

Process and Resolution of the Papua Problem

Dialogue Based on Cultural Approach

Hendra Manurung, Arry Bainus

The emergence of a conflict is absence of mutual relations between two or more parties who have or feel they have incompatible goals. Conflict is emergence of never-ending perspectives about differences in interests where the aspirations of conflicting parties cannot be achieved simultaneously through peaceful harmonious consensus. The Papua problem requires a comprehensive and integrated solution by stakeholders who concerned with the future of economic empowerment and political awareness of local communities for boosting equitable prosperity for the people of Papua. Indonesia national leader, President Joko Widodo together with other stakeholders, should prioritise cultural approach and dialogue in solving Papua problem. Papuans youth who are living in Papua and other part of Indonesia still needs Papua's Indonesia brotherhood continuously due to what happens in Manokwari and Jayapura riots on August 19, 2019 after persecution and racialism in Malang, East Java, has led to uncontrolled mass demonstration.

Keywords: Indonesia, Papua, Joko Widodo, dialogue, cultural approach.

Papua is Indonesia's largest province located in the central part of Papua Island or the easternmost part of Indonesia's Papua region. The

Hendra Manurung, Arry Bainus. Process and Resolution of the Papua Problem: Dialogue Based on Cultural Approach. *Central European Journal of International and Security Studies* 13, no. 4: 169–190.

© 2019 CEJISS. Article is distributed under Open Access licence: Attribution - NonCommercial 3.0 Unported (cc by-nc 3.0).



eastern hemisphere is a country of Papua New Guinea. The province of Papua was formerly called Irian Jaya which covered the entire western part of Papua.

CEJISS
4/2019

On August 19, 2019, riots broke out in the restive Papua region, where a separatist movement has simmered since the 1960s. President Joko Widodo since his presidential inauguration on October 20, 2019 has sought to improve outcomes for the region, Indonesia's long-standing racism against Papuans risks undermining his national infrastructure plans.

Since presidential inauguration in October 2014, Indonesia President Joko Widodo has good willingness to reduce tensions in the restive region with steps such as building the Trans Papua highway to empower people economic activity and boost social welfare.

Due to the insecurity in Papua and escalation of the Papua problem is rooted in the implementation of special autonomy that is not optimally given, especially in the fields of public health, education, economy empowerment. The strong domination of national authorities resulted in discrimination and marginalization of the indigenous people of Papua (Bobby Anderson, 2015, p.16). The Papuan people who are still traumatic due to the repressive actions of the security forces during President Soeharto's government (1966-1998) marked a big problem that emerged in '*Bumi Cenderawasih*'. Another root of the conflict is the differences in understanding about the integration of Papua into the territory of Republic of Indonesia through the Act of Free Choice on August 2, 1969 (New Internationalist, 5 November 1999).

Indonesia withdraws from the UN on January 7, 1965 in protest at the appointment of Malaysia as a non-permanent member of the UN Security Council. This is part of Sukarno's on-going confrontation with Britain and Malaysia (John Saltford, 2003, p.22). The United States National Security adviser Henry Kissinger briefs President Nixon on his visit to Indonesia and likely conversations with Indonesian President Suharto (Henry Kissinger, 10 June and 18 July 1969). Kissinger argues that there is no U.S. interest in getting involved in the issue of West Irian and that it is certain its people will choose integration with Indonesia. In Nixon's talking points, Kissinger urges that the President refrain from raising the issue except to note U.S. sympathy with Indonesia's concerns.

This growing support for Indonesia coincided with the arrival of President Kennedy in the White House in 1961. Unlike his predecessor

Eisenhower, Kennedy was not opposed to possible US involvement to find a settlement. Nonetheless, there were still influential opponents in Washington to any shift of policy on the territory. In March 1961, the CIA sent a memorandum to the President's staff (John Saltford, 2003, p.38)

“To appease Sukarno on the West Irian and other questions, and to compete with the Bloc in economic and military aid in the vain hope of gaining time – would, we believe, finally destroy the resolve of conservative elements to oppose Sukarno's policies and to act as a brake on the leftward and downward course of Indonesia” (Memo from Bissell, Deputy Director of Plans CIA, to Bundy, Special Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, 27 March 1961. In Edward Keefer (ed.), US Foreign Relations 1961-63, Vol. XXIII Southeast Asia (Department of State Printing Office, 1994), p.328.).

The U.S was the first to ignore the West Papuans. In 1962, the U.S brokered a deal whereby the Dutch would leave the territory and transfer sovereignty to the United Nations until a local vote could be held for independence or integration with Indonesia (New Internationalist, 5 November 1999). The West Papuans were not involved in these discussions and instead of the UN, Indonesia quietly took over administration of the province and repression began.

There have been three main political movements seeking independence for West Papua, i.e.: the Federal Republic of West Papua, the West Papua National Coalition for Liberation and the National Parliament of West Papua (Amy Chew, South China Morning Post, 21 August 2019). The groups, thus, since 2014 have united to form a single umbrella organisation called the United Liberation Movement for West Papua (ULMWP).

