

Military Politics, Ethnicity and Conflict in Indonesia

Ikrar Nusa Bhakti, Sri Yanuarti and
Mochamad Nurhasim

CRISE WORKING PAPER No. 62
January 2009



© Centre for Research on Inequality, Human Security and Ethnicity

DFID Department for
International
Development *The UK Department of International Development (DFID) supports policies, programmes and projects to promote international development. DFID provided funds for this study as part of that objective, but the views and opinions expressed are those of the author(s) alone.*

Military Politics, Ethnicity and Conflict in Indonesia

Abstract

This paper outlines the history of the military in Indonesia and its role in politics, as well as in perpetrating violence. Since its inception at the time of Indonesian independence, the military has had a defined role in both defence and politics, particularly during the Sukarno (1945-1965) and Suharto eras (1966-1998). While this role has been somewhat reduced in the Reform era (beginning mid-1998) through various stages of military reform, many of the underlying principles of the involvement of the military in politics still remain in reality. Given the historical dual roles of the military, it has been able to set agendas and perpetrate violence without civilian oversight. In Papua, this has led to various acts of violence perpetrated by the military and the police, often tapping into local ethno-religious relations. However, this has been less overt than the violence occurring in Aceh.

In Aceh, the initial response of the military in the 1950s to Acehese resistance was more accommodating and less violent than the military operations in the 1970s to the 1990s. While the negotiations in the 1950s were a drawn-out process, it enabled a peaceful agreement to be reached without extensive use of force. However, in later periods the orchestrated use of violence in Aceh left locals seeing the military from Java as colonisers. Furthermore, these repressive strategies did not elicit peace agreements but rather stimulated further rebellion, which some argue was part of a broader military strategy of creating tension and maintaining a role for the military in domestic security provision. In Maluku, clashes between the military and police, as well as bias on the part of different sections of the armed forces towards each of the warring communal groups, increased the levels of violence and prolonged the conflict. Today, the role of the military in politics has been significantly reduced by disbanding the political sections of the military in the regions and a number of other reforms. However, many of the original principles of the functions of the military remain, whereby they can still be involved in politics and elections by resigning from their military posts.

The Authors

Ikrar Nusa Bhakti, Sri Yanuarti and Mochamad Nurhasim, are researchers in the Centre for Political Studies at the Indonesian Institute of Sciences (LIPI) and can be contacted at ikrar@cbn.net.id, yanuc2000@yahoo.com, hasim_nur@yahoo.com,

Table of Contents

List of Acronyms and Abbreviations.....3

1. Introduction5

2. Overview of the Role of the Military in Indonesian Politics: 1945-20045

3. Ethnicisation of the Military and the Violent Conflict in Maluku, Papua and Aceh.....11

 3.1 The role of the Military in Handling Separatist Sentiments in Papua 1998-2004 ..11

 3.3. TNI and Their Involvement in the Maluku Conflict.....23

 3.3.1 Violence in the Maluku Conflict and Military Ethnicity.....25

4. New National Military Laws and the Future of Military Politics29

5. Bibliography34

List of Acronyms and Abbreviations

ABRI	<i>Angkatan Bersenjata Republik Indonesia</i> – Indonesia Armed Forces (in use 1965-1999)
AMN	<i>Akademi Militer Nasional</i> – National Military Academy
ASNLF	Acheh Sumatra National Liberation Front
BKR	<i>Badan Keamanan Rakyat</i> – People’s Security Board
Brimob	Mobile Brigade (police special forces)
DI-TII	<i>Darul Islam</i> – The Indonesian Islamic Army
DOM	Region of Military Operations
DPR	<i>Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat</i> – House of Representatives
DPRD	<i>Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat Daerah</i> – Regional Parliament
FKM	Maluku Sovereignty Front
Foreri	<i>Forum Rekonsiliasi Rakyat Irian Jaya</i> – Reconciliation Forum for the People of Irian Jaya
GAM	<i>Gerakan Aceh Merdeka</i> – Free Aceh Movement
GPBK	<i>Gerakan Bersenjata Pengacau Keamanan</i> – Armed Insurgency Movement
GPK	Security Disturbance Movement
GPLHT	Hasan Tiro Illegal Insurgency Group
GPLK	Illegal Insurgency Movement
GSA	<i>Gerakan Separatis Aceh</i> – Aceh Separatist Movement
JI	<i>Jemaah Islamia</i>
JIM	Jakarta Informal Meetings
Kasad	Army Chief of Staff
KNI	Indonesian National Committee
Kodal	Field control command
Kodam	Regional Military Command
Kopassus	Military Special Forces Command
Kopkamtib	Operational Command for the Restoration of Security and Order
MPR	<i>Majelis Permusyawaratan Rakyat</i> – People’s Consultative Assembly

NKRI	<i>Negara Kesatuan Republik Indonesia</i> – Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia
OJM	<i>Operasi Jaring Merah</i> – Red Net Operation
OPM	<i>Operasi Papua Merdeka</i> – Free Papua Movement
Paskha	Air Force Special Forces
PDI-P	Indonesian Democratic Party of Struggle
PDMD	Regional Military Emergency Authority
PDP	<i>Presidium Dewan Papua</i> – Papua Presidium Council
PDS	<i>Penguasa Darurat Sipil</i> – Head of the Civil Emergency
PDSP	<i>Penguasa Darurat Sipil Pusat</i> – Commander of National Civil Emergencies
Pilkada	District/municipal head elections
Polda	Regional police
Polres	District police
POLRI	Indonesian Police
Polsek	Sub-district police
PPKI	<i>Panitia Persiapan Kemerdekaan Indonesia</i> – Committee for Indonesian Independence
Sishankamrata	<i>Sistem Pertahanan dan Keamanan Rakyat Semesta</i> – People’s Defence and Security System
TBO	<i>Tugas Bantu Operasi</i> – Assistant Operators
TKR	<i>Tentara Keamanan Rakyat</i> – People’s Security Army
TNI	<i>Tentara Rakyat Indonesia</i> – Indonesian National Army (post-1999)
TRI	<i>Tentara Rakyat Indonesia</i> – Indonesian People’s Army/ <i>Tentara Republik Indonesia</i> – Republic of Indonesia’s Army

Military Politics, Ethnicity and Conflict in Indonesia

By Ikrar Nusa Bhakti, Sri Yanuarti and Moch. Nurhasim

1. Introduction

The political role of the Indonesian military (previously ABRI, now TNI)¹ since the fall of Suharto in May 1998 has been significantly diminished through structural and legislative change, and to some extent public oversight. During the New Order era under the Suharto administration and the Old Order era under the Sukarno administration, the Indonesian military had a strong and pervasive political role through its presence in various civil institutions, the state apparatus and the business sector. However, its role has been reduced since 1998 when the political and business roles of the military were publicly challenged and its need for reform highlighted. In the aftermath of the 1999 general election, the position of the TNI-Police faction in parliament through reserved seats in each layer of government was reduced and following the 2004 general elections was completely erased.

Amidst these changes and the pressure to end the powerful political role of the military, Indonesia has faced a serious and fundamental problem of domestic security provision. Internal conflict, both in the form of vertical conflicts (e.g. separatism in Aceh and Papua) and horizontal conflicts (e.g. social violence, communal, religious, and/or ethnic conflicts) has occurred in different parts of Indonesia. This paper therefore seeks to examine how the changes in the political role of the military have become an obstacle to the settlement of domestic security problems. It does so by endeavouring to tease out the relationships between the changes in the role of the military, the problems of ethnic identity and the conflicts taking place in Indonesia (Papua, Aceh and Maluku), and the way the military handles these conflicts.

2. Overview of the Role of the Military in Indonesian Politics: 1945-2004

The Indonesian military was originally created from peoples' armed forces. Following Indonesian independence, proclaimed on 17 August 1945 and recognised by the Dutch in 1949, there were no regular or systematised national armed forces. But the new republic needed military officers during the interim struggle with the Dutch in order to maintain its independence. The first organisation of armed forces was established on 22 August 1945 and called the *Badan Keamanan Rakyat* (BKR/People's Security Board) aimed at 'maintaining security together with the people and related state bodies'. The BKR was placed under the Indonesia National Committee (KNI) which had a hierarchical structure comprising the Central Indonesia National Committee in Jakarta and the Regional Indonesia National Committee in the regions (Bhakti et al, 1999b: 55-57). BKR is a third type of military organisation which Amos Perlmutter calls a 'revolutionary soldier' (Notosusanto, 1991:16). The BKR was the founding institution of the contemporary military, made up of soldiers from the struggle for independence and was 'borne from the womb of the Indonesian revolution'.

At that time, the main personnel of the militia were officers educated by and inherited from the colonial forces, including both the Dutch and the Japanese. Dutch-inherited officers were educated in the tradition that the army should be politically neutral and professional. The officers trained by the Japanese, meanwhile, were not trained to be a professional army with a separation between military duties and politics. They were therefore considered to be a

¹ Since 1 April 1999, the name ABRI (Indonesian Armed Forces) for the Indonesia military has no longer been used and the Indonesian Police (POLRI) was officially separated from ABRI. The name ABRI was replaced by the Indonesian National Army (TNI). The term ABRI is no longer used in articles, newspaper reports or academic papers.

political army. As the military developed, many armed forces' personnel, including both Dutch-trained and Japanese-trained officers, followed the Japanese tradition and became members of political parties or organisations. These officers took the position that they did not need to separate their professional duties from their political activities within society (ibid). This characteristic of the armed forces was thus established as a consequence of the existence of BKR, which remained inseparable from state politics after Indonesian independence. Salim Said (2001:2) has asserted that TNI actually 'created itself' rather than being created by the state, in terms of establishing its own ideological underpinnings. This occurred because the very soldiers who fought for independence and later reorganised themselves to form the military base of the nation had a prior history of being members of political organisations and the militia wings of political parties during the Dutch colonial era. Such evidence affirms that long before the 'middle way' concept was introduced by A.H. Nasution in 1958, which allowed for an overlap between the political and defence force roles of the armed forces (see below), elements of BKR were dominated by the view that there was no need for a separation between the army and politics. Nasution was in fact just reaffirming the existing view in the post-independence period.

At the birth of Independence, PPKI (*Panitia Persiapan Kemerdekaan Indonesia* – the Committee for Indonesian Independence)² suggested that the newly formed BKR should be eliminated. President Sukarno eventually changed the name of BKR to *Tentara Keamanan Rakyat* (People's Security Army/TKR) on 5 October 1945 marking the birth of the Indonesian military. This date even today is considered the anniversary of TNI. In the above context, civil supremacy seemed dominant since the establishment of the BKR and eventually the TKR. Civil supremacy is defined as the submissiveness of the military to civilian political policies. The struggle of the people against the return of Dutch colonial power in the post-declaration of independence period was the main factor behind the change of the TKR to the *Tentara Rakyat Indonesia* (Indonesian People's Army/TRI) on 1 January 1946. One month later, on 24 January 1946, TRI was changed again to the *Tentara Republik Indonesia* (Republic of Indonesia's Army/TRI). With the structural merger of some of the militia into TRI, the name of TRI was again changed to *Tentara Nasional Indonesia* (Indonesian National Army) on 5 May 1947 (ibid: 59).

As noted above, in the Indonesian military's political history, the idea of involving the military in politics existed amongst Japanese-trained officers and within the militia which then became a part of TNI. Two important events further laid the foundation for the role of the military in politics: first, the declaration of martial law/'military emergency' in 1957, which allowed the military to be active in politics as they ran the state of emergency; and second, the introduction of the 'middle way' concept in 1958 by Army Chief of Staff AH Nasution. The middle way basically provided the opportunity for TNI to become involved in the government on the basis of the "*Asas Kekeluargaan*" principle (the principle of collaboration and working together). Nasution introduced this concept in order to prevent the military from instituting a *coup d'état* against the civilian government (Samega et al, 1998: 59), with the view emerging publicly at the *Dies Natalis* (Birth Day) speech of the *Akademi Militer Nasional* (National Military Academy/AMN) in 1958. The military was expected not only to act as an instrument of the government which was dominated by civilian politicians, but more importantly, Nasution wanted an absolute role for the military in politics:

"In line with military operations against separatism-DI/TII, RMS, PRRI-PERMESTA³; Nasution gradually adjusted the guerrilla war doctrine with the needs of anti-

² PPKI was founded on 7 August 1945 as a continuation of the BPUPKI (Badan Penyelidik Usaha Persiapan Kemerdekaan Indonesia). BPUPKI was a Japanese-organised committee for granting independence to Indonesia. Independence was announced on 17 August 1945, two days after Japan surrendered to the allied forces.

³ Three rebellions against the government in the 1950s

guerrilla elements, including the doctrine of nurturing the regions. Later, efforts were made to create a military structure which was parallel to the civilian authority structure.”(ibid: 15)

Nasution’s ideas had further laid the foundation for the military’s political role, and these were later developed by the New Order, which created parallel military and civilian (governance) structures. At the same time, it must be acknowledged that civilian politicians in the post-independence period were weak, forcing members of the military to seek roles beyond simply being ‘tools of civilian government’. The military’s role in guarding state sovereignty against internal factional politics between political parties was the main argument providing support for their excessive role.

