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The war against terror in the mainstream of approaches and strategies is very stigmatizing towards certain cultures and results in unclear targets. The controversy over the U.S. attack on Iraq during the presidency of G W Bush Jr. was related to the issue of international legitimacy and the mainstream conceptions of terror and terrorism, with their derivative products in the approach and strategy of the war on terror. This research presents critical views from the international community on the conception of terror and terrorism and highlights the policy of the fight against terror. This research is qualitative research, with literature review and analysis method in the form of meta-analysis. The findings of this research are that many experts in the international community criticize the conceptions of terror and terrorism and propose other approaches that are considered fair and reasonable. That approach is cultural identification regarding acts of terror (the act of terror) whose emergence factors are stratified and the scope of ethnicity, nation-state, and the dominance of the giant business sector. This alternative approach can be a more just way of handling terror acts and solid moral, legal, and political basis.
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1. Introduction

In the last ten years, the new world order, especially in the economic and political fields, has shown problems in culture. In addition to the ineffectiveness of conflict resolution mechanisms—especially politics and resources—the current new world order also faces challenges regarding people's views and ways of interacting between nations.

After the end of the Cold War, the multipolar world system moved wildly, including in the Middle East region when previously there was order by the workings of the balance politics between the East Block and the West Block. The situation in the area without a strong master, then bilaterally America declared war on terrorism by attacking Iraq under Saddam Hussein’s regime. Since then, GW Bush’s war against terrorism policy has drawn criticism and caused controversy.

The following descriptions highlight the nature of terror acts, whether they occur sporadically in the local context or are forms of violence due to the globalization crisis. The crisis of globalization is very likely related to the failure of today's humanity - as a valuable lesson from the ‘failure’ of European history in the form of de-humanization, atrocities, and contemporary violence. Pop culture products are displayed in the mass media, written by a professor who initially worked at Johns Hopkins University. He wrote, referring to the books In the Match of Folly (by Barbara Tuchman), The Demoralization of Society: From Victorian Virtues to Modern Values (by Gertrude Himelfarh), The Making of the Modern University: Intellectual Transformation and the Marginalization of Morality (by Julie Reuben),

"Widespread promotion of Western values by the media and unthinking imitation by leaders and elite are putting some of our most important institutions at risk. Western family structures have been destroyed by the pursuit of wealth, careers, luxury, and individualistic pleasures at the expense of commitment, sacrifice, and loyalty. The point of this article is that we must learn from the West, but we need to distinguish between their failures and successes and avoid the former while adopting means to acquire the latter".
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New research is worth doing if it touches at least one of these two traits: urgent and interesting (Siregar et al., 2021, p. 51). This study aims to provide a comprehensive description and exposition as a reference in policymaking.

2. Literature Reviews

Terrorism can be understood by categorizing crime events offered by Quinney (1977) as, First, the crime of domination or repression, which is methodologically carried out by capitalists or the ruling class and their accomplices. Second are crimes of accommodation or resistance/rebellion committed by the working class or lower class, which are crimes to survive (Barak, 2001, p. 62). The central concept of this study is acts of terror. What is an act of terror? The following illustration or case may be helpful to lead us to the notion of terror. Persuasion is one thing.

Meanwhile, coercion with various modalities is another negative thing. One of these coercions in the fall of victims – the result of the politics of ‘looking for a scapegoat’ (scapegoating) or the politics of making other targets as victims (victimization). All of these are potential and actual problems run by the abuse of coercive (State) power; it can also be exercised by other types of non-coercive ‘civil’ power.