Papuans have long faced discrimination in Indonesia. It could be a major factor which has driven some young people to join rebel causes. The coming of Papua new generation to Indonesia political system, for many years, has not been considered by many studies on Papua developmental studies. It becomes worst situation created by central government misinterpretation and wrong handling on Papua.

It is very little has been written based-on literature findings on local indigenous rights in Southeast Asia region. Researchers attempt to address issues concerning Papua conflict, indigenous rights in the region, and proposing continuous cultural approach and constructive.

*Hendra
Manurung
Arry Bainus*

Southeast Asian states are still required to protect indigenous rights under obligations derived from the general human rights instruments to which they are signatories. Instruments containing provisions relevant to indigenous peoples include the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR, March 23, 1976), the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR, December 16, 1966) and the International Convention for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (Racial Discrimination Convention, March 7, 1966).

Southeast Asian states are also obliged albeit only politically, to abide by the standards set in the main UN minority instrument, the Declaration on the Rights of Persons Belonging to National or Ethnic, Religious and Linguistic Minorities (Declaration on Minorities, 1993). Currently, it is widely accepted that indigenous peoples can use the protection provided by minority instruments without harming their claims as indigenous peoples, minority provisions have been used repeatedly by the UN Human Rights Committee or UN HRC to protect indigenous rights (UN Human Rights Committee, 1997).

Figure 1. Indonesia and Papua



Source: Crying Freedom (2016), <https://www.cryingfreedom.net/cryingfreedom-web-browser.html>

This research topic proposed by researchers is meaningful who attempt to describe analytically due to what happened recently in Manokwari and Jayapura on August 19, 2019 initiated by Papuan peoples. The article demonstrates that this inadequacy is inconsistent with international standards on the prohibition of discrimination, protection of minority cultures and more specifically on indigenous rights, as are recognised in international instruments, interpreted by international organisations, and transferred into national practices.

The New York Agreement is an agreement signed on 15 August 1962 by J. H. Van Roijen and C. Schurman (the Kingdom of Netherlands) and

Figure 2. Free West Papua Mural



*Process and
Resolution of the
Papua Problem*

Source: ABC News, April 26, 2019, <https://www.abc.net.au/news/2019-01-29/free-west-papua-mural-1/10608238>

Subandrio (Republic of Indonesia) in the U.N Headquarter, New York, regarding the administration of the territory of West New Guinea (the United Nations Treaty Series, 1962). On Article I Ratification of Agreement and Resolution of The General Assembly of The United Nations, Article II Transfer of Administration, and Article XII stated clearly:

Article I

“After the present Agreement between Indonesia and the Netherlands has been signed and ratified by both Contracting Parties, Indonesia and the Netherlands will jointly sponsor a draft resolution in the United Nations under the terms of which the General Assembly of the United Nations takes note of the present Agreement, acknowledges the role conferred upon the Secretary-General of the United Nations therein, and authorizes him to carry out the tasks entrusted to him therein”.

Article II

“After the adoption of the resolution referred to in article I, the Netherlands will transfer administration of the territory to a United Nations Temporary Executive Authority (UNTEA) established by and under the jurisdiction of the Secretary-Gen-

eral upon the arrival of the United Nations Administrator appointed in accordance with article IV. The UNTEA will in turn transfer the administration to Indonesia in accordance with article XII”.

CEJISS **Second Phase**
4/2019 **Article XII**

“The United Nations Administrator will have discretion to transfer all or part of the administration to Indonesia at any time after the first phase of the UNTEA administration. The UNTEA’s authority will cease at the moment of transfer of full administrative control to Indonesia”.

The United Nations Temporary Executive Authority who administered West New Guinea 1 October 1962 to 1 May 1963 transferred administration of West New Guinea (WNG) to Indonesia. Papua joined Republic Indonesia on May 1st 1963 after UNTEA transferred administration to President Soekarno (John Saltford, 2003, p. 22). On May 4, 1963, Indonesian 1st President Sukarno arrives in West Irian (WNG) for a visit, thus Appointed Papuan politician Eliezer Bonay as Governor. All existing Papuan political parties and unofficial political activity are banned (John Saltford, 2003, p. 22). On September 30, 1966, during an official visit to the UN Headquarter in New York, U.S to arrange Indonesia’s re-entry to the organisation, Foreign Minister Adam Malik announces that Jakarta will permit a Papuan act of self-determination (John Saltford, 2003, p.22).

On January 29, 2019, West Papuans claim they have been victims of decades of human rights abuses by the Indonesian government (ABC NEWS, January 29, 2019). By the end of August 2019, Papua returns in the international spotlight.

