Protection of Citizens in Armed Conflict Zones: An Analysis of State Obligations and the Diplomacy of Evacuating Indonesian Citizens from Lebanon in 2024

Sarifah Ainun Jariyah, Ariawan Gunadi
Fakultas Hukum, Universitas Tarumanagara, Indonesia
ariawang@fh.untar.ac.id

Article Info

Received: 2026-06-27
Revised: 2026-09-14
Accepted: 2026-12-21

Keywords: *Armed Conflict; Consular Protection; Diplomatic Coordination; Evacuation; Protection Of Citizens; Indonesian Citizen.*

Abstract

This research employs a normative juridical method using statutory, conceptual, and case approaches. Data were collected through the examination of relevant national legislation, international legal instruments, scholarly literature, and official documents issued by the Indonesian Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The findings indicate that Indonesia's legal framework for protecting citizens abroad is established, among others, through Law No. 37 of 1999 on Foreign Relations and Minister of Foreign Affairs Regulation No. 5 of 2018 on the Protection of Indonesian Citizens Abroad. These regulations provide for preventive measures, early detection, rapid response, contingency planning, and emergency evacuation. In practice, the Indonesian government undertook a series of evacuation operations from Lebanon through coordination among the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and several Indonesian diplomatic missions in the region. The operations were conducted in seven phases between August and November 2024, involving land and air transportation, followed by administrative assistance, health checks, and facilitation of onward travel upon arrival in Indonesia. However, the available official report contains inconsistent figures regarding the number of Indonesian citizens evacuated and does not provide sufficient information to verify the implementation of all regulatory requirements, particularly concerning formal emergency-status decisions, contingency planning, and citizen mapping. This study concludes that Indonesia demonstrated concrete efforts to protect its citizens through evacuation and diplomatic coordination. Nevertheless, a comprehensive assessment of legal compliance requires more transparent and detailed documentation. Strengthening citizen data management, contingency planning, crisis communication, and post-evacuation accountability is therefore essential to ensure more systematic and sustainable protection for Indonesian citizens in armed conflict zones.

I. Introduction

The protection of citizens abroad is one of the fundamental functions of a state governed by the rule of law, relating to the fulfillment of human rights, the implementation of constitutional obligations, and the conduct of international relations. This obligation becomes increasingly complex when citizens are located in territories experiencing armed conflict, as threats to human life, limited access to assistance, infrastructure disruptions, and rapidly changing security conditions may hinder the implementation of protection measures. In this context, the state is not only required to provide a legal framework that guarantees the protection of its citizens, but also to develop adequate institutional capacity and response mechanisms to address emergency situations. Accordingly, the protection of citizens abroad should be understood as both a legal issue and a matter of governance and diplomacy that requires integration between norms, authority, and operational action. Within Indonesia's constitutional system, the constitutional basis for such protection can be traced to the Preamble of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia (UUD 1945), which affirms the state's objective of protecting the entire Indonesian nation and all of Indonesia's territory. This principle is reinforced by Article 28D paragraph (1), which guarantees recognition, guarantees, protection, and fair legal certainty, as well as Article 28I paragraph (4), which places the protection, promotion, enforcement, and fulfillment of human rights under the responsibility of the state, particularly the government. These foundations demonstrate that the protection of citizens is not merely a matter of government policy choice, but forms part of a constitutional responsibility that must be implemented through legal instruments and state administration (Asshiddiqie, 2010; Marzuki, 2014).

Nevertheless, the application of these constitutional obligations to citizens located outside Indonesian territory requires careful legal interpretation. The state's obligation to protect Indonesian citizens (WNI) abroad cannot be interpreted as authority to exercise power directly within the territory of another state. Its implementation must take into account the sovereignty of the receiving state, international law, the capacity of diplomatic and consular missions, and the factual conditions encountered. Therefore, an analysis of the protection of WNI in conflict zones needs to distinguish between the existence of state obligations, the scope of those obligations, and the state's capacity to implement them under high-risk conditions. This distinction is important to ensure that evaluations of government action do not focus solely on operational success or failure, but also consider the relevant legal standards and the limits of state authority. At the national level, Law Number 37 of 1999 concerning Foreign Relations provides an important foundation for implementing the protection of WNI abroad. These provisions should be read together with regulations concerning consular relations and WNI protection policies implemented by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the diplomatic missions of the Republic of Indonesia. At the international level, the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations 1963 provides a framework for consular functions, including assisting and protecting the interests of the sending state and its nationals within the limits permitted by international law. This framework becomes relevant when Indonesian diplomatic missions must collect data on citizens, issue security warnings, facilitate assistance, and coordinate the relocation of citizens from dangerous areas (United Nations, 1963).

Such protection is also related to international human rights instruments, particularly the Universal Declaration of Human Rights 1948 and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights 1966. The right to life and the right to personal security are important principles in assessing policies concerning threats to human safety. The Human Rights Committee (2018) affirms that the right to life remains applicable during armed conflicts and public emergencies. However, the use of these instruments to assess Indonesia's obligations toward WNI abroad must be accompanied by an analysis of the scope of the applicable obligations, jurisdictional connections, and relevant legal standards. The existence of a threat to the right to life does not, in itself, establish that the state of origin has committed a violation; such an assessment requires an examination of the relevant obligations, the measures that could reasonably have been taken, and the specific circumstances encountered. In international legal doctrine, this issue is also related to the concept of diplomatic protection. This conceptual distinction is important to ensure that Indonesia's actions in the Lebanon case are analyzed according to the appropriate legal categories, rather than treating all protective measures as identical mechanisms (Brownlie, 2008; International Law Commission, 2006).