The act of terror in a soft sense is coercion based on authority, from superiors to subordinates. In this case, the religious hierarchy in the name of doctrine limits the social role of the subordinates—even though the subordinate’s social movement results in corrective action by his subordinates. A bishop (head of the Catholic Church in a country) in Brazil is reported by the BBC. Indonesia. October 7, 2005, was pressured by his superiors to end the bishop’s protest. The protest was carried out to oppose the State’s political policies. The result? The Brazilian government agreed for consultations to divert irrigation routes for a river environmental project. The bishop protested because the project would only benefit wealthy landlords. Unfortunately, this spirituality-based movement was “suppressed” (a kind of terror?) by the bishop’s superior, Pope B. Ritzinger, at the center of the Catholic Church in Vatican City. This is a matter of policy based on the interpretation of teachings: it is conceivable if the late. Pope Paul II is still on the throne in the Vatican. Perhaps policies at the center could be different or more flexible. Flexibility to defend the weak and oppressed; is better morally religious than allowing the hegemony of the wealthy landlords. The context of the feeling of oppression of the Polish people during the past communist totalitarian regime and the oppression of the poor in Brazil is undoubtedly more felt by the late Pope Paul II.

The second concept relates to a counter-terror but ends up in the act of terror that he commits himself. The illustration is in local terror, for example, horizontal conflict. The case occurred in Bali after the October 2003 bombing terror. As explained by Ngrurah Suryawan, "Terror in the guide of culture," in The Jakarta Post, February 27, the overreaction of residents was to sweep the migrants. Suryawan says this as mass terror. He wrote: "Balinese raid teams, the pecalang and others under the municipality and the customary villages have thus committed the real terror." The third concept is an understanding that the State generally uses.

Acts of terror within a country may not be terrorism in a specific sense—terrorism whose definition has reached the highest number, namely 100, which is still a matter of controversy as to what exactly is the correct definition. The definition of Hoffman (in Muhammad Haripin’s article, "Terrorism a la Israel," 2009) is that terrorism is a ‘sophisticated’ fear and exploits that fear through violence or threats of violence to change the political constellation. Roughly speaking, it can be seen that the triggering factor for the emergence of acts of terror by community segments is a non-democratic political setting. This is categorized by Wordlaw (1986) as an act of sub-revolutionary terror—if it is simply “against state policy”; terror acts are categorized as revolutionary if they want to overthrow the existing order completely. The local people’s fierce resistance is often labelled as an act of terror by the local political regime; or faced and handled or treated by the authorities in an overly repressive manner—if the action is classified as terror, then this is categorized as repressive terror by the State. However, there are still disagreements about what terrorism is. The context of tensions and conflicts themselves can transcend national boundaries: The sources of conflict go beyond mere geopolitical transitions at the global level—namely, the North vs South divide, as Hugh Miaill lists. Call it here with “transnational acts of terror,” i.e., those whose locations are not purely domestic but also not purely international—as conceptualized by Mill. International social conflicts are defined as “conflicts that are neither pure international (interstate) conflicts, nor pure social (domestic) conflicts but sprawl somewhere between the two.” Various perceptions of global conflict are described in article no. 3 in this chapter as well.

Fourth is a system understanding, especially in relations between countries and political economy. Among the preconditions for the occurrence of protracted social conflict, Azar’s version, are (1) politics & political economy and (2) relations between nations—in which

the first is in the governance area while the second is in the international linkage function; the first precondition is correlated with the scale of political repression. The second is correlated with the volume of imports and exports of weapons.

Various experts identify the causes of acts of terror that manifest or appear from various points of view. One of them is the political economy point of view. That results from economic disparity, injustice, and excessive repression by a power (political/economic)
over other groups. Luhulima (2003), for example, mentions this when discussing the handling of terrorism in Southeast Asia: “several observers argue that terrorism is the result of a repression that excessive (surplus repression) as a result of the deep gap between the rich and the poor, the economic disparity between developed and developing countries...” The U.S. invasion of Iraq was one of the political policies that sparked controversy around such acts of terror. In the context of the invasion of Iraq by the US-led alliance, in the U.S., there is a “splitting” of opinion, one of which is pro-foreign policy/policy: Arguments for the invasion of Iraq here and there use harsh words, but different direction

“Rough” and emotional debates and arguments are taking place inside America—as this pro-Bush essay suggests: “The Iraq Panic,” which was an opinion piece in The Asian Wall Street Journal, June 28, 2005, and by George Melloan, “Bush Will Defend His Plan for a Safer World” in the same daily. These politics did not take the form of acts of terror against the anti-war segment among U.S. citizens themselves. The counter-war calls the plight of U.S. troops in Iraq a quagmire has shown that the terrorists have no vision and aim. The pro-war used it as a pretext to reject the name quagmire above.

