



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

**UPDATING PAPUA ROAD MAP:
PEACE PROCESS, YOUTH POLITICS,
AND PAPUAN DIASPORA**

By :

Adriana Elisabeth, Aisah Putri Budiatri, Amorisa Wiratri,
Cahyo Pamungkas, Wilson

Translate by :

Abellia Anggi Wardani



Indonesian Institute of Sciences (LIPI)
Jakarta, August 2017





Executive Summary

**Updating Papua Road Map:
Peace Process, Youth Politics, and Papuan Diaspora**

By :

Adriana Elisabeth, Aisah Putri Budiatri, Amorisa Wiratri,
Cahyo Pamungkas, Wilson

Translate by

Abellia Anggi Wardani

Jakarta, August 2017

iv + 44 page; 14.5 x 20.7 cm | Design by: Prayogo

Published by:

Center for Political Studies, Indonesian Institute of Sciences (P2Politik - LIPI)

Gedung Widya Graha LIPI, Lt. XI

Jl. Jend. Gatot Subroto KAV-10, Jakarta 12710 - INDONESIA

Tlp. / fax : 021 - 520 7118 | Website: www.politik.lipi.go.id

Twitter: @PolitikLIPI





Table of Content

Introduction	1
First Part Activities After the Launching of <i>Papua Road Map</i> Book	5
Second Part Ideas, Roles of Actors, Political Movements and Network in Papua	17
Third Part Strategy to Build Peace in Papua	32
Conclusion	39
Reference	41





INTRODUCTION

In 2009, Papua Studies team from Lembaga Pengetahuan Indonesia (LIPI/Indonesia Institute of Sciences) published a book titled *Papua Road Map: Negotiating the Past, Improving the Present, and Securing the Future*. This book was a result of four-year extensive research from 2004-2008. The author team consisted of Muridan S. Widjojo (coordinator and editor of the *Papua Road Map/PRM*), Adriana Elisabeth, Cahyo Pamungkas, Amiruddin al Rahab, and Rosita Dewi. The book analysed four main roots of conflict in Papua, which stand for history of the integration of Papua land to the Republic of Indonesia and political identity of Papuans, political violence and Human Rights violations, failure of socio-economic development in Papua and inconsistency of the implementation of Otsus Law (Special Autonomy) in Papua, as well as marginalization and discrimination towards Papuan people (Widjojo, 2009, p. 6-7).

Amidst the aforementioned four main roots of conflict, PRM suggested four agendas as means to resolve conflicts in Papua which are intertwined to each other, such as: (1) recognition by promoting positive affirmation towards Papuan people in protection of their rights and compensation of the marginalization and discrimination towards them in the past, (2) new paradigm for development in Papua to fulfill Papuan basic needs and rights in education, health and economic welfare, (3) dialogue as a means to create mutual trust between Jakarta and Papua, to reach out common agreement on issues and problems in the past, and to put forward common vision towards the future of Papua, (4) Providing path of reconciliation to reveal



past incidents of violence and human rights violations in Papua and agreement from the part of state authority to admit their wrongdoings in the past (Widjojo, 2009, p. xxvii).

After publishing and launching the PRM book, LIPI team developed its academic approach towards Papuan issues not only through research and study, but also by organizing various discussions and academic lecture, as well as policy advocacy to push the relevant stakeholders to implement recommendations based on the PRM findings, especially on the importance of dialogue as a means to build peace in Papua. Meanwhile, to introduce the concept of dialogue as an alternative way for conflict settlement, LIPI team have held several public consultations in Papua, explorative meetings in several cities in Indonesia, Papua Peace Conference (Konferensi Perdamaian Papua/KPP) in Jayapura, media briefing, diplomatic briefing and other activities. That being said, the concept of dialogue has been broadly known and become familiar among human rights activists, academicians in Papua, as well as Central Government, Local Government, national and regional parliament members.

Since 2009, dialogue as a means to resolve Papua conflicts has become the concern of the President of Republic of Indonesia, the idea is being carried on to the current Jokowi administration. Thanks to LIPI and JDP efforts, the word dialogue is no longer considered as a taboo term. President Jokowi stated that he was ready to conduct a dialogue with Papuan people to address issues and resolve conflicts, but until today, President, Papuans and local Government in Papua have not shared the common understanding on the definition of dialogue. Whether it is meant to be a constructive communication between Central government and Papuan people, or political dialogue in Aceh in 2005 to resolve disputes and bring about



peace through Memorandum of Understanding Helsinki (ICG, 2010, p. 25; www.bbc.com; Kartono, 2015, www.nasional.kompas.com; Jordan, 2015, www.news.detik.com; Mambor, 2015, www.tabloidjubi.com).

In attempts to promote a common understanding on the definition of dialogue, LIPI team together with Papua Peace Network (Jaringan Damai Papua/JDP) conducted a number of discussions with various actors and formulated the concept of dialogue to resolve conflicts in Papua. This endeavour has been carried out since 2010 up to today with the same goal, to materialize dialogue in Papua. LIPI team also collected and received a number of critics and inputs pertaining to the meaning and relevance of peaceful dialogue to resolve Papuan conflicts and reach out reconciliation in Papua.

To answer such critics LIPI team decided to update the previous version of PRM book in order to highlight a more concise and elaborate definition of dialogue. This book is an updated version of the previous PRM. One of the aims of this updating attempts is to reformulate the meaning of dialogue as a new peace strategy or approach for the settlement of Papua conflicts. Also, in this updated version, it is important to analyse the changes that have occurred in the course of development in Papua since the launching of the first version of PRM, 5 years ago. This current version is rich in terms of providing most recent data and findings that are carefully analysed using academic approach. Papuan issues are dynamic in the sense that the actor mapping and the sources of conflict have changed considerably since the first version of PRM was released. Therefore, this updating PRM will emphasize on the Papuan political dynamics in local, national, and global network. PRM will remain a reliable academic source about conflicts in Papua,



also, it serves as a basis for decision making in responding to the current situation in Papua.

Updating data and analysis focuses on two main aspects, actor mapping in conflicts in Papua, this relates closely to youth movement and Papuan diaspora abroad, as well as dialogue as peace approach for Papua. The first two issues have been chosen to be the main focus of this book and are new elements compared to the previous version. However, in general, the four roots of problem that have been analysed in the PRM are relatively still relevant to the current situation in Papua because findings suggest that there has not been much shift on the side of policy and program implementation especially in regards to the amelioration of condition and social-economic welfare of Papuans. Issues related to political and historical statues of Papua, Human Rights violations, failure of development, and marginalization towards Papuan people are still relevant as the roots of problem for Papua up to today. In a similar vein, the three solutions that are offered in the PRM 2009, such as recognition, new development paradigm, and reconciliation and human rights settlements are still seen as important solutions towards the current condition of Papua. The only issue that still needs to be further discussed is dialogue as a means to resolve conflicts in Papua. The mismatching views on dialogue, and the fact that this approach has not been inclusively realized and regarded as a means to build trust and common ground towards reconciliation in Papua. Discussions and debates over the views on Papua dialogue continue to exist, thus comprehensive studies on such issue are needed, both in updating this PRM and in building peace in Papua.



First Part

Activities after the launching of *Papua Road Map* book

This updating PRM sets forth two main ideas. *First*, the appearance of Jaringan Damai Papua (JDP), youth group movements and Papuan diaspora as the new actors in the enduring conflicts in Papua. In the previous version of PRM, there were seven identified actors that played out in the conflicts, such as Central and local government, Free Papua Movement (Organisasi Papua Merdeka/OPM), Papua Presidium Council (Presidium Dewan Papua), Papua Customary Council (Dewan Adat Papua), Religious Group (Church), Non-Government Organization, and Tribal Chiefs. JDP is constituted as a new actor that has not been clearly identified in the PRM because this network of dialogue facilitator came into being a few years after the launching of PRM book. It was after the idea of dialogue has been widely spread and promoted by various parties especially at the grassroots level, that the role of JDP got strengthened. Meanwhile, other raising actors that are understudied comprise youth group movements and Papuan, at that time, these actors have not consolidated well among themselves and therefore have not contributed significantly towards the socio-political dynamics in Papua. After the Papua Peace Conference (Konferensi Perdamaian Papua/KPP) was held in 2011, the youth group movements became more solid and grew in numbers, even the Papuan diaspora has extended their networks to cooperate with various international elements to seek for support, especially by bringing up human rights violation issues in Papua.



