

Securitization and Global Terrorism Threat

Obsatar Sinaga

Department of International Relations, Padjajaran University,
Jl. Bukit Dago Utara No. 25, West Java, Indonesia

Abstract: This study discusses the development of securitization issues in facing global terrorism threat, specifically in the case of United States changing approach toward terrorism. After the cold war, the pattern of threats faced by nations worldwide underwent a drastic change. The change includes the complexity of threats faced by a nation from various aspects such as economy, politics, social aspect, environment, health, etc. By employing qualitative approach, this study focuses on threats of transnational crimes, especially international terrorism.

Key words: Securitization, transnational crime, international terrorism, social aspect, Indonesia

INTRODUCTION

The end of the cold war brought changes in the pattern of international relations and threats caused by it. This has encouraged the development of a contemporary international relations concept that derives from international system, marked with superpower and great power. The concept still circles around security threats that securitization concept arose as a step to overcome various issues that occurred after the cold war. According to Buzan (1991), the definition of securitization is as follows: Security is the move that takes politics beyond the established rules of the game and frames the issue either as a special kind of politics or as above politics. Securitization can thus, be seen as a more extreme version of politicization.

Securitization committed by a nation does not necessarily use the state-centric system where actors other than the state can directly participate in the securitization process. But, the state holds a bigger portion and authority compared to other actors and it is the main actor and should take an active role in the securitization process regarding certain security issues.

Security is divided into 2 axes vertical and horizontal where vertical security focuses more on domestic political structure issue that relates to sovereignty while horizontal security focuses on threats coming from activities across nation's borders, thus these issues are arising: Environmental security issue, epidemic disease and transnational crime (Muna, 2004). Meanwhile according to Roberts (1976), terrorism is a premeditated action, systematic murder, hurting and threatening innocent people to raise fear in achieving certain political purpose. For Roberts, terrorism is a pure crime.

Terrorism has been discussed widely in the literatures such as by Gunaratna (2002) who focuses on Al Qaeda terrorist network and Banlaoi (2009) who did study on effective measures on combating terrorism in Southeast Asia. However, study that focus on terrorism as part of securitization process is still limited. This study examines, how should securitization be implemented in facing global terrorism threat.

Securitization and transnational crime: Threats that develop in the context of international relations vary in many aspects, from economic to social, cultural and international crimes. These aspects can turn into security threats, despite not using military approach. An emerging economic incident or issue can turn into political threats to a nation (Buzan, 1991).

Global security assessment has been long discussed in international relations studies. The end of the cold war opened a new era in understanding security. After the cold war, the definition of security no longer focuses on the conflict of ideology between the Western and Eastern bloc. Lately, the definition of security includes economic issues, development, environment, human rights, democratization, ethnic conflicts and other social issues. After the cold war, security is defined not only as mere inter-state relations but also focuses on security for the people where it takes cooperation with other nations to execute (Buzan, 1991).

Conceptually, securitization was included in international relations studies in 1990 by Ole Weaver and the development was fast in mid 1990s (Buzan *et al.*, 1998). This concept initially mentioned in a book entitled security, new framework for analysis. According to Weaver's definition and explanation in the book, security is defined through a speech act that delivers existential

threats (Buzan, 1991). The definition has since continued to develop as more perspectives on securitization were provided by international relations researchers.

Other international security researchers argue that securitization is a process or response to politicization. Politicization means the process of transformation of issues that are originally non-political. The issues arising in the securitization process are typically not of the concerns of a state and are not the subject of polemic within the society thus, do not need political decisions that lead to politicization. However, the issues subsequently need a decision, a public policy equipped with political decision from the government and also resources to secure it. Hence, the issues then become potential threats that require a quick decision from the government, beyond the political procedures (Collins, 2007).

