Counter maritime terrorism: Multitrack diplomacy
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Abstract

With these special issues of defense studies, the researchers placed the issue of terrorism maritime as a threat to disrupt the security and sovereignty of a country. The Southeast Asia region is inhabited by some island nations, such as Indonesia and the Philippines, the strongest sign of growth and development of maritime activities of terrorist groups. Acts of a maritime terrorist group is a form of the real threat that unwittingly compromises the security and sovereignty of a country. The targets of a maritime terrorist group are all the things associated with the sea, either infrastructure or cross-country vessels transporting goods of high economic value. Since 1998 up to 2016, the Global Terrorism Database noted an act of terror in the sea area of about 368 incidents. Indeed, the numbers are still much lower than the terrorism that makes religious figures/institutions as the target, but because of marine resources being most potential, everyone will fight over this great potential and can impart to the emergence of conflict and even war in the future. Therefore, researchers sought anticipatory measures to counter maritime terrorism solutions, especially in the Southeast Asia region. In the end, the researchers analyzed the strategy of soft power to counter maritime terrorism, precisely multi-track diplomacy, where the problem of terrorism is used as a general problem because it is not the state or government that resolves it, but all relevant stakeholders of maritime counter the terrorism.
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INTRODUCTION

"There is no region nor country in the world that is completely safe from acts of terrorism". This statement is the definition of terrorism issued by the United Nations (UN), "Terrorism is commonly understood as a reference to political or ideological aims. In legal terms, although the international community has adopted a comprehensive definition of terrorism, existing declarations, resolutions, and universal sectoral relations with specific aspects define certain acts and core elements". In accordance with this definition, terrorism is a form of threat that continues to overshadow the sovereignty and security of a country, so that many countries are currently preparing and implementing counter-terrorism policies. The notion of terrorism, which every period shows for its existence, forces the government in every country to begin to develop a strategy to fight the acts of terrorism. After the 9/11 attacks on the United States, global social, political and security temperatures became heated. A few months after the UN Security Council issued UNSCR 1441, the United States accused Iraq of being affiliated with Al Qaeda and attacking Iraq without UN approval. Even though in the future, the world knows that this American attack has no strong reason, but this is a sign; the development of terrorist activities is beginning to be felt by the global world. Al Qaeda proved to be the mastermind behind the acts of terror that occurred in New York in 2001. Their views on the Western culture that threaten Islam are the reason they carry out acts of terror in various countries. After the 9/11 World Trade Center (WTC) attacks in 2001, governments in every country increasingly raised their awareness of organized terrorist groups and sacrificed thousands of lives to achieve their desired goals.

At first, the awareness of this terrorist group was realized by the government through land and air security systems, but now the government’s attention is shifting to the maritime sector and realized with a security system on port infrastructure and trade routes that are included in marine territories in a country. Maritime security is an issue
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currently discussed as a hot topic; this is possible because the maritime sector is becoming increasingly strategic in order to achieve national goals and interests of a country. In line with this, the issue of maritime terrorism can be interpreted as a phenomenon related to acts of crime, including terrorist activities that occur in the sea area in a particular country. Nevertheless, there are still differences of views from various circles related to the meaning of maritime terrorism. They analogize that maritime terrorism is only a form of piracy and ship piracy that occurs in the territorial sea. But what should be remembered is that maritime terrorism is not merely a financially oriented action, but an action that is aimed at achieving goals, both politically and ideologically.

Following the statement above, policymakers became increasingly concerned about the possibilities of future maritime terrorist attacks. Some maritime attacks are real and have a significant influence on the state because they result in mass casualties, infrastructure damage, and disruption of the sea-based inter-state trading system.

