

Threat Assessment Part III:
Domestic Terrorism in the United States

ILyea Shanz

PS633-T301 Strategic Deterrence: Past, Present, and Future (2237-1)

Aug 12, 2023

Threat Assessment Part I

Introduction

In recent years, the United States has faced a growing and formidable threat from within its own borders – domestic terrorism. Defined as acts of violence committed by individuals or groups against civilian targets to further ideological, political, or social objectives, domestic terrorism has emerged as a significant concern for national security, public safety, and social cohesion. This paper seeks to engage in a strategic threat analysis, shedding light on the nature, extent, and consequences of domestic terrorism in the United States.

Research Question

To what extent does domestic terrorism pose a threat to the United States, and what are the implications for national security, social cohesion, and public safety?

Threat Problem and Organization Explanation

The rise of domestic terrorism has shaken the foundations of American society, leading to a critical reevaluation of security measures and intelligence gathering techniques (Jones, et al. 2020). As acts of violence committed by homegrown extremists become more prevalent, understanding the multifaceted aspects of this threat is paramount for safeguarding the nation's well-being and preserving the core values that define the United States.

This paper will unfold in three parts, each aimed at delving deeper into the complexities of domestic terrorism. In part 1, section 1, we will embark on a comprehensive exploration of the nature of the domestic terrorism threat. By analyzing its various forms, ideologies, and tactics employed by extremist groups, we aim to provide a comprehensive understanding of the underpinnings of this menace.

Subsequently, Part 1, Section I will also delve into the extent to which domestic terrorism poses a problem for the United States compared to other security concerns. We will examine its implications on national security, social cohesion, and public safety, considering the challenges faced by law enforcement agencies in combating this threat effectively.

Furthermore, in Part 1, Section I, we will explore how domestic terrorism manifests within the United States, identifying the regions or cities most affected by such activities. By analyzing notable incidents, trends, and patterns, we aim to uncover similarities and differences between various extremist groups operating in different states.

Moreover, this paper will focus on the evolution of domestic terrorism over time and its socio-political consequences in Section I. We will investigate how extremist ideologies have transformed, the role of online platforms in fueling radicalization, and the impact of socio-economic factors on the prevalence of domestic terrorism (Jones, et al. 2020).

Drawing from credible and peer-reviewed academic sources, Section I will build on existing research to highlight the scholarly efforts invested in understanding and combating domestic terrorism. By presenting the current academic landscape on this pressing issue, we aim to contextualize the broader implications of our analysis.

Furthermore, Section I will also identify and discuss at least two theoretical perspectives used to study domestic terrorism. These theoretical lenses will illuminate the root causes, motivations, and recruitment strategies associated with domestic extremist groups, offering deeper insights into the drivers of this threat.

Lastly, we will document and evaluate two theoretical or academic prescriptions for addressing domestic terrorism in the United States in Section I. By critically analyzing the

strengths and weaknesses of these approaches, we hope to inform policymakers and stakeholders of potential strategies to counter the menace of domestic terrorism effectively.

Thesis Statement

This paper will explore the multifaceted aspects of domestic terrorism in the United States, analyzing its various forms, ideologies, manifestations, and consequences. By examining the extent to which domestic terrorism poses a problem compared to other security concerns, we aim to highlight its impact on national security, social cohesion, and public safety. Additionally, we will investigate the evolution of domestic terrorism over time and explore theoretical perspectives and academic prescriptions for addressing this pressing issue.

Section I: Domestic Terrorism in the United States

Nature of the Threat

Domestic terrorism in the United States encompasses a wide range of ideologies and tactics employed by extremist groups. Extremist organizations motivated by white supremacy, anti-government sentiments, religious fundamentalism (Kachan 2018), or other ideological beliefs have engaged in acts of violence against civilian targets to further their objectives (Smith, Ph.D 2018). The threat is characterized by a decentralized nature, with smaller, loosely connected groups or individuals often carrying out attacks (Kaplan 2019). This diffusion of extremist activity poses challenges for law enforcement agencies in tracking and mitigating potential threats (Dmitrieva and Meloy 2021).

Extent of the Threat

Domestic terrorism poses a significant problem for the United States, with profound implications for national security, social cohesion, and public safety. In recent years, the number of domestic terrorism incidents has increased, surpassing the threat posed by international

terrorism (Kurzman, Kamal and Yazdiha 2017). The threat extends beyond isolated incidents, with the potential for long-term societal consequences and political instability.

