TERRORISM CRIMES IN INDONESIA: A COUNTERTERRORISM PERSPECTIVE

[i],*Muhammad Hatta, [ii]Ramalinggam Rajamanickam, [ii]Tengku Noor Azira Tengku Zainudin,
[ii]Mohd Zamre Mohd Zahir, [i]Zulfan & [i]Husni

[i]Faculty of Law, Universitas Malikussaleh, Aceh Utara, Indonesia
[ii]Faculty of Law, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, 43600, UKM Bangi, Selangor Darul Ehsan, Malaysia

*(Corresponding author) e-mail: muhammad.hatta@unimal.ac.id

ABSTRACT

Terrorism has emerged as a significant concern in contemporary societies. In Indonesia, the primary factor contributing to individual involvement in terrorism is the pervasive influence of deviant Islamic ideologies, particularly those pertaining to *jihad* and caliphate governance. Misinterpretations of Islamic teachings, with an inclination towards extremism, substantially increase an individual's propensity to engage in terrorist acts such as suicide bombings. This study aimed to investigate terrorism in Indonesia using an anti-terrorism approach, specifically counter radicalism. This qualitative research employed normative or doctrinal methodologies to identify, explain, analyse, and systematically articulate facts, principles, concepts, theories, and laws, with the objective of generating new knowledge and ideas for legal reform. It is crucial to acknowledge that the motivations of terrorist groups in Indonesia extend beyond religious doctrine. These groups sought to fully implement Islamic law (*kaffah*) and establish an Islamic state (*Darul Islam*) through the caliphate system. Associated with the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS), these entities aimed to establish both an Islamic state within Indonesia and a global Islamic caliphate. The Indonesian government can enhance its counterterrorism initiatives by implementing more stringent penalties for those involved, as delineated in Law No. 5 of 2018, which focuses on eradicating terrorism. Furthermore, the government should augment proactive measures by instituting a counterterrorist ideological programme to cultivate a comprehensive understanding of Islamic teachings and national values, thereby ensuring accurate comprehension among individuals. The study concluded that terrorist organisations in Indonesia are motivated not only by religious fanaticism, aimed at the perfect implementation of Islamic law (*kaffah*), but also by political ambitions to establish an Islamic state (*Darul Islam*) within the country. This study is expected to enhance the comprehensive understanding of the implementation of counter-ideological and de-radicalization initiatives while also promoting nationalist values to preserve the integrity of the Republic of Indonesia.

Introduction

The acts of terrorism perpetrated by terrorist organisations are intended to elicit attention from the state government. Terrorism is not invariably associated with violence; rather, it represents the culmination of violent actions. Although violence can exist independently of terror, terrorism cannot exist without violence. It is important to distinguish terrorism from intimidation or sabotage because the targets of the latter are typically specific, whereas terrorism is often indiscriminate. Victims of terrorist activities frequently include civilians or groups that are not affiliated with foreign interests.

Terrorist activities differ from those of mafia organisations, which emphasise that secrecy exhibits extreme group loyalty and unity against their adversaries. However, modern terrorist groups often openly broadcast statements and demands through media channels to convey their messages to the public. After incidents such as abductions, homicides, or bombings, terrorist groups typically promptly claim responsibility (Selamat et al., 2023).

Terrorist attacks in Indonesia have resulted in the tragic deaths of many Indonesian citizens and foreigners. Suicide bombings in Legian Kuta, known as Bali Bombing I and II, killed people from countries such as Australia, the USA, Germany, and the UK. Other targets included the Senen Atrium Shop, Jakarta Stock Exchange, McDonald's in Makassar, JW Marriott Hotel, Philippine Embassy, Australian Embassy, Sarinah, Ritz Carlton, and other locations (Yaqin, 2007). These attacks inflict physical damage on structures and instil apprehension among Indonesian citizens and foreign nationals interested in Indonesia.

Table 1. Major Cases of Terrorism in Indonesia (Heryanto, 2006)

Terrorism Attack	Location	Year
Philippine Embassy Bombing	Jakarta	2000
Indonesian Stock Exchange (IDX) Bombing	Jakarta	2000
Bali Bombing I	Bali	2002
McDonald's Restaurant Bombing	Makassar	2002
JW Marriott Hotel Bombing	Jakarta	2003
Australian Embassy Bombing	Jakarta	2004
Bali Bombing II	Bali	2005
Ritz Carlton Hotel Bombing	Jakarta	2009
Sarinah Building Bombing	Jakarta	2016

These terrorist attacks were directed at non-Muslims (*Kafirs*) and symbols of the American state in Indonesia, as well as nations perceived to support American policies (Subaidi & Bahreisy, 2024). Terrorism has caused numerous casualties, severely compromised national security, and tarnished the international reputation of the Indonesian government (Hoffman, 2009). Consequently, the prevalence of terrorism in Indonesia has led to the collapse of the tourism sector and deterred potential investors, creating a negative perception of the country. Indonesia has been characterised as a "terrorist haven", prompting several countries to issue travel advisories for their citizens planning to visit (Nick Mawdsley, 2003). Conversely, Islam, as one of the predominant religions in Indonesia, often suffers from negative perceptions due to its association with extreme Islamic identity, radical Islam, or fundamentalism.

The international community has shown sympathy and exerted pressure on Indonesia to act against terrorist groups following terrorist acts. The United Nations adopted two resolutions: Resolution No. 1438 of 2002 condemns the Bali bombings and expresses condolences to Indonesia and the victims' families, whereas Resolution No. 1373 of 2002 calls for cooperation and support from Indonesia to ensure a fair trial for those involved in terrorist activities.

