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Abstract

This research entitled: The Essence of Terrorism: We Are Different was written with the aim of showing that a strong belief in an ideology or a religion can lead to the concepts of the self (we) and the other (they). Thought about this concept gave an issue to a sense of difference and animosity towards other parties. This party must be destroyed because "we are different" and the other party is a threat. The research method used is Content Analysis and Hermeneutics Technique. The findings and discussion of this research are the reluctance of certain groups to accept differences related to any ideology and religious beliefs. In addition, there are also stages of attitude: fanatical, exclusive, extreme, radical, and terrorist, which are marked by various attitudes of destruction and annihilation. The conclusion of this research is the view of certain groups who assume that everything they do is the truth. Death is a defense and is a coveted gift.
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INTRODUCTION

It has been a long time needed to define the concept of terrorism. Many experts in this fields try to find the right definitions to define terrorism. A large amount of literature has also been produced by those who feel an interest in this topic. The social sciences and humanities did not miss to contribute to this debate.

Terrorism means to frighten (to terrify). This word comes from Latin, *terrere* (causing trembling and anxiety). This word is generally used in political understanding, as an attack on the civil order during the reign of terror of the French Revolution at the end of the 18th century (Juergensmeyer, 2003: 6). This anxiety often triggers anger when acts of violence are encapsulated in a justification through religion. Lately terrorism is like a single issue of public concern and is widely debated because the threat is so rampant and very terrible for human civilization. The term 'terrorism' was used long before Marxists did it, but the action was used for the first time to describe radical political attitudes and violence, for example Jacobin's violence during the French revolution and its effects. The term 'terrorism' is more often associated with acts of violence committed by a group of people who are not recognized by the government. They are motivated by extreme left or right ideology and try to gain power and influence, in addition to being based on religious interests (Juergensmeyer, 2003: 7).

Many experts understand terrorism as a threatening act with the aim of destroying targets intended for political purposes. Tony Coady defines terrorism as "the use of organized violence to attack non-combatans or" those who are innocent, "in a special sense, or to attack their leaders for political purposes. Coady has put forward the definition of 'tactical' since terrorist acts are directed at non-combatans. However, difficulties arise regarding the term non-combatans, therefore, this term needs to be clarified further. In addition, Coady also conveyed the term "tactical" to be used when terrorist acts were aimed at innocent people and their leaders. It does not stop here, because the term "tactical" also causes debate because terrorists act are terrorizing their victims but not tactically.
Communities that bear the burden of terrorism, whether local or international, overcome the terrorist disaster by upholding the law, designing and implementing policies, making political decisions and moral choices and acting on behalf of humanity. For a variety of reasons, decision makers make: better legislation and policies, wiser and more effective political and moral choices; studies in psychology, and history, as well as philosophical reviews were developed (Primoratz, 2006: x).

Important contributions in the field of philosophy have enlivened this debate. When philosophers deal with issues of morality and values in general, they try to do two ways to analyze and explain the concepts involved with this problem. The purpose of the study is to analyze, clarify, and criticize various moral and other arguments and principles through values that strengthen their arguments. When the social sciences fields study the causes, varieties, and effects and the history of terrorism. The traces of terrorism that have evolved over time raise the curiosity of some philosophers who focus their attention on two basic questions: What is terrorism? Is terrorism morally justified? First, conceptual questions are the beginning for any discussion about terrorism, both in philosophy and in every other scientific discipline, or in public debate, they are the source of the problems. The second question is whether morality might be considered appropriate when viewed from the history and social sciences.

The method of research being used in this study is the Content Analysis and the technique of Hermeneutics. Content analysis aims to uncover, understand, and grasp the message of literature. A researcher is doing this by building a concept associated with the literature. Elements were highlighted in the content analysis include, among others, the problem of moral ethics, things didactic, psychological problems, and philosophical values. The procedures relating to procurement data and determine the unit of analysis. Conclusion and analysis process includes an understanding of the symbolic meaning of any data and the paradigm of this study is a qualitative approach (Creswell, 1994: 21). The use of a qualitative study with the conceptual realm, to get the message that a comprehensive literature include: the validity of semantics, understanding the
symbolic meaning inherent in context; while reliability is used for adjustment between the results of the review of the research literature that has been formulated (Endraswara, 2008).

