

Overcoming the Past; History and Transition of Indonesian Internal Security Infrastructure

John Haller
Graduate School of Public and International
Affairs (GSPIA), University of Pittsburgh
2006-34

About the Matthew B. Ridgway Center

The Matthew B. Ridgway Center for International Security Studies at the University of Pittsburgh is dedicated to producing original and impartial analysis that informs policymakers who must confront diverse challenges to international and human security. Center programs address a range of security concerns—from the spread of terrorism and technologies of mass destruction to genocide, failed states, and the abuse of human rights in repressive regimes.

The Ridgway Center is affiliated with the Graduate School of Public and International Affairs (GSPIA) and the University Center for International Studies (UCIS), both at the University of Pittsburgh.

This paper is one of several outcomes of the Global Security group.

Executive Summary

For Americans Indonesia is probably the least talked about strategically important nation in Asia. It is the most populous Muslim majority nation in the world. Islamic terrorists from Indonesia played key roles in the September 11, 2001 attacks on the United States. The country's importance goes beyond the Global War on Terrorism. Indonesia promises to be an economic powerhouse in the region, combining natural resources, an excellent location, and an ample supply of human capital. The Indonesian government is burdened, however, by a history of state terrorism to maintain order combined with serious short term and strategic threats.

This paper will examine the history of the Indonesian internal security infrastructure and its current transition. I will also examine the possibility that Indonesia can be made a part of a cooperative international internal security regime. Some highlights:

- I. Indonesian political culture is a unique product of native Javanese concepts of government, three years of Japanese occupation during World War Two, and a subsequent colonial struggle against the Dutch. The internal security forces are an outgrowth of this culture.
- II. Security forces during the last thirty years of the country's history practiced state terrorism to maintain order. Democratic reforms were instituted after the 1998 fall of General Suharto.
- III. Current security threats include Islamic terrorism, separatist movements, sectarian violence, and piracy in the Straits of Malacca. A large youth

population bubble and the need for economic growth and education will exacerbate security problems in the future.

- IV. Internal security forces have only recently become cognizant of the threat of Islamic terrorism. However, with modest Western assistance the Indonesian police have had impressive early successes against groups like Jemaah Islamiyah.
- V. Security assistance to Jakarta is complicated by Indonesia's human rights record. However with time, real leadership, and a coordinated engagement plan a transparent, cooperative internal security regime can be built with Indonesia.

Indonesia can best be described as an emerging democracy struggling to overcome its history as an autocracy. The country's security infrastructure has typically reacted brutally to any perceived threat, with little regard for human rights and with almost no oversight. In essence, during the last thirty of the country's history internal security forces practiced state terrorism to maintain order. Indonesia's challenge over next twenty years will be to overcome its legacy as an authoritarian regime while coming to terms with new threats like terrorism. Indonesia is instituting democratic reforms, such as civilian oversight of the security infrastructure, while simultaneously dealing with radical Islamic terrorist groups such as Jemaah Islamiyah. It is in the United States' interest to facilitate this transition and bring the country into a cooperative internal security regime.

Indonesian Political Culture

An independent nation since 1949, Indonesia only had two presidents before 1998. The country's first President, Sukarno, was removed in 1967 with American and British complicity because of his perceived communist leanings.¹ In his stead General Suharto rose to the presidency. Suharto ultimately lost support from elites as well as ordinary Indonesians and was forced to resign in 1998.² The following year Indonesia had its first truly free state elections since 1955.³ Other legal and social reforms have been initiated, including the removal of the military from active participation in political life, reform of the legal system, measures against corruption, and a limited accounting for past human rights violations.

¹ Damien Kingsbury, *The Politics of Indonesia* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 45.

² Damien Kingsbury, *The Politics of Indonesia* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 6.

³ *Ibid.*, 58.

Indonesia's political culture is a product of both its geography and unique history. Indonesia consists of more than 17,000 islands spanning roughly 1.8 million square miles.⁴ Very different cultures have evolved on these islands, thanks in large part to communication difficulties and the islands' differing geography. The development of distinct cultures throughout the archipelago has resulted in a history replete with ethnic and racial divisiveness.⁵ Modern day Indonesia owes its existence to Dutch colonization of the islands and the creation of the Netherlands Indies. The Dutch helped create modern Indonesia by organizing the nation as a single colony, with political power centralized in Jakarta. Resentment of Dutch colonial rule also fostered the unity necessary for Indonesian nationalists to organize and create a nation.⁶

The character of Indonesian government developed both from uniquely Javanese concepts of government and from institutions created during three years of Japanese occupation. Japanese strategy included the development of "quasi-independent puppet states" to relieve garrison commanders of daily administrative duties. To this end they trained Indonesians to do administrative tasks. As the allies advanced, the Japanese established an Indonesian Auxiliary Army, known as PETA,⁷ which later became the basis for the modern Indonesian Army.⁸ In March 1945 the Japanese created the Investigating Committee for the Preparation of Independence and co-opted a prominent

⁴ U.S. Department of State, *Indonesia; International Religious Freedom Report 2003*, <http://www.state.gov/drl/rls/irf/2003/23829.htm>.

⁵ Robert Crigg and Colin Brown, *Modern Indonesia; A History since 1945* (London: Longman Group Limited, 1995), 1-4.

⁶ Robert Crigg and Colin Brown, *Modern Indonesia; A History since 1945* (London, Longman Group Limited, 1995), 8-9.

⁷ Robert Crigg and Colin Brown, *Modern Indonesia; A History since 1945* (London, Longman Group Limited, 1995), 15. General Suharto, the second president of Indonesia, was a battalion commander in PETA and received much of his military training from the Japanese. Angel Rabasa and John Haseman, *The Military and Democracy in Indonesia; Challenges, Politics, and Power* (RAND 2002), 7.

⁸ Damien Kingsbury, *The Politics of Indonesia* (Oxford, Oxford University Press 2002), 29-30.

nationalist leader, Sukarno, to run it.⁹ This committee wrote Indonesia's 1945 constitution, which, while revised in 1999, remains the nation's governing document. The constitution is relatively short, consisting of thirty-seven articles. Enumerated civil rights are absent.¹⁰ It places almost all power in the hands of the executive, although the 1999 amendment does make the president more accountable to the legislative assembly.¹¹

Traditional Javanese ideas about the relationship between rulers and subjects have helped to shape Indonesia. These concepts are based on island villages, which are characterized by mutual aid between villagers and "oneness" between the village leader and the citizens.¹² Sukarno drew on this tradition when he included five bedrock principles, or *pancasila*, in the preamble to the 1945 constitution. These *pancasila* are: social justice, a just and civilized humanity, belief in one god¹³, Indonesian unity, and government by deliberation and consent.¹⁴ There is evidence that these traditional Javanese concepts of "communal harmony, oneness with leaders, and solidarity" led one of the framers of the constitution, Raden Supomo, to reject both democracy and Marxism. Rather, he favored a form of government modeled on Imperial Japan and Nazi Germany

⁹ Damien Kingsbury, *The Politics of Indonesia* (Oxford, Oxford University Press 2002), 30.