Second, with the last development of Papua issues, this book tries to elaborate two significant changes concerning dialogue approach. The first one is that dialogue has been accepted as an alternative way to resolve conflicts in Papua. It should be understood that dialogue was once a taboo term that has been avoided by various parties when discussing about the issues of Papua. Nevertheless, parties have not reached the same understanding on the definition and especially on mechanism of the proposed dialogue concept. While the second change closely relates to the shift of actor's views from 'dialogue as a solution' to become 'dialogue as an approach' in attempts to address Papua issues. In the previous version of PRM, dialogue was posited as a solution to address issues related to history of integration, political status, and political identity. In its development, dialogue has been seen more as an approach to talk about various issues in Papua that have triggered the current conflicts. In this context, dialogue becomes a common forum to gather and connect conflicting parties to discuss issues on the roots of conflicts in Papua, different ideologies and interests among actors, especially on economic issues, politics, and security issues in Papua.

1. Development of current social situation in Papua

This version of PRM highlights the importance of defining the roots of conflicts in Papua. Many parties have agreed that the PRM has succeeded in capturing the real struggles and issues in Papua. In the meantime, it should also have been acknowledged that Central government has put their efforts to resolve the roots of conflicts in Papua. During its first book launch, the Law no. 21 year 2001 about Special Autonomy Law for Papua Province (UU Otsus) has been implemented for 8 years, yet



now it has come into force for more than a decade. Apart from that, government had formed a unit called Development Acceleration Unit for Papua and West Papua Province (UP4B) that was expected to push forward the development in Papua during the administration of President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono (SBY) in 2011.

In a more optimistic outlook, the Special Autonomy Law (UU Otsus) for Papua should be able to resolve the problems in Papua, or at least to reduce the complexity of the problems in Papua concerning that the four root causes have been clearly mentioned in the Special Autonomy Law. Three out of four solutions offered in the previous version of PRM have also become part of the mandate of the Law, although it has not yet touched the promotion of dialogue as a peace tool (Widjojo, 2009, p. 152-153). Autonomy Law fails in addressing four Papua issues at the time because such Law has no legitimacy (Widjojo, 2009, p. 153). Relevant actors, such as local governments and legislators saw limitations in establishing priority sectors in the Special Autonomy Law. While the executive government in Papua stated that although the Law has covered most of the issues, in practice, not all can be done easily. Many of the rules in the Special Autonomy Law in fact cannot be executed because it collided with other legal rules (higher) and / or do not have sub-laws that govern the technical implementation. Although in the last five years (2011-2015), the Government has allocated 203.5 trillion Rupiah to develop Papua, it seems not to provide any significant changes towards the remaining four root causes.¹

1 The allocation of these funds is an accumulation of the General Allocation Fund (DAU), Special Allocation Fund (DAK), Special Autonomy Fund (DBH), Additional Infrastructure Fund, Education-School Operational Assistance Fund (BOS), Professional Teacher Allowance, employee benefits, Regional



In 2012-2013, LIPI team and JDP conducted exploratory meetings in four cities, namely Badung (Bali Province), Manado (North Sulawesi), Lombok (West Nusa Tenggara) and Yogyakarta (Yogyakarta Province) unveiling most discussed issues and problems faced by Papuans. The themes of these meetings closely relate to political, legal, security, socio-economic and socio-cultural issues. The findings of these exploratory meetings suggested that there are 14 main problems, they later are narrowed into four main sources of conflict in Papua that previously have been mentioned in the PRM (Papua Study Team LIPI & JDP, 2015, p. 3-4).² The LIPI team found

Intensive Fund, and Village Fund. This data was presented by representatives of the Ministry of Political, Legal and Security during an exploratory meeting with medias in Jakarta on May 11, 2016.

- 2 Fourteen identified problems in Papua are: (1) vertical conflicts including separatists stigmatization, banning the use of regional symbols, violence perpetrated by army forces / police and armed groups, and conflicts between Indonesian nationalism versus Papua ethno-nationalism, (2) political violence during local elections, (3) inconsistencies of the implementation of government policies, (4) implementation of good governance, (5) policy emphasizes on the state security and not on the human security, (6) disharmony of the implementation of modern and traditional economy as well as the rights of indigenous peoples to the natural resources that are not protected, (7) limited and uneven number of qualified teaching staff and infrastructure of education, and lack in promoting Papuan cultural values in the education curriculum, (8) limited and unequal number of qualified health personnel, low health infrastructure quality, low community nutrition, high mortality rate of pregnant women and children, high number of Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV), tuberculosis (TB) and malaria, as well as discrimination towards indigeneous Papuans by health workers, (9) violations of basic social cultural rights of the indigenous people of Papua, (10) the destruction of sacred places and buildings, (11) the stigma and discrimination against people of Papua, (12) Lack of government's recognition of the system and the structure of tribal governments, (13) the rampant land grabbing of ancestral community in the name of development, (14) the imposition of interfaith and faith in religion. See Policy Brief "Bersama-sama Membangun Papua Damai" formulated by the LIPI team and JDP in 2015.



that these four issues remain relevant to this day. Although, it should be understood that the new emerging actors and the growing complexity of issues requires a more comprehensive approach, so that fixing one problem will have an impact on the improvement of the other aspects or dimensions. Yet, many policies and programs that are intended to resolve problems in Papua end up becoming a new problem, for example, the problem of depopulation, or reduced number of native Papuan (OAP) population due to the arrival of migrants in Papua, this brings speculation that the OAP potentially extinct. Tracing back to 2010, Jim Elmslie an academician from Australia delivered his studies on the number of OAP that are increasingly low compared to the number of migrants in Papua (Elmslie, 2010, p. 1-10).³ This depopulation issue might not be explicitly mentioned in the previous PRM but it falls into the issue of marginalization and discrimination. This means that, although various issues have emerged recently, they could still be classified into the four root causes.

One of the main aspects that saw dramatic changes in the course of Papua conflicts are the new constellations of actors. From the side of Indonesia supports, they remain the same, while the middle-position groups and the ones supporting Papua independence, they are getting more actors on board. In this context, the establishment of JDP represents the emergence of middle-position groups, while the growing supports towards Papua youth movements and Papuan diaspora represent groups that support Papua political agendas such as referendum and Papua independence.

3 The number of migrants in 2010, as quoted by Elmslie from census data taken from National Statistics Agency (BPS), was 1,822,677 migrant people (50.45%), while the number of OAP/native Papuan are 1,790,777 (49.55%).

2. Actors in Papua Peace Process

After 2009, LIPI team⁴ applied the findings of the PRM, especially by promoting dialogue as peaceful tool to resolve conflicts, supported with a series of activities of policy advocacy. Being aware that LIPI capacity is limited to supporting academic resources, it was then Muridan Widjojo who initiated the formation of Jaringan Damai Papua (JDP) or Papua Peace Network (PPN) with Father Neles Tebay in late 2009. This network aims to function as facilitator that bridges all elements who support the creation of Papua Land of Peace and it consists of representatives of the various elements of the community both from indigenous Papuans as well as migrants.

JDP was officially formed in 2010, through consensus, it was agreed that Muridan became the coordinator of JDP Jakarta, while Neles Tebay as the coordinator of JDP Papua. JDP membership is voluntary, with members having various backgrounds including professors, researchers, students, NGOs, religious organizations, organizations based on ethnic / tribal / indigenous and other relevant groups both inside and outside Papua. They strive to connect conflicting parties and prepare the Jakarta-Papua dialogue. Currently there are about 60 facilitators, both native Papuans and / or non-Papuans representing various parties in the community (30% are women). In addition, JDP also has regional coordinators in various districts / cities in which JDP organized public consultations (Interview Amorisa with Cahyo Pamungkas in Jakarta, 5 April 2016).