Situated at the eastern end of the Indonesian archipelago, West Papua occupies the western half of the island of New Guinea. The eastern half is the independent state of Papua New Guinea, hereinafter, ‘PNG’. West Papua land is currently comprised of two provinces, Papua and West Papua. The Indonesian government since 1963 has forcibly occupied Tanah Papua, as it is known in Indonesian. While the territory:

‘May only be a swim and walk away from Australia, [...] it may as well be the dark side of the moon. [It] is [largely] a secret story, hidden from the world by the vagaries of geopolitics and a policy that keeps foreign journalists, human rights workers, and even diplomats out’ (Jason MacLeod, 2015).

Papua's diverse population:

'With more than 200 distinct indigenous ethnic groups and a large population of migrants from elsewhere in Indonesia, struggles with some of the lowest development an indicator in the country' (Cillian Nolan & Sidney Jones, 19 May 2015, p.17-18).

*Hendra
Manurung
Arry Bainus*

Moreover, the ongoing dispute over who should rightly control the land and resources of West Papua is 'the Pacific's longest-running political conflict' (Jason MacLeod, 205, p.27). Since 1969, for fifty years Papua conflict of fire never goes out and potentially can become threatening time-alarm for Jakarta. It triggered by persecution and racism treatment toward Papuan students in Malang, East Java on 15 to 16 August 2019.

After the 4th governance of President Republic Indonesia, Abdurrahman Wahid, approach used of Papua is much more concern with technical problem, which is, regional infrastructure and local infrastructure. However, post-Manokwari and Jayapura riots, it is time for government to utilize cultural approach and dialogue that give attention on Papua people dignity. Even though still there is psycho-politics problem within Papua contextual problem related-to suffered collective memories for thirty-two years of 2nd governance of President Soeharto.

Currently, presence perspective information gap between Indonesia governments with Papua people mostly on Papua integration history to Indonesia. Government stated that the Papua problem is already final while Papua peoples still concern with integration process. It needs facilitating channel to bridge the widening between them. Indonesia government should reduce suspicious behaviour and acts toward separatist-groups.

Papua Issue

The embattled Indonesian Papua Province has had a decades-long independence struggle, with its identity torn between several conflicting stakeholders. Based on ABC News, Indonesia's acquisition of West Papua has been the cause of controversy for more than 60 years (ABC NEWS August 30, 2019). In 2003, the Indonesian Government into West Papua and Papua split the province of West Papua.

Internationally, they are still referred to collectively as their historic name of West Papua, but the people from the region refer to them-

selves as Papuans. West Papua shares its borders and cultural ethnicity with Papua New Guinea, but while PNG was colonised by the British, prior to German and Australian administration, West Papua was colonised by the Dutch, setting it on a different course.

CEJISS
4/2019

Intervention is usually defined as dictatorial interference by a state in the internal affairs of another state or in the relations between other states. Most text writers regard intervention as illegal in principle because it violates the independence of states which it is the purpose of International Law to protect (G.G. Wilson, 1939, p. 64). Despite these injustices, Papuans supported by civil society organisations at a national and international level that have been working for lasting peace. Yet the efforts of the peace movement and the continued injustices suffered by indigenous Papuans go largely unreported in the western media (Neles Tebay, 2005, p.4).

Figure 3. West Papua Map (July 3, 2019)



Source: ABC NEWS, Jarrod Fankhauser, <https://www.abc.net.au/news/2019-01-30/west-papua-map-1/10756138>

Article 2 (4) of the Charter of the United Nations (“the UN Charter”) expressly prohibits the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of states, and Article 2 (3) requires that all interstate disputes are settled by “peaceful means”. The Charter was signed at the San Francisco Conference on 26 June 1945 (The Charter of the United Nations, 1945). However, states have usually put

forward justifications for their interventions and it is clear that interference by one state in the territory or activities of another may be legal in some circumstances.

Based on recent reports suggest that indigenous peoples in South-East Asia face serious problems, some of which endanger their very survival in a rapidly changing environment (Suhās Chakma, 'Behind the Bamboo Curtain: Racism in Asia' in Suhās Chakma and Marianne Jensen (eds), *Racism against Indigenous Peoples* (2001), pp. 176, 180; Christian Erni (ed), '...Vines That Won't Blind...' *Indigenous Peoples in Asia* (1996), pp. 34-35; Minority Rights Group International (ed), *Forests and Indigenous Peoples of Asia* (1999); Diana Vinding et al (ed), *The Indigenous World 2002-2003* (2003), pp. 8.). Therefore, despite the gravity of the indigenous peoples' situation, indigenous rights in South-East Asia have attracted relatively little interest from the international legal community. Voices from Australia, New Zealand, and North America have been more prominent within the transnational indigenous movement. Although their perspectives have given voice to needs that are similar to those of indigenous peoples in other regions, by virtue of their prominence they have also muffled the voices of their South-East Asian counterparts.

However, these voices do not pierce the global consciousness with the same force where few Asian groups have had the means to maintain active involvement in the international arena and to put their claims on the international agenda. At the same time, Southeast Asian states consistently abstain from participating in the international human rights arenas and monitoring bodies that address indigenous rights issues. For instance, United Nations treaty-based bodies have repeatedly reprimanded Southeast Asian states for not submitting the required monitoring reports (Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination-CERD, 1997).

