Securitisation and the Challenge of ASEAN Counter-terrorism Cooperation

Neal Imperial

Editors: Melissa G. Curley and Nick Thomas

Centre of Asian Studies
The University of Hong Kong

2005

SECURITISATION AND THE CHALLENGE OF ASEAN COUNTER-TERRORISM COOPERATION[1]

Neal Imperial

INTRODUCTION

How has ASEAN responded to the threat of terrorism?[2] Why has ASEAN counter-terrorism cooperation been slow to progress despite universal recognition by ASEAN leaders and officials of transnational terrorism as a major regional and global threat? What explains the plethora of cooperative measures being pursued by its members on a bilateral and sub-ASEAN basis? What has been the role of non-ASEAN countries, such as the United States (US), in ASEAN's securitisation of terrorism? What are the prospects for deeper and wider counter-terrorism cooperation at the ASEAN level? What are the implications of counter-terrorism cooperation on the future of ASEAN security cooperation?

To answer the above questions, this paper examines how the securitisation of terrorism has shaped the policy responses of ASEAN from the period between 9/11 and September 2004. It will discuss and assess the forms of counter-terrorism cooperation undertaken by ASEAN, and the factors constraining them, in the context of the security dynamics at the domestic, regional and global levels. It will also discuss how domestic factors in two countries – the Philippines and Indonesia – have affected the securitisation of terrorism in

ASEAN as a whole, and the role of the US as a global level security player in this process.

This paper utilises the framework of the *regional security sub-complex* developed by Buzan and Waever (2003)[3] and the *securitisation* model as applied by Emmers (2004)[4] as they relate to a non-traditional security issue in the post-Cold War period. The two analytical tools are combined to explain the policy responses of a regional security regime (ASEAN) in the context of a confluence of relevant domestic, regional, and global factors in the prevailing Southeast Asian security sub-complex. Focusing on the development of counter-terrorism responses of ASEAN, the paper argues that the securitisation of terrorism in Southeast Asia has led to various modes of cooperation, qualitatively different from each other. However, the securitisation of terrorism at the ASEAN level remains incomplete and problematic due to varying threat perceptions among key countries in ASEAN and a preference to adhere to ASEAN's traditional norms and mechanisms. The global war on terrorism has given both the US and key ASEAN countries the opportunity to revitalise their defence and security relations. The US emphasis on bilateral counter-terrorism cooperation to complement its strategic posture in the region however has not encouraged ASEAN-level cooperation against terrorism. This situation limits the scope and depth of ASEAN cooperation beyond what has thus far been achieved, and the prospects for greater region-wide joint efforts.

This paper is divided into three parts. The first part discusses the applicability of Buzan, Waever, and Emmers' theoretical approaches using the concepts of securitisation and regional security complexes to discuss and analyse the factors constraining and promoting ASEAN counter-terrorism cooperation. The second section maps how terrorism has become recognised by ASEAN as a major regional security threat and the actions it has undertaken to combat this menace. The last portion explores the obstacles to regional counter-terrorism cooperation posed by sub-regional and regional dynamics and how domestic factors in two ASEAN countries (Indonesia and the Philippines) have led to divergent threat perceptions and responses. It also discusses the important role

of external countries (primarily the US) in fostering or hindering ASEAN-wide counter-terrorism cooperation.

SECURITISATION AND THE ASEAN REGIONAL SECURITY SUB-COMPLEX

This paper combines the regional security complex theory (RSCT), developed by Buzan and Waever (2003), and Emmers' (2004) interpretation of securitisation, initially developed by Buzan and Waever. The emphasis of RSCT on viewing security through the lens of regional security dynamics and its "regionalist" bias allows the analysis of non-traditional security issues, such as terrorism, which systemic or state-centric perspectives cannot provide. Emmers' updated version of securitisation is also utilised to investigate and assess how ASEAN has responded to the threat of transnational terrorism in the context of domestic and sub-regional factors. This combined framework provides both structural and relational (societal and political) elements that are best suited for understanding the constraints on and catalysts for ASEAN counter-terrorism cooperation.

In RSCT, the prevailing security structure of the international system is characterised in terms of mutually exclusive regional security complexes defined by "actual patterns of security practices".[5] This paper situates ASEAN in the post-Cold War context where one global level power, four great powers, and several distinct regional security complexes (1+4+regions) constitute the "emergent new structure of international security".[6]

The end of the Cold War transformed security relations in Southeast Asia from one of conflict formation between Vietnam and ASEAN along bipolar lines to a security regime that has united the entire Southeast Asian sub-region.[7] The decline of the Soviet Union resulted in Vietnam's withdrawal from Cambodia and Laos, creating conditions for the entry of these three states into ASEAN and achieving ASEAN's goal of

enlargement from six to ten members by 1998. This development allowed ASEAN to transform the sub-region from an area focused on ideological confrontation to a security regime[8] whose embodiment is the sub-regional organisation of ASEAN. With the formation of the ASEAN-10, security concerns became more focused on relations with an ascendant China and Japan and the larger East Asian security environment. As a result of this shift, Southeast Asia (and Northeast Asia), while possessing its own security dynamics, could be incorporated as a sub-complex within a new and larger East Asian regional security complex (RSC).[9]

The emergence of an East Asian RSC does not imply that the US as a global level player has ceased to play a major role in the security dynamics of this region. Indeed, the US has maintained key defence alliances with a number of ASEAN states (Philippines, Thailand) and Northeast Asian (Japan, South Korea) countries and continues to be a crucial actor, together with China, in defining the security patterns of the region. This paper will also look at how the US as a global level actor continues to affect the security dynamics of the sub-region, particularly in relation to counter-terrorism cooperation.

Theoretical Framework: Regional Security Sub-complexes and Securitisation

The concept of *regional security complex* is a conceptual tool for bridging the global and national levels of analysis. In contrast to systemic analysis, the importance of territoriality in security issues is assumed "whether in the form of states, nations, insurgency movements, or regions."[10] An RSC is defined as "a set of units whose major processes of securitisation, desecuritisation, or both are so interlinked that their security problems cannot reasonably be analysed or resolved apart from one another".[11]

In this context, a sub-complex is "essentially the same as an RSC, the difference being that a sub-complex is firmly embedded within a larger RSC".[12] This paper will emphasise the autonomous workings of the Southeast Asian sub-regional security complex, particularly in relation to transnational terrorism, now a major security threat being faced by Southeast Asia and the US. Thus, while ASEAN is within the East Asian RSC, the focus of discussion will be on ASEAN and US responses to terrorism.[13] An advantage of the regionalist perspective is that it incorporates securitisation as an important element of the framework for analysing a security issue.[14] This allows domestic and other factors within the sub-complex to be a part of the overall analysis, apart from systemic or regional factors.

Buzan and Waever, and the Copenhagen School that they represent, have adopted a comprehensive notion of security which incorporates four other categories of security, namely: political, economic, societal, and environmental security, in addition to the military one.[15] Securitisation is defined as a two-stage process that helps distinguish between what is and what is not a security threat. First, an actor (traditionally, the elite or the government) presents an issue or an entity as an "existential threat" to a "referent object" (usually the state, government, or society) and is accepted as such by the audience. Second, "the audience (usually the population) has to accept the elite's interpretation of events and recognize that extraordinary measures must be implemented".[16] Thus, an issue is successfully securitised when the actor is able to convince the audience that a referent object is existentially threatened and that extraordinary measures have to be taken to deal with the threat.[17] In this process, security is understood as a "socially constructed concept"[18] or a discourse.

This process requires the identification of the securitising actor who initiates the securitising move, the referent object, and the audience. Securitising actors are "actors who securitize issues by declaring something, a referent object, existentially threatened".[19] They can be "political leaders, bureaucracies,

governments, lobbyists, and pressure groups".[20] Referent objects are defined as "things that are seen to be existentially threatened and that have a legitimate claim to survival".[21] They can be the state, national sovereignty, the national economy, or collective identities,[22] while the audience may refer to public opinion, politicians, military officers or other elites.[23]

Emmers (2004) improves on this concept of securitisation by incorporating the importance of non-discursive elements into its definition. Emmers argues that successful securitisation should not be understood merely as a speech act (a declaration by the securitising actor that the referent is under existential threat and its acceptance by the relevant audience), but also as a result of policy implementation and actions. This paper utilises this definition of the securitisation process since it combines discursive and non-discursive elements and allows an analysis of how an issue is securitised based also on policies and actions taken. Instead of considering the speech act as the main element and starting point of securitisation as the Copenhagen School does, Emmers' approach also stresses the importance of the threats posed by the chosen issue as well as the incentives that lead to securitisation.[24]

Using this analytical framework, this paper will: (1) describe the issue of terrorism, (2) discuss the issue in the context of the Southeast Asian RSSC, (3) explore the reasons why ASEAN needs to securitise this issue, (4) outline ASEAN's acts of securitisation, and the measures taken to address the issue, and (5) explore how domestic factors in two member countries, Indonesia and the Philippines, influence securitisation at the ASEAN level.

TERRORISM IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

Terrorism has become a major global security concern since the devastating attacks on the US on 11 September 2001. The attacks were blamed on Al Qaeda, led by

Osama Bin Laden. "9/11," as that pivotal day is now called, has resulted in a major re-orientation of US strategic policy, resulting in two wars – Afghanistan and Iraq – and an intensification of security relations between the US and various states on a common agenda to combat terrorism. 9/11 has also forced other governments to rethink and upgrade their security and strategic policies, pushing terrorism to the top of their national, regional, and international security agenda.

The US-led "global war on terrorism" resulted in the defeat of the ruling Taliban regime in Afghanistan and the crippling of Al Qaeda's network, which had used the country as its base of operations since 1996.[25] With the defeat of the Taliban, Al Qaeda lost its training camps, which had served as the largest terrorist training grounds in the world. Al Qaeda is estimated to have trained at least 70,000 people mostly in Afghanistan, creating a global and multinational network of terrorists.[26] Many of these trainees came from Islamist groups from all over the world and were dispersed and re-deployed back to their respective regions to organise and conduct terrorist operations against Western targets and moderate regimes.

There is evidence that since 9/11 the global counter-terrorism effort has succeeded in downgrading the size and capability, and disrupting the operations of Al Qaeda and its terrorist affiliates. Out of a numerical strength of 4,000 members, more than 3,200 of its leaders, members and supporters have been either killed or captured in more than 100 countries,[27] including in Southeast Asia. However, despite these successes, Al Qaeda has proven resilient and remains a potent threat. According to Gunaratna, Al Qaeda has been able to replenish its manpower, supplies, and funding due to a "robust Islamist milieu worldwide" and its "sufficient strategic depth...for the generation of support and recruits".[28]

The intensified campaign of the US and its allies in Afghanistan and the Pakistani border have forced Al Qaeda to regroup in zones of conflict where governments exert minimal

control, and where it had established links with Islamist groups. Al Qaeda is expected in the future to rely on its terrorist networks and associate organisations elsewhere, such as Jemaah Islamiyah (JI) in Southeast Asia, to conduct operations against Western targets and allies, diffusing the terrorist threat globally.[29]

The capture of key Al Qaeda and JI leaders and operatives has revealed the close and extensive relationship between Osama Bin Laden's group and JI, the largest of more than 20 Islamist terrorist organisations in Southeast Asia. JI is now known to have assisted two of the 9/11 hijackers. Its captured members have also confessed to being behind the bombing of a night club and cafe in Bali on 12 October 2002, the worst terrorist attack since 9/11.[30] Outside Pakistan and Afghanistan, Southeast Asia is reportedly home to the highest concentration of Al Qaeda-trained active members with about 400 JI members trained by Al Qaeda.[31]

Al Qaeda's links with JI began in the early to mid-1990s. Al Qaeda's operatives first established cells in the early 1990s in Manila, and later in Malaysia, Singapore, and Indonesia.[32] These cells served as regional offices which planned attacks against Western interests, provided sanctuary to Al Qaeda members, and transmitted and laundered funds for various causes. It is believed that by 2002, about a fifth of Al Qaeda's organisational strength was concentrated in Southeast Asia.

