

The United States Policy in Combating Terrorism: A New Mode of International Conflict

Ambarwati

*Pengajar Ilmu Hubungan Internasional
Universitas Jayabaya Jakarta*

ABSTRAK

Tragedi 9/11 telah didiskusikan secara meluas di antara para ahli hubungan internasional. Salah satu penyebab maraknya diskusi ini adalah karena adanya perbedaan pandangan tentang apa dan siapa yang dianggap “musuh” oleh Amerika Serikat (AS) selama Perang Dingin dan sesudahnya. Kalkulasi rasional-irasional dan senjata nonkonvensional yang digunakan kelompok teroris telah merobohkan benteng pertahanan AS. Pendekatan-pendekatan baru tentang perang dan keamanan sebagai hasil dari bentuk baru konflik telah muncul. Menyikapi perubahan ini, Presiden AS George W. Bush mendeklarasikan perang melawan terorisme, sebuah kebijakan yang mengombinasikan strategi khusus antara militer dan nonmiliter. Tulisan ini menyarankan mahasiswa hubungan internasional perlu melengkapi diri mereka dengan konsep baru, teori-teori yang berkaitan dengan perkembangan konflik masa kini.

Kata-kata Kunci: terorisme, rasional-irasional, model baru konflik.

Early of 21st century is an era where the United States (US) and European countries challenge new form of hostilities. Beginning with suicide attacks of WTC building and Pentagon, we see a war on terrorism in the 21st century. The US with its allies both in Europe and outside Europe pledges to make war against terrorism around the world. Afghanistan was the first country to burden the US policy. The government of Islamic fundamentalism of Taliban in Afghanistan was considered as patron of terrorist groups under the guidance of Mr. Osama bin Laden.

After attacking Afghanistan, the US directed its military offensive policy toward Iraq. President of Iraq, Saddam Hussein, was leader whose policies were regarded as dangerous to humanity. In the time of US – Iraq war, suicide attacks were happened many times which the targets of attack were persons or military officers of the US and its allies.

Suicide bombers from anti-western movements were both male and female people. In Iraq, numbers of woman suicide bombers exceed those of male bombers. Suicide bomb with a lot of victims happened on January 17, 2000. A woman exploded herself near Shia Mosque in Baghdad, killed eleven people and eighteen people injured. (*Kompas*, January 17, 2008). Two days before, Norwegian Foreign Minister, Jonas Gahr Støre fortunately could be saved from being the target of suicide bomb at Serena Hotel in Kabul. Støre could be saved but seven more people were dead, including a Norwegian journalist and an American. The Taliban was responsible on the attack at Serena Hotel. As reported by Reuter, the Taliban launched more than 140 suicide attack in 2007 to overthrow the pro-American government of Afghanistan (*Kompas*, January 15, 2008).

What is faced by the US people now is a totally different conflict from the conflict they faced in cold war era. The enemy like the USSR block and its allies in Warsaw Pact changes its form now. In his speech at National Defense University on October 23, 2007, President Bush stated that nowadays the US is in state of war, namely war on terror, that is a war with brutal enemy, cold-blooded killers who despise freedom, rejection and kill the innocent people in pursuit their political vision. In such a war, the American can see who the enemy in the US – Iraq war is. President Bush also expressed that threat on American was a new kind of which endanger American freedom and peace, and in turn the world would be occupied by the power of darkness under the shadow of terrorism ideology (Embassy of the United States Belgium 2007, 2).

The enemy faced by American in post cold-war era is characterized as follows: *first*, the enemy seeks to infiltrate operates into the country and attack from within. The enemy is able to defeat the US military forces openly, so the enemy attacks secretly and kill innocent people to pursuit their goals. *Second*, the enemy uses advanced technology to recruit operatives and to train suicide bombers and attack American people. *Third*, the enemy conspires in secret, so information about targets attacked can be obtained only from the terrorists themselves. *Fourth*, the enemy seeks weapons of mass destruction that would allow them to kill people on a large scale (Embassy of the United States Belgium 2007, 2).

In the study of International Relations, international problems connected to terrorism reemerged as highlighted issues after September 11, when Twin Tower of WTC and Pentagon were attacked. The rise of non-state actors' role, notable

terrorist group with some characteristics as stated by President Bush above, has brought the problems related to traditional concepts in the study of International Relations. The problems raised are, inter alia, is there a paradigm shift in viewing national security problems? Are US policies in combating terrorism indication of changing of conflict form, from rational strategy to irrational one?