Suharto took power following the political violence of 1 October 1965 as the representative of the military (from this point on the military was referred to as *Angkatan Bersenjata Republik Indonesia* - Indonesian Armed Forces, ABRI). He then used the military to build personal power and a dictatorship. To support his efforts, Suharto established a pyramid base whereby he controlled all resources of power, as David Jenkins noted:

“...Soeharto had spent the years since 1965 extending and defending his power base and he was now very much more than the *primus inter pares* in a collegial army leadership. Soeharto stood at the apex of the pyramid; his appointees sat in each of the key executive, legislative, and judicial branches of government. He dominated the cabinet and the state bureaucracy. He dominated the armed forces (*Angkatan Bersenjata Republik Indonesia*, ABRI) and had hand-picked both the minister of defense [sic] and the commander of Kopkamtib, the powerful Operational Command for the Restoration of Security and Order. He dominated the People’s Consultative Assembly (*Majelis Permusyawaratan Rakyat*, MPR) –the body that continued to reelect him for successive five-year terms – and had selected a trusted military colleague to preside over its deliberations” (Jenkins, 1997:13)

Suharto made use of the military as a ‘Trojan horse’ for his interests. He also established a parallel structure of military and civilian authority in order to control the bureaucracy.

Harold Crouch argues that for the four years following 1965 one of Suharto’s priorities was to strengthen his control over ABRI (1986:346). Suharto got rid of ‘Sukarno-ism’ and the extreme anti-Sukarno elements among his political opponents. He also reduced the autonomy of the three pillars of the armed forces, i.e. TNI-AL (Navy), TNI-AU (the Air Force), and POLRI (the National Police). This process was completed through the full integration of ABRI under a single command at the end of 1969. By integrating each of the commands into ABRI under his own control, ABRI became one of the main pillars of Suharto’s power. It is not surprising that at the time ABRI, together with Golkar (the Functional Group party) and the bureaucracy, became Suharto’s power support. Suharto’s political role grew and he used it to suppress parties critical of him but also to maintain his power.

During Suharto's reign, the dual function (*dwifungsi*) of the military as both a defence force and a participant in civilian politics and governance was legitimised by Law No. 20/1982 on State Defence Regulations. Article 26 and 28 of the law plainly regulated the National Armed Forces' non-military roles. Article 26 stated that the armed forces functioned as defence force and social force. Article 28 (1) stated that the armed forces acted as a social force by being a motor and ‘stabiliser’ that, with help from other social forces, held the responsibility to secure and strengthen the nation’s struggle for independence and the prosperity of the people. Article 28 (2) stated that in order to execute the aforementioned actions, the armed forces were directed to participate actively in development and to strengthen national defence by participating in the decision-making process related to state and government affairs and to

develop *Pancasila*⁴ Democracy and government practices and development in accordance with the 1945 Constitution. This law strengthened the legal basis for the armed forces' dual function. Furthermore, the dual function of the armed forces was strengthened in Law No. 2/1988 on Soldiers in the Armed Forces, in which Clause 6 mentioned that a soldier carries out his dual function as a defence force and a social force (Samego et al, 1998: 95-6).

Jenkins (1997:47-48) similarly identifies the political space occupied by ABRI under Suharto:

“The Department of Home Affairs – the other great bastion of Soeharto’s rule – was of equal importance in any Golkar victory. Presided over by the blunt-speaking Amir Mahmud and with an influence which extended down to virtually the village level, it was dominated by military men serving in *kekaryaan* [functional] roles....This gave the military 89 percent of the top slots in Home Affairs (up from 29 percent in 1966 and 71 percent in 1971)....In 1977, twenty-one of the twenty-seven – that is, 78 percent – of provincial governors were army men....In May 1977, the month of general election, more than half (155) of Indonesia’s 294 *bupati* [regents or district heads] and mayors were ABRI men...”

The implementation of this dual function of the military has resulted in the involvement of armed forces in non-military fields, often being referred to as it’s ‘stabiliser’ (agents of stability) and ‘dinamisator’ (agents of mobilisation and change) role. Members of the military filled posts in the cabinet, the embassy, and the seats in the DPR (*Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat* – House of Representatives), MPR (*Majelis Perwakilan Rakyat* – People’s Consultative Assembly), and the DPRD (*Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat Daerah* – Regional Parliaments), as well as being appointed to the positions of mayors and governors. Furthermore, there was a significant presence of the armed forces in the cabinet of the day. For example, in the *Kabinet Pembangunan* I (first New Order cabinet, the First Development Cabinet), eight (24%) of the 23 cabinet members were from the Armed Forces. In the second, third, fourth, fifth and sixth cabinets, six, 15, 17, 14 and 10 positions respectively were held by the armed forces (Samego et al, 1998: 99). Meanwhile, the governors appointed from the armed forces significantly decreased from 70% at the beginning of 1969 to 40% at the end of 1994, which was the first long-term development period of 25 years (PJP I). The numbers of ambassadors from the armed forces also decreased from 44.4% to 17% over the same period (ibid: 99).

Even so, the existence and role of the armed forces continued to the end of Suharto’s reign, although the number of key government positions which they held varied over time, as is evident in Table 1 below. In the DPR, the number of armed forces members increased. In 1967, there were 43 members from the armed forces amongst the 350 members. In 1968, this number increased to 75 persons (18%) out of 414 members. Through Law No. 16/1969, it was decreed that members from the armed forces should number 75 out of a total of 460. After the issue of UU No. 2/1985, the number was increased to 100 persons (20%) out of 550 members (ibid). This number remained high until the election in 1992. By 1997 the number of armed forces in the national parliament had decreased to 75 persons (Samego et al, 1998: 99), and was halved by 1999 to only 35. In the 2004 elections, the armed forces no longer had seats in the parliament.

⁴ The five principles of the Republic of Indonesia acknowledge commitment to belief in one supreme God, a just and civilised humanity, national unity, and people’s rule through consultation and representation, to achieve social justice for all Indonesians.

Table 1: Number of ABRI seats in the House of Parliament in 1967-1999

Year	ABRI seats	Total seats
1967	43	350
1968	75	414
1969	75	460
1985	100	550
1992	100	550
1997	75	550
1999	35	550

The increase in the number of ABRI-held positions in the national parliament mainly took place between 1969-1992 in order to control the DPR and to maintain Suharto's power. As a result, the Indonesian military became less professional in its key role of providing defence but more professional in politics and the business sector.

The pervasive role of the military created huge problems during the political crises of the late 1990s. The removal of the socio-political role of the armed forces following the fall of Suharto in 1998 became a complex problem. The 'Reformists' – especially the student movement which came to the fore in 1998 – demanded the removal of the armed forces from politics as soon as possible. This discourse surrounding the removal of the armed forces from politics continued to grow during this period due to the effects of the armed forces' dual function on democratic life in Indonesia. However, the ruling civilian government – especially the legislative branch and then-president B.J. Habibie – took an approach of gradual change in accordance with the 'new paradigm' of the armed forces issued through the Armed Forces Chief of Staff, Wiranto. This gradually reduced the role of the armed forces in civilian politics. On 2 October 1998, the Headquarters of the Armed Forces issued a white paper titled *ABRI Abad XXI: Redefinisi, Reposisi, dan Reaktualisasi Peran ABRI dalam Kehidupan Bangsa* (ABRI in the 21st Century: Redefinition, Reposition, and Reformulation of the Role of ABRI in National Life). In this, ABRI analysed and evaluated its role in the past and attempted to define its future role in national life. In the 1999 elections, ABRI was banned from participating and were to remain neutral. The bureaucracy, which had been a driving force during every election in the New Order era, was also to remain neutral,

After the 1999 elections, ABRI's political role was gradually reduced. On 1 April 1999, the National Police were separated from the Indonesian Armed Forces and the name ABRI was changed to TNI. In addition, the Central Political and Social Council (Wansospolpus) and the Provincial Political and Social Council (Wansospolda) were abolished. Furthermore, ABRI Political and Social Staff (Syawan) were changed to Territorial Staff and ABRI general staff and those in the Kamtibmas (Coordinating Body on Assistance for National Stability) and the Functional Guidance Body (Babinkar) were forced into retirement or given new positions. The regional, district, and sub-district level social and political staff commands of the military were abolished while the ABRI factions in the national, provincial and district parliaments was gradually phased out. Organisational relations between the military and the Golkar party were cut and equal relations were maintained with all parties. At the same time, the military were committed to remaining neutral in general elections (Bhakti et al 1999a: 139). The reform era supported these changes that put an end to the social role of the armed forces in Indonesia, particularly through the efforts of the student movement. However, there are still critics who argue that while the socio-political role of the military has changed, this has not ended their role in the business sector.

One problem which has proved difficult to solve in the internal reform of the TNI has been that of the territorial command structure. Territorial commands were one of the instruments used by the New Order regime to create a 'military' government shadowing the civilian

government. Despite the reform initiatives mentioned above, this territorial command is still active. It seems that the armed forces have been unwilling to let go of territorial commands, agreeing only to let go of territorial counselling which became the purview of regional civilian governments. Furthermore, the difficulty of dismissing the territorial command lies in the fact that it is connected to the myth of NKRI (*Negara Kesatuan Republik Indonesia* - Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia). The TNI continues to believe that territorial commands ensure that NKRI will be maintained. It is not surprising that the reform era has failed to bring the abolition of territorial commands – on the contrary, the government has increased the number of territorial commands by reviving the regional command (Kodam) I Iskandar Muda in Aceh and the formation of Kodam Pattimura in Maluku.

During the Reform era, there has been debate over the form of the Indonesian state, specifically whether the unitary state is still suitable for Indonesia or whether there is an alternative, more appropriate, model, such as federalism. During these debates, the military always argues that NKRI is a given, and cannot be changed. For TNI, NKRI is more than just a myth – it is also a non-negotiable concept. However, the reformists believe other forms are possible. Amien Rais (ex-Speaker of the House), for instance, once stated that he would like to propose a federal rather than unitary state formation. The problem is not only one of discourse, as the reality has been that no changes to state formation have taken place, despite four rounds of amendments to the 1945 constitution

Army General (Ret.) Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono, who won the 2004 presidential elections, has rejected the idea of abolishing TNI territorial commands. According to Yudhoyono, the territorial command structure is part of the 'People's Defence and Security System' (*Sistem Pertahanan dan Keamanan Rakyat Semesta* – Sishankamrata) which exists in order to develop Indonesia's defence system⁵. He argues that the territorial command structure is a legal part of the *sishankamrata*. In the New Order era, however, the territorial command structure only existed (as a part of the system) so that the army could continue monitoring the movements of members of the community as part of military control over any emerging criticism towards the government of the day.

In fact, Law No. 3/2002 on National Defence clearly states that development of Indonesia's defence structure in the future should pay more attention to Indonesia's geographical status as a maritime-based country. Instead the military has further developed the territorial command structure, both by establishing new regional commands (Kodam) and by setting up 22 new territorial command bases in March 2005. A variety of Indonesian civil society groups, including non-government organisations (NGOs) and civil society organisations (CSOs) argue that the territorial command structure is no longer relevant given the political transition in Indonesia, which has shifted responsibility for internal security to the police. For example, the Coalition for Democracy at the Hotel Santika in Jakarta on 3 March 2003 voiced their criticism of the Draft Law on TNI (which later became Law No. 34/2004) because it allowed for the expansion of military commands again rather than minimising the role of the military *vis-a-vis* the police.⁶ The Union of Social Democrats (*Uni Sosial Demokrat*) and KontraS (*Komisi untuk orang hilang dan Korban Kekerasan* – The Commission for "Disappeared" and Victims of Violence), for example, rejected the government plan for reinstatement of the Iskandar Muda Regional Military Command in Aceh.⁷ Students in Malang who formed the Malang Opposition Front (*Barisan Oposisi Malang*) also rejected the

⁵ See Kompas (19 June 19, 2003) 'Jangan Buat Pernyataan yang Mengarah ke Fitnah'

⁶ The people involved in the Coalition for Democracy include Todung Mulya Lubis, Munir, Kusnanto Anggoro, Fajrul Falaakh, Ikrar Nusa Bhakti, Syamsuddin Haris, Eddy Prasetyono and Chusnul Mar'iyah. Sinar Harapan (March 4, 2003)

⁷ http://www.unisosdem.org/ekopol_detail.php?aid=45&coid=3&caid=3, accessed 1 June 2008 07:36:04 GMT. See also, KontraS (6 February, 2002) and Kompas (27 February, 2002)

proposal for the Draft Law on TNI to the parliament, arguing that it strengthened the territorial command structure⁸.

However, such organisations have also failed to suggest new alternatives for a defence and security model suitable for Indonesia or do not have the requisite skills to do so. Such weaknesses are constantly highlighted by the military when discussing abolition of the territorial command structure. For example, the Armed Forces Commander General Endriartono Sutarto has stated that:

“We always ask for other parties to assist us in finding a solution to this problem. It is important, remembering that now; the ratio of the military personnel to the size of Indonesia’s territory, which needs to be secured, is no longer adequate. I do not reject the idea that the territorial command may be perceived as no longer relevant. However, it should be noted that the area of our territory is so vast, equivalent to the distance from London (England) to Baghdad (Iraq). In the meantime, our soldiers consist of only 350,000 personnel. The ratio of our military strength is one of the lowest.”⁹

This has been the ultimate reason used by the military to convince others that the territorial command structure should be maintained.

Law No. 3/2002 on State Defence outlines the basic principles on the position of TNI in the democratic system as well as on its role and function following the separation of the defence and security functions. Nonetheless, the separation of TNI and POLRI had led to problems in solving the communal and separatist conflicts in post-Suharto Indonesia. The strategy of retaining the territorial command of TNI is also linked to the conflicts still occurring in some parts of Indonesia. The National Police, who were initially given authority to handle internal security, have been unable to manage the conflicts fully. There are concerns that if the territorial commands were shut down, chaos would result; without the necessary commands to control emerging conflicts, the security of the region would automatically be somewhat disturbed, and this would generate chaos in the internal organisation of TNI itself. Thus, to date there have been no moves towards abolishing the territorial commands. Within this context, the role of TNI in providing defence and security services, especially in conflict resolution, is described in the following sections.

