

SELF-PROTECT' RESPONSIBILITY MODEL FOR WITNESS PROTECTION: Learning from the United States and Indonesia Challenges and the Propose for the Future

Elisabeth Sundari^{*}, Aloysius Wisnubroto²

¹*Law Faculty of Universitas Atma Jaya Yogyakarta, Indonesia*
email: sundari20@uajy.ac.id, <https://orcid.org/>, 0000-0001-9196-4662

biographical notes: focus studies on Indonesian justice system, human rights, social justice, civil justice

²*Law Faculty of Universitas Atma Jaya Yogyakarta, Indonesia*, email: al.wisnubroto@uajy.ac.id
<https://orcid.org/>, 0000-0003-4474-4741

biographical notes: focus studies on criminal law, Indonesian justice system, human rights, criminal justice

Corresponding Author: Elisabeth Sundari,

Law Faculty of Universitas Atma Jaya Yogyakarta, email: sundari20@uajy.ac.id
HP.+628164266216

Acknowledgements

The Research and Public Services Institute (RPSI) of Universitas Atma Jaya Yogyakarta (UAJY) supports this work by the grant. The e-library of UAJY supports e-literatures and the room to work. We acknowledge and thank to the Head of RPSI and The Head of The Library of UAJY. Also to my valuable college, Dr. Amos Setiadi, S.T, M.T., who kindly shares a meaningful contribution to the submission of this paper. Those that inevitably remain in my final writing are entirely my responsibility.

Declaration of interest statement

I declare that there is no conflict of interest with the third party relating the content of the paper, the funding support, the copy and any other intellectual rights, and the relating the reviewing and editing process. It is my responsibility to any breaching of this ethical standards.

ABSTRACT

This study aims to explore the challenges of self-protect' responsibility model for witness protection and to promote in the state members of the United Nations. Through doctrinal research method it examines the self-protect basic ideas and legal framework from the United Nation, its challenges in the United States and Indonesia context as the sample, together with the conditions to promote it. The result shows that self-protect responsibility model for the witness protection is developed in the basis of self-defence as a part of human rights. It has a benefit as a sharing model adjoining with the state and as an alternative protection model when the state fails to protect witnesses. However, two essential challenges remain in its strategies, namely uneducated barriers to aware the potentially dangerous circumstances, low-income barriers to provide devices for self-protection by the witnesses, and the malpractices of using firearms other than for self-protection. The willingness and commitment of the country members to overcome the challenges will influence the promotion of the self-protection model. Three ways as the important features to make the self-protect responsibility model possible to be adopted, include

establishing regulation relating the usage of nonlethal weapons together with its sanction for the malpractice. Second, educating people on how to use nonlethal weapon properly and lawfully. Third, providing self-protect devices to a potential witness as needed. The original value of this result contributes to propose the way to make self-protect responsibility model being implemented broadly for a better witness protection program among countries members.

Keywords: *self-protect, responsibility, witness, protection.*

INTRODUCTION

A witness protection program is a strategy to secure witness cooperation and testify without fear in the criminal proceeding. It is a prerequisite for the criminal justice systems to achieve their intended goals, wit, security, and peace for the community and protect them from anti-social behaviour (Elliott and Quinn, 2016/2017). United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (2008) revealed that the protection is more important, especially to combat corruption and other severe or organized crime. Security is vital. Nurhidayat and Kusumasari (2019) and Group 1 Members of United Nations Asia and Far East Institution (2012) found that the failure or success of any criminal case prosecution - including corruption or organized crime - depends on the witness' willingness to cooperate, including "insider" witness of organized crime, to dismantle the leaders of crime organization and break the criminal conspiracy.

The tremendous inconvenience may force a witness reluctant or even refuse to testify. Nor the witnesses, Nurhidayat and Kusumasari (2019) also found the whistleblower to do so. A 2015 Uganda survey by Mbago et al. (2018) in the public sectors shown that from 2400 respondents who may become whistleblowers, only 6 per cent of them reported unethical behaviour in public sectors to the government officials. Such a situation becomes an obstacle in corruption or organized crime' law enforcement, as punishing such criminals is challenging without the willingness of witnesses to testify.

Moreover, it has a significant impact that many severe and dangerous crimes, including corruption, terrorism, organized crimes, become unclear and dismissed. For instance, Demir (2018) studied that the police dismissed to proceed La Cosa Nostra. Based on Group 1 Members of The United Nations Asia and Far

East Institution (2012) statement, the officer in Thailand dismissed 20% of cases since no witnesses were cooperating in testifying. The police moreover can't process. The Bumiputra Malaysia Finance (BMF) scandal in the 1980s after the internal auditor was murdered (Leong, 2017). The situation shows how vital and crucial the witness is in testifying the complex or organized crime cases and reflects how difficult it is to present the witness to testify without a protection program.