Basically, securitization is a follow-up from the Copenhagen School concept. There are 2 influential factors in the study: Securitizing actor and referent object. Collins strictly stated that securitizing actor is an actor that securitizes an issue by announcing statement or official declaration on the issue. The declaration, then turns the issue into public attention and demands the government to declare certain policies. The success of a securitization depends much on the speech act delivered by the securitizing actor while referent object is any party that is threatened by the development of the issue. The process of influencing the threatened parties shows the development of a certain issue (regardless of the form) into a security issue (Collins, 2007).

In a broader perspective, the global development leads to formation of a new pattern in the international security aspect. Global development, as the result of the globalization, changes the definition of security threat that previously was only dominated by the role of a nation into security threat that is caused by a non-state actor. This global development shows that insecurity still exists but is no longer dominated by a nation's role as a threat towards other nations (Baylis, 2005). It also proves that in the new international system structure, political system and human behavior affect the interaction pattern of international relations actors from individuals to nations and international institutions.

Hence, global security is formed as a collective action from global society in creating conditions that ensure international peace. Global security is implemented to protect international society from transnational threats. Global threats are not only those caused by military power or war but also by various international issues that are considered influential to security. For example, a disease that spreads in several places and is predicted to spread

into wider areas is considered as global threat in health sector. This threat is within the jurisdiction of the WHO (World Health Organization), as the representation of global society in the United Nations (UN) institution. Similarly speaking, a threat caused by famine is also considered as a global threat which falls under the jurisdiction of the World Food Program (WFP). Other than the role of WFP, other institutions also play their roles, such as the Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) that handle humanitarian issues perceived as global threats.

Even some national security issues are securitized into global security issues, such as the September, 11 attack for which United States later declared the incident as a global security threat. United States used global security as referent object that was being threatened by the terrorist attack to the nation. United States announced a speech act that declared war on terror and asked the international community to fight terrorism.

The unipolar system enables United States and other nations to transform national security issues into international or global security issues. Using multipolar system, the nations are able to collectively transform national threat as a threat to global security. Unipolar chain enables international society to face certain issue as a collective threat (Baylis and Smith, 2005).

Transnational crime: The development of the international relations phenomenon, shifting the issue to non-state actors also puts transnational crime into an interesting subject for international relations researchers. Crimes committed by such organizations are run across nations, supported by systematically structured network power. An example of transnational crimes is the relations between United States and Italian mafias back in the 1950s. Cooperation network in narcotics and cocaine smuggling is an evidence that transnational crime has been taking place for a long time (Collins, 2007). Narcotics sale has been an emerging issue long before studies on international terrorism arose.

Globalization phenomenon has given strong supports on transnational crime growth. These supports include communication, transportation and technology access for transnational criminals to plan their evil scheme at a global level. Narcotics sale and business in 1980s and the high number of illegal migrants smuggling to developed countries from third-world countries have encouraged the rise of security studies and concepts in dealing with transnational crimes.

Looking at the patterns of the transnational criminals actions issues on transnational crimes are difficult to study. This is because identifying transnational criminals

is troublesome that each nation's government finds it difficult to investigate who are involved in a certain crime. The difficulty is also caused by criminals movements that have no boundaries (Williams and Vlassis, 2001). The rise of the number of transnational crimes are caused by 2 factors:

- The increase on the flow of human capital, resources and money at international level
- Dual transitions wave and the increasing number of international organizations that offer facilities to transnational crime network (Collins, 2007)

On the other hand, UN defines transnational crime as an inter-state crime with the following restrictions: 1st, the crime takes place in more than one countries and is not clearly organized and 2nd, the crime occurs in a particular country but the other crime activities were conducted in other countries (or controlled from another country) and third, crime takes place in a particular country but affects other countries in a global scope (UNODC, 2008).

Therefore, transnational crimes could be considered as inter-state crimes which are committed by non-state actors. Transnational crime could be committed in a country, yet affects many other countries or committed in a country but controlled from another country. One of the transnational crimes that is recurring lately and considered a global threat is international terrorism. Researchers will hereby discuss international terrorism specifically.

