

**CHAPTER III**  
**THE HISTORY OF BOTTOM-UP CONFIDENCE BUILDING**  
**MEASURES (CBMs)**

The turbulence in Australia-Indonesia relations brought the biggest impact for Australia. As their interest was pretty much in danger, reengaging with Indonesia was urgently needed. To that extent, the role of bottom-up CBMs in which the mixture of CBMs and track two diplomacy can be a way to establish trust and confidence. However, since the government-to-government links were hardly to be re-established, the involvement of societies in conducting diplomacy might be an alternative to make the relations better.

**A. The Confidence Building Measures (CBMs)**

In the case of Australia involvement in supporting East Timor, the issues of trust became one of the sensitive issues that might put a strain in their relations. It made Canberra and Jakarta have to reengage one and another on the basis of special partnership in which the relations would be based on practicalities rather than sentiment. Trust is very crucial in securing states relationship due to misunderstanding might lead to the reduction of power and the failure in achieving national interest. Maintaining trust becomes the homework for both countries since trust cannot be forced and the loss of those aspects will be burden to conduct cooperation.

Buitargo argued that trust can be a trigger to ease tension, build more cooperative and peaceful relations.<sup>90</sup> The failure in achieving it, creates many obstacles that can be seen from the turbulence of Australia relations with Indonesia. Building trust between countries can also be achieved through the promotion of culture in order to foster stability and cooperation.<sup>91</sup> Thus, it can be said that the level of trust can alleviate the opportunity to solve conflict peacefully and combating the common enemies will be easier. To that extent, Australia should have an urgency to regain trust and confidence from Indonesia. CBMs can be one of the ways in fulfilling those goals. As stated by Krepon that CBMs become the bridge to build trust and confidence because of it is require less political intervention.<sup>92</sup>

The Confidence Building Measures (CBMs) started to be implemented after cold war. Desjardins once argued that “confidence-building measures (CBMs) are often described as the fastest growing business of the post-Cold War era”.<sup>93</sup> CBMs are most often discussed in the context of traditional security challenges and strategic cooperation. Before that, the origin of CBMs can be traced as a result of Conference of Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE).<sup>94</sup> CBMs were also

---

<sup>90</sup> Buitrargo, loc.cit..

<sup>91</sup> Ibid., pp. 743-745.

<sup>92</sup> M. Krepon, *Global Confidence Building: New tools for troubled regions*, Macmillan Press, Houndsmill, UK, 2000, pp. 1-9.

<sup>93</sup> M. Desjardins, *Rethinking Confidence-Building Measures*, The International Institute for Strategic Studies, London, 1996, p. 4.

<sup>94</sup> Organization For Security and Co-operation in Europe, ‘*OSCE Guide on Non-Military Confidence Building Measures (CBMs)*’, Organization For Security and Co-operation in Europe, Vienna, 2012, pp. 11-12, Accessed on 26 February 2017, < <http://www.osce.org/cpc/91082?download=true>>

written and stated in 1975 the Helsinki final act, 1986 Stockholm Document on Confidence and Security Building Measures (CSBMs) and 1990 Vienna document which explained the importance of CBMs in military aspects.<sup>95</sup> It has widely used because the purpose of CBMs can prevent misunderstanding in terms of security which becomes one of the ways to maintain state relations during the time of peace. Correspondingly, CBMs are also used as alternatives to improve relationship, increase positive intention and commitment and also avoid problem escalation”.<sup>96</sup>

Furthermore, Asada has described CBMs in the military context as being designed to provide reassurance about military intentions by demonstrating a nonaggressive and friendly posture.<sup>97</sup> While Noor claimed that CBMs, whether military or not, find a role to play in the process of easing the tensions between states by helping to change the mindset of general public and leadership.<sup>98</sup> CBMs are also considered as an instrument to prevent wars, bringing about arms control and disarmament agreements and facilitating conflict resolutions.<sup>99</sup> As Desjardins said that “if CBMs won’t work, [then] nothing else will”.<sup>100</sup> It shows since its

---

<sup>95</sup> Organization For Security and Co-operation in Europe, pp. 12-13.

