

INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF THE CONCEPT OF VIOLENT EXTREMISM IN COUNTERTERRORISM POLICIES IN INDONESIA



Title :

Institutionalization of the Concept of Violent Extremism in Counterterrorism Policies in Indonesia

Writers : Husni Mubarak (Researcher at the Center for the Study of Religion and Democracy (PUSAD), Paramadina Waqf Foundation, Paramadina University, Jakarta)
Editor : Alamsyah M. Dja'far
Proofreader : Junaidi Simun
Design and layout : Jumrotin

Published by Wahid Foundation in November 2020

Address of WAHID Foundation
Jl. Taman Amir Hamzah No. 8 Jakarta 10320
Telp. 021-3928233 / 3145671
Fax. 021-3928250
E-mail: info@wahidinstitute.org
Website: www.wahidfoundation.org



INTRODUCTION

The terms ‘violent extremism’, ‘countering violent extremism’, and ‘preventing and countering violent extremism’ have become common conversation topics among a number of government officials and activists in civil society organizations. Although they are foreign terms, they have relevance in Indonesia. Since the beginning of reform, Indonesia has experienced a number of incidences of terrorism committed by extremist-jihadist groups. Apart from bombings in places of worship, terrorists have attacked other locations, such as in Bali, several hotels in Jakarta and other areas. Recently, the acts were carried out individually and involved women and children.

These acts of terrorism encourage a number of parties to address and anticipate further acts. The government established the Anti-terrorism Special Detachment 88 (Densus 88)¹ and the National Counterterrorism Agency (BNPT)² in an effort to paralyze terrorist networks and to conduct prevention measures through various programs for those who have been involved or connected with terrorist groups. Meanwhile, civil society organizations are engaged in prevention efforts. They either do it alone or collaborate with the BNPT. Initially, the counterterrorism measures used a ‘hard’ approach known as the ‘war on terror’³. However, this approach only resolved the symptoms, but not the disease. A new approach has emerged, namely preventing/countering violent extremism (P/CVE). This approach is considered more effective because it prioritizes the persuasion approach and emphasizes prevention before acts of terrorism are possibly committed.

Unfortunately, the concept of violent extremism does not have an approved synonym in Indonesian. Various organizations use different terms from one another. Furthermore, the concept of violent extremism also has no equivalent word in the Indonesian regulatory nomenclature. Why has there been no proper approved equivalent word in Indonesian? To what extent can the concept of violent extremism be implemented and mainstreamed in policies?

¹ The Anti-terrorism Special Detachment 88 was formed based on the Presidential Instruction No. 4 of 2002 concerning the formulation of policies to eradicate criminal acts of terrorism, and to provide operational measures and mitigation as a response to terrorist bombings that happened in 2001. Operationally, the formation of Special Detachment 88 was stipulated in the Decree of the Indonesian Police Chief No. 30/VI/2003 dated June 20, 2003 with the aim of implementing the Law No.15 of 2003 concerning the regulation in lieu of Law No. 1 of 2002 regarding the Eradication of Criminal Acts of Terrorism. At the beginning of its establishment, A special desk was formed under the coordination of the Coordinating Minister for Political and Security Affairs. Since then, Densus 88 has been at the forefront countering acts of terrorism (<https://nasional.tempo.co/read/465820/begini-detasemen-khusus-88-antiteror-dibentuk>, accessed on September 18, 2020).

² BNPT was formed according to the Presidential Regulation No. 46 of 2010, that was later amended by the Presidential Regulation No. 12 of 2012. The establishment of this agency is a new measure taken by the Indonesian government in responding to acts of terrorism in addition to law enforcement, Densus 88, and the prevention measures. Prevention and recovery efforts (or reintegration of former convicted terrorists) fall under the authority of BNPT. In 2015, this agency established the Forum for the Prevention of Terrorism (FKPT) in almost all provinces in Indonesia (BNPT, 2014).