International terrorism: There are different understandings in defining terrorism. Many who study this issue also face different developing aspects on terrorism. The usual practice of academics is to look for universal definition and understanding and this has made it difficult to find similarities in defining terrorism. Let us start with Whittaker's concept on terrorism. According to him, terrorism is an act of violence on something through coercive actions against the government civil society population or certain objects.

Terrorism could also be defined as a calculation of actions of violence to create force through intimidation against the government for political, religious or even ideological purposes (Whittaker, 2001). Whittaker's definition considers terrorism as a part of transnational crimes that leads to violence. In reality, terrorism uses intimidation to attack its target such as the government, society and vulnerable social facilities.

Terrorism also includes political violence such as riots, turmoil, rebellion, revolution, civil war, guerillas and slaughter, etc. However, terrorism is not always political

for example, act of a psychopath or sadistic who takes hostages (Hardiman, 2005). Wilkinson provides several characteristics of political terrorism which are:

- Demanding intimidation
- Using murders and vandalism systematically as a means to achieve certain goals
- The victim is not the purpose but serves as a means to create psychological warfare which is kill a man to scare another thousand
- The target of the terror is chosen and it works in discreet but its actual purpose is publicity
- The message is clear although, the perpetrators do not always declare themselves personally
- Most perpetrators are motivated by extreme idealism, such as religion and humanity (Wilkinson, 1997)

Despite many perspectives on terrorism it is difficult to find its universal definition because of the wide range of terrorism studies. The breadth of study coverage leads to many assumptions and postulates that direct to different definitions. The basic types of terrorist groups can be divided into 3:

- Religion-based terrorist group such as Islamic radical group or Islam fundamentalism committed actions to achieve ideological purposes
- Ethno-nationalist terrorist group (right-wing terrorism) committed actions as an evidence or an effort to reject foreign influences to the country. The influence could be in the form of left wing idealism or rejection against cultural and ethnic assimilation or religion differences brought by the foreign country. Such terrorist group targets foreigners staying or working in the terrorists' country
- Ideological-based terrorist group (left-wing terrorism) is a terrorist group who rejects influence of capitalism ideology coming from the Western countries that leads to colonialism of their country. Such terrorist group typically based their acts on Marxism ideology (Collins, 2007)

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study in this research, uses a qualitative method. This method provides a whole picture of global terrorism study as a threat to international security. The main research instrument in this approach is the researcher who is obliged to collect data. The researcher's existence is very much needed in such a qualitative research.

The researcher uses a descriptive case study method to explore everything needed in using a descriptive theory which can provide an intact framework needed in the securitization theory.

In a qualitative research method, data should be acquired from several sources continuously. Data analysis is a process of systematic search and organization of data that is acquired through interviews, field research and other sources to make it understandable to be informed to other parties or persons.

The researcher also analyzes secondary data sources such as documents, journals, articles or Memorandum of Understandings (MOUs). As for primary data, the researcher is unable collect data from interviews with informants that are considered knowledgeable in the subjects being researched.

This study is composed by gathering primary data through interview process with parties who are considered knowledgeable in the subject being researched. As for secondary data, the researcher gathers data from documents, journals, articles and scripts related to research subject.

The researcher also uses data triangulation technique to compare secondary and primary data to support the data. Data triangulation also avoids the difference of perceptions on the issue being researched thus, proofing the validity of the analysis by means of comparing data acquired from the field during data gathering. Based on triangulation technique and guidance for primary and secondary data usage, the researcher uses various sources such as documents, files, interview results, observation records and interviews with several subjects who can provide different point of views. The researcher also compares and rechecks any information acquired from different sources.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A new form of terrorism, however was found in Southeast Asia. Since the 9/11 tragedy, terrorism issue has become a main agenda in every annual regional or international meeting. The US was considered the only terrorism target at that time due to their active international roles and their title as the only superpower country with the strongest military bases in the world.