3. Ethnicisation of the Military and the Violent Conflict in Maluku, Papua and Aceh

3.1 The role of the Military in Handling Separatist Sentiments in Papua 1998-2004¹⁰

The province of Papua – previously known as Irian Jaya, West Irian and Dutch New Guinea – is the most eastern province of Indonesia. Papua has been considered part of Indonesia since 1 May 1963 based on an Agreement signed between the Government of Indonesia and the Netherlands in New York on 15 August 1962. Indonesia’s sovereignty over West Irian strengthened after the controversial Act of Free Choice (*Penentuan Pendapat Rakyat—Pepera*) was carried out in the region in July-August 1969. Since that time, the province has experienced continual separatist movements, which until 1998 were sponsored by the Free Papua Movement (*Operasi Papua Merdeka—OPM*). The OPM itself was founded in 1964. The movement began in 1965 in Ransiki, Manokwari, when Indonesia, especially in West

⁸ Tempointeraktif.com, 6 August 2004.

⁹ *Kompas*, 13 December 2004.

¹⁰ This part of the paper is mostly taken from research conducted by Ikrar Nusa Bhakti in 2004 on Army and Police Roles in Handling Internal Security 2000-2004 under the Center for Political Research (*Pusat Penelitian Politik-P2P*) with the National Institute of Sciences (LIPI), which is discussed in P2P-LIPI publications in 2004.

Irian, was experiencing a crisis in meeting the everyday needs of the population. Since then the separatist movements of the OPM have emerged and carried out sporadic activities, attacking military and police posts, sabotaging strategic and vital projects/infrastructure/public facilities in Freeport, attacking transmigration residential areas, or conducting other forms of semi-military agitation, which caused people to seek refuge from Irian Jaya in Papua New Guinea in 1969, 1971, 1977, 1982, with the greatest outflow of Papuans in 1984/85 (Osborne, 1985: xiii, 11, 44).

ABRI (including the police) handled the problem of separatist movements during the New Order era in both persuasive and repressive ways (Osborne, 1985). Some of the negative policies include torture, burning down villages, and killing village heads in relation to the 1977 legislative elections, mainly in the Central Mountains (Osborne, 1985). These negative policies (many more of which are discussed below) have in some quarters been considered to be a part of a larger strategy to stimulate domestic insecurity and justify the continued intervention by the military in domestic issues.

The persuasive policies of the government/ABRI took the form of invitations and other initiatives to persuade OPM to halt their activities and stop their struggle to separate from Indonesia. These included giving amnesty to members, providing guidance for them, and facilitating their return to the community. A concrete example of the policy, amongst others, is the Smiling Policy released by the Minister of Defence/Armed Forces Commander General M. Jusuf in the 1980s, which was developed in Papua by the Pangdam (Regional Commander) Cenderawasih at the time, Major General Raja Kami Sembiring Meliala, in the form of Territorial Counselling in Irian Jaya.

When Police Inspector General Made Mangku Pastika became the head of regional police in Papua in 2001-2002, the police enforced an "Affectionate Approach" to persuade the people of Papua not to undertake activities that might affect the security situation in Papua. The new approach began with the elimination of physical punishment in the police academy in Papua and a prohibition on using violence when investigating suspects or the people of Papua. Mangku Pastika even employed 500 local youths from Papua out of a total 600 new police personnel he recruited to serve as police in Papua. This was a sea change in policy, never having occurred previously in Papua. The Heads of Regional Police who have followed, i.e. Inspector Police General Budi Utomo and Inspector Police General Timbul Silaen, have continued this policy, albeit with decreasing numbers of local youths being recruited. The era of Made Mangku Pastika represented a decline in the militaristic approach of the police.

Then-president B.J. Habibie's approach following the end of the New Order was to prevent the separation of East Timor spilling over and triggering the loss of Irian Jaya from Indonesian territory. While the referendum given to the people of East Timor was a government decision agreed to by both military and civilian government representatives, albeit heavy-heartedly, many of the elites in Indonesia are still traumatised by the loss and believe there should be no other separation.¹¹ Thus, it is not surprising that President Habibie and the following president, Abdurrahman Wahid, were often reminded by their assistants and the MPR not to make any statements referring to referendums for the agitating provinces of Aceh and Papua.¹²

At the beginning of the reform period, a number of intellectual elites, civil society organisations, and cultural and religious figures from Irian Jaya established what was called the Reconciliation Forum of the People of Irian Jaya (*Forum Rekonsiliasi Rakyat Irian Jaya*—

¹¹ Such views were discussed at the Foreri and Jakarta Informal Meetings in the early stages of the reform period.

¹² The paragraphs below have been elaborated in Chauvel and Bhakti (2004).

Foreri). Foreri succeeded in building cooperation with the office of the National Secretariat to organise a series of dialogues known as Jakarta Informal Meetings (JIM) in the office of the vice president in early November 1998. These public figures from Papua, members of the executive and legislative arms of the national government, and intellectuals from Indonesia attended the meeting.¹³ The meeting between the elites of Papua – who called themselves Team 100 – with President B.J. Habibie was held in February 1999 in Jakarta.

At the meeting, Tom Beanal (Papuan Amungme ethnic group leader), the Leader of Team 100, read out a political statement in front of the president and several cabinet members. The statement outlined Papua's requests to separate itself from the Republic of Indonesia, to establish a transitional government in Irian Jaya under the auspices of the United Nations, and that, if necessary, the UN should take part in an international dialogue between the government of the Republic of Indonesia and the people of Papua. Even though he acknowledged the bitter experience of the Papua people during the New Order era, President B.J. Habibie gave no response whatsoever to the demand from the Papua political elite, but rather sought to persuade Tom Beanal that Irian Jaya stay united with Indonesia.

Abdurrahman Wahid, who was democratically elected in the General Session of the MPR in 1999, experienced the same dilemma in enforcing an accommodative policy for Irian Jaya. He sought to find a win-win solution to accommodate the different and conflicting perspectives on nationalism: Indonesian nationalism and Papuan nationalism. However, Abdurrahman Wahid's accommodative style in handling Papuan demands was in conflict with the statements of Vice President Megawati Sukarnoputri and the then-coordinating minister for social and political affairs, Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono, who did not support such measures.

On 1 December 1999, the *Bintang Kejora* (Morning Star) flag, the national flag of Papua, was raised in Jayapura without any efforts by the security apparatus to bring it down. When visiting Jayapura to witness sunrise at the beginning of the new millennium, on 1 January 2000, Wahid gave a new name to the province, Papua. He also gave permission for the *Bintang Kejora* flag to be raised below the Indonesia red-and-white national flag as a cultural rather than a political symbol. At the same time, he allowed demands for independence to be put forward under the principle of freedom of speech. However, he stated that when it came to establishing a country inside a country, it was his duty under his mandate from the MPR to maintain the territorial integrity of Indonesia in any possible way and in accordance with the constitution.

During Wahid's presidency, the Papuan elites were able to hold a *Musyawahar Besar Papua* (Papua Grand Consultative Meeting) on 23-26 February 2000, which resulted in formation of the Papua Presidium Council (*Presidium Dewan Papua* – PDP), chaired by Theys Hiyo Eluay (a key leader of the independence movement) with Tom Beanal as the vice chairperson. The second National Papua Congress followed this in May-June 2000. Even though Wahid did not attend the congress, the Indonesian central government contributed Rp1billion. The congress was called the Second National Congress of Papua because in October 1961, the political elites of Papua conducted a National Congress of Papua, which resulted in adoption of the following: first, "Hai Tanahku Papua" or "Oh My Land Papua" as the national anthem; second, the slogan "One People One Soul" as the national slogan; third, the Mambruk Bird as the national symbol; and fourth, the Morning Star flag as the national flag, which the Dutch colonial government permitted to be raised below the red-white-blue flag for the first time on the December 1, 1961.

¹³ One of the authors of this paper participated in the JIM, and this section of the article represents the observations of the author on what happened in the series of dialogues.

Wahid's approach, which allowed such liberties, not only caused confusion within the security apparatus in terms of handling freedom of movement in Papua, but also gained very sharp criticism from members of the MPR. The policy was considered too accommodative, and may have been one of the most important factors leading to the fall of Wahid in mid-2001. At the Annual Meeting of the MPR in 2000, members criticised Wahid's policy for endangering the national unity of the Republic of Indonesia. The MPR demanded that Wahid crack down on separatist movements and implement special autonomy in Papua. At the time a draft law on special autonomy had already been proposed to the DPR by some parts of Papuan society and Papuan intellectuals. After being discussed in parliament, the draft itself became Law No.21/2001 on Special Autonomy for the Province of Papua, which was signed by President Megawati Sukarnoputri in early 2001.

Meanwhile, repressive policies were being carried out by the armed forces in the form of military operations to stop the sporadic emergence of OPM separatist movements. These included murdering those who fought back, torturing, and even burning down villages and camps where OPM members were hiding out. Neither POLRI nor TNI (the Armed Forces) provided room for the operation of movements categorised as subversive or attempting to separate Papua from Indonesia. In many of the incidents, there was a similarity between the old (New Order regime) and new (reform era) military approaches. There were similar patterns of violence carried out by society, TNI and POLRI officers. People attacked the police and military stations, killing TNI/POLRI members; and there was retaliation from the officers in the form of sweeping, killing, oppression, and so on. In several cases, mistakes were made and officers shot the wrong targets, including people carrying out social and political activities unrelated to OPM activities, which were later on labelled as separatist movement activities. Many of the cases of military and police actions against local communities were about defending their illegal business interests. Later people who opposed these activities were labelled or stigmatised as OPM supporters, sympathisers or members (Chauvel and Bhakti, 2004).

All this was taking place at the time when Wahid was implementing an accommodative policy toward the Papua elites. The most concrete example of the armed forces' failure to provide room for separatist movements was when security officers hauled down the Morning Star flag by force in Wamena on October 6, 2000. This caused what was a vertical conflict between security officers (representing the state) and society to turn into a horizontal conflict between the native people of Wamena and the newcomers/outside, including Papuans who came from outside Wamena. Military officers used propaganda and other initiatives to blame outsiders for some of their own activities, all the while arming the outsiders and initiating campaigns to encourage the people of Wamena to resent the newcomers. Thirty people died in a clash between these two groups. However, this, the largest incident of communal conflict in Papua, did not spread to other areas in Papua because civil society public figures and traditional and religious leaders staged interventions to stop Papua escalating into a widespread communal conflict area along the lines of Maluku (Chauvel and Bhakti, 2004:30-31).

During the last week of November in the same year, the police arrested five leaders of PDP – Theys Eluay, Thaha Al Hamid, Priest Herman Awom, Don Flassy, and John Mambor – who were accused of carrying out subversive activities and demanding Papua separate from Indonesia. According to the prevailing law, despite the fact that their movement was given a chance by Wahid initially, the police did not want to take a risk and arrested them.¹⁴

¹⁴ Jayapura District Court only released the suspects on March 4, 2002. Judge Edward Sinaga made a strange decision: the PDP leader, Theys Eluay was declared guilty but not punished. Theys himself had already been released before this decision was released, but the *Kopassus* (Military Special Forces Command) killed him on November 11, 2001, before his release day was announced.

Several other examples of this pattern of violence involving both society and security officers can be seen in the following cases: On December 7, 2000, only six days after the celebration of “Papua Independence”, students from the middle mountain range area in Papua, especially Wamena, attacked the police station in Abepura. This resulted in Brimob (the elite Mobile Brigade) officers retaliating against students who came from that area, irrespective of their involvement. They arrested and in some cases killed students from the boarding house in the area who came from the middle mountain range area. One of the students was even chased to the Skyline area in Jayapura and killed by Brimob. The previous head of the Papuan Regional Police (Kapolda Papua) in 2001–2002, Irjenpol I Made Mangku Pastika¹⁵, explained that the emotion of the young Brimob members was difficult to contain at the time because they were friends of the victim of the attack on the police station. These examples demonstrate the action-reaction pattern of the New Order era in Papua continued in the reform era (Chauvel and Bhakti, 2004: 33).

Furthermore, the murder of four Kopassus (Military Special Forces Command) members in Sarmi in Papua was also followed by a retaliation operation by Kopassus in that area. On March 31, 2001, three loggers in Wasior were murdered (Democracy Alliance for Papua, n.a.).¹⁶ This incident resulted in more Brimob officers being sent to that area, who then arbitrarily arrested and tortured members of the community and killed six civilians. Three months later, on June 13, 2001, an unidentified armed group killed five Brimob members and one civilian who was guarding a logging area (HPH) in Wasior. This triggered another retaliation by Brimob in the form of a *sapu bersih* (sweeping) operation and the burning down of residents’ homes in Wasior in June and July 2001. Around 5,000 people left their homes. According to a report by the Papuan Institute for Human Rights Study and Advocacy (Elsham Papua) and church sources, daily activities in the community were totally halted and the people lived in fear (ibid).

In another incident in Freeport, two Americans working for the mining company and an Indonesian teacher were killed. Accusations flew in all directions, the military accused OPM, while the US Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) accused the military. It is interesting to note that the police at the time did not suspect OPM, because they did not have arms or ammunition in the area as it was a restricted area category to which it was incredibly difficult to gain access. Furthermore, the OPM had no history of killing foreigners and the forensic report of the apparent suspect killed by the military at the time highlighted that the body was several days old. Elsham Papua, which publicised Kopassus’ involvement in the attack at Freeport, is still facing criminal indictment by TNI for lack of evidence. The police provided much information on Kopassus’ involvement but they used the phrase ‘suspect’, which has provided space for the TNI indictment.