Indonesia has transitioned from being a "stopover" or training ground for terrorists to a target for terrorist activities (Paamsyah et al., 2023). To address this issue, the Indonesian government must implement comprehensive, systematic, integrated, and sustained measures to dismantle terrorist networks and disrupt the channels through which terrorist ideologies are disseminated. These organisations in Indonesia frequently recruit members and suicide operatives, referred to as "brides", utilising religious doctrines that promise celestial rewards. They often misinterpret Islamic concepts, particularly *jihad*, to persuade

individuals to engage in suicide bombings (Takdir et al., 2023). Consequently, terrorism is frequently associated with extreme ideologies and misinterpreted religious doctrines such as *jihad*. Terrorist organisations deliberately engage in diverse acts of violence, including homicide, property destruction, abduction, larceny, suicide bombings, and other criminal activities.

Terrorism is not exclusively driven by aberrant beliefs or religious doctrines; numerous acts are politically motivated as well. This phenomenon is evident in Indonesia, where terrorist groups reject its sovereignty and designate it as a *"thaghut"* state. Their objective was to transform Indonesia into a caliphate or Islamic state based on their interpretation of Islam. All Indonesian terrorist organisations are affiliated with the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS).

Terrorist organisations worldwide aim to impose and fully implement Islamic law *(kaffah)*. However, this ideological motive has evolved in conjunction with political motives, resulting in the objective of terrorist organisations not only to implement Islamic law but also to establish an Islamic state through a caliphate system of government. Certain terrorist organisations in Indonesia, such as the Islamic State of Indonesia (NII), *Jamaah Islamiyah* (JI), *Jamaah Ansharut Daulah* (JAD), *Mujahidin Indonesia Timur* (MIT), *Jemaah Ansharut Tauhid* (JAT), and others, do not recognise Indonesia as a sovereign state. These entities categorise Indonesia as a *thaghut* state and aim to transform the country into an Islamic state (*Darul Islam*) through the implementation of the *Khilafah* system of government or the establishment of an Islamic state based on their interpretation of the concept. These terrorist organisations are affiliated with *Al-Qaida*, which has evolved into the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS).

Terrorist organisations use online propaganda to advance their agendas. In Indonesia, they target state facilities, symbols, and law enforcement because of the nation's role in safeguarding foreign interests, prompting these groups to incite militants against Indonesia and its allies. This study enhances the comprehensive understanding of counter-ideology and de-radicalization. The study's novelty lies in its identification of the multifaceted causes of terrorism in Indonesia, which include not only deviant ideological elements but also political ambitions to establish an Islamic state. This underscores the need for a counter-ideological strategy to address ideological and nationalistic misconceptions. Therefore, this study aimed to evaluate the Indonesian government's counterterrorism strategies.

Literature Review

Mestika (2023) examined the ongoing discourse regarding the interpretation of terrorism. Formulating a comprehensive definition of terrorism is challenging because of its subjective nature, as each nation possesses a distinct perspective. Controversies surrounding the definition of terrorism originate from the potential for severe criticism of perpetrators if they are designated as terrorists. Consequently, any attempt to define terrorism is inevitably associated with political and ideological biases (Mestika, 2023).

While there is ongoing debate regarding the definition of terrorism, numerous scholars have attempted to interpret it from multiple perspectives. Pape (2003) characterised terrorism as an *attitude d'intimidation*, encompassing actions and attitudes intended to induce fear in individuals (Pape, 2003). One researcher defined terrorism as the use of force or threats to undermine and intimidate others. He described it as a violent activity aimed at intimidating civilians, influencing government policies, or affecting state administration through acts such as kidnapping or murder. The goals of terrorism include instilling fear, extortion, radical political change, advocating for human rights and freedom for innocents, and fulfilling political demands.

The European Convention on the Suppression of Terrorism has significantly broadened the definition of terrorism, shifting it from a state-targeted crime (including the assassination or attempted assassination of state leaders or their family members) to one against humanity, targeting civilians (Bellelli, 2016). Crimes against humanity are categorised as egregious violations of human rights, characterised by widespread or systematic attacks directed against civilian populations and non-combatants.

Defining terrorism is vital for both academic understanding and practical purposes, such as developing effective counterterrorism strategies. Despite the lack of a universal definition, each country must define terrorism according to its government's policies, characteristics, and legal culture (Neumann, 2010). As an ancient crime with evolving motives, terrorism is classified as an extraordinary crime that requires

careful formulation of legal policies. Thus, a precise definition is essential for comprehending its nature and designing appropriate punishments for terrorists in Indonesia.

Terrorism is characterised by large-scale acts of violence, the destruction of public infrastructure, and mass casualties, motivated by deviant ideologies. In Indonesian criminal law, Muladi (2004) classifies terrorist offences as *mala per se* or *mala in se*, viewing terrorism as inherently against human nature and a threat to peace, prohibited by its very nature as well as by law.

The pattern of terrorism in disseminating its message often aligns with that of many international terrorist organisations. Schaukowitch (2018) noted that in Southeast Asia, numerous terrorist groups are linked to international organisations, resulting in similar patterns, characteristics and methods. The most prominent affiliated groups are ISIS and *Al-Qaida*. They frequently mimic these organisations' propaganda techniques, including spreading terror through religious ideology, exerting territorial control, and using literary or digital narratives for propaganda (Schaukowitch, 2018).

Arromadloni et al., (2022) argue that terrorist groups find the concepts of *jihad* and an Islamic state governed by a caliphate particularly effective for propaganda, interpreting various Qur'an verses and hadith to fit their views (Arromadloni et al., 2022). Wright (2017) notes that Abu Bakr Al Baghdadi and associates first introduced the caliphate concept in a Mosul Mosque. For the ISIS caliphate, they established a leadership structure with an Imam, an Amir, and Regional Leaders. The Imam delivers lectures on religious duties, emphasising *jihad*, while the Amir guides the congregation on Islamic teachings such as purification. Regional leaders act as extensions of the Imam and Amir in their respective areas (Wright et al., 2017).

Bjørgo proposed a typology for understanding the factors contributing to terrorism, differentiating between two categories: preconditions and precipitants. Preconditions include enduring factors, such as motivational ideologies that mobilise individuals over time. Precipitants refer to specific events or phenomena that directly trigger terrorism, such as injustice, ignorance, and poverty (Bjørgo, 2004).

