

Session No. 5

Course Title: Social Dimensions of Disaster, 2nd edition

Session 5: Terrorism: Changing Threat Perceptions and Response Preparedness

1 hr.

Objectives:

- 5.1 Describe key features of the first biological terrorist attack in the U.S.A.
- 5.2 Define and differentiate among terrorism, catastrophic terrorism, international terrorism, and counter terrorism
- 5.3 Differentiate among three types of weapons of mass destruction (WMD)
- 5.4 Differentiate among three types of potential terrorist targets
- 5.5 Discuss five recent examples of terrorist attacks on the U.S.A.
- 5.6 Describe six similarities and differences between responses to natural disasters and terrorist attacks
- 5.7 Summarize five key conclusions from research conducted on responses to the 9-11 attacks
- 5.8 Summarize the major structures for combating terrorism
- 5.9 Discuss three policy issues in terrorism preparedness.

Scope:

In this session students will be introduced to terrorism in its various forms, including catastrophic and international terrorism. Distinctions will be made among weapons of mass destruction and potential types of targets. Similarities with and differences in responses to natural disasters will be highlighted as will illustrative research conclusions based on the 9-11 attacks. Major structures for combating terrorism, including the proposed Department of Homeland Security, and other policy issues in terrorism preparedness will be reviewed. The Department of Homeland Security and other federal emergency management structures will be reviewed in the next session of this course, i.e., Session No. 6 entitled “All-Hazards Emergency Management”.

Readings:

Student Reading:

Miller, Judith, Stephen Engelberg, and William Broad. 2001. *Germs: Biological Weapons and America's Secret War*. New York: Simon and Schuster. (Chapter 1 only; "The Attack," pp. 15-33).

Professor Readings:

Waugh, William L., Jr. 2000. *Terrorism and Emergency Management: Instructor Guide*. Emmitsburg, Maryland: Emergency Management Institute, Federal Emergency Management Agency (especially Chapters 2, 3 and 4 entitled: "The History of Violence and Terrorism in the United States," pp. 2-1 through 2-23; "Domestic Terrorism," pp. 3-1 through 3-27; and "International and Transnational Terrorism," pp. 4-1 through 4-28).

Committee on Science and Technology for Countering Terrorism. 2002. *Making the Nation Safer: The Role of Science and Technology in Countering Terrorism*. Washington, D.C.: The National Academies Press (especially Chapter 1; entitled "Introduction," pp. 25-38).

Jenkins, Philip. 2003. *Images of Terror: What We Can and Can't Know about Terrorism*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Background References:

McEntire, David A., Robie Jack Robinson, and Richard T. Weber. 2001. "Managing the Threat of Terrorism." *IQ Report* 33 (December):1-19.

Spies, Steven C. 2000. "Planning For WMD Terrorism Response: Factors to Consider." *Journal of the American Society of Professional Emergency Planners* 7:1-15.

Miller, Judith, Stephen Engelberg and William Broad. 2001. *Germs: Biological Weapons and America's Secret War*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Rubin, Claire B. and Irmak Renda-Tanali. 2002. "Effects of the Terrorist Attacks of September 11, 2001 on Federal Emergency Management In the U.S." *Journal of the American Society of Professional Emergency Planners* 9:1-18.

Michaels, Sarah. 2001. "Digital Disaster Assistance: How and Why Selected Information Technology Firms Contributed to Recovery Immediately After the September 11, 2001, Terrorist Attacks" (Quick Response Report #141). Boulder, Colorado: Natural Hazards Research and Applications Information Center, University of Colorado.

Stehr, Steven and David Simpson. 2002. "Victim Identification and Management Following the Collapse of the World Trade Center Towers" (Quick Response Report

#148). Boulder, Colorado: Natural Hazards Research and Applications Information Center, University of Colorado.

Mitchell, James, Peter Kabachnik, Robert Donovan, Junko Noguchi and Tom Mitchell. 2001. "Field Observations of Lower Manhattan in the Aftermath of the World Trade Center Disaster: September 30, 2001." (Quick Response Report #139). Boulder, Colorado: National Hazards Research and Applications Information Center, University of Colorado.

General Requirements:

Student Handouts (5-1 through 5-5 appended).

Overheads (5-1 through 5-6 appended).

See individual requirements for each objective.

Objective 5.1 Describe key features of the first biological terrorist attack in the U.S.A.

Requirements:

Start this session with the student exercise and proceed with lecture material specified below.

Use Overheads 5-1 and 5-2.

Remarks:

I. Introduction.

A. **Exercise.**

1. **Remind** students of exercise procedures.
2. **Divide** class into four groups and assign student roles.
 - a. Chair.
 - b. Reporter.
 - c. Timer.
3. **Announce** time limit: 5 minutes.

