

Transnational Security Threats to Indonesia

James R. Campbell

Key Findings

- Senior Indonesian military agree that their country has no imminent conventional external threat; internal and transnational security threats receive top priority in Indonesian security planning.
- According to high-level Indonesian authorities, corruption is the number one domestic security problem for Indonesia. President Yudhoyono's anticorruption agency has been effective in fighting corruption.
- Along with corruption, other domestic security threats such as economic issues are prioritized over transnational security threats. Nontraditional threats like illegal fishing and other environmental crimes are weighted more heavily than terrorism, narcotics or human trafficking. Terrorism, especially international terrorism, is not viewed as an existential threat to the country.
- As nontraditional threats such as environmental crime often involve the same networks, actors and elements of corruption as other transnational security threats, assisting Indonesia in investigating its priority nontraditional security threats may represent a less contentious way for the United States to address its own terrorism concerns in the region. Programs for fighting terrorism and other security threats need to be seen not as foreign initiatives but as Indonesian solutions that empower the government.
- In programs designed to fight terrorism and other transnational crimes, the military, the police and the National Intelligence Service compete for resources and status, and thus resist cooperation and intelligence sharing.
- The United States can make its most immediate contribution to Indonesian security by helping to increase the professionalism of the National Police.

- It is often expressed by Indonesian security personnel that the United States should revise its vetting process as it relates to International Military Education and Training and historical human rights violations, and focus more on creating a security environment in which such violations will not occur.
- Indonesia's rating in combating human trafficking fluctuates between Tier 2 and Tier 3, with shifting government interest in this transnational security threat.

Indonesia has no conventional external threat to its security. National security priorities therefore tend to focus on the many internal and transnational security challenges that Indonesia faces today. This paper characterizes the current vulnerability of Indonesia with respect to such threats from an Indonesian perspective and analyzes the conditions and forces within this vast archipelago that predispose the country to domestic challenges of external origin. Mechanisms are discussed through which Indonesia counters transnational security threats by engaging with regional neighbors and the United States. This paper further argues that while many of Indonesia's transnational security threats are consistent with US priorities, other threats are ranked differently by the two countries. Thus, this discussion focuses on Indonesian perceptions of key threats, and how the United States and Indonesia can better coordinate their efforts against these transnational threats.

High-profile transnational security threats like terrorism and narcotics trafficking appropriately receive international attention, and these crimes are repudiated by most countries. Other types of transnational crime such as human trafficking, and environmental crimes like illegal fishing, illegal logging and illegal wildlife trade are less frequently viewed from a security standpoint. Nonetheless, such environmental crimes outrank terrorism in terms of transnational challenges in Indonesia. Greater US attention to environmental issues is not necessarily a quid pro quo for improved cooperation in other areas such as counterterrorism. However, recognition by the United States that Indonesia considers these issues to be national priorities would be an influential component of an integrated strategy for engaging Indonesia in security cooperation.

Terrorism

Probably the most significant terrorist threat to Indonesia is the domestic, Indonesia-based Jemaah Islamiyah (JI). Other lesser actors include Laskar Jihad, Hizbullah Front, Laskar Mujahidan, and Islamic Defenders Front (FPI), the latter being more in the category of “violent moralists” rather than terrorists. In the past, there have been international connections with the Abu Sayyaf group in the Philippines, which included training and funding. “Afghan Veterans,” reported by one senior Indonesian diplomat to number perhaps as many as six thousand, consist of Indonesians who trained or participated in military jihad operations in Afghanistan in opposition to the Russian occupation of that country. However, more conservative estimates hold these numbers to be only in the hundreds.ⁱ Regardless of the actual total, many of these Afghan mujahideen returned to Indonesia, bringing destructive elements into the region, where some perpetrated violence in Christian-Muslim religious conflicts in Ambon, Maluku and Poso, Central Sulawesi, particularly from 1998 to 2001.ⁱⁱ