Acts of terrorism in Indonesia encompass several elements, specifically crimes that have been criminalised within the Indonesian criminal law system, which are intended to instil terror among the populace in Indonesia or to influence and establish affiliations with international terrorist organisations to perpetrate acts of terror that result in mass casualties. These acts are motivated by aberrant ideological interpretations and political agendas (Bassiouni, 1981).

One study suggests that terrorism in Indonesia involves using or threatening violence to create widespread fear, potentially leading to mass casualties or damaging strategic assets, the environment, and public or international facilities, motivated by ideological, political, or security disruption. This definition highlights both violent acts and the threat of violence, categorising them as terrorist crimes (Abeyratne, 2011).

The Indonesian government uses its national power to neutralise terrorists, their organisations, and networks, preventing them from using violence to incite fear and force compliance with the law. The counterterrorism strategy incorporates the techniques, tactics, and deployments of the government, military, law enforcement, intelligence agencies, and businesses to combat and prevent terrorist activities (Nahdhodin et al., 2024).

Zaidan (2017) indicates that public discourse in Indonesia largely attributes terrorism to radical Islamic ideology and socioeconomic deprivation. However, empirical evidence refutes the direct link between poverty and terrorism, suggesting that ideological factors are the intermediate causes. This viewpoint shapes Indonesian counterterrorism policies, including network disruption and anti-terrorism efforts focused on deradicalisation and counterradicalisation. Addressing the multifaceted causes of terrorism requires more than legal measures; it necessitates approaches that consider the diverse factors leading to terrorism (Zaidan, 2017).

Methodology

This qualitative study aimed to gather empirical evidence to understand societal realities (Rowe, 2015). This study was conducted as a legal, doctrinal, and normative study. Normative studies seek to discover, explain, analyse, and systematically articulate facts, principles, concepts, theories, and laws to generate new knowledge and ideas for reforms (Yaqin, 2007; Zulhendra et al., 2023; Abrar et al., 2024; Gunawan & Zulfiqri, 2024). This study also examines terrorism and countermeasures in Indonesia by exploring punitive, preventive, counter-ideological, and de-radicalisation strategies. This study used diverse sources, including books, journals, reports, archives, court decisions, and relevant literature in both print and electronic formats. The data were qualitatively processed and systematically analysed to conclude the findings.

Findings and Discussion

The emergence of terrorist organisations in Indonesia is influenced by various factors, with the predominance of deviant Islamic interpretations. This factor is central as several groups, including *Laskar Jihad*, *Mujahidin Indonesia Timur* (MIT), *Jamaah Ansharuut Tauhid* (JAT), *Daulah Islamiyah Nusantara*, *Mujahidin Indonesia Barat* (MIB), and *Jamaah Islamiyah* (JI), all operate under Islam's banner and advocate for an Islamic state governed by a Khilafah system. These organisations exploit and distort the concept of *jihad* to incite a militant mindset for executing terror acts.

Technological advancements and improved information dissemination correlate with increased terrorist incidents, as terrorist groups exploit the Internet and social media to spread their propaganda and ideologies. These organisations primarily use the Internet to sway individuals' beliefs through aggressive campaigns, persuasive rhetoric, recruitment, radicalisation, and incitement of terrorist acts. In multimedia communication, ideologies, justifications, and endorsements of terrorism and warfare have been propagated. This dissemination can take various forms, such as presentations, electronic magazines, scholarly writings, audio and video files (e.g. lectures, religious songs, or Nasyid), and video games created by terrorist organisations or their supporters.

The susceptibility of individuals in Indonesia to radicalisation and terrorist group involvement stems from a lack of understanding of Islamic religious knowledge and jurisprudence. Younger people are increasingly using online platforms for Islamic teaching without consulting authoritative sources. Exposure to extremist ideologies can lead individuals to reject national concepts and view Indonesia as a "*thaghut*" state, justifying attacks on it. Although ignorance and poverty are not direct causes of terrorist attacks in Indonesia, they can contribute to the acceptance of terrorist doctrines. Comprehensive measures are essential to address terrorism in Indonesia.

While punitive measures in Law Number 5 of 2018 target severe sanctions for terrorism offenders, the government must also employ pre-emptive strategies to protect Indonesians from radical influence. Current counter-ideological programmes (deradicalisation) focus on youth, disseminating credible information, and studies of Islamic jurisprudence, particularly *jihad* and *khilafah*. Individuals need to gain an accurate understanding of Islamic law from the Qur'an and the Hadith, guided by knowledgeable and righteous scholars.

To implement a counter-ideological program, the government must emphasise nationalism, statehood, and patriotism. Terrorist organisations have challenged Indonesia's sovereignty by advocating a caliphate system. Initially, their attacks targeted foreign nationals, interests, and assets in Indonesia; however, recent incidents have focused on state officials, heads of state, and government facilities. These groups argue that Indonesia is an infidel state because of its non-Islamic government system and therefore deserves opposition. Thus, the counter-ideology program aims to clarify the interpretations of Islam, as well as the concepts of nationality and statehood.

The Motivation of Terrorism Activities in Indonesia

In the aftermath of the 11 September 2001 attacks, which claimed 5,000 lives at the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, terrorism became closely linked to religious ideology (Hung 2003). This has led to significant speculation regarding the attackers' motives and goals. The U.S. government attributed the attacks to radical Islamic groups, alleging that certain Islamic nations supported and financed these terrorists (Johannen, 2003). Consequently, Islam became widely associated with terrorism and violence, and Muslims were often viewed as radical (Noor, 1997).

The baseless claim that Islam endorses violence is widespread in Western media, both in print and electronic forms, including opinions alleging that the Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) engaged in terrorism (Mestika, 2023). These accusations are biased, severe, and unfairly attribute the actions of specific groups to Muslims worldwide without substantial evidence. In Palestine, acts of terrorism have occurred, with Palestinians facing violence from extremist Jewish factions, Zionist military personnel, and the Israeli government, which is predominantly Jewish. However, no Western media outlet labels Judaism as a violent faith that supports the killing of innocents (Syihab, 2023). Israel's terrorist acts are consistently attributed to political rather than religious factors (Mubarok, 2020). Terrorist movements have historically occurred in Islamic countries, but similar phenomena have also occurred in the United States, South America, East Asia, and Europe (Johannen, 2003).

