



**International Convention on the  
Elimination of All Forms of Racial  
Discrimination**

Distr.: General  
23 August 2007  
English  
Original: French

---

COMMITTEE ON THE ELIMINATION OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

Seventy-first session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 1831st MEETING

Held at the Palais Wilson, Geneva,  
on Wednesday, 8 August 2007, at 3 p.m.

Chairperson: Mr. de GOUTTES

SUMMARY

CONSIDERATION OF REPORTS, COMMENTS AND INFORMATION  
SUBMITTED BY STATES PARTIES UNDER ARTICLE 9 OF THE  
CONVENTION (*continued*)

Initial, second and third periodic reports of Indonesia

---

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent *within one week of the date of this document* to the Official Records Editing Section, room E.4108, Palais des Nations, Geneva

Any corrections to the records of the public meetings of the Committee will be consolidated into a single corrigendum, to be issued shortly after the meeting.

*The meeting was called to order at 3:10 p.m..*

CONSIDERATION OF REPORTS, COMMENTS AND INFORMATION  
SUBMITTED BY STATES PARTIES UNDER ARTICLE 9 OF THE  
CONVENTION (agenda item 4) (*continued*)

Initial, second and third periodic reports of Indonesia (CERD/C/IDN/3; list of issues to be taken up and State party's written replies, documents without symbol distributed at the meeting in English only)

1. Ms. HARKRISNOWO (Indonesia) assured the Committee that the Indonesian delegation was filled with a whole-hearted spirit of cooperation on this historic occasion, that is, consideration of her country's initial, second and third periodic reports. She was convinced that Indonesia's dialogue with the Committee would help with the daunting challenge of the country's transformation, which was based on four pillars: democratization, economic recovery, respect and protection of human rights, decentralization.
2. All international observers were agreed that the parliamentary, presidential and local elections recently held had been free, democratic, peaceful and honest, which augured well for the democratization process. The 1999, 2000, 2001 and 2002 amendments to the Constitution had also established an effective balance between the executive, legislative and judicial branches. Similarly, a constitutional court had been created in 2003 and was playing an important role in the interpretation of the Constitution and giving Indonesians the opportunity to assess how consistently constitutional guarantees were followed in the implementation of laws and regulations at every level. In the context of legislative reform, the authorities had begun a comprehensive review of laws and regulations inconsistent with the spirit of the new Constitution or international human rights standards and had enacted new laws to strengthen respect for human rights and democracy, including the following three important laws: the Law on the Protection of Witness and the Law on Citizenship (2006), and the Law on Human Trafficking (early 2007).
3. The new citizenship law had abolished some old discriminatory provisions. While retaining the *jus sanguinis* principle, it allowed *jus soli* to be applied in certain cases, i.e. to children whose father or mother had Indonesian citizenship, whether the parents were married or not; children born in Indonesia, although the nationality of the father or mother was unclear; children born in Indonesia to foreign parents, where either the father or the mother had died before their marriage. In addition, children of mixed marriages could now have dual nationality until their eighteenth birthday or their marriage. The new law on citizenship was also a step forward for Indonesian women married to foreigners: they were now free to retain their Indonesian citizenship after marriage, which had previously been reserved for men, and their spouses could more easily obtain Indonesian citizenship after five consecutive years of residence in the country.
4. Indonesia had completed the process of ratifying the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, bringing to six the number of major international human rights instruments to which it was a party. It had also ratified the eight ILO conventions. It was working to strengthen the institutional and human capacity of the police, the prosecutor's office, the judiciary and its other public law enforcement agencies. No cases of flagrant human rights violations had been reported in Indonesia since 2004

and authorities were determined to maintain that record. It should be noted that maintaining a unitary state was a constant challenge in a country with 1,172 ethnic groups and subgroups; the diversity of geographic and demographic structures, sociocultural contexts, and levels of economic development among the various ethnic groups must not lead to conflict, separatism or marginalization.

5. In 2004, 125 million voters had turned out, at 575,000 polling stations throughout the archipelago's 6,000-odd islands, to elect the first President and Vice-President directly elected by the people in the country's history. Indonesia had become the third largest democracy in the world. Members of Parliament too were now directly elected, as were governors, district chiefs and other local authorities—this to enhance the regions' autonomy. Since June 2005, over 300 “pilkadas” (regional leaders) had been directly elected, through elections that had been conducted peacefully and with respect for democracy. The Central Government had shown complete neutrality in the elections and any parties dissatisfied with their results had been able to appeal to the courts. In an effort to decentralize government, autonomous regions could now manage their resources as they saw fit; governance and the provision of public services had thus been improved. The new law on regional autonomy, in 2004, recognized the needs and cultures of specific communities and ethnic groups and its implementation had given an increasing number of members of local communities a direct role in the conduct of public affairs, at the legislative and executive levels.

