



Disaster Victimization And Victimology: Lessons from the Aceh and Yogyakarta Earthquakes in Indonesia

HERU SUSETYO

Department of Law and Society, Faculty of Law, University of Indonesia

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received March 6, 2012

Received in revised form April 2, 2012

Accepted April 16, 2012

ABSTRACT

Indonesia's location on the volatile Circum-Pacific Belt (Pacific Ring of Fire) makes the country uniquely vulnerable to extreme geophysical events. Recent earthquakes in Aceh and Yogyakarta provide valuable lessons regarding the type of victim's needs in the aftermath of a natural disaster and the role of governmental and non-governmental actors in meeting these needs. Current national and international legal frameworks for responding to natural disasters are inadequate and there is ongoing debate whether to include the concept of disaster victims in the victimological discourse.

© 2012 Tokiwa University

In the past decade, 84% of all deaths due to disastersⁱ have been directly related to natural hazards and 14% to technological disasters such as transport and industrial accidents. The Asian region accounts for 75% of these deaths and Indonesia ranks prominently among the Asian countries severely affectedⁱⁱ (Wispriyono, 2007; see also Malanczuk, 2008). To illustrate the magnitude of these natural hazards, the Aceh Earthquakeⁱⁱⁱ (M_w 8.9) of December 26, 2004 triggered a massive Indian Ocean tsunami engulfing the coastal areas of Malaysia, Thailand, Myanmar, India, Sri Lanka, Maldives, and Somalia. It killed 165,000 people and left many thousands missing (Wispriyono, 2007). Similarly, on May 27, 2006, Yogyakarta and Central Java also suffered a devastating 6.3 magnitude earthquake^{iv} killing 5,788 people (Widyatmoko, Tan, Seyle, Mayawati, & Silver, 201, p. 485).

Department of Law and Society, Faculty of Law, University of Indonesia. UI Campus, Depok 16424, Indonesia.
E-mail: hsusetyo@ui.ac.id

Printed by The Press, California State University, Fresno.
All rights reserved.
doi: 10.5364/ipv.6.2.104

The focus of this article is the government and non-government response (NGO) to these catastrophic events. On December 30, 2004, the author led a volunteer group affiliated with the Indonesian Red Crescent (IRC) to help in the transfer of dead bodies from the disaster area for identification in Rukoh Village, Darussalam District, Banda Aceh City. Three times more women than men were killed in Aceh many of who had been trapped inside their houses when the tsunami surged through the area (ESCAP, 2008). The IRC affiliated volunteer group also distributed staple foods, blankets, and emergency supplies to the survivors as well as to various victim assistance agencies. Furthermore, two months after the tsunami, the author accompanied three psychiatrists from the United States who conducted PTSD training for medical personnel and social workers based in and around Banda Aceh City.

The experience of working in the disaster-affected area conveyed the unique vulnerability of disaster victims struggling to cope and in need of targeted and immediate attention in ways that were far in excess of what they were provided. Overall, the emergency assistance given survivors in the aftermath of the earthquake and tsunamis was insufficient in terms of duration. For example, the majority of NGOs

continued operations in the affected areas for less than a year, or even for a shorter period of time. The Some international NGOs and foreign countries provided short-term assistance for only several months, but some organizations remained for several years. The Government of Indonesia provided the longest duration of assistance to the victims ranging from emergency response activities that lasted for three months to the rehabilitation and reconstruction phase that lasted four years. The reconstruction phase was coordinated by an agency established in the immediate aftermath of the earthquake and tsunami called the Agency for Rehabilitation and Reconstruction of Aceh and Nias [*Badan Rehabilitasi dan Rekonstruksi Aceh dan Nias*].

In the Central Java-Yogyakarta Earthquake of 2006, the author also joined an Indonesian Red Crescent team to distribute staple foods and clothes to survivors in Bantul Regency in the province of Yogyakarta. The IRC team also inspected damaged houses, stayed with local people, and noted the significant destruction to this cultural city. The people of Yogyakarta, ethnically different from those living in Aceh, had not experienced an earthquake for many years. As a result of their lack of experience in dealing with disaster, they struggled to cope with the impact of the 2006 earthquake. In contrast, the people in Aceh had long experience of responding to earthquakes, but the historically unprecedented tsunami that came after the earthquake was beyond all expectations.

