STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Defense or any of its agencies. This document may not be released for open publication until it has been cleared by the appropriate military service or government agency.

DOMESTIC TERRORISM AND OUR NATIONAL SECURITY STRATEGY

BY

COLONEL ROBERT D. CARTER
United States Army

19980417 062

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A:
Approved for public release.
Distribution is unlimited.

USAWC CLASS OF 1998

U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE, CARLISLE BARRACKS, PA 17013-5050

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 3

USAWC STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

Domestic Terrorism and Our National Security Strategy

by

Colonel Robert D. Carter
United States Army

Colonel Leo A. Brownyard
United States Air Force
Project Advisor

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Defense or any of its agencies. This document may not be released for open publication until it has been cleared by the appropriate military service or government agency.

U.S. Army War College
CARLISLE BARRACKS, PENNSYLVANIA 17013

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A:
Approved for public release.
Distribution is unlimited.

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 3

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: Robert D. Carter, COL, U. S. Army

TITLE: Domestic Terrorism and Our National Security Strategy

FORMAT: Strategy Research Project

DATE: 1 April 1998 PAGES: 36 CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

The threat of terrorism has encroached our national borders and has created a heightened sense of vulnerability among many Americans. President Clinton has stated, "Fighting terrorism is and will for a long time to come be one of the top priorities of the United States." Two acts passed in 1996 have strengthened our fight against terrorism, the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act and the Defense Against Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) Act. The Defense Against WMD Act designated the Department of Defense the executive agent for coordination of assistance in responding to threats involving biological and chemical weapons. The focus of this research project will be to follow this trail and analyze DOD's course of action in meeting their obligation and assess the probability that DOD will maintain this function after the 1 October 1999 legislative mandate.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT III

INTRODUCTION 1

TERRORISM TRENDS 3

PROJECTIONS FOR THE FUTURE 6

LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS 10

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE RESPONSIBILITIES 15

CONCLUSION 21

ENDNOTES 25

BIBLIOGRAPHY 29

INTRODUCTION

"Protecting the security of our nation—our people, our territory and our way of life—is my foremost mission and constitutional duty."[1] That is the first sentence and theme of President Clinton's 1997 National Security Strategy. The Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1986 amended the National Security Act of 1947 to read "The President shall transmit to Congress each year a comprehensive report on the national security strategy of the United States."[2] Specifically the President is to include a description and discussion of those things necessary to deter aggression. The President must also focus on the implementation of the national security strategy and uses of the elements of national power to protect and promote our interests and achieve our goals and objectives.

Absent any major global adversary, other threats have transcended our national borders. A number of attacks in the 1990s have brought the issue of terrorism to the forefront of public attention, creating a heightened sense of vulnerability among many Americans. The World Trade Center bombing, the identification of the Unabomber, the Oklahoma City bombing, and the Centennial Olympic Park bombing are a few of the major occurrences that have encroached our nation. The National Security Strategy addresses terrorism as follows:

> "We further seek to uncover, reduce or eliminate foreign terrorist capabilities in our country; eliminate terrorist sanctuaries; counter state-supported terrorism and subversion of moderate regimes through a comprehensive program of diplomatic, economic and intelligence activities; improve aviation security worldwide and at U. S. airports; ensure better security for all U. S. transportation systems; and improve protection for our personnel assigned overseas."[3]

The Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) defines domestic terrorism as the "unlawful use of force or violence, committed by a group(s) of two or more individuals, against persons or property to intimidate or coerce a government, the civilian population, or any segment thereof, in furtherance of political or social objectives."[4] Using the Unabomber Theodore Kaczynski example it is probably prudent to expand the definition to include individual acts as well. Joint Pub 1-02 defines terrorism as "The calculated use of violence to inculcate fear; intended to coerce or to intimidate governments or societies in the pursuit of goals that are generally political, religious, or ideological."[5] It also defines a terrorist as "An individual who uses violence, terror, and intimidation to achieve a result."[6] The issue is not to debate the definition of terrorism but just to illustrate the focus of the problem.

The intent of this research project is to look at domestic terrorism, where it has been, and what are the projections for the future. We will then identify the legislative actions that have enabled us to fight this ongoing threat and the Department of Defense's role in responding to the use of weapons of mass

destruction. We will conclude with an assessment of the probability that DOD will maintain its mission after the 1 October 1999 legislative mandate. Let's now look at the terrorist trends since 1980.