The fifth is self-defence and a sense of ownership of property. This self-defence act is mainly related to an unjust political economy or domination by the state and large corporations. Stigma and (global) violence can also trigger the formation of terrorist elements among them who are politically suppressed continuously—because of sensitive issues such as territorial integrity and national security. Taiwan is seen from the PRC’s national interest as a serious problem. Meanwhile, with its remarkable history, Taiwan seems to have the potential to become a society with its own cultural and political-economic system. The nation-state dilemma with the power and strength paradigm of self-respect and territorial sovereignty in the case of the PRC is that the PRC firmly insists on its solution: enter into the lap of the PRC or, if it is stubborn, be attacked.

This is a form of violent politics instead of diplomacy. Report from Taipei, Taiwan by Rene Patiradjaware (Kompas, Tuesday, March 16, 2004), “Taiwan Identity: Not Enough through Elections and Referendums” describes the non-political task of whoever wins the party there: issues of economic identity, language, and culture of the Taiwanese people not as simple as solving in the political sphere.

The sixth is an act of terror based on the doctrine of religious faith. In the global constellation, we can also mention armageddons, namely the religious, theological beliefs of the American President, George W. Bush, which justifies his ‘holy war against the ‘evil forces’ of Saddam Hussein. Unfortunately, this superpower has now been successfully “crippled” by the Israeli Prime Minister, Sharon, when he asserted that the Israelis now controlled America; Sharon did not want to bow to the U.S. proposal. Sharon insists on incorporating Palestinian territories such as Gaza and the West Bank under the authority of the State of Israel (Reza Sibudi, “Israel and the Powerlessness of George W. Bush.” Kompas, April 17, 2004.). Zbigniew Brzezinski sees three words. They are a war on terror (WoT) created by the Bush regime. It is now America’s mantra, which Zbigniew Brzezinski sees as cornering America itself—“we feel terrorized by these words and weaken the image of democracy”; One of WoT’s main goals is that it scares people—including Americans’ fears—and then their emotions overpower reason and become the soft fodder for politicians with their demagogies. In short, a new culture emerged, namely a culture of fear, or a culture of fear (Zbigniew Brzezinski, “Terrorized by ‘War on Terror,’” Washington Post.com. March 25, 2007) accessed 12/24/2008. (You can imagine the “evil” role of political consultants and political marketing experts to continue to create P.R. products for regimes with frightening fabrications, and then these regimes carry out political policies that are destructive and humiliating to humanity).

3. Research Method
The method used in this study is a qualitative research method. Data acquisition is carried out simultaneously with developing concept categories for various materials based on the principles. Materials are taken from secondary data by tracing various views written in books and scientific journals. With the development of concepts, it is possible to make an empirical generalization. The analysis was carried out based on the results of the empirical generalization.

Several scientific articles were collected from various international journals. The sources of information in the form of opinions are categorized views that provide relatively new points of view are identified.

4. Results and Discussion
The following presentations are the facts surrounding various acts of terror that have occurred in various parts of the world—to bring us to the question, who committed terror against whom? The answer is not singular: there are groups of citizens who terrorize their government, countries that terrorize their citizens, developed countries carry out certain types of terror against developing countries. And others.

