
COMPARISON OF OPERATION TRIKORA AND DWIKORA IN THE CONTEXT OF WAR RULES

Benedictus Benny Koessetianto¹, Hari Prasetyo²

Universitas Pertahanan Indonesia, Jawa Barat, Indonesia

benedictus.benny@doktoral.idu.ac.id¹, hari.prasetyo@doktoral.idu.ac.id²

ABSTRACT

This study explores the fundamental differences in the approach and application of the rules of war between Operations Trikora and Dwikora, two significant milestones in Indonesian history related to the defense of national sovereignty and territorial integrity. Operation Trikora was a military campaign against Dutch efforts to seize the territory of West Irian, demonstrating Indonesia's commitment to asserting its claim over Papua and achieving unification with the homeland. Dwikora, on the other hand, was a confrontation with Malaysia that began in 1963, aiming to strengthen national identity and defend sovereignty. The research employs descriptive qualitative analysis, supported by literature reviews, scientific journals, anecdotes, relevant documents, and theoretical frameworks. Through this approach, the study highlights how differences in the rules of war between Trikora and Dwikora reflect each conflict's distinct historical and strategic contexts and their impact on how Indonesia defended its sovereignty and territorial integrity. The findings offer insights into the dynamics of war and diplomacy in Indonesian history and their implications for the development of nationalism and foreign policy. The study concludes that understanding these differences is crucial for appreciating the complexities of war and diplomacy in the context of Indonesian history and its influence on the country's national identity and foreign policy. The analysis provides valuable knowledge that can guide future research and policymaking in related areas.

Keywords: Operation Trikora, Operation Dwikora, Rules of War, Diplomacy, Populist Factors, Conflict Resolution.

Corresponding Author: Benedictus Benny Koessetianto

E-mail: benedictus.benny@doktoral.idu.ac.id



INTRODUCTION

Operations Trikora and Dwikora are two important milestones in Indonesian history closely related to the defence of the country's sovereignty and integrity. Operation Trikora, initiated by President Soekarno in 1961, responded to the Dutch attempt to retain Nederlands Nieuw Guinea or West Irian as its colony (P. S. J. F. Kennedy, 2017). The initiative signalled Indonesia's commitment to assert its claim to West Irian and fight for its unification with the rest of the region (Hartono, 2017). This operation marked an important moment in Indonesia's diplomatic and political struggle on the international stage.

Meanwhile, Operation Dwikora was a confrontation with Malaysia that began in 1963 and was initiated by President Soekarno (Irshanto, 2019). This conflict arose as part of an effort to strengthen Indonesia's national identity and defend the country's sovereignty. Dwikora was not only a war between two neighboring countries, an arena for the involvement of other powers (Britain and Australia), and a foreign policy gamble, but it also galvanized the spirit of nationalism in domestic political competition. This initiative united the Indonesian people to support a greater national goal, strengthening unity amidst regional and global challenges.

Both operations reflect the spirit and determination of the Indonesian people to deal with threats to their sovereignty and territorial integrity. Trikora and Dwikora also demonstrated Indonesia's ability to play an active role in regional and international politics (P. S. J. Kennedy, 2017). Trikora and Dwikora are important events in Indonesian history and symbols of struggle that inspire later generations to continue fighting for the country's integrity and honour.

The study addresses critical theoretical and practical problems related to the application of the rules of war in different historical and strategic contexts, emphasizing the challenges of adapting international law to complex conflict situations. It explores how populist factors and leadership dynamics influence foreign policy and military strategy, underscoring the importance of understanding the interplay between public opinion and national security decisions. Additionally, the research examines the impact of colonialism and imperialism on national identity and foreign policy, highlighting the ongoing relevance of historical legacies in shaping contemporary international relations.

The practical implications of the study involve the need for nuanced approaches to understanding the historical and strategic contexts of conflicts, accounting for the challenges of applying theoretical frameworks to real-world scenarios. It stresses the significance of considering the influence of leadership and public opinion on shaping foreign policy and military strategy, particularly the role of populist factors. The study also underscores the continued impact of historical legacies on international relations, calling for a comprehensive understanding of historical contexts to navigate contemporary conflicts effectively.

