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Abstract
In the wake of recent escalations and attacks involving members of college and university communities, the authors explore a specific and detailed investigation of how a student, faculty, or staff’s radical ideologies can move from strongly held beliefs to extremist violence. Using a case study methodology in addition to a literature review, the authors identify and summarize 30 cases of violence or terrorism motivated by an ideological belief to identify the factors related to violent extremism. This article examines risk factors for violent extremism, mobilization factors contributing to violent actions, and protective factors that reduce the potential for violence to provide a risk assessment model for college and university behavioral intervention teams or threat assessment teams.
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Introduction
CAMPUS BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTION and threat assessment teams (BITs/TATs) have become increasingly concerned with how to identify the potential for radicalization of students, faculty, and staff toward extremist violence. There have been several recent attacks, including Alexandre Bissonnette at a mosque in Quebec (Austen and Smith 2017), Abdul Razak Ali Artan at Ohio State (Grinberg et al. 2016), and Dzhokhar Anzorovich “Jahar” Tsarnaev and Tamerlan Tsarnaev at the Boston Marathon (Candioti 2013), where a radicalized individual carried out a terrorist attack on a college campus or was connected to a college community.

In the wake of the 2016 presidential election, campuses are also seeing an increase in incidents of hardened and fixated political ideologies (Fox News 2017; Hauser 2016; McCarthy 2016), leading to harmful debate, aggressive exchanges, and potential violence requiring a greater understanding of the processes wherein an individual moves from radical thoughts to violent extremism.

When a radicalized individual or group embraces violence as a justified pathway to achieve their political, religious, or social goals, this can transform to extremism and terrorism (Pressman 2016). All sources show a progressive connection from radicalism to extremism to terrorism. Extremism is the vocal and active opposition to the essential values that potentially escalate to terrorism wherein violence is used to achieve the desired goals and ends (Scarcella et al. 2016). Terrorism is then defined as the unauthorized or unofficial use of violence and intimidation in pursuit of political, religious, or ideological goals (Scarcella et al. 2016). Here, the individual is interested in the attack itself as well as the impact of the attack on others and the larger community. This can occur as a lone terrorist without command and control from a group, or with support or inspiration from other individuals.

Although many individuals in the campus community feel marginalized, treated unfairly, discriminated against, and unengaged in society, only a small number move toward violence to express these frustrations or to bring about change. Radical thoughts and ideas are not, in and of themselves, dangerous or problematic. There are many examples throughout history of positive contributions from radical individuals and groups. Unfortunately, there are other examples wherein an individual’s radical thoughts and ideas transform to embrace violence and intimidation as reasonable actions to reach his or her political, religious, or ideological goals. One of the central goals of this research is to better define the tipping point toward violence.
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In analysis of research on risk factors (RFs), multiple and complex processes have been identified as related to violent extremism. In their seminal meta-analysis, Scarcella et al. (2016) suggest that given the multifaceted nature of extremism and terrorism, a diverse team of professionals from psychology, criminology, law enforcement, and law would better be able to discuss the nature of these factors. This parallels the current state of practice for institutions of higher education relaying on behavioral intervention teams (BITs) and threat assessment teams (TATs) with diverse membership. This article seeks to provide these teams with an understanding of what to look for to identify and intervene with at-risk individuals who have radical thoughts and behaviors that are escalating to extremist violence and terrorism.

It is essential to think broadly about the political environment of these behaviors and the danger of labels. The labels we use are often contextually defined based on our experiences and worldview. The wizard in the popular musical Wicked captures this concept well for us in his song Wonderful, “A man’s called a traitor, or a liberator. A rich man’s a thief, or a philanthropist. Is one a crusader, or ruthless invader, it’s all in which label is able to persist.” Although labels and context may differ, we are focused on exploring the tipping point, wherein an individual makes the transition to see violence as an acceptable means to achieve his or her ideological goals or further his or her agenda.

A Continuum Approach

We suggest radicalism and extremism should be seen on a continuum. Radical thoughts are those counter to the predominant culture with an intent to influence political, religious, or social change (Pressman and Flockton 2012). These could have positive social ends to bring individuals together, or they could be eliminating or marginalizing another group. For college and universities, policing and extinguishing radical thoughts and divergent speech should not be the goal. Instead, college and universities should see these as potential fertile grounds where individuals may shift from critical or counter-culture thoughts toward seeing violence as a reasonable path to bring about a desired change. Preventing these extremist and terrorist behaviors that may rise out of radicalized individual or group thoughts and beliefs is important.

Although we have seen an increase in U.S. attacks fueled by this radicalization (Christie et al. 2016; Grinberg et al. 2016; Swisher 2016), we have also seen recent escalations in extreme religious and political thoughts (Fox News 2017; Hauser 2016; McCarthy 2016). Our research offers insight to recognize the difference between a threat to campus safety and simply unpopular or divergent thinking—a type of thinking, frankly, more common in the progressive cognitive, emotional, and psychological developmental stages common for students in living and learning communities.

Not a New Problem, Not Just Islamic State in Iraq and Syria (ISIS)

Although it may be tempting to see terrorist actions and violence to be occurring at rates never seen before, during the 1970s, 60–70 terrorist events took place in the United States each year. This figure is 15–20 times greater than the decade after 9/11 (Jenkins 2010; Rosenau 2013). Radical thoughts leading to terrorist action are not new issues, and understanding the history and breadth of this kind of violence is essential. These are not new problems.

There is a temptation to center on examples involving Islamic or Christian religious ideologies as those most driven to violence and terrorism to reach their goals. Instead, we encourage casting a wider net and exploring the history of those who saw violence as a justification for their actions. This would include groups such as Greenpeace (Guardian Staff 2013), the Earth Liberation Front (Dejevsky 1998; Lipsher 2006), Animal Rights (Wolcott 2017), the Suffragettes (Trueman 2015), the KKK and white supremacy (Kennedy 1987; The Southern Poverty Law Center 2017), the IRA (Dylan 1996), antiabortion (Turkewitz and Healy 2015), and the Black Liberation Army (Burrough 2015). These groups often turned to intimidation, threats, and violence to advance their agendas. These agendas are far reaching, including environmental protection, animal rights, women’s voting rights, race supremacy, and equality.

There are even occasions wherein these goals stand in direct opposition to one another. Dylann Roof sought to start a race war against African Americans in his 2015 shooting in Charleston, SC (Berman 2016), and the 1971 killing of two New York City police officers by Black Liberation Army member Anthony Bottom (Burrough 2015) was motivated by a desire to punish those Caucasian officers in authority positions. The important question for a BIT or TAT that overlaps these cases is identifying the tipping point wherein they feel justified turning to violence to achieve their ends.

Different than School Shootings

Those in the threat assessment community have spent considerable time and resources to better understand and prevent incidents of targeted and strategic violence such as the Virginia Tech Massacre (Flynn and Heitzmann 2008), Northern Illinois University Shooting (Vann 2008), Umpqua College Shooting (Vanderhart et al. 2015), the Santa Monica College Shooting (Groves et al. 2013), and the shootings by James Holmes (Elliot 2013) and Jared Loughner (Roy 2011). Despite these efforts, there is a need for updated exploration and study that considers the common thread of radical ideology on the potential to move to violence with the context of the college campus in mind.

Earlier we noted the recent targeted violence perpetrated by individuals on a college campus or connected to a college campus who also indicated a motivation related to radical ideologies. It is time to explore the radicalization of these individuals to extremist violence. In other words, at what point did they begin to see violence as the path to meet their ideological goals? In addition, how might these RFs appear in the college environment? Although the objective and research-based tools for targeted violence have been useful in understanding at-risk behavior and threat in the college community, an exploration of additional research is needed to more effectively assess and understand the potential for violence related to a radical religious or political ideologies.

Suicide as a Motivator

Dr. Adam Lankford shares some important insight here regarding the interplay between suicidality and terrorism.
Before his work, there were some assumptions that the desire for change based on the religious, political, or social ideology was paramount. After his research (Lankford 2010, 2013), the issue of suicidality—the sense of hopelessness, depression, isolation, and failure—came forward as an initial catalyst rather than the desire to achieve some larger societal message or culture shift. Likewise, other research has identified the identity crisis and struggles often associated with those vulnerable to radicalization (Commission’s Expert Group on European Violent Radicalisation [CEGEVR] 2008; Horgan 2008; Pressman 2009).

This distinction here, regarding suicidality as primary motivation rather than an unfortunate price to pay for the cost of achieving a larger mission goal, is critical. The motivating factors must be understood before an attack. Plainly stated, a suicidal individual may look for a justification to take his or her own life, rather than losing one’s own life as an ultimate sacrifice for the cause. As we move into exploring the research with a focus on risk, protective factors (PFs) and underlying motivations, and suicidal thoughts and ideations, a desire to escape a life of chronic disappointments and pain is an important construct to understand.

