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.

COMBATING DOMESTIC TERRORISM: OUR NATIONAL SECURITY PRIORITY?

BY

LIEUTENANT COLONEL TERRY L. QUARLES
United States Army

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

USAWC CLASS OF 1999

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

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 4

19990618 118

USAWC STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

COMBATING DOMESTIC TERRORISM: OUR NATIONAL SECURITY PRIORITY?

by

LTC TERRY L. QUARLES
UNITED STATES ARMY

COL BARRINGER F. WINGARD
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

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: LTC Terry L. Quarles

TITLE: Combating Domestic Terrorism: Our National Security Priority?

FORMAT: Strategy Research Project

DATE: 1 February 1999 PAGES: 25 CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

As we approach the 21st century, as the superpower nation of the world, the United States must be prepared to combat the emerging threat of domestic terrorism, a threat that will be employed by both international and domestic terrorist organizations. In anticipation of this, our response to domestic terrorism must incorporate a positive, proactive, and comprehensive program that identifies terrorist organizations and their threat capability, prevents them from committing attacks if possible, yet allows us to respond in a prepared manner, once an attack has occurred. This can be accomplished with an effective counter-terrorism policy that addresses both offensive and defensive measures. This project will focus on terrorist, our efforts to counter terrorist activities, their threat capability, our response, both military and civilian, as well as preparedness. Hopefully we can answer, "Are we really where we need to be, and if not what must we do to get there?"

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT III

INTRODUCTION 1

NATIONAL SECURITY STRATEGY 2

DEFINITIONS 2

TERRORIST ORGANIZATIONS 5

THREAT CAPABILITIES 10

ANTI/COUNTER-TERRORISM LEGISLATION 13

ANTI/COUNTER-TERRORISM EFFORTS 16

CONCLUSION 24

ENDNOTES 27

BIBLIOGRAPHY 29

INTRODUCTION

Terrorism is a phenomenon that governments around the world have come to fear.[1] The problem of how to deal with the threat of terrorism has been studied by political leaders in virtually every democratic nation. Since World War II we have witnessed the use of terrorism as a tool for change by a variety of groups for a variety of reasons. There have been and still are hundreds of terrorist groups operating worldwide, each pursuing its own political agenda, with the cases seemingly endless.

Combating this continuous stream of terrorist events has proven to be a troublesome political issue for democratic governments, especially when trying to protect their citizens, property, and interests at home. The threat that this country faces at the hands of terrorist organizations, both foreign and domestic, has become an issue of serious discussion and concern. "Terrorism on American soil isn't a question of if, it's a question of when."[2] In the United States today, both within the military and among those considering and criticizing national policy, we find extensive debate concerning anti/counter-terrorist measures and preparedness issues. This paper will look at combating domestic terrorism and the efforts of our national agencies in applying the necessary safeguards to deter this cancer of the world, as well as prepare this nation for the inevitable terrorist attack by that will be crippling and demoralizing.

NATIONAL SECURITY STRATEGY

"Protecting our citizens and critical infrastructures at home is an essential element of our strategy. Potential adversaries - whether nations, terrorist groups or criminal organizations - will be tempted to disrupt our critical infrastructures, impede government operations, use weapons of mass destruction against civilians, and prey on our citizens. These challenges demand close cooperation across all levels of government - federal, state and local - and across a wide range of agencies, including the Departments of Defense and State, the Intelligence Community, law enforcement, emergency services, medical care providers and others."[3]

DEFINITIONS

What is terrorism? In order to understand the phenomenon of terrorism, one must assess the differing views of what exactly constitutes terrorism. The definition of a term like terrorism cannot be detached from the question of who is the defining agency. With multiple government agencies that are part of the effort to counter terrorism, we find that each has their own definition from which they are working their own agendas. Even though there are several definitions, it is apparent when we look for measures to combat terrorism, we seem to be bogged down in rhetoric over whether it is an act of war, (terrorism) or an expression of philosophy with motives that exceed the simple distinction between the political and the criminal mind,

(extremism). While we are primarily concerned with domestic terrorism, we must first define terrorism and then look at how domestic terrorism differs from the concept of what we have in the past regarded as terrorism.