Terrorist groups known for having the ability to carry out maritime terrorist acts are the Abu Sayyaf Group (ASG), Palestinian groups, Al Qaeda, the Moro Islamic Liberation Front (MILF), and the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE). In the Southeast Asian territory itself, the Abu Sayyaf group is a group that heads many acts of terror, including maritime terrorism. In 2003, the M/V Penrider tanker from Singapore that sent fuel to Penang-Malaysia experienced piracy carried out by separatist group named Gerakan Aceh Merdeka (GAM). This event is one of the several acts of terrorism, where GAM actually launched a maritime attack that took place in the North Malaysian territorial sea. The group took three hostages (the master, chief engineer, and engineer of the ship), who were finally released after a $52,000 ransom paid. Subsequently, in 2004, Philippine Super Ferry ships were bombed by the Abu Sayyyaf group and supported by other terror groups, such as Jemaah Islamiyah (JI). The attack used 20 dynamites planted on television that had been perforated. The bomb caused the fire to quickly spread throughout the ship, resulting in more than 100 people being victims of the action. This event is one of the deadly acts of maritime terrorism (Brandt & Sandler, 2010).

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

**Theory of Multi-Track Diplomacy**

In the earlier discussion, the background, targets, and strategies of terrorist groups have been explained in carrying out their acts of terror. Understanding related to this matter is very much needed. As a material for analysis, researchers figure out the theory and method of analysis to solve the problem of maritime terrorism. Completion of using soft power is a solution that researchers offer, more specifically using multi-track diplomacy pathways. Azhar (2015); Diamond and McDonald (1996) said that multi-track diplomacy is a diplomatic concept that explains the process of world peace in the international system through a combination of government path diplomacy, group path diplomacy, and personal path diplomacy (Diamond & McDonald, 1996). The main goal of multi-track diplomacy is to create world peace and peacebuilding integrated with one another using soft power (Diamond & McDonald, 1996; Sutiono, 2018).

Multi-track diplomacy is an extension of Track Two’s paradigm; Track Two, which has defined the field of conflict resolution since the 1990s. The idea of multi-track diplomacy was formulated by the establishment of a multi-track diplomacy institution in 1992. The country’s diplomatic approach to countries that were less efficient led to the formation of diplomatic multi-track. This multi-track diplomacy brings the scope of more interaction in people-to-people relationships effectively to resolve conflicts. Multi-track diplomacy combines all aspects of mediation from lower levels, namely civilians to top-level meetings, namely the head of state. Broadly speaking, it can be concluded that this multi-track diplomacy uses all levels of society to figure out the needs and facilitate communication between all levels.

This peacebuilding structure in multi-track diplomacy is very necessary because basically, any conflict cannot be resolved by itself to make peace unless accompanied by negotiation and lobbying. Structural peacebuilding is not only involved with government or non-government actors so that it can be more effective in dealing with world problems. This means that in building peace and realizing peace in the 21st century, not only can it be realized by using military defense instruments but can also be realized with other instruments, such as diplomacy, negotiation, and lobbying between all levels and multi-actors with soft power. Thus, the strategy of multi-track
diplomacy is considered as a smart and proper diplomacy strategy in carrying out a foreign policy to handle the release of the ship’s crews.

Diamond and McDonald (1996) contribute to the design of multi-track systems. They emphasize the relationship between different tracks. The relationship they assume is not a hierarchical structure but a connected circle. There is no single track that is more important than the other, and no one track is independent of the other. Each track has its own resources, values, and approaches, but because they are interconnected, they can use more strongly when coordinating with each other.

![Figure 1. Skema multi-track diplomacy](image)

The concept of multi-track diplomacy consists of nine tracks of diplomacy which are a combination of various diplomacy actors, namely Track One: Government, Track Two: Nongovernmental/Professional, Track Three: Business, Track Four: Private Citizens, Track Five: Research, Training, and Education, Track Six: Activism, Track Seven: Religion, Track Eight: Funding, Track Nine: Communication and Media, making it easy to understand complex systems of peace activities (Diamond & McDonald, 1996; Yilmaz, 2017).

In this study, the multi-track diplomacy strategy undertaken is one Government’s diplomacy track, two Nongovernmental/Professional diplomacy tracks, diplomacy track four Citizens, diplomacy track five Activist, and diplomacy track seven Religion.