B. **Display** Overhead 5-1; “Workshop Tasks”.

1. Group 1 – Summarize the sequence of key events that best describe the *salmonella typhimurium* attack in the Dalles, Oregon, in September, 1984.
2. Group 2 – In what ways did the Oregon attack reveal cultural differences and coordination difficulties between law enforcement agencies and various scientific and public health units?
3. Group 3 – How are responses to terrorism similar to and different from those induced by natural disasters? (identify 2 differences and 2 similarities).
4. Group 4 – In what ways may governmental actions designed to increase public safety threaten civil liberties?

C. **Start** discussion.

D. **Stop** discussion.

E. **Display** Overhead 5-2; “Session Overview.”

F. **Review** the nine topics that comprise this session.

1. **Emphasize** breadth and scope is the objective.
2. **Explain** that group reports from groups 3 and 4 will be deferred until later in the session.

II. The Attack.

A. Group 1 report (2 minutes).

B. **Elaborate** as necessary to cover such points as these (based on Miller et al. 2001, pp. 15-33).

1. **Location:** The Dalles, Oregon.
2. **Date:** September 9, 1984 through 1986.
3. **Method:** *salmonella typhimurium* was sprayed and/or sprinkled in at least four (probably ten) restaurants, e.g., salad bars, dressings, coffee creamers (p. 30).

4. **Terrorist group:** The Rajneeshees.

- a. Followers of Bhagwan Shree Rajneesh from Poona, India (p. 15).
- b. Purchased land (64,000 acres) in Wasco County, Oregon (p. 15).
- c. Established a commune; approximately 4,000 (p. 16).

5. **Illness sequence.**

- a. Symptoms start, September 9, 1984.
- b. Reports of illness increase: 751 confirmed with salmonella (p. 19).
- c. Local hospital: all 125 beds filled (p. 19).

6. **Detection sequence.**

- a. Local hospital confirmed salmonella (p. 18).
- b. State health department identified specific salmonella strain (p. 18).
- c. U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Epidemic Intelligence Service (CDC, EIS) assisted in design and conduct of epidemiological study (p. 20).
- d. **Conclusion:** no evidence of **deliberate** contamination (p. 23).

7. **Law enforcement actions.**

- a. Joint Task Force (established after Bhagway press conference; claimed sub-group committed numerous crimes) (p. 24).
 - 1) State Attorney General (in charge).
 - 2) FBI.
 - 3) Local police.
 - 4) State police.
 - 5) County sheriff.

6) Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS).

7) National Guard.

b. **Search** conducted (pp. 24-25).

1) Search warrants.

2) Materials sent to CDC; salmonella confirmed.

3) Evidence of other crimes.

c. Federal **witness protection** program (p. 26).\

d. **Grand Jury** investigations (p. 26).

e. **Arrests** and charges (pp. 31-32).

1) No antiterrorism law in the state of Oregon.

2) Cult members charged with violation of immigration laws and consumer-product tampering.

3) Leaders charged with attempted murder, etc.

f. **Outcomes** (p. 32).

1) Leaders plea no contest; served less than four years in prison.

2) Bhagwan: 10 yr. suspended sentence plus fines of \$400,000; paid and left U.S.A.

C. **Group 2** report (2 minutes).

D. **Elaborate** as necessary to cover such points as these.

1. **Scientific teams:** “If it looks like a horse, don’t think about zebras,” (Miller et al., p. 25).

a. Training.

b. Attitude toward bigotry.

2. **Law enforcement:** culture of suspicion.

3. Organizational **culture clashes**.
4. **Lack** of information **sharing**.

Supplemental Considerations:

This section, and the entire session, could be **expanded** easily through permitting more student discussion time and in-depth **analysis** of the case study (e.g., a two hour session). Within the time constraint of a one hour session, however, the **key messages** of this section are these: 1) case study of first documented terrorist attack using biological material; 2) clash of organizational cultures, i.e., scientific vs. law enforcement.

Objective 5.2 Define and differentiate among terrorism, catastrophic terrorism, international terrorism and counterterrorism.

Requirements:

Use Student Handout 5-1.

Remarks:

- I. Terrorism.
 - A. **Distribute** Student Handout 5-1; “Key Definitions.”
 - B. **Refer** students to definition and highlight key elements.
 1. **Innocent** are attacked.
 2. **The context outside**, i.e., of armed conflict.
 3. **Objective**, i.e., spreading fear and intimidation.
 - C. **Ask students:** “How long, historically speaking, have acts of terrorism been documented?” (**Answer:** through all of recorded history).
 - D. **Ask students:** “Has the U.S. government ever used terrorist tactics?”
 1. **Answer:** yes.
 2. **Example:** “During the Second World War, the U.S. dropped atomic bombs on the civilian populations of Hiroshima and Nagasaki in order to intimidate and demoralize the Japanese so that they would surrender without an Allied invasion.” (Waugh 2000, p. 1-10).

E. **Ask students:** “During the American Revolution did the colonists practice terrorism?”

1. **Answer:** yes.