There is a very glaring humanitarian challenge from the various acts of terror. In the last ten years, what happened was the tragedy of the Mumbai terror acts in India at the end of November 2008. Nevertheless, later it is tragic humanitarianism and acts of terror resulting from Israel’s “war design” against HAMAS in Palestine. One article containing an academic analysis by a master student of defence management at ITB—Cranfield University, England, Muhammad Hairpin, would be appropriate to categorize this
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The modernization politics in the regions are dedicated to the center in Jakarta. Poso and Ambon’s political policy cases—namely for the forestry sector and the agrarian sector—are roughly coloured by the interests of Jakarta. The politics of development plus violence are handled through local agents. Conflicts of interest based on economic disparity, the factor of “Jakartans” and non-Jakartans, justifications for oppression and repression by the security forces have been a fire in the husk for decades. The fire in the husk appears in the present when conditions give it a chance. Terror in Poso resurfaced again this October 2006. The mass media in Jakarta in particular presented news of this violence. BBC London Thursday, October 19, reported the emergence of interfaith movements demanding that an independent commission be formed to uncover this terror. However, there is security in the heart that such a commission is unnecessary. Our record is that, as has been widely speculated, the State is again seeking to satisfy itself through solving the problem of terror in its way, which for the more comprehensive middle class in the cities, the government’s solution is considered not to solve the problem.

Our second note is: the experts must have calculated the possibility of sophisticated designs that are again being made by national elites who ‘control’ various resources with their own goals and interests with the design of terror. There is invisible power whose political power overcomes or exceeds the legal instruments and government security—with the risk that the State has to pay because the national legal system becomes ineffective. There is another victimization process.

In developmentalism in the Philippines, with a socio-political setting where the Church (especially Catholics) is in a unique position because the majority is Catholic, policies against terrorism can also result in the potential for acts of terror by the State. This was especially so in 1995 during the presidency of Fidel Ramos when the Anti-terrorism Act was planned to be enacted. In addition to the rejection by the Civil Society in general and the business sector, the Church also rejected the draft law whose articles could have a negative impact. The objection includes the basis, is the threat of terrorism to the Philippines real?
To kill terrorism can be used to carry out terror against its citizens or suppress people in opposition. The anti-terror legislation that was designed “will be used to terrorize citizens themselves or curtail legitimate dissent.” From the various activism and protests of various segments of society and organizations, the Philippine government finally took a step back—postponing the enactment of the Anti-Terror Law. This terrorism.

The lessons that can be drawn from this case in the Philippines are that policies resulting from developmentalism often make the State careless and careless; therefore, insistence pressure from various parties is needed to put the country in the right place. Other lessons include the fact that in the context of the Philippines, religious organizations are very active in defending civil rights (religion in the broadest sense); On the other hand, in Indonesia, religious organizations are only concerned with internal "religious" issues (in a narrow sense).

The lesson includes our assessment: Fires in the husks like those in Ambon and Poso are barely handled in the form of significant action—except perhaps in the form of discourse and observation—by social scientists and political scientists. Why? A precise and scientific answer is required. We hypothesize that the world of science is also affected by repression by the State. Our campuses seem to be “swallowed” by the earth. In addition, the world of social science and political science may also suffer from two kinds of diseases: First, the disease of scientific hegemony—with an indication that textbooks are oriented towards developed countries (with positivistic social science reductionism based on material epistemology) which are swallowed up without reflection on the condition of the world. and the level of the local community itself. (The illustration is simple: as a recent colleague ‘reported,’ in March 2007, brought a cooperative mission to Guangxi Province, China, where campuses deal with appropriate technology (TTG); while we in Indonesia TTG technical craftsmen like in Tegal (Central Java) and Pasuruan (East Java) were "turned off" by the inappropriate orientation of our campuses. ) Second, there are too few reflections and attempts to find relevance between "imported" theoretical knowledge and practical application in the field, resulting in inaccuracies. Understanding and meaning of empirical reality at the local and national level.

