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Top of Form

In the current setting, the causes of crises are evolving to being more man-made. In this case, the actions of individuals and different world powers often lead to the emergence of crises. In the past, most of the crises were caused by natural phenomena that were out of human control. Even so, the current settings, crises are caused by different world powers wanting to protect their interests. That is evidenced by the crisis in Syria which has been caused by the war on terror. In this instance, different world powers such as the US and Russia are involved in fighting ISIS which is a terrorist group (Howe, 2016). In that case, it means they are protecting their interests. Such a conflict has resulted in a crisis where there is a lot of suffering as people cannot get access to aid.

The changes in the causes of crises like in the case of Syria will impact humanitarian aid in a big way. For instance, the process of availing aid to those who need it will become highly politicized. That means the procedure of availing aid to the needs will be by a huge extent influenced by political affiliations and the interests of the donors (Fleshman, 2006). That being the case, there is a portion of those affected by a crisis who will not have access to humanitarian aid. Given the huge influence of political and donor agencies on the process of delivering humanitarian aid, it has made the entire system to be less effective. Therefore, there is a need for different organizations that are involved in humanitarian aid to be independent of the influence of donors and politicization. That can be achieved by passing legislation that requires the humanitarian agencies to be neutral players in the case of any conflict. Hence, they would operate like the United Nations and its different organs. Therefore, the agencies will focus on availing aid to those who need it most and not worry about political and donor influence.
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Bottom of Form

Second post

  The world today is witnessing multiple scenarios of crises ranging from environmental, social, security, to economic. With the increasing occurrence of crises, the origin of crises has also changed. For instance, with climate change and conflict, millions of people have been displaced from Syria by conflict, while climate change has displaced people outside and within their borders (Global Humanitarian Overview 2019 - Trends in Humanitarian Needs and Assistance - World. n.d.). Although disaster displacement is not new, climate change is contributing to twice the likelihood of natural disasters like floods and droughts. With increased weather conditions, the probability of infectious diseases also increases, with diseases like malaria and cholera being on the rise. Security crises are being influenced by extremist groups, especially in countries without the capacity to deal with extremist groups. The crises are evolving as young people join extremist groups as a response to military response by governments. Although crises are not a new thing, what is causing them and making them harder to address is changing? From climate change, rising extremism in countries like Somalia and Sudan, and rising numbers of infectious diseases like Ebola in Africa are all new.

          For humanitarian agencies, the change in the landscape of humanitarian crises demands that the response is also changed to respond to evolving causes. Disasters today result from various natural and human-made causes and vary in their level of vulnerability. With the influx of Boko Haram in Nigeria, for instance, the conflict has resulted in war between armed groups and the military, threatening aid. Climate change is increasing the devastating effects of poverty and conflict in Africa. With rising temperatures across the globe, humanitarian aid should be prepared to respond to an increase in insecurity across the world (Maurer, 2019). Although there are no shortcuts to addressing harm to people, even with the complicated nature of crises, humanitarian relief is not enough to address all the rising demands of the world populations. Humanitarian agencies should be prepared to reset and reconcile to ensure that they can guide local, national, and international organizations on how to pool resources and skills (Maurer, 2019). The humanitarian relief response needs a new model that takes advantage of connectivity across the globe. Humanitarian aid in response to evolving causes of crises should be supportive of people’s efforts and shifting from traditional models to a more individualized response.

          Considering the connectivity of the world today, one of the ways to address the challenging landscape of humanitarian response is using digital opportunities. Digital tools are available, which can transform crisis response and improve the interaction between communities in crisis (Maurer, 2019). One of the challenges in humanitarian aid is logistics, supply chain, which can be solved using analytics. Moreover, humanitarian aid has been focused on visible trauma. Hence, there is a need to address the deep invisible suffering like mental health issues caused by displacement, suffering, and sexual violence (Maurer, 2019). Considering the rising occurrence of crises, humanitarian agencies are ill-equipped to reach all affected communities. It is essential to create a culture of self-reliance where people affected by the crisis are encouraged to create income generation models.
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Subject : Principles of Terrorism

