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Abstract: This Trends article discusses and evaluates claims that “the Bush Administration’s policies and programs for homeland security...too sparsely [invest] in relevant initiatives.”

Opponents of the Bush Administration’s policies and programs for homeland security often assert that the Administration is investing too sparsely in relevant initiatives. For example, Benjamin and Simon (2003) state that “as much as $160 billion in new financing has been poured into national security since 9/11, but only a small fraction has been used to make Americans safer at home.” The question then becomes what within a national security rubric qualifies as helping Americans becoming safer.

The authors opine that “troops, conventional weapons systems and traditional military investments” don’t qualify. Instead, “aviation security, vaccine research and a stockpile of vital drugs” do. The authors’ inference is that what’s outside the formally defined homeland security budget counts, while what’s inside does not. The fact is, however, that all military, law enforcement, and intelligence assets have consequences for homeland security—as do health, education, and all other initiatives taken by the Administration. Further, the phenomena contributing to homeland security go far beyond what the Administration seeks to influence and is even aware of. It could well turn out that the biggest contributor to homeland security might be the Administration’s international information programs targeting various foreign audiences or the Administration’s trade and aid initiatives, or other events and phenomena taken or influenced by other political actors for reasons seeming to have nothing to do with security on their face value.