JI has deep historical roots in Indonesia. It was formed by clerics Abdullah Sungkar (now deceased) and Abu Bakar Bashir, who are considered to be the ideological heirs of the Darul Islam rebellion from the 1940s to the 1960s that sought to establish an Islamic state and sharia law in Indonesia. Bashir and Sungkar put up a *pesantren* or Islamic boarding school in Pondok Ngruki in Central Java which served as their base for establishing JI. The subsequent exile of both men to Malaysia during the Soeharto regime forced them to move Jemaah Islamiyah's base of operations to Malaysia.[33] Sungkar then went to Afghanistan and met Osama Bin Laden, establishing

an enduring link between his organisation and Al Qaeda.[34] Organisational and ideological links ensured a strategic partnership between the two groups, with Al Qaeda serving as the international network providing training, funding, and ideological support. JI, however, apparently enjoys a wide degree of autonomy and possesses its own unique history, dynamic, and complexity.

After Soeharto's downfall, Sungkar and Bashir returned to Indonesia in 1999 and re-established JI's base there. Sungkar was to die shortly after his return, to be replaced by Bashir as head of JI. Bashir would also form the Indonesian Mujahideen Council (MMI), an umbrella organisation of militant Islamic groups that would serve as the above-ground political front of JI. Through the MMI, JI has been able to gain access to mainstream political groups and politicians in Indonesia.[35]

In line with its goal of establishing a Muslim caliphate covering Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, Mindanao in the Philippines and southern Thailand, JI also formed Rabitatul Mujahidin, an alliance of Islamist groups and separatists from the Philippines (Moro Islamic Liberation Front), Indonesia (Laskar Jundullah), Malaysia, Myanmar, and Thailand.[36] Training for JI recruits were conducted in MILF-controlled Camp Abubakar in Mindanao for several years. The training camps were moved to Poso, Central Sualwesi and Kalimantan in Indonesia when Abubakar was re-captured by the Armed Forces of the Philippines in 2000.[37]

Clusters of bombings were carried out in Manila, Jakarta, and Thailand in 2000. The most sophisticated of these attacks was the Christmas Eve bombings of churches and religious houses in 11 cities and provinces throughout Indonesia, demonstrating the ability of JI to carry out complex and coordinated attacks. In the Philippines, a series of bombs exploded on Rizal Day (30 December) 2000, killing 22 and injuring about a 100 people.[38]

JI's estimated core membership is between 500 to 1,000.[39] JI has established alliances and temporary arrangements with other radical Islamists in neighbouring countries. It has cooperated in the sharing of resources, joint training, weapons procurement, and even joint operations with Islamic separatists.[40] As a result, its reach and influence extends well beyond its membership to sympathetic *pesantrens*, mass organisations, other radical Islamist groups, even politicians.

Upon its discovery, JI's structure consisted of a Regional Advisory Council chaired by Nurjaman Riduan Isamuddin (a.k.a. Hambali), a key Al Qaeda member who served as JI's chief of operations.[41] Sungkar and Bashir served as the spiritual advisors of JI.[42] The capture of Al Qaeda and JI operatives, such as Hambali in Thailand in 2003, exposed JI's plans to bomb diplomatic targets in Singapore and Manila, as well as places frequented by Westerners in Thailand, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore and Indonesia. Many of the arrests were a result of police and intelligence coordination among Indonesia, Philippine, Malaysian, Singaporean, and US authorities. However, JI's network remains largely intact and its alliance with indigenous separatist movements and Islamists throughout Southeast Asia is still a critical threat to peace and security in Southeast Asia.

WHY ASEAN SHOULD SECURITISE TERRORISM

Terrorism has become one of the most serious transnational threats of the 21st century. The 11 September attacks in New York alone caused an estimated 2,825 deaths,[43] higher than the death toll from the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbour. In 2003, 625 civilians died in terrorist bombings and shootings, while 3,646 were injured worldwide.[44] With the exception of 2001, more people have died in 2003 due to terrorist attacks than at any other time since 1998.

The new virulence of terrorism has spurred governments to implement policies aimed at upgrading security from such attacks, raising the cost of counter-terrorism measures to protect vulnerable sectors. Wood (2003) warns that these costs may negate the advantages of globalisation:

> Continued acts of terrorism and the threat of terrorism have the potential not only to bring world recession but to undermine the foundations of modern globalisation – the revolution of transport and communications, the opening of borders and the increasingly free flow of goods, capital and labour.[45]

New security measures, for instance, are estimated to add 1 to 3 percent to transaction costs of US international trade flows, reducing trade flows by several percent.[46] Since Southeast Asia is heavily dependent on the US market for its exports, rising costs negatively impacts on its trade performance. Given the interrelated nature of the global economy, Wood further argues that counter-terrorism action (or inaction) should produce global and regional benefits (or costs) for all countries.[47]

Maritime terrorism also poses a serious threat to the free and safe navigation in the vital sea lanes of the Straits of Malacca, the Sunda Straits, and the Singapore Straits, three of the busiest sea lanes in the world. Through these narrow straits pass Southeast Asian oil, natural gas, and other exports and imports to and from Japan, China, and the US – the world's three largest economies. Attacks on ships passing through the straits could substantially raise the cost of transport and insurance, or cause serious environmental damage to outlying littoral states. The spate of sea piracy in these sea lanes and the prospect of terrorist attacks are prompting Singapore, Malaysia, Indonesia, the US, and Japan to seek ways of patrolling these vital sea lanes of trade and commerce.

A recent study also suggested that the terrorist threat could be damaging to the regional economy in general: ASEAN economic output is projected to dip by 1.6 percent; the US would incur a cost of A$310 billion within five years; while the impact on Australian economy would reach A$13 billion. The study also stressed that East Asia, including China, would be hardest hit because of the region's reliance on exports to the US and foreign direct investments.[48]

Terrorist attacks and threats have also been damaging to the tourism sector in ASEAN member countries, which rely heavily on this sector for employment and foreign revenues. The Bali bombing alone removed half a percentage point from Indonesia's gross domestic product (GDP) growth of 3.5 percent in 2002.[49] Singapore, Thailand, and Malaysia have equally large tourism industries, which were affected by the Bali bombings. They too remain vulnerable to the negative perception created by terrorist attacks or their presence in Southeast Asia.

The situation is aggravated by indiscriminate travel advisories being issued by developed countries and their tendency to generalise and impose blanket advisories on entire countries and the entire sub-region at times based only on raw intelligence. US ambassadors in Malaysia, Singapore and Thailand reportedly asked the US State Department to exclude these three countries from its negative travel advisories because they were less prone to terrorist attacks.[50] The State Department nevertheless issued a travel advisory for 11 Asian countries, including the three countries. After the Bali bombing, Australia also issued a travel advisory to all of Southeast Asia, not just to Indonesia. These ASEAN-wide advisories directly result in lower tourist arrivals and a decrease in investor confidence.

Transnational terrorism in Southeast Asia also threatens the social harmony of the region's ethnically and culturally diverse states. Countries such as Indonesia and Malaysia have had a recent history of racial riots and/or sectarian communal

conflicts that is being exploited by JI and militant Islamists to promote their goals. This was all too apparent in the sectarian violence in Maluku and Sulawesi and the 2001 Christmas Eve bombing of churches in Indonesia.[51] JI and other radical Islamists are undermining the legitimacy and stability of secular governments of Southeast Asia by sowing religious and ethnic divisions, supporting separatist groups, and projecting governments as corrupt and un-Islamic.

The goal of JI to establish a pan-Islamic caliphate covering most of maritime and a part of peninsular Southeast Asia is a direct threat to the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the affected countries. For Thailand and the Philippines, it would mean dismemberment of its southern provinces; for Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, and Brunei, it would mean the overthrow of their secular governments and their forcible union. For ASEAN, it would simply mean its dissolution as an organisation of sovereign states. Towards this end, JI and Al Qaeda have been working with Southeast Asian Islamic separatist movements and providing them with an international dimension to their struggles, amplifying their capability, effectiveness, and their danger to the whole of ASEAN.[52]

The multi-dimensional threat posed by a regional terrorist organisation with strong links to Al Qaeda and to indigenous separatist movements has spurred Southeast Asian regimes to eventually acknowledge the need to respond comprehensively in cooperation with other states. To cope with the threat, ASEAN has had to intensify intra-ASEAN cooperation, and to cooperate with its dialogue partners, such as the US and Australia, to improve its modest capability in dealing with threats from transnational non-state actors. Making terrorism a key security concern has also enabled Southeast Asian governments to boost their domestic legitimacy in preserving peace and order, which are prerequisites for economic growth, and generate a sense of security among their constituents.

THE ACT OF SECURITISATION

For the purpose of this study, the securitising actor is ASEAN as a whole, led by the heads of government/state who represent their countries at the ASEAN Summit and the foreign ministers who meet at the ASEAN Ministers Meeting (AMM) each year. Leaders make decisions at their annual meeting for implementation. Statements, declarations, and work programmes are first threshed out at the senior officials level and proposed to the AMM, which then reports to the Summit on new initiatives and proposals, and the progress of implementation of the leaders' decisions. In securitisation terms, the referent objects are the national sovereignty and territorial integrity of ASEAN members, the economic growth and stability of ASEAN members and the region, and religious and ethnic harmony in ASEAN countries. The audience is public opinion in ASEAN countries, and the international community.

Before the concept of transnational crime became accepted as an area for cooperation in ASEAN, ASEAN as an organisation did not openly discuss terrorism at its sessions. The issue was viewed largely as an internal or domestic concern instead of a global threat requiring a concerted response. The problems posed by transnational crime, particularly drug trafficking, served as important vehicles to introduce non-traditional security issues with otherwise sensitive security implications for ASEAN members.[53] Under the rubric of cooperation to counter transnational crimes, terrorism was eventually included, together with seven other transnational crimes, namely money laundering, international economic crime, trafficking in drugs, persons, and arms, cyber crime and sea piracy.

It was the 30th AMM in Kuala Lumpur in July 1997 "which stressed the need for sustained cooperation in addressing transnational concerns including the fight against terrorism, trafficking in persons, illicit drugs and arms and sea

piracy".[54] A subsequent meeting of ASEAN interior and local government ministers in 1997 in Manila sought the creation of an ASEAN Ministerial Meeting on Transnational Crime, which, since then, has become the main ASEAN body for coordinating and addressing efforts in confronting transnational crimes in the sub-region.[55]

Cooperation on transnational crime was undertaken essentially as a form of functional cooperation on matters encompassing law enforcement, immigration, finance, and legal issues. Terrorism was placed in the same category as other transboundary crimes to be dealt with within the normal purview of ASEAN mechanisms and processes. This approach changed after 9/11.

Amid the backdrop of the US-led invasion of Afghanistan in October 2001, ASEAN leaders at their 7th Summit in Brunei in November 2001 strongly condemned the 11 September attacks on the US and pledged to cooperate with the US and the United Nations in fighting terrorism at the global level.[56] Their statement framed the attack as "a direct challenge to the attainment of peace, progress and prosperity of ASEAN and the realization of ASEAN Vision 2020".[57] The attack was treated as a threat with an immediate and serious bearing on the future of ASEAN itself.

