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Abstract

Terrorists conducted a brazen attack on United States’ soil on September 11, 2001, that attacked the conscious of Americans everywhere. The terrorists attacked on a grand scale on that day. An attack on that scale did not seem feasible from that day forward. Since then there has
been growing concern for lone wolf terror attacks by those following radical ideology. The lone wolf attacker has limited, or no affiliation, with terrorist groups making them difficult to track and stop. There have been ninety-six known terror attacks or foiled plots since the attacks on September 11\textsuperscript{th} with sixty-six of those perpetrated by lone wolves. The exact number of attacks or plots cannot be known without classified information from closed sources. A review of the terror plots and attacks revealed the lone wolf tactics, techniques, and procedures (TTP’s). Of the sixty-six attacks by lone wolf terrorists, fourteen occurred within the confines of a “sanctuary city”; an immigration enforcement safe haven. State, local, and federal cooperation is key to disrupt future lone wolf terror attacks. A cohesive relationship between all stakeholders is the only method to deny a lone wolf from perpetrating attacks on innocents within Homeland. Legislation and jurisdictional cooperation are a necessity to utilize field intelligence to the fullest.

\textit{Keywords:} lone wolf, radical, jihadist, immigration, terrorism
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

“Terrorism, too, must be excised wherever it exists, which will take years, and which can't happen without the total commitment and the everyday involvement of the American people.”

- David Hackworth, Colonel, United States Army, January 3, 2002.

Background of the Problem

Radical jihadist lone wolf attacks in the United States have increased each year since the September 11, 2001, attacks. Lone wolf attackers receive no direct orders from a leader to attack; they use whatever weapons are available to them, from firearms to bladed weapons to explosives. Lone wolf perpetrators move to the forefront of concern after every uncovered plot or attack is carried out. They are unpredictable.

Omar Mateen, a lone wolf attacker with radical jihadist beliefs, killed 49 innocent people and injured 53 when he attacked a popular nightclub in Orlando, Florida (Smiley, 2016). Before the attack, Mateen stated on the social media platform, Facebook, that there would be an Islamic state attack in the United States. This warning was unheeded.

The federal government spends billions of dollars each fiscal year to support counterterrorism and homeland security operations within its borders at the federal level. The state and local governments respond to lone wolf attacks first. In 2015 and 2016, the federal government did not respond first to any lone wolf terror attack in the United States.
The laws of the United States afford federal authorities the power to detain suspected lone wolf attackers based on their immigration status and probable cause. The authority to detain an individual based on immigration status is limited in state and local law enforcement. The federal government may grant this authority to state and local law enforcement officials. The political climate surrounding immigration enforcement at the state and local level is heating up under the current administration.

The immigration status of each lone wolf attacker is under scrutiny by lawmakers and federal authorities. The immigration status plays an important role in the detention and removability of alleged lone wolf attackers. Removing or detaining a threat before the attack is a method of disruption before the loss of life.

**Problem Statement**

The terrorist attacks carried out by Al Qaeda on September 11, 2001, changed the landscape of law enforcement in the United States at all levels: local, state, and federal. The United States focused efforts on stopping large-scale terror attacks but supplied limited efforts to curb small-scale attacks. The United States has seen a marked increase in lone-wolf attacks in the past decade. There is limited data or studies to determine if lone wolf attacks can be disrupted or stopped using federal resources. This study examines whether methods are available that local, state, and federal resources can combine to address lone wolf attacks and prevent them before they occur.

**Purpose of the Study**

This qualitative study explores methods to disrupt or stop radical jihadist lone wolf terrorist attacks in the United States at the state and local government levels using assistance from federal agencies. The study examines known law enforcement methods to ascertain the ability to stop lone actor terror attacks by bridging the gap between state & local officials and federal agencies. The research analyzes past attacks with an understanding of the attacker's footprint to discover methods to prevent future attacks. The footprint includes but is not limited to, social media use, past criminal conduct, weapons usage, and immigration status.

**Research Questions**

This study examines lone wolf plots and attacks carried out by foreign-born or homegrown actors that follow radical jihadist ideology. In addition, the study focuses on events taking place within the United States during the period 9/11 to 2017. The following questions are the basis for this study:

- Can the immigration status of potential attackers be used to disrupt attacks?
- Did any of the previous lone wolf attackers plot to attack a sanctuary city?
- Can lone wolf attackers be identified by their social media footprint using federal open source intelligence analysis?

**Research Hypotheses (H)**
Some state and local agencies do not have a working relationship with immigration officials based on their jurisdictional status as a sanctuary city.

Lone wolf attackers can be identified and legally detained before they attack based on open source intelligence data provided by the federal government.

The terrorist tactics, techniques, and procedures used by prior lone wolf attackers (post 9/11 to July 2017) show immigration authority can be used to identify methods to deport alien lone wolves.

Significance of the Study

The purpose of this study is to analyze the relationship between state, local, and federal agencies to determine if radical jihadist lone wolf attacks can be disrupted. The significance of this study is to ascertain if methods exist to effectively disrupt or stop attacks before the loss of innocent people. The study seeks to determine if state/local agencies actively work with federal agencies. The study culminates with discovering methods to use federal resources to remove or detain lone wolf attackers before they attack.

Definition of Terms

Active Shooter. The Federal Bureau of Investigation defines an active shooter as an individual actively engaged in killing or attempting to kill people in a populated area.

Alien. Any person, not a citizen or national of the United States. “Foreign national” is a synonym and used outside of statutes when referring to noncitizens of the United States.

Alienage is the official status of an alien. In immigration, alienage is the legal status of the person.

Domestic Terrorism encompasses dangerous activities within the territorial jurisdiction of the United States that violate US criminal laws and appear to be intended to intimidate or coerce a civilian population, to influence the policy of a government, or affect the conduct of a government by mass destruction, assassination, or kidnapping (Mueller, 2002).

Lone Wolf is defined as an individual, acting alone, committing political violence, who does not receive direct orders from a leader (Hamm & Spaaj, 2015).

Mass Murderer the killing or attempted killing of multiple people in a distinct, populated area that may occur at one or multiple locations, however, if multiple attacks occur, the time between violent events will be limited to several hours up to several days (Hagan, Podlogar, & Joiner, 2015).

Radical is defined “as believing or expressing the belief that there should be great or extreme social, economic, or political change” (Dictionary, 2017).

Sanctuary City. A “sanctuary city” is a state or local jurisdiction that does not cooperate in part or whole with federal immigration authorities (Bernal, 2017).
Terrorism is the use of force intended to influence or instigate a course of action that furthers a political or social goal.

Assumptions

The open source data was assumed to be valid with a majority of the information being peer-reviewed. The researcher expected there is a need to prevent future lone wolf attacks.

Limitations

This study is limited to open source information available from scholarly and reputable internet sites. The researcher could not gain access to official police reports, classified intelligence information, or other sources to gather quantitative data. The qualitative data was limited to studies of previous research; limited government open source investigative reports; newspaper articles; and reports to government officials.

Organization of the Dissertation

This chapter provided an overview of the problem of radical jihadist lone wolf attackers in the United States. Chapter 2 is a review of the literature supporting this study. Chapter 3 provides the methodology used to analyze the existing data. Chapter 4 is the discussion of the results. The final chapter provides the study’s overview, conclusion, and suggestions for future studies.

CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The purpose of this study is to discover methods to disrupt or stop radical jihadist lone wolf attacks by identifying the tactics, techniques, and procedures of previous lone wolf subjects. The study’s research analyzes methods of disrupting attacks by identifying the deporting and/or detaining, the suspected lone wolf. In conducting this literature review, several open-source databases will be reviewed with a focus on peer-reviewed articles.

A month cannot go by without news of an attack by a lone actor with radical beliefs, whether domestically or abroad. On May 22, 2017, a suspected lone wolf attacker detonated an improvised explosive device at Britain’s Manchester arena killing twenty-two innocents and injuring fifty-nine (Chandran, 2017). In July 2016, a lone wolf attacker used a truck to kill eighty-four people (Chrisafis, & Fishcer, 2016). The attacks occurred during high-profile events with large crowds; one a popular concert and one a parade.

Different radical ideologies drive the lone wolf attacker. These ideologies range from religion to hate to anti-government beliefs to unexplained issues. The lone wolf can attack at the spur of the moment, plans their attacks in advance, attack on their own, attack based on a
leader’s guidance, or unknown reasons making it seemingly impossible to track and stop. The lone wolf acts alone without direct guidance from a leader.

The Georgetown University’s National Security Critical Issue Task Force (NSCITF) authorized a study of lone wolf terrorism. Two members of the NSCITF, Connor & Flynn (2015) stated that lone wolf terrorism is:

The deliberate creation and exploitation of fear through violence or threat of violence committed by a single actor who pursues political change linked to a formulated ideology, whether his own or that of a larger organization, and who does not receive orders, direction, or material support from outside sources. (p. 9).

Former FBI Director Robert S. Mueller, III, testified before the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence of the United States Senate on February 11, 2003. Director Mueller laid out the FBI’s successes and efforts since the 9/11 attacks. The speech did not just relay the FBI’s successes but cautioned that embedded jihadist radicals are in the United States and capable of attacking with little or no forewarning. The Director spoke of rising popularity of singleton (i.e. lone wolf) attacks by those loosely affiliated or compassionate with Al Qaeda because of successful attacks. Proving to be true with dozens of attacks since the 2003 speech. Director Mueller (2003) stated:

I am particularly concerned about loosely affiliated terrorists and lone offenders, which are inherently difficult to interdict given the anonymity of individuals that maintain limited or no links to established terrorist groups but act out of sympathy with a larger cause (p.1).

According to Hamm & Spaaj (2015), there have been sixty lone wolf attacks from 9/11 to 2015. Of the sixty attacks, fifteen were law enforcement sting operations. The attacks continued as Director Mueller prophesied they would.

**Lone Wolf Versus Active Shooter**

There is a difference between lone wolf attacks and active shooters. Historically, lone wolf attackers did not target law enforcement or military, but since the 9/11 attacks, the lone wolf has begun targeting uniformed personnel. An active duty Army Major attacked and killed thirteen innocent civilians at Ft. Hood, Texas in 2009. In July 2015, a lone wolf attacked two military recruiting stations in Tennessee killing four service members.

A lone wolf’s motives spawn from a feeling of deprivation according to Hamm & Spaaj (2015). The lone wolf feels deprived of a right and feels aggrieved enough to follow the path of set ideology, in the case of this research, radical jihadist beliefs, as in the case of U.S. Army Major Nidal Hasan. Hasan felt the United States was attacking Islam. Hasan may have used this to fuel his lone wolf attack on his fellow soldiers and innocent civilians. In 2009, Hasan used firearms to attack and kill thirteen innocent victims and injure thirty-four (Stewart & Burton 2009).
The United States government defines an active shooter as “an individual actively engaged in killing or attempting to kill people in a confined and populated area” with the use of a firearm (Schweit, 2015). Most active shooter attacks happened in malls or other areas of commerce and educational institutions.

The main difference between a lone wolf attacker and an active shooting is the randomness of the attack. The active shooter attacks random people usually after some catalyst event; domestic issues, psychotic feelings, etc. The active shooter can still initiate their attack on a personal target of choice. Upon execution, the active shooter chooses targets of opportunity.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) conducted a study of active shooter incidents in the United States between 2000 and 2013 (FBI, 2013). The FBI states an active shooter is a sole individual acting alone and not a member of a group. The FBI further states an active shooter is shooting in progress in a confined space with the use of a firearm. There were one hundred and sixty incidents examined. Sixty-four of the active shooters killed themselves after the act.

A lone wolf is defined as an individual, acting alone, committing political violence, who do not receive direct orders from a leader (Hamm & Spaaj, 2015). The lone wolf terrorist differs from an active shooter because of ideology. The lone wolf terrorist attacks are based on a radical ideology that can align with other terror groups. The lone wolf is not directly affiliated with any one organization.

A Lone wolf differs from a terror group because they do not directly follow a leader or attack with a group; they act alone based on their plan and motives. The lone wolf can follow the ideology of a group or learn how to attack from their publications.

**Lone Wolf Motives**

Al Qaeda called for leaderless attacks based on their inability to seize and control a geographical area in the late 1990’s (Nesser, 2012). The method changed in the early 2000’s when Al Qaeda provided methods for their worldwide followers to conduct individual attacks. Al Qaeda published this guidance through their publication *Inspire*.

Nissan Ratzlav-Katz (2014) discussed the trend of global terror networks inspiring lone wolf attacks. In 2012, Al Qaeda published *Convoy of Martyr*. The new publication identified targets for lone-wolf operations as; anyone fighting against Islam; the economy of the enemy; any military targets; or media of the enemy.

The Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS), generically referred to as the Islamic State of Iraq Levant (ISIL) based on translation, is different than Al Qaeda. ISIS calls for attacks on all Westerners at any time or anywhere (Hamilton, 2016). ISIS spread this message in open source forums without secure communications. While Al Qaeda initially focused on large-scale cell-based attacks, ISIS chose to influence sympathizers to attack targets of opportunity, especially using lone-wolf tactics. For instance, in an attack like Al Qaeda’s 9/11, ISIS would call for the destruction of the Twin Towers by their followers rather than through an organized attack. ISIS would rather have one-person attack one-hundred targets than a group waging one
attack killing one-thousand. The goal of ISIS is to make Westerners feel unsafe where they normally feel secure.

The Driving Factors of Lone Wolf Attacks

The former DHS Secretary, Jeh Johnson, testified before the House Committee on Homeland Security on Worldwide Threats to the Homeland in 2014. Secretary Johnson discussed the growing threat of foreign fighters attempting to enter the United States after being recruited by the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) or another violent extremist group. Secretary Johnson also briefed the committee on concerns that over 100 United States citizens attempted, or did, join an overseas extremist group. Secretary Johnson further discussed the lone-wolf threat and his direction to DHS to build relationships with state and local law enforcement with its “If You See Something, Say Something” campaign.

There is a difference between a lone wolf acting on ideological beliefs and an individual active shooter. In Lone Wolf terrorist or Deranged Shooter? A study of Ideological Active Shooter Events in the United States, 1970-2014, Joel Capellan (2015) discusses the likenesses and differences between mass killers and lone wolves. A mass killing is three or more killings in a single action; this can fall into both categories. The difference is the lone wolf acts on extreme radical jihadist ideologies; the active shooter relies on non-ideological reasons for attacking.

