

11-25-2018

MAKING THE BEST OUT OF THE WORST: UTILIZING INDONESIA'S EXISTING LAWS TO PROTECT ASYLUM SEEKERS IN TRANSIT

Tanita Dhiyaan Rahmani
Universitas Indonesia, tanitadhiyaan@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarhub.ui.ac.id/jils>



Part of the [Islamic Studies Commons](#), and the [Religion Law Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Rahmani, Tanita Dhiyaan (2018) "MAKING THE BEST OUT OF THE WORST: UTILIZING INDONESIA'S EXISTING LAWS TO PROTECT ASYLUM SEEKERS IN TRANSIT," *Journal of Islamic Law Studies*: Vol. 1 : No. 3 , Article 7.

Available at: <https://scholarhub.ui.ac.id/jils/vol1/iss3/7>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty of Law at UI Scholars Hub. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Islamic Law Studies by an authorized editor of UI Scholars Hub.

MAKING THE BEST OUT OF THE WORST: UTILIZING INDONESIA'S EXISTING LAWS TO PROTECT ASYLUM SEEKERS IN TRANSIT

Tanita Dhiyaan Rahmani¹

Abstract

Being a party in the 1951 Convention on the Status Relating to Refugees and its 1967 Protocol is not an exclusive solution to legal protection of asylum seekers and refugees in Indonesia. Although the Government of Indonesia has not ratified both instruments, it has acknowledged the protection of asylum seekers and refugees under the People Consultative Assembly (MPR) Decree Number XVII Year 1998 and Law Number 37 year 1999 regarding Foreign Relations. A 2016 United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees reported that Indonesia has become a transit destination for more than 13,000 asylum seekers and refugees, including nearly 1,000 Rohingya asylum seekers. Asylum seekers suffer the most in Indonesia's legal imbroglio. Despite the existing laws, the government of Indonesia has been identifying asylum seekers as illegal migrants under Immigration Law and kept them inside Immigration Detention Centres (IDCs), with common reports on ill-treatment and rampant violence. As a transit country, Indonesia carries the moral and legal responsibility to protect refugees during their transit with the ultimate purpose to prepare them to be resettled in countries that have signed the 1951 Convention. During this commonly lengthy and uncertain period of transit where the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees or International Organization of Migrants will issue their refugee application result, protection should not be absent. Instead of suggesting Indonesia to ratify the 1951 Convention on the Status Relating to Refugees and its 1967 Protocol, this paper argues that Indonesian existing laws and regulations have provided it with national and international obligations to protect asylum seekers in transit, including to refrain from *refoulement* action. Thus, rendering the claim of an absence legal basis an irrelevant excuse.

Keywords: transit, *refoulement*, Foreign Relations Law, international obligations, existing laws.

¹ Faculty of Law, Universitas Indonesia. E-mail: tanitadhiyaan@gmail.com

The Problem of Asylum Seekers in Indonesia

The United Nations High Commissionaire of Refugee (“UNHCR”) recorded nearly 14,000 total of refugees and asylum seekers presently transit in Indonesia.² Most of them are asylum seekers awaiting their refugee status to be processed and granted.³

However, Indonesia has neither acceded the Convention on the Status of Refugees of 1951 nor its 1967 Protocol (“Refugee Conventions”). This renders the country free from the obligation to determine one’s status as refugee and provide them with the rights enumerated especially for them under the said conventions. Nevertheless, Indonesia has a longstanding tradition to temporarily host asylum seekers and refugees and by that, the International Organisation on Migrants (“IOM”) describes Indonesia as “a key transit country” for the movement of asylum seekers and refugees.⁴

However, transiting in Indonesia may feel like being stuck in an infinite limbo. Unlike other transit countries that allow local integration, resettlement or voluntary repatriation to their homeland are about the only two options for a refugee in Indonesia.⁵

Unfortunately, the former option usually takes a very long time to happen. With over 6,000 acknowledged refugees in Indonesia in 2016, the UNHCR reported that less than 900 people has been resettled each year in the past two years.⁶ The latter option is not favourable for most refugees, although noted to happen. The UNHCR notes that there are several hundreds of refugees in Indonesia chose to be voluntarily repatriated.⁷ Asylum seekers suffers the most in Indonesia’s legal imbroglio. Due to the absence the Refugee Conventions, asylum seekers (who are still waiting for their refugee status to be confirmed) are treated as “illegal migrant” or “irregular migrants”. Indonesia holds this stance through Law number 6 of 2011 regarding Immigration (“Law 6/2011”) and Director General of Immigration Directive Number 1489 of 2010 regarding the Management of Illegal Migrants (“DGI Directive 2010”). Under both laws, “illegal

² UNHCR [1], *UNHCR Indonesia Fact Sheet* (February 2016), (accessible in: <http://www.unhcr.org/50001bda9.pdf>).

