Media and State Sponsored Terrorism

Brett O'Donnell
Norwich University
Masters of Diplomacy
School of Graduate Studies
Northfield, Vermont 05663-0367
brettx79@aol.com

David H. Gray
Campbell University
Buies Creek, NC 27506
grayd@campbell.edu

Abstract

Terrorism expert Brian M. Jenkins once stated that "Terrorism is a theater" and there has been no greater tool to the cause of this macabre performance than the media. Terrorists are known to carefully select their targets based on the chance that the most people will witness the act and the most attention will be drawn to their cause. This has been known since the 1972 Olympics and it was again witnessed on September 11th 2001 when people around the world watched the events take place on live television. However, this tool can and has been used as a counter method to terrorism. Modern technology makes the media and information accessible to nearly all people in every corner of the planet. With this accessibility to information individuals are learning that there are alternatives to violence, to dictatorships, and to isolation from the modern world. A new option is being provided to the youth through the social revolution as has been seen in Egypt and the other Arab Spring nations. Media is changing contemporary terrorism and this time it is a tool that the counter terrorist community can use to their advantage.

Key Terms: Media, Terrorism, Technology, Socioeconomics, Social Revolution, Middle East, Journalism, Internet, PLO, al Qaeda, Al Jazeera,, al Qaeda.

"The speed of communications is wondrous to behold. It is also true that speed can multiply the distribution of information that we know to be untrue." Edward R. Murrow

Terrorism expert and political advisor to Presidents, government agencies, and international organizations on the behavior of terrorists Brian M. Jenkins, once stated that "terrorism is a theatre" (Hoffman 2006). No statement in regards to terrorism is truer than this. This statement exemplifies contemporary terrorism in that everything they do is done to draw as much attention, on the world stage, to their cause as possible.

In its early stages terrorism was focused on a specific political target with the intention of causing as little collateral damage as possible where the goal was specifically to only kill the target and no one else. The 1972 Olympic attacks by the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO) on the Israeli Olympic team changed the future of terrorism. The attacks on the Israeli

team drew in worldwide attention and changed how terrorism would be enacted for the next four decades, and most likely will continue to influence terrorism for years to come until it evolves again. It became a realization of terrorist groups everywhere that the media and modern information and technology could be used to draw the world's attention to these devastating acts. The media was used to draw the attention of not just the citizens of the world to their cause but also to get the governments of the world to pay attention to them as well.

Along with this realization by terrorist organization, state sponsors also came to the realization that they could use the media for their own benefit. By providing the people misinformation they could misplace blame on the west for their problems. At the same time they also had to keep their people from realizing the truth and in many cases the states employed only state run media networks and blacked out information from the outside world, especially by blocking out many internet websites and preventing admittance to foreign journalists.

State sponsors of terrorism restricted the most basic of freedoms, the freedom of information. States such as Iran, North Korea, and Libya restricted information to restrain their populations' ability to learn and see what was beyond their borders. It was done to encourage support of the political leaders' agendas, and to misinform the people. The state sponsors made it seem that the terrorist organizations they supported were saviors and heroes, revolutionaries fighting for the people and that the West and Israel were monsters, decadents, hedonists without morals or souls, and the lands they lived in were ruled by tyrants, Hollywood, and money.

Daniel Byman suggested that "cutting the deadly connection between states and terrorist groups is difficult at best and impossible at worst" there are opportunities for policymakers to take steps to do so. In order to combat state sponsored terrorism the international community can "engage the state sponsor, use massive military force to change a regime, use punitive or coercive uses of military force, threaten military force, economic sanctions, backing insurgency or terrorist groups of one's own, and diplomatic isolation" (Byman 2005).