The oppressed groups try to fight back; parties who feel their ownership has been robbed then rise to fight for their rights. Suppose officials say that the Poso and Ambon conflict is not religious. In that case, the conflict started over social and economic injustice in Poso and Ambon—the result of mismanagement of the nation and State. Furthermore, it stems from decades of modernization politics. When the continuity of the engine of development under the developmental regime suddenly did not materialize, the situation then turned to smoulder. (Lee Kwan Yee’s regime in Singapore has continuity; so does Mahathir's regime in Malaysia.

The explanation of the policy of religious harmony can be put forward. However, this should not be seen partially. This policy is only part of a more comprehensive policy pattern—one that is not simple and requires wisdom. For the city of Ambon itself, the issue of religious harmony is a further result of various inequalities in public policies in the past, one of which is the demographic composition factor and the social mobility factor. The composition of the immigrant population beat the composition of the native population. Nevertheless, again, demographic factors are only part of the problem of jealousy and a sense of socio-economic injustice—which initially includes government ineffectiveness.

The second is political terror. The bitter experience of the Indonesian people during their independence for more than 50 years is the ongoing political terror. Often this is done on behalf of the State. The Dutch colonial state model in Indonesia was a police state. After independence, the culture of the apparatus was to frighten the people. In the name of collectivism, individuals who are seen as deviating from the general public are punished socially, up to punishment in ex-communication and terror. The politics of terror is reinforced by the social capital of traditional collectivism plus the “equality” of ideology; for example, the idea of a classless society from Communism—the “United Nasakom” political project of the 1960s. It is collectivism in such a combination, that is, a fusion of ideology with traditional collectivism; and at the same time, the “get rid of the stubborn” project is a politics of terror against the opposition voiced by PSI and Masayumi against the incredible power of President Sukarno, which terror was whispered by the Communists, and which closed dialogue and democracy.

In terms of humanity and participating in creating world order, many Indonesians are not responsive and take the initiative to humanity and the global community’s problems, such as mass poverty and hunger. Various brutalities and oppression in various parts of the world are ignored by most of us, Indonesia. In terms of critical attitudes towards global violence, for example, many of our people are more afraid of being said to be joining terrorists. (Or are citizens used to being pressured and threatened by a state that fools their nation, so they do not “embrace” the world?). The radical “embracing” world movement in Indonesia may be voiced by people/activists/thinkers/figures. It is like Solomon Simanungkalit (Kompas, March 17, 2004), who wrote, "Love the world, then your parents." (Of course, this title is meant to be more of a provocation of radical ideas – so that there will be a reaction. But I do not think it suppresses theology in general). He voiced the acceptance of world civilization in a “relaxed” manner, without scaring Indonesian students: good civilization from outside to be applied even better, Etc. Why “relaxed”? Because our sense of nationalism—as is also possible in many other nations—is infected with childish diseases: narrow-mindedness of nationalism, narrow-mindedness of ethnicity, narrow-mindedness of groups. Regional autonomy, for example, is an example and proof. Because of autonomy, residents and people are fighting each other and disturbing and disturbing the Unitary State of the Republic.
of Indonesia. (What is wrong is not the autonomy but the fire in the husks of decades due to the nation's miseducation and, also, due to the idiosyncratic national elite that toppled the engine of developmentalism itself.) The movement to "embrace" the world for more and more Indonesians also needs to be encouraged by how many Americans criticized the president.

Bush was reportedly criticized by various parties, especially the victims of the September 11 incident. The reason is that Bush has advertised himself on various televisions by taking advantage of the event’s pictures. (Kompas March 6, 2004): There are two contrasting perspectives; Bush looked at the ad showing "Look, I am a heroin fighting to defend you who are victims," while the perspective of members of the victims is "what are you doing in front of tragic victims?. Lu even showed in front of the suffering of the victims. No shame and no taste."