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ Global Detention Project, *Indonesia Immigration Detention*, (accessible through: <http://www.globaldetentionproject.org/countries/asia-pacific/indonesia>).

⁵ Antje Missbach, “Essay: Transit Migrants in Indonesia between the Devil and the Deep Blue Sea”, *Pacific Geographies* #39, January/ February 2013, pg. 33.

⁶ UNHCR [1], *ibid.*

⁷ JRS Asia Pacific, “The Search: Protection Space in Malaysia, Thailand, Indonesia, Cambodia and the Philippines”, *JRS Asia Pacific 2012*, (available at: <http://www.refworld.org/pdfid/506bfb622.pdf>).

migrants” are subject to detainment inside the IDCs. They may be released from IDCs once they have obtained refugee status from the UNHCR, which unfortunately, may take 8 to 20 months of waiting list period for the first interview session.⁸

Under Law 6/2011, a foreigner is considered an illegal migrant if he/she is either not a victim of people smuggling or human trafficking which violates Indonesia's immigration law by not having valid travel documents or a victim of human trafficking or smuggling which violates Indonesia's immigration law (who will not be subject to administrative law but is still required to be detained).⁹ This law highlights that the period of detainment shall be until they are “deported” or up to ten (10) years, both without any mechanism of appeal or judicial review.¹⁰ Affirming this provision is the DGI Directive 2010, which was issued specifically to respond to the issue of incoming asylum seekers.¹¹ Recent trends of the so-called “boat-people” shows that most asylum seekers who entered Indonesian territory have not processed their refugee status yet and have no or incomplete travel authorisations.¹² There are even records where those who have obtained valid refugee status or an attestation letter of asylum seeker from the UNHCR supposedly be exempted from immigration treatment, can still be treated as “illegal migrants”.¹³ The practice has become a normal procedure, which is in contrary to a 2012 Guidelines by UNHCR essentially declaring that detaining asylum seekers should “be avoided” and can only be applied as “a last resort”.¹⁴

⁸ UNHCR [1], *Ibid.*

⁹ Indonesia, Undang-Undang tentang Imigrasi, UU No. 6 Tahun 2011, LN No. 52 Tahun 2011 (Law Number 6 Year 2011, SG No. 52 Year 2011), Articles 83 and 86.

¹⁰ Indonesia, *Ibid.*, Article 85 (1) and (2).

¹¹ Preamble of Director General of Immigration Directive Number IMI-1489.UM.08.05 Year 2010, para. 2, (“*whereas, to minimize the impact brought about by the existence of irregular migrants declaring themselves as asylum seekers and refugees, there is a need for a regulation that provides uniformity of direction in the handling and treatments pertaining to immigration issues.*”)

¹² Savitri Taylor, “Asylum Seekers in Indonesia: Why do They Get on Boats?”, *The Conversation*, (available at: <http://theconversation.com/asylum-seekers-in-indonesia-why-do-they-get-on-boats-8334>).

¹³ Human Rights Watch, “Indonesia: Anak-Anak yang Mencari Suaka Menemukan Kekerasan dan Penelantaran,” (available at: <https://www.hrw.org/id/news/2013/06/23/250191>); see also Article 3 para (1) of Director General of Immigration Directive Number IMI-1489.UM.08.05 Year 2010, which reads: “An irregular migrant’s status within the country shall not be in question provided that such person: a. has obtained an Attestation Letter of Asylum Seeker from the UNHCR; or b. has been granted refugee status by the UNHCR.”; on Australia involvement with IDCs for refugee see Amy Nethery, Brynna Rafferty-Brown and S. Taylor, “Exporting Detention: Australia-funded Immigration Detention in Indonesia”, *Journal of Refugee Studies* Vol. 26, No. 1, 88-109.

¹⁴ UNHCR[2], Guidelines on the Applicable Criteria and Standards relating to the Detention of Asylum-Seekers and Alternatives to Detention (UNHCR, Detention Guidelines), 2012, para.14, (available at: <http://www.refworld.org/docid/503489533b8.html>).