To discuss these problems, this paper will be divided into five sub sections: first is background, the second will be sub section of shifting paradigm in connection with conflict and security. Consequently, the third is sub section of US's policy in combating terrorism (war on terror), and fourth is about characteristics of new mode of international conflict, and the last is conclusion.

Conventional Conflict and the Shifting Paradigm

In traditional international politics, conception of war is regarded as war if it includes two or more states. In this case, state actions may conflict with the objectives of another state. In an anarchic system by definition there exist no reliable processes of reconciling interests, as there is no overarching authority with the power of enforcement. A state may negotiate a solution to such conflict, or seek accommodation, but it may also resort to force to secure its interest.

The construction of interstate relations since the Westphalia treaty implies that sovereignty of state will be balanced if it faces other state sovereignty. Recognition of sovereignty of the state as the highest political unit has endured centuries up to the end of cold war, where non state actors have role as big as state's role in international interaction scene.

One of form of non-state actor involved in setting of interaction of conflict situation is a group of terrorist. Terrorism deserves special mention, because there is no doubt exists that it is a type of violence that has come to play an increasingly large role in contemporary international relations. With the emergence of terrorist actions, what we think of war has changed its forms. The distinction between war and peace in the twentieth century is made even more difficult by the proliferation on international actors. As different actors rose to prominence during the century, however, and as those actors gained access to military equipment and weapons, an increased frequency of "new style of warfare" became inevitable as states interests conflicted the interest of non-state actors. The difficulty in distinguishing between war and peace in the twentieth century is more than a semantic problem emanating from the proliferation of non-state actors and the growing reluctance of states formally to declare war (Papp 1984, 504).

The action of suicide terrorism is an interesting phenomena to be explored in the study of International Relations because target of suicide terrorist action is people and infrastructures owned by government both domestic and foreignness. In the study of International Relations, this phenomenon can be studied from psychological aspects and strategic aspect. The suicide attacks can be used to explain cases which the terrorists intend to kill themselves, by car bombing, exploding themselves, or high risk attack where some of them killed by national army.

Actions of terrorism have many forms and the actions become widespread because of technological advance, benefits of globalization, and trans-nationalism. Form of terrorism backed by sophisticated technology is well known as modern terrorism. Paul Wilkinson specifically states that there are four forces of internationalized modern terrorism. The most important of these are the deep and bitter ethnic, religious and ideological conflict which remain unresolved and which fester in international system, spawning many forms of violent conflict including terrorism, and periodically erupting into civil and international war. Another underlying cause has been the global strategic balance which has prevails throughout the period from the early 1950's right through to Gorbachev era. In the shadow of the nuclear balance of terror between the Superpowers methods of unconventional and proxy war, such as terrorism, become more attractive as instruments of policy for states and sub-state organizations such as national liberation movements. The worldwide dissemination of new technology has also greatly facilitated the growth of terrorism. Technology such as satellite TV and civil aviation can be used by terrorist group to achieve its goals. Modern weapon technology has also proved a great boom to terrorist, providing them with modern plastic explosive such as Semtex and highly accurate lightweight portable firearms such as UZI sub machine gun. And the most important of all the factors encouraging the spread of terrorism has been the sheer success of this method in achieving short term tactical objective of great value to the terrorist (Wilkinson 1992, 231).

Moreover, terrorism has become such a diverse phenomenon that either it disappears under a host of precise definitions or it is covered by too broad an umbrella. The US Department of Defense has adopted such definition:

The calculated use of unlawful violence or the threat of unlawful violence to inculcate fear intended to coerce or to intimidate governments or societies in the pursuit of goals that are generally political, religious and ideological (Mockaitis 2003, 23).

Meanwhile, Brian Jenkin as quoted by Russet and Starr describes "terrorism is theater", which its attacks are planned carefully to obtain attention from media and international press. Actions of terrorism are done to make the targets being

threatened by doing dramatic and surprised actions (Russet and Starr 1992, 166). On the other hand, the mass media competes to expose that situation exaggeratedly to exceed the other media without considering that this situation is intended by the terrorists (Hoffman 2007, 8). Al-Qaeda has proven it. The Al-Qaeda and its network fully understand how to use the mass media to expose the accident of bombing. This understanding is based on the modern journalist mentality that the more dramatic means the more lead or, if-it-bleeds-it-leads (Mockaitis 2003, 27).

