intelligence reports, say officers who read them, is that they simply re-slice the same facts already in circulation. "It's the soccer ball syndrome. Something happens, and they want to rush to cover it," said Richard H. Immerman, who was the ODNI's assistant deputy director of national intelligence for analytic integrity and standards until early 2009. "I saw tremendous overlap."

Even the analysts at the National Counterterrorism Center (NCTC), which is supposed to be where the most sensitive, most difficult-to-obtain nuggets of information are fused together, get low marks from intelligence officials for not producing reports that are original, or at least better than the reports already written by the CIA, FBI, National Security Agency or Defense Intelligence Agency.

When Maj. Gen. John M. Custer was the director of intelligence at U.S. Central Command, he grew angry at how little helpful information came out of the NCTC. In 2007, he visited its director at the time, retired Vice Adm. John Scott Redd, to tell him so. "I told him that after 4 1/2 years, this organization had never produced one shred of information that helped me prosecute three wars!" he said loudly, leaning over the table during an interview.

Two years later, Custer, now head of the Army's intelligence school at Fort Huachuca, Ariz., still gets red-faced recalling that day, which reminds him of his frustration with Washington's bureaucracy. "Who has the mission of reducing redundancy and ensuring everybody doesn't gravitate to the lowest-hanging fruit?" he said. "Who orchestrates what is produced so that everybody doesn't produce the same thing?"

He's hardly the only one irritated. In a secure office in Washington, a senior intelligence officer was dealing with his own frustration. Seated at his computer, he began scrolling through some of the classified information he is expected to read every day: CIA World Intelligence Review, WIRE-CIA, Spot Intelligence Report, Daily Intelligence Summary, Weekly Intelligence Forecast, Weekly Warning Forecast, IC Terrorist Threat Assessments, NCTC Terrorism Dispatch, NCTC Spotlight . . .

It's too much, he complained. The inbox on his desk was full, too. He threw up his arms, picked up a thick, glossy intelligence report and waved it around, yelling.

"Jesus! Why does it take so long to produce?"

"Why does it have to be so bulky?"

"Why isn't it online?"

The overload of hourly, daily, weekly, monthly and annual reports is actually counterproductive, say people who receive them. Some policymakers and senior officials don't dare delve into the backup clogging their computers. They rely instead on personal briefers, and those briefers usually rely on their own agency's analysis, re-creating the very problem identified as a main cause of the failure to thwart the attacks: a lack of information-sharing.

The ODNI's analysis office knows this is a problem. Yet its solution was another publication, this one a daily online newspaper, Intelligence Today. Every day, a staff of 22 culls more than two dozen agencies' reports and 63 Web sites, selects the best information and packages it by originality, topic and region.

Analysis is not the only area where serious overlap appears to be gumming up the national security machinery and blurring the lines of responsibility.

Within the Defense Department alone, 18 commands and agencies conduct information operations, which aspire to manage foreign audiences' perceptions of U.S. policy and military activities overseas.

And all the major intelligence agencies and at least two major military commands claim a major role in cyber-warfare, the newest and least-defined frontier.

"Frankly, it hasn't been brought together in a unified approach," CIA Director Panetta said of the many agencies now involved in cyber-warfare.

"Cyber is tremendously difficult" to coordinate, said Benjamin A. Powell, who served as general counsel for three directors of national intelligence until he left the government last year. "Sometimes there was an unfortunate attitude of bring your knives, your guns, your fists and be fully prepared to defend your turf." Why? "Because it's funded, it's hot and it's sexy."

Last fall, U.S. Army Maj. Nidal Malik Hasan allegedly opened fire at Fort Hood, Tex., killing 13 people and wounding 30. In the days after the shootings, information emerged about Hasan's increasingly strange behavior at Walter Reed Army Medical Center, where he had trained as a psychiatrist and warned commanders that they should allow Muslims to leave the Army or risk "adverse events." He had also exchanged e-mails with a well-known radical cleric in Yemen being monitored by U.S. Intelligence.

But none of this reached the one organization charged with handling counterintelligence investigations within the Army. Just 25 miles up the road from Walter Reed, **the Army's 902nd Military Intelligence Group** had been doing little to search the ranks for potential threats. Instead, the 902's commander had decided to turn the unit's attention to assessing general terrorist affiliations in the United States, even though the Department of Homeland Security and the FBI's 106 Joint Terrorism Task Forces were already doing this work in great depth.

The 902nd, working on a program the commander named RITA, for Radical Islamic Threat to the Army, had quietly been gathering information on Hezbollah, Iranian Republican Guard and al-Qaeda student organizations in the United States. The assessment "didn't tell us anything we didn't know already," said the Army's senior counterintelligence officer at the Pentagon.

Secrecy and lack of coordination have allowed organizations, such as the 902nd in this case, to work on issues others were already tackling rather than take on the much more challenging job of trying to identify potential jihadist sympathizers within the Army itself.

