

KEUSKUPAN JAYAPURA
KOTAK POS 1379
JAYAPURA 99013
PAPUA—INDONESIA

SEKRETARIAT Keadilan & Perdamaian
TEL: +62-967-534993
FAX: +62-967-534993
E-Mail: sekkp@jayapura.wasantara.net.id

OFFICE FOR JUSTICE AND PEACE-DIOCESE OF JAYAPURA

Jakarta, June 27, 2001

Some notes
On recent socio-political condition in Papua
As the context to deal with the contingency planning

J. Budi Hernawan ofm*

It would be worthwhile to understand the framework of Papua Problem first before discussing what can be done in the conflicting area. I would like to describe three fundamentals aspects that would make a common ground to discuss which contingency planning is relevant to Papua region. The three aspects are [1] the factual background that will summarize some fundamentals facts that make a Papuan collective memory, [2] Pro-independence aspiration part will describe a sketchy process of the struggle to speak out the Pro-independence aspiration in Papua, [3] and some thoughts towards conflict resolution will give some initial insights to solve the problem.

I. Factual background

The factual background comprises of three kinds of problems that are related to the past.

1. A complex of experience during the last decades commonly referred to as the collective "Memoria Passionis", or "memory of suffering".

These suffering experiences found their sources in:

- a. The development policy applied by the Indonesian government during last 38 years;
- b. The recurrence of gross human right violations in Papuan territory during its integration in the Republic of Indonesia.
- c. The behavior of the Indonesian armed forces in this territory, commonly marked by arrogance and high-handed show of power.

2. Events during Papuan history, such as:

- a. Program toward freedom initiated by the Dutch Government on December 1st, 1961 by (1) nominating representatives of local community

* The paper presented at UNHCR Regional Consultative Contingency Planning Workshop, Jakarta 2-4 July 2001.

to 50% of the total members of *Nieuw Guinea Raad* (parliament); (2) flying Morning Star Flag beside the Dutch flag; and (3) socializing the national anthem "Oh Papua, My Land".

- b. The adoption of New York Agreement (NYA) of 1962 as the basis of transfer of the *Nederlands Nieuw Guinea* from the Dutch to the Indonesian governments. This basic agreement was taken without the participation of Papuans themselves in the negotiation.
- c. The Determination of People's Opinion (PEPERA) in 1969 was implemented incorrectly as it was accompanied by intimidation, coercion, torture, and unilateral interpretation of conditions of the implementation that was laid down in the NYA, so that it was legally flawed.

3. Protest of the public has not been heard nor responded seriously by the authority, thus

- a. The Papuans have never felt that their dignity and identity as real human being were recognized;
- b. The Papuans have never felt that they were recognized and protected as full Indonesian citizens with all rights and obligations, as it was provided in paragraph 4 of the preamble of the constitution of the Republic of Indonesia (UUD 1945).

4. Silence because of helplessness

The sufferings summarized above finally produced a community that was deeply disappointed, scared, felt isolated, used as an object of projects and that kept its anger for so many years. It is quite natural that one day this "memory of collective suffering" would reveal itself and become a source of "strength in the struggle", provided an opportunity is given to it.

II. Pro-independence aspiration 1998-2001

In the last three years since the fall of Soeharto, former President Indonesia, the atmosphere of freedom overwhelmed Indonesia, including Papua. The silent Papuans could speak loudly all their hope, which for a long time was kept in a dark room. One of the Papuan dreams is a dream of independence. The development of pro-independence aspiration can be summarized as follows:

1. Initially (May 1998 - July 1998 period) the disappointment of Papuan community was revealed in a number of demonstrations, a part of which was related to certain policy elements, such as: transmigration program, denial of traditional rights on land, exploitation of natural resources, lack of opportunity for local community to take part in state administration, etc. and some others were related to human right violations.
2. After the bloody incident in Biak (July 6, 1998), the protests began to change its tone to be "more political", as Papuan community felt deeply frustrated when the peaceful demonstration during the reform era in Biak by raising the

Morning Star Flag (the Papuan flag) continued to be responded by the security forces with violence only.