Rational and Irrational Conflict

Many scholars of all disciplines who have studied political violence agree that it is generally accepted that terrorism is a special form of political violence. It is not a philosophy or political movement. Terrorism is a weapon or method which has been used throughout history by both states and sub-states organizations for a whole variety of political causes or purposes. There are many differences that worth to be mention in recent phenomena of terrorism, that is the action of terrorism is aimed at a massive victims and losses worth to be published in order to spread fear among societies. Terrorists use the advantage of mass communication technology as a dominant agent to influence mass psychological condition. This was not commonly used in pre second world war, except Japanese army who could combat until death (*kamikaze*) or guerrilla war of Vietcong in Vietnam in order to make mass destruction of the US army.

What is faced by the US and its allies recently is not mere group of terrorist at local level but the group consists of global scale organization with good management and supported by sophisticated technology. The groups are also supported by states or elements in the state both tacitly or actively. The US feels that the US is a main target of terrorism so that they need to adopt new strategy unlike logical strategic balance applied in challenging the USSR. The war on terrorism as it is popularly called in the US has created a new strategic environment.

In traditional conception, the logics of strategies in interstate interaction are based on rational calculation. Rational calculation as explained by Morgenthau who called it as a conception that is standard in neo-classical economic. To say that governments act rationality in this sense means that they have consistent, ordered preferences and that they calculate the cost and benefit of all alternative policies in order to maximize their utility in light both of those preferences and of their perceptions of the nature of reality (Keohane 1986, 11). In their dictionary, Evan and Newnham (1998, 468) state that being rational means following the minimax precept one maximizes gains or minimizes losses. In making foreign policy,

national context is connected with alternative of choices which will be favored by decision makers with minimax calculation.

Actors of suicide terrorism are regarded as irrational actors. On many interviews with Sayyid Muhammad Husayn Fadlalah (senior clergy of Shia and joined with Hezbollah movement) by Middle East magazines as quoted by Walter Reich, Fadlalah stated prudently that self-suicide attack is not justified except for difficult cause. Implicitly, the Shiite clergy agrees with this manner because there is no way to challenge dominant power of the US but the mode of self-suicide. The oppressed people will find new guns and methods everyday. The methods are only balance ones for imbalance power of combatants if oppressed nations fight big imperialists' power, each sides will try to look for the ways complementing its power attributes. It is used to neutralize weapons used to by the enemy (Reich 2003, 185).

US's policy of war on terror can be approached by what MccGwire called shifting paradigm of security. The policy has altered the conception on security known so far. Borrowing from term of MccGwire, there is a shift of security conception from ANSP (adversarial national security paradigm) to CGSP (cooperative global security paradigm). The policy of war on terror can be categorized as a form of CGSP (MccGwire 2002, n.p.).

According to MccGwire, there are some forces to endorse the shifting conception, namely: an impulse for change, deriving from shared fears and a common vision of an alternative; the absence or removal of obstacles to change; an engine of change; a precipitating cause or event (MccGwire 2002, n.p.).

Common fears provide a stronger impulse than shared vision, but their relationship is symbiotic. The range of global problems that face the Western world is vast, but to provide an effective impulse for change the danger has to be of a scale and comprehensibility that will evoke public support for precautionary action, even if the even horizon is known to be 10-20 years in the future.

According to MccGwire, the greatest obstacle in the concept of CGSP is state autonomy, in this case the US, which is too big in foreign policy. When the US shows its superiority as an individual state, it will be an obstacle in global cooperation. But, some evidences show that the autonomy of the US foreign policy was in decline in the Kosovo crises US sought to rely solely on NATO. And then, the conflict in Afganisthan of Autumn 2001, where interest, honor and retribution are involved, has shown that the lesson of Kosovo was well learned. The UN and NATO have both been used to provide legal and political cover, but are excluded from political and military decision making (MccGwire 2002, n. p.).

Whether September 11 could prove to be a precipitating event in term of shifting the paradigm from ANSP to CGSP? After September 11 attack, the immediate US response being a compressed version of the pattern established in the first decade of the Cold War. The attack was described in terms of an assault on freedom, democracy, civilization (as like Truman Declaration); those who were not with us were against us (John Foster Dulles); and anyone who sought the underlying the motivation was guilty of moral equivalence (the Reagan version of “soft on communism”). To face this situation, President Bush declared war on terror and the Taliban, protector of Al-Qaeda, is the real American enemy. Perception of American leader on Taliban was similar to that of Soviet leader in Cold War years. Both of Taliban and Soviet leader were perceived as fanatic, and based on this perception, the US prepared seriously to destroy Taliban and Al-Qaeda infrastructure and dragged Osama bin Laden to the court.

