



JICA Research Institute

*JICA-RI Working Paper*

Human Security in Practice: East Asian Experiences

Perception on Human Security: Indonesian View

---

**Lina A. Alexandra**

No. 99

March 2015

JICA Research Institute



JICA Research Institute

This paper was prepared as part of a research project on “Human Security in Practice: East Asian Experiences,” organized by the Japan International Cooperation Agency Research Institute (JICA-RI).

Use and dissemination of this working paper is encouraged; however, the JICA Research Institute requests due acknowledgement and a copy of any publication for which this working paper has provided input. The views expressed in this paper are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent the official positions of either the JICA Research Institute or JICA.

JICA Research Institute

10-5 Ichigaya Honmura-cho

Shinjuku-ku

Tokyo 162-8433 JAPAN

TEL: +81-3-3269-3374

FAX: +81-3-3269-2054

Copyright ©2015 Lina A. Alexandra All rights reserved.

# Perception on Human Security: Indonesian View

Lina A. Alexandra<sup>1</sup>

## Abstract

Two decades after its inception in the Human Development Report 1994, the Human Security (HS) concept has gained certain traction among the policymakers as well as the civil society. Some stakeholders have welcomed the concept as a useful tool for elevating some issues that posed significant challenges to the security of the individuals within a country or more than a country at the same time. But some others consider the concept as too broad and all-encompassing, which needs more clarification in terms of its application, to take up some issues as security concerns. Therefore, it is timely to check the understanding on this HS so far and to what extent the concept has been considered suitable and useful to deal with challenges that may be considered as new or non-traditional security concerns.

This paper aims to elaborate on the perception of different stakeholders on HS in Indonesia. The perception covers aspects such as definition of HS in relation to three basic elements, i.e., freedom from want, freedom from fear, and freedom to live in dignity; priority issues; protection and empowerment; and cross-border characteristics. It also examines sovereignty and the involvement of military instrument questions in dealing with issues that fall under the HS discussion. The study is based on in-depth interviews with different stakeholders that included policymakers (high-rank officials), ex-military officers, academics, and non-governmental organization activists.

The paper is divided into three sections. The first section begins with an introduction of the HS concept, the research methodology, and some results of a survey by the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) on the perception of HS among the society. The second section broadly examines several acts/regulations that contain elements related to HS. It is interesting to note that while many regulations have been enacted to ensure freedom from want, freedom from fear, and freedom to live in dignity, none of the regulations actually include the word "Human Security." This somehow may reflect a level of hesitancy among the policymakers to fully embrace the concept and use it as a policy tool, due to some perceptions on the intentions behind the delivery of the HS concept and in what direction that concept is heading to. These different perceptions of HS are then elaborated in the third section. Finally, it is hoped that this elaboration may provide a better knowledge of how the HS concept is being perceived in Indonesia.

---

<sup>1</sup> Special thanks to Rocky Intan, Junior Researcher at the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) who helped conduct the interviews and wrote some parts of the introduction section.

## **Introduction**

Since Human Security (HS) was introduced in the *Human Development Report* in 1994, the concept has been accepted with different interpretations. Mostly associated with development or socio-economic concerns, certain stakeholders, especially the civil society or non-governmental organizations, tend to view HS as an effective tool to raise various issues or challenges to be taken up as security concerns. However, some other actors, mainly coming from the government officials, still have some reservation whether issues which used to be seen as social or economic issues should be put under the term ‘security’ since such action may bring some significant consequences, such as the use of extraordinary measures, including military means.

In the context of Indonesia, in spite of its relatively stable economic growth, the country continues to face lots of challenges related to human security. Indonesia is one of the most vulnerable countries in the world to natural disasters as the country is struggling to reconstruct the victimized areas, starting from the tsunami in Aceh back in 2004, the earthquake in Yogyakarta, volcanic eruptions in several cities in Indonesia, as well as floods that hampered the capital city of Jakarta in early 2013. The country also faced challenges before from pandemics, such as the avian flu and is continuously struggling to reduce the spread of HIV/AIDS. Recently, Indonesia is also facing religious tensions in some areas, causing some minority groups to be displaced from their hometown while some have even been harassed and killed.

This paper aims to elaborate on how Human Security (HS) is being perceived in Indonesia and how different stakeholders in Indonesia view HS threats/challenges. The result contributes to the overall perception of how East Asian countries perceive and interpret HS as well as how these countries perceive HS threats. The elaboration also includes perceptions on how actors are responsible for dealing with these challenges as well as the readiness to handle the issues.

## 1. Research Methodology

The research has been conducted using two methods. The first method is document analysis that was applied to observe and analyze various regulations that deal with HS issues. The second method is in-depth interviews which were conducted with 12 respondents with different backgrounds, i.e., government, military, academicians, and activists from different non-governmental organizations (NGOs). The list is as follows:

**Table 1. List of Interviewees**

<b>List of Respondents</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Institution</b>
Rachmawati Hussein	Vice Chair	Muhammadiyah Disaster Management Centre
Melani Budianta	Professor of Literature	Faculty of Cultural Knowledge, University of Indonesia
Andika Putraditama	Outreach Officer	World Resources Institute
Dicky Sofjan	Core Doctoral Faculty	Indonesian Consortium for Religious Studies
Sidney Jones	Director	Institute for Policy Analysis of Conflict, Jakarta
Sudarno Sumarto	Senior Research Fellow	SMERU Research Institute
Anis Hidayah	Executive Director	Migrant Care
Nafsiah Mboi	Minister of Health	Ministry of Health
Andreas Harsono	Indonesia Researcher	Human Rights Watch
Agus Widjojo (Retd. General)	Chair of the Executive Board	Yayasan Indonesia Cerdas Unggul
Bonar Tigor Naipospos	Vice President	Setara Institute for Democracy and Peace
Kuntoro Mangkusubroto	Head	President's Delivery Unit of Indonesia (UKP4)

Due to the limitation of time and budget, unfortunately the interviews can only be conducted in Jakarta. Nevertheless, we managed to interview one respondent that is based in Yogyakarta via Skype.

## 2. Overview of HS Conditions in Indonesia

In Bahasa Indonesia, Human Security (HS) is translated into the word “*keamanan manusia*” or “*keamanan insani*” (*manusia/insani* = human; *keamanan*=security). However, in the context of HS, the term “*keamanan*” can also be slightly adjusted into “*kesejahteraan*” (welfare) since the term “*keamanan*” is generally referred to as hard security with a heavy emphasis on the military dimension. However, in many occasions, most of the discussions that address new security challenges tend to refer to other terms such as “non-traditional security” and “transnational threats,” while HS from its definition encompasses those kinds of threats.<sup>2</sup>

Briefly on Indonesia’s development conditions, although Indonesia was the country hit hardest by the 1998 Asian Financial Crisis, it has made great strides in its fight against poverty since then. From 1998-2013, the percentage of the population living below the national poverty line has been falling consistently from 24% to 11%.<sup>3</sup> The unemployment rate has also shown considerable improvement. From 2000-2013, the unemployment rate has fallen from 9% to 6%.<sup>4</sup> In the health front, the percentage of infants under the age of five receiving Polio immunization has increased from 86% in 1999 to 90% in 2012.<sup>5</sup>

Yet, the perception of Indonesians on the threats to their human security tells a different story. Despite the steady fall in the national unemployment rate, among 1200 respondents surveyed on March 2014, 32% stated “threat from unemployment” as the most important security threat.<sup>6</sup> This was followed by the “threat of lack of basic food” at 17%. The perception of the most important security threat is featured in Figure 1. The threat of communicable

---

<sup>2</sup> Rizal Sukma, “Indonesia’s Security Outlook, Defence Policy, and Regional Cooperation,” *Asia Pacific Countries’ Security Outlook and Its Implications for the Defense Sector* no.5 (2010): 3-24, accessed July 31, 2014, [http://www.nids.go.jp/english/publication/joint\\_research/series5/pdf/5-1.pdf](http://www.nids.go.jp/english/publication/joint_research/series5/pdf/5-1.pdf).