Historical studies indicate that terrorism does not originate from a particular ideology or have a specific association with a particular religion. Historically, authorities have perpetrated acts of terror against their populace to instil fear, submission, and obedience, thereby maintaining or expanding their power (Heryanto, 2006). For instance, in Northern Ireland, the Irish Republican Army (IRA), also known as the Provisional Irish Republican Army, committed acts of terrorism (Bowden & Davis, 2008; Mansfield, 2019). The IRA was a republican paramilitary organisation that sought to establish a united Irish republican constitution, terminate British rule in Northern Ireland, and achieve reunification with the Republic of Ireland. The IRA movement predates the establishment of Northern Ireland. During the Anglo-Irish War (Irish War of Independence, 1919-1921), the IRA employed guerrilla tactics, including acts of terror, ambushes, raids, and sabotage, to compel the British government to negotiate (English, 2023).

Modern terrorist acts are often driven by distorted ideological beliefs. All religions inherently advocate kindness, provide life guidance, and specify repercussions for violating religious principles. Religious beliefs not only concern the afterlife but also regulate behaviour throughout one's life. Ball and Dagger argue that, ideologically, terrorist movements can be discerned through religious interpretations of values and doctrines that reflect moral, social, and political interests (Suryani et al., 2009). Unfortunately, followers frequently misuse these interpretations, leading to unjustifiable violence that contradicts the core tenets of the religion.

It is evident that certain groups misinterpret the religious principles. This misinterpretation is subsequently used to justify acts such as killing, bombing, kidnapping, persecuting, and abducting individuals with differing beliefs. Those who engage in such actions often identify themselves using terms such as separatists, liberation fighters, crusaders, militants, or mujahideen, depending on their religious context (Suryani et al., 2009). In the Islamic context, commonly used terms include '*jihad*' or '*mujahideen*', which became the rationale for committing acts of terrorism in the name of Islamic teachings. This justification serves as a unilateral benefit for individuals or groups by rationalising terrorist acts.

The ideology of terrorism is often linked to the concept of *jihad* in Islam, similar to the relationship between the Crusades and Christianity (Adam & Afrizal, 2025). Some Muslim extremists interpret *jihad* in a manner that leads Western Orientalists to associate *jihad* with terrorism. Both groups' understanding of *jihad* was limited by their subjective views and interests. Extremists and Western Orientalists share a literal interpretation of *jihad*, focusing on a single definition among many (Pipe, 2002). This contradicts scholarly traditions, which value diverse perspectives and inclusivity in understanding complex concepts (Junaid, 2013).

Terrorism in Indonesia stems from factors such as limited knowledge, poverty, political motivations, and misinterpretations of religious doctrines (McAlister, 2002). Chaidar (2019) further states that terrorism is viewed as heroic by radical intellectuals who manipulate religious beliefs to justify violence against those with differing ideologies and political views.

The Bali Bombings I and II involved members from various terrorism networks such as *Darul Islam* (DI), the successor of the Indonesian Islamic State (NII), *Jamaah Ansharut Daulah* (JAD), *Mujahidin Indonesia Timur* (MIT), *Jemaah Ansharut Tauhid* (JAT), and *Jemaah Islamiyah* (JI). The Bali Bombing occurred on October 12, 2002, in Kuta, Bali, killing 220 people and injuring 209, predominantly foreigners. The victims were tourists from Australia, the UK, the US, Germany, Sweden, the Netherlands, France, Denmark, New Zealand, Switzerland, Brazil and Canada. The Bali Bombing II, also known as the 2005 Bali Bombings, struck the Kuta and Jimbaran areas three times, resulting in 23 deaths and 196 injuries.

Naharong asserts that in the Bali I bombing, Imam Samudra and his associates maintained that the attack was an expression of the doctrine of *jihad*, which they considered to be part of *fard 'ain*, signifying that every individual is obligated to adhere to the tenets of Islam. In essence, they regard *jihad* as the sixth pillar of Islam (Putra & Hitchcock, 2006). *Jemaah Islamiyah* (JI) contends that radicalism is the appropriate means to accomplish the objectives of its movement. Their radicalism represents an unprecedented effort to supplement the existing governing system with an entirely new system (McAlister, 2002). This argument posits that the complete replacement of an established government system must be achieved through revolutionary rather than incremental measures. *Jemaah Islamiyah* (JI) postulates that radical methods, such as acts of terror, are more effective in advancing the objectives of movements (Suryani et al., 2009). The involvement of *Jemaah Islamiyah* (JI) in the Bali Bombing I incident demonstrates the continuity of fundamentalism as the ideology of the movement, radicalism as a method of movement, and terrorism as a practice or operational step in JI.

Since the emergence of ISIS in Syria and Iraq, the motivations of terrorist groups in Indonesia have partially shifted (Robertson, 2007). Numerous such organisations now advocate for a fundamental transformation of the state's ideology and governmental structure. Those espousing radical ideologies seek to either establish an Islamic state or supplement the Indonesian government with a *Khilafah* government system. The tactics employed by ISIS in combat have been adopted in Indonesia to destabilise the sovereign government through terrorism.

Terrorist organisations in Indonesia have long used political strategies to achieve their goals. According to Viotti and Kauppi (2007), terrorism is a politically motivated form of violence intended to disrupt social and governmental structures. This perspective conceptualises terrorism as a rational actor seeking to achieve political influence through the use or threat of force (Hoffman, 2009). It is often perpetrated by groups that perceive themselves as politically marginalised. Fundamentally, terrorism is strategically designed to instil fear through violent acts or the threat of violence in the pursuit of political change.