4 LIPI Team experienced several personnel changes after the issuance of Papua Road Map. In fact, the team had a vacuum period because the team coordinator had to complete the doctoral studies. Despite its internal dynamic organizational changes, this team holds their strong passion to continue spreading the idea of dialogue.



It is important to note that LIPI and JDP has clearly stated their stance as institution to support and promote the concept of dialogue to resolve conflicts in Papua. LIPI as government agency focuses on academic studies or scientific development, while JDP focuses more on practical works on the ground. Both agencies cooperate in various activities that underline the important of dialogue, such as conducting information dissemination, public discussions, exploratory meetings, expert meetings with various parties (both from central and local government, NGOs and academia) (JDP website, accessed March 2016).

In January 2010, JDP and LIPI team designed a public discussion, which later referred to as public consultation for communities in Papua to collect their aspirations and at the same time advocate the idea of dialogue in the provinces of Papua and West Papua. The first public consultation carried out in Wamena on January 25, 2010. A public consultation was also carried out for non-Papuans and other groups, such as women's groups, religious groups, NGOs, academics, and others. Finally, the public consultation carried out in 20 districts / cities for Papuans and 6 regions for non-Papuans. These public consultations helped JDP to campaign for dialogue and to prepare the Papua Peace Conference (Siregar, et al, 2013, pp. 2-3).

On July 5-7, 2011, LIPI and JDP organized Papua Peace Conference (KPP) in the auditorium of Cendrawasih University in Jayapura, it was attended by representatives of the local government, the Central government, indigenous representatives, and academics, namely Marshal Djoko Sujanto at that time serving as Coordinating Minister for Political, Legal and Security Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia (RI



Legal and Security Affairs), Barnabas Suebu as Governor of Papua Province, Bekto Suprpto as Police Chief of Papua, Erfi Triasunu as Cenderawasih Military Commander, Leo Laba Ladjar Jayapua as Bishop of the Diocese, Dr. Tony Wanggai as Chairman of the Regional Board of Nahdlatul Ulama (NU) Papua Province and representative of the Majelis Muslim Papua, Pastor. Socrates Sofyan Yoman, M.Th. as Chairman of the Synod communion Baptist Churches in Papua and Forkorus Yaboisembut as Chairman of the Papua Traditional Council (DAP) (JDP Website accessed in March 2016). The conference participants were selected through public consultations forum organized by the JDP in 26 regions in Papua (Siregar, et.al., 2013, p. 3). The aim of this conference was to serve as the first meeting to agree on the idea of conducting a peaceful dialogue as the way to resolve conflicts in Papua, therefore LIPI team considered it to be important to engage in this process.

The conference discussed a series of problems that are seen as obstacles to build Papua Land of Peace, covering areas of economic, social, cultural, political, security, legal, human rights and dialogue. In addition, KPP also produced seventeen criterions for negotiators to represent both sides in the dialogue between Jakarta and Papua. Based on these 17 criterions, Papuan people appointed five negotiators to represent them in the dialogue. They five chosen people are Papuan diaspora leaders living in several different countries outside of Indonesia. They are Rex Rumakiek who lives in Australia, John Ondawame in Vanuatu, Leoni Tanggahma in the Netherlands, Octo Motte in the US and Benny Wenda in the UK (Mawel, 2014). However, the declaration of Papua Peace Conference that contains the names of the five negotiators received critical responses from various parties, especially from the part of Indonesian institutions.



Despite the political declaration at the end of the conference was never planned or intended by the organizers, it was indeed the only thing that was widely spread in the news and caused public scrutiny. Central Government condemned such severe misconduct and started to lose their trust towards JDP and especially the idea of dialogue (Wiratri Amorisa, interview with Adriana Elisabeth in Jakarta, March 14, 2016). Neles Tebay stated that the declaration was spontaneous and it was unplanned, it might be because the Papuan participants were very enthusiastic (Wiratri Amorisa, interview with Neles Tebay in Jakarta, October 19, 2015). Meanwhile, Adriana argued that Papuans took the opportunities to finally express their opinion and concern, which for decades have been forced to silence (Wiratri Amorisa, interview with Adriana Elisabeth in Jakarta, March 14, 2016). This marked the starting point for the Government of Indonesia to be increasingly resistant to the idea of peace through dialogue approach. Even though it should also be understood that the concept of inclusive dialogue has been prepared by the LIPI team on the basis of valid studies and intense discussions among LIPI intellectuals along with officials from ministries/ relevant institutions and non-governmental organizations including medias.

Since 2013, LIPI team cooperated with JDP members to conduct initial meetings that brought together leaders from Papua and Jakarta. The main purposes of the explorative meeting are to discuss issues that could help both parties to create a shared vision that is acceptable for all stakeholders in regards to the future of Papua, as well as to build mutual trust among participants, and so they can improve better cooperation in the future. The first explorative meeting was held in Jimbaran, Bali on 22-24 February 2013 under the title “Shared Vision for



the Future of Papua”, which was supported by the office of the Secretary of the Vice President (Setwapres) Indonesia and was attended by 26 representatives of ministries and institutions (Kementerian / Lembaga) in Jakarta, as well as representatives of Papua. This meeting was followed by a second meeting held in Manado in April 2013 in cooperation with Political Research Centre Indonesian Institute of Sciences (LIPI P2P), JDP, and the Political Science Association of Indonesia (AIPI). The tension at the first meeting began to thaw in line with the implementation of the second meeting. Through this second meeting, an agreement was made concerning the important of continuing such activities in order to strengthen the trust. Therefore, in August 2013 the third exploratory meeting was held in Lombok that succeeded to produce indicators for Papua Land of Peace.

Furthermore, the fourth explorative meeting was held on 25-26 January 2014 in Yogyakarta and was attended by the Governor of Yogyakarta. This event was followed by a fifth meeting in September 2015 in Semarang which was opened by the Governor of Central Java province, Mr. Ganjar Pranowo. The involvement of head of provincial government, local and central government representatives at the meeting further indicated government’s support towards the planned peace process. From the last two meetings, participants were able to generate a matrix on indicators for Papua Land of Peace. This matrix is then divided into three main clusters (political security, social, economic and socio-cultural) and a policy brief titled “Together to Build Papua Land of Peace”. LIPI team has submitted this policy brief to President Joko Widodo precisely on September 16, 2014 at the Auditorium LIPI Jakarta. This policy brief provides feedbacks on the issues mapping of Papua



and 11 policy recommendations to resolve conflicts in Papua peacefully. There are two points of recommendations that were adopted by President Joko Widodo shortly after he came into office, the liberation of political prisoners and the provision of access for foreign journalists to Papua.

In February 2015 LIPI and JDP resumed the sixth explorative meeting in Jakarta attended by Coordinating Minister for Political, Legal and Security Affairs and the Minister of Women's Empowerment. The presence of two ministers and director generals in the exploratory meeting showed a high appreciation from the Government, especially during the administration of President Jokowi. It served as a good forum to build trust with representatives from Papua because they believe that this forum could become a place to express their aspirations. Moreover, the statement of the Coordinating Minister of Politics, Legal, and Security, Admiral Tedjo Edhy Purdijatno about the need for dialogue to Papua, in particular through sectoral dialogue, becoming one of the important points of this meeting. Sectoral Dialogue was a forum to bring parties to discuss planning and implementation of programs in certain sectors, such as education, health, economy and investment, law and security, human rights, environment, culture and others.

Subsequently, in November 2015, the seventh explorative meeting was held in Sentul, Bogor, which addressed the root causes of politics, legal, security and human rights (HAM) issues in Papua, the regionalization of Papua conflict in the Asia Pacific region, the plan to form a Regional Military Headquarters in Manokwari, West Papua Province and the Mobile Brigade headquarters in Wamena, as well as the simultaneous election on December 9, 2015. At the end of this meeting, the participants drafted a press release, that further was delivered to President



Jokowi and for public on the progress of the investigation results and obstacles encountered in the settlement process of human rights violations in Papua. The press release also aimed to call on the government to ensure the implementation of Law No. 21 of 2001 on Special Autonomy for Papua Province, as amended by Law No. 35 year 2008, in an optimal and consistent way, and to build peace in Papua through dialogue that gradually involving relevant parties to the process.

