

# A Wolf In Military Clothing: A Case Study Examination Of Lone Wolf Terrorism And The Roles And Responsibilities Of Government Agencies

2012

Peter Bandel

*University of Central Florida*

Find similar works at: <https://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd>

University of Central Florida Libraries <http://library.ucf.edu>

 Part of the [American Politics Commons](#), and the [Comparative Politics Commons](#)

## STARS Citation

Bandel, Peter, "A Wolf In Military Clothing: A Case Study Examination Of Lone Wolf Terrorism And The Roles And Responsibilities Of Government Agencies" (2012). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 2271.  
<https://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd/2271>

This Masters Thesis (Open Access) is brought to you for free and open access by STARS. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of STARS. For more information, please contact [lee.dotson@ucf.edu](mailto:lee.dotson@ucf.edu).

A WOLF IN MILITARY CLOTHING: A CASE STUDY EXAMINATION OF LONE  
WOLF TERRORISM AND THE ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF GOVERNMENT  
AGENCIES

by

PETER D BANDEL  
B.A. Northeastern University, 2005

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of Master in Arts  
in the Department of Political Science  
in the College of Sciences  
at the University of Central Florida  
Orlando, Florida

Fall Term  
2012

## **ABSTRACT**

Since the fall of September, 2011, there has been a major increase in awareness and study of global terrorism. Academia, the media, politicians, and the average citizen all have varying definitions, ideas, and concerns about terrorism. The focus has mainly been on international terrorism. Terrorist organizations like Al Qaeda have permeated the discussion. However, there is a growing concern of the "lone wolf terrorist." A lone wolf terrorist acts without a terrorist organization and is capable of having his/her own radical agenda with the audacity and simplicity to carry it out solely and enact great damage. The focus in the United States and globally has been on international lone wolf terrorists. This is important, but a longstanding concern (that often goes without much conversation) is the domestic lone wolf terrorist. Using Gustav Freytag's Triangle and Rational Choice theory, it is shown that lone wolf terrorism must be examined by the United States government to ensure safety of its citizens. A lone wolf terrorist is characterized as a United States citizen who enacts a terrorist action without being part of an organization or terror group. His motives are extremist in nature. This thesis examines the

growing phenomena of the domestic lone wolf terrorist. In doing so, the primary function is to look at an even starker reality: that some lone wolf terrorists have served in the military, and during service have shown to portray radical thoughts and actions. Furthermore, these lone wolf terrorists used their military training and weapon insight to enact their catastrophic aims. This thesis uses a case study methodology to examine three lone wolf actors. From the Oklahoma City Bombing, to the 1996 Olympic Summer Games in Atlanta and on to the Ft. Hood shootings the studies find that in all cases the actors did have radical beliefs, military training and used that training in concert with their attacks. This thesis can be used as a discussion about lone wolf terrorism, but also about governance. The findings show an increased need for the Department of Defense to work closely with the Department of Homeland Security and seek greater advice from organizations like the Federal Bureau of Investigation in order to conduct better psychological studies and examinations of military personnel.

A disclaimer must be made that this thesis does not, in any way, seek to disparage the amazing amount of work and sacrifice of United States government personnel and agencies. This thesis aims to provide research towards improved understanding and combating of lone wolf terrorism.

To my loving parents whose support has carried me through my academic career and throughout my life. And to my entire family for countless hours of support, help and believing in me even when it became difficult.

To Dr. Houman Sadri for the continuous support and valued advise.

To Dr. David Houghton and Dr. Naim Kapucu for all the research guidance, discussions and strong feedback.

To the University of Central Florida Housing and Residence Life Staff. Thank you for the opportunity to be a part of UCF and to contribute to the success of other students. Thank you for all your support, guidance and friendship.

To S. Powell for all the amazing moments, for constantly being there for me, and for reminding me to simply put pen to paper and write.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES.....	vii
LIST OF TABLES.....	viii
CHAPTER ONE: "LONE WOLF" TERRORISM.....	1
Department of Defense: History and Role.....	1
U.S. Northern Command History and Role.....	3
Federal Bureau of Investigation: History and Role.....	4
Department of Homeland Security: History and Role.....	6
National Incident Management System History and Role.....	8
Defining Governance.....	11
Freytag's Triangle and Rational Choice Theory.....	16
Defining Terrorism.....	21
Lone Wolf Terrorism.....	24
Research Methodology.....	27
CHAPTER TWO: TIMOTHY MCVEIGH AND OKLAHOMA CITY BOMBING.....	37
Background.....	37
Actions Taken.....	41
Governmental Response.....	44
CHAPTER THREE: ERIC ROBERT RUDOLPH AND CENTNNIAL BOMBINGS.....	47
Background.....	47
Actions Taken.....	49
Government Response.....	53
CHAPTER FOUR: NIDAL HASAN.....	56
Background.....	56
Actions Taken.....	57
Government Response.....	59

CHAPTER FIVE: FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION.....	62
Findings.....	62
Recommendations.....	65
Conclusion.....	68
REFERENCES.....	70

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: The Components of Good Governance .....	15
Figure 2: Barbara McManus's Representation of the Freytag Pyramid.....	17
Figure 3: Direct Actors in Relationship to Lone Wolf Terrorism .....	26



## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Comparison of U.S. Domestic Lone Wolf Terrorists.....	33
--	----

## CHAPTER ONE: "LONE WOLF" TERRORISM

### Department of Defense: History and Role

From the beginning of the United States of America's revolution towards independence, there was a growing consolidation of forces. Starting even in 1775, the Army, Navy and Marine Corps. were established as organized bodies with specific warfare purposes. In 1789 the War Department was created and it helped to greater establish a commonality between the various military branches. This consolidation continued through the Spanish-American War, Civil War, and World War I. Beginning in 1947, however, a true Department came to function. This was known as the National Military Establishment (Department of Defense, 2012). With the newly established Department of the Air Force and the other Departments in tow, the size of the U.S. military had grown substantially and consolidation was ever more needed. This spurred the creation of the Department of Defense in 1949. The DOD, today, has the various military branches reporting to a Secretary of Defense,

who in turn reports directly to the Commander and Chief of the United States (Department of Defense, 2012).

This history is important to understand when it relates to modern warfare and especially terrorism. Much of the DOD's responsibility is to defend the nation, but also to wage war on behalf of the United States. In the modern day, war has changed much from static battlefields to very dynamic combat zones. What this means, is the United States no longer is able to rely on waging war against nations and knowing where the battle may lay. In many cases, war is waged by generals rather than nations, by renegades rather than those seeking nationalistic means, and simply by terrorist organizations that seek to subvert the status quo for their own beliefs. Terrorist organizations and counterterrorist pursuits are now a major facet of the DOD. The combat in Afghanistan, beginning at the end of 2001, highlights how the DOD is fighting against a terrorist organization and not a true state or nation ((ISAF website, 2012).

It is the mission of the DOD to, "provide the military forces needed to deter war and to protect the security of the country" (DOD mission statement, 2012). This is obviously a critical mission, and as noted, modern day tactics have proved

to make things more difficult for the DOD. There are currently almost 1,200,000 persons in the U.S. military (subtracting the Coast Guard which during domestic peacetime is a part of the Department of Homeland Security), and that is simply active duty (DOD personnel statistics, 2012). The vast amount of personnel greatly exceeds that of active duty, but the active duty number provides a benchmark for the understanding that the DOD is exceeding in sheer volume. Due to this, the pressures felt by the DOD to not only provide defense for the U.S. but to run and maintain the Department are exponentially heavy.

### U.S. Northern Command History and Role

On October 1, 2002, President Bush approved and enacted the creation of the United States Northern Command. The Northern Command was created as a direct response to the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001. The purpose of the Northern Command was to better tighten and solidify national responses to large-scale domestic attacks that may impact the United States and areas surrounding the U.S. such as Mexico, Canada and air and waterways that connect to those locations (U.S. Northern Command, 2012).

The Northern Command's mission is to "Conduct operations to deter, prevent, and defeat threats and aggression aimed at the United States, its territories, and interests within the assigned area of responsibility" (Unified Command Plan, 2002). The Northern Command operates through a connected framework of various military agencies. The Army, Navy, Air Force and Marine Corp are all integral actors in sharing knowledge and combining their trainings and preparations to thwart potential attacks. Along with these actors, government actors ranging from Mexico and Canada to areas controlled by the United States like Puerto Rico and Guam are primary actors within the Command. Besides these large-scale actors, the Northern Command makes a concerted effort to work with state and local law enforcement and emergency response personnel at all times. There is an understanding that during a major crisis any, or even all, of the above mentioned parties will be needed to assist, respond or take the lead in helping to end the crisis that is taking place.

## Federal Bureau of Investigation: History and Role

The Federal Bureau of Investigation began in 1910 reporting to the Department of Justice. The FBI's primary mission at that

time was to investigate banking and bankruptcies, antitrust cases and peonage (FBI history, 2011). Essentially, the FBI operated on "white collar" crimes that were the order of the day. But, as time pressed on, like the DOD and many other U.S. bureaucracies, the role of the FBI grew in fashion and its membership went from an original 34 to a present day total of 35,664 persons (FBI history, 2011). This seismic growth correlates to the growing responsibilities of the FBI.

Like the DOD, the FBI has moved from its original foundations within white collar crimes to investigations of all crimes at a national level. Today's FBI has a strong focus on terrorism and terrorist aims. Again, like the DOD, the FBI has learned to operate in a world fabric where the conventional criminal is not the only criminal to be accounted for. There is the often more subtle, yet many times more harmful terrorist to be accounted for. The FBI works in tandem with international agencies to mitigate and prevent international terrorism (Priest & Akin, 2010). The FBI also works strongly towards preventing domestic terrorism. To this end, beginning in 2002, the FBI revamped its mission by strengthening "its support to federal, county, municipal and international law enforcement partners" (FBI history, 2012).

## Department of Homeland Security: History and Role

After the tragic events on a warm September day in 2001 occurred, and the smoke finally started to dissipate, and life in the United States started to normalize its self, many questions were left with very few answers. Of the many questions asked, one question was that of how to better protect America from terrorist attacks. This became the gravest national concern. President George W. Bush declared a "War on Terror" and on October 7<sup>th</sup>, 2001 began military "strikes against al Qaeda terrorist training camps" (Presidential Address to Nation, 2001). President Bush and leaders of Congress moved swiftly to make better and stronger all aspects of military, first responders, intelligence and critical infrastructures within the United States.