6. The unity of the nation had repeatedly been threatened but had in the end been preserved. The structure and form of the unitary state of the Republic of Indonesia, based on the five principles making up the national Pancasila ideology, namely belief in one God, a just and civilized humanism, national unity, consultative democracy and social justice, were appropriate. Though conflicts were inevitable in a society as heterogeneous and pluralistic as Indonesia's, protracted conflicts had devastating effects on the national process, all the more in a country that was also prone to natural disasters. The Government was therefore taking all possible measures to manage conflict and restore peace. civil society organizations were playing an important role: to educate the parties in conflict and to implement conflict resolution and training programmes in the affected areas. Security in areas like Aceh, Poso, Maluku and North Maluku was clearly improving.

7. Until 1996, the distinction between the native (“pribumi”) and non-native (“non-pribumi”) population had been well marked, a situation inherited from the colonial legislation of the former Dutch East Indies, under which the Indonesian population was divided into three: the European population, governed by laws derived from various European codes; the East Asian population, governed by the laws of their country of origin, except for trade and business, which were regulated by European law; and finally natives of the Indonesian islands, governed by indigenous laws. This highly discriminatory system put natives at the bottom of the social ladder, so that until 1970 they were in practice deprived of the protection and jurisdiction of Western courts. That historical context explained the reference in the 1945 Constitution to native and non-native Indonesians, the goal being to make non-natives full citizens. It was also worth noting that the term “non-pribumi” had generally been used to refer to Indonesians of Chinese origin but not those of another foreign origin, Arab or Indian for example. In 1998, in the name of equality and non-discrimination, the President had issued a decree prohibiting the use of “pribumi” and “non-pribumi”.

8. “Masyarakat adat” were clans or tribes still living according to their ancestral customs and cultures in some areas of the archipelago. These clans and tribes still retained the *hukum adat* (adat or customary law), which was primarily an oral law. Adat law was recognized by the authorities in some regions and was considered a source of law to the extent that it was compatible with national policy in force for the promotion and protection of all Indonesians’ human rights.

9. Mr. PILLAI (Rapporteur for Indonesia) was glad to observe that the State party had sent a large, high-level delegation, including representatives of the national human rights institution. He regretted, however, that the written replies had been received too late for him to look over them and that the report too had been submitted a little late. Though he recognized how arduous the task was for a state with so complex an ethnic makeup, he urged Indonesia in future to meet its obligations to submit reports on time and drew attention to the General Guidelines on the Form and Content of Reports (HRI/GEN/2/Rev.4). He further urged the Government to give NGOs and the national human rights institution an active role in the dialogue on which it was embarking with the Committee.

10. As for the report itself, Mr. Pillai found a number of positive aspects in it, including the recognition by the State party of its multiethnic population, Indonesia’s determination to combat discrimination and its willingness to promote development of the eastern region, the formulation of national plan of action in the field of human rights, to be implemented in a decentralized manner, the creation of a national human rights institution, and the abolition of the requirement to provide proof of citizenship imposed on Indonesians of Chinese origin.

11. On the issue of indigenous peoples, such as the Dayak mentioned in paragraph 105 of the report, Mr. Pillai noted a contradiction between paragraph 163, which stated that the “Water Institution” in Canada believed that Indonesia offered the best example of how to deal with indigenous people, and paragraph 64, which said that in reality, ensuring the survival of the indigenous people was proving to be a daunting task. He asked the delegation to give its opinion on the issue, especially as the President of the Republic had himself declared, on the occasion of the International Day of the World’s Indigenous People in 2006, that natural resource exploitation often trumped the rights of the country’s original inhabitants.

12. Mr. Pillai observed that there was a dilemma facing countries trying to maintain their demographic diversity without hampering evolution towards a unifying national identity. In that connection, he requested additional information on the work of the Working Group on Society Blending mentioned in paragraph 122 and how its activities had been received by the various population groups.

13. Welcoming the establishment by the State party of a decentralized governance system, Mr. Pillai noted with interest the initiatives taken by local institutions to combat discrimination based on race or ethnicity. He particularly welcomed the fact that the local governments of Batam, Semarang and Solo had removed proof of Indonesian citizenship from the documents required to obtain a bank loan, that the city of Bogor longer mentioned religion on ID cards, and that each Indonesian province had created an institution to implement the National Action Plan for Human Rights in its jurisdiction.