Citing The Lagano Report (1999), Simunungkalit agrees with the rejection of the ideological war paradigm. The main point of Simunungkalit's view on "embracing the world" a.l. is that today's competition is not a war of ideology, but a war of speed and practical-technological people. So the war between the fast and the slow, the receiver and the giver, etc. He felt "suffocated" because Indonesian politics seemed to separate itself from the world. Our cognitive system wants to escape from the context of the world. The obstacle to "embracing" the world comes from Indonesian scientists themselves.

In various developed countries, segments of citizens in the world community in developed countries act and react to crimes against humanity; they need not be afraid of being called 'treason' to the 'national interest.' The voice of universal humanity came a.l. of the late Pope John. The big Islamic organizations in Indonesia should be louder than the voice of the world's Catholic leaders.

The third is the democratization project vs the poor and messianic theology. The outbreak of the Iraq War through the U.S. foreign policy initiative to get rid of weapons of mass destruction (= getting rid of President Saddam Hussein) resulted in many prisoners of war. During the controversy whether the treatment of them is different from ordinary prisoners of war, the argument put forward by the U.S. authorities is that the procedure for the treatment of prisoners of war is different from prisoners classified as terrorists. Is it so different that human rights are violated? It should not. Various world institutions, world-class NGOs, and the global community have criticized the methods of the U.S. troops in Abu Ghraib and Guantanamo Bay. The International Red Cross: as quoted by the Washington Post, stated that as many as 70% to 90% of those arrested (out of 43,000 prisoners,) only 600 prisoners were eventually prosecuted and prosecuted (Kompas, Wednesday, May 12, 2004). How many people were not prosecuted? Of course, a lot.

Terrorism in the sense of religious radicalization with a justification of world views and theology in the context of Muslim society can be studied from the case of the significant support of the poor to the militant resistance under the leadership of a young cleric against the U.S. invasion of Iraq, Muqtada Al-Sadr, a young Shia cleric after the overthrow of Saddam. Hussein by the US-led coalition army. As reported below: Citing AFP, A.P., Etc., the leading Indonesian daily Kompas (May 15, 2004) reported the siege of the holy Shia Muslim city, Najaf. This siege is to capture the dissident Al-Sadr, who does not want to submit to the plans made by the U.S. to seek a solution to the Iraq crisis. In that siege, America deployed 2000 troops; The young clerical-Sadr built his fort on the hills 100 meters away. The news is quoted that although some residents of Najaf who support Al-Sistani (senior clerics) want al-Sadr's troops out of Najaf, (but) many Shiites, who generally come from poor backgrounds, support the struggle of the 'hard-line' clerics. It is further written that the Abu Ghraib scandal has also increased their hatred of U.S. troops.

The poor support of the young ulama above seems to be a strong indication that the Iraq War finally forced the citizens to be dragged into an escalating war. It is not only an escalation in the corridor of eliminating weapons of mass destruction and removing Saddam Hussein's power but also an escalation of the theological beliefs that in the context of Shia Islam is related to messianic theology—which is suitable for the poor. Namely that the oppression during the Saddam Hussein era that they experienced before seems to be going through them again with the presence of the U.S. plan; Therefore, this helplessness can only be treated by following the character identified as "the saviour;" "the messiah;" who fights against such oppressed conditions. The ideology of the poor like this is a revolutionary ideology. To continue to live, they will only be oppressed, without hope, so it is better to fight no matter what the outcome is—what is inevitable in holy war theology, the great hope of such jihad is the reward in life after death. There is an escalation here, that is, an escalation that is, let us say, a theological escalation. The theological escalation of the Iraq War, in the end, can also be interpreted with the reverse formulation: the blind political policy of a country is a significant trigger for the emergence of violence and brutal acts, between State and Society, between Society and Society, as well as State and State, and human tragedies. Such that suddenly get justified in the name of religion—war for God.