¹⁰ The Constitution states; "All Citizens shall be equal before the law and shall have the duty to respect the law and government." Indonesian Constitution art 27. The constitution lists no individual or civil rights. Damien Kingsbury, *The Politics of Indonesia* (Oxford, Oxford University Press 2002), 58.

¹¹ No powers are listed in the original constitution for the legislature and the constitution merely requires that the legislature agree with statutes. Indonesian Constitution art. 20. The president may determine government regulations in lieu of statutes. art 22.

¹² David Bouchier, *Totalitarianism and the Nationalist State, Recent Controversy about the Philosophical basis of the Indonesian State* (Jim Schiller and Barbara Martin-Schiller, eds. Center for International Studies, Ohio University 1997), 157. , Kingsbury at 3.

¹³ The question of Islam's role in politics was early decided in favor of secularism. While Indonesia has a population of 210 million Muslims, Islamic law is only relevant to issues such as divorce and marital property. It is also important to note that to receive their national identity card all Indonesians must declare their membership in one of the five approved religions. Failing to do so may delay receipt of the card or make it impossible. Therefore the actual number of devout Muslims is generally overstated. U.S. Department of State, *Indonesia; International Religious Freedom Report 2003*, <http://www.state.gov/g/drl/rls/irf/2003/23829.htm>.

¹⁴ Damien Kingsbury, *The Politics of Indonesia* (Oxford, Oxford University Press 2002), 31.

as more suitable to the Indonesian national character.¹⁵ This concept of a “national personality” was again cited by President Sukarno in 1959, when he used it as a justification to reject a new constitution that would have reduced executive power.¹⁶

In practice, this deference to traditional governance has manifested itself as corruption, human rights abuses, and unlimited executive power. In 2004 Transparency International, a non-governmental organization that monitors corruption worldwide, ranked Indonesia as 133rd out of 145 countries in terms of corruption, together with Angola and the Congo.¹⁷ It has been estimated that former President Suharto himself accumulated over \$15 billion in private funds¹⁸ and that a total of \$85 billion was illegitimately moved from the banking sector into private hands. An Indonesian court recently declined to charge corruption suspects, because charging all of those involved would have removed most senior level managers and crippled the economy.¹⁹

Indonesia’s political culture of barely limited executive power, combined with the very strong traditional role of the army, has resulted in a security structure marked by little oversight. During the Suharto regime the executive branch, in other words General Suharto himself, oversaw the military and police. Under the 1945 constitution the President is the supreme commander of the armed forces. They report directly to him, and he has the sole authority to declare war.²⁰

¹⁵ Ibid., 160.

¹⁶ David Bouchier, *Totalitarianism and the Nationalist State, Recent Controversy about the Philosophical Basis of the Indonesian State* (Jim Schiller and Barbara Martin-Schiller, eds. Center for International Studies, Ohio University 1997), 157.

¹⁷ Transparency International, *Transparency International Corruption Perceptions Index 2004*, http://www.transparency.org/cpi/2004/dnld/media_pack_en.pdf.

¹⁸ Kingsbury, *Politics in Indonesia*, p. 197.

¹⁹ Ibid, p. 198.

²⁰ 1945 constitution, article 10.

The Indonesian Army, some 308,000 strong,²¹ derives its legitimacy from its history as the savior of the Indonesian nation. The roots of the army are found in the Japanese auxiliary army formed in 1943, and in its subsequent guerilla struggle with the Dutch between 1945 and 1949.²² The Indonesian Army predates the state itself and has long been viewed as its guardian. After 1947, when the Dutch captured the entire civilian leadership and most of Java, the army continued the struggle and eventually defeated the Dutch.²³ As a result of this action and generally weak civilian leadership, the army has enjoyed more credibility than the civilian government. Under Suharto it claimed to be “the only organization competent enough to run the state.”²⁴

The army codified an entire legal framework, *dwifungsi* (two functions) to support its involvement in society and politics. Under Suharto most, if not all, government ministers were generals or former generals, and the military was involved in every aspect of political life. Military officers occupied positions at every level of the administrative structure down to and including village head.²⁵ Until the mid-1990’s the military had one hundred seats in the 500 member parliament, all of which voted under the direction of the Chief of Staff for Sociopolitical Affairs.²⁶ This position was filled by an army general officer and was equivalent in authority to the Chief of the General Staff.

During the Suharto regime police and military doctrine was based on a “continuum of escalating threats” whereby the authorities viewed all threats, from petty crime up to and including global war, as threats against the regime. For Indonesian

²¹ Angel Rabasa and John Haseman, *The Military and Democracy in Indonesia; Challenges, Politics, and Power* (RAND 2002), 48.

²² Rabasa and Haseman, *The Military and Democracy in Indonesia*, 7.

²³ Cribb and Brown, *Modern Indonesia*, 22-23.

²⁴ Kingsbury, *The Politics of Indonesia*, 55.

²⁵ Ibid, Cribb and Brown, *Modern Indonesia*, 140 – 141.

²⁶ Rabasa and Haseman, *The Military and Democracy in Indonesia*, 47.

internal security forces the degree of threat may have varied but the nature of the threat did not.²⁷ The government made the Indonesian National Police (I.N.P.) into another branch of the armed forces in 1960, and the police were placed under the control of the Ministry of Defense in 1967.²⁸ Indonesia's curious military doctrine justified this melding of the police and military, since it recognized no divide between external threats and domestic threats, or between the military and civilian law enforcement.

Brutal History

Control of internal security during the Suharto regime was brutal. In 1965 opposition forces attempted a coup, resulting in the deaths of six generals. The exact circumstances of the coup are still debated, but in any event it was attributed to the P.K.I. opposition party, still loyal to President Sukarno. Army forces loyal to General Suharto subsequently killed 300,000 to 400,000 P.K.I. members and suspected sympathizers.²⁹ Some authorities estimate the true death toll at over a million.³⁰ Throughout the Suharto regime the security forces used practically any method to maintain order. These included covert operations, blackmail, manipulation of competing elites, threats, extortion, kidnapping, employment of hoodlums, and murder.³¹ In some cases the Indonesian authorities resorted to aerial strafing of villages in insurgent areas.³²

²⁷ International Crisis Group, *Asia Report No. 90, Indonesia: Rethinking Internal Security Strategy*, December 29, 2004, 2; see also <http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/world/indonesia/abri.htm>;

²⁸ International Crisis Group, *Asia Report No.13, Indonesia: National Police Reform*, February 20, 2001, 2.

²⁹ Damien Kingsbury, *The Politics of Indonesia* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 47.

³⁰ Ariel Heryanto, *State Terrorism and Political Identity in Indonesia, Fatally Belonging* (London, Routledge Press, 2006).

³¹ International Crisis Group, *Rethinking Internal Security*, at 2.

³² Elizabeth Brundige et. al., *Indonesian Human Rights Abuses in West Papua; Application of the Law of Genocide to the History of Indonesian Control*, Yale Law School, Allard Lowenstein International Human Rights Clinic, April 2004, available at:

http://www.law.yale.edu/outside/html/Public_Affairs/426/westpapuahrights.pdf.