The next terrorism incident was the bombing in Bali in 2002. The incident, known as the Bali bombing, created a belief on the international society that terrorism threat could take place at any time and in any places. Besides, topographically speaking, Southeast Asia is the region with the highest number of Al-Qaeda networks in the world. It is also supported by simultaneous terrorist attacks that claim many victims in Southeast Asia.

It is almost certain that terrorism movements are happening in all Southeast Asia countries. Terrorism

analysts see a threat in Thailand in the form of Pattani United Liberation Organization (PULO) which has declared its demand to separate and form a new Islamic country. This group has been identified as Abu Sayyaf group. There is also Guragan Mujahidden Pattani in Thailand whose demands similar to those of PULO and is part of Al-Qaeda and Jemaah Islamiyah group. There is also Wae Ka Raeh, another Al-Qaeda group.

In Laos, there is a Hmong Guerrilla terrorist group that demands autonomy. This is an ethno-nationalist group. Even in Cambodia, there is a terrorist group known as Cambodian freedom fighters, an ethno-nationalist and local political group. Another ethno-nationalist group in Cambodia is the Khmer Rouge. In Burma, there are 6 groups that declare autonomy demand in similar movement; ethno-nationalist. Those 6 groups are Karen National Union, Kachin Defence Army, Eastern Shan Army, Ommat Liberation Front, Kawtholoi Liberation Front and Muslim Liberation of Burma. The sample research of terrorist mapping in Southeast Asia can be seen in Table 1.

Other than in those countries, Jemaah Islamiyah has also been identified in Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore and even the Philippines. These movements indicate to establish an Islamic country in Southeast Asia. In the Philippines, Abu Sayyaf and Moro National Liberation are growing and they have strong basis in Southern part of the country. There is also a communist movement in the Philippines known as the new people's army. This is a hard line, local political group. Generally, the purposes of the terrorist actions are:

- To publicize certain messages through violence because only through violence would the publications be immediate and possible
- As a revenge for a partner or group member
- As a trigger for militarization or mass mobilization
- To spread hatred and inter-communal conflicts
- To declare enemies or scapegoat
- To create mass panic and to damage public trust on the government

The variety of terrorism definitions is caused by many parties defining terrorism based on their own purposes (Hardiman, 2005) (Table 2).

The change of focus in security studies after the cold war could affect the existing global society lives (Buzan, 1991). Arbitrary actions such as suicide bombing, attacks on a state by individual actors or through radical organizations are evidences that current security is not only focused on state and military but also 5 new aspects: Military, politics, economy, society and environment.

Table 1: The 4 class divisions of terrorism in Southeast Asia

Categories	Groups	Countries
Separatist insurgencies	Fretilin, Organisasi Papua Merdeka, Gerakan Aceh Merdeka	Indonesia
	Hmong rebels	Laos
	Karen National Union, Kachin Independence Organization, China National Front, Shan State Army, Rohingya Solidarity Organization	Myanmar
	Moro Islamic Liberation Front, Abu Sayyaf Group, Rajah Solaiman Islamic Movement	Philippines
Armed anti-government	Pattani United Liberation Organization, Barisan Revolusi Nasional	Thailand
	Burma Student Democratic Front, National Council Union of Burma	Myanmar
Political opposition groups	Communist party of the Philippines/new people's army/national democratic front communist party of Thailand	Philippines Thailand
	Jemaah Islamiyah	Indonesia
Radical Islamist groups	Kampulan majahideen Malaysia	Malaysia
	Rohingya solidarity organization	Myanmar
	Moro Islamic liberation front, Abu Sayyaf group, Rajah Solaiman Islamic Movement	Philippines
	Gerakan Majahideen Islam Pattani	Thailand
	Majelis Muhajideen Indonesia (Laskar Jundullah, Laskar Jihad, Front Permbela Islam and Komite Solidaritas Islam)	Indonesia
Overt radical organizations	Islamic Studies, Call and Guidance (ISCAG), Darul Hijra Foundation, Fi-Sabilillah Da'wah and Media Foundation (FSDMF)	Philippines

