

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

1		
2		
3	IN RE NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY )	MDL Dkt. No. 06-1791-VRW
4	TELECOMMUNICATIONS RECORDS )	
5	LITIGATION )	<b>PUBLIC DECLARATION</b>
6		<b>OF LT. GEN. KEITH B.</b>
7	<u>This Document Relates to:</u> )	<b>ALEXANDER, DIRECTOR,</b>
8		<b>NATIONAL SECURITY</b>
9	<i>Shubert v. Bush</i> , Case No. 07-693 )	<b>AGENCY</b>
10		Hon. Vaughn R. Walker
11		

**PUBLIC DECLARATION OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL KEITH B. ALEXANDER,  
DIRECTOR, NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY**

I, Lieutenant General Keith B. Alexander, do hereby state and declare as follows:

**INTRODUCTION**

1. I am the Director of the National Security Agency (NSA), an intelligence agency within the Department of Defense. I am responsible for directing the NSA, overseeing the operations undertaken to carry out its mission and, by specific charge of the President and the Director of National Intelligence, protecting NSA activities and intelligence sources and methods. I have been designated an original TOP SECRET classification authority under Executive Order No. 12958, 60 Fed. Reg. 19825 (1995), as amended on March 25, 2003, and Department of Defense Directive No. 5200.1-R, Information Security Program Regulation, 32 C.F.R. § 159a.12 (2000).

2. The purpose of this declaration is to support an assertion of the military and state secrets privilege (hereafter "state secrets privilege") by the Director of National Intelligence (DNI) as the head of the intelligence community (as well as the statutory privilege assertion by the DNI under 50 U.S.C. § 403-1(i)(1)). In addition, through this declaration, I also hereby invoke and assert the NSA's statutory privilege set forth in section 6 of the National Security

1 Agency Act of 1959, Public Law No. 86-36 (codified as a note to 50 U.S.C. § 402) (“NSA Act”),  
2 to protect the information related to NSA activities described below. The statements made  
3 herein are based on my personal knowledge of NSA activities and operations, and on  
4 information available to me as Director of the NSA.

5  
6 3. In the course of my official duties, I have been advised of this litigation and the  
7 allegations in the Plaintiffs’ Amended Complaint. As summarized herein and described further  
8 in my classified declaration submitted for the Court’s *in camera*, *ex parte* review, various  
9 classified facts related to the Plaintiffs’ claims are subject to the DNI’s state secrets and statutory  
10 privilege assertions, as well as to my assertion of the NSA’s statutory privilege. The disclosure  
11 of this information, which relates to NSA intelligence information, activities, sources, and  
12 methods, reasonably could be expected to cause exceptionally grave damage to the national  
13 security of the United States. Accordingly, as set forth further below and in my classified  
14 declaration, it is my judgment that information described in these declarations should be  
15 protected from disclosure. In addition, it is my judgment that sensitive state secrets are so central  
16 to the subject matter of the litigation that any attempt to proceed in the case risks the disclosure  
17 of the secrets described herein and in my classified declaration and, thus, exceptionally grave  
18 damage to the national security of the United States.  
19  
20

### 21 BACKGROUND

#### 22 A. The National Security Agency

23  
24 4. The NSA was established by Presidential Directive in 1952 as a separately  
25 organized agency within the Department of Defense. Under Executive Order 12333, § 1.12(b),  
26 as amended, the NSA’s cryptologic mission includes three functions: (1) to collect, process, and  
27 disseminate signals intelligence (SIGINT) information, of which COMINT is a significant  
28 subset, for (a) national foreign intelligence purposes, (b) counterintelligence purposes, and (c)

1 the support of military operations; (2) to conduct information security activities; and (3) to  
2 conduct operations security training for the U.S. Government.

3 5. There are two primary reasons for gathering and analyzing foreign intelligence  
4 information. The first, and most important, is to gain information required to direct U.S.  
5 resources as necessary to counter external threats. The second reason is to obtain information  
6 necessary to the formulation of U.S. foreign policy. Foreign intelligence information provided  
7 by the NSA is thus relevant to a wide range of important issues, including military order of  
8 battle; threat warnings and readiness; arms proliferation; international terrorism; and foreign  
9 aspects of international narcotics trafficking.  
10