However, as the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (2018) stated, and O'Flaherty and Sethi (2010) supported, it is the state's responsibility to provide a witness protection program to implement human rights. Accordingly, country' worldwide today recognize the importance of witness protection programs. Moreover, the United Nations has established The United Nations on Drugs and Crimes (UNODC), which continually encourages member countries, including Indonesia, to strengthen witness protection. Especially, to combat serious and organized crimes, such as corruption, terrorism, and trafficking. Therefore, the state responsibility to give and conduct safety with this is called the state-responsibility model. Furthermore, the study by Hernandez (2017), IM Oudom (2017), Phomkong (2017), and Fatoni (2014) shown that state responsibility model becomes the basis of all witness protection programs in ASEAN countries, even in Indonesia.

On the other hand, the model remains a problem to work effectively, at least in Indonesia (Public Relations of LPSK, 2017; Mareta, 2016; Bere, 2015). These facts support what United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (2008) remind that protecting witness and human rights defender is not easy in practices. Neither a blueprint nor a

single correct approach to witnessing protection and human rights defender protection.

While all ASEAN countries emphasize merely the state responsibility model to protect witnesses, the United Nations Office of High Commissioner of Human Rights (2008) and United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (2008) introduced a self-protect responsibility model as a sharing model adjoining the state. In the self-protect responsibility model, the witnesses themselves shall establish their safety. However, although United Nations Office of High Commissioner of Human Rights and United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime introduced it, none of the ASEAN countries adopted in their legal protection policies. Moreover, the discussion and studies of the model, together with its challenges, has not developed yet, even in Indonesia. In the other hand, the research of the challenges and the way to provide the self-protect model is feasible, considering its benefits as a sharing model adjoining with the state and as an alternative protection model when the state fails to protect witnesses.

The originality of this research is exploring the challenges to implement the model in Indonesia as a sample, and the propose of adopting the self-protect model for a better witness protection legal policy management. This value is a learning for other states in adopting such a model to eradicate corrupt criminal for their condition. The discussion focuses on the two following research questions. Firstly, exploring the challenges of embracing the self-protect model in Indonesia. Second, examining the arguments and adopting the self-protect model work well for witness protection legal policy management in the future.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The research methodology in this paper uses both the doctrinal approaches (Ali et al., 2017), especially legal doctrinal approach. Through legal policies, research results, and official report it examines the global legal framework and ideas on the self-protect responsibility model to protect the witness together with its challenges into Indonesian condition, learning from the United States practices. Qualitatively, the research will analyse the benefits and

challenges in implementing the model into Indonesian situation and explore the conditions to make it work as an alternative and a sharing model adjoining with the state responsibility, for a better witness protection program. However, because of a minimal source provided by hard-copied international journals and books on the topic, this research used secondary data that are mostly offered electronically on the internet. Hereafter, the conclusion uses a deductive way of thinking (Elo et al., 2014).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The challenges of embracing the self-protect model in Indonesia

United Nations gives a broader meaning of witness, including informant, witness, judicial official, an undercover agent or other (United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, 2008), and expert (Art.32 of UNCAC), who is eligible to be considered for protection. Moreover, many Asia Far East Countries adds whistleblower (Group 1 Members of The United Nations Asia and Far East Institution, 2012). Hernandez (2017) stated that the witnesses play an essential role in bringing the perpetrator to justice by giving testimony in the criminal proceeding. On the other side, it is a crucial issue. As Demir (2018), Mareta (2016), and Montanino (1990) studied, they often at risk of being threatened, attacked, or even killed by powerful and influential individuals or groups, to prevent them from testifying. For instance, in Indonesia, the risk happened to several witnesses and undercover agents. Novel Baswedan- a senior investigator of the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) – whose face was sprayed with hydrochloric acid by strangers on April 11, 2017 (Mohammad, 2017). Hermansyah were attacked or threatened by an unknown man (Riyandi, 2017). An unidentified person killed Fredi, a prosecuted man who refused to make the alibi for two East Miomafo Police Station (initials FCY and L.U.) when Paul Usnaat's murder happened (Bere, 2015). S.H. (initial), an anti-corruption activist in South Sumatra, was also doused with hydrochloric acid by a stranger in Palembang (Public Relations of LPSK, 2017). Therefore, it is essential to protect witnesses from the tremendous inconvenience which may

force witnesses reluctant or even refuse to testify.

Witness protection refers to all effort to prevent, minimize, and stop any harm, intimidation, or threats on witnesses. United Nations Office of High Commissioner of Human Rights (2008) includes the security of any measures to prevent and respond to harm or threats.

State Responsibility and Self-Protect Responsibility Model: Learning from The United States

Since witnesses are part of the citizens and protecting them from any risk and harm which threatens life and security are part of human rights protection, it is the state responsibility to do so. Furthermore, United Nations Office of High Commissioner of Human Rights (2008) emphasizes it as the primary responsibility of the state. In the state responsibility model, the state gives and conducts the protection.