However, with recent events it is being realized that perhaps the media is not only a symbiotic partner to terrorism in that they both have something to gain and can continue to prosper and survive through exploiting each other, but it is a tool to end terrorism. It is being recognized by the populations of these state sponsors and by the West that the media can be used to educate the people and to inform them that there are better alternatives. States that sponsor terrorism for long periods of time have a history of being poor and suffering from severely broken infrastructures. The people suffering under these awful socioeconomic conditions are finally saying they have had enough. From Morocco to Iran revolts are occurring as the people through the information of the media are realizing they can win, that they can create change.

A Brief History of Terrorism

Before going further it is important to understand the creation of contemporary terrorism in further detail and how the media helped create it. Terrorism arguably, most probably existed in some form since the first organized state existed with a political party, an official leader, and an individual that did not approve of how things were being handled. After all even Julius Caesar

was assassinated by his own peers and "friends" that wanted a change and he was a ruler thousands of years before the concept of terrorism became an accepted universal term without a definition.

Terrorism in its earliest stages gained modern acceptance and emerged during the French Revolution. "The word terrorism in contrast to its contemporary usage, at the time terrorism had a decidedly positive connotation" (Hoffman 2006). This positive connotation would come as a surprise to many of today's readers as terrorism is quite literally a bad word in the modern English language. The French Revolutionaries that were coined as terrorists were heroes of the people; they became champions of change that sought out to destroy an oppressive ruling class that left them without the basic necessities of food and home. That is not to say that some of their tactics weren't without brutality.

In time terrorism would be adopted by many other parties throughout the world and it would be used as a responsible tool. The Nardonaya Volya of Russia whom were known for targeting specific leaders of the opposition party would go to great lengths to avoid injuring innocents, even if it cost them the mission and their very lives. But in time terrorism would become distorted and bastardized and used by parties like the Irish Clan na Gael, the IRB, the Nazi's, the Italian Fascists, and the Russians under Stalin where hurting innocents and causing destruction were no longer off limits and the accomplishment of the mission was all that mattered. Achieve your goals no matter the cost. It is however, important to remember that what the Nazi's and even Stalin did was genocide not terrorism, which is no less evil but just as horrible only on a much larger scale.

Contemporary terrorism would emerge with the creation of the Palestinian Liberation Organization and the realization by this party that terrorism was more successful not only if you ignored avoiding innocent casualties and avoided property destruction but if you actually sought out to cause them on as large a scale as possible. The PLO is significantly important for two reasons, 1) it was the first of its kind to embrace tactics that involved getting media attention and 2) according to Bruce Hoffman whom is arguably the leading terrorism expert in the world, the PLO was the first international terrorist organization (Hoffman 2006).

The PLO would first make its media statements by hijacking planes. This was not an uncommon tactic used by terrorist organizations at the time but instead of just hijacking the planes and making demands they would hijack the plane and kill the passengers to make "a major media event" (Hoffman 2006). These tactics would pale in comparison when they took terrorism to a whole new level in 1972 at the Olympics in Germany.

At the 1972 Olympic event the PLO terrorist cell Black September would take the Israeli team hostage and in eventually kill 11 Israeli athletes and coaches as well as one German Police Officer. This massacre drew unprecedented media attention to the actions of the terrorists and PLO cause. "The undivided attention of some four thousand print and radio journalists and two thousand television reporters and crew already in place to cover the Olympiad was suddenly refocused on Palestine and the Palestinian cause. An estimated 900 million people in a hundred different countries saw the crises unfold on their television screens" (Hoffman 2006).

This created a new feeling in terrorists the world over that by drawing media attention to their causes they could gain recognition, and legitimacy. It gave terrorists their greatest tool in whatever "war" they found themselves involved in. By gaining this much attention from the media the terrorist organizations found themselves able to gain support, resources, and in many cases actual legitimacy. The PLO in time would gain political legitimacy - the PLO "a nonstate actor, established formal diplomatic relations with more countries (86) than the actual established nation-state of Israel (72) [and amassed an] annual income of $600 million, of which some $500 million were from investments" (Hoffman 2006).

The PLO was the first international terrorist organization to gain political legitimacy only to be followed by organizations like Hezbollah, however its legitimacy would not last as they could not handle political responsibility and its leadership was found struggling with the challenge.