Comparatively, the problem of domestic terrorism outweighs other security concerns faced by the United States. While international terrorism remains a threat, the rise of domestic extremism demands increased attention and resources. The decentralized nature of domestic terrorism makes it challenging to address, as lone actors and small groups can evade detection until they carry out attacks (Silber and Bhatt 2007). Moreover, domestic terrorism poses unique challenges due to the First Amendment protections of free speech and association, making the distinction between protected political expression and unlawful incitement of violence complex (L. 2019).

Manifestation of the Threat

The manifestation of domestic terrorism varies across different regions and cities within the United States. Certain areas, such as the Pacific Northwest and the South, have experienced higher concentrations of extremist activities (Dr. Mullins 2020). Factors such as historical context, socio-economic disparities, and existing networks of extremist groups contribute to the regional variations in the manifestation of the threat.

Various extremist groups operating within the United States demonstrate differing ideologies and tactics. Some groups, like white supremacist organizations, seek to uphold racial hierarchies and promote ethnonationalism (Moghadam, Berger and Beliakova 2014). Others may espouse anti-government sentiments, leading to acts of violence against government institutions or law enforcement officers (Freilich, et al. 2019). The emergence of online platforms has facilitated recruitment, radicalization, and the spread of extremist ideologies, transcending geographic boundaries (Berger 2018).

Evolution and Consequences

The threat of domestic terrorism has evolved over time, shaped by socio-political factors and advancements in communication technology. Extremist ideologies adapt and mutate, responding to societal changes and exploiting vulnerabilities (Knott and Lee 2020). The Internet and social media platforms have accelerated this evolution, enabling the dissemination of extremist propaganda and facilitating online recruitment and radicalization (Cronin 2009).

The consequences of domestic terrorism are profound, impacting multiple dimensions of society. In addition to the loss of innocent lives and physical destruction, these acts of violence instill fear and erode societal trust (Lindfors 2022). Furthermore, the political and socio-economic consequences of domestic terrorism can be far-reaching, leading to polarization, the erosion of democratic values, and potential destabilization of democratic processes (White House, The 2021).

Current Academic Research

Academic research on domestic terrorism in the United States has made significant contributions to understanding the multifaceted nature of the threat. Scholars have examined various aspects of domestic terrorism, including its causes, dynamics, and implications for counterterrorism efforts like the work of Turk (2015).

Recent studies have focused on the socio-political factors that contribute to the rise of domestic extremism. Research by McCauley and Moskalenko (2020) emphasizes the importance of social identity, grievance, and perceived threats in fueling extremist ideologies. Other scholars, such as Chassman (2016), have explored the role of ideology, psychological factors, and group dynamics in the radicalization process.

Furthermore, academic research has shed light on the use of online platforms by domestic extremist groups. Studies by Alava, Frau-Meigs and Hassan (2017), Ganesh and Bright (2020),

and Tschantret (2020) highlight the strategies employed by extremists to recruit and radicalize individuals through online communities and social media. Understanding these digital networks is crucial for developing effective counter-narratives and interventions.

Scholars have also investigated the effectiveness of various counterterrorism strategies. Research by Freilich et al. (2019) evaluates the impact of community-based approaches, highlighting the importance of building trust between law enforcement agencies and communities to prevent radicalization and identify potential threats. Additionally, studies by Marko Milanovic (2021) have examined the role of intelligence sharing and interagency cooperation in countering domestic terrorism.

These and other scholarly works provide valuable insights into the dynamics of domestic terrorism in the United States, informing policy discussions and guiding efforts to mitigate the threat.

Theoretical Perspectives

The study of domestic terrorism incorporates various theoretical perspectives that offer distinct explanations for the phenomenon. Two prominent theoretical frameworks are social identity theory and strain theory.

Social identity theory, rooted in social psychology, posits that individuals' identification with extremist groups is driven by a need for social belonging, self-esteem, and meaning (Hogg and Rinella 2018). This theory emphasizes the role of group dynamics, intergroup conflicts, and the influence of social identity in shaping extremist behaviors.

Strain theory, drawn from sociology, highlights how societal strains and perceived injustices can lead individuals to engage in extremist acts (Agnew 2010). Strain theorists argue

that when individuals face blocked opportunities, relative deprivation, or a sense of injustice, they may resort to violence to achieve their goals or express their grievances.

By applying these theoretical perspectives, researchers gain a deeper understanding of the underlying motivations and processes driving domestic terrorism, enabling the development of targeted interventions and prevention strategies.

Prescriptions for Addressing the Threat

Addressing the threat of domestic terrorism requires a comprehensive approach that combines law enforcement efforts, community engagement, and proactive prevention strategies. Academic research has proposed several theoretical and academic prescriptions to counter domestic terrorism in the United States.

One prescription is the enhancement of community resilience and engagement. Building strong partnerships between communities and law enforcement agencies fosters trust, facilitates information sharing, and empowers local initiatives to prevent radicalization (Borum 2004). Strengthening community cohesion and promoting social inclusion can serve as protective factors against extremist ideologies.