14. On Article 1 of the Convention, Mr. Pillai said that the State party should bring its Law No. 39 of 1999 on Human Rights in line with Article 1 of the Convention and to include, in particular, the prohibition of discrimination based on descent.

15. With regard to article 2 of the Convention, Mr. Pillai would be glad to see the State party describe, in its next periodic report, the legal framework it had established to eliminate racial discrimination and its policy in that regard, as well as the legislative, judicial and administrative measures it was taking to revise laws and promote better understanding among ethnic groups, the mechanisms for the follow-up of the Committee's concluding observations and such of its recommendations as might have been implemented by the State party, together with any special measures to advance disadvantaged communities and afford them equal opportunities. The delegation might also indicate whether the State party had established a national institution for human rights with specific responsibility for combating racial discrimination.

16. Mr. Pillai asked whether specific legislation had been enacted to implement Article 4 of the Convention and, if so, whether that legislation was effective. He asked whether complaints of any acts referred to in Article 4 of the Convention had been filed; if so, whether the perpetrators had been prosecuted; and finally, what sentences had been imposed in such cases.

17. The Rapporteur for Indonesia echoed the concerns expressed by some civil society organizations with respect to the operation of the *Komnas Ham*, i.e., the oldest national human rights institution in the region, as well as the human rights courts. It would appear that no Indonesian law laid down penalties for persons guilty of acts of discrimination. Similarly, the legal procedures prescribed by Law No. 26 of 2000 on the Human Rights Court were inadequate in that they applied only to gross human rights violations, including genocide and crimes against humanity. Moreover, it was the responsibility of the Attorney General—not the *Komnas Ham*—to decide whether or not further investigation and prosecution would be pursued. Mr. Pillai would appreciate further information on that subject.

18. With regard to Article 4 of the Convention, Mr. Pillai would also appreciate receiving additional information on the results of investigations into reputed acts of violence against Indonesians of Chinese origin and on the actual implementation of the law on Indonesian citizenship, as amended in July 2006.

19. Regarding the implementation of Article 5 of the Convention, Mr. Pillai was glad to see that Article 28 D(3) of the Constitution provided that every citizen was entitled to equal opportunity in the conduct of public affairs, but believed that equal opportunity was possible only if the various population groups enjoyed the same level of autonomy; consequently, he urged the development of special measures for disadvantaged groups, particularly in the field of education, health and employment. He asked whether the Indonesian Government had set targets for the enjoyment of the various rights and whether it meant to implement projects aimed at advancing the most disadvantaged groups and so enabling them to achieve those objectives.

20. Some reliable reports had it that the city of Bogor still required religion to be mentioned on ID cards, contrary to what was stated in paragraph 111 of the report. Mr. Pillai asked the delegation to confirm or deny those reports, for if they were true, indigenous peoples with their traditional religion and persons practising a religion other than the five official ones were victims of discriminatory treatment.

21. Mr. Pillai would like to know if the abolition of the requirement of proof of Indonesian citizenship was only for bank loan applications or applied to all situations where Indonesians of Chinese origin had been required to show proof of citizenship.

22. Mr. Pillai would like the State party to provide detailed information on the social consequences of Indonesia's transmigration programme for indigenous peoples, particularly the Kubu Rimba, noting that the purpose of that programme was to transfer some 5 million people from the overcrowded islands of Java and Bali to the tribal lands of Papua. The expert would also like some information on the land claims of the Denai community of northern Sumatra and the Karonsi'e Dongi indigenous community of South Sulawesi, as well as on the situation of the Dayak, who were about to lose almost all their ancestral lands due to development of large palm oil plantations in Kalimantan.

23. Regarding the implementation of Article 6 of the Convention, Mr. Pillai asked for information on the comprehensive study conducted by the Working Committee on Evaluating Discriminative Laws and Regulations established by the National Commission of Human Rights and referred to in paragraph 158 of the report. Had the fact that the staff of the Commission of Human Rights were now accountable to the Government rather than the said Commission not reduced the independence the Commission should enjoy under the Paris Principles? Had the Indonesians of Chinese ancestry who had been victims of rape and killing during the May 1998 riots referred to in paragraph 150 of the report received compensation as required by Law No. 26 of 2000 on the Human Rights Court? And had the perpetrators been brought to justice?