Terrorism and the Media

Margaret Thatcher once said that "publicity is the oxygen of terrorism." Terrorist organizations embrace the media for without it they lack a significant tool and what has arguably become their most effective weapon. "Terrorists must have publicity in some form if they are to gain attention, inspire fear and respect, and secure favorable understanding of their cause, if not their act" (Soriano 2008). From the perspective of the terrorist, media coverage is the measurement of success for a campaign. "According to Brigitte Nacos, one of the scholars that has most studied this issue, terrorists commit violent acts looking for three universal objectives: to get attention; to gain recognition; and to obtain a certain degree of respect and legitimacy. These objectives are attainable for those individuals who are capable of receiving the most media coverage (Soriano 2008).

In recent events it would appear that terrorists carefully select their targets in knowing where the most media coverage will be accessible or in which events that would draw the most attention. The attacks on New York City on 11 September 2001 by al-Qaeda made media coverage highly accessible in that the media was readily available and the residents and significant number of tourists visiting would be able to give firsthand accounts and acquire footage of photographs and videos for the media to show the world. Similar to this is the attack on the school in Beslan, Russia in which Chechen rebels killed a large number of school children. This attack although remote was unfortunately well planned because they knew that no media outlet would ignore such a horrific attack on children.

Terrorists and the media have an interesting relationship. French Sociologist Michael Wieviorka performed a study that separated terrorists and their relationships to the media into four levels: "Complete Indifference, where terrorists complete their act of terror with no regard to media coverage; Relative Indifference, in which terrorists complete their act of terror with an understanding that media could assist their cause, but are still uninterested in media coverage; A Media-Oriented strategy, in which terrorist are aware of and utilize the media to further their message; and Complete Breakaway, in which the media is seen as the enemy and the terrorists

will respond to the media in the same way they respond to any enemy" (Soriano 2008). It could be argued that contemporary terrorism would show that terrorists are on a mixture of the last three levels and that complete indifference is hardly recognized. One would be hard pressed to find a terrorist organization that does not desire media attention in some form. They are almost all interested in drawing some attention to their cause although keeping the media alive is obviously not a priority. There are many media outlets out there and if a few get eliminated in the process it will only serve to increase the attention to the incident. Whether or not this is productive to the cause is a different argument all together.

In some instances it is debated that the media are the principal authors of the stereotyped and clearly negative vision that society has of terrorist organization's participants and activities. By this perception the press is considered to be "mere extensions of the enemy" (Soriano 2008). Terrorists can fall into several categories ranging from needing the media, to avoiding it, to hating it. "A series of recent terrorist acts indicates the emergence of trends that impact on the relationship between the media, the terrorist, and government. These include: (1) a trend toward anonymity in terrorism; (2) a trend towards more violent terrorist incidents; and (3) a trend towards attacks on media personnel and institutions" (Perl 1997).

Anonymous terrorism occurs when no one claims responsibility and no demands are made. When the media reports on such instances it is argued that they are amplifying a terrorist's agenda. "Reportage is inevitable; especially if it includes unbridled speculation, false threats or hoaxes, coverage can advance terrorists' agendas, such as spreading panic, hurting tourism, and provoking strong government reactions leading to unpopular measures, including restrictions on individual liberties" (Perl 1997).

Terrorism has also recently taken a turn for the worse in that the incidents are becoming increasingly more violent. This can be attributed either to the advancement of technology or to a more violent terrorist. "The Department of State's Patterns of Global Terrorism: 1996 notes that while worldwide instances of terrorist acts have dropped sharply in the last decade, the death toll from the individual act is rising and the trend continues toward more ruthless attacks on mass civilian targets and the use of more powerful bombs. The threat of terrorist use of materials of mass destruction is an issue of growing concern..."