ISIS recruiting tactics mirror gang recruitment (Hamilton, S. 2016). ISIS recruits those looking for structure, youth, disenfranchised, and those easily influenced. ISIS recruits’ sympathizers to wage global jihad on their behalf. The sympathizers attack targets based on ISIS influence. According to Hamilton, there is an ISIS presence throughout the United States. The author further states ISIS seeks numerous attacks rather than single attacks; with the purpose of instilling fear.

ISIS published the names and addresses of military United States armed service members in 2014(Hamilton). ISIS called for sympathizers to attack service members where they lived. The goal of ISIS was to instill a sense of continuing fear throughout the homeland.

Tactics, Techniques, Procedures of the Attacker

The study of the tactics, techniques, and procedures (TTP) of previous lone wolf attackers need to be analyzed to conduct this research. The TTP verify possible means to deport and/or detaining lone wolf attackers to disrupt attacks at the state and local level using federal resources.

In Michael Becker’s 2014 article, the author analyzed attacks in the United States from 1940 to 2012 and documented them in Explaining Lone Wolf Target Selection in the United States. Becker analyzed 84 different lone wolf attacks to determine the attacker's target selection, methodology of attack, and ideologies. Becker (2014) theorizes the lone wolf could have an unlimited supply of targets but limits target selection based on ideology. Becker further explains the ideology of the lone wolf is what distinguishes them from a regular criminal attacker. In Becker’s broad study of 84 lone wolf attacks, the overwhelming majority attacked
targets they considered “enemies.” Becker studied attacks from different types of ideologies; from anti-civil rights to radical jihadist beliefs.

According to Becker, group-based terrorists differ from lone wolf attackers. A lone wolf does not belong to a group and attacks based on their own ideological beliefs; even if those beliefs are in line with others. The lone wolf terrorists do not receive direct guidance from a leader, unlike group based terror attacks. Several actors typically coordinate a group terror attack. Target selection precedes a terror attack, surveillance by operatives other than the attacker, and the large-scale attack. The lone wolf is acting as a solo actor, therefore limiting the scope of their attack to a specific area.

Becker (2014) studied the weapons used in the 84 attacks from 1940 to 2012. The majority, over 55%, used firearms, 35% used bombing, and 10% used knives or other weapons. Bomb attacks spiked in the United States after September 11, 2001, with 22 of the 30 bomb attacks happening post 9/11 per Becker’s study. Becker says the attackers chose firearms based on ease of obtaining them and because bombs tended to be ineffective.

**Responses to Attacks**

Lone wolf attacks typically last fifteen minutes or less (Hamilton, S. 2016). Victims with life-threatening wounds have limited time to be saved; less than five minutes or less for severely wounded victims with major bleeding. A law enforcement and emergency personnel response must be immediate and effective, but this is not viable without safe passage to the victims and a neutralized threat.

**Law Enforcement.**

Lone wolf attackers’ tactics, techniques, and procedures evolved over the years (Hamilton, 2016). Lone wolf attackers train and prepare to fight until death. The attackers training surpassed those of first responding law enforcement. The law enforcement response calls for Special Weapons and Tactics Teams (SWAT) to engage to the attacker.

Response to an active shooter and lone wolf terrorist are the same; stop the attack and make the area safe to conduct emergency operations. Local and state law enforcement respond first to attacks with follow-up support from federal agencies. The local law enforcement response can be in minutes. For example, in 2014, an active shooter opened fire at a Maryland mall. The responding department received active shooter training. The SWAT team trained at the same mall the where the shooter opened fire. The officer in charge received the same active shooter training. The local police department used social media to broadcast messages on the scene. Using social media is precedent setting to save life and limb.

**Emergency Services.**

In Steven Hamilton’s (2016) study *Terrorism in 2016*, he discussed the lack of preparation by emergency services since the 9/11 attacks. There have been few attacks to study to prepare for new attacks. The author further states each agency reacts to attacks differently making even more impossible to prepare an effective response.
Hamilton (2016) identifies several reasons there are no specific singular reactions to a lone wolf attacker. For instance, every municipal is different, and intelligence collection is different in each of them. The lone attack does not end when the attacker is dead either; lone wolf tactics can call for the emplacement of Improvised Explosive Devices (IEDs) to murder first responders.

Initially, first responders would rush to the scene of an event (Hamilton, S. 2016). The advent of an active attacker limits their response until the scene is safe. The active event causes first responders to stage at a safe location causing increased response time. Lone wolf attackers historically committed suicide after the initial assault. Recent attacks show the lone wolf may fortify their position and engage first responders until death or capture.

Some departments created a Rescue Task Force (RTF) to respond to lone wolf attackers or other emergency events requiring an armed response (Hamilton, S. 2016). An armed task force not feasible or even possible for every event. The capabilities of the law enforcement officials protecting the first responders are paramount to the use of an RTF. According to Hamilton, the RTF is not effective if it cannot accomplish all the following; respond within twenty minutes, supply enough trained & prepared law enforcement to stop the threat, ability to secure the surrounding scene, and have a command element emplaced.

**Civilian Response.**

Hamilton (2016) discusses actions on the objective that civilians can take to mitigate the loss of life or limb. The author provides a response that emergency management and civilians can take in the event of an attack. Emergency management dispatchers can talk civilians through applying first response medical aid to victims such as; tourniquets, pressure dressings, etc. The author discusses mass notifications systems to broadcast messages about active emergency events such as a lone wolf attack. The broadcast could relay instructions to assist victims in need.

The United States government, through its intelligence and law enforcement capabilities, is aware of the threat of lone wolf attackers. The lone wolf attack methodology is similar to active shooters. Active shooters operate similarly to lone wolf attackers; victims are typically random, there is no way to predict the attack, and having a plan in place can save life or limb.

On March 15, 2017, the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) published guidance on responding to an active shooter to several different audiences; private citizens, human resources or security professionals, active shooter workshop participants, and first responders. Within this guidance, DHS provided references for responding to attack. The new guidance is to Run, Hide, and Fight. Run; plan your escape, help others if possible, leave everything behind, keep your hands in the open, and call 911. Hide; stay out of view of the attacker, lock or block doors, and silence your phone. Fight; fight when necessary to survive, stop the shooter with all means necessary, act with absolute conviction, and commit to action.

**The Lone Wolf and Social Media**
The past several years have seen a marked increase in the use of social media as a means of communication and recruitment (Thompson, 2011). Global terror networks use social media to communicate with potential recruits. The disaffected potential lone wolf grew up with social media influences such as: Facebook, YouTube, Twitter, or secretive mediums. There is no more need for sitting at a computer station; they are available on handheld devices. All popular social media platforms can have a global reach in seconds.

The government is limited in stopping the spread of hateful rhetoric across the World Wide Web. The interpretation of laws, ownership of the site, and protection of civil liberties can limit United States’ actions (Theohary & Rollins, 2011). For instance, a radical website inciting hate and attacks on the homeland is owned by a non-United States company and is not operated by United States citizens. The United States government may be able to take actions such as, but not limited to; monitoring the site for intelligence gathering; shutting the site down; and identifying the culprits behind the site for exploitation (Theohary & Rollins, 2011). This scenario changes when the site is owned or operated by citizens of the United States (Theohary & Rollins, 2011). Citizens are afforded rights under the First and Fourth Amendments of the Constitution. Any actions the government takes on the site or site owners may require court orders or may not be legal.

