A. Theoretical Framework

1. Theory of Decision-Making in Crisis

The term crisis comes from the Greek *krinein*, meaning to separate. A medical crisis is a turning point in a serious illness toward either recovery or death. In international politics, the turning point may be between war and peace.

Scholarship and analysis in world politics has stipulated more specific meanings for crisis. At least three alternative definitions deserve attention, i.e. systemic crisis, international confrontation crisis, and governmental decision-making crisis.

In the third orientation to crisis, the focus is on a single country. Governmental or decision-making crisis involve an event or other stimulus that poses a severe problem for the policymakers and possibly their constituents. Definitions of crisis emphasize properties of the situation facing the policymakers, usually as they are perceived by the decision makers. According to Charles F. Herman, they are three properties in crisis situation: high threat, short time, and surprise. More specifically, a crisis involves the combination of high threat to basic goals of the policymakers, short time before the situation evolves in a manner undesired by them, and appearance as a surprise (i.e., a lack of expectation that the situation would occur)¹.

The difference among crisis situation and the other situations in international politics is illustrated in the situational cube following.

To explain the crisis behavior of decision makers, Charles A. McClelland has noted that analysts of international crisis behavior have focused on five approaches: (1) definition of crisis; (2) classifications of types of crisis; (3) the study of ends, goals, and objectives in crisis; (4) decision-making under conditions of crisis stress; and (5) crisis management².

The U.S. government support to Delta 88 was unnatural decision that could not be decided in a normal situation. By supporting Delta 88, the U.S. had clearly abused (ignored) its own decision to ban on military training and weaponry transfer to Indonesia as decided in Foreign Appropriations Act FY 2000 (there are five general provisions about military and weaponry embargo on Indonesia within this act)³. The situation was exactly the same with Charles F. Hermann explanation that said in a crisis situation, with its extreme danger to national goals, allow the decision makers to ignore usual bureaucratic procedures⁴.

By using the theory of decision making in crisis, the writer is going to explain that the U.S. government support to Delta 88 is the result of crisis situation within the U.S. government after 9/11 tragedy. The Black September (9/11 tragedy) is the worst attack from the U.S. ‘enemy’ to the United States homeland since the Second World War that threatened the high-priority goal of the U.S. government, notably its national security. The tragedy had stimulated the security crisis in the U.S. homeland and panic throughout society. The U.S. foreign policy, then, was very affected by the crisis behavior of its decision makers.

Figure 1. Charles F. Hermann’s situational cube representing the three dimensions of threat, decision time, and awareness with illustrative situations from the perspective of American decision-makers.

A. Crisis situation
   High threat/ Short time/ Surprise
B. Innovative situation
   High threat/ Extended time/ Surprise
C. Inertia situation
   Low threat/ Extended time/ Surprise
D. Circumstantial situation
   Low threat/ Short time/ Surprise
E. Reflexive situation
   High threat/ Short time/ Anticipated
F. Deliberate situation
   High threat/ Extended time/ Anticipated
G. Routinized situation
   Low threat/ Extended time/ Anticipated
H. Administrative situation
   Low threat/ Short time/ Anticipate

2. Alliance Theory

According to Robert E. Osgood, an alliance is a “latent war community, based on general cooperation that goes beyond formal provisions and that the signatories must continually estimate in order to preserve mutual confidence in each other’s fidelity to specified obligations.” Thus, alliances have usually been formed in international context in which conflict, or the threat of conflict, is present.

Stephen M. Walt discussed about the background of the establishment of an alliance in his “balance-of-threat” theory of alliance formation. Walt argued that states are primarily concerned with their own security. Therefore, states seek security from threat rather than from power. As result, states tend to balance against strong or threatening powers by allying against them.

However, Randall L. Schweller criticized Walt’s theory and launches a new theory as a refinement of Walt’s. Schweller argued that the emergence of an alliance is because of, among other things, the status quo states. As he illustrated the status quo states in zoology of states as the Lions, he argued that the status quo (satiated) states tend to form an alliance as the self-preservation of values already possessed. Schweller argued that satisfied powers will join the status quo coalition even when it is the stronger side. An alliance for satiated states by this mean will occur automatically as a tool to achieve self-preservation of values already possessed.

By using the alliance theory, the writer is going to explain that the war on terrorism has made the U.S. government feel threatened and less confident so that they attempt to build an alliance with Indonesia regardless the weaponry and military banning on Indonesia. As a result of this alliance, the U.S. government supported the establishment of Anti-Terror Squad Special Detachment 88 within Indonesian National Police. In another side, Indonesia agreed to join with this alliance and received the U.S. government support in the form of the establishment of Delta 88 because of the insecure situation after some bombing blasts that happened in Indonesia. According to George F. Liska, nations join alliance for security, stability, and status.
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B. Hypothesis

By supporting Delta 88, the U.S. government has abused its own decision to give the military and weaponry embargo on Indonesia. However, the U.S. support to Delta 88 is the result of crisis situation within the U.S. government after 9/11 tragedy. Since September 11, 2001, all of the U.S. national interest has shifted into how to win the war against terrorism.

The U.S. government support to Delta 88 is determined by the Indonesian government position as a member of U.S.-led alliance against terrorism. By supporting Delta 88, the U.S. wants to maintain its alliance and gets the support in War on Terrorism so that it will enhance the U.S. confidence in War on Terrorism.

Based on considerations above, the writer proposes two hypotheses:

1. The more crisis situation, the more possible the U.S. government ignores the regulation that is made by itself.

2. The more support to Delta 88, the more confidence the U.S. government faces the War on Terrorism in Indonesia.