TERRORISM TRENDS

During the 1980s, United States citizens increasingly became the victims of terrorist attacks. Between 1982 and 1992, there were 165 terrorist incidents in the United States and 32% of the incidents worldwide targeted Americans.[7] In 1992, anti-United States attacks accounted for 39% of the worldwide total.[8]

Certain characteristics of terrorism changed during the decade of the 1980s. The threat from right-wing organizations, generally white-hate, anti-black, and anti-Semitic in orientation, were represented by groups as the Aryan Nations and reached their peak in the 1980s. The May 19th Communist Organization and the United Freedom Front, with a left-wing Marxist-Leninist background, were most active in the 1980s. There was also a prominent occurrence of anti-Castro Cuban and Jewish sponsored terrorist elements throughout the previous decade. The good news is this particular threat diminished significantly. As the 1980s progressed, groups and state sponsors of terrorism distanced themselves from publicly associating with acts of terror.

The emergence of "special interest" terrorism brought a new diversity in the 1980s. Our expanding use of nuclear energy was targeted by environmental organizations and introduced sabotage to our nuclear power stations and other facilities. Veterinary research laboratories have been a victim of terrorist threats and destruction as the use animals to further human ends developed. The pro-life movement caused anti-abortion groups to evolve and abortion clinic bombings continue plaguing society to present day. The militia movement within our own society is a growth industry. Discussions of their evolution and ideology will be presented later in this section.

The constant trend through the 1980s was that indiscriminate violence continued. Because of intense investigations on part of Federal, state, and local law enforcement, it seems terrorism has decreased in the United States when we see a high of 51 incidents in 1982 to only 4 in 1992.[9] The bombing of Pan American Flight 103 over Lockerbie, Scotland, the World Trade Center bombing, and the Oklahoma City bombing are just examples of how the incidents of terrorism have evolved. It is an ever-changing entity that can occur quickly and without discrimination. The number of incidents could increase rapidly with the advent of special interest terrorism.

Morris Dees, author of *Gathering Storm: America's Militia Threat* and chief trial counsel for the Klanwatch Project of the Southern Poverty Law Center, has been investigating the militia

movement and its relationship with domestic terrorism since 1979. He states, "Assessing the magnitude of the threat posed by militia groups operating today is a bit like gauging the risk to shipping posed by icebergs. The number that can be seen is important, but the real danger lies beneath the surface."[10] Timothy McVeigh's involvement in the Oklahoma City bombing and his connection with militias has highlighted this growing movement.

Dees has identified approximately 441 militia units across the United States and another 368 Patriot groups allied to the militia units.[11] While he says that they are not all extremists, they do harbor the extremist potential. Over one hundred groups have ties to the racist right in such organizations as the Aryan Nations and the Ku Klux Klan.[12] The Patriot groups, while not as openly active as the militia, provide information and materials to them promoting their existence. Rapid changes in the U. S. culture and its economy have caused increasing concern among many American citizens. Incidents at Ruby Ridge and Waco awakened an anti-government sense that grew with measures of gun control, involvement in international affairs, and the feeling that the world will destroy our individual liberties. The ideology that a foreign conspiracy is out to create a "New World Order" headed by the United Nations has stemmed a new perspective in extremist thought. Author Stephen Scheinberg summarizes his feelings that extremism is embedding itself into today's society, "Thus a

politicized extremism with a popular base and operating within one of the two major parties is appearing in the United States for the first time in many years."[13] Let us transition from what we have already faced to those expectations for the future.

PROJECTIONS FOR THE FUTURE

Terrorists and their ardent supporters continue to improve abilities to collect information, raise money, and issue rhetoric in support of their causes. Public computer databases provide a medium for passing propaganda, communications, computer viruses, and even recipes for conventional and unconventional weapons. Terrorists have learned from past incidents such as the World Trade Center bombing and the Oklahoma City bombing, prompting future terrorists to plan with greater care.

