



BIO-TERRORISM, IMPERIALISM AND HEMORRHAGIC FEVER EBOLA VIRUS

¹Oluka, Nduka Lucas & ²Kunle Olawunmi PhD

¹Lecturer Department of Political Science, Novena University, Ogume, Delta State, Nigeria

²Professor of Intelligence & Security Studies, Novena University, Ogume, Delta State, Nigeria

Abstract: Terrorism, diseases, famine, and war as ways of mitigating challenges of population and domination have become a source of worry particularly in Africa. In real terms, the beautiful Earth may not be saved through these obscene population reduction strategies. While the Malthusian prognosis could be ruled as credible, there is a whirl of intelligence that favours fairness and education across the world. The frequency with which Ebola virus appears randomly, particularly in Africa, has raised suspicion that it could be a hegemonic tool of imperial powers to sustain their over bearing influence in Africa. The involvement of state actors in terrorists financing and technical assistance is also of pertinence. This study, therefore, attempts to examine the implications of Ebola virus as some state and non-state actors put it to use for sinister motives. The study examines the concept of bioterrorism, its source(s) and the challenges it poses to the continent and the intelligence community, as this megalomania could become a tool of non-state terrorism. Conspiracy theory is thus adopted as the appropriate theory to drive this prognosis about the new wave of bio-terrorism. The study finds it necessary to suggest appropriate measures to forestall the use of Ebola strains as a means for biological warfare by terrorist groups. To review relevant literatures in the study area, the study adopts the qualitative approach of research, such that historical research method is applied via secondary sources of data, including textbooks, official documents, and Internet sources, among others.

Keywords: Ebola virus, Fever virus, Diseases, Epidemic, Bioterrorism, Bio-weapons, Terrorists, State and non-state actors, Africa.

1.1 Introduction

Consistently, moderate to conservative demographic projections indicate that by 2070 global human population would reach 10 billion, fostering growing tension between two seemingly irreconcilable trends – population growth and normative consumption pattern. It has thus become increasingly apparent over the past 50 years that the *Earth* may not support more than 3 billion people. Malthusian cataclysm is the prediction that population growth would outpace agriculture unless it is checked by moral restraint, disaster, disease, famine, war, or widespread poverty. Africa, Middle East and Asia lead on population growth globally - a common feature of poor governance. And conservatives have taken it upon themselves to save the *Earth* from this catastrophe by killing Africans in order to reduce its overblown population growth projections. Among many population reduction strategies are complex application of communicable endemics, afflictions and laboratory syndromes including the Ebola virus.

It is instructive to understand in Africa that instituting democratic reforms, including humanitarian assistance and human rights culture have become a guise for continuous domination of Africans. Outside religion, other sundry issues have made it possible for the imperial powers to directly and indirectly institute their hegemonic policies in Africa. The United States under Donald Trump has shown clearly its duplicity to the dogma of equality, egalitarianism and the traditional conception of equality that were preached while spreading the democratic ideology at the outset of the Cold War.

The outbreak of the hemorrhagic fever virus Ebola in 1976 at a village close to River Ebola located in Congo Democratic Republic (DRC) formally known as Zaire, and the South Sudan outbreak, further confirm the betrayal of trust. The randomness and frequency with which the virus is appearing in densely populated regions in Africa show that the virus is not a natural occurrence. It is a pattern to ensure maximum effect and spread (See WHO Health Report, 2015). This policy is

Academic Journal of Current Research

An official Publication of Center for International Research Development

Double Blind Peer and Editorial Review International Referred Journal; Globally index

Available www.cird.online/AJCR; E-mail: AJCR@CIRD.ONLINE



multidimensional in that aside from killing the undesirables, it also creates jobs, foreign exchange and enriches the pharmaceutical industries overseas. But just like other weapons of mass destruction, non-state actors cannot easily convert the application of these strains for reprisals on the inventors. The question about how long before nihilists would be able to extract and cultivate the virus strains and similar viruses for bioterrorism should be of a greater concern to great powers. Perhaps this is why the World Health Organization is worried stiff about how to eliminate the spread of the virus across national borders and contain the strain within the African Continent (see Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, CDC, 2018).