The leaders "endorsed the convening of an Ad Hoc Experts Group Meeting and special sessions of the SOMTC and the AMMTC that will focus on terrorism" and called for "the early signing/ratification or accession" to anti-terrorist conventions, the enhancement of information/intelligence exchange, to upgrade coordination and cooperation between the AMMTC and other ASEAN entities in relation to countering terrorism, and to utilise existing mechanisms, such as the ASEAN+3 (ASEAN+China, Japan, and South Korea), the ASEAN Dialogue Partners and the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) "to make the fight against terrorism a truly regional and global endeavor".[58] These statements in effect "regionalised" terrorism in the sense that it was recognised as a

threat that required a collective response from the region. Malaysia subsequently hosted a Special ASEAN Ministerial Meeting on Terrorism in May 2002. The joint communiqué of that meeting underscored "the urgency for a cohesive and united approach to effectively combat terrorism".[59]

The 8th ASEAN Summit in Phnom Penh in 2002 made an even stronger declaration of resolve to combat terrorism, having been held after two of ASEAN's founding members, Indonesia and the Philippines, were savagely attacked by terrorists. The horrific Bali bombing in October 2002 and the bombings in Zamboanga in Mindanao dramatically showed that the threat of terrorism was regional in scope and very serious. The regional leadership expressed their determination to intensify their efforts to address terrorism in the region "with practical cooperative measures" in ASEAN and "with the international community".[60]

The threat has also been portrayed as having a strong impact on ASEAN economies, particularly on the tourism sector, because of a rash of negative travel advisories on countries targeted by terrorists. This undermined investor confidence and threatened ASEAN's steady but fragile recovery from the 1997 economic crisis. The leaders called on the

> international community to avoid discriminately advising their citizens to refrain from visiting or otherwise dealing with our countries, in the absence of established evidence to substantiate rumors of possible terrorist attacks, as such measures could help achieve the objectives of terrorists.[61]

They also "urged the international community to support ASEAN's efforts to combat terrorism and restore business confidence in the region".[62]

Aside from the human and economic cost of terrorism, the leaders recognised the existential threat it posed on political

stability and social harmony in ASEAN member- countries. The leaders expressed their "resolve to ensure the security and harmony of our societies and the safety of our peoples and also of others who are in our countries and in the region."[63] At the same time, they "deplored the tendency in some quarters to identify terrorism with particular religious and ethnic groups". Belonging to multi-ethnic and multi-religious societies, the ASEAN leaders were careful not to be identified with attempts to portray terrorism along civilisational or religious lines. To do so would spark further political and sectarian divisions, fulfilling the agenda of militants, particularly in states with large Muslim populations. ASEAN has also tried to avoid a stereotyping of terrorists in an effort to preserve religious and social harmony and avoid any accusation that it is against a particular religious grouping. ASEAN Ministers in May 2002 stressed that "terrorism must not be identified with any religion, race, culture or nationality".[64]

The articulation of terrorism in respective ASEAN countries as a threat to the referent objects, as well as the measures undertaken to deal with it, have generally been supported by the public across the ten ASEAN states. Although there have been protests from opposition and human rights groups in Indonesia, Malaysia, and the Philippines, the move to implement stricter measures against terrorists and their supporters did not elicit massive protests in these countries that threatened regime legitimacy. Most of the protests in Indonesia and Malaysia were staged against the US war in Afghanistan and Iraq, which were either opposed or not supported by both President Megawati Soekarnoputri and Prime Minister Mahathir Mohammed. While supportive of the international effort to fight terrorism, their respective decision not to support specific US policies was consistent with public opinion in their predominantly Muslim countries.

The severity of terrorist attacks seemed to have pushed the Islamists on the defensive and helped legitimise a more hard-line approach towards terrorism. Terrorism did not even factor as a defining issue during the recent electoral transitions

in these three countries, showing how much public support these countries' counter-terrorism approach has received. Despite Megawati's electoral loss to her erstwhile Coordinating Minister for Political and Security Affairs, Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono, her successor is widely expected to continue her security policies, particularly on counter-terrorism.

Although ASEAN has been criticised by those impatient for results for its lack of region-wide operational response to terrorism, the international community's focus of attention had been on the actions taken by the members of ASEAN at the bilateral and sub-ASEAN level, and their cooperation with dialogue partners. International support, especially after Indonesia's more effective counter-terrorism response after the Bali bombing, has become more constructive and less critical as evidenced by the growing cooperative arrangements being implemented with non-ASEAN countries, and in such multilateral forums as ARF and APEC.

COUNTER-TERRORISM COOPERATION IN ASEAN

Institutional Cooperation

Since ASEAN security cooperation has historically been limited, it is not surprising that ASEAN's initial response to transnational terrorism was fairly tentative and limited to the political and diplomatic spheres. Although ASEAN cooperation has matured and advanced through the decades, lingering bilateral disputes that may have been shelved – but not resolved – have, to a certain extent, hindered closer security cooperation.

The nature of transnational terrorism as a new global and regional threat to Southeast Asia also helps explain the limits of ASEAN's initial response. The lack of information on the extent of Al Qaeda's and JI's network and reach in the subregion and, consequently, ASEAN policymakers' varying grasp of the nature of the threat ensured that the problem

would not be perceived and acted upon with uniform urgency within ASEAN. The increase in policy capacity would be achieved only after a clearer picture of the threat had surfaced; indeed only after significant arrests of terrorists and debriefings had been made by the US and ASEAN countries, and intelligence information had been disclosed and filtered by the countries' policy-making processes.

It is to the credit of the ASEAN leaders that in their 2001 summit in Brunei there had been early recognition of the threat of terrorism to ASEAN's long-term goals and the need for concerted action. The leaders' 2001 ASEAN Declaration on Joint Action to Counter Terrorism signified the group's political commitment to pursue cooperation with its dialogue partners and identified the United Nations mechanism and its relevant resolutions as a basis for multilateral cooperation against terrorist acts.[65]

The initial phase of ASEAN's response was preoccupied with finding the issue's proper place in the organisation's diverse agenda for cooperation and action. Under ASEAN's normal time frame, this would take at least a year before the new agenda, action plan, and work programme reached the leaders at their annual summit or retreat, and is finally "institutionalised". Again, it is to ASEAN's credit that this time frame had been shortened considerably by timely ASEAN initiatives that have opened the possibility for a deepening of cooperation.[66] It is partly for these reasons that ASEAN so far has had more success at the political and diplomatic level. The full range of ASEAN's diplomatic mechanisms have been utilised to explore all possible ways of responding to the security threat.

Since 9/11, ASEAN has made a number of declarations and statements –including joint statements/declarations with its dialogue partners the US, Australia, Russia, and India – on the need for cooperation to combat terrorism, and with China on cooperation to combat transnational crime. ASEAN has also actively supported activities in the ARF aimed at

responding to the threat of terrorism. It has participated in the crafting of the ARF Statement on Terrorist Financing, the ARF Statement on Cooperative Counter-terrorist Action on Border Security, and supported the establishment of an ARF Inter-Sessional Meeting on Counter-Terrorism and Transnational Crime (ISM-CT-TC),[67] several workshops on counter-terrorism, and an ISM-CT-TC focussed on transport security as it relates to counter-terrorism.[68] ASEAN coordination was also done in supporting numerous statements and meetings of the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation, where the economic dimension of terrorism is being addressed; and in the ASEAN-EU Ministerial Meeting.[69]

It was only during the Special Ministerial Meeting in Malaysia in May 2002 that the work programme to implement ASEAN's plan of action for transnational crime, including terrorism, was endorsed. Six areas for counter-terrorism cooperation are listed in the work programme: information exchange, legal matters, law enforcement matters, training, institutional capacity building, extra-regional cooperation, compilation and dissemination of bilateral and multilateral agreements. The Chair of the ASEAN Standing Committee (ASC) has been tasked to oversee the implementation of the programme.[70] Among the more interesting objectives were the criminalisation of terrorism in ASEAN member countries, legal arrangements to facilitate apprehension, investigation, prosecution, extradition, inquiry and seizure to enhance mutual legal and administrative assistance among member countries where feasible, and work on a regional operational convention or agreement to combat terrorism.

Do these new institutional responses qualify as extraordinary measures? Are they sufficiently effective to counter terrorism? Perhaps it is too soon to tell. Some of these proposed actions will take time to implement, particularly those involving legislation and multilateral treaties.

ASEAN's annual meetings of police chiefs, intelligence, immigration, and justice officials have become regular venues

to discuss how best to coordinate efforts and cooperate in the fight against terrorism and transnational crime. Since November 2001, for instance, ASEAN army chiefs have been meeting annually to discuss military cooperation against terrorism.[71] In addition, ASEAN Chiefs of Police have pledged to pursue law enforcement cooperation through the Annual Conference of ASEAN Chiefs of Police (ASEANAPOL) since 2002.[72] These meetings at the agency level have improved the comfort level of these officials in dealing with otherwise sensitive security issues.

ASEAN is also expected to incorporate its regional response to combating terrorism in its plan of action for the ASEAN Security Community, which is envisioned to be one of the three pillars of ASEAN in the next decades.[73] The action plan is expected to push for stronger regional security cooperation and may call for the conclusion of a regional extradition treaty and a regional convention on counter-terrorism, which are crucial in addressing the regional threat of terrorism. These two measures are already being discussed in other ASEAN bodies. In fact, the proposal for a regional extradition treaty had been originally envisaged by the 1976 *Declaration of ASEAN Concord*, but could not be pursued actively due to bilateral differences. Its inclusion in the plan of action would motivate ASEAN to move closer to a consensus on this issue, as well as politically commit ASEAN members that have not yet ratified all relevant UN counter-terrorism conventions to do so with greater urgency.

Bilateral and Sub-ASEAN Cooperation

The most effective response of ASEAN member countries after 9/11 was to use existing mechanisms that could produce practical results. There were already a number of bilateral agreements between Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, and the Philippines covering extradition, mutual legal assistance, border security, intelligence exchange, defence, and cooperation in combating transnational crime, constituting a

web of bilateral mechanisms for dealing with terrorism. Counter-terrorism cooperation flowed naturally from these existing arrangements and from long histories of bilateral political and security cooperation comparatively deeper and more comprehensive than at the ASEAN level. Long-time ASEAN observer Dr Carolina Hernandez of the Institute of Strategic and Development Studies (ISDS) opines that this area is often ignored when assessing ASEAN security cooperation:

> The pattern of security cooperation has emerged long ago – in joint border patrols, joint exercises, joint measures to combat piracy in the Straits of Malacca among Indonesia, Malaysia, and Singapore, exchange visits of military and defense officials, joint training in each other's military training schools, etc. This is unknown or often ignored by those who are studying security cooperation in ASEAN.[74]

Worth mentioning is the cooperation between Indonesia and the Philippines. Since the 1990s both countries have implemented a joint border patrol agreement in the Mindanao and North Sulawesi areas. This prolonged cooperation has developed a strong level of comfort and mutual trust. In 2000, the Philippine National Police sent a team to Jakarta to coordinate with the Indonesian National Police during the investigation of the bombing of the Philippine ambassador's residence on 1 August of that year.[75] In 2002, Philippine authorities gave permission to a team of Indonesian policemen to interview Agus Dwikarna, alleged head of Laskar Jundullah, and two other Indonesians arrested for possession of explosives.[76] This type of law enforcement cooperation was essential in piecing together additional information from Singapore, Malaysia and the US on the extent of the JI network, and in solving the numerous bombings in Jakarta and Manila over several years.

Other types of intelligence and law enforcement cooperation had been done on a more ad hoc basis. The

following arrests can be credited to this type of intra-ASEAN intelligence cooperation:

> In June 2003, Thai police captured three alleged Thai JI members in southern Thailand based on information provided by Singapore. The militants were allegedly plotting to bomb tourist spots in Bangkok, Pattaya, and Phuket;[77]
>
> JI operations chief and Indonesian Al Qaeda leader Nurjaman Riduan Isamuddin (a.k.a. Hambali), arrested in Thailand as a result of intelligence cooperation between several states;[78]
>
> Singapore JI leader Mas Selamat Kastari in the Indonesian Riau archipelago in February 2003 based on information from Singapore;[79]
>
> JI explosives expert Fathur Rohman Al-Ghozi in Manila in early 2002 based on leads from Singapore;[80] and
>
> In Manila in early August 2002, Abdul Jammal Balfas, Tamsil Linrung, and Agus Dwikarna, alleged head of Laskar Jundullah, an Indonesian paramilitary group affiliated with the Indonesian Mujahideen Council (MMI) were captured.[81]

Through a combination of national efforts, bilateral arrangements, and regional commitment, more than 200 JI members had been arrested throughout Southeast Asia, including 90 from Indonesia by August 2003.[82]

Beyond bilateral cooperation, the agreement that has the best potential of becoming a region-wide pact is the Philippine-initiated *Agreement on Information Exchange and Establishment of Communication Procedures*, which began as a trilateral agreement among Indonesia, Malaysia and the Philippines in May 2002. Six countries have now acceded to it; five of which have ratified it. Among the projects identified to give substance to the agreement are the setting up of hotlines, sharing of

airplane passenger lists, sharing of immigration blacklists, and conducting joint training and exercises on combating terrorism and other transnational crimes.[83] Manila hosted a simulation exercise in 2003 which produced a proposed terms of reference for the Joint Committee to oversee project implementation once the treaty enters into force.[84]

One often cited deficiency in the counter-terrorism effort of ASEAN countries (with the exception of Singapore) is their weak institutional capacity to combat terrorism on a sustained basis. As an official from the Philippine Center for Transnational Crime admits: "bilateral cooperation...due to economic difficulties, usually does not cover capacity building or logistics assistance, which are needed by law enforcers...in order to effectively implement (the) campaign against transnational crime".[85] Due to the lack of resources and expertise, ASEAN countries have been tapping external sources to improve their institutional resources to combat terrorism. The international community has been supportive of these efforts. For instance, Malaysia and the US have set up a regional counter-terrorism training centre in Malaysia,[86] while Indonesia and Australia have set up the Indonesian Centre for Law Enforcement Cooperation[87] to help improve law enforcement and training to counter terrorism. The two centres are envisioned to benefit countries in Asia, particularly Southeast Asia.

