

General instructions to be followed to pass essay

1- Spend time on rightly comprehension of the topic, you won't pass the essay unless and until you addressed the asked part

Outline:

1- Introduction

2- Try to make your main heading in the outline from the words in the question statement

2- Morality defines Resistance and Rebellion

3- Try to add hook in the introduction. The length of introduction must be of 2 sides

a- Quaid-e-Azam

b- Mahatma Gandhi

c- Sir Syed Ahmed Khan

4- your topic sentence in your argument must be aligned with the ending sentence

4- When power controls the narrative: The Dominants define the deviants

5- Avoid firstly, secondly, thirdly etc. in outline

a- Benjamin Netanyahu presents Genocide in Gaza as self defense.

6- add references in your arguments with proper source. Go for diversification of references

b- Putin Justify war in Ukraine as an attempt to protect Russian Identity

7- Do not add new idea or point in Conclusion

c- Mullah Umar

d- Kim Jong-un at North Korea

8- You won't pass the essay if make more than 4-5 grammatical mistakes

8- Day Threat:

a- words can wage wars.

9- outlines that are not self explanatory or does not aligned with the essay statement are liable to mark 0 and the essay would become null and void

a- Case in Point: Mahatma Gandhi and Faiz Ahmed Faiz

b- The Pen and the protest share the same Battle:

10- always try to be relevant to the topic, if even your 1 or 2 arguments are irrelevant, the examiner would not pass your essay.

a- Case in Point: Malala Yousafzai

b- Martin Luther King Jr.

You haven't understood the topic at all

6- Political interests
Villains.

Must work on your topic comprehension

7- Way Forward.

Improve your phrasing and expressions

8- Conclusion

Words selection must be improved

History reveals that the definition of terrorism and freedom is neither absolute nor objective. It is defined by those in power not by those who suffer under it. Throughout different eras, political authorities have labeled movements of justice as insurgencies to protect their dominance.

Must attend the tutorial session for further suggestions and mistakes

This essay examines how moral relativism, state interests, power dynamics decides who becomes a terrorist and who become a Freedom fighter.

A terrorist is the one who uses violence, fear against civilians to achieve political, ideological or social gains. Terrorism refers to the systematic use of violence in terms of ideologies to create fear in society to achieve political, religious goals. On the other hand, Freedom is state of being free to act, speak or think without any fear or unjust restrictions. In simple words it is the right to self-determination and to live with dignity without external domination.

Why are you telling this to me?
You are supposed to unfold the topic. You are just beating around the bush

The boundary between resistance and rebellion shifts over time and context. It is also the moral compass of these groups. What one generation condemns as treason, another reverse it as heroism. This moral relativity defines how individuals who rise against oppression are interpreted either as terrorists threatening order or as freedom fighters working hard for restoring justice. So, it's not the action that matters but ^{the one} who judges it. When Quaid-e-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah demanded for a separate homeland for Muslims, the India national Congress accused him of dividing the India and destroying the vision of united nation. Yet for millions of Indian Subcontinent he was the embodiment of Liberation who used logic, law and leadership to secure their fundamental human rights. So Jinnah's moral strength did not come from universal approval but from those having strong belief on him that he was actually fighting for fair and right cause. His struggles shows that what is considered "moral" is often decided by those who are oppressed not by those who are in power.

Similarly, Mahatma Gandhi, the apostle of non-violence, was not celebrated universally in his lifetime. The Britisher regarded him as trouble maker who caused unrest in their empire. But for his followers he

represented moral strength, ^{a man} who challenged a powerful empire using truth and conscience. His peaceful approach showed that resistance doesn't always mean to fight with weapons but to stand firmly with faith and courage against injustice. Sir Syed Ahmed Khan were criticised due to its loyalty to the Britishers but his reforms saved Muslim identity.

If morality defines how actions are judged, then power decides how they are remembered. Those in power always control the narrative. What one side calls it, bravery or courage, the other calls it terrorism. It depends on who has the power to shape the narrative. The media, politics and global influence allow them to present their version as reality. For instance the Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu calls his attacks on Gaza as "Self defense", while the Palestinians see them as acts of terror and occupation. One mirror with two opposite truths. Similarly, Vladimir Putin claims his invasion of Ukraine is to protect "Russian Identity" but west calls it "a war against humanity. Both sides use moral words to justify their interests showing how truth bends before power."

In Contrast Volodymyr Zelensky is seen as

You are just providing me the information

a symbol of bravery and democracy but in Russia, he is portrayed as a puppet of foreign powers. Why the west calls Zelensky a symbol of democracy? West glorifies him as symbol of democracy because he represents a frontline defense against Russian influence in Eastern Europe. ~~But~~ however, behind this there are clear economic and political interests of USA. Ukraine has many natural resources such as Li, coal, Fe, and fertile land crucial for industries and future energy needs. By supporting Ukraine, western countries will be able to stop Russian expansion as well as will have access to valuable resources and trade routes.

Just as one side glorifies Zelensky, the same west branded ~~on the~~ Mullah Umar with the tag of terrorist for resisting foreign presence in his own land Afghanistan. Similarly Kim Jong Un who presents himself as the protector of national sovereignty in North Korea is labeled by west powers as dictator and global threat.

When truth or narratives are filtered through power, in such situations words rise as weapons of resistance. When artists, truth and poets write of freedom, then their poetry turned into resistance. Farz Ahmed Farz used ~~this~~ his art of poetry

Similarly
against oppressors. ↑ Mahmoud Darwish
the voice of Palestine used poetry
to preserve identity and dignity
under occupation. Both proved that art
can fight without violence and win
without armies.

In our own times, Mahla Yousifzai carries
the same spirit of resistance. Her
voice for girls' education shook the
foundations of extremism more powerfully
than any weapon. She proved that
a single idea can challenge entire
systems of oppression.

The lessons from history and modern
times are clear that resistance through
expression are only effective when
guided by moral clarity and purpose.
This shows that when a struggle is
driven by conscience and the desire
for justice, it becomes noble; but
when guided by hatred or greed it
loses its meaning. Societies and leaders
must therefore protect free expression,
promote education - and distinguish the
real resistance from propaganda.

By doing so they ensure that
acts of resistance and voices of truth
serve justice rather than division,
shaping a world that values both
freedom and conscience.

In conclusion, history shows that heroes and villains are often defined by those in power. Yet voices like Faiz, Dawood and Malala prove that truth and moral courage can challenge oppression more than weapons. Moral clarity and justice help distinguish noble resistance from harmful rebellion and society that uphold these values can survive and thrive with dignity and peace.