

# Fighting Terrorism towards Global Peace

Muhammad Nur Islami

Faculty of Law, Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta, Indonesia

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2024.804053>

Received: 29 March 2024; Accepted: 03 April 2024; Published: 03 May 2024

## ABSTRACT

One of the fundamental issues that will be examined in the results of this research is that to see and understand the problem of terrorism, it must be traced from its causes, the context of its occurrence and the meaning contained in it. According to Walter Reich, the complexity of the problem and the variety of interpretations of terrorism make it difficult for ordinary people to understand what terrorism is. Apparently, it also happened in the case of terrorism in Indonesia. Usually, ordinary people will see an action based on the results it causes without asking why someone has the heart to do such a cruel thing. This phenomenon intrigues the researchers regarding the issue of terrorism should not simply be examined by how to punish the perpetrator but instead asks the underlying reason of why the perpetrator did the act. From the results of the study, it was revealed that the acts of terror committed by the terrorists were motivated by acts of revenge against the “Real Terrorists,” the United States and its allies. For example, what was done by the US against Iraq, and what was done by Israel against Palestine. These terrorism cases are influenced by the religious teachings and ideology of the perpetrators. This research was a descriptive study, while the data collection was carried out for a long time, not only by tracing library materials but also by understanding the terrorism cases that occurred in Indonesia, as well as by conducting in-depth interviews and reading books by terrorists, such as Abu Bakar Baasyir and Imam Samudra. The conclusion is that the acts of terror carried out by terrorists in Indonesia are an “Effort of Resistance” against the real terrorists, the United States, and its allies.

**Keywords:** Terrorism, Resistance Efforts, Eclectic Study

## INTRODUCTION

All religions teach that peace will bring happiness, while enmity will cause disaster on earth. In Islamic teachings, for example, killing someone is not because that person kills another person or not because that person has done damage on earth. Then it is the same as killing all humans (Sura Al-Maaidah verse 32). In al-Hujurat verse 13, it is also emphasized that Allah SWT created humans on this earth from male and female, nations, and tribes, to get to know each other and work together, not to be enemies and kill each other [1].

All religions teach that peace will bring happiness, while enmity will cause disaster on earth. In Islamic teachings, for example, killing someone is not because that person kills another person or not because that person has done damage on earth. Then it is the same as killing all humans (Sura Al-Maaidah verse 32). In al-Hujurat verse 13, it is also emphasized that Allah SWT created humans on this earth from male and female, nations and tribes, to get to know each other and work together, not to be enemies and kill each other [2].

Therefore, terrorism is not a teaching of Islam, nor is it a teaching of any particular religion. However, in reality, terrorism occurs everywhere, and there must be a strong reason for this incident.

Terrorism expert from the Community of Ideological Analysts (CIIA), Haris Abu Ulya, believes that the government needs to make a clear definition of radicalism before executing it. With a clear definition, countering terrorism will be carried out appropriately. If there is no clear definition, there will be a bias in the meaning of what is meant by radicalism. Moreover, radicalism is often identified with Islam. The same thing needs to be done to the definition of terrorism. Although it has been formulated in the Law, in reality, there are still differences of opinion about what terrorism actually is [3].

According to “The Concise Oxford Dictionary (1987), radical means ‘root’, ‘source’, or ‘origin’. Meanwhile, radicalism refers to an understanding or sect. Other defines it as an extreme understanding closely related to violence.

Meanwhile, according to the Big Indonesian Dictionary (KBBI), radicalism is a radical understanding or sect in politics, an understanding or sect that wants social and political change or reform by means of violence or drastic, as well as extreme attitudes in political schools. Thus, many countries oppose the notion of radicalism because they want to change or renew through violence or drastic or even extreme measure. The desired changes were carried out on a large scale through violence.

A clear definition of radicalism must be immediately formulated by the government by inviting experts in the fields because lately radicalism is often associated with religious understanding, especially in Islam.

One of the basic things that want to be conveyed in this simple discussion is that seeing and understanding the problem of terrorism must be traced from its causes, the context of its occurrence and the meaning contained in it. The complexity of the problem and the diversity of interpretations of terrorism make it difficult for ordinary people to understand it [4].

Research and understanding of the root causes of acts of terror both in Indonesia and in other parts of the world are urgently needed to be carried out continuously because terrorism is very destructive and disrupts people’s lives, both in Indonesia and the international community in general.

Fighting the crime of radicalism/terrorism does not have to be done with violence but eliminates the root causes. It’s like a tree, even though the branches, leaves and twigs are cut off, but if the roots that plunged into the ground are still there, then one day the tree will grow again, even more fertile than before [5].

The root cause of terrorism, of course, cannot be found in Indonesia alone because terrorism is a global crime. It could be that we have to trace the previous acts of terrorism, such as the spectacular one in the case of the “WTC 9/11 Tragedy”.

Walter Reich said that terrorism is a complex problem, the causes are diverse, and the people involved are even more diverse. Any attempt to understand the motivations for the actions of a terrorist individual or group must consider this great diversity. Therefore, there is no psychological theory or other theories that can single-handedly explain terrorism [6].

Usually, ordinary people will see an action based on its consequences without asking why someone has the heart to do such a cruel thing and why did he actually do it. Likewise, law enforcers, such as the police, immediately arrest perpetrators, both alive and dead, while legal experts are only trying to find out which articles are suitable for punishing a terrorist.

We also need to consider whether the perpetrators carrying out their crimes with a specific purpose, for example, as an effort to resist? If you fight, then who do you fight? It may also be overlooked to discuss who is the “Real Terrorist” who makes many people become terrorists? The meaning of an event seems to be missed in the discussion of terrorism, questions such as “why are people willing to be martyrs in carrying

out suicide bombings so that their bodies are shattered into pieces, which sometimes only kills a handful of people, why did he do it? Why did Imam Samudera, known as a terrorist, call the US the terrorist?

Questions like that are perhaps more important to find answers to before pulling the trigger or looking for articles to punish the perpetrators [7].

It becomes a question for all of us, why do acts of terrorism also occur in Indonesia? Why did the perpetrators have the heart to do this, and what is the underlying reason? Could this crime be caused by injustice, poverty, or religious factors?

On the one hand, the term Global War on Terrorism can be said to be correct because almost no part of the world is free from acts of terrorism, including our country, the Republic of Indonesia. The term “terrorism” has been known since the September 11 Tragedy, when the World Trade Centre Building in America was attacked by a group of terrorists using a commercial aircraft belonging to the United States Government. But on the other hand, the big question remains, what exactly is terrorism, who is a terrorist, and how does it occur? This big question arises because why did the US, such a large superpower, be attacked by a group of terrorists?