Critics have argued that ASEAN's members have had more success at practical cooperation and obtaining capacity-building assistance at the bilateral level. Rather than viewing them as competing with or being contradictory to a collective ASEAN approach, sub-ASEAN efforts should be seen as an array of counter-measures, with varying degrees of effectiveness, against a clandestine, multi-layered network of terrorists with decentralised operations across several countries. The question should not be which is the more effective approach – the bilateral or the regional – but how both approaches can reinforce the total effort, given domestic and sub-regional constraints. The finer points of concepts are less

important than the existing and potential results of these two approaches combined. Indeed, external countries coordinate and cooperate with ASEAN and its members at both levels, seeing that both approaches have their advantages, as well as limitations.

ROLE OF EXTERNAL ACTORS

To a certain extent, ASEAN's response to terrorism has been both spurred and limited by its external environment. The 11 September attacks precipitated a rethinking of US military doctrine and geopolitical strategy. Confronted with an enemy that uses asymmetric warfare, the US realised that the Cold War doctrines of deterrence and containment no longer applied to the new threat of terrorism amid the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. In his 1 June 2002 speech at West Point, President Bush advocated the strategy of pre-emptive strikes when necessary: "If we wait for threats to fully materialize, we will have waited too long."[88] With the discovery of strong links between Al Qaeda and JI and other militant Islamist groups, the subregion has been referred to by US-centric pundits as a "second front" in the War on Terror. Southeast Asia has again become an important strategic focus, after being eclipsed by American geostrategic interest in Northeast Asia, particularly the Korean peninsula and China.

There has been a visible US reengagement with Southeast Asia focussed on counter-terrorism. This development, however, must be qualified. First, counter-terrorism cooperation is more evident with maritime Southeast Asia, where Al Qaeda's links to indigenous groups are believed to be stronger than with newer members Cambodia, Laos, Myanmar, and Vietnam. Indonesia and the Philippines in particular have received the majority share of US counter-terrorism-related military assistance. Second, US strategic priority over the medium to long term remains centred on Northeast Asia and the Middle East, despite renewed interest in Southeast Asia.[89]

Of particular interest is the change in American strategic perception of China after 9/11. In its 2001 Quadrennial Defense Review, China was originally considered a "strategic competitor" of the US.[90] 11 September apparently has led to a suspension of this policy as Washington sought the support of Beijing in its global counter-terrorism efforts.[91] This shift raises questions on whether greater US penetration of Southeast Asia is purely counter-terrorist in nature or indirectly intended to counter China's growing influence and clout in the region.

Many Southeast Asian states still recognise the US as a stabilising presence in the region where the existence of US bilateral alliances with the Philippines, Singapore, and Thailand, and its continued security cooperation with Indonesia and Malaysia act as a cornerstone for stability and growth in the sub-region. As a result, the aggressive counter-terrorism thrust of the US in the subregion has been generally welcomed by ASEAN policymakers as an opportunity to improve and enhance political and security ties with Washington, particularly for countries which have had strained relations with the US over human rights issues. US counter-terrorism and intelligence assistance has also helped to upgrade the capability of Southeast Asian states to address the threat posed by JI and other groups.

The US has shown a preference for the bilateral approach to counter-terrorism cooperation, utilising its existing alliances within the sub-region. It has, for instance, conducted its regular joint military exercises with Thailand (dubbed Cobra Gold) on the theme of counter-terrorism, and has provided logistical and intelligence support to the Philippines in fighting the Abu Sayyaf within the framework of its Mutual Defence Treaty.[92] Malaysia has improved its bilateral relations with Washington after 9/11 on the basis of counter-terrorism cooperation. Realising the pivotal role of Indonesia in counter-terrorism, the US has provided funding assistance to Indonesia amid serious efforts in the US to end its suspension of military sales and training to the Indonesian military.

More recently, however, the US has also realised the need to support regional and sub-regional approaches to combat terrorism. The 2002 National Security Strategy (NSS) adopted by Washington would seek to "develop a mix of regional and bilateral strategies to manage change in the Asia-Pacific region".[93] For FY 2005, the US is providing US$2.5 million for the ASEAN Cooperation Plan, launched by the State Department in 2002 to combat transnational threats, strengthen the ASEAN Secretariat, and to facilitate the integration of new members. It also pledged US$250,000 for the ASEAN Regional Forum.[94] Compared to the hundreds of millions of dollars in counter-terrorism assistance Washington is providing to Indonesia and the Philippines, US funding for ASEAN projects seems paltry. Considering the burgeoning list of counter-terrorism projects of ASEAN, more external support would help strengthen its collective thrust.

While a bilateral approach has been quite effective in limiting the functional space of terrorists at the national level, the political space in which JI's and Al Qaeda's pan-Islamic ideology thrives need to be addressed if the war to "win hearts and minds" is to be won. A major criticism of the US approach is its overemphasis on military strategy in dealing with terrorism. Malaysian Defense Minister Najib Razak called on the US to address "the underlying legitimate grievances that allow for such extremists to gain support" and to adopt a "judicious mix of hard and soft force" to win the conflict.[95] On analysing the US National Strategy for Countering Terrorism (NSCT), a follow-up document to the NSS, Ramakrishna contends that the US is focussing too much on the "hard" power or military aspect of its counter-terrorism strategy. Only three of the 14-page document, he contends, is devoted to the equally important "non-coercive, non-military goal of 'Diminishing the Underlying Causes that Terrorists Seek to Exploit'".[96] Ramakrishna cites as an example the post-Bali measures to counter JI, which is still dominated by the military mode of thought.[97] This perception, especially among Muslim Southeast Asians, is reinforced by the US-led wars in

Afghanistan and Iraq and the American adoption of the doctrine of pre-emptive strikes.

What has weakened American credibility and political standing in Southeast Asia are its highly unpopular policies in Afghanistan and Iraq among the predominantly Muslim ASEAN states. It is no surprise then that conspicuously absent in the major ASEAN declarations on counter-terrorism from 2001 to 2003 is any mention of support for the US-led wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. It may have been impossible for ASEAN to arrive at a common position on these two issues given the divergent positions between the US alliance partners in ASEAN, and Indonesia and Malaysia. Malaysia was quite vocal in its opposition to both the US-led wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, while Indonesia issued a statement cautioning the US on its use of force in Afghanistan, and categorically opposed the invasion of Iraq.[98]

It is easy for critics to cite this as an example of ASEAN's failure to make timely decisions on global issues. But, in retrospect, omitting these two issues from ASEAN's agenda may have strengthened ASEAN's position vis-à-vis domestic public opinion, particularly in Indonesia, Malaysia and Brunei, while quietly continuing their counter-terrorism cooperation with the US. Indeed, Malaysia and Indonesia's position proved crucial in winning domestic support for the strong counter-terrorism measures needed, and preventing terrorists from hijacking the nationalist bandwagon and using it against their governments. In doing so, ASEAN has prevented the US from dominating the securitisation discourse of terrorism within the organisation. ASEAN also makes it a point to consistently refer to UNSC resolutions 1373, 1267 and 1390 in its statements as the multilateral framework for counter-terrorism.[99] This assertion of institutional autonomy has given ASEAN more flexibility in cooperating with a more diverse group of countries and organisations in the region and beyond, such as India, China, and the EU. There is clearly an effort within ASEAN to define the problem on its own terms, and not in terms of US foreign policy discourse on the global war

on terrorism. This is particularly significant in the context of what Haacke sees as an intensified "competitive struggle for influence by the US, China, Japan, and even India" in Southeast Asia.[100] US reengagement with Southeast Asia is occurring simultaneously with a stronger push for greater security cooperation and economic integration within East Asia.

After concluding the *ASEAN-US Joint Declaration for Cooperation to Combat International Terrorism* on 1 August 2002, the leaders of China and ASEAN issued a joint declaration on cooperation in the broader area of non-traditional security issues at the 6th ASEAN-China Summit in November of the same year. In January 2003, ASEAN and the European Union foreign ministers issued a declaration on cooperation to combat terrorism, followed by a similar declaration between ASEAN and India at their second summit in October 2003. Most recently, there has been an effort to institutionalise cooperation on transnational crime at the ASEAN+3 level by holding a meeting between the AMMTC and the three dialogue partners. The meeting is envisioned to be a regular feature of the annual AMMTC meetings, which seeks to find solutions to transborder issues that have a regional scope and impact, such as drug trafficking and trafficking in women. These high-level meetings and statements have conveyed ASEAN's openness as a collective entity to external cooperation and demonstrated its strong political commitment to prioritise non-traditional security issues, particularly terrorism, and at the same time creating the foundations for deeper security relations.

In the aftermath of the 1997/98 economic crisis, a weakened ASEAN realised the need to embrace the larger region, particularly its ASEAN+3 partners, through closer economic and political cooperation. Since the late 1990s, ASEAN has welcomed a more active ASEAN+3 process. India has also been elevated into a summit-level dialogue partner. Free trade agreements or frameworks for closer economic cooperation are being proposed or negotiated with Japan,

China, India, and Australia-New Zealand. These ASEAN-level initiatives are paralleled by bilateral free trade agreements between Singapore and Thailand with a host of other countries.

The potential benefits of these emerging economic arrangements have given ASEAN more flexibility and a stronger rationale for seeking support for its efforts to create a more stable subregion. It has also underscored the need for collective action against transnational issues that threaten the stability required for these economic possibilities to be realised.

DOMESTIC FACTORS AND COUNTER-TERRORISM POLICY IN INDONESIA AND THE PHILIPPINES

It is instructive to look at how domestic factors in Indonesia and the Philippines have affected the securitisation of terrorism at the ASEAN level. The two countries shared startling similarities in 2001. Both were undergoing a political transition, had long-running insurgencies, and had long porous coastlines, weak states, economic problems, communal strife, and a permissive political and social climate that made it easier for terrorists to penetrate.[101]

Indonesia

From 1997 to 2001, Indonesia had four successive presidents who had to focus on domestic rather than regional problems. This diminished Indonesia's leadership role in ASEAN and its international standing. In 2001 President Megawati Soekarnoputri inherited a government facing formidable economic, political and security challenges. Indonesia was facing the dual challenge of democratisation and the crippling effects of the 1997/98 economic crisis, which shrivelled its economy, and caused massive economic dislocation.[102] TNI's *dwifungsi* or dual military and socio-political role was curbed amid accusations of human rights violations and abuses during Soeharto's 33-year rule. TNI's ability to stabilise Indonesia was put to a severe test in the

sectarian conflicts in Ambon and Poso, and in East Timor, whose separation created nationalist resentment among Indonesians against the West, particularly Australia and the US. East Timor's separation also triggered growing demands in Aceh and West Papua for independence.

Democratisation also unleashed the forces of political Islam, which took advantage of the new political freedoms afforded by the fall of President Soeharto. The conflict in Ambon and Poso drew JI as well foreign and local Islamic militants to wage a jihad against Christians.[103] In 1999, Islamic parties won a strategic number of parliamentary seats in Indonesia's first-ever democratic elections since the 1950s. These small parties played a crucial role in electing Abdurahman Wahid, the leader of Nadhatul Ulama, to the presidency. In 2001, the same Islamic parties helped orchestrate Wahid's downfall and replacement by his vice-president, Megawati Soekarnoputri, and the election of Hamzah Haz, leader of the largest Islamic party, as Indonesia's new vice-president.[104] This ideologically tenuous coalition between the Islamic parties and Megawati's secular nationalist party complicated Indonesia's response to transnational terrorism and cooperation with the US on terrorism.

President Megawati's visit to the US a week after the 11 September attacks improved relations between the two countries and raised hopes that suspended bilateral military ties would be restored.[105] The US needed Indonesia's political support, as the largest Muslim country, in the war against terrorism, while Indonesia sought US investments to boost the Indonesian economy and the normalisation of bilateral military ties. Indonesia initially supported US moves against terrorist networks, reportedly even offering overflight clearance for US military support aircraft.[106] However, when Islamic groups, including some of Megawati's coalition partners, opposed US plans of a military strike in Afghanistan, she modified her tone by criticising the use of force against terrorism and regretting the civilian casualties in Afghanistan.[107] Washington's advocacy of pre-emptive strikes

ran counter to Jakarta's traditional adherence to non-alignment principles and opposition to the unilateral use of military force by major powers.

