

Indonesia's Gaza Deployment: Peacekeeping or Political Misstep?

News:

Indonesia announced its readiness to send up to 8,000 troops to Gaza under President Donald Trump's Board of Peace (BoP) initiative, marking one of the first and largest public commitments to the mission. Brig. Gen. Donny Pramono stated that an initial 1,000 troops could deploy as early as April, pending President Prabowo Subianto's final approval. The government stressed that the deployment would be strictly non-combat, aimed at humanitarian support, stabilization, and reconstruction in Gaza. The pledge comes days before the inaugural BoP summit in Washington. However, the initiative has sparked skepticism among U.S. allies, who view the BoP as an attempt by Trump to build a rival institution to the United Nations. While initially envisioned as a body to oversee a cease-fire between 'Israel' and Hamas, the BoP charter grants it a broad global mandate, raising concerns about its legitimacy, accountability, and political motives. ([newyorktimes.com](https://www.nytimes.com))

Comment:

Indonesia's plan to send as many as 8,000 troops to Gaza under the Board of Peace (BoP) initiative represents a bold but deeply contentious foreign policy move. While Jakarta frames the mission as a strictly humanitarian effort—supporting reconstruction, stability, and civilian protection—the wider political architecture surrounding the deployment raises troubling questions that cannot be ignored.

The BoP itself is at the heart of the controversy. Conceived and led by President Donald Trump, the institution attempts to operate as a parallel global security body, one whose sweeping authority appears designed less to promote peace than to consolidate U.S. influence outside established multilateral frameworks. Analysts have correctly noted that the BoP risks functioning as a rival to the United Nations—one without the same checks, consensus mechanisms, or human rights commitments. Any peacekeeping mission conducted under such a structure carries inherent legitimacy concerns.

For Indonesia, a nation with a long history of supporting Palestinian self-determination and rejecting colonial occupation, participating under the BoP umbrella risks sending contradictory signals. Jakarta insists its troops will not engage in combat and that the mission respects Palestinian sovereignty. However, this does not resolve the larger dilemma: by joining a Trump-led stabilization scheme in Gaza, Indonesia may inadvertently lend credibility to an arrangement that sidelines Palestinian agency and normalizes 'Israel's' ongoing control over Gaza's borders, security, and humanitarian access.

There is also the question of operational effectiveness. Even with thousands of troops deployed, Indonesia cannot realistically restrain the Jewish entity's military operations or prevent ongoing restrictions on aid. A peacekeeping force that cannot stop bombings, raids, or civilian displacement risks being confined to symbolic or low-risk zones—an arrangement that offers minimal protection to the people of Palestine while providing political cover for the BoP.

Ultimately, Indonesia's intentions may be rooted in solidarity and humanitarian concern, but good intentions do not neutralize flawed political design. A mission conducted within a framework perceived as legitimizing occupation or bypassing international law could undermine Indonesia's moral standing and long-held commitment to liberation of Palestine.

If Indonesia wishes to strengthen its support for Palestine, its efforts would be better directed toward demanding accountability for the Jewish entity's violations rather than participating in an initiative whose political foundations are widely suspected of serving to prolong the genocide and colonial project in Palestine.

Written for the Central Media Office of Hizb ut Tahrir by

Abdullah Aswar