1. Simon Sinek on Leadership and Teamwork
   The RAND Distinguished Speaker series recently featured the best-selling author of *Start with Why: How Great Leaders Inspire Everyone to Take Action*.
   MORE AT www.rand.org/a140723

2. Bouncing Back from Disaster
   Emergency preparedness is important, but so is community resilience. This infographic lays out the road to resilience in easy-to-understand terms for individuals and organizations.
   MORE AT www.rand.org/t/IG114

3. Marriage Equality Gains Support, but It’s Still a Partisan Issue
   The RAND American Life Panel asked survey participants questions on their attitudes toward the legalization of same-sex marriage.
   MORE AT www.rand.org/b141229

4. Technology Summit for Victim Service Providers
   RAND convened a summit in Silicon Valley for victim service providers and technology innovators to devise new ways for crime victims to quickly and effectively obtain the help they need.
   MORE AT www.rand.org/v140908

5. The Changing Role of Criminal Law in Controlling Corporate Behavior
   RAND offers suggestions on how the use of criminal sanctions to regulate corporate activity might be improved.
   MORE AT www.rand.org/t/RR412
The New Drug Wars The growing threat of drug-resistant disease demands a global response.

Enemies Among Us More than 100 Americans have tried to join jihadist groups overseas. RAND takes a look at the danger they pose.

What Research Says About Profiling It doesn’t work when it’s based on race or other personal characteristics. But what if it’s based on risk?

Research Briefly

The Q&A Veteran Kayla Williams talks about combat and caring for her wounded husband.

POV Rockefeller Foundation president Judith Rodin discusses disasters and resilience.

By the Numbers

Giving Longtime supporters Donald B. and Susan F. Rice establish their third scholarship fund for students at Pardee RAND.

at RANDom Gunflash goggles: Smart, sophisticated, and oh-so-stylish.
Research Briefly

Not Just Horsing Around

British police have long used horses to corral unruly crowds, but the real value of mounted officers may be as good-will ambassadors, according to a recent report by RAND Europe.

Mounted police are good at restoring order, no question. Researchers found they could control crowds in ways that officers on foot or in cars cannot. Put simply, people “are unlikely to risk an altercation with a horse,” they wrote.

But the mounted officers in the RAND study spent very little time in the front lines of crowd control. Instead, they spent most of their time patrolling neighborhoods, where their high visibility seemed to encourage trust and confidence in police.

Even hardcore British soccer fans interviewed in focus groups acknowledged a soft spot for the horses.

The mounted officers also attracted far more public attention than their counterparts on foot, the researchers found. People were more likely to acknowledge a police horse clopping through their neighborhood, and—perhaps fortunately—curious crowds were more likely to gather around a horse than a street cop.

The research, conducted in partnership with the University of Oxford, was meant to help British police agencies measure the value of mounted patrols as they weigh the added expense. Putting an officer on horseback can cost £6,550 to £22,000 (or around $10,000 to $35,000 U.S. dollars) annually, depending on how it’s measured.

It’s not clear whether the findings would hold true outside of the United Kingdom. As the researchers note, mounted policing may be a uniquely British appreciation.

MORE AT
www.rand.org/t/RR830z1

Risky Business

A little professional advice, courtesy of the researchers at RAND: Watch out for the open palm if you have business in Nigeria.

Businesses there face the highest risk in the world of being hit up for government bribes, according to a country-by-country index developed at RAND. Other countries more likely to have wink-and-a-nod officials include tiny Yemen and Angola, but also Vietnam and India.

Ireland, on the other hand, was the least likely to demand a little extra, followed by Canada, New Zealand, Hong Kong, and Sweden. The United States ranked 10th least likely on the index.

The RAND index takes into account how often businesses in each country have to interact with government officials; how well any anti-bribery laws are enforced; whether there’s an independent media to keep an eye on corruption; and whether there’s enough public transparency to shine a light on dirty dealings.

India, for example, lost points for the high frequency with which businesses must cross paths with government officials. Nigeria scored well for the strong anti-bribery laws it has on the books, but near the bottom in almost every other major category, giving it the worst overall score.

The index fills a need, the researchers note, for businesses to gauge whether and how they might encounter officials with their hands out, especially in this era of globalization. It’s a high-stakes question: In 2013 alone, the U.S. government collected $720 million in penalties from businesses accused of bribing foreign officials.