This resulted in the overcapacity of IDCs all around Indonesia. As of 2015, there are at 13 IDCs and 20 other temporary detention facilities spread in 12 provinces around the country.¹⁵ However, with over 7,000 asylum seekers entering Indonesia, the capacity of each of those centres simply cannot hold water.¹⁶ Conditions in IDCs are also reportedly poor, as the Human Rights Watch described the condition as “appalling”, citing the lack of sanitation and basic bedding.¹⁷ Unaccompanied children can be seen mixed with non-related adults in cramped cells.¹⁸ These particular phenomena led to the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child called Indonesia to “cease the administrative practice of detaining asylum-seeking and refugee children.”¹⁹ Reports of violence both from other asylum seekers and officers have also been notable in the past few years.²⁰ One of the emblematic cases was of Taki Neqoye, an Afghani refugee in Pontianak IDC, who was found dead with heavy bruises and wounds from the officers who tried to prevent him from running away.²¹ Although the UNHCR noted that many officers were trying to prevent risky escape, such as those trying cross to Australia by boats, it is still unreasonable to use force so excessive that it caused death.

Based on such depiction, ratifying the Refugee Conventions appears to hold an important role in steadfast the process of identifying and granting refugee to asylum seekers.²² However, the possibility for the Indonesian government to accede the Refugee Conventions seems greatly unclear, with little source of confidence to believe otherwise. True, the Indonesian Government has repeatedly expressed its intention to ratify them,

¹⁵ UNHCR [1], *Ibid.*

¹⁶ Komisi Nasional Hak Asasi Manusia (“Komnas HAM”), “Urgensi Ratifikasi Konvensi Pengungsi”, Wacana HAM Edisi I Tahun X/2012, pg. 8, (available at <http://www.komnasham.go.id/sites/default/files/dok-publikasi/WACANA%20HAM%20EDISI%20%2001%20THN%202012.pdf>); see also Directorate General of Immigration, The Jakarta Immigration Detention House Have Overcapacity of Asylum Seekers, (available at: <http://www.imigrasi.go.id/index.php/en/berita/berita-utama/842-the-jakarta-immigration-detention-house-has-overcapacity-of-asylum-seekers>)

¹⁷ See Human Rights Watch, *Barely Surviving: Detention, Abuse, and Neglect Migrant Children in Indonesia*, (available at: <https://www.hrw.org/report/2013/06/23/barely-surviving/detention-abuse-and-neglect-migrant-children-indonesia>)

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁹ Committee on the Rights of the Child, “Concluding observations on the combined third and fourth periodic reports of Indonesia,” *United Nations, CRC/C/IDN/CO/3-4, 10 July 2014*, (available at: <http://uhri.ohchr.org/document/index/4cbccb2b-753b-47f5-8f0e-ab50707146f9>).

²⁰ See Human Rights Watch, *Ibid.*

²¹ Antje Missbach and Frieda Sinanu, “Life and Death in Immigration Detention, Inside Indonesia”, *Inside Indonesia July-September 2013*, (available at: <http://www.insideindonesia.org/life-and-death-in-immigration-detention>).

²² For discussion on whether or not Indonesia should ratify the 1951 Convention and its 1967 Protocols see Dita Liliansa and Anbar Jayadi, “Should Indonesia Accede to the 1951 Refugee Convention and its 1967 Protocol?”, *Indonesia Law Review (2015) 3*: 324-346.

only to delay it. The 2004-2009 Indonesian Human Rights Action Plan set a commitment to ratify the Refugee Conventions by 2009.²³ However, in 2007, during a meeting of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, an Indonesian delegate stated its political and social concern that discouraged them to soon accede or ratify these treaties:

*“Indonesia had traditionally been a transit country for refugees and asylum-seekers, rather than a destination country, which was one reason why it had not ratified the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees. The commitments arising from ratification, in particular the prohibition on refoulement or expulsion, would overburden an archipelagic State with a large ocean territory, and one which had many internally displaced persons as a result of disasters and conflict.”*²⁴

It then repeated its intention in 2009 and most recently in 2014 before the Human Rights Council. It has also continue to list the Convention in the National Human Rights Agenda for the 2010-2015 and the 2015-2019 period.²⁵ A bill on the ratification of the Convention has been drafted since November 2013 and a presidential decree governing an extensive measure of refugee has also been drafted.²⁶ However, there are no signs of any of these plans to be manifested soon. This push and pull gesture indicates that the issue of ratifying the Refugee Conventions remains politically unfavourable. Regardless of the ratification of the Refugee Conventions, this paper argues that Indonesia, indeed, has had the legal provisions that render it bounded with national and international obligation to protect asylum seekers in its territory.