Amid this backdrop, it was understandable that there was no specific mention of Afghanistan or the necessity of military action against terrorists in the ASEAN leaders' 2001 statement in Brunei. Indonesia's delicate situation may also explain the strong emphasis by the leaders not to identify terrorism with any religion or ethnic group in their statement and the statement of the Special ASEAN Ministerial Meeting on Terrorism in May 2002.

America's decision to attack Iraq caused a clear policy shift in Jakarta, a year ahead of national elections. Thousands protested in Jakarta against the invasion, which saw US favourable opinion among Indonesians plummet from a high of 79 percent in 1999 to a low of 15 percent in 2003.[108] Unlike US actions in Afghanistan, Megawati had little choice but to categorically oppose the US-led invasion of Iraq, to preserve the unity of her fragile coalition and ensure regime stability. Supporting the US-led war in Iraq would have created a backlash that would have erased the gains the president had achieved in restoring a measure of political and economic stability. Yet, at the same time, Indonesia continued to cooperate quietly with the US in combating terrorism.[109] In June 2002, Indonesia handed over Asian Al Qaeda leader Omar Al-Faruq to US custody for interrogation despite bilateral tensions.[110]

Even Jakarta's counter-terrorism posture apparently was not spared from domestic pressures. Despite the string of bombings in Indonesia from 1998 to 2001, including one against the Philippine ambassador, no major arrests were made against the perpetrators and masterminds, some of whom would later be linked to JI.[111] After major arrests of JI members in Singapore and Malaysia, both governments shared vital information on extremists operating in Indonesia, but the suspected members of JI were still not arrested. Senior

Minister Lee Kwan Yew's comment that Singapore remained under threat while the leaders of terrorists were at large in Indonesia sparked a sharp retort from Indonesian Foreign Minister Hassan Wirajuda. Wirajuda suggested that his country could not just apprehend anyone without sufficient proof, in contrast to Singapore's more authoritarian approach.

At the ASEAN level, however, there was no acrimonious debate over divisive issues such as Iraq, Afghanistan or Indonesia's policy towards Islamic extremists as these issues were not included in its agenda. Instead, ASEAN focused on areas of counter-terrorism cooperation where agreement could be reached.

The 12 October 2002 Bali bombings, however, galvanised Indonesia into clamping down on extremists. The bombings threatened regime stability and the Indonesian economy, prompting the Indonesian government to finally recognise the full gravity of the terrorist threat. Since the Bali attacks, Indonesia has demonstrated greater political resolve to combat terrorism. It has arrested and prosecuted many of those behind the Bali bombings, three of whom were given the death penalty.[112] The government passed tough anti-terrorism laws that served as basis for the arrest and prosecution of a number of JI leaders and members, including Abu Bakar Bashir. It also allowed the Australian Federal Police to help in the investigation of the Bali bombings and co-hosted with Australia an important regional ministerial conference on counter-terrorism in Bali in 2003.[113]

Rather than an Islamic backlash, the bombings produced a backlash against extremism. The two largest Indonesian Muslim organisations, Nadhatul Ulama and Muhammadiya, threw their support behind the government's tougher policy on terrorism and distanced themselves from religious extremism.[114] With greater domestic support for counter-terrorism, Indonesia gained wider room for manoeuvre and greater openness for cooperation with other countries. In October 2003, President Bush visited Bali where he expressed

support for President Megawati's actions against terrorism.[115] Indonesia has also coordinated and cooperated more closely with Malaysia, the Philippines, and Singapore on a bilateral basis. It has also agreed to hold joint patrols of the Straits of Malacca with Singapore and Malaysia in an effort to prevent sea piracy and maritime terrorism.[116]

At the same time, Indonesia has had to balance its stronger domestic response to terrorism with a more nuanced foreign policy on the global war on terrorism. It continues to emphasise multilateral and regional measures to counter terrorism, through the UN and ASEAN, while opposing the US occupation of Iraq. Its counter-terrorism approach is still very much influenced by its perception of the threat in terms of regime stability and the role of the US in regional and global affairs.

The Philippines

Like Indonesia, the Philippines underwent a turbulent political transition in 2001. In the midst of an impeachment trial for corruption charges, then President Joseph Estrada was forced to vacate Malacanang Palace and was succeeded by his vice president, Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo, after a military-backed civilian uprising in January 2001.[117]

Realising that economic progress was impossible without peace and stability, Arroyo reversed the all-out war policy of Estrada against the MILF when she assumed power. The military under Estrada had succeeded in capturing more than 40 MILF camps, including Camp Abubakar, which was reportedly used for training by JI and other radical Islamists.[118] From a position of military advantage, President Arroyo, with help from Malaysia, succeeded in persuading the MILF to return to the negotiating table and agree to a ceasefire.[119] Despite the Philippines' unresolved territorial dispute with Malaysia over Sabah, Malaysia was invited to serve as a third-party facilitator to the talks,[120] the second ASEAN country

after Indonesia to play a major role in the peace process in southern Philippines.[121]

Cooperation between the Philippines, Malaysia, and Indonesia along their maritime borders had been ongoing since the 1990s. The spate of maritime piracy and kidnappings in their adjacent waters prompted the three countries to cooperate bilaterally through joint border agreements and joint patrols of the concerned areas. These were early bilateral measures against transnational crime and terrorism in the waters of Sulu, Sabah, and Sulawesi. Amid the abduction of foreigners by the Abu Sayyaf[122] from a Malaysian resort in Sipadan in 2000, then Philippine Secretary of Defence Orlando Mercado called for a trilateral border patrol pact between the Philippines, Malaysia and Indonesia to prevent cross-border kidnappings.[123] More recently, the Philippine army chief even proposed to revive the joint military exercises among Indonesia, Malaysia and the Philippines during the time of MAPHILINDO.[124]

9/11 ushered in a major policy shift in the Arroyo government that bolstered its counter-terrorism approach. President Arroyo was one of the first Asian leaders to throw her support behind the US efforts to fight terrorism after the 11 September attacks. In late September, the president announced a new counter-terrorism policy based on 14 pillars. In support of *Operation Enduring Freedom* in late 2001, the Philippines allowed access to its air space and facilities as transit and staging grounds for US forces en route to Afghanistan.[125]

In the 2001 ASEAN Leaders Summit in Brunei, President Arroyo played a proactive role by highlighting the Philippine initiative for a trilateral agreement against terrorism with Indonesia and Malaysia. Indeed, the Philippine president tried to play a leading role in the region by displaying an openness to cooperate with as many countries as possible, whether bilaterally or multilaterally, even if this may have domestic repercussions. Arroyo, for instance, signed the trilateral

agreement, despite strong reservations from her Secretary of Foreign Affairs, Teofisto Guingona, on the inclusion of the phrase "threatening the stability, territorial integrity, political unity or sovereignty of independent States" in the definition of terrorism. Guingona believed that this definition could undermine the government's negotiations with the MILF since they could be classified as terrorists under this definition.[126]

President Arroyo's state visit to the US in November 2001 solidified the Philippines' security alliance with the US, which had suffered from benign neglect after the closure of US naval and air bases in the country. Arroyo saw alignment with the US at this crucial time as a means of strengthening the Philippines' internal capabilities to solve its national problems, particularly in southern Philippines.[127] Arroyo's visit coincided with Washington's renewed strategic interest in Southeast Asia as a result of the war on terrorism.

Since 2001, the Philippines used its joint military exercise with the US, called *Balikatan*, to degrade the Abu Sayyaf and displace it from Basilan. The Philippines is the only country in ASEAN to have allowed foreign combat troops, albeit in a training capacity, in or near conflict areas. US special forces have been deployed in the Philippines since 2001 to train the Philippine military for counter-terrorism. US re-engagement has benefited the Philippines and enabled it to improve its military's capability to deal with internal threats, not limited to terrorism. Among the notable gains of this stronger bilateral partnership cited by the Philippine Ambassador in Washington are the following:

> The designation of the Philippines as a Major Non-NATO Ally of the US resulted in major increases in US defence assistance for the Philippines with an emphasis on improving counter-terror capabilities of the Philippine troops;
>
> Since 2002, US logistics support to the AFP include eight helicopters (with 30 more to follow), two naval patrol

> boats, one Cyclone naval vessel, 330 two and a half tonne trucks, 30,000 M16 infantry rifles, and a C-130 transport aircraft;
>
> Training and full equipping of three Light Reaction Companies (LRCs), counterterrorism training and partial equipping of four AFP battalions, and training and equipping of an engineering company, and;
>
> US support for the Philippine Defense Reform Program (PDRP), a major initiative for the reform, upgrading of capabilities, and modernization of the AFP, entailing a total cost of nearly US$400 million to be shared in the medium-term by the two countries.
>
> Furthermore, President Bush pledged US diplomatic and financial support for the peace process with the MILF. This illustrates the comprehensive nature of Philippine-US security cooperation.[128]

The Philippine ambassador also claims that with US help, "Filipino security forces have not only degraded the terrorist Abu Sayyaf...they have (also) helped prevent Al Qaeda-affiliated Jemaah Islamiyah and other extremists from attacking US targets and allies in Southeast Asia."[129]

Compared to Indonesia, domestic public opinion in the Philippines favoured a strong counter-terrorism response against radical Islamic extremists. Nationwide there was no danger of an Islamic backlash in the predominantly Catholic Philippines.[130] However, the presence of US troops in conflict areas was a controversial issue in the Philippines. In 2003, a plan to implement the second phase of US military cooperation with the Philippines involving more than a thousand US troops in the Muslim province of Jolo was shelved after questions of its constitutionality and warnings of a possible Muslim backlash were raised.[131]

Although critics and nationalists questioned the move's constitutionality, a poll conducted showed that more than 80

percent of Filipinos welcomed the presence of American troops.[132] Another survey revealed that 62 percent of Filipinos approve of US military assistance to fight the Abu Sayyaf.[133] In Muslim majority provinces of Mindanao, however, the same survey showed that Muslim-Filipinos were divided with 42 percent who approved and 39 percent who disapproved of US assistance. Even after the hostage-taking of a Filipino national in Iraq and the pullout of the Philippine contingent there, "56 percent of Filipinos surveyed nationwide say it was right for the Philippines to join the coalition of forces in Iraq" while "69 percent say it was right for the US to send forces to Iraq."[134] Although the same survey showed that three-fourths of Muslim-Filipinos disapproved of both decisions to send Philippine and US forces to Iraq, it is notable that most Muslims approve of US military assistance against the Abu Sayyaf.[135] This distinction is important for it shows that President Arroyo does not suffer from the same one-sided domestic pressure as her Indonesian counterpart among Muslims in Indonesia.

This is also why the Philippine government makes a distinction between the Abu Sayyaf as a terrorist group and the MILF as a secessionist group despite evidence linking the latter to Jemaah Islamiyah. The Abu Sayyaf has been tagged as a Foreign Terrorist Group by both the US and the United Nations. However, the Philippine government is keen not to have the MILF branded as such so as to avoid complications in ongoing peace talks as it is the standard policy of any government not to negotiate with terrorists.[136] The Philippines is trying to separate domestic movements from international terrorists because it is still possible to negotiate with groups with domestic grievances and impossible to talk to groups with "apocalyptic goals".[137] The government is hoping that it is still possible to persuade these domestic movements to sever any and all terrorist links. For the MILF, this means severing its reported ties with Al Qaeda and JI. The Philippine government has therefore limited the role of the US in the peace process with the MILF to one that is supportive of a political settlement based on a comprehensive approach, in

contrast to the military approach of the Estrada administration. Involving the US militarily may lead to an escalation of the conflict and add an unnecessary international dimension to it. So far this approach seems to be working as the continuing ceasefire between the two sides still holds.

This balancing act, however, does not sit well with some critics who do not believe that the MILF will sever its terrorist links even with a peace accord.[138] Countries such as Australia have been stressing the continuing links between Al Qaeda and JI with the MILF to put pressure on the latter to completely cut off ties with the two groups, but at the same time making it difficult for Manila to talk peace with the MILF.