In both the Aceh and Yogyakarta natural disasters, the survivors suffered physically, socially, and psychologically—and also legally. An average of 5% of elementary school students in Yogyakarta displayed behavioral signs of distress two years after the earthquake, but the actual rates of psychosocial trauma varied widely among schools in the community with incidence varying from 0.5% to slightly more than 17% (Widyatmoko, Tan, Seyle, Mayawati, & Silver, 2011, p. 489). Furthermore, Andriyanto (2008) found many survivors in the Yogyakarta provinces had to deal with perceived unequal and unjust compensation after disaster. Although the government provided financial aid and other assistance to re-build destroyed homes, the compensation process was perceived by the victims to be inadequate and unfair—numerous cases of corruption and maladministration limited their ability to benefit from reconstruction assistance. In Aceh, survivors also struggled to cope with social and legal problems. Living in emergency shelters for months resulted in social discord due to being separated from their families and the their land. Being separated from their families for extended periods of time proved to be a significant stressor for those living in

emergency shelters. Further, because the tsunami had washed away their homes and destroyed their land, victims could not return to their birthplace. Also, legal documents such as birth certificates, educational certificates, ID cards and even deeds to land in many cases had been lost, resulting in the “civil death” of victims. The loss of legal claim to land set the stage for many land dispute cases in the tsunami-affected areas.

Disaster Countermeasures in Indonesia

In accordance with the guidance issued by the National Coordinating Board (through Decree No. 2 by the National Coordinating Board Secretary Decree in 2001), the overall strategy in coping with disasters and the handling of refugees in Indonesia is based on the following phases of (a) emergency response, (b) empowerment, (c) reconciliation; and (d) relocation. Further, the processing of refugees and Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) is as follows: (a) emergency search and rescue; (b) data collection; (c) emergency assistance; and (d) people’s involvement. Despite this phased response, victim assistance programs in Indonesia are generally inadequate to cope with any disaster—they are generally unorganized, uncoordinated, and poorly planned.

This state of affairs set the stage for legislative change in Indonesia for managing natural disasters. The Parliament of Indonesian enacted the Disaster Management Act [*Undang-Undang Penanggulangan Bencana No. 24/2007*] on March 29, 2007. Prior to this legislation, regulations for disaster management included two decrees—Presidential Decree No. 3 for the year 2001 regarding the National Coordinating Board on Disaster Management and the Handling of Refugees [*Badan Koordinasi Nasional Penanggulangan Bencana dan Penanganan Pengungsi*] and Presidential Decree No. 111 for the year 2001 on the amendment of the Presidential Decree for the year 2001 regarding the National Coordinating Board Secretary Decree on Common Guidance in Disaster Management and the Handling of Refugees.

The National Coordinating Board for Disaster Management and Handling of Refugees [*Badan Koordinasi Nasional Penanggulangan Bencana dan Penanganan Pengungsi*], a body coordinating disaster management with branches throughout the provinces and regencies of Indonesia was the next target of change. The Board could not adequately integrate and coordinate disaster countermeasures since it had limited jurisdiction, poorly defined policies, a small budget, limited staff, and inadequate facilities. Therefore, when the disaster occurred, the

victim service providers and caregivers, either emanating from the common people, NGOs, or from government bodies, ran their activities independently. The unequal and discriminatory disbursement of financial assistance, misallocation of reconstruction funds, poorly managed data, and corruption in the rehabilitation and reconstruction phases were also addressed in the legislation.

Indonesian laws addressing victims' issues have also proved inadequate to cope with any disaster situation and to provide for the needs of disaster victims. The legal definition of a "victim" under Indonesian Law No. 13 of 2006 on the Protection of Victims and Witnesses is that person who physically, mentally, or economically suffers as a result of a criminal act. Therefore, victims of natural disaster are outside the jurisdiction of this law. On the other hand, Indonesian Law No. 24 (2007) on Disaster Management defines disaster victims as those persons who suffer or have lost their lives as a result of a disaster. This definition does not include indirect victims and others who might be victimized in the future by those who have not coped successfully with the disaster.

In general, Indonesia does have a disaster management strategy determined by the Disaster Management Act of March 29, 2007 (see also Anthony Dm Siahaan, 2006). However, the policies adopted under this legislation, as well as measures taken so far, are far from adequate. Indonesia still requires greater integration of policy and response to manage the multifaceted difficulties that arise as a result of the impact of a natural hazardous incident. The newly enacted legislation is a step forward, but it is not enough.