The main background of using the state responsibility model in mostly country members of United Nations is that they ratify and implement Article 24 of The United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime [UNTOC]: General Assembly Resolution 55/25 of November 15, 2000, and Article 32 of United Nations Convention against Corruption [UNCAC]: The General Assembly Resolution 58/4 of October 31, 2003, as the basis of witness protection programs. These two international conventions use the state responsibility model to protect witnesses, victim-witness, and whistleblower (Group 1 Members of The United Nations Asia and Far East Institution, 2012).

Providing a witness protection program may encourage witnesses willing to testify without fear. Thus, the program will support the success of adjudicating criminals to the court. The Philippines, for instance, has got the benefit of providing witnesses protection program as succeeding in deciding 34 severe criminal cases from the period of January 1, 2011 – June 30, 2011, with witness covered under the program willing to testify, and 32 of the cases have won, including the second Estrada plunder case (Perez, 2014). But, on the other hand, many studies and reports reveal several weaknesses of

the state-responsibility model in providing witness protection programs, as follows.

1. The process to entitle protection programs from the state needs an extended procedure, which may put the witness at risk of threats before being included in the state's witness protection program.
2. There was less representative of the witness protection agency in the regions, which causes a lack of witness protection in remote areas.
3. The program has a limit on intelligence and security forces.
4. A limited budget causes the weakness of the supporting system.
5. There is a lack of responsible officials to perform the protection voluntarily.
6. It remains an inadequate technology and other infrastructure.

Meng et al. (2019), Demir (2018), Mareta (2016), United Nations Office of High Commissioner of Human Rights (2008), and Group 1 Members of United Nations Asia and Far East Institution (2012), found that weaknesses.

Considering the weaknesses of the state-responsibility model, United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (2008) and United Nations Office of High Commissioner of Human Rights (2008) promotes an alternative and sharing model for witness protection legal policy, which is called the self-protect responsibility model. Nevertheless, most country members, including Indonesia, have not adopted it yet.

The purpose of the self-protect responsibility model is to reduce immediately or suddenly one's exposure. Its concept bases on self-defence as a part of human rights, especially the right to defend for life or the security of a person. Such human right is protected well in Article 3 of Universal Declaration of Human Rights. As a part of human right, self-protection has a principle that everyone, including witnesses, has the right to protect themselves from every situation which endangers their life. Furthermore, to get their safe life, they also respond to defend themselves before waiting for the state to protect them. This right and self-responsibility bring them in the condition where they shall be aware and have the ability and power to defend every minute the threaten

comes unpredictably. Therefore, it encourages discussing the strategy to establish a self-protect responsibility model legal policy as described below.

As United Nations Office of High Commissioner of Human Rights(2008), United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime(2008), and Dedel(2006) found, it is not wrong that individuals, including witnesses, are their own best protectors. However, some people are not able or have sufficient power to protect themselves physically. Of that position, Dedel (2006) comes to the opinion that the state or police shall shift some greater responsibility to them in sharing responsibility. Thereof, Scott & Goldstein (2005) and Dedel (2006) promotes police-community partnerships to address specific public safety problems. As the witness protection problem is a part of the public safety problem, the state may adopt the police-community partnership model more extensively in the witness protection legal policy management.

In the framework of police-community partnerships, Scott & Goldstein (2005) develop methods for shifting and sharing responsibility for public safety problems by compelling others to accept community problems. This method can employ in several ways. including:

1. guiding victims and offenders.
2. making a straightforward informal request of some entity.
3. making a targeted confrontational request of some entity.
4. engaging another existing organization.
5. pressing for the creation of a new organization to assume responsibility.
6. shaming the delinquent.
7. withdrawing police services.
8. charging fees for police services.
9. pressing for legislation.
10. bringing a civil action to compel entities to accept responsibility.

The shifting and sharing responsibility indicate that peoples, even the witnesses responsible for protecting themselves, must not depend on the state. As developed by Scott & Goldstein (2005), several methods may become the supporting methods to make self-protect work well. However, when a sudden threat exposes,

the main factor in defending is the witness position, awareness, ability, and power before getting state or police services.

Regarding United Nations Office of High Commissioner of Human Rights (2008) and United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (2008), the self-protect-responsibility model for witness protection may develop two main strategies, including:

1. Promote to everyone who potential of being a witness:
 - a. to be aware of the potential risks of a dangerous circumstance.
 - b. to exercise proper judgment, caution, and sensitivity in all their situation; should critically tailor responses to local events and justify each reaction based upon reliable analysis.
 - c. To accurately aware of their security environment for establishing contact with the field presence; determine their self-protection strategy due to their reliable estimation of the danger.
2. Develop the forms of self-protection strategies that may be chosen by the witness/victim, including:
 - a. Strengthening protective physical barriers by, for instance, installing alarms or electronic devices, hiring bodyguards, or travelling with armed escorts.
 - b. Applying a rapid response mechanism, such as having access to a contact person on call and a phone, or entrance to safe harbour within a community.
 - c. Changing behaviour by reducing or hacking activities may drive the threat to be carried out, adopt unpredictable and different routines, hide relationships, or change individual attitudes.
 - d. visiting a friend or family out of town, going into hiding, fleeing a location temporarily, being transferred to another office's location temporarily or permanently.
 - e. creating a distance with the threats.
 - f. In a specific condition, the protection units may include training in basic self-defence techniques or the use of firearms.