And for Africa, regional security is supposedly the podium of democracy, but if democracy loses its security imperatives, it has lost its core essence. This demagogue is evident and is further affirmed in the works of some of these state actors at providing technical and professional assistance to the Third World, and yet demanding reciprocity in return from the beneficiary. The incidences of terror attacks with chemical substances such as the Syria sari gas attack in 2013, the Tokyo subway multiple attacks with an odourless, colourless and highly toxic nerve gas (sari) in 1995, and a similar attack in Karachi-Pakistan in 2007, the contamination of salad with salmonella in a restaurant at Oregon in USA to obstruct voters' turnout in a local election, the use of pesticide by a terrorist group in Afghanistan against students of a girls school in 2002, and significant others are pertinent indications that Ebola virus and similar viruses are potential substances for bio warfare(See Cave & Seth Caru, 2014; Hilper & Oliver, 2018). In other words, Ebola virus disease (EVD) has been identified alongside other diseases such as HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, Lassa fever, hepatitis, and significant others as one of life threatening diseases and potential future weapons of mass destruction. Because we are all connected, therefore, this study sets out to examine the long-term implications of this myopic policy to eradicate perceived undesirables through Bio-terrorism.

1.2 Aim and Objectives of the Study

The main aim of this study is to highlight the long-term consequences of the application of Ebola virus and similar viruses for the purpose of bioterrorism and population control, while the specific objectives are to:

- (i) Examine the possibility of adoption of Ebola virus by global nihilists as bio-weapon,
- (ii) Attempt to discourage great powers from further conspiracies to control population growth through bio-weapons.

1.3 Research Questions

The following questions are raised to give direction to the study:

- (i) What will be the implication of Ebola virus in the hands of nihilists?
- (ii) What would discourage great economic powers from proliferating bio-weapons?

1.4 Research Method

The study adopts the historical research method, which means that explorative, comparative, and qualitative research methods are adopted to examine the implication of the use of Ebola as bio-weapon by terrorist groups, and state actors in Africa. This method is also adopted to examine the appropriate measures suitable to prevent its potential use as bioterrorism. In other words, this inquiry relies extensively on secondary data such as textbooks, journal articles, official documents or records, Internet services, etc.

1.5 Theoretical Framework

The study adopts "*Conspiracy theory*" to explain the link between the potential or possible adoption of Ebola virus for bioterrorism by state and non-state actors. The term "*Conspiracy theory*" was applied for the first time in 1871. In terms of origin, it emerged in the wake of surprising and unsettling events such as terrorist attacks, mass shooting, plane crashes, economic shocks and the deaths of famous or important personalities (See Monica Jimenez, 2019).

The theory, like every other social science discipline, is masked by conceptual difficulties. We thus provide a definite explanation of the notion and support what the theory inclines to elucidate. There are two schools of thought on why the theory proliferates in our contemporary studies. First is sustained by the "*Individualistic*" framework pioneered by Richard Hofstadter, a Professor of American history at Columbia University and his associates. This school argues that those who participate in conspiracy have a paranoid personality and tend to use others as scapegoats and possess the "*us versus them worldview*". This group also argues that conspiratorial thinking is associated with marginalized group of individuals because they feel powerless before the larger group. The second school of thought, championed by Peter Knight, (a Professor of English and American studies at the University of Manchester) views conspiracy more from "*cultural sociological*" perspective and its emphasis is on pervasiveness of government secrecy (See Samantha Korta, 2018:31).

According to Barkun (2003) cited in Benjamin (2017) the theory persists because it raises awareness about "*behind the scene*" information, and increasing cynicism towards corporate and government powers. Conspiracy theorists believe that an



organization(s), clandestine and non-clandestine, made of individuals or group of actors acting covertly, tend to achieve some malevolent ends, and are, thus, involved in conspiracy. The theory also explains reasons for some events such as the case of the extreme right groups- the ethno-nationalism groups, the new religious extremist movements, and millenarianism (a belief in an ideal society especially one created by revolutionary action) in particular. This means that every event is traced to an identifiable cause (Barkun, 2003:3).