In addition to joint activities with JDP, LIPI team are also cooperating with Non-Governmental Organization (NGO) such as Impartial, Papua Itu Kita, Institute for Policy Research and Advocacy (Elsam), the Wahid Institute, Commission for Missing Persons and Victims of Violence (KONTRAS), National Papua Solidarity (NAPAS), Sobat Papua and the Institute for Inter-Faith Dialogue (Interfidei). Cooperation with NGOs is done in the form of discussions and expert meetings. This cooperation is important to push forward the issues of Papua on the agenda of non-governmental organizations in Jakarta. LIPI also organized Public Consultations (SAR) to collect Papuan aspirations in regards to the indicators for Papua Land of Peace from Papuans living in Papua and outside Papua. Such activities helped by Papua Itu Kita in Surabaya, Yogyakarta and Salatiga. LIPI team also formed a partnership with the media and held several media briefings aiming to deliver updates for Papua issues. LIPI team believe that the struggles to achieve Papua Land of Peace require strong supports from the Indonesian community in general so that peace efforts in Papua can become a national concern.



Second Part

Ideas, roles of actors, political movements and network in Papua

1. Youth Political Movement

In a research conducted by LIPI, titled Mapping Roles and Interests of Actors (Elisabeth, et al, 2004, p. 7) LIPI team explored the two types of independence movement in Papua, the OPM (Free Papua Organization) who use guerrilla warfare and the other are groups of urban citizen promoting peace discourse on the street. At that time, one movement that was considered to have strong political nuances was the Papua Presidium Council (PDP), which was formed during the Second Papuan People's Congress in 2000 (Elisabeth, et al, 2004, p. 32). But the PDP failed to make use of the given momentum and trust, to turn their movement into a solid political organization and a strong network of inter-ethnic roots. PDP became weaker after the assassination of the chairman of the PDP, Theys H. Eluway, causing the loss of its symbolic charismatic leadership. Nevertheless, the weakened role of PDP opened more space for emergence of new actors in the Papua independence movement focusing more on local identity and actions against Indonesia. This new generation largely received their education in universities in Java and Sulawesi.

According to Muridan Widjojo (www.politik.lipi.go.id, 2009) a new layer of resistance groups can be classified as militant groups. Their patterns of action and political language were heavily influenced by Student Movement (Gerakan Mahasiswa/GM) in 1998, back in the period of the fall of Soeharto era.



During demonstration, these groups did not hesitate to clash with and even to attack the security forces. Compared to the conventional group of Papua pro-independence, for example members of the Free Papua Organization (OPM) or PDP, or other groups residing abroad, the new resistance group shows more organizational improvement. They coordinate their activities/actions fast, integrated, dynamic and reach out a broader scope. The intensive use of SMS, internet and other communication technologies helps them to better organize and disseminate their actions and ideas (www.politik.lipi.go.id, 2009). This new layer filled with young people who have never been part of Indonesian politics in the era before the reforms of 1998 and thereafter. This group resist to accept the fact that the old Papua pro-independence political elites were the ones that had been part of earlier Indonesian political regime (Amiruddin, 2010, p. 33). The younger generation of Papua confront older generation's political traditions, accusing them as not developing continuous ideology or struggle tradition. The older generation tended to have limited the political stage in order to not to be taken over by the revolutionary youth. In many cases, clash of ideology between young people and older generation was inevitable, youth who fought through mass movement revolutionary actions got hampered by the “older generation” who later are accused of being collaborators of Freeport (ICG, 2010). But others argue that the older generation of Papua are acutely fragmented, both in Papua, Indonesia and the diaspora abroad, that they often plan to impose their own interests. While the movement of the ‘senior actors’ is still suffering from elitism-feudal and patronism, a domination of actors from old traditional leadership type: tribal chief, Ondoafi, and king, this way, decision is taken solely by senior actors and



leaders, democracy in terms of collective decision-making are far from reality (Howay, 2016, www.sosialisapua.com).

Important transformations in the political movement of young people are the strengthening of political struggle by non-violent civil disobedience. Referring to Jason MacLeod's theory (2011, p. 72) the current strategy of movement in Papua uses the method of civil disobedience (civil resistance) by actions outside the formal political institutions through protests, strikes, boycotts, and the use of political symbols and social denial. In addition, they also prioritise unarmed civilians as a source of resistance. According to MacLeod, by using this method, the movement could attract more mass participation, than lobbying or armed conflict.

Another transformation that is worth to count is the youth strategy movement that has changed in terms of their geopolitical attitudes, previously from isolated armed struggles in the forests, into urban political diplomacy. The latter focuses more on demanding the rights of self-determination through a referendum. This movement cannot be separated with the opening of democratic space in Indonesia, where symbolizing Papuan identity became more apparent in public. At this stage, the youth movement are played out by new actors who are completely unrelated to the OPM (Amiruddin, 2010, pp. 28-29).

The strategy of the youth resistance movement in urban areas also attempt to adapt with the social landscape of heterogeneous urban society, their challenge also includes engaging with more diverse social groups and broadening their target scope rather than focusing only on students (www.ampnews.org, 2011). Their vision is to build and promote grassroots organizations, to discuss and cooperate with



grassroots actors to bring their ideology of movement closer to people (the result of Garda Papua Congress, 2009). Young people also began to transform their struggle movement through a more solid and structured organization with democratic and participatory principles. Decisions on issues related to organization, program and ideology are taken through discussions based on the organizational mechanism.

The West Papua National Committee (KNPB) began to promote and encourage the democratic process and public participation as a method of struggle. One of their aims is also to help people to establish and join in the People Regional Parliament (PRD) in 23 districts / cities in Papua. In April 2012, PRD held a conference to establish the National Parliament of West Papua (NPWP) and democratically elect board members from all representatives of the PRD. The formation of the PRD and NPWP show consistency of youth movement to progressively opening up space for more participatory, structured, programmatic, and solid struggles, more importantly to promote peaceful struggles.

Another important transformation in the current youth movement lies in the discourse and participation of women in the struggles. According to Heni Lani, head of Papua Women's Solidarity (SPP) who is also activist of Papua Student Alliance (AMP), it is important to showcase woman existence and supports in the liberation movement in Papua. Furthermore, such movement should be in line with the struggles for women's liberation in Papua in general. This way, Papuan women are encouraged to build progressive women's organizations to provide rooms to discuss, analyze and conclude the problems



of oppression and exploitation of women in economics and politics as part of the national liberation of Papua (Lani, 2013)⁵.

Furthermore, the current movement calls for building national unity and struggle body that can be acceptable to all major factions of the resistance movement, as well as providing organizational and political leadership to the entire resistance movement. In the framework of establishing a more solid and structured movement, building a front has taught youth to find common ground in terms of analysis, strategy, methods of struggle, and to build mutual trust and intensive communication among the leaders of the youth resistance movement. The establishment of the United Liberation Movement for West Papua (ULMWP), for example, can be considered as the paid hard work of youth consistent attempts to liberate Papua.

For youth resistance group, ideology is considered as an important part of the struggle. Referring to leftist theories, the liberation movement should reach out national level and therefore it needs access to engage participation from the whole Papuan people. Their task also comprises the need to propagate progressive culture such as science, democracy, solidarity, equality and justice for women, build schools that support the idea of liberation, as well as producing and distributing organizations' newspapers and other propaganda tools (the Garda Papua Congress). Young people consider that in order to understand the intricacies of exploitation, the oppressed parties require to have scientific, contextual, progressive and

5 Heni Lani is a female youth activist from Wamena. She studied in Singapore and became the founder of AMP. She engaged in the Front of Street Parliament, Front of Act of Free Choice, and she is listed on the Police most wanted person. Heni Lani spearheaded the issue of women in her movement, and along with other Papuan students in many cities, they set up Papuan Women Solidarity. Heni is also the manager and founder of the National Papua Solidarity (NAPAS).



revolutionary system thinking, so as to be able to fight and find the system of oppression imposed to them.