As mentioned earlier, some would argue the trend of terrorism in the United States has declined. There are fewer attacks, but they have also become more deadly. The Oklahoma City bombing was one of the largest explosions ever investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and it killed more Americans than any terrorist attack in modern times. "Where traditional terrorists use the event to gain access to a "bully-pulpit" to air their grievances, these "silent terrorists" send a silent message creating a superordinary sense of overwhelming fear and vulnerability."[14]

Some feel that the evolution of today's terrorism is caused by a religious revivalism as it has in the past centuries. Others feel the more recent disintegration of the bipolar world order of the Cold War has caused the increase. Society's attention is no longer focused on the great enemy that resided abroad. Its efforts are now consumed with those issues that are concerned with individual rights and their survival. Author Stephen Scheinberg states in his book, *The Extreme Right: Freedom and Security at Risk*, "the emerging but as yet ill-defined new enemy resides at home, and that change could ultimately disturb the domestic tranquility of Americans."[15]

Bruce Hoffman discusses in his monograph, *Responding to Terrorism Across the Technological Spectrum*, the trends for terrorism in the future. He feels terrorists will continue to use the same two basic weapons: the gun and the bomb. Second, the sophistication of these devices will be in their simplicity. He combines the resurgence of religiously motivated imperatives, proliferation of what he calls "amateur" terrorist groups, and the growing sophistication of more "professional" groups as the grounds for predicting that higher levels of lethality and destruction will occur. He also feels that the post-cold war new world order will entice groups to embrace terrorism as the vehicle for the realization of their dreams. Finally, the United States will remain the favored target for terrorism as it has since 1968.[16]

In his book, *Terrorism in America: Pipe Bombs and Pipe Dreams*, Brent L. Smith feels, "Predicting terrorism is a risky business. Because levels of terrorism can be dramatically altered by extremely small groups of people, all predictive efforts are tenuous at best."[17] Smith concludes that left-wing terrorism will continue its decline but we will see an increase in the right-wing extremism because of frustration from political issues, a narrowing job market, and slower economic growth in America. He also predicts that "special interest" terrorism will continue centered on environmental organizations like Evan Meacham Eco-Terrorist International Conspiracy (EMETIC) and the Animal Liberation Front (ALF).

There are certain schools of thought that feel terrorist of the future will not threaten to use weapons of mass destruction (WMD). They perceive a group of frustrated political actors trying to press their political agenda. These actors will not exceed a certain violence threshold since it would result in their eradication. Additionally they believe creation of such weapons are cost-prohibitive. This can not be further from the truth. "Lo-tech" WMD are well within reach and cost of contemporary extremist groups and possession of a WMD capability allows a higher position of relative power and prestige.

Weapons of mass destruction use can cause mass casualties and substantial infrastructure disruption. Biological and chemical weapons have been used primarily to terrorize unprotected

civilian populations and not as a weapon of war. The Department of Defense estimates that as many as 26 nations may possess chemical agents and/or weapons and an additional 12 may be seeking to develop them. At least 10 countries are believed to possess or be conducting research on biological agents for weaponization according to the Central Intelligence Agency.[18] WMD proliferation may be the top security threat our Nation faces today. Senator Sam Nunn echoes these sentiments:

> "The number one security challenge in the United States now and probably for years ahead is to prevent these weapons of mass destruction, whether chemical, biological or nuclear, and the scientific knowledge of how to make them, from going all over the world to rogue groups, to terrorist groups, to rogue nations."[19]

Besides the obvious ramifications of a nuclear incident; chemical and biological weapons pose our greatest threat. Not new to the arsenal, the recent utilization of chemical and biological agents show the ease at which they may be procured. A U. S. neo-Nazi group produced 80 pounds of typhoid bacillus in 1972. Salmonella bacterium was dispensed in Oregon restaurants in 1984 and had affects on seven hundred and fifteen people. Clostridium botulinum has been connected to the Baader Meinhof gang in Germany and more recently to Aum Shinrikyo in Tokyo. Aum Shinrikyo released the sarin gas mixture in the Tokyo subway system in 1995 killing 12 and sending 5,500 to area hospitals.[20] It has been publicized that the biological agent ricin is made from castor beans and the threat of anthrax has resulted in the

Department of Defense initiating an inoculation program for the military.

The extremist groups' pattern of interest in unconventional weapons has certainly been on the rise and will most likely continue. The question is no longer "if" weapons of mass destruction will be used but "when and where" they will surface. The recent experience of United Nations inspectors in Iraq trying to implement Resolution 687, shows the task of eliminating such weapons is extremely difficult if not impossible. What has the United States done to hinder those who continue to use terrorism as a threat to influence our thoughts and processes?

LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS

> It is the policy of the United States to deter, defeat and respond vigorously to all terrorist attacks on our territory and against our citizens, or facilities, whether they occur domestically, in international waters or airspace or on foreign territory. The United States regards all such terrorism as a potential threat to national security as well as a criminal act and will apply all appropriate means to combat it.
>
> —PDD-39, 21 June 1995

Following the sarin gas attack in Tokyo and the Oklahoma City bombing, President Clinton signed Presidential Decision Directive 39 (PPD-39). Its intent is to describe the U. S. policy on counterterrorism. The unclassified version directs that four major steps be taken:

1. Reduce our Vulnerabilities
2. Deter Terrorism
3. Respond to Terrorism
4. Combat Weapons of Mass Destruction

The directive assigns agency responsibility to protect both people and facilities against terrorism. It describes our intent to deter terrorism and states that our policies will not be affected by terrorist acts. Lead agency responsibilities are assigned in the event of a terrorist incident and support from interagency activities is formed in a rapid deployable Emergency Support Team. The term consequence management is defined, in this directive, as our response to terrorist acts directed toward our population including those using weapons of mass destruction. The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) is assigned as the lead agency and tasked with assuring that the Federal Response Plan is adequate to meet the needs of our Nation. Finally, the emphasis on detecting, preventing, and defeating the perpetrators of weapons of mass destruction is declared.[21] PPD-39 has produced long-overdue and sustained attention to the very real threat from weapons of mass destruction.

The President first transmitted antiterrorism legislation to Congress in February 1995. The "Omnibus Counterterrorism Act of 1995" was primarily aimed at fighting international terrorism but after the Oklahoma City bombing, agencies were asked to reassess their needs in relation to domestic terrorism. Hence, the "Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act" was produced and ratified. Upon its signing on 24 April 1996, President Clinton stated:

> "This legislation is a real step in the right direction. Although it does not contain everything we need to combat terrorism, it provides valuable tools for stopping and punishing terrorists. It stands as a tribute to the victims of terrorism and to the men and women in law enforcement who dedicate their lives to protecting all of us from the scourge of terrorist activity."[22]

This legislation creates a federal death penalty for terrorist murders and broadens the federal jurisdiction to prosecute anyone who commits a terrorist attack in the United States. It bans fund raising in support of terrorist organizations and gives authority to deport and bar foreign terrorists from American soil. It increases government controls over biological and chemical weapons and authorizes more than $1 billion over five years for various federal, state, and local government programs to prevent, combat, or deal with terrorism.[23] This is definitely a step in the right direction. Our government has to have the tools to enforce our laws and protect our citizens. It puts teeth into our legal system to handle those violators and once used will act as a deterrent to other aggressors.

Congress also passed Public Law 104-201, the "Defense Against Weapons of Mass Destruction Act," in 1996. Through a series of Congressional findings, it described the nation's inability to conduct consequence management and stated "the U. S. lacks the adequate planning and countermeasures to address the threat of nuclear, radiological, biological, and chemical terrorism."

State and local emergency response personnel were found not adequately prepared or trained and serious deficiencies existed in their preparedness and required coordination during response exercises.[24]

Under this Act, the Department of Defense assumes four major roles concerning consequence management of weapons of mass destruction incidents or threatened use. These responsibilities are effective until 1 October 1999 and at that time the President may designate an organization to assume this mission or DOD continues its efforts. The Emergency Response Assistance Program requires the Secretary of Defense to conduct a program to provide civilian personnel of federal, state, and local agencies with training and expert advice regarding emergency responses. In the event of an emergency, an agency within the Department of Defense will act as executive agent for coordinating all DOD assistance to appropriate officials in response to threats. The Department of Defense will develop and maintain at least one domestic terrorism rapid response team to aid officials in the detection, neutralization, containment, dismantlement, and disposal of weapons of mass destruction. Finally, the Secretary of Defense shall develop and carry out a program of testing and improving responses of federal, state, and local agencies to incidents involving WMD related materials.[25]

Whenever the U. S. Armed Forces become involved in domestic affairs, as in this act, the Posse Comitatus Act bears reviewing.

Posse Comitatus prohibits the use of the military to execute the laws of our country unless specifically authorized by the Constitution or act of Congress.[26] The law was passed in 1878 to preclude the presence of soldiers from deterring voters during the Reconstruction.[27] It is incumbent on leaders of our nation and the military to understand the legal ramifications and controls that it presents during domestic operations.