Likewise, these states have not been vocal in UN debates on indigenous rights (Indigenous Peoples Center for Documentation, Research and Information-DOCIP, May/June 2002). For example, at the 2001 UN Working Group on the Draft Declaration on Indigenous Peoples held in Geneva, Switzerland, none of South-East Asian state took the floor to express their opinion on the draft declaration, although Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Thailand, and Vietnam attended.

This reluctance to become more directly involved leads to the limited availability of credible information regarding indigenous peoples'

rights, and more importantly, a lack of serious discussion with the states government about the situation of indigenous groups in their territories.

CEJISS
4/2019

Along 2019, Papua becomes never ending field of armed-conflict. In early December 2018, post shooting of sixteen construction workers done by armed separatist criminal groups or *Kelompok Kriminal Separatis Bersenjata, KKS*B (KOMPAS, September 6, 2019) has made a joint military operation involve Indonesian national army (TNI) and Indonesia Police (POLRI). They did sweeping and chasing armed separatist criminal groups led-by Egianus Kogoya in Nduga regional district.

Police officers in Papua still use the Civil Emergency Law No. 12 of 1951 to take legal action against a number of alleged violations, from possession of sharp weapons to possession of ammunition and explosives. According to “Papuan Behind Bars” records, the Act was used for detention in 32 political cases (Hendra Manurung in Imparsial.org, March 9, 2017). To this day, the indigenous people of Papua continue to carry knives, especially if they are involved in political activities, which would surely be threatened by the Law. The toughest sentence imposed on the law is the death penalty. Currently, the issue of capital punishment has received special attention, as the death penalty moratorium is still a discourse. This law has expired and must be abolished. The police must be able to use the appropriate articles of the Criminal Code or Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Pidana (Sydney Morning Herald, March 9, 2015).

At the international level, based on the Agenda for Peace initiated by former the United Nations Secretary General, Boutros-Boutros Ghali in 1992 (Boutros-Ghali, B., 1992), peace building is defined as one of the four stages of diplomacy, including preventive diplomacy, namely the government’s actions to reduce conflicts and prevent the spread of conflict, agreements, peace (peacemaking) as actions to reconcile the two parties to the conflict, peacekeeping maintaining as the assignment of UN peacekeeping forces in the field, and post-peace peace building conflict as the construction of a new environment. Within this framework, peace building is understood as an advanced stage that takes place after the conflict can be overcome.

The UN Working Group on Arbitrary Detention said that the Indonesian Emergency Law was the oldest Emergency Law, which was compiled when Indonesia was still fighting for its independence in 1945 (Imparsial, org, March 9, 2017). Similarly, when riots broke out in

West Kalimantan (2000-2002) and the struggle for independence for East Timor (1999), the same law was implemented in Papua.

As a country that has been resolute in upholding its constitutional mandate and commitments to the global norms on human rights, Indonesia underscores the importance of the Human Rights Council's mechanism on Universal Periodic Review (UPR). Taking action on the UPR recommendations is crucial to support the efforts to realise the full enjoyment of human rights for all in Indonesia (UN General Assembly, 2017).

At the end of August 2019, a petition signed by more than 1.8 million people calling for an independence referendum in Indonesia's West Papua province was delivered to United Nations Human Rights Chief, Michelle Bachelet (ABC NEWS August 30, 2019).

Benny Wenda as a chairman of the United Liberation Movement for West Papua, ULMWP (ABC NEWS August 30, 2019), suspected was behind the Papuan riots. The separatist figure who once hacked the Abepura Penitentiary prison in 2002 was no longer an Indonesian citizen (detikNEWS, September 6, 2019). Benny Wenda is a born in Baliem, Papua from the Lani tribe. But now his work involved concerned the separation of Papua from the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia is becoming more and more severe.

Benny's involvement in riots in Papua has been suspected and explained by Indonesia National Chief-Police, General Tito Karnavian. Benny deliberately and intentionally masterminded the riots in Papua in the hope that the issue could be raised at the forum of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), and the UN General Assembly on 23 and 24 September 2019.

Meanwhile, Indonesian police have named human rights lawyer and well-known West Papua advocate Veronica Koman as a suspect in the spreading of fake news, accusing her of provoking widespread unrest in Indonesia's easternmost provinces (The Guardian.com, September 5, 2019). Moreover, since unrest has flared across West Papua, divided into the two Indonesian provinces of Papua and West Papua, in some cases erupting in violent and fatal clashes, Koman has proved a critical source of information, regularly updating her Twitter account with photos and videos that have provided a rare insight into the realities on the ground. It comes at a time when internet access has been cut for more than two weeks in the remote area, which is restricted to foreign journalists.