And finally there has been an upsurge in attacks on journalists and media personnel, more so than ever before. "Recent attacks occurred in Algeria, Mexico, Russia, Chechnya, and London, but there have been cases as well in Washington, D.C. at the National Press Building and at the United Nations in New York. One private watchdog group estimates that forty-five journalists were killed in 1995 as a consequence of their work" (Perl 1997).

Failure to Define Terrorism

Throughout contemporary history dealing with modern terrorism has faced one major obstacle and that is the inability of the world community to come up with a sufficient definition for terrorism. This is no surprise as even government departments within the United States cannot agree on one definition as they each focus on their own mission statement. Defining

terrorism eventually turns into an argument of semantics as the modern terrorist will "never acknowledge that he is a terrorist and moreover will go to great lengths to evade and obscure any such inference or connection" (Hoffman 2006). Terrorism is often looked at very subjectively. Terrorism depends largely "on whether one sympathizes with or opposes the person/group/cause concerned. If one identifies with the victim of the violence, for example, then the act is terrorism. If, however, one identifies with the perpetrator, the violent act is regarded in a more sympathetic, if not positive light, and it is not terrorism" (Hoffman 2006).

This inability to create a definition unfortunately transfers over to the media. The western media indiscriminately mixes terms such as revolutionary, guerilla, criminal and terrorist. They do this for maximum effect as the media, in most cases, especially in relation to the United States seeks to create the biggest impact and eerily similar to terrorists seek to get the biggest audience.

This is a significant issue as it makes the west look like they are deliberately trying to be discriminatory against all Muslim organizations, those that are rightly terrorists and those without any association. However, the media in the Arab world is often viewed as being sympathetic towards terrorist organizations again obscuring definitions to make them look like the peoples revolutionaries bringing forth a Robin Hood type of quandary.

Terrorist Media

Although terrorism has existed far longer than mass media terrorism has always been about making a statement to the public. Technology has made reaching audiences far easier than ever before with satellite radio and television, and especially with the assistance of the internet. "It seems fair to say that there exists a mutually beneficial relationship between the terrorist and the media of today" (Soriano 2008). Terrorist use the media to spread misinformation and the media uses the terrorist for ratings. According to retired Indian Air Marshal and Air Vice Chief of Staff Bhushan Gokhale, when speaking at the 17th anniversary of the Pune Working Journalists Union, he stated "terrorists are using the media as a tool to spread misinformation and terror, terrorists are using the media as a weapon. For them, a casualty rate of 100-150 is not a big deal. The fact that so many people will be glued to their television screens would ensure that their message of terror is spread" (Goenka 2009). India has now made the homeland security integrate the media as part of its national policy.

Terrorist organizations have found interesting ways of using the media for their own ends. There are two prominent organizations that can be looked at that have very different relationships to terrorist groups. One is declared a terrorist organization by the US Department of State, the Mujahideen e-Kalq (MEK) and the other is an independent television outlet that is denying that it has ties to terrorism, Al-Jazeera.

The Mujahideen e-Khalq (MEK) is an Iranian opposition group working from exile spreading their own information into Iran to help overthrow the current administration. The MEK reaches into Iran using its own satellite television channel and claims a network of activists inside the Islamic Republic. Although designated a terrorist organization some would argue that MEK could be helpful to the United States by driving out President Ahmadinejad. "The MEK

represents a viable alternative to the clerical regime in Tehran by halting the nuclear weapons program, introducing economic and political reform, and contributing to regional and global stability. In short, despite its terrorist designation, some argue the MEK can serve as a tool to increase US pressure on Iran to effect positive developments regarding the issues in dispute" (Bahgat 2004).

And then on the other end is Al-Jazeera. Al-Jazeera currently is a media source that claims it is independently run, unlike most media outlets in the Middle East which are state controlled, and has no ties to terrorist organizations. But it has been argued that Al-Jazeera is tied to Osama bin Laden and al-Qaeda, after all Osama is a self-proclaimed viewer of Al-Jazeera.