Mubarak defines political terrorism as the use of violence by individuals or groups, regardless of their stance towards the government. This violence aims to instil profound fear beyond the immediate victims, pressuring targeted groups to meet the perpetrators' political demands (Hatta et al., 2018). Ramelan (2009) argued that terrorist bombings in Indonesia are mainly driven by political motives. He believed that the attackers sought to undermine the United States by targeting Indonesia, which was seen as an ally of the USA. Additionally, Ramelan linked these terrorist acts to political agendas shaped by the Israeli-Arab conflict and U.S. interventions in Muslim countries (Prayitno, 2009).

The offence of terrorism is defined in Article 1, paragraph (2) of Law Number 5/2018, jo. Law Number 15, Year 2003, on the Eradication of Criminal Acts of Terrorism. This law clarifies that terrorism involves the use or threat of force to instil widespread terror or fear, potentially causing significant loss of life or damage to critical assets, public infrastructure, environmental resources, or international facilities, driven by ideological, political, or security motives. These provisions highlight that terrorism is not solely linked to specific religious ideologies but also includes political motivations.

Recently, terrorist organisations have surfaced worldwide, including in Indonesia, using terrorism for political aims. These acts are closely tied to identity politics, leveraging affiliations with specific religions. This has resulted in the rise of fundamentalism, primordialism, and ethnocentrism, which promote the group's superiority and sanctity while demeaning others. Why is terrorism deemed effective for political purposes? SB Agus argues that terrorism is chosen because of its simplicity, low cost, and ease of organisation, making it an efficient means of shifting power dynamics in politics.

Countermeasure Terrorism

Two methods are used to prevent terrorist acts: preventive and repressive methods. Preventive methods are applied before terrorist acts occur, whereas repressive methods are enacted post-crime, involving legal enactment and strict penalties for offenders. Sanctions are crucial in Indonesia's anti-terrorism efforts; however, human rights protection must be considered when punishing such criminals. Law enforcers must uphold justice and expediency to ensure legal certainty.

The repressive measures enforced by the government to counter terrorism are as follows (Koruth Samuel, 2016):

i. Establishment of a counter-terrorism agency and specialised units to eliminate terrorism.

ii. Conducting raids on terrorist perpetrators' hideouts.

iii. Existing evidence confirms that severe legal punishment should be enacted for individuals convicted of terrorism.

Crime prevention via criminal law emphasises a punitive approach. Deterring terrorism necessitates a law that discourages potential offenders, given that terrorism is a crime against humanity and a threat to human civilisation. This endangers national sovereignty and is an international crime that threatens global security and peace. Furthermore, it undermines societal welfare and highlights the need to eradicate terrorism using deliberate and sustainable strategies.

In 2017, Indonesia witnessed 44 cases involving death penalty charges and decisions. Prosecutors filed 38 charges, and judges imposed 27 death penalties, regardless of prosecutorial requests. In 24 cases, both the prosecutor and the judge demanded and imposed the death penalty. Data from the Institute for Criminal Justice Reform (ICJR) suggests that this increase in prosecutions and death penalties underscores the government's commitment to combating crime, especially narcotics and terrorism (Muhid et al., 2019). In Law No. 5/2018 on the Eradication of Terrorism, the death penalty is stipulated in several provisions pertaining to terrorist offences. Capital punishment may be imposed for crimes that fulfil the requirements of Articles 6, 8, 9, 10, and 10A paragraphs 1, 14, 15, and 16. For instance, Article 10A (1) stipulates that any individual who unlawfully enters the territory of the Republic of Indonesia, produces, receives, acquires, delivers, controls, carries, supplies or possesses, transports, stores, conceals, or removes from the territory of the Republic of Indonesia, such as chemical weapons, biological weapons, radiological materials, microorganisms, nuclear weapons, radioactive weapons, or their components, with the intent to commit the crime of terrorism, shall be subject to a minimum imprisonment of three years and a maximum of 20 years, life imprisonment, or death penalty.

Table 2. Selected of regulations regarding the Counter-Terrorism Act.

Regulations	Type	Content
Perpu No. 1 of 2020	Act	Eradication of Criminal Acts of Terrorism
Law No. 15 of 2023	Act	Eradication of Criminal Acts of Terrorism
Law No. 9 of 2013	Act	Prevention and Eradication of Terrorism Financing
Law No. 5 of 2018	Act	Eradication of Criminal Acts ofTerrorism
Perpres No. 7 of 2021	Executive regulation	National Action Plan for Preventing and Combating Violent Extremism of Terrorism
PBNPT 1 /2017	Technical regulation	Coordination of the Implementation of Deradicalisation for Suspects, Defendants and Convicts of Criminal Acts of Terrorism

The laws and regulations enacted by the Indonesian government aim to comprehensively address terrorism. These measures encompassing not only the enforcement of legal penalties but also the implementation of counter-ideological and de-radicalisation initiatives. Specifically, in law enforcement, Law No. 5/2018, which amends Law No. 15/2003 on the Eradication of Criminal Acts of Terrorism, prescribes severe penalties, including life imprisonment and the death penalty, for individuals convicted of terrorism-related offences.

Eddyono (2017) asserted that despite severe punitive measures, including capital punishment, for terrorism offences, the incidence of terrorism-related crimes has increased due to the expanding terrorist network. He contended that imposing the death penalty for terrorism is unwarranted, as it reinforces the portrayal of terrorists as ideological martyrs. Moreover, there exists an implicit notion that perishing while executing an act perceived as ideological confers great honour, serving as an inspiration for others and impeding the progress of deradicalisation efforts (Sainuddin, 2017).

The deradicalisation approach aims to prevent individuals who have been convicted, ex-convicts, or other parties potentially involved in criminal activities from engaging in acts of violence or terrorism. Evidence suggests that arrest, detention, and punishment through legal proceedings do not effectively deter or prevent terrorists from participating in violent or terrorist behaviours. Conversely, the combination of law enforcement and the deradicalisation of individuals in custody, ex-convicts, and other potentially implicated parties has demonstrated significant efficacy in averting the recurrence of violence and terrorism. This outcome can be attributed to the recognition and adoption of constructive lifestyles.