2. **Example:** “During the American Revolution, the Sons of Liberty dumped tea into Boston harbor to protest British invasion. They also beat, tarred and feathered, and even killed loyal supporters of the King to discourage opposition to the rebel cause.” (Waugh 2000, p. 1-10).

F. **Ask students:** “What recent acts of terrorism have occurred within the U.S.A.?” (briefly discuss recent cases, e.g., 9-11 attacks).

G. **Ask students:** “What about the world scene? What recent instances of terrorism have been in the news?” (briefly discuss recent cases in other countries to emphasize **variety of methods** and **targets**, e.g., suicide bombers, buildings, etc.).

II. Catastrophic terrorism.

A. **Refer** students to definition on Handout 5-1.

B. **Highlight** key elements.

1. **Serious** consequences.

2. **Hard variables.**

a. Deaths.

b. Injuries.

c. Property damage.

3. **Soft variables.**

a. Disruption of key functions.

b. Loss of public confidence.

c. Injury to way of life.

d. Erosion of economic health.

C. **Ask students:** “In what ways do the 9-11 attacks reflect these criteria?”

1. Hard variables.
2. Soft variables.
3. Some might regard the 9-11 attacks at “near-catastrophic.”

D. **Ask** students: “What would be an example of catastrophic terrorism?”

1. Possible explosion of a nuclear bomb.
2. Bioterrorism attack using a strain of smallpox which induces an epidemic.

III. International Terrorism.

A. **Refer** students to definition on Handout 5-1.

B. **Highlight** key elements.

1. Violence or threats.
2. Foreign government.
3. Victims: U.S. residents or foreign nationals in the U.S.A.

C. **Ask students:** “What examples of international terrorism have occurred within the past year or so?”

1. 9-11 attacks.
2. Bombing of USS Cole.

IV. Counterterrorism.

A. **Refer** students to definition on Handout 5-1.

B. **Highlight** key elements.

1. **Objective:** prevent or lessen impact.
2. **Methods:**
 - a. Harden society.
 - b. Make critical systems more resilient.

c. Enhance ability to recover.

C. **Ask** students: “What measures could be taken to harden our society?”

1. **Example:** increased border patrols.

2. **Example:** more rigorous monitoring of student visas.

D. **Ask** students: “What examples can you think of whereby critical systems might be made more resilient?”

1. **Example:** increased security at airports (transportation).

2. **Example:** increased security at nuclear power plants (energy).

Supplemental Considerations:

By presenting the Student Handout as a resource for future work, this section can go quickly. The point is to **sensitize** students to the **four key terms** and elements of their definition. Additionally, they should be introduced to the **complexities** involved in labeling actions as “terrorism.” Like disasters, in general, the labeling process involves making judgments about **values** that are **not shared universally** and are subject to the constraints of history, including **reinterpretations**. Remember, a few U.S. military commanders received accommodations, even had name plaques placed on memorials, for their successful slaughter of the elderly, women, and children during the “liberation” of **Native American Indians** from lands previously guaranteed to them through treaty. For example, the 1864 attack in Kiowa County, Colorado, known as “The Sand Creek Massacre.” (see *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (Vol. 6). 1972. Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., pp. 88A-88B).

Objective 5.3 Differentiate among three types of weapons of mass destruction (WMD).

Requirements:

Use Student Handout 5-2.

Remarks:

I. Nuclear material.

A. **Distribute** Student Handout 5-1; “Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD)”.

B. **Review** various types, e.g., attack on a nuclear power plant.

- C. **Ask** students: “What types of scenarios have you read about wherein some type of nuclear material was involved in a potential terrorist act?”
 - D. **Discuss** a few student generated examples to insure a general understanding of the range and complexity of potential future disasters.
- II. Biological material.
- A. **Refer** students to handout 5-1.
 - B. **Review** the examples of actual attacks during 2001, 1999 and 1984.
 - C. **Emphasize** that the listing on the Handout is very selective, e.g., Waugh (2000) lists many more cases (pp. 3-19 through 3-22).
 - D. Some **pathogens** are **available** relatively easily. Spies (2000) includes items like Ricin which is sold widely as an ornamental flower, venom from snakes, spiders, and other such animals, as well as, materials commonly found in research laboratories.
 - E. **Rapid detection** and treatment **strategies** are complex and not currently well developed, e.g., recall anthrax experiences.
 - F. **Worldwide increase** in number of CBRN incidents (chemical, biological, radiological or nuclear materials).
 - 1. 2000: 73 incidents, including 25 hoaxes.
 - 2. 2001: 628 incidents, including 603 hoaxes.
 - 3. Almost all hoaxes involved **anthrax threats** or suspicions.
 - 4. Source: Dolnik and Pate. 2002, p. 2.
 - G. **Crops and livestock** also are vulnerable for many reasons.
 - 1. Grown over large areas with minimal surveillance.
 - 2. Understaffed plant diagnostic laboratories.
 - 3. Hybrid crops with low levels of genetic diversity.
 - 4. Much seed used actually produced outside U.S.A.