On a general note, the theory argues that an individual or some powerful groups of individual actors such as the terrorist groups plan some events or incidences or circumstances in secret. The theory, thus, explains an event that provokes a conspiracy by sinister or powerful actors (Marmura, 2014:2378). When there is tragedy, danger or confusion, people seek answers as to why the incident happened and when it happened? Like rumors and other forms of extra-factual information, conspiracy can turn politically problematic and dangerous, particularly when politicians and other actors seek to exploit belief in unverified information for political gain. In most extreme cases, this form of conspiracy may result in genocidal attacks, evident in the cases of the Nazi Germany which held sway from 1933 to 1945, and Rwanda in 1994 (Jimenez, 2019).

The LANCET Conference (2005), while revealing the Laura Borgart of RAND Corporation and Sheryl Thurburn of Oregon State University studies of a new United States, states categorically that one in seven African Americans believes that HIV/AIDS pandemic was created in a Government laboratory to control the increasing population of blacks and that the cure was intentionally withheld from the poor masses (The LANCET Conference Alert, 2005). Our research asserts that this is exactly the situation, given the attempted efforts of some state and non-state actors to desperately extract strains of viruses for bioterrorism primarily to control population growth in Africa.

2.1 Review of Literature:

2.1.1 Bioterrorism: Conceptual Clarification

Bioterrorism, also referred to as biological warfare or bioweapon (BW), has a very long historical pertinence. Biological agents in bioweapons no doubt have progressed from crude forms in Early and Middle ages to more sophisticated forms of BW, as was witnessed during and after the Second World War (WWII). The misconstruing of natural epidemics for alleged biological attacks and vice versa have made it difficult for scholars to provide a succinct definition and classification of the concept of bioterrorism, further attempts to define the concept were based on its societal level

of disruption and the panic caused to mankind (Bhalla & Warheit, 2004).

Notwithstanding, institutions and scholars, some of which conceived the concept as a potential weapon of mass destruction (WMD), have provided several workable definitions. According to Jansen and Grobusch (2014), bioterrorism is a deliberate release of viruses, bacteria, and other similar agents to cause illness or death in people, animals and plants. Merriam Webster Collegiate Dictionary (2003) defines it as that form of biological weapon used to cause death. Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of English (2005) defines it as the use of infectious agents or other harmful biological or biochemical substances as weapons of terrorism. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, CDC (2014) opines that bioterrorism is used to create casualties, terror, societal disruption, or economic loss and to inspire ideological, religious or political beliefs by some state and non-state actors. DaSilva (1999) cited in Cenciarelli et al. (2013) defines biological warfare as the intentional use of microorganism and toxins of microbial, plant or animal origin, to produce diseases and cause death among humans, livestock and crops. For Roffey et al. (2002), bio-weapons are micro organisms such as bacteria, virus, fungi and other organisms that can be dispersed deliberately to cause disease infections and death to humans, animals and plants.

The US Department of Health and Human Services and the Department of Agriculture describe biological agents as those substances such as toxins that have the potential of posing severe threats to health and safety. U.S CDC in 2014 categorized biological agents into the highest priority agents that can easily be disseminated or transmitted from person-to-person and capable of causing secondary and tertiary cases; those that cause high mortality cases and are capable of causing major public health implication, those that are capable of causing panic and social disruptions, and those that require special action for public health preparedness (see CDC, 2014). In fact, most of these toxins are found in anthrax (a disease that is sometimes found in cattle and sheep), salmonellosis (a bacteria sometimes found in foods that make people sick), tularemia (rabbits or rodents or some domestic animals fever), plague (a disease that causes death and spreads quickly), smallpox, botulin toxin (botulism) and ricin (a poisonous protein). Most of these have been used as bioweapon. The consequence of the use of pathogenic organism or toxin to cause death, however, is "*better imagined than experienced*".