3. On the eve of the National Dialogue (February 1999) the political tone resounded even stronger. It was not surprising that in the direct meeting between 100 representatives of Papuan People (Team of 100) and President Habibie, it was expressed clearly that the Papuan People have been fed up, have not had confidence any longer in the Indonesian government and strongly demanded that Papuan freedom/sovereignty be recognized according to the fact that had been established back in 1961.
4. The statement before the President and his cabinet was welcomed enthusiastically by wide sections of Papuan community. This response served as a very strong indication that wide sections of the community really supported the revealed direction of struggle. Furthermore, the people began to organize themselves through Command Posts, a very simple mass organizing; nevertheless it became an effective means of popularizing the "M (pro-independence) aspiration" struggle. The M aspiration has become a daily talk of the community of all strata.
5. Internally GERASEM organization has not been developed rapidly, so that its leadership and program appeared somewhat abstract. Leadership began to be an open discourse after November 12, 1999, when Theys Eluay announced a plan to fly the Morning Star flag throughout Papuan territory as from December 1, 1999.
6. From December 1, 1999 some new figures/leaders emerged and began to direct GERASEM by bringing Papuan aspirations to the local and central parliaments. Meanwhile, President Abdurrahman Wahid's visit on December 31, 1999 was utilized to deliver an initial step for the organizational consolidation by the announcement about the convocation of a Papuan Congress. At the same time President Wahid agreed to change the name of Irian Jaya into Papua, and for the first time the Indonesian government officially apologized for human right violations that had been committed.
7. Recently, the organizational consolidation was conducted in two phases: (a) the convocation of a Great Deliberation, 24 - 28 February 2000; and (b) Papuan Congress II, May 29 - June 4, 2000. In the latest development, a "political party" was formed as a means to promote the M Aspiration, so that on June 23, 2000 the Papuan National Front (FNP) was officiated under the leadership of Mr. Herman Wayoi, a historical Papuan figure. During this organizational consolidation process there was a shift in the emphasis of different aspects of struggle. If in the early stage of the struggle much emphasis was given to "the settlement of human right violations", in the latest development emphasis was given more to the "rectifying history" as the basis and direction of struggle.
8. Finally, the Papuans held their second congress 29 June – 4 July 2000 which formulated: [1] collegial Papuan leadership that was called as Presidium of Papuan Council (Presidium Dewan Papua/ PDP); [2] aspiration for independence as a collective decision; [3] rectifying history as a program delegated to the PDP. During and post Congress of Papuan People II,

chairperson of the general assembly (MPR) in Jakarta and the chairperson of House of Representative (DPR-RI) said that the Papuan people had made the revolt or subversion (makar) against the government of Indonesia.

9. Based on the growing pressure of Jakarta and the growing tension in Papua, an agreement of lowering the Morning Star Flag (Papuan Flag) signed by the provincial government and the PDP (October 3, 2000). The main point was the Papuan Flag had to be lowered by October 19, 2000 although it was not *harga mati* until the PDP had a chance to meet with the President.
10. But the police did not follow the agreement because they made an operation to lower the Morning Star Flag in Wamena October 6th, 2000. As a result, the bloody incident happened. There were at least 13.466 IDPs both inside and outside Wamena. In the same time, chief of police in Papua conducted 'Operasi Tuntas Matoa 2000' in all areas in Papua. Again a bloody incident happened in Merauke November 9, 2000. Many Papuans fled out to the forest or went across the border to PNG meanwhile the non-Papuans fled out to the other islands in Indonesia according to their ethnicity.
11. PDP and the provincial government signed an agreement on lowering the Papuan Flag at November 9, 2000. The main points were that the Papuan Flag (morning Star) was allowed to be raised just in 5 districts in Papua (there are 13 districts in Papua) by December 1st, 2000; and that Gedung Dewan Kesenian Irian Jaya as the headquarter of Papuan Task force had been empty by December 2nd, 2000. Step by step many people fled out of their home. The Papuan people fled out to the forest or across the border meanwhile the non-Papuans fled out to the other islands in Indonesia according to their ethnicity. The tension was getting heated when 37 warships were on alert around Papua.
12. All Papuans made their commemoration on the Independence Day December 1st, 1961 by raising the flags in all districts. There was not a clash or violent incident with the security forces. But at December 2nd, 2000 in Merauke once again, the clash broke down between the police and the Papuan because of the Papuan people tore down the Indonesia flag that was raised in the front of the Pariwisata Office.
13. There was an attack to the police station in Abepura and *Kantor Dinas Otonom* conducted by unidentified group December 7th, 2000. A police officer and a security guard were killed. Based on the intelligence information, the offenders were identified as separatist movement that consisted of Inland Papuan people. As a result, the special police (brimob) made the attack to the student dormitories and *perkampungan* where the inland Papuan people stay around Abepura.