During 2004, security issues associated with the general elections in Indonesia caused a problem: legislative elections were held on 5 April and two rounds of presidential elections were held on 5 July and September 20, 2004, respectively. There were efforts from some security officers and from outside Papua from 2003 to “heat up” the security situation there and “burn” Papua. A number of prominent issues arose. First, there were accusations from TNI officials in Jakarta that foreign intelligence agencies were carrying out activities in Indonesia, especially Papua, by using NGO activists as their partners (Jayapura Diocese Secretariat for Justice and Peace, 2004:7-8). Second, there was a debate circulating that OPM would interfere with the election in Papua, which justified the need for soldiers to be sent to the voting stations in the areas which were vulnerable to conflict. Third, another issue arose that “ex-East Timorese” were entering Papua, and would likely react to any separatist

¹⁵ Interviewed in Denpasar, July 2004.

¹⁶ The Wasior case can be read in detail in “*Laporan Advokasi Rakyat Untuk Wasior*” (People Advocacy Report for Wasior), Jayapura: Democracy Alliance for Papua, no year available. The events have been confirmed in other confidential interviews with officers and civilians.

action. This was based on Eurico Guterres, a former Commander of the East Timorese pro-integration militias, forming *laskar merah putih* (red and white paramilitary) militia in Wamena. Furthermore, Timbul Silaen, a former high-ranking officer of the police in East Timor, was appointed head of the Papua Regional Police, and also had a history of being anti-separatism and a perpetrator of human rights abuses in Timor Leste. These appointments triggered Moses Weror (a pro-OPM activist), previously an Indonesian diplomat who ran away to PNG, to campaign that OPM should “heat up” and “burn” Papua, so that there would be repressive reactions from the military and these leaders, bringing international attention to Papua, and making OPM international diplomacy easier. Fourth, the First Commission of DPR, after meeting the head of the Cendrawasih Regional Command (*Pangdam Cendrawasih*), made a statement that civil emergency status needed to be implemented in Papua, justifying sending more troops to Papua.

Providing security during the general elections became TNI and POLRI's key reason to send more personnel to the areas where the potential for disturbances at polling stations by OPM was most likely, including Sarmi, Merauke, Wamena, Teluk Bintuni and other areas. This caused restlessness in Papuan society. Members of the local community were already familiar with military strategies of making statements about the potential for chaos in Papua as justification for sending two new battalions to Papua. Furthermore, they were worried that a civil emergency status would be declared, which would further decrease Papuan Governor Jap Solossa's authority. His authority had already been depleted by Inpres (Presidential Instruction) No.1/2003, which accelerated the implementation of Law No. 45/1999 on the division of Papua into three provinces and the establishment of several new regencies and cities, splitting the power base of the governor.

Eventually, during the elections, electoral security officers and members of the electoral monitoring committee (*panwaslu*) were murdered, for example Briptu Anwat and Kornelius Yolman Silooy in Yowit Village, Merauke Regency, on April 3, 2004 (Jayapura Diocese Secretariat for Justice and Peace, 2004:3). There was also shooting between Kopassus and OPM on August 17, 2004, in Wamena (*Cenderawasih Post*, August 18, 2004). However, the latter was a small incident and not a social disturbance linked to the general election. A larger incident, however, did occur in Teluk Bintuni on April 20, 2004, when police officers and Brimob members from Polsek Babo (Babo Sub-district Police) shot Mariedi villagers in Fufuar district, Teluk Bintuni, killing five people and injuring two others. The reason given by the police for the killings was that they were members of GPK/OPM (Insurgency Movement) who had carried out resistance activities against police officers assigned to guard the Djajanti Group (HPH-logging company) staff. However, these people were only demanding compensation for Djajanti activities taking place on the communal land owned by Mariedi villagers. There were no OPM group activities taking place in that area. Mariedi only has a new messianic movement or religious sect (considered by some to be deviant) led by Bernard Furima who was shot dead by the police (Jayapura Diocese Secretariat for Justice and Peace, 2004:7-8).

This incident was an indication of the return of Brimob to control the area to provide security services to the company, which had previously been withdrawn from the HPH area during the era of Mangku Pastika. Furthermore, the Mariedi incident was a warning to BP, which was exploring the Tangguh gas fields in Teluk Bintuni, not to give over security surveillance privileges to the local people because Brimob has the ‘duty and obligation’ to watch over Strategic Vital Objects (*Obyek Vital Strategis* – core strategic infrastructure and public services) for the country. Mariedi village itself is only 60 km from the Tangguh gas area. Guarding Strategic Vital Objects is a source of competition not only between Brimob and society, but also between Brimob and TNI officers (Kopassus or Kostrad).

Following the murder of pro-Independence leader Theys Hiyo Eluay on November 11, 2001, the security situation in Papua quietened down. Such security disturbances as there have

been have been minor. However, often POLRI and TNI officers use the 'OPM issue' to discredit civil society movements that defend their communal title, or to give legitimacy to the building of new military posts and the adding of battalions to prevent disturbances triggered by OPM. The reality is that Papuans see that there is unhealthy competition between the police and military in Papua. Even though the border areas are guarded by TNI, and there is a division of labour between TNI responding to armed rebellions and law and order being the purview of the police, the overlapping of roles of each division of the security apparatus still takes place in the field.

OPM seems to still be a commodity and project for the security and defence officers in Papua. However, citizens are beginning to unite and realise that management of the Papuan Province does not depend on the use of force by the armed officers. As long as the dependency on security provision remains, and poor management under Special Autonomy for Papua continues, several areas in Papua will always be considered a red zone and the people of Papua will continue to live with uneasiness in their daily life. The repressive approach of the security forces towards handling problems has traumatised Papuans. Stories of ABRI's cruelty towards Papua's native people are verbally inherited from one generation to another. Apart from "spicing up" these stories to invoke terror and provoke hatred towards ABRI or the government of Indonesia generally, the results of the repressive acts by ABRI during the New Order regime and later, especially in Papua, still linger.

3.2 Violence in Aceh: The Javanese Army as "Colonisers?"¹⁷

Acehnese resistance first occurred between 1953-1963 during the time of Darul Islam – the Indonesian Islamic Army (DI-TII) – and later led to the birth of the Free Aceh Movement (*Gerakan Aceh Merdeka*/GAM) in 1976-1998 which demanded separation from the Republic of Indonesia. However, the response of the military to the resistance movements was very different across the two periods, particularly in the way it sought to repress the rebellions. According to the literature of the day, during the time of DI-TII, Daud Beureueh, who led the DI-TII rebellion, rarely made reference to the ethnic origins of the military commands and troops entering Aceh. For example, it is clear from the literature that there were large groups of Javanese soldiers, Sumatran soldiers, and others who were sent to Aceh to stop the rebellion, however, the ethnicity of the troops was not a pertinent issue in the discourse on the suppression of the rebellion at the time. This is despite the fact that Colonel Yasin, who led the troops in Aceh at the time, was considered very "*njawani*" (Javanese) by the 'soft' way he ended the ten-year rebellion led by Beureueh between 1953-1963. In fact, Colonel Yasin is Javanese, but the Acehnese did not label the actions of ABRI at the time as "*pa'i*" or colonisers from Java. However, by the time the military sought to suppress GAM, from 1976, a view emerged that Java was colonizing Aceh, and by 1998, TNI was considered *pa'i*.¹⁸ The change in public discourse on these colonising attributes of the military in the suppression of the different rebellions in Aceh is discussed in more detail below

¹⁷ Much of the research underpinning this section comes from the work of Nurhasim on Aceh, which has been published by IPSK LIPI, about the military and New Order regime's politics of violence in Bhakti et al (2001).

¹⁸ This can be further found in a book written by Daud Beureueh's foster son and letters sent by Colonel Yasin and General A.H. Nasution themselves to Daud Beureueh. Colonel Yasin refers to Daud Beureueh as his "Ayahanda." (godfather) (Sihbudi et al, 2001: 335). Daud Beureueh he was treated with respect, not labeled an enemy and was given space to negotiate during the process of ending the rebellion (see El Ibrahimy, 2001: 196).

The approach of the military during the handling of the DI-TII rebellion in 1953-1963, their response to the emergence of the Aceh Sumatra National Liberation Front (ASNLF¹⁹) in 1976-1995, and later their response to the Free Aceh Movement during the reform era (1998-2004) was very different. In some official reports from the armed forces on the DI-TII, they describe the actions of Daud Beureueh as a rebellion, while other military reports describe them as heroes (El Ibrahimy, 2001: 187-88). At the same time, the government at that time decided the rebellion in Aceh was a 'Militaire by stand'²⁰ area according to Presidential Decision No. 175, 1952. To destroy the rebellion, the government sent four army battalions and 13 mobile brigade battalions into the war zone (ibid).

Even though the situation in Aceh in the post-1998 reform period was described in similar terms to the *Militaire by stand* of the Daud Beureueh era as a "military emergency", generally the army's behaviour during the 1950s was to avoid battle with the citizenry as much as they could. The armed forces assigned to Aceh in the post-New Order period were also instructed to be "soft". The existing documents on the actions of soldiers during the 1950s do not mention the use of sexual and other violence. Some of this evidence can be traced to a book written by Daud Beureueh's adopted child, which reprints personal letters sent by Colonel Yasin (discussed below) and by senior General A.H. Nasution, who was in charge of the armed forces nationally. Colonel Yasin, for example, refers to Daud Beureueh with the expression "father" (ibid: 322). General Nasution was considered very gentle and polite in explaining the steps of the Aceh settlement to Teungku Mohammad Daud Beureueh (ibid: 322).

In a more specific example, official military documents of the time describe an incident in which the Indonesian military succeeded in encircling the DI/TII troops by building guard posts at strategic points. Several DI/TII troops went down the mountain to get food supplies, taking them from military posts, which the officers on duty allowed them to do, and there was no exchange of fire.²¹ Similar cases were mentioned in military reports concerning the restorative peace efforts in Aceh from 1953 to 1963. In addition to the military efforts, the Indonesian government of the day also sent delegations to meet Daud Beureueh on several different occasions to carry out negotiation, diplomacy, and peaceful initiatives to end the rebellion.²² Such evidence indicates that the Indonesian government and armed forces had a serious intention to solve the situation in Aceh peacefully, and to end the conflict.

Through such measures of diplomacy, and despite lasting 10 years, the rebellion ended and Aceh remained integrated with Indonesia. The chief military officers of the day, including General Nasution, did not consider Beureueh an enemy. Such an opinion is evident in the letter from Infantry Colonel M. Jassin, the Commander of Regional Military Command I (Kodam)/Iskandar Muda, to Beureueh. This letter was written in the spirit of brotherhood, based on their experience of fighting together against the Dutch to defend the independence of Indonesia. It also used language expressing the sentiments of a son to his father. At the beginning and closing of the letter, Infantry Colonel M. Jassin quoted the Qur'an instead of the standard military approach, as a way of using a religious approach to find a middle ground with Daud Beureueh (ibid).

¹⁹ The term Aceh Sumatra National Liberation Front (ASNLF) is the English term often used to refer to GAM (Gerakan Aceh Merdeka, Free Aceh Movement) in GAM's English language documents. Hasan Tiro proclaimed "Independence" for Aceh including parts of Sumatra (Sjamsuddin, 1989: 70).

²⁰ Dutch, meaning War Emergency.

²¹ Classified documents on the rebellion from the Bukit Barisan regional military command (1963).

²² Representatives of the Government of Indonesia opened up diplomatic lines. Mohammad Hatta as the vice president of Indonesia, along with Prime Minister Bahanuddin Harap, went to Aceh to hold negotiations with the rebels. This peaceful approach continued to be carried out to solve the problems in Aceh during the period of Daud Beureueh leadership.

Such an approach was very different to that experienced by Hasan Tiro when he began to set up the ASNLF. He was considered an agitator or rebel and a threat to stability by the Indonesian military and by the New Order government. Many terms were used to name ASNLF, such as a Security Disturbance Movement (GPK), an Illegal Insurgency Movement (GPLK), and Hasan Tiro's Illegal Insurgency Group (GPLHT).²³ The Hasan Tiro-led movement was considered a rebellion and its ideology was prohibited. Hasan Tiro himself was considered an enemy of the state. Similar cases emerged during the New Order in other parts of Indonesia where other groups were considered such enemies, particularly the leaders of the actions against the state in the Tanjung Priok case in 1984 and the Jihad Command in 1981. GAM became prominent again by the end of the 1980s, leading to a crackdown by the Suharto regime.

The coercive policies of the New Order government were based on the 'use of force' ideology embraced by the state. This ideology included the mechanisms, processes, and coercive techniques which were collectively and structurally carried out to maintain power and control citizens (Bhakti et al, 2001: 27). The use of force was a part of New Order policy and the strategies of the Indonesian military at that time. Movements such as GAM in Aceh, OPM in Papua, the Jihad Command and the incidents at Tanjung Priok were perceived not only to threaten the state, but also to threaten Suharto's power. The military under the New Order dealt hastily with such cases using coercion and violence.

In Aceh, the use of force by ABRI was not always carried out in plain view, especially the activities of Red Net Operation – *Operasi Jaring Merah (OJM)* between 1989 and 1995. Other forms of “use of force” and coercive policies were clearly seen. OJM was a special mission conducted in anticipation of the re-emergence of GAM, after the government had succeeded in defeating the movement in 1979, when GAM activists escaped abroad, including to Malaysia, Libya, and Sweden. This operation had several consequences. First, there are indications that Aceh became a killing field between 1989 and 1997. From numerous existing data (see Bhakti et al, 2001:209-222), it is clear that the operations of the military were divided into several posts, called tactical unit posts (*Pos Satuan Taktis/Pos Sattis*). In cases in the Region of Military Operations (DOM), several posts were very cruel and sadistic, i.e. (1) Tactical Post Bille Aron in Glumpang Tiga, known as Tactical Post Rumoh Geudong and (2) Tactical Post Jiem-Jime in Ule Glee Bandar Dua. Each post usually supervised several sub districts. In North and East Aceh, the people were often able to see the posts, for example Rancung Tactical Post (ibid, 223). Second, there were many killings attributed to military operations and people were “disappeared” without following due legal process. Third, rape and sexual abuse took place. Fourth, cruelty against citizens and other kinds of coercive actions took place.