METHOD

The research employed a descriptive qualitative analysis method, as outlined by (Lambert & Lambert, 2012), to examine the Indonesian struggle to reclaim West Irian from Dutch rule. This approach involved the careful analysis of historical facts and events surrounding the conflict, providing an in-depth look at Indonesia's efforts to assert its sovereignty over the region. By focusing on the narratives from this period, the study offers a comprehensive view of the complexities of the conflict and Indonesia's strategic responses.

The analysis was further supported by an extensive review of literature, including national and international scientific journals and relevant documents. These sources and theoretical and juridical perspectives referenced by (Hanschel et al., 2022) provided a solid foundation for the journal's writing and analysis. This comprehensive approach enabled the research to draw meaningful conclusions about Indonesia's historical struggles and the broader implications for its national identity and foreign policy.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Definition and Background of Operation Trikora

Tri Komando Rakyat (Trikora) was a military operation launched by President Soekarno on December 19, 1961, in Yogyakarta in response to the unresolved issue of West Irian, which the Dutch controlled. Based on the Round Table Conference (RTC) decision in 1949, West Irian was to be handed over to Indonesia one year after the conference. However, until 1961, the territory was never handed over. After Indonesia's independence, West Irian was the last region under Dutch colonial rule. Under President Soekarno's leadership, the Indonesian government demanded that the Netherlands hand over West Irian to Indonesia to realize the concept of "one Indonesia" that

was fully independent and sovereign. Thus, the main objective of Trikora was to reclaim West Irian (now Papua) from the Netherlands and ensure that the region was integrated into the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia (NKRI) (Hari Purwanto, 2021); (Kurnia & Miftahuddin, 2019).

This operation had three main orders: thwarting the formation of a puppet state of Papua by the Dutch, raising the Red and White in West Irian and preparing for general mobilization to defend independence; preparing the military to face the Dutch; and increasing domestic production to support military operations. Operation Trikora manifested Indonesia's aggressive and principled anti-colonialist foreign policy, showing Indonesia's firmness in fighting for its territorial sovereignty. (Hartono, 2017).

Definition and Background of Operation Dwikora

Dwi Komando Rakyat (Dwikora) was an operation announced by President Soekarno on May 3, 1964, in response to forming the Federation of Malaysia. The main objective of Dwikora was to oppose the formation of the Federation of Malaysia consisting of Malaya, Singapore, Sarawak, and Sabah, which Indonesia considered a neocolonialism project by Britain. Dwikora had two main commands: to mobilize the Indonesian military and people to prepare for potential aggression and to support the struggle of the people of Malaysia, Singapore, Sarawak, and Sabah against the formation of the Malaysian Federation (Irshanto, 2019).

The background of Dwikora is closely related to the relationship between Indonesia and Malaysia, which has experienced ups and downs since Malaysia became independent from Britain on August 31, 1957. The relationship between the two countries was initially good and marked by the signing of a friendship treaty on April 17, 1959. However, the relationship began to suffer mainly due to the different political ideologies practised by the two countries. Tensions increased when Tunku Abdul Rahman, the Prime Minister of Malaysia, attempted to form a Malaysian Federation that included Malaya, Singapore, Sarawak and Sabah, which was declared on September 16, 1963. Indonesia strongly opposed the formation of this federation and withdrew its ambassador from Malaysia on January 30, 1963. Indonesia also withdrew from UN membership in January 1965 due to Malaysia's acceptance as a non-permanent member of the UN Security Council. The confrontation between Indonesia and Malaysia lasted from January 20, 1963, when Indonesian Foreign Minister Soebandrio announced a hostile stance with Malaysia until the peace agreement of August 11, 1966. The armistice took place on February 11, 1963 and was followed by the announcement of Dwikora by President Soekarno on May 3, 1964 (Irshanto, 2019).