Is it true that the attack was carried out by the Al-Qaida group led by Osama Bin Laden as accused by America? Regarding the events of 9/11, Osama no less than three times swore in the name of Allah to declare that he did not commit or mastermind the tragedy of the WTC and the Pentagon. In an interview with the Urdu magazine Al-Ummah Pakistan, Osama stated [8]:

*“I have stated several times that I was in no way involved in the bombings in the US. This is my confession from the bottom of my heart. I’m a Muslim, so don’t lie. Furthermore, I really did not know any information about the explosion. I am against terrorism and the killing of innocent people. Islam forbids killing regardless of the pretext, both against women and children. Even in war, even if the enemy has surrendered, it is not to be killed. It is precisely the US that has killed innocent people as well as people or countries that oppose them, especially Muslims, as has been done in Palestine, Chechnya and many others.”*

If Osama bin Laden dares to swear in the name of Allah, and if it is true, then who is the perpetrator of the terror act at the WTC Twin Towers on September 11, 2001? Despite America being claimed as the strongest and safest country with a super modern defence and security system and supported by its strong intelligence. Until now, it is still unclear who is the real mastermind behind the perpetrators of this world-shaking crime [9].

Jerry D. Gray, in his book “The Real Truth of 9/11” and in his other book “Art of Deception,” asserts that America carried out the attack on the WTC by borrowing the operators who were forced to do it because it was impossible for the building to collapse only when it was hit by a plane (according to the architects). Because it turned out that bombs had been installed on each floor, so along with the explosion on the floor the plane hit, every floor in the building exploded, so the building was deliberately torn down. So, who can put bombs on each floor if not the US itself? It is also evident from the facts that on that fateful day, thousands of workers in the two buildings did not come to work. This means they all know that the building is going to be blown up. From another fact, it was revealed that the plane used by the terrorists was a commercial aircraft belonging to the US itself. Then of the people accused of being terrorists by the US, it turned out that most of them were still alive. From this fact, it can be said that if what Jerry D. Gray stated is true, then the question is, why did the US do all that? The answer, according to James Petras, is so that the United States has a justification for retaliating more violently against the groups or countries it targets, such as the al Qaeda group, Afghanistan, or Iraq [10]. Similar things have been done by the US, such as in the case of dropping the atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, which were said to be the US defence against the Japanese attack, even though the US had deliberately prepared many ships and planes. Franklin Delano Roosevelt had known beforehand about the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. However, it can be

used as a justification for dropping atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. James Petras also said that the need to create a cause is the most pressing thing for imperialist countries because their national territory is not under threat [11].

## METHOD

This research was a descriptive study, while the data collection was carried out for a long time, not only by tracing library materials but also by understanding the terrorism cases that occurred in Indonesia, as well as by conducting in-depth interviews and reading books by terrorists, such as Abu Bakar Baasyir and Imam Samudra. The conclusion is that the acts of terror carried out by terrorists in Indonesia are an “Effort of Resistance” against the real terrorists, the United States, and its allies.

## DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS

### A. The Difficulty of Defining Terrorism

Many experts have acknowledged that discussing terrorism cannot be done easily before finding out what terrorism actually means. There is no universally accepted definition of what is called terrorism [12].

Yusuf Qardhawi, in his book “Islam Radikal,” cites the statement of the mantiq scholars who stated: “That judging something is part of his description because it is impossible to judge something that is not known, just as it is impossible to judge something whose substance and essence are disputed.”

If the word Radix means root, then is practicing religious teachings to their roots called radicals? Isn't it good to practice religious teachings down to the detail? Moreover, there are commands in the Koran that we should be kaffah (perfect) in religion.

In his book Islam Radikal, Yusuf Qardhawi gives the characteristics of the alleged radical person [13]:

1. The fanaticism toward one opinion without respecting other opinions.
2. Always use violence, even though some factors demand convenience and require others to do what Allah does not require.
3. Rough attitude in socializing, harsh in the method of da'wah, contradicting the instructions of Allah and His Messenger.
4. Be suspicious of others.
5. Accused others as Kafir (takfir).

According to Mark Juergensmeyer, terrorism comes from the Latin “terrere” which means to cause a sense of trembling and anxiety. In English, “to terrorize” means to frighten. Terrorist means terrorist, the perpetrator of the crime. “Terrorism” means to create fear or anxiety [14].

Mark Juergensmeyer states [15]:

*“ ... public response to the fears of violence as a result of terrorism is part of the meaning of the term, that is the definition of a terrorist act which is then given by “us”-those who witnessed it, people who are targeted by terror and not by groups who support the action. It is we-or more often our public agents, the mass media- who label violent acts as terrorism. These are acts of public vandalism, carried out without a military pretext, that sow widespread fear”.*

According to Mark Juergensmeyer, the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki in World War II was the worst terrorism. Mark also admits that what often drives acts of terrorism is religion, sometimes through a

combination of other factors, often as the main motivation [16].

Meanwhile, according to the US Department of Defense, terrorism is an unlawful act or action that contains threats of violence or coercion against individuals or property rights to coerce or intimidate the government or society for political, religious or ideological purposes.

Furthermore, in the TNI AD manual on Anti-terror 2000, it is stated that terrorism is a way of thinking and acting that uses terror as a technique to achieve goals [17].

The word terrorism first became popular during the French revolution. At that time, the word terrorism had a positive connotation. The system or Regime de la terreur in 1793-1794 was interpreted as a way to restore order during a period of anarchic chaos and upheaval after the people's rebellion in 1789.

In Law No. 15 of 2003 concerning the Eradication of Criminal Acts of Terrorism, Chapter I General Provisions, Article 1 paragraph 1, states that the Criminal Acts of Terrorism are all acts that meet the elements of a criminal act in accordance with the provisions of this Law. Then in Articles 6 and 7, everyone is punished for committing a crime of terrorism, if [18]:

1. *Deliberately using violence or threats of violence to create an atmosphere of terror or fear of people widely or cause mass casualties by depriving freedom or taking other people's lives and property or causing damage or destruction to vital strategic objects or the environment or public facilities or international facilities (Article 6).*
2. *Deliberately using violence or threats of violence intends to create an atmosphere of terror or fear towards people widely or cause mass casualties by depriving freedom or taking other people's lives and property, or causing damage or destruction to vital objects, such as strategic or environmental or public facilities or international facilities (Article 7).*

Someone is also considered to have committed a crime of terrorism, based on the provisions of articles 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12 of Law Number 15 of 2003 concerning the Eradication of the Crime of Terrorism. Of the many definitions put forward by many parties, the characteristics of terrorism are [19]:

1. *There is a plan to carry out the action.*
2. *Done by a certain group.*
3. *Using violence.*
4. *Targeting civilians with the intention of intimidating the government.*
5. *It is carried out with certain objectives of the perpetrator, which can be in the form of social, political or religious motives.*

According to the new terrorism Law Number 5 of 2018 [20]:

*Terrorism is an act that uses violence or threats of violence. It creates an atmosphere of terror or widespread fear, which can cause mass casualties and/or cause damage or destruction to strategic objects, the environment, public facilities, or international facilities with ideological, political, or security disturbance motives.*

In contrast, the definition formulated by the Indonesian Ulema Council is as follows [21]:

*Terrorism is an act of crime against humanity and civilization that poses a serious threat to state sovereignty, is a danger to security and world peace and is detrimental to the welfare of the people. Terrorism is a form of crime that is well organized, transnational in nature and classified as an extraordinary crime that does not discriminate between targets (indiscriminatory).*



One element that is somewhat different and exists in the definition of the MUI is that acts of terror contain transnational elements, while Law Number 15 of 2003/and Law Number 5 of 2018, which are international in nature, include targets for acts of terror such as international facilities. This is, of course, different because one is the action, while the other is the goal.