There are many examples of those killed by police or who committed suicide as part of their attack plan. Larry McQuilliams who wrote “let me die” in marker across his chest during his 2014 attack in downtown Austin was killed. Larry McQuilliams who wrote “let me die” in marker across his chest during his 2014 attack in downtown Austin was killed by police (Olhieiser and Izadi 2014). John Russell Houser committed suicide after his attack on women at the screening of the movie Trainwreck (Karimi and Ellis 2015). Antireligious and white supremacist Chris Harper-Mercer shot and killed nine people at Umpqua Community College before killing himself (Ford and Payne 2015).

Case Methodology

After a literature review of the information available on radicalism and extremism and the a priori development of themes, the authors used a case study approach to better explore and confirm the presence of these factors in various cases of violence. The selection of cases stemmed from a population of cases with a specified ideology communicated directly or indirectly by the perpetrator as a motivating factor either before, during, or after the violent act. Theoretical sampling drove the case selection method with multiple cases chosen to fill various categories of ideological motivation, specifically anti-American, anti-Muslim, antiwomen, antigay, white supremacist, environmental protection, anti-Semitic, and antiabortion.

Although the authors’ intent is to consider each of these factors as they appear in college populations, case studies were selected based on the presence of a specified ideology instead of the enrollment of an individual on a college campus. Our approach explores ideologies related to radical thoughts and extremist actions that occur broadly outside of the college population to allow inferences to those that might occur within the college population. In reviewing the available literature and limited cases involving college populations, there do not appear to be critical differences in factors related to violent extremism between college and noncollege populations.

Terroristic and targeted attacks are often described as black swan events, occurring infrequently, yet drawing intense scrutiny when they do transpire. This reduced data set presents a challenge to traditional research methodologies. The cases presented in Appendix 1 also represent a wide timeline (1983–2017). The authors’ goal was to make sure the cases represent a broad array of ideological motivations and not focus only on anti-American terrorism. Various archival sources were used by the three authors to identify cases, including news story archives and previous literature. The authors wrote descriptive summaries while observing the factors and elements described in the archive information about the case. By looking for both RFs and PFs, the authors were able to identify cross-case patterns. The case study information was then used to refine the categories of RFs, PFs, and mobilization factors (MFs) identified in this article. We strove to bring together cases that illustrate the spectrum of escalating behavior toward violence, within a diversity of social justice, political, and religious content arenas.

Defining RFs, PFs, and Mobilization

There are no magic wands or crystal balls when it comes to assessing the risk of an individual with radical thoughts, divergent political ideologies, or fringe religious beliefs who is at the tipping point moving toward violence. The challenge here is to review the extensive literature on the topic of terrorism and extremism and draw from areas of convergence. These data and research then can help professionals on the frontline to avert a potential escalation by focusing on early intervention.

There are limitations in the existing research on radicalization, extremism, and terrorism. Broader research on terrorism is often limited to case studies and some analysis of archival data sets (Christmann 2012) and is largely focused on incidents connected with religious ideology. Much of the research on radicalization has also been concentrated on the act of violence, leaving the early process and thoughts before the violence unexplored (Scarcella et al. 2016). Although some research considered specific environments and populations, such as incarcerated communities (United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime [UNODC] 2016), information about individuals in colleges and universities has not been considered.

Existing tools related to assessing predictors for violence consider the subjects’ inner beliefs, psychological traits, their willingness to engage in extreme means, level of hostility, overall mental well-being, and stance toward authoritarianism and fundamentalism (Scarcella et al. 2016). Additional studies have critiqued the misuse of these tools by untrained professionals, the problem of false positives, and inconsistent or unpolished research regarding RFs and mobilization (Cage Advocacy 2016).

A central premise in the research related to RFs is applying caution to avoid getting lost in the woods because you become stuck on a singular leaf. Although we should be cautious about focusing on any one factor in isolation, the combination of factors can provide a framework for understanding the processes related to violent extremism (Christmann 2012; Schanzer et al. 2016). Those on-campus BITs and threat teams should cultivate the ability to look at a growing pattern of thoughts or behavior that can give insight into future trajectory.

RFs, PFs, and MFs for violence will always fall short of perfection. Given this limitation, we can proceed despite an
incomplete data set or limited tools. When assessing these factors, we should determine whether there is enough data to extrapolate a trajectory. For example, consider the phrase: “Cn I rd ths wrds wth vwls? hrd, bt nt mpsbl.” The key here when exploring factors is to not get lost in the woods or on a singular data point, but instead look at the patterns.

The concepts RFs, PFs, and MFs are supported by the literature reviewed in the following respective sections (Risk Factors, Protective Factors and Mobilization Factors) as well and past cases highlighted in Appendix 1.

**Risk factors**

RFs are the concerning thoughts or behaviors that have been shown by research and past attacks to be present. There are 10RFs that are highlighted here to better understand the escalation from radicalization to extremist and violent behavior. These are described in summary in Table 1.

1. Hardened point of view, injustice collecting. An individual with a hardened point of view begins to selectively attend to his or her environment, filtering out material or information that does not line up with his or her beliefs. Stances begin to harden and crystallize (Glasl 1999; Turner and Gelles 2003; Van Brunt 2012). These views are beyond a strongly held belief and contain a passion and emotion that rejects other points of view or hardened ideological positions, and they are reinforced through other personal experiences and networks (Sageman 2007).

Within a hardened point of view, an individual may begin injustice collecting (Calhoun and Weston 2009; O'Toole 2002; Van Brunt 2012, 2015). O'Toole described this individual as “a person who feels ‘wronged,’ ‘persecuted,’ and ‘destroyed,’ blowing injustices way out of proportion, never forgiving the person they felt has wronged them” (O'Toole and Bowman 2011, p. 186). Injustice collectors keep track of past wrongs committed against them and are often upset in a manner that exceeds what would typically be expected. They embrace past affronts, many back as far as childhood, and see the world from this stricken position. In addition, they often have poor coping skills to deal with their frustrations (Van Brunt 2015).

There is often the presence of a personal grievance that inspires one toward a political end (Her Majesty’s Government 2011). These grievances could be about poor personal experiences, unfair treatment at work, or more broad inequalities in society (Bhui et al. 2012). These grievances may have roots with the individual facing discrimination that prevents health, social status, and access to wealth (Bhui et al. 2012). They obsess on a perceived injustice or deprivation and experience anger, frustration, and shame as a result (Moghaddam 2005; Pressman 2009). These strong feelings of injustice may be expressed toward a group or country and inspire a desire for revenge (Pressman 2009).

Omar Mateen (Case 3) discussed his desire for vengeance and justice for those killed in American airstrikes. Dylann Roof (Case 5) wrote that violence is necessary to fight for white people and white supremacy. Eric Rudolph (Case 25) planted multiple bombs to fight against abortion and the so-called homosexual agenda. Each of these cases demonstrates the strongly held, hardened beliefs that, in turn, feed a desire to create justice in the face of injustice.

2. Marginalization and perceived discrimination. Here the individual exists within a marginalized state in society. This marginalization may be based on social factors, ethnic or racial differences, cultural dissimilarities, or diverse gender expression. Marginalization may be related to differences in religious involvement, records of past crimes, the presence of mental illness, or divergent political ideologies. The marginalized individual feels out of step with the greater society and experiences being an outsider (Bhui et al. 2012). The marginalized individual may experience microaggressions that contribute to feelings of “outsiderness” and difference. Sue (2010) defines these experiences with microaggressions as, “brief, everyday exchanges that send denigrating messages to certain individuals because of their group membership” (p. xvi). These are often unintended slights that have serious implications and impact those of a different country, ethnicity, culture, sexual identity, disability, or mental illness (Van Brunt 2015).

Those who are marginalized often experience discrimination that results in a perceived threat to the group in which the individual identifies and a sense of moral outrage (Bhui et al. 2012; Sageman 2007). This discrimination and perception of social injustices often create barriers to integration into mainstream society (CEGEVR 2008). They experience humiliation, deprivation, and stigmatization that may result in a high level of anger and frustration (Pressman 2009; Schmid 2013).

Andrew Joseph Stack (Case 20) wrote in his six-page suicide note of the way the Internal Revenue Service marginalized and discriminated against him through his taxes. Members of the Earth Liberation Front (Case 26) burned down a Vail ski resort on behalf of the lynx population that they believed would have been decimated by the construction. George Hennard (Case 29) blamed women for the way they treated him and called them snakes and vipers. Each of the attackers felt marginalized and discriminated against by different groups and chose violence to meet their goals.

3. Connection to extremists. The individual seeks contact with extreme subcultures within his or her local community (Sinai 2005, 2012) or through friends, family, lovers, or a political event to learn more about the extremist movement (Gill 2007; Her Majesty’s
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**Table 1. Overview of Risk Factors, Protective Factors, and Mobilization**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Hardened point of view, injustice collecting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Marginalization and perceived discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Connection to extremists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Affiliation seeking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Indoctrination into polarized religious thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Cognitive bleakness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Personal failures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Societal disengagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Justification to violent action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Predisposing characteristics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Government 2011; McCauley and Moskalenko 2008; Schmid 2013). There may be an interest in extremist narratives that manifest with an individual seeking information on the internet (Pressman 2009; Weimann 2006) or attending group meetings (Bhui et al. 2012). In some cases, the individual may travel abroad for more than 6 months and have contact with extremist networks (Horgan 2008; Pressman 2009; Travis 2008).