Nevertheless, while Indonesia is poor, it still has the capacity to protect its most vulnerable citizens (Vitchev, 2007). The basic problem is a lack of political will in the country's leadership and a system whose priorities lie elsewhere. Indonesia produces or imports adequate supplies of building materials to construct dams, sea walls to protect against tsunamis, and to reinforce the hillsides in urban areas in danger of being buried by landslides. The failure to deal with the problems associated with natural and man-made disasters is rooted in the calculus of profit and the entrenched corruption of the system. Local companies and officials have developed a unique ability to profit from everything—including natural disasters and the suffering of fellow citizens. When the death toll due to these natural hazards is measured in the hundreds of thousands, the omission to act due to corruption means those responsible for the human impact of natural hazards should be held accountable.

In the absence of any integrated package of disaster management policies and disaster

preparedness, the Indonesian people as a whole are vulnerable. Thus, while governance did respond Aceh and Yogyakarta disasters by providing emergency relief, long-term assistance, and newly enacted legislation and policy, these measures seem aimed at ensuring bureaucratic survival rather than and radical and systematic change to enhance the coping skills of those people most vulnerable to natural disasters.

Disaster Management for Victims of Natural Disasters

The lessons learned from the experiences of the Aceh Earthquake/Indian Ocean Tsunami and the Yogyakarta Earthquake demonstrate that disaster management is the central issue in coping with the aftermath of natural disaster. However, the management strategies adopted in Indonesia in the aftermath of a natural disaster are complex due to the variety of the natural hazards that impact the country, the size and geography of its landmass, its multicultural profile and its unevenly distributed population (Wispriono, 2007). While these factors may have partly contributed to the late and slow response in the emergency phase of the Aceh and Yogyakarta disasters, it is important to note that it also led to secondary victimization of those people who survived the earthquakes and tsunamis, and to the potential victimization of an unborn generation of children. A more likely cause, however, is the inherent corruption and maladministration during the reconstruction and rehabilitation process that is the catalyst for secondary victimization of the survivors, a process second only the impact of the extreme natural event itself. In particular this concerns victim assistance specialists or volunteers, personnel attached to caregiver agencies, law enforcement officials, local or central or even foreign government personnel and also the media/ press, all of whom do not adequately acknowledge and meet the needs of the survivors, this can lead to re-victimization. This highlights the requirement for a well-constructed disaster management scheme involving preparedness^v mitigation,^{vi} response,^{vii} and recovery^{viii} (Morrissey, 2004; Walsh, 2005; Dussich & Mundy, 2008).

Abandonment of Natural Disaster Victims

Beyond the traditional focus of victimology on victims of crime and so on, victims of disasters are among those who experience significant degree of harm in today's world. However, the current status of international law protecting these victims, in

particular regarding disaster relief, is highly unsatisfactory (Malanczuk, 2005). There is no definite, broadly accepted source of international law that spells out legal standards, procedures, rights, and duties pertaining to disaster response and assistance. Further, no systematic attempt has been made to pull together the disparate threads to existing law to formalize customary law or to expand and develop the law in new ways (IFRC, 2008).

Although the United Nation General Assembly, in Resolution 45/ 100 paragraph 5 declared “the abandonment of victims of natural disasters without humanitarian assistance to constitute a threat to human life and an offence to human dignity” (UN General Assembly Resolution A/RES/45/100 on 14 December 1990 at 68th Plenary Meeting). That is, the resolution invites all states whose populations are in need of humanitarian assistance to facilitate the work of organizations in implementing humanitarian assistance, in particular the supply of food, medicines, and health care, for which access to victims is essential (Kumar, 2008). However, the ambiguity of the principle of state sovereignty, a cornerstone of international law, was underlined in the Asian tsunami disaster in 2004. The prevailing principles on disaster victims (in this case, IDPs) are in the realm of legally non-binding principles and were neglected in Indonesia (Malanczuk, 2008).

There is a lack of attention to human rights protection. Measures need to be taken to address issues such as discrimination. This issue has been addressed in reports of the tsunami in India and Indonesia made by Human Rights Watch (Human Rights Watch World Report—Indonesia, 18 January, 2006) and Amnesty International (Amnesty International Report—Indonesia, 23 May, 2006). Another problem is corruption and the need for transparency in the distribution of aid (Kumar, 2008).