Fourth is the ‘form of terror’ resulting from a country’s “crazy” policy. Terror and radical acts are also a by-product of a country’s crazy philosophy and policies. The case is the protracted and bloody conflict in Israel-Palestine: Israel’s policies that are not feasible but enforced. Sharon planned to build a nine km-long Philadelphia corridor because Palestinian civilian homes were destroyed. (Republika, Saturday 15 May 2004). This political policy has led to disagreements within the Israeli government itself.
In Indonesia, the older generation knows the U.S. journalist Bob Woodward, who worked for The Washington Post, exposed the Watergate scandal, and then the U.S. president was ousted. For the current Bush-era, Bob Woodward, once again in his book The Plan of Attack, reveals a new secret that Bush was secretly planning to attack Iraq.

Conscience and common sense reject foreign policy, which is counter-productive to the so-called war on terror itself. In mid-May 2004, there was news about the U.K., which among other things launched pressure from ministerial elements and Labor Party figures - Tony Blair, for Tony Blair to “stay away” from the U.S. (original quotation marks on Kompas, May 15, 2004).

In this connection, it is necessary to call State terrorism as it is happening in the Middle East by Israel. In this Middle East political context, Djoko Susilo, a member of Commission I of the Indonesian House of Representatives, in his article “The Roots of Zionism,” made a flashback to the founding of the State Israel. He cites Edward Said (1978), who reveals the rottenness of this sectarian Zionist ideology through historical politics as part of the ideological-scientific movement called Orientalism: the project of rewriting the Palestinian territories before establishing the State of Israel, etc. The roots of Zionism are very clearly explained. From that explanation, the root of (regional) violence at the end of the world is the narrowness of religious doctrine. (Republika, Thursday, May 13, 2004). Therefore, the opinions and actions of Indonesians must have two sides: one is to reject “ideological” terrorism by groups in Indonesia, and the other side is to strongly protest the political radicalism of Zionism in Israel which is rooted in the narrow-mindedness of religious doctrine. It is also advisable that the opinions and actions of Indonesians reject such narrow-minded religious doctrines—just as the enormous mass organizations N.U and Muhammadiyah also reject narrow-minded religious doctrines within Indonesian Muslims themselves.

Countries in the world, such as Bush and his religious sect that gave rise to Augustinian political philosophy in the United States itself. (Let us not just “blame ourselves; meanwhile, do not protest against the narrow political theology and doctrine in Israel!) Indonesians should learn to be critical between our need for the economy and U.S. foreign policy on the one hand and the narrow-minded religious doctrines held by some high-ranking officials.

In this context, Bush himself, in mid-March 2004, received the lowest rating, 46 per cent, wrote the Washington Post. His presidency is back. However, again, the relief is not without the influence of the global community’s concrete steps. The global community must from now on be more aggressive with pressures. Indonesians also have to learn to “embrace” the world with certain forms of participation in movements, statements, and others.

Terror and radicalism are also triggered by the State’s wrong approach and wrong strategy. There was an incident on August 21, 2003, when British troops opened fire on civilians in the city of Karma Ali, Iraq, even though there was no real threat. That was Amnesty International’s report as quoted by Kompas Daily, Wednesday, May 12, 2004. Very few victims were reported. However, it mirrors brutal acts. Long before Thursday, March 18, 2004, it was reported that the Spanish PM rejected Bush’s call not to withdraw his troops from Iraq. As quoted, “I will listen to Bush, but my position is obvious and firm. The occupation (of Iraq) was a failure.” (Kompas, March 18, 2004). Referring to the views of Hans Blix, who was a former Swedish foreign minister and former head of the United Nations weapons inspection team, in his book Disarming Iraq, the opinion of this newspaper (Kompas) agrees that terrorism cannot be overcome only by a security approach.