³ This campaign was launched by the former president of the United States of America, George W. Bush, shortly after the 9/11 attacks in 2001 that killed thousands of people. See the website of the U.S. Department of State, 2001, accessed on September 18, 2020, link: <https://2001-2009.state.gov/s/ct/rls/wh/6947.htm>

Based on a limited discussion held by the Wahid Foundation, this paper presents the institutionalization of the concept of violent extremism in Indonesian regulations, which has been a challenge so far. Further, the implementation of violent extremism prevention stated in the existing policies also need to be reconsidered by all parties. The complexity of institutionalization and implementation of policies begins with the concept of violent extremism, which has not been agreed upon by all parties, especially by policy makers, and there is no equivalent word that fits the term in the Indonesian violent extremism prevention policies.

After the introduction, this paper exposes various concepts used in the context of religious-based violence prevention in Indonesia. The following section describes how non-governmental organizations use the term in advocacy. The extent to which the concept of violent extremism is implemented and institutionalized in Indonesian regulations will be in the following discussion. This paper ends with a conclusion and a number of recommendations.

LIMITED DISCUSSION

As mentioned above, this paper is based on a limited virtual discussion held by the Wahid Foundation (WF) on Monday, August 24, 2020. This discussion departed from the concern that arose in the previous discussion with representatives from the Ministry of Law and Human Rights that violent extremism had no basis in Indonesian regulations. This assumption is confirmed by Law No. 5 of 2018 concerning Eradication of Criminal Acts of Terrorism (Terrorism Law) that does not have a specific term regarding violent extremism. However, the concept of violent extremism emerged as an attempt to reduce the pejorative meaning of the concept of terrorism.

In WF's findings, violent extremism has been used by and referred to in Indonesian policies. Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono (SBY) in his speech on the 69th Indonesian Independence Day, mentioned the term 'violent extremist organizations', a type of transnational crime that is a challenge to the Indonesian government. The Ministerial Regulation of the Ministry of Defense in 2014 expanded the scope of violent extremism to include ideological, religious and political purposes. Later, BNPT proposed to use the term 'violent extremism' on the National Action Plan on Preventing/Countering Violent Extremism (NAP P/CVE), which is still being drafted.

Based on those considerations, WF held a limited discussion on the potential implementation and institutionalization of the concept of violent extremism in Indonesian policies. This discussion led to the document you are currently reading, providing a clearer picture of the possibility of institutionalization and implementation of violent extremism in the context of state policy. For two hours, this discussion was presented by speakers Robi Sugara, Director of the Indonesia Muslim Crisis Center (IMCC) and Riri Khariroh, a researcher of the Alliance for a Peaceful Indonesia (AIDA). This discussion was also attended by several researchers and advocates for the prevention of violent extremism in Indonesia. This paper is based on the results of this discussion and several other relevant sources.

Referring to the minutes of the meeting, neither the speakers nor the participants discussed directly the institutionalization and implementation of the concept of violent extremism in Indonesian policies as expected in the terms of reference of the discussion. The speakers and participants again discussed the complexity of the concept of violent extremism and how it was translated into Indonesian. In addition, they also discussed the concept of violent extremism in academia and civil society. Departing from the complex issue, the participants discussed the possibility for the concept of violent extremism to be institutionalized in regulations seen from several aspects. Based on the discussion materials, this paper develops possibilities for specific studies on the institutionalization and implementation of the concept of violent extremism in Indonesian policies.

DIFFERENCES IN DEFINING VIOLENT EXTREMISM

Before discussing further on the implementation and institutionalization of the concept of violent extremism, there are a number of concepts that need to be elaborated in order to have a clear understanding. Regarding violent extremism, several terms overlap: terrorism, radicalism, extremism and intolerance. The first three concepts are often considered the same, and are distinguished only from intolerance. Terrorism is an act of violence that is intended to create a terror effect for the targeted party based on an extreme ideology or belief. In short, terrorism is extremism that manifests in action. Extremism in acts of terrorism can be triggered by a religious or non-religious ideology. It is not difficult to find examples where extremism based on nationalism has produced acts of violence, some of which were done through acts of terrorism.