24. Regarding the implementation of Article 7 of the Convention, Mr. Pillai would appreciate information on education human rights programmes for civil servants—which could put an end to the impunity some of them had enjoyed and the serious mistakes which, according to reports by some NGOs, they had committed. Citing paragraph 170 of the report, Mr. Pillai asked what were the very innovative ways the Indonesian Government had found to let all ethnic groups feel they lived in safety and were treated equitably, without discrimination.

25. Mr. AVTONOMOV asked whether the State party was considering making the declaration called for in Article 14 of the Convention. He would also like to know how the human rights courts operated, how their decisions were implemented and in particular whether they could be quashed by other courts.

26. Mr. Avtonomov would also like to know the status of the conflict between the Dayak and Madura peoples in West and Central Kalimantan and whether the Indonesian Government meant to take steps to prevent conflicts of that kind from breaking out in Indonesia in the future.

27. Mr. VALENCIA RODRÍGUEZ took it that the list of major ethnic groups in Table 1 of the report also covered the indigenous groups. He asked whether the regulations for the protection of indigenous people mentioned in paragraph 62 of the report also applied to the descendants of the primitive tribes of the Indonesian archipelago. What was these people's status in terms of health, education, employment and housing?

28. Mr. Valencia Rodríguez would be glad if the delegation would give the Committee further information on the protection and special treatment the

Indonesian Government was giving the remote communities in 27 of the 33 provinces, among other things by providing housing, as referred to in paragraph 63 of the report.

29. The expert asked what the functions of the Ombudsman (*Defensor del Pueblo*) were; whether he or she was empowered to receive and investigate individuals' complaints of racial discrimination, and whether such cases in fact been referred to the Ombudsman.

30. Expressing satisfaction that particular attention had been paid to the training of police, prison staff, lawyers, judges, teachers, the military and other officials in the Plan of Action for the implementation of the Decade, Mr. Valencia Rodríguez thought it would be useful if, in future, the principles enshrined in the Convention were disseminated through training of that type, in particular for vulnerable groups. Referring to paragraph 84 of the report, he also saw it as appropriate for the delegation to describe the NGO-supported programmes to promote the rights of minorities.

31. Mr. Valencia Rodríguez requested additional information on Presidential Decree No. 40 of 2004 on the National Plan of Action on Human Rights, which was particularly concerned with the priority given by the government to the promotion and protection of human rights, including the abolition of racism and racial discrimination, and on the practical results of the Plan.

32. Reading in paragraph 102 of the report that the Government was reviewing all existing laws to ensure their compliance with the principle of non-discrimination enshrined in Article 281 of the Constitution, he asked what were the main reforms to the legislation had been.

33. Then, referring to paragraphs 105, 112 to 114 and 168 et seq. of the report, he noted that there were ethnic tensions and racial discrimination, much of which had religious implications. He felt, therefore, that it would be desirable for the authorities to make sure the Convention was implemented and for the State party to continue to inform the Committee of the measures taken to remedy the problems referred to.

34. Noting that banks often asked loan applicants for a certificate of Indonesian citizenship, he asked what the difference was between that certificate and the ID card, and who was required to obtain one or the other.

35. With regard to Article 3 of the Convention, paragraph 121 said that a Presidential decree had been issued stating that Chinese religious activities, beliefs and traditions could be engaged in without special permit from the government. One might therefore conclude that such had not been the case previously; and that raised the question of whether only Chinese traditions and religion were covered by these permits or if other religions were too. An overview of the current situation in that regard would be welcome.

36. Mr. Valencia Rodríguez recalled that Article 3 also applied to cases of racial segregation occurring in urban areas with high concentrations of people from ethnic groups, and asked whether that was seen in the State party.

37. Regarding the implementation of Article 4 of the Convention, Mr. Valencia Rodríguez requested more information on the scope of Law No. 26 of 2000 on the Human Rights Court and of Law No. 39 of 1999 on Human Rights. The

expert considered that the main provisions of Article 4(a) of the Convention were being complied with, but that the information relating to the implementation of paragraph *b* was inadequate. Finally, he asked the delegation to indicate how the provisions of Law No. 37 of 1999 on Foreign Relations, and particularly those of Chapter V on Protection for the Citizens of the Republic of Indonesia abroad, were implemented, and whether the State party was receiving international assistance therewith.