Based on the first strategy, to strengthen the witness position at risk and minimize the problem, every person, especially those potentially being witnesses, shall be warned by the government that the threats, intimidation,

retaliation, and attack may expose them everywhere, every time to everybody. Of these situations, the witness shall make an immediate response to self-protection before applying furthermore to responsible officials' protection. The reaction to the threats means any response, including a self-protect strategy. The witness must take initial action before justifying the right design to respond to intimidation is to analyse the level of the threats or intimidation and whether the surrounding community shares responsibility for the oppression and can help respond to it (Dedel, 2006). The responsive surrounding community is thus a factor that may determine how self-protect can work effectively. Measuring the level of the threat will allow determining the effective strategy. Choosing which strategies as promoted by United Nations Office of High Commissioner of Human Rights (2008) and United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (2008) depends on the status of the danger that may differ from every witness. The forms of self-protection strategies introduced by United Nations Office of High Commissioner of Human Rights (2008) and United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (2008) undoubtedly may further be broadened or varied. It depends on the type of threats; the environment in which the person lives (e.g., a rural or an urban, a conflict or a post-conflict); access to legal, financial, and other resources, and the existence of social networks.

However, self-protection strategies are not free of challenges. Some challenges which may practically raise are:

1. Individual inability to aware of potential danger's circumstances, and critically tailor responses to the threats, intimidation retaliation, or the offensive.
2. The economic barrier to provide means of self-protection.
3. Firearms' malpractice usage, other than for self-protection purposes.

The United States, for instance, experienced firearm-malpractice use. At least forty state constitutions protect a right to bear arms in the self-protection, while others prohibit it, especially for felons, minors, and old (Volokh, 2009). The facts show that using possession of weapons for intimidation is more often than for

self-protection (Hemenway & Matthew, 2004). In their research, Hemenway and Solnick (2015) concluded that self-defence gun use is rare and not more effective at preventing injury than other protective actions. It is better not to use a firearm to broaden the self-protection strategy in witness protection for paying attention to the harmful excesses.

The Challenges of Adopting the Self-Protect Model in Indonesia

Even though laws and practices vary from country to country, it is apparent that every state in the world experience common problem on how to protect witnesses effectively. In a world that is becoming increasingly interconnected, it is essential that every state considers the global legal framework, ideas, and reported practices of the self-protect responsibility model to be adopted or implemented as far as possible in their local legal system. Therefore, it is better for every state, including Indonesia, to explore its concept or principle, its strategy, and its challenges before adopting the model.

Indonesia's legal framework accepts the concept of the self-defence responsibility model as a part of human rights, especially the right to defend for life or the security of a person. It is provided well in Article 28A of Indonesia Constitution and Article 9 paragraph 2 and Article 29 paragraph 2 of Law No.39 of 1999 of Human Right Law, which promulgates the right to defend for life and security self-protection. Based on that legal framework, every witness has the right to protect life or security in facing a dangerous circumstance. It supports what Orücü found (2000) that adopting a legal substance -in this case the concept and principle of the self-protect model- is more accessible than a legal culture. There will not be a mismatch in the adoption process since the concept and principle of the self-protect model follows the Indonesian legal framework, namely the protection of human rights. Furthermore, it will support thriving management in establishing a witness protection legal policy using the self-protect model adoption.

Even most of the strategies and the forms of self-protection strategies as explored by United Nations Office of High Commissioner of Human Rights (2008) and United Nations Office on

Drugs and Crime (2008) normatively may be implemented in Indonesia since there is no contradiction with the legal framework as well as human rights protection. The state is responsible for respecting, protecting, fulfilling, and promoting human rights effectively, includes establishing two main self-protect strategies as introduced by United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime and United Nations Office of High Commissioner of Human Rights. Articles 71 and 72 of Law No.39 of 1999 of Human Rights Protection guarantees that responsibility.

The protection management may include promoting to everyone who potential of being a witness to be aware of the potential risks of endanger, exercising proper judgment, caution, and sensitivity in all their interactions, critically tailoring responses to local circumstances and justifying each reaction based upon reliable analysis, establishing contact with the field presence, determining their self-protection strategy due to their reliable estimation of the danger. Furthermore, developing the forms of self-protection strategies chosen by the witness/victim, as promoted by United Nations Office of High Commissioner of Human Rights (2008) and United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (2008), may also be implemented in Indonesia since no contradiction found with the Law, except the use of firearms.

Another adoption process that may be considered, as Orücü states (2000), is a mismatch or problem in adopting cultural differences, such as the challenges practices. However, Indonesia should overcome to manage adoption work well in Indonesia. Of that issue, considering Orücü point of view (2000), Indonesia should make a harmonization.

