

DILEMMA ETHIC OF SUICIDE BOMBING

Saadah Mardliyati

saadahmardliyati@mail.uinfabengkulu.ac.id

Despite the global Covid outbreak, another suicide bombing occurred in Indonesia on March 28, 2021, in front of a cathedral church in Makassar. At the same time, Americans look back on memories and protests over the Nashville bombing on December 25, 2020, after the FBI released an investigative report on the case on March 15, 2021 (FBI, 2021). The late case suicide bombing in Indonesia in front of Mapolsek Astana Anyar, Bandung on December 07, 2022. Although these cases are not new, each carries a different meaning and context.

Several scholars have described suicide bombing using several terms. It has been referred to as suicide terrorism, suicide missions, human bombs, human weapons, suicide bombings, and suicide attacks, among other phrases. This research uses both 'suicide bombing' and 'suicide attack' terms interchangeably to refer to suicide using a bomb.

Often, suicide bombings are defined as an attack in which the death of the bomber or attacker becomes necessary for the attack's success. Several studies on suicide bombing have focused on the death of the bomber as a requirement to meet the classification of a suicide bombing (Crenshaw, 2007:138., and Pape, 2005:10). Other studies only required a very high chance of death on the part of the bomber (Alvanou, 2006:2-3., Reuter, 2004). The researcher, at this point, supports the first idea that the death of the bomber is a prerequisite for categorising a case as a suicide bombing.

In the researcher's view, a suicide bombing is only categorised as a suicide if the perpetrator is dead because the act of killing himself/herself has happened. If a bomb explosion kills some people, but the perpetrators of the explosion are not killed, this research does not categorise it as a suicide bombing because of the non-occurrence of ending one's own life. Such an incident can only be referred to as a suicide 'attempt'. An experimental action will not be claimed successful if the results are not as planned. As someone who tries to quit smoking but after a few days later he returns to smoking, then he is not called quitting smoking just trying to quit smoking. Therefore, an act can be called a suicide bombing or attack if the person concerned (the perpetrator) is dead.

In the case of the suicide bombing in Surabaya, Indonesia, on May 13, 2018, a family was carried out in three churches that killed all the perpetrators (5 people) and 13 people around

them; without a doubt, it was categorised as a suicide bombing. The suicide bombing at the Surabaya Indonesia police headquarters, which occurred on May 14, 2018, which only killed 4 out of 5 perpetrators and injured several people around it, was considered a suicide (BBC, 2018). The suicide bombing in Tunisia, Africa, on July 2, 2019, at a bus stop that only killed the perpetrator was also classified as suicide bombing (The Sun, 2019). In all of the above cases, the act of ending one's own life occurred, and these cases are categorised as suicide bombings.

In the case of the bomb detonation that occurred in front of the Surakarta Police Headquarters on June 3, 2019, the perpetrator was not dead; therefore, it is not categorised as a suicide. The perpetrator used a waist bag, which was modified into a bomb, and detonated it in front of the gate of the Surakarta police headquarters. The bomb, which has low explosive power, only injures the perpetrator while the perpetrator's life can still be saved, so in this case, the act of killing himself does not occur. This research views that the act of detonating a bomb like this is only called an attempted suicide.

Suppose in a bomb explosion, the perpetrator brings the bomb and detonates it somewhere and kills people around the bomb, while the perpetrator survives the explosion. In that case, the incident is not categorised as a suicide bombing but rather a murder.

In the case of the series of bombings in Bali on October 12, 2002, which killed 202 people and injured 209 people in three places (Liputan6, 2002), not all of these cases were categorised as suicide bombings. The first bomb that exploded at the Paddy's Pub was a bomb carried by one of the perpetrators in a backpack that detonated himself inside the Pub. It is considered a suicide bombing. While the second bomb explosion, where the perpetrator detonated the bomb installed in the L300 van at the Sari Club restaurant parking lot's using a remote trigger, is not included in the category of a suicide bomb. The explosion that killed visitors at the Sari Club restaurant that time was categorised as an act of murder because the perpetrator was not there and either detonated or did not detonate himself. The third bomb that exploded in front of the gates of the American consulate on Jalan Hayam Wuruk Bali left no casualties or injuries and was only destroying the gates of the American consulate. This act was called vandalism. According to the police investigation, the same group conducted the three consecutive bomb explosions; however, the first incident was different from the second and the third incidents. The first occurrence of ending oneself and killing those around them is undoubtedly called a suicide bombing. In the second and third explosions, the perpetrator only put the bomb and detonated it remotely; therefore, it is only called a case of murder (second

explosion) and vandalism (third explosion) because the perpetrator's act of ending his own life did not occur in the two explosions.

Therefore, a suicide bombing is said to be a suicide bombing if the suicide bomber dies and detonates; in other words, the suicide act has occurred along with the explosion. Whether the people around the explosion were killed or not is not considered as long as the perpetrator dies along with the explosion. If the perpetrator survives the explosion, it is not included in the category of a suicide bombing but an attempted suicide. So that in this research, the selected cases that become the research material are suicide bombing, in which the death of the perpetrator is a requirement for this category.

Various other debates surrounding the suicide bombing also occurred, not only the debate over the conditions for the perpetrator's death. Some other debates include: Which is the dominant desire in the case of a suicide bombing, the desire to die to kill or the desire to kill to die? Was the suicide bomber a criminal/murderer or victim? Are suicide bombings always related to religious doctrine? What are the common assumptions that arise when people hear of suicide bombings? Why is suicide bombing an option? Researchers will discuss some of these other debates in the following sections to reinforce this research position.