Several expert bombmakers remain at large, and access to explosives and/or small arms is not particularly difficult. These extremists include Taufik Bulaga and Tedi, both apprentices of the late Malaysian bomb specialist, Dr. Azhari Husein. Noordin Top, a Malaysian national and leader of a violent JI splinter group responsible for several major bombings in Indonesia, was recently killed by police during an antiterror investigation, following the July 21, 2009 bombings of the J. W. Marriott Hotel and Ritz Carlton Hotel in Jakarta. JI’s leaders are opposed to Al-Qaeda-style bombings on Indonesian soil, not because they are considered illegitimate, but because they are counterproductive—attacks on Western targets have killed more Indonesians than infidels, provoked community outrage, and led to mass arrests.ⁱⁱⁱ Also, international funding for jihadi operations has largely dried up, with no significant external funding for JI since 2003. Nonetheless, small but persistent domestic terrorist cells continue to attract global attention to Indonesia, and the potential for renewal of international terrorist support cannot be dismissed.

The vast majority of Indonesians reject terrorism, but many are troubled by a possible perception that the US War on Terror is also focused on Muslims. Indonesians are aware of “homegrown” terrorist organizations like JI but do not generally consider them a significant problem. This is in large part because Indonesia had not suffered a significant terror attack since 2004. It remains to be seen whether or not

the recent bombing attacks on hotels in the capitol city of Jakarta will change this perception. Indonesia also feels that as a nation it now has credibility in global finances, and it does not want terrorism to blemish its standing in world banking and financial markets.

For most Indonesians, the most pressing security threats involve the economy: putting food on the table, the rising price of gasoline, and paying for children’s schooling.^{iv} Externally, JI does not appear to be formally linked to regional extremist groups in the Pattani province of southern Thailand, the Rohingyas in Burma, or the Abu Sayyaf group in the Philippines, although there is a great deal of uncertainty regarding the exact nature of the relations. The Indonesian government is developing a database of international terrorist-related websites that may be used for recruitment within the country by different groups, and one area for US cooperation may be to provide technological assistance for this effort. While JI takes inspiration from organizations like Al-Qaeda and the Taliban, senior Indonesian security analysts suggest that transnational terrorist organizations do not appear to have an actual “footprint” in Indonesia.^v Al-Qaeda’s intransigence, indiscriminate brutality, and dismissal of politics as a perversion of religion banish it to the fringes of Muslim society. Its global brand has suffered a damaging ideological backlash from repentant violent extremists, prominent religious leaders and an overwhelming number of Muslims who feel horrified by the movement’s wanton killings.^{vi}

Currently JI is focusing on publishing and appears less interested in mounting operations, likely reflecting a decision from the top to focus on religious outreach and recruitment as a way of rebuilding the organization. JI has developed a profitable consortium in and around the country’s religious schools (pesantren). The Indonesian government should monitor these enterprises more closely, but they may be useful in channeling JI energies into political struggle through the printed page rather than through acts of violence. The best way to ensure adequate scrutiny would be for the Indonesian government to enforce its own laws with respect to publishing, labor, corporate registration and taxation. Such enforcement would not only offer a means of monitoring these enterprises, but it could also yield valuable information about the size and status of the JI organization. Every publisher is also required by law to provide copies of every title to the National Library.^{vii}

Nonetheless radicalization—the process by which law-abiding individuals become willing to use violence to achieve their goals—

remains a risk in Indonesia, as in the case of the “Palembang Group.” This group demonstrated how easy the transformation can be if the right ingredients are present: a core group of individuals, a charismatic leader, motivation and opportunity for targeted killing. Access to funding and weapons may also spur jihadi groups to violence.^{viii} While very few religious schools (pesantren) in Indonesia today promote violent extremist ideologies, the schools serve as a social network where such ideologies can be discussed. Approximately fifty JI-affiliated schools remain active, mostly on Java. The challenge is to identify individual problem schools without stigmatizing the entire system.^{ix}