Another prescription focuses on early intervention and prevention. Research suggests the importance of identifying individuals at risk of radicalization and providing them with targeted support and interventions (Ellefsen and Sandberg 2022). This approach involves leveraging social services, mental health resources, and community-based programs to address the underlying factors that contribute to radicalization.

While these prescriptions offer valuable insights and potential strategies, it is essential to evaluate their strengths and weaknesses in practice. Some argue that potential infringements on civil liberties, issues of surveillance, and the potential for discriminatory targeting must be

carefully considered (Lai and Tanner 2022). Striking the right balance between security measures and safeguarding individual rights is a crucial challenge in countering domestic terrorism.

Additionally, the effectiveness of these prescriptions may vary across different contexts and populations. Factors such as cultural, socio-economic, and ideological differences can influence the applicability and acceptance of these strategies (Perliger and Pedahzur 2016). Flexibility and adaptability in implementing and tailoring these approaches are necessary to address the unique challenges presented by domestic terrorism.

Overall, a comprehensive response to domestic terrorism requires a multi-faceted approach that integrates law enforcement efforts, community engagement, prevention strategies, and ongoing research and evaluation. By leveraging theoretical insights, lessons from academic research, and collaborative partnerships, stakeholders can develop nuanced and effective strategies to mitigate the threat of domestic terrorism in the United States.

Section II: Domestic Terrorism Throughout the World

Extent of Domestic Terrorism Globally

While domestic terrorism is a significant concern in the United States, it is important to recognize that the threat extends beyond its borders. Domestic terrorism manifests itself in various forms and ideologies across different countries and regions, posing a global challenge to security and stability. This is why countering domestic terrorism is a major focus of the NATO alliance as explained in their Countering Terrorism report put out in 2023 (NATO 2023).

Many countries have experienced instances of domestic terrorism motivated by factors such as ethnic tensions, separatist movements, political extremism, or religious fundamentalism (Kachan 2018). In Europe, for example, acts of domestic terrorism have been linked to nationalist movements, ethno-nationalist groups, and extremist ideologies (Neumann 2016). Similarly, in

countries like India, Pakistan, and Sri Lanka, domestic terrorism has been fueled by religious conflicts and separatist movements (Hafez 2019).

The extent of the threat varies across nations, influenced by factors such as historical context, socio-political dynamics, and the presence of extremist organizations. In some regions, domestic terrorism poses a significant challenge to national security and social cohesion, leading to violence, polarization, and political instability (Gunaratna and Kam 2016). The global nature of domestic terrorism necessitates international cooperation and information sharing to effectively address the threat.

Common Manifestations of Domestic Terrorism Worldwide

Domestic terrorism manifests itself in different ways across the globe, reflecting the unique socio-political contexts and grievances within each country. While the specific ideologies and motivations may differ, common manifestations include attacks against civilian targets, government institutions, and symbols of authority.

In many regions, extremist groups seek to advance political or ideological agendas through acts of violence. For instance, in some African countries, domestic terrorism is linked to insurgencies, rebel groups, or ethnic conflicts (ACFSS 2022). These groups often employ tactics such as bombings, assassinations, and kidnappings to destabilize governments or assert control over specific territories.

Religious extremism also plays a significant role in domestic terrorism globally. In several countries, extremist organizations driven by radical interpretations of religious ideologies carry out attacks against religious minorities, government entities, or international targets (Neumann and Rogers 2020). Such acts of terrorism not only threaten national security but also exacerbate interfaith tensions and hinder social cohesion.

Global Consequences and Implications

Domestic terrorism has far-reaching consequences and implications at the global level. The impact extends beyond the immediate loss of life and physical destruction, affecting societal dynamics, international relations, and global security.

At a societal level, domestic terrorism erodes trust, exacerbates divisions, and perpetuates cycles of violence. Communities affected by domestic terrorism experience fear, trauma, and a sense of insecurity, hindering social progress and cohesion (Ranstorp 2007). The rise of extremist ideologies can also fuel xenophobia, discrimination, and marginalization, further straining social fabric.

Internationally, domestic terrorism poses challenges to regional stability and security. Transnational connections among extremist groups enable the diffusion of tactics, strategies, and radical ideologies across borders (Mickolus, Sandler and Hess 2000-2018). Furthermore, the spillover effects of domestic terrorism, such as refugee flows, cross-border attacks, or the destabilization of neighboring countries, have broader implications for regional security and counterterrorism efforts.