14. On Christmas December 25, 2000: the President Wahid made the visit to Jayapura and Timika. Once again, he said that he had no hesitation to do a hard action to any movement to secede one province out of NKRI, including Papua.
15. March-May 2001: Investigation commission on human rights abuses (set up by Indonesian Human Rights Commission/ Komnas HAM) made their investigation on Abepura incident December 7, 2000. In their final report submitted to Indonesian Human Rights Commission, they concluded that there was a crime against humanity conducted by the police in Abepura case.
16. After a long process to formulate the draft bill on Special Autonomy of Papua Province due to the aspiration for independence, the representatives of all districts in Papua made the analysis forum to deal with the draft bill 28 March 2001. Based on the facts that the aspiration for independence had been widespread into the grass root level, the people made a rally to *menolak* Special Autonomy and therefore broke down into a clash between the demonstrators and the police.
17. The political tension in Papua was not getting down. It happened an attack by unknown group to the timber factory in Wasior, District of Manokwari, on March 30, 2001. The tension was more heated when the security forces lowered the Papuan flag that had been raised in the front of the tribal council house at May 1st, 2001.
18. A TPN-OPM faction (armed wing of West Papuan Pro-Independence Movement) held two Belgians filmmakers as hostages in Ilaga, inland area. They required the leaders of the churches in Jayapura to endorse the Papua problem to the international forum. The hostage crisis is still going on.
19. Again in District of Manokwari, there was an attack to the timber factory June 13, 2001. 5 special police were killed. As a consequence, the police have been conducting their police operation. The area was isolated from any humanitarian intervention of the churches or NGOs.

IV. Summary

1. The roots of the conflicting situation in Papua are the unsolved problems, which consist of collective memory of suffering, a dark history of the-60s, and identity crisis.
2. The strongest expression i.e. raising the Morning Star flag, is always perceived by the government or security forces as a separatist movement that must be taken in a harsh action.
3. The widespread hope is aspiration for independence that proceeds in a rapid formulation.

4. There is no real best solution or at least win-win solution to Papua Problem. So the conflicting situation is still going on.

V. Some thoughts of conflict resolution

5. Short term: the government should recognize the Papuan identity with officially change the provincial name of Irian Jaya to Papua; the House of Representative (DPR-RI) should adopt the draft bill on Special Autonomy based on the version that was formulated by Papuan team itself not on the central government version; government, House of Representative (DPR), and General Assembly (MPR) should immediately set up the tribunal on Human Rights abuses to deal with the dark past of Papuans History; in emergency cases, government and security forces in all level should give any access to humanitarian institutions to make any humanitarian intervention and also government should recognize the fact of refugees or IDPs by giving the legal status to them as they are.
6. Medium term: government and humanitarian institutions should develop a comprehensive recovery program to the traumatic people in different areas; all stakeholders should develop a peaceful activities e.g. traditional commemorations, a peace day, a sharing the experience of sufferings in public, etc. as a concrete step to build up a peaceful condition in Papua; all stakeholders should not use a violent way.
7. Long term: the General Assembly should formulate officially the guidance principles on a peaceful dialogue to solve the Papua problem that can be implemented in the lower acts/ bill.