Dying to kill or Killing to die

Suicide bombing, according to Jacqueline Rose, is '*an act of passionate identification - you carry your enemy in a deadly embrace*' (Rose, 2004:23). Rose concludes that the perpetrator's desire to kill or destroy the enemy is more dominant than the death of the perpetrator himself, or to borrow Talal Asad's term, "*someone who dies in order to kill*" (Asad, 2007:40). This opinion differs from that of Robert A. Pape (2010:322), who suggest that '*terrorists are willing to commit suicide in order to achieve religious martyrdom regardless of their political goals*' Suicide is a tactic that seems to reinforce how much "*they hate their enemies*".' Pape views the suicide bombing as an attempt by someone to sacrifice himself or the predominant suicidal desire to achieve his goal or destroy his enemy, which Talal Asad referred to as "*someone who kills in order to die*" (Asad, 2007, p. 40). Other scholars often discuss these different perspectives through psychological factors to understand the suicide bombing case before it happens.

This phenomenon drives researchers to understand the reasons that prompted the perpetrators to commit suicide bombings. Several questions were already raised, such as the perpetrator's thoughts of the victim or the enemy? Does the victim or the enemy deserve to die

because they disappointed or bothered the perpetrator? Do victims or enemies die with the perpetrator because they got in the perpetrator's way? Which one would the offender enjoy more, being the 'other' killer or killing himself? However, in the researcher's view, these questions are not essential compared to the suicide bombing result, that is, killing someone. Either suicide bomber killed himself and others, or simply killed himself; this action occurs because of the desire to kill. If the perpetrator does not have the desire to kill, the final execution of the action will not happen at the last moment. In the final moment, before the perpetrator commits their act, the desire to kill emerge, and the perpetrator is forced to execute the action.

Some scholars have further illustrated the desire to 'kill to die' or 'die to kill' that dominates the suicide bomber. The first school of thoughts suggests that the desire to kill another dominates the action in the sense that the enemy's death or perhaps hatred of the enemy is the main trigger for the suicide bomber action. The enemy's death is the main focus of this action; therefore, hatred towards the enemy motivates the perpetrator to destroy the enemy. The perpetrator will do whatever it takes to destroy the enemy to the point of being ready to die for the sake of killing the enemy. The second group argues that the desire to sacrifice him/herself is more important than the desire to kill or destroy the enemy. The key driver to commit suicide is primarily self-sacrifice or suicide. The focus of this urge is to take the perpetrator's life, whether other people will die with him or not, because an action is not essential. The death of the offender is the primary choice for this impulse.

The two thoughts mentioned above also often spark debate in justifying the moral actions of suicide bombers. Several other debates have also arisen over how to determine which is more dominant in a suicide bomber's actions, the desire to kill others or the desire to commit suicide? This debate, according to researcher, will be challenging to determine, because the urge crystallises just before the person carrying out the attack executes the action. Generally, suicide bombers die right away, so it is difficult to know which desire dominates the perpetrator to take action, and only the perpetrator knows what prompted him to take action. In the last moment, when a perpetrator decides to blow him/herself up, he/she was left behind from other interventions. Detonating a bomb or not is purely the perpetrator's choice at the last minute before exploding himself. It is possible that someone who was preparing to carry out the suicide bombing failed to execute the explosion because the urge to kill weakened just before the decisive moment, so the execution failed. When the executions took place, only the attacker knows which is the primary desire, whether to kill oneself or to kill others.

Several studies analyse the primary desires of the suicide bombing perpetrator by investigating the process of preparation and implementation and the outcome. *First*, if a suicide bomb attacker places or carries a bomb attached closely to his/her body, in the sense that there is no distance between the bomb and body, this indicates a primary intention to kill oneself. However, if the bomb is not attached to or at some distance from the body, then a dominant desire to kill others prevail. *Second*, if the perpetrator minimises the space with their target, it indicates that the desire to kill other people is more dominant. In contrast, if the perpetrator does not think about his distance from the target, it indicates a predominant suicidal intent. *Finally*, on the outcome, when the suicide bomb explosion that occurred has a high destructive force, it indicates that the perpetrator wants to destroy the others. If the resulting explosive power only destroys the perpetrator and its surroundings, then the suicidal intention of the perpetrator to commit suicide is more dominant than killing other people.

These arguments, however, are being criticised for their uneasiness to arriving at the correct conclusion. *First*, the bomb's placement on the body (attached to the body) cannot be concluded solely because of the perpetrator's decision. The position of the bomb is not always related to the dominating will of the perpetrator. The suicide bomber's decision to place the bomb on his body is related to the situation and condition of the chosen target. On the other hand, the placement of a suicide bombing in some cases is not the perpetrator's decision but of the main actor (strategist) behind the perpetrator (in the case of a suicide bombing carried out by a specific group or organisation). In this case, the perpetrator acts merely as the primary weapon of the explosive strategy. In several suicide bombings carried out by the Jamaah Islamiyah group in Indonesia, Dr Azahari bin Husein and Nordin M. Top are the main actors and bomb makers behind several suicide bomb attacks in Indonesia (Kumparan, 2017).

The positioning of a bomb is the preparation part for the suicide bombing action. There is a time gap between the preparation and execution of the action. Some other considerations or decisions can occur during the preparation stage, which is not purely a decision or action of the perpetrator. Thus, the positioning of explosive bomb cannot be used as a sole measure of the perpetrator's desire, either to 'kill to die' and vice versa, because of the time gap between the preparation and execution in which anything can happen. This research argues that the perpetrator's greatest dominating desire to kill oneself or to kill the other becomes his/her final motivation in the last moment before the explosion occurs. Only the executor knows his primary motivation for exploding without further intervention.