The Technique of hermeneutics is "interpretation". Language is a medium without borders, which brings something in it - not only understood culture through language, but also everything that is contained in the field of understanding (Sumaryono, 1993: 28). According to Prof. Dr. Abdul Hadi W.M., hermeneutical interpretation is a theory in understanding the meaning of the text, especially in literature. Modern Hermeneutics, as presented by Paul Ricoeur, stating that the language is a container of meanings, when someone reads a text, the intention to understand its contents through interpretation. A researcher is able to reach the deepest meaning because it has complete knowledge of the culture, religion and history, not just knowledge of language, literature, and aesthetics.

According to Ricoeur, hermeneutics is the best strategy to interpret the texts of philosophy and literature. The study design was: the interpretation of deep understanding figurative language, such as a symbol. Coherence is to understand the meaning of the element structure, internal relations to integrate all the elements to get the deepest meaning, analogy is the observation of meaning and values, and describe their results through analysis by using some theories, in this context. First, the text read very carefully by interpreting “figurative language” to understand the language that contains the idea of the subjects and to show the main idea and comprehensively that the authors want to convey.

RESULT AND ANALYSIS

This chapters contain the discussions of: The Self and The Other, Views of Enemies, We fight those Who Are Different from Us, 'Extermination' Is the Essence of Terrorism, The Target of Terrorism is Fear and Violence and Religion.

'Extermination' Is the Essence of Terrorism

Philosophers from Plato to Husserl from the Western hemisphere, and from Ibn Sina - Sufrawardi in the Muslim world - have different views about the essence of terrorism. For Plato, the essence of terrorism is something that
is found in a universal form that pre-existed in an ideal and transcendent world. Ibn Sina believes that with the exception of God's existence, the essence and existence are one and the same, a combination of essence and existence. Surahwadi stated the idea that the essence is real, where the existence of everything is in it. So these philosophers and experts assume that basically the essence of terrorism is the annihilation of something that exists to be nonexistent (Kamal, 2008:7).

In this case, if there is an act of violence known as terrorism, we need to recognize its essence. To do this we must struggle with aspects when terrorism is present and can be understood. Based on this analysis, the essence of terrorism is "extermination". The purpose of terrorism is not to subdue but to destroy others. Annihilation is against the freedom of the other person and the total destruction of the other's existence. This is an action where the other is not reduced to 'things' but changes from a state of existence to non-existence. (Kamal, 2008: 7).

Terrorism manifests itself and becomes actual through symptoms, such as intimidation. Terrorism is a characteristic of a creature who commits terrorism as a project of that creature. Nature, can even cause great damage to life and produce high levels of fear, but are not labeled as terrorists. Natural disasters that destroy human lives are truly frightening not to be considered terrorism, possibly due to the absence of the same essence as carried out by terrorist groups.

Terrorism is not a post-modern political phenomenon. Since the events of September 11, the public has been busy understanding its meaning, and experts have tried to understand the cultural significance of terrorism. Some people see terrorism as a cultural production that starts with political discourse, when fatigue arises from the failure of the dogma of cultural polarization. The best example is the analyst Samuel Huntington in The Clash of Civilizations. Although the political definition of terrorism focuses on the use of violence, violent support does not reveal the essence of terrorist acts, because violence, which is used to induce intimidation, is a method of the essence of terrorism.

To understand the meaning of terrorism philosophically Kamal (2008)
uses interpretation theory to understand the concept of conflict from Hegel, namely, the conflict of self (the self) with others (the other). Hegel was the first thinker to give a philosophical understanding of the emergence of terror in his book *The Phenomenology of Mind*, when the rise of the principle of free will which later developed into "Absolute Freedom." According to Hegel, terrorism was the result of "Enlightenment" which occurred after the French Revolution during the Robespierre government, the revolution was formed as a repressive institution that turned to terror. He saw Napoleon as an embodiment of the world's spirit to complete the novel "revolution." Someone claimed that he had absolute freedom and values, denied differences and became intolerant and was aggressive towards the idea of differences or anything that was not covered fully in the domain of oneness. This principle rejects everything that is outside of him or outside his oneness.