The next issue concerns state responsibility. International legal literature indicates that state responsibility arises when an act or omission is attributable to the state and constitutes a breach of an international obligation binding upon it (Crawford, 2013; International Law Commission, 2001). Accordingly, a state's inability to evacuate all its citizens from a conflict zone cannot automatically be classified as a violation of international law. The analysis must first identify the applicable legal obligations, the relevant standard of due diligence, the actions that have or have not been taken, and the relationship between those actions and the obligations in question. This approach enables a more proportionate assessment of state responsibility while avoiding the conflation of operational failure, capacity limitations, and violations of legal obligations. Previous studies on the protection of WNI abroad have provided an initial foundation for understanding these issues. The national literature cited in this research proposal, including Nasution (2020), Sihombing (2021), Nurjanah (2020), and Prasetyo et al. (2018), examines the protection of WNI from the perspectives of administrative law, inter-agency coordination, protection policies in conflict-affected countries, and international law. Meanwhile, discussions on legal protection and human rights can also be found in the works of Hadjon (1987) and Marzuki (2014). The international literature used in this proposal, such as Goodwin-Gill and McAdam (2007) and Hathaway (2005), provides perspectives on protection under international law, although the primary focus of both works is refugee law. Therefore, their relevance to the protection of WNI during evacuation operations must be positioned proportionately and should not be treated as research that has directly evaluated the 2024 Lebanon case.

The performance report of the Directorate for the Protection of Indonesian Citizens of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs records that the evacuation from Lebanon took place in seven waves between August 10 and November 4, 2024. The operation successfully evacuated 89 WNI and two foreign nationals holding Lebanese citizenship, using routes that included Beirut, Damascus, and Amman before their repatriation to Indonesia. Its implementation involved coordination among several ministries and government agencies domestically, as well as several Indonesian diplomatic missions abroad (Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia, report on the evacuation

of WNI from Lebanon). These data demonstrate that evacuation cannot be understood as a single action, but rather as a series of operations involving institutional coordination, cross-border travel arrangements, and the repatriation of citizens after they have left dangerous areas. These facts raise deeper legal and policy issues. First, how are the obligations to protect WNI under national and international law translated into preventive measures, consular assistance, and evacuation? Second, how does Indonesian diplomacy facilitate access and the movement of citizens through the territories of other states while respecting the sovereignty of those states? Third, how can the effectiveness of protection be assessed without disregarding operational limitations and the choices of some citizens to remain in conflict zones? Fourth, to what extent do the existing legal framework and coordination mechanisms provide adequate guidance for government action before, during, and after evacuation? These questions position the Lebanon evacuation as a relevant case for examining the relationship between legal obligations, the conduct of diplomacy, and the governance of WNI protection during emergencies.

Accordingly, the analytical contribution of this article lies in using the 2024 evacuation of WNI from Lebanon to assess the relationship between state obligations, consular functions, evacuation diplomacy, and the limits of implementing protection within the territory of another state. The analysis does not merely measure success based on the number of citizens successfully repatriated, but also examines the legal basis of authority, the conformity of actions with applicable legal norms, inter-agency coordination, and issues requiring improvement in protection mechanisms. This approach is expected to clarify the distinction between binding legal obligations, the scope of government policy discretion, and factual limitations in evacuation operations. Based on the foregoing discussion, this article aims to analyze the state's obligations to protect WNI in armed conflict zones and evaluate the implementation of Indonesia's evacuation diplomacy for WNI from Lebanon in 2024 under national and international law. The analysis is directed toward answering two main questions: how does the legal framework regulate the protection of WNI in armed conflict zones, and how can the implementation of protection through the 2024 Lebanon evacuation be assessed under that framework? Ultimately, this research is expected to contribute to the development of legal studies on the protection of citizens abroad while formulating recommendations for strengthening a more coordinated, risk-based, and human rights-oriented system for protecting WNI.

II. Research Methods

2.1. Type of Research

This study employs normative legal research (normative juridical research), namely research that positions law as a norm or rule serving as a guideline for social life and the administration of the state. Normative legal research is conducted by examining legal principles, legal norms, laws and regulations, doctrines, and legal principles relevant to the issues under investigation. In the context of this study, the normative method is used to examine the legal basis and scope of the state's obligations to protect Indonesian citizens (WNI) residing in areas affected by armed conflict, particularly in relation to the implementation of the evacuation of WNI from Lebanon in

2024. The focus of the research is not limited to identifying applicable legal provisions, but also encompasses an assessment of the consistency, adequacy, and integration of national and international legal norms in ensuring the protection of citizens abroad (Soekanto & Mamudji, 2019, pp. 13–14; Hutchinson & Duncan, 2012). Normative legal research is primarily characterized by the analysis of legal materials to identify legal constructions, explain relationships between legal norms, and formulate legal arguments concerning the issues under examination. Hutchinson and Duncan (2012) explain that doctrinal legal research is a method centered on the identification, analysis, and explanation of legal sources as the basis for understanding a legal issue. In line with this view, Theil (2025) explains that doctrinal research relies on legal sources as the basis for identifying and explaining legal rules and principles, while the use of an empirical approach may provide an additional contribution when research also seeks to assess how law operates in practice. Therefore, this study remains classified as normative legal research, with the evacuation of WNI from Lebanon in 2024 serving as the context for the application of legal norms, rather than as field research relying on interview or observation data (Hutchinson & Duncan, 2012; Theil, 2025).

III. Research Findings and Discussion

3.1. Legal Framework Governing the Protection of Indonesian Citizens in Armed Conflict Zones under National and International Law

3.1.1. Constitutional Foundations and State Obligations to Protect Indonesian Citizens Abroad

The protection of Indonesian citizens (WNI) residing in armed conflict zones constitutes part of the state's responsibility to safeguard the safety and interests of its citizens. This responsibility is not limited to providing protection when citizens are within Indonesian territory but also encompasses state action through its diplomatic and consular missions when Indonesian citizens face threats abroad. Constitutionally, this protection obligation can be traced to several provisions of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia. Article 28A guarantees the right of every person to life and to defend their life. Article 28G paragraph (1) guarantees protection of the person, family, honor, dignity, and property. Meanwhile, Article 28I paragraph (4) affirms that the protection, advancement, enforcement, and fulfillment of human rights are the responsibility of the state, particularly the government. These provisions constitute the constitutional basis for the government to take protective measures on behalf of Indonesian citizens facing serious threats to their safety and fundamental rights abroad.