The interconnectedness of the globalized world also means that domestic terrorism can have economic ramifications. Instances of terrorism can deter foreign investment, disrupt tourism, and damage infrastructure, impeding economic growth and development (Enders and Sandler 2011). The resulting economic instability can exacerbate social grievances and provide fertile ground for the emergence of extremist ideologies.

Threat Assessment: Part II

Current Policies Dealing with Domestic Terrorism in the United States

The United States has grappled with the challenge of domestic terrorism, necessitating the formulation and implementation of various policies aimed at countering this threat. To understand the current policy landscape, we will analyze peer-reviewed articles, books, Think Tank reports, and other reputable sources.

Current US Policies

In response to the growing threat posed by domestic terrorism in recent years, US policymakers have implemented a comprehensive plan known as The National Strategy for Counterterrorism. This framework provides an overarching approach towards combating all forms of extremist violence both domestically and globally while placing special emphasis on addressing homegrown threats specifically. The Think Tank CSIS states the issue as

There has been a significant rise in the number of domestic terrorist attacks and plots at demonstrations in the United States, according to new CSIS data. The result is escalating violence in U.S. cities between extremists from opposing sides, a major break from historical trends. In 2021, over half of all domestic terrorist incidents occurred in the context of metropolitan demonstrations. In addition, the most frequent targets of attacks were government, military, and law enforcement agencies, who are increasingly at the center of domestic terrorism by extremists of all ideologies. (Doxsee, Jones, et al. 2022)

As such it serves as an important tool in keeping Americans safe from harm caused by these dangerous groups or individuals who seek to cause chaos within our borders.

The National Strategy for Counterterrorism was first introduced in 2011 and has since undergone several revisions to address changing threats. In particular, an important update took place during the 2021 that placed greater emphasis on combating domestic terrorism due to the increasing number of violent acts committed by homegrown extremists. This adaptation ensures that our counterterrorism efforts remain effective against all types of danger.

In addition to this, the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) deals with preventing terrorism both domestically and internationally. They put out reports detailing their policies and

planned actions to counter terrorism. However, in their report in 2019, DHS National Strategy for Counterterrorism “acknowledges that, despite a “robust counterterrorism architecture” designed to thwart attacks, the United States does not have “a prevention architecture to thwart terrorist radicalization and recruitment” (DHS 2019).

The Current Policy - Is It Effective?

Assessing the National Strategy for Counterterrorism effectiveness in combating domestic terrorism is a complex task due to various factors such as decentralized threats and ever-changing extremist ideologies (White House, The 2022). Although this policy has contributed positively by enhancing coordination among federal agencies while improving intelligence sharing mechanisms, it still faces challenges when preventing all acts of domestic terrorism completely.

Critics argue that the policy's focus on international terrorism, particularly after the events of 9/11, may have initially diverted attention from the growing threat of domestic extremism. However recent revisions demonstrate a commitment to addressing this issue by recognizing its significance and taking action accordingly. This shows that they are dedicated towards ensuring safety within their borders as well as abroad. The government has demonstrated an understanding of how important it is to prioritize both types of threats equally in order to keep citizens safe from harm. With these changes made clear progress can be seen towards achieving greater security across all fronts.

Given the fact domestic terrorism is still a growing problem, begs the question on if the policies in place are in fact effective. However, given the focus on domestic terrorism was not enacted in the National Strategy for Counterterrorism as more of a focus until 2021, there is not enough data out yet to determine if the changes have been adequate in their intentions. A few more

years of data will be needed before we can accurately assess the effectiveness of the most recent changes to combat domestic terrorism.

Short and Long-term Implications of Current Policy

The current policy's short-term impact involves intensified surveillance, intelligence gathering, and law enforcement efforts aimed at disrupting potential domestic terrorism plots (White House, The 2022). However, these measures have raised concerns about privacy rights as critics argue that certain approaches may infringe upon individual liberties.

To effectively combat domestic terrorism in the long term requires addressing its root causes such as extremist ideologies, socio economic disparities, and online radicalization. This necessitates targeted community engagement programs that focus on education while also acknowledging underlying grievances to create lasting change within society itself. By taking these steps we can work towards a safer future for all citizens of our country (Doxsee, Jones, et al. 2022).

Policy Effectiveness - Reforms and Changes Needed

To improve the effectiveness of our current policy in dealing with domestic terrorism several changes and reforms are necessary. A key component is allocating more resources towards analyzing and counteracting ideologies that fuel extremist behavior within our borders. This approach will help us better understand how these beliefs operate so we can develop targeted strategies for addressing them effectively. By doing this we'll be able to make significant progress against those who seek harm through violence or intimidation tactics on American soil (Doxsee, Jones, et al. 2022).