Deradicalisation is often interpreted as a method of countering terrorism ideology (Hearne & Laiq, 2010). Perpetrators frequently interpret these actions as religious imperatives. This erroneous ideology stems not only from ignorance but also from the deliberate, systematic, and structural indoctrination of followers or sympathisers by terrorist organisations to propagate and instil ideologies that deviate from the truth. In addition to the ideological approach, the government is obligated to enhance livelihood and educational equity across Indonesia. The involvement of intellectuals, religious leaders, tribal chiefs, and communities should be augmented to reinforce counter-ideological strategies against terrorist groups in Indonesia.

Deradicalisation integrates interdisciplinary methods from law, psychology, religion and sociocultural studies to counter radical and violent ideologies. Terrorism aims to shift narrow, fundamental religious views toward more moderate and inclusive ones. Often seen as an alternative to counterterrorism, deradicalisation frequently involves the use of force (Widya, 2020). Horgan suggested that efforts to change radical beliefs can unintentionally lead to further radicalisation, emphasising the importance of socioeconomic empowerment and disengagement from violent and radical groups.

Deradicalisation programmes require diverse approaches tailored to the specific characteristics of the radicalisation process experienced by individuals and groups. The implementation of deradicalisation programmes arises from the recognition that terrorism originates in the process of radicalisation. Consequently, interrupting the radicalisation process is considered more effective in counterterrorism efforts. Radicalisation encompasses a sequential process that rationalises the acceptance of violent behaviour. Therefore, it is imperative to enhance our understanding of this phenomenon based on the underlying context by using various approaches that correspond to specific contributing factors.

In Indonesia, deradicalisation typically begins after a convicted terrorist is sentenced and placed in correctional facilities. Prisons collaborate with the National Counterterrorism Agency (BNPT) to implement the program. BNPT starts by identifying terrorists' roles in their organisations, such as founders, initiators, mobilisers, primary actors, militants, supporters, and sympathisers. Program materials must be tailored to the specific needs of offenders, and the content and personnel involved in deradicalisation efforts must be customised accordingly (Shahbaz, 2018).

BNPT identifies potential terrorists in Indonesia based on their exclusivity, intolerance, fanaticism, radical religious views on *jihad*, revolutionary aspirations, and adherence to *Takfiri* ideology (Nahdhodin et al., 2024). To prevent terrorism, the government employs deradicalisation strategies, such as individual and group counselling, guided discussions, and classes on tolerance, peace, and moderate religious views. A credible religious figure often aids in clarifying misunderstood concepts (Suratman, 2017). Additionally,

these programs may include formal education and job skills training to improve post-release employment prospects (Kurniawan et al., 2020).

To implement the deradicalisation programme, convicted terrorists are incarcerated in super-maximum, maximum, medium, and minimum security prisons in accordance with the classification of terrorism perpetrators, considering the aspects of security, safety, stability, and interaction among inmates in correctional facilities (Salas & Anwar, 2021). Placing terrorist prisoners in specialised facilities prevents the spread of radicalism among inmates and preserves the quality of rehabilitation programmes, ensuring that released terrorist inmates can reintegrate into society.

The complex causes of terrorism cannot be effectively addressed solely through legal mechanisms; they must be supplemented by non-legal strategies, such as de-radicalisation. The de-radicalization approach serves as a counterbalance to the law enforcement strategies that rely on criminal law instruments, often referred to as the "punitive approach". By adopting a non-punitive strategy, efforts to counter radicalism and various forms of terrorism are initiated at the source, addressing the fundamental causes of radicalisation. This approach aims to rectify misconceptions associated with certain religious ideologies considered heretical and misleading, without resorting to criminal law.

From 2012 to 2017, the National Counterterrorism Agency (BNPT) executed a deradicalisation initiative targeting 800 terrorist detainees in Indonesia, claiming that none of them reengaged with terrorist factions (Jordan, 2018). However, this claim by the BNPT is met with scepticism, particularly in light of ongoing terrorist incidents in Indonesia. Jerry Indrawan points out that the perpetrators of suicide bombings in Cicendo, Thamrin, Samarinda, and the bomb detonation near the Tugu Kartasura Security Post (Pospam) in Sukoharjo, Central Java, were former terrorism convicts who had undergone the deradicalisation programme (Indrawan & Aji, 2019).

Several criticisms have been directed at the BNPT regarding the implementation of de-radicalisation programme in Indonesia. Sofyan Tsauri, a former terrorism convict who participated in a de-radicalisation initiative, argues that the programme is insufficient if it focuses solely on altering religious ideological perspectives. He notes that the de-radicalisation content has predominantly emphasised counter-narratives or counter-ideologies against misinterpretations of religion. However, the root causes of terrorism in Indonesia are multifaceted and continue to evolve, incorporating specific religious ideologies as well as political, economic, ignorant, and unjust factors (Indrawan & Aji, 2019).

In Indonesia, terrorist organisations have adopted ideological frameworks associated with both *Al-Qaeda* and ISIS. The ideology linked to *Al-Qaeda* is relatively inclusive, as it does not seek to detach itself from broader society or establish a separate state. In contrast, the ideology of ISIS affiliated groups is more exclusive, characterised by adherence to the *Takfiri* ideology and aspirations to form a state (Syahputra & Sukabdi, 2021). Consequently, deradicalisation programmes must be comprehensive.

The present study highlights the inseparability of religious and political ideological factors. Terrorist groups in Indonesia are motivated not only by extreme Islamic religious fanaticism, which aims to implement Islamic law in its entirety (*kaffah*) according to their interpretation, but also by a political desire to establish an Islamic state (*Darul Islam*) in Indonesia, modelled on the caliphate system of governance. Radical Islamic factions in Indonesia consistently assert that the Indonesian state is an infidel state (*thaghut*) and must be opposed (Widiatno, 2018). Therefore, counter-ideological and deradicalisation programmes should not only provide a comprehensive understanding of authentic religious teachings but also promote nationalism and national values to preserve Indonesia's integrity. A frequent critique of the deradicalisation programme is that it includes not only coaching but also essential mentoring and empowerment. These elements are crucial for the successful reintegration of individuals convicted of terrorism after their release from prison. Typically, the responsibility for mentoring these individuals falls to their family members and guardians. However, the BNPT has not adequately supported these guardians in their dual roles as companions and supervisors of high-risk inmates (Indrawan & Aji, 2019). Additionally, these guardians lack formal recognition, protection, and clear incentives that reflect the significant risks they encounter.