At the statutory level, these obligations are more specifically regulated under Law Number 37 of 1999 concerning Foreign Relations. Article 19 stipulates the obligation of the Representative of the Republic of Indonesia to foster unity and harmony among Indonesian citizens and to provide protection, safeguarding, and legal assistance to Indonesian citizens abroad in accordance with applicable legislation, international law, and international customs. Furthermore, Article 21 stipulates the obligation of the Representative of the Republic of Indonesia to provide protection,

assistance, and shelter for Indonesian citizens facing imminent danger by gathering them in a safe location and arranging their repatriation to Indonesia whenever circumstances permit. These provisions demonstrate that the protection of Indonesian citizens abroad is not limited to providing information or administrative assistance. When there is a real threat to citizens' safety, the state has a legal basis to undertake more concrete protective measures, including facilitating their relocation to safer locations and their repatriation to Indonesia. Nevertheless, the implementation of these obligations must take into account security conditions, operational capacity, access to the relevant territory, and the laws of the host state.

Accordingly, the state's obligation in the context of protecting Indonesian citizens in armed conflict zones should be understood as an obligation to undertake appropriate, prompt, coordinated, and accountable protective measures. This obligation cannot automatically be interpreted as a guarantee that every Indonesian citizen can be evacuated under all circumstances. The state remains required to demonstrate genuine and reasonable efforts based on threat assessments, available resources, and the feasibility of access and evacuation operations.

3.1.2. Consular and Diplomatic Protection under National Law

Technical regulations concerning the protection of Indonesian citizens abroad are elaborated in Minister of Foreign Affairs Regulation Number 5 of 2018 concerning the Protection of Indonesian Citizens Abroad. This regulation is important because it provides an operational framework for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Representatives of the Republic of Indonesia in undertaking preventive measures, early detection, and rapid responses to problems encountered by Indonesian citizens abroad. Article 4 of Minister of Foreign Affairs Regulation Number 5 of 2018 divides the scope of protection into three principal forms, namely prevention, early detection, and rapid response. Prevention is carried out through regulatory strengthening, public awareness, institutional strengthening, and cooperation. Early detection is implemented through the mapping of conditions and risks, mitigation measures, and the preparation of contingency plans. Meanwhile, rapid response encompasses measures to promptly address complaints or reports, assess the problems encountered, and determine and implement the necessary protective measures.

These provisions demonstrate that the protection of Indonesian citizens in conflict zones should not commence only after a conflict has created an immediate threat. The state needs to establish anticipatory mechanisms through mapping the whereabouts of Indonesian citizens, monitoring developments in the security situation, issuing warnings, and preparing evacuation scenarios. Accordingly, responses to emergency situations constitute part of a broader protection framework that should have been prepared before threats reach a level that endangers the safety of Indonesian citizens. Further provisions concerning protection planning are stipulated in Article 5. Under this provision, contingency plans must, at a minimum, include the background of the situation, mapping of the number, conditions, and distribution of Indonesian citizens, stages of emergency status, actions to be undertaken by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Representatives of the Republic of Indonesia, safe evacuation routes, and resource requirements. These resource requirements include human resources, budgets, communication facilities,

transportation, food, and security arrangements. Contingency plans must also be updated in accordance with developments in the situation and coordinated with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

For a state whose citizens are present in armed conflict zones, these provisions have strategic significance. Mapping Indonesian citizens is necessary to determine who requires assistance, where they are located, and the level of risk they face. Such information serves as the basis for determining evacuation priorities and selecting the most feasible routes. Without adequate mapping and planning, evacuation measures risk being delayed, poorly coordinated, or unable to reach all citizens requiring protection. Furthermore, Article 6 of Minister of Foreign Affairs Regulation Number 5 of 2018 includes war or armed conflict as one of the conditions that may be categorized as an emergency situation. The determination of emergency status is made through a decision of the Head of Mission or the head of the relevant institution. Where the Representative of the Republic of Indonesia faces capacity limitations, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs may provide technical support and undertake coordination. These provisions demonstrate the relationship between the authority exercised by the Representatives of the Republic of Indonesia in the field and the coordinating responsibility of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs at the central level. Representatives play an important role because they are closest to Indonesian citizens and developments in the security situation of the receiving state. However, when threats exceed the capacity of the representatives, support from the central government becomes necessary to ensure that protective measures can be implemented effectively.

Minister of Foreign Affairs Regulation Number 5 of 2018 also distinguishes between consular protection and diplomatic protection. Articles 7 to 8 regulate the scope of consular protection, including measures to protect the interests of the state and Indonesian citizens, the issuance of travel documents, the performance of administrative and civil functions, the provision of assistance in legal matters in accordance with applicable provisions, and other forms of consular assistance and advocacy. Meanwhile, Article 12 regulates diplomatic protection, which may be undertaken when consular protection has been maximized and/or special considerations exist, through a proposal submitted by the Minister to the President. It should be emphasized that the term diplomatic protection in this Ministerial Regulation is a term used within the framework of national regulations. It must not automatically be equated with the concept of diplomatic protection under international law, which has a distinct technical meaning. Under international law, diplomatic protection essentially refers to the action of a state in invoking the responsibility of another state for injury suffered by its nationals as a result of an internationally wrongful act, subject to applicable requirements, including nationality links and, in certain circumstances, the exhaustion of local remedies (see Vermeer-Künzli, 2007a, Vermeer-Künzli, 2007b, and Vermeer-Künzli, 2007c). This distinction is important for this study because the evacuation of Indonesian citizens from conflict zones is more appropriately analyzed as a measure of consular protection, state assistance to its nationals, and the fulfillment of protection obligations under national law. Evacuation does not, in itself, constitute the exercise of diplomatic protection in the technical sense of international law.

3.1.3. Protection of Indonesian Citizens under International Law

Under international law, the protection of Indonesian citizens in armed conflict zones relates to several legal regimes, particularly diplomatic and consular law, international human rights law, and international humanitarian law. These three regimes have different scopes and regulatory subjects but can complement one another in providing protection to civilians affected by armed conflict. First, consular protection derives its legal basis from the 1963 Vienna Convention on Consular Relations. Article 5 of the Convention regulates consular functions, including protecting the interests of the sending State and its nationals in the receiving State within the limits permitted by international law. Consular functions also encompass providing assistance and support to nationals of the sending State, whether individuals or legal entities. Article 36 of the 1963 Vienna Convention regulates communication and relations between consular officers and nationals of the sending State. This provision primarily concerns communication, notification, and consular access to nationals who have been detained. Although it does not specifically regulate evacuation procedures in armed conflict situations, the Vienna Convention provides an institutional basis for states to assist their nationals through consular representation.