Replicating previous experiences and processes of nation building, the youth movement in Papua are using Marxist perspective to examine oppressions towards Papuans. Marxism teaches that a conscious revolution can only succeed if people understand the basic vision of communities where they live. Furthermore, it is also important to understand the driving forces that steer the socio-economic development of the community. Analysing the situation in Papua using Marxian approach, the youth resistance group conclude that class relations, in the context of Papua as an oppressed nation against the state, and the capitalist system are considered to be the source of oppression. There are three key issues at the root of oppression towards Papuans namely colonialism, imperialism and militarism. These three forces are supporting each other in control of natural resources in Papua coupled with the repressive involvement of the state apparatus.

Papuan youth put nationalism as to be inseparable with the interests of national and international capital. Economic and political dimensions of oppression towards Papuan people have supported the emergence of a more consolidated nationalist feeling and forged an embryo of collective identity among members of youth resistance group. Nationalism of “oppressed nation” is different with a strong ethno-nationalism and or primordialism. Occupation over Papua is part of Indonesia’s domination and international interest towards economic capital. Therefore, it has broadened the definition of independence, not only as a nation, but also freedom from all structural and systematic oppressions. The national liberation of West Papua is not only based on awareness of their identity,



as the people of Papua, but it strives to liberate West Papuan people from imperialism, colonialism, and militarism (Yeimo, 2015a).

Imagined nationalism also relates to the values of humanity, not a racist chauvinist nationalism, but nationalism as an inclusive bound by the commitment of human liberation. Papuan people's resistance against Indonesian occupation is not confined within a narrow definition of nationalism, but is based entirely on the consciousness and the larger idea to be free from all forms and actors who colonize and destroy Papua Land (Yeimo, 2015b, www.indoprogress.com). Papuan nationalism is not narrow nationalism, primordial and ethnocentric, but nationalism for all people who live in Papua. Thus it protects pluralism, gender, the environment, and pro-humanity. Nationalism based on differences in skin color or racism is a legacy of colonialism (FGD, October 22, 2015).

Young people seek to build a front and alliances involving different organ movement capable of uniting in the West Papua Youth Reconciliation Team brought the issue into the Pacific Island Forum in August 2010 in the Republic of Vanuatu. ULMWP which was formed in 2015 by young people regarded as a representation of the struggle for independence Papuans peacefully through a referendum. Therefore, the organs of the youth consolidated, put efforts to disseminate the ideas and collect signatures to support ULMWP to become a full member of the Melanesian Spearhead Group (MSG). More importantly, the liaison figures of ULMWP in Papua, currently all are under the leadership of young people. Although youth movement groups have gone through various upstreams, they are taking process in its own way and eventually succeeded forming ULMWP and secured membership in the MSG. More



importantly, they united the struggle movements under one common platform and leadership of ULMWP, both politically and organizationally.

2. Papuan Diaspora and ULMWP

Internationalization of Papua conflict issues has entered a new stage when West Papua National Coalition for Liberation (WPNCL) registered as an observer in the MSG in 2013. However, the MSG summit in Port Moresby decided that West Papua must re-apply for its membership in a unified and inclusive form, also must submit the application again to MSG. Representation remained the main problem for MSG members to take any decision over West Papua organizations membership at that time. Between October 2013 to October 2014, Reconciliation Team held a meeting and conducted a reconciliation process among the leaders of Papua movement organization. Throughout the period, they had hosted meetings with the leaders of the Federal Republic of West Papua (NRFPB), WPNCL, and PNWP. On 6th December 2014, in Saralana, Port Villa, a declaration of unity had been agreed upon and signed by Edison Waromi (NRFPB), Rex Rumakiek (WPNCL), and Buchtar Tabuni (WPNCL). They agreed to form a coordinating entity under the name of United Liberation Movement of West Papua (ULMWP). One of its goals is to represent aspirations of West Papuan People in the struggles for self-determination by using peaceful ways in the attempts to push through the idea of Free West Papua at the international level. This formed organization does not dissolve the three founding organizations, yet it serves as a coordinating body for these three to reach their shared goals. Furthermore, ULMWP also aims to get full membership at MSG.



The 20th MSG Summit was held on June 24-26, 2015 in Honiara, Solomons Island and it was filled with high tension between the delegation of Indonesian Government and the ULMWP representatives. The five country members of MSG negotiated and compromised on the membership application of ULMWP. Fiji and Papua New Guinea (PNG) could not stop the commitment of Solomon Islands, Vanuatu, and the Front de Liberte National Kanaks Socialiste (FLNKS) to accept ULMWP application. On the other hand, Vanuatu, Solomon Islands and FLNKS could not reject the commitment of Fiji and PNG to accept Indonesia as well. Subsequently, ULMWP was accepted as member of MSG, representing Melanesian people outside Papua with status as an observer, while the membership status of Indonesia representing Indonesian Melanesian Community in five provinces (Maluku Province, North Maluku, East Nusa Tenggara, Papua, and West Papua) was upgraded from observer to associate member.

The Indonesian government does not consider ULMWP to represent the entire Papuan communities, because this organization is a group of Papuan Diaspora residing abroad.⁶ In the meantime, Indonesian government officials are still reluctant when discussing about ULMWP, particularly concerning the internal consolidation of Papua Youth Political Movement which has been more solid and structured since the past three years. Various responses are present among civil society members in Papua. Religious leaders and non-government organization in the land of Papua, mainly in Jayapura and Manokwari, mentioned their absolute supports towards ULMWP and acknowledged that it is the only entity that has

6 It was delivered by one of the speakers from Central Government in the Papua National Seminar, held by LIPI on 27th January 2016 at LIPI Jakarta.



political mandate from Papuan people to represent them and fight for their aspirations, especially at the international level. Meanwhile, it also has strong supporters at the grassroots level in Papua that include various generations, tribes, and religious groups. This fact is strongly held by the leaders of ULMWP to defend their claim over their legitimate leadership, particularly those who originally came from Papuan diaspora representing NRFPB, the National Parliament of West Papua (NPWP) and WPNCL. Representation of NRFPB in ULMWP cannot be separated from the two figures of Papua who have extensive experiences in international political diplomacy, named Octavianus Mote and Jacob Rumbiak. Both actors were at the beginning elected as the Executive Committee of ULMWP, where Octavianus Mote became the Secretary General (*Sekjend*) and Jacob Rumbiak was mandated as the spokesperson.

NRFPB itself is a Papua Movement Organization formed during the Papuan Congress III in Jayapura on October 17-19, 2011. This Congress set forth NRFPB's Constitution and elected Chairman of the Papua Customary Council, Forkorus Yaboisembut, as its President and Edison Waromi as the Prime Minister. According to the Basic Handbook of NRFPB (2012, p.2-3), NRFPB claims that the basis of this Congress was the PDP recommendation on June 10, 2010, recommendations from People's Consultative Assembly (MRP) and Papuan People in 2010, the 10th Plenary of Papua Customary Council in Biak, 2011 as well as a need to respond to the Peace Conference of Papua in July 2011. The Congress was held to consolidate the Papuan political movement and filled the vacuum of political leadership in the land of Papua since 2001.



In 1999, Mote led Papua delegations to meet President B.J. Habibie⁷. After the meeting, he visited the United States with an invitation from the US Department of Foreign Affairs. At that time, due to possible threats from the part of Indonesian Security Services if he chose to return to Indonesia, Mote decided to stay in United States. Meanwhile, Jacob Rumbiak, lecturer at Cendrawasih University, was jailed in 1989 in 8 military prisons and 4 civil imprisonments due to his illegal political activities⁸. In 1999, Jacob escaped to Timor-Timur, and then the Australian Government evacuated him and gave him political asylum status.

NPWP is a progressive political movement organization in Papua highlighting the basis of civilized manner and people democracy. As the description stated on the website of NPWP, Parliament refers to People's Representative Foundation, whereas the word national is associated with the people of a nation. Therefore, the National Parliament is a People's Representative Foundation of West Papuan People which consists of many different tribes and groups, regardless their background (civilian, military or diaspora of Papua) as long as they share the same objectives to achieve national liberation of West Papua. Parliament or People's Council means the representatives come from the grassroots level, in which people vote directly their representatives in the political struggle of their own.