To accomplish this monumental task, it became necessary to look at creating a new department within the United States government. What was needed was the creation of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). The idea for the DHS first began on March 21, 2001 as a House of Representatives bill to create a National Homeland Security Agency (H.R. 1158, 2001). The bill lingered around within Congress for many months. However, after September 11<sup>th</sup> of that year, there was no doubt in anyone's mind

that the need for a Homeland Security Agency was paramount and of grave importance. On October 8, 2001, President Bush gave Executive Order 13228 to establish the office of Homeland Security (EO 13228, 2001).

The Department of Homeland Security's mission is "One Team, One Mission, Securing Our Homeland" (DHS Strategic Plan, 2008). This mission encompasses all facets of what DHS must do. It must secure the United States and protect the homeland. It also must be unified; it must be one team to accomplish that mission. Presidential Directives have created a networking nexus for DHS to collaborate with agencies and departments like the Department of Justice and the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and countless others.

The genesis of the DHS came under Homeland Security President Directive 1. HSPD-1 gave the organizational capacities of the Office of Homeland Security and put over 40 federal agencies under the department's control (HSPD-1, 2001). Subsequent Presidential Directives gave the DHS its preverbal teeth by giving the department its mission, objective, and legal capabilities.

The Department continued to grow and to gain strength as more Presidential Directives were given. Currently DHS has 24



Presidential Directives, providing policy guidelines and network guidance for all facets of emergency preparedness.

This brief history highlights the creation, implementation changes, and current features of DHS. Though it may be a brief history, the tasked objective and directive of the department will ensure its existence for years to come.

## National Incident Management System

As part of the DHS's mandate to better protect the nation from man-made and natural threats, the National Incident Management System was created (NIMS). NIMS is an organized framework that has been developed to provide unified responses to threats and incidents that might develop within the United States and its interests. Essentially, NIMS, "provides a systematic, proactive approach to guide departments and agencies at all levels of government, nongovernmental organizations, and the private sector to work seamlessly to prevent, protect against, respond to, recover from... the effects of incidents" (FEMA website, 2012). NIMS, much like the U.S. Northern Command is designed to encompass many different actors who might have different agendas, needs, wants and priorities and to streamline

them into one understanding so that an incident can be prevented, minimized, and recovered from as best as possible.

The chief component of NIMS is its ability to create a standardized language that all personnel from various organizations and entities can learn, share, and communicate to one another. This is a paramount task for NIMS since, as the definition above shows, there are many different actors that take part in the NIMS system. To better explain this point, the example of Hurricane Katrina in 2005 will be used.

In 2005, Hurricane Katrina besieged the Gulf region of the United States causing massive flooding and damage to the states of Alabama, Arkansas, Texas and Louisiana. Katrina destroyed many communities and cities; the most famous being New Orleans. During the hurricane, the national government through FEMA (Federal Emergency Management Agency) reacted to the hurricane and sent personnel, equipment, rations and monetary aid to the region. However, FEMA was operating under an organized platform that was created in 2002. This platform included the help of various non-profits like the American Red Cross to provide assistance during the crisis. Unfortunately, the Red Cross was overwhelmed and was not able to meet the expectations given. The Red Cross was under the assumption that it would be able to provide short-term relief to the area by way of temporary meals

and bedding. FEMA expected a longer duration of help, and was not ready to meet the needs of the victims in crisis in the region. This breakdown of communication caused a very dangerous situation to escalate to the point of chaos in the area (Lipton, et al, 2005).

There are a lot more events and underpinnings that transpired within the events of Hurricane Katrina. A large number of government actors, non-profits, private actors, and citizens played a part in the chaos that occurred. NIMS was designed to help fray the potential for that chaos. NIMS provides training and implementation standards for all groups and persons in the United States. The rationale is to create a unified set of terms, definitions, and standards that all can meet. In so doing, the ability to prevent, respond and recover to any event that might take place is much more highly attainable.

As another example, one only needs to look at the findings of the *9/11 Commission Report*. The report was commissioned to examine the actions taken by the September 11<sup>th</sup>, 2001 terrorists and to look at the governmental reactions. A huge concern and finding within the report was that not all governmental personnel were appropriately trained and ready to act. One finding of the report states, "The defense of U.S. airspace on

9/11 was not conducted in accord with preexisting training and protocols. It was improvised by civilians who had never handled a hijacked aircraft that attempted to disappear, and by a military unprepared for the transformation of commercial aircraft into weapons of mass destruction" (9/11 Commission Report, 31). This finding is exactly what the NIMS system, along with U.S. Northern Command and others, is designed to prevent. At times of catastrophe, it is of absolute necessity that all involved are on the same page and speaking the same language with a systematic standard of training already completed.

## Defining Governance

Governance is often difficult to define; various fields have various definitions. Economists, political scientists, sociologists, business-persons, public affairs persons and a host of other disciplines all grapple with a concrete definition of the term (Kjaer, 2004). It is a complex term, and one that Americans are often unfamiliar with. Rod Rhodes defines governance as, "the changing boundaries between public, private and voluntary sectors... Such networks have significant degree of

autonomy from the state - they are self-organizing ..." (Rhodes, 2007).

Although there is no set definition of governance, one striking characteristic of the term is that it is built upon application of government. It is not just the type and role of government, but how a government actually functions and most importantly if it functions effectively. The United States government is a complex set of bureaucracies, agencies, organizations, governing institutions, non-governmental organizations, and various other actors and bodies. Within this complexity is the need for government agencies to be accountable, productive, efficient and at their best. This is not always the case, as in the example of FEMA during Hurricane Katrina. For it to be the case, public and private spheres must, as Rhodes describes above, be "self-organizing." As they self-organize, they form themselves into being independent actors whose interests are two-fold: the first being to expand and to absorb more power and control. The second is to legitimize that power by producing results on the charged task given. Max Weber saw the harnessed capacities of a self-organized bureaucracy. There are the advantages of having experts within the department, organization or bureaucracy (Weber, 1947).

To better illustrate what governance is, Figure 1 shows the relationship of attributes that best define governance. These attributes include transparency, ethics, and accountability. Transparency allows for those included in the department, organization or bureaucracy to know what is happening at all times. Transparency also allows for other organizations and those with vested interests to know the inner workings of the various organizations and departments, etc. Transparency creates good ethical behavior.


Ethics is vastly important in governance as it is a determining factor that an organization, department or other entity is doing what its mandated purpose and is operating at the maximum level that it can. Figure 1 simplifies the connection of transparency to ethics. When a bureaucratic actor is practicing transparency, they are operating under a mode of ethics. What this means is that, as an example, if the Department of Education is being transparent with its national standardized testing results by providing that information to any persons that wants to read it, the Dept. of Education is being ethical as well. The ethics component comes from allowing information to be freely disseminated to anyone that wants it, in so doing, the Dept. of Education has been open with the results of its findings. Being open, or transparent, provides

anyone with a vested interest in the Dept. of Education's work to have a clear understanding of what the Department is actually doing. In a larger scope this creates a framework for accountability.

Lastly, accountability is what organizations and departments need to truly determine its worth. Accountability is the checking of an organization by its employees, those who are invested in it, and other organizations that must work with it. If an organization is ethical and is transparent, it is much easier to hold it accountable. As stated above, when information is freely provided, and an organization or bureaucracy operates with an "open-door" approach, they become fully accountable to themselves and those they serve. Those within the organization are held to higher standards since they know that their fellows have access to the work being produced. The public that the organization serves also benefits strongly because they are able to see the results of the organizations operations. In the example of the Department of Education, the public is able to see if standardized test scores are on the rise or decline. Knowing if standardized test scores are on the rise gives a concise rubric to begin assessing the Dept. of Education's benefit to its public. If the scores are not

rising, the Dept. of Education needs to examine why and explain the results.

Within the realm of governance, the DOD, DHS and FBI have a critical mission to accomplish. The long version is that they are expected to safe guard the nation in their own objectives and capacities. They protect against conventional, biological, chemical, cyber and economic terrorist attacks. The short version, for purposes of this thesis, is that all have a role in mitigating the threat of domestic lone wolf terrorism.



**Figure 1: The Components of Good Governance**



## Freytag's Triangle and Rational Choice Theory

In 1863, Gustav Freytag wrote the book, *Technique of Drama*, in it he featured the idea of organizing plots to create a unity of action. This idea he expanded upon from Aristotle (Freytag, 1863). Freytag was writing on the principal foundations of creating a play production. He highlighted how a play is to be broken up, the amount of crises to take place, and how the action should proceed. He also created what is now called the Freytag Triangle (sometimes referred to as the Freytag Pyramid.) Dr. Barbara McManus, former professor at the College of New Rochelle, demonstrates the Freytag Triangle, as highlighted in Figure 2 below. The Triangle shows a Beginning, Middle and End of action.



Figure 2: Barbara McManus's Representation of the Freytag Pyramid

The Beginning of action is a rise in a set complication, or problem, which the actors must recognize and begin to react to. This stage is where persons begin to sense that something is awry. The arrow trends upwards showing that there is still an apex of concern to occur and that the complication will only become worse before better.

The second action is the Middle. The Middle stresses upon concern for the actor. This is a dramatic landscape as the crisis and complication has reached an apex. The actor is left to figure out what the causes of the Beginning actions were and

to guess or estimate the totality of what the effects will be. The actor is still at a very vulnerable and impressionable period during this period.

The third action is the End. This is typically considered the resolution of the action. The cause/effect relationship has shifted and the actor is left to wonder more about the causes. The totality of effects are felt by this point and the actor is to consider what caused the action.

Finally, there is a fourth action. This action is typified as a return from the End to the Beginning. This is where the actor has felt the effects of his actions and has recovered as best as possible. This is also the stage of action where the actor starts to use what he learned from the previous action for benefit of the next action sequence. Basically, the actor has gone through an action sequence and has determined what he feels caused that action. He now returns to the Beginning with knowledge that may help to safeguard against another negative action sequence of the same, or similar, consequences. This is the development of the actor, and it also highlights a cause and effect relationship. This cause and effect relationship can be theorized by Rational Choice theory.

Max Weber, when discussing bureaucratic administration stated, "Bureaucratic administration means fundamentally the

exercise of control on the basis of knowledge. This is the feature of it which makes it specifically rational" (Weber, 1947.) Weber is discussing three fundamental assertions here. The first is exercise of control. As the DOD, FBI and DHS gains more Presidential Directives, Congressional allocations, receives more funding, takes on more tasks and so-on the power, or sphere, of control and influence grows greatly. The second assertion is a basis of knowledge. Bureaucracies, and most top organizations, are theoretically built around having very knowledgeable and highly skilled employees (Weber, 954). The DOD, DHS and FBI are no different. Each sub-agency of the organizations has personnel that are at the top of their various fields. The third assertion is that the department, organization or bureaucracy is a rational actor.