Banlaoi (2009)

Table 2: Terrorism typology

Types	Purpose	Action
Epiphenomenal terrorism (terror from below)	Without any specific purpose a side effect of big scale horizontal violence	Not well organized, takes place in the context of fierce struggle
Revolutionary terrorism (terror from below)	Revolution or radical change upon the existing system	Is always a phenomenon of group, leadership structure, program, ideology, conspiracy, military elements,
Sub-revolutionary terrorism (terror from below)	The motive is political it provokes the government to alter policy or law, makes political war with rival group, rules out certain officials	Committed by either a small group or an individual, hard to predict and sometimes difficult to identify whether it is criminal or psychopathic
Repressive terrorism (terrorism from earlier/ state terrorism)	Represses individual or group (opposition) that is unwanted by the repressor (authoritarian/totalitarian regime) by liquidation methods	Develops into mass terror with terror officers, secret police, persecution techniques, spread of suspicion within the people and functions a mean for leaders' paranoia

Wilkinson (1997)

Terrorism movements in Southeast Asia through radical groups such as Al-Qaeda, Jemaah Islamiyah, Abu Sayyaf Group in addition to the attack on the World Trade Center in 2001, have encouraged the US to behave aggressively in responding to any terrorist groups actions. US political stance that perceives global issues as a part of its domestic issues which in turn affect their domestic security becomes the basis for the US to behave unilaterally.

It also influences the way the US perceives a security concept. By naming Al-Qaeda suspect and Jemaah Islamiyah strongest network of Al-Qaeda, the US legitimates itself to fight the global terrorism network. Then, no one can stop US military expansion in Southeast Asia where it claims that many Al-Qaeda groups and networks operate and terrorists grow.

The following study discusses changing policies taken by United States government in response to the increasing terrorism threats. These policies show changing way of thinking and handling terrorism.

US security policy after 9/11: Terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center (WTC) twin tower and the Pentagon have changed the way the US thinks about its security

concept which was once considered capable in securing its territory from military aggression. Thanks to its military ability and capability which are at the strongest level. The Pentagon even predicted in 1998 that security environment from that year until 2015 would have no global power able to compete with the US in terms of military capability. One of the reasons is the downfall of the Soviet Union which was considered as US main competitor during the cold war. This was reinforced by US secretary of defense William S. Cohen who stated that until that time or any immediate future, the US would not have any global opposition or competitor.

However, the 9/11 incident changed the paradigm that security could be guaranteed by military superiority. Threats have now changed and the US is obliged to transform in responding to threat changes committed by non-state actors, such as a transnational organized crime that took 3,000 lives in an attack committed on daylight and later known as the Black Tuesday.

The implementation of the Patriot Act, as part of the US' preventive actions through securitization process towards actors who can influence significant changes towards US national security, has become an important point in making the policy post 9/11

incident. In September, 2003 as quoted from the progress report on the global war on terrorism, the US stated:

- The US has managed to influence 170 nations to support war on terrorism
- The US has arrested terrorism perpetrators by stating: The United States and Southeast Asia allies have made significant advances against the regional radical organization: Jemaah Islamiyah (JI) which was responsible for the Bali attack last October that have killed >200 people. In early August, 2003 on Indonesia court, convicted and sentenced to death a key JI figure in the bombing
- The US has also managed to sponsor G8 meeting to take actions against terrorist groups
- The US has provided scholarships to provide understandings for counter-terrorism, amounting to US \$20 million per year

Those points describe how the US gravely fights international terrorism by promoting regional cooperation aspects, especially in Southeast Asia region using environmental factors that are influential in the recruitment process of the radical Islam organizations that will develop into transnational crime and international terrorism (Whittaker, 2001).