For the Arroyo administration, however, finding a political solution to the MILF problem is *the* overriding concern. Peace is a precondition for stability and economic progress in all of Mindanao. In the long-run, solving the MILF insurgency through a comprehensive approach will also remove the functional space where JI has operated in the Philippines and, more importantly, the social and political environment that allows extremism to breed.

In conclusion, the Arroyo government was able to strengthen its counter-terrorism policy, as well as its peace process, by enlisting external support from the US and ASEAN countries. Its decision to support the US war on terrorism and to involve the US in the country's domestic counter-terrorism strategy strengthened its alliance with the US, and improved its military capability. Its approach also received strong backing from a majority of Filipinos and, surprisingly, even from the Muslim provinces grown tired of decades of war.

Summary

In both the Indonesian and Philippine cases, concern for regime stability and territorial integrity influenced in varying

degrees how each country responded to transnational terrorism and its openness to cooperation with other countries. Resistance or openness to counter-terrorism cooperation with the US and ASEAN was very much determined by domestic factors, particularly the intensity of domestic public opinion and, to a certain extent, nationalist sentiment. Unlike in Indonesia, the US-led wars in Afghanistan and Iraq strengthened, rather than weakened, Philippine bilateral relations with the US. Cooperation to counter terrorism was immediately seen by Manila as a means of improving regime stability instead of threatening it as in the Indonesian case. This partly explains the Philippines' relative openness to both military and non-military counter-terrorist cooperation with other countries. This is not the case in Indonesia, whose sensitivity to big power involvement in regional affairs was heightened by the involvement of foreign troops in the eventual separation of East Timor in 1999. However, when terrorism became a greater threat to regime stability than domestic public pressure after the Bali bombings, a policy shift emerged, resulting in greater openness to cooperation with other countries.

The two case studies show how divergent domestic factors shape counter-terrorism responses in two ASEAN countries and how the involvement of the US in counter-terrorism can either complicate or enhance the position of governments domestically. Securitising terrorism at the ASEAN level depends greatly on how the problem is perceived uniformly or divergently by its members, particularly in countries where it is considered a threat. Indeed, former ASEAN Secretary-General Rodolfo C. Severino, Jr. identified this obstacle to regional counter-terrorism cooperation rather succinctly:

> I think one of the problems impeding cooperation in ASEAN is the mutual suspicion that arises from different perceptions and assessments of the terrorist threat and the different views on the role of outside powers, the US being the obvious one.[139]

ASSESSMENT

Although there are difficulties in determining how much ASEAN has securitised terrorism, there are indications that the process is well underway. While ASEAN has been able to portray terrorism as a major security threat to the sub-region, it is debatable if the measures it has so far undertaken could qualify as "extraordinary measures", a prerequisite for successful securitisation, particularly in the area of practical cooperation. It is difficult to gauge what constitutes "extraordinary measures" in ASEAN's response to terrorism. ASEAN has always been predisposed toward a gradualist and consensus-based approach to dealing with issues, especially political and security issues considered to be sensitive or involving the internal affairs of a member-country. The increase in its membership from six to ten over the last decade has imposed further limitations on the speed and quality of its decisions. It is perhaps unrealistic (and unfair) to expect ASEAN to react to a threat the way the EU or an established military alliance would when its members could do so with better results based on their own patterns and habits of cooperation.

A survey of the modes of cooperation would show that ASEAN has had more success at cooperation at the political/diplomatic level than at the operational level. For instance, it has been able to espouse a common position in APEC and the ARF without being dominated by the US discourse on terrorism and maintaining the integrity of its role. This form of regional political solidarity is vital in denying legitimacy to an expansionist terrorist agenda that aspires to be sub-regional, and that hopes to overthrow existing governments through indiscriminate violence. Displaying a political posture close but distinct to that of the US weakens the anti-Western argument of JI and Al Qaeda, a tactic essential in removing terrorism's political oxygen.

Practical cooperation, apparently, has been most effective on a bilateral basis, while still a work-in-progress at the regional level. Many criticisms of ASEAN have centred on the slow pace of its collective response or its inability to translate its decisions into practical action or cooperation. One has to stress the difficulty in ascertaining the success of ASEAN's response because many of its collective decisions and actions on terrorism, including those in its work programme on terrorism, are still ongoing. Some of the areas for cooperation identified in the work programme will necessarily take time to implement at the national level, especially those requiring legislation or ratification of a regional convention or agreement. Yet these rather lengthy processes are necessary to ensure that ASEAN's collective action is accepted by its peoples, institutionalised and reflected in the laws of its members. Public support and legitimacy are important for these actions to be truly effective to combat a long-term and politically divisive threat such as terrorism.

ASEAN does not yet have a regional mechanism for operational cooperation on counter-terrorism beyond the exchange of information and best practices. As a limited security regime, it cannot be expected to behave like an alliance and, therefore, cannot be expected to focus on the coercive aspect of counter-terrorism cooperation. Another problem hindering counter-terrorism cooperation is the absence of anti-terrorism laws and differences in domestic legislation. The Philippine Center for Transnational Crime has lamented that: "The lack of anti-terrorism law has led to the practice of indicting suspected terrorists for offences that are either minor or barely related to the major atrocity they have committed".[140] Some suspected terrorists, such as senior Al Qaeda member Omar Al-Faruq, have been deported to the US in the absence of proof that they had violated any of the laws in the countries they had been caught.[141] While ASEAN has identified this as an area for cooperation and action, the PCTC is advocating legal agreement on a regional definition of terrorism as the existence of different anti-terrorism laws also

complicates the legal framework to be used as basis for cooperation.[142]

Until now, ASEAN still has no collective definition of terrorism. This is hampered by the fact that some ASEAN members have yet to enact legislation criminalising terrorism, three years after 9/11.[143] Indeed, this lack of a common definition has been one of the most basic criticisms of ASEAN. Despite this there are a number of new directions in ASEAN's counter-terrorism response worth noting.

There is reason to be optimistic that a collective definition may soon be achieved. A majority of ASEAN's members (Brunei, Cambodia, Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, and Thailand), including those countries where JI is reported to have a presence, have acceded to the *Agreement on Information Exchange and Establishment of Communication Procedures*, the only sub-ASEAN multilateral agreement containing an operational definition of terrorism.[144] There are also positive indications that Singapore might accede to the agreement.[145]

Another indication that terrorism is being securitised is that it is being prioritised beyond the normal AMMTC process and, indeed, in almost all of ASEAN's bodies (the ASEAN Secretariat, the AMMTC, the SOM process, the AMM, the ASEAN Summit, even the ARF) for three years now. Since 9/11 and the Bali bombings, the discourse on transnational crime had been altered from being a main focus of ASEAN attention, to terrorism as a dominant theme being "grafted" into other transnational crimes and issues, such as maritime piracy, money laundering, port security and tourism. The leap from treating terrorism as a mere component of transnational crime to a menace deserving to be prioritised and treated as a concern apart, though related, to transnational crime is an indicator of the process of deepening and broadening acceptance of an issue.[146]

The US has played a critical role in initiating different forms of cooperation with ASEAN and its members. Counter-

terrorism was catapulted to the top of ASEAN's agenda because of 9/11 and the discovery of the interconnected networks of terrorism in the sub-region and Al Qaeda. Due to the demands of its new counter-terrorist strategy, the US is now more deeply engaged in Southeast Asia. Security cooperation has never been more pronounced since the Cold War era, not only with its alliance partners, but even with Muslim-majority countries such as Indonesia and Malaysia. Bilateral cooperation, however, has been the preferred American strategy over regional or multilateral approaches.

The US-led wars in Afghanistan and Iraq have accentuated differences within ASEAN in perceiving the regional and global role of the US and the acceptability of certain elements of its foreign and strategic policy. The unpopularity of the US-led wars in Afghanistan and Iraq complicated the position of predominantly Muslim states vis-à-vis their domestic publics and ultimately affected the content of ASEAN's cooperation with the US. Ironically, this situation has given ASEAN an incentive to cooperate more on a sub-regional basis. Southeast Asia's new strategic importance to the US has also led to more intensified economic and security cooperation with ASEAN's other dialogue partners, notably China, through the ASEAN+3 framework.

CONCLUSION

ASEAN's counter-terrorism response is partly a product of securitisation and the regional security sub-complex of Southeast Asia. 9/11 and terrorist attacks in several ASEAN countries have pushed ASEAN to recognise transnational terrorism as a major threat to ASEAN and its goals. It has embarked on a collective work programme to address this threat. A rethinking of US strategic policy has led to US reengagement in Southeast Asia, which has deepened security cooperation with several ASEAN countries on a bilateral level. However, US policies in Afghanistan and Iraq have created both tensions and opportunities for individual

ASEAN states, affecting their responses to terrorism and to regional cooperation.

The response of ASEAN to terrorism has been comprehensive and cooperation is broad-based, covering various aspects of terrorism as well as other issue-areas related to it. Terrorism is not viewed as essentially a military problem but a threat with a socio-political character. ASEAN cooperation has been largely at the political level and, to some degree, at the operational level, but has not reached the stage of joint combat operations.

There are strong indications that the securitisation of terrorism at the ASEAN level is still a work-in-progress. It would seem that incomplete securitisation has somewhat limited, but not prevented, ASEAN cooperation. While ASEAN has tried to securitise terrorism through its statements, mechanisms and initiatives, much work has to be done in the implementation of measures that will have a major impact in limiting and removing the functional and political space of terrorist networks such as JI. These areas include practical cooperation in sensitive security matters such as extradition, joint operations, and border patrols, which are already being done on a bilateral basis.

To understand this process better, more study should be made at how the level of the organisation (state or regional) affects the time frame for successful securitisation. It would seem that securitisation is faster and easier to discern at the state level, but more difficult to measure at the regional level, because of the number of actors that comprise it, and simply because the agreed regional policies must be implemented at the national level. That takes time.

Domestic factors in ASEAN member countries have also affected the degree of securitisation at the ASEAN level. The varying perceptions of terrorism as a threat has been partly a function of domestic considerations, affecting the political will of ASEAN members to implement strong counter-terrorism

measures, and the degree to which ASEAN could reach a collective position on security issues. A reluctance to include important but divisive international issues, such as the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq in its agenda, has limited ASEAN's voice in global affairs, but it has also encouraged a more sub-regional focus on solutions to the problem of counter-terrorism. Similarly, differing views among certain ASEAN states on the US role in the war on terrorism has affected ASEAN's collective position and cooperation at the ASEAN level.

One major consequence of the securitisation process of terrorism in ASEAN is to deepen and hasten security cooperation in ASEAN. This is happening simultaneously at the bilateral, sub-ASEAN, and ASEAN levels. The scale, breadth and pace of this development is unprecedented in ASEAN's history and are important building blocks for the future ASEAN Security Community.

ENDNOTES

1. All the ideas and views expressed in this paper are entirely the author's and do not in any way reflect the official position of the Philippine Department of Foreign Affairs or government.

2. Terrorism is defined here as "the modern permutation of warfare deliberately waged against civilians with the purpose of destroying their will to support either their leaders or policies that the agents of such violence find so objectionable." Caleb Carr, *The Lessons of Terror: A History of Warfare against Civilians: Why It Has Always Failed and Why It Will Fail Again* (New York: Random House, 2002).

3. Barry Buzan and Ole Waever, *Regions and Powers: The Structure of International Security* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

4. Ralf Emmers, Non-Traditional Security in the Asia-Pacific. The Dynamics of Securitisation (Singapore: Eastern Universities Press, 2004).

5. Buzan and Waever, *Regions and Powers*, p. 41.

6. *Ibid*., p. 40.

7. *Ibid*., p. 154.

8. *Ibid*., p. 155.

9. *Ibid*., pp. 154-55.

10. *Ibid*., p. 11.

11. *Ibid*., p. 491.

12. *Ibid*., 492.

13. This should be contrasted to Northeast Asia, which is still primarily preoccupied with more traditional military-strategic concerns. However, the role of China and Japan in ASEAN counter-terrorism cooperation will not be discussed in detail in this paper.

14. Buzan and Waever, *Regions and Powers*, pp. 70-76.

15. Emmers, Dynamics of Securitisation, p. 4.

16. Alan Collins, *Security and Southeast Asia: Domestic, Regional, and Global Issues* (Boulder, Co: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2003), p. 5.

17. In contrast to securitisation, desecuritisation involves the "shifting of issues out of emergency mode and into the normal bargaining processes of the political sphere." See Emmers, *Dynamics of Securitisation*, p. 4.