Police have embarked on a prisoner-focused “deradicalization” program aimed at persuading jihadists to reject the use of terrorist tactics. A key element is the provision of economic aid—usually to prisoners’ families and often involving school fees for children—on the assumption that acceptance of aid from the police entails a rejection of the jihadi premise that all officials are “thoghut” (anti-Islam).^x While police clearly hope that deradicalized prisoners will return to their communities and help discourage recruitment into terrorist cells, there has been little strategic thinking about how this might actually be accomplished. Muhammadiyah, the nation’s second-largest Islamic organization, had been working with the government on deradicalization; however, the funding support ran out, and cooperation has ceased. Discussions with staff at an influential Jakarta think tank suggest that Muhammadiyah is no longer participating in the government deradicalization, although the organization remains willing to accept post-radicals (“Alumni Bui”) into their own existing programs. The United States should support prison reform in Indonesia but lacks credibility in offering assistance, as Abu Ghraib and Guantanamo have become the “poster children” of prison abuse.

Indonesia’s strategy for dealing with terrorism is based on “soft power,” because more than 90 percent of the population is Muslim, and thus a hard-power approach to Islamists is deemed unacceptable, although aggressive interventions by security forces are not “off the table.”^{xi} Sensitivities with regard to battling Islamic extremism mean that even following the recent terrorist bombings of two Jakarta hotels, President Yudhoyono carefully avoided naming the perpetrators as Jemaah Islamiyah, as this name literally means “Islamic community,” and using it would have opened him to criticism by Islamist politicians of defaming Islam.

Conservative Indonesian Salafi Muslims oppose organizations like JI.

The strictest Salafis in Indonesia are religious—not political—activists. Ironically, this means that the most “radical” of the Salafis are the most immune to jihadist teachings; Salafism in Indonesia is not the security threat sometimes portrayed. It may come across to outsiders as intolerant or reactionary, but for the most part it is not prone to terrorism, in part because it is so inwardly focused on faith.^{xii}

US counterterrorism assistance in Indonesia, which is focused on increasing the competence of police and courts to investigate and prosecute terrorism, has been effective and should be continued. US assistance to Detachment 88, the elite antiterrorism force of the Indonesian National Police, should be increased, and the force should be better integrated with the parent organization. The United States should not just bring funding and a proposal for Indonesia to implement. US negotiators should first meet with the National Intelligence Service (BIN) and discuss what the problem is, including the unresolved definition of terrorism, and a way forward. The reason for the United States to include BIN in these discussions is because the military (TNI) and the National Police (POLRI) are often focused too tactically, rather than strategically. One way to optimize security assistance would be through supporting education to enhance Indonesian police capacity in surveillance and evidence gathering, as all antiterrorist actions must be done on Indonesia’s terms, and not at the insistence of US or other foreign authorities. A challenge for the United States is that US funding is stovepiped for the different components of the Indonesian security sector. Such an arrangement inherently reinforces the existing stovepiped structure of the Indonesian security forces and may exacerbate the lack of interagency communication and intelligence-sharing.

Corruption and the Security Sector

From the perspective of Indonesian policymakers, the foremost internal threat to Indonesian national security is corruption. Ten years after the fall of the kleptocratic Suharto regime, corruption remains a significant challenge for Indonesia, which is ranked 126 out of 180 countries in Transparency International’s 2008 Corruption Index.^{xiii} Transnational crime organizations are drawn to operate in Indonesia because of the perception that the police are corrupt and inept. Transnational crime is more a symptom of weak governmental institutions and corruption, rather than an externally imposed threat. The Indonesian term *oknum* refers to

members of the police or military who abuse their position by engaging in a range of extralegal economic activities with various degrees of backing from the state.^{xiv} President Yudhoyono has taken an aggressive approach to fighting corruption through the creation of the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK). This organization has relentlessly pursued corrupt politicians and businessmen, bringing to justice more than one hundred high-profile public and corporate officials. Ironically, in May 2009 the head of KPK, Antasari Zahra, was arrested on suspicion of conspiracy to murder. While his arrest marred the pristine reputation of the KPK, it apparently did not seriously damage the political platform of good governance that carried Yudhoyono into a second five-year term as president in July of this same year. Despite the President's unequivocal backing of the KPK, International Anti-Corruption Day on December 9, 2009 saw large rallies in several major Indonesian cities. Rally participants demanded zero tolerance for corruption, and alleged a systematic government attempt to weaken the KPK and the Anti-Corruption Court.