In sum, terrorism is violence, or the threat of violence, calculated to create an atmosphere of fear and alarm, and to have far-reaching psychological repercussions on a particular target audience. The acts are designed to coerce others into taking actions they would otherwise not undertake or to refrain from taking actions that they desire to take.[4]

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]

The definition that has been developed by the FBI is, "Terrorism is 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."[6] This definition not only reflects U.S. Congressional legislation but that of senior-level government advisory and consulting bodies such as the Vice President's Task Force on Terrorism.[7]

Title 22 of the United States Code, Section 2656f(d) defines terrorism as follows: "The term terrorism means premeditated, politically motivated violence perpetrated against noncombatant

targets by sub-national groups or clandestine agents, usually intended to influence an audience."[8]

Domestic terrorism involves groups or individuals whose terrorist activities are directed at elements of our government or population without foreign direction.[9] This definition differs from international terrorism in that there is no foreign direction, and the terrorist activity does not transcend U.S. national boundaries. From this author's point of view the definition of Domestic terrorism should read:

- Domestic terrorism involves groups or individuals whose terrorist activities are directed at elements of our government or population within our territorial boundaries.

If and when a terrorist attack of massive proportion occurs on American soil, I don't believe the Federal Bureau of Investigation's (FBI) definition of domestic terrorism will suffice, especially when the perpetrator of the attack is identified as having American citizenship, or a visa, yet working for the cause of some non-state actor receiving direction from some foreign base. If the event occurs on United States soil, it should be categorized as domestic terrorism.

Definitions of action to control terrorism must also be clarified. Anti-terrorism refers to defensive measures employed to protect personnel and facilities against a terrorist incident.

Counter-terrorism refers to offensive measures that respond to terrorist acts once they have occurred.[10] The distinction between these two terms will become relevant when this study examines issues related to terrorism preparedness.

While it is apparent that without one standard definition of terrorism, all agencies and organizations that propose to fight this threat will most likely pursue their agendas relative to their own definition. To those outside looking in, multiple definitions will get multiple responses directed toward differing goals, without the benefit of coordination between agencies, and a unity of effort toward a common goal.

Developing an effective national strategy requires agreement on what we are dealing with, in other words, we need a definition of terrorism. A definition that goes without questioning, if the act committed fits the parameters of terrorism, or is it an act that can readily be categorized as criminal activity that should be deferred to the respective law enforcement agency to effectively handle. When an agreed upon definition of terrorism is decided, the acts relative to domestic terrorism can be defined.

TERRORIST ORGANIZATIONS

The face of terrorism, the oldest form of warfare known to mankind has continued to be an evolving issue in the United States. The national growth of a domestic terrorist threat, earmarked by the Oklahoma City bombing, is an indicator that

terror has come to America from within.[11] Terrorism is no longer viewed only as an international issue involving foreign, state-sponsored terrorist organizations. The terrorist threat that the United States faces today focuses primarily on Domestic terrorist groups. These groups are based and operate entirely within the United States and Puerto Rico without foreign direction and whose violent acts are directed at elements of the U.S. Government or population. Their causes spring from issues relating to American political and social concerns.[12]

Domestic terrorist groups can be divided into three distinct organizations:

- Right-wing/racist, anti-authority, survivalist-type groups;
- Left-wing/radical organizations;
- Special interest belief/issue-oriented groups (including anti-abortionists, animal rights, and environmental extremist groups).

Right-wing terrorists relate their efforts to conspiracies, such as the New World Order and gun-control laws, with apocalyptic views such as the approach of the millennium, and white supremacy. They also advocate anti-government, anti-taxation, and anti-abortion sentiments, as well as engage in survivalist and/or paramilitary type operations that will promote survival of the United States as a white, Christian nation.[13] Often right-wing groups are oriented to specific political

issues, and generally operate through the political involvement within the established system.[14] Certain right-wing groups such as the "militia" or "patriots" can not work within existing structures of government. Their motives for membership vary from a desire for self-determination, to racism and religious extremism, with a common-thread of anti-federal government ideology.[15] Some of these groups do not view themselves as citizens of the U.S., they renounce their allegiance to the United States and swear allegiance to their cause. They are opposed to paying federal taxes as an aspect of their conviction, as well as opposed to any form of government above the county level, and do not recognize the judicial system we have in place. They have created their own court system and annually appoint supreme court justices in each state. They exhibit paranoia and openly express an impending armed conflict with the federal government. They try to impose a "one world dictatorship" or "New World Order," that necessitates their paramilitary training and stockpiling of weapons. Many of these right-wing groups are violent in nature to the point of murder for the cause, and spawn future generations to carry on the movement.[16]

The growth of the 500 plus militia organizations in the U.S. today is traced to the effective communications now available via the internet, computer bulletin boards, and fax networks where materials from well known hate-groups are easily disseminated. Also, they are tied to organized crime and the drug cartels,

whose funding for services rendered enables the militia movement to logistically prepare themselves for their long-term survival, and to achieve their "higher" goals. They espouse their ideology at gun shows and patriot rallies, exploiting the population and environment from which to recruit new members.