Partnerships between law enforcement agencies and local communities are crucial for proactive prevention. Community based initiatives such as community policing and trust building measures have demonstrated promise in identifying potential threats before they escalate into

violence through radicalization. These approaches provide an opportunity to dissuade individuals from taking part in violent acts by addressing their underlying concerns or grievances early on. By working together with the community law enforcement can create a safer environment that fosters cooperation rather than fear.

To effectively address the role of online platforms in radicalization it is essential to collaborate with social media companies on curbing extremist content and recruitment efforts. This should be accomplished while maintaining principles that protect free speech without censorship of legitimate political expression (Ganesh and Bright 2020).

To effectively combat domestic terrorism policymakers must prioritize comprehensive research and evaluation of their policies. Continuous assessment allows for refinement based on empirical evidence and lessons learned, ultimately leading to more effective strategies in the fight against this dangerous threat.

The Allies and Adversaries of the Specific Policy

The National Strategy for Counterterrorism has received backing from a diverse range of stakeholders including law enforcement agencies, intelligence communities, and local governments. These allies are critical to the policies implementation and enforcement efforts.

The policy has been met with opposition from civil liberties advocates who voice concerns about potential infringements on individual rights. The challenge of finding a balance between security measures and safeguarding civil liberties remains contentious, prompting some adversaries to call for revisions that prioritize protecting personal freedoms over all else. The basis for their claims can be found in a report from the Center for Strategic and International Studies titled “The War Comes Home: The Evolution of Domestic Terrorism in the United States.”

The number of fatalities from terrorist attacks in the U.S. homeland is still relatively small compared to some periods in U.S. history, making it important not to

overstate the threat.⁷ Roughly half of the years since 1994 had a greater number of fatalities from terrorism than 2020—at least between January 1 and August 31, 2020. There were also no mass-casualty terrorist attacks, a stark contrast from such incidents as the April 1995 Oklahoma City bombing, which killed 168 people; the September 2001 attacks, which killed nearly 3,000 people; and the June 2016 Orlando attack, which killed 49 people. Still, violence levels in the United States could rise over the next year depending on political polarization. (Jones, et al. 2020)

These findings give major concerns for those opposing drastic policies due to the very possibility that the acclaimed growing threat is not what those making the policies is actually a growing threat that warrants the reduction of personal liberties.

Summary

The National Strategy for Counterterrorism has evolved over time to address domestic terrorism as a significant concern. While this demonstrates the government's commitment towards tackling such threats there is still room for improvement in terms of effectiveness and long-term impact. By focusing on root causes behind these acts while also strengthening community partnerships alongside engaging with online platforms; America can develop an approach that balances democratic principles along with civil liberties when countering domestic terrorism. This will ultimately lead us closer towards achieving our goal of keeping everyone safe from harm's way without compromising fundamental rights or freedoms enjoyed by all citizens under lawful authority.

Threat Assessment: Part III

Threat Problem/Thesis Statement and Introductory Organization

The purpose of this Threat Assessment paper is to conduct a comprehensive analysis of domestic terrorism in the United States. The paper aims to explore the nature, extent, and consequences of this growing threat and assess the existing policies in place to identify and counter any domestic threat. The paper will be organized into several sections to delve into different aspects

of the topic. We will begin by presenting the threat problem and providing a thesis statement that guides our research. The subsequent sections will focus on theoretical perspectives, research methods, findings, policy implications, and the personal application of this research. The conclusion will summarize the key findings and insights gained throughout the paper.

Theory/Theories

In studying domestic terrorism, academics often employ various theoretical perspectives to understand the motivations and dynamics driving extremist actions (Jones, et al. 2020). One of the main theories used is social identity theory. This theory emphasizes how individuals' identification with extremist groups is influenced by the need for social belonging, self-esteem, and a sense of meaning (Borum 2004). Recent research within this theoretical framework has explored the role of social identity, grievances, and perceived threats in fueling extremist ideologies (McCauley and Moskalenko 2020). Additionally, scholars have investigated the influence of ideology, group dynamics, and psychological factors in the radicalization process (Lobato, et al. 2023).

Method

Researchers studying domestic terrorism use a range of research methods to gain insights into the threat. Two commonly used methods are content analysis and case studies (DHS 2019). Content analysis involves systematically analyzing texts, speeches, or online materials to identify patterns and themes related to extremist ideologies and recruitment strategies. Case studies focus on in-depth examination of specific domestic terrorism incidents or groups, providing detailed insights into the factors contributing to their actions (Zeiger and Aly 2015).

The feasibility of these methods varies based on data availability and ethical considerations. Content analysis allows for large-scale analysis but may face challenges related to

the reliability of online data sources (Ranstorp 2007). On the other hand, case studies offer valuable depth but may be limited by access to sensitive or classified information (Ellefsen and Sandberg 2022).