Indonesia’s Existing Legal Provisions on Asylum Seekers and Refugees

Indonesia is firstly bound by the principle of *non-refoulement*, which guarantees that individuals have the right not to be forcibly returned to countries where they face persecution.²⁷ This principle has been agreed to be a customary international law.²⁸ As

²³ Task Force Pemantauan RANHAM, *Evaluasi Pelaksanaan RANHAM 2004-2009 dan Rencana Ratifikasi Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture (CAT) dalam RANHAM 2004-2009 dan Perencanaan RANHAM 2010-2014*, (accessible through: <http://www.kemitraan.or.id/sites/default/files/20120809092409.Evaluasi%20Pelaksanaan%20RANHAM%202004-2009.pdf>), pg. 27.

²⁴ Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, *Summary Record of the 1832nd Meeting held at the Palais Wilson, Geneva, on Thursday, 9 August 2007*, UN Doc CERD/C/SR.1832, 14 August 2007 para. 34.

²⁵ Sophie Duxson, Filling the Legal Gap, *Inside Indonesia Edition 124: April-June 2016*, (available at: <http://www.insideindonesia.org/filling-the-legal-vacuum>).

²⁶ *Ibid.*

²⁷ David Weissbrodt and Isabel Hortreiter, “The Principle of Non-Refoulement: Article 3 of the Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment in Centre of Islam and Islamic Law Studies
Lembaga Kajian Islam dan Hukum Islam
Faculty of Law, Universitas Indonesia

a customary international law, Indonesia is bound to comply with this principle regardless of its ratification status to the Refugee Conventions. More-over, the principle is also widely known to be an *erga omnes* character, which means that it cannot be derogated or become an exception.²⁹ This principle is emphasized in the Refugee Conventions, where Article 33 paragraph 1 of the 1951 Convention on the Status of Refugee stipulates: “No Contracting State shall expel or return (*refouler*) a refugee in any manner whatsoever to the frontiers of territories where his life or freedom would be threatened on account of his race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion.”

This is further reverberated through various other international treaties such as the International Convention on Social and Political Rights (“ICCPR” or the “Convention”, interchangeably) and The Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or The Committee against Torture or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (“CAT”). In fact, these two conventions set forth the principle to be applied beyond the limit of asylum seekers and refugees.³⁰ Cases of *refoulement* by Indonesia has been noted to occur the most during the Indochina crisis where many Southeast Asian countries and Australia refused to accept asylumseekers.³¹

Media reports in February 2012 also noted 13 Iranian asylum seekers who were deported after their boat got capsized and stranded in the coast of Tasikmalayadistrict, West Java.³² These 13 Iranian were part of a group of 46 people from Afghanistan and Iran, wishing to obtain refugee status in Australia.³³

Besides the existing customary international law, Indonesia also have several laws and regulations that can works as sufficient basis for the protection of asylum seekers in

Comparison with the *Non-Refoulement* Provisions of Other International Human Rights Treaties”, 5 *Buff. Hum. Rts. L. Rev.* 1 (1999), (available at http://scholarship.law.umn.edu/faculty_articles/362), pg. 2.

²⁸ Elihu Lauterpacht and Daniel Bethlehem, “The Scope and Content of the Principle of Non-Refoulement”, (Background Paper for Expert Roundtable Series, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, 2001), paras. 201-216

²⁹ Fernando M. Marino Menendez, “Recent Jurisprudence of the United Nations Committee against Torture and the International Protection of Refugees”, *Refugee Survey Quarterly* 2015, 0, 1-18, pg. 2.

³⁰ Taylor Savitri and Brynna Rafetti-Brown, “Difficult Journeys: Accessing Refugee Protection in Indonesia”, *Monash University Law Review* (2010) 36(3) (forthcoming).

³¹ Dina Imam Supaat, “Escaping the Principle of Non-Refoulement”, *International Journal of Business, Economics and Law*, Vol. 2, Issue 3 (June) (86-97), pg. 88, (available at: <http://ijbel.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/Escaping-The-Principle-Of-Non-Refoulement-Dina-Imam-Supaat.pdf>).