5. “. . . biological agents that could affect crops are more numerous than the pathogens that affect humans, making it more difficult to focus research funding available for efforts to counter agricultural bioterrorism.” Committee on Science and Technology for Countering Terrorism. 2002, p. 78.

H. National **readiness levels** are **low**.

1. **Example:** Department of Health and Human Services surveyed **state programs** early in 2002.
2. **Conclusion:** “Even Florida, the one state deemed ready to receive the National Pharmaceutical Stockpile, still must conduct drills to make sure its plans will work.” (*Pueblo Chieftain*, November 2, 2002, p. 7A).

III. Chemical Material.

- A. **Refer** students to Handout 5-1.
- B. **Review** the example of the attacks on the women’s clinics in Florida wherein butyric acid was used.
- C. **Worldwide trends** from prior years of actual attacks involving CBRN materials have been **stable** when single atypical cases are excluded (Dolnik and Pate 2002).
- D. **Example:** only 9 CBRN fatalities occurred during 2001, while 795 occurred in 2000.
 1. One event accounted for 778 of the 795.
 2. Location: Kanungu, Uganda.
 3. Poisoning of members of doomsday cult, i.e., Movement of the Restoration of the Ten Commandments of God.

Supplemental Considerations:

The message of this brief review is that there are **three** major types of **weapons of mass destruction** (WMD). Some professors may wish to expand on this section, but the brief presentation outlined accomplishes the objective within the context of the overall session.

Objective 5.4 Differentiate among three types of potential terrorist targets.

Requirements:

Use Overhead 5-3.

Remarks:

- I. Introduction.
 - A. **Display** Overhead 5-3; “Potential Terrorists Targets.”
 - B. **Briefly review** each of the categories as noted below.
- II. Nuclear and Radiological.
 - A. **Ask** students: “What would be an example of a potential target of this type?”
 - B. **Example:** nuclear power plant.
- III. Human and Agricultural Health Systems.
 - A. **Ask** students: “What about this area, what would be an example of this type of target?”
 - B. **Examples:**
 1. Smallpox or anthrax.
 2. Contamination of crops.
- IV. Toxic Chemical and Explosives.
 - A. **Ask** students: “What would be example targets for this type?”
 - B. **Examples:**
 1. Attack on a chemical manufacturing plant.
 2. Cause a transportation accident with truck or ship loaded with explosive materials.
- V. Information Technology.
 - A. **Ask** students: “What about information technology? How could that represent a target for terrorists?”
 - B. **Examples:**

1. Introduce computer virus into financial systems.
2. Disrupt communication facilities.
3. Disrupt Internet.

VI. Energy Systems.

A. **Ask** students: “What about energy systems? In what ways do they represent a vulnerability for terrorists?”

B. **Examples:**

1. Attacks on electric-power grids.
2. Bombing of hydro-electric generating facility (dam).

VII. Transportation System.

A. **Ask** students: “Beyond using aircraft as the 9-11 terrorists did, what vulnerabilities do our transportation systems reflect?”

B. **Examples:**

1. Bombing of rail tracks or bridges to cause crashes.
2. Simultaneous food poisoning attacks on cruise ships; resultant decline in future bookings.

VIII. City Infrastructure.

A. **Ask** students: “What examples can you envision, wherein terrorist groups might attack aspects of a city infrastructure?”

B. **Examples:**

1. Bomb several community emergency operations centers.
2. Contamination of several hospital facilities, e.g., anthrax.

IX. Source: Adapted from Committee on Science and Technology for Countering Terrorism. 2002, pp. 39-266.

Supplemental Considerations:

This section could be **expanded** easily through additional student input. Within the context of this session, the message is to **increase student awareness** of the scope of vulnerability. The emphasis should be on the enormous **variety of targets** and the interdependencies among them that permit widespread disruption through relatively small scale attacks.

Objective 5.5 Discuss five recent examples of terrorist attacks on the U.S.A.

Requirements:

Student Handout 5-3.

Remarks:

- I. Introduction.
 - A. **Distribute** Student Handout 5-3; “Examples of Terrorist Attacks.”
 - B. **Emphasize** this Handout as a future resource.
 - C. **Briefly review** several of the examples in the different categories (see Handout 5-3 for case details).
- II. Domestic Terrorist Attacks.
 - A. **Individuals**, e.g., McVey and Nichols.
 - B. **Organized** groups, e.g., Georgia Militia.
- III. International Terrorist attacks.
 - A. **Examples:**
 1. October 14, 2002. Bali, Indonesia (see Handout).
 2. Waugh (2000) research regarding events between 1979 and 1999.
 - a. 1987 – largest number – 666 attacks.
 - b. Average: 460 per year.
 - B. **Events during 2000.**

1. *Patterns of Global Terrorism – 2000*; annual report from U.S. State Department.
2. **Encourage** students to **visit** this Internet URL for updated and expanded information, i.e., Department of State.gov.
3. **Most frequent attacks** occurred in: India, Sierra Leone, and Columbia.
4. **Additional examples:** see Handout.
 - a. March 20, 2000. El Salvador.
 - b. July 31, 2000. Nigeria.
 - c. August 11, 2000. Columbia.
 - d. October 19, 2000. Sri Lanka.