After a national disaster, the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief Act of 1984 authorizes that assistance can be provided by the military. Active-duty soldiers can be employed under this act, once a state of emergency is declared. The intent is to allow the military to aid in disaster relief but does not give the authority for law enforcement. Only pursuant to presidential power to quell violence, can federal troops be expressly exempt from the prohibitions of Posse Comitatus. National Guard troops, under the state's control, maintain an ability to exercise law enforcement. Once federalized, they also come under the jurisdiction of Posse Comitatus.

After the Oklahoma City bombing, federal, state, and local agencies were mobilized to deal with this shocking act of domestic terrorism. Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) served as the focal point of relief operations and Army assets were provided under the terms of the Stafford Act. The constraints that Posse Comitatus placed on military use was evident as both relief operations and crime analysis occurred.

FEMA's effort, with the military, was on recovery while the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) focused on the crime scene, an area the military could not be involved in.[28] With the growing threat of domestic terrorism, there is a high probability that military forces will be employed to counter terrorism. Our civilian leaders must understand the conditions under which they place the military and should further define the rules of engagement they are required to abide.

The Department of Defense assumes a major undertaking in the legislative mandates that have been laid down. With the continuous cuts, both budget and personnel, that DOD has succumbed to and future status still in question, how do we handle these tasks and what changes do they bring to our organization? We will now look at those missions and the proposed solution.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE RESPONSIBILITIES

The Constitution under Article IV, section 4 states, "The United States shall guarantee to every state in this Union a republican form of Government, and shall protect each of them…against domestic violence." The Stafford Act, as previously discussed, enables the Federal Government to provide support in times of major disasters and civil emergencies. By executive order the President designated the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) as the lead Federal agency for disaster and

emergency assistance in domestic incidents. Coordination for Department of Defense support is processed through the Secretary of the Army, specifically the Directorate of Military Support (DOMS), as the DOD action agent in providing military support for civil authorities.

When a domestic disaster occurs, local authorities provide the first response assets and if needed, state organizations supplement. The governor has the authority to activate the National Guard and may request help from the President if the disaster exceeds state abilities. FEMA then coordinates with DOMS if Department of Defense assets are required. DOMS, under the auspices of the Secretary of Defense, has designated the Commanders in Chief of U. S. Atlantic Command (ACOM), U. S. Pacific Command (PACOM), and U. S. Southern Command (SOUTHCOM) as the DOD operating agents for military support for civil authorities for states, territories, and possessions in their areas of responsibility. In coordination with the Joint Staff, DOMS can also task supporting CINCs such as U. S. Transportation Command (TRANSCOM) and other defense agencies for assistance.

The Commander in Chief, U. S. Atlantic Command (ACOM), as with the other designated CINCs, has assigned lead operational authorities for military support for civil authorities (MSCA). ACOM utilizes USCINCACOM Functional Plan 2501-97 to designate Forces Command as the lead agent for MSCA. Forces Command has exercised that authority on multiple occasions: the Los Angeles

riots (1992), Hurricane Andrew (1992), the Olympics (1996), and Hurricane Fran (1996).

Support to civil authorities occurs on almost a daily basis and can range from a small one-time request to a major undertaking due to emergency requirements. Recent cases include a technical escort unit to support a Ricin chemical agent seizure by the FBI but can also encompass incidents like the Oklahoma City bombing or the crash of TWA Flight 800. During the Oklahoma City recovery, peak support strength reached about 1,002 personnel and included air and surface transportation, specialized equipment, and life support items. The impact of support for the Olympics was enormous, over 14,000 service personnel from all components were committed to a variety of missions from providing non-emergency support to preparing and supporting contingency plans with bomb disposal and chemical/biological teams in case of a terrorist threat. Nearly a thousand DOD personnel supported the TWA Flight 800 crash, including Air National Guard C-130s; Navy salvage ships, equipment, and divers; Army Corps of Engineer barges; aviation support from the Army National Guard; and a forensic anthropologist from the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology.[29]

In response to incidents of weapons of mass destruction, the military is particularly well-suited to aid in the "consequence management." The Army trains to fight and win in a chemical and biological environment and thus has been given the mission of

responding to terrorist acts of WMD. The United States covers a large area and providing a "first response" capability can be supported by the Army National Guard and Army Reserve which resides in all 50 states. Secretary of Defense William S. Cohen has stated, "The Guard and Reserve are going to play a major role in detection of biological and chemical weapons, how to intervene, how to deal with the victims when it occurs."[30]

There are some advantages and disadvantages to the use of the Army Reserve in this capacity. Since they train to fight in this environment, they are best prepared to assist victims in such cases. Army Reserve units have the organization, training, and some of the equipment to aid in this response but are neither trained nor manned and equipped to deploy within hours. Responding to civil emergencies isn't typically in their repertoire either, warfighting is their focus.