Government diplomacy is the process of peacebuilding and peacemaking between countries at the government level that seeks to prove, manage, and improve the system of international relations, trust, confidence, mediation, crisis intervention, conflict resolution, even to prevent violence and secure national interests, such as the economy, trade, politics, human rights, science, culture, and academics, because today society, culture, religious identity (Berman, 2011) groups, ethnic groups, or political interest groups, and citizens also have a formal place in the global system (Diamond & McDonald, 1996). The application of the track one diplomacy can be in the form of direct signing, agreement or visit of the head of state or minister.

Non-government/professional diplomacy is where a professional non-government is able to bring peace through conflict resolution to analyze, prevent, resolve, and accommodate international conflicts with communication, understanding, and building good relations in dealing with problems together. Actors here certainly have great potential to create peace in a way. The advantage of this diplomacy is that it can show the issues faced clearly and be able to find alternative and improvised ways to solve problems that might not be reached by the government (Soy, 1997).
Citizen diplomacy is the achievement of peace carried out by private or personal citizens who contribute to development and peace activities. Diplomacy on this path is usually carried out by a citizen through exchange programs, private voluntary organizations, NGOs, and various interest groups (Chalk, 2008).

Activist diplomacy is a mass movement that brings enlightenment and resistance to inhuman political action, such as oppression and disturbing peace with justice. This path emphasizes activism in terms of human rights, the environment, social and economic justice, and advocacy for special interests about certain policies taken by the government (Diamond & McDonald, 1996). Religion diplomacy is the realization of peace through the power of trust. In this pathway, the activities carried out are oriented towards peace by spiritual and religious communities and anti-violence. Usually, these movements refer to pacifism, namely the belief that peaceful conflict resolution is the most correct one (Diamond & McDonald, 1996).

Through government diplomacy, non-government/professional diplomacy, citizen diplomacy, diplomacy activist, and religion diplomacy carried out by Indonesia in handling the release of children, not ships that are held hostage by the Abu Sayyaf group, have been systematically arranged through careful consideration. When viewed from this side, it can be said that multi-track diplomacy, i.e., soft power, plays an important role in protecting citizens and the security of a country. The concept of multi-track diplomacy is used as an alternative of government in formulating policies to be a solution to the problem of maritime terrorism. Based on the arguments of the researchers, the presence of terrorist crimes that threaten maritime security in a country is a condition that cannot be underestimated. The sea area which limits the territory of one country to another among ASEAN countries is a condition that should be used as the main force to fight maritime terrorism whose target is the sea.

But what must be underlined is that the role of the government sector is no longer a single fighter in combating the problem of maritime terrorism. Groups or institutions outside the government based on people’s power can be an added force to confront terrorism jointly. These groups or institutions include professionalism that has capabilities in the field of maritime security (academics and experts in the field of maritime and terrorism), the private sector (entrepreneurs in the maritime field), and even research institutions to the media center to lead opinions on maritime terrorism.

METHODOLOGY

In this study, researchers used a qualitative method with a case study research design. Qualitative research is a research procedure that produces descriptive data in the form of written or oral words from people and observable behavior (Cresswell, 2013). In contrast to quantitative research methods that emphasize the number or quantity of samples from the population studied, research using a case study model emphasizes understanding of the problem under study.

The author chose to use the case study method considering that in this study, the focus and sub-focus that we examined would coincide with certain cases in a certain period, namely Counter Maritime Terrorism: Multi-track Diplomacy. Here, a group of maritime terrorism will be explained as the subject of actor crimes in international and regional scope. Soy explained the process or six steps for conducting a case study; determine research questions, select cases and determine data collection and analysis, preparation for collecting data, data collection, evaluation and analysis, and reporting (Soy, 1997). By choosing a case, the researcher narrows down the situation or individual who will be the object of research, in this case, ASEAN as the main object of research.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

In this section, we provide all information and data on the issue of maritime terrorism. We send it into four main topics, namely Land to sea, system, and target of maritime terrorism, container shipping, and ferries shipping. That can help you to understand the issue of maritime terrorism.

