THE ROLE OF STATE ON CASES OF INTOLERANCE AND RADICAL PRACTICES IN INDONESIA

MURADI

Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Department of Government, University of Padjadjaran,

Jl. Ir. Soekarno KM 21, Jatinangor, Bandung West Java Indonesia

ABSTRACT

The rise of terrorist acts in Indonesia is allegedly due to the lack of synergy between the interests of the state in counter terrorism, in the other hand public actually has not fully understood the essence of the state's interest in that issue. A small percentage of the public feel that the state's policy to combat terrorism is on the back of a global agenda to combat terrorism. The public also understands that the global agenda of combating terrorism explicitly positions certain religious activists as the target of counter terrorism. However, this article argued that the role of the State is important when intolerance and radicalism grew stronger. The State should play a significant role to maintain the diversity life of the state and society. The state should also distinctly its existence to put forward of state administration in term of legal instruments or policy which strengthen the role of the state to ensure justice in society as a key stakeholder.

KEYWORDS: Terrorism, State Roles, Intolerance, Radicalism, Public Interest

INTRODUCTION

Pan bomb terror in Bandung, West Java last 27th of February 2017 indicated the current level of terrorism and how terror groups are still on the run in Indonesia. The assumption of no retaliation between terrorism and intolerance act is the real neglecting symptom of difference and diversity. The distinctive point is that the root of terrorism actually grows prosper in countries rejecting and against to be part of diversity in their development process.[1] Guiora stressed in his book, intolerance and terrorism are two of a kind with strong connections and support system.

Based on the research made by Indonesia's National Commission for Human Right (KOMNAS HAM) and NGO's The Setara Institute early 2017, West Java is considered as the most intolerance Provinces, including all regencies and municipalities in the related province.[2] Aside of the role of West Java as the supporting system of the State Capital, the strong symptom of intolerance in Guiora theory is the main entrance for radicalism and culminated in terror as basis of terrorism. The general view in Indonesia, radicalism and intolerance grew significantly for the last couple of months, especially related to the mass rally against Basuki Tjahaja Purnama, Incumbent Governor of Jakarta, who was indicted for blasphemy.

It is hard to believe where tolerance perspective as formulated and depicted in State Pillar, Pancasila, has changed in reality. The changes happened as part of the acculturation of eastern cultures. If the situation is not well managed,

---

[1] Guiora, Amos. N. (2014). *Tolerating Intolerance: The Price of Protecting Extremism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Especially chapter 1

[2] See Pikiran Rakyat (2017). "Jabar Masih Menjadi Provinsi Paling Intoleran". http://www.pikiran-rakyat.com/nasional/2017/01/10/jabar-masih-jadi-provinsi-paling-intoleran-390238 (accessed on 28 February 2017). See also Metrotvnews (2017). "Setara Institute Tempatkan Jabar Sebagai Provinsi Paling Intoleran" http://news.metrotvnews.com/hukum/akWwYqdk-setara-institute-tempatkan-jabar-sebagai-provinsi-paling-intoleran

then it will divide the society. Huntington post Cold War thesis on the conflict of the Western - Liberal against Islam does not appear in an open conflict. In some Moslem majority populated countries, there is an integrated politic that strengthens the bond of Islam and democracy, where Indonesia is one of them. However, some other countries considered the conflict between Western and Islamic should be maintained. This is the context where diversity in Indonesia should be well guarded to prevent open conflict between Western and Islamic.

This article argued that the role of the State is important when intolerance and radicalism grew stronger. The State should play a significant role to maintain the diversity life of the state and society. The state should also distinctly its existence to put forward of state administration in term of legal instruments or policy which strengthen the role of the state to ensure justice in society as a key stakeholder.

Ideas of State Role

Terrorism activity in current Indonesia after the death of Azahari, Noordin M Top and Santoso, including the arrest of Abu Bakar Baasyir, is not disappear or reducing.[3] After Osama Bin Laden was killed, terrorism was only stopped for a while, where the remaining terrorist cell built new radical and undetected diaspora network through Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS).[4] One factor that made new terrorist cell is hard to be detected is the new cells emerged for various motive and reasons, not merely on issues of religion and western affair, like those in the post-911 era.[5]

The on-going terrorism activity in Indonesia currently is probably caused by the disintegrated perception between State and People, where the government demands the terrorist cell is destroyed down to their roots while people do not understand the real picture and government agenda in combating terrorism. Some part of the people still considers government agenda in eradication of terrorism in Indonesia is part of the international agenda. These people consider international agenda in combating terrorism cornered religion activists and become targets of the eradication of terrorism. It is no surprise if all tasks in combating terrorism are government agenda, not an initiative of the people. It shows that steps to eradicate terrorism as the highest target of intolerance and radicalism are not easy, because there are other intriguing interests that disturb the diversity identity of the people. These symptoms appeared on simultaneous rally of 411, 212, 112 and 212.