The legality of the existence of their organizations is traced to Title 10, United States Code, section 311, chapter 13; which authorizes the "organized militia" (National Guard and Naval Militia), and the "unorganized militia". Section 312 goes further to list those persons that are exempt from militia duty, and includes; members of the armed forces, except members who are not on active duty."[17] From this classification of militias and the exception, it can—and often is-inferred that every citizen, including reserve military personnel are members of the militia simply as an obligation of citizenship. However, the interpretation of what constitutes an organized or unorganized militia, and whether it is controlled by the federal government, has become the central point of discussion and debate.[18]

Left-wing groups generally view themselves as protectors of the American people against capitalism and imperialism. They seek to bring about changes and believe their cause can only be achieved through revolution, such as organized criminal actions rather than through political process. Some of the more prominent left-wing groups, such as the Puerto Rican terrorist groups, Fuerzas Armadas de Liberacion Nacional(FALN), Comandos Armados de

Liberacion(Armed commandos of Liberation), and Movimiento de Independencia Revolucionario en Armas(Armed Independence Revolutionary Movement), have claimed credit for attacks against military facilities, corporate offices, and federal buildings. Often these groups believe that bombings alone will not produce the desired change, but realize that these are the tools to gain publicity for their cause and to earn support from the masses.

For over three decades these groups posed the predominant threat in the United States. Due to the efforts of the FBI, many of the key members were arrested in the late 1980's and early 1990's, and, as a result, membership and support for their effort greatly diminished.[19] Although Puerto Rico voted to remain within the U.S. Commonwealth in 1993, some extremists are still willing to plan and conduct terrorist acts in order to draw attention to their desire for independence.

Special interest organization's traits' of terror tend to differ from left-wing and right-wing groups in that specific interest resolutions are sought, rather than widespread political changes. Some of the special interests of these groups include animal rights, (People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals - PETA), anti-abortion, environmental issues (Earth Night Action Group and Act Up), and Hawaiian independence. Because of the criminal activity that these groups conduct, they seem to misalign their efforts to entice the masses for support, even

though the causes they represent can be understandable and oftentimes noteworthy in nature.

They try to force segments of society, and hopefully public opinion, to alter their attitudes about issues that are important to them. Results of the cause and concern from these groups will continue to present a threat that can and will surface from time to time.

Right-wing and issue-specific groups have been identified with the greatest frequency by all types of organizations. These two types of terrorist organizations are not only the most frequently identified in terms of existence but also are most frequently identified as having committed specific acts of terrorism.

Regardless of their political orientation, organizational beliefs, racial biases, and referenced religious practices, terrorists all share a common thread, they all seek the shock effect and publicity they gain from their attacks against government, public facilities, private firms, or innocent civilians.

THREAT CAPABILITIES

The threat that this country faces at the hands of domestic terrorist organizations, has become an issue of serious discussion and concern. The attack on the Murrah Federal Building, carried out by individuals whose ideological justification for violence is identical with many far right-wing

extremist groups in this country, caused the public to focus attention on this emerging problem.[20]

In years past the gun and the conventional bomb have been the weaponry of choice for the terrorist. The gun of choice has not always been small caliber rifles, shotguns, or handguns that are readily available in the United States. The terrorist now ventures out and largely depends on illegal gun-traders and black-market sources to provide him with automatic/high-tech, military equipment that allows him to intimidate, disorient, and destabilize his enemy, (U.S. citizens).

With explosive devices providing a more effective means of inciting mass terror than guns, bombs have often been the domestic terrorist weapon of choice. We have seen the pattern of explosive devices go from the well known, low cost quarry grade dynamite, to advanced explosives such as Tovex, and Iremite.

Despite continued use of conventional weapons by terrorist, the possibility exists that unconventional weapons of a chemical, biological, or nuclear nature could be employed in future attacks by domestic terrorist, producing devastating results to Main Street USA. When we closely examine the threat capabilities of the domestic terrorist organizations, we see the "changing face" of terrorism brought about by the impact of advanced technology, and the Weapons of Mass Destruction(WMD)-related production information availability, which is occurs at an extremely rapid rate.

