

DEMOCRACY, NATIONAL SECURITY AND FOREIGN POLICY ¹⁾ AGUS WIDJOJO ²

Democracy and Democratization

We are living in an age in which more and more nations are embracing democracy as a system of government. Processes of democratization or struggle for democracy has been characterizing the political landscape for many nations in the world. Going through history, Samuel Huntington broke down this phenomena into three waves taking place in the late twentieth century, beginning with the breakdown of the fascist regime in Portugal in 1974 and reaching its peak with the transition in Central and Eastern Europe in 1989 ³⁾. Fukuyama termed the situation a remarkable consensus concerning the legitimacy of liberal democracy as a system of government that had conquered rival ideologies like hereditary monarchy, fascism and communism, which may constitute the “end point of mankind’s ideological evaluation” and the “final form of human government” ⁴⁾.

From this vantage point, there is an increasing conviction among nations regarding the viability of democracy. This feeling has been encouraged not only by the collapse of the communist system and the globalization of common aspects and requirements of democracy, but also by domestic impulses that necessitate nations to adopt democracy. It is generally believed that adopting democracy would mean nurturing foundational sources of becoming modern states.

Despite the continuing existence of some socialist states, the appeal of democracy seems to be irresistible. Democracy puts people and their rights at the heart of national processes - including their political, economic, and socio-cultural rights – as well as freedom of speech, religion, assembly, communications media, and petition for redress of grievances without fear of reprisal. Those democracies also provide the guarantee of the rights to adequate food, clothing, shelter, education, and health care.

Democracy has liberated humankind from oblivion and degradation. It has saved common people from the oppression of tyrants, autocrats and despots. In Africa and Latin America, democracy has brought hopes and promises. It has also facilitated the emergence of civil society, including human rights groups in the regions. In Eastern Europe, democracy continues to serve as a critical pillar of the economic growth of countries in the region as well as the regional security.

As far as the Asia-Pacific is concerned, democracy has taken roots steadily in the region. Japan, India, and South Korea are among the foremost democracies therein. Democratic practices in those states have been long established and their influences on the life of their populace have been pervasive. Successes in democratizing functional sectors essential to their

¹ A paper presented in NDU/PACOM Symposium: Asia-Pacific Democracies: Advancing Prosperity and Security in Honolulu, Hawaii on June 8, 2005

² Lieutenant General (Retired), Indonesian Army, Currently Senior Follow CSIS, Jakarta

³ Samuel P. Huntington, *The Third Wave: Democratization in the late Twentieth Century* (1991). University of Oklahoma Press : Norman and London, P13

⁴ Francis Fukuyama, *The End of History and The Last Man* (1992), Avon Books, New York Pix

national development have been recorded. Thus, democracy has generated a political environment conducive to productive development.

A gradual, but steady, grasp of democratic processes in the economic sector in China has brought about astonishing progress in that field. Such progress has steadily led the country to emerge as a world class economic power. This approach could serve as a model for other socialist states that wish to take up democracy in a step-by-step, but determined, manner. There should be no imposition on a state that intends to democratize itself. Voluntary and genuine commitments, no matter how sluggish, of states are indispensable in ensuring a sustainable acceptance of democracy.

Democracy is one thing, democratization is another thing. Despite efforts to develop models of democratic transitions, these transitions largely defy generalization. Transitions are one thing, which mainly allow new democratic regimes to emerge, but they do not necessarily result in stable democratic regimes. The process of democratic transition is only a phase, which has to precede democratic consolidation⁵⁾.

Transition is the process of transforming an authoritarian regime into a democratic regime. Consolidation is a useful concept to reflect the idea that a new regime's structures and processes are becoming stable. A common criteria to measure when a situation has reached that phase of democratic consolidation, is the condition when the elites and masses accept democracy as "the only game in town."⁶⁾ A political situation facing such transition will encounter enormous challenges. History has shown not only successful democratic transitions, but also failures in democratic transitions. The people's lack of experience with democracy and the adjustment to new structures comprise some of the challenges associated with transition.⁷⁾

Southeast Asia, Indonesia, Malaysia, Thailand, and the Philippines continue to consolidate their democratic transitions. Not long ago, in Indonesia, a quantum leap for greater democracy was achieved when Indonesia succeeded in carrying out legislative and presidential elections with a new and more democratic system in a transparent and safe manner. It was the first time in the history of Indonesia that Indonesians elected their representatives and head of state and government in a direct way. This accomplishment has given Indonesians confidence to hold more strongly to democratic values and principles.