*Hendra
Manurung
Arry Bainus*

CEJISS
4/2019

Michelle Bachelet in Geneva, the U.N High Commissioner for Human Rights, who until now has been blocked from the visiting West Papua, said on Wednesday that she was concerned about escalating violence. “There should be no place for such violence in a democratic and diverse Indonesia, and I encourage the authorities to engage in dialogue with the people of Papua and West Papua on their aspirations and concerns, as well as to restore internet services and refrain from any excessive use of force,” she said, “Blanket internet shutdowns are likely to contravene freedom of expression and limiting communications may exacerbate tensions” (The Guardian.com, September 5, 2019).

However, due to the effect of armed-conflict and presence of hundreds military soldiers is wave of refugees in some districts, such Jayawijaya, Mimika, Asmat, Lanny Jaya, and Yakuimo. Total amount of refugees as reported by local government of Nduga district is 45,532 persons (Hipolitus Y.R Wangge in KOMPAS 6 September 2019). In Wamena, hundreds of them founded death in refugees’ evacuation location. It is kind of fact to understand on how this armed-conflict so complex and complicated involved state and non-state actors.

It led to Papuan unhappiness, upset, and anger that emerged in form of anarchy demonstration up to the end of August 2019. They burnt down government offices, private stores, and tires as emotional angry reaction for what’s happening in Malang. Meanwhile the central and local government still working very hard to implement law-enforcement, and especially in arresting those suspected criminal person who has triggered persecution and racialism behavior on Papuan students before.

After the 1998 national reformation, the human rights situation in Papua still has not shown significant improvement (Hendra Manurung in Imparsial.org, March 9, 2017). Papua is located on the border of the Asia and Pacific region, consists of two provinces, Papua and West Papua. This region still continues to be plagued by cases of human rights violations and prolonged humanitarian conflict. The living conditions of indigenous Papuans are also very different compared to the living conditions of migrants who come from other regions in Indonesia. May 2014, the number of arrests of protesters increased to hundreds of people, where there were 470 arrests in just one month. In addition, the number of threats, intimidation

and actions hampering the work of local journalists nearly doubled, compared to 2013. Demonstrations also declined as a result of policies and repressive policies by law enforcement officials against the Papuan social movement.

It might begin with Papuan leaders and people request to Indonesia elite leaders for apology and law-enforcement, and become a demand for referendum instead of only having Papua special autonomy. At least there are four complex problem identified in Papua which must be solved by central government, provincial government, local government, and all Papuan stakeholders (Papua Road Map, LIPI, 2009), such 1) Papua status and political history due to Papua integration into Indonesia; 2) national development failure (in public education, public health, and people economy); 3) state's violence (discrimination and marginalization of Papuan peoples in their home-mother land); and 4) intentional human rights violations.

After ten years of Papua Road Map published (2009-2019), those four major problems still exists in Papua. It could lead to any open and direct potential conflict horizontally. This fire of conflict could explode suddenly like a time-bomb explosion. Unfortunately, On August 19, 2019, this bomb just blown up, and it creates anarchistic actions to the end of August 2019 (Aisah P. Budiatri in KOMPAS, September 6, 2019).

The phenomenon of malnutrition and measles does not need to occur because since the Papua Special Autonomy policy most of the authority has been transferred to the regions accompanied by large budget allocations, including Special Autonomy funds. In the context of health policy, for example, the minister of health can no longer regulate health policies in the regions due to national health policies including the availability of local public health facilities or *Pusat Kesehatan Masyarakat (PUSKESMAS)*.

Papua is a rich natural-resources land, but so far it seems to still have a number of phenomena of poverty and food suffering. The wealth of the earth, ecosystems, and enormous geo-economic and geo-political values for the interests of Indonesia as a whole make Papua a prosperous land for its people. However, it seems that Papua is only viewed from a material-economic perspective for the central government. See for example the phenomenon of rice surplus in Merauke Regency. According to the Ministry of Agriculture, after so long importing rice, Indonesia was finally able to export rice in 2017 (Koran SINDO, February 1, 2018) .

*Process and
Resolution of the
Papua Problem*

Human Rights Problem

There are at least eleven cases of alleged human rights violations in Papua that took place during the reform era, where three of them were recommended and categorised as heavy human rights violations, including the cases of Wasior, 2001, Wamena, 2003, and Paniai, 2014 (Aisah P. Budiatri in KOMPAS, September 6, 2019). Additionally, to be able to resolve armed conflicts in Papua, the state-government must actively present with a humanitarian approach, not with a violent and authoritarian acts.

This is particularly important if the country wants to eradicate the miserable passion of memory of the people of Papua due to military operations launched by the central government in the past.

The development approach with the implementation of special autonomy in 2001, which was expected to be a solution to the conflict, was apparently not effective either, because it was implemented partially and inconsistently. The Special Autonomy Law for Papua Province Number 21 of 2001 compiled by academics and local political elites in Papua complex problem not only about economic development alone but much more comprehensive than that. It includes written articles on the protection and respect for human rights, efforts to clarify the history of Papua, recognition of the cultural symbols of the local people of Papua, affirmative actions, and various efforts to develop Papua. Regrettably, the results are far from the fire where there are many policies in the Special Autonomy Law that are not implemented properly and precisely.