Land to Sea

Even though the facts related to maritime terrorism have shown some evidence, researchers feel the need of revealing the background of the shifting target of terrorists, who oriented on land but are currently shifting towards the sea. In fact, the ability and knowledge of marine-oriented maritime terrorism targets have a significant difference from the target of terrorism on land; this is proven by the attacks on maritime targets carried out by
terrorists that are still relatively small. The Global Terrorism Database (GTD) notes that over the past 40 years, there have only been 199 out of 98,000 terrorist attacks that make maritime targets. This figure, if presented, is only 0.2% of the total.

This becomes logical because carrying out maritime terrorism actions must have some capability to arrange attacks with conditions that are different from conventional attack operations, such as land. Around 14 maritime terrorist attacks have occurred in various parts of the world in 2017. Six maritime terrorist attacks were carried out by the Abu Sayyaf group in Philippine waters. The latest attack from the Abu Sayyaf group happened on April 18, 2017, in the marine waters of Zamboanga Del Norte, Philippines. The attackers tried to hijack the MV Anabelle cargo ship in waters near Siocon, Zamboanga Del Norte Sea, Philippines. Security forces intervened, causing the attackers to flee and no casualties reported. No group claims responsibility; however, sources suspect that the Abu Sayyaf group was involved in this terrorist attack.

This attack was considered unsuccessful. Maritime terrorism attacks are successful if they make some real effects of the attack. For example, in successful bombings, bombs detonated and destroyed property and killed someone, while unsuccessful bombs were discovered and defused or detonated earlier and killed the perpetrators. Success or not is assessed in terms of the greater goals of the actors. For example, bombs that explode in a building will be counted as a successful attack if there are fatalities and invite attention from the media and the government.

According to a study conducted by Peter Lehr, the actions of maritime terrorism that are now carried out by terrorists are still conservative and tend to copy strategies and tactics they have done before. Should implementation of maritime terrorism actions require that terrorists use specific strategies, tactics, and skills to make sure the success of the terrorist attack, it is not intended to support maritime terrorist attacks, but the researchers see that the things carried out by the perpetrators of terror in the sea still use the methods they did before on the land. The perpetrators of maritime terrorism must have the abilities, knowledge, and talent to carry out maritime attacks. Regarding the ability, terrorists must have abilities, such as skill in operating a boat, skills in concocting strategies, the ability to show connections or networks with parties that have the same direction, and the ability to conduct illegal trade such as buying and selling firearms and illegal drugs. In terms of knowledge, maritime terrorism actors must have good knowledge of maritime and know the details related to the vessel being targeted for attack, whether the ship is a container ship, ferries or cruise ships. So that through good ability and knowledge, maritime terrorism actors can successfully carry out their attacks. If these things are not met properly, what happens then is the failure of the terror attack and the cost that comes out is useless as experienced by Al-Qaeda terrorist groups who failed during the attack on the USS the Sullivans in 2000. The boat used by the terrorist group carried too many explosives, so the boat they boarded sank and the attack failed.

There are other problems that make researchers wonder why the target of terrorism shifts from land to the sea, which is related to logistics. Every implementation of a terrorist attack requires sufficient logistics to support the success of an attack. The distance traveled by terrorists to reach the target ships also makes it difficult for terrorist groups to distribute the logistics needed. Next is the media spotlight. Unlike acts of terrorism in the land which are easily highlighted by the media, maritime terrorism is not much highlighted by the media. This is possible because news coverage by the media is relatively small in the sea area. It shows that every act of terror carried out by terrorists requires an existence. This existence is obtained if the actions they carried out were covered and disseminated to the wider community. On the other hand, the lack of coverage of maritime terrorism makes terrorists get a conducive situation to carry out every attack.