Second, international human rights protection can be analyzed through the 1966 International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR). Article 6 of the ICCPR guarantees the right to life and prohibits arbitrary deprivation of life. In General Comment No. 36, the UN Human Rights Committee explains that the state's obligation to respect and ensure the right to life may have an extraterritorial dimension, insofar as there is a jurisdictional link as contemplated in the Committee's interpretation. Third, international humanitarian law provides special protection for civilian populations during armed conflicts. The Fourth Geneva Convention of 1949 relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War is one of the principal instruments governing such protection. Article 27 stipulates that protected persons are entitled to respect for their persons, honor, family rights, religious convictions, and practices, as well as their manners and customs. They must be treated humanely and protected against acts of violence or threats thereof. In the context of armed conflict, Indonesian citizens residing in Lebanon as civilians are, in principle, entitled to protection under international humanitarian law in accordance with their status and actual circumstances. Such protection primarily constitutes an obligation of the parties involved in the conflict under the applicable provisions of international humanitarian law.

Fourth, the concept of state responsibility under international law can be used to understand the consequences of violations of international obligations. Crawford (2013) explains that state responsibility arises when an act or omission is attributable to a state and constitutes a breach of an international obligation binding upon that state (see Crawford, 2013). In the context of this study, this concept helps distinguish between Indonesia's obligation to undertake protective measures for its citizens and the obligations of the parties involved in the conflict to comply with international humanitarian law.

3.2. Implementation of Legal Protection for Indonesian Citizens during the 2024 Evacuation from Lebanon and Its Conformity with National and International Law

3.2.1. Overview of the Situation and Implementation of the Evacuation of Indonesian Citizens from Lebanon in 2024

The escalation of security tensions in Lebanon in 2024 created risks to the safety of civilians, including Indonesian citizens residing in the country. Under these circumstances, the Government of Indonesia, through the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Embassy of the Republic of Indonesia (KBRI) in Beirut, undertook protective measures for Indonesian citizens, one of which involved conducting an evacuation operation. The primary document used to analyze the implementation of these measures is the 2024 Performance Report of the Directorate for the Protection of Indonesian Citizens, published by the Directorate for the Protection of Indonesian Citizens, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia, in 2025. This document constitutes an official government source containing reports on activities undertaken to protect Indonesian citizens, including the evacuation from Lebanon.

According to the report, KBRI Beirut established Alert Status I (Siaga I) on August 4, 2024. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs subsequently conducted a phased evacuation involving KBRI Beirut and several other Indonesian diplomatic missions, namely KBRI Damascus, KBRI Rome, KBRI Amman, and KBRI Cairo. The evacuation was conducted through land and air routes along the Beirut–Damascus–Amman–Soekarno-Hatta route. Page 32 of the report states that the evacuation process took place in seven waves, from August 10 to November 4, 2024. Upon arrival in Indonesia, evacuees received administrative assistance, medical examinations, and facilitation of repatriation to their respective regions of origin, coordinated with the relevant ministries and regional governments (Directorate for the Protection of Indonesian Citizens, 2025, p. 32).
This information demonstrates that the evacuation was not carried out through a single transfer operation but rather through several stages. The use of land and air routes, together with the involvement of several Indonesian diplomatic missions, indicates the need for cross-regional coordination in implementing the operation. The Beirut–Damascus–Amman–Soekarno-Hatta route also demonstrates that the transfer of Indonesian citizens involved transit through several territories before reaching Indonesia.

However, an important issue in the primary document requires attention. On page 32, the report states that the number of evacuees consisted of 89 Indonesian citizens and 2 Lebanese nationals. Meanwhile, on page 55, in the section specifically addressing the evacuation of Indonesian citizens from Lebanon, the report states a total of 259 Indonesian citizens and 2 foreign nationals. On page 21, the report also records 261 evacuees in the context of emergency situations in Lebanon and Syria, consisting of 259 Indonesian citizens and 2 foreign nationals (Directorate for the Protection of Indonesian Citizens, 2025, pp. 21, 32, 55). The discrepancy between the figures on pages 32 and 55 constitutes an internal inconsistency within an official Ministry of Foreign Affairs document. Although page 21 records 259 Indonesian citizens and 2 foreign nationals, the context combines emergency situations in Lebanon and Syria. Therefore, this figure cannot automatically be used to explain the discrepancy with the data presented on page 32. Similarly, the figure of 259 Indonesian citizens on page 55 cannot immediately be regarded as a confirmed figure without further clarification from the report's publisher.

In this study, the discrepancy is not resolved by selecting one of the figures based on assumptions. Both figures are recorded as information contained in the primary document, while the final number of Indonesian citizens evacuated from Lebanon is considered unconfirmed based solely on that report. Clarification is necessary through operational documents, such as recapitulations of evacuees for each evacuation wave, the final operational report, or an official explanation from the Directorate for the Protection of Indonesian Citizens. This observation is important from the perspectives of methodology and accountability. The number of evacuated citizens is not merely statistical information but also constitutes an indicator for assessing the scope of state protection. Inconsistencies in the figures may affect assessments of the operation's coverage, resource requirements, and the number of citizens who have received protection. Therefore, government performance reports should present data that are consistent, traceable, and verifiable.

3.2.2. Legal Analysis of the Implementation of Evacuation Based on Minister of Foreign Affairs Regulation Number 5 of 2018

The implementation of the evacuation of Indonesian citizens from Lebanon in 2024 can be analyzed by examining its conformity with the stages of protection stipulated in Minister of Foreign Affairs Regulation Number 5 of 2018. This examination covers aspects of prevention, early detection, contingency planning, determination of emergency status, rapid response, evacuation implementation, and protection following the arrival of Indonesian citizens in Indonesia.