In the 1980's, after the police and army effectively crushed political opposition, they turned their attention to criminal activity. As a result, Indonesia experienced a wave of killings symbolized by the word "*Petrus*", an acronym for *penembak misterius* or "mysterious killers".³³ The Indonesian government formed death squads consisting of members of the police and military, mostly from *Kopasandha*, or paramilitary command units to carry out these killings.³⁴ In 1983 between three and four thousand suspected criminals were killed. The killers typically left their bodies in the streets and fields of Indonesian towns and villages to draw public attention and discourage criminal activity.³⁵

During the *Petrus* campaign, many criminals about to be released from prison were summarily executed on the day of their release. Others committed petty offenses in order to return to prison, where they felt safer.³⁶ In all, approximately five thousand people died as part of *Petrus* between 1982 and 1984.³⁷ After *Petrus*, police practices continued to include torture and a shoot-on-sight policy for suspected criminals.³⁸ The longtime practice of prophylactic killing still resonates in Indonesia. As recently as 1999, militia leaders involved in East Timorese massacres paradoxically requested asylum in East Timor after independence was granted. They feared that if they stayed in Indonesia the army would kill them to prevent them from testifying about human rights abuses.³⁹

Reform

Indonesia's internal security infrastructure is presently experiencing transition, like the rest of the country. The doctrine of *dwifungsi* (two functions) has been

³³ Justus M. van der Kroef, "*Petrus*": *Patterns of Prophylactic Murder in Indonesia*, Asian Survey Vol. 25 No. 7 (July 1985) 746.

³⁴ *Prophylactic Murder* at 748.

³⁵ *Ibid.*

³⁶ *Ibid.* at 752.

³⁷ Kingsbury, *Politics of Indonesia*, at 190.

³⁸ Kingsbury, *Politics of Indonesia*, at 191.

³⁹ *Ibid.*

undermined and barriers erected between the military and civilian life. The Indonesian National Police were separated from the military in 1999 and given new authority for internal security. While the separation of the police is an important step in Indonesia's democratic transition, the lines of authority between the police and military remain blurred.

Various factors began to undermine the *dwifungsi* doctrine throughout the 1990's. The competence and credibility of the civilian government improved, reducing the need for military officers in administrative capacities. The army began to become a distinct caste, which corroded the traditional view of the military as the embodiment of the people. Younger officers began to question whether their intimate involvement in civilian affairs impaired their efficiency as a military force.⁴⁰ Finally, in 1998, the position of Chief of Staff for Sociopolitical Affairs, emblematic of *dwifungsi*, was eliminated. The number of military seats in the legislature was reduced to thirty-eight, and the government plans to eliminate these seats entirely by 2009.⁴¹

The government has initiated other reforms. Civilian defense ministers have been appointed, although it is unclear exactly how much power they have.⁴² The police have been separated from the military and given nominal responsibility for internal security, a job that had previously been exclusively military.⁴³ Partially in response to pressure from the United States, human rights have received more attention. The third standing order of

⁴⁰ Cribb and Brown, *Modern Indonesia*, 152.

⁴¹ Rabasa and Haseman, *The Military and Democracy in Indonesia*, 47.

⁴² Rabasa and Haseman, *The Military and Democracy in Indonesia*, 48.

⁴³ Rabasa and Haseman, *The Military and Democracy in Indonesia*, 45.

Indonesian army officers now includes a duty to “. . . uphold the law and human rights wherever your duty takes you.”⁴⁴

The future of these reforms is unclear. It is unknown whether soldiers will be allowed to vote in return for the military giving up its parliamentary seats. Strong military voting blocks may result in the continuation of a disproportionate military influence. Most importantly, these reforms will impact stability. During Suharto’s “New Order” period, the military had a territorial structure that resulted in a strong military presence in every part of the country. It has been estimated that the military was roughly twice as large as needed to defend against an external threat. It was this large specifically to maintain internal order and security.⁴⁵ The result was an often violent, but generally stable nation. With active ethnic separatist movements, greater pressure from the West on human rights, and the decreased power of the army, it is unknown how stable Indonesia will be in the future.

Police Reform

Because of international and public pressure the government formally separated the Indonesian National Police (INP) from the T.N.I. on April 1, 1999 as part of Indonesia’s democratic reforms.⁴⁶ The I.N.P. remained part of the Ministry of Defense until July 1, 2000, when it began to report directly to the President.⁴⁷

⁴⁴ Available at: <http://www.tni.mil.id/reputation.php>.

⁴⁵ Damien Kingsbury, *The Politics of Indonesia* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 2002), 56.

⁴⁶ *Police Formally Separated from Armed Forces*, BBC Summary of World Broadcasts, April 5, 1999, pt. 3 Asia-Pacific.

⁴⁷ *National Police Separates from Defense Ministry*, The Jakarta Post, July 2, 2000.

The I.N.P. numbered 250,000 in 2001, and the government planned a force level of 300,000 by 2004.⁴⁸ The 2001 force level implied a police to civilian ratio of 1:810, which is quite low by international standards. Even so, the Indonesian National Police are the largest national police force in the world. While other agencies do law enforcement work in Indonesia, they are relatively insignificant next to the I.N.P. For instance, there are 200,000 private security guards, a civil defense force (*Hansip*), and municipal police in Indonesia. While the private security guards (SATPAM) are numerous they are organized and employed by each enterprise or facility requiring physical security. Therefore they have no unity of command. The *Hansip* are volunteers only deployed for emergencies. The municipal police are very small; Jakarta's force numbers only 700. Notably, both *Hansip* and the municipal police may only be armed with clubs or other less than lethal weapons for self defense.⁴⁹ There is no effective separation of police power in Indonesia like that typified by the United States' federal system.

The Indonesian National Police received their mandate from the Second Amendment to the 1945 constitution, passed in the 2000 session of the MPR.⁵⁰ This amendment designated the military's role as "to defend, protect and maintain national sovereignty and unity" and the I.N.P.'s role as "to safeguard security and public order with responsibility for protecting, guiding, and serving the public". During the same session the legislature formally mandated the separation of the police and the military in Decree VI/2000. While it defines neither defense nor security Decree VI/2000 clearly states that the military's job is defense and the police function is security. The decree

⁴⁸ International Crisis Group, *National Police Reform*, at 4.

⁴⁹ International Crisis Group, *National Police Reform*, at 6-8.

⁵⁰ International Crisis Group, *Rethinking Internal Security*, at 2

also requires both services to cooperate with each other.⁵¹ While this decree seems at least somewhat clear, Decree VII/2000, passed during the same session of the MPR, lists among the military's principle tasks to "protect all Indonesians from threats and disturbances to the unity of the people". This language again makes it hard to know which agency has the primary responsibility for internal security.⁵²

The Defense Law, Law 2/2002 of January 2002, specifies that the national security apparatus will be organized according to democratic principles. The T.N.I. Law, passed in September 2004, again blurred lines of responsibility by listing several areas of military responsibility other than external defense, including: overcoming armed rebellion and separatist movements, overcoming terrorist actions, safeguarding borders, executive protection for the president, assisting the police in maintaining law and order, and helping the government guard against piracy, hijacking, and smuggling.⁵³ It also allows military officers to continue to serve on ministerial posts for political and security affairs, the national narcotics agency, and the Supreme Court. These provisions cast some doubt on the abandonment of *dwifungsi*.⁵⁴

While the police do have a legal mandate to handle internal security, they face obstacles to earning the full faith and confidence of the Indonesian people. One of them is psychological. Because of the Army's revered place in Indonesian history, and the historically inferior position of the police, police officers in Indonesia have an inferiority complex. Another problem is corruption. A recent survey found that eighty-three

⁵¹ Ibid at 9.