The United States is limited but does not have its hands tied. The federal government takes measures to counter internet extremism (Theohary & Rollins, 2011). The Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) builds and operates websites, referred to as honeypots, to attract radical extremists for exploitation. The National Security Agency can exploit websites and shut them down at the source. The Department of Justice (DOJ) provides a legal interpretation of laws and policies to empower agencies to strike at extremists.

**Radical Jihadi Recruitment.**

Online radical jihadist websites spread hate and call for *jihad* from their supporters (Theohary & Rollins, 2011). The jihad they refer are attacks on non-Muslims and non-believers. The website owner's portrayed it as the follower’s duty. The sites have evolved into professionally published propaganda machines with copies of their publications, links, and videos.

One of the most prolific online recruiters for radical Islam was Anwar al-Awlaki (Tsesis, 2017). Al-Awlaki, working with a Yemeni branch of Al Qaeda, created the *Inspire* magazine(Figure 1). Al-Awlakipublished hundreds of hours of radical speeches calling for action against non-believers on YouTube.
A cursory search of “Anwar al-Awlaki lectures” provides over sixty-three thousand results. Al-Awlaki’s speeches have been tied to numerous terror attacks in the past decade, including but not limited to; the Charlie Hebdo attack, the New York & New Jersey Bombings, the Boston Marathon bombers, and numerous others. The United States killed al-Awlaki in 2011 with a drone strike, but radicals still use the videos as recruitment tools.

ISIS uses the internet to recruit members, spread information & disinformation, send encrypted messages, fundraise, and coordinate attacks (Tsesis, A., 2017). ISIS established a worldwide network of communication using multiple Twitter accounts. Tsesis says the future may see ISIS using Twitter to coordinate real-time attacks.

Federal Measures to Counter Lone Wolf Attacks

The Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI).

The FBI is the lead federal agency charged with investigating terror-related cases. Even before the 9/11 attacks, the FBI’s top priority is to safeguard America from attacks by terrorists. Since its inception in 1908, the FBI focused principally on criminal investigations with intelligence-based investigations following a distant second. Intelligence based investigations, including terror cases, are hard to prove and conclude with successful prosecutions. The post 9/11 focus shifted from to National Security, including terrorism. The FBI does this by
employing over 35,000 people operating with a budget of $8.7 billion. The FBI operates 56 field offices and 381 resident agencies domestically with 78 overseas posts (Today’s FBI, 2014).

**Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE).**

ICE is a part of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). ICE’s two main components are Homeland Security Investigations (HSI) and Enforcement and Removal Operations (ERO). HSI has a broad mission of protecting the homeland from foreign threats, including terrorists. ERO’s mission is to enforce immigration laws and to identify, arrest, and remove aliens that pose a threat to the homeland. Both HSI and ERO work in coordination with federal, state, and local task forces.

**The Task Force.**

The federal government maintains massive resources to conduct law enforcement, intelligence, and other security-related operations. After the 9/11 attacks, the federal government pushed these resources to the state and local governments under the direction of National Joint Terrorism Task Forces (NJTTF). The NJTTF, run by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), is delegated to participating agencies; state, local, and federal. Participation requires appropriate clearance and invitation; this leaves a gap in who the end receiver of the intelligence is and if the intelligence is accessed at the needed levels. There are 140 NJTTF’s located throughout the United States with the mission of disseminating terrorism-related intelligence to its members (NJJTF, 2008).

The NJTTF coordinates responses to terrorist threats with state, local, and federal partners (JCAT, 2017). The response includes enforcement, sharing actionable intelligence, prosecution assistance, and liaison between agencies. The mission of the NJTTF is to “leverage the collective resources of the member agencies for the prevention, preemption, deterrence, and investigation of terrorist acts that affect US interests, to disrupt and prevent terrorist acts, and to apprehend individuals who may commit or plan to commit such acts” (JCAT. 2017).

The NJTTF uses Sources of Information to supplement their terrorism investigations. The United States Attorney General provides guidelines on the use of confidential informants (Guidelines, 2005). Former FBI Director Robert Mueller valued confidential informants, especially the “assets” in the counterterrorism sections. Director Mueller stated “human sources are vitally important to our success against terrorists and criminals. They often give us critical intelligence and information we could not obtain in other ways, opening a window into our adversaries’ plans and capabilities. Human sources can mean the difference between the FBI preventing an act of terrorism or crime, or reacting to an incident after the fact”. (Guidelines, 2005).

**The Law.**

In 1978, the United States government created the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA) to review requests for national security warrants (Kwoka, 2017). The United States amended FISA in 2008 and created a “new authority for intelligence collection allowing the FISA court to authorize foreign intelligence surveillance targeting communications of non-U.S.
persons located abroad, without having to find probable cause that the target is a foreign power or agent of a foreign power, and without having to justify the locus of the surveillance (Kwoka, 2017, p.173).”

The Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 added a Lone Wolf amendment to FISA (Bazan, 2004). The new provision allows the government to conduct surveillance under FISA for individuals conducting, or planning, terrorist activities. The law considers these lone actors as agents of a foreign power.

**Intelligence Sharing Resources**

**Open Source Enterprise.**

The Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) stood up the Open Source Enterprise in 1941 to collect Open-Source Intelligence (OSINT) (CIA, 2015). The CIA created the Open Source Specialist position to have subject matter experts delve through millions of OSINT. The OSINT subject matter experts can identify radical social media activity.

**ArcGIS for Law Enforcement.**

ArcGIS is a tool used by law enforcement and intelligence officials for dynamic collaboration (ArcGIS, 2017). The ArcGIS network allows officials to “understand trends, analyze the dynamics of an incident, collaborate with other agencies, and allocate resources effectively to protect human life and property…”. The ArcGIS platform can be used on mobile devices as well as on a desktop. ArcGIS is used to create map overlays to plot almost any type of activity; crime locations, cellular data, etc. ArcGIS can plot data pulled from the internet to show patterns. For instance, a user plotted information pulled from Wikipedia to show a chronology of terrorist attacks throughout the world. An ArcGIS user can pull information from reliable law enforcement databases to plot target locations and track historical patterns.

**National Counterterrorism Center (NCTC).**

The federal government transitioned the Terrorist Threat Integration Center (TTIC) into the NCTC in 2004 (NCTC, 2017). The NCTC directly supports the President of the United States by analyzing and disseminating domestic and foreign intelligence. The NCTC mission statement is:

Lead and integrate national counterterrorism (CT) effort by fusing foreign and domestic CT information, providing terrorism analysis, sharing information with partners across the CT enterprise, and driving whole-of-government action to secure our national CT objectives” (NCTC, 2017, p.1).

**Joint Counterterrorism Assessment Team (JCAT).**

The JCAT mission statement is “to improve information sharing and enhance public safety. In coordination with the FBI and DHS [Department of Homeland Security], JCAT collaborates with other members of the Intelligence Community. The JCAT researches produces and disseminates counterterrorism intelligence products for federal, state, local, tribal, and
territorial government (SLTT) agencies and the private sector and advocates for the
counterterrorism intelligence requirements and needs of these partners throughout the
Intelligence Community” (JCAT, 2017, p.1).