Supplemental Considerations:

The message of this section is to emphasize the **diversity** among domestic and international attacks. Americans traveling in many parts of the world, in whatever capacity, i.e., business, tourists, students are at **risk**. Within the U.S.A., however, **militant** groups, including foreign agents, represent an increased threat to public safety. Through this brief introduction to examples of attack, students will have an **expanded awareness** of the scope, frequency, and diversity of this threat.

Objective 5.6 Describe six similarities or differences between responses to natural disasters and terrorist attacks.

Requirements:

Use Overhead 5-4.

Remarks:

- I. Introduction.
 - A. **Group 3 report** (2 minutes).
 - B. **Display** Overhead 5-4; “Natural Disasters vs. Attacks.”
 - C. **Elaborate** briefly and integrate student report with items displayed (adapted from McEntire et al. 2001).

- II. Two types of counterterrorism activities.
 - A. **Consequence management:** primarily an emergency management function, i.e., protect public health and restore essential services.
 - B. **Crisis management:** primarily a law enforcement function, i.e., anticipation, prevention, prosecution.
- III. Mitigation.
 - A. **Focus of threat assessments.**
 - 1. Natural disasters as vulnerabilities.
 - 2. Monitoring of potential terrorist groups.
 - 3. Identification of potential terrorist targets, e.g., sporting venues, government buildings, etc.
 - B. **Non-structural mitigations.**
 - 1. **Example:** setback parking requirements for buildings, airports, and other critical facilities.
 - 2. **Example:** use of armed guards to protect facilities like dams.
 - 3. **Example:** metal detectors at schools.
 - 4. **Example:** terrorism insurance as a parallel to fire, liability, or flood.
- IV. Preparedness.
 - A. **Planning Requirements.**
 - 1. Role of law enforcement and public health.
 - 2. Rapid federal level involvement.
 - 3. Protective equipment requirements, e.g., exposure to CBN materials.
 - B. **Political leaders as targets.**
 - 1. Any natural disaster may impact.
 - 2. Political leaders may be priority so as to maximize disruption.

3. **Example:** anthrax in U.S. Capital.

V. Response.

A. **Similarities.**

1. Warning.
2. Evacuation.
3. Search and rescue.
4. Public information.

B. **Additional requirements.**

1. Responder safety.
2. Decontamination of impact area.
3. Crime scene protection.
4. Donations: funds, events and goods.

VI. Recovery.

A. **Impact site.**

1. Debris removal vs. criminal investigation.
2. Mass casualties.
3. Rebuilding decisions.

B. **Emotional trauma.**

1. Gods's will vs. the enemy.
2. Short-term vs. long-term adjustments.

Supplemental Considerations:

Emphasize that the next course session will detail the complex network of **structures** that comprise all-hazards emergency management. The message of this session is a quick **introduction** to some of the **unique challenges** for emergency managers represented by

terrorism. Professor **review** of McEntire et al. (2001) prior to this session could provide additional materials for lecture and/or class discussion questions if this section is expanded.

Objective 5.7 Summarize five key conclusions from research conducted on responses to the 9-11 attacks.

Requirements:

Overhead 5-5.

Student Handout 5-4.

Remarks:

- I. Introduction.
 - A. **Emphasize:** since the 9-11 attacks, numerous research studies have been conducted.
 - B. **Four examples:**
 1. Illustrate the **range** and **variety**.
 2. Illustrate **aspects** of the social dimension.
 - C. **Distribute** Student Handout 5-4; “Citations: Examples of Post 9-11 Research.”
 1. **Emphasize:** student resource as note taking device.
 2. **Examples** of “Quick Response Research”; funded through the Natural Hazards Research and Applications Information Center, University of Colorado (noted in Session No. 2).
 3. **Review** author affiliations; reflects disciplinary focus.
 - a. Rubin and Renda-Tanali – private consultant, both affiliated with George Washington University, Institute for Crisis, Disaster, and Risk Management.
 - b. Michaels – School of Planning, University of Waterloo.
 - c. Stehr and Simpson – Stehr, Department of Political Science and Criminal Justice, Washington State University; Simpson,

Department of Urban and Public Affairs, University of Louisville.