Part of the basis for the corruption problem in the security sector lies in poorly articulated regulations and inadequate funding levels for the police and military. After President Suharto left office in 1998, the police (POLRI) were assigned responsibility as lead agency for internal security, while the military (TNI) was limited to an external security role, including Territorial Capacity Building (TCB). Law 34 was written to define security responsibilities of the police and the military; however as of May 2009 the law had not been ratified by the People's Representative Council (DPR) and thus has not been implemented. Since Indonesia currently has no real external adversary, the military basically has no formal mission. As a result, TNI has not been successful in justifying the budget it deems necessary for modernization.^{xv} The police, public prosecutor's office and the courts are still weak, yet they have been given the security responsibilities formerly ascribed to the military. For the next ten to fifteen years, the military may still have to remain engaged, in the background, to aid development of the internal security role of the police. Currently, only the military enjoys a modicum of respect as a security force. However, the successful police operation that resulted in the death of Noordin Top, Indonesia's most dangerous terrorist following the Jakarta hotel bombings of 2009, resulted in a great deal of positive media coverage regarding the developing capabilities of the police in counterterrorism.

Formerly, the regional military commands (KODAM) were reported to

be funded by a mix of funds estimated to be 30 percent from the government budget and 70 percent from off-budget private businesses managed by officers in the KODAMs (although the exact proportion from each source remains unclear). When approval to manage these private businesses was officially revoked, TNI found itself faced with the prospect of operating with less than one-third of previous revenues. It is difficult to assess with certainty whether the extrabudgetary funding stream has actually stopped or just transformed into a "shadow" budget. As the "official" operational funds support salaries, training, equipment purchases and maintenance, TNI's equipment maintenance strategy has basically become one of cannibalization. The priority for the Government of Indonesia is the economy and education, not modernization of the military. Economic development and social development programs garner 70 percent of the budget, while defense and security receive 30 percent of the budget. While TNI is now ostensibly under civilian control, senior military officers confided that should democracy fail in Indonesia, they believe the military remains competent to run the country.

The police currently operate under an analogous split-funding arrangement, although its off-budget private businesses are operated under private contracts, ostensibly with no oversight by senior police officials. However, if approval is revoked for the regional police commands (POLDA) to benefit from private businesses as it was for the military, the police will be forced to scale back operations significantly. The national police organization is only ten years old and, while it has made great progress, there is much work to do in terms of developing professionalism among its leadership and strengthening basic police investigative skills. The United States should increase training assistance in investigative skills to POLRI. Better police work might have detected and arrested the Palembang Group before it was able to carry out its terrorist acts in 2006–07.^{xvi}

In cooperating with TNI, the US military needs to engage in operations and activities that make a difference and stay engaged long enough to gain credibility. The US military participates in nearly 150 joint exercises each year with TNI, two-thirds of which are US-sponsored. However, a limitation on US military hardware transfer to Indonesia is the requirement for a commitment by the government to maintain the equipment in the future with Indonesian funds. Another mechanism is the International Military Education and Training (IMET) program, which historically has been an important mechanism for security cooperation. For example,

reform-minded President Yudhoyono is a graduate of US IMET training. Indonesian, regional and US security would be enhanced by an expansion of this program. Alongside such an expansion, it has also been suggested by some that the opportunity could be taken to reassess the human rights vetting process associated with the program, as this is perceived to be in need of improvement in order to more effectively pursue US goals.