The Total Army's chemical warfare organizations are specifically organized, trained, and equipped to respond to weapons of mass destruction. The Army Reserve has eight battalion and three brigade headquarters, as well as 33 chemical companies capable of providing the needed support. Twenty-six of these companies will be able to perform decontamination missions during consequence management.[31]

The National Guard has a lesser degree of capability and only lends two decontamination companies to the fight and no chemical command and control abilities.[32] National Guard units are in

every state and across a huge span of cities in each state, but that becomes a disadvantage in the use of the National Guard. This is the governors' only response capability and will most likely already be involved in whatever support is required. Since they may be called into state active duty, they can aid in the search and rescue requirements and have already been trained to prevent riots, looting, and entry into prohibited areas; and have the legal authorities to back such actions.

A couple of active military units possess the required capabilities needed in response of WMD incidents, one in the Army and one in the Marines. The Army's Technical Escort Unit is trained to identify and contain incidents involving weapons of mass destruction. The Chemical-Biological Incident Response Force (CBIRF) of the Marines has the capability to provide command and control, reconnaissance, decontamination, and medical assistance. Unfortunately, both are relatively small organizations and because they are active military, have a world-wide deployable mission, that may take them "out of pocket" in time of need.

The Department of Defense continues to study the requirements and determine the forces needed to respond to domestic terrorism attacks against our homeland. Recently, after receiving a briefing on the *DoD Plan for Integrating National Guard and Reserve Component Support for Response to Attacks Using Weapons of Mass Destruction*, Deputy Defense Secretary John Hamre

earmarked $49.2 million in the FY '99 Defense Budget to implement this plan. Deputy Secretary Hamre approved the following preparations:

- fielding 10 Rapid Assessment and Initial Detection (RAID) elements to advise fire, police, and other emergency response officials on the nature of a particular attack;
- equipping and training 65 decontamination and 22 reconnaissance elements;
- training 100 medical personnel and refining medical procedures;
- validating the requirements for other response elements, if necessary; and
- conducting various interagency exercises.

The Secretary of the Army will also establish a Consequence Management Program Integration Office to manage these efforts, determine the locations of the 10 RAID elements, and take other steps in the FY '99 implementation.[33] This is a substantial effort in not only combatting terrorist attacks in the United States but also in furthering the integration and roles of the Army's National Guard and Reserve for the 21st Century.

CONCLUSION

"Terrorism is escalating to the point that U. S. citizens may soon have to chose between civil liberties and more intrusive forms of protection."

—Secretary of Defense William S. Cohen[34]

The threat of terrorism in our nation is one that continues to grow. During the summer of 1997, the Defense Science Board concluded a study that emphasized "Transnational threats - those posed by free-lance terrorists whose sponsors are difficult to identify and punish - can be as serious as those of a major military conflict."[35] As previously discussed, the terrorist threat within our borders has grown and taken on a totally new form, one that we have not previously faced. Just in the limited time of conducting this research project, domestic threats continue to plague the populace. Bombings of several abortion clinics have occurred and taken innocent lives.

The Armed Forces are the best asset available for providing a response to terrorist incidents. They are trained, equipped, and responsive to meeting the needs of our towns and cities. The military clearly understands the importance of the mission and what it means to our nation. The recent Quadrennial Defense Review identified the threat of terrorism and its use as an indirect method of confrontation with the United States. It also lays out that the purpose of U. S. forces is to deter threats to our homeland, including terrorism.[36] Its mission not only

includes protection of military forces but also the civilian citizens of the United States.