- d. Mitchell et al. – Department of Geography, Rutgers University and graduate students in his department.
4. **Ask** students: “As reflected in their article titles, how do these departmental affiliations, reflect the types of research questions posed?”
 - a. **Example:** Rubin and Renda-Tanali; focus on governmental needs and reforms.
 - b. **Example:** Stehr and Simpson; focus on victim identification.
5. **Display** Overhead 5-5; “Example Conclusions From Post 9-11 Research.”

II. Key Findings: Rubin and Renda-Tanali (2002).

A. **Range** of impacts.

1. **Rapid** media coverage; many witnessed second airplane crash via television.
2. Many governmental **officials** were informed via **television** which triggered **immediate** mobilization.
3. First responder **deaths**.
4. Economic and financial **costs**.
 - a. Direct: property and equipment damages.
 - b. Indirect: business interruption; tourism losses; airline losses; stock exchange.

B. **Response** weaknesses.

1. Emergency Operations Centers (some damaged).
2. Organizational and interorganization coordination (has been criticized).

C. **Outcomes**.

1. Increased national public awareness of terrorism (altered threat perception).
2. Increased public awareness of emergency management.
3. Numerous reports and documents, including three Executive Orders and two Homeland Security Presidential Directives.

D. **Knowledge vs. political will:** “It would appear that the information and knowledge about what to do already existed before Sept. 11th. What was lacking was the political backing for change and the political will to act.” (p. 14).

III. Key Findings: Michaels (2001).

A. **What assistance** was provided?

1. What they did normally, but **donated** this time.
2. WERT (Wireless Emergency Response Team).
 - a. **Created** on evening of 9-11.
 - b. **Aided** search and rescue: detected signals from victims trapped.
3. Various donations by staff, including blood.

B. How was **assistance provided**?

1. Helped traditional emergency responders.
2. Business-to-business.
3. Existing industry associations.
4. New emergent groups.

C. How did **firms decide** on what to do?

1. Prior experience.
2. Plan in place.
3. Current customers as priority.

IV. Key Findings: Stehr and Simpson (2002).

A. **Past research conclusions.**

1. Short time frame.
 - a. SAR to save lives.
 - b. Body identification for family closure activities.
2. Official response.
 - a. Initial volunteer help.
 - b. Death certificates, etc., required.

B. **Four ways** WTC collapse differed from other disasters.

1. **Impact scene:** “Ground Zero”.
 - a. Disaster operations area.
 - b. Crime scene.
 - c. Mass grave.
 - d. National point of grieving.
2. **One, two punch.**
 - a. Air crashes mobilized first responders.
 - b. WTC collapse changed victim profile.
3. **Acute pressures on officials.**
 - a. Surprise attack.
 - b. Terrorism cause.
 - c. Extensive and rapid media coverage.
 - d. Protection of crime scene.
4. **Number of victims.**

- a. Prior events in **recent** U.S.A. history; maximum death tolls averaged 200 or so.
- b. “Mass causality” event redefined.
- c. Duration of victim identification task (weeks, not hours).

C. Emergency management lessons.

1. Mass causality events must be anticipated.
2. Logistical issues must be included in plans,.
3. Information management requirements.
4. Future research required.

V. Key Findings: Mitchell et al. (2001).

A. Construction of posters.

1. **Insights** into response and priorities.
2. **Number:** tens to hundreds of thousands estimated.

B. Types of posters.

1. 17 different types identified.
2. Diversity in purpose.
 - a. Poems, paintings, etc., expressed empathy.
 - b. Religious tracts.
 - c. Political commentary.
 - d. Government safety information.
 - e. Requests for supplies.
 - f. Pets without owners.

C. Frequency of type.

1. Most common (mourning event and victims).

- a. **Example:** childrens' messages.
 - b. **Example:** poems, paintings, and quotations.
 - c. **Example:** expression of empathy, thanks, and inspiration.
 - d. **Example:** candles, flowers, icons.
2. Very common (missing persons information).
3. Common (5 types).
- a. **Example:** religious or political commentary.
 - b. **Example:** community announcements.
 - c. **Example:** thanks to helpers.
4. Least common (10 types).
- a. **Example:** solidarity with vulnerable minorities,.
 - b. **Example:** election campaign.
 - c. **Example:** appeals to customers.

Supplemental Considerations:

These four **selected** studies reinforce the similarities and the differences in the emergency management issues between terrorist attacks and other forms of disaster. They also illustrate the enormous **scope** and **complexity** of the required **research agenda**. If this session is expanded into a two hour unit, student understanding could be enriched through **discussion** of **additional** research topics. For example, ask students: “What other types of research questions do you believe should be posed that are related to the 9-11 attacks?” Ask students: “What other types of research or responses to terrorism should be studied?”

Objective 5.8 Summarize the major structures for combating terrorism.

Requirements:

Student Handout 5-5.