The Difference between Operation Trikora and Dwikora in the Perspective of the Theory of the Rules of War

The rules of war theory include principles and norms that govern behavior in armed conflicts, including war. Clear war aims, the conduct of war, and the dignified end of the war are important aspects of this theory, which aims to limit the impact of war on soldiers and civilians and ensure that actions in war are conducted ethically and morally.

A clear war aim is often associated with the concept of *jus ad bellum*, one of the main pillars of just war theory. This concept emphasizes that war can only be justified if it meets certain criteria, such as a just cause for war, war as a last resort, and proportionality in the use of force.

The rules of war, or *jus in bello*, govern how armed conflicts should be conducted. They emphasize the importance of distinguishing between combatants and non-combatants and prohibiting the use of unnecessary or cruel force against those not engaged in combat. This principle

also includes prohibitions against the use of weapons that cause unnecessary suffering or do not distinguish between military and civilian targets.

The dignified end to war, or *jus post bellum*, encompasses principles that apply after a war has ended, including just peace agreements, rehabilitation for war victims, and efforts to rebuild conflict-affected communities. This principle ensures that the peace achieved after an armed conflict is sustainable and just for all parties involved.

In addition, the ethics of war also provide guidance on how armed conflict should be conducted, including the treatment of prisoners of war and the protection of non-combatants. They emphasize the importance of treating prisoners of war well and protecting the environment (Basyar, 2020).

The rules of war are also set out in international humanitarian law, which includes conventions such as the Geneva Conventions, which aim to protect those who are not participating or have ceased to participate in combat and limit the permissible methods and means of warfare (Mahfud, 2020); (Awoah, 2016); (Antouw, 2020).

The following is a table of the differences between Operation Trikora and Dwikora from the perspective of the Theory of War that shows the differences between the two operations based on the four aspects mentioned. Operation Dwikora and Operation Trikora had different objectives and methods. However, both were carried out in the same context of opposing colonialism and imperialism.

**Table 1. Differences between Operation Trikora and Dwikora
in the Perspective of the Rules of War Theory.**

Aspects	Operation Dwikora	Operation Trikora
Purpose of War	1. Operation Dwikora was implemented in response to the formation of the Federation of Malaysia, which the British considered a form of neocolonialism. The rules of war applied included military, political and diplomatic aspects to show rejection of the formation of the Federation of Malaysia. 2. The purpose of Operation Dwikora was to oppose the formation of the Federation of Malaysia and show resistance to imperialism and colonialism.	1. Operation Trikora was implemented to thwart the Dutch East Indies government in maintaining power in West Irian and ensure the region's unification with Indonesia. The rules of war applied focused on liberating the territory from the rule of the action and national unification. 2. The goal of Operation Trikora was to thwart the creation of a puppet state of Papua by the Netherlands and unite West Irian with Indonesia.
War Procedures	Operation Dwikora involved the infiltration of guerrilla forces into Malaysian territory in North Kalimantan and an international campaign against the formation of the Federation of Malaysia.	Operation Trikora involved military education (mobilization), the use of warships for transporting troops, tanks, and logistics, and military action against the Dutch.
A Dignified End to the War	Operation Dwikora ended without achieving its main objectives after the political changes in Indonesia with the fall of President Soekarno and Suharto's rise to power.	Operation Trikora succeeded in handing over West Irian to Indonesia through the New York Agreement in 1962, followed by the Act of Free Choice in 1969.

Source: Processed by the author

Political Influence and Populist Factors of President Soekarno in Confrontation with Malaysia in Operation Dwikora

In addition to the differences between Operation Trikora and Dwikora in the Rules of War Theory perspective, other factors distinguish between Operation Trikora and Dwikora. In Operation Dwikora, there was President Soekarno's populist factor. President Soekarno, as a charismatic leader and an accomplished orator, did have a significant ability to mobilize popular support through his uplifting speeches. In the context of Operation Dwikora, this ability became very important. Operation Dwikora was launched in response to the formation of the Federation of Malaysia in 1963, which Indonesia saw as a neocolonialist attempt by Britain, with the support of other Commonwealth countries, to maintain their influence in the Southeast Asian region.