Al-Jazeera is an Arabic satellite television station created by the monarchy in Qatar in order to provide a more independent Arab point of view. They run on a more Western platform and bring in experts and reporters from both the West and the Arab world. However, the argument that emerges that Al-Jazeera has ties to terrorism is their willingness to allow Bin Laden the opportunity to express his opinion through their network, as well as to release videos and written statements through them.

After September 11th the station became a spokesperson for bin Laden and the Taliban. "Though the station presented both the Western and the Taliban sides of the conflict, by giving both sides an equal footing, Bin Laden finally had a television media outlet in which he had control over the message being sent to the public" (Soriano 2008). Al-Jazeera argues that they never let Bin Laden have control over the message being sent to the public instead insisting that they show both sides of the conflict. With the wars with Afghanistan and Iraq, Al-Jazeera attempted to focus on the victims of the American offensive. By showing both sides, especially al-Qaeda's point of view, the station has become extremely popular. The war and the connection to the terrorist organization of al-Qaeda and the Taliban has been hugely beneficial for the media station. "Though there is discrepancy around the loyalty that Al-Jazeera has for Al Qaeda, and whether or not they act as direct mouthpiece for Osama bin Laden, showing his videos sans editing or not, it is clear there is more sympathy in Al-Jazeera's programming to the Iraqi militants, Palestine and the Muslim world" (Soriano 2008). The Muslim world has a variety of other media outlets but none as prominent as MEK and Al-Jazeera. Both significantly tied to terrorism yet they each have exceedingly different roles to play.

However, al-Qaeda believes that the West is using media as a tool of war by lying about the motivations behind both the jihad movement and the motivation of Western governments. This is argued in four points "1) the Western media diverts the attention of the Muslim population by focusing on issues that are small or of little importance considering the bigger picture, 2) the media exaggerate the military strength of the west, 3) the media distorts the Arab image and motivation to that of madmen, 4) and the media promotes Western aggression against Islam thus creating a scenario in which American military violence against al-Qaeda is widely accepted" (Soriano 2008). It is obvious that the media is used as a tool of war by both sides. Both believe the other is making them out to be madmen. The war on terrorism is shifting away from a political war to a cultural war which has been the underlying issue all along. With new methods

of gaining accurate information and the ability to see or read both sides through the internet people are coming to the realization that not everything they hear is the truth.

Media Control

The media can make great changes in the world of the oppressed peoples but it is not without its issues. The media like any organization needs to be monitored for truth and held responsible for the complications it can create. Some would even go so far as to argue in the past that the media made mass killings by terrorists more likely than less. When the media drew the attention that the terrorist organizations so desperately craved they only spread the desire for a bigger more horrific incident. "Without gain there would be less incentive for the horrific behavior" (Neuwirth 2006).

When all the media agrees on a specific incident a majority of the population would naturally believe they are being told the truth, and why wouldn't they. The media is supposed to be the people's source of accurate reliable information. However, they can turn certain stories into propaganda, intentionally or not. A prime example of the media following their own agenda was when the New York Times printed an article with a picture of An Israeli Policeman and a Palestinian on the Temple Mount, "The photo suggests a Palestinian so badly beaten that blood was running down his face. When in reality the picture was of an Israeli policeman that was protecting the beaten Jewish victim from Arabs (Neuwirth 2006). The New York Times was forced to retract the story by outraged protestors but they did so only reluctantly and with much contestation. The result of this dilemma was the creation of a media watchdog organization. The New York Times is such a prestigious and reliable source of media it brings into question any media organization.

This also brings about the need for the government and media collaboration to monitor stories and keep control. Not only is it to keep the print honest, but it is also to protect the state's population from media releasing information that provides incentives for terrorists or perhaps even provides them with information about a specific target or when to act next. The Congressional Research Service Intelligence Brief offers some suggestions on how the media and the government can work together. These include: (1) financing joint media/government training exercises; (2) establishing a government terrorism information response center; (3) promoting use of media pools for hostage-centered terrorist events; (4) establishing and promoting voluntary press coverage guidelines; and (5) monitoring terrorism against the media (Perl 1997). These voluntary guidelines can help monitor the media and keep false stories from emerging. However the government has to play a balancing act in that they do not over step their bounds. "The media and the government have common interests in seeing that the media are not manipulated into promoting the cause of terrorism or its methods. On the other hand, neither the media or policymakers want to see terrorism, or counter terrorism, eroding constitutional freedoms including that of the press" (Perl 1997).