The evolution of terrorist movement changed the public paradigm. If terrorism was considered as a social pathology, nowadays, terrorism and radicalism area considered as part of social control.[6] Donald Black stated that terrorism, just like ordinary crimes, is part of social control over state policy.[7] However, in fact, terrorism as the highest level of radicalism and intolerance has strong and deep root in the society. The underlined word is social control and the mass rally of 411, 212, 112 and 212 were part of social control over the case of blasphemy conducted by a government official.

---

[3] *Okezone*. (2017). "Noordin Tewas, Ancaman Terorisme Belum Berakhir". [online available]: http://news.okezone.com/read/2009/10/07/62/263331/noordin-tewas-ancaman-terorisme-belum-berakhir (accessed 28 February 2017).
[4] *Inilah*. (2017). "Reorientasi Gerakan Teror Pasca Osama". [online available]: http://m.inilah.com/read/detail/1472302/reorientasi-gerakan-teror-pasca-sama (accessed 28 February 2017).
[5] See, Muradi. "The Coordination of Counter Terrorism in Indonesia" and Scott Nicholas Romaniuk. "The Metamorphosis of Terror: From Al Qaeda to Global Salafi Jihad" in Romaniuk, Scott Nicholas. (2012). *New Wars: Terrorism and Security of the State*. Pittsburgh: Red Lead Press.
[6] See Lesser, Ian O. et al. (1998). *Countering the New Terrorism*. Washington: Rand.
[7] Donald Black. "Terrorism as Control Social" in Deflem, Mathieu (ed). (2004). *Terrorism and Counter-terrorism: Criminological Perspectives*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Black stated four reasons why radicalism and terrorism are part of social control: first, radicalism and terrorism are part of public responses of incorrect policy/behavior. It is viewed on how society responded to terror and radical acts as new expression, different than most people act. Second, terror and radical expression are conducted independently by a group of community that made impact to another group of community. Third, terror and radical acts have made issues of race, ethnic, national and state symbol as a target. Fourth is the impact of state policy which does not support the ideas or hopes of a certain group in the society.

Black's theory has put aside of State's role a little. State, in reality, is still present as policy maker and play key role in society through regulation and law enforcement. The stressing idea of public participation is an interesting part of Black's theory.

As part of an organic entity, the State has approaches based on Constitution and Law to be implemented in regulations. The idea of State's role in the issue of intolerance, radicalism and terrorism is based on issues as follows: first, the protection of the people based on equality in Law and ideal protection. No discrimination against a group of people conducted by State or other group's majority nor minority, of people. State, in this context, made regulation and rules that will protect people against threats of radicalism, intolerance, and terror.

Second, the state needs to ensure the maximum ability of the state apparatus, bureaucracy and security through regulation and rules. If these issues are well implemented properly, the threat of intolerance, radicalism and terrorism can be reduced.

Third is the law enforcement. In this context, the State should not be dissolved with existing dynamic. Every step taken should represent the presence of the State in the real meaning. Law enforcement should be well delivered down to the operational level. In the end, the state is present for effective administration and responsibility for what have been formulated in implementing periodically.

The Role of State in Cases of Intolerance and Radicalism

Aside of State role in the eradication of terrorism and radicalism, there is an interesting part where public activity is considered strategic likes terrorism at the highest level of intolerance and radicalism. During the term of terrorist organization, public is generally considered as passive supporters through various sentiments and approaches, such as religion, ethnic, nationhood etc. Public is also considered as grass root supporting terrorism organization, ideologically or based on current propaganda.[8] It is similar when State also consider, if they can win heart of minds of public, State will be assisted in the support against radicalism or terrorism. If the public does not accept the intolerance and radicalism, it will be easy for State to manage and implement programs against the ideas of intolerance and radicalism. However, if the public does not respond the hope of terrorist organization, the people will become targets of terrorism. This is the situation where the State should actively take part in the eradication of terrorism. In other word, people who are angry and against terrorism could become a strategic partner for the government to eradicate terrorism.