<sup>3</sup> “Number of Poor People, Percentage of Poor People, and the Poverty Line, 1970-2013,” Statistics Indonesia, accessed July 10, 2014, [http://www.bps.go.id/eng/tab\\_sub/view.php?kat=1&tabel=1&daftar=1&id\\_subyek=23&notab=7](http://www.bps.go.id/eng/tab_sub/view.php?kat=1&tabel=1&daftar=1&id_subyek=23&notab=7).

<sup>4</sup> “Number of Labor Force, Labor, Unemployment, TPAK and TPT, 1986-2013,” Statistics Indonesia, accessed July 10, 2014, [http://www.bps.go.id/eng/tab\\_sub/view.php?kat=1&tabel=1&daftar=1&id\\_subyek=06&notab=5](http://www.bps.go.id/eng/tab_sub/view.php?kat=1&tabel=1&daftar=1&id_subyek=06&notab=5).

<sup>5</sup> “Health Indicators 1995-2012,” Statistics Indonesia, accessed July 10, 2014, [http://www.bps.go.id/eng/tab\\_sub/view.php?kat=1&tabel=1&daftar=1&id\\_subyek=30&notab=33](http://www.bps.go.id/eng/tab_sub/view.php?kat=1&tabel=1&daftar=1&id_subyek=30&notab=33)

<sup>6</sup> Centre for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS), *National Survey* (Jakarta: CSIS, March 2014).

diseases also featured prominently among respondents, with 59% of them saying that they have not felt protected from the communicable diseases.<sup>7</sup>

From the statistics, ironically, it can be seen that Papua, one of the richest area in Indonesia in terms of energy resources, still struggled with many human security problems, starting from general poverty, unemployment, and the pressing issues of public health. The percentage of people living below the poverty rate in the provinces of Papua and West Papua stood at 30.05% and 27.13% on March 2014.<sup>8</sup> The poverty figures in both provinces are almost double the national average, which stood at 11.25%. The employment situation was doing better with unemployment at 3.63% and 5.49% in Papua and West Papua on August 2012, respectively.<sup>9</sup> This compares favorably to the national average of 6.14%. This is not the same with the issue of health, however. To take the example HIV/AIDS, the disease is a low-level epidemic in both provinces. 2.4% of the population aged 15-24 suffered from HIV/AIDS based on a 2012 report by the Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS, compared to the national average of 0.3%.<sup>10</sup>

---


<sup>7</sup> Ibid.

<sup>8</sup> “Numbers and Percentage of People under Poverty, the Poverty Line, Poverty Depth Index, and Poverty Prevalence Index by Provinces, March 2014,” Central Statistics Agency, accessed October 28, 2014, [http://www.bps.go.id/tab\\_sub/view.php?kat=1&tabel=1&daftar=1&id\\_subyek=23&notab=1](http://www.bps.go.id/tab_sub/view.php?kat=1&tabel=1&daftar=1&id_subyek=23&notab=1).

<sup>9</sup> “Unemployment Rate and Workforce Participation Rate by Provinces, 2002-2012,” Central Statistics Agency, accessed October 28, 2014, [http://www.bps.go.id/tab\\_sub/view.php?kat=1&tabel=1&daftar=1&id\\_subyek=06&notab=13](http://www.bps.go.id/tab_sub/view.php?kat=1&tabel=1&daftar=1&id_subyek=06&notab=13).

<sup>10</sup> “Growing HIV/AIDS awareness in Indonesia’s Papua region,” *IRIN NEWS*, June 18, 2013, accessed October 28, 2014, <http://www.irinnews.org/report/98245/growing-hiv-aids-awareness-in-indonesia-s-papua-region>.

**Figure 1. Perception on the Most Important Security Threat in Indonesia**



*Source: CSIS National Survey, March 2014.*

### **3. Discourse on HS in Various Regulations**

It is important to note first that the exact word “Human Security” cannot be found so far in any formal regulations in Indonesia. However, the Bill of the National Security Act (October 16, 2012 version) clearly mentioned human security. According to Chapter 5 of the Bill, national security consists of four types: human security, public security, internal security, and external security. In the additional explanation section, issues that can be generated as those of human security are among others pandemics, extreme hunger, natural disasters that caused many victims, abject poverty, crimes against humanity, and extreme stress. Chapter 16 also mentioned



human as one of the referent objects of national security threats. Human here refers to both Indonesian citizens as well as foreign citizens who happen to be in Indonesia.

Then, in chapter 17, it is differentiated between military threats, armed threats, and non-armed threats. While military threats are perceived as external threats coming from another country's military to attack Indonesia's sovereignty, armed threats and non-armed threats both fall within internal threats and can also threaten humans. Armed threats to human security are among others terrorism, separatist acts or armed separatist struggles, and armed hijacking. Then, non-armed threats to humans which can be considered as public security and human security are horizontal/communal conflicts; anarchism; unhealthy trade practice; monetary crisis; natural disasters; non-natural and social disasters; transnational crimes; radicalism; elimination of national moral and ethical values; water and food scarcity; misuse of chemicals, biologicals, radioactives, nuclear substance; environmental degradation; energy scarcity; pandemics; and social problems (such as poverty, injustice, illiteracy, violations of law, and corruption).

It is interesting to note that this chapter also address potential threats and actual threats. Potential here means that such threats have not existed before or very rarely taken place but then carry the potential, should such threats take place, to threaten the existence and security of the nation-state. Then, actual means that such threats have taken place before and will take place again sometime in the future.

In spite of the absence of the HS term, there are several chapters in the Constitution that highlight various rights which strongly link with human security elements. Chapter 27, for example, mentions that each citizen has the right to a decent job and living. Then, chapter 28A talks about the rights to life and to maintain it. It continues with chapter 28H that ensures the right to have a welfare life and to receive social security. Even, chapter 34 specifically ensures provision for the poor and abandoned children from the state. All these then relate with efforts from the state to ensure freedom from want.