Local book stores, libraries, and the internet provide the reasonably educated individual with information to construct a low-tech chemical weapon, capable of producing mass casualties if used in the proper setting.[21]

The nature of domestic terrorism change is driven by what might be called the "supply side" and the "demand side." On the supply-side is the availability of materials and technical requirements to produce an elementary WMD capability, and the financial capability to fund. While on the demand-side, there are changing notions about the ownership and the use of WMD as an element of negotiating status and power.[22]

Terrorist attraction to WMD focuses on the results in mass casualties and mass disruption against their enemies, and audience. Through the use of Nuclear, Biological, or Chemical means, terrorists can achieve a strength they could never hope to achieve through conventional means. Their aim is the destruction of the existing order, replacing it with a new one of their choosing, brought about by infrastructure disruption, mass casualties, and terror in our streets. Through usage of WMD devices, domestic terrorist will control their spellbound audience, create that Cable News Network (CNN) shock-effect, and ultimately accomplish their goal, by creating terror in the streets.

These new technologies of terror and their increasing availability, along with the increasing mobility of terrorists,

raise chilling prospects of vulnerability to chemical, biological, and other kinds of attacks. This places each of us into the category of possible victim, and seriously threatens the security of a national population with a single blow. The catastrophic effects of a WMD attack on American society will be a transforming event. Aside from the actual physical effects and human suffering, the psychological impact will shake the nation's trust and confidence in its government to the core. Terrorists events such as this pose a threat to all mankind!

ANTI/COUNTER-TERRORISM LEGISLATION

"Potential enemies, whether nations, terrorist groups or criminal organizations, are increasingly likely to attack U.S. territory and the American people in unconventional ways. Adversaries will be tempted to disrupt our critical infrastructures, impede continuity of government operations, use weapons of mass destruction against civilians in our cities, attack us when we gather at special events, and prey on our citizens overseas. The United States must act to deter or prevent such attacks, and, if attacks occur despite those efforts, we must be prepared to limit the damage and respond decisively. We will spare no effort to bring attackers to justice, ever adhering to our policy toward terrorists that, "You can run, but you cannot hide."[23] The emphasis of this statement, reflects our continuing National Security Strategy in the fight against domestic terrorism. The following legislative actions began in

1995 (after the most horrific act this nation has witnessed,) and continue to reflect our nation's position in deterring/responding to terrorism.

Presidential Decision Directive (PDD-39) was the first of several legislative actions under President Clinton to describe the U.S. policy on counter-terrorism. This directive defined consequence management, assigned FEMA as the lead agency with responsibility for development of the Federal Response Plan, and outlined three major steps in the counter-terrorism process.[24]

- Reduce our Vulnerabilities/Deter Terrorism
- Respond to Terrorists Acts
- Combat Weapons of Mass Destruction/Manage the Consequences

Presidential Decision Directives (PDD) 62 and 63 addressed some of the noted shortfalls in preparation for incidents of WMD. PDD-62 sought to reaffirm agencies' counter-terrorism roles and strengthen the interagency coordination process by creating the Office of the National Coordinator for Security, Infrastructure Protection, and Counter-terrorism, emphasizing the consequence management role and preparation.

PDD-63 established a National Infrastructure Assurance Plan based on a 5 year document. PDD 63 also designated responsibility for specific infrastructure sectors and functions to lead federal agencies, as well as special functions within their normal missions. (e.g. DOD/National Defense, CIA/foreign intelligence).[25]

As a result of the Oklahoma City bombing, the "Anti-terrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act" was developed and ratified. President Clinton emphasized that the passing of this legislation was a step in the right direction, providing valuable tools; however, it was not, an all encompassing counter-terrorism act. It added to our arsenal in combating terrorism:

- A federal death penalty for terrorists
- Broadened federal jurisdiction to prosecute terrorists in the United States
- Banned fund raising in support of terrorist groups
- Gave authority to deport/bar foreign terrorists from the United States
- Established funding to support government counter-terrorist programs

With the enactment of the Defense Against Weapons of Mass Destruction Act of 1996 (Title XIV)[26], Congress took the next logical step in combating the WMD terrorist threat, by identifying the inability of this nation to conduct consequence management. Section A of this law covers specifics regarding Domestic threat.[27]

- It enhances the capability of the Federal Government to prevent/respond to WMD incidents
- Provides support to state and local emergency responders

- Provides training to civilian personnel in response to WMD preparedness
- Established DoD as the lead in Chemical-Biological Emergency Response to Civil Authorities (Sep 1999)

ANTI/COUNTER-TERRORISM EFFORTS

While there is no one single, comprehensive federal law dealing with domestic terrorism, there are numerous pieces of legislation, stating that certain acts of terrorism are federal crimes. This legislation has been adopted and supported with funding by the Congress of the United States with the main emphasis directed toward combating this emerging threat.