To assert that an actor is rational is to need to come to a definition of what a rational actor is. Political Scientists and economists see rational choice as a theory describing an actor's cost/ benefit analysis of choices. Sociologists define rational choice as actions and choices that people believe are "likely to have the best overall outcome" (Elster, 22). The nuances between cost/ benefit analysis and best outcomes within rational choice theory can be either miniscule or very large depending on the critique of the theory.

For the purposes of understanding the role of the DOD, FBI, DHS, the nuances are miniscule, and act as compliments for each other. All three are characterized as being rational choice actors. Their motives are to make critical decisions within a cost/benefit landscape. These decisions are reflected in organizational change, directive establishment, and within day-to-day operations in dealing with crises. They are also rational in that they continually seek options that will have that best overall outcome. This is a standard observance within a rational choice actor.

It is of critical importance to note that these bureaucracies of government function as rational actors to understand the total scope of their obligations. The preparation, response, and recovery efforts to best protect over nearly four hundred million people are as large and noble a task as any can be. And as rational choice actors, when crises, emergencies, disasters and dangers change and morph, all must be prepared and ever-ready to meet them head-on.

## Defining Terrorism

Terrorism, typically international terrorism (the one that is highlighted by the media and brings about the strongest images and responses) is in its self very difficult to define. The League of Nations, in 1937, attempted to defines terrorism as, "all criminal acts directed against a *state* and intended or calculated to create a state of terror in the minds of particular persons or a group of persons or the general public (Acharya, 2009). Since that initial modern attempt at defining the term, other state and trans-national actors have provided definitions. The U.S. Department of State defines terrorism as, "premeditated, politically motivated violence perpetrated against non-combatant targets by sub-national groups or clandestine state agents" (USDOS, 2005). The Department of Defense defines the term as, "the unlawful use of violence or threat of violence to instill fear and coerce governments or societies. Terrorism is often motivated by religious, political, or other ideological beliefs and committed in the pursuit of goals that are usually political" (DOD Dictionary of Military Terms, 2012). The Federal Bureau of Investigation defines the term as, "The unlawful use of force or violence against persons or property to intimidate or coerce a

Government, the civilian population, or any segment thereof, in furtherance of political or social objectives" (FBI Terms, 2012). Lastly, some international organizations, specifically the United Nations avoids defining terrorism all together in that the various nations of the organization cannot agree on a solidified term (United Nations General Assembly, 2005).

As the various definitions show, there are softened nuances to each definition, but all hold key ideas. Terrorism, for purposes of this paper, is: a violent action taken by a non-governmental actor(s) in attempts to scare a person or populous in the hopes of enacting the perpetrators own political, religious or social radicalized ideology. What this means is that a terrorist group, organization, actor, or "cell" has a desire to invoke a change within an organization or government and attempts to accomplish this goal by afflicting violence (physical, emotional, psychological) on a person or groups of persons. Terrorism can be chiefly characterized as Machiavellian, as the "ends justify the means." Unfortunately, too often, and partially due to the lack of a concrete definition of the term, terrorism becomes defined like Associate Justice Potter Stewart defined pornography: one simply knows it when they see it. This often leads to a grave misidentification

and becomes worse as terrorism is parceled into smaller segments like domestic, international, lone wolf, and the like.

The United States international terrorism focus is on groups like Al Qaeda, The Armed Islamic Group, Columbia's National Liberation Army, Egypt's Al-Jihad, and countless others. The Center for Defense Information (under the banner of the World Security Institute) produces an updated list of terrorist groups periodically. This list includes well over 100 organizations and separates them by the country of origin while providing insight like Operational Locations, Affiliations, and Comments (World Security Institute, 2012).

Domestically, terrorism has not received the same attention. There could be various reasons for this which might include less domestic terrorist groups in the United States, domestic terrorism is more easily thwarted, or it could be partially caused by a misunderstanding of definitions. Typically domestic terrorists have been defined by groups like The Weatherman whose sensationalized radical behavior and bombings of government infrastructures dominated headlines and provided the grassroots for a radicalized agenda of terrorism in America (Berger, 2006). Also, The Black Liberation Army had an agenda as being to "take up arms for the liberation and self-determination of black people in the United States" (START.UMD,



2012). These groups, along with the Klu Klux Klan and others, created an era in the late 1960's until the late 1970's that saw a rise in domestic terrorism. International terrorism still trumped, but an era of fear due to terrorism, assassination, riots, and mass killings helped to redefine the terminology used to describe terrorism.

Since that time, domestic terrorism seemed to wane. David Koresh and the Waco siege in 1993 stood out as domestic terrorist group activity, but for the most part United States domestic terrorism seemed silent in the last thirty years. Silent in the sense that political, media, and civilian attention remained low. However, this truly is not the case as domestic terrorism has been strongly dominated by a force that is difficult to define. Domestic terrorism has been dominated by the "lone wolf" terrorist.

## Lone Wolf Terrorism

Lone wolf terrorism has caused a grave amount of physical, emotional, psychological and economic damage in the United States. A lone wolf terrorist's agendas is the same as traditional terrorist organizations. He, or she, uses violence

as a means to evoke change in a government, organization, or group of people. The paramount difference is that lone wolf terrorists act solely, or by aid of only two or three people, to accomplish their actions. This makes the lone wolf much more difficult to find and much more difficult to prevent. Any person with a radicalized agenda who wants to evoke change by violent means has potential to do so. Janet Napolitano, security of Homeland Security, recently stated that lone wolves, "were harder to detect in part because by their very definition, they're not conspiring with others, they may not be communicating with others, there's very little to indicate that something is under way" (Washington Examiner, 2012). Lone wolf terrorists create a growing threat to the United States.

A simplified model of the various organizations that are involved in protecting against, preparing for, and responding to lone wolf terrorism is shown in Figure 3 below. In the center is the individualized lone wolf terrorist actor. Circled around the terrorist are federal departments and agencies, state and local agencies and private organizations. The chief federal departments and agencies include the Department of Defense, Department of Homeland Security, the State Department and the Federal Bureau of Intelligence. The state and local agencies include police and intelligence agencies, emergency response

agencies and various other actors that are directly and indirectly affected by a terrorist threat and/or attack. Also, private organizations are included. Private organizations include non-profits like the Red Cross and Salvation Army, private contractors and businesses, hospitals and others.



**Figure 3: Direct Actors in Relationship to Lone Wolf Terrorism**

Increasing this threat is the potential of lone wolf terrorists to be anyone within society. With no formal connection or affiliation that provides directive for their

actions, a lone wolf terrorist could be anyone (Vollers, 2006). The threat becomes even more severe when there is potential that these terrorists may be found in different governmental positions, high security positions, or even the U.S. military. The last of these is very dangerous as warfare techniques, weaponry uses, retaliation methods, etc. are all at the terrorist's disposal for learning and future use.

## Research Methodology

The original perspective for this thesis was to look at various U.S. government agencies and their roles in combating global terrorism. The purpose of the initial research was to better understand how the United States protected its citizens from global terrorism. The unit of measure was to be individual government departments and agencies.

Two hypotheses were to be tested. The first stated: The United States government has better prepared against terrorist threats since September 11, 2001. The second stated: The creation of the Department of Homeland Security, and subsequent collaboration with other government agencies, has provided a

higher level of governance in regards to citizen protection against terrorist threats.

The two hypotheses were to be tested with an empirical design examining terrorist acts and various agencies' mitigation and response activities. A pre and post September 11, 2001 timeline was initially constructed to look at terrorist acts that involved United States citizens globally and domestically. Also, the hypotheses would further be tested by looking at comparison variables such as percentage of government budget allocated towards terrorism research and study, prevention, and recovery. The totality of damage would be examined as well. The totality of damage was to include causality numbers, property damages (including buildings, equipment, land and environmental damage,) and mental and psychological costs.

During the infant stages of research and design, it became apparent that the hypotheses were far too vast to accurately test within a reasonable framework. In other words, the amount of information and variables grew exponentially and caused large issues of staying on point. The research proved to be nebulous in scope. Another difficulty came in the form of defining terrorism. There is no universal definition of terrorism and using any one definition of terrorism created problems in testing the second hypothesis. This meant that using one

definition of terrorism, whether it came from the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Defense, or State Department could dilute the accuracy of hypothesis two. Any definition may include or exclude variables that other definitions may or may not.

Although the original thesis proved to have significant faults from the beginning, the copious amount of research aided in understanding the complexity of the issue of terrorism. Terrorism is such a broad term that the study of it in totality becomes wrought with challenges. However, many different questions and specified topics for research were found.

One such topic proved to be heavily parceled throughout the initial research collection. The topic was of "lone wolf" terrorism. The term lone wolf existed in topics of international terrorism, domestic terrorism and at all levels of government reports. Yet, much like the parent term of terrorism, lone wolf terrorism had no set definition and no set catalogue of what were officially deemable acts. This more clearly meant that the line between a lone wolf terrorist act and a mass killing, kidnapping, or attack on government was very thin and inexact.

Though still daunting, the research focused on exploring lone wolf terrorism none-the-less. The seriousness of the topic

and the lack of attention paid to it by academics, government agencies and state actors made for a necessity of exploration. The methodology for exploring lone wolf terrorism changed from a quantitative exploration to a qualitative one. This occurred for two reasons. The first reason is again an issue with research. As research was conducted, it became very difficult to find concrete examples of lone wolf terrorism that more than at least two government agencies and/or international bodies could agree on as being examples. Many would-be acts of lone wolf terrorism have historically been classified as assassinations, kidnappings, rebellions, and other acts of violence. This is much akin to the problems of amassing all examples of genocide. Different scholars and institutions have different criteria for inclusion. The second reason was propagated by the first in that without steadfast definitions of terms and catalogues of numbers any empirical research would be greatly flawed.

Joining these two reasons, another obstacle became apparent. There was a limited amount of scholarly research conducted on lone wolf terrorism. This was even more grossly highlighted when investigating domestic lone wolf terrorism. Scholarly examples proved to be very few and far between. Most research was found from journalistic books and media sources.

The sources found provided insight into lone wolf actors and their motivations for actions. And since these lone wolves were few in number, they could be more readily treated as outlying examples of terrorism.

This outlier rationale provided merit for constructing a case study approach to examining lone wolf terrorism. The approach began by gathering a compilation of definitions of terrorism from various domestic agencies and international bodies and forming a working definition that combined the universal similarities in each. From there the same was done for defining lone wolf terrorism. After a working definition was created, a list of all possible domestic lone wolf terrorist actions was created. This list proved to be long at first, but sticking by the definition constructed in the Defining Terrorism section of this paper, the list shrunk immediately. As the number of cases dwindled due in large part to misclassifications which included individuals who were directly associated (often through funding) to larger terrorist organizations, individuals whose actions were carried out while they were highly mentally unstable and those whose actions were for personal gain solely and not to create change in society, government or other actors, certain observations were made feasible.