Riedels (2005) cited in Mohamed (2011) opines that one of the earliest documented incidents of the intention to use bioweapon



was recorded between 1320 and 1000 B.C. among the Philistines, when plague was disseminated. This attempt, although primitive in nature and less effective, is an indication that bioterrorism existed even in the ancient time. According to Danzing and Berkowsky (1997) cited in Atlas (1999), a minute quantity of some biological agents can cause mass casualties, and can easily be obtained since technologies for production and weaponization are readily available, and only limited financing and training will be required to establish a biological weapons programme. This is complemented by Christopher et al. (1997) and Derbes (1966) as they note that biological weapons have been used during warfare in a limited number of cases, evident in the 14th century Tartars alleged catapulting of dead bodies over the fortified walls of Kaffa (Feodosia, Ukraine) in an attempt to introduce plague.

Further evidences were seen during the French and Indian war in 1754-1767 when the commander of the British forces in North America, Sir Jeffrey Archer purportedly suggested using contaminated blackest to introduce *Smallpox* into Native American populations that were sympathetic to France. Germany was also alleged to have used biological weapons during World War One (WWI) to infect livestock in a number of countries, particularly horses and mules destined for United States. Japan too was accused of attacking eleven Chinese cities with biological agents during WWII, contaminating air, water, and food with *Bacillus anthracis*, *vibrio cholera*, *shigella* spp, *Salmonella* spp, and *Yersinia pestis*-infected fleas. Considering, therefore, that Britain, the United States, and the Soviet Union, with much sophistication, have built on the Japanese experience with biological weapons, there is the possibility of state actors and terrorist organizations adopting the Ebola virus and similar viruses for bioterrorism in order to cause considerable damage and death (see Atlas, 1999).

2.2 Empirical Review:

2.2.2 Ebola Virus as a Potential Bio-weapon (BW)

Undoubtedly, man's existence and safety are constantly challenged by the behaviours of some obstinate and nonconformist state and non-state actors. Apart from the threats regularly caused by the change in climatic condition as well as the growing intensity and frequency of floods, droughts, earthquake and extreme weather disasters, terrorism has posed the most challenge to man's survival and safety. Accordingly, the potential use of bioterrorism has never been more threatening. In this regard, pundits such as Hummel (2014) have argued and wrongly too, that hemorrhagic fever virus Ebola is not and cannot be classified alongside potential bio-weapons because its mortality rate is very low. What Hummel and his co-conspirators forget to understand is that any Ebola

outbreak that is not well managed could wipe out an entire region because of its high infection rate. The only credible argument by these cohorts is that temporary setback in terms of insufficient knowledge, specialization and equipment required to effectively extract as well as put the virus to use as a bio-weapon by terrorists or state actors could deter terrorists' interest in cultivating the virus (see Hummel, 2014). In line with this argument, Teckman (2013) and Hummel (2014) argue that:

“For the virus to be put to use as bio-weapon, it will require technical expertise and procedures, most of which are not easily available to the terrorists despite the alleged involvement of some state and non-state actors in rendering technical and financial supports to them, and if the virus does not survive well outside its host it cannot be extracted from an infected host and frozen for a later date and uses” (Teckman, 2013 & Hummel, 2014).

This line of thought by Teckman and Hummel further reinforces the conjecture about conspiratorial idea put forward by this article.

Johnson et al. (1995) cited in Hummel (2014) in a more elaborate manner, argue that: “for terrorists to extract the virus, they must first obtain a live host infected with the virus and then transport the host to a laboratory to extract the virus, which is not a simple process”. There is also the risk of being infected in the process if not carefully done, and even if it is achievable, what will be the fate of the family members of the terrorists? Are they going to be immune and protected from the attack if it is eventually released? There is, therefore, the need to address the contrary views of some individuals, scholars and institutions as well as to establish the fact that Ebola virus is a potential bio-weapon for terrorists, and a possible hegemonic and imperial tool to command obedience from the Less Developed states of Africa.