MORE AT
www.rand.org/t/RR839
Parents’ Stance

Football is getting a parental stiff-arm amid growing concern about the lifelong health risks posed by concussions, a RAND survey has found.

Forty-four percent of the adults in the survey said they would not feel comfortable with their sons playing football. Fewer than ten percent expressed similar reservations about baseball or basketball; for soccer, it was 11 percent. Only ice hockey worried more respondents.

Football did better in the Texas-Oklahoma region, where 63 percent said their kids could play, and worse in New England (45 percent) and in parts of the Midwest and Plains states (49 percent). People with college degrees were far less likely to want their kids on the gridiron.

But well-educated respondents were actually more likely to approve of their children playing every other sport—just not football and hockey for their sons, or football, cheerleading, and gymnastics for their daughters.

The survey asked more than 2,700 adults their comfort with each sport, given what they know about safety. It was part of a series of surveys that RAND conducted in the fall of 2014.

At the time, the researchers note, the deaths of three high school football players were in the news, along with medical studies and player lawsuits over sport-related concussions.

MORE AT
www.rand.org/b141104football

Army Lessons from France’s War in Mali

French forces rushed into Mali in January 2013 to quash a well-armed Islamist offensive that was sweeping south toward the capital.

What came next—a headlong dash into the desert as French troops routed and then pursued the Islamist fighters—offers a model to U.S. military leaders pondering the future of their own forces, a recent RAND study suggests.

Operation Serval (named after a small but powerful cat) showcased the French Army’s agility, its ability to innovate on the fly, and—as one colonel said—its sheer audacity. The French relied on small fighting groups that could operate alone or be built up and folded into larger formations, RAND found, giving them a level of quickness and flexibility that appeared to take the Islamists by surprise.

At almost the same time, U.S. Army Chief of Staff General Raymond Odierno was presenting his vision for rapid-deployment forces that could hit hard even in such shifting, decentralized operations. The French experience in Mali, RAND noted, gives some idea of how a technologically sophisticated army can organize and field such an expeditionary force.

It’s not a perfect model. Quick-strike expeditionary warfare is built into France’s military culture, RAND noted, but carries its own risks and might not perform as well against a better-organized enemy.

In Mali, for example, the French put more emphasis on ground combat and sometimes shrugged off much air support. They stretched their forces in a way that sometimes put soldiers beyond the immediate reach of medical support.

And the speed of the operation overwhelmed more than just the Islamist fighters. French logistics had trouble keeping up, too—to the point that soldiers fought with boots on their feet that had come unglued in the Saharan heat.

MORE AT
www.rand.org/t/RR770

MORE AT
www.rand.org/b141104football
Kayla Williams, outside the Women in Military Service for America Memorial in Arlington, Virginia, is a project associate at RAND. She is the author of Plenty of Time When We Get Home: Love and Recovery in the Aftermath of War (W.W. Norton and Co., 2014) and Love My Rifle More than You: Young and Female in the U.S. Army (W.W. Norton and Co., 2006). Her primary research interest is military health care.

From Combat to Caregiving

Q You’ve written books about being the spouse of a wounded warrior and about being a female soldier. What was uniquely difficult about being a woman in the military?

A The vast majority of challenges that I faced in the military were not exclusive to women. But I was acutely aware that, as a minority, I didn’t represent just myself. If a man had some sort of breakdown during our deployment to Iraq, it was, “Oh, Joe couldn’t take it.” But if a woman broke down, it was, “See, this is why women don’t belong in a combat zone.”

What compelled you to document that experience in Love My Rifle More than You?

When I got home from Iraq in 2004, the only women soldiers in the popular media were Jessica Lynch and Lynndie England, and I didn’t feel they represented my time in the military. On my book tour, women who served in the current conflict, Vietnam, and the first Gulf War would tearfully tell me the book helped them realize they weren’t alone. I even got letters from men saying, “I have a hard time talking about the war, but I can give your book to my mom and help her understand.” It was really rewarding.

You met your husband in Iraq. Your latest, Plenty of Time When We Get Home, is a candid account of life after he was injured by a roadside bomb.