**The Concept of The Self and The Other**

Terrorism must be understood in the matrix of conflict between the self and the other, where others are not explicitly determined, but targeted randomly. Human history is seen as a platform for this conflict. Hegel advocated the idea that the purpose of this conflict was 'recognition'. This is an understanding of human history by Hegel, especially in the dialectics of masters and slaves in *The Phenomenology of Mind*.

The individual’s desire for recognition acts as a necessary impetus in history. This aspect accommodates certainty goals for independence itself. Other existence is important for the certainty of the goal of independence, as the need to recognize the self from the other. The other party is also a threat because it imposes restrictions on the independence of the self. To acknowledge someone as another human being - 'the same' as me - is a recognition that this human has desires and recognition. These characteristics become significant to the other, challenging the self. At the end of the battle between the self and the other transforms into two social beings who are not the same as social status and new types of relationships, having various types of rights and obligations. The self is recognized as a master and recognizes the wishes of the slave, the other.
Views on the Enemy

Every war has a hero and must have enemies. The concept of the enemy "is formed from social society." Regarding the events of religious terrorism, the enemy must be created, if it has not or does not exist. Rites of violence in the war of religions in South Asia leads to "demonizing the victims and wiping them out or destroying them" as the idiom "liberation from evil spirits" (Juergensmeyer, 2003: 259).

"We" Fight "them"

The view of war in Protestant Christianity places believers in a religious cosmos that contains moral valence, but this does not apply to all religious traditions. Wars in the Mahavamsa, the Jewish Bible, and Hindu epics, for example, provide witness to the different forms of fighting. The theme that crosses the myths of warfare is the theme of "us" against "them," which is famous for fighting "the unknown." The battle depicted in the Jewish Bible and epics such as the Ramayana, the enemy is always a stranger coming from shady cliffs like Canaan, Philistine, and Lanka (Juergensmeyer, 2003: 237). When warfare becomes sacred, events that are taken into consideration before war occurs are differences and insults (Juergensmeyer, 2003: 245). Overcoming defeat and humiliation is the nature of war.

The Target of Terrorism is Fear

Feeling afraid because of something frightening, is a characteristic of human existence. Humans are afraid of something that threatens their existence. Fear of death appears as the dominant feature of a conflict. Meanwhile death and its realization produce feelings of fear, making individuals aware of the value of life. This value at the time of death appears as something absolute and incomparable. Fear of death determines the fate of a rival. The self and violence empower the other to intimidate each other. They do not realize any value or value outside themselves. The self is seeking recognition from the other and he/she does not accept the reality of the other as something independent and different. Meanwhile, as oneself and others have the same claim because the existence of others is 'the same' as theirs. Through fear of death and realizing the value of life, the self and the other, as two rivals, emerge at the end of the fight with a new existential status and non-reciprocal
recognition or recognition of one will be achieved. Rivalry between the self and the other gives rise to the concept of master and slave.

Terror or intimidation is not a device, but rather the quality of a terrorism movement. If terror is considered an act of violence as a tactic, then there are those who think it could be terrorism without terror, because what is tactical is intentional. Therefore, there are those who view terrorism as an act of violence that does not target innocent people. This action occurs only to foster a sense of fear for anyone, because this violence can befall anyone, anytime, and anywhere. Thus, it can be said, the initial target of terrorism is to raise feelings of fear.

An act of violence becomes a terror only if it intimidates and targets its action to non-combatants. Thus, the definition of "tactical" about terrorism becomes contradictory. Igor Primoratz defines terrorism as 'intimidation with a purpose, an act of terror is carried out so that those who are terrorized do things they did not do.' Robert Young's definition of terrorism is not much different from the previous definition - terror is focused on the use of violence against people or ownership or leaders for political interests. However, Robert Young's definition is somewhat confusing because he does not explain victims of terror whether combatants or non-combatants. Sue Ashford states that terrorism is the use of violence - as a policy - against people so they will change their faith or loyalty. According to James Lutz and Brenda, terrorism contains connotations of crime, extraordinary violence, and brutal acts. Some Marxist thinkers debate the term terrorism after the October Revolution. Karl Kautsky. A German socialist theorist criticizes the use of the word violence proclaimed by the Bolsheviks in Russia. He considers this type of action as terrorism. Kautsky's criticism of the Bolsheviks based on the view of preserving human life; while Leon Trotsky maintains the use of the term violence put forward by the Bolsheviks and considers it an important and appropriate method for the success of a revolution:

Revolution The revolution "logically" does not demand terrorism, just as "logically" it does demand an armed insurrection. What a profound commonplace! But the revolution does require of the revolutionary class that it should attain its end by all methods at its
disposal if necessary, by an armed rising; if required, by terrorism (Kamal, 2008: 2).