⁵² Abu Hanifah, *MPR Told to Review Decree on Police and Military Roles*, The Jakarta Post, October 17, 2001.

⁵³ International Crisis Group, *Rethinking Internal Security*, at 11.

⁵⁴ *Military Bill Reflection of Civilian Reluctance to Reform "T.N.I."*, Antara (Indonesia), October 1, 2004 Friday, Nationwide International News, Jakarta.

percent of Indonesian police have had to supplement their income to survive.

Unfortunately one way to supplement income is to accept bribes. Corruption extends to the upper echelons as well, as typified by the actions of Jakarta's former chief of police. Upon retirement in 2002, he personally donated \$574 million worth of cars and motorcycles to his old department.⁵⁵

While the Indonesian government has taken the important step of passing legislation that loosely delegates responsibility, the MPR decrees so far are not specific and in some cases create confusion. They fail to resolve organizational issues, such as which agency is responsible for suppressing insurgencies and terrorism, and when the TNI should aid the police.⁵⁶ Another issue is that President Yudhoyono is currently in sole command of the military and the police and there is no central agency to formulate a coherent policy for internal security and security cooperation.⁵⁷ There is confusion due to conflicting statutes, reviewed above. Therefore many decisions regarding the authority of the police and military are made on an *ad hoc* basis.

After 2000 the government turned responsibility for counterinsurgency in Aceh and Papua over to the INP but this proved to be a fiasco, partly because the police were inadequately trained.⁵⁸ There are tensions involved in counterinsurgency work. On the one hand involving the police in military raids and other forceful measures can compromise the police image of working with the community. On the other hand many are reluctant to allow the TNI to handle these insurgencies because of its tragic human rights record.

⁵⁵ Ibid. at 10.

⁵⁶ International Crisis Group, *Rethinking Internal Security* at 5.

⁵⁷ *National Police Separates from Defense Ministry*, The Jakarta Post, July 2, 2000; *see also*, International Crisis Group, *Rethinking Internal Security* at 5.

⁵⁸ Ibid.

Human Rights and Police Oversight

Legislative decrees stipulate that internal security will be conducted based on democratic principles. However it may be some time before the authorities fulfill this mandate. In November 2000 detachments from police mobile brigades (Brimob) murdered as many as thirty peace protesters in Aceh, and apparently killed as many as nine or ten people per day during this period.⁵⁹ During the April 2003 Wamena incident in West Papua, army raids displaced thousands from their villages, resulting in forty-two deaths in refuge camps. Thirty other suspects were also apparently tortured.⁶⁰

The oversight structure for the police and the military is not solidified. Parliamentary commissions are one possible way to maintain oversight over the police. Technically the People's Consultative Assembly (the Indonesian legislature, or M.P.R) has some oversight ability over the military because it controls the budget. However this oversight has not been very effective because only a portion of the Army's funding comes from the government's allocation. As recently as 2002, for instance, the central government's military budget covered less than one third of the armed forces operational expenses. In lieu of full government funding the T.N.I. owns and operates business ventures to support itself. The Army's business interests in 2002 included insurance, high technology manufacturing, real estate, timber, and golf courses. The military's involvement in the economy is bad for both professionalism and for civilian oversight of

⁵⁹ Kingsbury, *Politics of Indonesia*, at 181.

⁶⁰ Muninggar Sri Saraswati, *Human rights Commission reveals abuses in Papua*, The Jakarta Post, September 3, 2004.

the military.⁶¹ The police have continued this practice, although to a somewhat lesser extent. Police economic interests include a bank, office space in Jakarta, and insurance.⁶²

There is hope that this will change because of the September 2004 T.N.I. law, which stipulates that the T.N.I. must relinquish its business holdings within five years.⁶³ Another possibility is that the executive branch of the government could oversee police operations through an executive council. Presidential Decree No. 17/2005 also established a civilian review board, which began to select members in November of 2005.⁶⁴ While a promising step, the president retains the right to reject members which he finds unsuitable for the panel.⁶⁵ Training provided by the United States and other nations may also improve police practices with regard to human rights. The INP currently receives aid and police training through the U.S. State Department's Antiterrorism Assistance Program (ATA).⁶⁶ The ATA includes training on human rights and modern counterterrorism measures.⁶⁷

Indonesia's internal security apparatus is changing. The government is struggling to reconcile the need for human rights reform and accountability with major security threats. Recent legislative attempts to organize the security infrastructure are hampered by two major factors. First, the law as it stands now is too vague. Second, as a practical matter

⁶¹ Angel Rabasa and John Haseman, *The Military and Democracy in Indonesia; Challenges, Politics, and Power* (RAND 2002), 73 – 78.

⁶² Rabasa and Haseman, *The Military and Democracy in Indonesia*, at 76.

⁶³ *Kostrad Off-loaded Business Units*, The Jakarta Post, April 25, 2005.

⁶⁴ Eva Komandjaja, *Members of the KKN to be Selected*, The Jakarta Post, November 28, 2005.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶⁶ See *Antiterrorism Assistance Program: Report to Congress for Fiscal Year 2004*, United States Department of State, <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/44890.pdf>; Jason Tedjasukmana, *Police Academy I; At an Unusual School in West Java, the U.S. is Training and Arming Indonesian Cops to Fight Terrorism*, Time Asia Magazine, November 17, 2003.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*

the police are too weak in terms of funding and training and therefore require still require assistance from the army.

Threats to Indonesian Security

The Indonesian security apparatus, dominated by the Army, has had to deal with a variety of threats over its history. These threats include violent religious groups and sectarian violence, separatist movements, and pirate attacks on shipping in the region. Only recently has the government also become cognizant of radical Islamic terrorist groups such as Jemaah Islamiyah.

Fighting between Christians and Muslims is endemic to Indonesia. The largest recent incident was in the Moluccas islands. Apparently triggered by an altercation between a Christian bus driver and two Muslim passengers in January 1999, the subsequent rioting and fighting spread throughout the island and resulted in the massacre of 500 Muslims in December of that year. While the Christians initially had the upper hand, the Muslims prevailed when fighters from the Muslim group Laskar Jihad arrived in 2000.⁶⁸

Laskar Jihad was founded by Jafar Umar Thalib in January 2000.⁶⁹ Thalib served in with the Mujahhidin in Afghanistan between 1987 and 1989. After the Afghan war he returned to Indonesia and formed Laskar Jihad. The group's first major action was in the 2000 fighting on the Moluccas Islands. Thalib sent 3000 fighters, who soon seized a police station and obtained weapons and thousands of rounds of ammunition. They

⁶⁸ Angel Rabasa and John Haseman, *The Military and Democracy in Indonesia; Challenges, Politics, and Power* (RAND 2002), 94.