a. Prevention and Early Detection

Article 4 of Minister of Foreign Affairs Regulation Number 5 of 2018 stipulates that the protection of Indonesian citizens is carried out through prevention and early detection, both before and during the development of a particular problem. In the context of Lebanon, the establishment of Alert Status I by KBRI Beirut on August 4, 2024, demonstrates that the Indonesian diplomatic mission had taken precautionary measures in response to developments in the security situation. The establishment of this alert status is relevant to the early detection function because it demonstrates an institutional response to a situation considered potentially dangerous to Indonesian citizens. However, the existence of Alert Status I in the report is insufficient to establish that all early detection measures were implemented in accordance with Article 4. A comprehensive assessment of this aspect requires information concerning security monitoring, risk mapping, registration of Indonesian citizens, the issuance of security alerts, and communication between KBRI and Indonesian citizens residing in Lebanon. Accordingly, based on the available documents, it can be established that precautionary measures were undertaken through the determination of Alert Status I. Nevertheless, the overall effectiveness of the early detection system cannot yet be conclusively assessed because the performance report does not provide comprehensive details concerning the monitoring, communication, and risk mitigation mechanisms implemented.

b. Contingency Planning

Article 5 of Minister of Foreign Affairs Regulation Number 5 of 2018 requires the preparation of a contingency plan containing a mapping of Indonesian citizens, stages of emergency status, actions to be taken by relevant parties, evacuation routes, and resource requirements. In the context of the evacuation from Lebanon, the existence of the Beirut–Damascus–Amman–Soekarno-Hatta route and the implementation of the evacuation in seven waves indicate that the operation involved arrangements concerning routes and stages of implementation. This information may be regarded as an indication of operational planning. The involvement of several Indonesian diplomatic missions also demonstrates that the implementation of the evacuation required a division of roles and cross-regional coordination. However, the existence of evacuation routes and phased implementation does not automatically prove that all elements of the contingency plan required under Article 5 have been fulfilled. The available performance reports have not presented the contingency plan document of the Embassy of the Republic of Indonesia in Beirut, a map of the distribution of Indonesian citizens, updated risk data, details of resource requirements, or the mechanism for determining evacuation priorities. Therefore, the conclusion that can be drawn is limited to the existence of evidence that the evacuation operation was carried out through specific routes and stages. Meanwhile, the conformity of the planning documents with all the elements of Article 5 still requires examination of the contingency plan documents and operational reports.

c. Determination of Emergency Status

Article 6 of Minister of Foreign Affairs Regulation Number 5 of 2018 expressly includes war or armed conflict as one of the circumstances that may be categorized as an emergency. The article also stipulates that emergency status is determined by a decision of the Head of the Representative Mission or the head of the relevant agency. The 2024 Performance Report of the Directorate for the Protection of Indonesian Citizens states that the Embassy of the Republic of Indonesia in Beirut established Alert Level I status as of 4 August 2024. This information constitutes evidence of an increase in institutional vigilance. However, the report does not include a decision number or a copy of a document indicating that the establishment of Alert Level I also constituted a formal decision determining emergency status as referred to in Article 6 paragraph (2). Accordingly, these two matters must be distinguished. Alert Level I status constitutes information regarding the level of vigilance reported by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, whereas the determination of emergency status under Article 6 paragraph (2) has a formal basis in the form of a decision issued by an authorized official. In the absence of such a decision document, this study cannot yet ascertain whether the establishment of Alert Level I was accompanied by, or formally incorporated into, a decision determining emergency status as required by the regulation. This limitation of evidence does not necessarily prove that a formal determination was never made. Rather, what cannot yet be established is the existence and form of the formal document based on the materials available for this study. To verify procedural compliance, an examination of the decision issued by the Head of the Representative Mission or other relevant official documents is required.

d. Rapid Response and Evacuation Implementation

Article 4 of Minister of Foreign Affairs Regulation Number 5 of 2018 regulates rapid response as an action to immediately respond to reports or complaints, assess the problems, and determine and implement protective measures. In the context of Lebanon, the implementation of the evacuation in seven waves from 10 August to 4 November 2024 demonstrates concrete measures to relocate Indonesian citizens from areas facing security risks. The involvement of the Embassy of the Republic of Indonesia in Beirut, the Embassy of the Republic of Indonesia in Damascus, the Embassy of the Republic of Indonesia in Rome, the Embassy of the Republic of Indonesia in Amman, and the Embassy of the Republic of Indonesia in Cairo illustrates the importance of coordination among diplomatic missions in carrying out the operation. Such coordination was relevant because the evacuation process involved not only the relocation of Indonesian citizens from their initial locations, but also travel through transit countries and arrangements for their onward journey to Indonesia. From the perspective of national law, these actions are consistent with the direction of the protection obligations stipulated in Law Number 37 of 1999 and Minister of Foreign Affairs Regulation Number 5 of 2018, particularly with regard to providing protection and facilitating the relocation of Indonesian citizens to safer locations. However, assessing the quality of the rapid response cannot be based solely on the fact that the evacuation was carried out.

3.2.3. Analysis of Evacuation Implementation under International Law

The implementation of the evacuation of Indonesian citizens from Lebanon in 2024 must also be examined within the framework of international law. This analysis not only assesses the actions of the Government of Indonesia, but also takes into account the protection of civilians in armed conflict and the limits of a state's authority to undertake measures within the territory of another state. From the perspective of consular law, the implementation of an evacuation constitutes one form of state assistance to its nationals through its diplomatic missions abroad. Consular functions, as regulated under Article 5 of the 1963 Vienna Convention, provide a legal basis for diplomatic missions to protect the interests of the sending State and its nationals. In this context, the coordination between the Embassy of the Republic of Indonesia in Beirut and several Indonesian diplomatic missions, as well as the implementation of the relocation of Indonesian citizens, demonstrate the use of the state's network of diplomatic missions to provide assistance to nationals facing risks.

However, the 1963 Vienna Convention does not specifically stipulate that a sending State must always succeed in evacuating all its nationals in every armed conflict. The provision of consular assistance must still take into account the laws of the receiving State, security conditions, access to the territory, and the possibility of cooperation with relevant authorities. Therefore, the evacuation of Indonesian citizens from Lebanon can be understood as a consular protection measure relevant to the functions of diplomatic missions, rather than an absolute obligation of result irrespective of factual circumstances. From the perspective of human rights, the right to life

under Article 6 of the 1966 ICCPR provides a normative basis for the importance of preventive measures against threats that may result in the loss of human life. General Comment No. 36 emphasizes that the protection of the right to life is not limited to the prohibition of arbitrary deprivation of life, but also encompasses the obligation of states to take appropriate measures in response to threats to human life.