Freedom from fear can also be reflected from chapter 28A on the rights to life and to maintain life. People who are being threatened with death actually lose their freedom from fear. Chapter 28G then stipulates the right of an individual to protect him/herself and also the right to be free from torture or ill treatment that undermine human dignity. It is then somehow repeated again in chapter 28I that mentions the right to live, not to be tortured, and so on. In the context of Indonesia, freedom from fear is also linked with the freedom of religion, which is guaranteed in chapter 28E as well as 29. From many cases within the past five or even ten years, we can witness how members of certain religious groups are living in fear since they have been threatened while doing their religious practice according to their personal belief, which unfortunately is considered false teaching or not supporting the so-called “harmonious religious life” among different religions. What it means by supporting harmony is for the minority to be able to “adjust” or “position” themselves among the majority, despite the fact that the minority should deny their freedom to worship what they believe.

Finally, freedom to live in dignity is somehow linked with the other two elements of freedom from want and freedom from fear. While an individual can live a decent life, receive good education (chapter 34), have a proper job, and practice his/her religion freely, then it is already more than half way for a person to be able to live in dignity. Nevertheless, chapter 28G as mentioned before specifically acknowledges the right to be free from insulting acts that undermine dignity of an individual.

Moreover, to follow up from the Constitution, there are various specific regulations issued to ensure protection of HS. For example, Indonesia has specifically the Act on Health, the Act on Social Welfare, the Act on Allocation and Protection of Indonesian Migrant Workers Abroad, the Act on Eradication of Human Trafficking Criminal Practice, the Act on Disaster Management, the Act on Social Conflicts Management, and the Act on Elimination of Racial and Ethnicity Discriminations.

While the term Human Security is not specifically mentioned in those acts, each act refers to the elements of HS, i.e., freedom from want, freedom from fear, and freedom to live in

dignity, but with different notions, such as welfare, human rights, dignity, social protection, safety, and basic needs. The explanation section of the Act on Health underlines that health is part of human rights as well as one of the elements of welfare. Then, the Act on Social Welfare mentioned about the goal to create a decent life and in dignity, while at the same time to fulfill the basic needs of the people.

#### *Act on Health 36/2009*

In the Introduction part it is mentioned that health is an element of human rights and one of the welfare aspects. Chapter 1 to chapter 4 basically elaborate on the right of every person to gain health physically, mentally, and spiritually, which enables him or her to live a productive life, both in a social and economic manner. Then, chapters 14 to 19 state that government is responsible for ensuring efforts related to the provision of health in an equal and accessible way for the people. Regarding this, the government has issued a social safety system where health service is a component.

#### *Act on Social Welfare 11/2009*

This Act mentions that the state provides services to achieve a decent and dignified life, as well as to fulfill the rights of citizens for basic needs as part of creating social welfare. Social welfare is defined as the fulfillment of material, spiritual, and social needs so the people may sustain their life and be able to develop themselves and perform their social functions in the society. The government, both national and local, are then responsible for managing social services, which cover aspects such as social rehabilitation, social safety net, social empowerment, and social protection. Social protection in particular refers to efforts to prevent and to handle risks from social susceptibilities or shocks. Then, empowerment is aimed at assisting those who have social problems to be able to meet their basic needs. Chapter 4 states clearly that the state, in this case the government, has the sole responsibility for organizing matters related to social

welfare. Chapter 5 then elaborates the criteria of target groups to receive social services: 1) poor; 2) displaced; 3) disabled; 4) isolated; 5) socially disabled or having deviant behaviors; 6) disaster victims; and 7) victims of torture, exploitation, and discrimination.

*Act on Allocation and Protection of Indonesian Migrant Workers Abroad 39/2004*

This Act recognizes the right to work as a human right which needs to be respected and protected. In Chapter 5, the Government has the obligation to regulate, conduct, and monitor the process regarding the placement and protection of migrant workers abroad. Then, Chapter 6 reaffirms that government is responsible for enhancing the efforts to protect migrant workers abroad. Chapter 8 regulates that each worker has the right to be protected by law from disgraceful acts and violations of his/her rights.

*Act on Eradication of Human Trafficking Criminal Practice 21/2007*

This Act, in the Introduction part, clearly states that human trafficking, especially of women and children, should be eradicated since it is an act against the dignity of human beings and also a violation of human rights. In a more detailed explanation, the Act considers human trafficking as a modern form of slavery. It has been understood also that such crime may be organized and not only involves individuals, but also corporations, while the perpetrators usually have networks in many countries to conduct this crime.

Chapter 59 asserts that the government has to implement international cooperation, either bilateral, regional, or multilateral to increase the effectiveness in preventing and eradicating this human trafficking crime. Chapter 61 then talks about the government's obligation to open access for people's participation, both at the national and international levels, in order to prevent and handle this issue. It is important to note that the fact Indonesia has this specific law to regulate the eradication of human trafficking is already a significant achievement and a clear recognition of one of the most serious threats to HS.

*Act on Disaster Management 24/2007*

The Introduction part of this Act acknowledges the geographical, geological, and demographic conditions that are vulnerable to disasters, which can be man-made disasters or purely natural disasters that may claim human lives. From here at least it can be identified that the policymakers detect a certain level of downside risk to manage in relation to disaster. It leads then to the preventive measures as well as early-warning systems to reduce the damage caused by disasters. Chapter 6 mentions the responsibility of government in conducting disaster management, starting from reducing the risks from disasters as well as incorporating such risk-reduction efforts into development programs, protecting the society from the impacts of disaster, and meeting the needs of the people, including the victims/displaced ones that have suffered from the negative impacts of the disaster.

Then, Chapter 30 allows international and non-governmental organizations to participate in disaster relief efforts and also to receive protection from the government when conducting their tasks in the country. This indicates then a level of intervention in the form of external support in dealing with disasters is recognized.

*Act on Social Conflicts Management 7/2012*

This Act particularly regulates how social conflicts should be managed, started from the conflict prevention (including building an early-warning system), conflict management (cessation of violence/hostilities), and conflict resolution (post-conflict peacebuilding, reconstruction). This Act also mentions the establishment of mechanisms on how to settle conflicts, including the establishment of an ad hoc task force.

This Act reiterates the national goal to protect the nation, including ensuring safety and security as well as to be free from fear in order to create social welfare as mandated by the Constitution. Again, the state, or the government, has the full responsibility to provide such protection and promotion of human rights for everyone. This Act also portrays the diversity of

ethnicity, religion, and culture which coincide with the development gap, injustice, and the social, economic, and political gap carry the potential to cause conflicts. Interestingly, other than those factors, we can also detect an anxiety over foreign intervention within this Act. A more detailed explanation on this Act mentions foreign intervention in the context of democratic transition in a globalized world, as one of factors that may situate Indonesia to be prone to conflicts, especially horizontal conflicts.