The second concept is radicalism. Radicalism is a concept originating from philosophy, which studies fundamental questions. The concept of radicalism was later adopted into a revolutionary political movement. Radical movements represent groups that crave changes in the political system based on religious beliefs, ideologies or interpretations. One example of the radical movement groups is the caliphate. Radicalization is then understood as a process done by an individual or a group that intends to change the political system based on extreme ideology and with or without violence.

Another concept that is considered to be connected to violent extremism is intolerance. WF defines intolerance as an act of violation against citizens' religious freedom by non-state actors (WF, 2019). Such an act can be committed by extremist groups, and by those who cannot accept differences. This definition is then used to analyze the data on people's behavior in the Annual Report on Freedom of Religion and Belief in Indonesia. Even though intolerance captures the behavior of the wider community, the behavior of intolerant groups can be a stage for the radicalization process and a seed for the growth of extremism, which may lead to violent extremism.



Meanwhile, the concept of extremism does not always mean violence. The word “violence” accompanying ‘extremism’ as in ‘violent extremism’ indicates that there are models of extremism that do not embody the use of violence. The fact that acts of terrorism are only performed by a small proportion of those who have similar views to those that manifest in acts of violence, shows that not all people who think or adhere to extremism create violence. Robi Sugara, Executive Director of the IMCC, strengthens this argument by pointing out that Ayman Al-Zawahiri, one of the leaders of Al-Qaeda, who was responsible for a number of suicide bombings, has the most influential in expressing his disagreement with the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS) because he considers ISIS to be too extreme. Several figures from Hizbut Tahrir also express disapproval of the use of violence by ISIS even though the goal was the same, namely establishing a caliphate. There are also other extreme movements that demand justice but forbid violence. This movement was practiced by Mahatma Gandhi and Martin Luther King (Schmid, 2014).

Violent extremism refers to a movement that adheres to an ideology that justifies and considers only violence to achieve goals. They use violence openly, as ISIS does, or secretly as terrorist groups do. After the 9/11 tragedy, acts of terrorism that killed thousands of people, the United States government declared war on terror i.e., dealing with violence with violence. The United States then invaded a number of countries in the Middle East, such as Iraq.

Fighting terrorism with violence, otherwise known as the hard approach, is considered ineffective. Instead of stopping violence, it only produces further violence that never ends. The idea of a soft approach emerged for those who could potentially become part of the terrorist movement (Aldrich, 2012). Based on this idea, a wave of advocacy known as countering violent extremism was born. Countering Violent Extremism (CVE) as an alternative to the ‘war on terror’ was first introduced by Barack Obama, the former President of the United States, through the CVE Summit at the White House in 2015. This idea departed from the assumption that extremism cannot be solved by intelligence, the police, and militarism. There are many structural causes that must be overcome such as intolerance, authoritarianism, and economic and political marginalization. The United Nations then uses the concept of ‘preventing’ rather than countering violent extremism (UNDP, 2016).

If explored further, in reference to Riri Khariroh, the idea of resistance to terrorism and its causes has appeared in documents issued by the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), although they still use the term ‘counter terrorism’. The attack incident in Madrid (2004) and London (2005) made European policy makers aware that fighting with violence has increasingly heightened the radicalism of terrorist groups. The European Union formulated four pillars as an approach to CVE in 2005: prevent, protect, pursue, and respond. These four pillars have demonstrated a holistic approach in countering violent terrorism.



Unfortunately, as Riri reminds us, the concept of violent extremism is political. In the United States, the concept of violent extremism has slipped into a project of spying on Muslims. The police in the United States monitor Muslim residents, who use symbols as used by extremist groups (Schanzer, Kurzman, Toliver, Miller, 2016). Violent extremism is then associated with Islam as well as acts of terrorism by other groups, such as the white supremacist movement.

Moreover, according to her, this concept is used to subdue those who are against government policies, such as, some Muslim preachers in the United States, who profile-wise, are not from extremist groups. Since their political views are against the government, they are labelled as being radicals, extremists and even terrorists. In the name of national security, the US government then silences groups that criticize national policies using extremist narratives.