The political influence in the confrontation with Malaysia during Operation Dwikora was significant, as this confrontation was triggered by Indonesia's foreign policy, which was influenced by President Soekarno's ideology of anti-colonialism and anti-imperialism. In the context of foreign policy, Indonesia then adopted a "Free and Active" policy, which meant that Indonesia did not want to be tied to any bloc during the Cold War. However, Britain's formation of the Federation of Malaysia was perceived as an attempt to maintain its influence in Southeast Asia, which contradicted Indonesia's anti-colonialism principles. Therefore, President Soekarno launched Operation Dwikora to oppose the formation of the Federation of Malaysia, which was considered a form of neo-colonialism (Kusmayadi, 2017).

The populist factor in Soekarno's leadership was evident in how he communicated the purpose and rationale behind Operation Dwikora to the Indonesian people. Through his speeches, Soekarno managed to evoke a sense of nationalism and awareness of the importance of national sovereignty and integrity. In addition, Soekarno also utilized existing political and social organizational structures to spread ideas and mobilize support. For example, through organizations with nationalist and anti-imperialist ideologies, he invited various groups of people to support the government's foreign policy (Widariyanti, 2022).

Using mass media and public speeches, Soekarno garnered widespread support from various layers of Indonesian society. This support was important for the legitimization of Operation Dwikora in the eyes of the Indonesian people. It boosted the morale of the soldiers and individuals directly involved in the operation (Irshanto, 2019). This populist factor, rooted in Soekarno's ability to communicate and build emotional connections with his people, became one of the key aspects that distinguished his leadership and strengthened Indonesia's position in the international arena during the confrontation with Malaysia.

Consistency in the Implementation of the Rules of War in Trikora and Dwikora

Several aspects, including the objectives of the operation, the tactics used, and respect for international humanitarian law, can be used to compare the consistency of the implementation of the rules of war in Operation Trikora and Dwikora.

Operation Trikora

Operation Trikora was launched with the main objective of thwarting the establishment of a puppet state of Papua by the Netherlands and ensuring the integration of West Irian into Indonesian territory. Indonesia undertook a massive military mobilization in this operation, including deploying troops and military equipment to the conflict area. Despite intensive military preparations, a large-scale armed confrontation was avoided thanks to the intervention of the

United Nations and the signing of the New York Agreement, which allowed for conflict resolution through international mechanisms (Suryawan, 2019).

Operation Dwikora

Meanwhile, Operation Dwikora was a response to forming the Federation of Malaysia (Haidah, 2023). In this operation, Indonesia carried out a series of actions known as Confrontation, which included infiltration and sabotage against Malaysia. The tactics used tended to be guerrilla and not always overt, which raises questions about consistency with the rules of war, especially in terms of identifying troops and protecting civilians.

Comparison of Consistency of Implementation of the Rules of War

In the context of the rules of war, the two operations have differences in terms of implementation, which are presented in the following table:

**Table 2. Comparison of Consistency Implementation Rules
The War Between Operation Trikora and Dwikora**

Aspects	Operation Dwikora	Operation Trikora
Objectives and Tactics	Dwikora was more military with guerrilla tactics and confrontation with Malaysia.	Trikora focused more on the political and diplomatic goal of integrating West Irian.
Respect for International Humanitarian Law	In Dwikora, there were reports of actions that may not have been fully compliant with international humanitarian law, such as infiltration and sabotage, which could endanger civilians and did not always adhere to the principles of legitimate warfare.	In Trikora, Indonesia sought to avoid open armed conflict and eventually resolve the issue through international negotiations.
Conflict Resolution	Dwikora ended after political changes in Indonesia and increased diplomacy between Indonesia and Malaysia.	Trikora ended with a diplomatic settlement through the UN

Source: Processed by the author

Overall, the consistency of implementing the rules of war in the two operations varied. Trikora tended to follow international rules of war more consistently, mainly because the conflict could be resolved through diplomatic mechanisms. Dwikora, on the other hand, showed some challenges in applying the rules of war, mainly due to the nature of the confrontation, which involved guerrilla tactics and sabotage.