As the list became smaller, there appeared to be a loosely associated trend within the lone wolf terrorist actors. This trend was that several of the lone wolves had served in the military and used their military training to carry out their attacks. With this finding, a sub-grouping of lone wolves with military backgrounds was formulated, as seen in Table 1 below. This helped to specify the focus and to eliminate terrorists like Ted Kaczynski, Andrew Stack, (who flew a private plane into an IRS building in 2010) and Abdulhakim Muhammad and others.

Table 1: Comparison of U.S. Domestic Lone Wolf Terrorists

	McVeigh	Rudolph	Hasan
Military Service	Yes	Yes	Yes
Extremist Views Held	Federal Government Over-Throw	Far Christian Right	Far Islamic Right
Terrorist Actions Taken	Bombing of the Alfred P. Murrah Building in Oklahoma	Olympic Park Dirty Bomb, Abortion Clinic Bombings	Fort Hood military base shootings
Numbers Dead and Wounded	162 dead 794 wounded	2 dead 160 wounded	13 dead 29 wounded
Agencies Involved	Oklahoma State and Local Police and Emergency Services, FBI, DOJ, DOD	Georgia State and Local Police and Emergency Services, U.S. Marshalls, FBI, DOJ	Texas State and Local Police and Emergency Services, FBI, DOD, DOJ, DHS

Another trend developed within the research as the list diminished. The trend was that a smaller subset of the domestic lone wolf terrorists that were military trained also had openly known extremist views against the United States before and during their service in the U.S. military. Three such cases

were found and initial research showed an alarming amount of similarities.

Before discussing the three case studies of this paper, it is important to at least open up the discussion of the psychological mindset of a lone wolf terrorist actor. As stated above, the proposed case study examples all had military training and experience. The cases should be treated as extreme outliers, but their totality of damage and various similarities caused a large red flag. The interesting perspective for future examination is to look at the psychological impacts of military training on the lone wolf terrorist actors. More clearly, did military training simply provide better training for actions that would have taken place regardless of service? Or did the actions that took place happen as a result of military training and indoctrination to killing that takes place within the military. The former presupposes that military training made an already pre-disposed killer more effective. The latter presupposes that military training and indoctrination of killing is a primary reason for the lone wolf terrorist actor to go over an edge and enact the terrorist plots. While this author does not have a significant background in psychology to dive deeply into this quasi chicken-and-egg dilemma, it is certainly a topic that further research must discuss. This being said, a good

benchmark for this topic is David Grossman's research. Grossman closely examined the effects of military training and indoctrination towards killing in his book, *On Killing: The Psychological Cost of Learning to Kill in War and Society*. In his book, Grossman ascertains that:

It is as though there were two filters that we have to go through to kill. The first filter is the forebrain. A hundred things can convince your forebrain to put a gun in your hand and go to a certain point: poverty, drugs, gangs, leaders, politics, and the social learning of violence in the media—which is magnified when you from a broken home and are searching for a role model. But traditionally all these things have slammed into the resistance that a frightened, angry human being confronts in the midbrain. And except with sociopaths (who, by definition, do not have this resistance), the vast, vast majority of circumstance are not sufficient to overcome this midbrain safety net. But if you are conditioned to overcome these midbrain inhibitions, then you are a walking time bomb, a pseudosociopath, just waiting for the random factor of social interaction and forebrain rationalization to put you at the wrong place at the wrong time (Grossman, xix).

This assertion by Grossman is scary and yet very rational. Persons that are predisposed of having outside factors promoting killing and are then conditioned, or indoctrinated, into finding killing acceptable, even palatable, are "time bombs" set to go off at the wrong place and wrong time.

The three cases examined are of Timothy McVeigh and the Oklahoma City bombing in 1992, Eric Robert Rudolph and the 1996 Summer Olympic Games bombings and Nidal Hasan and the Ft. Hood shootings in 2009. All three cases share common variable traits of the actors being typified as lone wolf terrorists, all having

military training, all having openly known extremist views towards the U.S. government, and all used their military training to aid in their attacks.

Drawing from the original hypotheses stated above, two new hypotheses were developed for testing. Hypothesis One states: If individuals with known extremist views against the U.S. government gain military training they are likely to commit acts of lone wolf terrorism. Hypothesis Two states: If the United States military is concerned about providing governance then it will pay closer attention to past and present military personnel with extremist views against the U.S. government.

## CHAPTER TWO: TIMOTHY MCVEIGH AND OKLAHOMA CITY BOMBING

### Background

On April 19, 1995 the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City was bombed by suspect, and later convicted, Timothy McVeigh. The Oklahoma City Bombing is primarily the standard for domestic terrorism in the United States. The actions taken by McVeigh and his lone accompish Terry Nichols was the largest and most unprecedented attack on the United States by terrorist actor at the time of the attack (Hamm, 2000). The bombing killed 168 and injured almost 700 (many of whom were children). The actions taken by McVeigh are haunting, but they show just how far citizens will go to show their disagreements with the United States.

Timothy McVeigh was born in 1968 to parents William and Mildred McVeigh. William and Mildred had three children and lived in Lockport New York. There were not any significant happenings in McVeigh's childhood until the age of ten where his parents divorced. However, after the divorce, McVeigh went to

live with William and from there his attitudes and personality traits began to develop.

McVeigh moved to a new town as a child and as a recent child of divorce was subjected to verbal and physical taunts and attacks by his classmates. McVeigh began to imagine what it would be like to get revenge on his classmates. He started to develop and hone retaliatory instincts that would later serve his purposes.

McVeigh also learned traits and garnered habits that helped him execute the Oklahoma City Bombing. He learned how to "hack" into computers and was able to do it successfully to break into government level organizations and files. His enjoyment of computers aided in his disassociation with other people. He was able to gain momentum in his fantasy world. McVeigh also used irrational and bold actions to try and impress others and presumably girls within his high school classes (Vollers, 2006). He frequently took firearms that he received from his grandfather or from a local gun shop to school and showed them to whoever was willing to see.

Taking guns to school and disassociating from others is not of huge consequence but it does create a standard of behavior and highlights his developmental behavior. After unsuccessfully attempting college, McVeigh Timothy McVeigh took his interests

in guns and enlisted in the U.S. Army. In the Army, he became a quick learner and enjoyed the military life. He was able to learn about how to be a sniper, use explosives, and gain vast amounts of knowledge on weapons (Hamm, 2000).

McVeigh did well as a soldier, but his radical views caused issues with his fellow soldiers and superiors. It was common to hear him voicing about too much government control, "white disenfranchisement" issues and so forth. McVeigh, in a form of retaliation, wore "white power" t-shirts on base because he was angry at the shirts black soldiers were allowed to wear.

Timothy McVeigh battled back and forth between being a good soldier and the want of expression of his beliefs (Michel & Herbeck, 2001).

Unfortunately, McVeigh was a great soldier and created much of the Oklahoma City Bombing to his U.S. Army training. McVeigh took what he learned in the military and expanded those skills by learning more. He also learned how to fully disassociate, an emotional separation he practiced as a child, and became able to switch his emotions off.

Although McVeigh was a great soldier he became increasingly unstable. His psychiatric tests for entrance into the Special Forces showed him as having mental issues that would not allow



him into the programs. Subsequently he ended his military career and returned to New York (Michel & Herbeck, 2001).

Without the structure of the military McVeigh became increasingly unraveled. He had stints as a security guard and other odd jobs. He voiced his opinions about the role of government and the mockery of elections. Essentially, he felt that all the government wanted was more taxes and it would not leave people alone to live their own lives. He still had issues with maintaining friends, could not find a girlfriend, gambled too much, isolated, and became overly restless. A letter in 1993 to his sister, Jennifer, highlights McVeigh's growingly unstable mind. McVeigh wrote to his sister, talking about a feverish emotional episode in which he became irate against the United States government, "it was almost suicide, at that point, but rage, but denial, but acceptance--all these feelings were battling for control" (*New York Times*, 1998).

The final developmental piece came when McVeigh drove to Texas. He drove to Texas to show support for the Waco compound. The FBI and ATF sieged the Waco compound and the nation watched the events nightly on the news. McVeigh felt that those in the compound deserved the freedom to live how they wanted and should be awarded for being separatists. He passed out pro-gun and anti-government literature and gained momentum in his own

causes. The FBI finally ended the stalemate by opening sniper fire on the compound. Many were killed and wounded (Michel & Herbeck, 2001). McVeigh viewed this as a drastic and terrible action by the government.

### Actions Taken

Waco was the icing on McVeigh's disillusionment cake. He blamed the U.S. government for being inconsistent with its laws and who these laws protected and vilified. After Waco, he bounced around the various parts of the U.S. and created alias and identities. His purpose was to scope out suitable targets for his aims. He looked at nuclear plants, military bases, and other governmental structures. He then strengthened his criteria by focusing that the location should house the FBI, DEA and/or the ATF. Due to its size, ease of access and potential for devastation, he settled on the Alfred P. Murrah building in Oklahoma City (Michel & Herbeck, 2001). McVeigh felt the building housed the agencies he was looking to target and it had the potential to create the most collateral damage. As a double incentive to pick the Murrah building, McVeigh knew that fringe

groups had previously plotted to blow up the building. With McVeigh's training, he was going to do it successfully.

To accomplish his task, McVeigh enlisted the help of one person. He recruited Terry Nichols into the fray. Nichols had met McVeigh in the military and through McVeigh's strong approach and quick words; Nichols believed what McVeigh said (Rimer, 1995). The two began preparations in the months after Waco. They slowly, but consistently, gathered explosive materials, guns, ammunition and holding lockers for all the materials. The operation would prove fairly smooth for the two. McVeigh had Nichols buy large amounts of materials like ammonium nitrate, but in separate quantities and not enough to raise concerns.

During the time of the construction of the bomb and the readying of plans, McVeigh became bold and showed a friend, Michael Fortier, the plans he was designing. Fortier was a radical as well and owned a very extensive gun collection. The action of McVeigh showing Fortier the plans illustrated McVeigh's deep belief in his cause, and the pride for his work. He and Nichols amassed an array of volatile chemicals and explosives and stored them in a storage facility where they began to create the compound necessary to aggregate the largest explosion (Romano, & Kenworthy, 1997).