Indonesia made the strategic decision to launch itself into a democratization process through a national reform in 1998, after the resignation of President Soeharto. A factor having implications on the Indonesian democratic transition, which cannot be understated is that the democratic transition in Indonesia is occurring in the midst of the era of globalization. Globalization itself is both a highly complex and debated issue. Globalization can be referred to as the processes of economic liberalization and transformation, as well as the rapid scientific

⁵ Juan Linz and Alfred Stepan, *Problem of Democratic Transitions and Consolidation: Southern Europe, South America, and Post-Communist Europe* (1996) Johns Hopkins University Press Baltimore.

⁶ John Higley and Richard Gunter, eds. *Elites and Democratic Consolidation in Latin America and Southern Europe* (1992) Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

⁷ Thomas C. Bruneau, *Intelligence in New Democracies: The Challenge of Civilian Control* (1999) Occasional Paper No. 5, The Center for Civil-Military Relations, Naval Post Graduate School, Monterey, California.

developments in communication, transport and information ⁸). The nature of the Indonesian democratic transition can also be accredited to the process it went through, when it was initiated. The Indonesian democratic movement has moved so fast that there was no clear theory as to what the impetus behind the democratization really was. Was it only to replace an authoritarian regime, because it was to bring down the system and processes associated with the previous regime? But there was no clear blueprint as to what was to replace the authoritarian regime. Basically, we saw the structures brought down, but the replacing structures have not been completely established, with some parts still in a process of trial and error to find the final form.

Can democracy contribute to national security?

Within the current context of complex interdependence, security of a nation could be understood as a sum of security of the individuals of the nation. This human-centered perspective is pertinent considering the fact that threats to security could come from the internal as well as external milieus of the nation. Security could also be understood in a comprehensive and non-conventional manner. This understanding would include poverty, hunger, the spread of HIV/AIDS, Natural disasters, and illiteracy as threats to national security.

Globalization has also changed the nature of security. The conditions of globalization not only have increased international economic liberalization, trade and financial flows, but they have also opened the way for illicit transnational flows of narcotics, smuggled migrants and other never before imagined transnational issues such as health and environmental hazards. Globalization has, therefore, opened a new dimension of security, particularly in the form of non-traditional security. Non-traditional security moves beyond inter-state conflicts and geopolitical concerns. It focuses on non-military security issues and non-state actors. In the era of globalization, the security of political communities cannot just be associated with military force as it also depends on non military factors. Ralph Emmers argues that while the military aspects of security are by no means irrelevant, a traditional understanding of security has increasingly been questioned in terms of how security should be defined, and for whom globalization has also undermined the national sovereignty and state autonomy. The development of the concept of security as affected by globalization has two main implications to the way we traditionally approach sovereignty. It has shifted the level of analysis from the state to the individual, and that shifts the perception of sovereignty from the right of one state to a responsibility of the states to protect their citizens. Since the end of the Cold War advocates of an alternative approach to security studies have questioned the position that security can only be about the military dimension. They have focused on non-traditional security matters, which can come from transnational of crimes or intra-national conflicts. It is becoming common belief that individual security does not necessarily flow out from a country's national security. One of the challenges facing military forces today is how to adjust their competence and capability to a new security agenda.

The notion of human security has emerged as a competing approach to traditional security. It argues that security is not only a result of one state's foreign relations and military power, but also depends on the quality of life and being free of any threats.

⁸ Ralf Emmers, *Non-Traditional Security in the Asia Pacific: The Dynamics of Securitization* (2004) Eastern University Press, Singapore.

The term 'human security' was introduced in the international security discipline following a 1994 Human Development Report published by United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). The report outlined seven areas of human security: economic security, food security, health security, environmental security, personal security, community security and political security. It also identifies six main threats to human security. They are: unchecked population growth, disparities in economic opportunities, migration processes, environmental degradation, drug trafficking and international terrorism.