Brian sustained a penetrating traumatic brain injury (TBI) early in the war, and a lot of the systems and services that one would expect to be available to wounded warriors didn’t exist. There were no training programs or support groups for caregivers, and I didn’t know anything about post-traumatic stress disorder or TBI. But I’ve seen significant improvements since we left active duty. The services are more open to talking about mental health challenges, trying to reduce stigma, and encouraging people to get help.

How’s your husband today?

He’s going to college and continuing to make progress, which is incredibly heartening. But it was hard to get here. He didn’t receive any sort of cognitive rehabilitation; it was getting a job that caused his brain to reroute around injured areas.

Perhaps the most therapeutic thing for us both was becoming involved with a community of veterans and engaging in advocacy by sharing our stories publicly. Instead of feeling as if we were personal failures for, say, ending up on unemployment briefly after our military service, we were able to talk about the gaps and barriers that we faced and urge improvements.

What do you hope people take away from this latest book?

One key takeaway is that vets aren’t broken; most can continue to be contributing members of society. The second is that caregivers aren’t saints. It’s OK to say you need help and acknowledge you have complicated and even ugly feelings. What matters is what you do with them and finding ways to take care of yourself so you can continue caring for your loved one.

And finally, treatment works. Some people have said to me, “I tried going to a psychiatrist once. I didn’t like the meds they gave me, so I never went back.” If you bought toothpaste and you hated the flavor, would you quit brushing your teeth? No, you’d buy a different brand. The same is true for therapy. If you didn’t have a good experience with a psychiatrist, try a psychologist or a social worker or equine therapy.

What’s next? Is there another book in your future?

I am trying my hand at fiction writing. But I find that really scary and intimidating, so I haven’t released anything yet.

Are you writing in the military genre?

No, I’m not. It’s a totally new direction.

I think that’s called a cliffhanger. ☺️
Bouncing Back Better

A Conversation with Judith Rodin

Judith Rodin got a firsthand lesson in resilience after Superstorm Sandy scoured the New York region in October 2012. Rodin, president of The Rockefeller Foundation, helped lead a post-storm commission seeking ways to not just survive such a blow, but recover from it and adapt. The subtitle of her book The Resilience Dividend sums it up: Being Strong in a World Where Things Go Wrong. She recently delivered a keynote address at RAND’s Politics Aside event in Santa Monica, California.

On crisis as the ‘new normal’
A week doesn’t go by that we don’t see some kind of disturbance somewhere to the normal flow of things. A cyber attack. A new strain of virus. A structural failure. A violent storm. A civil conflict. But not every disruption has to become a disaster. There are ways to avoid the unmanageable and manage the unavoidable. We need to stop lurching from crisis to crisis and shift our paradigm from disaster relief and recovery to one of prevention and return.

On the cost of ‘business as usual’
Doing the same thing over and over again and expecting a different result is no longer only insanity; it may be tantamount to political malpractice, because it’s costing us billions of dollars. According to the Center for American Progress, the federal government spent almost $150 billion from fiscal years 2011 to 2013 just on disaster relief. That comes out to roughly $400 a household per year. Imagine what would change if we invested that $400 per household on measures that actually made those households more resilient.

On the rebirth of New Orleans
A case study, actually, for the need for building resilience and the dividends that it can generate. After Hurricane Katrina, New Orleans transformed its public education system, it diversified its economy, and it reenergized its neighborhoods. Today, the city is actually a magnet for talent and for startups, and it’s piloting new, innovative resilience planning projects to restore wetlands, to bring down crime rates, and to improve public health.

On the politics of resilience
Resilience building is a process with no ideology. The great shocks of our time are not discriminating. They destroy Republican and Democratic communities alike. And there are common-sense solutions that lend us an opportunity for common ground to work together. A great mayor once said there’s no Democratic or Republican way to pick up garbage. So goes resilience.

On the Hoboken example
In Hoboken—a city very vulnerable to flooding—the city is planning the construction of underground parking garages with green recreation space on the surface level. This is a project that will deliver a triple win. First, it will add much-needed parking spaces to the city. Second, in times of flooding, the garages are engineered using a Dutch technology with the capacity to become tanks for water overflow. And third, it creates new green space for recreation and community cohesion. Three wins for one investment. That’s the resilience dividend.

