

Terrorism – asymmetric threat



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

According to a 2008 article by Duursma, terrorism does not have a definition that is accepted by public, international law. There is although an international legal definition of terrorism. It is there to indicate which the acts of terrorism are and how to combat the causes of terrorism. Following these indications, it will most probably debate and not come to an agreed definition of terrorism. What is clear about terrorism is that it is tact, and its use is to accomplish various goals. These goals might be religious ideological or ethnic in nature. Nowadays, however, the objectives seem vaguer. It seems that they may emphasize revenge or punishment according to an article by Pilat.

According to an article by Michael Rubin, asymmetrical threats are between two uncompromising sides. This is when a side focuses their strengths against the others weaknesses. In *Terrorism, Concepts and Theories*, James. F. Pastor says that asymmetrical threats appear to be an age-old game that existed since time immemorial. The only difference is that it is happening in today's context. It states that a Palestinian rocket detonated in an Israeli barrack. In response, a Hamas spokesperson stated that was a gift from god to their struggle. This is how serious.

Terrorism will equal asymmetrical threats. One of the protagonists of this concept is the famous Bin Laden. According to the 9/11 commission report, he is drew one the fundamentalists, and the extremists to do the bidding. Thus, base the logic of their actions on religion. These actions ended in the deaths of human beings. These attacks can happen abroad or domestically depending on the intentions of the terrorists. Police arrested Sean Michael Gillespie in connection with firebombing a temple, according to the 2002-

2005 terrorism report by the FBI. It is no secret that terrorism only benefits the perpetrators. It can also take many forms and faces.