18. Emmers, Dynamics of Securitisation, p. 4.

19. *Ibid*., p. 3.

20. Barry Buzan, Ole Waever, and Jaao de Wilde, *Security: A New Framework for Analysis* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1998), p. 40 as quoted in Emmers, *Dynamics of Securitisation*, p.3.

21. Buzan et. al., Security: A New Framework for Analysis, p. 36 as quoted in Emmers, Dynamics of Securitisation, p.3.

22. Emmers, Dynamics of Securitisation, p.4.

23. *Ibid*., p 5.

24. *Ibid*., pp. 6-7.

25. Rohan Gunaratna, "Defeating Al Qaeda – The Pioneering Vanguard of the Islamic Movements," in Russell D. Howard and Reid L. Sawyer (eds.), *Defeating Terrorism: Shaping the New Security Environment* (Guilford, Conn: McGraw-Hill/Dushkin, 2004), p. 2.

26. "FBI to interview al Qaeda in Kandahar," 18 December 2001, online at www.archives.cnn.com/2001/US/12/18/gen.war.against.terror/.

27. Gunaratna, "Defeating Al Qaeda," p. 2.

28. *Ibid*., p. 2.

29. *Ibid*., p. 4.

30. The bombings killed 202 people, mostly Australians and other Westerners on holiday.

31. Gunaratna, "Defeating Al Qaeda," p. 15.

32. Maria Ressa, *Seeds of Terror* (New York: Free Press, 2003).

33. An interesting account of the birth of Jemaah Islamiyah can be found in Ressa, *Seeds of Terror*, pp. 45-63.

34. Ressa, *Seeds of Terror*, p. 50.

35. *Ibid*., p. 52.

36. Gunaratna, "Defeating Al Qaeda," p. 19.

37. *Ibid*.

38. "Moclis confesses to LRT, Maigo bombings," 10 June 2003, online at www. manilatimes.net/national/2003/jun/10/top_stories/20030610top3.html.

39. Zachary Abuza, "Funding Terrorism in Southeast Asia: The Financial Network of Al Qaeda and Jemaah Islamiyah," *NBR Analysis* (Vol. 14, No. 5, December 2003), p. 6.

40. *Ibid*.

41. Under the council were functional committees and four *mantiqis* or regional brigades.

42. Sidney Jones, "Jemaah Islamiyah in South East Asia: Damaged but Still Dangerous," *International Crisis Group Report No. 63*, 26 August 2003, pp. 27-28.

43. Eric Lipton, "In Cold Numbers, a Census of the Sept. 11 Victims," *The New York Times*, 19 April 2002, online at www.nytimes.com/2002/04/19/nyregion/19VICT.html?todaysheadlines.

44. Peter Slevin, "New 2003 Data: 625 Terrorism Deaths, Not 307," *The Washington Post*, 23 June 2004, Section A1.

45. Alan Wood, "Counter-terrorism costs threaten globalisation," *The Australian*, 1 April 2003, p. 13.

46. *Ibid*.

47. *Ibid*.

48. "Asian Economies Most at Risk From Terror Attacks," *Bernama*, 14 June 2004.

49. Simon Osborne, "Bali: counting the cost and rebuilding tourism," *UPI*, 21 January 2003.

50. Amando Doronila, "Those travel advisories," *The Philippine Daily Inquirer*, 13 November 2002.

51. For a comprehensive account of how JI's network participated in the 2001 Christmas Eve bombings and the sectarian conflict in Ambon, Poso, see: "Indonesia Backgrounder: How the Jemaah Islamiyah Terrorist Network Operates," *International Crisis Group Asia Report No. 43*, 11 December 2002.

52. Even if only one or two countries in ASEAN become Islamic states, this would have dire consequences on the group's stability and cohesion, perhaps triggering a re-configuration of alliances reminiscent of the Cold War, albeit along politico-religious lines.

53. Transnational crimes such as drug trafficking had been an area of ASEAN functional cooperation for some time, and extending cooperation to similar transboundary problems received support from countries that had realised the limits of relying solely on domestic policies to address these problems.

54. ASEAN Declaration on Transnational Crime, 20 December 1997, online at www.aseansec.org/5640.htm.

55. See www.mfa.gov.sg/unsc/AnnexG.doc for more information on this.

56. The first ASEAN statement of solidarity with the US and calls for greater cooperation were actually made by the ASEAN Economic Ministers just hours after the attacks in New York, Washington, DC, and Pennsylvania. Prior to the Brunei summit, the Third ASEAN Ministerial Meeting on Transnational Crime's communiqué condemned the attacks and pledged to enhance cooperation among the law enforcement agencies of ASEAN. ASEAN leaders also supported the APEC Leaders Statement on Counter-Terrorism during the APEC Leaders Summit in October 2001.

57. 2001 ASEAN Declaration on Joint Action to Counter Terrorism, 5 November 2001, ASEAN Secretariat, online at www. aseansec.org/3638.htm.

58. *Ibid*.

59. Joint Communiqué of the Special ASEAN Ministerial Meeting on Terrorism, 21 May 2002, ASEAN Secretariat, online at www.aseansec.org/13075.htm.

60. Declaration on Terrorism by the 8th ASEAN Summit, 3 November 2002, ASEAN Secretariat.

61. *Ibid*.

62. *Ibid*.

63. *Ibid*.

64. Joint Communiqué Special ASEAN Ministerial Meeting on Terrorism.

65. See: 2001 ASEAN Declaration on Joint Action to Counter Terrorism.

66. See: 2001 ASEAN Declaration on Joint Action to Counter-Terrorism.

67. The formation of this ISM was welcomed by the foreign ministers in the Ninth ASEAN Regional Forum Ministerial Meeting, Bandar Seri Begawan, Brunei Darussalam, 31 July 2002. The first meeting was held in Karambunai, Sabah, Malaysia, on 21-22 March 2003.

68. The 2nd ISM on CT-TC, co-chaired by the Philippines and Russia, was held in Manila on 30-31 March 2004 and focussed on the theme of port security.

69. See *ASEAN Efforts to Counter Terrorism,* a paper prepared for the UN-Counter-Terrorism Committee, at online at www.aseansec.org/14396.htm; and "ASEAN way of fighting terrorism," ASEAN Features, online at www.202.154.12.3/12776.htm.

70. Work Programme to Implement the ASEAN Plan of Action to Combat Transnational Crime, Kuala Lumpur, 17 May 2002, online at www.aseansec.org/5616.htm.

71. David Capie, "Between a Hegemon and a Hard Place," *The Pacific Review* (Vol. 17, No.2, June 2004), p. 238.

72. Author's e-mail interview with Director Rodhora Poliquit, Philippine Center on Transnational Crime (PCTC), October 2004.

73. The other two pillars are the ASEAN Economic Community and the ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community.

74. Author's e-mail interview with Dr Carolina Hernandez, 2 November 2004.

75. See letter of Philippine Press Undersecretary Michael T. Toledo to *Asiaweek*, "Jakarta Bombing," online at www.64.233.167.104/search?q=cache:0fvCFOGBywJ:ww

w.asiaweek.com/asiaweek/magazine/2000/0901/letters.html+PNP+team+Jakarta+Caday&hl=en.

76. "Government Defends Trio Linked to Terrorism," 20 March 2002, online at www.laksamana.net/vnews.cfm?ncat=22&news_id=2276.

77. Kumar Ramakrishna, "US Strategy in Southeast Asia: Counter-Terrorist or Counter-Terrorism?" in Kumar Ramakrishna and See Seng Tan (eds.), *After Bali: The Threat of Terrorism in Southeast Asia* (Singapore: Institute of Defence and Strategic Studies, 2003), p. 318.

78. Kumar Ramakrishna and See Seng Tan, "Is Southeast Asia a Terrorist Haven?" in *After Bali*, p. 19.

79. Daljit Singh, "ASEAN Counter-terrorism Strategies and Cooperation," in *After Bali*, p. 213.

80. *Ibid*.

81. They were captured possibly with help from Indonesian intelligence authorities.

82. Ressa, *Seeds of Terror*, p. xvi.

83. Agreement on Information Exchange and Establishment of Communication Procedures, 7 May 2002, Department of Foreign Affairs, Philippines.

84. See Philippine Secretary of Foreign Affairs Delia Domingo Albert, *Statement on Regional Counter-terrorism Response*, delivered at the Bali Regional Ministerial Meeting on Counter-Terrorism, 4-5 February 2004, Bali, Indonesia.

85. Interview, Director Rhodora Poliquit.

86. See *ASEAN Efforts to Counter Terrorism*, online at www.aseansec.org/ 14396.htm.

87. "New Indonesian-Australian Law Enforcement Centre Boosts Regional Battle Against Terrorism," 3 July 2004, online at www.foreignminister. gov.au/releases/2004/ fa099a_04.html.

88. Brian Michael Jenkins, "Countering Al Qaeda" in *Defeating Terrorism*, p. 143.

89. *Ibid*., p. 240.

90. David Garcia, "U.S. Security Policy and Counter-Terrorism in Southeast Asia," *UNISCI Discussion Papers*, May 2004, p. 2.

91. *Ibid*.

92. See Mark Manyin (Coordinator), Emma Chanlett-Avery, Richard Cronin, Larry Niksch, Bruce Vaughn, *CRS Report for Congress*, "Terrorism in Southeast Asia," (Updated 13 August 2004).

93. *The National Security Strategy of the United States of America*, Washington DC, The White House, 2002, p. 26, as quoted in Capie, "Between a Hegemon," p. 238.

94. David Garcia, "US Security Policy," p. 4.

95. *CRS Report for Congress*, 13 August 2004, p. 36.

96. Kumar Ramakrishna, "US Strategy in Southeast Asia," in *After Bali*, p. 331.

97. *Ibid*.

98. Capie, "Between a Hegemon," p. 228 for Indonesia's position, and p. 231 for Malaysia's position.

99. Reference to all three UNSC resolutions, for example, appears in the *ASEAN-United States of America Joint Declaration for Cooperation to Combat International Terrorism*, 1 August 2002, online at www.aseansec.org/7424.htm.

100. Jurgen Haacke, "The War on Terror: Implications for the ASEAN Region," in Christopher M. Dent (ed.), *Asia-Pacific Economic and Security Co-operation, New Regional Agendas* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), p. 129.

101. Jose Almonte, "Enhancing State Capacity and Legitimacy in the Counter-Terror War," in *After Bali*, 2003, p. 230.

102. Anthony L. Smith, *Strategic Centrality: Indonesia's Changing Role in ASEAN*, Pacific Strategy Paper 10 (Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, 2000), pp. 29-30.

103. CRS Report for Congress, p. 16.

104. Angel M. Rabasa, "Political Islam in Southeast Asia: Moderates, Radicals and Terrorists," *The Adelphi Papers* (Vol. 358, Issue 1, July 2003), p. 32.

105. A major hurdle to the normalisation of Indonesia-US relations were the military sanctions imposed by the US Congress on the Indonesian military. In 1999, Senator Patrick Leahy introduced an amendment that banned the resumption of military ties with Indonesia until reforms were pursued by the TNI, including the prosecution of those behind the 1999 carnage in East Timor. See Ressa, *Seeds of Terror*, pp. 200-201.

106. Capie, "Between a Hegemon," p. 228.

107. *Ibid*.

108. CRS Report for Congress, p. 19.

109. This included a pledge of US$60 million counter-terrorism assistance announced by the State Department in 2002. See Capie, "Between a Hegemon," p. 229.

110. Capie, "Between a Hegemon," p. 230.

111. The dominant thinking in government apparently was that arresting the extremists "could radicalise the moderate Muslim majority, if it were perceived as unjust and taken at American behest". Having just recovered from the riots of 1998, the threat of social and religious unrest loomed large as more serious than any terrorist threat. See Capie, "Between a Hegemon," p. 228.

112. "Bali bomber let out for coffee at Starbucks" 9 June 2004, *The New Zealand Herald*, online at www.nzherald.co.nz/storydisplay.cfm?storyID=3589469&thesection=news&thesubsection=world&thesecondsubsection=&reportid=712591.

113. "New Indonesian-Australian Law Enforcement Centre Boosts Regional Battle Against Terrorism," Joint Press Release of Australian Foreign Minister Alexander Downer with Senator Chris Ellison, Minister for Justice and Customs, 3 July 2004, online at www.foreignminister.gov.au/releases/2004/fa099a_04.html.