In practice, every act of terrorism in Indonesia is always accompanied by the use of explosives (bombs) . Aside of explosive action, the action of terrorism in Indonesia also involved a woman and children. Yet, in the definition, there is no such element. Therefore, the massacre at the Wali Songo Islamic Boarding School, for example, is sufficient to say that it is a gross violation of human rights, not terrorism. According to the author, this is due to the absence of explosives and no transnational elements, even though hundreds of people died. On the other hand, even if only one or two people died, if it was done by detonating a bomb, it would be called terrorism. Confusing right? It is also necessary to analyze and clarify what is meant by the wide-scale action? What is the size of the extension? Is it national or international? Is it the impact or the number of victims that matter? Because, in today's modern era, an act can become widespread if social media reports on the incident on a large scale, with an international scope, even though the number of victims is small. On the other hand, crimes that have a large number of victims but are not published globally.

Consequently, in international political talks, terrorism is not only carried out by individuals or organized groups, but it can also be carried out by the state. This is called "State Terrorism," for example, done by Israel and the United States.

So, which definition will we use and implement?

In Indonesia, with this unclear definition, Densus 88 Anti-Terrorism often shoots terrorist suspects, while it is not clear/proven their guilt at the suspect. Is this also an act of terror? For the case that occurred in Indonesia, as it is known that the discussion about the Siyono case that some time ago had surfaced as well as what was no less heartbreaking was that which happened to a terrorist suspect named Adib Susilo, this terrorist suspect has not been proven guilty, but has died and finally met his death was shot by members of Densus 88 in the Surakarta jurisdiction. Tragically, the shooting was carried out in front of his pregnant wife [22].

From a historical perspective, several decades ago in Indonesia, there were no acts of terrorism. Domestic security disturbances are more often colored by internal conflicts, which in the end, can be resolved properly by the Government and the people of Indonesia. Most of the internal conflicts that occur in Indonesia are related to opposition to state ideology. During the Old Order era under President Soekarno, there was a movement spearheaded by Karto Soewiryo, who tried to establish the Islamic State of Indonesia (NII) and the event was known as DI/TII (Darul Islam/Army Islam Indonesia), a religious revolution movement that began was declared on August 8, 1949. This movement was finally resolved by the Indonesian government by being arrested, tried, and executed (with the death penalty) by the leader of the movement, namely Sekarmaji Marijan (SM) Karto Soewiryo, in 1962. SM Karto Soewiryo was sentenced to die in front of a firing squad in a place that was kept secret by the Soekarno government at that time. The place of execution, as well as the burial place of Karto Soewiryo, was only discovered some time ago on Ubi island in the Seribu Islands.

After that, during the New Order era, there was a crackdown on the September 30 Movement Rebellion of the Indonesian Communist Party (G 30 S PKI), which occurred in 1948 and reached its peak in 1965. The movement was finally dissolved by the New Order Government under President Suharto to be declared a prohibited organization/movement in Indonesia [23].

The rejection of the state ideology again occurred in Indonesia in 1974/1975, namely the opposition to the state ideology of Pancasila by Abu Bakar Baasyir and Abdullah Sungkar. These two figures openly

opposed the Pancasila ideology and carried out their da'wah through a private radio station in Surakarta known as RADIS (Radio Da'wah Islam Surakarta). As a result of these actions, the two scholars were brought to the Sukoharjo District Court, Central Java (south of the city of Surakarta). However, while waiting for the results of their appeal to the Supreme Court, Abu Bakar Baasyir and Abdullah Sungkar fled to Malaysia. This happened in 1985. In this country, these two clerics preached and received protection from the Malaysian government. It was safe enough for the two of them to be there, trading to make a living. Then on May 20, 1998, in Indonesia, there was a massive demonstration to overthrow the Suharto government. This movement was called the "Reformation Movement," which was supported by all elements of the nation, including academics, students, as well as national figures at that time, such as Dr. Amien Rais. This movement succeeded in making President Suharto finally resign from the presidency [24].

With the fall of President Soeharto, then the position of President was temporarily occupied by Prof. Dr. BJ Habibie. With the new government and the end of Suharto's power, Abu Bakar Ba'asyir and Abdullah Sungkar were able to safely return to Indonesia in 1999. After only one year of setting foot on Indonesian soil, Abu Bakar Ba'asyir and the scholars who supported him held a National Congress in 2000. This congress also established the establishment of the Majelis Mujahidin Indonesia (MMI), and the Amir elected was Ustadz Abu Bakar Baasyir. One year since MMI was founded, the tragedy of the collapse of the WTC Twin Towers occurred in the US. George Bush, as US President at that time, declared war on terrorism, and the alleged perpetrator was the Al-Qaida Group led by Osama bin Laden. It did not just stop here since the US government then made a statement which read; "...either you are with the Terrorist or with us". This means that the US invites countries in the world to make terrorism a common enemy, and for each country, there are only two choices where the country will position itself with the US and fight terrorists, or if not, it means with terrorists and is part of the of terrorists to fight. There are only those 2 options.

This call to fight terrorists is certainly very confusing for each country in the world, especially developing countries with a majority Muslim population like Indonesia. It is not clear who the terrorists are and what terrorism is since the problem of terrorism is complex. What is accused of being a terrorist state is a country that is used as a hiding place for Osama bin Laden (namely Afghanistan) or another Middle Eastern country such as Iraq (which was led by Saddam Hussein at that time). Of course, it is difficult for countries with a majority Muslim population, such as Indonesia, to follow the invitation (because it means it will attack its own brother), but if it does not heed the US invitation, it means that it is ready to face the US attack [25].

What has attracted the attention of the international community is that most of the perpetrators of recent terrorism crimes are Muslims. Hence Islam becomes the focus of the discussion. In fact, the terrorist movement also has actors from other religions.