Even though the above description indicates that war on terror is likely ANSP strategy, but the next steps in the strategy of war on terror shows description as a CGSP characteristic. The US immediately built international coalition across boundaries in developing international means of responding to this newly urgent threat, while the requirements for political and logistic support for US operations against Afganistan have realigned interest and developed new channels of international cooperation. Besides, top-elites contacts were done intensively by involving leaders of UK and Russia. The more important thing was the emergence of conscience that the increasing of terrorism attack was a by product of gap in world society. Western countries were also responsible to this situation so that it needed to involve in cooperation and collaboration (MccGwire 2000, n. p).

US's Policy in Combating Terrorism : War on Terror

In response the challenging of non-traditional form of conflict, the US has done two essential things. *First*, to improve existing institution through such process such as intelligent reformation, establishment of Department of Homeland Security and additional capacity for non-traditional war at Department of Defense. *Second*, to build new paradigm to adjust new realities. With new paradigm, the American faced new conflict milieu which was altered by new technology and social condition that make existing organization and concepts become obsolete.

The war on terror may see (and now has seen) other campaigns like the one waged in Afghanistan. Policy declared by President Bush has led American to the situation of war. Related to the conception of war on terror, this paper will discuss military and non-military measures, such as establishing of Special Operation Forces (SOF), winning the heart and mind, and forming alliances as well.

Establishment of SOF is needed to destroy the unconventional ways of terrorist strategies. Conventional wars are military operations conducted between land, sea and air forces, which are designed to concentrate the maximum level of force against an opponent's armed forces. Wars are won through the execution of successive battles that seek to annihilate the enemy's forces. Unconventional wars are characterized by a conscious decision made by a state or sub state group to rely on a unorthodox range of means to achieve their aims. Such actions include urban and guerrilla warfare and terrorism (Simons and Tucker 2003, 80).

War on terrorism, as opposed to wars on nation-states, requires the opposite of what the hierarchy prefers. The hierarchy prefers conventionalization, direct action, and armed force over arm and then unarmed finesse. The war on terrorism requires the use of civic action (CA), psychological operations (PSYOP), their civilian equivalent and SOF tasked to do unconventional war. Standard of operation, strategies and tactics of SOF are totally different from conventional military operations. SOF conducts many activities connected to civilian action in order to neutralize enemy's influence on local society. To work with indigenous forces, SOF must win their trust. To do this, they live with them. Eat with and share the same living condition. They also take the opportunity to study local practices and learn social preferences. Building trust invariably takes time, but the payoff comes in a better understanding of the operation environment, and the ability to solicit the kind of solid intelligence that enables operation (Simons and Tucker 2003, 82).

In the war against Taliban government in Afghanistan, the SOF infiltrated Northern Alliance. They live with civil society, even shave off their beard even though they had grown. Purpose of this activity, is to make the local community believe that the SOF will help them to eliminate the terrorist hard-core.

Terrorist movements are easily emerged and developed in marginalized societies which their demands on basic need are not fulfilled. Their aspirations are not heard and paid attention by both local and national (central) authorities. Usama bin Laden is supported by groups of community in Egypt, Saudi Arabia, and Afghanistan. In Saudi Arabia, proponents of Wahabism support him. Besides, he also has ties to militant in several states where the government at least opposes him. Muslim insurgents in the Philippines, the terrorist who bombed the nightclub in Bali, Indonesia and the Palestinian group Hamas all have ties to Al-Qaeda.

To overcome this situation above, it is necessary to apply strategy which stressed on protection and security of terrorist sympathizer communities. Supporters of terrorist should be marginalized politically and physically. The next strategy to get support and cooperation from local high risk community is to make effort and apply some political endeavor and development to make them satisfied. Mockaitis

call this strategy as winning the heart and minds (Mockaitis 2003, 35). Winning the heart and minds strategy is applied in homeland and foreign countries as well, without avoiding offensive military operations. It is used to separate moderate communities from extremist people. This strategy makes it easier to obtain intelligent information concerning purposes and movement of terrorist groups.