The study conducted by the U.S. Army Medical Research Institute of Infectious Diseases (USAMRIID), reveals that the virus could be transmitted in an aerosolized form. This was tested by the experiment in which the virus was administered on rhesus monkeys that were made to inhale large quantities of droplets via a breathing apparatus containing the virus (see Johnson et al., 1995). The 1970s W. H. O. study of the effects of aerosolized Rift Valley Fever (RVF) is a complement of the experiment above. This investigation demonstrated the extent to which viruses can be used to infect a larger proportion of the population. For instance, if 50 kilograms of aerosolized RVF is released to a municipality of 500,000 people, it can cause over 35,000 casualties with a mortality rate of 0.5% (Hummel,



2014). Hummel opines that since Ebola has a higher mortality rate than RVF, 50 kilograms of the virus will be enough for terrorists to cause harm and danger to the targeted population. Notable also was the alleged attempt by the Soviet Union during the cold war era to weaponized Ebola virus, of which the Soviets were said to have spent billions of dollars to do so. A large amount of microbes was also grown for potential use as bioterrorism. The Soviets were also alleged to have attempted to cultivate smallpox, anthrax, tularemia and other forms of hemorrhagic fevers for potential use in bioterrorism (Hummel, 2014). This is clear evidence that some state actors and state sponsored terrorist organizations can extract and spread the virus by getting their members or agents infected. Since “suicide bombing” has been one of the major tactics or skills adopted by these leading terrorist organizations, they can adopt same pattern in coordinating their act of spreading the Ebola virus to unsuspecting population (Joachim, 2014).

The strength of the virus as a potential bio-weapon is re-emphasized as Teckman (2013) opines that:

“Not only can Ebola virus be used as a highly contagious infectious disease, the virus which causes it also has the potential to be used as a bio-weapon and is likely to be cultivated by these terrorist groups and state actors to cause death”(Teckman, 2013).

Teckman argues that the large presence of terrorism in East Africa and the generally accepted belief that the region is a “safe haven and home” for terrorists in Africa could possibly create a conducive environment to extract and test Ebola virus bioterrorism. Zubay (2005) cited in Teckman (2013) opines that the virus can be weaponized as “Ebola pox” (a hybrid of Ebola and Smallpox), since the harvest of the viruses possesses a violent hemorrhaging and high fatality rate. She therefore concludes that: the high fatality rate of Ebola virus infection and contagious smallpox virus has the potential of adoption for bioterrorism. This notion seems to conform with the thought of Bhardway et al. (2009), when they opine that the danger associated with Ebola virus is striking and copious. They argue, that apart from the use of a suicide-infecter, car and robotic devices to spread the virus, a suicide cougher or coughers who have been self-infected could possibly infiltrate large gathering and pass on the virus without suspicion. In fact, the implication of the virus in any form in the hand of nihilists is better imagined than experienced since nihilism has dominated their myopic thoughts.

According to a 2013 special report issued by the Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS), a large number of people positive with HIV/AIDS virus and receiving anti-

retroviral treatment in 2012 was over seven times the number of those receiving treatment in 2015 with nearly a one million increase on yearly basis (See Global Information and Education on HIV/AIDS, 2018). Suffice to state that majority of these people are found in Africa and that Africans are the most affected by the virus. Also, anti-retroviral and other forms of preventive campaign are prominent in Africa - sponsored by the great economies through the specialized agencies of the United Nations (UN), such as the United Nations International Children’s Emergency Fund (UNICEF), the W.T.O, and other accredited international Non-Governmental Agencies (NGOs). This is equally an indication that Ebola virus could possibly do same if cultivated and spread into Africa by the leading terrorist groups and Developed States. In fact, the devastating Ebola outbreak in Guinea, Sierra Leone and Liberia that killed over 11,310 people in 2014-2015 should be seen as a harbinger of what could happen again if the activities of these recalcitrant, dissident and nihilist actors are not restricted (see Gronvall, 2017). This remains a potent threat to our existence in Africa and must not be tolerated by Africans.

2.2.2 Measures to Prevent Terrorists’ Efforts in Extracting Ebola Virus for Bioterrorism

Since bioterrorism threat is a deliberate attempt by some state actors to cause diseases and death to unsuspecting individuals, governments in Africa have adopted the provisions of the biological weapon conventions and other international efforts that prevent terrorism and promote the development of global public health infrastructures. It is, therefore, pertinent to note that the Geneva Convention of 1925 signed by 108 nations was the first multilateral agreement that extended prohibition of chemical agents to biological agents. In 1972, the United States signed the biological and toxic weapons convention, which banned the development, production and stockpiling of microbes or their poisonous products, except in amounts necessary for protective and peaceful research. By 1996, over 137 countries had signed the treaty (Onyenekenwa, 2012).