In 1997, fortunately, the International Federation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent societies (IFRC) initiated the development of an International Disaster Response law, called the Sphere Project (IFRC, 6 December, 2011). This law contains guiding principles and practices regarding international disaster response. The Sphere Project may be regarded as a humanitarian charter and minimum standards common to all sectors in disaster response.

A Victimological Perspective on Disaster Victims

While the current status of international law regarding disaster relief is considered highly unsatisfactory (Malanczuk, 2008), a firm statement regarding the status of disaster victims is not to be found within victimology as a discipline. Some

scholars contend that victimology deals only with crime victims while others state that victimology should take into account all kinds of victims and victimization, regardless of the cause of victimization.

The United Nation Declaration of Basic Principles of Justice for Victims of Crime and Abuse of Power from 1985 defines “victims” as those persons who, individually or collectively, have suffered harm, including physical or mental injury, emotional suffering, economic loss or substantial impairment of their fundamental rights, through acts or omissions that are in violation of criminal laws operative within Member States, including those laws proscribing criminal abuse of power” (UN General Assembly, 29 November 1985).

It is also argued that victims are socially constructed. That is, it is not sufficient that persons claim the status of victims without sufficient social acknowledgement (see Barkhuizen, 2007). Hence, since its earliest beginnings, the science of victimology has struggled with delineating its boundaries. An overview of the field reveals three main approaches in victimology. The first is *penal victimology*, which considers victimology as a branch of criminology and is focused on victims of crimes. The second is *general victimology* and includes victims of all types, such as victims of accidents and natural disasters. The third approach is a human rights approach, that focuses on man-made victimizations of all kinds, including genocide, torture, and slavery (Wemmers, 2009).

Fattah (2002) defines victimology as the study of crime victims, their characteristics, their relationship to, and their interactions with their victimizer, their role and their actual, contribution to the genesis of crime. It offers great promise for transforming etiological criminology from a static, one-sided study of the traits and attributes of the offender into a dynamic, situational approach that views criminal behavior not as a unilateral action but as the outcome of dynamic processes of interaction. According to Fattah, the study of the victims is, and will always remain, an integral part of criminology.

Shichor and Tibbets (2002) describe victimology as a process of delineating its focus of study, defining its key concepts, theoretical approaches, refining its data collection methods, and generally trying to establish itself as a legitimate and independent discipline. Initially, victimology focused on individual victims of violent crimes committed by individual perpetrators, but gradually, it has victimological studies expanded to organizations and corporations as victim and victimizers.

Kirchhoff (2005, p. 54) defines victimology as “the scientific study of the victim of human rights

violation (including crime), of victimizations," and of reactions to both of those. He states that victimology deals with victims, with victims of human rights violation (including crime), and with empirically accessible social realities. Victimology is concerned with *the process of becoming a victim*—that is, what social, group, institutional and individual conditions lead to the processes of victimization. Victimology looks at reactions, reactions to victims and reactions to victimization (Kirchhoff, 2005).

Natural disaster victims, no doubt, are among vulnerable persons seriously affected by victimization. The next question is whether or not victimology also encompasses disaster victims. When we talk about this matter, we certainly must bear Mendelsohn and his "general victimology" in mind. Benjamin Mendelsohn was the first person to use the word, *victimology*. Mendelsohn lay the groundwork for a new science, that he called victimology and saw as a separate discipline from criminology. Mendelsohn's vision for the future of victimology is remarkable. In setting the parameter of this new science, Mendelsohn asked if victimology should include mass victimization, political victims as well as international victims, and his response was that only time would tell (Wemmers, 2009). Mendelsohn continued to develop his ideas about victims of crime until he arrived at the theory of general victimology. *Its purpose was to help 'victims of all kinds' -including victims of forces beyond human control* (Hoffman, 1992, p. 90).

General victimology is inclusive and does not exclude any victims. This approach recognizes that the word victim is used in many different contexts other than criminal victimization. As a result, it covers much more than criminology and is justified as a separate science. This broad approach recognizes that victimization is a subjective appraisal rather than the result of some objective, external criteria. Also, general victimology emphasizes the similarities in people's reactions to different types of victimization such as natural disasters (Wemmers, 2009).

However, in general victimology, everyone is a victim and, thus, the limits of the science are blurred. Moreover, people's reactions to intentional victimization are structurally different than unintentional victimizations (such as earthquakes). When intentionally harmed by another human being, common reactions include anger and loss of faith in others. These reactions are unique to man-made victimizations and do not occur when the victimization was the result of a natural disaster. Moreover, the causes of man-made victimization versus natural disasters are different. Understanding the causes of a tsunami requires very different knowledge than understanding the causes of criminal

victimization (Wemmers, 2009).