When we looked at defining terrorism in a preceding section, it was determined that the federal government does not have a single definition of terrorism. The agencies involved in the efforts to counter terrorism use different terms to describe the protective and deterrent programs, activities, and countermeasures against the threat of a terrorist attack.

For example, the FBI uses the term counter-terrorism to refer to the full range of its activities directed against terrorism, including preventive and crisis management efforts.[28,29]

On the other hand DOD uses the term counter-terrorism to refer to offensive measure to prevent, deter, and respond to terrorist attacks, and anti-terrorism to cover defensive measures to reduce the vulnerability of individuals and property to terrorist acts.

To examine the efforts directed against terrorism, this paper will utilize the definition of Combating Terrorism as the full range of federal programs and activities applied against domestic terrorism regardless of the source. The federal agencies' programs and activities are (1) prevent and deter terrorism; (2) respond to terrorist threats or incidents; and (3) manage the consequences of a terrorist act, especially involving weapons of mass destruction.[30]

Presidential Decision Directive (PDD) 39 provided the base document or blueprint for the U.S. strategy on combating terrorism and measures to implement it.[31]

Many programs and activities have been developed to implement these three elements of the U.S. strategy for combating this growing cancer. The primary document that describes the activities and the agencies of the federal government that will respond to a declared disaster is the Federal Response Plan. When implemented, the Federal Response Plan calls on 26 federal agencies, (DOD inclusive) and the American Red Cross to provide support. Resources provided by these agencies are organized into 12 categories referred to as Emergency Support Functions, and headed by a primary agency based on that agency's capabilities.

In response to terrorist incidents, and managing the consequences of terrorist acts under the Federal Response Plan, lead agencies establish interagency quick-reaction support teams,

create special operational units, develop contingency plans, and conduct interagency training and exercises.

Federal agencies are also involved in programs to assess the capabilities of state and local jurisdictions to immediately respond to and manage the consequences of domestic terrorist incidents. Further, they provide these agencies with training and assistance. With more than 40 federal departments, agencies, and bureaus involved in this effort to combat terrorism, this paper will discuss key elements involved in the initial response effort.

Using the aforementioned, definition of domestic terrorism, the Department of Justice (DOJ) has the lead as the overall agency coordinator for U.S. policy issues on combating terrorism. DOJ will apply federal efforts to respond to domestic terrorist incidents with or without foreign involvement.[32]

The key lead elements outlined in the role of combating domestic terrorism are the DOJ/FBI, the Federal Emergency Management Authority, the Department of Defense, Department of Energy, and the Public Health Service.[33]

Interagency coordination and mission directive are further broken down into two distinct efforts, crises response/management and consequence management.

Crisis response/management refers to those measures that identify, acquire, and plan the use of resources to anticipate, prevent, and or resolve a threat or act of terrorism. Consequence

management is the preparation for and response to the consequences of a domestic terrorist incident.[34]

Regarding crisis response, the Department of Justice, through the FBI, has the lead for crisis response/management of domestic terrorist incidents in the United States. The FBI capabilities for crisis management include a 24-hour command center watch every day of the year to respond to any terrorist incident. A number of specialized military units, are constantly on alert, ready to respond within a few hours with a command and control element that is well versed in terrorist scenarios.[35] They have also been tasked with forming a Domestic Emergency Support Team (DEST), which operates under draft guidelines detailing agency roles and responsibilities to include command and control during an incident.

In keeping with the charged mission of prevent/deter, the FBI also provides a crucial intelligence link in the effort to combat domestic terrorism. They monitor and collect intelligence on domestic groups and individuals, which they believe pose a terrorist threat. This information is communicated to the law enforcement agencies through its teletype National Law Enforcement Telecommunications System, in an effort to prepare communities to possible threats or acts before they are committed.

The FBI has also developed "Guidelines for the Mobilization, Deployment, and Employment of U.S. Government Agencies in

Response to a Domestic Terrorist Threat or Incident," also known as the "Domestic Guidelines."[36] These guidelines serve to facilitate the marshaling of federal assets required to defeat or punish terrorists involved with domestic incidents.

Under authority from the Nunn-Luger-Domenici (NLD), or the Defense Against Weapons of Mass Destruction Act of 1996, centers were established to provide domestic emergency preparedness training to the first responders who would have to deal with a terrorist attack of WMD. Although it has been said the nuclear capability is available, it is highly unlikely that it will be employed by domestic terrorist. A more likely scenario would involve either chemical or biological agent usage.