At this point, McVeigh began to rationalize his thinking and behavior by his military training. The military taught him to kill and not think about it. The premise was to justify the action by the end result. McVeigh felt he had been pushed to an edge where his only ability to justify was to create the biggest end result possible. He became even more brazen his plan as his created alias like Robert D. Kling and others (BBC.CO.UK, 2007). These aliases helped him ease in and out of locations and afforded him the ability to gather materials without evoking suspicion.

The plan became more detailed as time moved forward. However, there did not appear to be any doubt or fears in McVeigh. He and Nichols pushed forward. On April 16<sup>th</sup>, McVeigh and Nichols drove a truck to the site of the building. He took the license plate off and left a note on the car stating the car's battery was dead and he would be back to get the car. The getaway car was in place.

At 9am on April 19, 1995, McVeigh unleashed his explosives on the Murrah building. The destruction tore the building apart and the north and east sides of the building were destroyed with debris everywhere. The bomb took the lives of persons that worked in the building and also the lives of many of the children that attended the daycare. The blast caused

shrapnel to be a main cause of injury and death to those in the building and around the site (Michel & Herbeck, 2001).

Buildings in all directions were destroyed, burnt, or damaged; cars and other gasoline sources caused further explosions.

Beyond the horrific death and injury totals, the economic totals were in the millions of dollars.

### Governmental Response

The morning of the bombing, Timothy McVeigh bore a t-shirt with the Latin, "Sic semper tyrannis" meaning "thus always to tyrants." He also had literature and quotes from Thomas Jefferson and John Locke and displayed himself as a revolutionary (Linder, 2006). McVeigh and Nichols left the scene and for all intents and purposes felt they had a strong getaway planned.

However, McVeigh was arrested within two hours of the bombing. He was driving north and pulled over by an Oklahoma State Trooper. The Trooper, Charlie Hanger, stopped McVeigh for driving without a license plate. During the questioning of

McVeigh, Hanger noticed a gun in the car and asked if McVeigh had a permit. He did not, and Hanger arrested him.

During the arrest, Hanger found evidence that would later be used against McVeigh. McVeigh had not been as cautious and careful in getaway as he was in his preparations. The getaway car did not have a license, McVeigh was a walking quote for radical action, and he left a business card with information pertaining to the purchase of TNT and other explosives in the back of the police car (Linder, 2006).

This information and the inconsistencies of home addresses and state licenses gave the Oklahoma police enough probable cause to contact the FBI on an urgent basis. Within three days, the FBI and the state Troopers were gathering and sharing information. They were able to link the rental truck to a specific agency and match descriptions of McVeigh and Nichols. They attained positive ID's of the suspects and moved forward with the case.

McVeigh was turned over to federal investigators and they pressed for more information and looked for as much damning evidence as could be found. The FBI gathered search warrants for McVeigh's family's houses and Nichol's as well. They tapped phones and kept collecting on inconsistencies like names and dates that did not match up (Hamm, 2000).

Terry Nichols was still at large and eventually heard about the FBI's full investigation, which was proving to be the largest on record. He decided to turn himself in. He aided the FBI in the search for evidence and they found materials used for the making of the same bomb ingredients found at the scene (Rimer, 2005).

This was enough information: paper trails, photographic evidence, false identifications, witnesses and an accessory to the crime. McVeigh was then indicted on 11 counts by the federal government. His charges ranged from first degree murder to creation and utilization of weapons of mass destruction and on to willful destruction of federal property.

Timothy McVeigh stood on his convictions and defended his actions. He believed that he had no other choice but to destroy the building. The government had become tyrannical and its denial of liberty was an evil act. On June 2, 1997 McVeigh was convicted and was executed on June 11<sup>th</sup> 2001.

## **CHAPTER THREE: ERIC ROBERT RUDOLPH AND CENTNNIAL BOMBINGS**

### Background

Eric Robert Rudolph is known for bombing the Atlanta Olympics in 1996. He was born in Merritt Island Florida in 1966. From Merritt Island, he and his family, moved to a small rural community called Nantahalia North Carolina. Rudolph quickly learned to appreciate the outdoors and as a child played and learned about all aspects of outdoors life. He became impassioned and enthralled with the survivalist style of life (Vollers, 2006).

Rudolph lost his father at age 15 and he and his brothers and sisters were raised by his mother. There was pressure to make money and keep the family together. Rudolph felt he needed to help his family generate income. This reason, and possibly others, caused him to leave school at the end of ninth grade.

From there, ERR gained a trade by becoming a carpenter. He worked with his brother for close to two years. Rudolph became experienced working with his hands. He learned how to mold and



morph new materials from old and gained more appreciation for working with and in nature (Schuster & Stone, 2005). At age 18, he went to the Christian Identity compound with his Mother. The compound was in Missouri and he gained insights into radical ideas on government and institutions.

Though he dropped out of school before graduating, Rudolph was not viewed as anything but intelligent. He took his GED's and was accepted into Western Carolina University. He excelled for two semesters, but then left the university. His unrest and irritability was strengthened by his boredom. In 1986 ERR joined the United States military. He went through basic training and did well. His training evolved quickly and he went from being part of the 101<sup>st</sup> Airborne to attending Air Assault School (Walls, 2003). During his training he learned a significant amount of survival skills and special weapons practices, both of which would assist him in his later pursuits.

However, just like high school and college, ERR became listless and prone to self-destruction or quitting. Rudolph was discharged due to marijuana use. He left the military in 1989. Rudolph's years leading up to the Atlanta Olympics bombing do not shed much light on the character of the man or what he did during that time. Much information highlights his private nature, his religious leanings and his radicalism. He was an

avid spokesman of the anti-gay and anti-abortion movements and believed he was a soldier fighting in a war against abortion (Walls, 2003). After the Atlanta Olympics bombing, it would be pieced together that it was Rudolph who bombed two other abortion clinics within the country.

### Actions Taken

The city of Atlanta Georgia hosted the Olympic Games in the summer of 1996. It was a showcase of peace and a reprieve from racial, sexual, religious and cultural tensions. The focus was on athletics, the world, and the city of Atlanta being a great host. Eric Robert Rudolph did not agree and did not want to see the Olympics used as a way to denigrate what he loved about the United States. The United States was about Christian values and small government (Crenshaw, 2000). He did not want to see global socialism and multi-national agreement.

Rudolph became enraged by the Olympics. He wanted to disrupt the games. He wanted to show what horrid ideas the federal government had on abortion and how wrong they were. The

government was showing the world that abortion and immoral actions were allowable and enjoyed by Americans.

The actions taken by Rudolph would not be discovered until 2003 when he was finally apprehended, but on the night of Friday July 26<sup>th</sup>, 1996 at the Global Village a concert and celebration was happening (Schuster & Stone, 2005). Athletes and spectators were listening to a variety of musical artists and enjoying a warm summer night. Atlanta had spent a lot of federal money to create a venue where thousands could congregate. As the night wore on, the people did not leave.

A security guard named Richard Jewell (who would later be the falsely named suspect) found a green army bag resting alone underneath a park bench. Jewell contacted the Georgia Bureau of Investigation and his supervisors. All were alerted to the scene. An explosives unit arrived as well due to pipes and wires sticking out of the bag. To add to the suspicion of the bomb being in a bag, an anonymous 911 call was placed stating the bag was indeed a bomb (CNN, 2007).

The timing of the call and placement of the bag were done with an expert understanding of the surroundings. The location of the bag, in front of a large soundstage with hundreds of people in an enclosed setting made it difficult for the forces on hand to evacuate the location. Adding to this was the fact

that it was after midnight and alcohol was being consumed. Most did not care for the police and were either rude or ignored them. Also, the vast size of the venue aided in the dilemma. The park allowed for many people to gather together but it created congestion, stagnation and inefficiency (Schuster & Stone, 2005). All of these were benefits to Rudolph's plans.

Jewell and others assisted in evacuating as many people as they could out but it was a slow process. In the span of about 50 minutes one officer was able to escort 11 people out. No one wanted to yell bomb due to the serious fear of a bottle neck stampede that could take place. The bomb exploded at 1:20am and it tore into the crowd. Some thought the bomb was part of the show until they saw friends and other spectators or themselves with blood seeping from body parts.

The aftermath of the explosion was that one person, Alice Hawthorne, died and 111 others were injured. The horrific nature of the bombing was never fully realized however. The bomb's original location was underneath a park bench and was moved slightly to outside of that position. If the bomb had stayed in position its explosive nature would have been more greatly realized. It is the equivalent of having a firecracker in the palm of a hand verses having a hand surround the firecracker completely. Had the bomb been under the bench, its

explosive nature would have been much higher (Department of Justice, 1998).

Another aspect to the bomb, one that showcases Rudolph's acquired skill set from the military was the nature of the bomb. It was a dirty bomb. A detonator was charged to explosive material with piping that contained nails, screws, glass, and other small items. This created a "dirty bomb" that was easy to build, and could be transported without much effort. Unlike other bombs this type of bomb did not require a large amount of ingenuity or planning. The maker needed only the expertise to make the bomb, from there it was easy to repeat for use (Department of Justice, 1998).

The bombing did do as Rudolph wanted, just not to the full extent he had hoped. The Olympic Games gained a focus on the bombings and the world watched to learn more about it. But, the games still went on. And an unexpected consequence took place. Rudolph had become skilled in planting bombs and being the least likely of suspects. ERR was an attractive young man who did not invite a lot of scrutiny. In a large Olympic venue, he could have seamlessly passed through. This being the case security guard Jewell became the suspect of bombing.

Jewell, a quick hero and alert guard on the scene found that he was the lead suspect in the bombings. There were no

other suspects and he was being held for questioning. The longer time went by and the more questions asked the more Jewell became uneasy and asked for lawyers and demanded his rights. The world media was determined to find a culprit and have the games go on without continued fear. Jewell became a scapegoat to that effect (CNN, 2007). Days later the FBI went to Jewell's house looking for evidence. The FBI took trucks worth of information away. It would not be until later reports and months down the road that the government found Jewell to not be a suspect. All of this gave Eric Robert Rudolph a vast amount of time to get away.

### Government Response

The Olympic Games is of critical importance to the world and especially to that of the host nation. Due to this, the fervor and need for results by the GBI and FBI helped aid in their mistakes in finding Rudolph. The focus was on one man and even years after being cleared as a suspect civil trials were still attempted against Jewell (CNN, 2007). In the meanwhile, Rudolph had long since disappeared into backwoods places and was surviving on his own.

After the Olympic Games, there were other bombings. In 1998 a bomb was exploded at an abortion clinic in Birmingham, Alabama. A security guard named Robert Sanderson was killed and others were severally wounded. A witness on scene saw a man take off a blonde wig and speed away in a car. The license plate was traced and it was deemed to belong to Eric Robert Rudolph (Vollers, 2006).