Since the principal victims of disaster are the persons who are affected by the disaster, there is a need for them to receive the most immediate attentions. Victims of disasters include not only persons directly affected by the disaster, but also those indirectly harmed by the disaster such as a family, one of whose members has died or is otherwise adversely affected (Chockalingam, 2008). The victimological perspective on disaster centrally locates the victims in the discourse relating to disaster management. The victimological perspective regarding disaster management attempts to emphasize developing a framework whereby the rights of disaster victims are duly protected, and victims receive the required assistance in the aftermath of disasters (Chockalingam, 2008). Disaster victimization requires a response that places victims at the center of attention. The response mechanism needs to be based upon the needs of victims. There is a need to recognize the unique vulnerabilities of children and women during disasters. Victimology extends the area of focus of the criminal justice system. Recognizing the rights of disaster victims expands the scope of victimology. This expansion requires developing inter-disciplinary approaches to disaster management (Chockalingam, 2008). A victimological account of disasters needs to emphasize the importance of developing a viable system of disaster preparedness that ensures that countries are better prepared for disasters and are able to respond to them. Such measures involve planning, recognizing the plight of disaster victims, and developing strategies for addressing their needs (Chockalingam, 2008). Disaster victims have no equivalent perpetrator. Victims face serious challenges in coming to terms with their victimization. Disaster victims need more emphasis placed on relief and rehabilitation than assistance in court trials or legal aid (Chockalingam, 2008).

Last, but not least, theoretical victimology should take serious note of disaster victims by: (a) formulating response strategies and suggesting policies and mechanisms for providing the necessary assistance and other forms of relief to victims of disasters; (b) identifying key actors to participate in a network for disaster management; and (c) establishing victim-focused approaches in disaster management (Chockalingam, 2008).

Conclusion

Natural disasters, undoubtedly, are a significant source of victimization, in addition to crimes and accidents. Globally, the number of disaster victims

may surpass that of crime victims. This is especially the case in Indonesia, where natural disasters are part of Indonesian life. However, assessments of the response to the Aceh Earthquake/Indian Ocean Tsunami in 2004 and the Yogyakarta Earthquake in 2006 demonstrate that the attention and services provided to disaster victims are still poor. In these disasters, victims' rights and needs were not properly assessed and provided for by officials as well as other victim assistance personnel. Furthermore, the Indonesian law on witness and victim protection that was passed in 2006 does not encompass disaster victims. In addition, the Indonesian law on disaster management passed in 2007 provides an inadequate and narrow definition of disaster victims. Consequently, it appears that victims of natural disasters are literally abandoned under both international and national law. Indonesia's *track record* in dealing with the victims of natural disasters can help specialists in international law as well as victimology identify what is needed and what should be avoided to attend to the needs of disaster victims. Natural disasters may lead to subsequent harm in the form of secondary victimization. With respect to secondary victimization, disaster victims and crime victims are similar. The current status of international law regarding disaster relief is highly unsatisfactory. There is no definite, broadly accepted source of international law that spells out legal standards, procedures, rights, and duties pertaining to disaster response, nor is there any theoretical agreement on whether or not disaster victims should be considered as victims, in the traditional sense of victims of crime and victims of human rights violations, or as general victims, in the sense described by Mendelsohn. This article argues that theoretical victimology should encompass and focus on the situation of disaster victims. A victimological perspective regarding disaster management attempts to emphasize developing a framework whereby the rights of disaster victims are duly protected, and victims receive the required assistance in the aftermath of disasters.

Should scholars put the victims in general terms which also encompassing disaster victims, the problems of disaster victims will certainly not to be left alone? Victims will always be victims and must get proper attention, regardless of the causes of victimization.

References

Amnesty International, *Amnesty International Report 2006 -Indonesia*, 23 May 2006, available at: <http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/docid/447ff7aa2f.html> [accessed 16 April 2012]

Andriyanto, W. (2008). *Tinjauan Yuridis terhadap Pelaksanaan Pemberian dan Rekonstruksi Rumah Pasca Gempa Bumi 27 Mei 2006 di Kabupaten Gunung Kidul*. [Judicial Review of the Implementation of Provision and House Reconstruction after the Earthquake, May 27, 2006, Kidul Regency]. Graduation Thesis, Faculty of Law, Gadjah Mada University, Indonesia.