During the period of OJM/DOM, civilians were involved in the efforts to destroy GAM. According to TNI notes (Bhakti et al, 2001: 27), they were called TBO (Tugas Bantu Operasi) or Assistant Operators, while several sources in Aceh and the local media referred to them as *cuak* (informants) (ibid). Generally, TBOs were killed by anonymous actors. To September 1999, according to the report of I Municipal Military Command Bukit Barisan (ibid), 18 people were killed. Meanwhile, according to NGO versions of events in Aceh, hundreds of people were killed since many young men were acting as TBO in that period.

²³ Such terminology was often used in the media in 1970-1980s. ASNLF were obviously insurgents that had to be destroyed. GPK and GPL were used by the military apparatus to downgrade the political motives of the separatist movements. By doing so, it gave the military a broad space to stabilize the situation in the area and to reduce criticism from the Indonesian people in Irian Jaya and Aceh in the Suharto era. For example, in Kompas of 24 June 1991 it was stated that on 21 June 1991 77 suspected members of GPK were freed from jail. In Kompas of 13 November 1995 it was stated that 35 detained GPK persons were freed from jail. After they were freed they declared their loyalty to NKRI. Other documents refer to the events during the DOM era as GPK (Widjanarko and Sambodjo, 1999).

The examples above and the position of the military under the New Order illustrate how armed groups such as GAM were treated as enemies of the state and communists, and other terms were used to label these groups negatively, and thus they were to be destroyed. Almost all public officers, including members of parliament and the leaders of political parties, were frightened of the authoritarian politics of the state. The Indonesian military never referred to GAM as an independence movement; instead they were labelled as an illegal insurgency movement. These terms were used to sully their name as part of a diplomatic war between the Indonesian military and GAM.

In the post-1998 era of reform, there were changes in the viewpoint of the state and elites towards GAM and its associated groups, especially after the DOM status of the area was revoked on 7 August 1998 in Lhokseumawe. GAM was no longer labelled a “rebellion” movement. Thus, a vacuum existed between 1998 and 1999 in how to manage GAM. The political orientation at that time, especially in the parliament and amongst officers of the state, partially saw GAM as an Aceh Separatist Movement (*Gerakan Separatis Aceh-GSA*). General Wiranto, who was the defence and security minister at the time, allowed several NGO representatives to meet Hasan Tiro. At the time he said: “It is okay to meet Hasan Tiro as long as it is for good reason and the settlement of Aceh. But, I want to alert you all not to aggravate the situation.”²⁴ But in some quarters the term GPL, or Illegal Insurgency Movement, was still used.²⁵ For example, a document produced by Municipal Military Command I Bukit Barisan on the list of groups carrying out actions against the military and police between August 1998 and September 1999, clearly stated that GAM was an Armed Insurgency Movement or GPBK (*Gerakan Bersenjata Pengacau Keamanan*).²⁶

Such terminology was the standard used by TNI in the reform period, indicating that TNI’s approach to GAM had not changed from that of the New Order period. Furthermore, Defence and Security Minister/TNI Commander Wiranto occasionally referred to GAM operators as insurgents, albeit there were changes in paradigm. There were some efforts to conduct arbitration between GAM and TNI coercive operations in Aceh post-DOM revocation. However, these kinds of actions were seen as an effort to change the TNI image, not as genuine attempts to enforce human rights in Aceh.

During Megawati’s administration, the military carried out Integrated Operations (*Operasi Terpadu*) beginning 19 May 2003. Prior to this however, General Endriartono Sutarto had already said when he served as Army Chief of Staff (Kasad) that military operations in Aceh were the only way to defend the sovereignty of Indonesia, which is why military posts were being prepared to defend the Indonesian state if necessary.²⁷ Meanwhile, Kasad Ryamizard Ryacudu had also explicitly stated that GAM was not only an agitator, but also a rebel. The approach of this Army Chief Officer on the possibility of an integrated operation was clear when he stated in the mass media that GAM was the enemy of the state and therefore had to be destroyed. Yet, on one occasion he said that, “It takes no longer than six months to face and destroy those agitators and insurgents.”²⁸ TNI Commanders Endriartono Sutarto and Widodo AS were also known to refer publicly to GAM as an insurgency group.

²⁴ Interview with TNI General Wiranto in *Rakyat Merdeka Daily*, 31 July 1999.

²⁵ Several statements from TNI chief officers on mass media from 1999-2003. For example, General Major R. Pramono of TNI, the regional commander of Bukit Barisan, used the label GPL, as reported in his statements in *Kompas*, 24 June 1999.

²⁶ Unpublished secret document’s from the Military Municipal Command I Bukit Barisan on the actions of POK GPBK at Dista, Aceh, between December 1998 and September 1999.

²⁷ Statement by TNI Commander General Endriartono Sutarto to the mass media, a week before the Presidential Decree on Integrated Operations in Aceh was issued.

²⁸ TNI Major General Ryamizard Ryacudu made this statement, a week before President Megawati Sukarnoputri issued the Integrated Operations. The approach of the highest levels of the military, the parliament, and Governor Lemhanas to the resistance movement can be seen in the *Jakarta Post*, (13

However, the delay in dealing with the problem resulted from rivalry within the security forces over field control command (Kodal), which caused ineffectiveness. In 2002-2003 there were changes in the conception of Kodal to the security efforts in Aceh. Initially, Kodal was handled by the district chief of police, with the municipal military commander as deputy. Later, every security institution had their own Kodal, including the division of territories and responsibility for territorial security, which reduced rivalries amongst the different forces.²⁹

TNI later explicitly referred to GAM as the Aceh Separatist Movement or GSA (*Gerakan Separatis Aceh*). The GSA terminology started to be used in the mass media soon after the Aceh Regional Military Emergency Authority (PDMD) asked the press in Aceh not to publish any reports that supported GAM. Critics of TNI's use of force were labelled anti-nationalists.³⁰ Not long after, the minister of communication and information, Syamsul Muarif, who first appealed to the citizenry to be more reasonable and use more patriotic journalism, then requested the press to be supportive of the Indonesian government in dealing with GAM. The press then changed their use of terminology, from referring to the movement as GAM to using Aceh Separatist Movement (GSA) (Stanley, 2003).

Impatience with peace-building efforts in Aceh resulted in Presidential Decree No. 28/2003 on increasing the status of Nanggroe Aceh Darussalam to an integrated operation. By means of this decree, all of Nanggroe Aceh Darussalam Province was declared to be in a State of Emergency, and given the status of a Military Emergency, with the highest command held by the president as the National Military Commander for Military Emergency. The Regional Military Commander for Military Emergency in Nanggroe Aceh Darussalam Province was held by the Commander of the Iskandar Muda Regional Military Command (Kodam). In terms of implementation, the Regional Military Commander for Military Emergency was to be assisted by: (a) the governor of Nanggroe Aceh Darussalam Province; (b) the chief of the National Police Force; and (c) the head of the Nanggroe Aceh Darussalam Provincial Supreme Court. Through this decree, Martial Law was imposed on Nanggroe Aceh Darussalam Province in line with Bill No. 23/1959 on the State of Emergency which has been modified twice, most recently through Bill No. 52/ 1960.

In implementing that Presidential Decree, to restore security in Aceh TNI carried out several war and non-war strategies. War strategies were conducted through military operations, while non-war strategies were conducted through various other means such as control over the press, assistance, indoctrination and so on. These were actually old methods acquired during the New Order period.

TNI deployed over 50,000 personnel to Aceh, supported by 13 Scorpion tanks, 23 Amphibian tanks, 12 regular tanks, two F-16 jet fighters, four Hawk-200s jet fighters, six carrier planes and Hercules paratroop personnel carriers, five Twinpact helicopter jets, one Superpuma helicopter, and six OV-10 Bronco light bomber jets (*Jakarta Post*, May 22 2003). As stated by TNI spokesperson Sjafrie Syamsuddin, combat operations were the central operations to restore security, and were supported by intelligence operations, territorial operations, judicial operations and police operations (*Serambi Indonesia*, 20 May 2003). This war was aimed at destroying GAM, using approximately 5,000 personnel and 2,000 weapons. The only

April 2005), "Cautious optimism as Aceh Peace Talks Resume." Also for TNI views on the resistance movement, see *Jakarta Post* (9 June 2005), "TNI vows to continue the fight in Aceh".

²⁹ A civilian military observer conveyed the information to the writer in 2003.

³⁰ Several statements by the TNI chief officers demonstrated this tendency (see above). Moreover, the civil society organisations appealed to them to decrease the use of force in order to avoid the same human rights violation cases which had occurred in the past, especially when OJM I-IX were conducted on the premise that such violations would become the boomerang for the settlement of Aceh in long term.

difference from New Order tactics was that these operations were less violent compared to the Red Net Operations of 1989-1990.

The principle behind the military operations as stated by the TNI in Aceh was guerrilla warfare.³¹ TNI created several stages for the integrated operations in Aceh:³²

- (1) The Target Operation Areas were Northern Aceh, Western Aceh, Southern Aceh, Southeastern Aceh, Central Aceh, Aceh Besar, Pidie, Bierendeun, Simeulue;
- (2) Pre-operations, increasing the number of personnel from 24,000 to 50,000 TNI and POLRI and isolating Aceh;
- (3) Operation I, a specific operation on land marine combat battalion to skim the entire Aceh beach line, followed by Special Forces Command (Kopassus) and then by Combat Zeny Battalion, whose duty was to combat and to build infrastructure;
- (4) Operation II was an operation aimed at attacking interior hinterland areas, led by the army, especially by air operations by the Army Strategic Command (Linud Kostrad) supported by Airforce special forces (Paskhas TNI-AU);
- (5) Operation III involved bombing of difficult GAM strongholds by OV-10 Bronco jets;
- (6) Operation IV monitored attacks on target areas, led by TNI-AU monitoring forces and using Nomad N-24 jets and Boeing 737s equipped with GPS;
- (7) Operation V involved counter guerrillas, in which TNI utilised all aspects including spies. During this war, GAM was believed to recruit citizens as bait or living barricades. During the guerrilla war, the forces of GAM are estimated to have increased from 5,000 to 10,000 personnel; and
- (8) The closure operation, including government restoration, security settlement, a humanitarian mission, and law enforcement.

The armed forces capacity ratio to deal with guerrilla warfare according to official sources was 1:10 (ie one GAM personnel against 10 army soldiers). With GAM forces estimated to be around 5,000-6,000, the number of military personnel required was 50,000-60,000. The units deployed in Aceh were supported by three important military units, namely the local administrator of the military insurgency, the army and the police. Each unit had the following numbers:

Table 2
Units sent to Aceh during the first period of integrated operations

Unit	Army	Navy	Air Force	National Police	Local Govt	KEJATI	Total
PDMD	299	10	10	85	63	38	505
Amy	25,886	3,234	2,971	2,063	-	-	34,154
Local police	-	-	-	12,100	-	-	12,100
Total	26,185	3,244	2,981	14,248	63	38	46,759

Source: Compiled and processed from sources such as PDMD and media coverage during military operations.

The guerrilla warfare strategy employed during the operations was intended to avoid civilian casualties. There were three components: first, the armed forces would create conditions that separated GAM geographically from civilians; second, it would conduct a marginalisation of GAM phase, and third, it would conduct targeted destruction of GAM. The military conducted ID checks on citizens in its operations. In the first month it aimed to destroy GAM enclaves and to separate GAM from civilians. The measure of success in military operations according to the Supreme Commander of the Armed Forces was determined by two factors:

³¹ See the document on the Evaluation of Integrated Operations in Nanggroe Aceh Darussalam May 19–November 19, 2003, by Dr. Rosita S. Noer, Dr. Humam Hamid, and Moch. Nurhasim, S.Ip., Drs. Robertus Robet, MA, Drs. Daniel Hutagalung, MA, unpublished, Forum Komunikasi Kesatuan Bangsa (FKKB).

³² This data has been compiled from various sources and information from Dispendam Kodam Iskandar Muda, as reviewed in *Republika*, May 20 2003.

quantitative indicators (of GAM forces destroyed) and qualitative indicators (of how far society supported the armed forces in eradicating GAM). The military operations were complemented by other operations, such as humanitarian missions, law enforcement operations and government restoration programs. These four types of operation became the Integrated Operations (*Operasi Terpadu*).

Due to numerous acts of violence during the New Order and reform period, parts of Acehnese society referred to the Indonesian military (ABRI-TNI) as *pa'i*. *Pa'i* is an ancient concept that exists in local myths and history which was then reproduced and revived by students and Acehnese society to refer to colonial powers. In the minds of the Acehnese, *pa'i* is the figure of a Dutch soldier who enters Aceh with a colonial mission to exploit. This concept developed in the dawn of the reform movement to demand justice in Aceh since 1998 based on the gross human rights violations mentioned previously. Furthermore, in 1976, Hasan Tiro as the initiator of ASNLF mentioned that the Javanese – specifically Javanese soldiers – were colonisers and exploiters of Acehnese wealth in Aceh. When we compare this back to the conciliatory and less violent approach employed by the state in the 1950s and 60s, it is clear how the perception of domination and colonisation has emerged in Aceh with reference to the New Order and reform period's violent approaches to Acehnese resistance.