Conclusion

Terrorism in Indonesia is often linked to Islam because of its radical interpretation of *jihad*. The association of terrorism in Indonesia with Islam is frequently attributed to the practice of a deviant interpretation of *jihad*. Consequently, Western Orientalists often critique Islamic ideology and its concept of *jihad*, analogous to the Christian notion of the "crusades" as a potential cause of terrorism. Thus, both extremist Muslim groups and Western scholars share a similar perspective on this deviant form of *jihad*. Their interpretive approach strictly adheres to a literal interpretation, thereby limiting their comprehension to a singular meaning within the broad spectrum of *jihad* interpretations. This mode of understanding notably contradicts their esteemed scientific heritage, which is firmly grounded in embracing a multidimensional perspective and fostering an inclusive approach to understanding phenomena.

Global terrorist organisations aim to enforce Islamic laws (*kaffah*). This ideological motive merged with political objectives, leading these groups to seek not only the implementation of Islamic law but also the establishment of an Islamic state through a caliphate system. In Indonesia, groups like the Islamic State of Indonesia (NII), *Jamaah Islamiyah* (JI), *Jamaah Ansharut Daulah* (JAD), *Mujahidin Indonesia Timur* (MIT), and *Jemaah Ansharut Tauhid* (JAT) reject Indonesia's sovereignty, labelling it a *thaghut* state. They strive to transform Indonesia into an Islamic state (*Darul Islam*) through the *Khilafah* system or their interpretation of an Islamic state. These organisations are linked to *Al-Qaida*, which has evolved into the ISIS.

The Indonesian government can address terrorist acts through stricter measures and enhanced punitive actions, as per Law Number 5 of 2018, which amends Law Number 15 of 2003 to target terrorism-related crimes. In addition, the government should bolster preventive strategies by promoting the rehabilitation of extremists and countering terrorist ideologies. These initiatives should aim to foster a comprehensive understanding of Islamic law and correct misconceptions about national identity, thereby encouraging an accurate and nuanced understanding of these subjects.

References

Abrar, A., Khalida, A., & Hareem, H. (2024). Revealing legal politics in city branding: A study of Padang Panjang city as the Kota Serambi Mekah. *JURIS (Jurnal Ilmiah Syariah)*, *23*(2), 309. https://doi.org/10.31958/juris.v23i2.13241

Abeyratne, R. (2011). Cyber terrorism and aviation-national and international responses. *Journal of Transportation Security*, *4*(4), 337–349. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12198-011-0074-3

Adam, B., & Afrizal, T. Y. (2025). Strengthening of state company on strategic commodities in indonesia for food security interest under WTO rules. *Cendekia : Jurnal Hukum, Sosial Dan Humaniora*, *3*(1), 929–945. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14619225

Arromadloni, M. N., Al Munawar, S. A. H., & Mansurnoor, I. A. (2022). The hadith interpretations of radical-terrorist groups. *KURIOSITAS: Media Komunikasi Sosial Dan Keagamaan*, *15*(2), 218–246.

Bassiouni, M. C. (1981). Terrorism, law enforcement, and the mass media: perspectives, problems, proposals. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, *72*(1), 1–51.

Bellelli, R. (2016). The Council of Europe. In *International cooperation in counter-terrorism*. Routledge.

Bjørgo, T. (2004). *Root causes of terrorism: Myths, reality and ways forward*. Routledge.

Bowden, B., & Davis, M. T. (2008). *Terror: From tyrannicide to terrorism*. Univ. of Queensland Press.

Chaidar, A. (2019, January). *"MIT, teroris "tamkin""*. Kompas. https://www.kompas.id/baca/utama/2019/01/04/mit-teroris-tamkin

English, R. (2023). The IRA and the partition of Ireland. *Review of Irish Studies in Europe*, *6*(2), 23–35.

Gunawan, Y., & Zulfiqri, A. (2024). Violence in Abyei: Legal implications of the Sudan–South Sudan dispute. *Brawijaya Law Journal*, *11*(2), 289-307. https://doi.org/10.21776/ub.blj.2024.011.02.06

Hatta, M., Rajamanickam, R., Abdullah, D., Hartono, H., Saleh, A., Djanggih, H., Bunga, M., Wahab, M., Susena, K. C., & Abbas, I. (2018). Internet and terrorism in Indonesia. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, *1114*(1), 1–7.

Hearne, E., & Laiq, N. (2010). *A new approach? Deradicalisation programs and counterterrorism*. International Peace Institute.

Heryanto, A. (2006). *State terrorism and political identity in Indonesia: Fatally belonging*. Routledge.

Hoffman, B. (2009). Defining terrorism. In *Terrorism and counterterrorism: Understanding the new security environment* (3rd ed.). The McGraw-Hill Companies.

Hung, W. Y. (2003). Review on the World Trade Center terrorist attack fires. *International Journal on Engineering Performance-Based Fire Codes*, *5*(2), 45–49.

Indrawan, J., & Aji, M. P. (2019). The effectiveness of national agency for combating terrorism's deradicalization program toward terror convicts in Indonesia. *Journal of Defense & State Defense*, *9*(2), 1–22.

Johannen, U. (2003). *September 11 & political freedom: Asian perspectives*. Select Pub & Friedrich Naumann Foundation.

Kurniawan, S., Putri, A. R., Septiyo, T., & Pujiyono, P. (2020). Non-criminal measures to combat terrorism through deradicalization programs in Indonesia. *Jurnal Yustisiabel*, *4*(1), 14–26.