The JCAT is a partnership built with volunteers from state and local first responders and
safety staff. The federal government oversees the JCAT and has intelligence staff integrated.
The JCAT is located at the National Counterterrorism Center (NCTC) and provides unclassified
intelligence product.

Law Enforcement Enterprise Portal (LEEP).

The LEEP delivers a gateway for the state, local, and federal law enforcement and
intelligence to share intelligence (LEEP, 2017). LEEP allows for users to create special interest
groups, virtual command centers, and access to intelligence. The virtual command center is
described as ideal to address terrorist attacks and threats. LEEP is available to law enforcement,
intelligence, and armed forces staff.

Open Source Portal.

The Open Source portal allows the law enforcement and intelligence “community to get
access to the latest open source reporting and analysis. Accounts are available to US federal,
state, and local government employees and contractors” (Open, 2017). The Open Source portal
provides analysis on several topics, to include, but not limited to; media analysis; jihadist website
intelligence gathering; jihadist ideology reporting; foreign language translation; live/archived
video; analysis assistance; gray literature and regional reporting.

The portal lets users personalize their pages for to narrow topical focus including the use
of blog posts and wikis. The site allows the user to enter blog questions for review by
intelligence/law enforcement experts. The user can search historical posts on numerous topics
and commercial databases.

Immigration Authorities to Remove Aliens

According to the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS), removal
is defined as the “expulsion of an alien from the United States. The United States expels an alien
based on inadmissibility or deportability” (USCIS, 2017, p.1). Deportation defined is:

The formal removal of an alien from the United States when the alien has been found
removable for violating the immigration laws. Deportation is ordered by an immigration
judge without any punishment being imposed or contemplated. Before April 1997
deportation and exclusion were separate removal procedures. The Illegal Immigration
Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 consolidated these procedures. After
April 1, 1997, aliens in and admitted to the United States may be subject to removal
based on deportability. Now called Removal, this function is managed by U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (USCIS, 2017, p.1).

**Immigration Status**

All classes of aliens are subject to removal. The following are the main classes of aliens that were part of this study.

**Lawful Permanent Resident.**

Lawful permanent resident (LPR) status “allows an alien to reside and work permanently in the United States. LPRs are also known as green card holders, although the card has not always been green. Lawful permanent residents can be subject to removal for engaging in a wide variety of illegal activity, as specified in Federal Immigration Law” (USCIS, 2017).

**Conditional Permanent Resident.**

Conditional permanent residents “include alien spouses and their children who applied for lawful permanent resident status based on a qualifying marriage to an LPR or a citizen. The conditional status expires on the second anniversary of obtaining conditional status unless the alien and his or her spouse have jointly applied for lawful permanent resident status before that time” (USCIS, 2017).

**Non-Immigrant Visas.**

The law provides for a variety of categories of aliens that are eligible for visas to legally enter the United States on a temporary basis for a limited period. The State Department classifies these visa holders as non-immigrants. Eligible aliens include vacationers, students, certain classes of temporary workers, and a variety of specialized categories. The Visa specifies the authorized length of stay. The alien may have to take certain actions to maintain the status.

**Refugee/Asylum.**

The following are the basic conditions for refugee/asylee status; the individual has a well-founded fear of persecution on the basis of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion if returned to the home country or country of last permanent residence; the individual is not a security risk or perpetrator of persecution; the individual has not committed certain categories of crimes. A person in the United States must apply for asylum within one year of admission.

**Conditional Releases**
Immigration authorities can release aliens in custody under certain circumstances. For instance, a non-criminal removable alien waiting on an Immigration Court date under an Order of Supervision (OSUP) under certain conditions. A designated official can grant an OSUP and apply certain requirements to the alien’s condition of releases. At a minimum, the official requires the following:

- The alien reports to a specified officer periodically and provide relevant information under oath as directed; the alien continue efforts to obtain a travel document and assist the Service in obtaining a travel document; the alien report as directed for a mental or physical examination or examinations as directed by the Service; the alien obtain advance approval of travel beyond previously specified times and distances; and the alien provide DHS with written notice of any change of address in the prescribed manner (Conditions, 2017, p. 1).

The OSUP can be amended or contain additional requirements. A designated official can require the alien to not associate with criminals, to not travel out of a certain area, or specific requirement as necessary. The OSUP condition can require the alien to be placed on a GPS monitoring (i.e. ankle bracelet.).

**Secure Communities**

DHS implemented Secure Communities to every jurisdiction in the United States, over thirty-one hundred, in 2013 (Secure, 2017). The Secure Communities is an information sharing program between state & local and the federal governments. The program revolves around the sharing of fingerprint data with the FBI that in return shares it with DHS. The fingerprints can determine if the subject is present in the United States without permission or is removable for other offenses.

**Sanctuary Cities and Detainers**

President Donald Trump signed Executive order 13768, *Enhancing Public Safety in the Interior of the United States* (Sessions, J., 2017). The Executive Order laid out the framework for defining what constitutes a “sanctuary city” for aliens. In the Executive Order, the President (2017) states:

Tens of thousands of removable aliens have been released into communities across the country, solely because their home countries refuse to accept their repatriation. Many of these aliens are criminals who have served time in our Federal, State, and local jails. The presence of such individuals in the United States and the practices of foreign nations that refuse the repatriation of their nationals are contrary to the national interest.

Although Federal immigration law provides a framework for Federal-State partnerships in enforcing our immigration laws to ensure the removal of aliens who have no right to be in the United States, the Federal Government has failed to discharge this basic sovereign responsibility. We cannot faithfully execute the immigration laws of the United States if we exempt classes or categories of
removable aliens from potential enforcement. The purpose of this order is to direct executive departments and agencies (agencies) to employ all lawful means to enforce the immigration laws of the United States.

The Executive Order defines a sanctuary city as a jurisdiction that “willfully” refuses to comply with 8 United States Code 1373 (8 USC 1373). The law states:

8 USC 1373, communication between government agencies and the Immigration and Naturalization Service, states that state & local governments, “may not prohibit, or in any way restrict, any government entity or official from sending to, or receiving from, [federal immigration officers] information regarding the citizenship or immigration status, lawful or unlawful, of any individual." (Sessions, J., p.1, 2017).

Of note, the former Immigration and Naturalization Service changed to Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) upon the creation of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) in 2003.

Sanctuary cities do not just stop immigration authorities from targeting illegal immigration but also non-citizen aliens committing crimes from being identified by local law enforcement. For example, an alien commits a crime by illegally purchasing a firearm and is arrested by a police officer from a sanctuary city. The arrest data will not be provided to federal immigration authorities if that a location is a sanctuary city. If the jurisdiction releases the arrest data to federal authorities, the local official is prohibited from assisting federal officials based on their status as a sanctuary city.

The sanctuary cities essentially block all biometric data from being directly released to ICE. The biometric data provides ICE with a limited means to identify the alienage of the subject in custody, including their removability. ICE does receive the biometric fingerprint data from the FBI when a subject’s fingerprints are entered into the FBI’s National Crime Information Center (NCIC). ICE uses NCIC information to identify subjects in custody for further investigation but sanctuary cities do not cooperate with ICE.