An example of a crime whose perpetrators come from other religions can be illustrated in the Case of the Massacre of Residents of the Walisongo Islamic Boarding School in Poso on May 28, 2000. Can the following events not be called terrorism? [26]

*After carrying out the massacre of Moluccan Muslims in 1999 (Bloody Eid al-Fitr), it turned out that Christians were still continuing their massacre of Muslims in Poso (Year-2000), and Hundreds of lives were lost at Pesantren Wali Songo.*

*The sad news from Togolu Village, Lage District, Poso, touched the hearts of all residents. Hundreds of lives have been lost at the Wali Songo Islamic boarding school located in the area, not to mention those who were injured and fled full of fear. That's the testimony of Mrs. Ani, wife of the commander of Kodim 1307 Poso.*

*"The bodies that have been identified are around 200 people," explained Mrs. Ani. Meanwhile, the Antara News Agency said that hundreds of residents of the Wali Songo Islamic boarding school in Kilometer Nine*

*(Togolu Village) Lage District, Poso Regency, Central Sulawesi, were “missing,” and it was strongly suspected that they ran for safety when a group of rioters carried out the attack on May 28, 2000.*

Another example of terrorism is the heinous act that occurred in Myanmar, in which case the victims were Muslims. The perpetrators were Buddhists. The case is almost the same as what happened in Poso, motivated by hatred based on religion.

Most cases of terrorism in the Middle East are motivated by war, such as the attacks carried out by Israel on Palestine. The issue of terrorism is different from “War” (International Armed Conflict). In a war between countries, the armed forces of one country are faced with the armed forces of other countries. Recent acts of terrorism are carried out in times of peace and do not have to be face-to-face with their enemies (e.g., in the case of suicide bombings). In a war between countries, the target for combat is the armed forces of an enemy country (combatant), while in terrorism, the target is civilians due to the random nature of the attack [27].

Terrorist attacks are more dangerous because it is impossible to predict where and when they will occur. They can happen in office buildings, malls or even in tourist attractions (such as the Bali Bombing case). Acts of terrorism can also cause large numbers of victims (e.g., the WTC case where approximately 3000 people died).

The act of eradicating terrorism in each country has increased drastically. This is because acts of terrorism are an act that is opposed by the international community of any religion, whether it is Islam, Christianity, Hinduism, Buddhism, Confucianism and other religions, including people who do not have any religion strongly oppose this action. However, there are still difficulties in formulating a universally accepted definition of terrorism. The difference in the definition of terrorism does not only refer to a mere terminology understanding but what is more decisive is the difference in the interests of each party. So the problem of terrorism is very complex, not only a national problem of a country but also an international problem. It is not only a matter of catching and punishing the perpetrators but also the problem of finding the causes. Terrorism is not just an ordinary crime; instead, it is a Crime Against Humanity. It can even be said as an “Extraordinary Crime” or crime committed in the name of religion [28].

Experts from both politicians, academics and religious circles pay close attention to why acts of terrorism are always associated with Islam? History has recorded that acts of terrorism are not only from Muslims. There are also acts of terrorism carried out by non-Muslims, including, according to some experts, the state terrorism done by Israel (with US support) against Palestine, which has been going on for decades and has caused many casualties. Mohsin Muhammad Saleh said:

“The Palestinian issue is a major issue that has been a major problem in the Arab and Islamic worlds. The various Jewish-Zionist superiorities in the military, political and cultural aspects are implanted in the heart of the Islamic world. Palestine is the most difficult challenge faced by Muslims in their march towards independence, unity and revival to restore their status and honor in the international arena. It should be noted that the Palestinian case was never the case of the Palestinian people themselves. This is because the West-Zionist alliance from the beginning created divisions and weaknesses and then perpetuated the disintegration between Muslims as the main target that was aspired from the start. This is intended so that this ummah continues to rotate in the cycle of subordination of superpowers.

Every terrorist act, whether in Palestine, Afghanistan, Japan and other countries, including Indonesia, the manifestation of the terrorist act is mostly accompanied by bomb blasts in entertainment buildings, foreign embassies, malls or tourist attractions such as Bali, and the most spectacular to date is the 9/11 WTC Tragedy, here too, accompanied by an explosion using an airplane [29].

Is it true that Islam teaches violence accompanied by suicide? If at the beginning of this paper, it was



emphasized that killing an innocent human soul is tantamount to killing all humans and is a major sin. Therefore, for the perpetrators of this action, there must be a strong reason why they dared to do this action if it violated Islamic Law. Mathematically, acts of terror carried out by Islamic groups have claimed the lives of hundreds or even thousands of people, but if this number is compared with the number of victims due to acts of violence carried out by the US in Vietnam, Japan, Afghanistan, Iraq, Palestine, Sudan, Libya and several other countries, the number it means nothing [30]. The author believes that, in fact, the acts of terror that have been carried out so far are an effort of resistance. Yes, a resistance effort that becomes difficult to stem because it is based on an ideological struggle in accordance with the ideology of the perpetrators.

Although at the beginning of this article, Jerry D. Gray had emphasized that the perpetrators of the WTC tragedy were the US itself, not long after the attacks that hit the twin towers of the WTC and the Pentagon on September 11, 2001, in front of the congress session of the then US President George W. Bush emphasized His attitude with regard to al-Qaidah and Osama bin Laden is as follows [31]:

“On Sept.11, enemies of freedom committed an act of war against our country. Americans have known wars, but for the past 136 years, they have been wars on foreign soil, except for one Sunday in 1941. Americans have known the casualties of war, but not at the center of a great city on a peaceful morning. Americans have known surprise attacks, but never before on thousands of civilians. Americans have many questions tonight. Americans are asking, “who attacked our country?”

The evidence we have gathered all points to a collection of loosely affiliated terrorist organizations known as al-Qaidah. They are some of the murderers indicted for bombing American Embassies in Tanzania and Kenya and responsible for bombing the USS Cole. al-Qaidah is to terror what the Mafia is to crime. But its goal is not to make money. Its goal is remaking the world and imposing its radical beliefs on people everywhere” [32].

On September 18, 2001, the US Congress authorized President Bush to: “Use all appropriate and necessary force against the nations, organizations, or persons who, in his opinion, planned, carried out, was involved in or financed the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001, or detained certain organizations or persons in order to prevent future acts of international terrorism against the US, by any nation, organization or certain people”. On the other hand, Bush made a controversial statement as reported on the BBC, Bush stated: “This Crusade, this war on terrorism is going to take a long time” (BBC September 16, 2001). The Deputy Secretary of Defense for Intelligence Affairs, Lieutenant General William Boykin, said the same thing as quoted by Voice of America on October 22, 2003: “The US battle with Islamic Terrorist as a clash with the Devil” From these two statements, it seems that the impact is very large because there is the use of provocative words, “Crusade”, “Islamic Terrorist” (Islamic terrorists) and the word “Devil” (which means Satan) [33].