11 **B. September 11, 2001 and the al Qaeda Threat.**

12 6. On September 11, 2001, the al Qaeda terrorist network launched a set of  
13 coordinated attacks along the East Coast of the United States. Four commercial jetliners, each  
14 carefully selected to be fully loaded with fuel for a transcontinental flight, were hijacked by al  
15 Qaeda operatives. Those operatives targeted the Nation's financial center in New York with two  
16 of the jetliners, which they deliberately flew into the Twin Towers of the World Trade Center.  
17 Al Qaeda targeted the headquarters of the Nation's Armed Forces, the Pentagon, with the third  
18 jetliner. Al Qaeda operatives were apparently headed toward Washington, D.C. with the fourth  
19 jetliner when passengers struggled with the hijackers and the plane crashed in Shanksville,  
20 Pennsylvania. The intended target of this fourth jetliner was most evidently the White House or  
21 the Capitol, strongly suggesting that al Qaeda's intended mission was to strike a decapitation  
22 blow to the Government of the United States—to kill the President, the Vice President, or  
23 Members of Congress. The attacks of September 11 resulted in approximately 3,000 deaths—  
24 the highest single-day death toll from hostile foreign attacks in the Nation's history. In addition,  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 these attacks shut down air travel in the United States, disrupted the Nation's financial markets  
2 and government operations, and caused billions of dollars of damage to the economy.

3 7. On September 14, 2001, the President declared a national emergency "by reason  
4 of the terrorist attacks at the World Trade Center, New York, New York, and the Pentagon, and  
5 the continuing and immediate threat of further attacks on the United States." Proclamation No.  
6 7463, 66 Fed. Reg. 48199 (Sept. 14, 2001). The United States also immediately began plans for  
7 a military response directed at al Qaeda's training grounds and haven in Afghanistan. On  
8 September 14, 2001, both Houses of Congress passed a Joint Resolution authorizing the  
9 President "to use all necessary and appropriate force against those nations, organizations, or  
10 persons he determines planned, authorized, committed, or aided the terrorist attacks" of  
11 September 11. Authorization for Use of Military Force, Pub. L. No. 107-40 § 21(a), 115 Stat.  
12 224, 224 (Sept. 18, 2001) ("Cong. Auth."). Congress also expressly acknowledged that the  
13 attacks rendered it "necessary and appropriate" for the United States to exercise its right "to  
14 protect United States citizens both at home and abroad," and acknowledged in particular that  
15 "the President has authority under the Constitution to take action to deter and prevent acts of  
16 international terrorism against the United States." *Id.* pmb1.

17  
18  
19  
20 8. As the President made clear at the time, the attacks of September 11 "created a  
21 state of armed conflict." Military Order, § 1(a), 66 Fed. Reg. 57833, 57833 (Nov. 13, 2001).  
22 Indeed, shortly after the attacks, NATO took the unprecedented step of invoking article 5 of the  
23 North Atlantic Treaty, which provides that an "armed attack against one or more of [the parties]  
24 shall be considered an attack against them all." North Atlantic Treaty, Apr. 4, 1949, art. 5, 63  
25 Stat. 2241, 2244, 34 U.N.T.S. 243, 246. The President also determined that al Qaeda terrorists  
26 "possess both the capability and the intention to undertake further terrorist attacks against the  
27 United States that, if not detected and prevented, will cause mass deaths, mass injuries, and  
28

1 massive destruction of property, and may place at risk the continuity of the operations of the  
2 United States Government,” and he concluded that “an extraordinary emergency exists for  
3 national defense purposes.” Military Order, § 1(c), (g), 66 Fed. Reg. at 57833-34.

4 9. As a result of the unprecedented attacks of September 11, 2001, the United States  
5 found itself immediately propelled into a worldwide war against a network of terrorist groups,  
6 centered on and affiliated with al Qaeda, that possesses the evolving capability and intention of  
7 inflicting further catastrophic attacks on the United States. That war is continuing today, at  
8 home as well as abroad. Moreover, the war against al Qaeda and its allies is a very different kind  
9 of war, against a very different enemy, than any other war or enemy the Nation has previously  
10 faced. Al Qaeda and its supporters operate not as a traditional nation-state but as a diffuse,  
11 decentralized global network of individuals, cells, and loosely associated, often disparate groups,  
12 that act sometimes in concert, sometimes independently, and sometimes in the United States, but  
13 always in secret—and their mission is to destroy lives and to disrupt a way of life through  
14 terrorist acts. Al Qaeda works in the shadows; secrecy is essential to al Qaeda’s success in  
15 plotting and executing its terrorist attacks.

16 10. Accordingly, after the September 11 attacks, the President directed the NSA to  
17 detect and prevent al Qaeda-related terrorist attacks within the United States by intercepting the  
18 content<sup>1</sup> of telephone and Internet communications for which there were reasonable grounds to  
19 believe that (1) such communication originated or terminated outside the United States, and (2) a  
20 party to such communication was a member or agent of al Qaeda or an affiliated terrorist  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

28 <sup>1</sup> The term “content” is used herein to refer to the substance, meaning, or purport of a communication, as defined in 18 U.S.C. § 2510(8).