⁶⁹ Zachary Abuza, *Militant Islam in Southeast Asia; Crucible of Terror* (London, Lynne Rienner Publishers 2003) 69.

subsequently ethnically cleansed Christians from the Moluccas Islands.⁷⁰ With an estimated membership of 10,000, Laskar Jihad differs somewhat from other terrorist organizations in that it operates more openly. For instance in 2002 Laskar Jihad had an office in Jakarta and openly solicited funds outside mosques.⁷¹

Similar religious conflict erupted in the Sulawesi district of Poso in 2001. There, as on Molucca, Laskar Jihad reinforced the Muslim population and with small arms, grenade and rocket launchers, and heavy equipment defeated the Christians in fierce fighting. Apparently outnumbered by Muslim fighters in the area, the police and army were generally passive and ineffectual.⁷²

Perhaps the most serious threat to the Indonesian nation is regional separatist movements. The largest such movement is the Free Aceh Movement (Gerakah Aceh Mederka, GAM). The Acehnese have long resisted Jakarta for several reasons: a strong Acehnese religious and ethnic identity, a widespread belief that the central government has deprived Aceh of the benefit of their province's natural resources, resentment of Jakarta's social migration policies, and bitterness over the government's heavy handed counterinsurgency efforts.⁷³

The Acehnese do have legitimate grievances. For example, in the 1990's the central government in Jakarta took all the revenue from oil and gas exploration, with no investment in Aceh. The province was under "operational military status" for ten years, resulting in almost 3000 civilian deaths at the hands of the T.N.I. and other security

⁷⁰ Zachary Abuza, *Militant Islam in Southeast Asia; Crucible of Terror* (London, Lynne Rienner Publishers 2003) 70.

⁷¹ Angel Rabasa and John Haseman, *The Military and Democracy in Indonesia; Challenges, Politics, and Power* (RAND 2002), 84

⁷² Angel Rabasa and John Haseman, *The Military and Democracy in Indonesia; Challenges, Politics, and Power* (RAND 2002), 95.

⁷³ Angel Rabasa and John Haseman, *The Military and Democracy in Indonesia; Challenges, Politics, and Power* (RAND 2002) 100.

forces, and the relocation of some 90,000 people into refugee camps.⁷⁴ The GAM's goal is a free and independent Aceh. GAM's leaders have distanced themselves from more extreme organizations such as Al Qaeda, stating they are a nationalist organization, not a religious one, and emphasizing Acehnese grievances with Jakarta.⁷⁵

The GAM was formed in the 1970s but saw little success under Suharto's restrictive regime. After the removal of the "New Order's" political controls, GAM began again to mobilize popular support and step up attacks. Estimates of the group's strength range from 2,000 to 3,000 fighters. GAM has been fairly discriminating in limiting their attacks to police, military, and economic targets.⁷⁶ The economic targets attacked have included pipelines and natural gas facilities. Gunmen have also hijacked supply trucks carrying goods and employees to natural gas fields.⁷⁷ While there was brief respite in the violence in 1999, when the T.N.I. temporarily withdrew, the East Timorese peace referendum encouraged the Acehnese and led to new violence. In response, by May 2003 the T.N.I. had 50,000 troops stationed in Aceh.⁷⁸ Finally, on August 15, 2005 GAM and the Indonesian government signed a peace deal to end the violence.⁷⁹

In addition to threats from organized terrorist and separatist movements, pirate attacks on private vessels in the Straits of Malacca and nearby South China Sea are a significant problem. The Straits of Malacca is the passage between the Indonesian island of Sumatra and the Malaysian peninsula, and is a critical shipping lane in the region. The

⁷⁴ Zachary Abuza, *Militant Islam in Southeast Asia; Crucible of Terror* (London, Lynne Rienner Publishers 2003) 66.

⁷⁵ Angel Rabasa and John Haseman, *The Military and Democracy in Indonesia; Challenges, Politics, and Power* (RAND 2002) 105.

⁷⁶ Angel Rabasa and John Haseman, *The Military and Democracy in Indonesia; Challenges, Politics, and Power* (RAND 2002) 100-101.

⁷⁷ Ibid.

⁷⁸ Zachary Abuza, *Militant Islam in Southeast Asia; Crucible of Terror* (London, Lynne Rienner Publishers 2003) 67.

⁷⁹ Muningggar Sri Saraswati, *Gov't, GAM Upbeat on Deal*, The Jakarta Post, August 15, 2005.

Straits are transited by approximately 60,000 ships per year.⁸⁰ During the first half of 2005 there were forty-seven attacks committed on ships in the South China Sea and Straits of Malacca.⁸¹

There are indications that many of the pirate attacks over the last several years are linked to terrorist or separatist organizations. Authorities suspected GAM was behind these attacks, mostly based on Aceh's proximity to the affected areas and the nature of the attacks.⁸² GAM's probable motivation was to acquire funds for the continued purchase of weapons. Additionally, authorities suspected that the group attacked oil tankers and natural gas carriers because of complaints over Jakarta's excessive taking of oil and gas profits.⁸³ The pirate attacks may have decreased because of the August 2005 peace agreement with GAM. Of even greater concern than the historically sporadic attacks is the possibility that the more extremist groups will hijack large gas carrying ships and use them as weapons,⁸⁴ or that they will pursue economic terrorism in the region, engaging in more systematic, widespread attacks.⁸⁵

Recognition of the terrorist threat has been conspicuously absent until recently.

The most notable domestic terrorist group in Indonesia is Jemaah Islamiyah. Authorities

⁸⁰ Catherine Zara Raymond, *The Malacca Straits and the Threat of Maritime Terrorism*, Power and Interest News Report, August 24, 2005.,

http://www.pinr.com/report.php?ac=view_printable&report_id=352&language_id=1

⁸¹ *Reports on Acts of Piracy and Armed Robbery Against Ships, First Quarterly Report*, International Maritime Organization (London, May 27, 2005), *Reports on Acts of Piracy and Armed Robbery Against Ships, First Quarterly Report, International Maritime Organization* (London, August 3, 2005).

⁸² Kate McGeown, *Aceh Rebels Blamed for Piracy*, BBC News Online, September 8, 2003; Piracy and maritime Terror in South East Asia, International Institute for Security Studies, July 6, 2004, <http://www.iiss.org/showfreepdfs.php?scID=386>.

⁸³ McGeown, *Aceh Rebels Blamed for Piracy*.

⁸⁴ Ali M. Koknar, *Piracy and Terrorism are Joining Forces and Creating Troubled Waters for the Maritime Industry*, Security Management Online, June 2004,

<http://www.securitymanagement.com/library/001617.html>.