Beyond redundancy, secrecy within the intelligence world hampers effectiveness in other ways, say defense and intelligence officers. For the Defense Department, the root of this problem goes back to an ultra-secret group of programs for which access is extremely limited and monitored by specially trained security officers. These are called **Special Access Programs - or SAPs - and the Pentagon's list of code names for them runs 300 pages. The intelligence community has hundreds more of its own, and those hundreds have thousands of sub-programs with their own limits on the number of people authorized to know anything about them. All this means that very few people have a complete sense of what's going on.**

"There's only one entity in the entire universe that has visibility on all SAPs - that's God," said James R. Clapper, undersecretary of defense for intelligence and the Obama administration's nominee to be the next director of national intelligence.

Such secrecy can undermine the normal chain of command when senior officials use it to cut out rivals or when subordinates are ordered to keep secrets from their commanders.

One military officer involved in one such program said he was ordered to sign a document prohibiting him from disclosing it to his four-star commander, with whom he worked closely every day, because the commander was not authorized to know about it. Another senior defense official recalls the day he tried to find out about a program in his budget, only to be rebuffed by a peer. "What do you mean you can't tell me? I pay for the program," he recalled saying in a heated exchange.

Another senior intelligence official with wide access to many programs said that secrecy is sometimes used to protect ineffective projects. "I think the secretary of defense ought to direct a look at every single thing to see if it still has value," he said. "The DNI ought to do something similar."

The ODNI hasn't done that yet. The best it can do at the moment is maintain a database of the names of the most sensitive programs in the intelligence community. But the database does not include many important and relevant Pentagon projects.

Because so much is classified, illustrations of what goes on every day in Top Secret America can be hard to ferret out. But every so often, examples emerge. A recent one shows the post-9/11 system at its best and its worst.

Last fall, after eight years of growth and hirings, the enterprise was at full throttle when word emerged that something was seriously amiss inside Yemen. In response, President Obama signed an order sending dozens of secret commandos to that country to target and kill the leaders of an al-Qaeda affiliate.

In Yemen, the commandos set up a joint operations center packed with hard drives, forensic kits and communications gear. They exchanged thousands of intercepts, agent reports, photographic evidence and real-time video surveillance with dozens of top-secret organizations in the United States.

That was the system as it was intended. But when the information reached the National Counterterrorism Center in Washington for analysis, it arrived buried within the 5,000 pieces of general terrorist-related data that are reviewed each day. Analysts had to switch from database to database, from hard drive to hard drive, from screen to screen, just to locate what might be interesting to study further.

As military operations in Yemen intensified and the chatter about a possible terrorist strike increased, the intelligence agencies ramped up their effort. The flood of information into the NCTC became a torrent.

Somewhere in that deluge was even more vital data. Partial names of someone in Yemen. A reference to a Nigerian radical who had gone to Yemen. A report of a father in Nigeria worried about a son who had become interested in radical teachings and had disappeared inside Yemen.

These were all clues to what would happen when a Nigerian named Umar Farouk Abdulmutallab left Yemen and eventually boarded a plane in Amsterdam bound for Detroit. But nobody put them together

because, as officials would testify later, the system had gotten so big that the lines of responsibility had become hopelessly blurred.

"There are so many people involved here," NCTC Director Leiter told Congress.

"Everyone had the dots to connect," DNI Blair explained to the lawmakers. "But I hadn't made it clear exactly who had primary responsibility."

And so Abdulmutallab was able to step aboard Northwest Airlines Flight 253. As it descended toward Detroit, he allegedly tried to ignite explosives hidden in his underwear. It wasn't the very expensive, very large 9/11 enterprise that prevented disaster. It was a passenger who saw what he was doing and tackled him. "We didn't follow up and prioritize the stream of intelligence," White House counterterrorism adviser John O. Brennan explained afterward. "Because no one intelligence entity, or team or task force was assigned responsibility for doing that follow-up investigation."

Blair acknowledged the problem. His solution: Create yet another team to run down every important lead. But he also told Congress he needed more money and more analysts to prevent another mistake.

More is often the solution proposed by the leaders of the 9/11 enterprise. After the Christmas Day bombing attempt, Leiter also pleaded for more - more analysts to join the 300 or so he already had.

The Department of Homeland Security asked for more air marshals, more body scanners and more analysts, too, even though it can't find nearly enough qualified people to fill its intelligence unit now. Obama has said he will not freeze spending on national security, making it likely that those requests will be funded.

More building, more expansion of offices continues across the country. A \$1.7 billion NSA data-processing center will be under construction soon near Salt Lake City. In Tampa, the U.S. Central Command's new 270,000-square-foot intelligence office will be matched next year by an equally large headquarters building, and then, the year after that, by a 51,000-square-foot office just for its special operations section.

Just north of Charlottesville, the new Joint-Use Intelligence Analysis Facility will consolidate 1,000 defense intelligence analysts on a secure campus.

Meanwhile, five miles southeast of the White House, the DHS has broken ground for its new headquarters, to be shared with the Coast Guard. DHS, in existence for only seven years, already has its own Special Access Programs, its own research arm, its own command center, its own fleet of armored cars and its own 230,000-person workforce, the third-largest after the departments of Defense and Veterans Affairs.

Soon, on the grounds of the former St. Elizabeths mental hospital in Anacostia, a \$3.4 billion showcase of security will rise from the crumbling brick wards. The new headquarters will be the largest government complex built since the Pentagon, a major landmark in the alternative geography of Top Secret America and four times as big as Liberty Crossing.