³² Aditya Muharam, Respect the Principle of *Non-Refoulement*, *Jakarta Globe*, February 21, 2012, (available at: <http://jakartaglobe.beritasatu.com/archive/respect-the-principle-of-non-refoulement/>).

³³ *Ibid.*

Indonesia.³⁴ The right of asylum seekers to be protected is enshrined under the Indonesian Constitution. Article 28G paragraph 2 of the Constitution recognizes that everyone has the right to live with dignity and receive asylum protection from other countries.³⁵ This is echoed by Article 24 of People Consultative Assembly (MPR) Decree Number XVII Year 1998 (“MPR Decree 1998”) and Law Number 39 of 1999 regarding Human Rights (“Law on Human Rights”). More extensively, Law Number 37 of 1999 regarding Foreign Relations (“Foreign Relations Law”) governs not only the recognition of asylum seekers and refugees but also how the State can play more roles. Article 25 of this law explains that the discretionary power of the President to grant asylum protection to any foreign individuals, provided that he/ she consulted with relevant Minister(s).³⁶

Historically, Indonesian President has used this discretion when he permanently establish settlement for Vietnamese refugees who fled from the Vietnam War and host them in Galang Island in the period of 1979-1996.³⁷ Putting aside the controversial “prison-like” camps in Galang Island,³⁸ a lesson Indonesia should take is that it has once been willing to make such discretion. Article 26 of the law further enumerates that the granting of such status should be done in accordance with “applicable domestic law with respect to international laws, customs and general practices.”³⁹

If granting the status of refugees based on Presidential discretion seems too ambitious, Indonesia is still bound to its international obligation to protect asylum seekers. This international obligation stems from Indonesia’s ratification to the IC-CPR in 2005 through Law Number 12 of 2005 regarding the Ratification of International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The language of ICCPR applies inclusively to everyone, regardless of their status in a country.⁴⁰ This is in particular made explicit for the principle

³⁴ JRS Asia Pacific, *ibid.*, pg. 25.

³⁵ Translation of Article 28 G para. 2 reads: “each person has the right to be free from torture or inhuman and degrading treatment and shall be entitled to obtain political asylum from another country.”

³⁶ Article 25 paragraph (1) of Foreign Relations Law states that “the authority for granting asylum to foreign nationals is vested in the President and shall take into account the views of the Minister.”

³⁷ Dita Liliansa and Anbar Jayadi, *Ibid.*, pg. 334.

³⁸ Antje Missbach, “Waiting on the islands of ‘stuckedness’: managing asylum seekers in island detention camps in Indonesia; from the late 1970s to the early 2000s”, *ASEAS - Österreichische Zeitschrift für Südostasienwissenschaften* 6 (2013), 2, pp. 281-306, pg. 283 (available at: http://www.ssoar.info/ssoar/bitstream/handle/document/40154/ssoar-aseas-2013-2-missbach-Waiting_on_the_islands_of.pdf?sequence=1)

³⁹ Original text of Article 26 of Law Number 37 of 1999 reads as follows: “Pemberian suaka kepada orang asing dilaksanakan sesuai dengan peraturan perundang-undangan nasional serta dengan memperhatikan hukum, kebiasaan, dan praktek internasional.”

⁴⁰ S. Persaud, *Protecting Refugees and Asylum Seekers under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights*, UNHCR, New Issues in Refugee Research, No. 132, 2006, pg. 5-6; see also C. Harvey, Time for Reform? Refugees, Asylum-seekers and Protection under International Human Rights Law, *Refugee Survey Quarterly* 2014, 0, 1-17, pg. 50-51.

of *non-refoulement* and the protection from arbitrary detention. On the principle of *non-refoulement*, The Human Rights Committee'

General Comment stipulates that the Convention obliges States Parties to ensure the Covenant rights for "all persons in their territory" and "all persons under their control" not to be "extradite, deport, expel or otherwise remove a person from their territory, where there are substantial grounds for believing that there is a real risk of irreparable harm".⁴¹ The reference to "all persons in their territory" and "all persons under their control" is indiscriminative upon the status of a person in the country. Identical obligation is also served under CAT, which Indonesia ratified in 1998.