The individual may also crave a connection with a charismatic leader or spiritual sanctioner of his or her beliefs (Horgan 2008; Pressman 2009; Sinai 2005, 2012; Travis 2008). A “cognitive opening” drives the individual to seek a religious or political ideology that echoes the individual’s concerns (Sinai 2005, 2012). This leader then exploits this opening or identity confusion and takes advantage of the individual’s vulnerability and weakness (Neumann and Rodgers 2007). The leader seeks to shift the blame and focus to an enemy (Moghaddam 2005), particularly if the movement has
demonstrated the enemy (CEGEVR 2008; Weimann 2006).

Also of concern are teachings and doctrines that glorify violence (Pressman 2009) as a means to an end and exploits the “cognitive opening” of a vulnerable individual following frustration, anger, and desire to find something tangible to blame for his or her misfortune (Schmid 2013; Sinai 2005, 2012). The group may use propaganda that reduces cognitive dissonance, supports adherence to groupthink, supports moral disengagement, and dehumanizes the enemy (CEGEVR 2008; Weimann 2006).

These communities may provide an opportunity for individuals to become extremists for a cause (Sinai 2005, 2012) and to seek revenge of those who have wronged them (Pressman 2009). The enemy is further polarized in the mind of the followers as they are encouraged to see themselves as different from their enemies (Borum 2011; Moghaddam 2005). There is a level of moral disengagement wherein they see their actions as pure and blessed and their enemies as flawed and corrupt (Moghaddam 2005). There is little empathy for those outside their specific group (Pressman 2009).

4. Affiliation seeking. Here the individual has a strong desire to identify with a like-minded group (CEGEVR 2008; McCauley and Moskalenko 2008; Pressman 2009). They are motivated by the experience of the group and the sense of community and solidarity that is offered (Her Majesty’s Government 2011). They may seek coalitions that share their viewpoint and strengthen their resolve to action. They seek supporters to their viewpoint, often within the peer/social group or through online connections. The individual seeks to find those who confirm existing beliefs and reinforce a villainized target (Meloy and Hoffman 2014; Randazzo and Plummer 2009; Van Brut 2012).

This group affiliation provides the person with increased agreement with the extreme position being adopted in his or her views (McCauley and Moskalenko 2008). The acceptance by the group may provide a sense of legitimized goals (Moghaddam 2005), a reward such as status or a title (Horgan 2008) or the filling of a high need for approval and acceptance for the individual (CEGEVR 2008; Pressman 2009). The group provides support for their political, religious, or ideological cause (Her Majesty’s Government 2011; Pressman 2009) as well as offering a sense of bonding, belonging, and identity (Pressman 2009; Sageman 2007).

The group may also use a leader/spiritual sanctioner who offers justification or a license to kill in the name of religion (Slothman and Tilley 2006), as well as any underlying messages in the ideology that justify violent acts. Consider the example of religious ideologies.

Although religion offers many a sense of peace and solace along with a better way to understand the world, conceptualize a sense of purpose, and give meaning to suffering, there are some characteristics within some religious groups that should be considered as escalating factors for extremism. Religious doctrines that have an overly legalistic, orthodox, and black/white view of the world can empower those seeking justification or a license to kill in the name of religion (Slothman and Tilley 2006; Sinai 2005, 2012). This doctrine or teaching is reductionist and limiting, referring to a singular concept of truth and encouraging trust for only those religious authorities who conform to their existing beliefs (Borum 2011).

Also of concern are teachings and doctrines that glorify violence (Pressman 2009) as a means to an end and exploits the “cognitive opening” of a vulnerable individual follower’s frustration, anger, and desire to find something tangible to blame for his or her misfortune (Schmid 2013; Sinai 2005, 2012). The group may use propaganda that reduces cognitive dissonance, supports adherence to groupthink, supports moral disengagement, and dehumanizes the enemy (CEGEVR 2008; Weimann 2006).

5. Expressions of polarized thinking and ideology. The underlying distinction between other types of violence and violent extremism or terrorism is the presence of a political, social, or religious ideology. When considering the element of risk associated with a radical ideology and the potential for movement to violence, the focus must be on the individual’s willingness to engage in thinking that is different from his or her own as well as any underlying messages in the ideology that justify violent acts. Consider the example of religious ideologies.

The leader exploits those searching for spiritual guidance (Her Majesty’s Government 2011; Horgan 2008), those having identity conflicts or vulnerability (Neumann and Rodgers 2007), and those with a high need for approval and acceptance (Pressman 2009).

Dylann Roof (Case 5) connected to others on the internet who shared his beliefs related to triggering a race war. Chris Harper-Mercer (Case 7) admired and studied mass killings before his attack at Umpqua Community College. Patrick Stein, Gavin Wright, and Curtis Allen all had links on their Facebook pages to conspiracy and anti-Muslim websites in their planned attack in Garden City, Kansas. Twenty-nine Greenpeace activists (Case 15) were involved in the attempted boarding and shutting down of the Russian oil rig Prirazlomnaya. Anzorovich “Jahar” Tsarnaev and his brother Tamerlan Tsarnaev (Case 14) planted bombs during the Boston Marathon at the inspiration of Muslim cleric Anwar al-Awlaki.
and extreme pressure to conform and comply with the norms of the group (McCauley and Moskalenko 2008). There is pressure for group cohesion and emersion into the group, which further legitimizes the goals of the group (McCauley and Moskalenko 2008; Moghaddam 2005).

Robert Dear (Case 8) killed three and injured nine in his Planned Parenthood attack based on his deeply held religious convictions. Wade Page (Case 16) was influenced by his white supremacist ideologies when he killed six people in his attack on a Sikh temple. Timothy McVeigh (Case 27) hoped to inspire a revolt against the government with the Oklahoma City bombing. Larry Steve McQuilliams (Case 13) attacked the Mexican Consulate shortly after President Obama issued his executive order regarding immigration.

6. Cognitive bleakness. This occurs when the individual’s thinking is full of dissatisfaction and disillusionment, wrought with anger, disenfranchisement, and emotional vulnerability (Goli and Rezzei 2010; Horgan 2008). Depressive symptoms create sympathies for violent protests and terrorism. They are occupied with thoughts of disconnection, isolation, and rejection of the values and society around them (Her Majesty’s Government 2011; Horgan 2008; Pressman 2009). They may struggle to feel connected to their social group, reject societal values, feel alienated and disengaged from others (CEGEVR 2008; Taarnby 2005), or they may feel caught and lost between cultural expectations or between generations (CEGEVR 2008).

This sense of bleakness creates a “cognitive opening” or “identity crisis” wherein a catalyst or crisis can shake the individual’s previously held beliefs (Bhui et al. 2012; Christmann 2012; Wiktorowicz 2004). The dissatisfaction with mainstream political or social protests as a method to create change (Horgan 2008) leads to a seeking of a new way of thinking that creates a larger sense of meaning that seems more true (Wiktorowicz 2004). This may be found through seeking a religious or political ideology that supports violent action, or an internalized martyrdom, as a clearer path (Pressman 2009). They also become a target for recruitment tactics based on this vulnerability (Moghaddam 2005).

Patrick Stein, Gavin Wright, and Curtis Allen (Case 12) all held anger and frustration toward women and Somali immigrants, which they called “cockroaches.” Wellington Menezes de Oliveira (Case 18) talked about a long history of bullying, depression, and a desire for suicide in a note before his 2011 attack in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. Nidal Malik Hasan (Case 22) killed 13 people in his Fort Hood attack after feeling marginalized and disenfranchised as a Muslim in the American Armed Forces.

7. Personal failures. The Individuals’ environment around them is in freefall. They experience a powerful loss or difficulty integrating with their community, school, work, primary support group, and/or social circle. Examples include chronic unemployment, a financial crisis, death of a loved one, problems adjusting to a new life circumstance such as a birth of a child in a perceived unjust world, dismissal from an academic program or internship, a sudden loss of a job, or a sense of blocked upward mobility based on their personal characteristics such as race, ethnicity, religious beliefs, or appearance (Bhui et al. 2012; Schmid 2013; Travis 2008). Individuals may experience discrimination based on a marginalized status with little or no hope for a pathway to a better tomorrow (Sinai 2005, 2012) or lack of social or occupational opportunities within their community (Schmid 2013). These failures may include longer term isolation from others or inability to create or maintain sexual or intimate relationships with others (Meloy TRAP-18).

Omar Mateen (Case 3) had lost his job as a prison guard after threatening to bring a gun to work and was unsuccessful gaining admission into the police academy before his 2013 attack at a Florida night club. Andrew Joseph Stack (Case 20) was being audited by the IRS at the time of his attack. George Hennard (Case 29) had a history of stalking and was discharged from the Merchant Marines before his 1991 attack.