The partnership between State and public is the answer to problem of eradication of terrorism and radicalism. Leaving public initiative without strategic partnership may not solve the real problem. Public initiative is not the right answer to eradicate terrorism. It requires synergy between State Policy and public support to respond threats of radicalism, intolerance and terrorism comprehensively.

---

[8] See *Guy S. Goodwin-Gill* . "Everyone and the citizen: the devaluation of principles and protection" dalam Hocking, Jenny. (2007). *Counter-Terrorism and the Post-Democratic State*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited. Hal. 101-109.

Based on the description above, there are three roles of State in eradication of intolerance, radicalism and terrorism: first, contra-radicalism steps where the State presents to protect people against hoax and propaganda that may lead to hate ideas and turn into tolerance acts. The state may design direct programs for the people through formal institution such as the National Agency for Eradication of Terrorism (BNPT), Special Detachment 88 (Densus 88), Indonesia National Police (Polri), or even Indonesia Armed Forces (TNI), or unscheduled activities based on public initiative. The state and people conduct efforts to protect youth against radical thoughts and terrorism. It is a protective step taken by the State for the people to reduce and prevent the growth of intolerance, radicalism and terrorism. Some positive result oriented programs should be supported by government to protect youth generation from radicalism and terrorism.

Efforts to improve public awareness become concerned to prevent and eradicate terrorism. High public awareness may limit the movement of terrorist and vigilantes. One important program is the obligation to report any suspicious activity in the neighborhood.

It is important to improve public resilience against the growing strength of terror. Another interesting program is community policing to improve public resilience and integrate the responsibilities to secure the neighborhood to the community.

Another effort is to support the negotiation process between government and organization suspected as terrorist. The public could become a mediator between the government who want to arrest the suspected terrorist and the suspected people who lived in their community.

Second, stimulate public independently to be able to protect themselves and immune against the growing, dynamic, especially on issues of intolerance, radicalism, and terrorism. The second role asks government to gain support from public to stimulate organizations against terror and radicalism. The organization could become permanent or temporary, which could involve humanitarian activists, religion figures, or even youth organization. The key word is on the role of other organizations as part of public education against terrorist and their hazardous materials used for terror.

Third is the role for law enforcement. The state should focus on repressive steps to enforce the law. The role of the State is based on four issues: cultural issue, religion approach, and legal aspect, social and political issue. Therefore, State should involve cultural and religion organization to eradicate terrorism.

Based on the description above, the role of the State against intolerance and eradication of radicalism and terrorism is not yet ideal. There are five obstacles in eradication of radicalism, intolerance, and terrorism: first, the public assumption that eradication of terrorism and radicalism is against major religion teachings in Indonesia. The assumption is based on the arrest and execution of terrorist in Indonesia who most of them were religion activists before being arrested.[9]

Second is public assumption, where people are not the target of terrorism. The state, critical object and foreigners is the target of terrorism and radicalism. The assumption is based on 911 tragedy, where terrorist targeted western symbol, state symbol, and critical object as target. Besides that, religion's symbol which is against terrorism in Indonesia has also become targets of violence and threats.[10]

Third, the government tends to dominate prevention and eradication of terrorism and radicalism. Public involvement is considered as supporting faction of the program. The only room for public to participate is through

---

[9] See *Hizbut Tahrir Indonesia*. (2017). "Politik: Kontra Terorisme Tetap Menyasar Umat Islam". [online available]: http://hizbut-tahrir.or.id/2012/12/30/politik-kontra-terorisme-tetap-menyasar-umat-islam/ (accessed 28 February 2017).
[10]   See   *Inilah*.   (2017).   "Potensi   DPR   Sasaran   Teroris   Sangat   Besar".   [online   avialable]: http://nasional.inilah.com/read/detail/1902167/potensi-dpr-sasaran-teroris-sangat-besar (accessed 28 February 2017).

non-government organization, supported by foreign, as accused by public to government to eradicate terrorism and radicalism.[11]

Fourth, the public assumption where eradication of terrorism is government domain, people are reluctant to support the government, especially in term of facility and funding. People think eradication of radicalism and terrorism is the interest of the State and funding agency only.[12]

Fifth, strong permissive culture in the society. The similarities between religion and ethnicity, made public welcome new inhabitants in their community. The permissive approach has often become boomerang for the government and an environment where terrorist could establish foothold and gather supporter.[13]

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the description above, State cannot effectively implement the role in the eradication of terrorism, intolerance and radicalism. On the other side, public initiative is also not answer to the problem. It requires synergy and integrated program between public and State to limit and reduce violence and radicalism and also to eradicate the spirit of hatred as a landscape of terrorism and radicalism. In Indonesia, public role in the eradication of terrorism is not effective because the assumption of State as the single agency in charge to eradicate radicalism and terrorism in Indonesia.