The right to liberty and protection from arbitrary detention noted an identical message. Article 9 of the Convention stipulates that, "everyone has the right to liberty and security of person..." and that "...no one shall be subjected to arbitrary arrest or detention." The Human Rights Committee, in its General Comment, explains that the term "everyone" in this Article includes,

"...among others, girls and boys, soldiers, persons with disabilities, lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons, aliens, refugees and asylum seekers, stateless persons, migrant workers, persons convicted of crime, and persons who have engaged in terrorist activity."

The Human Rights Committee (hereinafter, the "Committee") also extensively interpret the obligation of State not to arbitrarily detain refugees and asylum seekers. Article 9(1) of the ICCPR stipulates that "No one shall be subjected to arbitrary arrest or detention". Although detaining under the basis of immigration is not "*per se* arbitrary", it will become so if it is prolonged without clear justification.⁴² Particularly for "illegal migrants", their detention in the immigration centre is only justified "...for a brief initial period in order to document their entry, record their claims and determine their identity if it is in doubt".⁴³ The Committee further notes that the only reasons of prolonging their detention period while waiting for their claims to be processed, would only be due to the

⁴¹ UN Human Rights Committee ("HRC"), General Comment no. 31 [80], *The Nature of the General Legal Obligation Imposed on States Parties to the Covenant*, UN Doc. CCPR/C/21/Rev.1/Add.13, 26 May 2004, para. 12.

⁴² HRC, General Comment No. 35, para. 18: "*Detention in the course of proceedings for the control of immigration is not per se arbitrary, but the detention must be justified as reasonable, necessary and proportionate in the light of the circumstances and reassessed as it extends in time*"; Communication No. 560/1993, para 9.3; see also S. Persaud, *Protecting Refugees and Asylum Seekers under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights*, UNHCR, New Issues in Refugee Research, No. 132, 2006, pg. 18.

⁴³ HRC, General Comment No. 35, *Ibid.*, para. 18

“likelihood of absconding”, “a danger of crimes against others,” or “a risk of acts against national security”.⁴⁴

As long as they are detained, the Convention also ensures the fulfilment of their rights. The Committee interprets the Article of the Convention where people seeking for refuge or asylum seekers “...should be informed of their right to communicate with their consular authorities, or...with the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees”.⁴⁵ Ultimately, the Committee also noted that in the case of a stateless person entering the territory of a state, “the inability of a State party to carry out the expulsion of an individual because of statelessness or other obstacles does not justify indefinite detention”.⁴⁶ Unlike Law 6/2011 and DGI Directive 2010, the ICCPR ensures the right of a detainee to appeal.⁴⁷ Article 9 paragraph 4 states the following: “*Anyone who is deprived of his liberty by arrest or detention shall be entitled to take proceedings before a court, in order that that court may decide without delay on the lawfulness of his detention and order his release if the detention is not lawful.*”

Conclusion

Indonesia is bound under customary international law to protect anyone to be repelled back to his/ her homeland where persecution is feared (non-refoulement principle), regardless of its ratification status to the Refugee Conventions. It has recognized the status of asylum seekers and refugees under its Constitution, MPR Decree 1998, and Law on Human Rights. It further allow Presidential discretion in granting refugee status under the Foreign Relations Law, and this discretion has indeed been used in the past. Besides its national obligation, Indonesia also has an international obligation under the ICCPR and CAT. Under these treaties, the use of detention centres for asylum seekers are deemed irrelevant and prone to being arbitrary. Therefore, Indonesia should no longer use the “absence of legal framework” as an excuse to treat asylum seekers with little care. It should, also, no longer use the excuse that it has not ratified the Refugee Convention to continue the suffering of the thousands of asylum seekers in its territory.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, para. 58; *see also* Body of Principles for the Protection of All Persons under Any Form of Detention or Imprisonment, approved by the General Assembly in its resolution 43/173, principle 16 para. 2.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, para. 18.

⁴⁷ Article 9 (4) ICCPR reads as follows: “anyone who is deprived of his liberty by arrest or detention shall be entitled to take proceedings before a court, in order that that court may decide without delay on the lawfulness of his detention and order his release if the detention is not lawful.”

Instead, it should reflect on its existing laws and obligations to help asylum seekers in transit, making the best out of the already appalling situation.