FIVE PRINCIPLES OF RESILIENT CITIES

1. They are AWARE of their vulnerabilities and assets.
2. They have DIVERSE and redundant systems to cope with disaster.
3. Agencies are INTEGRATED and share information.
4. They are SELF-REGULATING: if one system fails, they can cut it off without allowing it to cascade into catastrophic failure.
5. They are ADAPTIVE and flexible.
The New Drug Wars

The rise of drug-resistant superbugs demands a massive worldwide research effort to combat them.
In all his years practicing medicine, Dr. Brad Spellberg had never seen an infection like this one, coursing through the blood of a young cancer patient.

Spellberg—now the chief medical officer at Los Angeles County-USC Medical Center and an expert on drug-resistant disease—had tested every antibiotic he had as the woman’s condition worsened.

The lab reports all came back marked with the same deadly ‘R.’ Resistant to everything.
This, he imagined, was what practicing medicine in the 1930s must have felt like. After decades of innovation in treatment, technologies, and health care delivery, here was a microbe so potent that even the best drugs were powerless to stop it.

He is still haunted by what he had to tell the woman’s husband outside her hospital room: “I have nothing left to use.” She died the next day.

Modern medicine is built on the promise that antibiotics will clear away the bacteria that made everything from skin infections to surgery potentially lethal just a few generations ago. But drug-resistant strains of disease—“superbugs” in the headlines—have spread in recent years through hospitals, nursing homes, even locker rooms.

Left unchecked, that resistance could kill millions of people in the next few decades and stagger the world economy, according to models developed by research teams from RAND Europe and KPMG. Even their most optimistic scenario projects a worldwide loss of 11 million adults by 2050 because of antimicrobial resistance.

“In 2015, you’re not supposed to confront infections that we can’t fight,” said Spellberg, the author of a book on the growing danger of drug-resistant disease that he titled Rising Plague. It opens with the story of his losing fight to save that young cancer patient several years ago. “It leaves a mark,” he said.

Un-natural selection

Drug resistance has shadowed modern medicine from the moment the first dose of penicillin was given. It’s a case study in un-natural selection. A successful antibiotic kills the most susceptible bacteria, but may leave behind a few that have adapted some kind of defense. Over time, those survivors spread while their weaker counterparts vanish, until resistance becomes the new normal.

For decades, a medical arms race sent new antibiotics into the field just as the old ones lost ground. But antibiotic overuse has given bacteria the advantage in recent years, while economic reality has shifted the focus of drug companies and researchers to more profitable therapies. The result has been a growing global threat that already kills an estimated 23,000 Americans every year.

The danger is even more acute in the developing world, where conditions such as malaria, tuberculosis, and HIV have also started to withstand the drugs used to fight them.

Quantifying the threat

A British task force on antimicrobial resistance—a term that includes any resistant disease, viral or bacterial—commissioned RAND and KPMG to look into the medical future. They used existing health data and economic models to estimate what could happen worldwide if such diseases continue to build resistance.

The scope of the study included both hospital-acquired infections and infectious diseases, given the different impact of these in developed and developing countries. For hospital-acquired infections, the research team included only infections caused by one of three bacteria: Escherichia coli, Staphylococcus aureus, and Klebsiella pneumoniae. For infectious diseases, the team considered only resistance to drugs for the three conditions: malaria, tuberculosis, and HIV.

They calculated that failing to tackle antimicrobial resistance could wipe out between 11 million and 14 million working-age adults by 2050 if current rates of resistance continue or even slow some. Eurasia and sub-Saharan Africa would be especially hard hit.

Then they darkened the picture. A significant rise in resistance that put those diseases beyond the reach of first-line antimicrobial drugs 40 percent of the time would cost the world nearly 105 million working-age adults by the year 2050, they calculated. Increase the resistance rate to 100 percent, and the toll reaches 200 million. Completely eliminate
all antimicrobial treatments—a worst-case scenario that would set medicine back 100 years—and the world stands to lose 444 million adults by the year 2050. The numbers include people killed by resistant disease as well as those who are never born because of it.

Those kinds of losses would carve at least $53 billion a year, on average, from the world economy, they estimated. At the high end, the average annual loss could top $3 trillion—roughly equivalent to today’s annual British economy.