One of the challenges in implementing a self-protect strategy in Indonesia and the United States is the malpractices of using firearms other than self-protection. Indonesia even allows someone to possess firearms for self-protection, however, with the police's strict selection and license. Article 8 to 10 of The Chief of The Republic Indonesia Police Regulation No.18 of 2015 on Licensing, Supervision and Control Non-organic Firearms to Self-protection provides it. Although there is a strict selection

and license to possess firearms, the fact shows that Indonesia experienced malpractices of using guns by civilians. Civilians own 41.102 firearms until 2013 and illegally had some of them (Munandar et al., 2018; Latifah, 2017). Four hundred fifty-three cases of malpractice usage of weapons occurred in 2009-2011 (Hikmawati, 2021). Those who were shot in a crime were victims of crime, not perpetrators (Mafula, 2020; Munandar et al., 2018) and using firearms for intimidation (Latifah, 2017). Of these experiences, it seems so hard for the police to control each civilian not to use guns other than for self-protection. Even the excess of firearms by a civilian is more dangerous and inversely violates others-human rights than self-protect purposes. It causes a deathly lot.

There are other challenges in implementing self-protect strategies in Indonesia. Such as an individual inability to aware and respond to potential danger's circumstances and the economic barrier to provide self-protection. These challenges seem to be the more complex experiences for Indonesia as a low-middle income country (World Bank,N.d) with other problems such as infrastructure and educational problems. It is difficult for potential witnesses with low income to provide self-protection strategy, such as installing alarms or electronic devices, hiring bodyguards, or travelling with armed escorts. Thus, there are limitations to choosing a costly system. In fact, it is also hard for potential witnesses with low educational background to be aware of potential danger's circumstances and critically tailor responses to the threats. What works in one place may not work well everywhere.

The Condition to Make Self-Protect Responsibility Adoption Work Well: Learning from Indonesia

Making self-protect responsibility adoption work well in Indonesia means that Indonesia accepts its concept and principle and minimizes the challenges of its strategies as internationally explored instead of eliminating. Bellow describes the conditions support.

Even though Indonesia's legal framework conceptually and principally accepts the self-protect responsibility model, none of Law

strictly regulates it yet. Law Number 13 of 2006, as amended by Law Number 31 of 2014 of Witness and Victim Protection, arranges a state-responsibility model for witnesses-protection. Article 11 of Law Number 13 of 2006 provides the establishment of the Witnesses and Victims Protection Agency which is entitled to organize and coordinate witness protection programs as set in Article 5 of Law Number 13 of 2006 as amended in a broader meaning of witnesses by Law Number 31 of 2014. However, the Law does not set witnesses right to develop any forms of self-protect strategy, especially to respond to the immediate threat they faced before the state placing them into the witness protection program. Therefore, a self-protect approach is needed in that dangerous situation and must be regulated to ensure the right, any form of self-protect strategies that the witness may choose, and how to make it work well, related with the challenges of its design.

The first challenge that should eliminate in self-protection is the malpractice using of firearms. Based on the facts that malpractice using guns by civilians tends to cause deathly excess and inversely violates others-human rights than self-protect purposes, it would be wise to prohibit it in Indonesia. Instead, it may alternatively use any other object of weapons for self-protection as permitted by Article 4 paragraph (2) of The Chief of Republic Indonesia Police Regulation No.18 of 2015. The Article provides the use of tear gas sprayers and electrical shocks. These forms of weapon are nonlethal or less-lethal weapons. Out of the provision, there are other weapons specified as nonlethal or less-lethal weapons. These forms include such as stun guns, hand-held chemical irritant sprays (Volokh, 2009), baton, kinetic impact projectiles, dazzling weapons that use, for example, lasers or light-emitting diodes (LEDs), and acoustic weapons (United Nations Office of High Commissioner of Human Rights, 2020). All these forms of nonlethal weapons properly account for their classification and their specific risk before adopted and may be chosen by the witness for self-protect.

Using nonlethal weapons for self-protection only means to deter, intimidate, minimize, or stop the threat as much as possible by threatening or

occasionally inflicting severe pain. They intend to be less likely to kill unless proven otherwise, or incidental casualty risk, which causes serious injury even death. Civilians may use nonlethal weapon force only in the circumstances when strictly necessary, subject to proportionality. In situations where other less harmful measures have proven are ineffective to address the threat. A part of witnesses who cannot use nonlethal weapons may take a class on using the nonlethal weapon lawfully and adequately for self-protection, which the police or public security agency shall provide. However, improper, and unlawful use of nonlethal weapons may cause maximum injury to persons who do not pose a severe threat sufficiently to warrant the use of such weapons. Therefore, if someone gets seriously injured or dies caused by nonlethal weapons, the Indonesian Law has promulgated that the user is not responsible for self-protection, except otherwise proven likely to kill, as will be interpreted by the judges. Article 49 paragraph (1) of The Indonesian Criminal Code (S.1915 Number 732 into effect by Law Number 1 of 1946) warrants that condition. On these facts, the state should regulate it clearly about whom can possess nonlethal weapons, the strict selection and license to own, and in which circumstances the usage is lawful and unlawful together with its sanction for malpractice usage. All of those is solely in the merits of witness protection goal and work.