Second, based on this research, the space gap between the perpetrator and the victim is insufficient to assess the desires that dominate the perpetrator's actions. In a suicide bomb attack, the perpetrator attempts to delimit distance from the target or enemy. However, these attempts may fail due to some conditions. Delimiting the space between the perpetrator and the victim is not solely the perpetrator's act; the victim is also part of the action either actively or passively. Both parties play their role to close the gap between one and another; hence it cannot be seen merely as the perpetrator's action. The perpetrator commonly tries his best to eliminate the distance from the target, while the target will create a space from the perpetrator; although, in some cases, the target fails to build a distance from the perpetrator. The recent suicide bombing in Makassar – Indonesia, on March 28, 2021, shows that the perpetrator was unable to remove the space from the explosion target. The perpetrator's failure occurred because he was obstructed by the vigilance of the church security officers who prevented the perpetrator from approaching the target; hence, this is an active role of the target. If the church did not have a security guard on time and allowed the perpetrator to remove the distance from the target, this could be said to be the target's passive act. Therefore, delimiting space between one and another involves both parties' participation. The gap between the offender and the target does not imply the dominating impulse to kill the other or kill oneself.

Third, the explosive power generated by a suicide bombing cannot be used solely to assess the desires that dominate the perpetrator's actions. The explosive power, which has an extraordinary scale of damage, cannot be ascertained because the urge to kill the other dominates. Whereas an explosion that has minor damage also does not indicate that the perpetrator's desire to kill the other is less than the perpetrator's desire to kill himself. The outcome of a suicide bombing does not represent the dominating desire of the perpetrator (to kill or die as a killer) because it is not only related to the wish of the perpetrator. It also relates to the preparation of the action or the conditions under which the explosion occurred. Based on the investigations of the Indonesian police in various suicide bombings in Indonesia, the perpetrators of suicide bombers are not people who understand the explosive power of a bomb. Some cases showed that the bombs used by the perpetrators had been prepared and concocted by other people, and the perpetrators acted solely as the executors of death. In such a case, the result of the suicide bomb explosion is not only the perpetrator's decision; it is possible to participate in other roles in creating the outcome of the explosion. Therefore, the explosion outcome is not entirely the perpetrator's decision and cannot be used to judge the dominating desires of the perpetrator. Only the executor knows whether his action driven by a desire to die

as a murderer or to kill someone else and die with the enemy at the last moment before he executed the act of a suicide bombing.

From the above arguments, there is also a possibility that a person who commits a suicide bombing is dominated by both desires to kill other people and commit suicide. Judging which desire dominates the actor's action cannot be simply analysed. The perpetrator's decision to execute the explosion is purely his/her decision just before the explosion occurs. Whether it is driven by the desire to kill or die as a murderer, only the culprit knows the answer. For sure, a suicide bomber desires to kill; if he/she does not have such desire, then there is no suicide bombing execution. The desire to kill is what underlies the perpetrator's decision to execute his/her action, and, thus the executor can be morally judged. This ethics-moral assessment is the discussion in this study.

Murder or Victim

The public sees that the act to explode oneself by one person or more to end his/her life by using an explosive device is a suicide bombing. In such a case, the self-detonating act occurs due to the perpetrator's desire to kill, and therefore, he/she is known as a killer, murdered, assassin or criminal. How the public values one's action has been made upon the desire to kill.

However, what if a suicide bomber commits this action to benefit other people or group? Does not it mean that the perpetrator was the victim of a suicide bombing? Because the perpetrator becomes a victim of the other interests, and the perpetrator dies when the explosion occurs and cannot enjoy the results of his actions. Therefore, it is interesting to discuss whether the suicide bomber was a victim or a criminal/killer.

On the one hand, the perpetrator should be perceived as a victim of the action because he/she died when the explosion occurred without enjoying the results of the action, such as the wider political changes. The perpetrator is only a victim of the political interests behind the attack. Maybe the perpetrator also commits the suicide bombing because there is no other choice other than to kill himself and his enemies to save the interests of the others. I would argue that such perception, which position a perpetrator as a victim, emerged due to the perpetrator being marginalised from the benefits that he/she might get for the act. Even the perpetrator is considered as having no other choices within life circumstances that make him/her want to kill his/her enemy and him/herself.

On the other hand, some other opinions attribute the act of suicide to the act of a soldier of God, to achieve glory before God, and the perpetrator will enjoy the results based on his belief in life after death. These suicide bombers, referred to as 'God's future bride' or 'groom', are willing to sacrifice themselves for others in God's way in exchange for the life of heaven after death (Kruger, 2002). But does God justify the act of killing others for personal gains, such as in hoping for God's heaven? Wasn't killing another in the name of God is also called murder? I would argue, the perspective of suicide bombers as victims in the name of religion, according to such researchers, can be temporarily removed from this debate. The reason is that a selfish desire of the doer who desires heaven after death which makes the perpetrator morally responsible for his actions because the perpetrator has become a murderer, at least by killing himself for his own sake (hoping for heaven). Debates and justifications of suicide bombing in the name of religion will be discussed further in chapters three and four.

Public opinion also considers suicide bombers to be murderers, assassins, killers, or criminals. A person who takes someone's life on purpose is driven by the desire to kill the perpetrator, ensuring that the perpetrator is called a murderer or criminal. The act of suicide using a bomb is often an option because it is considered effective to end someone's life. In the suicide attack, the perpetrator intends to commit suicide along with his enemy and destroys the area around the explosion, allowing the lives of others not to be saved. If the people around the explosion also died, then the culprit had become the murderer of someone else and himself. If the suicide bombing only kills the culprit and there are no other victims, he will still be a killer, killing himself.

In the above debates, the researcher stands on the more general opinion that the suicide bomber is either a murderer or a criminal. I agree with the label of a murderer or criminal because the perpetrator deliberately kills someone. A person who intentionally takes another person's life will be called a murderer. Whatever the background and reasoning of a suicide bombing should not justify a killer being called a victim. The act of killing someone using an explosion is an active action by the perpetrator. The perpetrator became the executor of the suicide bombing because of the urge to kill. The desire to kill triggers the perpetrator to act; inevitably, the perpetrator must be called a murderer or a criminal.