In 1967, the United States ended its biological weapons programme by adopting President Nixon’s Unilateral Declaration which later became the foundation of the international agreement enacted in 1972, popularly known today as the Biological and Toxin Weapon Convention (BWC), and which prohibits the production, retention and stockpiling of biological weapons (see Atlas, 1999). Unfortunately, in 1995 Libya, North Korea, South Korea, Iraq, Taiwan, Syria, Israel, Iran, China, Egypt, Vietnam, Cuba, Bulgaria, India, Sao, South Africa, and Russia were suspected to possess biological weapons (see Onyenekenwa, 2012). Jansen and Grobusch (2014) suggest that the Geneva Protocol of 1925 currently



ratified and signed by 66 states to prohibit the development and production of biological substances should be revitalized to effectively prevent terrorist and recalcitrant state actors from putting Ebola virus or other viruses to use as biological weapon. Nevertheless, some recalcitrant states till date continue to pursue biological weapon programmes to cause threat to lives.

Accordingly, African States should reject any form of unverifiable vaccination program coming as a Greek gift from developed economies. Because great economies are not altruistic by nature, all NGOs coming to Africa in the guise of humanitarian aid should go through rigorous screening. Africa would continue to suffer same fate from these mindless state terrorists as long as Africa believes they are a noble people.

3. 1 Summary/Conclusion

According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Report (CDC) in 2018, the Zaire Ebola and Sudan Ebola viruses were caused by two genetically distinct viruses of same destructive effect on infected persons, and have existed long before the outbreaks. The discovering of the 1989 Reston virus in Monkeys from the Philippines into the United States, the 1994 Cote d' Ivoire outbreak, 1995 Kikwit Zaire now DRC outbreak, the 2014-2016 outbreaks in West African countries of Sierra Leone, Liberia, Guinea and Nigeria, and the 2018-2019 outbreak in Eastern DRC show that the virus is no longer confined within a particular region but is present in other areas such as Asia, and is likely to be cultivated and spread to other parts of the world if not prevented. The challenge remains – who will stop these characters that play God by killing others? Population in Africa could be controlled through education and good policies as we saw in China's One-Child policy. But man is easily attracted to acts of Genocide. To be specific – Europeans are impudent about black civilization, and always scheme to exterminate it at the slightest excuse. History is replete with this. Before the Jewish holocaust, black population had always been a target of genocide. Efforts to shrink population from a probable Y2070 peak of 10 billion to a 23rd Century optimums of 2 Billion people is prejudiced and ill motivated. The globalists' terrorist designs are grounded on this idea.

Globalists, driven by greed, hate and egoism has focused on iniquitous acts of induced famine, war and diseases (Ebola, HIV, Diabetes, and Cancer etc.) to reduce Black population particularly where growth is exponential. And since it is difficult to differentiate natural pandemic diseases from biological attacks or bioterrorism, the task to detect and prevent the attack becomes difficult too. This is attributed to the deceptive interpretation that every pandemic occurs through

natural causes, thus the suspicion of artificial or intentional spread of viruses such as yellow fever, smallpox, Lassa fever, and Ebola fever viruses becomes difficult to establish. Nonetheless, the plethora of issues raised in this study is clear indications that Ebola virus and other similar viruses are potential biological weapons aimed at causing death, and also achieving complex economic gains.

The researchers, therefore, conclude that apart from terrorist organizations, state actors particularly great economies are capable of extracting the virus and spreading same to cause massive pandemic so as to reduce the alleged over blown population in the Third World, as well as provide them with vaccines while demanding reciprocity in kind, cash or respect. The consequence of this relationship is evident in the North-South relations which is characterized by inequality, with the South, particularly Africa on the losing side and the North (i.e. the former imperial or colonial powers) as well as the new entrants, USA, China, etc., as the most favoured of the relationship. The researchers also perceive this as a means to sustain the already established North's hegemony in the Third World, especially in the peripheral nations of Africa, which are the most affected of all.