8. Societal disengagement. The individuals begin to feel separated from larger societal values and experience social or political frustrations. They distrust those in the established order and may have experienced a history of violence at the hands of an unjust authority in the past (CEGEVR 2008; Pressman 2009, Slootman and Tilley 2006). In a society that they feel is endorsing negative attitudes toward religious or other groups, the individual actor’s willingness to buy into state legitimacy is reduced (CAGE).

They may have been culturally uprooted or displaced (Horgan 2008) or face marginalization or discrimination related to migration from another country or environment (Schmid 2013; Travis 2008). If the individuals are connected to a social group or community, they might perceive a threat to this social or cultural group (Moghaddam 2005) or feel anger at political foreign policy and actions of the country (Slootman and Tilley 2006). In their mind, violence against the state is justified because they are morally engaged and their enemy is not (Horgan 2008; Moghaddam 2005).

Anders Behring Breivik (Case 19) was socially isolated before his bombing and shooting attack in Norway. George Hennard (Case 29) also experienced social isolation and disengagement before his shooting attack in 1991. Syed Rizwan Farook (Case 4) was increasingly socially disengaged from others at his work due to his religious perspective and had an altercation with his work before the 2015 San Bernardino attack. Khalid Aldawsari (Case 17) indicated that depression and isolation were contributing factors to his desire to build a weapon of mass destruction.

9. Justification for violent action. Before committing to violence, it is necessary for the individuals to achieve a sense of peace and larger justification for their actions (Moghaddam 2005). As with soldiers, there is a period of moral disengagement and adherence to the mission wherein the enemy is depersonalized and dehumanized (O’Toole 2002; O’Toole and Bowman 2011; Van Brunt 2012, 2015). There is often a pervasive sense of anger and frustration toward the target and a desire for revenge (Pressman 2009).
This justification may include a sense of moral outrage, a desire for vicarious revenge and a willingness to die for a cause based on political, religious, or ideological goals (Bhui et al. 2012; Porta and LaFree 2012; Pressman 2009; Schmid 2013) or in reaction to a personal loss or grievance (McCaulley and Moskalenko 2008). There is peer, family, and/or community support for violent action (Pressman 2009) and the individual sees violence as a natural consequence for an unjust enemy (Horgan 2008; Pressman 2009).

Andrew Joseph Stack (Case 20) saw his attack justified against the IRS for the way the government had treated him over the years. Anders Behring Breivik (Case 19) felt justified in his 2011 attack in Norway against the ruling party’s attitude toward Muslims, Islam, and political correctness. Activists from the Earth Liberation Front (Case 26) believed their actions were justified in protecting the environment and lynx population when burning down the ski resort in Vail, Colorado. Likewise, Rodney Coronado (Case 28) saw the firebombing of the Michigan laboratory in 1992 as vindicated against the university and the fur industry he believed they were supporting.

10. Predisposing characteristics. There are several characteristics in the literature that are correlated with extremists. These include:

a. easily manipulated, impressionable, a sense of low self-esteem (CEGEVR 2008; Pressman 2009),
b. religious naivety (Travis 2008),
c. depressive symptoms (Bhui et al. 2016; Her Majesty’s Government 2011),
d. early exposure to violence in the home or community, negative social backgrounds, and military or paramilitary training at home (Pressman 2009),
e. a serious criminal history of incarceration (Christmann 2012; Her Majesty’s Government 2011; Travis 2008),
f. thrill-seeking, chasing fantasies of glory (Bhui et al. 2012; Sageman 2007).

Dylann Roof (Case 5) had a serious criminal past of felony drug convictions. Wellington Menezes de Oliveira (Case 18) displayed a low sense of self-esteem, depression, and suicidal feelings before his attack in 2011. Jim Adkisson (Case 23) displayed a religious naivety and desire for glory in his 2008 attack at the Universalist Unitarian Church.

Protective factors

PFs are those stabilizing, social, or environmental supports that balance and gird the RFs. In the R3, these PFs are reducing and mitigating the impact of RFs. As with the RFs, these PFs are supported by research in radicalization, extremism, and terrorism as well as lessons from previous attacks. These are described in summary in Table 2.

1. Social connection. A central PF involves the individual’s connection to family, friends, and community. These connections include positive experiences with social support and attachment to others, those who have positive attachments to the community, and a sense of social bonds (Bhui et al. 2016; Pressman 2009). There is support from a societal level of group belonging and integrated cultural respect and identity (Kurzman 2011). There is a sense of belonging and acceptance for the individual within his or her primary support group, neighborhood, community, and within the larger society. Opportunities exist to engage with political structures and processes (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization [UNESCO] 2016) that provide prospects for peaceful collective action and community solidarity.

2. Pluralistic inclusivity. This phrase describes an individual who can balance various opposing viewpoints simultaneously. In many ways, this is a hallmark of an ideal college student experience—the ability to hold differing points of view without advancing to harmful debate or contentious argument (Sokolow et al. 2014). The individual has been exposed to positive experiences with counter-ideological narratives (Kurzman 2011) through his or her primary support, community, and societal influences.

The religious, societal, or political ideology is tempered with a sense of inclusiveness and tolerance for other points of view. There is pluralistic and inclusive understanding of religious doctrine created within a backdrop of equal participation (Moghadam 2005). Within the community, whether religious, social, or political, there is a lack of peer or community support for violent action (Pressman 2009). Conversations within these communities are helpful to clarify beliefs and encourage empathy and understanding for diverse positions. This provides access to critical leadership that can moderate and inform perspectives (Bhui et al. 2012). It be that although the individual does not leave a potential violent group, he or she shifts ideologies (Pressman 2009) or disengages from violence, or he or she may begin to feel that the violent methods were not legitimate or lose faith and become disillusioned with the leader of the group (Horgan 2008).

Furrow (Case 24) lacked this sense of pluralistic inclusively and allowed his hardened beliefs to drive his 1999 attack on a Jewish Community Center in 1999. This was similar to Cross’s (Case 9) more recent attack of a Jewish Community Center in 2014. Adkisson (Case 23) attacked a Unitarian Universalist Church in Tennessee because he believed they were running the country with their inclusive, liberal teachings.

3. Nonviolent outlets. Individuals have access to nonviolent outlets for expressing frustrations and resolving grievances (Bhui et al. 2012; Kurzman 2011). This occurs in peer and family groups as well as within

---

Table 2. Overview of Protective Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protective factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Social connection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Pluralistic inclusivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Nonviolent outlets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Social safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Emotional stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Professional/academic engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Global competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Empathy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Resilience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Consequences of actions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

This table provides an overview of protective factors that balance and gird the risks of violent extremism. These factors are supported by research in radicalization, extremism, and terrorism as well as lessons from previous attacks. The table is organized to highlight key areas where protective factors can be found, such as social connection, pluralistic inclusivity, and nonviolent outlets.
community and society. They have access to democratic means for negotiating how to meet their individual needs, explore options related to opportunities to improve their situation (social mobility), or to change a decision impacting them (Moghaddam 2005). When faced with grievances, individuals have an opportunity to seek resolution through nonviolent actions (Schmid 2013). Family and the community offer support with a rejection of violence (Pressman 2009). They are connected to opportunities for peaceful collective action (UNESCO 2016).

4. Social safety. Here individuals have a sense of safety and security within their family, community, and social structures (Bhui et al. 2012). They have family support toward nonviolent action (Pressman 2009; Schanzer et al. 2016) along with other significant peer support. They feel connected and able to have their voice heard in political action movements. These environments may be nurturing to their particular point of view or at least tolerant of diverse viewpoints within a backdrop of acceptance. There are opportunities for new social connections, supportive relationships, and educational or employment progress (Horgan 2008).

5. Emotional stability. This is the opposite of vulnerability and emotional instability. There is a psychological steadiness, well-being, and constancy as well as sense of empathy and understanding of other’s points of view (Pressman 2009). Individuals have the capacity to process cultural ideals in contrast to their personal beliefs and have a sense of self-esteem, empowerment, and an integrated cultural identity (Bhui et al. 2012). There is a resistance to extremist narratives and they have acquired the skills needed to balance their doubts and engage constructively in nonviolent ways to reach their goals (UNESCO 2016).

6. Professional/academic engagement. Individuals are engaged in or have achieved professional, career, or academic success. They are a part of these communities and possess a sense of connection, commitment, and progress in their academic or professional lives (Bhui et al. 2012). They engage in critical thinking, have a sense of empowerment and engage in activism related to counter-violent ideologies (Schmid 2013). They have a high sense of self-esteem and view their place in the professional and academic world on stable ground (Pressman 2009).