Environmental Crime, Narcotics Trafficking and Piracy

While terrorism remains an ongoing challenge for Indonesia, environmental crime ranks higher among the government's set of transnational security threats. It is estimated that illegal fishing costs Indonesia US\$5 billion per year in lost revenues, with prime offenders being Thailand, Malaysia and Taiwan.^{xvii} Of all timber produced in Indonesia, 70 percent is logged illegally^{xviii}, and much illegal timber moves between Indonesia and Malaysia on its way to overseas markets. The Indonesian government estimates that illegal logging results in an annual loss in revenue of about US\$3 billion.^{xix} Corruption and collusion by local elites with illegal logging operations have been exacerbated by the political decentralization that followed the fall of Soeharto's regime, and this has created an environment where domestic and transnational environmental criminals operate with impunity. Some local governments have emphasized development over conservation and in some cases have urged people to settle and open businesses in protected areas, simply ignoring national laws.

The Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES)^{xx} functions to improve intelligence-sharing, review weak laws, and coordinate enforcement actions. One hundred and sixty-seven countries are party to the CITES treaty, and it is one of the few multilateral environmental agreements to which all ten Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) members, including Indonesia, are party.^{xxi} Transnational crime organizations involved in arms, narcotics and human trafficking also are likely to be involved in the illegal wildlife trade, and these criminal activities can supply funds to terrorist organizations.^{xxii} The illegal wildlife trade is attractive to organized criminal groups because of their synergistic links with trafficking of other contrabands, particularly narcotics.^{xxiii}

One way to address these criminal activities is to strengthen marine and border surveillance. The Office of Defense Cooperation at the US Embassy

in Jakarta has used Department of Defense 1207 counterterrorism funding^{xxiv} to enable the Department of State to purchase and install fifteen new radar stations on northeast Sulawesi, near Manado and at various locations along the strategic Straits of Malacca in support of the "Eye in the Sky" program,^{xxv} jointly operated by Indonesia, Malaysia and Singapore. This program enhances regional maritime surveillance capabilities to combat illicit activities such as smuggling and narcotics trafficking in the waters bordering these countries. Indonesia previously had to deal with narcotics primarily as a transshipment point for these drugs. Today narcotics are increasingly becoming an internal threat, with both the domestic production and use of methamphetamines and ecstasy. It is estimated that there are approximately one million drug addicts today in Indonesia.^{xxvi}

Indonesia has been remarkably successful in reducing piracy in its waters. However, joint efforts are delicate because of sovereignty issues and extant territorial disputes involving Malaysia and Singapore. US support for effective regional responses is critical to reduce pressure on external maritime powers and to intervene to protect commercial shipping. Previously, much of the piracy in the northern Malacca Straits was carried out by Indonesians from the Aceh region of north Sumatra. When Aceh's economic situation improved, piracy in the northern Malacca Straits declined. However, Indonesian Bugis sailors still conduct piracy in the southern Malacca Straits. For Bugis, capturing a vessel through piracy is considered a "rite of passage" and earns them the title "Lord of the Sea." The Indonesian government is seeking to replace this act of piracy with just a ceremonial event.

Indonesia contributes little to the airborne surveillance effort because most of its helicopters are not operational, and it possesses few C130 and no P3 aircraft. An additional hindrance is that Indonesia prefers not to appear "too cooperative" with the United States for domestic political reasons. Pirates and smugglers understand these "fault lines" in security cooperation and continue to exploit them for criminal purposes.

The United States is working to set up a Joint Operations Center for Maritime Security in Jakarta to enable increased maritime presence, and support should be extended to include the Joint Maritime Patrols of Indonesia, Malaysia and Singapore. In 2008 the US Department of Justice's International Criminal Investigative Training Assistance Program (ICITAP) helped to establish Indonesia's first Marine Police Special Boat Unit to provide criminal investigative assistance with maritime transnational crime (TNC).