The first of the centers established to provide emergency responder training, emergency management, state, and local officials training, was established at Ft. McClellan, Alabama, under the DOJ, Office of Justice Programs. This center for domestic preparedness was established in June, 1998 and began its training program September, 1998. This center conducts training sessions in advanced chemical, ordnance, biological, and radiological operations; incident command; pre-incident planning; public works; community leadership; risk communications; and decontamination. The primary purpose of this training is to enhance/improve the capabilities of state and local emergency response agencies to prevent and respond to WMD incidents.

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) has been assigned as the lead agency in regard to consequence management. Specific consequence management activities include measures to alleviate damage, loss of life, or suffering; protect public health and safety; restore essential government services; and provide emergency assistance. If consequences become imminent and occur, state and local authorities would initiate consequence management actions, while FEMA would monitor the situation in consultation with the president and the governor. Only when it is determined that state and local capabilities are overwhelmed, the president could then direct FEMA, (in coordination with the FBI), and support of; the appropriate federal agencies, to assist the state. Consequence management can follow crisis management, but they probably will occur simultaneously or overlap, depending on the nature of the incident.

The DOD, has designated The Commander in Chief, U.S. Atlantic Command (ACOM), as the lead authority for military support to civil authorities (MSCA). The role of the DOD under the Nunn-Luger-Domenici legislation was to provide:

- Emergency Response Training, Advice and Assistance
- Assistance in Developing a Rapid Response Team - Chem/Bio Rapid Response Team (C/BRRT)
- Testing and Evaluation of Preparedness
- Assistance in Developing and Maintaining an inventory of Physical Equipment/Assets - FEMA lead

- Assistance in Procurement of Equipment to Interdict WMD Movement

Knowing full well that the military of the United States is prohibited by "Posse Comitatus" from executing the laws of our country unless specifically authorized by the Constitution or an act of Congress, they can provide assistance to civil authorities under authority granted in the Stafford Disaster Relief Act.

After completing a study of the requirements and forces needed in the response to domestic terrorism, the Department of Defense has requested a more robust and demanding integration of the National Guard and Reserves in the homeland defense. At the state and local level the governor has the authority to activate the National Guard, which does not fall into the category of "posse comitatus" unless federalized. Although the National Guard covers a large geographic area, and plays a major role in detection of chem/bio weapons, they are normally not manned or equipped to respond to the incident scene within the critical time required.

An asset that the National Guard is developing to augment the detection role is ten regional Rapid Assessment Initial Detection (RAID) detachments. Initially these ten detachments will be co-located with the regional FEMA assets. When operational in 2000, they will provide rapid assessment and detection at the incident scene. However, under their current operational guidelines, they will not be deployed to the incident

scene within the 1st four to six hours. Based on available planning data that the emergency management agencies are utilizing, the initial hour is considered golden. After that casualties start to mount and the capabilities of the local responders will soon be overwhelmed. In order for the RAID detachments to be a viable asset, dedicated air assets will be needed to move the elements to the scene early and quickly. RAID detachments will also need better detection equipment in order to provide the emergency responders with the identification of the chemical or biological agent so that antidotes, or vaccines can be administered and casualties minimized.

The Department of Energy and the Department of Health Services each play a key role in the domestic preparedness against a Weapons of Mass Destruction attack. The efforts of each of these agencies are coordinated under direction of the Office of the National Coordinator for Security, Infrastructure Protection and Counter-terrorism. Through research into new vaccines, medicines, and Public Health Surveillance, along with procurement of a national stockpile of specialized medicines, the Department of Health Services assists emergency first responders in preparing for a possible chemical or biological attack.

The Department of Energy working through the interagency process to conduct training events, is preparing for possible attacks on the infrastructure power sources by developing

stronger prevention and deterrence measures in their efforts for homeland defense.

CONCLUSION

In order to reduce our vulnerabilities to terrorist attacks, the interagency process must fully implement the tools provided by enacted legislation to ensure the security of this nation.

To deter terrorism, our public position must be that our policies will not be affected by terrorist acts and, that we as a nation, will vigorously deal with terrorist and their sponsors to reduce their capabilities to commit such acts.

We as a nation must be prepared to respond to terrorism, through use of rapid and decisive means of protecting Americans, and responding by providing relief to victims of terrorist attacks once they have occurred. Efforts to provide relief in an incident such as this are outlined and coordinated under the direction of our Federal Response Plan. This plan is based on the assumption that a significant incident will overwhelm the capability of the state and local governments to carry out the extensive emergency operations necessary to save lives and protect property. Consequently, resources of Federal departments and agencies, grouped into Emergency Support Functions, will be used to provide assistance to the States.[37]

Numerous legislative acts have provided millions of dollars to key agencies to support this on-going effort to combat domestic terrorism. However, in my opinion, standards that

clearly define the required level of proficiency for emergency responders, and the training to meet these standards, is not clearly established. In the absence of standards many will be somewhat trained, but will they be able to come together if and when there is a requirement for the total domestic defense effort to become operational?