Anthony Dm Siahaan. (December 2006). *Legal Framework for Disaster Management Particularly In The Field of Early Warning System In Indonesia*. German-Indonesian Cooperation for Tsunami Early Warning System (GITEWS) Capacity Building in Local Communities: GTZ-International Services, Jakarta, Indonesia.

Barkhuizen, J. (2007). Victimology and the Creation of Social Reality: Victimology—Victim—Victimization—Branches of Victimology and Creation of Social Reality. *Tokiwa Journal of Human Science*, 15, 71-82.

Camp, Vic. (2006). *How Volcanoes Work, Krakatau Indonesia 1883*. Department of Geological Sciences, San Diego State University <http://bit.ly/EyMhS>

Carter, N. (1991). *Disaster Management: A Disaster Manager's Handbook*, Manila: Asian Development Bank.

Chockalingam, K. (2008). "Victimological Perspectives in Establishing a Disaster Management Network." In J. P. J., Dussich, & K. G., Mundy (Eds). *Disaster Victimization: Understanding and Responding to the Impact and Needs of Disaster Victims*. Proceedings of 3rd Symposium of Tokiwa International Victimology Institute. Mito, Japan.

Chockalingam, K. (2008). "Systematic Advocacy in the Aftermath of a Disaster." In J. P. J., Dussich, & K. G., Mundy (Eds). *Disaster Victimization: Understanding and Responding to the Impact and Needs of Disaster Victims*. Proceedings of 3rd Symposium of Tokiwa International Victimology Institute. Mito, Japan.

Coenraads, R. (2006). *Natural Disaster*, New South Wales: Millennium Publishing House.

Dejoras, F. M. (1997). *Disaster Preparedness A Primer*, Manila: Lagat Ambakan Publishing.

Dussich, J. P. J. & K. G. Mundy. (2008). *Disaster Victimization: Understanding and Responding to the Impact and Needs of Disaster Victims*. Proceedings of 3rd Symposium of Tokiwa International Victimology Institute. Mito, Japan.

Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP). (2009). Escap Trust Fund For Tsunami, Disaster And Climate Preparedness: Strategic Plan. Retrieved April 16, 2012, from <http://www.unescap.org/disaster-preparedness-fund/strategic-plan.pdf>

Hoffman, H. (1992). What did Mendelsohn Really say? In S. Ben David & G. F. Kirchhoff (Eds.) *International*

Faces of Criminology. World Society of Victimology (WSV) Publishing: Monchengladbach, Germany.

Human Rights Watch, *Human Rights Watch World Report 2006 Indonesia*, 18 January 2006, available at: <http://bit.ly/ILthZn>

International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC). (December 6, 2011). Humanitarian standards help make the world a safer place. The Sphere Project, 6 December, 20011, available at: <http://bit.ly/HMudg9>

Kirchhoff, G. F. (2005). *What is Victimology?* Monograph Series No. 1. Mito, Tokiwa International Victimology Institute.

Kumar, C. R. (2008). *Human Rights and Governance Implications of Disasters: Law and Development Perspectives*. In J. P. J. Dussich & K. G. Mundy (Eds). *Disaster Victimization: Understanding and Responding to the Impact and Needs of Disaster Victims*. Proceedings of 3rd Symposium of Tokiwa International Victimology Institute. Seibundo: Tokyo.

Malanezuk, P. (2008). Protecting Disaster Victims: Some Recent International Law and Policy Issues. In J. P. J. Dussich & K. G. Mundy (Eds). *Disaster Victimization: Understanding and Responding to the Impact and Needs of Disaster Victims*. Proceedings of 3rd Symposium of Tokiwa International Victimology Institute. Seibundo: Tokyo.

Marks, K. (December 29, 2009). Tsunami 2004: Aceh Women carry on. *Christian Science Monitor*. Retrieved April 8, 2012, from <http://bit.ly/8Qf3jO>

Ministry of Internal Affairs Regulation (2006). No. 33 on *General Guidance of Disaster Mitigation*, Indonesia.

Shicor, D., & Tibbets, S. G. (2002). *Victims and Victimization*. Prospect Heights Illinois: Waveland.