Human Trafficking and Threat of Pandemic Disease

Indonesia is a major source and transit point for women trafficked to Malaysia, Thailand, Taiwan and Japan, as well as to the Middle East. A major transit route is through the island of Batam, off of South Sumatra, to Malaysia.^{xxvii} In addition, women from the Central Asian states, notably Kazakhstan, are brought into Indonesia for prostitution. Building international cooperation to control human trafficking has been difficult for Indonesia because Malaysia denies complicity. The Malaysian government sponsors RELA, a public security auxiliary force consisting of five hundred thousand “volunteer civilians” who have been given the authority to arrest illegals. Halfway houses have been set up just across the border in Indonesia to repatriate these women. However, once detained inside Malaysia, the women are often just re-trafficked for profit by the volunteers.^{xxviii}

The regional realpolitik of lack of women’s rights is a root cause of trafficking of women in Indonesia. Exacerbating this, the laws and legal processes in Indonesia related to human trafficking are not easily understood by people who lack legal training. Rescued human trafficking victims may fear possible criminal charges, retaliation by traffickers if they provide information to police, or attacks against family members. Indonesia was elevated to a Tier 2 country rating in the US State department’s most recent Trafficking in Persons report, in part because of strong efforts to assist victims of trafficking through the funding of basic services and referral of victims to nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) and international organizations. However, there are few reported efforts to prosecute, convict or punish Indonesian law enforcement and military officials complicit in human trafficking.^{xxix} With little fear of prosecution by corrupt Indonesian law enforcement authorities, traffickers continue community recruitment of vulnerable women and children, particularly in rural areas of central Java. A complicating political factor is that if Indonesia pressures countries like Malaysia or Saudi Arabia to regulate trafficking, these countries may retaliate by sending home legal Indonesian guest workers in their countries, leading to significant losses in remittances sent to Indonesia.

In central Java, there are regions where institutionalized human trafficking represents a significant part of the local economy. This is a sensitive problem for the Indonesian government that was confirmed by US officials working on these issues in central Java. In these areas, local citizens cooperate with police in investigating human trafficking networks,

while at the same time engaging in community-level recruiting of young women for these networks.^{xxx} Wherever there is wealth, such as at the Freeport Mining Corporation, Timika, Papua, or at other mining, logging or energy production camps, there is trafficking. The US Embassy has held discussions with Freeport on this issue, but little concrete action has been taken to resolve the problem. The apparent lack of will by both governments in addressing this problem inevitably sends a signal to traffickers and to international businesses that trafficking in humans is considered less than a priority threat.

To help Indonesia grapple with this problem, the United States should send more trainers to the Jakarta Center for Law Enforcement Cooperation (JCLEC). In 2008, the United States sent nine trainers (the Netherlands sent thirty, the United Kingdom sent thirty-two, and Australia sent one hundred and twenty). In 2007 Australia initiated a five-year, A\$21 million partnership with Indonesia to fight the human trade. Historically, the United States has provided a total of US\$20 million to assist Indonesia in the fight against human trafficking, and it needs to continue this support.

To deal effectively with TNC, Indonesia needs to clarify its policies with respect to international cooperation on surveillance, apprehension and particularly extradition of transnational criminals. Indonesia is open and flexible on these issues; however, traditional ASEAN perceptions of national sovereignty hamper regional progress in this area.^{xxxi} For countries with which Indonesia lacks a formal extradition treaty, regional national chiefs of police have developed an unofficial system of cooperation through which wanted individuals in one country have on occasion been “handed over” to the country of origin of the suspect.^{xxxii}

A more insidious aspect of human smuggling and trafficking involves the international spread of disease. Illegally trafficked individuals as well as official foreign guest workers often carry infectious diseases between Indonesia and other countries where screening for tuberculosis, hepatitis, and sexually transmitted diseases is inconsistent. Indonesians are more concerned about domestic health issues (malaria, dengue, tuberculosis) than transnational health threats such as avian influenza (bird flu), H1N1 (swine flu), severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS), and to a large extent the human immunodeficiency virus (HIV)/AIDS, which is still viewed as an “external” problem. Pandemic preparedness is led only by the Public Health sector, within the Ministry of Health. Citing valid concerns over potential exploitation by the international pharmaceutical industry, the Indonesian Ministry of Health has failed to cooperate fully

with the World Health Organization in H5N1 avian influenza vaccine development.^{xxxiii} This situation does not bode well for the current H1N1 pandemic.