There were a number of political struggle movements on behalf of Papuan people, unfortunately most of them could

7 Between 1999 and 2000, Mote worked as Bureau Chief for Kompas Daily Newspaper for West Papua.

8 Mote was then moved to Tangerang and Cipinang Jakarta, together with Xananan Gusmao (Commander of Fretilin Group, Timor-Timur).



hardly meet the expectations of the West Papuan People due to no direct and democratic public consultations have been conducted to collect Papuan's aspirations. NPWP has two organizations below it, which are the West Papua National Committee (KNPB), an executive committee of political struggle of West Papuan people and the Free West Papua Campaign (FWPC), which consists of Papuan Diasporas abroad. The FWPC acts out as NPWP's diplomacy wing, it was established in 20014 in Oxford, United Kingdom. The organization has evolved and succeeded in conducting campaigns concerning the protection of Human Rights in West Papua. Later, it evolved into an organization with a permanent office in Oxford (United Kingdom), Den Haag (Netherlands), Port Moresby (PNG), and Perth (Australia). In addition to the Free West Papua Campaigns, NPWP has political relations with the International Parliamentarians for West Papua (IPWP). IPWP was founded on October 15, 2008 in the United Kingdom. It is a group of politicians from cross-party politics around the world that support the rights of West Papuan People to obtain self-determination.

Benny Wenda is one of the famous Papuan Diaspora members, both in Papua and abroad. He originally came from the central mountains and did many campaigns related to the rights of West Papuan People to self-determination. Together with his family, they are living in England and organizing the Free West Papua Campaign and the International Parliamentarians for West Papua (IPWP). After the establishment of ULMWP, he was chosen as the spokesperson of the ULMWP. After the fall of New Order regime, he formed the Presidium of Papua Council (PDP) as one of the results from Papuan People Congress II, 29 May – 3 June 2000 in Jayapura. However,



along the way, some members of PDP cooperated with the Government of Indonesia and left the idea of Free Papua, therefore some political organizations did not recognize the existence of PDP⁹. On 19 March 2002, in a meeting attended by Brigadier General Nicolaus Ipo Hau (OPM Revolutionary Council), Tom Beanal (PDP), Edison Waromi (West Melanesia Council), and activists from Study Institution and Human Rights Advocacy of West Papua (ELSHAM), participants agreed on the importance of reconciliation between Political Resistance of West Papuan People. Subsequently, ELSHAM conducted peace conference for Papua on 15 – 16 October 2002. ELSHAM gave recommendation to establish a Task Force (*Satgas*) for Peace, later known as the West Papua Peace Task Force (WPPTF). This task force comprised elements of Church activists and social volunteers. Between 2003 and 2008, they conducted a number of meetings which involved the diaspora of Papua and contributed to the formation of WPNCL (West Papua National Council for Liberation).

Papuan diasporas who represented WPNCL in ULMWP are Rex Rumakiek and Leoni Tanggahma. Both were elected as spokesperson member. Rex is based in Canberra, Australia, who has been working as Secretary General of WPNCL since 2008 and also was the Chairman of Decolonization Committee, Pacific Concerns Resource Center Suva, Fiji. While Leoni Tanggahma (the daughter of the late Ben Tanggahma, Minister for Foreign Affairs of West Papua Republic proclaimed by Seth Rumkoren on 1 July 1971, settled in Senegal)¹⁰ lives in

9 On 16th August 2004, West Papua National Authority (WPNA) continued the struggle of PDP to free Papua from Indonesia. However, this organization failed in gaining support from various elements in West Papua.

10 Ben became the head of OPM's representative in Africa and supported by the Government of Senegal.



the Netherlands, she is working as liaison officer of European ELSHAM. Leoni also regularly helped represent Papuan People in the UN forums such as working group of indigenous people, Human Right Council, and other sub-commissions. Currently, Leoni is working as Document Management Assistant in an international organization based in the Netherlands. On another note, the development of Papuan Diaspora in the Pacific region, particularly since 1970 could not be separated from the role of late John Otto Ondawame and Andi Ajamiseba. John Ondawame was an intellectual figure as well as OPM figure who was very influential, inside and outside Papua.

ULMWP is getting supports from international communities, especially from the Pacific Region. Such support marks ULMWP's strengthened position not only within Papua land but also abroad. Their support towards ULMWP is in line with struggles that are promoted by various civil societies on the ground in the region. There are two significant civilian political powers, namely the Pacific Islands Association of Non-Governmental Organizations (PIANGO) and the South Pacific Church. PIANGO consists of member from 22 regions and South Pacific countries established in 1991, it aims to introduce the work of advocacy, voice out community's aspirations, and cooperate with development actors to promote equitable and sustainable human development.

Another civil power that is also important in supporting ULMWP movement is churches organization in South Pacific Area. On 20 March 2015 after going through a series of meetings organized by Pacific Conference of Churches (PCC) and the Anglican Church of Melanesia (ACoM), they decided to form the Solomon Islands Solidarity for West Papua Freedom. This meeting was attended by the representatives of Forum Solomon



Islands International (FSII), Free West Papua Movement in the Solomon Islands, Grassroots for West Papua, ACoM's Commission for Justice, Reconciliation and Peace (CJRP), ACoM Mothers Union, Young Women's Parliamentary Group, Voice Blo Mere, and the Development Service Exchange (DSE). On March 12, 2015, as many as 50 leaders of Methodist Church in Fiji signed a petition of solidarity movement to support West Papua to join MSG. This petition led by the Ecumenical Centre for Research, Education, and Advocacy (ECEA) subsequently submitted to the Prime Minister Voreqe Bainimarama in the late of April 2015 (FGD, 30 October 2015).

On the whole, considering the formation of ULMWP and the immersion of Papuan Diaspora figures from different resistance groups, it can be said that the resistance movement of West Papuan People have become effectively consolidated. Although all three ULMWP powers have different diaspora's center, NRFPB in Australia, WPNCL in Vanuatu, and NPWP in England, but each institution is complementary to one another. In addition, the diasporas abroad are keeping close contact with people on the ground in Papua. This situation differed the character of Papuan movement before the year 2000, where their works were unrelated and lack of coordination with each other despite their common goals to liberate Papua from Indonesia.



Third Part

Strategy to Build Peace in Papua

For almost five years, the political dynamics of Papua have become more complex. It requires more attention from the government and other relevant institutions especially with the growing and strengthening Papuan youth movements in Papua land. Not only these youth movements are becoming more solid, but they also are also building up connection and network with various actors abroad. Consolidation of Papuan political movement reached its peak after the formation of ULMWP, in which during the MSG meeting (a regional economic cooperation in South Pacific) in June 2015; ULMWP received observer status in the MSG.

In addition to the formation of ULMWP, the attempts to settle Papuan conflict are facing the fact that political violence still often occurred. The perpetrators of the violence have extended not only by the security apparatus, but also by armed civil society. Political violence in Papua has led to the increase of cases of human rights violations in Papua land. Recent cases such as Tolikara, April 2016 and Paniai, December 2014 extended the long-overdue list of Human Rights issues in Papua along with other unsolved issues such as the case of Wasior, Wamena, and violence imposed in the past that occurred between the 1970s – 1980s. Furthermore, since about last year, the number of violence cases in Papua tend to increase and nearly occur every day. Various cases such as murder, shooting, arrests, and other “unwitnessed” cases, received poor attention from the formal institutions, such as National/ Regional



Police, National Committee of Human Rights (KOMNHAM), Attorney General, and other related institutions.

On the other hand, the socio economic welfare of some Indigenous Papuan People (*OAP*) also have not improved significantly yet, in which access to education and health have been inadequately available across Papua regions. The current socio-economic condition in Papua is also influenced by the shift of demographic composition. Native Papuan people are experiencing marginalization, and it has attracted more attention than the occurrence of the environment damage that are decreasing the quality of Papuan life. Such condition depicts the partial portrait of Papua condition nowadays.