*Act on Elimination of Racial and Ethnicity Discriminations 40/2008*

To follow up from the ratification of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination 1965, the Act on Elimination of Racial and Ethnicity Discriminations was issued in 2008. This Act basically mentions that the elimination of this racial and ethnicity discrimination should be implemented by protecting and ensuring equality before the law for all citizens (article 5). Article 9 clearly mentions that all citizens have the right to receive equal treatment to gain their civilian, political, economic, and social rights without being discriminated against based on race or ethnicity. An addendum of this article elaborates on those rights, among others the rights to live in any place within the country, freedom of expression, to gain information, to receive equal treatment before the law, to receive protection from any racial violence, to participate in government processes as well as in defending the country, to work and earn a living, to receive equal treatment when accessing public and social services, and to express their culture. Furthermore, Article 8 gives the mandate to the National Human Rights Commission to monitor the implementation of such protection, including to do fact-finding investigations against those, including government institutions, who are suspected as displaying discriminative acts. Article 13 underlines the right of individuals to submit a lawsuit should he or she receive any discriminative treatment that has caused him or her certain loss.

#### 4. Perceptions on Human Security

Human Security (HS) indeed is a very broad concept. It can be perceived differently by different individuals. This part elaborates on the views of different stakeholders coming from different backgrounds (i.e., government officials, ex-military, academicians, and NGO activists), on the HS concept and how they perceive HS threats/challenges.

For the purpose of this article, the views on HS are measured from these four aspects:

- (1) Elements of HS based on the *Human Development Report 1994*: freedom from fear, freedom from want, and freedom to live in dignity;
- (2) Responding to HS challenges, whether it is more focused on protection (top-down) or empowerment (bottom-up);
- (3) Preparedness to downside risks, not only reactive or emergency response; and
- (4) Policies to cope with cross-border risks as well as domestic risks.

##### *General knowledge/understanding on HS*

In general, the stakeholders in Indonesia have some knowledge of what HS is. However, only very few respondents could elaborate HS as what has been described in the *Human Development Report 1994* that mentioned two elements of freedom from want and freedom from fear, which were later joined by freedom to live in dignity.<sup>11</sup> Some acknowledge that this concept was promoted by the United Nations in the past but could not, or even were not, really interested in deepening the conversation on how such a concept has been developing until now. Nevertheless, all of them have a general or basic understanding of what HS is, which is a concept that addresses issues related to the basic needs of human beings or individuals beyond the traditional security that focuses on military threats. One respondent that engages in women's

---

<sup>11</sup> United Nations General Assembly, *2005 World Summit Outcome : resolution / adopted by the General Assembly*, October 24, 2005, A/RES/60/1.

issues framed HS as the ability of people to be resilient because they acquire a better quality of life.

While most respondents do not problematize the concept itself, one respondent with a military background has a particular concern about HS. According to him, the development of HS is totally separated from the way traditional security develops, which he simply put as “military.” Regarding prioritization of human security issues, he argued that if the government should prioritize human security, it happens “by default” rather than “by design.” It means that if certain problem is worsening to the extent that it can threaten the whole population then by itself that human security has become a national priority. This confirms the argument of another respondent who is NGO activist that HS is still very much viewed under the paradigm of national security. A respondent who is an activist in protection of migrant workers argued that rather than simply threatening the migrant workers as individuals only, this issue can actually become national security when the issue is perceived as causing tensions in bilateral relations, such as between Indonesia and Malaysia, and Indonesia with Saudi Arabia, and so on. Thus, while acknowledging a shift to recognize the importance of HS as a policy framework, the government still emphasizes on how to create stability and security to sustain the national development.

Furthermore, the respondent with the military background puts a strong note on this concept by quoting two criteria on how an issue can become a security threat. First, if such issue poses an existential threat in a way that it threatens the survival of the people. Second, if there is a need to take an extraordinary measures to handle such threat. It is important for certain problem to be scrutinized first whether it meets those two criteria before seeing it as human security threat. He even portrayed the ambiguity of HS concept itself by arguing that there is no indicator so far to differentiate between human security and human development issues, while acknowledging that threats to human security are actually real. This, according to him, shows that people’s understanding on HS has actually not been deep enough. Such concern, to a certain extent is valid as another respondent is still confused in differentiating between HS



threats with personal problems between individuals, taking the example that a person's dignity is threatened when one person feels excluded from society because he/she is not invited to a wedding party.

A similar response also comes from one of high-rank government official. While saying that he has no objection at all toward the concept, he argues that human security is still very much a vague concept. He also explains on how the term human security has gained certain rejection and criticism due to its political baggage during its inception, which then according to him prevented the inclusion of such concept into the Report submitted by the High Level Panel for Millennium Development Goals in Post-2015. Nevertheless, he agrees that such concept is useful when the humanitarian "face," instead of political, is being attached to this HS.

Moreover, he continued by critically saying that we should not rush to put everything under the term human security. He basically claims that issues, such as poverty, natural disasters, religious conflicts, and even child sexual harassment as serious challenges to tackle, but those issues are still within the social dimension and not security. A certain issue can become a human security issue if there is a deliberate action from authorities to threaten the safety and security of its own people. This, according to him, can only be reflected if there is a specific regulation that clearly limits the ability of people to achieve freedom from want, freedom from fear, and freedom to live in dignity. Other than that, the issues should remain social or economic issues and cannot be treated as security issues.

While there are differences in the understanding of the HS concept between governmental and non-governmental actors, both actors understand that HS is beyond traditional security that is associated with military dimension/defense issue. Some respondents refer to the term "non-traditional security threats" when identifying human security threats. Respondents from civil society/non-governmental sector believe that the government has a level of knowledge of what HS is as well as on HS threats. However, some respondents have argued that the high-ranking officials may have better knowledge compared to the lower rank ones. This condition then leads in implementation level when trying to deal with the HS challenges.

### *HS as a policy framework*

Despite various views on HS as a concept, all respondents have generally agreed that HS is useful as a policy framework to raise security issues that threaten individuals in other dimensions than military threat. Moreover, since many respondents believe that the government, especially the high-ranking ones, has some knowledge on HS, there is a possibility according to them that certain HS elements have been considered or incorporated as a policy framework. From the earlier elaboration on the regulation side, despite the fact that the word Human Security is not directly used, but the aspects of HS and also the HS challenges are clearly addressed by issuing those regulations/acts.

However, this is not to argue that there are no problems left to face. Using HS as a framework has yet led into a comprehensive policy on how to dealing with HS threats/challenges. This can be seen in the poverty issue. According to one respondent who is working in an NGO that focuses on poverty reduction, policies tend to be constructed within the mindset of philanthropy action or charity rather than a set of comprehensive measures to alleviate poverty. This explains why the responses so far are mainly reactive in nature rather than preventive and sustainable.

Another challenge, according to some other respondents, comes from the bargaining process in the decision-making process which eventually has politicized efforts to deal with HS. In other words, HS challenges would be addressed only if there are political benefits to gain from handling such issues. This can be seen, especially, when dealing with religious issue. For example, to defend a minority group against the forced closure of a church in West Java, has been considered as not bringing political benefits as the majority may not vote for the local leaders if there is a local election in the future. Even worse, the majority may challenge the legitimacy of those leaders. Therefore, such issue remains unsettled until now.