An effective Continuity of Operations (COOP) plan for pandemics requires an interagency approach involving other service sectors such as telecommunications, food and water, sanitation, banking and education. The United States should encourage ASEAN, via its new Ambassador to the Secretariat in Jakarta, to establish regional standards in disaster preparedness to deal with transnational health threats such as pandemic influenza preparedness. Minimum preparedness standards should apply: (1) within countries for interagency communication and cooperation; (2) for information sharing with neighbors; and (3) for communication with NGOs and donors.

Implications for the United States

The biggest challenge to security sector development in Indonesia is the lack of professionalism among the police and, to a lesser degree, the military. Improvement in leadership skills, strategic thinking and technical training of security personnel should be a primary goal of any US engagement strategy for Indonesia. Increased professionalism among the national police will help reduce corruption and increase public confidence in the police as a credible security force. Furthermore, a more stable and secure society in Indonesia supports the strategic goals of both the United States and Indonesia. The United States recently acceded to the ASEAN Treaty of Amity and Cooperation. This important confidence-building measure was a *sine qua non*, and provided the United States both credibility and gravitas to engage effectively in negotiations with Indonesia in a regional context. In this way, programs for fighting terrorism and nontraditional security threats can be crafted as Indonesian solutions, not foreign mandates, thereby empowering the Indonesian government.

For the United States to demonstrate global leadership it must build partnerships with other nations to share the burden of addressing transnational security threats.^{xxxiv} Both countries should look forward and concentrate on creating a security environment beneficial to the region. This is best accomplished by continued security sector development and professionalization of Indonesian security forces at all levels. A comprehensive partnership between the United States and Indonesia,

which supports long-term capacity-building in a culturally sensitive manner, is the best strategy for creating a sustainable security environment in Indonesia and advancing US national interests.

ⁱAbuza, A. 2002. Tentacles of Terror: Al Qaeda's Southeast Asian Network. *Contemporary SE Asia* 24(3): 427-465.

ⁱⁱInternational Crisis Group. 22 Jan 2008. Indonesia: Tackling Radicalism in Poso. *Asia Briefing* No. 75: 1-11.

ⁱⁱⁱJones, S. July 2008. Briefing for the New President: The Terrorist Threat in Indonesia and Southeast Asia. *Annals Amer. Acad. Political and Social Sciences* 618: 69-78.

^{iv}Public Affairs official. 2009. US Embassy, Jakarta. Interview by author. Jakarta, Indonesia, 14 June.

^vSukma, R. 2009. Executive Director. Centre for Strategic and International Studies. Interview by author. Jakarta, Indonesia, June, 2009.

^{vi}Boukhars, A. 2009. There are Many Ways to Exploit Al-Qaeda's Vulnerabilities. Brookings Institution, 22 June. Available online at: http://www.brookings.edu/opinions/2009/0622_al_qaeda_boukhars.aspx.

^{vii}International Crisis Group. 28 Feb 2008. Indonesia: Jemaah Islamiyah's Publishing Industry. *Asia Report* No. 147, p. 1.

^{viii}International Crisis Group. 20 May 2009. Indonesia: Radicalization of the "Palembang Group." *Asia Briefing* 92: 1-19.

^{ix}Della-Giacoma, J. 2009. Radicalisation: Look at the Network, not the School. *The Interpreter*. 29 June. Available online at: <http://www.crisisgroup.org/home/index.cfm?id=6195&l=1>.

^xInternational Crisis Group. 19 Nov 2007. Deradicalization and Indonesian Prisons. *Asia Briefing* No. 142: 1-31.