Koruth Samuel, T. (2016). Radicalisation in southeast asia: a selected case study of daesh in indonesia, malaysia and the philippines. In *The Southeast Asia Regional Centre for Counter-Terrorism (SEARCCT)*. https://doi.org/363.3250959

Mansfield, D. (2019). The Irish Republican Army and Northern Ireland. In *Insurgency in the modern world* (pp. 45–86). Routledge.

McAlister, M. (2002). A cultural history of the war without end. *Journal of American History*, *89*(2), 439–455.

Mestika, H. F. (2023). Terrorism and Islam in the global perspective. *Indonesian Journal of Counter Terrorism and National Security*, *2*(1), 147–178.

Muhid, A., Hadi, M., Fanani, A., Arifin, A., & Hanif, A. (2019). The effect of hate speech exposure on religious intolerance among indonesian muslim teenagers. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, *370*(December), 148–151. https://doi.org/10.2991/adics-elssh-19.2019.31

Nahdhodin, M., Sudarmanto, K., Triwati, A., & Arifin, Z. (2024). Efforts to combat terrorism crimes from a criminological perspective. *Jurnal USM Law Review*, *7*(1), 502–513.

Neumann, P. (2010). *Prisons and Terrorism: Radicalisation and De-radicalisation in 15 Countries*. International Centre for the Study of Radicalisation and Political Violence (ICSR).

Noor, F. A. (1997). *Terrorising the truth*. Just World Trust (JUST).

Mawdsley, N. (Ed.). (2003). *Bali after the tragedy: The impact and challenges of tourism-based development in Indonesia.* United Nations Development Program (UNDP), United States Agency for International Development (USAID), & Bank Dunia.

Paamsyah, J., Irawan, H., Feprizon, H., Perdana, M. A., & Jainah, Z. O. (2023). Efforts to combat terrorism in Indonesia. *Innovative: Journal of Social Science Research*, *3*(6), 2973–2985.

Pape, R. A. (2003). The strategic logic of suicide terrorism. *American Political Science Review*, *97*(3), 343–361.

Pipe, D. (2002). "What is jihād?". The New York Times. https://www.nytimes.com/

Prayitno. (2009, December). *"Teroris di Indonesia punya motif politik"*. Kompas. https://nasional.kompas.com/read/2009/12/05/16025025/Prayitno.Teroris.di.Indonesia.Punya.Motif.Politik

Putra, I. N. D., & Hitchcock, M. (2006). The Bali bombs and the tourism development cycle. *Progress in Development Studies, 6*(2), 157–166.

Robertson, A. E. (2007). *Terrorism and global security*. Facts On File, Inc.

Rowe, S. E. (2015). Legal research, legal analysis, and legal writing: Putting law school into practice. *Stetson Law Review, 29*, 1193–1211. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1223682

Salas, A. Y., & Anwar, U. (2021). Pembinaan narapidana terorisme dalam upaya deradikalisasi di lembaga pemasyarakatan super maximum security. *Journal of Correctional, 4*(1), 33–43.

Sainuddin, L. (2017). Legal analysis of crime terrorism and counter terrorism strategy. *International Journal of Advanced Research*, *5*(7), 93–95.

Salazar, P. (2018). *Words are weapons: Inside ISIS's rhetoric of terror*. Yala University Press.

Selamat, F., Shah, H. A. R., & Ali, N. M. (2023). Juxtaposition of right to self-determination and terrorism under international law. *Malaysian Journal of Syariah and Law, 11*(2), 187–201.

Subaidi, J., & Bahreisy, B. (2024). The legal position of corporate crime in Indonesia. *International Journal of Law, Social Science, and Humanities (IJLSH), 1*(1), 50–55. https://doi.org/10.70193/ijlsh.v1i1.143

Suratman, Y. P. (2017). The effectiveness of de-radicalization program in Southeast Asia: Does it work? The case of Indonesia, Malaysia, and Singapore. *Journal of ASEAN Studies, 5*(2), 135–156.

Suryani, L. K., Page, A., Lesmana, C., Jennaway, M., Basudewa, I., & Taylor, R. (2009). Suicide in paradise: Aftermath of the Bali bombings. *Psychological Medicine, 39*(8), 1317–1323.

Shahbaz, N. C. and D. R. and W. A. and M. (2018). *Impact of terrorism on stock markets: empirical evidence from the SAARC region* (Issue 15211). https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/84783/

Syihab, M. A., & Hatta, M. (2023). Metode penanggulangan tindak pidana terorisme di Indonesia. *Cendekia: Jurnal Hukum, Sosial dan Humaniora, 1*(1), 13–27.

Takdir, M., Basri, B., & Sidik, M. D. H. (2023). Psychography of terrorist religiosity: A case study in East Java. *Wawasan: Jurnal Ilmiah Agama dan Sosial Budaya, 8*(1), 31–42.

Viotti, P. R. (2007). *International relations and world politics: Security, economy, identity*. Pearson Education Inc.

Widya, B. (2020). Deradicalisation in Indonesia: Implementation and challenges. *Journal of Terrorism Studies, 2*(1), 32-50.

Wright, R., Berger, J., Braniff, W., Bunzel, C., Byman, D., Cafarella, J., Gambhir, H., Gartenstein-Ross, D., Hassan, H., & Lister, C. (2017). *The jihadi threat: ISIS, Al-Qaeda, and beyond*. United States Institute of Peace–Wilson Center.

Yaqin, A. (2007). *Legal research and writing*. Malayan Law Journal. https://books.google.co.id/books?id=s47AoAEACAAJ

Zaidan, M. A. (2017). Eradication of criminal acts of terrorism (criminal policy approach). *Law Research Review Quarterly, 3*(2), 149–180.

Zulhendra, J., Firdaus, F., & Wirman, H. P. (2023). The crown witness from the point of view of Islamic criminal law in truth discovery of criminal cases in Indonesia. *Al-Istinbath: Jurnal Hukum Islam, 8*(1), 155-172. https://doi.org/10.29240/jhi.v8i1.6918