One of the best tools available for standardizing the training throughout the agencies, is event training in a scenario of mass terror and destruction. Realistic training much like the military adheres to at the Combat Training Centers will be key for the preparation of all agencies involved in the homeland defense effort. Responding agencies must prepare for every contingency and drill to maintain a state of readiness, because a massive undertaking such as a WMD response cannot be left to chance.

A second noted shortfall is the lack of basic command and control ability at the local level. Most civilian organizations are not familiar with running, manning, or controlling multiple entities in crisis. A detailed command and control structure template must be established that will incorporate all local responders from all agencies into the organization. Included in this command and control must be an orchestrated communications plan. A vital link in the command and control process is the ability of the incident commander to effectively communicate his needs and guidance to the multiple agencies that will by their

actions, reduce the consequences of a WMD event. This communication plan must be field tested, working out any flaws in the architectural design before it has to be activated in an incident response.

While our National Security Strategy does effectively support and fund Combating Domestic Terrorism, legislation that supports and funds enhancement and preparedness programs does not provide the left and right limits to which all agencies will conform. Until a clear definition of domestic terrorism is agreed upon, the many agencies involved will continue to independently categorize acts that may or may not be terrorist acts. Thus, not providing our legislative branch with the accurate information required, to make sound and timely decisions, in developing laws that continue to support the scourge of this growing cancer.
Word Count 5408.

ENDNOTE

[1] George Bush, Public Report of the President's Task Force on Combating Terrorism (Washington, D.C.:U.S. Government Printing Office, 1986).

[2] David Kay, "New Frontiers in Terrorism," Emergency Information Conference 97 <http://technews.essentech.com/terror.htm>

[3] President William J. Clinton, A National Security Strategy for a New Century (Washington, DC: USGPO, Oct 1998), IV.

[4] Kevin Jack Riley and Bruce Hoffman, Domestic Terrorism: A National Assessment of State and Local Preparedness (Rand Corporation/National Institute of Justice, 1995), 3.

[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] Terrorist Research and Analytical Center, Counter-terrorism Section Intelligence Division, Terrorism in the United States 1982-1992 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, FBI, 1993), Appendix A, p.20.

[7] Riley 3.

[8] Charles T. Eppright, "Counterterrorism and Conventional Military Force: The Relationship Between Political Effect and Utility", (Department of the Navy, Washington D.C. USA). 1997

[9] "Close Up Foundation Domestic Terrorism Page," January 1997; available from http://www.closeup.org/terror.htm. Internet; accessed 20 January 1999.

[10] Riley 5.

[11] Bob Baker, "Department of Justice, Center for Domestic Preparedness," lecture, Emergency Responders Class on Domestic Terrorism, August 1998. cited with permission of Mr. Baker.

[12] Federal Bureau of Investigations, Terrorism in the United States, 1996 (Counterterrorism Threat Assessment and Warning Unit National Security Division), 16.

[13] Ibid, 17.

[14] Riley 14.

[15] Steven Mack Presley, Rise of Domestic Terrorism and Its Relation to United States Armed Forces (Marine Corps Command and Staff College, 1996), 17.

[16] Riley 12-16.

[17] Title 10 U.S. Code Sections 311 and 312.

[18] Presley. 17-19.

[19] FBI 16-19.

[20] Steven Pomerantz, "Counterterrorism in a Free Society," The Journal of Counterterrorism & Security International (Spring 1998): 1.

[21] James K. Campbell, "Weapons of Mass Destruction and Terrorism: Proliferation by Non-State Actors," Terrorism and Political Violence (Summer 1997): 28.

[22] Congress, Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Technology, Terrorism and Government Information, Chemical and Biological Weapons Threats to America: Are we Prepared? 22 April 1998, 3.

[23] President William J. Clinton, A National Security Strategy for a New Century (Washington, DC: USGPO, October 1998), 7-8.

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

[25] President William J. Clinton, Executive Order, Critical Infrastructure Protection, (Washington, D.C., The White House, 15 July 1996) 1-5.

[26] U.S. Congress, Defense Against Weapons of Mass Destruction Act, U.S. Code, Title XIV, Sec 1401 (1996).

[27] Ibid, Subtitle A, Sec. 1411.

[28] Riley. 12-16.

[29] DOD. 384.