Democracy could serve as a strategy to foster national security. From the perspective of an external milieu, such a milieu must be peaceful and stable in order to sustain national processes, including development. When a state is democratic and its neighbours are too, we learn that those states share common values and principles, and accordingly we could expect that as they are in the same level of playing field, they would promote cooperation instead of instigating conflicts, at least ideologically.

The shift of the concept of security in the globalized world has influenced the way national security policy is being made. One aspect which changes the characteristics of national security policy making processes in Indonesia is the pattern which follows the approach and scope of the concern of security. National security policies have now been expanded from a narrow military-focused and state as the level of analysis, to a wider scope which encompasses human security. In concrete terms it follows also the rearrangements of the security structure of Indonesia, where the Indonesian defense force has withdrawn from its sociopolitical role and main responsibility in internal security to focus on external defense. Responsibilities on law enforcement and internal security are now placed on the various law enforcement agencies, including the national police. By the same token of democratic principles as the basis, implementation will also have to be politically accountable, where democratic principles drive security policies, rather than security interests undermining democratic principles, as has been the practice in the past.

As for security spending, with the shift in the approach to security on a wider scope, actually military spending can be much lower compared to the spending in an authoritarianism regimes. This is due to the arguments that (1) democratic countries never go to war with each other (2) more reliance will be put in related peaceful constitutional dispute resolution (3) democracy allows more to a stable political system and security. Although in 'soft aspects' of the non traditional security we may see increase in social welfare side of public spending. With the military now more focused on the role of national defense, and national defense means external defense, we see the converging necessity between defense and foreign policies. But a common denominator for all national policies would be the nature of a more democratic policy making process. Policies are no longer being formulated by the government, but there will be greater number of actors involved in policy-making processes. This will result in more inclusive policies, legitimate, but the process will be on a slower pace. It can also be said that the ability of the state to control agendas and instruments has declined, compared to the way policies were established in an authoritarian process in the past. The current process would need more public consultations, which implies more compromise in the results.

From the point of view of the domestic milieu, the establishment of democracy has brought on the emergence of various elements of civil society-which include, among others, NGO's, community groups, professional organizations, business associations, faith-based organizations, self-help groups, social movements, and advocacy groups. Those civil society groups could play a pivotal role in democratic settlement of disputes or democratic resolutions of inter-communal conflicts.

When governments lack resources, the contribution of civil society groups is very much needed. This complementary role is indispensable when states are on the verge of collapse. In such a condition, civil society could strive to cope with the vacuum created by the conflict and raise the moral stakes. The worst scenario could happen when both government and civil society are absent, and no one makes an effort to prevent the unfolding of deadly conflicts.

The African experiences show the significant role of civil society in conflict resolution. One of the existing prominent civil-society-driven initiatives is The West Africa Network for Peace-building (WANEP). This group had a vision of West Africa where the dignity of the human being was paramount and where people held their destinies in their own hands.

The areas of complementarity between civil society and state actors could be further explored. Civil society must demonstrate a strong commitment to moving beyond analysis and deeper understanding to actually undertaking concrete actions in their respective sectors within their communities and countries and, wherever possible, at the sub-regional and continental levels. Civil society actors and institutions must also support each other.

Democracy has also encouraged the foundation of stable, clean, non-corrupt, rules-based, responsive, and transparent institutions. When those institutions are established, good governance will follow. The presence of good governance, which involves government, civil society, and the private sector, is essential for sustained economic growth. When the national economy is in a good and stable shape, it is highly hoped that people will do well and they uphold harmony instead of being at odds.

Democratic Foreign Policy

One of the fundamental consequences of democracy is the proliferation of non-state actors which comprise, among others, civil society groups. In conjunction with the unfolding of the democratic processes, those non-state actors become more exposed to issues under the domain of foreign policy. As their interests and knowledge of foreign policy-related issues increase, they give more attention to those issues and to persons and institutions involved in foreign policy making.

Democracies recognize the contribution of the non-state actors to the formulation and implementation of national policies, including foreign policy. Under a framework for constructive participation, they contribute to the consensual definition of foreign policy goals. The state listens to their wishes, and on the other hand, the non-state actors are to be supportive of constructive criticism of the state's policies. Thus, Indonesian foreign policy is to be formulated and implemented under democratic dynamics.