The other challenges of choosing the form of self-protect strategies for Indonesian people are an uneducated barrier to aware potential danger's circumstances, even critically tailoring the threats, and a low-income barrier to providing devices for self-protection. The state may eliminate the obstacles through two proposals: educational and funding support and a long-term improvement of people's welfare and education. However, it seems complicated to realize since it is an excellent policy that will burden the state's budget, while the state shall share the budget even for other development programs. As needed by a potential witness for self-protection, lending devices may become a cheaper way to choose, although not commonly used.

CONCLUSION

Based on the analysis it can be concluded that the self-protect responsibility model for the witness protection as internationally initiated by the United Nations Office of High Commissioner of Human Rights and United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime bases on self-defence as a part of human rights. It is a shifting and sharing responsibility between witness as individual and the state that develops two main strategies. First, promotes to everyone who potential of being a witness to be aware, to exercise proper judgment, to accurately aware of their security environment. Second, develops the forms of self-protection strategies that may be chosen by the witness/victim, including the use of firearms.

The main challenge in implementing self-protect strategy in Indonesia and the United States is the malpractices of using firearms other than self-protection. This issue should be considered before any member states decide to adopt them. Conceptually and principally any country's legal framework may adopt the model since it is a part of human rights. However, two other challenges remain as well as the malpractices of using firearms, namely uneducated barriers to aware the potentially dangerous circumstances, and low-income barriers to providing devices for self-protection by the witnesses.

Nevertheless, it believes that the state can still overcome the challenges even though some are easier than others. There are three proposals to make the self-protect responsibility model adoption work well. First, establishing regulation relating the strategies for self-defence, such as nonlethal weapons: the strict selection and license to own, and circumstances the usage is lawful and unlawful together with its sanction for malpractice usage. Second, educate civilians about their right to own nonlethal weapons for self-defence and how to use them properly and lawfully in a particular circumstance. Three, providing self-protect devices to a potential witness as needed.

REFERENCES

Ali, S.I., Zuryati M.Y., and Zaenal A.A. 2017. "Legal Research of Doctrinal and Non-Doctrinal". *International Journal of Trend in*

Research and Development 4(1): 493-495. <http://www.ijtrd.com/papers/IJTRD6653.pdf>.

Bere, S.M. 2015. "Saksi Pembunuhan Tahanan Dengan Alat Vital Putus Mengaku Dianiaya di Kantor Polisi". *Kompas.com*. April 27, 2015. <https://regional.kompas.com/read/2015/04/27/18451111/Saksi>. Accessed April 27, 2017.

Dedel, K. 2006. *Problem-Oriented Guides for Police Problem-Specific Guides Series No. 42: Witness Intimidation*. Center for Problem-Oriented Policing, The U.S. Department of Justice. https://popcenter.asu.edu/sites/default/files/sites/default/files/problems/pdfs/witness_intimidation.pdf.

Demir, M. 2018. "The Perceived Effect of a Witness Security Program on Willingness to Testify". *International Criminal Justice Review* 28(1): 62-81.

Elliott, C., and Quinn, F. 2016/2017. *English Legal System*. England: Pearson Education Limited.

Elo, S., Maria K., Outi K., Tarja P., Kati U., and Helvi K. 2014. "Qualitative Content Analysis: A Focus On Trustworthiness". *Sage Open Journal* 4(1): 1-10. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/2158244014522633>.

Fatoni, S. 2014. "Urgenitas Perlindungan Saksi dan Korban dalam Mengungkap Kasus Kekerasan dalam Rumah Tangga". *Mimbar Hukum* 26(3): 442-456. <https://doi.org/10.22146/jmh.16026>.

Group 1 Members of The United Nations Asia and Far East Institute. 2012. "Effective Measures to Secure Protection and Cooperation of Witnesses and Whistleblowers with Special Attention to Organized Crime and Corruption". Presented at The 149th International Training Course: Securing Protection and Cooperation of Witnesses and Whistleblowers. March 2012, Tokyo, Japan. https://www.unafei.or.jp/publications/pdf/GG4/Fourth_GG_Seminar_all.pdf. Accessed on February 12, 2019.

Hemenway, D., and Miller, M. 2004. "Gun Threats Against and Self-Defence Gun Use By California Adolescents". *Archives of Pediatrics and Adolescent Medicine* 158: 395-400. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1001/archpedi.158.4.395>.