Similar problem also arises in the issue of environmental degradation, i.e., deforestation. Parliament members, especially those within the Commissions that should defend for


environmental protection, prefer not to talk on how to reduce gas emission when meeting with their constituents. Because, if they talk about protecting the forest, they will be perceived as against the investors that have the interest to open the land for industrial purposes (palm oil companies), and then the investors will not bring money for the people there. At the end, if they talk about the protection, they will not be elected/re-elected during the election time. According to this respondent, the issue is framed in the potential clash between the need to achieve economic security by increasing the palm oil production on one hand, but on the other hand the excessive effort to convert forest into palm oil plantation has put a serious challenge to environmental security.

Finally, the challenge lies in a classical issue of political will. While HS may be incorporated as a policy framework, it definitely needs a strong political will from the government to handle those challenges seriously. The lack of such political will is shown clearly in the issue of migrant workers. In some other cases, including religious conflicts, it is clear that the government is ignorant despite the fact that it knows what the real problem is. According to the NGO activist on the migrant worker issue, the government seems to be reluctant to negotiate or criticize host countries in which such violations against migrant workers persist, simply for the sake of not disrupting good bilateral relations with those particular countries. Therefore, regarding the issue of migrant workers, the government tends to focus on how to protect state security rather than human security. When there is an issue of violations against workers' rights, the focus is simply on violations against state sovereignty/dignity rather than a threat to human security. In addition to this, one scholar who is working on the religious conflict issue suspects that discussing HS is considered sensitive since it gives an impression that the government does not perform well in fulfilling its responsibilities toward its own people. It is important for the government to create an image that this country is safe and peaceful.

### *Priority issues in HS*

Regarding the question of which element of HS is considered to be a priority or the most important one in Indonesia, all of the respondents tend to take up the issue that they are involved in (for example, poverty; environment/climate change/deforestation; health; religious discrimination against minority or religious conflict – threats by the majority; internal/horizontal conflicts; land conflicts; protection of women; and migrant workers). Some respondents have come up with similar answer; income gap, income inequality, or unequal distribution of welfare/resources.


**Figure 2. The Biggest Human Security Challenges in Indonesia**



*Source:* Interview of respondents.

Nevertheless, in general, most of respondents tend to argue that the three elements of HS are interrelated. The fulfilment of one element depends on the fulfilment of the other two elements. In order to live in dignity, an individual certainly needs to be free from fear and want. As highlighted by one respondent, the land grabbing issue is not only a threat to freedom from want but also freedom to live in dignity, since land is associated with identity. One scholar, who is an expert on the conflict resolution issue, has pointed out that while economic security (freedom from want) is the most important HS issue in Indonesia, the crisis in Papua also indicates another problem on how the people's dignity is being seriously undermined, which is beyond the need for food.

**Figure 3. Emphasis of Human Security Elements**



*Source:* Interview of respondents.

The poverty and welfare issue, which can be associated with freedom from want, have received special attention because poverty is viewed as a source that can lead to other kinds of

threats, i.e., terrorism, radicalism, or extremism. Similar to poverty, climate change is also perceived as carrying the potential to lead to other kinds of threats, such as food insecurity, natural disasters, and extreme weather.

Regarding the freedom from fear, some respondents argued that the situation has been improved compared with the one under the New Order era (1967-1998). Under the authoritarian regime, while welfare was not an issue due to high economic growth, people felt threatened by the oppression that limits the freedom of people to express their voices and identities. But, some other respondents have expressed a different view by saying that there is a different degree of threat against freedom from fear in this Post-Reformation (2000-onwards) era. Such threat comes from the ignorance of the government to protect minority groups in Indonesia, making them still live in fear.

One problem was raised by one of the respondents when asked about choosing the priority issue. In the issue of deforestation, there is a challenge to choose which issue should prevail - whether to protect environmental security by preventing more forests from being opened for plantation or to deal with food security and economic security by, for example, allowing palm oil production to increase in order to meet the consumption level, since palm oil has become one of the most important commodities.

Regarding issues of HS, some respondents rather disagree with the argument to treat such challenges as security issues. The respondent coming from a military background seems to be cautious on how to define certain problems/issues as human security concerns. According to him, taking the example of hunger, it should be measured first by whether the level of hunger has been widespread, thus putting the whole society in danger. Otherwise, it cannot be categorized as a human security threat. Infectious disease, for example, should also be scrutinized first, whether it may develop fast to kill the entire population should it not be tackled immediately and using extraordinary measures, such as in the case of Ebola. Otherwise, again it cannot be defined as a human security threat. Nevertheless, he agrees that human security is also part of national security, but there should be a clear understanding to define whether an issue is

really a security threat or not in order to decide what measures should be taken to handle that problem. If such problems do not present any existential threat, meaning that they do not threaten to destroy human lives, then they should not be considered as human security threats.

In a similar vein, one high-rank official argues that we can hardly say that there are HS challenges in Indonesia. According to him, the problem lies not with the issues, i.e., natural disasters or poverty, but rather in the way people fail to position themselves to prevent themselves from becoming the victims of those problems. People can become victims of natural disasters often because the local government failed to properly impose an effective “zoning” system that maps out disaster-prone areas that prevent people from living within those vulnerable areas, or the people themselves refused to follow such instructions to stay away from those areas.

#### *Protection and/or empowerment*

It is no surprise to find that most respondents have pointed out that the government, both at national and local levels is the most responsible actor to deal with HS threats. This is somehow related to the perception that most of the respondents believe that government officials do have a level of knowledge on HS, although several respondents have argued that high-ranking officials tend to have a better understanding, while the lower rank ones may not have substantive knowledge on what HS is. However, the challenge is always at the level of implementation.

Some respondents, while not precisely referring to the government, still in their elaboration have claimed that it is the government that has the resources and capacities to empower civil society to also work together in handling those challenges. The high-ranking government official even acknowledges that it is the government responsibility to nurture the ability of individuals to empower themselves, especially in the issue of health. Another high-ranking official highlighted the importance of improving education services in order to change

the mindset of the people, such as to escape from the poverty trap. It is interesting to add that one respondent has clearly underlined that should the military be involved in responding to certain issues, the ultimate decision should come from the civilian government and is not for the military agency to decide on its own.

Talking about the protection issue, there is a split argument. Respondents coming from the academic and NGO sides tend to claim that government still fails to protect the people in many issues. The scholar and NGO activists who particularly focus on religious freedom have said that there is no protection in the issue of religious freedom in Indonesia. Even worse, rather than protecting, the government, including the local governments, often acts as the violator of such freedom itself. For example, the government has decided on six “legal” religions and required every citizen to attach to one of those religions only. Then, instead of protecting the freedom of religion, government, in this case the related ministry and also other state institutions, tends to promote maintaining stability through “religious harmony” (*kerukunan beragama*), in which certain groups that are the minority or those who have different interpretations from the mainstream religions must “adjust” themselves vis-à-vis the majority groups.

Furthermore, in various cases of violent attacks against minority groups, either intra-religion, (i.e., Syiah in Sampang and Ahmadiyah in West Java), or inter-religion,<sup>12</sup> the government pretends not to know anything or simply does not have the will to know that these cases are serious threats against human security. This act of denial then justifies the argument that the government does not exist or simply ignores its responsibility to protect individuals’ freedom.