**The DB question**

**From your reading in the course, research you have done, other reading you may have done and any professional experiences in your career, discuss what you believe should be the United States’ policy for responding to terror attacks on American soil.  Be certain to present the response you feel would be optimal with regard to each of the classifications of terror attack methodology (i.e., types of attack) that you developed earlier in the course, or you may utilize those developed by someone else.  How should the government respond to each and in what time frame?  Should a U.S. response exceed the strict limits of simply resolving that attack or should it respond in a retaliatory manner and, if so, against whom or what government and where?  When should it stop?  Certainly, American troops and assets remain in Afghanistan more than 15 years after that 9/11 due to a policy of retaliation and neutralization.  Yet the threat of terrorism has not subsided.  Is this a paradigm for response that should be repeated or are there other approaches to be considered?**

**My posts**

Terrorism remains to be one of the major challenges the U.S. government is facing due to its evolution. The attackers keep changing their methods and timings of inversion and therefore the government cannot always predict when and how will the terrorists strike. It, therefore, becomes necessary for the government to always be prepared to respond to a terrorist attack, although it should always put enough mechanism to counteract any attack. To begin with the traditional attack, the government should always respond instantly depending on the nature of the attack. For instance, the government should send security personnel in places where terrorists are shooting the public. Instant response reduces the number of victims who are likely to be injured during the attack. This is mostly done by heightening surveillance around and in the neighborhood of crime scenes (Forest, J2007).

            For the case of technological terrorism, the government should take time to investigate the cause and the nature of the attack before responding to this kind of attack because of the complexity involved. Usually, terrorists often target to gain access to the most sensitive information of the government and its citizens so that through intimidation and coercing, they can get what they wish to have. The government should however never easily fall into this trap by being submissive to their requests since this would be a win to terrorists. As such, the need for higher forensic experts to launch investigations so that perpetrators are brought to book (Lehr, 2019). The government should be so quick in doing this because most sensitive information such as financial information of either the government or citizens is usually at stake.

            Intellectual terrorism has also been in existence for a very long time, especially in religion. Intellectual terrorism aims to demean and blackmail an entity to cause intimidation towards the target group (Gullett, 2009). This method is so popular in religious organizations whereby one religion may perceive to be superior to others and therefore it launches a campaign towards its counterpart by using all means that will demean its counterpart. This is usually achieved when the leaders of the religious organizations teach their members about extremism whereby the ultimate end of it all is the formation of groups like militants. This is one of the forms of democracy intolerance which the government should never allow it to happen. Therefore, the government should put all possible mechanisms ranging from the use of soft powers to the use of force to bring back the sanity in democracy.

            Lastly, I think America should resort to other methods to help Afghanistan stabilize. They can indeed retaliate once the troops have been recalled but there is no much difference and results achieved even though they have stayed there for long. America should be open to new methods of handling conflicts since things change with time and therefore the old techniques used by terrorists also change. Application of force does not always lead to achieving good results always and therefore I propose that other mechanisms As well,  I think there is a need to shift to technological solutions when dealing with terror groups instead of committing more troops on the ground which endangers more American lives. A good example is the use of drone strikes on suspected terror groups and Satellite monitoring . Apart from that, the US can make more investments in cybersecurity which will be used in tracking the activities of the terror groups. In that way, there will be the implementation of strategies to diffuse terror threats without the requirement of military interventions.  In many cases, interventions tend to aggravate people who are living in host countries. Notably, with such anger, it means that people will fall prey to propaganda from the terror groups and in that instance, embrace them.
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**The proof comments on the posts need you to reply too it**

You've offered a fair and balanced approach to the aspects of terrorism that you've addressed, and outlined some viable approaches to preventing and responding to them.  You expressed your perspective well on the US policy with Afghanistan and such things as drone strikes in other countries.

But what of the other attack methodologies we've covered in the class?  Are you saying that the broad, one-size-fits-all answer to every attack is to counter-attack and to do so right away? If so, just in the US ,who is going to do that?  The police will be first on scene, but just with untrained student shooters in schools they have not proven to be a consistent and reliable immediate response force.  How will they handle real terrorists with extensive training, good weapons and real tactics?

In the US the military will get on-site (if it's even called) very slowly.  Never less than 24 hours, and most likely longer.  Are the police ready to deal with all sub-tactics of Decimation Assaults, as well as Mass-Hostage Sieges and Symphonic Attacks in a rapid assault that they've never been trained for have never done before?