This mission does not come without its costs. The time, personnel, training, and funds spent in support of this mission detract from other mission capabilities. Deputy Secretary Hamre has taken the first step in providing additional resources for this task, but a continuing process of evaluation must be accomplished to ensure that it stays on track and does not conflict with the wartime mission of the Armed Forces. The expenditures, both personnel and time, in accomplishing the training required for assisting the major cities of the U. S. in their preparation, is an enormous bill. At this time only 120 cities are scheduled for training in the next three years.[37]

In the legislation that tasked the Department of Defense with its specific missions, it levied a 1 October 1999 date to determine if DOD would continue to retain the complete mission or any part therein. The President can reassign the responsibilities or leave them with the Department of Defense. As outlined, I do not believe there is another organization that has the capability to prepare the nation's assets for such a task. We are less than a year away from when that decision would have to be made and unless I am missing something, the U. S. military is still at the top of the pecking order. It is the most proficient and available organization in which to serve our nation. It has the dedicated professionals that understand the

priorities to serve. It is our nation and supporting it is a demanding chore but one that the military must continue to plan and execute for in the 21st Century.

Word count: 5801.

ENDNOTES

[1] President William J. Clinton, A National Security Strategy for a New Century (Washington, DC: USGPO, May 1997), I.

[2] Don M. Snider, The National Security Strategy: Documenting Strategic Vision (Carlisle Barracks, PA: U. S. Army War College, Strategic Studies Institute, 1995), 1.

[3] Clinton, 10.

[4] "Close Up Foundation Domestic Terrorism Page," January 1997; available from <http://www.closeup.org/terror.htm#conclusion>; Internet; accessed 18 September 1997.

[5] Department of Defense, Joint Chiefs of Staff, Department of Defense Dictionary of Military and Associated Terms, Joint Pub 1-02 (Washington, DC: The Joint Staff, 23 March 1994), 384.

[6] Ibid.

[7] Federal Bureau of Investigation, Terrorist Research and Analytical Center, Terrorism in the United States 1982-1992 (Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation, 1992), 11.

[8] Ibid.

[9] Ibid., 13.

[10] Morris Dees and James Corcoran, Gathering Storm: America's Militia Threat (New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 1996), 218.

[11] Ibid.

[12] Ibid., 219.

[13] Aurel Braun and Stephen Scheinberg, The Extreme Right: Freedom and Security at Risk (Boulder: Westview Press, 1997), 80.

[14] James K. Campbell, "Weapons of Mass Destruction in Terrorism: The Emerging Threat Posed by Non-State Proliferation," 27 October 1996; available from <http://www.emergency.com/wmd-terr.htm>; Internet; accessed 9 October 1997.

[15] Braun, 80.

[16] Bruce Hoffman, Responding to Terrorism Across the Technological Spectrum (Carlisle Barracks, PA: U. S. Army War College, Strategic Studies Institute, 15 July 1994), 18-20.

[17] Brent L. Smith, Terrorism in America: Pipe Bombs and Pipe Dreams (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1994), 198.

[18] Federal Emergency Management Agency, "Backgrounder: Terrorism," 25 August 1996; available from <http://www.fema.gov/fema/terror.html>; Internet; accessed 9 October 1997.

[19] Campbell.

[20] Charles L. Mercier, Jr., "Terrorists, WMD, and the U. S. Army Reserve," Parameters 27 (Autumn 1997): 99-103.

[21] President Bill Clinton, "U. S. Policy on Counterterrorism," Presidential Decision Directive 39, Washington, D.C., 21 June 1995.

[22] William J. Clinton, "Statement on signing the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996," Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents 32 (29 April 1996): 719-721, UMI ProQuest, General Periodicals OnDisc [CD-ROM], 1996, item 02870605.

[23] Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996, United States Code Congressional and Administrative News, 104th Cong., 2nd sess., 1996 (St. Paul: West Publishing Co., 1997), vol.4, 924-961.

[24] Defense Against Weapons of Mass Destruction Act of 1996, United States Code Congressional and Administrative News, 104th Cong., 2nd sess., 1996 (St. Paul: West Publishing Co., 1997), vol. 2, 2716.

[25] Ibid., 2718-2720.

[26] Posse Comitatus Act, U. S. Code, vol. 9, Sec. 1385 (1994).

[27] Thomas R. Lujan, "Legal Aspects of Domestic Employment of the Army," Parameters 27 (Autumn 1997): 83.

[28] Ibid., 85.

[29] David L. Grange and Rodney L. Johnson, "Forgotten Mission: Military Support to the Nation," Joint Force Quarterly 15 (Spring 1997): 112-115.

[30] George I. Seffers, "Guard May Fight Terrorism," Current News: Early Bird (15 September 1997): 8.

[31] Mercier, 108.

[32] Ibid.

[33] Bryan Bender, "DoD Approves Guard, Reserve Role in Domestic Terrorism," Current News: Early Bird (28 January 1998): 8.