At this point we understand why several terms, such as intolerance, radicalism, extremism and terrorism, overlap. These terms are used differently. Both the government and non-governmental organizations use the terms 'radicalism', 'extremism' and 'terrorism' interchangeably without clarifying the differences in meaning between the terms. Only on the concept of intolerance do various actors agree that it cannot be confused with radicalism or extremism, let alone terrorism. However, many believe that intolerance is a step towards radicalism and violent extremism. Violent extremism itself is an international term that does not have a synonym in Indonesian regulations in Indonesia. Even so, this concept has evolved from the 'war on terror', 'countering violent extremism', and recently to 'preventing and countering violent extremism'. How is this concept discussed by domestic and foreign academics?

The term 'violent extremism' has been widely discussed by academics, as can be seen in published journals at home and abroad. In foreign journals, the term 'violent extremism' is quite popularly used by a number of researchers in their writing to describe the violent extremism movement in Indonesia (Keohler, 2016; Harris-Hogan, Barrelle, & Zammit, 2016). Some researchers, for example, are trying to explain how and where extremism grows in Indonesia (Chalmers, 2017; Nuraniyah, 2019; Agastia, Perwita, & Subedi, 2020). There are also publications that aim to review education, capacity building, and various efforts made by civil society and the government in preventing violent extremism (Woodward, Rohmaniyah, Amin, & Coleman, 2010; Afrianty, 2012). In addition, papers that specifically evaluate prevention programs with CVE narratives can also be found in scientific publications (Jones, 2014).

The above discussion shows that the institutionalization of the concept of violent extremism in Indonesian regulations faces a circular path. Aside from the regulations, academics are still debating the concept of violent extremism. There are those who think that violent extremism should be part of state regulations and there are others who are skeptical of this concept being inserted in regulations because it contains bias. How then do the Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) view the concept of violent extremism and its institutionalization in government regulations?



CSOs AND THE CONCEPT OF VIOLENT EXTREMISM IN POLICIES

The Center for the Study of Islam and Society of Syarif Hidayatullah State Islamic University (PPIM UIN) is one of the CSOs based on campus that collaborates with the UNDP in running the program called CONVEY Indonesia. This project uses violent extremism as an overarching concept for various program activities. As an umbrella, violent extremism in this project includes studies on radicalism, intolerance, pluralism, and peace, especially in educational institutions. Violent extremism for PPIM UIN is "an ideology or socio-political movement whose position is far from the socio-political views of the mainstream." Violent extremism is distinguished from radicalism in its use of force. While violent extremism justifies any type of violence to achieve its goals, radicalism does not always use violence (PPIM UIN, 2019).

PPIM UIN has compiled seven policy papers submitted to the government regarding the handling of the concepts of violent extremism and/or radicalism in Indonesia. The PPIM UIN is evaluating a number of policies that could prevent violent extremism in education, for example, the Decree of the Minister of Religious Affairs of 2011 concerning Islamic Religious Education Standards. PPIM UIN considers that the decree does not emphasize enough religious moderation as a way out of preventing violent extremism. Another regulation that PPIM UIN advocates for is The Regulation of Minister of Education and Culture No. 21 of 2016 concerning Islamic Religious Education in Schools.

AIDA, a Jakarta-based CSO, claims to be an institution that brings together perpetrators and victims of terrorism in an effort to prevent violent extremism from recurring. This institution uses the terms 'violent extremism', 'anarchism', 'radicalism' and 'deradicalization'. This institution does not provide a specific explanation about the differences of these terms. They tend to give special emphasis to perpetrators and victims of acts of terrorism. They invite perpetrators and victims to meet each other to understand why violence causes pain rather than achieving the supposedly sacred purpose it carries. This institution then brings perpetrators and victims, who already have the same understanding, to schools to campaign against violence, whatever the reason may be.⁴

It is not surprising that AIDA emphasizes the proposed changes for the revision of the Terrorism Law so that it contains the victim's perspective. They consider that the Terrorism Law places too much emphasis on the prevention and handling of acts of terrorism. The Terrorism Law pays less attention to fulfilling the rights of victims of criminal acts of terrorism. They also encourage the government to accelerate the issuance of government regulations that cover the rights of these victims, which so far have not received serious attention from the government.