The FBI, understanding how dangerous and deadly Rudolph was posted him as one of their Ten Most Wanted. Being put on the Most Wanted list did not produce initial results for the FBI. Rudolph had skilled training and was known to be an extreme survivalist who was acclimated in some of the worst wilderness (Walls, 2003). To aid in the FBI's attempt to find Rudolph, they proceeded to enact an award of \$1 million U.S. dollars for his capture. This led to private search teams as well as state and federal level search teams that looked for Rudolph for over five years. During this longstanding manhunt, Rudolph dug deeper into the Appalachian hills and forests and even found sympathizers in his extreme right wing based philosophies. These sympathizers provided support during this time.

The manhunt that began in 1998, finally ended in May of 2003. Rudolph was arrested in rural North Carolina behind a grocery store close to dawn. The officer, Jeffrey Postell

arrested Rudolph, who did not resist and appeared to be healthy and fully clean shaven (Schuster, 2003). Upon sentencing for the various bombings, Rudolph struck a plea bargain with the FBI on the grounds that he would not receive the death penalty if he released the locations of his dynamite and other explosives. The FBI agreed and Rudolph disclosed that there was over 250 pounds of dynamite in the Appalachian Mountains ready for more bombings. Rudolph then received four life sentences for his bombings.

The FBI and local law enforcement agencies were relieved that they caught Rudolph and prevented another potential bombing. Rudolph however, saw his escaping the death penalty as a victory for his cause. Rudolph now is serving his four consecutive life terms, but his actions have been shown as a quasi-Robin Hood sort of heroics for those that support him.



## CHAPTER FOUR: NIDAL HASAN

### Background

On November 5th of 2009, United States Army Major Nidal Malik Hasan opened gunfire at Fort Hood in Killeen Texas. Hasan, a military psychiatrist killed 13 military personnel and wounded 29 others. Hasan's role as psychiatrist was to examine soldiers before and after their active duty tours. It has been noted that as the fighting in Afghanistan and Iraq continued, Hasan became increasingly opposed to U.S. forces in those regions. He became dismayed by what soldiers told him and took a negative view of the U.S. fighting in these arenas.

There is not a lot of information that has been disclosed about Hasan's upbringing and family life. The known information is that Hasan is an American Muslim with ancestry from Palestine. It is also known that Hasan increasingly had ties with radicalized Muslims in the Arab world. In 2008, the FBI ran a search and watch over Hasan's email relationship with Anwar al-Awlaki. Awlaki was a cleric that appeared on the FBI's and other counterterrorism agencies' lists of terrorists. Though the

FBI found no direct connection between Hasan and terrorist activity in 2008, al-Awlaki would later applaud Hasan's shootings. He would say of Hasan, "fighting against the U.S. army is an Islamic duty" (Raghavan, 2009). It was ruled out after the FBI's investigation post shootings that Hasan was connected to any terrorist group, but strong evidence was found to support his radicalized Islamic agenda.

It also has been noted by other psychologists who worked with Hasan that the terrorist became more and more radicalized as time went by. He became upset at his superiors for failing to post war criminal charges against some of the men that Hasan spoke with. Hasan became increasingly distraught and more zealous about United States atrocities in the Middle East (Bender, 2010).

## Actions Taken

On July 31, 2009 Hasan went to a local gun store and purchased a semi-automatic pistol with laser scopes and several magazine rounds for the weapon. He continued to purchase magazines for several weeks in apparent attempt to stockpile and ready himself (Thomas, 2009).

By the start of November, Hasan had amassed enough of an arsenal to carry out his plans. He walked into the Soldier Readiness Processing Center where he worked and sat down at his desk. He began to pray. Eye witnesses state that he said a prayer in Arabic then quickly stood up and began shooting the semi-automatic. As bullets flew through the air some soldiers tried to stop Hasan, most were killed in the process. Other soldiers hid behind cubicles, it was reported that Hasan was deliberate to focus on soldiers and to not shoot anyone in civilian clothes (Barnes, 2009).

Hasan then moved outside of the Processing Center and began opening fire at anyone he saw. He exchanged gunfire with several officers and civilian police. He wounded and/or killed many in the process. While outside, nurses and medics rushed inside the Processing Center to try and help the victims (Barnes, 2009). The blood loss was told to be so extreme that medics could not stay on their feet easily to reach the victims.

Outside, Hasan exchanged gunfire with police Sergeant Mark Todd. Todd stated, "Then he turned around and fired a couple of rounds at me. I didn't hear him say a word, he just turned and fired" (*New York Post*, 2009). Todd exchanged gunshots with Hasan and hit him five times causing Hasan to fall to the ground and become unconscious. It was found that upwards of 200 rounds of

bullets were found to be fired from Hasan's gun. (*New York Post*, 2009). As Hasan shot his victims he became more focused and meticulously fired into the air hoping to hit persons, he became increasingly aimed with his shots and used his laser scopes to better direct.

### Government Response

The FBI received its initial information on Hasan in 2008. This was the set of email exchanges between Hasan and Anwar al-Awlaki. These emails did not produce any suspected connection between Hasan and a terrorist group; however it did produce an understanding that Hasan was increasingly becoming radical in his Islamic views (Bender, 2010). Anwar al-Awlaki would later be classified by the United States as a Global Terrorist and by 2011 he would be killed.

Other concerns about Hasan's behavior showed more apparent in hindsight. After the death of his parents, Hasan was known to attend the Dar Al-Hijrah mosque in suburban Virginia. It is noted that Hasan attended during the same time of two of the September, 11th suicide attackers. It is also noted that Hasan became increasingly prone to depart from the topic he was

supposed to lecture on to talking about Islam and the Muslim faith. Also, there was growing evidence by Hasan's colleagues that he became more erratic in behavior. His colleagues noted that he was becoming disassociated and disconnected with his work. There was a growing concern in Hasan's temperament and character.

Many top U.S. officials including former U.S. attorney General Michael Mukassey deemed Hasan's actions as a domestic terrorist action. Retired General Barry McCaffrey stated, "it's starting to appear as if this was a domestic terrorist attack on fellow soldiers by a major in the Army who we educated for six years while he was giving off these vibes of disloyalty to his own force" (CNN Transcripts, 2009).

The FBI's initial investigation into the shooting found no direct connection to any terrorist group. It is believed Hasan had no co-conspirators and that he acted alone. However, the FBI did find that Hasan frequented radical jihadist websites that called for the killing of all non-Muslim believers. The FBI also found internet postings and conversations where Hasan was noted to support suicide bombings (CBS News, 2009).

The U.S. military conducted its own investigation of the incident and found that it was ill-prepared for any internal attacks on its bases (DOD Independent Review, 2010). This

troubled the Department of Defense. In 2010, the Boston Globe reported that those who worked with Hasan knew of his radical leanings as far back as 2005. The Globe's reports coupled with the U.S. military's findings coupled together to produce an understanding that Hasan had a long standing radicalized Islamic agenda.

## **CHAPTER FIVE: FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION**

### Findings

After a careful analysis of the three cases was performed there appeared to be strong similarities between the lone wolf actors. Setting aside the differences between the extremist ideologies and looking at the simple fact that all three actors held very strong extremist ideologies there is a merited concern over extremist persons receiving military training. This concern is warranted by the realization that any person at any time could engage in lone wolf terrorism. There is no ability to predict when a lone wolf terrorist will attack.

There are inherent concerns with the research that must be addressed. The first concern is that the research dealt with outlying cases. Obviously the three cases presented do not fit the average mold of U.S. military personnel. It would be faulty and careless to presume that these cases in any way reflect the totality of the U.S. military. However, the sizable amounts of dead and injured, long term psychological ramifications, economic destruction, and numerous other potential unintended

consequences provide credence to further explore these case studies.

Another concern is that of spuriousness. Hypothesis One states: If individuals with known extremist views against the U.S. government gain military training they are likely to commit acts of lone wolf terrorism. Hypothesis One, by the case studies provided proves to be true. Individuals with extremist views against the government and who serve in the military are very like to engage in lone wolf terrorism. But, again these are only three individual cases out of the millions of personnel that have served in the military. And there was no test to see if how many military personnel have/had extremist views and never engaged in lone wolf terrorism. The conundrum is that Hypothesis One is proven true by the cases in this paper, but due to their limit in scope much more testing needs to be done to prove Hypothesis One as a universal truth.

Still further, Hypothesis Two states: If the United States military is concerned about providing good governance then it will pay closer attention to past and present military personnel with extremist views against the U.S. government. Even if Hypothesis One is proven false in subsequent experiments, it is still highly plausible that Hypothesis Two will be found true.



Aiding in the proof of Hypothesis Two is the Department of Defense's report on the Fort Hood shootings. In the weeks that followed the events at Fort Hood, an Independent review was formed to examine what took place, what could have been avoided and what lessons can be carried over for future protection. The report closely follows the logic of Freytag's Triangle. The review's title is "Protecting the Force: Lessons from Fort Hood." In the report topics ranged from Personnel Issues to Emergency Response. Page 11 of the Personnel Issue section states, "The Department of Defense needs to understand and be prepared for the wide range of motivations and methods, including self-radicalization, distress over relationship problems, association with hate groups, and resentment over perceived personal and professional slights by others within the organization" (Protecting the Force, 2010).

Furthermore, on page 28 the review finds, "there is no consistency of reporting from those agents (Army Military Intelligence, Naval Criminal Investigative Service, Air Force Office of Special Investigations) back to the Department of Defense. The lack of a single functional management structure increases the likelihood of confusion on the part of the FBI when it deals with DoD representatives who operate under different functional guidance" (Protecting the Force, 2010).

The concern is that all various branches of the military investigations operate under their own wordings and patterns. When information is passed to other agencies and organizations like the FBI, it is confusing and taxing to try and decipher and swiftly move forward. The independent review board's finding and stark wording signifies an understanding that the U.S. military must address widespread issues. The addressing of these issues support better governance as the aim is to better protect military personnel and United States citizens.

## Recommendations

The research highlights three recommendations. The first is for all branches of the U.S. military, through the DOD to act upon the findings in *Protecting the Force*. It is of paramount importance that the DOD look to universalize its policies and procedures throughout the department and to more closely match that of other agencies and departments that it shares information with. A strong aid in doing this would be the utilization of the National Incident Management System (NIMS). NIMS is the guide and terminology set that can be universally applied for government agencies at all levels, non-government

actors, private enterprises, and so on. The universality of NIMS allows for expedient information sharing and disaster response. It also allows for all responsible parties in a situation to readily know proper techniques towards handling an event. In all three of the case studies provided, the NIMS system would have been highly beneficial.