Their purpose, the researchers said, was not just to sound an alarm about how bad it could get, but also to encourage a worldwide discussion about what to do about it. Antimicrobial resistance has not generated the kind of urgent attention given to climate change, for example, in part because policymakers have not had a clear picture of the potential future burden, they wrote.

The findings surprised even the research teams, but the researchers cautioned that their models were limited by inconsistent data and a wide difference of opinion among experts about what might realistically happen in the coming decades.

“We always knew that there were going to be a lot of assumptions,” said analyst Jirka Taylor, lead author of the RAND Europe report. “But there really isn’t any consensus about what will happen.”

**A survivor’s story**

Joseph Paz still wakes every morning with an ache in his knee from a brush with drug-resistant bacteria that almost killed him.

It started with a broken toenail.

The infection that seeped into his body after a toe injury on the basketball court soon seized the muscle in his leg with pain that his Advil couldn’t touch. Doctors diagnosed methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*, a notoriously vicious infection better known as MRSA. By then, it had spread to his heart.

Paz spent three months in the hospital and underwent two open-heart surgeries; at one point, a surgeon had to scrape infection from his heart tissue. He never allowed himself to believe that his doctors would run out of options; what scared him more was the thought that the infection might already be one step ahead.

In the end, the bacteria yielded to a big-gun antibiotic, but not before causing permanent damage to his knee. Paz had been a high school cross-country runner; afterward, he had to relearn how to walk.

“It was terrifying, really. It’s out of your control,” said Paz, now 19 and a student at the University of New Mexico. “There was nothing I could do. I really had to just believe that I was going to make it through.”

Paz still can’t run on his damaged knee; he has taken up bicycling, but misses the “runner’s high” of a long race. He organized a 5K fun run last year in his hometown of Las Cruces, New Mexico, to raise awareness of the infection that threatened his life. He called it “Miles for MRSA.” He’s hoping to be able to walk the course later this year.

**A call to action**

In fact, words of hope have started to creep back into the medical literature. A handful of new antibiotics have started to make their ways down the testing pipeline. Researchers also have started to look at drugs that disarm—but don’t kill—harmful microbes, a breakthrough that would neutralize them without fostering resistance. Faster and better tests might soon eliminate the guesswork that too often prompts doctors to prescribe antibiotics “just in case,” easing the problem of overuse.

And earlier this year, President Obama proposed a $1.2 billion investment to fund research programs and training initiatives that would slow the rise in microbial drug resistance, signaling that the United States recognizes the threat and is taking it seriously. The White House budget request was sent to Capitol Hill on February 2.

The World Health Organization has declared microbial drug resistance a “profound threat to human health.” It is expected to adopt a global action plan in May 2015 that will call for better use of existing antimicrobial drugs, stronger research and surveillance of resistant strains, and long-term investments in new medicines.

“This is a looming global crisis,” wrote the Review on Antimicrobial Resistance, the British task force that commissioned the RAND research, “yet one which the world can avert if we take action soon.”

What scared him more was the thought that the infection might already be one step ahead.
Americans who join overseas jihadist fronts pose a security challenge that cannot be overlooked, internationally renowned terrorism expert Brian Michael Jenkins says. But his review of more than 100 cases found that almost all ended up dead or in prison.
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIAN SINH VINH NGO NGUYEN LIVED HERE; HE PLEADED GUILTY TO ATTEMPTING TO JOIN AL QAEDA IN PAKISTAN.

FAISAL SHAHZAD LIVED HERE IN THE CONNECTICUT SUBURBS BEFORE HE PLEADED GUILTY TO ATTEMPTING TO BOMB TIMES SQUARE.
Sinh Vinh Ngo Nguyen was traveling on a phony passport, with a ticket to Pakistan and 187 firearm training videos in his luggage, when federal agents surrounded him at a California bus station.

He lived at home, played video games, wore his hair long, and had aroused so little suspicion before this that the state had licensed him as an armed security guard. But Nguyen also was a self-styled jihadist who had already traveled between his parents’ house in suburban Los Angeles and the front lines of Syria’s civil war.

He boasted on Facebook that he had a confirmed kill in the fighting there and added: “So pumped to get more!!” He was, he told a confidante, born for jihad.