Building alliance with global community was done by the US in order to weaken transnational terrorist network. This strategy is based on the assumption that global should perceive terrorist threat as a global threat. So the US government built its coalition with other governments, civilians, private organizations, multilateral institutions, and business enterprises. Through regional strategic initiatives, US State Department made cooperation with ambassadors and representative agencies in many areas. This cooperation was aimed at anticipating threat and arranging collaboration strategies, action plans, and policy recommendation. The initiative resulted a better coordination among US government agencies, a tighter cooperation with regional partners which all of them are aimed at marginalization of terrorist movement (Kantor Perlawanan Terhadap Terorisme – Departemen Luar Negeri AS 2007, 46).

In collaboration with Russia, US launched the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism, a coalition of more than 60 nations using their own resources to stop the illicit spread of nuclear materials. Moreover, the US try to cut financial resources used to support terrorist operations (Embassy of the United States Belgium 2007, 2).

Unfortunately, European states, especially in NATO, are not solid in support war on terror strategy. The UK supports the US policy on Iraq war, largely for reasons unrelated to the war on terror. The UK desires to keep NATO an Atlantic alliance with a Washington-London axis rather than see it become a European defense force with a Paris-Berlin. France and Germany have been most vocal in their opposition to adventurism in Persian Gulf. The Russian Federation supported the Afghanistan war to the point allowing using former Soviet bases in neighboring Uzbekistan, but Russia opposed war with Iraq (Mockaitis 2003, 35).

New Mode of International Conflict

Development of the twenty first century is indicated by globalization, interdependence and transnationalism. This in turn, will change patterns of interaction among actors in the study of International Relations. Pattern of conflict interaction is also changing, which is according to Majid Tehranian, can be seen from viewpoint of identity, organization, and legitimation. Based on the three

things above, Majid Tehranian draw table about changing model of war in the time of pre modern, modern and postmodern (Tehranian 1999, 1969).

Table 1 : Models of Warfare : Identity, Organization, and Legitimation.

	<u>Premodern</u>	<u>Modern</u>	<u>Postmodern</u>
Time	Sporadic Periodized	Discrete Declare (overt)	Permanent Undeclared (covert)
Space	Tribal Prestate Agrarian Empires	National State Nation-state	Global Postate Global system
Identity	Tribalist Tribal member Identity security Embodiment	Nationalist Civilian soldier Identity anxiety Coembodiment	Globalist-localist Professional soldier Identity panic Disembodiment
Organization	Spiritual-temporal Existential Ritualized Immanent Tribal Institutions	Secular-civilian Bureaucratic Regularized Visible Military Institutions	Military-industrial Technocratic Totalized Invisible institutions Total institutions
Institutions	Warriors Individual combat Medium-intensity conflict Physical-political violence	Mobilized population Mass assault High-intensity conflict Political-economic	Expert population Technical targeting Low-intensity conflict Cultural- environmental
Legitimation	Prelegitimation Dictates of nature Ontological Naturalist Manliness	Legitimation Reasons of state Ideological Instrumentalist Patriotism	Postlegitimation Economic motivation Praxiological

			Naturalized Acquiescence
--	--	--	-----------------------------

Sources : Majid Tehranian (1999 , 166)

Premodern time means the time before modern state based on Westphalia system. Recognition of state as an ultimate political entity in international politic based on Westphalia agreement was the beginning of modern era. This era continued up to the Second World War. Postmodern time is indicated by Cold War between Eastern and Western blocs (Tehranian 1999, 168-169). In this sub section, new mode of international conflict will be identified based on three important things, that is, *first*, involving new actors, *second* calculation of strategy which can not rely on conventional rationality anymore, and *third*, development of communication and transportation technology will affect the final result of new conflict.

First, new terrorist groups which emerged in post Cold War era are non state actors that have power attributes similar to those of state. Globalization and resistance against globalization are considered as causes of radical movement, including the terrorist groups. With a huge financial support, the terrorist groups can access various types of modern weapon as proliferated by states. By now, modern terrorist groups which are enemies of the United States and its allies are Al-Qaeda, Hezbollah Movement in southern Lebanon and Hamas in Palestine. Al-Qaeda has networks both active and passive (or sleeper) in more than sixty countries. Al-Qaeda receives financial support through legal business and supporter states. Mockaitis (2003, 26) quotes data which prove that after September 11, collaboration of international institution have frozen successfully hundreds of million dollar owned by terrorist groups. In their actions, Al-Qaeda and its networks usually attack symbolic targets to make dramatic affect to the public. The chosen Twin Tower of WTC and Pentagon are symbols of American economic and military power. Certainly, they need a lot of money to get all of requirements for these actions.