Indonesia admits the important role that non-state actors can play in foreign policy. This credit concurs with the democratic process that continues to unfold in the country. In addition to government-to-government contact (track I), Indonesian diplomacy acknowledges track II, through which the non-state actors could foster contacts with their counterparts. Their contribution was notable in the peaceful release of Indonesians held hostage by the Iraqi militias.

With the advent of globalization and the tendency of the warning of nation-state autonomy and the transnational nature of many foreign policy issues, a state does not have full control over results due to the regional or global context. Foreign policy as such has to be adjusted to accommodate both the increasing multilateral nature in some areas, and the need to express national interest in a higher profile. This is because important issues connected directly to national interests, which in the past have been low profile, are now attracting more attention. Such examples includes the responsibilities of the state to care for the well being of national citizens abroad, or other issues related to democracy and human rights. Democratization and globalization will also direct regional and strategic environmental developments to adapt similar democratic values. Such is also the spirit and intent of ASEAN Security Community.

The plurality of actors should not create any hindrance to effective foreign policy. As stipulated in Law no. 37/1999 on Foreign Relations, government remains the central agency in the conduct of foreign relations. A continuing mutual collaboration between the two entities will ensure the adoption of foreign policy that enjoys popular support. When public endorsement is high, government is likely to more confident to move on with what they have agreed upon.

Democracy-and-Security Promoting Foreign Policy

At the moment, both democracy and national security have become important elements of Indonesian foreign policy. In the years before, democracy was not an essential part of the Indonesian foreign policy. It used to be deemed solely as a domestic issue. Since the completion of the unimpeded democratic transitions in the country, especially for the success of the 2004 legislative and presidential elections, democracy has been regarded as an asset to Indonesian foreign policy.

Considering the vital role of democracy and its contribution to security, Indonesia has mainstreamed democracy and security in its foreign policy towards diverse parts of the world and in response to various international issues. This approach was taken with the conviction that democratic and secure regional and international milieus are essential for the national security, sustainable development, and the unimpeded process of democratization in the country.

From a concentric circle perspective, ASEAN continues to be the main pillar of Indonesian foreign policy. The importance of democracy and security is explicitly built within such an initiative as the ASEAN Security Community. This initiative reflects the recognition of the principle of comprehensive security which acknowledges the strong interconnections among political, economic and social realities.

In working towards this objective, as stipulated in the ASEAN Security Community Plan of Action, Indonesia and other ASEAN member countries shall promote political development to achieve peace, stability, democracy and prosperity in the region. This has been regarded as the

highest political commitment that would serve as the basis for ASEAN political cooperation. ASEAN member countries are also committed not to condone unconstitutional and undemocratic changes of government or the use of their territory for any actions undermining peace, security and stability of other ASEAN Member Countries. Indonesia believes that a favourable political environment will ensure continued peace, security and stability in the region.

Indonesia has interest in ensuring a democratic Southeast Asia. It foresees the possible impacts of that condition upon the realization of the ASEAN Security Community as well as the creation of an adjacent environment favourable for its national processes. In accordance with this approach, Indonesia pays particular attention to the democratic processes in Myanmar. Indonesia has exerted efforts at supporting the continuation of democratization in the country. This policy will continue in accordance with the principle of non-interference. Indonesia's democratic and security sphere also covers sub-regions of the South Pacific, the South West Pacific, and East Asia. The current situation in the Korean Peninsula remains a concern. The continuation of the Six Party Talks is a must in order to resolve the nuclear problem in the region. Indonesia's contribution to the resolutions of the Korean nuclear problem has been made through G-to-G mechanism, good offices, and the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) framework.

Another issue-area emerging in the region is the process towards the creation of an East Asian Community. This process and its ultimate realization should give rise to a democratic and secure East Asia. Its economic potential is great, and this should help in the promotion of democracy in the region. Within a broader framework such as the New Asian-African Strategic Partnership which was endorsed during the Asian-African Summit in April 2005, Indonesia, together with other Asian and African countries, is determined to strengthen democratic institutions and popular participation by sharing best practices and experiences as well as to promote and protect human rights and fundamental freedoms through dialogue and capacity building. In order to ensure inter-regional security, the Asian-African nations are also committed to the promotion of conditions essential for greater political cooperation and confidence building, conducive to the attainment of peace and stability in both regions.