Scientific, technical and financial assistance to TWCs have been identified as imperialists' tool to sustain their superiority over the TWCs through the UN agencies and the internationally accredited NGOs. This is evident in the HIV/AIDS pandemic with African Americans as the most affected, followed by Latino/Hispanic and Africans. Despite the fact that USA has the highest global financial response to the spread of HIV/AIDS virus, large portions of African Americans are the most infected.

And, because great economies are not altruistic by nature, all NGOs coming into Africa in the guise of humanitarian aid should be rigorously screened. If not, Africa and its people would continue to suffer same fate from these mindless state terrorists, on the false assumption that they have all come to serve a noble cause.

Reference:

American Academy of Family Physicians (AAFP), (2019)), Ebola Virus Disease. [Online] Available: <https://familydoctor.org/condition/ebola-virus-disease/>

Atlas, R. M. (1999). Combating the threat of Biowarfare and Bioterrorism: Defending against biological weapons is critical to global security. *Bioscience*, Vol. 49, Issue 6, pp. 465-477. Published by American Institute of



- Biological Sciences, (June, 1999).
[Online] Available: <https://doi.org/10.2307/1313554>. Also available at: <https://academic.oup.com/bioscience/article/49/6/465/229529>.
- Barkun, M. (2003). *A Culture of Conspiracy: Apocalyptic Visions in Contemporary America*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Benjamin, J. L. (2017). Behavioral Sciences of Terrorism and Political Aggression. Routledge Taylor & Francis Group, Vol. 9, No. 1, 4-20. [Online] Available: <https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/rirt20>
- Bhalla, D. K & Warheit, D. B. (2004). Biological agents with potential for misuse: A historical perspective and defence measures. *Toxicol Applied Pharmacol*, 199: 71-84. In H. M. Al-Agamy Mohamed (2011), *Tools of Biological Warfare. Research Journal of Microbiology*, Vol. 6, Issue: 3, pp.193-245. DOI:10.3923/JM2011.193.245 [Online] Available: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/article/pmc5314976/>
- Bhardway, P., Srivastava, J. P., & Karan, J. (2009). "Bioterrorism: An imminent public health threat. *International Journal of Epidemiology (IJE)*, *Oxford Academic*, 7(1), p.2. [Online] Available: <https://doi.org/10.1093/ije/dyy>
- Caves, J. P. & SethCarus, W. (2014). *The Future of Weapons of Mass Destruction: Their Nature and Role in 2030*. Centre for the Study of Weapons of Mass Destruction, Occasional Paper, No. 10: National Defence University Press, Washington, D. C.
- Cenciarelli, O., Rea, S., Carestia, M., Amico, F., Malizia, A., Bellecci, C., Gaudio, P., Gucciardino, A., & Fiorito, R. (2013). Bio weapons and Bioterrorism: A Review of History and Biological Agents. *Defense S&T Technical Bulletin*, 6(2):111-129.[Online] Available: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/26443591_Bioweapon_and_BioTerrorism_a_Review_of_History_and_Biological_Agents
- Center for Disease Control and Prevention (2014), Preparedness and Response to Specific hazards: Bioterrorism. [Online] Available: <http://www.bbt.cdc.gov/bioterrorism>.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, CDC (2018): History of Ebola in Humans. [Online] Available: <https://www.cdc.gov/vhf/ebola/history/summaries.html>.
- Christopher, G., Cieslak, T. J., Psvlin, J. A., & Eitzen, E. M. (1997). Biological warfare: A historical perspective. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 278: 412-417
- Danzig, R. & Berkowsky, P. B. (1997). Why should we be concerned about biological warfare? *Journal of the American Medical Association* 278: 431-432.
- DaSilva, E. (1999). Biological Warfare, bioterrorism, bio defence and toxin weapons convention. *EJB*, 2: 99-120
- Derbes, V. J. (1966). De Musis and the great plague of 1348: A forgotten episode of bacteriological war. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 196: 59-62.
- Gronvall, G. K. (2017). Prevention of the Development or Use of Biological Weapons. *Health Security*. 15(1): 36-47. Doi:10.1089/hs.2016.0096, Published by Mary Ann Liebert, Inc. [Online] Available: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/article/PMC5314976/> (February 1)
- Global Information and Education on HIV/AIDS, (2018): HIV and AIDS in the United States of America (USA). [Online] Available: <https://www.avert.org/professionals/hiv-around-world/western-central-europe-north-america/usa>
- Hilper, H. G. & Oliver, M. (2018). Facets of the North Korea Conflict. *German Institute for International and Security Affairs, SWP Research Paper. 12 December, 2018*. [Online] Available: <http://bt.ly/swp18DNK-Korean-Peninsula>
- Hummel, S. (2014). Ebola: Not an Effective Biological Weapon for Terrorists. *Combating Terrorism Center (CTC) Sentinel, Vol. 7, Issue 9*. (September, 2014) [Online] Available: <https://ctc.usma.edu/ebola-not-an-effective-biological-weapon-for-terrorists/>