The overlapping law enforcement and/or the absence of regulations governing technical implementation and clear rules those are the source of the problem, as many articles in the Special Autonomy Law have failed in implementation, and cannot be implemented.

For example, the Indonesian government stated that the Commission of Truth and Reconciliation which was expected to be able to carry out historical clarification and formulate a conflict reconciliation step could in fact not be formed as a result of Law Number 27 of 2004 concerning the KKR was canceled by the Constitutional Court in December 2006 (Aisah P. Budiatri in KOMPAS, September 6, 2019).

In the middle of Nduga armed-conflict and the presence of ten thousands internal displaced person refugees (IDP's) happened the killing of Indonesia police officer, 2nd Brigadier Heidar in another region of central mountains.

Around 800 internal displaced person refugees (IDP's) and three local people reported death due to sweeping done by military soldiers in Gome District, Puncak Region (Jubi, September 2, 2019). Some districts such Puncak, Puncak Jaya, Lanny Jaya, Mimika, Nduga, and Paniai is 'red spots' where founded armed-groups of Free Papua organisation (Organisasi Papua Merdeka, OPM), who are still active doing separatist guerilla operations in the remote mountains and forests.

*Hendra
Manurung
Arry Bainus*

Since January to August 2019, at least there are ten military soldiers and police officer being shooting victim of KKSB (Hipolitus Y.R Wangge in KOMPAS 6 September 2019). While, some victimized-death civilians founded in Nduga during December 2018 to July 2019, and a boy in Asmat being shot by Indonesia military soldiers in May 2019.

The framework of special autonomy policy implemented since 2002, in fact, does not bring any significant effect on Papua political and security condition. It is due to the presence of special autonomy policy only based on unilateral political concession, not by political negotiation (Chauval, 2002; McGibbon, 2004) comprehensively involve central government and all component of Papuan society, mostly those who always express political expression, either done by guerilla separatist armed-groups or non-armed groups.

The main interpretation of special autonomy policy only limit to amount of given money by central government distributed to local provincial Papua and West Papua government used for people welfare economy boosting.

The right of special autonomy does not give substantive authority at all and any cost dealt-with Papua local indigenous protection, and founded failed evaluation in solving those other local problems such political-military-security operations and poverty reduction.

Joko Widodo & Papua: Dialogue Based On Cultural Approach

In the context of Papua problem, President Joko Widodo together with his administration, 'Kabinet Indonesia Maju', should be emphasised that cultural approach and dialogue mechanism can be useful in reproducing Indonesian-ness in Papua. It is undeniable that the face of "Indonesia" in Papua is currently down. The failure of the special autonomy and Securitisation of the Papua conflict has resulted in Indonesia being better known by the people of Papua through the corruption of special autonomy funds and apparatus violence.

During decades of living in conflict situations, people's memories in Papua have been dominated by a negative image of Indonesia. This is very dangerous, bearing in mind that this perception has moved beyond the boundaries of intergenerational indigenous Papuans. As a consequence, the handling of conflicts in Papua is no longer limited to the placement of security forces.

Strategically, the use of a security approach is permissible, but there must be a clear mechanism and indicators of the deployment of national security forces in Papua, thus, that all people in Indonesia can measure the extent to which the repressive approach is able to mitigate spreading violence. This means that the repressive-approach must be temporary aimed at preparing a condition that is more accommodating and prioritizing to conflict resolution mechanisms such as dialogue and persuasive cultural approach.

This conceptual framework is missing from the government's security approach policy in Papua so far. Therefore, from this moment on, all policies that have been implemented by the Government in Papua must be thoroughly re-evaluated. This evaluation is needed so that we can reproduce the negative face of Indonesia to be positive for the indigenous people of Papua and also for other Indonesian people.

Henceforth, Indonesia must be known as a brother, a place where indigenous Papuans can pour out their complaints about all the problems they face so far and have a dialogue based on cultural approach to find constructive solutions for the future of peace and living harmony in Papua. In addition, in a democratic country, it is natural that any differences that arise must be resolved through a conflict resolution mechanism that eliminates the element of arising violence.

It is an irony when Indonesia has been praised by various figures and countries as the largest democratic country in Southeast Asia when the problem of Papua is overcome in ways that are not dignified. If viewed from the perspective of democracy, the issue of Papua is an important test for the process of democratic consolidation in Indonesia. Indonesia should be proud that in terms of conflict resolution, all people have a positive historical record regarding conflict resolution in Aceh initiated before by Indonesia Former Vice President, Jusuf Kalla.

Papua conflict resolution can be a major asset and national policy breakthrough for President Joko Widodo, Vice President Ma'ruf Amin with all concerned stakeholders to overcome the problem of conflict in Papua.