The second recommendation is for the DOD to allow the FBI and DHS to provide independent psychological screening for any military personnel that has been exhibiting extremist behavior or has openly made verbal attacks against the U.S. government. In so doing, some of the pressure that is on the DOD by the sheer volume of personnel will be eased. This will help to provide more room for independent second opinions and to lessen the case loads of military psychologists. Also, by having the FBI and DHS provide assistance in psychological screenings a smoother transition of information will occur. Military personnel who express extremist views and are strong candidates for becoming lone wolf terrorists will have their records easily transmittable to the FBI and DHS. This will aid the FBI and DHS in keeping a closer watch on these individuals. It will hopefully provide alerts and red flags to better ensure that elaborate plans and escapes do not take place. Lastly, having independent psychologists will help to avoid the events of Nidal

Hasan. Hasan's position as a military psychologist posed the question of, "who is watching the psychologists?" What happens when the psychologists are unstable themselves? They may have colleagues that see to help support them, having independent psychologists provide screenings will help prevent future attacks like Hasan's.

Lastly, the third recommendation is for the DHS, FBI and DOD to provide insight and training and timely knowledge when dealing with terrorism. As much as the DOD must continue its efforts to collaborate with other agencies and it is imperative that the DHS and FBI do so as well. It is not only imperative that the three bodies all communicate with each other about threats of lone wolf terrorism but also for the three to communicate and strengthen working relationships with all levels of government, supporting departments and agencies, and when warranted non-governmental actors. Vic Artiga states, "The FBI and DHS assess the threat (of terrorism) will come from smaller cells or even lone individuals operating autonomously" Artiga, 2010). Terrorist threats are becoming more difficult to predict. Creating an open door policy for all areas of government is extremely important. As shown throughout the case studies, when agencies and departments attempt to work alone their resources are limited and their scope of expertise and

knowledge is lessened. Security Solutions International, a private emergency management firm created a report on lone wolf terrorism in 2012. SSI finds, "Knowing how lone operator attacks are formulated requires a far more sensitive detection system... this requires not only effective data capture and exploitation enabled by efficient overall information management, but also fused intelligence products. This requires intelligence analysts and collectors to work in far closer union" (SSI, 2012). Working in tight concert with other departments will help to provide a much stronger network and will be thwart potential lone wolf activities.

## Conclusion

In conclusion, it is of a reminder that this thesis is a jumping off point for a research topic that does not have a lot of exploration yet. It is perceived that as the issue of lone wolf terrorism becomes more of a mainstay concern, there will be more scholarly contributions. It is the hope that there is substantial research poured into understanding as much about lone wolf terrorism as possible. It is also important to examine military training in relation to extremist viewpoints.

Though this thesis is limited in scope, its true purpose is to raise concerns and to start asking questions about issues that have not been strongly vocalized yet.

## REFERENCES

- Acharya, U. D. (2009, September 24). War on Terror or Terror Wars: The Problem in Defining Terrorism. *Denver Journal of International Law and Policy*, 37(4).
- AFNORTH Website. (2012). Mission of the AFNORTH as Part of the Northern Command. Retrieved from:  
<http://www.1af.acc.af.mil/units/afnsep/>
- Ahmed, S. (2011). Islam's War and Peace Signals: Context, Chronology, and Consequences. *Journal of Religion & Society*, 13. 1-13.
- Artiga, V. (2010). Lone Wolf Terrorism: What We Need to Know and What We Need to Do. TAK Response. Retrieved from:  
[http://www.takresponse.com/index/homeland-security/lone-wolf\\_terrorism.html](http://www.takresponse.com/index/homeland-security/lone-wolf_terrorism.html)
- Ballard, J. (2005). *Terrorism, Media and Public Policy*. New York, NY: Hampton Press.

Barnes, J. (2009, November 19). Pentagon Will Investigate Ft. Hood Shooting Rampage, Defense Secretary Says: Robert Gates Announces the Start of a Comprehensive Review of Events Leading Up to the Nov. 5 Shootings. Military Psychiatrist Nadal Malik Hasan is Accused of Killing 13. *The LA Times.com*. Retrieved from:  
<http://articles.latimes.com/2009/nov/19/nation/la-na-fort-hood-gates20-2009nov20>

BBC News. (2007, March 2). Timeline: Oklahoma Bomb. BBC News. Retrieved from:  
[http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/programmes/conspiracy\\_files/6292143.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/programmes/conspiracy_files/6292143.stm)

Bender, B. (2010, February 22). Ft. Hood Suspect was Army Dilemma: His Extreme Views Possibly Overlooked in Favor of Berger, D. (2006). *Outlaws of America: The Weather Underground and the Politics of Solidarity*. Oakland, CA: AK Press.

Bumiller, E. & Shane, S. (2010, January 15). Pentagon Report on Fort Hood Details Failures. Retrieved from:  
<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/01/16/us/politics/16hasan.html>



CBS News. (2009, November 6). Soldier Opens Fire at Ft. Hood; 13 Dead. CBS News. Retrieved from:  
[http://www.cbsnews.com/2100-201\\_162-5539067.html](http://www.cbsnews.com/2100-201_162-5539067.html)

CNN Articles- Richard Jewell Dies. (2007, August, 29).  
Vindicated Olympic Park Bombing Suspect Richard Jewell Dies. CNN.com. Retrieved from:  
[http://articles.cnn.com/2007-08-29/us/richard.jewell\\_1\\_richard-jewell-eric-robert-rudolph-lin-wood?\\_s=PM:US](http://articles.cnn.com/2007-08-29/us/richard.jewell_1_richard-jewell-eric-robert-rudolph-lin-wood?_s=PM:US)

CNN Transcripts: Anderson Cooper 360 Degrees. (2009, November 6). Investigating Fort Hood Massacre. Retrieved from:  
<http://transcripts.cnn.com/TRANSCRIPTS/0911/06/acd.01.html>

Cook, A. H. (2009) *Emergency response to domestic terrorism: how bureaucracies reacted to the 1995 Oklahoma City bombing*. New York, NY: Continuum.

Crenshaw, M. (2000, June). The Psychology of Terrorism: An Agenda for the 21st Century. *Political Psychology*, 21(2), 405-420.

Defense Manpower Data Center. (2011, December 31). Department of Defense Active Duty Military Personal. Retrieved from:  
<http://siadapp.dmdc.osd.mil/personnel/MILITARY/history/hst112.pdf>

Department of Defense Dictionary of Military and Associated Terms. (2011, January 31). Department of Defense Definition of Terrorism. Retrieved from:  
[http://ra.defense.gov/documents/rtm/jp1\\_02.pdf](http://ra.defense.gov/documents/rtm/jp1_02.pdf)

Department of Defense History. (2012). DOD History. Retrieved from: <http://www.defense.gov/about/#history>

Department of Defense Independent Review Panel Related to Fort Hood. (2010, January). *Protecting the Force: Lessons from Fort Hood*. Retrieved from:  
[http://www.defense.gov/pubs/pdfs/DOD-ProtectingTheForce-Web\\_Security\\_HR\\_13jan10.pdf](http://www.defense.gov/pubs/pdfs/DOD-ProtectingTheForce-Web_Security_HR_13jan10.pdf)

Department of Defense Mission Statement. (2012). Retrieved from:  
<http://www.defense.gov/about/>

Department of Homeland Security Annual Performance Report: Fiscal Years 2008-2010. (2010). Retrieved from:  
[http://www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/cfo\\_apr\\_fy2008.pdf](http://www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/cfo_apr_fy2008.pdf)

Department of Homeland Security Counterterrorism Instruction

Page. (2012). Retrieved from:

<http://www.dhs.gov/files/counterterrorism.shtm>

Department of Homeland Security History. (2012). DHS History.

Retrieved from:

<http://www.dhs.gov/xabout/history/index.shtm>

Department of Homeland Security: Our Mission. (2012). Retrieved

from: <http://www.dhs.gov/xabout/our-mission.shtm>

Department of Justice. (1998, October 14.) Eric Rudolph Charged

In Centennial Olympic Park Bombing. Retrieved from

:<http://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/1998/October/477crm.htm>

Diversity. *The Boston Globe*. Retrieved from:

[http://www.boston.com/news/nation/articles/2010/02/22/ft\\_ho](http://www.boston.com/news/nation/articles/2010/02/22/ft_ho)

[od\\_suspect\\_was\\_army\\_dilemma/](http://www.boston.com/news/nation/articles/2010/02/22/ft_ho)

Edling, C and Stern, C. (2003). Scandinavian Rational Choice

Sociology. *Acta Sociologica*, 46, 5-16.

Elster, J. (1989) *Nuts and Bolts for the Social Sciences*.

Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Executive Order 13228 Establishing the Office of Homeland Security and the Homeland Security Counsel. (2001, October 8). Retrieved from: <http://www.fas.org/irp/offdocs/eo/eo-13228.htm>

Federal Bureau of Intelligence definition of terrorism. (2005). Terrorism 2002-2005. Federal Bureau of Investigation Reports and Publications. Retrieved from: <http://www.fbi.gov/stats-services/publications/terrorism-2002-2005>

Federal Bureau of Investigation About Terrorism. (2012). Retrieved from: <http://www.fbi.gov/about-us/investigate/terrorism>

Federal Bureau of Investigation History. (2011). FBI History. Retrieved from: <http://www.fbi.gov/about-us/history>

Federal Bureau of Investigation: Terrorism 2002-2005. (2005). FBI Definition of Terrorism. Retrieved from: <http://www.fbi.gov/stats-services/publications/terrorism-2002-2005>

FEMA website. (2012). About the National Incident Management System. Retrieved from:

<http://www.fema.gov/emergency/nims/AboutNIMS.shtm>

Final report of the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks upon the United States. Washington, DC: National.

Commission on Terrorist Attacks upon the United States.

Freytag, Gustav. & MacEwan, E. (1863). *Freytag's Technique of the Drama: Exposition of Dramatic Composition and Art*.

Charleston, SC: BiblioBazaar Reproduction Series.

Ghosh, B. (2009, November 11). FBI Fights Claim It Ignored Intel on Hasan. *Time.com*. Retrieved from:

<http://www.time.com/time/nation/article/0,8599,1937574,00.html>

Goodwin, J. (2006, June). A Theory of Categorical Terrorism.

*Social Forces*, 84(4), 2027-2046.

Grossman, D. (1995) *On Killing: The Psychological Cost of Learning to Kill in War and Society*. E-Rights/E-Reads, New

York, New York.

H.R. 1158 To Establish the National Homeland Security Agency.