^{xi}LTG Bambang Darmono. 2009. Secretary General of National Resiliency Council. Presentation to Seminar on East Asian Security. 7 July. Jakarta, Indonesia.

^{xii}International Crisis Group. 13 Sept 2004. Why Salafism and Terrorism Mostly Don't Mix. *Asia Report* 83: 1-59.

^{xiii}Transparency International. 2008 Global Corruption Report 2008, p. 191. Available online at: http://www.transparency.org/publications/gcr/gcr_2008.

^{xiv}Scott, J. 1977. Patron-Client Politics and Political Change in Southeast Asia. In *Friends, Followers, and Factions: A Reader in clientelism*. Edited by S. Schmidt. Berkeley, University of California Press, 1997. Pp. 123-146.

^{xv}Bakri, C., *Defending Indonesia*. Gramedia Pustaka Utama Pubs. Jakarta, Indonesia. 2009. p. 128.

- ^{xvi}Senior official, Centre for Strategic and International Studies. Interview by author, Jakarta, Indonesia, June, 2009.
- ^{xvii}Sianipar, M. (2006). Deputy Chairman, Commission IV, Indonesian House of Representatives. Quoted in Media Indonesia, Jakarta. 6 April.
- ^{xviii}Larsen, J. 2002. Illegal logging threatens ecological and economic stability. Available online at: <http://www.westbynorthwest.org/summer02/larsen.vow.summer02/shtml>.
- ^{xix}Down in the Woods. 2006. The Economist. 25 March, p. 74.
- ^{xx}CITES, 3 March 1973, 993 United Nations Treaty Service 243.
- ^{xxi}Lin, J. 2005. Tackling Southeast Asia's Illegal Wildlife Trade. Singapore Yearbook of Intl Law 9: 191-208.
- ^{xxii}Vince, G. .17 June 2002. Organized Gangs Target Wildlife Trade. New Scientist. Available online at: <http://www.newscientist.com/article/dn2413>.
- ^{xxiii}Cook, D., M. Roberts, and J. Lowther. The international wildlife trade and organized crime. WWF Traffic Report, WWF UK. Godalming, UK. 2002.
- ^{xxiv}Serafino, N. 2008. DOD Section 1207 Security and Stabilization Assistance. CRS Report for Congress, pp 1-4.
- ^{xxv}Yusof, M. 2005. Eye in the Sky Over Malacca Straits. Bernama. Available online at: http://www.bernama.com/bernama/v3/news_lite.php?id=154485.
- ^{xxvi}Senior official. 2009. Centre for Strategic and International Studies. Interview by author. Jakarta, Indonesia 14 June.
- ^{xxvii}Political officer. 2009. US Embassy. Interview by author. 12 June.
- ^{xxviii}Senior Protection Officer. 2009. United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. Refugee Lecture to Seminar on East Asia Security. Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, 9 July.
- ^{xxix}US DOS Trafficking in Persons Report 2009 – Indonesia 16 June 2009. Available online at: <http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/docid/4a4214a6c.html>.
- ^{xxx}Political officer. 2009. US Embassy. Interview by author. 12 June.
- ^{xxxi}Jemadu, A., 2009. Associate Dean. National Sovereignty Lecture to Seminar on East Asian Security. Universitas Pelita Harapan. Jakarta, 10 July.
- ^{xxxii}Senior faculty, Indonesian National Police Headquarters, College of Police Science. 2009. Interview by author. Corroborated by law enforcement officials at US Embassy, 10 June.
- ^{xxxiii}Sedyaningsih, E., S. Isfandari, T. Soendoro, and S. Supari. 2008. Towards mutual trust, transparency and equity in virus sharing mechanisms: The avian influenza case of Indonesia, Ann. Acad. Med. Singapore 37: 482-488.
- ^{xxxiv}Pascual, C. 2009. American Leadership in a Global Century. Brookings Institution. 12 June 2009. Available online at: http://www.brookings.edu/speeches/2009/0612_american_leadership_pascual.aspx