Dozens of young Americans like Nguyen have attempted to join overseas jihadist groups in the past several years, raising special concern among counterterrorism officials that they might bring the fight home when they return. The threat was punctuated with gunfire earlier this year, when two French brothers—Chérif and Saïd Kouachi—stormed the Paris offices of the news magazine Charlie Hebdo; both had reportedly trained with groups in Yemen and then slipped back into French society.

A “new layer” of threat

A RAND analysis by internationally renowned terrorism expert Brian Michael Jenkins of more than 100 cases found that almost all of the American jihadists who went overseas ended up dead or landed in the same place as Sinh Vinh Ngo Nguyen. Brought down by his trusted confidante, who was really working undercover for the FBI, Nguyen admitted in court that he was trying to get to Pakistan to help train al Qaeda fighters. He was sent to prison for 13 years.

“Yes, this does represent a new layer of threat, a new dimension,” says Jenkins. “But given the numbers of it, it’s something that’s manageable. The fact is, most of the people returning to the United States haven’t done anything because they’re arrested.”

The trickle of American recruits to overseas jihadist groups has quickened in recent years with the opening of new—and especially violent—fronts in Syria and Iraq, according to intelligence estimates. President Obama cited the threat those fighters could pose if they return home “trained and battle-hardened” as one reason to launch air strikes against the group known as the Islamic State.

Freedom fighters and jihadi tourists

Jenkins looked at how previous waves of American volunteers had fared as they tried to make their way to and from jihadist camps in places like Somalia or Afghanistan.

He found that a third had been arrested before their plans even got off the ground, typically on charges of attempting to provide material support to a terrorist organization. Another third were arrested or killed overseas, and a quarter more were arrested after they came home.

That left roughly one in ten who had made it overseas and remained at large, none of whom are known to have returned.

The majority of the volunteers were native-born or naturalized U.S. citizens, Muslims by birth or—like Nguyen—zealous converts. Some were little more than “jihadi tourists,” writes Jenkins, snapping selfies and bragging to their friends online. Most saw themselves as freedom fighters or religious warriors, committed to the cause and ready to die for it.

Stray dogs

Despite the rhetoric, their record as terrorist threats within the United States has so far been thin. Of the 124 cases Jenkins analyzed, nine were accused of plotting to carry out an attack on American soil after they returned. Eight were arrested, most
Where do American jihadist recruits go for training?

THE FLOW OF AMERICAN VOLUNTEERS TO JIHADIST FRONTS OR TERRORIST GROUPS HAS FlUCTUATED OVER TIME IN RESPONSE TO EVENTS ON THE GROUND. THIS TIMELINE SHOWS THE DESTINATIONS OF MORE THAN 120 U.S. CITIZENS OR PERMANENT RESIDENTS KNOWN TO HAVE GONE OVERSEAS TO JOIN JIHADIST GROUPS.

Preferences for destinations have changed over time.

1980s–2001

1993: Two U.S. helicopters were shot down in Somalia, starting an hours-long firefight that killed 18 Americans and inspired the book and movie BLACK HAWK DOWN.

AFGHANISTAN WAS THE PRINCIPAL DESTINATION WHERE VOLUNTEERS WENT TO JOIN AL Quida OR THE TALIBAN. THIS CHANGED WHEN THE TALIBAN WAS TOPPLED IN 2001.

2002

Ethiopia engaged Islamists in battle, a key to the Somali diaspora support for the Islamic court.

2003–2004

1 JIHADIST RECRUIT

2005


2006

The civil war in Syria began to attract foreign fighters in 2012, with numbers increasing in 2013 and 2014.

2007

Famine and drought in Somalia.

2008


2009


2010


2011


2012


2013


2014 (to Oct.)

before they could do much more than plan. Only one managed to see an attack through to the end—almost.

Faisal Shahzad—described by neighbors in media reports as a “normal dude” who appeared to be living a typical American life—parked a Nissan Pathfinder packed with explosives in New York City’s Times Square in May 2010. He had spent time in a militant camp in Pakistan, learning to make bombs—but on this night, he couldn’t get the Pathfinder to detonate. He fled and was arrested days later trying to board a flight to Dubai. His guilty plea sent him to prison for life.