1 organization (hereafter referred to as the "Terrorist Surveillance Program" or "TSP"). The  
2 President acknowledged the existence of this program in December 2005.<sup>2</sup>

3 **INFORMATION SUBJECT TO ASSERTIONS OF PRIVILEGE**

4 11. I understand that the Plaintiffs in this lawsuit allege that the NSA conducts a  
5 "dragnet" surveillance program involving the interception of "virtually every telephone, internet  
6 and/or email communication that has been sent from or received within the United States since  
7 2001." Amended Compl. ¶¶ 1, 4. I also understand that the Plaintiffs allege that the content of  
8 their own telephone and Internet communications were subject to "unlawful interception, search  
9 and seizure, and electronic surveillance," in connection with the alleged "dragnet" program.  
10 *Id.* ¶ 87. I further understand that the Plaintiffs allege (1) that they are customers of Verizon  
11 and/or AT&T, and (2) that those companies participate in the content surveillance dragnet that  
12 Plaintiffs allege. *See id.* ¶¶ 5-8.

13  
14  
15 12. As set forth further below, the following categories of information are subject to  
16 the DNI's assertion of the state secrets and statutory privileges, as well as my assertion of the  
17 NSA statutory privilege, and this information should be protected from disclosure in this matter:  
18

- 19 A. Information that may tend to confirm or deny whether the  
20 Plaintiffs have been subject to any alleged NSA  
21 intelligence activity that may be at issue in this matter; and  
22 B. Information concerning NSA intelligence activities,  
23 sources, or methods, including:  
24

25 <sup>2</sup> On January 17, 2007, the Attorney General made public the general facts that new  
26 orders of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court had been issued that authorized the  
27 Government to target for collection international communications into or out of the United States  
28 where there is probable cause to believe that one of the communicants is a member or agent of al  
Qaeda or an associated terrorist organization; that, as a result of these orders, any electronic  
surveillance that was occurring as part of the TSP is now being conducted subject to the approval  
of the FISA Court; and that, under these circumstances, the President determined not to  
reauthorize the TSP.

1 (1) Information concerning the scope and operation of the  
2 Terrorist Surveillance Program, including information that  
3 may be needed to demonstrate that the TSP was limited to  
4 one-end foreign al Qaeda-related communications and that  
5 the NSA does not otherwise engage in the content  
6 surveillance dragnet that the Plaintiffs allege; and

7 (2) Any other information concerning NSA intelligence  
8 activities, sources, or methods that would be necessary to  
9 adjudicate the Plaintiffs' claims, including, to the extent  
10 applicable, information that would tend to confirm or deny  
11 whether the NSA collects large quantities of  
12 communication records information; and

13 C. Information that may tend to confirm or deny whether  
14 Verizon/MCI, AT&T, or any other telecommunications  
15 carrier has assisted the NSA with the alleged intelligence  
16 activities.

17 **HARM OF DISCLOSURE**

18 13. As set forth in my classified declaration submitted for the Court's *in camera, ex*  
19 *parte* review, disclosure of information in the foregoing categories would cause exceptionally  
20 grave harm to national security. I briefly summarize the harms at issue below.

21 14. The first major category of information as to which I am supporting the DNI's  
22 assertion of privilege, and asserting the NSA's own statutory privilege, concerns information as  
23 to whether particular individuals, including the Plaintiffs in this lawsuit, have been subject to  
24 alleged NSA intelligence activities. Disclosure of information that would tend to confirm or  
25 deny whether or not certain individuals have been subject to NSA intelligence activities would  
26 cause exceptionally grave harm to the national security. As a matter of course, the NSA cannot  
27 publicly confirm or deny whether any individual is subject to surveillance activities because to  
28 do so would tend to reveal actual targets. For example, if the NSA were to confirm in this case  
and others that specific individuals are not targets of surveillance, but later refuse to comment (as  
it would have to) in a case involving an actual target, a person could easily deduce by comparing  
such responses that the person in the latter case is a target. The harm of revealing targets of

1 foreign intelligence surveillance should be obvious. If an individual knows or suspects he is a  
2 target of U.S. intelligence activities, he would naturally tend to alter his behavior to take new  
3 precautions against surveillance. In addition, revealing who is not a target would indicate who  
4 has avoided surveillance and who may be a secure channel for communication. Such  
5 information could lead a person, secure in the knowledge that he is not under surveillance, to  
6 help a hostile foreign adversary convey information; alternatively, such a person may be  
7 unwittingly utilized or even forced to convey information through a secure channel. Revealing  
8 which channels are free from surveillance and which are not would also reveal sensitive  
9 intelligence methods and thereby could help any adversary evade detection.  
10