Another CSO that uses the concept of violent extremism in its organizational vision is the Institute for International Peace Building (YPP). This institution was founded by, among others, Noor Huda Ismail, an alumni of the Al Mukmin Ngruki Islamic Boarding School in Sukoharjo, an institution that is known to have spawned terrorists in Indonesia. This foundation works seriously in inviting former convicted terrorists to reintegrate into the community and cut off the terrorist network. Some of its ideas include helping former convicted terrorists start businesses that can divert them from terrorism. The terms 'violent extremism', 'radicalism' and 'deradicalization' are present in various programs, such as in research, and capacity building for young people, prison guards, and those who have returned from Syria (prasasti.org, accessed on September 15, 2020).⁵

⁴ <https://www.aida.or.id/> (accessed on September 15, 2020).

⁵ <https://prasasti.org/> (accessed on September 15, 2020).

YPP, in its position paper, emphasizes that the government still needs to clarify policies regarding the handling of former convicted terrorists during imprisonment through its de-radicalization program. The position paper reminds us that prison has become a school of radicalism from which former convicted terrorists are again involved or caught in other acts of terrorism. There should be preventive efforts in the correctional institutions. YPP suggests revising the regulations related to correctional institutions, specifically for convicted terrorists.

Another institution that is important to discuss here is The Asian Muslim Action Network Indonesia (AMAN). This institution focuses on empowering women in preventing violent extremism. AMAN Indonesia hosted the Working Group on Women and Preventing/Countering Violent Extremism (WGWC). Together with other CSOs, AMAN Indonesia submitted a number of inputs to the government which is currently drafting an action plan for the 2018 Terrorism Law. The concepts of violent extremism and radicalism are not clearly differentiated. Extremism and radicalism are ideologies that will hamper the ideals of this institution which seeks to promote peace and progressive Islam at various levels, including locally, nationally and internationally.

The analyses and policy proposals of several CSOs above do not directly lead to advocacy for the institutionalization and implementation of the concept of violent extremism in policies. The institutions that are known to work on countering extremism and radicalism emphasize institutionalization in regulations outside the Terrorism Law. PPIM UIN, for example, emphasizes prevention in the world of education through religious moderation. AIDA proposes the handling of terrorism victims and their families. YPP has started proposing prevention, especially in correctional institutions, but has not immediately attempted to make the violent extremism concept accepted and enforced through regulations in Indonesia.

Different from these institutions, WF translates violent extremism as violence-based extremism that leads to terrorism. For WF, violent extremism is understood as a stage that will lead to terrorism. WF measures violent extremism as a real threat seen from the understanding of radicalism in Indonesia and among students. In running its programs, WF conducts both quantitative and qualitative studies, apart from advocacy by publishing policy papers. WF expresses its ideas and concepts through its assistance in the preparation of the National Action Plan for Preventing/Countering Violent Extremism (Wahid Foundation, 2019).



INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF VIOLENT EXTREMISM IN POLICIES

What is the concept of violent extremism in the context of regulations in Indonesia? The concept of extremism, especially violent extremism, does not appear in the legislations or regulations in Indonesia. The only use of the concept of violent extremism in state documents is in the speech delivered by SBY on Indonesia's 69th Independence Day in 2014. At that time, SBY called violent extremist organizations as transnational crime organizations. Another document that also includes the concept of violent extremism is the enclosure of the Minister of Defense Regulation Number 20 of 2014 concerning the State Defense Health System by the Ministry of Defense. The term extremism appeared in one of the revised drafts of the Terrorism Law. Then, the word disappeared. It was later discovered that this concept had changed to 'ideology based on violence'.