There is ambiguity in claiming that a perpetrator is a victim of a particular condition. On the one hand, the perpetrator is the executioner who executed the explosion. On the other hand, he/she is called the victim. Between being an executioner and being a victim, these two opposing positions cannot be combined. Suicide bombers basically have a choice whether to

execute the action or not. When someone decides to execute a suicide bombing, it becomes the perpetrator's choice, and this choice makes the perpetrator responsible for the act. This is different from being a victim because a victim cannot choose as to whether he/she wants to become a victim or not. Inevitably, no one wants to be the victim of a suicide act. If the perpetrator is also called the victim, then the ethical judgment of someone's actions will be ambiguous. Therefore, in assessing the actions of a suicide bomber, we cannot say that a suicide bomber is a victim, but a murderer.

In a suicide bombing that happened at the J.W. Mariot, Jakarta, Indonesia, on August 5, 2003, a perpetrator drove a car containing a bomb and detonated it upon arrival in front of the hotel lobby (Liputan6, 2003). This incident killed the perpetrator and 12 other people, and injured 150 people surrounding the explosion. No doubt, the perpetrator became a murderer. In the case of the suicide bombing in Nashville, USA, on December 25, 2020, a perpetrator blew himself up in a car which instantly killed the perpetrator (FBI, 2021). Therefore the perpetrator in this later case is also called a murderer, even though he only killed himself.

The act of suicide bombing is an act of killing or blowing oneself to end one's own life and possibly those of his/her enemies. Thus, this action makes the perpetrator a killer /criminal. Whether the people surrounding the explosion were killed or not, the perpetrator is a killer because at least he had killed himself.

A murderer or a hero

In the suicide bombing, the suicide bomber can be judged morally and ethically if the perpetrator who blew himself up is not a soldier carrying out his duties in war conditions. Actions of violence/attacks due to certain conditions carried out by a country government or obtained state legitimacy in war conditions are actions that legally justified under international law, including carrying out suicide attacks. As stated by Michael Walzer (2004), 'war is a legal activity if it meets certain conditions and war in existing international law legitimises certain types of violence'. Thus, as the act of murder in conditions of war can be legally justified, a soldier who dies in a suicide attack during the war is not called a murderer. The soldier who died in the suicide war mission governed by the country government would be called a hero. This justification is reflected in Japanese tradition, called Kamikaze, such as when Japanese soldiers self-explode their aeroplanes and killed themselves during World War II.

It should be noted that several conditions should be met to justify a war in international law. For example, an attack by the army cannot strike civilians; only army attacks on soldiers

are justified, and army attacks on civilians are not justified. Determining a justified and accountable war for international law must also see several conditions: *jus ad Bellum* (justice before the war), *jus in Bello* (justice during the war), and *jus post-Bellum* (justice after the war) (Frowe, 2016). This research, however, will not include cases of suicide attacks carried out on the assignment of the State while at war.

The legitimacy of the State against a suicide attack makes its assessment difficult. Involvement of the State in a suicide attack can be part of a war, justified under international law, so the perpetrator of such an attack cannot be said to be a killer. Violence or murder in certain war conditions can be legally justified. Even though sometimes a country attacks another country to start a war of aggression, it cannot be justified yet according to international law because it has to assess the social conditions of the people of a country to understand the acts of attack (Frowe, 2016). Suicide attacks involving the interests of a country are not easy to judge ethically. Beforehand, assessment is required to investigate whether these actions are part of a legally recognised war in international law. This study will not include the ethical debate about war; therefore, suicide attacks cases where the State is involved, which may be part of war or acts of aggression, will not be assessed in this study but for further research.

Suicide bombing can be judged morally and ethically in this study, if the act is committed consciously without any legitimacy from the State. The State's presence in a suicide attack should be considered a possible war strategy that may be justified legally, and will not form this research.

Religion ideology behind the suicide bombing

Many suicide bombers are willing to undertake this task and are on a long waiting list to be approved as suicide bombers because they believe that it will bring them honour and glory in the afterlife. They believe they are serving their Lord. Atran (2006) wrote that "*what matters to most of the would-be martyrs and their sponsors I have interviewed is the martyr's intention and commitment to God. It is inspired by a person's group love and by anger at those who would humiliate him, but certainly not blind anger*" (2006:139). In line with Atran, al-Husain explained that: "*A suicide bombing is a suicide activity that is motivated by the perpetrator's belief that the act is a form of struggle for the truth*" (al-Husain, 2005:7)

We cannot deny that the existence of an extreme understanding of religion is still one of the essential aspects highlighted in many suicides. In many cases of suicide bombings, the perpetrator uses his conviction to justify his actions. Religious radicalism is also the most

talked-about aspect of the adoption of suicide bombing. After the 9/11 attacks in the United States, which involved the Al-Qaeda groups, several radical religious practices and jihadist beliefs were brought into the spotlight. Pape has often mentioned the correlation between belief and suicide bombing in his various writings (Pape, 2003, 2005; Pape & Feldman, 2010). He argued that religious belief itself is fundamental. Religion has nothing to do with the adoption of suicide bombings. However, religious differences between groups and targets make adoption more likely, as religious differences can inflame nationalist sentiment (Pape, 2005:88). Suicide bombing cases involving groups such as Al-Qaeda, Hamas, The Taliban, Jun al-Khilafah and Jama'at Ansharut Al Dawlah (JAD) seem to confirm this opinion.

If we only accept the picture above, we will reveal religion's face as a source of motivation for religious adherents to commit acts of violence. The basic motivation of the religious community is life after death. Life before death is used as a place of struggle to achieve the goal of life after death. So that religion sometimes appears in two conflicting faces. On the one hand, religion is a place where people find peace, depth of life, and strong hope. On the other hand, religion is also a source of inspiration and motivation for heroic actions or arouse a spirit of sacrifice, which is confirmed by an analysis of Haryatmoko (2015:81) that there is a gap between religious ideals and the reality of religious life.