38. Mr. THORNBERRY requested information on the status and rights of indigenous peoples in Indonesia. Reading in paragraph 155 that the State party had decided not to use the terms “indigenous” and “non-indigenous”, he asked what designation was used for ancestral communities. He also drew the delegation’s attention to the ILO Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention, No. 169, which gave valuable guidance on that point. Noting that according to the report, several development projects had been implemented in the interests of the nation, he would like to know how the interests of the indigenous peoples were catered for and pointed out that in paragraph 4(c) of its General Recommendation XXIII on indigenous rights, the Committee had urged States parties to provide indigenous peoples with a suitable environment for sustainable economic and social development, consistent with their cultural characteristics. Mr. Thornberry asked about religions not officially recognized, and in particular on the consequences of non-recognition for practitioners. Furthermore, he asked whether Indonesia had enacted the laws mentioned in paragraph 62 of the report to improve the protection and treatment of all ethnic groups. He requested an explanation of the ethnic conflicts related to land title, customary traditions and ancestral lands. Regarding the logging being done in certain areas, he asked whether the indigenous peoples concerned had been consulted, in particular to obtain their consent. He drew the Committee’s attention to paragraph 5 of its own General Recommendation XXIII calling on States parties to recognize and protect indigenous peoples’ right to own, develop, control and use their lands, resources and communal territories.

39. Mr. LINDGREN ALVES, noting that there were six officially recognized religions and that religion was part of the founding principles of the State, asked whether Indonesia considered itself a religious or a secular state and whether any person was free to proclaim his or her atheism. He was surprised to read in paragraph 90 of the report that “there is no discrimination [...] since the national law guarantees the elimination of discrimination”; he observed that the fact that discrimination was outlawed hardly meant that none existed. Finally, he asked if Indonesia was having any success in imposing a single official working language, namely “Bahasa Indonesia”, while 500 languages and dialects were spoken across the country.

40. Mr. KJAERUM asked what the first results had been of the National Plan of Action for Human Rights for 2004 to 2009, and in particular what measures were being taken to combat racial discrimination. He also asked what the results had been of the research studies mentioned in paragraph 85 and what steps had been taken. He was glad of the enactment of Law No. 39 of 1999 on Human Rights and asked whether its provisions had been invoked in court and penalties imposed. He asked whether the alleged victims of human rights violations could obtain legal aid for their court cases and whether some had been compensated for the violation of their fundamental rights.



41. Mr. Kjaerum spoke of the laws discriminating against ethnic Chinese Indonesians that had been adopted between 1959 and 1998. Though the Government was seeking to revise and abolish them, it seemed many were still in force. The delegation was invited to provide explanations on that point. Noting, in paragraph 143 of the report, that the Government had enacted Law No. 40 of 2004 on the Social Security System, which guaranteed all citizens the satisfaction of many basic needs, he asked how non-citizens, and in particular refugees, were affected. In that connection, he asked why Indonesia was one of the few countries that had still not ratified the 1951 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees and the Protocol thereto. He drew the delegation's attention to General Recommendation XXX on discrimination against non-citizens.

42. Mr. CALI TZAY asked which of the 500 languages found in Indonesia were spoken languages only and which had written forms that could be taught in school. He also asked about the ethnic composition of the armed forces and police. He asked for details on the minorities referred to in paragraph 84 of the report. He asked why the State party had decided not to use the terms "indigenous" and "non-indigenous" and would like its assurance that that decision was not part of a policy of homogenizing the population. Reading in paragraph 163 that it could not be that denied that some local or international groups had used the issue of indigenous people as a pretext to criticize the Government, Mr. Cali Tzay asked what the burden of those criticisms had been. He would like to learn more about the events in Kalimantan in 1994 (para. 171 of the report), and in particular about the groups referred to, namely the Dayak and Madura. Finally, he asked what the representative of Indonesia had meant when, in her introductory statement, she spoke of "inevitable conflict". Was she referring to conflicts related to cultural or ethnic issues?

43. Mr. TANG Chengyuan noted that, according to the initial examination, there was no discrimination in Indonesia, be it direct or indirect, extreme or ordinary (para. 90) and that the country had no legal definition of racial discrimination. He recalled in that connection that the fact that the law did not codify racial discrimination did not mean that such acts were not committed, especially as the report itself mentioned the problems posed by the Islamist Ahmadiyah faction (para.114). He wanted to know the findings of the team appointed by the President to investigate the May 1998 riots, which had involved acts of racial discrimination against persons of Chinese origin (para. 150).