[30] Federal Response Plan, Public Law 93-288, (April 1992), amended (February 1995).

[31] General Accounting Office, Combating Terrorism: Federal Agencies' Efforts to Implement National Policy and Strategy (Washington, D.C.: U.S. General Accounting Office, November 1997), 4-6.

[32] GAO Report, 6-10.

[33] Louis J. Freeh, FBI Director, "U.S. Must Strengthen Ability to Confront Terrorism," 9 March 1998; available from http://www.usembassy.org.uk/terror52.html; Internet. Accessed 4 February 1999.

[34] Riley, 6.

[35] Congress, House, National Security Committee, "Department of Defense (DOD) role in the Federal Response to Domestic Terrorism Involving Weapons of Mass Destruction," 4 November 1997; available from http://www.fas.org/spp/starwars/congresss/1997 h/h971104r.htm; Internet; accessed 9 November 1998.

[36] Robert Blitzer, "FBI's Role in the Federal Response to the Use of Weapons of Mass Destruction," 4 November 1997; available from HTTP://www.fbi.gov/congress/wmd/wmd.htm; Internet; accessed 27 January 1999.

[37] Federal Response Plan, Public Law 93-288, (April 1992), amended (February 1995).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Baker, Bob. "Center for Domestic Preparedness: Emergency Responders." Lecture. Fort McClellan, Alabama, Department of Justice, August 1998. Cited with permission of Mr. Baker.

Blitzer, Robert. "FBI's Role in the Federal Response to the Use of Weapons of Mass Destruction." 4 November 1997. Available from HTTP://www.fbi.gov/congress/wmd/wmd.htm. Internet. Accessed 27 January 1999.

Bush, George Public Report of the President's Task Force on Combating Terrorism Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1986.

Campbell, James K. "Weapons of Mass Destruction and Terrorism: Proliferation by Non-State Actors." Terrorism and Political Violence (Summer 1997): 28.

Clinton, William J President. A National Security Strategy for a New Century. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, October 1998.

Clinton, William J. President. Executive Order, Critical Infrastructure Protection. Washington, D.C.: The White House, 15 July 1996.

Clinton, William J. President. U.S. Policy on Counterterrorism. Presidential Decision Directive 39. Washington, D.C.: 21 June 1995.

Close Up Foundation. "Overview of Domestic Terrorism." January 1997. Available from http://www.closeup.org/terror.htm. Internet. Accessed 31 January 1999.

Eppright, Charles T. Counterterrorism and Conventional Military Force: The Relationship Between Political Effect and Utility. Washington, D.C.: Department of the Navy, 1997.

Federal Bureau of Investigation. Terrorism in the United States, 1996. New York: H.W. Wilson Company, 1997.

Freeh, Louis J. "U.S. Must Strengthen Ability to Confront Terrorism." 9 March 1998. Available from http://www.usembassy.org.uk/terror52.html. Internet. Accessed 4 February 1999.

Kay, David. "New Frontiers in Terrorism," Emergency Information Conference 97. 15 July 1997. Available from

http://technews.essentech.com/terror.htm. Internet. accessed 30 December 1998.

Pomerantz, Steven. "Counterterrorism in a Free Society." The Journal of Counterterrorism & Security International (Spring 1998): 1.

Presley, Steven Mack. "Rise of Domestic Terrorism and Its Relation to United States Armed Forces." Marine Corps Command and Staff College. 1996.

Riley, Kevin J., and Bruce Hoffman. Domestic Terrorism: A National Assessment of State and Local Preparedness. Rand Corporation/National Institute of Justice., 1995.

Terrorist Research and Analytical Center, Counter-terrorism Section Intelligence Division. Terrorism in the United States. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, 1993.

U.S. Congress. Defense against Weapons of Mass Destruction Act. U.S. Code, title XIV, Sec 1401. 1996.

U.S. Congress. Federal Response Plan. Public Law 93-288. April 1992. Amended February 1995.

U.S. Congress. House. National Security Committee. "Department of Defense (DOD) role in the Federal Response to Domestic Terrorism Involving Weapons of Mass Destruction." 4 November 1997. Available from http://www.fas.org/spp/starwars/congress/1997 h/h971104r.htm. Internet. Accessed 9 November 1998.

U.S. Congress. Senate. Judiciary Subcommittee on Technology, Terrorism and Government Information. Chemical and Biological Weapons Threats to America: Are we Prepared? 22 April 1998.

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

U.S. General Accounting Office. Combating Terrorism: Federal Agencies' Efforts to Implement National Policy and Strategy. Washington, D.C.: U.S. General Accounting Office, November 1997.