Sonn, L., Megregor, H., Morrissey, J., & Wichmann, T. (2005). *August 2004 severe storm: Post flood assessment*, Prepared by the Disaster Mitigation for Sustainable Livelihoods Programme at The Environmental and Geographical Sciences Department of The University of Cape Town for The Directorate of Transport, Roads and Stormwater in The City of Cape Town.

Sullivan, M. (22 October 2007). In. *How a Volcano Eruption Wiped Away Summer* in NPR <http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=15448607>

United Nations General Assembly. (29 November, 1985). *Declaration of Basic Principles of Justice for Victims of Crime and Abuse of Power* (A/RES/40/34).

United Nations Economic And Social Commission For Asia And The Pacific (ESCAP). (2008). *Discussion Paper On Enhancing Community Resilience To Natural Disasters: Lives Of Children And Youth In Aceh*. ESCAP: Bangkok. Available at <http://bit.ly/HpCSVQ>

Vitchek, A. (January 16, 2007). Natural Disaster or Mass Murder? Retrieved April 16, 2012, from <http://worldpress.org/Asia/2637.cfm>

Walsh, D. W., Callsen, Jr., C. E., Miller, G., & Maniscalco, P. M. (2005). *National Incident Management System, Principles and Practice*, Jones and Bartlett Publishers, Boston, pp. 244.

Wemmers, J-A. (2009). A Short History of Victimology in Hagemann. In O. P., Schafer & S. Schmidt. (Eds.) *Victimology, Victim Assistance and Criminal Justice*. Perspectives shared by International Experts at the Inter-University Centre of Dubrovnik. Monchengladbach: Germany.

Widyatmoko, C. S., Tan, E. T., Seyle, D. C., Mayawati, E. H., & Cohen Silver, R. (2011). *Coping with Natural Disasters in Yogyakarta, Indonesia: The Psychological State of Elementary School Children as Assessed by Their Teachers*. School Psychology International: Sage.

Wispriyono, B. (2007). *Lesson Learned from Disaster Preparedness Program in Communities*. Jakarta, Indonesia: University of Indonesia, Faculty of Public Health.

Endnotes

ⁱ Dejoras (1997) defines disaster as “a sudden or great misfortune, calamity, or a sudden calamitous event producing great material damage, loss, and distress.” (p. 63) Hazard is defined as “a potentially damaging physical event, phenomenon or human activity that may cause the loss of life or injury, property damages, social and economic disruption, or environmental degradation.” (p. 63). Hazards can include “latent conditions that may represent future threats and can have different origins, natural (geological, hydro meteorological, and biological) or induced by human processes (environmental degradation and technological hazards” (Dejoras, 1997, p. 6).

Natural disasters roughly fall into three broad groupings: (a) geological events, triggered by the internal workings of our planet; (b) meteorological events, caused by variations in global weather patterns; and (c) biological disasters, resulting from the actions of living agents such as diseases or insect pest. They can occur separately or together, and are generally, although not always, unrelated. Natural disasters are also known as “acts of God” because they can strike with little or no warning and without any apparent direct human involvement (Coenraads, 2006). Another form of disaster is technological disaster or technological accident such as a transportation accident, industrial accident, construction accident, hazardous material accident, animal and plant accident, epidemic and fires.

ⁱⁱ Indonesia is situated on the *ring of fire*, a geographic location that increases the likelihood of extreme natural events may cause destruction on a large scale. Indonesia’s population of 240 million people resides on 13,700 islands and among 130 active volcanoes lying at the center of reverse plates (subduction zones), an area acknowledged as a trigger of earthquakes. Many highly destructive natural disasters have occurred in Indonesia. These disasters have taken many lives and inflicted significant damage to infrastructure and lifelines. Since 2000, Indonesia has experienced over 30 major earthquakes, almost 50 major floods and landslides, seven volcanic eruptions, and one disastrous tsunami (Asian Disaster Reduction Center, 2010). The Government of Indonesia, (Ministry of Internal Affairs Regulation, 2006) categorizes the country’s potential disasters as (a) floods, (b) landslides, (c) volcanoes, (d) earthquakes, (e) tsunamis, (f) forest fires, (g) droughts, (h) cyclones, (i) epidemics, (j) technological disasters, and (k) conflict. The most severe disaster in Indonesia’s history and one of worldwide impact was the Aceh Earthquake/Indian Ocean tsunami on December 26, 2004. Previously, the most severe disaster had been the Mount Tambora volcanic eruption in 1815, considered the largest volcanic eruption in recorded history. Mount Tambora is situated in the West Nusa Tenggara Province in southeastern Indonesia. The Tambora eruption caused a staggering loss of life:

92,000 people dead in the immediate aftermath, and effectively all life on Earth affected by the ensuing global climate anomalies which included the phenomenon known as the "volcanic winter" and the "year without a summer" in North America and Europe. Agricultural crops failed and livestock died in much of the Northern Hemisphere, resulting in the worst famine of the 19th century (Michael Sullivan on NPR Radio, 22 Oct. 2007).