3.3. TNI and Their Involvement in the Maluku Conflict

The communal conflict which occurred in Maluku from 1999 to 2001 killed approximately 5,000 people and resulted in an exodus of 500,000 people (Maluku Provincial Government, 2001; North Maluku Provincial Government, 2001). The mass clashes not only occurred in Ambon, the capital of Maluku, but widened to involve North Maluku province. The problem of social inequality, competition over natural resources, and disputes between political elites and bureaucrats underpinned the conflict, but some discourses distorted the causes of the violence, portraying it as a religious conflict.

The conflict in Central Maluku can be divided into three periods: (1) the first period, which began on January 19, 1999, with a bloody clash on *Idul Fitri* (Eid); (2) the second period following the elections in June 1999; and (3) the third period in April/early May 2000 marked by the arrival of Jihad militias in Ambon. The initial trigger for the escalation of violence in Central Maluku occurred when a bus driver and a young man in Batu Merah village in Ambon got into a fight.³³ In a very short time, the fight resulted in mass burnings of property in Batu Merah village and sporadic fights all around Ambon. Although members of the local police and Wirabuana Makasar Military District Command tried to stop the violence, the conflict in Ambon continued to widen.

By May 1999, the conflict in Central Maluku had settled down, until the Indonesia Democratic Party of Struggle (PDI-P) in Maluku, dominated by Christian leaders, won the election.³⁴ Dissatisfaction with this on the part of the Muslim community led to a re-escalation of the conflict in June 1999. Religion became a crucial issue during this period. Property in Maluku was destroyed and lives lost. Each side defended their own faith, regardless of whether their own relatives of different religions were targeted in attacks. During the conflict, the economy was in total disarray. Weapons used in the local war during this period escalated from

³³ In analysing the triggers of the conflict we should not ignore the clashes between Muslims in Wailete village and Christians in Hative Besar village and the burning of property on December 12, 1998. This incident was triggered by certain TNI members. There was also another clash between Muslims and Christians in Dobo, Central Maluku, on January 14, 1999.

³⁴ The founders of the PDI-P in Maluku were mostly from the new Indonesian Christian Party (*Partai Kristen Indonesia*) formed in 1999 and the leaders of the Maluku Protestant Church.

machetes, spears, and arrows, to locally produced guns. The ammunition was acquired mostly from the security services (TNI or POLRI) through theft, or in some cases being voluntarily donated by them (Yanuarti et al, 2003: 53-70).

During this period local authorities were actively involved in the conflict. They were evenly divided according to religious beliefs. For example, local officers in the Ambon District Police (Polres Ambon) located in Muslim areas would help the local community to fight against the Christians, while the local police in Christian areas in the Ambon Regional Police (Polda Ambon) supported Christian efforts against the Muslims.

The conflict in Central Maluku continued up until 2001. This period was dominated by the conflict between the Maluku Sovereignty Front (FKM) (the embryo of the Christian Militias) against the Muslim Jihad militias. Both sides used religious beliefs and symbols and other ideologies to label the conflict and to justify involvement. The Christian militias in the form of the FKM used Christian symbols and fought under the banner of separatism (Maluku independence), while the Muslim militias through Jemaah Islamia (JI) used symbols of Islam and fought under the umbrella of Indonesian nationalism (NKRI) (Kepolisian Republik Indonesia Daerah Maluku, 2001). Declaration of a civil emergency and the signing of the second Malino Agreement 2002 failed to defuse the conflict. The Maluku conflict did, however, settle down after the Jihad militias were withdrawn from Ambon, key perpetrators were captured, and intense reconciliation efforts between the opposing parties were undertaken by several NGOs.

Meanwhile, the communal conflict in North Maluku can be divided into four periods. The first period occurred in August 1999, triggered by a fight over the management of a gold mine in Malifut subdistrict (*kecamatan*) between the Kao Tribe – the original tribe of Makian island – and the Makian Tribe – migrants to Makian island. Makian island is located to the south of Ternate island. The first period of the conflict took fewer than 100 lives, but did result in the loss of materials and destruction of several places of worship (Yanuarti et al, 2004:1-2).

The second wave of violence occurred between October and November in 1999. The destruction of property and public facilities during this phase far exceeded that of the first wave of violence. In this second wave, around 16 villages from the Makian tribe were burned to the ground and the number of civilian casualties reached around 100, mostly from the Muslim community (Yanuarti et al, 2004). During the second wave of violence, the three sultanates in Maluku, the Ternate, Tidore and Bacan sultanates, assumed an active role in defusing tensions between the two warring groups. The Ternate Sultanate even took the controversial step of forming the so-called “Traditional Forces” (Pasukan Adat)³⁵, known as the Yellow Unit due to their yellow uniform (ibid). At first, the Yellow Unit assisted the police and army in defusing tensions in the area. But with time, they gradually took over the function of security provision to the point where they became the only security force in the city (ibid).

The third wave of communal violence in North Maluku took place between December 26 1999 and March 2000. In this period the communal violence was a spillover from the violence in Central Maluku. In this third wave, Christian communities simultaneously attacked Muslim villages in Toguliwa, Gurua, Kampung Baru, Gamsungi, Luari, and Popilo in the Tobelo district, as well as Mamuya in the Galela district. Based on NGO data, the civilian casualties in the riot were reported to reach 800, of which 200 people were burned alive in the Baiturrachman Mosque in Popilo village (ibid). The fourth wave of communal violence in North Maluku took place between May and August 2001. The violence in the final wave was triggered by the arrival of around 8,000 members of the Laskar Jihad (a paramilitary group of

³⁵ Aside from forming the Yellow Unit, the Ternate Sultanate revived its political instruments, e.g. the Traditional Council and the Kapita Lau (Commander of Forces).

'holy warriors') from Ambon, South Celebes and Java. In the fourth wave around 700 Christians were killed (North Maluku Provincial Government, 2001:3-5).

Results from research conducted by a team from LIPI in 2003 and 2004 (Yanuarti et al, 2003, 2004) on the conflict attribute the violence to more than one cause, highlighting the problems of social inequality, natural resource allocation disputes and conflicts within the political and bureaucratic elites as the main drivers of the violence. However, the riots in Maluku were triggered by the presence of political-military powers in society that deliberately maintained tensions and the conflict potential of the society. Such an approach conditioned the society to be prone to violent acts.

The role of the security forces in provoking the conflict is indicated by the distribution of arms through society, the biased attitude of state officers in handling and preventing unrest, and even the involvement of the state apparatus in numerous acts of violence, and the use of religious symbols by some security forces to strengthen the community through acts of violence. The communal conflict in Maluku was divided by society, the press and the security forces into Christian and Muslim allegiances.

3.3.1 Violence in the Maluku Conflict and Military Ethnicity

During the three years of conflict in Maluku, various strategies on the part of the security forces were used to stop the violence. These included replacement of the Maluku chief of regional police (Kapolda Maluku) seven times and of the Maluku commander of the regional military (Pangdam Maluku) five times to try to neutralise the involvement of security personnel in the conflict. As a response to the widespread escalation of the conflict in 2000, the president announced Presidential Decree No. 88/ 2000, 11 months after the conflict began, declaring a Civil Emergency in the area (*Tempo Interaktif*, June 26th 2000).

In the early stages of the conflict, between January and March 1999, the government deployed 5,300 security personnel both from the mobile brigade (Brimob) of the police and from the military to Maluku. However, these numbers were insufficient to handle tensions involving the 2 million citizens spread over 100 islands in the region. The reason for only sending small numbers of personnel was that at the same time Indonesian troops were concentrated on East Timor, which was holding a referendum on independence on August 30 of that year (*Kompas*, December 6, 1999).

Since the conflict did not come to an end, partly due to ineffective efforts on the part of security personnel to resolve the conflict, on May 15, 1999, the Maluku District Military Command (Korem Maluku) was upgraded to a Pattimura/XVI Regional Military Command (Kodam) under the leadership of a brigadier general (previously the command had been led by a colonel). But once again, this change of status did not resolve the conflict. Hence, in November the number of security personnel was increased to 6,000, including officers from the new Regional Military Command (Kodam). In January 2000, the military and Brimob forces were increased to five battalions (11,250 personnel).³⁶

Despite these changes, the conflict in Maluku widened. Some TNI and POLRI officers took sides in the conflict. Various events such as the Aruhu conflict on January 23, 2000, the attack on Sonya village, the burning down of Silo Church, and burglaries at Brimob headquarters, demonstrated the depth of TNI and POLRI personnel involvement in the conflict. Though such involvement has been officially denied by both the military and the police, the results of various investigations prove otherwise (Maluku Police Report, 2000). In the second phase of the Maluku conflict, certain military personnel were not only involved in the local war, but were also supplying weapons and ammunition. General Suadi stated that

³⁶ Interview with a resources person, June 23' 2004.

in the first four months of the conflict, the weapons used comprised traditional weapons, but by mid-1999, standard military weaponry was being used (Kompas, October 20, 2000).

The Civil Emergency declared on June 26, 2000³⁷, increased the number of TNI and Brimob personnel to approximately 14,000, consisting of seven Army Battalions and two Police Battalions. The main security troops in Maluku consisted of three organic army battalions and local police officers, including both Muslims and Christians. To balance the number of local police officers who were dominated by Christians, one battalion from Makasar, the capital of South Sulawesi, and one unit of Brimob from Kendari, Southeastern Sulawesi, who were mostly Muslims, were added to the force.

Maluku Governor Saleh Latuconsina and the acting governor of Northern Maluku, Brigadier General Abdul Muhyi Effendi, were appointed as the Head of the Civil Emergency (*Penguasa Darurat Sipil/PDS*). Furthermore, the commander of the Pattimura Regional Military Command, General Max Tamaela, a Muslim, was replaced by Brigadier General Made Yasa, a Balinese-Hindu, in order to neutralise the military's handling of the Maluku conflict. Under the Civil Emergency, PDS also forbade all kinds of non-essential meetings, and confirmed a deadline of June 30 2000 for citizens to turn in their weapons to the security authorities. PDS also instructed the Navy commander to check all visitors entering the region for weapons. Up to mid-June 2000, the Navy blocked 67 ships carrying weapons and eight boats carrying weapons and ammunition to be delivered to villages. In one interview with the police in Maluku it was stated that "if they did not have complete documents with them, or if their activities were suspicious then the police had the right to reject or to deport them, while ships loaded with weapons were to be guarded by the Navy".³⁸

Nonetheless, the fight between TNI and POLRI continued and strengthened. This can be seen in the attack by Jihad militias on a police weaponry warehouse at Tantui on June 21 2000. There are strong indications of TNI involvement in helping Jihad militias in that attack, especially TNI personnel from Battalion 303 and 733.³⁹ At almost the same time, in July 2000, an exchange of weapons fire took place between personnel from Battalion 509, Kodam Diponegoro and Kodam Brawijaya against Brimob personnel, in which at least one died police officer died.

The absence of the same rules of engagement between TNI and POLRI as the rules of engagement at the operational level created a delicate problem. Therefore the Commander of National Civil Emergencies (*Penguasa Darurat Sipil Pusat/PDSP*) decided to form a command to be led by a major general and assisted by a deputy who was a police brigadier general in Maluku. The command was then directly under the authority of the PDSD. The Commander was to control all security authorities, including both TNI and POLRI, in the region. However, the highest Commander in this operation came from the TNI. Hence, the command of control of the response to the Maluku conflict (including Central Maluku and Ambon) was entirely under the auspices of TNI.

The creation of this command was a response to a meeting held involving the first and second commissions of the national parliament and the staff of PDSP on the matter of Ambon. In that meeting, these parliamentary commissions forced the TNI Supreme Commander Laksamana Widodo AS and the chief of the National Police Force, Da'i Bachtiar, to restore the coordination between TNI and POLRI personnel in the area.

³⁷ The status of Civil Emergency is the lowest level of the state of emergency according to Replacement Government Regulation Law No. 23/1959 on Responding to State of Emergencies.

³⁸ An interview with Maluku police personnel, Ambon, June 21, 2000.

³⁹ The Jakarta Post, June 23, 2000, and SiaR News Service, June 27, 2000, and an interview with a resource person involved in the Tantui attack, Ambon, June 2003.

Laksamana Widodo AS together with Da'i Bachtiar expressed their concerns and promised to give serious attention to resolving the clashes between security authorities in Maluku.⁴⁰

In a recommendation written by the Working Group on Maluku, it is stated that the failure and the inability of TNI and POLRI to resolve the Maluku conflict coincided with a process of demoralisation within the security authorities across the nation, including both TNI and POLRI. The security authorities were required to give maximum effort, but at the same time were in a state of flux, and were particularly demoralised by the elimination of the land territorial organisation. Moreover, the public was unaware of the presence of security authorities, including their role in resolving the Maluku conflict (Marasabessy, 2002).

Some action was taken by the government and security authorities to end the involvement of security officers in the Maluku conflict beyond that discussed above. Under the command of Made Yasa, these included: (a) deportation of security officers involved in the conflicts to East Java on July 2000; (b) replacement of the Commander of the District Military Command; and (c) replacement of intelligence assistants and territorial assistants. To minimise the clashes between security authorities, in May 2001 TNI formed a United Battalion (Yon Gab) consisting of 450 personnel from special forces such as Koppasus, Marines and Paskhas (Jakarta Post, July 25, 2000). Meanwhile, Firman Gani at POLRI was undertaking the same initiative by removing 600 police officers and imposing sanctions on 87 of his personnel who were involved in the conflict (Jakarta Post, March 3, 2001). These actions conducted by Made Yasa and Firman Gani were quite effective in defusing the conflict between security authorities in the short term.