United Nations Security Council Resolution (UNSC) 1373 was issued on September 28, 2001, in response to the events of September 11, 2001. In the United States, the resolution aims to limit all activities of movements, organizations, and financing of various terrorist groups. UN member states are encouraged to share intelligence regarding terrorist groups to help fight international terrorism. However, the resolution does not define what is meant by terrorism and the working body that drafted the resolution only listed al-Qaida and the Taliban regime in Afghanistan on the sanctions list.

UNSC Resolution 1566 was then issued on October 8, 2004, to complement the shortcomings of UNSC resolution 1373 by defining that terrorism, according to the UN Security Council, is “criminal acts, including by the state against citizens, which cause death or physical torture or hostage-taking carried out with the aim of creating a state of terror in the midst of the general public or a certain group of people or persons, intimidating a population or forcing a government or an international organization to take or not to

take any action” [34].

Furthermore, the resolution regulates the issue of establishing a working body tasked with adding to the list of various terrorist groups subject to sanctions other than the Taliban and al-Qaida. The resolution also requires the Working Body to consider the possibility of providing an international compensation fund for victims of terrorism and their families, whose funds may be derived from facultative contributions raised through the confiscation of assets controlled by terrorist organizations and their members and sponsors.

By looking at the various facts above, it can be illustrated how complex the issue of terrorism is. We can also find out how the US actually behaves in dealing with terrorism. They don't just want to fight terrorism but also many other interests in it [35].

## **B. X`**

Furthermore, with regard to eradicating terrorism in Indonesia, it has been carried out seriously with the arrest of several people suspected of being perpetrators of terrorism crimes. Some of them have even been tried and executed (with the death penalty), as in the Bali Bombing group (Imam Samudera and his friends). In the recent eradication of terrorism in Indonesia, not only have the figures been arrested, tried and executed, but the way in which the government and its officers have handled it, according to the Muslim Defender Team, seems a bit excessive, so that from these counter-terrorism operations there have been the shooting of the suspects, which of course can be questioned whether the suspects who were shot were really terrorists, because they have not yet been brought to justice. An example is the shooting in Tanah Runtu, Poso, on January 11 and 22, 2007, during clashes between the police and the DPO. The operation in Poso is based on a strong suspicion that Jamaah Islamiyah will establish an Islamic State in Poso. With so many suspects being shot, it is actually a big loss for the Government of the Republic of Indonesia because it has lost a valuable source of information that could have been obtained if the suspect had not been shot [36].

AKBP Rudi Sufahriady (Poso Police Chief at that time) commented on this shooting as follows:

“I convey to the public, if there is a wrong action by the police, please take legal action, because those who were shot and those who were injured were not what we wanted. However, because this is a form of operation, we want to take police action according to the Law. If there are victims who feel innocent, please submit them to the police and the Law. I don't want to defend myself. We also hold dialogues with community leaders. They saw for themselves, and we brought them to Jakarta to witness the confessions of the suspects.”

Another comment from the Police was conveyed by Inspector General of Police Goris Mere (who at that time was acting as Wakabareskrim Polri Headquarters) as follows [37]:

*“Indeed, there are people from Java who teach radicalism. They train and carry out activities in the Land of Collapse. They created an educational program with the cover of the Ulil Albab Foundation and the Amanah Islamic Boarding School to attract public sympathy.”*

Meanwhile, with the rise of radicalism, Edward Aritonang put forward the idea of the need for rehabilitation. Aritonang emphasized the need for deradicalization to be carried out while the terrorists were serving their sentences and afterward. He explained that the deradicalization effort was carried out by rehabilitating the beliefs and lives of the former terrorists. However, this deradicalization effort is not only the responsibility of state institutions but also requires community participation. In this case, the community is expected to accept back former terrorists who have repented [38].

For the people of Indonesia in general, especially for those who are Muslim, the existence of these

operations to eradicate terrorism is feared to cause a new form of terror from the security forces. In addition to the handling methods that can frighten the public, the information received by the public is also through the mass media and electronic media, including through the Head of Division. Public Relations of the Police, experts and observers of terrorism are actually very confusing because often, what is discussed is related to ideology and religious understanding that has been stigmatized as Radical Islamic Ideology, which comes from Wahhabism (Saudi Arabia) and the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt, while the explanation of what Wahhabis and the Muslim Brotherhood are, there is no clear explanation [39].

Abu Jibril refuted the allegation that Wahhabi teachings influenced terrorism in his book “Fakta Syiah Bukan Islam”. Abu Jibril said that the Shia Revolution, led by Khomeini in 1979, succeeded in overthrowing the Shah Reza Pahlavi regime. Proud of this victory, Khomeini exported Shia to Islamic countries, including Indonesia, under the slogan “Mustadh’afin against Mustakbirin.” Since the 1980s, radical thoughts and movements in Indonesia have been heavily intervened by the doctrine of Shia ideology, said Abu Jibril. The fault of the authorities inherited by the security forces, BNPT (National Agency for Combating Terrorism) and Densus 88, is the stigmatization of terrorism and radicalism arising from the Wahhabi and Darul Islam (DI/TII) doctrines. This stigmatization creates hostility between the rulers and Muslims, even though Sheikh Muhammad bin Abdul Wahab, with whom the term Wahhabism is associated, never taught terrorism. The essence of the teachings that are called for is to invite back to monotheism, and eradicate shirk, heresy and superstition, said Abu Jibril [40].

In line with what was stated by Abu Jibril, AM Waskito in his book “Bersikap Adil Terhadap Wahabi” said as follows [41]:

Why do Sufis and Shiites hate Wahhabis so much? Because in Wahhabi da’wa, there is a very strong denial of grave worship, worship of the graves of guardians, seeking blessings at “sacred” graves and so on. Meanwhile, such affairs among Sufis and Shi’ites can be considered “religious veins”. Logically, if their spiritual source of religion is disturbed, they are clearly angry. Moreover, it has become an open secret that in the area of the “sacred” graves or historical remains, there is often a lucrative business turnover.”

Meanwhile, Darul Islam, led by SM Kartosoewiryo, is fighting for the establishment of an Islamic State for the implementation of Islamic Shari’ah. Its movement targeted the state, so it has never targeted houses of worship such as mosques, synagogues, churches, and temples that must be destroyed. This is in line with the teachings of the Qur’an, which forbid destroying places of worship for religious people.

Terrorism is a complex issue and will always provide room for new perspectives and interpretations. Besides, there is no agreement on a universally applicable definition of what is meant by terrorism. Discussing the issue of terrorism cannot be separated from 3 variables: the actors involved, the issues that develop and the dimensions of the conflict in it. Although Law Number 5 of 2018 concerning Amendments to Law No. 15 of 2003 concerning the Eradication of Criminal Acts of Terrorism has provided a definition of terrorism, this Law is still considered to have many weaknesses [42].