Violence and Religion

From the Biblical times to the adventures of the Crusades and the battle of the Shahid or Jihad the violence has been transversed by making religious symbols so that religion seems to need violence. It seems that terrorism is not related to personality problems, but rather closer to the problem of ideology (belief). Many of the terrorists are well-educated figures and even many of them have a high spirit of devotion in their contribution related to the vision of religion and become a role model for many people. They uphold the "interests" of their religion and even fanatics. They do not call their acts of violence "terrorist," but rather they use the term "defense." Thus, religious and political ideologies appear like twin brothers.

Dr. Rantisi explained that all Muslims want martyrdom, suicide bombing is permitted as a defense effort and as a notice to be careful of the perpetrators (Juergensmeyer, 2003: 105-6).

Violence is important to counter attack. Ayatollah Khomeini confirmed that the principles of Islamic teachings advocated struggling with the use of force. Although the teachings of the Koran prohibit murder, there are also Islamic teachings that justify this act (Juergensmeyer, 2003: 116). Violence can be used for purposes: law and defense of faith (religion). Jihad (fighting hard) is considered necessary to uphold the purity of religious existence. The initial purpose of defending religion extends into resistance to social and political injustice (Juergensmeyer, 2003: 118).

The culture of war has existed since the era of the Prophet Muhammad (610 AD) with the aim of defending the creed (religion) (Juergensmeyer, 2003: 117). In Sri Lanka the great war at the end of the 20th century in the name of Buddhism was part of the history of Sinhalese on the grounds of avoiding violence during the time of suffering (the time of suffering). Politicians who do wrong and appear to be enemies of religion can be used as reasons for bloodshed because they are considered a type of karmic retribution against their actions. The lord of evil must be torn down. Violence is finally rewarded with violence (Juergensmeyer, 2003: 166). Terrorist acts have a symbolic side in the sense of imitating religious rites
(religious rites). The victims are considered to threaten the lives of perpetrators and are considered as "symbols and evil creatures" who plunder the "face of the world" (Juergensmeyer, 2003: 187).

Basically all examples of terrorism of religious defenders lately have symbolic significance (Juergensmeyer, 2003: 194). These images of holy war are characteristic of religious activism. In some cases, this view is not something new, but it is a part of the legacy of religious traditions that span since ancient times which are abundant in the Scriptures (Juergensmeyer, 2003: 218).

What makes religious violence seem so cruel and never stop? The answer is that the culprit has placed the religious view of the sacred struggle - cosmic war into the task of worldly political warfare (Juergensmeyer, 2003: 219). The concept of the struggle of Muslims - jihad - has existed for centuries in Islamic theories about efforts to save individuals and efforts to save politics. "Life is a faith and a struggle," said Ayatollah Khomeini. He stated that the ideas of struggle are the basis for maintaining human existence together with religious commitments. When the militant Sikh leader, Jarnail Singh Bhindranwale urged his followers to act, he exclaimed: "Fight ... for our religion, for the Sikhs, for the oppressed." At the personal level of jihad is a conflict between creed and a lack of faith; at the social level this is a war between truth and sleaze (Juergensmeyer, 2003: 221).

The idea of war is closely related to religion and is very scary. History is sprinkled with religious conflicts such as the Crusades, Islamic Conquest and religious wars that dominated French politics in the 16th century. In a gripping manner, the wild war described by Natalie and Tambiah is a religious event. However, war is not only revealed in the history of religious legends. Protestant Christianity is an example, even though this new tradition of religion (religion) adheres to and highly respects "peace-loving," views on warfare abound in this religious rhetoric and symbolism. Everywhere Protestant preachers called on their followers to fight the forces of evil, and their acts of war were greeted with hymns of praise of the "Christian Army," fighting "fighting for virtue, and fighting" genuinely "(Juergensmeyer, 2003: 236).
The steps to become a terrorist can be summarized as follows: all is preceded by fanaticism in ideology or religious beliefs – any religions. From this emerged fanaticism then followed by exclusivism, extremism, then radicalism and terrorism. **Fanaticism** is understanding or behavior that shows excessive interest in something. ... It can be said that someone who is a fanatic has strict standards in his mindset and tends not to listen to opinions or ideas that he considers to be contradictory.