It is unfortunate if religion is associated with the phenomenon of religious violence. Religion tends to justify a discriminate act and give an excuse for committing violent acts, even to the point of murder. The defence of religion is usually very normative that religion teaches peace as opposes to violence. It is not uncommon for people to abuse religion for personal or group interests. This defence does not recognise the gap between "what should be" and "what is factual" between teaching and life practice. The problem that needs to be faced is how to bridge this gap so that religious teachings are increasingly manifested in the life and do not justify violence or the legitimacy of power.

In general, suicide bombing is seen as a form of 'harassment' or 'manipulation' of religious teachings. This view thus places suicide attacks as a deviant religious act. The biggest mistake here is that the act and use of violence in the name of religion is still seen from the perspective of religion itself. Therefore, there is a need to shift our attention from the general view of religion as a dependent variable of suicide attacks to the motivational interests behind it.

The political goal behind suicide bombing

Basically, suicide bombings cannot be separated from the motivation of interests by certain political goals, including suicide bombings, which are based on the motivation of jihad to defend religion and the homeland. The desire to achieve certain political goals is the interest of every group, whether it is a group acting on behalf of a religion or a certain political group. There is no goal achievement apart from certain political interests. Whichever strategy is used to achieve a goal, political interests will be behind every strategy used, including suicide attacks. Groups that carry out suicide attacks in the name of jihad, for example, basically have the interest to be considered on the right path or as a group with the mere truth. They feel they have to straighten out what they think is wrong, and only they, themselves, are in a justified position. Therefore, they have to show that they are right. The claim of jihad is a form of struggle towards the truth. Without realising it, the desire to be considered right and to correct wrong things is part of their political interests. So, basically, behind the various suicide bomb attacks that are often leaning on religion, they must be motivated by certain political interests.

Mia Bloom (2005), in this regard, describes the suicide bombing as "*a politically motivated violent attack, carried out in a state of deliberate consciousness by a person who detonates himself along with the selected target*" (Bloom, 2005:76). In line with Mia Bloom, Yoram Schweitzer (2008) puts political motivation into a suicide bombing by defining it as follows

a suicide bombing is a politically motivated violent operation that is carried out consciously, actively, and with the deliberate intention of an individual (or individuals) to commit suicide during operation, along with the target selected. The planned and definite death of the perpetrator due to such an act is a necessary precondition for the success of the operation (Schweitzer, 2008:114).

Bloom and Schweitzer's statements confirm that there is political interest in every suicide bombing. Political interests are the biggest motivation behind suicide bomb attacks, including cases of suicide bombings that are considered to adopt religious teaching.

Several studies have also tried to reveal some of the causes or incentives for someone to commit suicide bombings. Suicide bombings carried out by certain groups or organisations can be triggered by competition between groups for followers, territory, conquest, and claims that the group is not afraid of anything. Therefore, they need to show their commitment to group struggle through violence. This includes religious extremist groups that use suicide bombings. Bloom (2005) further concluded that suicide bombings are often the result of a

"beating" amongst groups. Showing off courage, or you could say carelessness, arises in this process. This research also confirms what has been formulated by Bloom, Schweitzer and other researchers with the same idea, that behind all suicide attacks, there is a certain political motivation.

A few research consider suicide bombing as a strategy for a group to achieve its goals; however, other studies have a different opinion. For the latter, this action is not the initial strategy, but the last choice of a group to defeat its enemy or achieve its political goals when other methods do not work and the results are not as expected (Crenshaw, 2007; Pape 2005). In this contrast, the research will stand on a second opinion, because taking the life of a group member with this action is also detrimental to the group. In the struggle to achieve goals, people will try to minimise the losses that may be suffered and maximise the benefits.

In line with what Pape puts it 'the organisation's decision to use a suicide bomb makes a lot of sense, if the use of a suicide bomb makes the group's success more likely' (Pape, 2005:65). The success in achieving the most possible goals is the main struggle objective of each group. Therefore, whatever strategy is used should provide more likely success for the group.

In addition, suicide bombing is a statement of the perpetrators' total and complete dedication to their group, given that the suicide bombing definitively involves members of the group who lost their lives. This complete dedication adds legitimacy to the actors and their organisations. Thus, they can claim the action and set an example or role model for outsiders and other terror groups. With a suicide bombing, a group loses its members, but with the totality of 'exemplary' in it, they can also use suicide to recruit and add more potential perpetrators.

The specific case of the suicide bombing is also the object of research by Whitehouse and his team at the University of Oxford. Whitehouse (2018) explains that in the case of suicide bombings, the most prominent role in the unification of a person's identity is to be willing to die for the sake of one group and their beliefs. Here he wants to show another side of a person's motivation to participate in a suicide bombing because there is a very high solidarity action in a group. For the sake of the group, people are willing to make sacrifices. This fact was discovered by Whitehouse and his team when conducting a study of extremist groups that carried out suicide bombings. As they claimed, 'the common view that each member of the group is a brother and sister who must share in every event creates a desire to protect each other who can encourage sacrifice ' (Whitehouse, 2018).

Whitehouse's statement also describes the group's interests based on a strong sense of brotherhood, which later encourages someone to commit suicide for their group. It seems like each member of the brotherhood may think that **no one can underestimate my group or persecute my brothers so that I am willing to die to defend them**. Such a desire is probably ingrained in the thinking of some suicide bombers and solidifies them into committing suicide. However, a sense of brotherhood, or a sense of belonging to this group, and the will to fight until the end for their group are part of political interests. Therefore, understanding the emergence of a sense of brotherhood in extreme groups and the political interests behind suicide bomb attacks is more logically acceptable than blaming extreme understanding of religion and always labelling them as terrorists.