A wide range of national policies and local programs have been implemented in the land of Papua, such as the Otsus law for Papua, Presidential Instruction (*Inpres*); the acceleration of the Papua Development, the formation of UP4B, also other variety of economic policies and infrastructure development under the administration of *Kabinet Kerja* (Jokowi's administration). However, those efforts have not succeeded in bringing peace in Papua. Apparently, the settlement of conflict in Papua is still partially conducted and neglecting the complexity of the existing problem. Moreover, no new strategies and approaches have been initiated lately to sustain the long-term peace efforts in Papua. The dichotomy of “Jakarta” and “Papua” views on the roots of conflicts in Papua seem to hamper the settlement process¹¹. The handling of Papua's case is also simplified in accordance with highly sectoral point of view, which oftenly raises new problems, for example the overlap of authority and regulation between Central government and local government

11 See *Policy Brief (2015). Bersama-sama Membangun Papua Damai, Jakarta: P2P LIPI and JDP*, page. 3.



in Papua causing internal tension within the government. In addition, opposing stance between Central government and Papuan people enlarges trust issues and suspicion, and makes it more difficult to build cooperation in order to enhance welfare and security of Papua.

The Indonesian Government, in this case, Joko Widodo's administration has shown serious efforts to build and develop infrastructure as well as to gradually solve political problems and human rights violations in Papua. The Indonesian Government has also been trying to better understand the complexities of Papua issues. For example, government has designed a development programs for Papua and West Papua based on seven customs territories (Bappenas, 2014), compared to previous development blueprint, this initiative shows that government wants to adapt the development model parallel to traditional mechanism in Papua. This way, the development results are expected to fulfill the expectations of Papuan people despite their variation in customary practices. This development policy has indeed showed a change of national approach.

However, during the President Jokowi's last visit to Papua (Sorong and Manokwari), it cannot be denied that the government's policies remain rather focusing on the ceremonial interest of Papua's infrastructure development than strengthening political communication through dialogue approach. This brings failure consequences in winning the heart of Papuan people who feel not only discriminated and marginalized in terms of socio-economic condition, but also their restricted political expression. Considering the fact that Papua is stigmatized as problematic area and land of separatists, a new approach to development cannot be separated from simultaneous attempts to open spaces for greater community



participation. The communication scheme that is transparent and mutually beneficial between the conflicting parties also need to be built to avoid political and economical risk that may arise in the future.

By looking at the complexity of the problem and the current socio-economic dynamics in Papua since 2010, focus and strategy of handling political issue, security, economic, and socio-cultural development in Papua should emphasize on three main things: first, settlement of unresolved problems in the past that still have impacts on the situation in Papua nowadays, both related to political and security situation, and socio-economic and socio-cultural conditions of Papua. The case of human rights violations in Papua have become a weak point of Indonesia in the international arena. Such issues have been discussed at various international forums as well as covered in many news and articles, mostly to criticize and corner the Indonesian Government on charges of deliberately letting the conflicts and abuses happen. The criticisms and accusations can only be reduced (if omitting them might be difficult to do) by serious efforts from the Government to resolve the continuous conflicts in Papua, particularly the Human Rights violations in Papua.

Second, change of diplomacy and communication strategy in facing political movement of young people in Papua and Papuan diaspora needs to be done. This change will help to limit the externalization of Papua issues. Concerning the diplomatic strategy, the government needs to open up more intense communication with many elements, from the government officials as well as from civil society groups, in countries where Papuan political movements are greatly present. Subsequently, appointing the right diplomats who possess accurate knowledge



and understanding about Papuan culture, not only the Papuan cultural products, but also the philosophy, ideas and cultural values that are embraced and practiced by the Papuan people. Furthermore, not only to change diplomatic strategy internationally, the government also needs to build more intense communication with Papuan grassroots level in the land of Papua. Such communication method is needed because the long continuous deadlock between Central Government and Papuan people have led to various movements at the grassroots level aiming at finding their ways to express their disagreement, discontentment, etc. For this particular reasons, Papuan people tend to mobilize their political power and build up networks, both in Papua and outside Papua. Their attempts include efforts to gain support from groups of Papuan independence movement in South Pacific regions. Therefore, elitist or top-down approach needs to be replaced with inclusive approach that gives a wider room for public participation in the process of development, and also communication strategy that could raise Papuan trust towards their leaders, particularly local government as well as Central government.

Third, the use of inclusive dialogue approach for Papua as a part of the mediation process to achieve a long term reconciliation and peace in Papua. In contrast to the initial bid offered by LIPI Papua Study team in the previous version of “Papua Road Map” about dialogue as a peaceful solution for Papua, in this updated version of PRM, LIPI team agreed to interpret the dialogue as comprehensive, integrative, and simultaneous approach. This way, the priorities of the dialogue approach are to provide openness and equality in the communication process. Accordingly dialogue approach is expected to open up a wider space for the involvement of



various elements in the process to get legitimacy for any deal reached during the dialogue, and to foster ownership (a sense of belonging) and responsibilities from each party involved in the dialogue. However, it has to be understood that the dialogue approach needs strong political commitment and adequate budget due to its length process and the needs of involvement of various elements of the community as well as the government.

The dialogue approach in the context of conflict resolution is not a new thing as it has been adopted by many countries facing conflict, including Indonesia. The Indonesian Government have the opportunities to carry out dialogue for peaceful settlement in Papua, particularly after President Jokowi declared his readiness for dialogue at the end of 2015. In the context of Papua, LIPI team have compiled and formulated a concept called national dialogue. The national dialogue aims to improve relations between Central and local government and Papuan people based on the mutual agreements to guarantee fulfilment of Papuan people's rights in various aspects.

In order to prepare such dialogue, President needs to appoint a "Special Envoy". The criteria that must be met are: (1) the person needs to possess full trust from the President of the Republic of Indonesia; (2) the person has an accurate understanding about the roots of conflict in Papua; (3) possesses objective ways of being and is not discriminative; and (4) is impartial, or has never been involved in the formation of civilian militias pro-Indonesia and/or supporting the independence of Papua. Those four criterions intend to ensure that the special envoy could work effectively and get a strong legitimacy in the dialogue process. Next, the special envoy needs to accommodate aspirations from various elements in the



society and the government, more importantly to engage both sides in the national dialogue.

The national dialogue must involve representatives from the central government, local government, indigenous Papuan, migrant associations, religious groups, activists/NGOs, medias, youth groups, academics/researchers, businessmen/investors, professional groups, women's groups, political parties, the TPN/OPM and the Papuan diaspora. In the national dialogue, many parties will discuss the problems that obstruct the peace process in Papua. Nevertheless, they first need to agree upon the list of problems to be discussed. Referring to the Policy Brief formulated by LIPI team and JDP, there are fourteen issues that need to be resolved¹².

Before the national dialogue to be held, a series of dialogues need to be conducted in parallel, they are: (1) dialogue between the President of Indonesia with the three pillars in the land of Papua – local Government of Papua and West Papua, representatives of Papua Council and representatives of West Papua Council, as well as representatives of Papua Assembly and West Papua Assembly; (2) dialogues among ministries and government agencies; (3) dialogues among elements of Papuan communities, and (4) sectoral dialogues that address thematic issues, such as education and health among relevant stakeholders. Pertaining to logistic issues, such as mediator, time and venue of the national dialogue, those can be put in the agenda of the first dialogue.

Subsequently, it needs to be emphasized that national dialogue and peace mediation are not an instant and easy process.

12 More information can be found in the Policy Brief *"Bersama-Sama Membangun Papua Damai"* compiled by Team of LIPI Papua Study team and JDP, Jakarta, 2015.



This relates to the fact that both conflicting parties need time to rebuild mutual trust among them. In fact, deadlock or failure is very likely to occur when the national dialogue or dialogue takes place. If this happens, the process of dialogue needs to be restarted, but it requires at least one party who is willing to initiate the second chance.

The resolution of Papua conflict through a peace mediation and a national dialogue should be viewed as a strategic step to rebuild trust among Papuan people and their sense of belonging to be part of Indonesian family, also to achieve long-term sustainable peace reconciliation. The most important thing from this dialogue approach is that it accommodates Papuan local culture which prioritizes communal negotiations to resolve disputes or conflicts among traditional Papuan tribes. Papuan negotiation culture is also in line with the Indonesia's democracy values, *musyawarah*, to resolve disputes within a community. In other words, this approach indulges Papuan's traditional conflict resolution mechanisms which are also part of the Papuan culture and in the meantime it is an important element to enhance pluralism in Indonesia.