Findings

The analysis of domestic terrorism reveals its multi-faceted nature, characterized by diverse ideologies, tactics, and regional variations (Congressional Research Service 2022). Extremist organizations driven by white supremacy, anti-government sentiments, or religious fundamentalism carry out acts of violence to further their objectives (Kachan 2018) (Doxsee, Jones, et al. 2022) (Smith, Ph.D 2018). The threat poses significant challenges to national security, social cohesion, and public safety, and has surpassed international terrorism as a concern (Hudson and Davidson 2012). Online platforms play a pivotal role in radicalization and recruitment, requiring concerted efforts to address the dissemination of extremist content (Shakhbazian 2021).

Policy

The current policy addressing domestic terrorism in the United States is the National Strategy for Counterterrorism (White House, The 2022) and the first policy ever by the White House under President Joseph R. Biden Jr., the *National Strategy for Countering Domestic Terrorism* (White House, The 2021). Although former policies have evolved to include domestic terrorism, Biden is the first to publish an entire brief focused on domestic acts of terrorism (Doxsee and Harrington 2021). There is definitely room for improvement in this particular brief for its effectiveness against domestic terrorism (White House, The 2023). Strengthening community partnerships and addressing the root causes of extremism are essential components to enhance policy efficacy (Broekhoven 2018). However, the idea of using local and community partnerships is not a novel idea. In Trump's terrorism policy he also focused on bringing in local communities

and police forces to counter acts of terrorism (Davis, et al. 2006) (Doxsee and Harrington 2021). It is vital that the actions of the government do not further divide the country by making false claims about certain segments of the American population. The balancing of security measures with the safeguarding of civil liberties is a complex challenge that policymakers must navigate in order to unite the country and ensure the protection of personal rights and the equal application of the rule of law in our Republic.

Application

Researching domestic terrorism has deepened our understanding of this pressing issue and its implications for national security. The topic's significance today lies in its potential to impact societal trust, political stability, and democratic processes (Tinnes 2021). The information gathered through this research can inform the shaping and maintenance of a strong security policy. By addressing the underlying drivers of domestic terrorism, policymakers can develop targeted interventions, engage communities, and prevent radicalization before it leads to violence (Charvat 2012).

Conclusion

Domestic terrorism is not confined to a single country but is a global phenomenon with varying manifestations and consequences (DOS 2001). It affects nations across different regions, driven by a range of ideologies, grievances, and socio-political factors. The threat of domestic terrorism poses challenges to national security, societal cohesion, and international stability.

To effectively address domestic terrorism globally, cooperation and collaboration among nations are essential. Sharing intelligence, best practices, and lessons learned can contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of the threat and the development of effective counterterrorism

strategies. Additionally, international efforts should focus on addressing root causes, promoting social inclusion, and countering extremist ideologies to prevent the radicalization and recruitment of individuals into domestic terrorist groups.

Understanding the impact of domestic terrorism throughout the world is crucial for policymakers, security agencies, and researchers. By analyzing global trends, case studies, and comparative approaches, stakeholders can gain valuable insights into the underlying dynamics of domestic terrorism and develop strategies that are tailored to specific regional contexts.

In conclusion, domestic terrorism transcends national borders, posing a significant challenge to global security. By recognizing the global nature of the threat and working together, the international community can strive to mitigate the impact of domestic terrorism, safeguard human lives, and foster a more peaceful and inclusive world.

By exploring theoretical perspectives, research methods, findings, policy implications, and personal application, we have gained valuable insights into the complexity of the threat and the importance of robust policy responses. Understanding the multifaceted nature of domestic terrorism is crucial for developing effective strategies that safeguard the nation's security, uphold democratic values, and foster social cohesion.

Bibliography

- Abrahms, Max. 2006. "Why terrorism does not work." *International Security* 31 (2): 42-76.
- ACFSS. 2022. *Africa's Contemporary Security Challenges*. Washington, D.C.: Africa Center For Strategis Studie.
- Agnew, Robert. 2010. "A General Strain Theory of Terrorism." *Theoretical Criminology* 14 (2): 131-153.
- Alava, Séraphin, Divina Frau-Meigs, and Ghayda Hassan. 2017. *Youth and Violent Extremism on Social Media*. Paris: The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.
- Berger, J. M. 2018. *Extremism*. Massachusetts: The MIT Press.
- Borum, Randy. 2004. *Psychology of Terrorism*. Tampa: University of South Florida.
- Broekhoven, Lia van. 2018. "Community-Based Preventive and Remedial Measures to Prevent Violent Extremism." *International Annals of Criminology* 56: 198–219.