In this case, Bloom, Schweitzer and some researchers only look at cases of suicide bombings committed by individuals for the benefit of their group. Suicide bombing cases carried out by an individual unrelated to a particular group escape their attention. Bloom and other researchers have indirectly narrowed the definition of a suicide bombing as a personal act associated with a certain group. According to this research, suicide bombings are not only carried out by someone related to a certain group. Still, they can also be carried out by someone who is not related to a particular group, as in the Nashville bomb case.

Suicide bombings carried out by individuals without being associated with a particular group also have a specific purpose behind their actions. People who kill themselves have a specific motive behind their actions in this unusual way. For example, they want to be in the spotlight so that people will find out why they killed themselves in this way. Could this action be an act of protest over certain conditions? What caused him to choose this method? What is the real purpose behind his actions? These highlights make suicide bombers more widely known than people who simply kill themselves in common ways, such as cutting a vein in the wrist or shooting themselves. The need to be widely recognised and understood by his actions is a particular political motivation behind individual suicide bombings.

Labelling suicide bombing as a terrorist act

Often people condemned suicide bombing and blamed it as a terrorist act. Many state leaders found the opportunity to make a public statement over a suicide bombing case link it to a terrorist act. For example, the President of Indonesia, Jokowi, just after the suicide bombing case in Makassar on March 28 2021, immediately claimed on the same day that it was a terrorist act (Kompas, 2021); even though the police has yet concluded their investigation.

The mass media, too, tend to exacerbate suicide bombing cases by using harsh statements while condemning the act. The media tends to jump to the conclusion that a suicide bombing is carried out by a terrorist group and immediately call for the authorities to take firm action against the perpetrators. Media coverage like this usually leads the readers' mind to link any emerging suicide bombing case with a terrorist act. It is interesting to assess whether such media coverage is beneficial or detrimental to the terrorist group. In this section, the researcher will discuss the advantages and disadvantages of labelling terrorists in every suicide bombing case. Meanwhile, chapter two will elaborate a detailed and in-depth discussion about the relationship between suicide bombings and terrorist groups.

Undeniable, the media has a vital role in campaigning issues of variety groups' interest, including those of terrorist groups. Mass media is an essential element in political communication because political messages cannot quickly and massively reach the broader audience without it. All political stakeholders are well aware of the vital role of the media, so that we often hear of certain political groups trying to build public opinion to gain support for their political decisions. In a democratic political system, the function of the media is as a channel of political communication, which initially originates from outside the media itself and at the same time sends political messages constructed by journalists (McNair, 1999: 11).

For political groups, understanding the value of news is also a determining factor. Their actions receive a large portion of coverage, such as news actuality, news relevance, conflict built in the news, human interest, and impact on readers (Itule and Anderson, 2007: 10). Such benefits are also recognised by the terrorist groups, so that any news covering terrorist acts turns into a free promotion for terrorist groups to the public. In every terrorist act that occurs, the media compete to provide the most up-to-date news about the case investigation, which often presents interviews with leaders of terrorist groups to get the maximum public attention as actual and relevant media. The interview with Osama bin Laden after the September 2011 attacks is one example of this case.

Consequently, interviews with terrorists become a free promotion of terrorist groups. And, the media indirectly become a means for terrorists to build public opinion that their actions are based on ideological and political orientations, not for individual or personal reasons. Indeed, in some terrorism cases, suicide bombers are victims of government actions that carry out military operations against terrorism, or at least members of society, who disagree with the dominant ideology and state policies. What happened to the Taliban group resembled this. However, terrorist groups prefer if their actions framed in mass media coverage as actions

that have political and ideological nuances. Thus, the public, who have similar or close ideological and political interests with the terrorist groups, are interested in joining or even becoming part of them. This analogy is possible given the constantly growing number of terrorist groups, even though other factors influence the development of these groups.

Media critics and hate speech against suicide bombing, which was then labelled as a terrorist act, simultaneously increase public fears and present terrorist as something that should be feared and not be underestimated. Even the media often dramatically portrays suicide bombings by presenting terrifying and sometimes fake or unproven visual images. Consequently, the media shares messages to the public that every act committed by a terrorist group should be taken seriously. Every time a suicide bombing occurs, various media pages become publications for terrorist interests. In the event the media labels suicide bombing as part of a terror act, the labelling has indirectly benefited the terrorist group itself. Although, terrorists will also be disadvantaged by this labelling because they are always under suspicion, limiting their movement to carry out their actions. However, the benefits of free promotions can outweigh the disadvantages they feel. So that terrorist groups will always choose locations for acts of terror that can provide wider access for the media to cover them, such as big cities or open areas.

Creating awareness of the media is also essential to ensure that the press is aware that the criticism, the incitement built by the media every time there is an act of suicide, and the labelling of a terrorist act, is not necessarily factual. As in the case of the suicide bombing in Nashville, USA, Agner Quinn Warner was committing suicide unrelated to any terrorist group. This action is better known as the '*lone wolf*' bomber. This case is a prove that not all suicides are related to terrorist acts. If indeed the suicide bombing is linked to a certain terrorist group, the media needs to avoid getting caught up in providing free promotions for the interests of terrorist groups.

Why suicide bombing?

Individuals who commit suicide consider this method an effective way to die, and there will be no potential failure to commit suicide. Further, they expect committing suicide to make them famous. Such thoughts can be triggered by various media reports about suicide bombing cases, which are often presented in dramatic and detailed ways of messaging. The continuous coverage in the media, which puts the perpetrator in the spotlight, influence people who want

to commit suicide to choose such a method. Maybe there is a thought in the mind of the suicide bomber that if she/he cannot be famous in life, he/she can be recognised by their death, and suicide bombing is one way of getting oneself becoming better known. As in the case of the Nashville bombing (Agner Quinn Warner), according to the FBI, Warner, who has previously known only to the Nashville community, is becoming famous in the other half of the world (FBI, 2021).