As explained above, the involvement of the military in the Maluku conflict, especially in Ambon, resulted from friction within their own ranks. Such problems were not avoided by the organic officers in Kodam Pattimura. Battalion 731, 732, and 733 which in the beginning were deployed to stop the violence and respond to the presence of Jihad militias, ended up divided into two. Battalion 731/ Kabaresi supported the Christians and Battalion 733/ Masariku supported the Muslims. Battalion 731 was dominated by officers from Central Maluku who were Christians, whereas Battalion 733 was dominated by officers from Northern Maluku who were Muslim. The clash between battalions was worsened by the presence of Kostrad 303 who were mainly Muslim. The fragmentation of the military in the Ambon conflict also occurred in the period of Civil Emergency Status in 2001-2002. Yon Gab 92 was considered to be pro-Christian and Battalion 407 and 408 were considered to be pro-Muslim (ICG, 2002). These problems within the military ranks re-escalated the tensions in Ambon from January to June 2001.

Such tensions did not only exist between soldiers but also among the military elites themselves, especially those who claimed to be indigenous officers. Facilitated by the mass media, tensions between former Military District Commander (Danrem) Rustam Kastor together with former General Chief of Staff Suadi Merasabessi (who recently became head of the Maluku Working Group) and the then-Provincial Military Supreme Commander/Pangdam Pattimura Max Tamaela, who was Christian, contributed to escalation of conflict in this area. Indeed, Rustam Kastor published a book titled "Political Conspiracy Between RMS (the South Moluccans Republic) and the Christians Destroyed Muslims in Ambon-Maluku". The title shows that the publication, describing conflict dynamics in Ambon 1999-2001, was a deliberate act to discredit the Christian group in the conflict.

Table 3: Name of Corps Operating in Central Maluku, 1999-2004

Name of Corps	Year of Operation	Type of Operation	Type of Corps	Commander

⁴⁰ An interview with a member of the local parliament (DPRD RI), Jakarta July 8 2004.

1. Batallion 731, 732, 733 KODAM Pattimura 2. Kostrad 303, Macassar	1999-2000	Security Recovery	Organic Non-organic	Max Tamaela
1. Batallion 407 and 408/Kodam Diponegoro 2. YonGap 92	2001-2003	Darurat Civil	Non-organic Anorganic	Major General Made Yasa
1. Arhanud 11 Bukit Barisan 2. Batallion 731, 733 Pattimura 3. Armed III Kaveleri Company	2003-2004	Civil order	Organic Organic Organic	Major General Agustadi

Tensions between the military elites and between the soldiers were also documented in the Maluku Conflict Report issued by Provincial Military Command (Kodam) Pattimura in 2002. This report inferred that the military handling of the Maluku conflict failed because of, among other things:

1. Existing tension among military soldiers and elites which resulted from religious animosity between organic officers and indigenous elite officers. This friction could not be prevented because many victims of the Maluku Conflict between 1999 and 2001 were members of the families of these soldiers. The soldiers' lack of understanding of the character of the Maluku conflict, to a certain extent, resulted in a difference of perception between local and national military officers.
2. The existing lack of understanding of the conflict was demonstrated by unease amongst military officers and awkward interactions with civilians. This was a result of demoralization processes occurring at the national level.
3. The involvement of military officers in the conflict occurring either individually or *ansambly* (in small groupings), either motivated by economic incentives, vengeance, or ideology (separatism and fundamentalism).
4. The military officers' lack of professionalism. The character of the conflict in Maluku was new to them, making it difficult for them to handle the conflicts.
5. The perception of difference among military officers mutated into physical clashes.
6. The lack of Civil Order Administrator leadership effectiveness. This worsened the military officers' lack of professionalism.

Meanwhile in Northern Maluku, friction between military officers rarely occurred because most of the military officers sent to the area were non-organic ones. Therefore, ideological and religious animosity did not motivate them to involve themselves in the conflict. These non-organic troops were sent to Northern Maluku when the process of stopping the violence and reinstating security had already begun. The absence of friction among the military officers also resulted from the fact that the acting governor of North Maluku, Muhyi Effendi, was from the military, making it easier to handle clashes among control commands of the security operations in North Maluku, especially when compared to those in Central Maluku.

Table 4: Name of Corps Operating in North Maluku, 1999-2004

Name of Corps	Year of Operate	Type of Operation	Type of Corps
---------------	-----------------	-------------------	---------------

1. Batallion 401/Provincial Military Command (KODAM) Diponegoro	1999	Security Recovery	Non-organic
2. Batallion 512/KODAM Brawijaya Armed IV/ Diponegoro	2000	Security Recovery	Non organic
1. Zipur III 2. Batallion 732/Banau Ternate	June 2000 -2002	Civil emergency	Organic
1. Arhanud 512 Malang 2. Batallion 10 Kostrad	2003 2004	Civil order	Non-organic

4. New National Military Laws and the Future of Military Politics

It is not an easy task to change the military and its involvement in politics. The democratic transition has been expected to carry out the task, with the end of the New Order in May 1998 coloured by public demands to end the socio-political role of the military. The central questions are how to do this and to what extent the role of the military should be pared back. As Indonesia experienced economic and political crises and the decline of the military's role in politics, an opportunity to reform the military's role arose. However, as is commonly experienced by states in transition from authoritarian regimes to democratic systems of governance, Indonesia has continued to face major challenges in the wake of the consolidated political role of the military. The military has offered gradual internal reform while at the same time civil society has structured its power base.

In June 1998, ABRI Headquarters released their approach on "Redefinition, reposition, and re-actualization of ABRI's role in nationhood" (Reposisi, dan Reaktualisasi Peran ABRI Dalam Kehidupan Bangsa") which outlined that between 1999 and April 20, 2000, the first stage of internal reform would take place in the form of 'the military's new social and political paradigm'. The new direction was established in the context that the military was still implementing its 'dual function' (*dwifungsi*) doctrine of involvement in security provision and civilian politics. The ABRI Chief of Staff at the time, Army General Wiranto, highlighted the four principles of the new social and political paradigm, namely: (1) changing the military's position so that it was not always the first to take action but instead took a back seat; (2) changing the conceptual understanding from 'occupying' to 'influencing'; (3) changing the conceptual understanding from direct influence to indirect influence; and (4) role-sharing with other stakeholders in decision-making processes on statecraft and governance issues (TNI, 1999).

The new concept was issued as an effort on the part of the military/TNI to revise the 'people's defence' doctrine which was born in the guerrilla war during the Independence period in the 1940s and 1950s (Sudarsono, 2004). Nonetheless, political nuances still haunt the military, which is reflected in its persistence in maintaining its privilege as 'political soldier(s)' and not as professional soldiers, even in the wake of Suharto's fall. Only after the People's Consultative Assembly released TAP (parliamentary decree) No. VI/MPR/2000 on the separation of TNI and the Police Force, did TNI HQ establish a second reform package, mentioning several issues: (1) gradually leaving behind its social and political role; (2) focusing on national defence functions; (3) devolving the function and responsibility of internal state defence to the Indonesian Police force; (4) ensuring greater consistency in implementing 'joint doctrines'; and (5) enhancing its internal management operations. These were backed up by 12 points outlined in the table below.

In 2001, as the third stage of reform, TNI HQ released the 'Implementation of TNI's new Paradigm'. Article III, page 21, of the document highlights the 'continuous internal reform of TNI', especially after the release of TAP MPR No. VI/MPR/2000 which consists of 21 reform

issues which follow on from the prior 12 points in the preceding concept note (Nurhasim, 2003)

Table 5: Stages of Internal TNI Reform

Stage of reform	Issues	Basic Doctrine/ principles	Time Frame
Stage I: New Paradigm of Social and Political Role of ABRI	<p>Slight inclination to maintain indirect political roles by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changing position and method so as not always to be at the forefront (of setting things in motion/acutating). • Changing concept from 'occupying' to 'influencing' • Changing method from direct influence to indirect. • Role-sharing with other stakeholders in the decision making process on statecraft and governance issues 	'Dwifungsi TNI'	1999 to 20 April 2000.
Stage II: Redefinition, reposition and reactualisation of TNI's role in Nationhood. (Stage II of TNI 's internal reform-continued)	<p>Principles of TNI reform are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gradually withdraw from social and political roles; • Focusing on national defence function; • Devolution of function and responsibility of internal state defence to Indonesian Police Force; • Enhancing the implementation of the 'joint Doctrine' • Enhancing internal management operations. <p>From the above principles TNI applied 12 points namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formulation of TNI's new paradigm; • Separation of TNI and POLRI; • Gradual withdraw from social and political roles, not involved in partisan activity; • Ending of functionality doctrine meaning that active soldiers are unable to become public officers unless they change status to become civilians when being nominated as electoral candidates.; • Dissolving social and political institutions within the TNI structure. • Political neutrality of TNI during elections.; • Reposition of relations between TNI and other TNI organization to become more function-based.; • Replacement of 'Korpri TNI' organization under the function of personnel management; • Formulation of territorial functions and restructuring of the concept as governance function; • Opening up organizational business management under TNI's Foundation by introducing transparency of professional management based on public accountability; • Enhancing the promotion of supremacy of the law and human rights among soldiers from all ranks; • Viewing challenges in nationhood by using the TNI's role and authority approaches as an instrument of national defence based on the Constitution according to the peoples' consent. 	'Dwifungsi' Doctrine was still influential.	2001.
Stage III: Implementation of TNI's New Paradigm under the current situation.	<p>In 2001, TNI HQ released the 'Implementation of TNI's New Paradigm'. Point III page 21 of the concept note mentions the continued internal reform especially after the birth of TAP MPR No. VI/MPR/2000. There are 21 reform agendas following the prior 12 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formulation of the new role of TNI in the 21st century; • Formulating the future vision of TNI's role as a result of its new paradigm; • Separation of POLRI and ABRI as the decision of Chief of ABRI on 1 April 1999 as an initial reform; • Abolition of ABRI's functionality by altering their status or by decision to retire (Kep: 03/P/II/1999); • Abolition of Wansospolpus (military council responsible for socio-political affairs at the central level) and Wansospolda/Wansospolda Tk-I (local military council for socio-political affairs at district level); • Decreasing of TNI-POLRI faction in the provincial and district house of representatives to abolish the social and political role of the military; • Not being involved in day to day politics; • Severing of organizational associations with Golkar party as well as 	Gradual changes from the 'dwifungsi doctrine' to the 'neutrality and professionalism of TNI'.	2001

	<p>distancing itself from all political parties;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistency and commitment to political neutrality during elections; • Restructuring of TNI relations with KBT (<i>Keluarga Besar TNI</i> - Big Military Family which consists of retired military personnel and their families); • Revision of the TNI Doctrine according to its reform and role in the 21st century.; • Changing of social and political staff into social and communication staff; • Changing of Social and Political Chief of Staff (Kasospol) into the Territorial Chief of Staff (Kaster); • Abolition of Sospoldam (Institution at the military command level responsible for socio-political affairs), Babinkardam (Board of military to place military officers at the national level into non-military institutions), Sospolrem (Board of military to place military officers into non-military institutions at the military regional level) and Sospoldim (Board of military to place military officers into non-military institutions at the district level). • Dissolution of <i>Staf Syawan ABRI</i> (staff that places military officers in public services, parliaments and public companies), <i>Staf Kamtibmas ABRI</i> (Coordinating Body on Assistance for National Stability) and Babinkar ABRI; • Implementing public accountability in military business organizations/ foundations; • Dissolution of Deputy Chief of TNI; • Abolition of Bakorstanas (Body of coordination on assistance for national stability) and Bakortanasda (Body of coordination on assistance for national stability at the local level); • Local executive candidates in local election (bupati/regent) from military must retire before the selection process of electoral candidates takes place; • Abolition of <i>Posko Kewaspadaan (Alert post)</i>; • Removal of ABRI's social and political lecture in TNI's education curricula. 		
--	---	--	--

Changes to legislation in recent years have influenced the changes in TNI structure. First, the roles of TNI and POLRI were separated through MPR No. VI/2000 and second, the function and tasks of TNI and POLRI were separated through TAP MPR No. VII/2000, which also limited the scope for TNI in security and defence. Third, military functions were also affected by the release of Law No. 3/2002 on State Defence which replaced Law No. 20/1982. Aside from regime change in the reform era which led to TNI internal reform, the new law stipulates changes in relations between defence organizations, namely relations between the Department of Defence (DoD) and TNI HQ, and between the national defence assembly, the DoD and TNI HQ. Fourth, changes in TNI took place after removal of the *Catur Dharma Eka Karma* (Cadek) doctrine. The Cadek doctrine provided the foundation for Suharto's military regime and the rules of the doctrine were rigidly enforced up to the early 1980s. The primary role of ABRI under the New Order was defined under Cadek as follows: as a Defence and Security Force to safeguard, to secure, to defend and maintain the independence, sovereignty and integrity of the nation and people; to safeguard, to secure, to defend and maintain the ideology of Pancasila and the 1945 Constitution; and to safeguard, secure, defend and maintain the organisation of national development and its achievements. Cadek was used to legitimise the military's involvement in all aspects of life

However, findings from research conducted by LIPI showed that the results of TNI's organizational changes have been that it has expanded vertically with the creation of new territorial commands and the organisational structure is still based on the Cadek doctrine, the substance of which is now encapsulated in the Tridek, and Sad Daya Dwi Bhakti (which is the implementing doctrine for Cadek) as mentioned in Law No. 20/1988 on the Principles of State Defence and Security. These two doctrines place TNI as the state instrument of defence and security, and still views their role as a social and political force, even though the structures for this have been dissolved. Furthermore, even though the military has dissolved many of its local political sections, TNI's organisation is still based on the principle of

prioritising a mainland defence strategy rather than a maritime strategy, and is still based on a peoples' defence doctrine which depends on guerrilla war strategies and territorial command deployment. These principles are outlined in Law No. 3/2002 on State Defence.