**Exclusivism** is one way of looking at a religion towards religions that are different from that religion. The exclusivism approach is one of the approaches in theological studies of religions. The exclusivism approach, for example, a statement that Christianity is the only way of salvation.

**Extremism** is an understanding or belief that is so strong towards a view, goes beyond the limits of reasonableness and violates applicable laws. In another sense, extremism is a doctrine whether political or religious to drive action in various ways in order to realize its objectives.

**Radicalism** is an understanding that wants a change or renewal in a drastic way to the very root. In fact, achieving it involves many ways to the most extreme: both symbolic and physical violence.

Sociologically, there are at least three symptoms that can be identified from the understanding of radicalism, namely, first, responding to the ongoing socio-political and economic conditions in the form of rejection and resistance. Especially aspects of ideas and institutions that are considered contrary to his beliefs. Second, from continuing refusal to coercion of the will to fundamentally change the situation towards another order which is in accordance with the perspective and characteristics of thinking that are affiliated with certain values, such as religion or other ideologies. Third, strengthen the joints of beliefs about the truth of the ideology that it believes are superior to others. In turn, this attitude of truth claims culminates in an attitude of disclaimer and confirmation of other systems. To encourage this effort, there was a mass involvement that was labeled in the name of the people or people who
were expressed emotionally-aggressively (Endang Turmudi, 2005). Especially when the era of democracy gives anyone freedom to express their thoughts, these three phenomena played by radicalism activists can increasingly be celebrated. (This article has appeared on Kompas.com under the title "Radicalism and Political Identity").


Terrorism is coordinated attacks aimed at arousing feelings of terror towards a group of people (https://www.google.com/search?client=firefox-b-d&q=terorisme+adalah).

CONCLUSION

Relating to the concept of friends and enemies in believing and adhering to an ideology or religious belief, all must become friends by inviting other parties. This kind of group might have the thought that those who are not friends can threaten their existence. Coercion of others to follow the desires of any group might because the group has the perception that their ideology or religious beliefs are the best. This is a manifestation of fanaticism. If they can invite or influence the others to accept their ideology or religious beliefs, then all is safe and there is no conflict. When the invitation faces rejection there will be a conflict and the rejection will be considered as the beginning of the difference which will ignite hostility and violence. Thus, coercion and perception of the truth itself is the beginning of contention. Exclusivism arises because the very fanatical group feels themselves special so that they do not need to mingle with other groups. They consider other groups not friends but instead they consider the other groups as enemies. Extremism is manifested by a sharp hostility because of their beliefs that everything they profess and believe is the best thing. The behavior of this group is very hard and determined. Radicalism is a continuation of exclusivism and gives rise to hostility. Radicalism is an expression of hostility and continues to desire to destroy and exterminate those considered enemies. The last one is terrorism. Terrorism manifests the thought of wanting to annihilate those who are considered opponents or enemies at any risk. Terrorists are fatalists who believe that their actions are the right and they will get the best gift from these actions. Terrorism might come from any political or religious groups.
The final conclusion, the absence of tolerance towards differences fosters the radical attitude of a group of people; of course this condition is a process that requires a long time so that this belief can penetrate so strongly into their hearts. To counteract this kind of attitude we require a counter ideology which also requires a long process of time. Deradicalization cannot be done in a hurry. In addition, tolerance should be taught from an early age from parents towards their children.

REFERENCES

Abullah Hadi, W.M. Prof. Dr. (2014). The Hermeneutics of Western and Eastern Literature.


Institute The University of Melbourne. National Centre of Excellence for Islamic Studies,


Jakarta: Sadra International Institute.


Primoratz, Igor (2004). Terrorism – The Philosophical Issue, Edited by Igor, Department of

Public Ethics, University of Melbourne.


Website