War on international terrorism

Department of Homeland Security (2001): After the terrorist attack that destroyed the World Trade Center, US' fear was more obvious. The US President George Walker Bush, Jr immediately established the Office of Homeland Security (OHS) on 21 September, 2001. To support the establishment of the OHS, George Walker Bush, Jr. proposed the establishment of the Department of Homeland Security on 6 June, 2002 to protect the US and its territory from threats and attacks of international terrorism perpetrators. The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) has the following tasks:

- Maintaining and preventing any terrorists from entering US territory
- Cooperating with local security authorities in giving quick response to any emergency situation
- Cooperating with the best researchers to develop a technology to detect any harms from chemical, biological, radiological or nuclear weapons to provide protection for US citizens
- Making analysis for information, especially those related to intelligence from all government agencies spread in US territory and mapping any threats towards US territory (DHS, 2008)

Quadrennial defense review: Bush administration explained the 9/11 incident through the Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) on 30 September, 2001 to provide understanding to the public regarding US military power limitation in facing attacks on its territory. US limited military power in responding to the terrorism attack put a massive pressure on Bush administration which was known as the hyper-trauma. Priority change by putting national security at its top list is executed by issuing policy instruments to prevent another attack to its territory.

The Patriot Act granted the attorney general rights to arrest anyone alleged to be involved with terrorists without court proceedings. As many as 660 people from 40 countries alleged to be involved with terrorists were jailed at Guantanamo, Cuba Bay, without court proceedings, access to a lawyer and opportunity to defend themselves before the court. Other than issuing the Patriot Act, Bush administration also made unilateral attempts which was later known as the Bush Doctrine by making preemptive strike to prevent the development of terrorism perpetrators by applying strict actions to regimes alleged to be supporters of terrorism (Mahally, 2003).

National security strategy: After the 9/11 attack, the US evaluated its national security strategy by issuing the National Security Strategy of the USA (NSS) on 18 September, 2002. In the document, a basic change is made to the national security concept by adding the preemption concept, focusing on possible terrorist attacks and the spread of mass killing weapons. Preemption concept means having an initiative to make offensive acts to immobilize enemies power before they launch an attack (Steinberg *et al.*, 2012).

In the 2002 National Security Strategy (2002 NSS), Bush administration chose these strategies for the global war on terror:

- Taking direct and sustainable actions to always use national or international power, focusing on terrorists, terrorist organizations and nations harboring international terrorism movements
- Seeking to protect US citizens and national interests, both inside and outside US territory by identifying and destroying threats before they disrupt or enter their territory. This is executed with or without the international assistance as a part of self-defense from terrorist threats that will disrupt its people and nation
- Seeking to eliminate nations alleged to support international terrorism movements by giving understanding or coercion to a nation to take responsibility to its own sovereignty (Steinberg *et al.*, 2012)

The US also holds campaign in its fight against terrorism by:

- Using its influence and establishing cooperation with its main partner nations and supporters to always consider terrorism as alike to piracy, slavery and mass murder. Any actions violating norms should be censured and would not be supported by civilized nations
- Encouraging and supporting moderate and modern governments, especially in word Muslim community, and ensuring that terrorism will never thrive
- Maximizing public diplomacy to promote freedom to information access and ideas to give hopes and freedom aspiration to communities struggling under governments that support international terrorism (Steinberg *et al.*, 2012)

CONCLUSION

Terrorist attack on 11 September, 2001 significantly changed US foreign policies. Researchers can see the change in two US leaders: Bill Clinton and George Walker Bush, Jr. Both campaign on democracy and uphold human right, but have different opinions in economy and military.

George Bush promoted war against terrorism which is summarized on the Patriot Act, Quadrennial Defense Review and National Security Strategies as US preemptive actions in fighting and eradicating international terrorism. Through those policies, US government made securitization on the issues that could threaten its national security.

It was done by upholding the security of each individual in the US and seeing that not only threats come from the military or the state but they can also come from non-state actors which in this case are radical Islam organizations which later formed an international terrorism network.

The purpose of the war against terrorism concept is to campaign democracy values and to destroy any ideologies that bear terrorism. Those radical organizations have always been the main attention for the US. Terrorism acts committed by the perpetrators violating the human rights for claiming lives of the innocence. And human rights violations are against democracy values.