7. Global competence. A sense of global competence implies an empathetic acceptance and tolerance to diverse viewpoints, religions, and philosophies. This does not imply a commitment to these various perspectives, but rather an emphasis on equal and inclusive participation (Moghaddam 2005). Individuals with a sense of global competence often have a multifaceted and cohesive view of society (Kurzmann 2011) and a respect for the potential shifts in various ideologies over time (Pressman 2009). They are willing to investigate the world and recognize the variety of perspectives that exist across cultures and religions (Jackson 2017). They appreciate the history and cultural motivations of behavior and can recognize, analyze, and articulate diverse perspectives, including those with which they personally disagree with (Jackson 2017).

8. Empathy. The ability to empathize with other’s perspectives stands against the dangers of objectification, dehumanization, and depersonalization (O’Toole 2002; O’Toole and Bowman 2011; Turner and Gelles 2003; Van Brunt 2012, 2015a). Jackson (2017) writes, “Willingness of one group to harm another group often stems from a lack of accurate information about the other’s history, cultural motivation and behavior” (p. 19). Empathy fosters a sense of community and perspective-taking that promotes understanding, tolerance, and acceptance and leads to a shared sense of attainment, opportunity, and positive prospects.

9. Sense of identity. Here individuals have a well-defined sense of self (Christmann 2012; Higgins 1994; Richardson et al. 1990; Taylor and Wang 2000). They are progressing toward or have achieved a sense of self-actualization. They are morally engaged and have a sense of critical decision-making (Bandura 1999; Kohlberg 1973). There is a cognitive resistance to extremist narratives, and they have acquired the skills needed to balance their doubts and engage constructively in society without the need for violence (UNESCO 2016).

10. Consequence of actions. Individuals have a sense of moral engagement and awareness of how their choices result in positive or negative actions (Bandura 1999; Kohlberg 1973; UNESCO 2016). They avoid negative action to avoid negative consequences for their social circle, primary support group, and career and financial status.

Mobilization

Mobilization captures the factors that are present when an individual transitions from a planning stage toward implementation. If the RFs are the gasoline and the PFs are dampening rain making the fire harder to start, the MFs could be the match to the gasoline. These are described in summary in Table 3.

1. Direct threat. Has there been a direct threat made by the individual in terms of his or her desire to move forward to an attack? This could be a threat to blow up the school, kill his or her professor or wage war on an unjust state. The threat does not require access to means or a specific plan. Does the individual express

Table 3. Overview of Mobilization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mobilization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Direct threat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Reactivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Escalation to action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Catalyst event(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Suicide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Increased group pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Access to lethal means</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Narrowing on target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Evaporating protective inhibitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Leakage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Suicide. Is the individual currently suicidal? Does he or she have thoughts of hopelessness, desperation, and a desire to take his or her own life (ATAP 2006; Dunkle et al. 2008; Lankford 2010, 2013; Meloy et al. 2014; O’Toole 2002; Randazzo and Plummer 2009; Turner and Gelles 2003; Van Brunt 2012, 2015a)?

6. Increased group pressure. Participation with the group includes a crystallization of ideas and a movement toward strengthening a viewpoint with an implied action (McCauley and Moskalenko 2008; Moghaddam 2005). The individual limits his or her view to ideas and thoughts that confirm existing beliefs that reinforce a villainized target (ASIS and SHRM 2011; ATAP 2006; Meloy et al. 2011; O’Toole 2002; Randazzo and Plummer 2009; Turner and Gelles 2003; Van Brunt 2012, 2015a). This could be involvement with a social media or internet group that provides a larger opportunity to reject societal or community values and receive support for divergent ideas.

7. Access to lethal means. Does the individual have access to weapons and/or is he or she researching plans of attack and/or building capability and the training that provides a readiness to act (ASIS and SHRM 2011; ATAP 2006; Meloy et al. 2011; Sinai 2005, 2012; Turner and Gelles 2003; US Post Office 2007; Vossekui et al. 2002)? Has he or she been contacted by or sought contact with violent extremists (Pressman 2009) who can provide access to funds, violent knowledge, and skills (Her Majesty’s Government 2011)?

8. Narrowing on target. Is there a narrowing fixation and focus on a target such as a person, group, or system (ASIS and SHRM 2011; Deisinger et al. 2014; Meloy et al. 2011; O’Toole and Bowman 2011; Turner and Gelles 2003; US Post Office 2007)? Is there an expressed desire for revenge fueled by a high level of anger and frustration (Pressman 2009) or centered on past injustices (ASIS and SHRM 2011; ATAP 2006; Calhoun and Weston 2009; O’Toole and Bowman 2011; Randazzo and Plummer 2009; Turner and Gelles 2003; Van Brunt 2012, 2015a)? Is there an angry perseveration, increasingly strident opinion, or angry emotional overtone in writing or emails (Van Brunt 2016)? An example of this narrowing was Roeder (Case 21) killing a physician known for performing late-term abortions. Roeder narrowed on those who killed preborn children onto a specific doctor he had access to attack.

9. Evaporating protective inhibitors. Is there a loss—gradual or sudden—of the social, financial, emotional, cognitive, spiritual, or psychological support that previously kept the individual from unstable or violent action (ATAP 2006; Randazzo and Plummer 2009; US Post Office 2007; Vossekui et al. 2002)? Is there a loss of PFs that kept the individual stabilized and away from action (Moghaddam 2005)?

10. Leakage. Has there been leakage around an attack plan or research (ATAP 2006; Deisinger et al. 2014; O’Toole 2002; O’Toole and Bowman 2011; Vossekui et al. 2002) and/or sharing of last act behaviors or the creation of a legacy token (ATAP 2006; Meloy et al. 2011; Turner and Gelles 2003; Van Brunt 2015)? Does the individual glorify violent events with graphic and disturbing language without an awareness of how these impacts others (ATAP 2006; Meloy et al. 2011; O’Toole 2002; Turner and Gelles 2003; US Post Office 2007; Vossekui et al. 2002). This may
also include fraudulent and concealment behaviors such as misrepresenting travel plans and possessing false documentation (Horgan et al. 2016). Days before the attack, Jared Miller (Case 11) posted videos on YouTube describing his desire for an armed resistance against the government. He writes, ‘Those of us who know the truth and dare speak it, know that the enemy we face are indeed our brothers…. To stop this oppression, I fear, can… only be accomplished with bloodshed.’

Final Thoughts

College BITs and TATs need tools better understand the risks associated with violent extremism. This article identifies the RFs, PFs, and MFs associated with the movement from radical thoughts and perspectives to extremism and violence, and it sets the stage for further analysis of these factors in the college and university environment. The intent is not to create obstacles to progressive social movements, free speech, and activism. In fact, the hope is that by understanding a more objective set of factors related to extremism, it is the first step in identifying more appropriate prevention strategies and interventions for those at-risk of violence.
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Appendix 1. Overview of Attacks

1. Quebec Mosque Shooting
   Alexandre Bissonnette, a student at Laval University, killed six and wounded eight people when he opened fire at a mosque in Quebec (Austen and Smith 2017). Bissonnette was described by friends as being very right leaning and an ultranationalist white supremacist with many related posts on social media. He made frequent extreme comments on social media denigrating refugees and feminism (Perreaux and Andrew-Gee 2017). The mosque was previously a target of a hate crime when a severed pig’s head was left there in June during the month of Ramadan (Newton and Yan 2017) (Appendix Tables A1 and A2).

2. Ohio State Shooting
   On November 28, 2016, Abdul Razak Ali Artan drove his car into a group of students at Ohio State University (Grinberg et al. 2016). Artan exited the vehicle with a butcher knife and began to slash and stab those around him. Thirteen people were injured in the attack. Artan was a Muslim Somali refugee and legal permanent resident of the United States. Minutes before the attack, he posted the following on Facebook. “In the name of Allah, the most merciful and the most gracious. My brothers and sisters, I am sick and tired of seeing my Muslim Brothers and Sisters being killed and tortured EVERYWHERE. Seeing my fellow Muslims being tortured, raped and killed in Burton led to a boiling point. I can’t take it anymore. America stop interfering with other countries, especially the Muslim Ummah (community). We are not weak. We are [not] weak, remember that. If you want us Muslims to stop carrying lone wolf attacks, then make peace with ‘Daawa in al sham.’ Make a pact or a treaty with them where you promise to leave them alone, you and your fellow apostate allies. By Allah, we will not let you sleep unless you give peace to the Muslims. You will not celebrate or enjoy any holiday. Stop all wars, all conflicts, all interventions. Everyone, Muslims and non-Muslims, let’s show mercy and respect to each other. Join our fight against the wolf attacks, then make peace with ‘Dawla in al sham.’”

   The FBI reports Roof was self-radicalized in his beliefs and was not connected to a larger terrorist group. Prosecutors

   were here today wouldn’t the western media call them terrorists? To conclude by Allah, I am willing to use a billion infidels in retribution” Kruta (2016, p. 1).