On the other hand, there are new and interesting things for perpetrators of maritime terrorism. First, maritime terrorist groups that do not yet have the competency to design and carry out attacks on the sea use commercial marine companies that offer training and marine equipment, and then increase their ability to carry out terror attacks at sea. Second, if this terrorism attack does not result in many casualties, sea terrorists can take advantage of other great potentials to take economic advantage. This can happen because the logistics shipping industry by the sea, which has spread widely throughout the world, makes investors start to look at this service business, thus making money circulation with high economic value on the sea route. This is an easy target for terror groups to help from every attack carried out.
However, the above argument makes its own paradigm about the world of maritime terrorism. Terrorist actions in the sea area are very tangent to the actions of pirates so that many terrorist attacks are only considered as acts of piracy. This can be seen from the data that states that in the sea areas of South Asia, Southeast Asia (Berrier, 2017), South America, and the Middle East, there are many acts of piracy carried out by sea-level groups, where maritime terrorist groups also carry out attacks in the region. Some researchers even conducted investigations related to the cooperative relationship between maritime terrorism groups and pirates. In fact, a cooperative relationship between maritime terrorism groups and pirates may occur as various tricks from piracy groups to carry out their actions, many of which are copied by maritime terrorist groups. Terrorists who carry out their actions in the sea area also use this condition to use pirate and smuggler equipment to support their sea transportation and logistics because the majority of maritime terrorist groups cannot fulfill their own needs, related to tools and competent staff who can be used to carry out their acts of terror.

An example of this is the maritime terrorist group movement, Liberation Tiger of Tamil Eelam (LTTE) in Sri Lanka. In 1984, the LTTE formed the Sea Tiger group to carry out the task of smuggling logistics to the LTTE. The Sea Tiger has smugglers and pirates living in Tamil Nadi and Sri Lanka. Some of the benefits gained by the maritime terrorism group make them increasingly trying to expand the network and strengthen the strategy of terrorist attacks on the target of maritime terrorism. In the end, there was a shift in the target of terrorism, which was originally in the land area towards the sea as a change in the paradigm of a terrorist group. This paradigm arose, along with the increasing efforts of the government in each country to protect and defend people’s sovereignty. On the other hand, the increasing logistical need to support each attack by terrorists also strengthens the reason for the change in the paradigm of perpetrators of terrorism. Terrorism groups need additional money to finance every action they plan, not to mention running the organization, such as training and accommodation. So the sea is used as an alternative means to support the shortcomings that they have not been able to fulfill. Facts, such as piracy of ships or robbery against pirate groups, are a strategy of terrorist groups to get extra money.

System and Target of Maritime Terrorism

Broadly speaking, the background of the activities and movements of the perpetrators of maritime terrorism has been described on the previous page. On this page, the author describes how maritime terrorism is carried out. Not only that; the targets of maritime terrorism activities are also interesting to discuss (Asal & Hastings, 2015). Explanation of the system and targets of maritime terrorism will be elaborated with examples of cases of attacks by maritime terrorists in the Sulu Sea area. Some maritime terrorism attacks have focused their activities on attacking ships crossing border waters, with hydrocarbon, chemical and tourist resorts in them. This attack also hurt people and all infrastructure that has high economic value. In line with this, the parties who feel disadvantaged for the attack feel more disadvantaged and inevitably have to bear significant losses individually because until now, there has not been a mechanism that can be implemented to claim the loss of such attacks. Although there are such cases, the implementation will take a long time and a lot of money. But the author does not discuss the form of government responsibility, insurance or policy for victims of maritime terrorist attacks (Greenberg, Chalk, Willis, Khilko, & Ortiz, 2006).

The targets of maritime terrorism attacks are cruise ships, freighters, and passenger ships. From each of these vessels, the systems and instruments used by maritime terrorism actors differ, so that every attack carried out in each ship will have a different impact, be it on the economic sector, hostage victims, and rescue efforts to be carried out by the authorities. A simple logic to explain the above statement is by looking at the type of vessel omit. If the attack is carried out on ferries that carry many passengers with various backgrounds, both economic and religious, the maritime terrorist group will not carry out a blind attack because among these passengers, there are still Muslims whereas attacks are carried out on cruise ships which are limited to only serving certain people. The majority of them have Jewish and Christian backgrounds so attacks can be carried out maximally without worrying about the risk of killing fellow Muslims.