Reflections on the Influence of Leadership on the Rules of War

President Soekarno, as the leader of Indonesia during the Old Order era, had significant influence in determining the direction of the country's foreign and military policies, including in Operations Dwikora and Trikora. His idiosyncratic leadership, which reflected his unique and strong personal characteristics, played an important role in the formation and implementation of these operations.

Soekarno's Leadership Influence in Operation Dwikora

In the context of Operation Dwikora, Soekarno's revolutionary and visionary leadership showed itself through his opposition to forming the Federation of Malaysia. Soekarno saw the formation of the Malaysian Federation as an unacceptable form of neo-colonialism. By combining nationalism, religion and communism in the Nasakom political concept, Soekarno tried accommodating various domestic ideologies to garner support for his anti-Malaysian policy (Hakim, 2023). His charismatic leadership allowed him to mobilize popular and military support in this

confrontation, although the tactics used in Dwikora-such as infiltration and sabotage-raised questions about consistency with international rules of war.

Soekarno's Leadership Influence in Operation Trikora

Meanwhile, in Operation Trikora, Soekarno's glorious and fashionable leadership was seen in his mobilising international and domestic support for integrating West Irian into Indonesia. Soekarno used anti-colonialism rhetoric to galvanize nationalism and gain widespread support from the public (Antouw, 2020). His leadership ensured that despite massive military preparations, large-scale armed confrontation was avoided, and conflict resolution was eventually achieved through diplomacy and international mechanisms.

Reflections on Soekarno's Leadership Influence

Reflection on the influence of Soekarno's leadership on the rules of war in these two operations shows that a leader's characteristics and ideology can influence a country's military strategies and tactics. With his idiosyncratic approach, Soekarno was able to mobilize national resources and influence public opinion to support an aggressive and bold foreign policy (Demaine, 2022). However, this also posed challenges regarding consistency with international rules of war, especially in Dwikora

Soekarno's leadership also reflected the complex relationship between domestic and international politics, where factors such as ideology, nationalism, and Cold War dynamics interacted and influenced decisions in armed conflict. In the case of Trikora, Soekarno's more diplomatic approach and resolution of the conflict through the UN showed respect for international rules of war, while in Dwikora, the tactics used raised questions about the application of these rules (Siti, 2023).

Overall, Soekarno's leadership in these two operations shows that strong and charismatic leadership can influence the direction of a country's military and foreign policy but also poses challenges in complying with international rules of war.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, this study has revealed significant disparities in the implementation and approach to the rules of war between Operation Trikora and Operation Dwikora, marking critical junctures in Indonesian military history. The analysis underscores how these disparities are intricately linked to the historical and strategic backdrop of each conflict, thereby shaping Indonesia's defense of its territorial sovereignty. Operation Trikora's initiation was prompted by Dutch territorial ambitions in Papua, showcasing Indonesia's resolute stance to uphold its claim over Papua and advocate for its integration into the Indonesian state. Conversely, Operation Dwikora unfolded as a response to the Malaysian confrontation in 1963, aimed at fortifying national identity and safeguarding territorial sovereignty. Moreover, this research accentuates the imperative of comprehending the interplay between warfare dynamics and diplomatic maneuvers in Indonesian historical narratives, illuminating their implications on nationalism's evolution and foreign policy development. It articulates that both operations epitomize Indonesia's unwavering spirit and resolve in safeguarding its sovereignty amidst external threats, while also exemplifying Indonesia's proactive engagement in regional and global politics. The study's outcomes hold profound implications for elucidating the nuances of war regulations and their contextual application across different historical and strategic frameworks. It underscores the challenges of aligning international legal frameworks with the intricacies of conflict, underscoring the enduring influence of historical legacies on

contemporary international relations. In summary, this study presents a nuanced perspective on the disparities in implementing the rules of war between Operation Trikora and Operation Dwikora, pivotal episodes in Indonesian history. It delineates the historical and strategic underpinnings of each conflict, illuminating Indonesia's defense of its sovereignty and territorial integrity. Additionally, the study underscores the pivotal roles of leadership and public sentiment in shaping foreign policy and military strategies, recognizing the substantial impact of populist elements on national security decisions.