These voluntary guidelines if balanced properly are not just helpful here in the United States but they can also have a significant impact on all states that belong to the United Nations. If all states are granted the basic freedom of information and the press then perhaps these revolutions would appear anywhere the people are oppressed. The guidelines could also help promote free media sources that are not limited or controlled by governments or supported by terrorists. The individuals are doing their part against their oppressors it is time the democratically free nations do their part to assist them. The United Nations makes claims they are doing all they can by forcing sanctions on the states where these revolutions are occurring, they are freezing assets, and they are holding meetings. Take it a step further and demand the freedom of information.

The Internet

Technology, especially the internet, has made the spread of information far more accessible than ever before. Terrorists use the internet to spread their message, and to recruit. The internet is not only safe and immediate, but allows al-Qaeda and other terrorist groups to speak directly to their audience with an untainted message.

However, the internet has also allowed the populations of states that are often dictatorships, oppressive, and sponsors of terrorists to see the truth and to learn more about the outside world. They learn how things could be, and that the west is not as "evil" as they are made out to be. The people of oppressed nations would like to have a more solidly built infrastructure, education, jobs, and the freedom to make decisions for themselves.

Thanks to the lack of filters on the internet which "acts as a direct media with no filter for language, message or imagery used, television is being pushed to show visuals which they would have shied away from in the past new communication technologies are pushing the boundaries of what television audiences are used to viewing" (Soriano 2008). Along with this and the ability of people to publicly blog opinions, and for two way communications to be established by people in separate parts of the world culture is spreading and blending causing people to see through the misinformation they were shown. This has led to dissent starting to rise in oppressed areas where media blackouts only partially existed. In the Middle East there has been significant cultural blending due to the internet and the ability of the populations to watch shows from the West and the ability to learn on their own that perhaps their oppressive leaders are the real problem. In 2006 a 56 year old doctor and human rights activist from Gaza named Mona El-Farra used her blog as a window to the world. She states she uses her blog as a way to create a bridge to the outside world. Due to sanctions by Egypt and Israel the people of Gaza have a difficult time traveling. Mona El-Farra said her blog not only "gives Gazans a chance to connect with the rest of the world, their blogs give those outside the region an inside view of Gaza" (Davies 2004). El-Farra's blog has thousands of readers from all over the world and helps encourage a sharing of culture and information.

However, in states like North Korea (and in some cases China) that continue to have total media and internet black outs a shift in the populations view of the leadership has not appeared and protest attempts always seem to fall flat.

Socioeconomic conditions and a lack of Information

Experts of terrorism have been arguing consistently for many years as to what causes a person to turn to terrorism. Many would assume that it would be the uneducated and the poor who unwittingly make up the ranks of the terrorist organizations. However, this is not the case as Alan Krueger and Jitka Maleckova through extensive research have found that it is in fact the educated and more economically well off that are more likely to participate in extremism and terrorism than those that are under educated and poor (Krueger 2003). This is significant information because a state with poor socioeconomic conditions may not breed new terrorists but it does allow for an oppressive government that sponsors outside terrorist organizations. When the poverty stricken masses finally become informed and have had enough of their leadership then they can make a change not only better for themselves but by doing so they unintentionally put an end to a state sponsor.

Those that are poverty stricken often have more interest in how to get another meal than participating in a political or militant movement. When applying this logic to Hezbollah they found that an increase in poverty actually led to a "10% reduction in participation and those that have secondary school or higher education have an 8% increase in participation" (Krueger 2003). Extremists involved in the Israeli underground consisted of "disproportionately well-educated and highly paid [individuals including] teachers, writers, university students, geographers, engineers, entrepreneurs, a combat pilot, a chemist and a computer programmer" (Krueger 2003).