In the current regulations, the concepts that have emerged in the 2020-2024 National Medium-Term Development Plan, which is the official state document referred to by all ministries and institutions in formulating the annual agenda, are intolerance, exclusivism, religious moderation, and terrorism. The agenda related to intolerance and exclusivism is mostly run by the Interfaith Communication Forum (FKUB); religious moderation by the Ministry of Religious Affairs; and terrorism by BNPT and Densus 88. The agenda of religious moderation developed by the Ministry of Religious Affairs is strategic, although it does not have regulatory links anywhere. Lukman Hakim Saifuddin, Minister of Religious Affairs for the 2014-2019 period, once formulated a Ministerial Regulation on religious moderation, but it was not passed. The Ministry of Religious Affairs conducts strategic religious moderation because this ministry houses religious-based educational institutions, including higher education institutions in Indonesia. Prevention of violent extremism can be done through the implementation of a religious moderation program.

Although religious moderation can be used as a concept for prevention campaigns, not all problems related to violent extremism can be resolved without explicit regulatory references, for example, the advocacy on reintegrating former terrorists into the community. The local governments do not want to spend money to support projects that have been initiated by non-governmental organizations. One of the reasons is because there are no regulations regarding this matter. Meanwhile, the preparation of regulations at various levels in Indonesia is a very long process because it adheres to civil law. Several organizations that advocate for the reintegration of ex-convicts have ceased activity due to an absence of regulations.

Another problem is bureaucracy. For example, when a law is passed, government regulations and action plans will be issued. The question that immediately arises is who has the authority to implement it? Echelon 1, 2, 3, or 4? According to Robi Sugara, it makes sense to eliminate echelons 3 and 4 as a strategy to streamline the bureaucracy. Not only the agenda of violent extremism, but also other issues in Indonesia will be helped if the bureaucracy is reduced.



Another problem is that preventing and countering terrorism is a multi-agency issue. BNPT may be the main sector, but there are certain aspects where other ministries and agencies must step in, for example, the prevention of terrorism through the deradicalization program. If its efforts include empowerment of micro businesses, the ministry that handles small and medium enterprises must step in. If the prevention includes strengthening the social aspects of the family, then the Ministry of Social Affairs or the Regional Social Services Office will take part through existing programs in these institutions. Without inter-agency cooperation, the overall prevention of terrorism or violent extremism is unlikely to succeed.



Although there is no explicit nomenclature, the spirit of preventing violent extremism can be attached to three aspects in the Terrorism Law No. 5 of 2018: national preparedness, counter radicalization and deradicalization. National preparedness is a process that is planned, integrated, systematic and sustainable. National preparedness includes community empowerment; capacity building of the apparatus; protection and improvement of facilities and infrastructure; terrorism studies development; and mapping of radical terrorism-prone areas.

Counter-radicalization is the process of targeting groups of people, who are vulnerable to being exposed to radicalism and terrorism. They have access to ideas that contain radicalism and terrorism, relate to a person or a group, who are considered to have radical and terrorist ideologies, a narrow understanding of nationalism, and considered to be economically vulnerable. Counter radicalization is carried out through counter narrative, counter propaganda, and counter ideology. This aspect is problematic because the openness of information technology allows everyone to access information on radicalism and terrorism. Preventing people from accessing certain beliefs can potentially violate citizens' freedoms. Counter-narrative in this context is the most sensible thing to do. This is where the prevention of violent extremism can be embellished.

The final aspect in the 2018 Terrorism Law that can be used as a reference for preventing violent extremism is deradicalization. Deradicalization is conducted towards suspects, defendants, convicts, prisoners, former convicts of acts of terrorism, and/or those who have been exposed to radical terrorism. The forms of deradicalization are identification and assessment, rehabilitation, re-education, and social reintegration. These forms of deradicalization are in line with the dimensions of preventing violent extremism.

Although these three aspects — national preparedness, counter radicalization, and deradicalization — can be used as references; Junaidi Simun, a researcher at the Center for the Study of Religion and Culture (CSRC) UIN Syarif Hidayatullah, reminds us that there is no need to force the use of the term 'violent extremism' in advocacy if it is to be completely rejected. Choose a term that matches the nomenclature in a law, regulation, or derivative regulation whose contents reflect the prevention of violent extremism.