REFERENCES

1. *Arrahmah*. (2017). "Inilah Tiga Kesalahan fatal Perang Melawan Terorisme Menurut Din

2. Syamsuddin" [online available]: http://www.arrahmah.com/news/2013/04/12/inilah-tiga-kesalahan-fatal-perang-melawan-terorisme-menurut-din-syamsuddin.html (Accessed 28 February 2017).

3. *Detiknews*. (2017). "Polisi Selidiki Motif Teroris Tempati Kontrakan Dekat Bandara

4. Bandung" [online available]: http://news.detik.com/read/2013/05/13/180114/2244660/10/polisi-selidiki-motif-teroris-tempati-kontrakan-dekat-bandara-bandung?nd772204btr (accessed on 28 February 2017).

5. Donald Black. "Terrorism as Control Social" in Deflem, Mathieu (ed). (2004). *Terrorism and Counter-terrorism: Criminological Perspectives*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

6. Guiora, Amos. N. (2014). *Tolerating Intolerance: The Price of Protecting Extremism*.

   Oxford: Oxford University Press.

7. *Guy S. Goodwin-Gill.* "Everyone and the citizen: the devaluation of principles and protection" in Hocking, Jenny. (2007). *Counter-Terrorism and the Post-Democratic State*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.

8. *Inilah*. (2017). "Reorientasi Gerakan Teror Pasca Osama". [Online available]:

9. http://m.inilah.com/read/detail/1472302/reorientasi-gerakan-teror-pasca-sama (accessed 28 February 2017).

---

[11] See, *Lazuardi Birru*. (2017). "Rehabilitasi Pelaku Teror" [online available]: http://www.lazuardibirru.org/jurnalbirru/ensiklopedia/rehabilitasi-pelaku-teror/ (accessed 28 February 2017).

[12] See Arrahmah. (2017). "Inilaåh Tiga Kesalahan fatal Perang Melawan Terorisme Menurut Din Syamsuddin" [online available]: http://www.arrahmah.com/news/2013/04/12/inilah-tiga-kesalahan-fatal-perang-melawan-terorisme-menurut-din-syamsuddin.html (Accessed 28 February 2017).

[13] *Detiknews*. (2017). "Polisi Selidiki Motif Teroris Tempati Kontrakan Dekat Bandara Bandung" [online available]: http://news.detik.com/read/2013/05/13/180114/2244660/10/polisi-selidiki-motif-teroris-tempati-kontrakan-dekat-bandara-bandung?nd772204btr (accessed on 28 February 2017).

10. *Inilah*. (2017). "Potensi DPR Sasaran Teroris Sangat Besar". [Online available]:

11. http://nasional.inilah.com/read/detail/1902167/potensi-dpr-sasaran-teroris-sangat-besar (accessed 28 February 2017).

12. *Lazuardi Birru*. (2017). "Rehabilitasi Pelaku Teror" [online available]:

13. http://www.lazuardibirru.org/jurnalbirru/ensiklopedia/rehabilitasi-pelaku-teror/ (accessed 28 February 2017).

14. Lesser, Ian O. et al. (1998). *Countering the New Terrorism*. Washington: Rand

15. Metrotvnews (2017). "Setara Institute Tempatkan Jabar Sebagai Provinsi Paling Intoleran"

16. http://news.metrotvnews.com/hukum/akWwYqdk-setara-institute-tempatkan-jabar-sebagai-provinsi-paling-intoleran

17. Muradi. "The Coordination of Counter Terrorism in Indonesia" and Scott Nicholas

18. Romaniuk. "The Metamorphosis of Terror: From Al Qaeda to Global Salafi Jihad" in Romaniuk, Scott Nicholas. (2012). *New Wars: Terrorism and Security of the State*. Pittsburgh: Red Lead Press.

19. *Okezone*. (2017). "Noordin Tewas, Ancaman Terorisme Belum Berakhir". [Online available]:

20. http://news.okezone.com/read/2009/10/07/62/263331/noordin-tewas-ancaman-terorisme-belum-berakhir (accessed 28 February 2017).

21. Pikiran Rakyat (2017). "Jabar Masih Menjadi Provinsi Paling Intoleran".

    http://www.pikiran-rakyat.com/nasional/2017/01/10/jabar-masih-jadi-provinsi-paling-intoleran-390238 (accessed on 28 February 2017).