Second, the domination of conventional military power of the US causes all of its enemies hinder conventional military strategy, so they choose conventional approach, such as terror which in the milieu of global information of global information based on internet and satellite communication, it is possible for terrorist groups to operate without geographical basis. Method of Al-Qaeda's operation, Fadlalah call it as an effort to make it balance with super power, that is impossible to be challenged with conventional rational strategy (Reich, 2003: 185). According to Edward Luttwark (Newsweek, December 2002-February 2003, 27), from the earliest times, small forces have found ways of wounding superpowers. Moreover, Luttwark say that Al-Qaeda learnt from militant movement in Somalia,

who had nothing to defend and no equipment larger than cheap rocket-propelled grenade (RPG). It seems that Al-Qaeda members were on the scene there. They may have taught Somalis how to shoot down multimillion-dollar helicopters with RPGs, while they perhaps learning the false lesson that Afghanistan could be defended by similar means. (Luttwark, December 2002-February 2003, 26-27).

Superiority of American military power is challenged by enemies which are not reckoned before. The hatred that US strength inspired among Islamist enemies was bound to bring on attackers arms with box cutters rather than ballistic missiles, exploding motorboats rather than submarines, suicide truck bombers rather than tanks, and alone assassins rather than armies in the field. Justification of suicide bombers came from religious faith. They believe that their actions are based on the phrase of in the name of God. In some interviews with member of Hamas and Hezbollah, Jerold Post asked about the reason behind the action suicide. One of respondents angrily answered that: "...It was not a suicide *an sich*. Suicide is a weak, egoist and that person is in mental disorder. It is a kind of *istishad* (a type of martyrdom or self-sacrifice in the name of God)...." (Post 2007, 12).

The tendency above will continue in the future if Al-Qaeda disappears. There will be other forms of new group which use unconventional mode of movement. David J. Killculen, senior adviser of multinational forces in Iraq, state that long before Al-Qaeda became a challenger, we could see that such organization indicated an era of new conflict (Killculen 2007, 40).

In the strategy to winning war against actor such as Al-Qaeda, the US can not rely upon conventional strategies. Al-Qaeda groups developed rapidly and freely operated because of community support morally, financially, and enjoyed many protections. To win against Al-Qaeda, the US use collaboration forces comprises conventional military and Special Forces for unconventional strategy. This policy differentiates American strategy in Cold War era and that of post Cold War era.

Third, in the conflict of post modern era, ability to acquiring advanced technology by its educated people becomes basis of terrorists' movement. Development of communication and transportation technology is the main characteristic of activities in an era of globalization and transnationalism. September 11 attack was so successful that it could manipulate and could not be detected by US intelligent. It was the terrorist could access, operate and succeed in using all of sophisticated technology owned by developed countries. Online Journal as quoted by Mosaddeq Ahmed, FBI (Federal Bureau of Investigation) was late in detecting that pilots who collided themselves on September 11, received their initial training at two flight schools in Venice, Florida (Ahmed 2003, 100).

Besides the ability to access transportation technology, the Al-Qaeda uses internet media for information management and propaganda in order to influence public opinion, recruited new members and raise funding. Internet network which can cover all part of the world is an effective means for whomever to send all of information. For Al-Qaeda, internet can be used as effective, rapid and unanimous mean to communicate with the fighter follower, sympathizer and supporter from all over the world as well as continue its psychological campaign. Even though Taliban regime, main supporter of Al-Qaeda continues to fight against American bloc and its allies which are perceived as permanent enemy using internet.

Before September 11 attack, Al-Qaeda was not reckoned by US intelligent agency. According to Mockaitis, in the report of the US State Department, *Patterns of Global Terrorism, 1997* does not even include Al-Qaeda in its list of terrorist groups. Although now suspected in earlier incidents, Bin Laden's organization announced itself in dramatic fashion with the near simultaneous bombings of the US embassies in Nairobi, Kenya and Dar es Salaam, Tanzania in August 1998. Two years later it struck again with a suicide bombing of the USS Cole in Aden harbor. Despite these attacks and Bin Laden's rabid hatred of the US, September 11 found American totally unprepared for the diabolical but brilliantly executed attack on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon (Mockaitis 2003, 25).

