

Why have the Arabs used “terrorism” and why hasn’t it worked?

Most countries in the world now change governments by having elections and votes. This was not always the case. In the 1930’s Mao- Tse- Tung said elections were a waste of time and that if you wanted to gain power you must use terrorism and violence. Once he had got the power in China he banned all elections and China is still a communist country even today.

In this case the Arabs wanted to use the same way as Mao – Tse – Tung to gain the land back which was set up in 1948. This had led to four wars with the Jews, the Arabs had lost all the four wars.

Yasser Arafat the leader of Palestine Liberation Organisation had finally understood that he could not defeat the Jews by war so they changed the ways. They used such as bombings, ambushes and assassinations. The Palestine Liberation Organisation claimed it was using the same methods the Jews had used against the Romans 2000 years ago and also against the British army between 1945-1948, when some Jews killed the British soldiers try to get the British government to give the Jewish people their own homeland which the claim is given by god. However, the unusual type of warfare used by the Palestinians is more commonly known to many other countries such as the United States as “terrorism”.

The word “terrorism” can mean violence and wanting to get powerful by force. There are many types of terrorism like suicide bombing, kidnapping, tortures, and murders which are mostly used to get attention from the world and also treating. Terrorism is mostly used by one side damaging another side because of all sorts of arguments and nothing in agreement.

I would like to use an example of an incident which includes “terrorist” which was controlled by Osama Bin Laden which happened on the September 11th 2001 in New York, which had led to a lot of innocent people die and also had brought a lot of attention upon them. The situation was two airplanes were hijacked and crashed into the World Trade Centre which caused a lot of people to die. The difference between this was that it was not Palestine.

The Palestinians based the plans on Mao-Tse-Tung because it was successful and they thought it was a good idea to follow that would bring them success.

In source A it shows that Mao-Tse-Tung was successful and achieving China by force and “terrorism”. In the source it says that “Political power grows out of the barrel of a gun”. This means that their only way to achieve is by “terrorism” and by force. The source is biased because it contains only how they got power and led to the situation. However the source is biased because it shows one point of view.

I think this would only lead to more violence in the world because people will think that violence is the only way to achieve what they want rather than in the good ways. In my opinion I would say that violence and “terrorism” would only cause innocent people to die and also it would be both sides damaging each other. At this time the Palestinians could not understand this because they had nothing to do and also the Mao-Tse-Tung gave them an example that “terrorism” works which does not. At that time there was a lot of hate against each other as well which made it very difficult to keep peace.

Source B is taken out from a school text book. It shows that Yasser Arafat tried hard to change his image from that of “freedom fighter” to the idea of a sensible, moderate

statesman. This also gives us an idea that he did not want Yasser Arafat to be seen as a “terrorist”. Yasser Arafat had signed a peace deal with Israel to run the West Bank and Gaza for five years. This gained some home rule and freedom for some Palestinian. The PLO had done secret deals with the enemy at these times, which led to a “terrorist” group called Hamas. The source is not reliable because it is from a text book that might not show bad things about Yasser Arafat. I would also say that it is reliable as well because it shows some things that happened and clues what was going on. The source is biased because it does not show who it was written by and also the Person who had wrote it might have been helping Yasser Arafat to look good.

Source C is from an interview with the PLO members in the 1970s and it talks about the reasons about being a “terrorist” and why they done the actions. The source shows that the Palestinians wanted to get attention around the world and also to be known. “The whole world notices us, whereas before the world ignored us”. This shows that they want people to know about them and think about the Palestinians for causing “terrorism” to gain what they want in an easy way and also to show that they can do something about it.

Source C might not reliable because it was taken from a text which might not show real things and make things up that were not talked about. However I would say the source is reliable because it shows what the PLO aims where and why they used “terrorism” which would be very useful to us.

Source D shows what Yasser Arafat has exactly done and also shows that Yasser Arafat did not want “terrorism” which gives us an idea that he has changed his speaking to more quiet and without violence for instance “Appeasement will only encourage more terror and bring more death”. The source is not reliable because it is from a British newspaper and also it might only show what the British think rather than the truth. However I would say the source is reliable because it gives clue how Yasser Arafat changed after the problem that they caused.

I would say that it would be very difficult to make peace in the Middle East because groups such as Hamas have keep using the same ways as Mao-Tse-Tung which causes violence and keeps “terrorism” going on.

I would like to use another example of a “terrorist” group called the IRA which happened in Northern Ireland including violence and “terrorism”. This had happened by the them sit down and talk to the British hence about deals 20 years ago when they were murdering. This gives a good example to the Jews and Arabs that they could sit down and talk there problems rather than violence and fighting which cause a lot of people to die. If this happens this may lead to the Middle East becoming a place with peace.

Overall I would say the Middle East would become a better place if they sit down and talk together which may lead to people not dieing, land not being destroyed and also “terrorism” would be taken over with peace. This may be very difficult to them because there are a lot of bad examples which show the wrong way such as the Mao-Tse-Tung which shows a bad way to the world. Well to keep peace they must ignore these and come together. So I would say that talking is much better than war.