1. What do you think are the major differences between terrorist incidents vs. natural disasters to the psyche of the population - both the population directly affected as well as the population indirectly affected?

I think the major difference between a terrorist incident versus a natural disaster to the psyche of the population is that a terrorist incident is quite polarizing. Both allow for groups of people to come together and have a sense of unity because it is a shared experience. For example, Hurricane Sandy and Hurricane Katrina pushed people into flight or fight mode and highlighted the need for care and aid. In contrast, a terrorist incident such as 9/11 had a different sense of community for the people affected. It began to make a distinction between Americans versus people of Middle Eastern descent, who became the "other". This distinction and alienation made it easy for blame to be placed and for a while allowed for religious persecution and attacks.

- 2. Is there a difference between a "terrorist" and a "mass shooter"?
 - a. If yes, what do you think the differences are? How does a terrorist differ from an ordinary criminal?

I don't believe there is a major difference between a terrorist and a mass shooter. Terrorists and mass shooters usually have political agendas to advance or strong ideological beliefs. I believe all mass shooters are terrorists, but not all terrorists are mass shooters because there are other mechanisms used to create fear i.e. cybersecurity attacks and sarin gas attacks.

- 3. Have long-standing assumptions about terrorism been challenged by terrorist events (e.g., the World Trade Center attack in 2001, the Boston Marathon Bombing in 2013, the Buffalo Shooting in 2022, the January 6 United States Capitol attack in 2021, etc.)? The long-standing assumptions are:
 - a. Violence appeals to supporters.
 - b. Focuses attention on the terrorists and their causes.
 - c. Attains tangible political aims or actions (e.g., the release of colleagues, change of government).

The 2022 Buffalo shooting has challenged these long-standing beliefs. For one, it focused on those affected in the shooting as opposed to the shooter's identity. It was mentioned in the news but was quickly deemed to be racially motivated and the media did not elaborate on his ideology. I'm thinking about his in contrast to the Ted Kaczynski bomb campaign where his manifesto was crucial to the story. I also disagree with the notion that violence appeals to supporters in this case as there was no public uproar in favor of the gunman and no connected copycat shootings. Lastly, no political aim was accomplished with this attack.