<sup>96</sup> S.J.A.Mason & M. Siegfried, ‘Managing Peace Processes: Process related questions. A handbook for AU practitioners’, *African Union and the Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue*, Vol. 1, 2013, p. 57, Accessed on 23 February 2017, <[http://www.css.ethz.ch/content/dam/ethz/special-interest/gess/cis/center-for-securities-studies/pdfs/AU\\_Handbook\\_Confidence\\_Building\\_Measures.pdf](http://www.css.ethz.ch/content/dam/ethz/special-interest/gess/cis/center-for-securities-studies/pdfs/AU_Handbook_Confidence_Building_Measures.pdf)>

<sup>97</sup> M. Asada, ‘Confidence-Building Measures in East Asia: A Japanese Perspective’, *Asian Survey*, vol. 28, no. 5, p. 489.

<sup>98</sup> S. Noor, ‘Nuclear confidence-building measures and peace making in South Asia’, *Strategic Studies*, vol. 32, no. 2/3, p. 136.

<sup>99</sup> *Ibid.*, p.138.

<sup>100</sup> Desjardins, *op.cit.*, p.5.

implementations, CBMs became very important tools in solving disputes compared to any other method.

The activities of CBMs undertaken by states would be underlined as the actions to make sure that each understands the intentions of others. In most cases, this step is purposing to prevent misunderstanding which will be easily to occur during the conflict. The main benefits of CBMs can be examined through three objectives which are to prevent problem escalation, to initiate and deepen negotiations and lastly to consolidate the process and its outcome.<sup>101</sup> Another thing is, CBMs also have a function in reducing the chance to use military power in seeking solutions. Furthermore, CBMs will lead to the openness and transparency that can reduce the suspicion between countries. As times goes by, the continuations in using CBMs outside the military matters become something important. Known as non-military CBMs, it is regarded as a process taken during the cycle of conflict across the three dimensions of security such as political, economic, environmental, humanitarian assistance, social or cultural fields to increase transparency, level of trust and also confidence between disputes countries.<sup>102</sup>

In the case of Australia for supporting East Timor independence, the turbulence in its bilateral relations with Indonesia has shaped an urgency to repair the conditions. As mistrust and misunderstanding reduce the confidence of Indonesia to Australia, the purpose of CBMs to restore the conditions would be very crucial for Australia. As the pure CBMs became the implementation in seeking

---

<sup>101</sup> Mason & Siegfried, *op.cit.*, pp. 58-60.

<sup>102</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 59.

reengagement in military sector, the combination to other method was urgently needed. As mentioned above, that the implementation on CBMs only played in defence sector. The decision of Australia in reengaging Indonesia through its people might resulted a new approach that the practice of CBMs can also enlarge to another sector.

### **B. The Nature of Track Two Diplomacy**

Track two diplomacy has been famously used around 1970s aims to repair states bilateral relations. Track two refers to unofficial activities involving academics, think tank researchers, journalists and former officials as well as current officials participating in their private capacities.<sup>103</sup> Track two diplomacy also involves private citizens or groups of individuals sometimes called citizen diplomats or non-state actors.

Track two diplomacy has its genesis in 1981 article by US foreign Service officer Joseph Montville.<sup>104</sup> He differentiated “Track One” or official diplomacy, conducted by professional diplomats, and “Track Two Diplomacy”, which he defined as unofficial, informal interaction between members of adversarial groups or nations with the goals of developing strategies, influencing public opinion, and organising human and material resources in ways that might help resolve the conflict.<sup>105</sup> It makes track two as one of the method for conducting diplomacy in

---

<sup>103</sup> D. Ball, A. Milner & B. Taylor, ‘Track 2 Security Dialogue in the Asia-Pacific: Reflections and Future Directions’, *Asian Securiry*, Vol. 2, No. 3, 2006, p. 175.

<sup>104</sup> R. Fraser, ‘Track Two Diplomacy – A Distinct Conflict Intervention Category’, Master Dissertation, University of Victoria, Canada, 2012, p. 9.

<sup>105</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 9-11.

more flexible ways. The countries such as Australia is one of the most active countries in implementing track two diplomacy.