Within the context of democratic transition, TNI is no longer involved in day-to-day politics; instead it focuses on defence issues, while POLRI focuses on security issues. The release of the Defence White Book and Law No. 2/2002 as well as Law No. 3/2002, has meant that the state defence system is an 'umbrella' to manage security and defence sectors. State defence consists of:⁴¹

1. An early state defence system, run by the government.
2. TNI as the main component in facing military threats, supported by reserve and support forces;
3. Government institutions as the main component when facing non-military threats supported by other elements of the nation, corresponding to the form and nature of the threat.

Placing the management of defence and security issues primarily with non-military institutions facilitates civilian control over military authority. POLRI is expected to provide security for the people and to maintain the supremacy of law and justice. Law No. 34/2004 on TNI was created to establish professional soldiers as a part of TNI's internal reform which can only be deployed by instruction of the supreme civilian leader, the president. In reality, there was a heated argument during the legislation drafting process on this law, especially regarding the content of Article 19 in the draft law on TNI which was proposed by the DoD. The article implied (slightly) that without civilian authority/consent, the commander of TNI can deploy soldiers in a state of emergency and then report this within 24 hours to the president. Not surprisingly, this created public controversy because it gave power back to the military, suggesting a military coup would be made possible. Thus, parliament was forced to change the content of the article (Sinar Harapan, August 4, 2004; Kompas, March 1 2003).

Even though it is stipulated clearly in one of the clauses of Law No. 34/2004 that TNI may not participate in day-to-day politics in Indonesia, it seems that the reality is otherwise. Democratic consolidation in the transformation era has proved to be such a cumbersome process, even though TNI's role in national and local parliaments has already been abolished. One of the causes for these problems is that civil politicians like to involve the military in politics by nominating them to run for election. TNI Law No. 34/2004 abolished TNI's political role, but Local Autonomy Law No. 32/2004 welcomes TNI's role in local politics. Members of TNI and POLRI are welcome to run as candidates for governors or mayors, even though the TNI Act clearly abolished the political role of TNI and POLRI members.

According to Government Regulation No.6/2005, Clause 4 Verse 2 F, members of TNI and TNI-state employees may participate as candidates in district/municipal head elections (Pilkada) so long as they are non-active members of their forces. However, they do not have to retire from their forces. This was clearly a step backwards. Thus, the commander of TNI published Telegraphic Letter No. STR/222/2005 dated April 13 2005. This letter regulates the requirements, procedures, and neutral standing of TNI members during Pilkada. If a TNI member would like to run for election, he/she must write his/her respective commander a letter of resignation. This commander would then forward this letter of resignation to the higher-level commander, until the letter reaches the commander of TNI's Chief of Staff. If this letter of resignation (and along with it, the candidacy of the TNI member) is approved by the Chief of Staff, the letter will be forwarded to the TNI commander who can release a permit for the TNI member to withdraw from his/her forces to participate in the PILKADA. Thus, at

⁴¹ Pasal 7 UU No. 3/2002 tentang Pertahanan Negara (Article 7, law No. 3/2002 on State Defence).

present, people with a background in the military, even though they do resign, can still be involved in politics. This implies there is still a nuanced role for the military in politics because these retired soldiers can still access their networks within the armed forces.

It is worth noting that there may be incentives for TNI to force its way back into politics because of the inadequacies it is currently facing. First, the state is not providing enough funds for the economic welfare of its soldiers, and is unable to finance the minimum defence budget necessary for the military to have the minimum essential force to defend the country. Second, the state is now taking over military businesses but at the same time it is not providing an adequate defence budget. Third, there are concrete measures in place to support the grand strategy of establishing a professional and modern TNI by 2018. Fourth, if democratic consolidation does not create an environment where military appointments are made on merit rather patronage, this will lead to further discontent within the military. Finally, if civilians continue to interfere in military matters, again this may trigger military disobedience.

5. Bibliography

- Bhakti, Ikrar Nusa, Hargyaning Tyas, Heru Cahyono, Japanton Sitohang, M. Hamdan Basyar, Moch. Nurhasim, Riza Sihbudi and Sri Yanuarti (1999a) *Tentara yang Gelisah: Hasil Penelitian Yipika tentang Posisi ABRI dalam Gerakan Reformasi*, LIPI, The Indonesian Institute of Sciences, Bandung: Mizan
- Bhakti, Ikrar Nusa, Hargyaning Tyas, Hermawan Sulisty, Heru Cahyono, M. Hamdan Basyar, Moch. Nurhasim, Riza Sihbudi and Sri Yanuarti (1999b) *Tentara Mendamba Mitra*, LIPI, The Indonesian Institute of Sciences, Bandung: Mizan.
- Bhakti, Ikrar Nusa, Heru Cahyono, M. Hamdan Basyar, Moch. Nurhasim, Riza Sihbudi and Sri Yanuarti (2001) *Militer dan Politik Kekerasan Orde Baru*, First Edition, LIPI, The Indonesian Institute of Sciences, Bandung: Mizan
- Chauvel, Richard, and Ikrar Nusa Bhakti (2004) *The Papua Conflict: Jakarta's Perceptions and Policies*, Policy Studies 5, Washington, D.C.: East-West Center Washington, East-West Center Washington's Projects on Internal Conflicts.
- Crouch, Harold (1986) *Militer dan Politik di Indonesia*, Jakarta: Sinar Harapan
- Democracy Alliance for Papua (n.a.) *Laporan Advokasi Rakyat Untuk Wasior* (People Advocacy Report for Wasior), Jayapura: Democracy Alliance for Papua
- El Ibrahimy, M. Nur (2001) *Peranan Tgk. M. Daud Beureu-eh dalam Pergolakan Aceh*, (The Role of Tengku M.Daud Beureuh in Aceh's Upheaval), Jakarta: Media Da'wah
- Hamdan, M. Basyar (2005) *Relasi TNI dan Polri dalam Pengelolaan Keamanan di Maluku, Papua dan Poso*, (TNI and POLRI Relations Managing Security in Maluku, Papua and Poso) Jakarta: P2P LIPI (The Indonesian Institute of Sciences).
- ICG (2002) *Indonesia: Memburu Perdamaian di Maluku*, ICG Asia Report No. 31, February 8, Jakarta: ICG
- Jayapura Diocese Secretariat for Justice and Peace (2004) "Socio-political Notes No 8. Papua Aktual 2004 (April-June)", *Sekilas Informasi*, Jayapura: Jayapura Diocese
- Jenkins, David (1997) *Suharto and His Generals: Indonesian Military Politics 1983*, Third printing, Cornell Modern Indonesian Project (Publication No. 64), New York: Cornell University, 1984 first printing.
- Kastor, Rustam (2000) "Political Conspiracy Between RMS (the South Moluccans Republic) and the Christians Destroyed Muslims in Ambon-Maluku", Yogyakarta: Wahidah Press.
- Kepolisian Republik Indonesia Daerah Maluku (Maluku Police) (2001) *Berita Acara Pemeriksaan (Saksi) Renaldo, Michael Silver Kriefkhoff*, No. Pol: BP 241/K/VII/2001/SERSE, July 12.
- Maluku Police (POLRI Daerah Maluku) (2000) Report on the Case of Regional Police in Ambon Island Resort and Lease Islands, No. Pol: BP 103/K/X/2000/SERSE, Polri Daerah Maluku, Resort Pulau Ambon and Pulau-Pulau Lease
- Maluku Provincial Government (Pemerintah Propinsi Maluku) (2001) *Kronologi Kerusuhan Bernuasa Sara Di Propinsi Maluku* (The Chronology of Ethnic Riots in Maluku Province) Ambon: Pemerintah Propinsi Maluku, Direktorat Sosial Politik, March.
- Marasabessy, Suaedi, ed. (2002) *Maluku Baru: Satu Wujud Ideal Masyarakat Maluku pasca Konflik* (New Moluccas: An Ideal form of Post Conflict Moluccan Society), Jakarta: Kelompok Kerja Masalah Maluku /Moluccan Task Force, November.
- Noer, Rosita S., Humam Hamid, Moch. Nurhasim, Robertus Robet and Daniel Hutagalung, (2003) *Evaluation of Integrated Operations in Nanggroe Aceh Darussalam May 19 – November 19 2003*, unpublished, Forum Komunikasi Kesatuan Bangsa (FKKB), November.
- North Maluku Provincial Government (Pemerintah Propinsi Maluku Utara) (2001) *Kronologi Kerusuhan Bernuasa Sara Di Propinsi Maluku Utara* (Chronology of Ethnic Riots in Maluku Utara Province), Ternate: Pemerintah Propinsi Maluku Utara, Direktorat Sosial Politik, March.
- Notosusanto, Nugroho (1991), *Pejuang dan Prajurit* (Guerrillas and Soldiers), Jakarta: Sinar Harapan
- Nurhasim, Moch. (2003) *Program SSR bagi Tentara Nasional Indonesia: Kendala dan*

- Tantangan* (SSR Programs for the Indonesian National Armed Forces: Obstacles and Challenges), in *Buku Evaluasi Reformasi TNI dan POLRI (Evaluation of TNI and POLRI Reforms)*, Jakarta: RIDeP
- Osborne, Robin (1985) *Indonesia's Secret War: The Guerrilla Struggles in Irian Jaya*, Sydney: Allen and Unwin
- Regional Military Command (KODAM) Pattimura (2002) *Maluku Conflict Report*, Regional Military Command (KODAM) Pattimura
- Said, Salim (2001) *Militer Indonesia dan Politik, Dulu, Kini dan Kelak*, (Indonesian Military and Politics, Past, Present, and Future) Jakarta: Sinar Harapan
- Samego, Indria, Dewi Fortuna Anwar, Hamdan Basyar, Ikrar Nusa Bhakti, Maswadi Rauf, Riza Sihbudi and Sri Yanuarti (1998) "...*Bila ABRI Menghendaki...*," 2nd Edition, LIPI, The Indonesian Institute of Sciences, Bandung: Mizan.
- Sihbudi, Riza, Arwani Irewati, Ikrar Nusa Bhakti, Moch Nurahsim, Syamsuddin Haris and Tri Ratnawati (2001) *Bara Dalam Sekam*, LIPI, The Indonesian Institute of Sciences, Bandung: Mizan.
- Sjamsuddin, Nazaruddin(1989), *Integrasi Politik di Indonesia*, Jakarta: Gramedia.
- Stanley (2003) "Jurnalisme Patriotis: Bukan Solusi, Tapi Kemudahan", unpublished paper given at launch of the sites acehkit.com, Cipta II Building, Taman Ismail Marzuki, Jakarta, 22 July 2003.
- Sudarsono, Juwono (2004) "Reformasi Militer yang Sesungguhnya Bergantung Kepada Sipil," (True Military Reform Depends on Civilian Force). London, Jakarta: Jakarta Post, June 24.
- TNI HQ (1999) *TNI Abad XXI, Redefinisi, Reposisi, dan Reaktualisasi Peran TNI Dalam Kehidupan Bangsa*, Markas Besar TNI: Jakarta
- Widjanarko and Asep S. Sambodjo, eds, (1999) *Aceh Merdeka dalam Perdebatan*, Jakarta: Citra Putra Bangsa
- Yanuarti, Sri, Yusuf, Josephine Rosa Marieta and Mardyanto Wahyu Nugroho (2003) Sub Program Otonomi Daerah, Konflik, dan Daya Saing, *Konflik Maluku di Maluku Tengah: Penyebab, Karakteristik, dan Penyelesaian Jangka Panjang*, Jakarta: Indonesia Institute of Sciences Jakarta/LIPI
- Yanuarti, Sri, Yusuf, Josephine Rosa Marieta and Mardyanto Wahyu Nugroho, (2004), Sub Program Otonomi Daerah, Konflik, dan Daya Saing, *Konflik Maluku Utara: Penyebab, Karakteristik, dan Penyelesaian Jangka Panjang*, Jakarta: Indonesia Institute of Sciences/ LIPI

List of newspaper sources

- Cenderawasih Post (August 18, 2004)
http://www.unisosdem.org/ekopol_detail.php?aid=45&coid=3&caid=3
- Jakarta Post (June 9, 2005) "TNI vows to continue the fight in Aceh".
- Jakarta Post, (April 13, 2005) "Cautions optimism as Aceh Peace Talks Resume."
- Jakarta Post, (July 25, 2000)
- Jakarta Post, (June 23, 2000)
- Jakarta Post, (June 9, 2005)
- Jakarta Post, (March 3, 2001) 'It's impossible to bring total peace in Malukus'
- Jakarta Post, (May 22, 2003)
- Kompas (February 27, 2002).
- Kompas (June 21, 1991)
- Kompas (March 1, 2003) Panglima TNI Kerahkan Pasukan, Ukurannya Harus Jelas
- Kompas Daily, (December 6, 1999)
- Kompas Daily, (October 20, 2000)
- Kompas, (June 24, 1991)
- Kompas, (March 1, 2003)
- Rakyat Merdeka Daily (July 31, 1999)
- Republika, (May 20, 2003).

Serambi Indonesia (May 20, 2003)
SiaR News Service, (June 27, 2000)
Sinar Harapan (August 4, 2004) RUU TNI "Fait Accompli" untuk Sebuah Legitimasi?
Sinar Harapan, (March 11, 2003)
Tempo Interaktif, (June 26, 2000)
Tempointeraktif.com (August 6, 2004) Barisan Opisisi Malang Demo RUU TNI
Tempointeraktif.com, (March 10, 2003). *Tempointeraktif.com*, 6 Agustus 2004