The US is making unilateral attempts to get involved in fighting terrorism in Southeast Asia after the findings of terrorism bases in the region, added with sluggish efforts from Southeast Asian nations in settling regional terrorism issues, the US is encouraged to braid regional

cooperation through ARF as a means of multilateral dialogue to discuss issues that are supposed to be given collective attentions.

The harmony of purpose and perception in settling terrorism network eradication issue should be paid attention to. Collective purposes will be achieved through fundamental aspects. Even so, the US still collectively builds its second front in Southeast Asia, through financial and weaponry aids or joint military drill. The coordination between the US and ASEAN after the 9/11 incident by establishing the ASEAN-United States Joint declaration for cooperation to combat international terrorism is considered as US starting point in giving its attention to Southeast Asia. These US actions which have influenced 170 nations worldwide to fight terrorism are considered as securitization that creates similar perception for the global society to face global terrorism collectively.

REFERENCES

- Banlaoi, R.C., 2009. Counter Terrorism Measures in Southeast Asia: How Effective Are They? Yuchengco Center, De La Salle University, Manila, ISBN: 9789719408925, Pages: 150.
- Baylis, J. and S. Smith, 2005. The Globalization of World Politics. 3rd Edn., Oxford University Press, Oxford, ISBN: 9780195676273, Pages: 807.
- Baylis, J., 2005. International and Global Security. In: The Globalization of World Politics, John, B. and S. Smith (Eds.). Oxford University Press, New York.
- Buzan, B., 1991. People, States and Fear: An Agenda for International Security Studies in the Post-Cold War Era. 2nd Edn., L. Rienner Publishing Company, London, ISBN: 9781555872823, Pages: 393.
- Buzan, B., O. Weaver and J. De Wilde, 1998. Security: A New Framework for Analysis. Lynne Rienner Publishers, London, ISBN: 9781555877842, Pages: 239.
- Collins, A., 2007. Contemporary Security Studies. Oxford University Press Inc., New York.
- DHS, 2008. Brief Documentary History of the Department of Homeland Security 2001-2008. US Department of Homeland Security, Washington, DC.
- Gunaratna, R., 2002. Inside Al Qaeda: Global Network of Terror. Columbia University Press, New York.
- Hardiman, B.F., 2005. Terorisme: Definisi, Aksi, dan Regulasi [Terrorism: Definition, Action and Regulations]. Imparsial, Jakarta.
- Mahally, A.H., 2003. Membongkar Ambisi Global AS [Opening up US Global Ambition]. Pustaka Sinar Harapan, Jakarta.

- Muna, R., 2004. Securitization of transnational crime: Small arms and light weapons and drug trafficking in Indonesia. <http://www.rsis-ntsasia.org/resources/publications/research-papers/transnational-crime/Riefqi.pdf>.
- Roberts, A., 1976. Nations in Arms: The Theory and Practice of Territorial Defence. Vol. 18, Macmillan for International Institute for Strategic Studies, London, Pages: 288.
- Steinberg, J.B., M.E. O'Hanlon and S.E. Rice, 2012. The new national security strategy and preemption. Brookings Policy Brief Series No. 113. <http://www.brookings.edu/research/papers/2002/12/terrorism-ohanlon>.
- UNODC, 2008. Fourth session of the conference of the parties to the united nations convention against transnational organized crime. October 8-17, 2008, Vienna, Austria. <http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/treaties/CTOC/CTOC-COP-session4.html>.
- Whittaker, D.J., 2001. The Terrorism Reader. Routledge, New York, ISBN: 9780415301015, Pages: 310.
- Wilkinson, P., 1997. Terrorism and the Liberal State. The Macmillan Press Ltd., London.
- Williams, P. and D. Vlassis, 2001. Combating Transnational Crime: Concepts, Activities and Response. Antony Rowe Ltd., London.