This is called economic inequality. Social development and democratization are needed so that the feeling of being oppressed and depressed can be treated. There was news that Hans Blix, before 1,200 people at the University of New York, expressed his highly critical views on the American invasion of Iraq. It is important to note that in Kompas news on Wednesday, March 17, 2004, Spanish mass media from various streams supported the plan to withdraw Spanish troops from Iraq by Zapatero, Prime Minister of Spain, during the transfer of power on June 30, 2004. In the U.K. itself, alternative discourses on approaches and ways to combat terrorism are starting to become more realistic, including the push to delete Bush’s three words, WoT, because “we are stupid to fight small and small group forces on a large scale,” and that they should be used ‘soft power’ is thought and culture, not military power. “Britons stops using the ‘war on terror’ phrase.” Associated Press, April 16, 2007. http://www.msnbc.msn.com accessed 12/24/2008

In 2005 the humanitarian catastrophe in Iraq exposed the dynamics between victims the human toll from the war with politics—mainly American politics alone. A large number of deaths resulted in the decline of the prestige of the Bush administration in Indonesia there, for example, shown by the results of a poll by Newsweek magazine, August 2005, with 61% disagreeing with Bush’s political style of dealing with Iraq. A total of 34% fixed agree. U.S. soldiers killed were 1,823, according to Pentagon records.

For Indonesians in general, the opinion of the mass media like that should be obvious.

The security approach is closely related to realist thinking in international relations theory: the fall of several victims is “realistic”—as sadly by Asad Zaman (2008), that in the eyes of a significant person like Madeleine Albright, former U.S. Secretary of State, the fall of victims in Iraq like a “normal” thing. Albright reportedly stated, “It was acceptable to kill half a million Iraqi children to achieve the U.S. policies.”
Our note: the newspaper’s opinion should have deeply explored the roots of conflict and terror. Take, for example, global economic disparity—African poverty vs the abundance of Western Europe and the U.S.—with a very resource-demanding lifestyle.

5. Conclusion

The acts of terror and the ideology of terrorism seem real, not simple. In the context of developing countries plus the regime of developmentalism, factors of an authoritarian political system and blind development policies can trigger self-defence acts—whatever the idealism of the struggle, whether ecology, religious fundamentalism, or feminism. Acts of ‘self-defence’ vary, from constitutional to violent and terrorist methods. Policies in the name of political regime developmentalism with actions of a terrorist nature can lead to counterterrorism in the context and or other factors such as “crazy” foreign policy or policy. This can trigger violent and radical retaliation and crystallize into a terrorist style.

In the context of uneducated multiculturalism, the stigma that is educated on individuals and community groups such as anti-Chinese, anti-Semitic, or anti-Islamic feelings is also a factor in the emergence of acts and understandings of radicalism that come from such stigmatized citizens. Political and economic violence at the level of global hegemony is also very concerned about the ongoing humanitarian tragedy.

All of this becomes a potential for terror, which at times manifests in terror activism. To some degree, the issue is not whether a political system is democratic or authoritarian; the choice of a developing country that is “less ideal but the best” may be the authoritarian, bureaucratic system that has succeeded in achieving a relatively just economic order. This choice seems to be able to support efforts to reduce radicalism.

Of course, in the real-life of individuals and citizens, violence and unfair competition appear here and there. There are evil acts, and there are noble acts. This is a matter of morality. However, this situation should not be taken for granted. Above the individual and the citizen, there is a coercive power like the State. It is the duty of the coercive authority that a just order and guarantee of life of individuals and citizens must be guaranteed. In the experience of the Muslim World, we find a definitive history that describes the Reason of State: The temporal-religious ruler who succeeded Muhammad SAW, namely Abu Bakr "The True Justifier," when he was mandated by the majority of the Muslim community in classical times, to become president of the successor of the Prophet SAW gave a speech a.i. “Whoever is weak among men is strong before me.” What does it mean? "I" is here as an institution, the State, which becomes an instrument for creating order and limiting fraud, violence, vigilantism, and acts of terror. The challenge now is that such quality state actors are rare; many have destructive ideologies and theologies and can harm humans.
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