"The data seem to suggest that a lack of civil liberties is associated with a higher participation in terrorism and that low income has no direct connection" (Krueger 2003). The finding that "terrorists are more likely to spring from countries that lack civil rights, is further support for the view that terrorism is a political, not economic, phenomenon" (Krueger 2003). Those that actually have the wealth to become educated often go through schooling controlled by supporters of one terrorist organization or another, creating new extremists. The poor continue to stay poor and disillusioned with no ability to make change, while the educated and well off become misinformed and desire to make change in the wrong way.

The psychological impact of socioeconomics is important to the development of terrorism; however it is the lack of civil liberties that are more important when it comes to the state sponsorship of such groups. Those states that restrict the information of the people, the rights of individuals, the ability to further better their lives, and feed them with misinformation is how the state sponsors keep their people in check. As people become better educated in such societies they learn that they are wrongly informed and they are slowly starting to realize it is their state that causes the problem and no one else.

Revolution 2.0

State sponsors rely on misinformation, lack of information, and oppression to keep the people in check. With a freedom of media and information with the help of modern technology

the oppressors are seeing revolutions occur. With revolution and the overthrow of old state sponsors terrorists may be losing their support systems. "Today's global media is the most effective weapon around for both governments and terrorists the maxim still holds that 'war is ultimately coercive [while] terrorism is impressive'; in other words, terrorism compensates for its relative lack of coercive force by relying on 'collective alarmism' to create the forceful reaction of the state it needs to rally people to its cause" (Yahya 2010).

However, with the revolution of the internet, cell phones, and the social network the Middle East is alive with revolution. The American social network is changing the region and spreading the seeds of discontent among the youth. Instead of turning into religious zealots that follow tradition the youth want to be independent, cultured, and most of all they want to work. Unemployment in the region hovers around 30% (Davies 2004). The youth have had the motivation to make change for some time and now they have the tools. On Thursday 24th February 2011 Catriona Davies of CNN reported that a few days after the fall of Egypt's President a young woman of 24 years named Nawara Belal was driving in Cairo when she was verbally abused by an army officer. She got out of the car opened his door and slapped him across the face. She stated "I realized he wouldn't do anything about it, and it gave me the power to do what I wanted to do to every harasser in my past. I would never have been able to do that before the revolution." Many women in Egypt reportedly feel there has been a change in the culture. The country has come a long way, the media is supporting them, but they still have a long way to go.

Governments can use the media in an effort to arouse world opinion against the country or group using terrorist tactics. Public diplomacy and the media can also be used to mobilize public opinion in other countries to pressure governments to take, or reject, action against terrorism (Perl 1997). If the media is a pillar of democracy then perhaps with this new round of revolutions in the Middle East the media, so embraced by the youth, can become a pillar that creates democracy there. Only time can tell if the Muslim Brotherhood or Democratic leadership will be put in places like Libya, Egypt, and Bahrain.

When speaking of the protestors in Egypt German Chancellor Angela Markel stated "In their eyes you can see what power freedom can have, by stepping down, President Mubarak had rendered a last service to the people of Egypt" (Davies 2004). In Libya reporters for MSNBC stated that the protestors were friendly and that they "believed the media helped overthrow the governments of Egypt and Tunisia" (MSNBC 2011). Hopefully soon Gadhafi will realize his cause is lost and step down allowing the people of Libya a chance to make a new future for themselves after decades of oppression.

To further show the influence the media has had on recent events in the world the revolutions of the Middle East have started to spread to China. According to Jo Ling Kent at CNN attempts at pro-democracy rallies fell flat last week protestors are making a second attempt. The initial attempts were made for 20th February 2011 but either out of lack of information or fear of government reprisal a protest was never held. The Chinese protestors are attempting to use Facebook, Twitter and YouTube, all of which are banned in mainland China. Perhaps a second attempt will be more successful as cell phones are just as prominent in China

as they are in many other parts of the world, and those may not be as protected by the state as the internet is. Years ago protests were regional affairs, today with the media and technology they truly are global.