(2001, March 21). Retrieved from:

<http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/BILLS-107hr1158ih/pdf/BILLS-107hr1158ih.pdf>

Hamm, M. (2000). *Apocalypse in Oklahoma: Waco and Ruby Ridge Revenged*. Boston, MA: Northeastern University Press.

Held, V. (2003, July 22). Terrorism and War. *The Journal of Ethics*, 8 (1), 59-75.

Homeland Security Presidential Directive 1. (2001, October, 29).

Retrieved from: <http://www.fas.org/irp/offdocs/nspd/hspd-1.htm>

Homeland Security Website. (2002, November, 25). Homeland Security Act of 2002. Retrieved from:

[http://www.dhs.gov/xabout/laws/law\\_regulation\\_rule\\_0011.shm](http://www.dhs.gov/xabout/laws/law_regulation_rule_0011.shm)

House of Representatives. (2001, March 21). To Establish the National Homeland Security Agency. Retrieved from:

[http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/getdoc.cgi?dbname=107\\_cong\\_bills&docid=f:h1158ih.txt.pdf](http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/getdoc.cgi?dbname=107_cong_bills&docid=f:h1158ih.txt.pdf)

Homeland Security Act of 2002. (2002, November 25). Homeland Security Act of 2002. Retrieved from:  
[http://www.dhs.gov/xabout/laws/law\\_regulation\\_rule\\_0011.shm](http://www.dhs.gov/xabout/laws/law_regulation_rule_0011.shm)

Hyden, G. & Court, J. & Mease. K. Making Sense of Governance: The Need for Involving Local Stakeholders. Retrieved from:  
<http://www.odi.org.uk/resources/download/3135.pdf>

Hyden, G. (2006). Between State and Community: Challenges to Redesigning Governance in Africa. Retrieved from:  
[http://www.indiana.edu/~workshop/papers/hyden\\_wrkconf.pdf](http://www.indiana.edu/~workshop/papers/hyden_wrkconf.pdf)

Iguchi, L. (2003, February 3). Japan warfare. History of Japan. Retrieved March 11, 2004, from <http://book.edu/japan>

ISAF Mission Statement. (2012). About ISAF. Retrieved from:  
<http://www.isaf.nato.int/mission.html>

Kellner, D. (2008). Guys and Guns Amok: Domestic Terrorism and School Shootings from the Oklahoma City Bombing to the Virginia Tech Massacre. Boulder, Co: Paradigm.

Kjaer, A. M. (2004). Governance (Key Concepts), MA, Polity Press.

Kuzma, L. (2000). Trends: Terrorism in the United States. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 64(1), 90-105.

Lee, R. & Perl, R. (2002, September 3). Issue Brief for Congress: Terrorism, the Future, and U.S. Foreign Policy. Retrieved from:

<http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/13396.pdf>

Linder, D. O. (2006). The Oklahoma City Bombing & The Trial of Timothy McVeigh. Retrieved from:

<http://law2.umkc.edu/faculty/projects/ftrials/mcveigh/mcveighaccount.html>

Lipton, E. & Drew, C. & Shane, S. & Rohde, D. (2005, September , 11). Breakdowns Marked Path from Hurricane to Anarchy. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from:

<http://www.nytimes.com/2005/09/11/national/nationalspecial/11response.html?pagewanted=all>



McKinley, J.C. & Dao, J. (2009, November 8). Fort Hood Gunman Gave Signals Before His Rampage. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from: [http://www.nytimes.com/2009/11/09/us/09reconstruct.html?\\_r=1&pagewanted=all](http://www.nytimes.com/2009/11/09/us/09reconstruct.html?_r=1&pagewanted=all)

McManus, B. (2005). Plot with Unity of Action: Freytag's Triangle Diagram. Retrieved from: <http://www2.cnr.edu/home/bmcm Manus/freytag.html>

Michel, L. & Herbeck, D. (2001). *American Terrorist: Timothy McVeigh and The Oklahoma City Bombing*. New York, NY: Harper Collins.

National Commission on Terrorist Attacks upon the United States. (2004). *The 9/11 commission report*:

National Counterterrorism Center: Country Reports on Terrorism 2005. (2006, April 7). Definition of Terrorism. Retrieved from: <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/65489.pdf>

Neil, M. (2012, June 19). Judge Bans Now-Bearded Fort Hood Shooting Suspect From Military Court. *ABA Journal*.

Retrieved from:

[http://www.abajournal.com/news/article/judge\\_bans\\_now-bearded\\_ft.\\_hood\\_shooting\\_suspect\\_from\\_military\\_court/](http://www.abajournal.com/news/article/judge_bans_now-bearded_ft._hood_shooting_suspect_from_military_court/)

New York Post Article. (2009, November 8). Cop: Shrink Shot

Soldiers Running for Cover. *New York Post*. Retrieved from:

[http://www.nypost.com/p/news/national/item\\_JSaylB8KX3TqwPDCqf4OFO](http://www.nypost.com/p/news/national/item_JSaylB8KX3TqwPDCqf4OFO)

New York Post Website. (2009, November 7). Cop: Shrink Shot

Soldiers Running For Cover. *New York Post*. Retrieved from:

[http://www.nypost.com/p/news/national/item\\_JSaylB8KX3TqwPDCqf4OFO](http://www.nypost.com/p/news/national/item_JSaylB8KX3TqwPDCqf4OFO)

New York Times Covert Operations. (1998, July 01). Experts From

Timothy McVeigh Letter. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from:

<http://www.nytimes.com/1998/07/01/us/excerpts-from-timothy-mcveigh-letter.html>

New York Times Website. (2011, July 21). Nidal Malik Hasan. *New*

*York Times Archives*. Retrieved from:

[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/h/nidal\\_malik\\_hasan/index.html](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/h/nidal_malik_hasan/index.html)

Presidential Address to the Nation. (2001, October). The White House Archives. Retrieved from: <http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2001/10/20011007-8.html>

Priest, D. & Arkin, W.M. (2010). Top Secret America: Monitoring America. The Washington Post. Retrieve from: <http://projects.washingtonpost.com/top-secret-america/articles/monitoring-america/3/>

Raghavan, S. (2009, November 16). Cleric Says He was Confidant to Hasan. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from: <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/11/15/AR2009111503160.html>

Rhodes, R. (2007, August). Understanding Governance: Ten Years On. *Organization Studies*, 28, 1243-1264.

Rimer, S. (1995, March 28). The Second Suspect - A Special Report; With Extremism and Explosives, A Drifting Life Found a Purpose. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from: <http://www.nytimes.com/1995/05/28/us/second-suspect-special-report-with-extremism-explosives-drifting-life-found.html?pagewanted=all>

- Rod Rhodes: Understanding Governance: Ten Years On. (2007, August). *Organization Studies* 28: 1243-1264.
- Rodin, D. (2004). Terrorism without Intention. *Ethics*, 114(4), 752-771
- Romano, L. & Kenworthy, T. (1997, April 25). Prosecutor Paints McVeigh as 'Twisted' U.S. Terrorist. *The Washington Post*, Retrieved from:  
<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wpsrv/national/longterm/oklahoma/stories/ok042597.htm>
- Romano, L. & Kenworthy, T. (1997, April 25). Prosecutor Paints McVeigh as 'Twisted' U.S. Terrorist. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from: <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wpsrv/national/longterm/oklahoma/stories/ok042597.htm>
- Rosen, J. (2011, July 6). Accused Fort Hood Shooter to Have Military Trial, Will Face Death Penalty. *Foxnews.com*. Retrieved from:  
<http://www.foxnews.com/us/2011/07/06/accused-fort-hood-shooter-to-have-military-trial-will-face-death-penalty/>
- Schuster, H. & Stone, C. (2005) *Hunting Eric Rudolph*. Berkley, CA: Berkley Press.

Schuster, H. (2003, May 31). FBI: Olympic Bombing Suspect Arrested. CNN.com. Retrieved from:  
<http://edition.cnn.com/2003/US/05/31/rudolph.arrest/>

Secretary of Homeland Security Napolitano discusses lone wolf terrorism. (2012, February, 20). Warning: 'Lone Wolf' Terrorists Work in Packs. The Washington Examiner. Retrieved from:  
<http://washingtonexaminer.com/article/295011>

Security Solutions International. (2012, January 17). Preventing Lone Wolf Terrorism: Some CT Approaches Addressed. Homelandsecurityssi.com. Retrieved from:  
<http://www.homelandsecurityssi.com/news/entry/1-17-2012-preventing-lone-wolf-terrorism-some-ct-approaches-addressed>

Sharpe, T. (2000, March). The Identity Christian Movement: Ideology of Domestic Terrorism. *Journal of Black Studies*, 30(4), 604-623.

Spaaij, R. (2012). *Understanding Lone Wolf Terrorism: Global Patterns, Motivations and Prevention*. Netherlands, Springer.

Sprinzak, E. (2001). The Lone Gunmen. *Foreign Policy*, 127, 72-73.

START Data Collections: Black Liberation Army. (2012). Retrieved from:

[http://www.start.umd.edu/start/data\\_collections/tops/terrorist\\_organization\\_profile.asp?id=3708](http://www.start.umd.edu/start/data_collections/tops/terrorist_organization_profile.asp?id=3708)

Thomas, P. (2009, November 11). Alleged Fort Hood Shooter Bought Gun, Despite Ongoing Terrorism Investigation. *ABC News*.

Retrieved from: <http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/fort-hood-shooter-obtained-weapon-ongoing-terrorism-investigation/story?id=9058803>

U.S. Northern Command Website. (2012). Mission of the U.S.

Northern Command. Retrieved from: <http://www.northcom.mil/>

United Nations General Assembly GA/L/3276. (2005, July 10).

Agreed Definition of the Term 'Terrorism' Said to be Needed for Consensus on Completing Comprehensive Convention Against It. Retrieved from:

<http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2005/gal3276.doc.htm>

Vollers, M. (2006). *Lone Wolf*. New York, NY: Harper Collins.

Walls, K. (2003). Man Hunt - The Eric Rudolph Story.

Jacksonville, FL: Global Authors Publications.

Weber, M. & Roth, G. (1978). Economy and Society: An Outline of

Interpretive Sociology. Berkley and Los Angeles, CA:

University of California Press.

Weber, M. ( 1947). The Theory of Social and Economic

Organizations. New York, NY: The Free Press.

Williams, P. et al. (2009, November 5). Gunman kills 12, wounds

31 at Fort Hood. MSNBC news article. Retrieved from:

<http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/33678801/>

World Security Institute. (2012). Center for Defense

Information. Retrieved from:

<http://www.worldsecurityinstitute.org/>