V. Map of conflict

What described below is a matrix to map out the conflicting situation in Papua that consists of some factors:

1. Conflicting area means region that have some conflicting factors
2. Stakeholder is every part who take an important position to set-up the situation either to maintain the normal, to make it worse, or to recover the bad situation
3. Trigger factor is any reason to get normal condition down
4. Resources is any mean that can be used of to make any humanitarian intervention
5. Handicap means any difficulty that will endanger any humanitarian intervention

No.	Conflicting area(s)	Stakeholder(s)	Trigger factor(s)	Resources	Handicap(s)
1.	Sorong	Panel Papua, Police, Satgas Papua, MNC,	Social gap, raising the Flag, ethnicity, land rights, company activities, religion,	Tribal leaders, Panel of Papua, churches, government in district level, transportation system, communication system, local NGOs, churches,	Coastal area, transportation and communication system limited in the town area
2.	Manokwari	Police, Satgas Papua, LMA Manokwari, NGO	Socio-economic gap, company activities, raising the flag, land rights issues	Tribal leaders, Panel of Papua, churches, government in district level, transportation and communication system, local NGOs	Transportation and communication system limited in the town area
3.	Fak-fak	Police, Satgas Papua, Satgas Merah Putih,	Socio-economic gap, religion,	Tribal leaders, Panel of Papua, churches, government in district level	Coastal area, transportation and communication system limited in the town area
4.	Nabire/ Paniai	LMA Nabire, Police, Gov in district level	Socio-economic gap, raising the flag, ethnicity, land rights issues	Tribal leaders, Panel of Papua, churches, government in district level, local NGOs	Transportation and communication system limited in the town area
5.	Biak	LMA, Police, Presidium,	Raising the flag, company activities	Tribal leaders, Panel of Papua, churches, government in district level, transportation and communication system, local NGOs	Transportation and communication system limited in the town area
6.	Serui	LMA, Police,	Raising the flag, ethnicity	Tribal leaders, Panel of Papua, churches, government in district level, transportation and communication system	Transportation and communication system limited in the town area

7.	Timika	Lemasa, PT FI, TNI/Police, Gov district, OPM	Socio-economic gap, raising the flag, Multi National Company, ethnicity, land rights issues,	Tribal leaders, Panel of Papua, churches, government in district level, transportation and communication system, local NGOs	Transportation and communication system limited in the town area
8.	Jayapura	PDP, TNI/Police, churches, LMA, non-Papuans, NGOs, TPN-OPM	Socio-economic gap, police policy, ethnicity, raising the flag, land rights issues, other political issues	Tribal leaders, Panel of Papua, churches, government in provincial level, transportation and communication system, local NGOs	Political interest of the stakeholder,
9.	Kerom	OPM, LMA, TNI	Raising the flag, military operation, OPM operation, land rights issues, socio-economic gap	Tribal leaders, Panel of Papua, churches, government in district level	Transportation and communication system limited in the town area, close to the border
10.	Tiom	TNI, Police, LMA, churches, Panel, OPM	Raising the flag, military operation, OPM operation, socio-economic gap	Tribal leaders, Panel of Papua, churches,	Mountainous area, only airway transportation, only radio communication
11.	Baliem Valley	TNI, Police, Tribal Council, churches, Panel Papua	Raising the flag, military/police operation, socio-economic problem, land rights, ethnicity, religion	Tribal leaders, Panel of Papua, churches, government in district level, NGOs (local and international), transportation and communication system,	Transportation and communication system limited in the town area
12.	Puncak Jaya	TNI, Police, Tribal Council, OPM, churches	Raising the flag, military/police operation, OPM operation, socio-economic problems	Tribal leaders, Panel of Papua, churches, government in district level	Only airway transportation, only SSB radio communication system, no NGO

13.	Merauke	Panel, Police, TNI, OPM, churches,	Socio-economic problems, military operation, OPM operation, ethnicity, religion, land rights issues, company activities	Churches, Panel of Papua, tribal leaders, government in district level, NGOs	Coastal area, transportation and communication system limited in the town area, close to the border (PNG)
14.	Asmat area	Police, churches, OPM, tribal council	Socio-economic gap, company activities, land rights issues	Churches and tribal council of Asmat	Muddy area, only waterway transportation and radio communication.