- Charvat, J.P.I.A.G. 2012. *Homeland Security Organization in Defence Against Terrorism*. Fairfax: IOS Press.
- Chassman, Alyssa. 2016. "Islamic State, Identity, and the Global Jihadist Movement: How is Islamic State successful at recruiting "ordinary" people?" *Journal for deradicalization* Winter (9): 205-259.
- Congressional Research Service. 2022. *Intelligence Coordination on Domestic Terrorism and Violent Extremism: Background and Issues for Congress*. CRS Report, Washington D.C.: Congressional Research Service.
- Cronin, Audrey Kurth. 2009. "How Terrorism Ends: Understanding the Decline and Demise of Terrorist." *Journal of Terrorism Research* 1 (1).
- Davis, Lois M., Louis T Mariano, Jennifer E Pace, Sarah K Cotton, and Paul Steinberg. 2006. *Combating Terrorism: How Prepared Are State and Local Response Organizations*. Santa Monica: National Defense Research Institute.
- DHS. 2019. *Department of Homeland Security Strategic Framework for Countering Terrorism and Targeted Violence*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Homeland Security.
- Dmitrieva, Aleksandra M, and J. Reid Meloy. 2021. "Troubled Waters: Domestic Terrorism Threat in the U.S. Coast Guard and the TRAP-18." *American Psychological Association* 153-170.
- DOS. 2001. *Patterns of Global Terrorism*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of State.
- Doxsee, Catrina, and Jake Harrington. 2021. "The First U.S. National Strategy for Countering Domestic Terrorism." *Center for Strategic and International Studies* [www.csis.org](https://www.csis.org/analysis/first-us-national-strategy-countering-domestic-terrorism#:~:text=The%20second%20pillar%E2%80%94preventing%20domestic,pathways%20and%20terrorist%20recruitment%20efforts). June 17. <https://www.csis.org/analysis/first-us-national-strategy-countering-domestic-terrorism#:~:text=The%20second%20pillar%E2%80%94preventing%20domestic,pathways%20and%20terrorist%20recruitment%20efforts>.
- Doxsee, Catrina, Seth G. Jones, Jared Thompson, Kateryna Halstead, and Grace Hwang. 2022. "Pushed to Extremes: Domestic Terrorism amid Polarization and Protest." *Center for Strategic and International Studies* [www.csis.org](https://www.csis.org/analysis/pushed-extremes-domestic-terrorism-amid-polarization-and-protest). May 17. <https://www.csis.org/analysis/pushed-extremes-domestic-terrorism-amid-polarization-and-protest>.
- Dr. Mullins, Sam. 2020. *Terrorism in the Indo-Pacific: The Year Gone By and the Road Ahead*. Maxwell AFB: Air University Press.
- Ellefsen, Rune, and Sveinung Sandberg. 2022. "Everyday Prevention of Radicalization: The Impacts of Family, Peer, and Police Intervention." *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*.
- Enders, Walter, and Todd Sandler. 2011. *The Political Economy of Terrorism*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Freilich, Joshua D., William S. Parkin, Jeff Gruenewald, and Steven M. Chermak. 2019. "Comparing Extremist Perpetrators of Suicide and Non-Suicide Attacks in the United States." *Terrorism and Political Violence* 31 (5): 943-965.
- Ganesh, Bharath, and Jonathan Bright. 2020. "Countering Extremists on Social Media." *P&I* 6-19.
- Gunaratna, Rohan, and Stefanie Kam. 2016. *Handbook of terrorism in the Asia-Pacific*. Hackensack: Imperial College Press.
- Hafez, M. 2019. *Salafism in Pakistan: The Religious and Political extremism of the Lashkar-e-Taiba*. Oxford University Press.
- Hogg, Michael A, and Mark J Rinella. 2018. "Social identities and shared realities." *Current Opinion in Psychology* 23: 6-10.