As stated earlier, suicide bombing is also a group's last resort to defeat its enemy or achieve its political goals when other strategies do not work, or if the results are not as expected (Crenshaw, 2007; Pape, 2005). If this strategy fails to hit the target or the enemy, the death of the perpetrator -as a member of a certain group- can become an important message to the target that the perpetrator group is serious about their actions. The act shows that they are willing to use the most extreme means to destroy the enemy; therefore, the enemy should be afraid and be more vigilant.

Dr Maria Alvanou (2006), in her paper 'Terrorism through Suicide Bombing', stated that suicide bombing had become the strategy of choice for terrorist groups because there are seven advantages behind suicide attacks. The first is because potential suicide bombers have a high dedication to their mission, so they put the mission above everything else. For them, the strategy used is as important as the mission itself. The second advantage is that the explosion device is delivered precisely to the target, ensuring a direct hit on the enemy or target. Third, suicide bombing enables the attack of more challenging and unusual targets, such as high-profile persons. Fourth, the device has a small vulnerability window and minimises failure of attack or mission. Fifth, no one will be left alive to be interrogated because the perpetrator of this attack will be dead after, breaking the gap in extracting information from the perpetrator. Sixth, there is no burden on friends who are injured, in the sense that no perpetrator has to be treated and become a burden to the group. Finally, the seventh advantage is the psychological impact on the wider public. The aftereffect of suicide bombing spreads fear and intimidate people, while also showing that there is nothing else feared by terrorist to success their mission. The attack shows that terrorists are not afraid to even sacrifice their lives to achieve their goals and, therefore, others should fear what they can do. In the view of suicide bombers, the primary reason to select this strategy is that the probability of a fail attack is very small. Even if the attack on the enemy fails, no perpetrator could be immediately interrogated because they die with the explosion.

Conclusion

From the various discussions above, it can be concluded that the act of suicide attack can be analysed morally and ethically in this study if it occurs in the following conditions.

First, it requires the death of the perpetrator. If the perpetrator does not die, the case will be excluded from this category. If in the act of detonating himself, the perpetrator does not die, then the act cannot be called a suicide bombing but only trying to kill himself. Therefore, the cases used as a reference in this study to analyse moral ethics will only cover suicide bombing cases where the perpetrators dead.

Second, the perpetrator's death occurred because of his/her desire to kill, solidifying the perpetrator in executing a suicide attack. Whether the desire to kill himself or the enemy is not something that will be debated in this research. This research only sees that the death of the perpetrator is due to the perpetrator's desire to kill, which makes the perpetrator morally and ethically responsible for his/her actions.

Third, the suicide bombers in this study are labelled as a murder or a criminal. In this suicide bombing, there has been an act of killing someone or more. A person who puts an end to someone's life must be called a murderer. Even if the only person who dies in a suicide bombing is the perpetrator, he is still said to be a murderer, at least because of killing himself. Suicide perpetrators cannot be called victims for any reason because the perpetrator and victim are two opposite positions, so it would be ambiguous if the perpetrator were called a victim.

The fourth, suicide bombings that can be assessed morally and ethically in this study are those that are not carried out in conditions of war. Cases of suicide in a state of war requires advanced assessment, including the social-humanity conditions, and must meet certain requirements of 'jus ad bellum' (justice before the war), 'jus in bello' (justice during the war), and 'jus post bellum' (justice after the war) (Frowe, 2016). Therefore, suicide attacks in war conditions will be excluded from the discussion of this study

In this research, the political interests behind each suicide attack case will be analysed, including suicides claimed based on certain religious interests. Each group that uses this strategy cannot be separated from the group's political interests. This research will uncover the political discourse behind suicides, such as the desire to be recognised, the desire to be heard, the desire to be seen as a saviour, and even the desire to make changes for certain conditions.

Not all cases of suicide can be said to be terrorist acts. The media labelling suicide as a terrorist act needs to be straightened out. Since media labelling has helped shape the public's

judgment, every act of a suicide bombing must be a terrorist act. Labelling suicide as a terrorist act actually benefits the terrorists themselves more than they do harm to others. The media indirectly becomes a means of promoting terrorist groups, which will claim their actions were carried out because of certain political or ideological motivations. On the other hand, this can even attract fringe groups who feel equal to terrorists and are marginalised by certain circumstances and interested in joining or using the means by terrorists to achieve their goals. So that several cases of suicide bombings emerged after having the idea of carrying it out from the media news. The suicide bomber may think that **if one could not be known while alive, then one would become famous through their death.**

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Victoroff, J., etc, 2012, *Psychological Factors Associated with Support for Suicide Bombing in the Muslim Diaspora*, Journal International Society of Political Psychology, Vol. 33, No. 6, December. (<https://www.jstor.org/stable/23324192>)

Abu Farha, N., 2009, *The Making of a Human Bomb: Ethnography of Palestinian Resistance*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Alvanou, M., 2006, *Terrorism through Suicide Bombings*, Presentation seminar, Cities against Terrorism project, European Forum and Urban Society, German: Tübingen. (https://efus.eu/files/fileadmin/efus/pdf/CATTuebingen_Alvanou.pdf)

Asad, Talal., 2007, *On Suicide Bombing*, New York: Colombia University Press.

Atran, S., 2010, *Talking to the Enemy: Faith, Brotherhood and the (Un) Making of Terrorists*, New York: HarperCollins.

BBC News, 2018, *Bomb attacks on three Surabaya churches: Suicide bomber 'woman with two children*, Indonesia, Mei 13. (<https://www.bbc.com/indonesia/indonesia-44097913>)

Berman, E., 2009. *Radical, Religious, and Violent: The New Economics of Terrorism*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Bloom, M., 2007, *Dying to Kill: The Allure of Suicide Terror*, New York: Columbia University Press.