CONCLUSION

Departing from the explanation of the current conditions in Papua, the four roots of the problem that have been mapped out in the previous version of PRM (2009) are still relevant. Although it has to be understood that changes happened, but the four roots remain as thorny issues to address in Papua. Concerning issue of historical and political status of Papua, although it has become increasingly open and discussed in a



public space, but tangible actions and follow up to resolve these issues are still lacking from the part of Central Government. Violence and human rights violations in Papua have attracted public attention both domestically and internationally, but the actual number of cases that have been legally resolved remain low. Furthermore, reconciliation of human rights violations in the past have not been addressed properly to date.

On the other hand, the youth resistance and diaspora groups become more solid in their fights for referendum and the independence of Papua. Their relationship became more firm, especially after the formation of ULMWP as an entity to gain legitimacy as the representative organization of many pro-independence Papuans inside and outside Papua. Moreover, the issue of Papua is becoming more frequently raised in the international forums, particularly in the South Pacific region. Discussions on human rights violations in Papua have become a focus in many international meetings, such as in the United Nations (UN) General Assembly, MSG, and the Pacific Islands Forum (PIF).

It has to be taken into account that through security and prosperity approaches, the Government has sought to resolve the Papua issue. However, this approach is proven to be ineffective in solving problems in Papua. On the contrary, such approach has deepened the conflict and expanded political movement and the referendum for Papua independence. Therefore, actors working on Papua issues continuously urge the Government to take alternative approaches. In this version of Updating Papua Road Map, LIPI team has proposed national dialogue as a more strategic approach to finding a common solution and an agreement that could be acceptable for various actors in the Papuan conflicts.

Dialogue approach is considered as the appropriate step to resolve Papua issues for it promotes peaceful, non-violent, non-manipulative, democratic approach. Most importantly, dialogue approach is in accordance with Papuan tradition in resolving internal conflict. Referring to the statement of late Muridan Widjojo as the author and editor of PRM book (2009), “dialogue kills no one, if it fails, then dialogue can simply be repeated.”¹³ But we will only know about the effectiveness of the peace dialogue for Papua until it is finally conducted. If the plan to carry out dialogue continues to be delayed, then we will waste a lot of time and opportunities to rebuild trust towards peace and reconciliation in Papua. ❖

Reference

- Al Rahab, Amiruddin, 2010, *Heboh Papua*, Jakarta: Penerbit Komunitas Bambu. Biro Politik Komite Pimpinan Pusat Aliansi Mahasiswa Papua, 2011, Open letter, on www.ampnews.org accessed in March 2016.
- Elisabeth, Adriana, et.al., 2004, *Pemetaan Peran dan Kepentingan Para Aktor Dalam Konflik di Papua*, Jakarta: LIPI.
- Elmslie, Jim, 2010, “West Papuan Demographic Transition and the 2010 Indonesia Census: “Slow Motion Genocide” or Not?” on CPACS Working Paper No. 11/1, University of Sydney.
- Howay, Julian, 2016, *Sosialisme untuk Pembebasan Papua*, on <http://sosialispapua.com/sosialisme-untuk-pembebasan-papua-diskusi-i/> accessed in April 2016.

13 LIPI team. 2016. “Press Release National Dialogue: Alternative settlements for Papua issues” Jakarta: 14 March 2016.

- International Crisis Group, 2010, *Radikalisasi dan Dialog di Papua*, Brussels: International Crisis Group.
- Jordan, Ray, 30 Desember 2015, "Jokowi: Demi Pembangunan Papua, Dialog dengan Siapapun Ayo Termasuk Separatis," on www.news.detik.com accessed on December 20, 2015.
- Kartono, Alfian, 9 May 2015, "Kedatangan Jokowi dan Upaya Dialog di Papua," dalam www.nasional.kompas.com yang diunduh pada tanggal 26 Desember 2015.
- Kementerian Perencanaan Pembangunan Nasional/ Badan Perencanaan Pembangunan Nasional (Bappenas), 2014, *Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Menengah Nasional 2015-2019*, Jakarta: Bappenas.
- Lani, H., 2013, "Perempuan Papua dan Jalan Pembebasannya," in the *Buletin NAPAS Satu Papua*, 02.
- MacLeod, J., 2012, "Pathways to Dialogue in Papua: Diplomacy, Armed Struggle or Nonviolent Resistance?" in Peter King, Jim Elmslie & Camellia Webb-Gannon (eds.), *Comprehending West Papua*, Sydney: Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies University of Sydney.
- Routledge. Mambor, Victor, May 12, 2015, "Jokowi: Di Papua Sudah Tidak Ada Masalah, Dialog untuk Apa?" on www.tabloidjubi.com accessed on December 20, 2015.
- Mawel, Benny, 2014, *Orang Papua harus bicara pengganti juru runding Papua Ondawame*, accessed from <http://tabloidjubi.com/2014/10/11/orang-papua-harus-bicara-pengganti-juru-runding-papua-ondawame/>, on January 20, 2016.
- Sekretariat Negara Republik Federal Papua Barat, 2011, *Pedoman Dasar Negara Republik Federal Papua Barat*, Jayapura: Sekretariat NRFB.

- MacLeod, J., 2015, "From the mountains and jungles to the villages and streets Transitions from violent to nonviolent resistance in West Papua," dalam V. Dudouet (Ed.), *Civil Resistance and Conflict Transformation: Transitions From Armed to Nonviolent Struggle*, New York:
- Siregar, Latifah Anum, et.al., 2013, *Menuju Tanah Papua: Perspektif Non Papua*, Jayapura: AIDP.
- Widjojo, Muridan (ed.), 2009, *Papua Road Map: Negotiating the Past, Improving the Present, and Securing the Future*, Jakarta: LIPI, Yayasan TIFA, and Obor Indonesia.
- Widjojo, Muridan, 2009, *Kolom Papua: Gerakan Mahasiswa dan Pemilu di Papua*, on www.politik.lipi.go.id accessed in March 2016.
- Victor Yeimo, 2015a, *Kesadaran Massa Rakyat West Papua*, dalam <http://www.wene-papua.com/2015/11/kesadaran-massa-rakyat-papua-barat.html> Accessed in March 2016.
- Victor Yeimo, 2015b, *Memandang Pembebasan Papua*, dalam <http://indoprogress.com/2015/05/memandang-pembebasan-papua/> Accessed in March 2016.
- November 7, 2011, Farid Husain, *Sang Juru Runding Daerah Konflik*, on www.bbc.com retrieved on April 1, 2016.
- "Profil JDP" accessed from the JDP Website, <http://jdp-dialog.org/profil/tentang-jdp> on March 14, 2016.
- "Pers Release Jaringan Damai Papua", accessed from http://www.jdp-dialog.org/download/cat_view/17-pers-release-jaringan-damai-papua?orderby=dmdate_published&ascdesc=DESC on March 13, 2016.



Elisabeth, Adriana, et.al., 2015, Policy Brief, “Bersama-Sama Membangun Papua Damai,” Jakarta: Tim Kajian Papua LIPI dan Jaringan Damai Papua.

Elisabeth, Adriana, et.al., 2016, Policy Brief, “Dialog Nasional”, Jakarta: Tim Kajian Papua LIPI. Information delivered during receiving representatives of Coordinating Ministry of Politics, Law, and Security, May 11, 2016.

Law No. 21 year 2001 on Special Autonomy for Papua Province.

Law No. 35 year 2008 (amendment) Law No. 1 year 2008 (amendment) No. 21 year 2001 on Special autonomy for Papua and West Papua Province.

Interview Amorisa Wiratri with Adriana Elisabeth in Jakarta, March 14, 2016.

Interview Amorisa Wiratri with Cahyo Pamungkas in Jakarta, April 5, 2016.

Interview Amorisa Wiratri with Neles Tebay in Jakarta, October 19, 2015.

Focus Group Discussion “SAR” in Jayapura, October 22, 2015.

Focus Group Discussion “SAR” in Jakarta, October 30, 2015.