3. Orlando “Pulse” Shooting
   In June of 2016, Omar Mateen killed 49 people and wounded 53 in an Orlando gay nightclub. Mateen claimed the attack for Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) and claimed it was revenge for the killing of ISIL militant Abu Waheeb the previous month. He purchased two firearms legally in the weeks before the attack. During the attack, he posted on Facebook, “I pledge my alliance to (ISIS leader) Abu Bakr al Baghdadi. May Allah accept me.” “You kill innocent women and children by doing us airstrikes. Now taste the Islamic state vengeance,” and “In the next few days you will see attacks from the Islamic state in the USA” (Zimmerman 2016, p. 1).

   Mateen was previously a prison guard who was terminated for joking about bringing a gun to work. He unsuccessfully tried to become a state trooper in 2011 and failed to gain admission into the police academy in 2015 (Swisher 2016). He was a security guard before the attack. There are reports he had a history of being mentally unstable, physically abusive, and was a long-time steroid user. He often used slurs and those who worked with him as security guards shared that he had a lot of hatred for people—black people, women, Jews, Hispanics, and gay or lesbian people (Times of Israel Staff 2016).

4. San Bernardino Shooting
   In December of 2015, Syed Rizwan Farook and Tashfeen Malik, a married couple from California, attacked an 80-person Christmas party at the San Bernardino County Department of Public Health. Syed was an American born citizen of Pakistani decent and Tashfeen was a Pakistani born legal U.S. resident. The couple fled after the shooting and were killed by police.

   Per the FBI, the couple had been stockpiling weapons, ammunition, and bomb-making material and had visited many websites related to jihadism and martyrdom and had traveled to Saudi Arabia before the attack. They had been planning an attack as early as 2011 and it is believed the mandatory attendance at the company Christmas party was a catalyst for the event (Christie et al. 2016). In the weeks before the attack, they acquired a $28,000 loan believed to help fund the attack. Investigations are ongoing, but it is believed the couple self-radicalized before their terroristic attack (Williams and Abdullah 2015).

5. Charleston Church Shooting
   In June 2015, gunman Dylann Roof shot and killed nine people at a church service at the Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church in Charleston, South Carolina (Reuters Staff, 2015). Roof became radicalized in his beliefs concerning white supremacy after the Trayvon Martin shooting in Florida in 2012. Roof had two prior arrests and convictions on felony drug counts that should have prevented him from purchasing the firearm used in the attack (Sanchez and Payne 2016).

   The FBI reports Roof was self-radicalized in his beliefs and was not connected to a larger terrorist group. Prosecutors

   APPENDIX TABLE A1. ATTACKS BY MOTIVATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Animal rights</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiabortion</td>
<td>8, 21, 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-American</td>
<td>2, 3, 4, 13, 14, 17, 20, 22, 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiauthority/police</td>
<td>10, 11, 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antibully</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antigay</td>
<td>3, 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiliberal</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Muslim</td>
<td>1, 12, 16, 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Semitism</td>
<td>3, 6, 9, 24, 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiwomen</td>
<td>1, 3, 6, 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental protection</td>
<td>15, 26, 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White supremacist</td>
<td>3, 5, 7, 9, 16, 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1/29/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11/28/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6/12/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12/2/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6/17/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>07/23/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>10/1/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>11/27/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4/13/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>06/04/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>06/08/2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
### Appendix Table A2. (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Attacker(s)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>10/14/2014</td>
<td>Patrick Stein, Gavin Wright, and Curtis Allen</td>
<td>The Crusaders: Stein, Wright, and Allen belonged to a group that held sovereign citizen, antigovernment, anti-Muslim, and anti-immigrant extremist beliefs. The men allegedly said the attack would “wake people up.” The three men were arrested after revealing a plan to attack an apartment complex in Garden City, Kansas, to an undercover FBI agent.</td>
<td>Anti-Muslim, anti-immigrant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>11/28/2014</td>
<td>Larry Steve McQuilliams</td>
<td>Downtown Austin Shootings: McQuilliams, fired &gt;100 rounds at government buildings in downtown Austin, including a police station, a Mexican consulate, a federal courthouse, and a bank. Police characterized McQuilliams as a “homegrown American terrorist trying to terrorize our people.”</td>
<td>Anti-American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>4/15/2013</td>
<td>Anzorovich “Jahar” and Tamerlan Tsarnaev</td>
<td>Boston Bombing: The brothers planted bombs around the Boston Marathon. The bombings killed 3 people and injured ~280 others.</td>
<td>Anti-American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>9/20/2013</td>
<td>Greenpeace</td>
<td>Russian Oil Rig: Twenty-nine Greenpeace activists on the ship the Arctic Sunrise were taken into custody by the Russian coast guard after they attempted to board and stop work on the Prirazlomnaya oil platform.</td>
<td>Environmental protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>08/05/2012</td>
<td>Wade Michael Page</td>
<td>Wisconsin Sikh Temple Shooting: Page, a white supremacist, used a semiautomatic weapon to murder six people during an attack on a Sikh temple in Oak Creek, Wisconsin. He had been a member of the neo-Nazi rock bands End Empathy and Definite Hate. Page committed suicide after being wounded by the responding officers.</td>
<td>Anti-Sikh/Muslim, white supremacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2/23/2011</td>
<td>Khalid Ali-M Aldawsari</td>
<td>Attempt to use weapon of mass destruction: Aldawsari was admitted to the United States on a student visa from Saudi Arabia, and was arrested on attempted use of a weapon of mass destruction. He described his desire for violence in blogs and a personal journal.</td>
<td>Anti-American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>7/22/2011</td>
<td>Anders Behring Breivik</td>
<td>Norway Shooting: Breivik set off a bomb at a government building in Oslo, killing eight. He then posed as a police officer and killed 69 youths on Utoya Island, a labor party youth camp. He claimed to have taken these actions to prevent a Muslim takeover of Europe.</td>
<td>Anti-Muslim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2/18/2010</td>
<td>Andrew Joseph Stack</td>
<td>Austin Suicide Attack: Stack deliberately flew his single engine aircraft into an IRS building, killing 1 and injuring 13 others. His suicide note detailed his dislike of the government and the IRS.</td>
<td>Anti-American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>5/31/2009</td>
<td>Scott Roeder</td>
<td>Assassination of George Tiller: Roeder killed Dr. George Tiller, a physician who was known for performing late-term abortions. Roeder publicly stated he had shot Tiller because “preborn children’s lives were in imminent danger.”</td>
<td>Antiabortion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>11/5/2009</td>
<td>Nidal Malik Hasan</td>
<td>Fort Hood Mass Shooting: The army major and psychiatrist fatally shot 13 people and injured &gt;30 others. Hasan was charged with 13 counts of premeditated murder and 32 counts of attempted murder under the Uniform Code of Military Justice. He was sentenced to death in August 2013.</td>
<td>Anti-American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Attacker(s)</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>07/27/2008</td>
<td>Jim David Adkisson</td>
<td>Tennessee Valley Unitarian Universalist Church Shooting: Adkisson killed two and injured seven others when he opened fire at a musical performance in Tennessee. Adkisson stated that he had targeted the church because they were ruining the country with their liberal teachings.</td>
<td>Antiliberals, Antidemocrats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>8/10/1999</td>
<td>Buford O. Furrow, Jr.</td>
<td>Los Angeles Jewish Community Center: Furrow wounded five people when he opened fire at a Jewish Community Center. He then killed a Latino mail carrier for his ethnicity and for being a federal employee. He said, “I wanted this shooting to be a wakeup call to America to kill Jews.”</td>
<td>Anti-Semitism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>10/8/1998</td>
<td>Chelsea Gerlach, Stanislas Meyerhoff, and Josephine Overaker</td>
<td>Vail Ski Resort Arson: The Earth Liberation Front burned down a Vail ski resort to protect the lynx population.</td>
<td>Environmental protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>04/19/1995</td>
<td>Timothy McVeigh</td>
<td>Oklahoma City bombing: The attack killed 158 people and injured &gt;600. McVeigh hoped to inspire a revolt against the government. McVeigh was executed by lethal injection on June 11, 2001.</td>
<td>Antigovernment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>02/28/1992</td>
<td>Rodney Coronado</td>
<td>Michigan State University’s (MSU) campus: Coronado was an ecoanarchist and an animal rights activists. On February 28, 1992, he built a pyre in an office. He was convicted for an arson attack on MSU’s campus. The incident caused $125,000 worth of damage and destroyed 32 years of research data.</td>
<td>Animal rights, environmental protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>09/16/1991</td>
<td>George Hennard</td>
<td>The Luby’s Shooting: Hennard drove his pickup truck through the front window of Luby’s restaurant, shot and killed 23 people, and wounded 27 others before he committed suicide. Hennard was described by others as angry and withdrawn, with a hatred of women and ethnic minorities.</td>
<td>Antifeminism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>07/1983–03/1985</td>
<td>Louis Beam</td>
<td>The Order: Beam is a voice of antigovernment hatred and white supremacy. He was part of The Order, a far-right terrorist group that had issued a “Declaration of War” against the United States in 1984. He and 13 others were indicted for “a seditious conspiracy between July 1983 and March 1985 to overthrow the government.”</td>
<td>Anti-American, white supremacy, anti-Semitism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
in the case argued Roof believes, “that violent action is necessary to fight for white people and achieve white supremacy … and that the choice of targets and execution of violent action should be conducted in a manner that promotes these objectives, to include publicizing the reasons for those actions to inspire others to engage in violent action to further white supremacy” (Berman 2016, p. 1).