Observing the arguments of the perpetrators/suspects of terrorism in Indonesia, terrorism cannot be separated from international politics, especially the conflict in the Middle East between Israel and Palestine supported by America, and last but not least, the issue of terrorism cannot be separated from the understanding of the religious teachings of the perpetrators.

It can be said that a terrorist’s understanding of his terror act which is interpreted as jihad, must be based on certain reasons and considerations that are right according to them but are against the Law according to the understanding of society (especially Muslims in general).

The causes of terrorism in Indonesia can be easily revealed from the statements and understandings of the

perpetrators (terrorists), which in this study are called internal factors, while the causes that are revealed from the targets of terrorist acts are both intermediate targets (locations where terrorist acts are carried out) nor the real target, the US and its allies are called external factors.

By understanding the factors that cause terrorism, it will be possible to carry out targeted efforts jointly between the government and related officials, community elements and religious leaders so that in the future, terrorism can be avoided or at least reduced.

Likewise, by knowing the application of legal provisions in Indonesia in resolving terrorism cases, it will be known which human rights violations occurred, especially for suspects, defendants and victims of acts of terrorism.

The establishment of an integrated and comprehensive law enforcement system in the future in settlement of terrorism cases will ensure a balanced and proportional legal protection between suspects, defendants and victims in fulfilling their human rights in accordance with the legal rules/stipulations contained in Law No. 5 of 2018, International Law and Islamic Law.

In the end, a concept/model for the settlement of terrorism cases in Indonesia that is just and fair toward progressive national Law can be formulated.

Based on literature studies and statements by terrorists, there are two reasons for their acts of terror, first is a 'reaction' (resistance) to colonialism, persecution, oppression and injustice carried out by the US and its allies against Muslim-populated countries, such as Palestine, Iraq, Afghanistan, Jordan, and so on. Second, demands for the enactment of Islamic Shari'ah in a kaffah (formalization of Islamic Sharia) in state institutions that are currently controlled by secular Law as a result of the colonialism.

Likewise, what happened in Indonesia, the statements of Abu Bakar Ba'asyir, Imam Samudera, and other terrorist suspects/accused basically represent their attitude of resistance and hostility to the arrogance of the US and its allies. Then, if we trace from history, it turns out that before our independence, the conflict between secular nationalist groups and groups who wanted the establishment of Islamic Sharia had been going on for a long time and was quite stressful. For example, in the event that the "Seven Words" were crossed out in the Jakarta Charter, then in the DI/TII case, to the rejection of the single principle of Pancasila, all of them contributed to strengthening or at least contributing to the cause of terrorism in the country.

Terrorist behavior and the social environment that plays a role in shaping their personality cannot be abandoned. Max Weber said the following [43]:

*"Weber utilized his ideal-type methodology to clarify the meaning of action by identifying four basic types of action. Not only is this typology significant for understanding what Weber meant by action, but it is also, in part, the basis for Weber's concern with larger social structures and institutions. Of greatest importance is Weber's differentiation between the two basic types of rational action. The first is means-ends rationality or action that is "determined by expectations as to the behavior of objects in the environment and of other human beings; these expectations are used as "conditions" or means for the attainment of the actor's own rationally pursued and calculated ends. The second is value rationally or action that is "determined by a conscious belief in the value for its own sake of some ethical, aesthetic, religious or other forms of behavior independently of its prospects for success. Affectual action (which was of little concern to Weber) is determined by the emotional state of the actor. Traditional action (of far greater concern to Weber) is determined by the actor's habitual and customary ways of behaving."*

Of the four types of social behavior from Weber, terrorist behavior is in accordance with the three types of



behavior above 1. behavior that is rationally directed to the achievement of goals, 2. Value-oriented behavior, including brotherhood values and religious values, and 3. Behavior that accepts its orientation from one's feelings or emotions.

According to the perpetrators, terrorism is a form of "resistance" against the target (enemy) that has caused injustice, so terrorism is full of "meanings," especially from the perspective of the perpetrators and their groups. Therefore, the target of this terrorist act is an "intermediate target" as a "symbol" of resistance. These intermediate targets are therefore not determined at random but are related to the symbolic meanings motivated by the perpetrator's religious understanding. For example, the WTC Twin Towers were targeted because the buildings were seen as symbols of enemy strength. Likewise, the bombing in Bali, in Imam Samudera's view, Bali is a city full of immorality that did not happen by chance but is believed to be something planned/deliberately damaged by a foreign power (the US and its allies). Therefore, the destruction of Bali as a world tourism city that can bring in foreign exchange for the government is seen by the perpetrators as a form of pious charity because "destroying a place of immorality" is an act of worship to Allah SWT. for the perpetrators. Meanwhile, the economic loss from the tourism sector for the perpetrators is not seen as a loss, considering that the money earned from disobedience is an illegal income. Likewise, the act of "suicide bombing" is interpreted by the perpetrators as an act that belongs to the category of "Jihad". From this problem, it can be seen that the mental construction of the perpetrator (terrorist) is expected to become a social construction.

Another example can be given here, why was the JW Marriot Hotel bombed? It turned out that after researching and obtaining information in the field against the group of perpetrators, an answer was obtained that they did it because the JW Marriot Hotel had been used as a meeting place used to discuss and plan actions that were detrimental to Muslims (this is in the view of terrorists) so that the bombing of the place was deemed appropriate for conducted. These are examples that in every unlawful act, there must be symbols as well as certain reasons or meanings that can be traced to the basics of hermeneutic science.

A terrorist commits an act of terror after understanding and interpreting the legal verses taken from the holy book as the basis for justifying his actions. Then this can be opposed by other parties outside their group who carry out understanding and interpretation in a different way, thus rejecting and condemning these terrorist acts.

From literature research, it can be seen that Imam Samudera admits to providing many interpretations of the verses of the Qur'an and the Prophet's Hadith based on interpretations that have been recognized among Islamic scholars. He also uses the fatwas of the scholars, which he calls Ahlu ats-Tsughur. In this case, we can analyze Imam Samudera's understanding by using hermeneutics as a "tool" or analytical knife, which of course, does not recognize the validity of this hermeneutic use .