The terrorist acts carried out by terrorist groups are divided into two motives, namely ideological motives and motives of ability. There are several things that can be used as an excuse for terrorists to launch their terror attacks in the sea area, in the context of the two motives described in the previous paragraph. An understanding of
the motivations of terrorist actors can give an overview of the strategic choices made by terror groups in carrying out their attacks. Terrorism activities are often considered as a form of ideological rebellion, where Islam is used as their reason to launch bomb attacks on other countries.

Al Qaeda is a terrorist organization or group that always acts on behalf of Islam as the basis of every attack. Al Qaeda’s decision to attack the US was a belief that was built by their own group that committing crimes against the US was decency based on the reason of defending Islam from munkar. But the question is whether maritime terrorism groups also carry out their actions for ideological reasons. Based on sources obtained by researchers, maritime terrorism does not move based on ideological impulses. Maritime terrorism commits acts of terror in the sea region based on their capabilities. Capability in question is their ability in network connection, organizational development, easy access to the sea area of a country, and the last is the ability to carry out illegal trade such as drug smuggling. Of the four things, the basic ability that must be possessed by maritime terrorism groups is the ability to network with each person and group that can help them to carry out acts of terror in the sea.

The attack from the maritime terrorist group made the wheels of government, especially the economic sector, experience disruption. This maritime terrorist attack resulted in the loss of life and destroying various kinds of port industry facilities, as well as cargo ships which were easy targets for terrorists in carrying out their actions. Currently, there are around 112 merchant ships, 6,500 seaports along with various facilities, and 45,000 sea-based freight forwarding bureaus that support the world’s maritime transportation system.

Container Shipping

The next focus is maritime terrorism groups that use sea transportation, in this case container shipping, to deliver war logistics, such as weapons, bombs, and smuggling of people related to the acts of terror they will carry out. This is not merely a priori in the Sulu Sea region, which is a sea borderline between Indonesia and the Philippines (Liow, 2016); it is a means of transportation for the Abu Sayyaf terrorist group to send weapons to be used by terrorists in Indonesia. In line with this, every attack carried out by perpetrators of maritime terrorism raises impacts that can be used as learning notes to create a counter-terrorism policy for governments in each country. There are several scenarios of maritime terrorism actions about container shipping. The first scenario is the hijacking of container ships in sea transportation and the destruction of all the ship’s infrastructure. This resulted in the fall of civilian casualties to the death of the crew. Not only did it cause casualties, but the actions of maritime terrorism also turned out to have consequences for the economic sector. In connection with the attacks carried out on container ships, more than ten of millions of dollars were spent on compensating families of casualties, more than tens of millions of dollars were spent on ship repairs, more than hundreds of millions of dollars were spent due to lost and damaged cargo carried, and almost billions of dollars in losses due to the failure of the agreed-upon buying and selling process. Despite the many disadvantages faced, there are still values that can be taken to overcome this problem; billions of dollars are budgeted by each container ship company to improve ship safety procedures, and the second is the company’s investment in insurance.

The second scenario is the use of container ships to deliver tools or components that can be used to assemble bombs. In line with these facts, the impact that will occur is the occurrence of bomb-breaking acts as the implementation of terror forms from terrorist perpetrators. Around hundreds of fatalities are predicted to be affected by this terrorist activity, not to mention the material losses due to damage to property, infrastructure, to the provision of compensation for families of victims of terrorism. One more thing is the reduced level of investor confidence to invest because of unsafe conditions.

Ferries Shipping

Ferries are sea transportation that is the choice of many passengers to carry out various activities in the region. Ferries are in demand by many passengers because of the relatively cheap, easy to reach and relatively short travel time. This mode of transportation becomes the mainstay of passengers because they are accustomed to serving sea shipping, even between ports or between countries, to river crossings. The available vessels have a large size that can accommodate thousands of passengers. These ferries also have the capacity to accommodate tens or even hundreds of four-wheeled vehicles and even more 6 wheels, such as minivans, minibuses, buses, and
expedition trucks.