References

Books and Journals

- Harvey, C. Time for Reform? Refugees, Asylum-seekers and Protection under International Human Rights Law. *Refugee Survey Quarterly* 2014, 0, 1–17.
- JRS Asia Pacific. “The Search: Protection Space in Malaysia, Thailand, Indonesia, Cambodia and the Philippines”. *JRS Asia Pacific* 2012. (Available at: <http://www.refworld.org/pdfid/506bfb622.pdf>).
- Liliansa, Dita and Anbar Jayadi. “Should Indonesia Accede to the 1951 Refugee Convention and its 1967 Protocol?”. *Indonesia LawReview* (2015) 3: 324-346.
- Menendez, Fernando M. Marino. “Recent Jurisprudence of the United Nations Committee against Torture and the International Protection of Refugees”, *Refugee Survey Quarterly* 2015, 0, 1-18.
- Missbach, Antje and Frieda Sinanu. “Life and Death in Immigration Detention, In-side Indonesia”. *Inside Indonesia July-September 2013*. (Available at: <http://www.insideindonesia.org/life-and-death-in-immigration-detention>).
- Missbach, Antje. “Waiting on the islands of ‘stuckedness’: managing asylum seek-ers in island detention camps in Indonesia; from the late 1970s to the early 2000s”, *ASEAS - Österreichische Zeitschrift für Südostasienwissenschaften* 6 (2013), 2, pp. 281-306. (Available at: http://www.ssoar.info/ssoar/bitstream/handle/document/40154/ssoar-aseas-2013-2-missbach-Waiting_on_the_islands_of.pdf?sequence=1)
- _____. “Essay: Transit Migrants in Indonesia between the Devil and the Deep Blue Sea”. *Pacific Geographies* #39, January/February 2013.
- Persaud, S. *Protecting Refugees and Asylum Seekers under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights*. UNHCR, New Issues in Refugee Research, No. 132, 2006.
- Supaat, Dina Imam. “Escaping the Principle of Non-Refoulement”. *International Journal of Business, Economics and Law*, Vol. 2, Issue 3 (June) (86-97). pg. 88, (available at: <http://ijbel.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/Escaping-The-Principle-Of-Non-Refoulement-Dina-Imam-Supaat.pdf>).
- Task Force Pemantauan RANHAM. *Evaluasi Pelaksanaan RANHAM 2004- 2009 dan Rencana Ratifikasi Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture (CAT) dalam RANHAM 2004-2009 dan Perencanaan RANHAM 2010-2014*. (Available at: <http://www.kemitraan.or.id/sites/default/files/20120809092409.Evaluasi%20Pelaksanaan%20RANHAM%202004-2009.pdf>)
- Taylor Savitri and Brynna Rafetti-Brown. “Difficult Journeys: Accessing Refugee

Protection in Indonesia”. *Monash University Law Review* (2010) 36(3).

UNHCR. Guidelines on the Applicable Criteria and Standards relating to the Detention of Asylum-Seekers and Alternatives to Detention (UNHCR, Detention Guidelines), 2012. (Available at: <http://www.refworld.org/docid/503489533b8.html>). *UNHCR Indonesia Fact Sheet* (February 2016). (Available at: <http://www.unhcr.org/50001bda9.pdf>).

Weissbrodt, David and Isabel Hortreiter. “The Principle of *Non-Refoulement*: Article 3 of the Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment in Comparison with the *Non-Refoulement* Provisions of Other International Human Rights Treaties”. *5 Buff. Hum. Rts. L. Rev. 1* (1999). (Available at http://scholarship.law.umn.edu/faculty_articles/362).

News Reports

Directorate General of Immigration. *The Jakarta Immigration Detention House Have Overcapacity of Asylum Seekers*. (Available at: <http://www.imigrasi.go.id/index.php/en/berita/berita-utama/842-the-jakarta-immigration-detention-house-has-overcapacity-of-asylum-seekers>).

Duxson, Sophie. Filling the Legal Gap, *Inside Indonesia Edition 124: April–June 2016*, (Available at: <http://www.insideindonesia.org/filling-the-legal-vacuum>).

Global Detention Project. *Indonesia Immigration Detention*. (Available at: <http://www.globaldetentionproject.org/countries/asia-pacific/indonesia>).

Human Rights Watch. *Barely Surviving: Detention, Abuse, and Neglect Migrant Children in Indonesia*. (Available at: <https://www.hrw.org/report/2013/06/23/barely-surviving/detention-abuse-and-neglect-migrant-children-indonesia>)