However, it is certainly no surprise that respondents from the government side tend to argue that the government had put serious effort into dealing with those challenges. High-

---

<sup>12</sup> Halili and Bonar Tigor Naipospos, *Stagnasi Kebebasan Beragama: Laporan Kondisi Kebebasan Beragama/Berkeyakinan di Indonesia Tahun 2013*, accessed July 31, 2014, <http://www.setara-institute.org/sites/setara-institute.org/files/Reports/140522-buku%20laporan%20kbb%202013%20SETARA%20INSTITUTE.pdf>.



ranking officials mentioned that the government has implemented various policies, such as to improve health or environmental degradation, or to cope with the impacts of climate change, reduce poverty rates, and so on. They also underline that the government has provided equal opportunities to all citizens to pursue their economic and social rights, and to receive public services, such as health services, without any discrimination.

A better perception can be found in the issue of climate change. One respondent, who is an NGO activist, argues that actually the Indonesian government has adopted many policies to mitigate the impacts of climate change. However, implementation remains problematic, especially on how to balance the implementation of those measures that protect the environment with business interests. According to him, another challenge regarding the issue of protection comes from the fact that it is certainly not easy to monitor all resources, such as the forest area in Indonesia which is very vast. The complete and updated statistic on land, including forest and non-forest areas, is difficult to get since it takes almost a year to update the data. So, while the data is ready, it is no longer the updated one.

Another issue regarding the protection aspect, as touched upon briefly earlier, is the dilemma between choosing to protect the environment (environmental security) and the need of people to get access to the forests to sustain their livelihood, such as to clear the forest to get arable land for farming, to get wood, or to secure other resources for living (economic security). In a bigger scope, opening the forest for plantations, such as palm oil plantations, is also important since palm oil is one of the most lucrative export commodities, which provides jobs and better income for local people. Therefore, according to this respondent, his institution is actually finding the right solution through finding a balanced approach on how to sustain the palm oil industry and at the same time mitigate the negative impacts that may come out of that particular industry.

On the issue of migrant workers, instead of protecting them, the collusion between state and non-state actors (companies that engage in sending workers abroad) has resulted in the treatment of this issue merely as a business transaction to send people as workers rather than

treating the workers as human/individuals that need to be protected. According to the activist, that particular practice does not change easily since most of the owners of the companies have political power as well.

Regarding the empowerment issue, very few respondents actually respond to this question. When asked about the role of civil society, the activist from the World Resources Institute (WRI) that is involved in the deforestation issue, actually criticized the way some NGOs look at the problem comprehensively. He points out an example where a famous NGO like Greenpeace takes a strong stand against palm oil industry in order to protect environment, but then fails to provide any solution on how to deal with the economic security side due to high demand for palm oil for domestic consumption as well as for export commodities. However, he has also shared a story about a program where local people who are living around some protected forest areas have been hired professionally as rangers to monitor any destructive activities that may harm the forest, while at the same time giving some buffer zone at the border with the forest where the local people can do some farming there.

However, it is a different reality in the issue of religious freedom. Rather than empowering the civil society, the tendency is to control certain groups/actors, especially those who are considered as critical. According to one activist, civil society is unfortunately still very much being excluded from the decision-making process as they are still seen as troublemakers.

*Downside risks: How prepared are we?*

Regarding the question related to downside risks, several respondents actually responded well, while some did not really get the idea of what downside risks refer to in spite of all the explanations given to them. For this purpose, the term “downside risks” was briefly explained as certain conditions which may, if being ignored in the mid- or long-term, develop into serious human security threats.

Some respondents argued that the income gap/inequality in Indonesia clearly presents the downside risk that needs to be handled. One of the scholars argued further that the issue of land conflicts and also conflict/competition over resources in some areas in Indonesia should even be considered as mid-term risks, as we see more and more violent conflicts taking place and these have caused a significant number of deaths and property loss.

From the government side, particularly on the health issue, it is believed that the government acknowledges the importance of preventing things before they become worse and too late to handle. The Ministry of Health, for example, has taken preventive measures, such as through health education in reproductive health. But then, this program has gained some strong criticism especially by some radical groups who argue that such program would encourage people to commit free sex. Therefore, there was a demand for the program to be turned down since it is perceived as being counterproductive. It is also the same with the program to prevent HIV/AIDS infections through providing free needles and condoms. Again, such initiatives have been seen as promoting illegal drug abuse and free sex, therefore it should be stopped immediately.

On the issue of migrant workers, according to the respondent, it is actually quite easy to detect what sort of downside risks to deal with since the problems remain the same, such as the issuance of fake documents to allow the workers to be sent; sending workers below age which then leads into the child labor issue; sending workers only with tourist visas instead of working visas; and leaving workers untrained which then make them prone to be abused. However, until now, we can hardly see any serious efforts from the government to fix those problems, making the same problems happen again and again.

On the issue of religious conflict, as elaborated on earlier, the way the government only recognizes six legal religions and also advocates religious harmony in order to achieve stability, has sown seeds of conflict or at least attacks against the minority, who are seen as deviating from the true or legal teaching. One scholar who is involved in this religious issue even

emotionally argued that it is not for the government to decide which religions or teachings are correct or incorrect.

Another issue is unemployment, which should also be considered as a serious issue in Indonesia. As pointed out by one scholar, high unemployment in Poso, one of the communal conflict areas in the past, makes it easy for the youth to be recruited to join terrorist groups. She also added that the way the government has handled the issue, which is a very short-sighted response, by focusing only on stopping the violence and to creating a so-called “conductive” situation without any mid- and long-term planning is actually dangerous and carries the potential to invoke another cycle of violence. For example, in the case of Aceh, after the peace agreement was reached, the government no longer continued the policies to deal with many HS challenges, such as dealing with food insecurity in Aceh.<sup>13</sup>

Dealing with these downside risks, several scholars have highlighted that the inability of government to handle downside risk strongly links with the inability to facilitate and support research activities in various research institutions/universities, as well as the unavailability of a comprehensive database which can be used to support good research. Even if research were conducted, the government would be reluctant to incorporate research results as the basis for making policies, to take preventive measures, or to create a long-term policy/roadmap, particularly to cope with HS threats. This explains why the government’s responses are still very much reactive rather than preventive. This can be seen from the case of prolonged drought in Kupang, East Nusa Tenggara, that has lasted for so many years but so far we can hardly see any progress, and it is also why some conflicts are likely to break out again.

Another issue is also the tendency of the government to apply a one-size-fits-all policy, such as in providing training or workshops to discuss these HS challenges, rather than carefully finding the distinct characteristics of each issue and the area where the problem arose. In the

---

<sup>13</sup> John McCarthy, “Learning from Disaster: Why Does Food Insecurity Persist in Post Tsunami Aceh?,” *Devpolicy Blog*, accessed July 22, 2014, <http://devpolicy.org/learning-from-disaster-why-does-food-insecurity-persist-in-post-tsunami-aceh-20131106/>.

issue of land conflict in Jambi, for instance, one scholar has portrayed that the solution is only directed to return the land that has been claimed by one community, without necessarily putting efforts into investigating what the actual problem is.