- Hemenway, D., and Solnick, S.J. 2015. "The Epidemiology of Self-Defence Gun Use: Evidence From The National Crime Victimization Surveys 2007-2011". *Preventive Medicine* 79: 22-27. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0091743515001188?via%3Dihub>.
- Hernandez, C.B. 2017. "Protection of Witness of The "Congressional Pork Barrel Scam". Presented at The Eleventh Regional Seminar on Good Governance for Southeast ASIAN Countries. 17-19 October 2017, Hanoi, Vietnam. https://www.unafei.or.jp/publications/pdf/GG11/20_GG11_CP_Philippines1.pdf. Accessed on December 20, 2019.
- Hikmawati, P. 2012. "Kontroversi Kepemilikan Senjata Api oleh Warga Sipil". *Info Singkat Hukum IV* (10/II/P3DI): 1-4. https://berkas.dpr.go.id/puslit/files/info_singkat/Info%20Singkat-IV-10-II-P3DI-Mei-2012-9.pdf.
- IM Oudom, H.E. 2017. "Best Practices in Anti-Corruption in The Kingdom Of Cambodia". Presented at The Eleventh Regional Seminar on Good Governance for Southeast Asian Countries, 17-19 October 2017, Hanoi, Vietnam. https://www.unafei.or.jp/publications/pdf/GG11/13_GG11_CP_Cambodia.pdf. Accessed on December 20, 2019.
- Latifah, M. 2017. "Kepemilikan dan Penyalahgunaan Senjata Api di Indonesia". *Majalah Info Singkat Hukum IX* (22/II): 1-4. http://berkas.dpr.go.id/puslit/files/info_singkat/Info%20Singkat-IX-22-II-P3DI-November-2017-222.pdf.
- Leong, C. 2017. "A Critical Look into The Whistleblower Protection Act 2010". Policy Paper No.36, *IDEAS*, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. <https://www.ideas.org.my/publications-item/policy-paper-no-36-a-critical-look-into-the-whistleblower-protection-act-2010/> Accessed on December 10, 2020.
- Ma'ula, K.A. 2020. "Penyalahgunaan Senjata Api Pelaku Militer Dan Pelaku Sipil". *Jurist-Diction* 3(1): 207-224. <http://dx.doi.org/10.20473/jd.v3i1.17633>.
- Mareta, J. 2016. "Policy Analysis of Witness and Victim Protection". *Jurnal Ilmiah Kebijakan Hukum* 10(1): 105-115. <https://ejournal.balitbangham.go.id/index.php/kebijakan/article/view/91/33>.
- Mbago, M., Ntayi, J.M., and Mutebi, H. 2018. "Does Legitimacy Matter in Whistleblowing Intentions? *International Journal of Law and Management* 60(2): 627-645. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJLMA-02-2017-0017>.
- Meng, T.P., Eng, T.K., and Leong, T.K. 2019. "The Whistleblower Protection Act 2010 – Nine Years on Southeast Asia". *Journal of Contemporary Business, Economics and Law* 18(4): 18-24. <https://seajbel.com/previous-issues/april-2019/vol-18-april-2019-issue-4/>.
- Mohammad, Y. (May 19, 2017), "Menjamin Keamanan Saksi e-KTP yang Diancam Dibunuh", Beritagar.id, <https://beritagar.id/artikel/berita/menjamin-keamanan-saksi-e-ktp-yang-diancam-dibunuh> (Accessed May 20, 2017).
- Montanino, F. 1990. "Protecting Organized Crime Witnesses in The United States States". *International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice* 14: 123-131. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01924036.1990.9688934>.
- Munandar, E., Suhaimi, S., and Adli, M. 2018. "Penanggulangan Tindak Pidana Kepemilikan Dan Penggunaan Senjata Api Tanpa Izin Dalam Sistem Peradilan Pidana". *Syah Kuala Law Journal* 2(3): 338-353. <http://jurnal.unsyiah.ac.id/SKLJ/article/view/11763>.
- Nurhidayat, I., and Kusumasari, B. 2019. "Why Would Whistle Blower Dare to Reveal Wrongdoing? An Ethical Challenge and Dilemma for Organizations". *International Journal of Law and Management* 61(3/4): 505-515. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJLMA-11-2018-0253>.
- O'Flaherty, B., and Sethi, R. 2010. "Witness Intimidation". *The Journal of Legal Studies* 39(2): 399-432. <https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/10.1086/649032>.
- Orücü, E. 2000. "Critical Comparative Law, Considering Paradoxes for Legal Systems in Transition". *Electronic Journal of Comparative Law* 4(1): 74. <https://www.ejcl.org/41/art41-1.html>.