⁸⁵ Osama bin Laden has discussed the importance of hitting nations by attacking their economies. Catherine Zara Raymond, *The Malacca Straits and the Threat of Maritime Terrorism*, Power and Interest News Report, August 24, 2005.,

http://www.pinr.com/report.php?ac=view_printable&report_id=352&language_id=1

have linked this group to attacks that include the October 2002 bombings of nightclubs in Bali, which killed 202 people, and the August 2003 car bombing of the Marriot Hotel in Jakarta that killed twelve people.⁸⁶ Jemaah Islamiyah has its roots in the activities of Abdullah Sungkar and Abu baker Ba'asyir, two Muslim clerics who had been urging that Indonesia adopt sharia (Muslim law) since the 1960's. Although initially formed in 1994, Jemaah Islamiyah did not launch any attacks until 2000, when it launched sporadic attacks in Thailand and Indonesia, including bombings of train stations, hotels, churches, and malls.⁸⁷ The authorities did not attribute these attacks to a single group, and there was no confirmation of J.I.'s existence until the November 2001. At that time U.S. authorities in Afghanistan captured and interrogated Mohammed Aslam bin Yar Ali Khan, a member of J.I.'s Singapore cell. He disclosed the existence of the organization.⁸⁸ In large part J.I.'s goals mirror those of Al Qaeda. Jemaah Islamiyah is seeking the establishment of one large Islamic state which would encompass Malaysia, Indonesia, Singapore, Brunei, and southern parts of the Philippines.⁸⁹

The roots of Jemaah Islamiyah and other extremist groups, as well as their links to Al Qaeda, stem largely from the war in Afghanistan against the Soviet Union.⁹⁰ The struggle against the Soviets spawned the development of extremist Islamist groups in two ways. First, it inspired Muslims in Southeast Asia and elsewhere to believe they could

⁸⁶ M. Taufiqurrahman, *First JW Marriott bomb suspect goes on trial in Jakarta*, The Jakarta Post, January 27, 2004.

⁸⁷ Zachary Abuza, *Militant Islam in Southeast Asia; Crucible of Terror* (London, Lynne Rienner Publishers 2003) 127 153.

⁸⁸ Zachary Abuza, *Militant Islam in Southeast Asia; Crucible of Terror* (London, Lynne Rienner Publishers 2003) 127 156.

⁸⁹ Alfonso T. Yuchengo, *Islamist Terrorism in Southeast Asia, Issues and Insights No. 1-03*, Pacific Forum CSIS, January 2003; Zachary Abuza, *Militant Islam in Southeast Asia; Crucible of Terror* (London, Lynne Rienner Publishers 2003) 127; Rabasa and Haseman at 84.

⁹⁰ Zachary Abuza, *Militant Islam in Southeast Asia; Crucible of Terror* (London, Lynne Rienner Publishers 2003) 125.

fight secular states and win. Second, the guerilla war against the Soviets provided Islamists with military training and experience.⁹¹ The Afghan war also helped extremists form networks with other like-minded individuals. There is even an organization, Group 272, for Indonesian veterans of the Afghan war.⁹² After the Afghan war, many of these fighters returned home to Indonesia committed to starting jihads against their own secular national governments. Many founded new *madrassas*, or Islamic schools, to indoctrinate and recruit members.⁹³ These schools currently number 37,362 in Indonesia, of which only 8.6 percent are under government control.⁹⁴

The political difficulties inherent in controlling Islamic terrorist groups in a nation of 210 million Muslims have historically made Indonesian leaders very reticent to broach this issue. The transitional nature of Indonesia's security and political institutions in the mid to late nineties also constrained the government's policy options. Combined, these factors have made Indonesia very sluggish in its response to terrorism.

An incident that occurred in May 2002 is illustrative of the country's aversion to recognizing the terrorist threat. In an attempt to determine whether U.S. claims about terrorism in Southeast Asia were credible, Indonesia's vice-president, Hamzah Haz, invited the leaders of several terrorist organizations to his residence for discussions. Attendees included JI leader Abu Bakar Bashir and Laskar Jihad leader Thalib. After four hours of discussion Haz emerged from the meetings to declare that there was no credible terrorist threat in Indonesia and that these organizations only urged the inclusion

⁹¹ Zachary Abuza, *Militant Islam in Southeast Asia; Crucible of Terror* (London, Lynne Rienner Publishers 2003) 11.

⁹² Zachary Abuza, *Militant Islam in Southeast Asia; Crucible of Terror* (London, Lynne Rienner Publishers 2003) 10.

⁹³ Zachary Abuza, *Militant Islam in Southeast Asia; Crucible of Terror* (London, Lynne Rienner Publishers 2003) 13.

⁹⁴ Zachary Abuza, *Militant Islam in Southeast Asia; Crucible of Terror* (London, Lynne Rienner Publishers 2003) 10-13.

of religion into life in Indonesia.⁹⁵ Five months later terrorists blew up nightclubs in Bali, killing 202.

Other events have threatened to ignite the flames of extremism in Indonesia. When the United States invaded Afghanistan in October of 2001, there were widespread protests in Indonesia, including threats by extremist Islamic groups to conduct violent “street searches” against Westerners. This led to a significant drop in tourism, Indonesia’s strongest industry.⁹⁶ Throughout this period, President Megawati Sukarnoputri had to walk a fine line between alienating religious leaders in Indonesia and working with the United States and other Western nations against terrorism. She visited Washington shortly after September 11, 2001, and met with Bush administration officials. After she returned home religious leaders criticized Sukarnoputri for her show of solidarity with the United States. She subsequently issued a purposefully vague, but pointed, statement condemning Western use of violence against terrorism. Her declaration was a thinly veiled reference to the U.S. invasion of Afghanistan. At the time, many Indonesians thought that Israel or the CIA had engineered the World Trade Center attacks to justify the invasion of Afghanistan and to discredit Islam.⁹⁷

As a result of President Sukarnoputri’s political problems with the Muslim community, Indonesia faced Western criticism for being generally passive with regard to terrorism. Sukarnoputri’s cabinet advisors differed in their approaches to Western pressure. Many argued that she should stay neutral or criticize Western actions because

⁹⁵ Nicholas Khoo, *Constructing Southeast Asian Security: The Pitfalls of Imagining a Security Community and the Temptations of Orthodoxy*, Cambridge Review of International Affairs, vol. 17 No. 1, April 2004, 140.

⁹⁶ Tatik S. Hafidz, *Assessing Indonesia’s Vulnerability in the Wake of the American Led Attack on Iraq*, After Bali, The Threat of Terrorism in Southeast Asia (Kumarr Ramakrishnas and See Seng Tan, eds., Institute of Defense and Strategic Studies 2003).

⁹⁷ Hafidz, *Assessing Indonesia*, at 385.

she needed support from Indonesia's Muslims. Others argued in favor of what became known as the "Musharaff Scenario" whereby Indonesia might be able to extract financial benefits from the West in exchange for cooperation on terrorism.⁹⁸

Watershed

Terrorism suddenly became a real concern to Indonesia's leaders after the October 12, 2002 bombing of nightclubs in Bali. Risking criticism from Islamic hardliners, Sukarnoputri quickly welcomed foreign assistance.⁹⁹ The Australian Federal Police (AFP) were the first to provide help. By 3:00 AM on October 13, 2002 two liaison officers from the AFP, already stationed in Bali, were helping the INP investigate the blasts.¹⁰⁰ The AFP's most significant contributions were in the areas of forensic investigation and disaster victim identification (DVI), a process that identifies victims based on dental records and examinations.¹⁰¹ Because of the large number of victims, teams from Sweden, Taiwan, and Japan also arrived on the scene and assisted with DVI and crime reconstruction.¹⁰²

While technical assistance from Australia and other nations was vital to apprehending those responsible for the Bali Bombing, credit for the actual investigation work must go to the Indonesian National Police. Authorities arrested the first suspect, a mechanic named Amrozi bin Nurhasyim (Amrozi) on November 5, 2002. Additional

⁹⁸ Hafdz, *Assessing Indonesia*, at 387.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.* at 388.