**Second posts on the same topic that we did need you to replies to it**

*From your reading in the course, research you have done, other reading you may have done and any professional experiences in your career, discuss what you believe should be the United States’ policy for responding to terror attacks on American soil.  Be certain to present the response you feel would be optimal with regard to each of the classifications of terror attack methodology (i.e., types of attack) that you developed earlier in the course, or you may utilize those developed by someone else. How should the government respond to each and in what time frame?*

Decimation Attacks

Response to decimation-style attacks should be immediate at the tactical level to treat injuries, save lives, neutralize threats, and stabilize the affected area. Emphasis should be placed on ensuring scene safety and ruling out the possibility of secondary attacks meant to injure responders. Additionally, only the required resources should be sent to the scene to facilitate the response to another potential site in the event of a symphonic attack. In other words, once an attack happens, responders should be aware that there may be others coming elsewhere so they should avoid resource consolidation. These procedural aspects of response can be achieved via policy and protocol, and reinforced with training.

This type of terrorist attack is quite simple, with the only associated ‘policy’ being respond, stabilize, and recover. (I’ll cover the potential retaliatory aspects in my response to the second posed question for each of these categories).

Mass Hostage Sieges

Before a mass hostage siege or kidnapping, al Qaeda’s manual states that the perpetrators should perform reconnaissance on the location (Olson, 2012). Vulnerable facilities should not display floor plans or give away important security details online that could be used to the advantage of a terrorist cell. Conversely, they should work with local police departments and potentially SWAT teams to improve a potential response and reduce vulnerability. I hold the opinion that the best way to deal with a mass-hostage siege, and any terrorist operation, is to prevent it from happening in the first place.

One notable concern emerged following the Pulse nightclub shooting and could be classified as it’s own methodology in the future, which we briefly discussed in class. Terrorists could disguise their actual decimation methodology by employing siege techniques based on what they have learned from the police response to these incidents. If they enter and mimic a hostage siege, it would give them time to organize hostages for systemic murder via low-velocity means (knife, strangulation, etc.). The police response to sieges currently includes attempts to negotiate and build rapport with the hostage-takers (PON Staff, 2019). The inability for responding forces to distinguish between the two types of hostage-taking presents response issues: rapid infiltration has the potential to either save or kill a lot of people.

Still, I’m leaning towards policy supporting rapid infiltration by local police forces. The tactics would prevent the terrorists from organizing the hostages and systematically killing them in the event of a disguised decimation attack. It would also catch the terrorists off-guard if they were planning on holding the hostages and negotiating. Denying terrorists the opportunity to organize and fortify might be a critical tactical advantage. Although negotiation in the face of a secured area may be the only option for responding forces, it only serves to reinforce the concept that hostage sieges can be used for profit. Additionally, rapid infiltration would decrease the media attention that the terrorists gain from the attack since the event would conclude faster.

My proposed policy/philosophy will have exceptions. In the United States, we have the home-field advantage and should do what we can to de-incentivize terrorists from conducting mass-hostage sieges. It will likely mean that some people will die, and I’d like to refine this policy more in the future to see how we can definitively minimize those numbers.

Symphonic Attacks & Hybrid Attacks

As I discussed with decimation attacks, resources should be dispersed to facilitate response to a dual or multi-location attack. Otherwise, the management of these situations should build off of the models for mass hostage siege and decimation attacks.

*Should a U.S. response exceed the strict limits of simply resolving that attack or should it respond in a retaliatory manner and, if so, against whom or what government and where?  When should it stop? Certainly, American troops and assets remain in Afghanistan more than 15 years after that 9/11 due to a policy of retaliation and neutralization.  Yet the threat of terrorism has not subsided.  Is this a paradigm for response that should be repeated or are there other approaches to be considered?*

We discussed this briefly in last week’s discussion board, so I’ll try not to repeat myself. I think that retaliation against terrorist organizations is warranted. A crime should have a punishment to increase the perceived cost of attacking Americans. In other words, I don’t think that terrorism will stop if we roll over and demonstrate passivity. Although we have not yet eradicated terrorism, by waging war in Afghanistan, we may have distracted terrorist cells, brought the fight to them, and made it more difficult to mobilize. We may have also watered the seeds of resentment in the region with our flashy and lengthy military presence. To “win the war on terror,” I think that we need a combination of precise tactical assaults and assassinations to neutralize current emergent threats and ongoing positive-reinforcement strategies to keep people from joining in the first place. We should be working with host governments (and within our own country) to accomplish these feats.
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