114. Daljit Singh, "ASEAN Counter-terrorism Strategies," p. 204.

115. Text of Bush-Megawati news conference, The Associated Press, 22 October 2003, online at www.newsday.com/news/nationworld/world/wire/sns-ap-bush-megawatitext,0,1417051.story?coll=sns-ap-world-headlines.

116. "Anti-piracy drive in Malacca Straits," BBC News, 20 July 2004, online at www.news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/asia-pacific/3908821.stm.

117. Although the legality of her presidency was subsequently upheld by the Supreme Court, the lack of an electoral mandate for her presidency and a deeply polarised polity hounded Arroyo until she won a fresh mandate in the 2004 elections.

118. See Ressa, *Seeds of Terror*, pp. 7-8.

119. Rabasa, "Political Islam in Southeast Asia," p. 55.

120. *PGMA's* (President Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo's) *Opening Statement during a Press Conference in Malaysia*, 8 August 2001, during her state visit to Malaysia, online at www.opnet.ops.gov.ph/speech-2001aug08a.htm.

121. The Philippines remains the only country in ASEAN which has allowed ASEAN member countries (Indonesia and Malaysia) to directly participate in peace talks as third-party mediators with a secessionist group.

122. The Abu Sayyaf is a violent radical Islamic group with early affiliations with Al Qaeda. It has since degenerated into a kidnap-for-ransom and extortion group.

123. "Manila urges tripartite border patrol pact," *Agence-France Press*, 29 April 2000.

124. "Philippine army chief proposes trilateral military exercises," *Kyodo*, 15 September 2003.

125. Rabasa, "Political Islam in Southeast Asia," p. 54.

126. Santos, Soliman, Jr., "Toasting Tito," 8 July 2002, online at www. cyberdyaryo.com/statements/st2002070801.htm.

127. The Philippine military is reputed to be one of the most ill-equipped in Southeast Asia.

128. Statement of Philippine Ambassador to the US Alberto del Rosario on Philippine–US Relations, Press Release, Philippine Embassy, Washington, DC, 29 October 2004.

129. *Ibid*.

130. Except perhaps in the Muslim heartlands of Basilan, Jolo, Maguindanao, and Tawi-Tawi.

131. CRS Report for Congress, pp. 23-24.

132. "Filipinos protest U.S. forces pact," 2 August 2002, online at www.archives.cnn.com/2002/WORLD/asiapcf/southeast/08/02/powell.philippines/.

133. Mahar Mangahas, "SWS 3rd Quarter Survey: Economic Hopes, Security Concerns, and Family Ties Bolster Filipino Desire for Good Relations with the U.S.; Filipinos OK Pullout from Iraq in Angelo De La Cruz Case, Despite Expectation of U.S. Backlash," 14 September 2004, online at www.sws.org.ph/pr140904.htm.

134. *Ibid*.

135. *Ibid*.

136. To bolster the talks, the Philippine government even dropped charges against the MILF's leadership for alleged involvement in several bombings in Mindanao.

137. Almonte, "Enhancing State Capacity," in *After Bali,* pp. 232-233.

138. Ma. Eloisa I. Calderon "MILF-JI 'ties' seen to continue even with accord," *BusinessWorld*, 13 October 2004.

139. Author's e-mail interview with former ASEAN Secretary-General Rodolfo C. Severino, Jr., 10 October 2004.

140. Interview with Ms Poliquit, PCTC.

141. Al-Faruq was caught in Indonesia on 5 June 2002 and immediately deported to the US.

142. Interview with Ms Ploliquit, PCTC.

143. The Philippine legislature has yet to pass an anti-terrorism bill endorsed as urgent by President Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo during her previous and present terms.

144. Of the six, only Indonesia has yet to ratify the agreement, to make it operational.

145. Although it is interested in acceding, Singapore still has reservations on some parts of the pact.

146. This could be attributed to the currency of the issue and a greater understanding of its relevance to the security of some ASEAN members and to its dialogue partners, most notably the US, Australia, the EU, and Japan. This is further proof that terrorism is now being treated more than just an area of functional cooperation, but one requiring an urgent response.

REFERENCES

Books, Articles, and Documents

Abuza, Zachary. "Funding Terrorism in Southeast Asia: The Financial Network of Al Qaeda and Jemaah Islamiyah," *NBR Analysis* (Vol. 14, No. 5, December 2003).

Philippine Department of Foreign Affairs. Agreement on Information Exchange and Establishment of Communication Procedures, 7 May 2002.

"Anti-piracy drive in Malacca Straits," *BBC News*, 20 July 2004, online at www.news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/asia-pacific/3908821.stm.

ASEAN Secretariat. Declaration on Terrorism by the 8th ASEAN Summit, 3 November 2002.

ASEAN Secretariat. Joint Communiqué of the Special ASEAN Ministerial Meeting on Terrorism, 21 May 2002.

ASEAN Secretariat. ASEAN Declaration on Joint Action to Counter-Terrorism, 5 November 2001.

ASEAN Secretariat. ASEAN Declaration on Transnational Crime, 20 December 1997, online at www.aseansec.org/5640.htm.

ASEAN Efforts to Counter Terrorism, a paper prepared for the UN-Counter-Terrorism Committee, online at www.aseansec.org/14396.htm.

ASEAN-United States of America Joint Declaration for Cooperation to Combat International Terrorism, 1 August 2002, online at www.aseansec.org/7424.htm.

"ASEAN way of fighting terrorism," *ASEAN Features*, online at www.202.154.12.3/12776.htm.

"Asian Economies Most at Risk From Terror Attacks," *Bernama*, 14 June 2004.

"Bali bomber let out for coffee at Starbucks." *The New Zealand Herald*, 9 June 2004, online at www.nzherald.co.nz/storydisplay.cfm?storyID=3589469&thesection=news&thesubsection=world&thesecondsubsection=&reportid=712591.

Buzan, Barry and Ole Waever. *Regions and Powers: The Structure of International Security* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

Carr, Caleb. *The Lessons of Terror: A History of Warfare against Civilians: Why It Has Always Failed and Why It Will Fail Again* (New York: Random House, 2002).

Collins, Alan. Security and Southeast Asia: Domestic, Regional, and Global Issues. (Boulder, Co: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2003).

CRS Report for Congress (US), "Terrorism in Southeast Asia," Mark Manyin (Coordinator), Emma Chanlett-Avery, Richard Cronin, Larry Niksch, Bruce Vaughn. Updated 13 August 2004.

Dent, Christopher M. (ed.) Asia-Pacific Economic and Security Co-operation: New Regional Agendas (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003).

Doronila, Amando. "Those travel advisories." *The Philippine Daily Inquirer*, 13 November 2002.

Emmers, Ralf. Non-Traditional Security in the Asia-Pacific, The Dynamics of Securitisation (Singapore: Eastern Universities Press, 2004).

"FBI to interview al Qaeda in Kandahar," 18 December 2001, online at www.archives.cnn.com/2001/US/12/18/gen. war.against.terror/.

"Filipinos protest U.S. forces pact" 2 August 2002, online at www.archives.cnn.com/2002/WORLD/asiapcf/southeast /08/02/powell.philippines.

Garcia, David. "U.S. Security Policy and Counter-Terrorism in Southeast Asia" *UNISCI Discussion Papers*, May 2004.

"Government Defends Trio Linked to Terrorism," 20 March 2002, online at www.laksamana.net/vnews.cfm?ncat=22&news_id=2276.

Haacke, Jurgen. "The War on Terror: Implications for the ASEAN Region," in Christopher M. Dent (ed.), *Asia-Pacific Economic and Security Co-operation, New Regional Agendas* (London: PalgraveMacmillan, 2003).

Howard, Russell D., and Reid L. Sawyer. (eds.) *Defeating Terrorism: Shaping the New Security Environment* (Guilford, Conn: McGraw-Hill/Dushkin, 2004).

"Indonesia Backgrounder: How the Jemaah Islamiyah Terrorist Network Operates," *International Crisis Group Asia Report No. 43*, 11 December 2002.

"Jakarta Bombing," Letter of Philippine Press Undersecretary Michael T. Toledo to *Asiaweek*, online at: www.64.233.167.104/search?q=cache:0fvCFOGBywJ:www.asiaweek.com/asiaweek/magazine/2000/0901/letters.html+PNP+team+Jakarta+Caday&hl=en.

Jones, Sidney. "Jemaah Islamiyah in South East Asia: Damaged but Still Dangerous," *International Crisis Group Report No. 63,* 26 August 2003, pp. 27-28.

Lipton, Eric. "In Cold Numbers, a Census of the Sept. 11 Victims," *The New York Times*, 19 April 2002, online at www.nytimes.com/2002/04/19/nyregion/19VICT. html?todaysheadlines.

Mangahas, Mahar. "SWS 3rd Quarter Survey: Economic Hopes, Security Concerns, and Family Ties Bolster Filipino Desire for Good Relations with the U.S; Filipinos OK Pullout from Iraq in Angelo De La Cruz Case, Despite Expectation of U.S. Backlash," 14 September 2004, online at www.sws.org.ph/ pr140904.htm.

"Manila urges tripartite border patrol pact," *Agence-France Press*, 29 April, 2000.

"MILF-JI 'ties' seen to continue even with accord," *BusinessWorld*, 13 October 2004.

"Moclis confesses to LRT, Maigo bombings," 10 June 2003, online at www.manilatimes.net/national/2003/jun/10/top_stories/20030610top3.html.

"New Indonesian-Australian Law Enforcement Centre Boosts Regional Battle Against Terrorism." Joint Press Release of Australian Foreign Minister Alexander Downer with Senator Chris Ellison, Minister for Justice and Customs. 3 July 2004, online at www.foreignminister.gov.au/releases/2004/fa099a_04.html.

Osborne, Simon. "Bali: counting the cost and rebuilding tourism," *UPI*, 21 January 2003.

PGMA's Opening Statement during a Press Conference in Malaysia. Statement by Philippine President Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo during her state visit to Malaysia, 8 August 2001, online at www.opnet.ops.gov.ph/speech-2001aug08a.htm.

"Philippine army chief proposes trilateral military exercises," Kyodo, 15 September 2003.

Rabasa, Angel M. "Political Islam in Southeast Asia: Moderates, Radicals and Terrorists," *The Adelphi Paper*s (Vol. 358, Issue 1, July 2003).

Ramakrishna, Kumar and See Seng Tan. *After Bali: The Threat of Terrorism in Southeast Asia* (Singapore: Institute of Defence and Strategic Studies, 2003).

Santos, Soliman, Jr. "Toasting Tito," 8 July 2002, at online at www.cyberdyaryo.com/statements/st2002_0708 _01.htm.

Severino, Rodolfo C. *Towards an ASEAN Security Community* (Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, 2004).

Slevin, Peter. "New 2003 Data: 625 Terrorism Deaths, Not 307," *The Washington Post*, 23 June 2004, Section A1.

Smith, Anthony L. *Strategic Centrality: Indonesia's Changing Role in ASEAN*, Pacific Strategy Paper 10 (Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, 2000).

Statement of Philippine Ambassador to the US Albert del Rosario on Philippine–US Relations, Press Release, Philippine Embassy, Washington, DC., 29 October 2004.

Statement on Regional Counter-terrorism Response. Statement of Philippine Secretary of Foreign Affairs Delia Domingo Albert at the Bali Regional Ministerial Meeting on Counter-Terrorism, 4-5 February 2004, Bali, Indonesia.

Tay, Simon S.C., Jesus P. Estanislao, and Hadi Soesastro, (eds.). *Reinventing ASEAN*. (Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, 2001).

Text of Bush-Megawati news conference, *The Associated Press*, 22 October 2003, online at www.newsday.com/news/nationworld/world/wire/sns-ap-bush-megawati-text,0,1417051.story?coll=sns-ap-world-headlines.

Wood, Alan. "Counter-terrorism costs threaten globalisation," *The Australian*, 1 April 2003, p. 13.

Work Programme to Implement the ASEAN Plan of Action to Combat Transnational Crime, 17 May 2002, at www.aseansec.org/5616.htm.

INTERVIEWS

Hernandez, Carolina. Head of Institute of Strategic and Development Studies. E-mail interview, 2 November 2004.

Poliquit, Rodhora. Director, Philippine Center on Transnational Crime (PCTC). E-mail interview, 18 October 2004.

Severino, Rodolfo C., former ASEAN Secretary General. E-mail interview, 10 October 2004.