The lack of coordination especially among government institutions also poses a crucial challenge. While the government seems to have some knowledge and put efforts into achieving HS, the way the government institutions interact with each other tends to show that each is going in its own direction. For example, in the case of land conflict in Mesuji, there was an instruction from the Coordinating Minister for Political and Security Affairs to expel the encroachers on the protected area to prevent further conflicts, but the local government refused to enforce the instruction.

The respondent from the military background reflected on the instruments of the past when a coordinating body called the Coordinating Agency for National Stability (Bakorstanas) still existed and functioned to monitor potential threats in Indonesia.<sup>14</sup> But now such body is no longer in existence, which then leads, according to him, to coordination problems. He takes an example of how police and armed forces are having a conflict with each other when they need to respond to a certain issue. However, another scholar who focuses on conflict resolution argues that there is a Violence Monitoring System (*Sistem Nasional Pemantau Kekerasan/SNPK*)<sup>15</sup> that has been developed and managed under the Coordinating Ministry of Welfare.

---

<sup>14</sup> Besides representatives from ministries, the members of this institution were retired military officers.

<sup>15</sup> *Sistem Nasional Pemantauan Kekerasan (SNPK)* is an information system to provide data and analysis on incidents of conflict and violence that are taking place in different areas of Indonesia. The main activities are to collect detailed and periodical data on when, where, how, and why violence are taking place as well as the impacts of such violence. Then, those data are processed and the results used for analysing various conflicts. These data and analyses are used to support policymaking and creating programs to manage and prevent conflicts in Indonesia. See more at: <http://www.snPK-indonesia.com/#sthash.99BwoUBJ.dpuf> [in Bahasa Indonesia]

### *Cross-border issues, sovereignty and involvement of the Military*

From the conversations with the respondents, it has emerged that most respondents are actually occupied with the perception that the issues they brought up are mainly within the domestic sphere. Therefore, there has not been much discussion on the cross-border risks. But one scholar has raised an issue of human trafficking, especially trafficking of women from Indonesia to other countries, which certainly needs international cooperation to deal with.

All respondents have come with the argument that sovereignty still very much matters. Nevertheless, most respondents have argued that cooperation with other countries as well as with international organizations is definitely needed, for example in dealing with HIV/AIDS, malaria, and tuberculosis. One high-ranking official, who was previously in charge of coordinating the humanitarian effort in Aceh following the tsunami disaster, has even strongly rejected the thinking that portrays foreign humanitarian assistance as part of intervention. Cooperation with other countries should not be seen as intervention.


This argument is mainly based on the view that Indonesia shares the same problems with other countries. Therefore, it is important to find ways in which we can gain benefits in the form of funding/technical support from more advanced countries or institutions, as well as learning from others' experiences on methods to deal with such challenges (knowledge sharing).

In dealing with religious conflicts, respondents have different views. The first respondent thinks that intervention is necessary. He does not say that it should be in the form of military intervention but at least foreign leaders, especially from the major countries, should put pressure and criticize the government about the violations against freedom of religion in Indonesia, instead of praising the country for being so tolerant and democratic. Mechanisms such as the Universal Periodical Review (UPR) should be maintained to control or put pressure on the government if they have failed to protect such freedom. The second respondent interestingly prefers foreign governments not to intervene since that issue is considered as a domestic problem. Those foreign countries claiming themselves as democracies tend to use the

issue to pursue their own agenda on weaker countries, making them to have double or even multiple standards. But, according to him, a different kind of intervention can take place among the societies. For example, certain groups that are affiliated with minority groups in country X can put pressure on their own government to wield influence over the government in country X to stop human rights violation against its minority groups. This can be seen from the way our people put pressure on the government regarding the issues in Palestine, Bosnia, and Kashmir.

Another respondent raises the issue of persecutions against the Rohingya in Myanmar that has spilled over into other neighboring countries in the region, including Indonesia. The fact that some Rohingya refugees actually went to Indonesia and asked for support from certain radical groups in Indonesia, as well as the occurrence of several bomb threats to Buddhist worship houses and the Myanmar Embassy in Jakarta, have indicated that serious cooperation is needed to handle this issue.

**Figure 4. The Use of Military Instruments in Dealing with Certain Human Security Challenges**



*Source:* Interview with respondents.

Finally, regarding the possibility of involving the Indonesian military in addressing some human security threats (such as in handling the implications of natural disasters, and social conflicts), most respondents have agreed it can be applied as long as the decision is made by the civilian government, in this case the president. There is no way that military can decide to intervene. It is also important that the response may not always be to use military means since the police should be the most responsible actor if there is a necessity to restore order. In conclusion, such engagement should be limited, since the military are actually not trained to counter non-military threats.

## **Conclusion**

From this study, we can clearly see that while HS is known and to a certain extent understood generally by different stakeholders in Indonesia, the concept has not been fully incorporated into the policy framework or used as an effective tool to address the so-called “new security threats/challenges.”

From the examination of several regulations and acts, we can see that elements of HS are only broadly touched on without any deep elaboration on how HS is adopted as a full policy framework. Such fact reflects a particular concern (as highlighted in the results of interviews, particularly from the elites), that HS is rather a “foreign” concept that needs further clarification and discussion on its implementation to fit with the local contexts and complexities.

Moreover, the existing pieces of legislation that are related to the HS challenges are also still lacking a more advanced elaboration of HS aspects, such as empowerment and how to deal with downside risks. Most of the regulations tend to focus only on ad hoc and immediate measures rather than developing instruments to identify potentials in order to prevent the outbreak of the problems before it is too late. This phenomenon then, is clearly reflected during the interviews in which most of the respondents have not elaborated on those two aspects of empowerment and downside risks.



It is interesting to see that there is a slightly different result between the national survey and the interviews. As the national survey comes out with unemployment and lack of food as the two most crucial HS challenges, the interviewees, who are officials, scholars, and practitioners, tend to see the challenge in more abstract terms such as income gap, inequality, and poverty. In a similar vein, people tend to refer to natural disasters as a HS threat while the interviewees tend to see beyond the actual disasters as they are actually the implications of more fundamental threats, such as environmental degradation or even income gap or poverty, that leads to certain activities that threaten the environment.

Nevertheless, it is inevitable that the stakeholders tend to identify issues or problems that are close to their particular focus/interests, which they view as significant threats, or at least potential threats, to security of the individuals in Indonesia. These include income gap, poverty, the migrant workers problem, environmental degradation, religious intolerance/conflict, and so on. However, some actors still have some objections to this concept, particularly since the concept may dilute the criteria of issues that can be considered as security threats. They even argued that the country is not facing any serious problems that can be considered as security threats since those issues do not significantly threaten the survival of individuals in Indonesia.