Good-Corporate Governance

Indonesians government should be honest that the problems in Papua are one of big problems of the Indonesian people that need to be resolved. The shadow of the failure of Papuan development will continue to haunt and save time bombs when various multiple Papuan problems are addressed inappropriately.

Since the Special Autonomy of Papua came into force, the budget allocated by the central government has increased. In terms of authority, Papua also has broad autonomy to organize self-government based on independence. However, the problem of Papua is not the lack of budget or limited authority, but the problem of governance in maximising the special autonomy budget for the welfare of the people. There is a lot of money in Papua, but its use is not effective so it is not surprising that malnutrition and measles occur.

On the other hand, oversight of the special autonomy budget has not yet been effective. Obstacles to the audit of the Special Autonomy Fund still exist, so that the Special Autonomy Fund has not yet provided a significant development impact. Since the Special Autonomy of Papua came into force, there have been changes, but these changes have not occurred significantly, even though the budget that is being disbursed for the development of Papua is getting bigger from year to year.

Based on researchers point-of-view, the current development of Papua needs a new perspective that there needs to be better governance so that the Papua Special Autonomy policy runs more effectively, efficiently, and has a broad impact on the welfare of the people of Papua. In terms of good governance, the Government of Papua needs to apply the basic principles of good governance, namely transparency, participation, accountability, and law enforcement and anti-corruption as the main elements.

First is transparency that implements openness to convey development policies and programs. The oversight will occur from the wider community. Transparency will encourage broad public participation. The transparency component includes comprehensive information, timeliness in information services, and the availability of information to the public.

Second is participation or inclusiveness. It is the process of involving stakeholders as widely as possible in the development of Papua's development policy. In formulating appropriate policies, the govern-

ment must involve the wider community, including Papuan ADAT or customary law instruments so that the policies formulated are right on target and in accordance with the needs and challenges of local community. Diverse input from various parties in the policy making process can help the central government in Jakarta to consider various issues, perspectives and alternative solutions in encouraging more effective local development of Papua.

Third, accountability, namely the mechanism of accountability between policy makers and the stakeholders served. The existence of an accountability mechanism provides the opportunity for stakeholders to ask for clarification and accountability if there are things that are not in accordance with the consensus in the implementation of governance. In accountability, there needs to be access to justice so that the people of Papua can feel the benefits of Special Autonomy.

Fourth is all about law-enforcement and anti-corruption. This is one of the main problems in the implementation of OTSUS in Papua. Law enforcement in Papua is still weak due to many factors, including the absence of legal awareness in the community, a law-abiding culture that is still weak at the level of the government apparatus, and under-optimal supervision.

Conclusion

At last, it realise that the various failures in the development of Papua since the enactment of Papua's Special Autonomy have not stemmed from the attitude of the central government that pays little attention to Papua, but stems from the lack of readiness of the Papuan government in implementing the Special Autonomy policy. What does it mean to increase money to develop Papua, when finally the money is not used effectively and maximally to develop the land of Papua.

In order to solve Papua conflict, Indonesia stakeholders should be ready to know and to reduce suspicious feelings and underestimate Papuans. It can be done through Papuans involving proactive participation in sustainable strategic nation-state process, such building national character through Pancasila as state ideology, UUD 1945 (national constitution), and Bhinneka Tunggal Ika (Unity in Diversity).

Last but not least, there will be no supporting justification for foreign states to intervene or interfere into Indonesia Papua's domestic affairs which prohibited by article 2 (4) and article 2 (3) Charter of the United Nations.



HENDRA MANURUNG is a doctoral candidate in International Relations, Universitas Padjadjaran, Bandung, Indonesia. The author can be contacted at hendra19001@mail.unpad.ac.id.

*Hendra
Manurung
Arry Bainus*

ARRY BAINUS is affiliated with the Department of International Relations, Universitas Padjadjaran, Bandung, Indonesia, and can be contacted at arry.bainus@unpad.ac.id.