The legislation will certainly not satisfy everyone. It is natural for some of us to criticize these three aspects of the 2018 Terrorism Law. Aside from the law, the statement of the CSO coalition's stance will never satisfy all parties. Therefore, while the opportunity is open and referring to the law is possible, we can make use of the law properly for the purpose of preventing violent extremism. In addition, those who make use of the law need to calculate risks, for example, to what extent will counter-radicalization result in violations of civil liberties by state officials in the name of radicalism? To what extent does deradicalization mean closing access to information in cyberspace (online)? There are still other questions that need to be considered when using the terms as stated in the Law.



Another route open to interpretation can be found in derivative regulations. Besides laws and government regulations, derivative regulations are still lacking definition, such as presidential regulations, ministerial regulations, regional regulations (by governors, regents, or mayors); and regulations at the lowest level, such as village regulations. The derivative regulations at the ministerial and local government levels have not much included the concept of violent extremism. The shortcoming of regional regulations is that not all regions consider it important to formulate counter-terrorism regional regulations if the regions do not have terrorism cases or other cases.

As mentioned above, the Wahid Foundation is currently assisting the formulation and institutionalization of the NAP P/CVE. Conceptually, the NAP P/CVE is the only regulation that explicitly uses the concept of violent extremism. Together with a number of ministries and agencies, as well as civil society, BNPT designed this NAP P/CVE as a basis for preventing acts of violent extremism. The NAP P/CVE aims to increase community resilience from the threat of violent extremism that leads to terrorism and to increase the protection of citizens' right to security from violent extremism that leads to terrorism. Based on these objectives, NAP P/CVE designs various institutions to work together to prevent violent extremism. In addition, the NAP PE also encourages the public to participate in prevention in their environment. In addition, the NAP P/CVE also encourages the publication of a number of studies examining the potential growth of violent extremism in Indonesia.

The NAP P/CVE consists of four pillars: (1) prevention (preparedness, counter-radicalization and protection); (2) deradicalization; (3) law enforcement and strengthening of the legislative framework; and (4) international partnerships and cooperation. In each pillar, NAP P/CVE formulates a number of focuses and activities that can be accomplished during 2019-2023. The NAP P/CVE is now entering the final stage to be confirmed by Presidential Decree.⁶

⁶ Rizki Maluna, "BNPT: Perpres Penanggulangan Ekstremisme Masuk Tahap Finalisasi", Okezone.com, 27 Agustus 2020, Link: <https://nasional.okezone.com/read/2020/08/27/337/2268681/bnpt-perpres-penanggulangan-ekstremisme-masuk-tahap-finalisasi>

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The first issue of violent extremism to be institutionalized and implemented is that the term has different meanings in English and when translated into Indonesian. Extremist violence and violent extremism have different meanings. The former emphasizes violence, while the latter focuses on extremism. The implications of the two meanings can be different, particularly how they are handled. Another problem with the violent extremism concept is the suspicion that it is biased towards Muslim groups.

Apart from the linguistic issue, the fact is that violence is the result of acts of terrorism in Indonesia. Violent extremism is a common issue.

Countering violent extremism is problematic because so far there is no legal umbrella that can accommodate this concept. The concept of extremism, notably violent extremism, does not appear in the Indonesian laws and regulations. Regulation wise, the concepts that appear in the 2020-2024 National Medium-Term Development Plan, which is the official state documents referred to by all ministries and agencies in formulating the annual agenda, are intolerance, exclusivism, religious moderation, and terrorism. Although religious moderation can be used as a concept for prevention campaigns, not all issues related to violent extremism can be resolved without explicit regulatory references.

Instead of implementing it, this concept still has to be advocated so that it can be institutionalized in policies. While a number of CSOs are targeting the preventive dimension, the Wahid Foundation is accompanying the institutionalization of violent extremism through the NAP P/CVE. In addition, there are several opportunities proposed in this discussion to address the institutionalization of violent extremism in Indonesian policies. The prevention of violent extremism can be embedded in three aspects of the 2018 Terrorism Law: national preparedness, counter-radicalization and deradicalization. While there is still an opportunity to refer to the Law, it must be utilized properly for the purpose of preventing violent extremism. Another recommendation is to take advantage of the existing regulations, namely derivative regulations, such as presidential regulations, ministerial regulations, regional regulations (issued by governors, regents, or mayors), or regulations at the lowest level, such as village regulations.