11 15. Second, I am supporting the DNI's assertion of privilege and asserting the NSA's  
12 statutory privilege over any other facts concerning NSA intelligence sources and methods that  
13 would be needed to adjudicate this case. This includes: (1) facts concerning the operation of the  
14 Terrorist Surveillance Program and any other NSA intelligence activities needed to demonstrate  
15 that the TSP was limited as the President stated to the interception of one-end foreign  
16 communications reasonably believed to involve a member or agent of al Qaeda or an affiliated  
17 terrorist organization and that the NSA does not otherwise conduct the content surveillance  
18 dragnet that the Plaintiffs allege; (2) other classified facts about the operation of the TSP that  
19 would be necessary to adjudicate the lawfulness of that program, to the extent it is at issue in this  
20 case; and (3) to the extent applicable, facts that would confirm or deny whether the NSA collects  
21 large quantities of communication records information. As set forth below, the disclosure of  
22 such information would cause exceptionally grave harm to national security.  
23  
24

25 16. As noted above, in December 2005, President Bush explained that, after the  
26 September 11 attacks, he authorized the NSA to intercept the content of certain communications  
27 for which there are reasonable grounds to believe that (1) such communication originated or  
28



1 terminated outside the United States, and (2) a party to such communication is a member or  
2 agent of al Qaeda or an affiliated terrorist organization. The President stated at the time that this  
3 activity, now referred to as the Terrorist Surveillance Program, did not involve the collection of  
4 purely domestic communications, or international communications with no al Qaeda connection,  
5 and these facts were reiterated publicly by the Attorney General and then-Deputy Director of  
6 National Intelligence. As the President made clear in describing the limited scope of the TSP,  
7 Plaintiffs' allegations of a content surveillance dragnet are false. But if the NSA had to  
8 demonstrate in this case that the TSP was limited as the President stated, and not a dragnet as the  
9 Plaintiffs claim, and that the NSA does not otherwise engage in the dragnet that Plaintiffs allege,  
10 sensitive and classified facts about the operation of the TSP and NSA intelligence activities  
11 would have to be disclosed. The disclosure of whether and to what extent the NSA utilizes  
12 certain intelligence sources and methods would reveal to foreign adversaries the NSA's  
13 capabilities, or lack thereof, enabling them to either evade particular channels of communications  
14 that are being monitored, or exploit channels of communications that are not subject to NSA  
15 activities, in either case risking exceptionally grave harm to national security.

16  
17  
18  
19 17. Similarly, confirmation or denial of any information concerning whether the NSA  
20 collects large quantities of communication records—to the extent such allegations are relevant to  
21 this case—would also disclose information about whether or not the NSA utilizes particular  
22 intelligence sources and methods and, thus, the NSA's capabilities or lack thereof.

23  
24 18. Finally, disclosure of any information tending to confirm or deny whether  
25 Verizon or AT&T assists the NSA with alleged intelligence activities as Plaintiffs claim would  
26 cause exceptionally grave harm to the national security. Again, such disclosures would help  
27 foreign adversaries evade detection by revealing whether or not the NSA utilizes particular  
28 intelligence sources and methods or monitors particular channels of communications.

1 19. Any further elaboration on the public record concerning these matters would  
2 reveal information that would cause the very harm that my privilege assertion and the DNI's  
3 privilege assertion are intended to prevent. As noted, my separate classified declaration provides  
4 a more detailed explanation of the information and harms to national security at issue.


5 CONCLUSION

6  
7 20. In sum, I support the DNI's assertion of the state secrets privilege and statutory  
8 privilege to prevent the disclosure of the information described herein and detailed in my  
9 classified declaration that is available for the Court's *in camera* and *ex parte* review. I also  
10 assert a statutory privilege under Section 6 of the National Security Act with respect to the  
11 information described herein which concerns the functions of the NSA. Moreover, because  
12 proceedings in this case risk disclosure of privileged and classified intelligence-related  
13 information, I respectfully request that the Court not only protect that information from  
14 disclosure but also dismiss this case to prevent exceptional harm to the national security of the  
15 United States.  
16  
17  
18

19 I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

20  
21 DATE:

25 May 2007



22 LT. GEN. KEITH B. ALEXANDER  
23 Director, National Security Agency  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28