Remarks:

- I. Introduction.
 - A. More **depth** in next session: Session No. 6 entitled “All-Hazards Emergency Management”.
 - B. **Numerous** changes in Federal structures (examples).
 1. Airport security:
 - a. Creation of federalized security standards.
 - b. Transportation Security Administration (TSA).
 2. Post security (heightened surveillance capacity).
 3. Border security.
 - a. Immigration and Naturalization Service.
 - b. U.S. Border Patrol.
 4. Military operations.
 - a. Northern Command established.
 - b. Location: Colorado Springs, Colorado (Peterson Air Force Base).
 - c. Mission: coordination of military units fighting terrorism.
 - C. **Creation** of the Homeland Security Office and Homeland Security Council.
 1. **Created** by two Homeland Security Presidential Directives.
 2. **Announced proposal** for cabinet level department in June, 2002. (passed by Congress and signed by President in November, 2002).
 3. **Distribute** Student Handout 5-5; “Proposed Department of Homeland Security.”
 4. Briefly **review** the core units and functions.
 5. **Established** the “Homeland Security Advisory System” (Five Threat Conditions).

- a. Low = green.
- b. Guarded = blue.
- c. Elevated = yellow.
- d. High = orange.
- e. Severe = red.
- f. Source: Office of Homeland Security. 2002. "Homeland Security Presidential Directive – 3."

II. Federal Agency responsibilities (illustrative) (adapted from Waugh 2000, pp. 7-15 through 7-16).

A. Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI).

- 1. Deals with domestic terrorist individuals.
- 2. Coordinates law enforcement and national security efforts.

B. Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).

- 1. Consequence management.
- 2. Coordinates federal agencies in support of state and local governments.

C. Department of Defense (DOD).

- 1. Training teams for NBC responses.
- 2. Equipment transfers to state and local agencies.

D. Department of Health and Human Services.

- 1. Identification of toxic agents.
- 2. Decontamination: people and facilities.
- 3. Mass care for infected and/or contaminated.

III. State Government responsibilities and initiatives (adapted from National Emergency Management Association. 2001).

A. Preparedness planning.

1. Most states had terrorism task forces or WMD working groups prior to the 9-11 attacks.
2. At least 18 states created new task forces, commissions or advisory panels.

B. Point of Contact.

1. Single point for terrorism preparedness.
2. Location of function varies by state.
 - a. Office of Emergency Management – 26 states.
 - b. Office of Homeland Security – 8 states.
 - c. Adjutant General – 4 states.
 - d. Other (e.g., lieutenant governor) – 4 states.

C. Public Health.

1. Significant increase in contact with emergency management and law enforcement.
2. Guidelines and procedures for suspicious mail.
3. Public information.

D. Legislative Initiatives.

1. **Example:** exemptions from Freedom of Information Act laws, e.g., sensitive terrorism preparedness information such as threat and vulnerability analyses.
2. **Example:** Emergency Management Assistance Compact (EMAC), i.e., interstate mutual aid agreement (43 states and 2 territories are members as of December, 2001).

IV. Local Government initiatives.

- A. Enhanced preparedness planning.
- B. **Example** of Homeland Security requests (Denver, Colorado, 2002).

1. \$2,700,000: acquiring a backup facility for 911 emergency system.
2. \$1,500,000: additional training for emergency and transportation workers.
3. \$350,000: emergency response kits and protective suits for workers in the “warm zone”.
4. \$250,000: thermal imagers and wireless remote TV camera system.
5. \$150,000: additional radio equipment for responders.
6. \$150,000:hydraulic rescue tools and saws, miscellaneous medical equipment and field computers.
7. Source: *Rocky Mountain News*, November 15, 2002, p. 25A.

Supplemental Considerations:

Emphasize to students that the next session of the course, No. 6 entitled “All-Hazards Emergency Management” will cover the basic structures in much more detail. The message here is provide a **brief overview** of illustrative structures related to terrorism preparedness and to introduce the idea of **intergovernmental partnerships**.

Objective 5.9 Discuss three policy issues in terrorism preparedness.

Requirements:

Overhead 5-6.

Remarks:

- I. Introduction.
 - A. Group 4 report (2 minutes).
 - B. **Elaborate** as necessary: public safety vs. civil liberties.
 1. **Example:** state legislation to constrain inquiry through Freedom of Information Act.
 2. **Example:** suspected terrorists defined as “persons of suspicion” but not officially charged.
 3. **Example:** establishment of “secret” files on citizens.

4. **Example:** delay in access to legal council for suspected terrorists.,

II. Other Issues.

A. **Display Overhead 5-6;** “Issues in Terrorism Preparedness.”

B. **Alternative Perspectives:** emergency management vs. law enforcement.

1. Organizational cultures.
2. Need for secrecy during investigation vs. open information sharing.
3. Disaster scene: victim assistance vs. crime scene protection.

C. **Protection of Civil Liberties vs. citizen safety** (covered by discussion of Workshop report).

D. **Public Health Issues:** Response vs. Inoculation.

1. Example: should public inoculations for smallpox be initiated prior to an attack?
2. Example: who decided when anti-anthrax drugs should be distributed?
3. Example: What **range** and **quantity** of response medications should be stockpiled?