In the context of this study, this principle supports the importance of anticipatory measures and protection undertaken by the Government of Indonesia for Indonesian citizens in Lebanon. The establishment of Alert Level I status, coordination among diplomatic missions, and the implementation of the evacuation constitute relevant measures to reduce risks to the safety of Indonesian citizens. However, any assessment of the implementation of extraterritorial obligations concerning the right to life must still take into account the basis of jurisdiction and state control as interpreted under international human rights law. The mere presence of Indonesian citizens in Lebanon should not be regarded as automatically imposing an obligation on Indonesia to control all security conditions within that territory. Meanwhile, from the perspective of international humanitarian law, civilians must be protected from the effects of armed conflict. The Fourth Geneva Convention of 1949 affirms the protection of civilians who fall within the category of protected persons. This principle of protection requires parties to the conflict to respect and protect civilians in accordance with the applicable provisions of international humanitarian law. Accordingly, Indonesian citizens present in Lebanon as civilians must not be made the object of attacks prohibited under international humanitarian law.

It is necessary to distinguish between the obligation of parties to the conflict to protect civilians and Indonesia's obligation to carry out evacuations. International humanitarian law primarily regulates the conduct of parties involved in the conflict and the protection of persons affected by it. Meanwhile, Indonesia's actions in this study are more closely related to its national obligation to provide protection to its nationals through diplomatic and consular mechanisms. These two obligations may complement each other, but they are not interchangeable. Thus, the implementation of the evacuation of Indonesian citizens from Lebanon can be regarded as a measure consistent with the objectives of protecting the right to life and fulfilling consular functions. However, concluding that all international legal obligations have been fulfilled requires a broader examination of consular access, coordination with the authorities of transit countries, the security of evacuation routes, the treatment of civilians, and potential obstacles encountered during the operation.

3.2.4. Evaluation of State Protection Performance: Between Actions, Outcomes, and Accountability

To assess the implementation of protection for Indonesian citizens more comprehensively, the success of the evacuation needs to be analyzed through several dimensions, namely process, outcomes, coordination, and accountability. Tindall and 't Hart (2011) developed a framework for evaluating government performance in consular emergencies that emphasizes the importance of assessing government actions not only based on their final outcomes, but also on the processes and coordination relationships involved. Tindall (2010) and Tindall (2012) also demonstrate that

the management of consular emergencies requires inter-agency coordination and the government's capacity to provide assistance to its nationals abroad. First, from the process perspective, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs report indicates the establishment of Alert Level I status, the implementation of a phased evacuation, and the use of evacuation routes through several countries. These circumstances indicate that the Government undertook operational measures to respond to security threats. However, the available information is insufficient to examine the entire process, particularly with regard to the mapping of Indonesian citizens, warning systems, the basis for determining priorities, and documents establishing the emergency status.

Second, from the outcomes perspective, the report states that Indonesian citizens were relocated from Lebanon and received assistance upon arrival in Indonesia. This demonstrates the achievement of concrete outcomes from the protection operation. However, the discrepancy in the evacuation figures on pages 32 and 55 means that the final number of evacuees cannot yet be established solely on the basis of that document. Therefore, the evaluation of outcomes needs to await data clarification to avoid drawing inaccurate conclusions regarding the scope of the operation. Third, from the coordination perspective, the involvement of five Indonesian diplomatic missions indicates that the evacuation operation required cooperation across diplomatic missions. Such coordination is relevant to the characteristics of consular emergencies, which often involve several institutions and jurisdictions. Tindall (2010) emphasizes that the government's capacity to respond to consular emergencies is strongly influenced by coordination relationships among the parties involved. Although the Ministry of Foreign Affairs report has identified the participating diplomatic missions, details regarding the division of responsibilities, coordination with the authorities of transit countries, and decision-making mechanisms have not yet been fully explained.

Fourth, from the accountability perspective, there is a need to ensure data consistency and the traceability of decisions. The discrepancy in the number of Indonesian citizens evacuated and the absence of formal emergency status determination documents in the reports examined are two matters that require clarification. Accountability concerns not only the successful implementation of operations, but also the government's ability to explain the basis for its decisions, the use of resources, the scope of protection, and the outcomes of its activities transparently. This evaluation demonstrates that the implementation of protection for Indonesian citizens cannot be assessed in purely binary terms by declaring that all actions were compliant or entirely non-compliant with the law. The available evidence indicates that concrete protective measures were undertaken, particularly through heightened vigilance, coordination among diplomatic missions, phased evacuation, and assistance following arrival in Indonesia. On the other hand, several aspects remain unverified, particularly the completeness of the contingency plan, the formal nature of the emergency status determination, the consistency of evacuation participant data, and details of coordination arrangements.

3.2.5. Findings on Data Gaps and the Need to Verify Operational Documents

Based on the analysis of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs performance report and Minister of Foreign Affairs Regulation Number 5 of 2018, several operational documents are required to conduct a more comprehensive compliance assessment.

First, a copy of or information regarding the decision of the Embassy of the Republic of Indonesia in Beirut establishing Alert Level I status and/or the formal decision determining emergency status is required. This document is necessary to examine the conformity of the measures taken with Article 6 of Minister of Foreign Affairs Regulation Number 5 of 2018. Second, the contingency plan of the Embassy of the Republic of Indonesia in Beirut, together with its updates, is required. This document is necessary to assess whether the planning covers the mapping of Indonesian citizens, risk analysis, stages of emergency status, evacuation routes, division of responsibilities, and resource requirements as stipulated in Article 5.
Third, a recapitulation of the number of Indonesian citizens participating in each evacuation wave is required. This data is important to clarify the discrepancy in figures between pages 32 and 55 of the performance report. If individual data cannot be disclosed for reasons of personal data protection or security, an aggregate recapitulation without personal identifiers may still be requested. Fourth, information regarding the dissemination of security alerts and communication between the Embassy of the Republic of Indonesia in Beirut and Indonesian citizens in Lebanon is required. Such information can be used to assess the implementation of preventive measures and early detection under Article 4. Fifth, reports on the implementation of each evacuation wave are required, including the division of responsibilities among diplomatic missions, the mechanism for determining evacuation participants, and coordination with the authorities of transit countries. These documents are necessary to assess whether the evacuation routes and relocation process were implemented through adequate coordination.