- Hudson, Anna, and Edwin Davidson. 2012. *Domestic Terrorism*. New York: Nova Publishers.
- Jones, Seth G., Catrina Doxsee, James Suber, Grace Hwang, and Nicholas Harrington. 2020. "The War Comes Home: The Evolution of Domestic Terrorism in the United States." *Center for Strategic and International Studies* www.csis.org. October 22. <https://www.csis.org/analysis/war-comes-home-evolution-domestic-terrorism-united-states>.
- Kachan, Konstantin. 2018. "Evolution of Islamic Radicalism During the 19th to 21st Centuries." *Journal for the Study of Religions and Ideologies* 17 (49): 105-119.
- Kaplan, Jeffrey. 2019. "Nothing Is True, Everything Is Permitted: Premodern Religious Terrorism." *Terrorism and Political Violence* 31 (5): 1070-1095.
- Knott, Kim, and Benjamin J. Lee. 2020. "Ideological Transmission in Extremist Contexts: Towards a Framework of How Ideas Are Shared." *Politics, Religion & Ideology* 21 (1): 1-23.
- Kurzman, Charles, Ahsan Kamal, and Hajar Yazdiha. 2017. "Ideology and Threat Assessment: Law Enforcement Evaluation of Muslim and Right-Wing Extremism." *Socius*.
- L., Victoria. 2019. *Terrorism, Violent Extremism, and the Internet: Free Speech Considerations*. CRS Report, Washington, D.C.: Congressional Research Service.
- Lai, Samantha, and Brooke Tanner. 2022. "Examining the intersection of data privacy and civil rights." *Brookings*. 18 July. Accessed July 1, 2023. <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/examining-the-intersection-of-data-privacy-and-civil-rights/>.
- Lindfors, Kate. 2022. "The Levels and Discrepancies of America's Fear of Terrorism." *Student Scholar Symposium Abstracts and Posters*.
- Lobato, Roberto M., Josep García-Coll, José María Martín-Criado, and Manuel Moyano. 2023. "Impact of psychological and structural factors on radicalization processes: A multilevel analysis from the 3N model." *Psychology of Violence*.
- McCauley, Clark, and Sophia Moskalenko. 2020. *Radicalization to Terrorism: What Everyone Needs to Know*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mickolus, E. F., T. Sandler, and H. H. Hess. 2000-2018. *The Changing Patterns of Global Terrorism*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Milanovic, Marko. 2021. *Intelligence Sharing in Multinational Military Operations*. United States Military Academy.
- Moghadam, Assaf, Ronit Berger, and Polina Beliakova. 2014. "Say Terrorist, Think Insurgent: Labeling and Analyzing Contemporary Terrorist Actors." *Perspectives on Terrorism* (Perspectives on Terrorism) 8 (5): 2-17.
- NATO. 2023. "Countering terrorism." *North Atlantic Treaty Organization* www.nato.int. July 19. https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_77646.htm.
- Neumann, Peter. 2016. *Radicalized: New jihadists and the threat to the West*. New York: I.B. Tauris.
- Neumann, Peter, and B. Rogers. 2020. *The New Terrorism: How to fight it and Defeat it*. Routledge.
- Perliger, Arie, and Ami Pedahzur. 2016. "Counter Cultures, Group Dynamics and Religious Terrorism." *Political Studies* 64 (2): 297-314.
- Ranstorp, Magnus. 2007. *Mapping Terrorism Research: State of the Art, Gaps and Future Direction*. New York: Routledge.

- Shakhbazian, Karina. 2021. "Cooperation of States in the Field of Combating Cyber Crime and Approaches to Solving the Problem of Cyber Terrorism." *Actual Problems of International Relations*.
- Silber, Mitchell D., and Arvin Bhatt. 2007. *Radicalization in the West: The Homegrown Threat*. New York: NYPD Intelligence Division.
- Smith, Ph.D, Allison G. 2018. *How Radicalization to Terrorism Occurs in the United States: What Research Sponsored by the National Institute of Justice Tells Us*. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice.
- Tinnes, Judith. 2021. "Bibliography: Terrorism and the Media (including the Internet) Part 1-5." *Perspectives On Terrorism* 179-239.
- Tschantret, Joshua. 2020. "Honor and Terrorism: Cultural Origins of the Severity of Terrorist Attacks." *Social Science Quarterly* 325-346.
- Turk, Austin T. 2015. "Terrorism and Counterterrorism." In *The Handbook of Deviance*, by Erich Goode, 597-608. Malden: John Wiley & Sons, Incorporated.
- White House, The. 2023. "FACT SHEET: President Biden Signs National Security Memorandum to Counter Weapons of Mass Destruction Terrorism and Advance Nuclear and Radioactive Material Security." *www.whitehouse.gov*. March 2.
<https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/statements-releases/2023/03/02/fact-sheet-president-biden-signs-national-security-memorandum-to-counter-weapons-of-mass-destruction-terrorism-and-advance-nuclear-and-radioactive-material-security/#:~:text=To%20coun>.
- . 2022. "National Security Strategy." *www.whitehouse.gov*. October 15.
<https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/10/Biden-Harris-Administrations-National-Security-Strategy-10.2022.pdf>.
- . 2021. "National Strategy for Countering Domestic Terrorism." *www.whitehouse.gov*. June 15.
<https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/National-Strategy-for-Countering-Domestic-Terrorism.pdf>.
- Zeiger, Sara, and Anne Aly. 2015. *Countering Violent Extremism*. Perth: Curtin University.