- Perez, D.P.2014. "Two Plunder Cases: A Comparison". Presented at The Eight Regional Seminar on Good Governance for Southeast Asia Countries, 18-20 November 2014, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.
https://www.unafei.or.jp/publications/pdf/GG8/00_GG8_all.pdf. Accessed December 20, 2019.
- Phomkong, V., and Phanka,T. 2017. "Report on Prevention and Anti-Corruption Efforts in Lao P.D.R". Presented at The Eleventh Regional Seminar on Good Governance for Southeast ASIAN Countries, 17-19 October 2017, Hanoi, Vietnam.
https://www.unafei.or.jp/publications/pdf/GG11/20_GG11_CP_Philippines1.pdf. Accessed on December 20, 2019.
- Public Relations of LPSK. 2017. "LPSK TelaahPermohonanPerlindunganAktifis Anti Korupsi yang Disiram Air Keras di Sumsel". February 21, 2017. Available at <https://lpsk.go.id/berita/detailpersrelease/2578>. Accessed May 2, 2017.
- Riyandi, D.(Ed.). (July 10, 2017), "Saksi Ahli IT Habib RizieqDiserang OTK, Ini Kata Anak BuahNovanto",Jawapos.com.
<http://www.jawapos.com/read/2017/07/09/143070/saksi-ahli-it-habib-rizieq-diserang-otk-ini-kata-anak-buah-novanto>(Accessed July 10, 2017).
- Scott, M.S., and Goldstein,H. 2011. *Shifting and Sharing Responsibility for Public Safety Problems*. Center for Problem-Oriented Policing, The U.S. Department of Justice.
https://popcenter.asu.edu/sites/default/files/shifting_sharing_responsibility_for_public_safety_problems.pdf.
- United Nations Office of High Commissioner of Human Rights. 2008. *Manual on Human Rights Monitoring: Chapter 14: Protection of Victims, Witnesses, and Other Cooperating Persons*. New York & Geneva: UNOHCHR.
<https://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Publications/Chapter14-56pp.pdf>.
- United Nations Office of High Commissioner of Human Rights. 2020. *Guidance of Less-Lethal Weapons in Law Enforcement*. New York and Geneva: UNOHCHR.
https://www.ohchr.org/Documents/HRBodies/CCPR/LLW_Guidance.pdf. Accessed on January 11, 2021.
- United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. 2008. *Good Practices for the Protection of Witnesses in Criminal Proceedings Involving Organized Crime*. Viena: UNODC.
https://www.unodc.org/documents/middleeastandnorthafrica/organised-crime/Good_Practices_for_the_Protection_of_Witnesses_in_Criminal_Proceedings_Involving_Organized_Crime.pdf.
- United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. 2018. *Organized Crime Module 9 Key Issues: Witness Protection*. Available at <https://www.unodc.org/e4j/en/organized-crime/module-9/key-issues/witness-protection.html> Accessed on March 31, 2020.
- Volokh, E. 2009. "Nonlethal Self-Defence, (Almost Entirely) Nonlethal Weapons, and the Rights to Keep and Bear Arms And Defend Life". *Stanford Law Review* 62(1): 199–255. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/40379723 Accessed on January 4, 2021.
- World Bank. n.d. "Low and Middle-Income Level". Available at <https://data.worldbank.org/country>. Accessed on February 12, 2021.
- Laws:**
- Republic of Indonesia Constitution 1945. Available at <https://www.dpr.go.id/jdih/uu1945>. Accessed on December 20, 2019.
- Republic of Indonesia Law Number 39 of 1999 of Human Rights Protection. Available at <https://www.komnasham.go.id/files/1475231474-uu-nomor-39-tahun-1999-tentang-%24H9FVDS.pdf>. Accessed on December 20, 2019.
- Indonesia Criminal Code (Wetboek van StrafrechtvoorNederlands-Indië, S.1915 Number 732. Available at <https://jdih.mahkamahagung.go.id/index.php/hukum-acara/4.-Hukum-Acara/Kitab-Undang-Undang-Hukum/> Accessed on December 20, 2019.
- Republic of Indonesia Law Number 13 of 2006 of Witnesses and Victims Protection. Available at <https://lpsk.go.id/assets/uploads/files/f398094c6c9cf8e16042214909acd0c8.pdf>. Accessed on December 20, 2019.

Republic of Indonesia Law Number 31 of 2014 of The Amendment of Law Number 13 of 2006. Available at <https://lpsk.go.id/assets/uploads/files/fde1db3d249db2abfb1ea61f8579d45e.pdf>. Accessed on December 20, 2019.

Republic of Indonesia Chief of Police Regulation No.18 of 2015 of Licensing, Supervision And Control Nonorganic Firearms for Self-Protection. Available at <https://ntb.polri.go.id/bimakota/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/17.-perkap-18-tahun-2015.pdf> Accessed on December 20, 2019.

United Nations. (2004), "General Assembly resolution 55/25 of November 15, 2000: United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime (UNTOC)", United Nations, New York. Available at https://www.unodc.org/documents/middleeastandnorthafrica/organised-crime/UNITED_NATIONS_CONVENTION_AGAINST_TRANSNATIONAL_ORGANIZED_CRIME_AND_THE_PROTOCOLS_THERETO.pdf. Accessed on December 20, 2019.

United Nations. (2004), "General Assembly resolution 58/4 of October 31, 2003: United Nations Convention Against Corruption (UNCAC)", United Nations, New York. Available at https://www.unodc.org/documents/brussels/UN_Convention_Against_Corruption.pdf. Accessed on December 20, 2019.