Related to the question of protection and the empowerment issue, most of the stakeholders have argued that there is still minimum protection provided by the government to protect or ensure individuals' freedom from fear, from want, and to live in dignity. A few even argued that the government, on certain issues such as religious conflict, has become the perpetrator itself. However, some other stakeholders differently argued that the government has made efforts to provide such protection. On the empowerment issue, the answer remains general in which some were of the view that the government still does not provide enough support to empower the society and even considers civil society more as a problem rather than a partner to be empowered. While other stakeholders, especially from the government side, thought that empowerment should come from the individuals themselves, such as in the health issue.

Finally, most of the respondents tend not to refer to issues of HS that have cross-border characteristics. Most stakeholders have highlighted mostly the issues that fall within the domestic or national scope, although some mentioned cross-border issues such as human trafficking but did not elaborate further on that. On the question of sovereignty, most stakeholders did not consider cooperation or assistance from other countries as an interventionist act but rather necessary especially when the government is unable to deal with the issue effectively. Furthermore, regarding the involvement of military, while most of respondents relatively agree on such action, all boldly underline that it should be limited and put fully under the civilian control since military is not designed to deal with non-military threats.

## **Bibliography:**

Centre for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS). "National Survey March 2014."

IRIN News and Analysis. "Growing HIV/AIDS awareness in Indonesia's Papua region." *IRIN News and Analysis*. Accessed October 28, 2014.  
<http://www.irinnews.org/report/98245/growing-hiv-aids-awareness-in-indonesia-s-papua-region>.

Halili and Bonar Tigor Naipospos. "Stagnasi Kebebasan Beragama: Laporan Kondisi Kebebasan Beragama/Berkeyakinan di Indonesia Tahun 2013." Setara Institute. Accessed July 31, 2014. <http://www.setara-institute.org/sites/setara-institute.org/files/Reports/140522-buku%20laporan%20kbb%202013%20SETARA%20INSTITUTE.pdf>.

"Health Indicators 1995-2012." Statistics Indonesia. Accessed July 10, 2014.  
[http://www.bps.go.id/eng/tab\\_sub/view.php?kat=1&tabel=1&daftar=1&id\\_subyek=30&notab=33](http://www.bps.go.id/eng/tab_sub/view.php?kat=1&tabel=1&daftar=1&id_subyek=30&notab=33).

McCarthy, John. "Learning from Disaster: Why Does Food Insecurity Persist in Post Tsunami Aceh?" *Development Policy Center*. Accessed July 22, 2014.  
<http://devpolicy.org/learning-from-disaster-why-does-food-insecurity-persist-in-post-tsunami-aceh-20131106/>.

"Numbers and Percentage of People under Poverty, the Poverty Line, Poverty Depth Index, and Poverty Prevalence Index by Provinces, March 2014." Central Statistics Agency. Accessed October 28, 2014.  
[http://www.bps.go.id/tab\\_sub/view.php?kat=1&tabel=1&daftar=1&id\\_subyek=23&notab=1](http://www.bps.go.id/tab_sub/view.php?kat=1&tabel=1&daftar=1&id_subyek=23&notab=1).

"Number of Labor Force, Labor, Unemployment, TPAK and TPT, 1986-2013." Statistics Indonesia. Accessed July 10, 2014.  
[http://www.bps.go.id/eng/tab\\_sub/view.php?kat=1&tabel=1&daftar=1&id\\_subyek=06&notab=5](http://www.bps.go.id/eng/tab_sub/view.php?kat=1&tabel=1&daftar=1&id_subyek=06&notab=5).

"Number of Poor People, Percentage of Poor People, and the Poverty Line, 1970-2013." Statistics Indonesia. Accessed July 10, 2014.  
[http://www.bps.go.id/eng/tab\\_sub/view.php?kat=1&tabel=1&daftar=1&id\\_subyek=23&notab=7](http://www.bps.go.id/eng/tab_sub/view.php?kat=1&tabel=1&daftar=1&id_subyek=23&notab=7).

Sukma, Rizal. "Indonesia's Security Outlook, Defence Policy, and Regional Cooperation." *Asia Pacific Countries' Security Outlook and Its Implications for the Defense Sector* no.5 (2010): 3-24. Accessed July, 31, 2014.  
[http://www.nids.go.jp/english/publication/joint\\_research/series5/pdf/5-1.pdf](http://www.nids.go.jp/english/publication/joint_research/series5/pdf/5-1.pdf).

"Unemployment Rate and Workforce Participation Rate by Provinces, 2002-2012." Central Statistics Agency. Accessed October 28, 2014.  
[http://www.bps.go.id/tab\\_sub/view.php?kat=1&tabel=1&daftar=1&id\\_subyek=06&notab=13](http://www.bps.go.id/tab_sub/view.php?kat=1&tabel=1&daftar=1&id_subyek=06&notab=13).

## Abstract (in Japanese)

### 要約

人間の安全保障の概念は、1994年の人間開発報告書で初めて提示されて以来20年、政策立案者と市民社会の双方から一定の関心を集めてきた。一国の内部で或いは複数ヶ国にまたがって個人の安全に重大な脅威を及ぼすようなある種の問題に対し、人間の安全保障の概念がその重要性を高める有用なツールであると歓迎する声がある一方で、同概念はあまりに広範で総花的であり、ある問題を安全保障上の課題として取り上げるためにはその適用についてさらなる明確化が必要だとする意見もある。このため、人間の安全保障に対してこれまでにどのような理解がなされてきたかを確認し、同概念が新たな或いは非伝統的な安全保障の問題に対処する上でどの程度適切で有益だと考えられているかを検証することは、時宜を得た試みである。

本稿の目的は、インドネシアの様々なステークホルダーが有する人間の安全保障についての認識を明らかにすることにある。具体的には、人間の安全保障の三つの基本的要素——すなわち欠乏からの自由、恐怖からの自由、尊厳をもって生きる自由——との関連における同概念の定義、人間の安全保障上の優先課題、保護とエンパワメント、国境を越えるという同概念の性質、といった側面に係る認識を分析する。また、人間の安全保障に関する課題を扱う際の、国家主権と軍事的手段の関与についても検証する。本研究は、政策立案者（政府高官）、元軍人、研究者、NGO活動家を含む様々なステークホルダーに対する詳細なインタビューに基づいている。

本稿は3つのセクションから構成される。最初のセクションでは、人間の安全保障の概念、研究手法、そしてインドネシア戦略国際問題研究所（CSIS）が同国社会における人間の安全保障の認識について実施した調査結果の一部について述べる。第2セクションでは、人間の安全保障に関連する要素を含む複数の法律・法令を広く分析する。興味深いことに、多くの法令が欠乏からの自由、恐怖からの自由、尊厳をもって生きる自由を保障するために制定されている一方で、「人間の安全保障」という言葉自体を実際に含んでいるものは皆無である。これは、人間の安全保障の概念が登場した背景にある意図や同概念が向かっている方向性について、政策立案者の間にはある種の認識が存在し、同概念を受け入れ政策ツールとして使うことに一定の躊躇があることを反映しているものと考えられる。第3セクションでは、こうした人間の安全保障に関する認識の違いについて詳述する。これらの分析により、インドネシアで人間の安全保障の概念がどのように認識されているかについて、より詳細な知見が得られるものと期待される。