Clemons, J.T., 1990, *What does the Bible say about Suicide*, Minneapolis: Fortress Press

Crenshaw, M., 2007, *Explaining Suicide Terrorism: A Review Essay*, Security Studies 16, No. 1., (January-March 2007).

Crenshaw, M., 2007, *The Debate Over the Old vs New Terrorism*, Centre for Security and International Cooperation, Stanford: Stanford University.

Durkheim, E., 1951, *Suicide: A Study in Sociology*, New York: Free Press.

FBI, 2021, *Release Report on Nashville Bombing*, Memphis, USA. (<https://www.fbi.gov/contact-us/field-offices/memphis/news/press-releases/fbi-releases-report-on-nashville-bombing>)

Frowe, H. (2016) *The Ethics of War and Peace, An Introduction*, 2nd edition, Oxon: Routledge.

Gill, Paul., 2007, *A Multi-Dimensional Approach to Suicide Bombing*, International Journal of Conflict and Violence, Vol. 1(2), p. 142-159. (DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4119/ijcv-2750>).

Hafez, M., 2006, *Manufacturing Human Bombs: The Making of Palestinian Suicide Bombers*, Washington DC: United States Institute of Peace.

Hafez, M., 2007, *Suicide Bombers in Iraq: The Strategy and Ideology of Martyrdom*, Washington DC: United States Institute of Peace.

Haryatmoko, 2010, *Dominasi penuh Muslihat; akar kekerasan dan diskriminasi (Deception is full of deception; roots of violence and discrimination)*, Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

Hassan, R., 2011, *Suicide Bombings*, London: Routledge.

Horgan, J., 2005, *The Psychology of Terrorism*, London: Routledge.

Hutchinson, W., 2007, *The Systemic Roots of Suicide Bombing*, Research Paper, Wiley Inter Science. (www.interscience.wiley.com) DOI:10.1002/sres.824)

Itule, Bruce D., and Douglas A Anderson., 2007, *News Writing & Reporting for Today's Media*, New York: Routledge

Kobrin, Nancy H., 2010, *The Banality of Suicide Terrorism*, Washington, D.C.: Potomac Books Inc.

Krueger, Alan B., and Jitka Malkova, 2002, "Education, Poverty, Political Violence and terrorism: Is there casual connection", NBER Working Paper, July 4, cited by Mia Bloom, 2007, *Dying to Kill: The Allure of Suicide Terror*, New York: Columbia University Press.

Kumparan news, 2017, "Rentetan Bom Bunuh Diri di Indonesia" (A Series of Suicide Bombs in Indonesia), Mei 25. (<https://kumparan.com/kumparannews/rentetan-bom-bunuh-diri-di-indonesia>)

Lankford, A., 2013, *The Myth of Martyrdom: What Really Drives Suicide Bombers, Rampage Shooters, and Other Self-Destructive Killers*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Liputan6 news, 2002, *Bom Bali rengut 202 nyawa (The Bali bombing claimed 202 lives)*, October 12. (<https://www.liputan6.com/news/read/2117622/12-10-2002-bom-bali-i-renggut-202-nyawa>)

McNair, Brian., 1995, *An Introduction to Political Communication*, London: Routledge

Merari, A., 2010, *Driven to Death: Psychological and Social Aspects of Suicide Terrorism*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Moghadam, A., 2008, *The Globalization of Martyrdom: Al Qaeda, Salafi Jihad, and the Diffusion of Suicide Attacks*, Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Pape, R.A., 2003, The Strategic Logic of Suicide Terrorism, in *American Political Science Review*, vol. 97, no. 3: p. 343-361, Chicago: The University of Chicago.

Pape, R.A., 2005, *Dying to Win: The Strategic Logic of Suicide Terrorism*, New York: Random House.

Pape, R.A. and Feldman, J. K., 2010, *Cutting the Fuse: The Explosion of Global Suicide Terrorism and How to Stop It*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Pedahzur, A., 2005, *Suicide Terrorism*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Post, J. M., 2004, *Leaders and Their Followers in a Dangerous World*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Reuter, Christoph., 2004, *My Life is a weapon*, transl: Helena Ragg-Kirkby, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Strenski, I., 2003, "Sacrifice, gift and the social logic of Muslim' human bombers", *Terrorism and Political Violence*, 15(3): p. 1–34.

Tha'mah, al-Qadah, Muhammad, 2002, *Aksi Bom Syahid dalam Pandangan Hukum Islam (The Syahid Bombing Action in the View of Islamic Law)*, Bandung: Pustaka Umat

The Sun, 2019, *BOMB BLAST Tunisia – 'Suicide bomber blows himself up at bus stop in Tunis' – days after deadly bomb attacks rocked capital*, Jenny Awford (editor), July 2. (<https://www.thesun.co.uk/news/9424256/tunisia-suicide-bomber-blows-himself-up-tunis/>)

Walzer, Michael, 2004, *Arguing about war*, New Haven: Yale University Press

Whitehouse, Harvey., 2018, *Dying for the group: Towards a general theory of extreme self-sacrifice*. Researchgate, Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 41: 1-64. (DOI: 10.1017/S0140525X18000249).

<https://nypost.com/2020/09/16/the-wall-street-bombing-of-1920-100-years-later/>

<https://www.inss.org.il/publication/suicide-bombings-worldwide-in-2019-signs-of-decline-following-the-military-defeat-of-the-islamic-state/>

<https://www.liputan6.com/global/read/3609762/5-8-2003-ledakan-bom-mobil-mengguncang-hotel-jw-marriott-jakarta>

<https://www.liputan6.com/news/read/3983089/polri-pelaku-bom-bunuh-diri-kartasura-masih-amatir>

<https://nasional.kompas.com/read/2018/05/14/14330251/sederet-kasus-bom-di-indonesia-yang-dikaitkan-dengan-jad?page=all>