¹⁰⁰ John Lawler, *The Bali Bombing, Australian Law Enforcement Assistance to Indonesia*, *The Police Chief* (International Association of Chiefs of Police) vol. 71, No. 8., August 2004.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*

¹⁰² Group Captain Christopher Griffiths, *Aspects of Forensic Responses to the Bali Bombings*, Australian Defense Forces Health, September 2003, 4 (2) 50-55, available at: http://www.defence.gov.au/dpe/dhs/infocentre/publications/journals/NoIDs/adfhealth_sep03/ADFHealth_4_2_50-55.pdf.

arrests were made on November 21, December 4, and January 12, 2003.¹⁰³ Thirty-three suspects in total were arrested in connection with the attack. By August 2004 the government obtained death sentences for three of the terrorists, life imprisonment sentences for three more, and lesser convictions for the rest.¹⁰⁴ The timely investigation and subsequent arrests were important moral boosters for the Indonesian National Police, only separated from the military in 1999.

Few in Indonesia expected the INP to find and convict those responsible for the killings in Bali. In fact, at the time of the initial arrests many thought that the INP had resorted to their old practice of simply fabricating evidence.¹⁰⁵ However, on February 18, 2003, the police staged an “open theater” on television. They forced the younger brother of the first suspect, Ambrozi, to publicly show how he had assembled the bombs.¹⁰⁶ Indonesian authorities have skillfully used the media by airing public confessions of the terrorists on television.¹⁰⁷ Official use of the media in this fashion has shown the Indonesian people the nature of the threat. It has also helped to silence the conspiracy theorists who saw terrorist organizations in Southeast Asian as a Western plot.¹⁰⁸

¹⁰³ IFP article page two.

¹⁰⁴ Police chief magazine page 2.

¹⁰⁵ Hafidz, *Assessing Indonesia*, page 391.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid* at 390, see also; Mark Bowling, *Bali Bombing Suspect Gives Extraordinary Confession*, Australian Broadcasting Service; Lateline, November 13, 2002., Daljit Singh, *ASEAN Counter Terror Strategies; How Effective*”, *After Bali*, page 203. Jordanian officials used the media in a similar fashion after the November 12, 2005 attack in Amman, when they televised the confession of a failed suicide bomber.¹⁰⁶ According to Jordanian Deputy Prime Minister Marwan Muasher “[i]t is very important for the public to know exactly what happened. I think the public was a bit relieved [by the televised confession] also to know that there were no Jordanians involved.” Subject to individual countries’ legal or procedural restrictions, the Jordanian and Indonesian use of the media should be a model. Authorities in both countries used the media to proactively, effectively communicate with the public, rather than allowing media coverage to drive their response. Cable News Network, *Jordanian Failed Bomber Confesses on TV*, November 14, 2005, available at <http://www.cnn.com/2005/WORLD/Meast/11/13/jordan.blasts/>.

¹⁰⁷ ., Daljit Singh, *ASEAN Counter Terror Strategies; How Effective*”, *After Bali*, at 203.

¹⁰⁸ Singh, page 203, *Didghit* at 393.

Many have praised Indonesia's prosecution of those who directly carried out the Bali and Marriot Hotel Bombings. However, the country has been criticized for its handling of higher-level terror suspects affiliated with JI. For instance, Abu Bakar Ba'asyir, who most analysts agree is the founder and spiritual leader of JI, was acquitted in 2004 of heading JI. In March of 2005, he received a sentence of thirty months for "engaging in an evil conspiracy" to carry out the Bali and Marriott Hotel attacks.¹⁰⁹ Both Australia and the United States expressed disappointment at this short sentence.¹¹⁰ This light punishment might explain why the United States has yet to release Hambali, the operational leader of JI, to Indonesian custody.¹¹¹

Indonesia has also made some efforts to reform the Pesentren, or Islamic boarding schools that many observers view as terrorist breeding grounds. In 2005 the United States delivered literature regarding America to several Pesentren and some of their students took advantage of opportunities to visit the United States.¹¹² Religious leaders at Islamic Pesentren have reacted to the criticism of their schools. In the fall of 2005, the Indonesian Islamic Boarding School Cooperation Body (BKSPPI) established the first-ever English language Human Rights Public Speaking Competition.¹¹³ It appears clear that reform of the madrassah and pesantren must come from within the Muslim community, and that direct, heavy-handed criticism of the Islamic school system risks backlash. After the October 12, 2002 bombings, Islamic leaders objected strongly to the

¹⁰⁹ *Dismay over Bali Bombing Sentence*, CNN World Online, March 3, 2005.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹¹ Raymond Bonner, *Letter from Indonesia; Cooperation on Terror Seems a One-way Street*, International Herald Tribune, September 8, 2005.

¹¹² Yuli Tri Suwarni, *Pesentren Face Hard Times After Spate of Terrorist Attacks*, The Jakarta Post, November 2, 2005.

¹¹³ Yuli Tri Suwarni, *'Pesantren Face Hard Times after Spate of Terrorist Attacks*, The Jakarta Post, November 2, 2005.

portrayal of Pesantren as terrorist “breeding grounds” simply because some of the suspects had been educated in these schools.¹¹⁴

While the police authorities’ performance has been good, this does not address the strategic picture. In the long term the Indonesian government’s central problem is how to pursue a vigorous campaign against Islamic terrorism without alienating the Islamic community and fostering blowback. In addition Indonesia is also suffering from a “youth bubble”¹¹⁵ and a lackluster economy. These conditions could easily lead to the future radicalization of large numbers of Islamic youth, unless the government addresses issues like education and economic growth. It remains to be seen if Indonesia can enact long term anti-terrorism policies that are tough, sensible, and politically feasible.

Conclusion

Some authorities have maintained that the brutal, authoritarian nature of Indonesia’s internal security forces was peculiar to the Cold War.¹¹⁶ If that is true, it is unlikely that Indonesians will see the return of state terrorism. Either way, the Indonesian military and police are definitely on the road to reform. While the country has many security problems, they would have to become extremely serious to prompt a return to aerial strafing of villages and “prophylactic killing”. Jakarta finally reached a peace agreement with Indonesia’s largest separatist movement, GAM, in 2005. Islamic extremism and terrorism are certainly serious threats. However, Muslims in Indonesia tend to be more diverse than those in the Middle East, worshiping in unorthodox ways

¹¹⁴ Hafidz at 391.

¹¹⁵ In 2005 thirty percent of Indonesia’s population was under fourteen years old. U.S. Census Bureau, International Database.

¹¹⁶ See Ariel Heryanto, *State Terrorism and Political Identity in Indonesia, Fatally Belonging* (London, Routledge Press 2006), 3.

that are colored by local and historical influences.¹¹⁷ This casts some doubt on the ability of radical Islamists to incite a mass movement that could overthrow the government.

Indonesia will most likely continue to make modest reforms to its internal security infrastructure. With the current level of occasional, but uncoordinated Western assistance the country will continue to have sporadic success against Islamic terrorism. At the same time the government will have to address serious strategic issues, like the youth bubble and the imperative for economic growth. While current trends are not entirely gloomy, failure to include Indonesia in an internal security regime would be a tragic loss of opportunity in Southeast Asia. For Indonesia could be brought into an effective, transparent global counterterrorism regime. It is only a matter of political will on the part of policymakers in the United States and Europe.