In Indonesia alone, there is an increase in the number of ferry passengers in 2017 as found in Indonesia’s westernmost province, namely Nanggroe Aceh Darussalam, which borders the State sovereignty of Malaysia - the number of passengers on ferries across Ulee Lheue - Lamteng (PP) year 2017. Some of the factors that can underlie the increase in the number of ferry passengers in the region are international level maritime festival activities conducted on Sabang Island (Sabang Sail).

Discussion

The actions of a maritime terrorist group are a form of the real threat that unwittingly disrupts the security and sovereignty of a country. The target of this group is all things related to the sea, both infrastructure and cross-country vessels carrying goods of high economic value. Based on the GTD, terrorist attacks targeting sea areas in all parts of the world reached 368 incidents. Southeast Asia’s sea area is the region most often targeted for maritime terrorism, with around 76 acts of terror occurring in this sea area. This action is carried out with various strategies, namely hijacking, bombing/explosion, armed assault, hostage-taking, and facilities or infrastructures.

Based on the picture above, the maritime terrorism group is actually active in carrying out terror attacks in the Southeast Asian region. Groups, such as Abu Sayyaf, JI, MILF (Moro Islamic Liberation Front), declare themselves to fight the western rule. Some of the terrorist groups above show their existence by carrying out acts of terror against the infrastructure of the western economy, such as ships and ports spread across countries around the world. Driving Brandt, those maritime terrorist groups carry out their terror attacks with all the capabilities they have. Unlike ISIS and Al-Qaeda who carried out their terror attacks on ideological reasons, maritime terrorism perpetrators did not base their actions on ideological reasons, both government and religious systems.

For researchers, such views cannot be fully justified; terrorist groups are different from pirate groups (Al-Zayyat, 2004) who only rank economic benefits in each of their actions. Basically, the different targets of terrorist attacks, such as the ISIS terrorist group and AL-Qaeda, prefer civilians as targets or may carry out suicide bombings to attack predetermined targets. Although this is not so relevant to the maritime terrorism group, it does not mean that the maritime terrorist group is free from ideological reasons (Raymond, 2006). In 2016, ISIS carried out its terror activities in the southern Philippines; they were affiliated with the Abu Sayyaf terrorist group and several other pro-ISIS groups. This proves that maritime terrorism groups, such as Abu Sayyaf, also have a strong ideological foundation. In addition to the current conditions, where the ISIS group migrated to the southern Philippines because of the position of ISIS which has been sandwiched in the Syrian region, the threat to the country is increasingly clear.
To overcome terrorism in the area, especially in the Sulu Sea, joint sea patrol activities have been carried out between Indonesia, the Philippines, and Malaysia on 12 October 2017. The Sulu Sea is located in waters directly next to the three countries. Until now, the Sulu Sea is the main cross used by terrorists, especially those in the Southern Philippines, to carry out all of its operations. Starting from buying and selling weapons, kidnapping, until the attack on the authorities was carried out there. This form of cooperation actually mimics the concept of maritime cooperation between the three countries already been implemented in the Malacca Strait, namely Indonesia, Malaysia and Singapore. The concept was proven to successfully suppress the movement of criminals in the middle of the sea. Moreover, now the cooperation is complemented by Eyes in the Sky (trilateral air patrol program between Indonesia, the Philippines, and Malaysia).

Indonesia, through the Minister of Defense, Ryamizard Ryacudu, offers cooperation in the field of intelligence called “Our Eyes” to ASEAN countries, which is an adaptation of the intelligence cooperation of “Five Eyes” belonging to the United States and its allies. Our Eyes was formed with the intention of detecting terrorists, eliminating and destroying while eliminating pirates in the trilateral region so that we know the position of terrorists. The cooperation agreement to implement this program has been signed by six ASEAN Defense Ministers in Singapore in 2018. The six countries are Indonesia, Malaysia, Thailand, Brunei Darussalam, the Philippines and Singapore. Unfortunately, Our Eyes cannot be applied at this time. There are several things that make this program have to be postponed. First, intelligence concerns the security and sovereignty of a country. As Thomas Hobbes said, the international world is anarchy. Actually, there is no country that really wants to share information that could threaten the security of its own country. Second, there are high costs and the location of the construction of the command headquarters. It is uncertain how much money will be spent to carry out this activity, especially to carry out daily activities. The Command Headquarters also cannot determine which country to build, because to build a command headquarters means that the country is ready to be entered by agents from other countries. Third, there is the issue of the Standard Operational Procedure (SOP). Until now, it cannot be ascertained as to what Our Eyes actually will operate.