Barbara Victor has done very interesting research on the true stories of Palestinian women who carried out martyrdom bombings. This article was published under the title Army of Roses, Inside the World of Palestinian Women Suicide Bombers. Barbara Victor directly covered the events that occurred in the Gaza Strip, Palestine. It was said that, at first, the role of women in Palestine was marginalized compared to men who could carry out resistance (Jihad) against the Israeli occupation. Even the Hamas leadership issued an official regulation that women are prohibited from going out in public without covering their heads with a hijab (veil) and wearing a headscarf (a long blouse and skirt), let alone going out to fight like the men. But according to Shalom Harrari (a former member of the Israeli intelligence service who served in the occupied territories for 20 years until he retired in 2000), communists and left-wing Marxists within the PLO encouraged women to carry out actions known as "Jihad Fardli", which means an attack carried out by one person so that in 1988 there were many attacks by women not only on the Jordanian border but also inside Israel. This action was supported by Dr. Al-Rantisi explained that it was easier for women to hide a knife or gun under their headscarves and pass security checks than men. This fardli jihad action escalated until, on



January 27, 2002, more than a thousand women flocked to hear Yaser Arafat's speech at his camp in Ramallah. Arafat emphasized the important role of women in the intifada. Arafat said: "You are my Rose Army, which will destroy the Israeli tanks". Tragically that afternoon, Arafat found his first martyr, Wafa Idris, a 26-year-old Palestinian woman, blown herself up to pieces in the center of Jerusalem in a shopping mall, killing an Israeli man and injuring 131 passers-by. Wafa Idris' steps were then followed by other martyrs such as Leila, Darine, Izzedine and others to date. According to Barbara Victor, the motive for carrying out this "Women's martyrdom bombing" was the oppression of the people under Israeli occupation. Many women were left behind by their husbands and children, so they had no hope except to sacrifice themselves for the sake of their homeland and the religion they believed in.

## CONCLUSION

There is no religion that teaches terror (including Islam). However, it can be said that terrorism is closely related to religious understanding. Terrorism is a form of "resistance" carried out by the perpetrators against the intended parties (targets). Even though the targets of these terrorist crimes are mostly only aimed at "intermediate targets," this is done so that the intended party (main target) can "catch messages" from the perpetrators of these terrorist acts. Terrorism is a global crime, an extraordinary crime caused by external and internal factors.

Based on the things mentioned above, solving the problem of terrorism in Indonesia requires an open dialogue between the Government and related parties, such as the MUI, community organizations, as well as suspects, prisoners and other parties deemed necessary so that this terrorism problem can be resolved by peaceful means and avoid violent means as much as possible.

In the matter of enforcing Islamic Sharia, the Government needs to re-discuss with all elements of society, especially the ulama and Islamic organizations, so that there is a common ground on this issue because the fact is revealed in research that the demands for the enforcement of Islamic Shari'a are so strong from terrorists. It can be stated that the terrorism that occurred in Indonesia is not only caused by external factors (i.e., but the occurrence of injustice also caused by colonialism, oppression, and arbitrary treatment of Muslims around the world by the US and its allies). Internal factors also demand the enforcement of Sharia Laws (formalization of Sharia) in Indonesia. This is what distinguishes this study from other terrorism studies.

## REFERENCES

1. C. Lum, L. W. Kennedy, and A. Sherley, "Are counter-terrorism strategies effective? The results of the Campbell systematic review on counter-terrorism evaluation research," *J Exp Criminol*, vol. 2, no. 4, pp. 489–516, Nov. 2006, doi: 10.1007/s11292-006-9020-y.
2. N. P. Gleditsch, P. Wallensteen, M. Eriksson, M. Sollenberg, and H. Strand, "Armed Conflict 1946-2001: A New Dataset," *Journal of Peace Research*, vol. 39, no. 5, pp. 615–637, Sep. 2002, doi: 10.1177/0022343302039005007.
3. A. A. Wibisono and A. R. Kusumasomantri, "Assessing the Expectations and Limitations of ASEAN-EU Counter-Terrorism Cooperation," *J. ASEAN Studies*, vol. 8, no. 1, p. 61, Aug. 2020, doi: 10.21512/jas.v8i1.6171.
4. R. K. Fleck and C. Kilby, "Changing aid regimes? U.S. foreign aid from the Cold War to the War on Terror," *Journal of Development Economics*, vol. 91, no. 2, pp. 185–197, Mar. 2010, doi: 10.1016/j.jdeveco.2009.09.011.
5. C. Heath-Kelly, "Counter-Terrorism and the Counterfactual: Producing the 'Radicalisation' Discourse and the UK PREVENT Strategy," *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, vol. 15, no. 3, pp. 394–415, Aug. 2013, doi: 10.1111/j.1467-856X.2011.00489.x.
6. P. D'Angelo and J. A. Kuypers, Eds., *Doing news framing analysis: empirical and theoretical*