REFERENCES

- Afrianty, D. (2012). "Islamic Education and Youth Extremism in Indonesia." *Journal of Policing, Intelligence and Counter Terrorism*, 7(2), 134-146.
- Agastia, I. G. B. D., Perwita, A. A. B., & Subedi, D. B. (2020). "Countering Violent Extremism through State-Society Partnerships: A Case Study of Deradicalisation Programmes in Indonesia." *Journal of Policing, Intelligence and Counter Terrorism*, 15(1), 23-43.
- Aldrich, D. P. (2014). "First Steps towards Hearts and Minds? USAID's Countering Violent Extremism Policies in Africa." *Terrorism and Political Violence*, 26(3), 523-546.
- Ali-Fauzi, I, Kartika, Dyah A., 2018. *Keluar dari Ekstremisme: Delapan Kisah Hijarah dari Kekerasan menuju Bina Damai*. Jakarta: PUSAD Paramadina.
- BNPT. 2014. *Blueprint Pencegahan Terorisme*. Jakarta: BNPT.
- Chalmers, I. (2017). "Countering Violent Extremism in Indonesia: Bringing Back the Jihadists." *Asian Studies Review*, 41(3), 331-351.
- Harris-Hogan, S., Barrelle, K., & Zammit, A. (2016). "What is Countering Violent Extremism? Exploring CVE Policy and Practice in Australia." *Behavioral Sciences of Terrorism and Political Aggression*, 8(1), 6-24.
- Jones, S. (2014). "Terrorism in Indonesia: A Fading Threat?". *Southeast Asian Affairs*, 2014(1), 139-147.
- Koehler, D. (2016). *Understanding Deradicalization: Methods, Tools and Programs for Countering Violent Extremism*. Taylor & Francis.
- Nuraniyah, N. (2019). "The Evolution of Online Violent Extremism in Indonesia and the Philippines." *Global Research Network on Terrorism and Technology Paper*, (5), 1-17.
- Rizki Maluna, "BNPT: Perpres Penanggulangan Ekstremisme Masuk Tahap Finalisasi", *Okezone.com*, 27 Agustus 2020, Link: <https://nasional.okezone.com/read/2020/08/27/337/2268681/bnpt-perpres-penanggulangan-ekstremisme-masuk-tahap-finalisasi>
- Schanzer, D. H., Kurzman, C., Toliver, J., & Miller, E. (2016). *The Challenge and Promise of Using Community Policing Strategies to Prevent Violent Extremism: A Call for Community Partnerships with Law Enforcement to Enhance Public Safety*. Durham: Triangle Center on Terrorism and Homeland Security.
- Schmid, Alex P. 2014. *Violent and Non-Violent Extremism: Two Sides of the Same Coin?*. The Hague: ICCT.
- Sumpter, C. (2017). "Countering Violent Extremism in Indonesia: Priorities, Practice and the Role of Civil Society." *Journal for Deradicalization*, (11), 112-147.
- Tempo.co, "Begini Detasemen Khusus 88 Antiteror Dibentuk". *Tempo.co*. Diakses pada 18 September 2020. Link: <https://nasional.tempo.co/read/465820/begini-detasemen-khusus-88-antiteror-dibentuk>
- U.S. Departemen of State. 2001. "The Global War on Terrorism: The First 100 Days", *2001-2009.state.gov*, US Government website. Diakses pada 18 September 2020. Link: <https://2001-2009.state.gov/s/ct/rls/wh/6947.htm>
- UNDP. 2016. *Preventing Violent Extremism through Inclusive Development and the Promotion of Tolerance and Respect for Diversity*. New York: UNDP.
- Wahid Foundation. 2020. *Mengapa RAN PE?*. Jakarta: The Wahid Foundation.
- Woodward, M., Rohmaniyah, I., Amin, A., & Coleman, D. (2010). "Muslim Education, Celebrating Islam and Having Fun as Counter-Radicalization Strategies in Indonesia." *Perspectives on Terrorism*, 4(4), 28-50.



© 2020