As explained earlier, terrorists also move based on a strong ideological foundation. Therefore, researchers believe that the approach that has been taken now through trilateral patrol and intelligence cooperation alone is not enough. It takes another track approach in diplomacy; in this case, the most appropriate is a religious approach. Terrorists, especially those affiliated with ISIS, move on behalf of Islam in every operation. While Islam is a religion that teaches peace, the acts of terror they commit cannot be justified. For this reason, an approach that is in line with their foundation is needed through Islam.

This has been implemented in Indonesia when President Abdurrahman Wahid approached GAM through religious and cultural sides. There are three aspects of cultural citizenship that underlie the peace agreement. First, recognition by accepting them as part of citizens within the negotiation framework, even though they have aspirations that are 180 degrees different. Second, there should be respect by providing a place and guarantee of freedom of opinion and gathering to formulate their aspirations in the sense of security. Third, there should be a transformation of state institutions in the regions in order to accommodate their social and cultural structures and informal figures in the regional political system through the Special Autonomy Bill. The outcome of the peace agreement is the basis for the next peace agreement. The peace agreement between the Government of Indonesia and GAM was realized on 15 August 2005 in Helsinki.

President Abdurrahman Wahid is basically using Track 7, though in this case, it can be debated. Multi-track diplomacy is a country’s way of establishing its interests abroad, using the existing nine tracks. President Abdurrahman Wahid’s move to resolve the domestic conflict is not an act of diplomacy. But we must see that President Abdurrahman Wahid saw examples of conflict resolution in Pope John Paul II’s case.

On May 13, 1981, Pope John Paul II was almost killed by Mehmet Ali Agca. This incident shocked the world; Catholic leaders worldwide were shot. The whale is seriously injured. He finally survived after five hours of rescue efforts. Mehmet himself was caught shortly after. In court, Mehmet gave confusing confessions. He had claimed he was visited by KGB intelligence who offered him three million marks to kill the Pope but later denied it. In July 1981, he was sentenced to life imprisonment. On December 27, 1983, Pope John Paul II went to Mehmet in prison. He directly forgave Mehmet. Pope John Paul II’s actions can be said to be a form of diplomacy...
track 7 through religion. He alleviates the tensions that occur in the world. Mehmet Ali Agca is a Turkish; then he carried Russia through his confession bribed by KGB agents. When Pope John Paul II directly forgives Mehmet, he basically teaches the basis of the teachings of all religions, namely love and forgiveness. This is what makes the world come back to not fighting each other anymore. Then no longer accuse the parties responsible for the assassination attempt. Instead, all parties must forgive one another and once again start the relationship from zero.

CONCLUSION

When Our Eyes cannot be applied, it shows that overcoming terrorists is not enough with diplomacy track 1. Every country should also involve other elements. For example, religion to achieve conflict resolution with terrorists (track 7). Then peace activities to prevent potential acts of terrorism occur in the future (track 6). Finally, the business element is to recover economic damage that affects countries around the conflict area (track 3).

Researchers believe multi-track diplomacy is a solution to overcome all acts of terrorism in the world. Terrorism cannot be overcome by only one country, nor can it be overcome by the government itself. Other elements are needed to overcome terrorism as a whole. Because terrorists themselves are human beings, they move on the basis of trust and reason that turns out to endanger humans themselves. The approach from the government is certainly necessary, but until now, this has proven to be only able to limit the terrorist movement. We need a solution to eliminating terrorism completely, and multi-track diplomacy is the answer.
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