Conclusion

Terrorists' actions in post cold war era have different pattern from those of earlier time. Modern terrorist groups are well equipped with latest sophisticated weapon which can not be detected by state intelligent agencies. The actions are also more dramatic because the terrorists use mass media exposing the tragedy so that fear effect will be increased.

The US strategy through establishment of SOF is a characteristic in new mode of war. SOF operation combined with 'winning the heart and minds' is new strategy based on the assumption that new threat to America is not merely military one. Dissatisfied and marginalized community and people are best place to seed radical behavior.

In building global and regional coalition, war on terror has proven that debate on security concept was shifted. Involving people in conflict resolution means a shifting meaning of security to a scope wider than mere a military sense. Power of non-state actors in making global insecurity is increasing. It is due to the ability of non-state actors to access all of power attributes is similar to that of state actors.

Based on the above arguments, students of International Relations need to think new form of conflict with its new variations. So, new variables should be examined carefully in order to get a deep and detailed explanation on new mode of conflict. For example, in the explanation of irrational behavior of self-suicide bombers, variable of individual psychology is good to be analyzed. Related to irrational behavior, minimax principles as rational bases in understanding foreign policy are no longer being the main analysis and pattern.

Bibliography

Books and Articles in Books

Ahmed, Nafeez Mosaddeq, 2003. *The War on Freedom: How and Why America Was Attacked, September 11th, 2001*. California : Tree of Life Publications.

Evans, Graham and Jeffrey Newnham, 1998. *The Penguin Dictionary of International Relations*. New York: Penguin Books.

Keohane, Robert O., 1986. Realism, Neo-Realism and Study of World Politics. in Robert O. Keohane (ed.), *Neo-Realism and Its Critics*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Mockaitis, Thomas R, 2003. Winning Hearts and Minds in the War on Terrorism. in Thomas Mockaitis and Paul B. Rich (eds.), *Grand Strategy in the War Against Terrorism*. London: Frank Cass and Company Limited.

Papp, Daniel S. ,1984. *Contemporary International Relations: Frameworks for Understanding*. New York: MacMillan Publishing Company.

Simons, Anna and David Tucker, 2003. United States Special Operations Forces and the on Terrorism. in Thomas Mockaitis and Paul B. Rich (eds.), *Grand Strategy in the War Against Terrorism*. London: Frank Cass and Company Limited.

Tehrani, Majid, 1999. *Global Communication and World Politics: Domination, Development and Discourse*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publisher, Inc.

Reich, Walter (ed.), 2003. *Origins of Terrorism: Tinjauan Psikologis, Ideologi, Teologi dan Sikap Mental*. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada.

Wilkinson, Paul, 1992. International Terrorism: New Risks to Worlds Order. in John Baylis and N. J. Rengger. *Dilemmas of World Politics: International Issues in a Changing World*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Journals

Hoffman, Bruce, 2007. Sebuah Bentuk Perang Psikologis. *eJournal USA: Agenda Kebijakan Luar Negeri*, **12** (5), p. 10.

Kilcullen, David J., 2007. Paradigma Baru Untuk Konflik Abad 21. *eJournal USA: Agenda Kebijakan Luar Negeri*, **12** (5), p. 39.

MccGwire, Michael, 2003. Shifting the Paradigm. *International Affairs*, **78** (1).

Post, Jerrold, 2007. Identitas Kolektif: Kebencian yang Mendarah Daging, *eJournal USA: Agenda Kebijakan Luar Negeri* , **12** (5), p. 12.

Magazines and Newspapers

Kompas, 15 Januari 2008.

Kompas, 17 Januari 2008.

Luttwark, Edward, 2002/2003. Asymmetric War: How the Weak Fight. *Newsweek*, December 2002-February 2003.

Websites

Embassy of the United States Belgium, 2006. President's Speech on the Global War on Terror. *US Policy Article*, [online] pp. 1-6. in <http://www.uspolicy.be/Article.asp?ID=26DAEF5F-IF4A-40EC-B530-CD7158426> [accessed 22nd Oktober 2008].

Embassy of the United States Belgium, 2007. President Bush Discusses Global War on Terror. *US Policy Article*, [online] pp. 1-5. in <http://www.uspolicy.be/Article.asp?ID=891AF132-09DI-4B9A-B14F-2FC021BD5> [accessed 22nd Oktober 2008].