The sanctuary city status further prohibits ICE from lodging an immigration detainer on any alien subject, regardless of their legal status. A detainer is a request from ICE, to the holding facility that has custody of the alien subject, to notify ICE when they plan to release the subject; typically, with at least 48 hours’ notice. A detainer allows ICE sufficient time to interview the subject in-person or telephonically to gather information to determine removability. Removability is when a subject violated their nonimmigrant status and is subject to removal. The violation can be as simple as staying in the United States beyond their Visa’s expiration date to felonious crimes such as committing murder. The removability of an alien is key to this study.

After the implementation of the Executive Order, ICE began publicly releasing a weekly report called the Weekly Declined Detainer Outcome Report to show localities that do not honor ICE detainers. The report breaks it down by the location that has the highest number of restricted immigration detainers. The report further breaks down the criminal activity associated
with the subjects in custody. The report then provides the ordinances the jurisdictions emplaced to block cooperation with ICE.

The Immigration and Nationality Act (INA), section 212(3)(B), is the mainstay of removing subjects involved in terrorist activities (Immigration, 2017). The law states that any alien that engages in terrorist activity is inadmissible. Therefore they cannot remain legally in the United States. The law is wide-ranging with the intent to prevent terrorist attacks within the homeland. A designated United States official, such as one delegated by the Secretary of Homeland Security, solely must believe the subject will engage, or likely engage, in any terrorist activity. The activity includes endorsing terrorist activity or persuading others to commit terror acts. The government can remove because they belong to a social group that supports or endorses terrorist activity.

**Summary**

The literature review justified the qualitative methodology case study method. The literature provided the data to justify further research, to include but not limited to, the immigration status of previous attackers, techniques, procedures, and radical ideologies of lone wolf attackers. The literature study sought to determine methods used to disrupt or stop lone wolf attacks with immigration authority if any. The chapter also outlined local, state, and federal resources available to counter lone wolf attackers. The chapter further outlined resources available to state and local officials to identify then coordinate with federal authorities to deport, and/or detain lone wolf attackers.

**CHAPTER 3. METHODOLOGY**

**Introduction**

This chapter specifies the methodology used to examine the data. This dissertation strategy revolved around qualitative research involving case studies. Qualitative research involves interpreting, collecting, and analyzing data to build a theme (Creswell, 2009). Creswell (2009) defined case studies as:
A qualitative strategy in which the researcher explores in depth a program, event, activity, process, or one or more individuals. The cases(s) are bounded by time and activity, and researchers collect detailed information using a variety of data collection procedures over a sustained period (p. 227).

This study is a basic qualitative research with the document and open-source analysis with the goal of interpretation for research use. For this study, a document is considered anything written, digital, visual, and physical material (Merriam, S. & Tisdell, E., 2016). The collected data is analyzed and interpreted for further study. The data is categorized to show the study’s findings. The findings are used to prove or disprove the research questions, if applicable. The data must be valid and reliable to be deemed useful in qualitative research.

**Methodologies**

John Creswell (2009) describes numerous research methods to include determining what research design is appropriate for study. This study relied on the qualitative case study method. Creswell (2009) states case studies are:

A strategy of inquiry in which the researcher explores in depth a program, event, activity, process, or one or more individuals. Cases are bounded by time and activity, and researchers collect detailed information using a variety of data collection procedures over a sustained period (p. 13).

**Data Collection**

This study relied on unclassified open-source information from several sources. Since the 1980’s, the FBI published this data for public consumption in their *Terrorism in the United States* publication (Terrorism, 2017). The publication rebranded post-9/11 to simply *Terrorism*. The data is limited to unclassified terrorist investigations. The FBI classifies terrorists as criminals but does not include general criminal investigative data in the *Terrorism* publication. The FBI open source data is limited. The study further relied on open source documentation, such as news articles, to locate attacks by radical jihadist lone wolf terrorists.

**Research Process**

The research process relies on investigating methods to disrupt lone wolf attacks before they occur. The research process relied on a qualitative review of previous research and studies of individual lone wolf attacks. The methods investigated in this study were limited to the following approaches:

1. Review the ninety-six terror plots perpetrated by a single actor from September 12, 2001, to June 20, 2017.
2. Determine if the act is considered a lone wolf attack by a radical jihadist.
   a. If yes, then proceed.
   b. If no, then the information is not relevant to this study.
3. Determine alienage, if possible, by researching arrest reports, affidavits, and open source material.
a. If alien, then proceed with methods federal immigration agencies can provide to state and local officials.

b. If not, then proceed with methods the Federal Bureau of Investigation can provide to state and local officials.

4. Determine if the subject plotted, or attacked, within the jurisdiction of a sanctuary city.

5. Identify any method immigration officials could use to detain or deport future subjects based on similar illegal activity or offenses.

6. Review final data to identify methods to disrupt future attacks.

**Detain.**

The authority to detain aliens falls under the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA). Specifically, under Section 287, Powers of Immigration Officers and Employees. The INA provides designated officials with powers to, including but limited to:

- Interrogate anyone suspected of being in the United States without permission, without a warrant.
- Arrest any alien that committed an offense against the United States, without a warrant, if the alien is likely to abscond.
- Administer oaths and seize evidence.
- Delegate power to specifically trained officers of state and local jurisdictions to conduct immigration enforcement.

President Donald Trump signed the Executive Order *Border Security and Immigration Enforcement Improvements* on January 25, 2017. The Executive Order allows the Secretary of Homeland Security, hereafter referred to as the Secretary, to take appropriate measures to protect the homeland from domestic and foreign threats.

The Executive Order provided further authority to state and local to enforce immigration laws. This authority provides the basis for state and local to detain aliens for immigration offenses. The Executive Orders was implanted to “empower State and local law enforcement agencies across the country to perform the functions of an immigration officer in the interior of the United States to the maximum extent permitted by law” (2017, p.1).

The detention of United States citizens falls under local, state, and federal law. Section 1021 of the National Defense Authorization Act of 2012 (NDAA) states under the law of war that the United States can detain a person without trial (Elsia, & Garcia, 2016). The NDAA authorizes detention and the transfer of detainees to foreign countries. The NDAA does not allow the indefinite detention but does allow detention. Detention is not “simple” there are numerous intricacies of this specific Act. One area that is forefront within civil liberties groups is the ability to detain without trial under NDAA.

Detention is typically limited to 48 to 72 hours at the federal, state and local level beforepressing charges against a suspect. The regulation falls under the right to a speedy trial;
Deport

The Executive Order provided expedited means to deport aliens (2017). Section 7 of the Order covers the return of foreign, aliens to their country of origin. It states the “Secretary shall take appropriate action… to ensure that aliens … are returned to the territory from which they came pending a formal removal proceeding” (Executive Order, 2017, p.1).

There are several key laws regarding the deportation and removal of aliens. The laws fall under the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA). Section 237 of the INA details the classes of removable aliens. This research solely covers those aliens involved in terrorist activities. Section 212 of the INA defines terrorist activities as “any activity which is unlawful under the laws of the place where it is committed [including their country of origin] … would be unlawful under the laws of the United States” (2017, p.1). This key section of the law allows immigration officials, or designates, to detain and remove aliens that were involved in terrorist activities in their country of origin or nationality; regardless if they were illegal there but illegal here.

