**Method/result**
Most people would agree that terrorism includes violence. What about threats of violence? Kidnapping? Arson? What if no one is harmed -- is it still terrorism?

**Perpetrator**
Who carries out terrorism? Is terrorism always carried out by organized opposition groups? Can states be terrorists? Can individuals? Consider issues of inspiration, planning, provision of weapons, and military assistance.

**Target**
**Does terrorism target only civilians**? Could an attack on a military target be terrorism? How do you decide what a civilian is? What about off-duty military personnel? Colonial occupiers? What about the assassination of a head of state, one of whose roles is commander in chief? To qualify as terrorism, must perpetrators of an act of violence deliberately target civilians, or simply be reckless as to whether civilians as well as military targets might be harmed? **Are all attacks on civilians terrorism**? Is the target of terrorism always human, or can acts of sabotage against property also be considered terrorism?

**Motive**
**Is the motive behind an act important in deciding whether it is terrorism, or should only the act itself be considered? What is the objective of terrorism?** Is terrorism "violence for an audience" -- an act committed to inspire fear in the public and therefore force policy changes? Or does a terrorist act have specific strategic objectives? **Does it make any difference if the perpetrators consider themselves martyrs for a religious or political cause**?

**Point of view**
**If a cause is considered legitimate, are any means to achieve its goals legitimate**? How does one distinguish between a terrorist and a freedom fighter? **What is the difference between terrorism and**[**guerrilla warfare**](http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/globalconnections/mideast/glossary/term/guerrilla.html)**?**Is terrorism "the weapon of the weak"? Are illegitimate acts against an enemy in war terrorism, war crimes, or is there even a difference? Does history change the definition of terrorism? If a group achieves independence using tactics called "terrorist" by their previous occupier or sovereign, making their "rebellion" into a "war of independence," are they justified by their eventual success in becoming a state?