Sixth, reports on assistance provided following arrival in Indonesia are required, including health examinations, administrative assistance, and repatriation to the respective regions of origin. This information can clarify the scope of protection provided after Indonesian citizens have left the conflict area. The need for these documents does not mean that measures not mentioned in the performance report were necessarily not implemented. The absence of information in the reports examined merely indicates the limitations of the evidence available for this study. Therefore, submitting an information request through the Public Information and Documentation Management Officer (PPID) mechanism of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs may serve as a follow-up step to obtain documents or summaries of information that may be disclosed to the public, while still taking into account exemptions concerning personal data and sensitive operational information.

Based on the overall analysis, the implementation of protection for Indonesian citizens in the evacuation from Lebanon in 2024 demonstrates that the Government of Indonesia undertook a number of concrete measures in response to security threats. These measures included heightened vigilance through the establishment of Alert Level I status by the Embassy of the Republic of Indonesia in Beirut, coordination with several Indonesian diplomatic missions, the implementation of evacuation by land and air routes in several waves, and the provision of administrative assistance, health examinations, and facilitation of repatriation after the evacuees

arrived in Indonesia. From the perspective of national law, these measures are consistent with the objectives of protecting Indonesian citizens as stipulated in Law Number 37 of 1999 and the operational framework established by Minister of Foreign Affairs Regulation Number 5 of 2018. Specifically, the evacuation measures relate to the state's obligation to provide protection and facilitate the relocation of Indonesian citizens facing danger to safer locations. However, full compliance with Minister of Foreign Affairs Regulation Number 5 of 2018 cannot yet be established because several aspects still require verification, particularly the contingency plan documents and the formal decision determining emergency status.

From the perspective of international law, these evacuation measures are relevant to the function of consular protection under the 1963 Vienna Convention and the objective of protecting the right to life under the ICCPR. Meanwhile, the Fourth Geneva Convention of 1949 provides a basis for protecting civilians affected by armed conflict. These three legal frameworks must be interpreted separately according to their respective scopes: Indonesia is responsible for undertaking protective measures for its nationals within the limits of its authority and capacity, while the parties involved in the conflict are obligated to respect the protection of civilians under international humanitarian law. This study also identifies an issue of data accountability in the official report of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The discrepancy in the number of evacuees between pages 32 and 55 cannot yet be resolved based on the available documents. Furthermore, the reference to Alert Level I status is insufficient to establish the existence of a formal decision determining emergency status as referred to in Article 6 paragraph (2) of Minister of Foreign Affairs Regulation Number 5 of 2018. Accordingly, the most proportionate legal conclusion is that the Government of Indonesia demonstrated the implementation of concrete protective measures through the evacuation operation of Indonesian citizens from Lebanon in 2024. Such implementation is substantively consistent with the objectives of protecting Indonesian citizens under national law and the function of consular assistance under international law. However, an assessment of overall procedural compliance and the effectiveness of protection for all Indonesian citizens still requires verification of operational documents and clarification of official data. The success of carrying out an evacuation is an important indicator of protection performance, but it is not the sole basis for concluding that all legal obligations have been fulfilled.

Furthermore, the legal assessment should distinguish the existence of a protective obligation from the standard of conduct required to discharge that obligation. The implementation of an evacuation may demonstrate that the State has taken reasonable and concrete steps to address risks faced by its nationals, but the adequacy of those steps must also be assessed against the applicable legal framework, the information available to the authorities, and the practical constraints arising from the conflict. In this regard, transparent documentation is essential to establish whether decisions were made in accordance with the prescribed procedures and whether the measures adopted were proportionate to the risks identified. Clarification of the discrepancies in official data would also strengthen institutional accountability and enable a more reliable evaluation of the operation. Therefore, the findings support a qualified conclusion regarding the implementation of protective measures, rather than an unconditional determination of full legal compliance.

IV. Conclusion

Legal protection for Indonesian citizens in areas of armed conflict constitutes a state obligation grounded in both national and international law. Under national law, this obligation is reflected in Law Number 37 of 1999 concerning Foreign Relations and further elaborated through Minister of Foreign Affairs Regulation Number 5 of 2018 concerning the Protection of Indonesian Citizens Abroad. These regulations position the protection of Indonesian citizens as a series of measures encompassing prevention, early detection, and rapid response, including the preparation of contingency plans and the implementation of evacuations in emergency situations. Meanwhile, international law provides a basis for protection through the principles of human rights, international humanitarian law, and consular relations law. Accordingly, the protection of Indonesian citizens in conflict areas is not merely an administrative and diplomatic responsibility, but also forms part of the state's obligation to take reasonable and feasible measures to protect the safety and interests of its nationals.

The implementation of the evacuation of Indonesian citizens from Lebanon in 2024 demonstrates concrete action by the Government of Indonesia in responding to the deteriorating security situation. Based on the 2024 Performance Report of the Directorate for the Protection of Indonesian Citizens, the Embassy of the Republic of Indonesia in Beirut established Alert Level I status as of 4 August 2024. The Government of Indonesia subsequently carried out the evacuation in stages through seven waves from 10 August to 4 November 2024, involving coordination between the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and several Indonesian diplomatic missions in the region, namely the Embassies of the Republic of Indonesia in Beirut, Damascus, Rome, Amman, and Cairo. The evacuation process was carried out through land and air routes along the Beirut–Damascus–Amman–Soekarno-Hatta route. Upon arrival in Indonesia, the evacuated citizens received administrative assistance, health examinations, and facilitation of repatriation to their respective regions of origin. This series of measures demonstrates that state protection does not end with the relocation of citizens from dangerous areas, but also encompasses coordination and assistance following their arrival. Based on these findings, it can be concluded that the Government of Indonesia has demonstrated the implementation of its obligation to protect Indonesian citizens through evacuation responses, diplomatic coordination, and post-repatriation assistance. However, the effectiveness of protection and its conformity with all legal provisions cannot be established solely on the basis of the published performance report. Therefore, strengthening the protection of Indonesian citizens in conflict areas should be directed toward improving the quality of mapping and data collection concerning Indonesian citizens, regularly updating contingency plans, clarifying procedures for determining emergency status, strengthening crisis communication systems, and ensuring transparent and accountable documentation and evaluation of evacuation operations. These measures are essential to ensure that the protection of Indonesian citizens is not merely reactive when conflicts escalate, but instead becomes a planned, coordinated, and sustainable protection system.