- perspectives, 1. publ. in Communication series. New York, NY: Routledge, 2010.
7. W. Enders, T. Sandler, and K. Gaibullov, "Domestic versus transnational terrorism: Data, decomposition, and dynamics," *Journal of Peace Research*, vol. 48, no. 3, pp. 319–337, May 2011, doi: 10.1177/0022343311398926.
  8. L. Harbom, E. Melander, and P. Wallensteen, "Dyadic Dimensions of Armed Conflict, 1946—2007," *Journal of Peace Research*, vol. 45, no. 5, pp. 697–710, Sep. 2008, doi: 10.1177/0022343308094331.
  9. K. S. Gleditsch, I. Salehyan, and K. Schultz, "Fighting at Home, Fighting Abroad: How Civil Wars Lead to International Disputes," *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, vol. 52, no. 4, pp. 479–506, Aug. 2008, doi: 10.1177/0022002707313305.
  10. C. Pantazis and S. Pemberton, "From the 'Old' to the 'New' Suspect Community: Examining the Impacts of Recent UK Counter-Terrorist Legislation," *British Journal of Criminology*, vol. 49, no. 5, pp. 646–666, Sep. 2009, doi: 10.1093/bjc/azp031.
  11. G. Morgan, S. Dagistanli, and G. Martin, "Global Fears, Local Anxiety: Policing, Counterterrorism and Moral Panic Over 'Bikie Gang Wars' in New South Wales," *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, vol. 43, no. 3, pp. 580–599, Dec. 2010, doi: 10.1375/acri.43.3.580.
  12. A. Acharya, "Global International Relations (IR) and Regional Worlds: A New Agenda for International Studies," *Int Stud Q*, vol. 58, no. 4, pp. 647–659, Dec. 2014, doi: 10.1111/isqu.12171.
  13. H. Onapajo, "Has Nigeria Defeated Boko Haram? An Appraisal of the Counter-Terrorism Approach under the Buhari Administration," *Strategic Analysis*, vol. 41, no. 1, pp. 61–73, Jan. 2017, doi: 10.1080/09700161.2016.1249177.
  14. P. Dixon, "'Hearts and Minds'? British Counter-Insurgency from Malaya to Iraq," *Journal of Strategic Studies*, vol. 32, no. 3, pp. 353–381, Jun. 2009, doi: 10.1080/01402390902928172.
  15. J. E. Alvarez, "Hegemonic International Law Revisited," *Am. j. int. law*, vol. 97, no. 4, pp. 873–888, Oct. 2003, doi: 10.2307/3133686.
  16. B. S. Frey and S. Luechinger, "How to Fight Terrorism: Alternatives to Deterrence," *Defence and Peace Economics*, vol. 14, no. 4, pp. 237–249, Aug. 2003, doi: 10.1080/1024269032000052923.
  17. H. Sahrasad, "INDONESIAN TERRORIST, ISIS, AND GLOBALIZATION OF TERROR: A PERSPECTIVE," *AHKAM:Jurnal Ilmu Syariah*, vol. 18, no. 1, Nov. 2018, doi: 10.15408/ajis.v18i1.7494.
  18. B. Lacina and N. P. Gleditsch, "Monitoring Trends in Global Combat: A New Dataset of Battle Deaths," *Eur J Population*, vol. 21, no. 2–3, pp. 145–166, Jun. 2005, doi: 10.1007/s10680-005-6851-6.
  19. M. Humphreys, "Natural Resources, Conflict, and Conflict Resolution: Uncovering the Mechanisms," *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, vol. 49, no. 4, pp. 508–537, Aug. 2005, doi: 10.1177/0022002705277545.
  20. C. Rousseau, T. Ferradji, A. Mekki-Berrada, and U. Jamil, "North African Muslim Immigrant Families in Canada Giving Meaning to and Coping With the War on Terror," *Journal of Immigrant & Refugee Studies*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 136–156, Apr. 2013, doi: 10.1080/15562948.2013.775892.
  21. C. Berrebi and E. F. Klor, "On Terrorism and Electoral Outcomes: Theory and Evidence from the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict," *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, vol. 50, no. 6, pp. 899–925, Dec. 2006, doi: 10.1177/0022002706293673.
  22. B. Burgoon, "On Welfare and Terror: Social Welfare Policies and Political-Economic Roots of Terrorism," *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, vol. 50, no. 2, pp. 176–203, Apr. 2006, doi: 10.1177/0022002705284829.
  23. K. Eck and L. Hultman, "One-Sided Violence Against Civilians in War: Insights from New Fatality Data," *Journal of Peace Research*, vol. 44, no. 2, pp. 233–246, Mar. 2007, doi: 10.1177/0022343307075124.
  24. E. Melander, T. Pettersson, and L. Themnér, "Organized violence, 1989–2015," *Journal of Peace Research*, vol. 53, no. 5, pp. 727–742, Sep. 2016, doi: 10.1177/0022343316663032.
  25. T. Pettersson, S. Högladh, and M. Öberg, "Organized violence, 1989–2018 and peace agreements," *Journal of Peace Research*, vol. 56, no. 4, pp. 589–603, Jul. 2019, doi: 10.1177/0022343319856046.
  26. G. Østby, "Polarization, Horizontal Inequalities and Violent Civil Conflict," *Journal of Peace*

- Research, vol. 45, no. 2, pp. 143–162, Mar. 2008, doi: 10.1177/0022343307087169.
27. J. A. Piazza, “Poverty, minority economic discrimination, and domestic terrorism,” *Journal of Peace Research*, vol. 48, no. 3, pp. 339–353, May 2011, doi: 10.1177/0022343310397404.
  28. R. M Wood, “Rebel capability and strategic violence against civilians,” *Journal of Peace Research*, vol. 47, no. 5, pp. 601–614, Sep. 2010, doi: 10.1177/0022343310376473.
  29. K. Drakos and A. M. Kutan, “Regional Effects of Terrorism on Tourism in Three Mediterranean Countries,” *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, vol. 47, no. 5, pp. 621–641, Oct. 2003, doi: 10.1177/0022002703258198.
  30. C. E. Ekumaoko and K. E. Ezemenaka, “Responsibility to protect: external intervention on Boko Haram terrorism in Nigeria,” *Secur J*, vol. 33, no. 3, pp. 493–513, Sep. 2020, doi: 10.1057/s41284-020-00239-1.
  31. P. Williams, Ed., *Security studies: an introduction*, Reprinted. London New York, NY: Routledge, 2010.
  32. D. Bethlehem, “Self-Defense Against an Imminent or Actual Armed Attack By Nonstate Actors,” *Am. j. int. law*, vol. 106, no. 4, pp. 770–777, Oct. 2012, doi: 10.5305/amerjintlaw.106.4.0769.
  33. J. Sides and K. Gross, “Stereotypes of Muslims and Support for the War on Terror,” *The Journal of Politics*, vol. 75, no. 3, pp. 583–598, Jul. 2013, doi: 10.1017/S0022381613000388.
  34. C. D. Kam and D. R. Kinder, “Terror and Ethnocentrism: Foundations of American Support for the War on Terrorism,” *The Journal of Politics*, vol. 69, no. 2, pp. 320–338, May 2007, doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2508.2007.00534.x.
  35. I. Brown and D. Korff, “Terrorism and the Proportionality of Internet Surveillance,” *European Journal of Criminology*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 119–134, Mar. 2009, doi: 10.1177/1477370808100541.
  36. T. Sandler, “The analytical study of terrorism: Taking stock,” *Journal of Peace Research*, vol. 51, no. 2, pp. 257–271, Mar. 2014, doi: 10.1177/0022343313491277.
  37. L. J. Laplante, “Transitional Justice and Peace Building: Diagnosing and Addressing the Socioeconomic Roots of Violence through a Human Rights Framework,” *International Journal of Transitional Justice*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 331–355, Oct. 2008, doi: 10.1093/ijtj/ijn031.
  38. D. Gregory, “The everywhere war: The everywhere war,” *The Geographical Journal*, vol. 177, no. 3, pp. 238–250, Sep. 2011, doi: 10.1111/j.1475-4959.2011.00426.x.
  39. M. B. Altier, C. N. Thoroughgood, and J. G. Horgan, “Turning away from terrorism: Lessons from psychology, sociology, and criminology,” *Journal of Peace Research*, vol. 51, no. 5, pp. 647–661, Sep. 2014, doi: 10.1177/0022343314535946.
  40. G. Schneider and V. E. Troeger, “War and the World Economy: Stock Market Reactions to International Conflicts,” *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, vol. 50, no. 5, pp. 623–645, Oct. 2006, doi: 10.1177/0022002706290430.
  41. M. Abrahms, “What Terrorists Really Want: Terrorist Motives and Counterterrorism Strategy,” *International Security*, vol. 32, no. 4, pp. 78–105, Apr. 2008, doi: 10.1162/isec.2008.32.4.78.
  42. M. Koskeniemi, “What Use for Sovereignty Today?,” *AsianJIL*, vol. 1, no. 01, pp. 61–70, Jan. 2011, doi: 10.1017/S2044251310000044.
  43. T. M. \* Franck, *Who Killed Article 2(4)? or: Changing Norms Governing the Use of Force by States*. 2017.