E. **Funding Priorities:** emergency management vs. other social problems.

1. Assistance for elderly.
2. “Normal” crime prevention programs,.
3. Improved educational systems.
4. Expanded transportation systems.

Supplemental Considerations:

This brief section will encourage **critical thinking** regarding terrorism within the broader context of **societal policy issues** and funding constraints. Depending on professorial interest and course context, this section could be expanded through use of **recent media reports**. Such expansion would enhance student awareness of the linkages between the course and ongoing policy debates. Some professors may incorporate a more **critical analysis** of public information on terrorism. The analysis by Jenkins (2003) is

recommended. His assessment of the strategies used to **socially construct** the “ownership” of the terrorism problem and related issues would greatly enhance student understanding of the complexities inherent in these matters.

Course Developer References:

- I. *2002 Britannica Book of the Year*. 2002. Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc.
- II. Committee on Science and Technology for Countering Terrorism. 2002. *Making the Nation Safer: The Role of Science and Technology in Countering Terrorism*. Washington, D.C.: The National Academies Press.
- III. Dolnik, Adam and Jason Pate. 2002. “2001 WMD Terrorism Chronology.” Monterey, California: Chemical and Biological Weapons Nonproliferation Program (CBWNP), Monterey Institute of International Studies’ Center for Nonproliferation Studies. <http://cns.miis.edu/pubs/reports/cbrnzkl.htm> (accessed October 31, 2002).
- IV. *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (Volume 6). 1972. Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc.
- V. Jenkins, Philip. 2003. *Images of Terror: What We Can and Can’t Know about Terrorism*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- VI. McEntire, David A., Robie Jack Robinson, and Richard T. Weber. 2001. “Managing the Threat of Terrorism.” *IQ Report* 33 (December):1-19.
- VII. Michaels, Sarah. 2001. “Digital Disaster Assistance: How and Why Selected Information Technology Firms Contributed to Recovery Immediately After the September 11, 2001, Terrorist Attacks” (Quick Response Report #141). Boulder, Colorado: Natural Hazards Research and Applications Information Center, University of Colorado.
- VIII. Miller, Judith, Stephen Engelberg, and William Broad. 2001. *Germs: Biological Weapons and America’s Secret War*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- IX. Mitchell, James, Peter Kabachnik, Robert Donovan, Junko Noguchi and Tom Mitchell. 2001. “Field Observations of Lower Manhattan in the Aftermath of the World Trade Center Disaster: September 30, 2001.” (Quick Response Report #139). Boulder, Colorado: Natural Hazards Research and Applications Information Center, University of Colorado.
- X. National Emergency Management Association. 2001. *Trends In State Terrorism Preparedness.*, Washington, D.C.: National Emergency Management

- Association.
http://www.nemaweb.org/Trends_in_Terrorism_Preparedness/index.htm
(accessed October 31, 2002).
- XI. *Natural Hazards Observer*. 2002. 27 (September):7.
- XII. Office of Homeland Security. 2002. "Homeland Security Presidential Directive – 3". Washington, D.C.: Office of Homeland Security.
http://www.iaem.com/body_homeland_security_advisory_sys.html (accessed October 31, 2002).
- XIII. Office of Homeland Security. 2002. "The Department of Homeland Security: President George W. Bush (June, 2002)." Washington, D.C.: Office of Homeland Security.
- XIV. *Pueblo Chieftain*, November 2, 2002, p. 7A.
- XV. *Rocky Mountain News*, September 11, 2002, p. 45.
- XVI. Rubin, Claire B. and Irmak Renda-Tanali. 2002. "Effects of the Terrorist Attacks of September 11, 2001 on Federal Emergency Management in the U.S." *Journal of the American Society of Professional Emergency Planners* 9:1-18.
- XVII. Spies, Steven C. 2000. "Planning For WMD Terrorism Response: Factors to Consider." *Journal of the American Society of Professional Emergency Planners* 7:1-15.
- XVIII. Stehr, Steven and David Simpson. 2002. "Victim Identification and Management Following the Collapse of the World Trade Center Towers" (Quick Response Report #148). Boulder, Colorado: Natural Hazards Research and Information Center, University of Colorado.
- XIX. *USA Today*, October 15, 2002, p. 6A.
- XX. U.S. Department of State. 2001. *Patterns of Global Terrorism – 2000*. Washington, D.C.: Office of the Coordinator for Counterterrorism, U.S. Department of State. <http://www.state.gov/s/ct/r/s/pgtrpt/2000/2419.htm> (accessed October 31, 2002).
- XXI. Waugh, William L., Jr. 2000. *Terrorism and Emergency Management: Instructor Guide*. 2000. Emmitsburg, Maryland: Emergency Management Institute, Federal Emergency Management Agency.