It can be shown from the actions of Australian ambassador John Burton in the mid-1960 that used track two diplomacy as a new method in settling problems with Singapore, Malaysia and Indonesia.<sup>106</sup> The initiation known as workshop method of mediation or facilitation typically by an impartial third party which Burton referred to as controlled communication.<sup>107</sup> Since then, the workshop model has become the classic approach to Track Two diplomacy. Track two diplomacy was also initiated by several scholars such as Ronald Fisher who argued the terms as interactive conflict resolution. He defined it as small-group, problem-solving discussions between unofficial representatives of identity groups or states engaged in destructive conflict that are facilitated by an impartial third party of social-scientist-practitioners.<sup>108</sup>

Under the Australian parliament decision, it has been argued that people-to-people basis actions is very important in regaining trust and confidence to Indonesia.<sup>109</sup> Track two diplomacy has brought the importance that society can be the third party in helping the improvement of state bilateral relations. As mentioned above, the CBMs should be combining with other concept to maximize the effort

---

<sup>106</sup> Ibid., pp. 15-17.

<sup>107</sup> Ibid., pp. 13-15.

<sup>108</sup> Ibid., pp. 20.

<sup>109</sup> Australia, Parliament, *People-to-people links & relationship building as part of Australia's public diplomacy*, Canberra, 2004, Accessed on 8 February 2017 <[http://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary\\_Business/Committees/Senate/Foreign\\_irs\\_Defence\\_and\\_Trade/Completed\\_inquiries/200407/public\\_diplomacy/report/ind](http://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary_Business/Committees/Senate/Foreign_irs_Defence_and_Trade/Completed_inquiries/200407/public_diplomacy/report/ind)>

of Australia in rebuilding the relations with Indonesia. The underlining of Australia's public diplomacy and its people to people links brought the fresh alternatives. Which can be said, through CBMs and track two diplomacy Australia would have a new strategy to repair the relations with Indonesia.

### **C. The Mixture of CBMs and Track Two Diplomacy Resulting the Terms "Bottom-up CBMs"**

As the implementation of CBMs itself is very general, the combination of CBMs and track two diplomacy result a unique mixture to repair countries relations. It has been argued that one of the characteristic of CBMs is multi-level implementation. It means that CBMs can be done bottom-up or top-down. The bottom-up is the combination of government and society at large while top-down only involve the society.<sup>110</sup> Under track two diplomacy, the role of CBMs can be more flexible. This combination known as bottom-up CBMs in which focus more on the implementation through the role of society. The evidence shows that the bottom-up CBMs would be more effective showing from the figure 3.1.

Apart from that, there are many forms in implementing bottom-up CBMs. Not only using people to people links but also keeping the role of government. In Australia's cases, their government role is implemented through the basis in giving humanitarian assistance. However, the extended practice on how to distribute the aid, should be built through society and also NGOs. The involvement of NGOs can

---

<sup>110</sup> Organization For Security and Co-operation in Europe, op.cit., p.18.

be an extended hand of government which the aid will be directly felt by the Indonesians.

To that extent, the combination of CBMs and track two diplomacy can be formulating as new approach known as bottom-up CBMs in which government effort can be running concurrently with the role of society. In this case, after Australia’s support for East-Timor Independence, Australia lost Indonesia’s trust. Indonesia has a lot of assumptions towards Australian actions in supporting East-Timor that would be a threat for the integrations of Indonesia. Such made suspicious occurred made it difficult to maintain good relationship. Thus, bottom-up CBMs became one of the last ways in repairing its relations especially after Australia’s changing position in the East Timor case. The implementation of bottom-up CBMs can possibly be conducted through foreign aid in health, humanitarian assistance, education and cultural exchange that would be done on people-to-people basis.

**Table 3.1:** Evidence on using bottom-up CBMs as solutions

| <b>Bottom-up CBMs as a conflict resolution</b> |   |
|--|---|
| <b>1960</b>                                    | “Ping-Pong” CBMs between China and U.S  |
| <b>1990</b>                                    | CBMs in Kenya applied in local, regional and national level                                     |
| <b>1991</b>                                    | CBMs in Western Sahara, addressing humanitarian concerns in the absence of a solution           |
| <b>2000</b>                                    | Belize and Guatemala: Multi-sector CBMs as a way of keeping small conflicts from escalating     |
| <b>2002</b>                                    | The Nuba Mountains Ceasefire Agreement of 2002, paving the way for the North South Negotiations |
|  | CBMs in the Sudan North-South process   |

Source: S.J.A. Mason & M. Siegfried, ‘Managing Peace Processes: Process related questions. A handbook for AU practitioners’, *African Union and the Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue*, Vol. 1, 2013, pp. 60-65.