- Jansen, H. J. & Grobusch, M. P. (2014). Biological warfare, bioterrorism and bio crime. *Clinical Microbiology and Infection*, 20(6), 488-496 [Online] Available: <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-0691> <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S119873x146173> (6 June, 2014)
- Jimenez, M. (2019). The truth about Conspiracy theories. TuftsNow, Medford, Massachusetts, September, 25. [Online] Available: <https://now.tufts.edu/article/truth-about-conspiracy-theories>
- Joachim, H. (2014). The Ebola Virus Pandemic: “A Weapon of Mass Destruction”? Global Research. [Online] Available: <https://www.globalresearch.ca/latest-news-and-top-stories>
- Johnson, E., Jaax, N., White, J. & Jahrling, P. (1995). “Lethal Experimental Infections of Rhesus Monkeys by Aerosolized Ebola”. *International Journal of Experimental Pathology* 76 (1995):pp.222-236.
- Korta, S. M. (2018). Fake News, Conspiracy Theories, and Lies: An Information Laundering Model for Homeland Security. A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts in Security Studies (Homeland Security and Defence), Naval Postgraduate, Monterey, California, (March, 2018).
- Marmura, S. (2014). Likely Stories: Conspiracy theories in an age of propaganda. *International Journal of Communication*, 8, 2377-2395.
- Merriam Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary, (2003). Eleventh Edition
- Mohamed, H. M. Al-Agamy (2011). Tools of Biological Warfare. *Research Journal of Microbiology*, Vol.6, Issue 3, pp.193-245.
- Onyenekenwa, C. E. (2012). Biological Weapons-agents for Life and Environmental Destruction. *Research Journal of Environmental Technology*, Vol. 6, Issue 3, DOI>10.3923/rjet.20126587, pp. 65-87 [Online] Available: <https://www.google.com/amp/s/scialert.net/fulltext/amp.php%3fdoi=cjet.2012.65.87?espv=1>
- Oxford Dictionary of English, (2018): Oxford University Press Catalogue Dictionaries, 2018 Edition.
- Roffeyet, R., Lantorp, K., Tegneil, A., & Elgh, F. (2002). Biological weapons and bioterrorism preparedness: importance of public-health awareness and international cooperation. *Clinical Microbiology and Infection*, Vol. 8, Issue 8. [Online] Available: <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1469.0691.2002.00497.x> <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1046/j-1469.0691.2002.00497.x>
- Teckman, A. M. (2013). The Bioterrorist Threat of Ebola in East Africa and Implications for Global Health and Security. Global Policy Essay (May, 2013).
- The LANCET Conference Alert, (2005). Conspiracy theories of HIV/AIDS, Vol. 365. Issue 9458. P.448, February 5, 2005. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6735\(05\)17875-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6735(05)17875-1) [Online] Available: [https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6136\(05\)17875-7/fulltext](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6136(05)17875-7/fulltext).
- W.H.O Preliminary Report, (2015). Health Workers Ebola Infections in Guinea, Liberia and Sierra Leone. [Online] Available: http://www.who.int/hrh/documents/21may2015_web_final.pdf
- World Health Organization, (2019). Key facts about Ebola Virus Disease. 30 May, 2019. [Online] Available: <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/ebola-virus-disease>
- Zubay, G. L. (2005). *Agents of Bioterrorism: Pathogens and their Weaponization*. Columbia: Columbia University Press.