Roof studied black on white crime and created a website and manifesto discussing white supremacy. He viewed this attack as a trigger for a future race war. Roof, a ninth-grade dropout, wrote, “I have no choice.” He stated as part of the final section, titled “An Explanation,” “[t]hose I am not in the position to, alone, go into the ghetto and fight. I chose Charleston because it is [the] most historic city in my state, and at one time had the highest ratio of blacks to Whites in the country” (Bernstein et al. 2015).

6. Lafayette Movie Theater Shooting
On July 23, 2015, John Russell Houser opened fire at a movie theater in Lafayette, Louisiana, during a showing of Trainwreck (Karimi and Ellis 2015). He killed two women, ages 21 and 33, and injured nine others before committing suicide. Investigators recovered a 39-page journal belonging to Houser, which contained the name of the theater and the time and date of the screening of Trainwreck, along with random notes and observations. Houser wrote about choosing this target because of the feminist ideas in the movie and Jewish background of the lead actress. Houser had some previous arrest and complaint records including arson, domestic violence, stalking, and selling alcohol to a minor, although these records were at least a decade old. He suffered from bipolar disorder; his wife and daughter had a protective order against him due to his erratic behavior.

7. Umpqua Community College Shooting
On October 1, 2015, Chris Harper-Mercer shot and killed nine people and injured nine others (Ford and Payne 2015). He entered a classroom and shot the assistant professor then he asked students to gather in the middle of the classroom. Some witnesses say that he asked students of their religion. If students were Christians, he told them they would go to heaven as he shot them. There was evidence that Harper-Mercer studied and admired mass killings. He was described as antireligious and a white supremacist. He was extremely isolated, was discharged from the army for not meeting minimum administrative standards of basic training, and was struggling academically in school. After being wounded by police, he shot himself in the head.

8. Colorado Springs Planned Parenthood Shooting
On November 27, 2015, Robert Dear killed three people and injured nine others at a Planned Parenthood in Colorado Springs (Turkewitz and Healy 2015). A 5-h standoff took place before Special Weapons and Tactics (SWAT) teams crashed armored vehicles into the lobby to capture Dear. He had a prior conviction of carrying weapons. Evidence indicated that he had previously targeted Planned Parenthood. Dear was found incompetent to stand trial, he was ordered to be indefinitely confined to a Colorado State mental hospital.

9. Overland Park Jewish Community Center Shooting
On April 13, 2014, Frazier Glenn Cross killed three people at a Jewish community center and retirement home in Overland Park, Kansas (Berlinger 2015). He killed a doctor and his 14-year-old grandson and a woman. He was a former leader of White Patriot Party in North Carolina and had published multiple books and articles about white supremacy. He had a prior arrest for his “Declaration of War” on federal officials, blacks, and Jews (Thomas 2014). Some evidence indicated that the shooting was planned when he became convinced that he was dying from emphysema. Miller was found guilty in the Overland Park shooting of one count of capital murder, three counts of attempted murder, and assault and weapons charges. He is currently on death row.

10. Moncton Shootings
Justin Bourque shot and killed three officers of Royal Canadian Mounted Police and injured two others on June 4, 2014. After a 2-day manhunt, he was arrested and pleaded guilty to three counts of first-degree murder and two counts of attempted murder (CVT News 2015). Bourque held antigovernment and antiauthority views and targeted police officers during his attack. He was asked to move out of his parents’ home before the attack and recently quit his job at a grocery store. Bourque was actively posting on social media regarding his mistrust for the authority. He held strong views regarding right to bear arms (Ha 2014). He was given a life sentence without the possibility of parole for 75 years.

11. Las Vegas Shootings
On June 8, 2014, in northeastern Las Vegas, Nevada, Jerad and Amanda Miller killed three people in an antigovernment attack (Lovett 2014). The couple killed two police officers at a restaurant and fled to a nearby Walmart, where they shot and killed a civilian. Jerad was shot by the police and Amanda committed suicide. Jerad had previous arrests for drug charges. On the day of the attack, Jerad had multiple posts on social media about distrusting police officers and law enforcement. He posted on Facebook the day of the attack, “The dawn of a new day. May all of our coming sacrifices be worth it” (Las Vegas Sun 2014). On June 2, he posted on Facebook, “We can hope for peace. We must, however, prepare for war. We face an enemy that is not only well funded, but who believe they fight for freedom and justice. Those of us who know the truth and dare speak it, know that the enemy we face are indeed our brothers…. To stop this oppression, I fear, can…. only be accomplished with bloodshed.”

12. The Crusaders
Patrick Stein, Gavin Wright, and Curtis Allen belonged to a group that held sovereign citizen, antigovernment, anti-Muslim, and anti-immigrant extremist beliefs (Berman et al. 2016). The three men targeted specific locations that had high Somali immigrant populations in Garden City, Kansas. They were gathering firearms, ammunition, explosive materials, and discussed setting off a massive explosion at an apartment complex. Stein also allegedly referred to the group’s targets, Somali immigrants, as “cockroaches,” and discussed dipping bullets in pig’s blood before using them. Allen had prior arrests for domestic abuse. All three men’s
Facebook pages contain links to articles on conspiracy websites, many of which are anti-Muslim in nature. The three men were arrested after revealing the plan to attack an apartment complex in Garden City, Kansas, to an undercover FBI agent (United States District Court of Kansas 2016).

13. Downtown Austin Shootings
Larry Steve McQuilliams started firing shots at 2:00 AM at a Mexican consulate, a federal courthouse, and a bank on November 28, 2014 in Austin, Texas (Ohlheiser and Izadi 2014). He was trying to set fire to the consulate when he was shot dead by the police. McQuilliams had “let me die’ written in marker across his chest. There were no other fatalities. Police searched his rental van and found homemade bombs made from propane cans, a map containing 34 targets, and a white supremacist book called “Vigilantes of Christendom.” There was no clear motive or manifesto left, but McQuilliams moved to shoot up the Mexican Consulate shortly after President Obama issued his executive order regarding immigration, so this order was believed to be the motive for the shootings. He had a history of aggravated robbery arrests in the past (Ohlheiser and Izadi 2014).

14. Boston Bombing
In 2013, Dzhokhar Anzorovich “Jahar” Tsarnaev planted bombs around the Boston Marathon with his brother Tamerlan Tsarnaev (Candioti 2013). The bombings killed three people and injured ~ 280 others. When he was 8 years old, his family moved from Russia to the United States under political asylum. They lived in Cambridge and became U.S. permanent residents in 2007. At the time of the bombing, Tsarnaev was a sophomore and lived on campus at UMass Dartmouth. He wrote that the bombings were payback for the U.S. military actions in Afghanistan and Iraq. He wrote that the Boston victims were collateral damage, the same way Muslims have been in the American-led wars. He continued, “When you attack one Muslim, you attack all Muslims” (Barrett and Levitz 2013). There was some evidence of previous research on attacks by Muslims.

15. Russian Oil Rig
Twenty-nine Greenpeace activists on the ship the Arctic Sunrise were taken into custody by the Russian coast guard after they attempted to board and stop work on the Prirazlomnaya oil platform on September 20, 2013 (Guardian Staff 2013). The activists were accused of protesting the rig, which was due to come online shortly. Greenpeace said the ship was in international waters at the time of the boarding. The Arctic Sunrise ran a similar mission to Prirazlomnaya last year, and several activists again climbed on to the rig, but there was no forceful removal. The crew was eventually released after 2 months of detention.

16. Wisconsin Sikh Temple Shooting
On August 5, 2012, Wade Page, a white supremacist, used a semiautomatic weapon to murder six people during an attack on a Sikh temple in Oak Creek, Wisconsin (Yaccino et al. 2012). Page’s connection to the white supremacist movement was well documented: he had been a member of the neo-Nazi rock bands End Empathy and Definite Hate. Page was discharged from the army in 1992 for “patterns of misconduct.” Page had ties to white supremacist and neo-Nazi groups, and was reportedly a member of the Hammerskins. Page fatally shot himself in the head after he was wounded by a responding police officer at the Sikh temple.

17. Attempt to Use Weapon of Mass Destruction
Khalid Aldawsari was admitted to the United States on a student visa. In February 2011, he was arrested and charged with the attempt to use a weapon of mass destruction (McKinley and Wheaton, 2011). Aldawsari was attempting to purchase phenol, a toxic chemical that can be used to make the explosive trinitrophenol, also known as T.N.P., or picric acid (U.S. Department of Justice 2011). He asked the chemical supplier to ship some of the chemicals to his residence. The supplier reported the suspicious request to the FBI. There were reports that Aldawsari sent himself e-mails about potential targets and how to convert a cellular phone into a remote detonator. He had a blog post and personal journal wherein he described his desire for violent Jihad. Some information indicates plans for violence before his arrival in the United States. Khalid was sentenced to life in prison (U.S. Department of Justice 2011).