[34] Patrick Pexton, "Cohen Focuses Sights on Terrorism," Current News: Early Bird (15 September 1997): 8.

[35] George C. Wilson, "Reserves to be 'First Responders' to Help Victims of Terrorism," Army Times, 29 September 1997, p. 16.

[36] Department of Defense, Report of the Quadrennial Defense Review (Washington, DC: USGPO, May 1997), 8.

[37] Mercier, 113.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996. United States Code Congressional and Administrative News. 104th Cong., 2nd sess., 1996. St. Paul: West Publishing Co., 1997. Vol. 4. 924-61.

Bender, Bryan. "DoD Approves Guard, Reserve Role in Domestic Terrorism." Current News: Early Bird, 28 January 1998, p. 8.

Braun, Aurel and Stephen Scheinberg. The Extreme Right: Freedom and Security at Risk. Boulder: Westview Press, 1997.

Campbell, James K. "Weapons of Mass Destruction in Terrorism: The Emerging Threat Posed by Non-State Proliferation." 27 October 1996. Available from <http://www.emergency.com/wmd-terr.htm>. Internet. Accessed 9 October 1997.

Clinton, Bill, President. "U. S. Policy on Counterterrorism." Presidential Decision Directive 39. Washington, D.C., 21 June 1995.

Clinton, William J. President. A National Security Strategy for a New Century. Washington, DC: USGPO, May 1997.

Clinton, William J. "Statement on signing the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996." Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents 32 (29 April 1996): 719-721. UMI ProQuest, General Periodicals OnDisc [CD-ROM], 1996, item 02870605.

"Close Up Foundation Domestic Terrorism Page." January 1997. Available from <http://www.closeup.org/terror.htm# conclusion>. Internet. Accessed 18 September 1997.

Dees, Morris and James Corcoran. Gathering Storm: America's Militia Threat. New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 1996.

Defense Against Weapons of Mass Destruction Act of 1996. United States Code Congressional and Administrative News. 104th Cong., 2nd sess., 1996. St. Paul: West Publishing Co., 1997. Vol. 2. 2716.

Federal Bureau of Investigation Terrorist Research and Analytical Center. Terrorism in the United States 1982-1992. Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation, 1992.

Federal Emergency Management Agency. "Backgrounder: Terrorism." 25 August 1996. Available from <http://www.fema.gov/fema/terror.html>. Internet. Accessed 9 October 1997.

Grange, David L. and Rodney L. Johnson. "Forgotten Mission: Military Support to the Nation." Joint Force Quarterly 15 (Spring 1997): 111.

Hoffman, Bruce. Responding to Terrorism Across the Technological Spectrum. Carlisle Barracks, PA: U. S. Army War College, Strategic Studies Institute, 15 July 1994.

Lujan, Thomas R. "Legal Aspects of Domestic Employment of the Army." Parameters 27 (Autumn 1997): 83.

Mercier, Charles L. Jr. "Terrorists, WMD, and the U. S. Army Reserve." Parameters 27 (Autumn 1997): 99-103.

Pexton, Patrick. "Cohen Focuses Sights on Terrorism." Current News: Early Bird, 15 September 1997, p. 8.

Posse Comitatus Act. U. S. Code. Vol. 9, Sec. 1385 (1994).

Seffers, George I. "Guard May Fight Terrorism." Current News: Early Bird, 15 September 1997, p. 8.

Smith, Brent L. Terrorism in America: Pipe Bombs and Pipe Dreams. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1994.

Snider, Don M. The National Security Strategy: Documenting Strategic Vision. Carlisle Barracks, PA: U. S. Army War College, Strategic Studies Institute, 1995.

Wilson, George C. "Reserves to be 'First Responders' to Help Victims of Terrorism" Army Times, 29 September 1997, p. 16.

U. S. Army War College. Communicative Arts Program Directive. Carlisle Barracks: U. S. Army War College, 1998.

U. S. Department of Defense, Joint Chiefs of Staff. Department of Defense Dictionary of Military and Associated Terms. Joint Pub 1-02. Washington, DC: The Joint Staff, 23 March 1994.

U. S. Department of Defense. Manual for Civil Emergencies. DoD 3025.1-M. Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Defense, 2 June 1994.

U. S. Department of Defense. Report of the Quadrennial Defense Review. Washington, DC: USGPO, May 1997.