The terrorist activities include high-jacking, sabotage, threatening others, violent attack upon a protected person, and assassination. The INA Section describes “engaging in terrorist activities” as inciting crime, planning/preparing a terrorist act, furthering terrorist activity (surveillance, funding, etc.).

CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

Analysis and Findings

There have been 96 plots in the United States from September 12, 2001, to June 20, 2017, with 66 perpetrated or plotted by lone actors(Inserra, & Walters, 2017). This researcher analyzed each of the 96 terror cases; of 96 cases, lone actors furthered 66 acts with 18 of themby aliens. Of the remaining 18 aliens, 14 plotted to attack within or attacked in, a sanctuary city (Figure 2). A sanctuary city limits coordination and liaison with federal agencies. The aliens operate with limited or no contact with federal agencies; allowing them to operate in plain sight. Of note, 11 of the alien subjects planned to use explosives to facilitate their attack. According to
Immigration and Customs Enforcement, in February 2017 there were 118 sanctuary cities in the United States.

*Figure 2.* A graph detailing 20% of attacks occurred or originate within Sanctuary Cities.

**Lone Wolf Cases After 9/11**

Lone wolf jihadists plotted or attacked, the United States numerous times after 9/11. The attackers planned to attack locals throughout the homeland, including those within the confines of sanctuary cities. The following cases provide a sample of subjects that conducted lone wolf attacks within a sanctuary city. The subjects appeared to have resided within the sanctuary city limits, and immigration authorities would not have had cooperation with state and local agencies to conduct any investigative efforts.

7. **Khalid Ali ALDAWSARI**

**Background**

Khalid Ali Aldawsari is a citizen of Saudi Arabia and resided in Lubbock, Texas when he began planning an attack with an improvised explosive device (IED) containing chemicals (Texas, 2011). Aldawsari entered the United States on a student visa. The FBI investigated Aldawsari and subsequently arrested Aldawsari after an extensive investigation.

**Lone Wolf Action**

A chemical supplier reported to the FBI that Aldawsari attempted to purchase concentrated phenol. Among its legitimate uses, it can be used as a high explosive as well. The FBI determined Aldawsari conducted searches on how to build explosives and for targets of interest. Aldawsari went further and purchased chemicals for the plot. Aldawsari purchased numerous articles in the furtherance
of the plot to include, but not limited to: a stun gun, a gas mask, hazmat suit, and wiring.

**Social Media Use.**

According to the FBI affidavit, Aldawsari posted on blogs and an online journal about becoming a martyr and jihad. Aldawsari emailed himself plans to target military members, civilians, and structures.

**Radicalization/Ideology**

Aldawsari created his blog voicing views about the state of Muslim affairs. Aldawsari is a radical jihadist.

8. **Ulugbek KODIROV**

**Background**

Ulugbek Kodirov is an Uzbek national residing in the United States for seventeen years (Uzbek, 2012). Kodirov entered the United States on a student visa that he overstayed; he remained in the United States illegally. Kodirov threatened to kill former President Barack Obama and illegal possession of a weapon. The Joint Terrorism Task Force (JTTF) arrested Kodirov. Kodirov pleaded guilty and incarcerated.

**Lone Wolf Action.**

Kodirov plotted to kill the former President with the use of a machine gun and hand grenades he purchases. Kodirov did not realize he purchased the weapons from undercover agents and they arrest arrested Kodirov.

**Social Media Use.**

Kodirov used his computer to show radical jihadist sites to an individual.

**Radicalization/Ideology.**

Kodirov stated he contacted an alleged member of the Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan (IMU), a designated foreign terrorist organization. Kodirov reflected that IMU told him to kill President Obama.

9. **Dahir ADAN**

**Background**

ISIS’ news agency *Amaq* claimed Adan acted as a soldier of ISIS (Volz &Dobuzinskis, 2016). According to the authors, Adan asked victims if they were Muslim and mentioned Allah during the knife attack. The FBI investigated the attack as an act of terrorism. ISIS claimed Adan was a soldier of ISIS.

**Lone Wolf Action**
Dahir Adan, armed with two knives, attacked and wounded ten civilians on September 17, 2016 (Kendell, 2016). Adan dressed in a security guard outfit and entered a popular Minnesota mall. Adan entered the mall and started to stab innocent people. Sixteen people witnessed Adan yelling “Allah Akbar” as he attacked.

An off-duty police officer was shopping in the mall when Adan approached him. Adan asked the officer if he was Muslim. The officer noted the knives and ordered Adan to lay down. Adan attacked the officer and the officer shot Adan, killing him.

Social Media Use

According to Special Agent in Charge Rick Thornton, FBI Minnesota, the FBI was still attempting to unlock Adan’s encrypted telephone and gain access to Adan’s social media accounts as of February 2017 (Forliti, A., 2017).

Radicalization/Ideology

The former Director of the FBI, James Comey, stated before the House of Representatives that it appeared Adan was radicalized. There were no other sources of radicalization available.

10. Abdul Razak Ali ARTAN

Background

Artan entered the United States as a refugee from Somalia in 2014. Artan was a student at Ohio State University (Smith, Callimachi, & Perez, 2016). Artan was a devout Muslim and complained to the university’s newspaper that Muslims did not have a place to pray on campus.

Lone Wolf Action

Artan drove his vehicle into Ohio State college students and crashed on November 28, 2016. Artan then got out of his car and attacked innocent civilians. The police shot and killed Artan minutes after the attack, ending his stabbing spree. Artan injured thirteen people. ISIS claimed responsibility for Artan’s actions, stating he was acting on ISIS worldwide broadcast to action.

Social Media Use

Artan allegedly referred to ISIS on his Facebook page. Artan further warned of being part of a sleeper cell.

Radicalization/Ideology

Anwar al-Awlaki, a radical cleric, inspired Artan. Awlaki was Al Qaeda’s most prolific recruiter before CIA killed Awlaki in a drone strike. Alwaki’s
radical jihadi message was, and is still, spread throughout the internet and used as a recruitment tool.

**Tactics, Techniques, and Procedures**

The tactics, techniques, and procedures (TTP) the subjects used can provide data to identify potential lone wolf attackers (Appendix 3). For instance, a subject purchased or attempts to purchase bomb-making materials. The authorities provide the data to federal officials for further interview or detention.

The weapons used or planned to be used, by the subjects varied (figure 3). Most of the lone wolves preferred plots involving bombs. The second most preferred firearms. These two methods can make an alien amendable to removal from the United States.

![Figure 3: Weapons used in lone wolf attacks since 9/11](image)

**Summary**

The lone wolf attacker’s motives vary, but all subjects in this study have one thing in common; they have a self-idolization of a radical ideology. The lone wolf attacks based on their beliefs gained from another source. The sources can be close hold, i.e. their immediate upbringing or the internet. Videos produced and publicized by radical clerics on YouTube that indoctrinate the potential lone wolf attacker resemble those produced by Hollywood. Internet recruitment to radical idolization exploded in the mid-2000’s. The production value of ISIS recruiting videos has been key to the recruiting of vulnerable youth and young adults.
CHAPTER 5. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Discussion

The immigration system of the United States has been considered flawed for decades. The advent of lone wolf attacks after 9/11 has focused enforcement efforts on immigration and preventing terror attacks. With the implementation of stricter immigration enforcement, several jurisdictions in the United States claimed their cities as sanctuary cities. A sanctuary city prevents local and state law enforcement agencies from cooperating with Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), a component of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). The status of sanctuary city does not preclude ICE from working within the cities but prevents state and local officials from cooperating with ICE.