18. Rio de Janeiro Shooting
On April 7, 2011, Wellington Menezes de Oliveira went into the Tasso da Silveira Municipal School in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, and introduced himself as a former student (he was) and said that he had a desire to see the school’s history. He proceeded to roam the halls, shooting children at point-blank range. Nearby police entered the school and shot the gunman in the leg, causing him to fall down the stairs. He then committed suicide. He left a letter stating that he planned to commit suicide. In a video recorded 2 days before the shooting, he stated, “The struggle for which many brothers died in the past, and for which I will die, is not solely because of what is known as bullying. Our fight is against cruel people, cowards, who take advantage of the kindness, the weakness of people unable to defend themselves” (Barbassa 2011).

19. Norway Shooting
On July 22, 2011, after 9 years of meticulous planning, Anders Behring Breivik set off a bomb at a government building in Oslo, Norway, killing eight (Englund 2011). He then posed as a police officer and killed 69 youths on Utoya Island, a Labor Party youth camp. He surrendered when armed police confronted him. He claims to have taken these actions to prevent a Muslim takeover of Europe. He outlined his thoughts and instructions for others to follow in his footsteps in his 1500-page manifesto. He wrote, “I am required to build a capital base in order to fund the creation of the compendium. I don’t know if I will ever proceed with a martyrdom operation at this point as it simply seems too radical” (Englund 2011). He sold many of his belongings to develop funds for his project, buried armor, weapons and ammunition underground in an airtight case, obtained explosives, reviewed public security reports released by the Norwegian government, and developed intricate cover stories for his friends and family. His planning was methodical, well documented, and focused on accomplishing his mission (Englund 2011).
20. Austin Suicide Attack

In 2010, Andrew Joseph Stack III flew his single engine aircraft into an IRS building, killing 1 and injuring 13 others (Brick 2010). In 1994, he failed to file a state tax return and declared bankruptcy on his company. He again had his corporation suspended in 2004 for failure to pay taxes. At the time of the incident, he was being audited by the IRS. His suicide note detailed his dislike for the government. He wrote, “I can only hope that the numbers quickly get too big to be white washed and ignored that the American zombies wake up and revolt; it will take nothing less. I would only hope that by striking a nerve that stimulates the inevitable double standard, knee-jerk government reaction that results in more stupid draconian restrictions people wake up and begin to see the pompous political thugs and their mindless minions for what they are. Sadly, though I spent my entire life trying to believe it wasn’t so, but violence not only is the answer, it is the only answer. The cruel joke is that the really big chunks of shit at the top have known this all along and have been laughing, at and using this awareness against, fools like me all along” (Stack 2010, p. 6).

21. Assassination of George Tiller

On May 31, 2009, Scott Roeder shot and killed Dr. George Tiller at a Sunday church service in Wichita, Kansas. Dr. Tiller was known for performing late-term abortions (Stumpe and Davey 2009). Roeder was a member of anti-government groups and considered himself a Sovereign Citizen. He had previous arrests for not having driver’s license, vehicle registration, or proof of insurance. He was also carrying explosive charges, a fuse cord, a pound of gunpowder, and 9 Volt batteries in his trunk. He was sentenced to life in prison.

22. Fort Hood Mass Shooting

On November 5, 2009, Nidal Malik Hasan shot and killed 13 people and injured more than 30 others in the Fort Hood mass shooting (Owens 2009). Hasan was a United States Medical Corps psychiatrist and described by his colleagues as “anti-American.” Six months before the attack, he posted online about suicide bombings and other threats. In August 2013, he was convicted of 13 counts of premeditated murder and 32 counts of attempted murder. He is awaiting execution.

23. Tennessee Valley Unitarian Universalist Church Shooting

On July 27, 2008, Jim Adkisson shot and killed two church members in Knoxville, Tennessee. The Tennessee Unitarian Universalist Church was hosting a youth play that Sunday morning with about 200 people watching. Adkisson opened fire and stated he planned to keep shooting until the police killed him. Instead he was detained by members of the church and arrested (Dewan 2008). During an interview and in a sworn affidavit, Adkisson stated that he was motivated by hatred of democrats, liberals, African Americans, and homosexuals. In his manifesto, he talked about his difficulty finding a job and hatred of democrats. He was sentenced to life in prison without parole (Dewan 2008).

24. Los Angeles Jewish Community Center

On August 10, 1999, Buford O. Furrow opened fire on a Jewish Community Center with about 250 children playing outside in Granada Hills, California. He had a semiautomatic weapon, five rifles, and two pistols. He fled the scene in his van, then switched vehicles by carjacking a woman. He then pulled over next to a USPS postal truck and shot and killed the postal carrier nine times. He later confessed that he killed the employee because Buford thought he was Asian and a federal employee. Furrow took an $800 taxi cab ride to Las Vegas and walked into the FBI office and said, “You’re looking for me, I killed the kids in Los Angeles.” Furrow also stated that he wanted his shooting to be “a wakeup call to America to kill Jews” (Carlson 1999).

25. Olympic Park Bomber

Eric Rudolph planted multiple bombs throughout the southern states to fight against abortion and the “homosexual agenda” between 1996 and 1998 (Rudolph 1996). On July 27, 1996, he planted a bomb at the summer Olympics in Atlanta that killed two people and injured >120 others. Rudolph also confessed to three other bombings including abortion clinics in Atlanta, Georgia, and Birmingham, Alabama, and a lesbian bar in Atlanta, Georgia. He was on the FBI top 10 most wanted for 5 years before he was caught in 2003. He took a plea bargain of pleading guilty for all charges to avoid the death penalty (CNN 2005).

26. Vail Ski Resort Arson

The Earth Liberation Front burned down a Vail ski resort on October 18, 1998 (Dejevsky 1998). The group had argued that the planned development would threaten a project to reintroduce the lynx in the region. In 2006, Chelsea Dawn Gerlach and Stanislas Gregory Meyerhoff both pleaded guilty to the attacks. The third attacker, Josephine Sunshine Overaker, remains at large (Lipsher 2006).

27. Oklahoma City Bombing

Timothy McVeigh was angry about the government’s handling of the Ruby Ridge incident in 1992 and the Waco Siege in 1993. He planned and organized an attack on the federal government building in Oklahoma. On April 19, 1995, a bomb exploded and killed 168 people and injured >680. McVeigh hoped to inspire a revolt against the federal government. This was the deadliest act of terrorism within the United States before the September 11 attacks (Gorman 2015). A friend of McVeigh’s named Terry Nichols helped build the bomb and Michael Fortier was aware of the bomb plot, both were arrested. McVeigh was executed by lethal injection on June 11, 2001.

28. Michigan State University’s Campus

On February 28, 1992, Rodney Coronado snuck into Michigan State’s University (MSU) research building and built a pyre in an office. At 5:30 AM the firebomb exploded; two students were in the building but were unharmed by the explosion. The incident caused $125,000 worth of damage and destroyed 32 years of research data (Wolcott 2017). Coronado was an ecoanarchist and an animal rights activists. He had built explosives before this
attack targeting other universities and fur farms on behalf of the Animal Liberation Front. He believed that the research being conducted on the campus was funded by the commercial fur industry. He had released animals and destroyed cages at the MSU mink farm. Coronado was arrested in July of 1993 for seven counts of conspiracy to commit crimes against the United States, malicious destruction, and arson.

29. The Luby’s Shooting

On October 16, 1991, George Hennard drove his truck through the front window of Luby’s restaurant in Killeen, Texas. He shot and killed 23 people and wounded 27 others before committing suicide. He yelled, “All women of Killeen and Belton are vipers! This is what you’ve done to me and my family! This is what Bell County did to me … This is payback day!” He was described as having a temper, anger, and a hatred of women and ethnic minorities (Kennedy and Serrano 1991). He had a history of stalking before the shooting incident and was discharged from the Merchant Marines for possession of marijuana. Hennard used two semiautomatic 9 mm pistols, a Glock 17, and a stainless-steel Ruger P89 that he purchased legally. A search of his home indicated that Hennard was doing research of shooting massacres months before his act (Terry 1991).

30. The Order, Louis Beam

Louis Beam was part of The Order, a far-right terrorist group that had issued a “Declaration of War” against the United States in 1984. He and 13 others were indicted for “a seditious conspiracy between July 1983 and March 1985 to overthrow the government” (The Southern Poverty Law Center 2017). There were multiple allegations brought forth, including firebombing of a Jewish community center, attempting to blow up a natural gas pipeline, and purchasing firearms and explosives. He was acquitted of any charges; he continues to post his views online (Kennedy 1987; The Southern Poverty Law Center 2017).