44. Mr. Tang Chengyuan welcomed the fact that the Government had undertaken to review all existing laws to ensure their compliance with the principle of non-discrimination and that on 17 January 2002, by presidential decree, the Government had revoked Presidential Instruction No. 14 of 1967 on Chinese religion, beliefs and traditions (para.102). However, he wished to know what the practical consequences of that measure had been in the Indonesian provinces.

45. The expert was surprised at the stipulation in Presidential Instruction No. 26 of 1998 that the terms "indigenous" and "non-indigenous" not be used (para.155), even though the report itself indicated that there were regulations to protect indigenous people and several bills were under consideration to improve the protection and treatment of all ethnic groups (para. 62). He asked the delegation to define precisely the concepts of "indigenous" and "ethnic group".

46. Mr. YUTZIS said that the report's undifferentiated references to either ethnic groups (para. 27), indigenous people (para. 62) or traditional communities (para. 62) were confusing; accordingly, he would like to know what criteria the State party used to define membership in those various entities. Noting that Table 1 contained an impressive list of ethnic minorities, he asked whether indigenous groups and traditional communities were listed.

47. Mr. Yutzis did not understand what was meant by paragraph 64 of the report under consideration, which states: "Article 28(1) of the 1945 Constitution guarantees full respect for the rights [of] indigenous people. However, in reality, ensuring the survival of the indigenous people is [proving] to be a daunting task. The indigenous people live dependent on nature, not by social contract." He asked the delegation to clarify the expression "dependent on nature". Did that mean the Government took the view that peoples dependent on nature did not have their own socio-political structure? And in particular, how could the Indonesian authorities provide protection for people that had not entered into a social contract with the rest of society?

48. He noted that the report contained no information on migrant workers' rights or on the measures taken to ensure the protection of refugees, especially children; information on those points would be welcome.

49. In addition, Mr. Yutzis wanted to know whether Islam, Protestantism, Catholicism, Hinduism and Buddhism were formally and legally recognized "major religious denominations" (para. 28). If so, he felt it would be valuable to obtain clarification of the legal status of other religious beliefs, including traditional indigenous religions.

50. Mr. AMIR asked the delegation whether measures had been taken by the Government to counter the effects of the disaster caused by the tsunami of December 2005, in particular by providing housing and employment assistance to victims and their families.

51. Mr. Amir would also like to know whether the delegation considered the provisions of the Penal Code effective in combating sex tourism and paedophilia and providing fitting punishment for such practices.

52. Recalling that it was the former Dutch colonizers that had established the now flourishing rubber industry, the expert asked whether the peasants living on forest lands that had subsequently been appropriated for industrial purposes had been properly compensated upon expropriation or had received other land as compensation.

53. The CHAIRPERSON, speaking as an expert, expressed surprise at the statements in the periodic report under review to the effect that there was no racial discrimination in Indonesia (paras.90 and 138), whereas the risk of ethnic conflict was unavoidable in a multiethnic and multicultural nation such as Indonesia. He noted, in that connection, that the report mentioned a number of past ethnic clashes in the country, in particular in 1994 in Palangkaraya, Central Kalimantan, between the indigenous population and migrants from the eastern part of Java, and added that there had been casualties on both sides (para. 168).

54. Mr. de Gouttes recalled that Committee members did not necessarily consider the absence of reported cases or complaints of racial discrimination a positive

indicator, for it could actually reflect citizens' inadequate awareness of their rights, victims' fear of reprisals or citizens' mistrust of the effectiveness of law enforcement and justice.

55. The Chairperson noted with satisfaction that many discriminatory laws had been repealed, such as the one relating to Chinese religion, beliefs and traditions (para. 102) and the Ministerial Decree of 18 November 1978 on inclusion of a religion column on ID cards. He was glad to note, too, that the Presidential Instruction of 1998 had eliminated the need for loan applicants to prove their Indonesian citizenship to the bank (para. 109).

56. Noting with interest that the National Commission of Human Rights had established a Working Committee against discrimination (para. 158), the expert wished to receive clarification on the nature of the Committee's work.

57. Mr. EWOMSAN noted that according to the initial report under review (para. 168 and 169), local authorities had been obliged for a time, following the 1994 conflict in Palangkaraya, Central Kalimantan, to separate the indigenous population and migrants from the eastern part of Java. He asked whether the local authorities referred to were decentralized State administrative authorities or indigenous authorities.

58. Ms. HARKRISNOWO (Indonesia) said that her delegation would reply to the numerous questions raised by Committee experts at the next meeting.

*The meeting rose at 5:50 p.m.*