Relevance of Study

This study sought to determine methods to prevent or disrupt future lone wolf attacks on United States’ soil. The study researched cases of lone wolf plots and attacks since after 9/11. The 9/11 attacks are significant to this study. 9/11 showed the world that large-scale terror attacks could occur on American soil. Since those attacks, recruitment of home grown and foreign-born jihadists has occurred at a rapid pace. The study sought to provide methods to prevent one or more attacks.

Limitations

This study was limited to the readily available non-classified material. As with any terrorism-related cases, the availability of classified sources to back-up and validate information is limited. The open source information available was limited to scholarly articles, new sources, and research-based databases. The subjects of this research attacked with their specific motives;
the motives, the ideology, the reasons for the attack are based solely on their mental state and cannot be identified completely.

**Research Questions Answered**

This study examined lone wolf plots and attacks in the United States from Post 9/11 to 2017; with foreign-born or homegrown actors; that follow radical jihadist ideology. The following questions are the basis for this study;

- Can the immigration status of potential attackers be used to disrupt attacks?
  - Yes, an alien discovered to be involved in terrorist activity can be detained and removed. An alien removed from the United States cannot wage jihad on the homeland.
- Did any of the previous lone wolf attackers plot to attack a sanctuary city?
  - Yes, an analysis of previous lone wolf plots or attacks since 9/11 revealed 14 of 66 attacks originated or occurred in sanctuary cities. 21% of the plots or attacks in sanctuary cities.
- Can lone wolf attackers be identified by their social media footprint using federal open source intelligence analysis?
  - Yes, attackers and plotters referred to their radical views before or during their attacks. For instance, Omar Mateen, the Orlando nightclub shooter, posted to Facebook about his ideology.

**Summary of Results**

**H1**  
*State and local agencies do not have a working relationship with immigration officials based on their jurisdictional status as a sanctuary city.*  

*True, if a sanctuary city.* Over 90% of the 3181 jurisdictions cooperate with immigration officials (i.e. ICE), but numerous key jurisdictions do not when they belong to a sanctuary city. The ICE Declined Detainer report (Appendix 2) details the jurisdictions that do not cooperate with ICE. While every jurisdiction is enrolled in the Secure Communities program, this does not mean they must work with immigration officials.

**H2**  
*Lone wolf attackers can be identified and legally detained before they attack based on open source intelligence data provided by the federal government.*  

*Partially true.* Under the INA, section 212(3)(B); terrorist activities (Immigration, 2017). The law states that any alien that engages in terrorist activity is inadmissible. Therefore they cannot remain legally in the United States. A designated United States official solely must believe the subject will engage, or likely engage, in any terrorist activity. The activity includes endorsing terrorist actions or persuading others to commit terror acts. The subject can be removed because they belong to a social group that supports or endorses terrorist activity. Therefore, if an alien purports to conduct a terrorist activity or affiliated with terrorist activity, they can be detained or removed. **The action only pertains to alien subjects.** A non-alien
subject will need to be fully investigated by law enforcement officials, and then, with probable cause, they can detain the subject.

**H3** The terrorist tactics, techniques, and procedures used by prior lone wolf attackers (post 9/11 to July 2017) show immigration authority can be used to identify methods to deport alien lone wolves.

**True.** A designated official can detain and/or deport an alien under INA 212. As stated before, a designated United States official, such as one delegated by the Secretary of Homeland Security, solely must believe the subject will engage, or likely engage, in any terrorist activity. Including the endorsement of terrorist activity or persuading others to commit terror acts. Immigration official can remove the alien because they belong to a social group that supports or endorses terrorist activity.

**Recommendations**

**Work Together to Identify the Subject**

**Open source pull.**

The results of an open source data-pull can result in the need for further investigation. Through investigative effort, including open source social media research, the identity of a subject with jihadi views can be revealed. There are numerous avenues that officials can take to prevent or discover future jihadi plots if there is reasonable suspicion of potential lone wolf attacks. One main avenue is to provide the identity of the subject to federal authorities for further investigation.

**Secure Communities.**

The Secure Communities enrolled all jurisdictions within the United States into the program as mandated by law. When the subject is encountered and arrested their fingerprints are submitted automatically to the FBI. The FBI in return forwards the fingerprints to DHS. DHS forwards all information regarding aliens to ICE for further analysis.

**United States Citizens.**

Through open source intelligence gathering, the identity of subjects with lone wolf ideology or rhetoric discovered. The reviewing officer refers the subject to the FBI. The referral provides the means to conduct further intelligence gathering via database search or by simple interview. A human interaction from a law enforcement official can provide immeasurable intelligence about motive and intent. The subject interview can determine if the subject needs further review or if officials can recruit the subject as a source of information.

**Aliens.**

An open source intelligence pull can reveal the identity of an alien subject residing in the United States. The reviewing officer refers the subject to ICE. ICE has the authority to investigate further and even detain an alien subject based on reasonable suspicion of illegal activity. Illegal activity in the realm of immigration is easier to decipher. An alien purporting to
conduct terrorist activity can be interviewed up to deported out of the United States. The next steps are crucial to human intelligence gathering with the expectation of preventing a future lone wolf attack. The following three diagrams detail a prospective flowchart to facilitate crucial intelligence gathering to disrupt future lone wolf attacks.

*Figure 4.* What to do when the subject is identified by intelligence or law enforcement

The subject is identified through open source data pull, encountered by law enforcement, or other means (figure 4). Law enforcement determines if the subject can be removed or detained. If not, they are interviewed and released. The interview process is crucial and provides an opportunity for law enforcement to gather intelligence or recruit the subject for de-radicalization. If the subject is removable, then they are referred to ICE and the FBI for further investigation. An alien released on an Order of Supervision is recalled for an interview; or detention if applicable based on law.
The INA and other applicable federal law provide ICE the opportunity to conduct investigations of aliens’ present in the United States. A specific tool afforded to ICE is the Order of Supervision (OSUP). The OSUP allows ICE officials to interview subjects, develop leads/gather intelligence, and detain the subject under certain circumstances. ICE can place a GPS monitor on the subject (Figure 5). The monitoring of the subject can provide law enforcement and intelligence officials with valuable information.

Figure 5. What to do when ICE encounters the subject.

Figure 6. What to do when FBI encounters the subject.
The FBI process is limited to a snapshot of their investigative and intelligence operations. The FBI process deserves additional research and a full study (Figure 6). This study does not touch on the FBI process past this flowchart.

**Conclusion**

This study is not meant to change local or state laws concerning sanctuary cities. This study is to provide relevant information for others to make their own knowledgeable decisions. The study relied on the relevant open source material to determine at least fourteen attacks or plots occurred within the confines of a sanctuary city; with two attacks resulting in serious injuries to innocent civilians and the death of the lone wolf attackers.

The identification of potential lone wolf attackers within the immigration system can provide subjects for further discussion with law enforcement or intelligence officials. These officials can provide means and methods to attempt de-radicalization of the suspected lone wolf plotter.
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