Indonesia's historic autocracy and human rights abuses have earned it criticism which has hampered efforts to train Indonesian forces. The United States sharply curtailed International Military Education and Training (IMET) funds after the massacre of civilians on East Timor in November 1991. As a result, between 1993 and 2002 Indonesian soldiers had little exposure to U.S. military training, including human rights training.¹¹⁸

In the wake of violence on East Timor in 1999, the United States Congress passed the Leahy Amendment to the 2000 budget. This amendment halted funding for IMET unless the president certifies that Indonesia has made progress on human rights

¹¹⁷ One analyst estimates that less than twenty percent of Muslims in Indonesia would qualify as strict Muslims by the standards of Arabic Islam. See Ralph Peters, *Also Known as Indonesia, Notes on the Javanese Empire* (Quantico, Marine Corps Warfighting Laboratory, 2001).

¹¹⁸ Rabasa and Haseman, *The Military and Democracy in Indonesia*, 114.

violations.¹¹⁹ President Bush made the certification in 2002 and total U.S. security assistance, including IMET and other programs amounted to \$47.5 million from 2001 to 2004.¹²⁰ United States Senator Patrick Leahy summed up the feelings of many human rights advocates towards Indonesian authorities when he stated that the United States was “. . . kidding ourselves, the way we did for forty-seven years” with the notion that we could reform the human rights performance of Indonesian security forces.¹²¹

However the alternative, withholding assistance as a punitive measure, comes with more serious problems. It is incompatible with the imperative to foster transnational cooperation to counter transnational threats like terrorism. This argument also assumes that ending roughly \$12 million per year in assistance can really change behavior. This is somewhat dubious, especially given the partial independence of Indonesian forces from their own government’s fiscal budget.

It is possible for the United States to encourage reform through training and assistance, and ultimately to bring Indonesia into a cooperative security regime. To do so will require training dramatically more Indonesian forces and greatly increasing the interaction between Indonesian officers and civilian officials and their peers in the United States and Europe. Assistance efforts to date have been patchwork, and conducted by

¹¹⁹ The amendment bans funding for IMET unless the president certifies that Indonesia has made progress on human rights violations. Rabasa and Haseman, *The Military and Democracy in Indonesia*, 139. President Bush subsequently made the certification.

¹²⁰ Government Accountability Office, *Southeast Asia; Better Human Rights Reviews and Strategic Planning Needed for U.S. Assistance to Foreign Security Forces*, Report GAO-05-793, July 2005.

¹²¹ *Senator Patrick Leahy Remarks on Indonesia Foreign Operations Bill markup Senate Appropriations Committee*, Office of Senator Patrick Leahy, July 18, 2002. It is notable that in the Dili massacre of 1991 which prompted the withdrawal of IMET to Indonesia, none of the Indonesian officers involved had been part of the IMET program. However, several of the officers who investigated the incident were IMET graduates. Government Accountability Office, *Security Assistance; Shooting Incident in East Timor, Indonesia*, Report GAO/NSIAD-92-132FS, February 1992.

individual United States government agencies with little coordination.¹²² From 2001 to 2004 security assistance to Indonesia consisted of twelve distinct programs run by the Departments of State, Justice, and Defense. In its recent report the Government Accountability Office lamented the lack of a clear, strategic, multi-year plan to coordinate assistance.¹²³

Clear strategic coordination of security assistance would accomplish two objectives. It would help bring Indonesia into a security regime, and it would reassure critics of Indonesia's human rights record. One option would be to place all training of security forces under the Department of Defense's IMET program. For the INP, a similar program could be coordinated through the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center in Georgia, currently used by U.S. federal law enforcement agencies. These options would deprive some Indonesian security forces of very specialized training, like the counter drug training done in Indonesia by the United States Drug Enforcement Agency. However, in the short term it is more important that large numbers of Indonesian personnel receive solid, basic training and learn about the role of the military and police in a democratic society. At the same time they will be building personal ties with their peers in the United States and other countries. It is these ties that can foster lasting cooperation at the operational level.¹²⁴

Indonesia has had a very poor human rights record and an internal security infrastructure that relied on simple, brutal measures to respond to all threats to security.

¹²² See, *Southeast Asia, Better Human Rights Reviews and Strategic Planning Needed for U.S. Assistance to Security Forces*, Government Accountability Office, Report GAO-05-793, July 2005.

¹²³ Ibid.

¹²⁴ For a detailed study of how IMET helps foster understanding and respect for the rule of law, see John A. Cope, *International Military Education and Training; an Assessment*, McNair Paper 44 (Washington D.C., Institute for National Strategic Studies, National Defense University, October 1995).

Only recently has the country's civilian leadership instituted meaningful reform and oversight of the police and military. Facilitating this transition will require meaningful engagement and real leadership, but the rewards will be even greater. The United States can and should help the country overcome its past and build a new cooperative internal security regime in the region.

Glossary

Antiterrorism Assistance Program – A security assistance program administered by the United States Department of State

Dwifungsi – Two functions, this term refers to the dual role of the military in Indonesia

G.A.M – *Gerakah Aceh Mederka* or Free Aceh Movement, a separatist organization that advocates statehood for the Indonesian territory of Aceh.

Hansip – Civil Defense Forces

I.M.E.T. – International Military Education and Training, a program run by the United States Department of Defense

I.N.P. – Indonesian National Police

Jemaah Islamiyah – “Islamic Community” A Southeast Asian Islamic terrorist group thought to have strong links to Al Qaeda.

Koppasandha – Indonesian Special Forces, implicated in some of the more serious human rights violations

Laskar Jihad – “Holy War Warriors” A terrorist organization in Indonesia that first came to prominence during sectarian violence on the Moluccas Islands in 2000. Founded by Jafar Umar Thalib

Madrassa – Arabic word for school or learning center

M.P.R. - *Majelis Permusyawaratan Rakyat*, the People’s Consultative Assembly. This is the Indonesian legislature.

Pancasila – The five guiding principles in the preamble to the 1945 Indonesian constitution. They are: social justice, a just and civilized humanity, belief in one god, Indonesian unity, and government by deliberation and consent.

Pesantren – Indonesian word for schools with an Islamic focus

PETA – Auxiliary army formed by the Japanese in Indonesia during their occupation

Petrus – An acronym for *Penambak Misterius*, or mysterious killings. This term refers to the death squad killings of suspected criminals in the 1980’s.

SATPAM – Private security forces

Suharto, Haji Mohammad (June 8, 1921 -) the second president of Indonesia and formerly a Lieutenant General in the Indonesian Army, Suharto ruled from 1967 to 1998.

Sukarno (June 6, 1901 – June 21, 1970) – The first president of Indonesia, ruled from 1949 to 1967.

Sukarnoputri, Megawati - daughter of Sukarno, she was Indonesia's president from 2001 to 2004.

T.N.I. - *Tentara Nasional Indonesia*, the armed forces of Indonesia. Formerly the military was called the *Angkatan Bersenjata Republik Indonesia*, or A.B.R.I..

Yudhoyono, Susilo Bambang – A former army officer and the current president of Indonesia.

Appendix

Indonesian Internal Security, A Timeline