References

Amiruddin, & Asikin, Z. (2018). *Pengantar metode penelitian hukum*. Rajawali Pers.

Choudhary, K. (2024). Which method should I select for my legal research – Doctrinal, empirical, multi-method or something else? *Teisė, 132*, 135–144. https://doi.org/10.15388/Teise.2024.132.10

Crawford, J. (2013). *State responsibility: The general part*. Cambridge University Press.

Direktorat Pelindungan Warga Negara Indonesia. (2025). *Laporan kinerja Direktorat Pelindungan WNI tahun 2024*. Kementerian Luar Negeri Republik Indonesia. https://kemlu.go.id/files/repositori/65397/174071018667c1212ae1402_LKJ_Dit__PWNI_2024.pdf

donesia. (2025). *Laporan kinerja Direktorat Perlindungan WNI tahun 2024*. https://kemlu.go.id/files/repositori/65397/174071018667c1212ae1402_LKJ_Dit__PWNI_2024.pdf

Human Rights Committee. (2018). *General comment No. 36 (2018) on article 6 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, on the right to life* (CCPR/C/GC/36). United Nations. https://www.ohchr.org/Documents/HRBodies/CCPR/CCPR_C_GC_36.pdf

Hutchinson, T., & Duncan, N. (2012). Defining and describing what we do: Doctrinal legal research. *Deakin Law Review, 17*(1), 83–119. https://doi.org/10.21153/dlr2012vol17no1art70

Imaduddin, M. I., et al. (2025). Penemuan hukum dan penafsiran hukum. *Edukreatif: Jurnal Kreativitas dalam Pendidikan, 6*(1).

Kementerian Luar Negeri Republik Indonesia. (2018). *Peraturan Menteri Luar Negeri Republik Indonesia Nomor 5 Tahun 2018 tentang Pelindungan Warga Negara Indonesia di Luar Negeri*. https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Download/130822/Permenlu%20No.%205%20Tahun%202018.pdf

Marzuki, P. M. (2017). *Penelitian hukum*. Kencana Prenada Media Group.

Marzuki, S. (2014). Negara hukum dan perlindungan hak asasi manusia terhadap warga negara. *Jurnal Hukum IUS QUIA IUSTUM, 21*(3), 345–362.

Nasution. (2020). Perlindungan warga negara Indonesia di luar negeri dalam perspektif hukum administrasi negara. *Jurnal Hukum & Pembangunan, 50*(2), 215–230.

Nurjanah, S. (2020). Peran pemerintah Indonesia dalam melindungi WNI di negara konflik (studi kasus Timur Tengah). *Jurnal Ilmu Hubungan Internasional, 7*(1), 45–60.

Prasetyo, R. B., dkk. (2018). Perlindungan hukum terhadap warga negara Indonesia di luar negeri dalam perspektif hukum internasional. *Jurnal Hukum Internasional, 15*(2), 213–230.

Republik Indonesia. (1999). *Undang-Undang Nomor 37 Tahun 1999 tentang Hubungan Luar Negeri*. https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Details/45358/uu-no-37-tahun-1999

Sihombing. (2021). Koordinasi lintas lembaga dalam perlindungan WNI di daerah konflik. *Jurnal Ilmu Hukum Refleksi Hukum, 5*(1), 77–92.

Soekanto, S., & Mamudji, S. (2019). *Penelitian hukum normatif: Suatu tinjauan singkat*. Rajawali Pers.

Sunggono, B. (2016). *Metodologi penelitian hukum*. RajaGrafindo Persada.

Taekema, S. (2021). Methodologies of rule of law research: Why legal philosophy needs empirical and doctrinal scholarship. *Law and Philosophy, 40*, 33–66. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10982-020-09388-1

Theil, S. (2025). Carefully tailored: Doctrinal methods and empirical contributions. *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies, 45*(4), 1047–1075. https://doi.org/10.1093/ojls/gqaf029

Tindall, K. (2010). Coping with consular emergencies: Four key governmental coordination relationships. *International Journal of Emergency Management, 7*(3/4), 281–295. https://doi.org/10.1504/IJEM.2010.037012

Tindall, K. (2012). Governments' ability to assist nationals in disasters abroad: What do we know about consular emergency management? *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management, 20*(2), 102–114. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5973.2011.00659.x

Tindall, K., & 't Hart, P. (2011). Evaluating government performance during consular emergencies: Toward an analytical framework. *Policy and Society, 30*(2), 137–149. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polsoc.2011.03.001

Undang-Undang Dasar Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 1945.

Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 37 Tahun 1999 tentang Hubungan Luar Negeri.

United Nations. (1948). *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. https://www.un.org/en/about-us/universal-declaration-of-human-rights

United Nations. (1949). *Geneva Convention relative to the protection of civilian persons in time of war (Fourth Geneva Convention)*. https://ihl-databases.icrc.org/en/ihl-treaties/gciv-1949

United Nations. (1963). *Vienna Convention on Consular Relations*. *United Nations Treaty Series, 596*, 261–333. https://treaties.un.org/PAGES/ViewDetails.aspx?chapter=3&clang=_en&mtdsg_no=III-6&src=TREATY

United Nations. (1963). *Vienna Convention on Consular Relations*. https://legal.un.org/ilc/texts/instruments/english/conventions/9_2_1963.pdf

United Nations. (1966). *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights*. https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/international-covenant-civil-and-political-rights

Vermeer-Künzli, A. (2007a). A matter of interest: Diplomatic protection and state responsibility erga omnes. *International and Comparative Law Quarterly, 56*(3), 553–581. https://doi.org/10.1093/iclq/lei182

Vermeer-Künzli, A. (2007b). As if: The legal fiction in diplomatic protection. *European Journal of International Law, 18*(1), 37–68. https://doi.org/10.1093/ejil/chm009

Vermeer-Künzli, A. (2007c). Diallo and the Draft Articles: The application of the Draft Articles on Diplomatic Protection in the Ahmadou Sadio Diallo case. *Leiden Journal of International Law, 20*(4), 941–954. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0922156507004554

Weruin, U. U., et al. (2016). Hermeneutika hukum: Prinsip dan kaidah interpretasi hukum. *Jurnal Konstitusi, 13*(1), 95–123.