Jenkins’ conclusion: Returning fighters “add another layer to the terrorist threat we already confront, but one that can be managed within existing resources and rules.” The threat is sharper in Europe, he noted, where returning fighters number in the thousands, not dozens. And it may worsen in the coming years as a new generation of fighters—drawn by online images of beheadings and bloodshed—makes its way home from the fighting in Syria and Iraq.

Jenkins prefers to think of them not as potential lone-wolf terrorists, but as stray dogs, snarling, snapping, unpredictable. The challenge for counterterrorism officials, local police, and community groups will be to see them coming before they lunge. After all, Jenkins said, “stray dogs can bite, too.”

The report When Jihadis Come Marching Home results from RAND’s Investment in People and Ideas program. Support for this program is provided, in part, by the generosity of RAND’s donors and by the fees earned on client-funded research.

MORE AT www.rand.org/t/PE130
10–30 pounds excess weight in armor, weapons, and equipment, above the Army's recommended load of 50 pounds, that soldiers regularly carried into battle in Afghanistan. RAND researchers found that today's armor is effective but may be overdesigned, a finding that could lighten the load of future soldiers.

MORE AT www.rand.org/armor

10.8 percent estimated percentage of deaths in the United States that can be attributed to physical inactivity. RAND developed an easy-to-use tool to measure how well public parks get people moving and identify park improvements that may help beat that number.

MORE AT www.rand.org/t/RR774

$44 billion potential U.S. savings over the next decade from the use of “biosimilar” versions of complex drugs used to treat illnesses such as cancer and rheumatoid arthritis. RAND found that the introduction of biosimilars would increase competition and drive down costs for patients, health care providers, and taxpayers.

MORE AT www.rand.org/t/PE127
What Research Says About Profiling

Michael D. Rich is president and chief executive officer of the RAND Corporation.

An earlier version of this commentary appeared on The RAND Blog in December 2014.
Recently revised standards prohibit federal agents from considering race, ethnicity, national origin, gender, gender identity, religion, and sexual orientation in policing efforts. The announcement sends a positive message about eliminating bias in law enforcement. But not all forms of profiling are rooted in bias and some are legitimate and effective.
The Justice Department’s recently issued guidance on profiling formalized what savvy and sophisticated law enforcement agencies already know—using race, ethnicity, national origin, and other personal characteristics to drive policing is bad policy.

The revised standards, unveiled late last year by Attorney General Eric H. Holder Jr., prohibit federal agents from considering race, ethnicity, national origin, gender, gender identity, religion, and sexual orientation in policing efforts. The new rules apply to federal law enforcement, national security, and intelligence activities.

But there is a difference between targeting individuals for law enforcement actions based on these kinds of characteristics and using established risk patterns to target law enforcement efforts on certain people, places, and times. The administration’s announcement sends a positive message about eliminating bias in law enforcement. At the same time, though, not all forms of profiling are rooted in bias and some are legitimate and effective.

The administration’s new rules came amid protests over recent grand jury decisions not to indict white police officers in the deaths of unarmed black men in Ferguson, Mo., and New York City. The use of racial profiling by police contributes to the anger of protestors in the streets of Ferguson, New York, and beyond.

As RAND vice president and public safety expert Jack Riley pointed out recently in the Cincinnati Enquirer, bias does not have to be systemic within police departments to affect the way community members feel about law enforcement. Even a limited number of officers behaving inappropriately can have negative consequences. This was a crucial finding of a RAND study that looked at police-community relations in Cincinnati in 2001, when police shot and killed an unarmed black youth, leading to four days of rioting. The city was the subject of a lawsuit over racial profiling at the time of the violence.

It’s important to note that authorities should be careful not to aggravate racial sensitivities, even when using types of profiling not mentioned by the Justice Department. A 2013 RAND report (Predictive Policing by Walter L. Perry et al.) describes geographic and statistical profiling that routinely help law enforcement prevent crime by predicting where and when it will occur. Creating profiles based on risk factors such as the criminal backgrounds of individuals has also proven effective.

When it comes to homeland security, things get even more complex. The administration’s new guidelines offer an exemption for Department of Homeland Security (DHS) officials as they screen incoming airline passengers and guard the borders. This may be necessary in some cases, but counting on profiling to identify all potential terrorists may be a mistake.