Indonesia's initiative in promoting democracy and peace within the ASEM framework focuses on capacity building and interfaith-dialogue. Europe's democratic experiences are an important source of best practices and lessons learned. Its support in the form of technical assistance could help enhance Indonesia's capacity in consolidating the democratic transitions. In addition, interfaith-dialogue could have a deterrent effect against faith-driven conflicts.

Indonesia's interest in APEC goes beyond economic issues. It emphasizes the promotion of cooperation on the issue of corruption. This is particularly important for the effective operation of good governance. Concerted efforts at addressing terrorism from an economic perspective in APEC have also become Indonesia's priority.

The quest for a just, peaceful and democratic world order remains an important endeavour in the agenda of Indonesia's foreign policy. This will be pursued through multilateralism that works within the UN and other international organizations. Reforming the UN is an urgent matter in order to ensure measures to democratize international relations. Indonesia has a strong interest in promoting the reforming of the UN with the aims of

strengthening multilateralism, and reinforcing the role of the UN in maintaining and promoting international peace, security and sustainable development.

Other international organizations such as Non-Aligned Movement (NAM), OIC, Group 77, Developing – 8 and Group 15 continue to be of paramount significance in the efforts by Indonesia to expand its democratic and security sphere. The agendas of these various groups cover a wide range of issues, from development to human rights, democracy, terrorism, and international security. As one of the founders and key figures of the NAM, Indonesia is steadfast in its non-aligned foreign policy within the new context of international relations.

As the world remains under the threat of nuclear weapons, Indonesia is committed to contributing to the steps taken by the UN to free the world community from fear, fear of possible thermonuclear war. In view of that, disarmament diplomacy has been used as an important instrument of Indonesian foreign policy. In line with that policy, Indonesia gives emphasis on the growing establishment of nuclear weapons free zone. We encourage such an effort by a group of states or an individual state like Mongolia.

The democratic sphere can also be enhanced by partnership between democracies. It is, therefore, important for Indonesia to promote relationships with both developed and developing democratic states. This collaboration should be based on the principles of equality and complementarity. One state should not impose its inclinations, even for democratic purposes, upon others. It is also imperative to develop cooperation with the emerging democracies. The emphasis should be given to capacity building cooperation in order to consolidate the on-going democratization.

Enhancing Indonesia-United States Cooperation

Bilateral relations between Indonesia and United States are a reflection of domestic policy developments of each country. Then we question, is the situation today similar to the bipolar world of the Cold War or has it changed into a multi-polar arrangement? If the world has shifted into a multi-polar blocs, would not multilateralism in international relations be the logical consequence? We have high expectations after leaving the Cold-War behind that we would also leave a bipolar world behind and adopt a post-Cold War framework with more options based on constructive motivations. A bipolar environment in common effort to confront terrorism would position developing countries, especially those with a Moslem majority population like Indonesia, in a difficult situation.

Indonesia's interactions with the United States may be more constructive if Indonesia is recognized as the country with the largest Moslem population, and as a country struggling to consolidate a democratic political system.

Indonesia maintained relationships independent of confronting blocs of the Cold War, with countries like Vietnam and North Korea. Indonesia can also play a role in mediating various issues in East Asia in a post-Cold War world.

Capacity building in democratic institutions and the development of good governance are high priorities in Indonesia. In this respect, it would be beneficial for the United States to offer educational and training opportunities.

Final Remarks

In the realm of today's inter-linkages, democracy and national security are closely interconnected. Democracy strengthens the societal foundation of national security. It energized both state and non-state actors to shape the construction of national security. It also promotes security with human faces that goes beyond gun powder.

Foreign policy is a tool that could be used to promote democracy as a strategy for national and international security. While democracy is unfolding, foreign policy making becomes democratic in the sense that it includes the participation of civil society groups. This condition could help build foreign policy consensus. There is a sense of obligation that democracies should help other democracies or other emerging democracies in a just and equal way. Foreign policy could be functioned for that purpose.