REFERENCES

- Antouw, Y. R. (2020). Peran International Committee Of The Red Cross Dalam Perlindungan Korban Perang Menurut Konvensi Jenewa 1949. *LEX ET SOCIETATIS*, 8(2).
- Awoah, A. E. (2016). Perlindungan Terhadap Korban Perang Dalam Perspektif Konvensi-Konvensi Internasional Tentang Hukum Humaniter Dan Ham. *Lex Crimen*, 5(7).
- Basyar, M. H. (2020). Etika Perang dalam Islam dan Teori Just War. *Jurnal Penelitian Politik*, 17(1), 17–30.
- Demaine, H. (2022). Furnivall reconsidered: plural societies in South-East Asia in era. In *Geography & Ethnic Pluralism* (pp. 25–50). Routledge.
- Haidah, A. (2023). Internalisasi Nilai-Nilai Keteladanan Pahlawan Revolusi Termuda Pierre Tendean dalam Pembelajaran Sejarah. *Sajaratun: Jurnal Sejarah Dan Pembelajaran Sejarah*, 8(2), 1–16.
- Hakim, A. B. (2023). Soekarno dan Nasakom dalam Pendekatan Idiosinkratik (psikologi kepemimpinan). *Conseils: Jurnal Bimbingan Dan Konseling Islam*, 3(1), 13–19.
- Hanschel, D., Bravo, M. G. A., Dashpurev, B., & Idris, A. K. (2022). Environmental Rights Between Constitutional Law and Local Context: Reflections on a Moving Target. *German Law Journal*, 23(7), 1012–1028.
- Hari Purwanto, S. H. (2021). *Gejolak Papua dalam Perspektif Intelijen*. Jakad Media Publishing.
- Hartono, A. (2017). *KORPS KOMANDO OPERASI ANGKATAN LAUT DALAM MENJAGA KEDAULATAN REPUBLIK INDONESIA 1961-1968*. Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia.
- Irshanto, A. B. (2019). Dari Konfrontasi Ke Perdamaian (Hubungan Indonesia–Malaysia 1963-1966). *CRIKSETRA: Jurnal Pendidikan Sejarah*, 8(2), 84–97.
- Kennedy, P. S. J. (2017). The Indonesian Defense and The Views on Threats and Ambitions in Every Era of Indonesian Regime. *Fundamental Management Journal*, 2(2), 71–76.
- Kennedy, P. S. J. F. (2017). *Bayang-bayang Intervensi*.
- Kurnia, D. D., & Miftahuddin, M. (2019). PERAN GERWANI DALAM TRI KOMANDO RAKYAT (TRIKORA) 1961-1963. *Mozaik: Kajian Ilmu Sejarah*, 10(2).
- Kusmayadi, Y. (2017). Politik Luar Negeri Republik Indonesia Pada Masa Konfrontasi Indonesia-Malaysia Tahun 1963-1966. *Jurnal Artefak*, 4(1), 23–34.
- Lambert, V. A., & Lambert, C. E. (2012). Pacific Rim International Journal of Nursing Research. *Qualitative Descriptive Research: An Acceptable Design*, 16, 255–256.
- Mahfud. (2020). *Hukum humaniter internasional dan rezim perlindungan situs budaya dan benda budaya dalam suatu konflik bersenjata*. Syiah Kuala University Press.
- Siti, M. (2023). *Analisis Bentuk Pemerintahan di Lingkup Negara ASEAN*. CV MITRA ILMU.
- Suryawan, I. N. (2019). *Jiwa yang patah*. BasaBasi.
- Widariyanti, C. (2022). Eksistensi Lekra dalam Pusaran Manifesto Kebudayaan Demokrasi Terpimpin. *ISTORIA Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Ilmu Sejarah*, 18(1).



© 2024 by the authors. This work has been submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY SA) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>).