The media changed with the PLO and altered the face of terrorism for the rest of the contemporary age. It is possible that with changes in technology that media may be changing terrorism for a second time, but this time for the better. With revolutions occurring in most major states that sponsor terrorism, the terrorist groups are losing their support systems, their resources, and their sanctuary. Perhaps if the United Nations and the West can help encourage the freedom of information contemporary terrorism can be combated with its own best weapon.

References

Arango, Tim. "World Falls for American Media, Even as It Sours on America." New York Times 30 NOV 2008. Web. 26 Feb 2011. <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/12/01/business/media/01soft.html?_r=2>.

Bahgat, Gawdat. "Oil, Terrorism and Weapons of Mass Destruction: The Libyan Diplomatic Coup," The Journal of Social, Political and Economic Studies, Vol. 29, No. 4 (Winter 2004).

Byman, Daniel. Deadly Connections: States that Sponsor Terrorism, Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Davies , Catriona . "Gaza bloggers build bridges to outside world." CNN World 04 Feb 2011. Web. 26 Feb 2011. <http://www.cnn.com/2011/WORLD/meast/02/04/gaza.bloggers/index.html>.

Goenka, Viveck. "'Terrorists use media as a tool'." Indian Express 18 DEC 2009. Web. 26 Feb 2011. <http://www.indianexpress.com/news/terrorists-use-media-as-a-tool/555588/>.

Hoffman, Bruce. Inside Terrorism. New York: Columbia University Press, Second edition, 2006.

Jo Ling Kent. "Organizers call for 2nd round of demonstrations across China." CNN World 27 Feb 2011. Web. 27 Feb 2011. <http://www.cnn.com/2011/WORLD/meast/02/04/gaza.bloggers/index.html>.

Krueger Alan B. and Jitka Maleckova, "Education, Poverty and Terrorism: Is there a Causal Connection?", Journal of Economic Perspectives, Volume 17, Number 4 (Fall 2003).

Mamdani , Mahmood Good Muslim, Bad Muslim: A Political Perspective on Culture and Terrorism American AnthropologistNew Series, Vol. 104, No. 3 (Sep., 2002), pp. 766-775

Soriano, Manuel R. Torres. Terrorism and the Mass Media after Al Qaeda: A Change of Course? Athena Intelligence Journal Vol. 3, No 1, (2008), pp. 1-20.

MSNBC Staff "Libya protesters to try to capture Qadhafi ." MSNBC 24 FEB 2011. Web. 26 Feb 2011. <http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/41731365/ns/world_news-mideastn_africa/>.

Neuwirth, Rachel. "How the Media Enable Terrorism." American Thinker 02 Aug 2006. Web. 26 Feb 2011. <http://www.americanthinker.com/2006/08/how_the_media_enable_terrorism.html>.

Perl, Raphael F. "TERRORISM, THE MEDIA, AND THE GOVERNMENT:." CRS ISSUE BRIEF 22 OCT 1997. Web. 26 Feb 2011. <http://www.fas.org/irp/crs/crs-terror.htm>.

Rampton, Sheldon. "The Media: Terrorist Tool?." PR WATCH 13 FEB 2003. Web. 26 Feb 2011. <http://www.prwatch.org/node/1734>.

Tessler, Mark and Michael D. H. Robbins. "What Leads Some Ordinary Arab Men and Women to Approve of Terrorist Acts against the United States?" The Journal of Conflict Resolution Vol. 51, No. 2 (Apr., 2007), pp. 305-328

Yahya, Birt. "Terrorism, Politics and Media Controversy." Musings on the Britannic Crescent 25 NOV 2010.. Web. 26 Feb 2011. <http://www.yahyabirt.com/>