The Mount Krakatau eruption on 26–27 August 1883, is considered the second largest volcanic disaster in Indonesia after Tambora. This volcano is situated on a small island in the Sunda Straits between Sumatra and Java Island. A series of cataclysmic explosions began at mid-day on August 26, and ended on August 27 with a stupendous paroxysmal eruption. On this day, the northern two-thirds of the island collapsed beneath the sea, generating a series of devastating pyroclastic flows and immense tsunamis that ravaged adjacent coastlines. The events that began on August 26 would mark the last 24 hours on earth for over 36,000 people, and the destruction of hundreds of coastal villages and towns (Vic Camp, Dept of Geology San Diego State University, 2006).

ⁱⁱⁱ 165,000 people were killed, with many thousands missing. The earthquake and tsunami left over 400,000 homeless, internally displaced persons, (IDPs) representing 20% of the total population. Hundreds of communities were washed away, and 1,000 villages were affected. More than 1 million buildings were damaged or destroyed. Over 300 km of provincial and national roads were damaged, 121 bridges destroyed, 316 bridges damaged, and 1,000 km of local roads were affected. Agriculturally, 50,000 wetland farms and dry farms were lost. A total of 2,066 schools were damaged or destroyed, and 1,870 teachers were lost. An estimated 8,000 rural and 25,000 urban wells were damaged, including water distribution pipelines and plants. Six hospitals and 77 health centers were destroyed. Fully 14 of 21 district governments in Aceh were severely affected (Wispriyono, 2007).

^{iv} The earthquake wreaked havoc on the surrounding community, resulting in 5,778 deaths, 37,883 serious injuries, and the complete destruction of 139,859 homes, with total damage estimated at USD 3,134 million dollars (Widyatmoko, Tan, Seyle, Mayawati, & Silver, 201, p. 485). The Bantul Regency was the most affected area, with 4,200 people killed, 12,000 injured, and more than 200,000 houses totally, severely or moderately damaged.

^v As Walsh (2005) states, preparedness is any activity taken in advance of an emergency that develops operational capabilities and facilitates an effective response when a disaster event occurs. It involves actions to establish and sustain predetermined response levels necessary to execute a full range of incident management operations. Preparedness can be implemented through a continuous and systematic process of planning, training, equipping, exercising, evaluating, and taking action to correct and mitigate. Although planning is a critical element of the idea of preparedness, without deliberate practice and feedback with error correction and remediation, preparedness activities will not be as efficient as they could be.

^{vi} Mitigation is any activity taken to eliminate or reduce the degree of long-term risk to human life and property from natural and human-made hazards (Sonn, McGregor, Morrissey, & Wichmann, 2005). Mitigation refers to activities, planning, or code developments that lessen the severity of an incident. These actions may occur before or during an incident and may be the result of lessons learned from previous or similar events. Mitigation activities are an important element of preparedness. They provide a critical foundation across the incident management spectrum, from

prevention through response and recovery. Issues related to protecting victims are as follows (Malanczuk, 2008): access to humanitarian aid, discrimination, involuntary relocation to, or exclusion from settlements and camps, camp security and military presence, protection of women and children, family reunification, access to education, loss of documentation, participation of internally displaced persons, voluntary return, resettlement and property issues.

^{vii} Response is any action taken immediately before, during, or directly after a disaster event to save lives, minimize damage to property, and enhance the effectiveness of recovery. During and in the aftermath of a disaster, some countermeasures must be taken for the victims. Victims' needs generally are "Physical evacuation, relocation, shelter, food and water, clothes, medical needs, psychological needs, relief and construction issues, public health issues, environmental and ecological issues and disaster welfare information" (Chockalingam, 2008, pp. 113-114).

^{viii} Recovery is a short-term activity to return life-support systems to minimum operating standards and long-term activity to normal functioning with significantly fewer symptoms (Dussich & Mundy, 2008).