In his recent RAND report When Jihadis Come Marching Home, Brian Michael Jenkins warns that the growing number of individuals going abroad to train “increases the avail-
able reservoir of Western passports and ‘clean skins’ that terrorist planners could recruit to carry out terrorist missions against the West.” A “clean skin” is an operative who is unknown to security authorities and who does not fit the profile of a terrorist.

Terrorists have long known about profiling and have taken steps to counter it over the years. In the 2007 report *Breaching the Fortress Wall*, RAND researchers found that when it became clear authorities were using profiling to detect terrorists, terrorist groups turned to operatives who didn’t fit the profile. An extreme example was the use of so-called proxy bombers—innocents compelled through threat to carry a bomb to its target—by the Provisional Irish Republican Army in its violent, decades-long campaign to force the British from Northern Ireland.

Like local law enforcement, security authorities at airports and other points of entry can make legitimate use of certain types of profiling. The Transportation Security Administration’s pre-check program is a form of profiling that targets people with clean backgrounds who pose little risk. Authorities might also profile those who travel in suspicious patterns, like those who repeatedly visit destinations where terrorist training takes place.

And much of the screening of travelers conducted by the DHS focuses on immigration violations, like visa overstays, that by their very nature may require profiling by national origin. Other characteristics, like age and gender, might also increase risk for these kinds of violations and can legitimately be considered in some cases.

Ultimately, when police take action on the basis of race, creed, ethnicity, or similar personal characteristics it is corrosive. It’s unfair, ineffective, and can stoke the flames of police-community tension. But as we have found from a variety of different assessments, law enforcement is best served when it bases its activities on risk—not on personal characteristics like race and ethnicity. Continuing to analyze and discuss these policies can only improve application and understanding.
Longtime RAND supporters Donald B. and Susan F. Rice, for the third time, have established an endowed scholarship at the Pardee RAND Graduate School. Their most recent gift of $1 million was generously donated as part of Pardee RAND’s Be the Answer campaign, which Don Rice chairs and which has thus far raised in excess of $19 million.

Rice Scholars for 2014–2015 are doctoral candidates Gulrez Azhar, Lisa Jonsson, and Xiaoyu Nie. Azhar previously worked in India on issues of environmental health, climate change, and infectious diseases. Jonsson served as a presidential management fellow and began her civil service career with the International Trade Administration Office of Policy as a trade analyst. And Nie worked as a research assistant at the Johns Hopkins Primary Care Policy Center, assisting with research projects on access to and quality of primary care for vulnerable populations in both the United States and China. She also interned with the World Health Organization.

Azhar, Jonsson, and Nie are just the latest Pardee RAND students to benefit from the generosity of the Rices. Seventeen current students and nine alumni have received Rice scholarship funds as well.

According to Susan Marquis, dean of the graduate school, “We are deeply appreciative of the Rices and their long-standing support of the graduate school. Don and Susan have provided not only financial support to our students but also encouragement, experience, and ideas to the school and RAND. Their wisdom and friendship have been invaluable.”

Don Rice was RAND’s president from 1972 to 1989. Today, he is a RAND trustee and a member of the graduate school’s board of governors (which he formerly chaired). He left RAND in 1989 to serve as the U.S. secretary of the Air Force. Susan Rice is also a RAND alumnus who worked at RAND for many years, primarily on health research and fundraising initiatives. Her firm, SFR Consulting, works with nonprofits on fundraising initiatives; she is particularly interested in expanding a culture of philanthropy in nonprofits.
Prototyped but never manufactured, the device was designed to detect the infrared spectrum of a muzzle flash. Though the goggles required a direct line of sight, they had a range of 173 to 565 yards, depending on whether the detector and target were moving or stationary. They were as accurate in daylight as at night.

Who’s the man behind the goggles? That’s L.J. Craig, a computer scientist at RAND, who conducted the research and wrote *On the Detection of Gunfire* for the U.S. Air Force in 1967. The report was declassified in 2006.

It is unclear why the goggles never evolved beyond the prototype, but today’s gunshot detectors rely on sound rather than sight. During the war in Iraq, the military began using the vehicle-mounted Boomerang gunfire detector, and in 2011, the U.S. Army issued the first individual gunshot detector.
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