References

- ABC NEWS. (2019). Free West Papuans Mural. April 26, 2019. It accessed from <https://www.abc.net.au/news/2019-01-29/free-west-papua-mural-1/10608238> on September 7, 2019.
- Anderson, B. (2015). *Papua's Insecurity: State Failure in the Indonesian Periphery*. Honolulu, Hawai'i, U.S: East-West Centre.
- Boutros-Ghali, B. (1992). *An Agenda for Peace: Preventive Diplomacy, Peacemaking and Peace-keeping*. New York, U.S: The United Nations Secretary General.
- Budiatri, P., & Aisah. (2019). Memadamkan Konflik Papua. KOMPAS, 6 September 2019.
- Chew, Amy. (2019). Explained: what has led to the violent riots in Indonesia's Papua? South China Morning Post, 21 August 2019. It accessed from <https://www.scmp.com/week-asia/explained/article/3023640/explained-riots-indonesias-papua-region> on 13 October 2019.
- Crying Freedom. (2016). Indonesia and Papua. It accessed from <https://www.cryingfreedom.net/cryingfreedom-web-browser.html> on September 8, 2019
- DetikNEWS. (2019). Benny Wenda di Balik Rusuh Papua, Bukan Lagi Warga Indonesia. September 6, 2019. It accessed from <https://news.detik.com/berita/d-4695532/benny-wenda-di-balik-rusuh-papua-bukan-lagi-warga-indonesia> on 5 September 2019.
- Droglever. P.J. (2005). *Tindakan Pilihan Bebas. Orang Papua dan Penentuan Nasib Sendiri: Kanisius Yogyakarta*.
- Giaji. B. (2011). *Hidup dan Karya Jhon Rumbiak. Gereja, LSM dan Perjuangan HAM Dalam Tahun 1980an di Tanah Papua. Deiyai West Papua*.
- Hernawan, B. (2013). Quo Vadis the Peace Dialogue for Papua? The Jakarta Post, March 10, 2013.
- Hernawan, B. (2014). What's Next for Papua after the MSG Diplomacy. The Jakarta Post.
- Humanrightspapua.org. (2012). West Papua at the UN Human Rights Mechanisms. It accessed from <http://humanrightspapua.org/resources/55-papua-at-un> on 3 August 2019.
- ICCPR. (1976). The ICCPR has been ratified by Cambodia, Laos, the Philippines, Thailand and Vietnam. Opened for signature 16 December 1966, 999 UNTS 171, entered into force March 23, 1976. It accessed from file:///C:/Users/USER/Downloads/Land_Rights_of_Indigenous_Peoples_in_South-East_As.pdf on August 25, 2019.
- ICESCR. (1976). The ICESCR has been ratified by Cambodia, Laos, the

- Philippines, Thailand and Vietnam. Opened for signature 16 December 1966, 999 UNTS 171, entered into force March 23, 1976. It accessed from file:///C:/Users/USER/Downloads/Land_Rights_of_Indigenous_Peoples_in_South-East_As.pdf on August 25, 2019.
- Indigenous Peoples Center for Documentation, Research and Information-DOCIP. (2002). Update 44/45, May/June 2002. It accessed from https://www.docip.org/anglais/update_en/up_en_44_45.html#oasa on August 30, 2019.
- Inter-Committee Meeting of Human Rights Treaty Bodies, Recent Reporting History of States Parties under the Principal International Human Rights Instruments. (2002). UN Document HRI/GEN/4/Rev.2 (2002).
- Kissinger, Henry. (1969). Memorandum for the President: Subject: Djakarta Visit: Your Meetings with President Suharto. Documents 9 and 10 The National Security Archives. It accessed from <https://nsarchive2.gwu.edu/NSAEBB/NSAEBB128/#1> on 12 October 2019.
- Lederach, J. P. (1997). *Building Peace: Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies*. Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace.
- MacLeod, J. (2015). *Merdeka and the Morning Star: Civil Resistance in West Papua*. Queensland, Australia: University of Queensland Press.
- Manurung, H. (2017). *Penyelesaian Konflik Papua VS Hak Menentukan Nasib Sendiri*. March 9, 2017. It accessed from <http://www.imparsial.org/publikasi/opini/penyelesaian-konflik-papua-vs-hak-menentukan-nasib-sendiri> on August 29, 2019.
- New Internationalist. (1999). *Breaking Free From Betrayal*, 5 November 1999. It accessed from <https://newint.org/features/1999/11/05/free/> on 13 October 2019.
- Nolan, Cillian and Jones, Sidney. (2015). 'Jokowi's Turn to Solve the Papua Question', *East Asia Forum*, 19 May 2015.
- Papua News. (2016). *Government: We Are Developing Many Roads to Papua*. September 2, 2016, papuanews.org. It accessed from <https://www.papuanews.org/government-developz-many-roads-to-papua> on September 28, 2019.
- PERATURAN PEMERINTAH PENGGANTI UNDANG-UNDANG REPUBLIK INDONESIA NOMOR 1 TAHUN 2008 TENTANG PERUBAHAN ATAS UNDANG-UNDANG NOMOR 21 TAHUN 2001 TENTANG OTONOMI KHUSUS BAGI PROVINSI PAPUA. Jakarta, Indonesia, 16 April 2008. It accessed from <https://sipuu.setkab.go.id/PUUdoc/16143/Perpu%201%202008.htm> on 26 August 2019.
- Racial Discrimination Convention. (1966). Opened for signature 7 March 1966, 660 UNTS 195, entered into force 4 January 1969.
- Saltford, J. (2003). *The United Nations and the Indonesian Takeover of West Papua, 1962-1969: The Anatomy of Betrayal*. London, U.K and New York, U.S: RoutledgeCurzon.
- Siregar, I. A., Mustafa, H., Conoras, Y., & Silpa, C. (2013). *Menuju Papua Tanah Damai: Perspektif Non Papua*. Jayapura: Aliansi Demokrasi untuk Papua.
- Soekadijo, R.G & Aditjondro. (2001). *Belanda Di Irian Jaya : Garba Budaya Jakarta*. Sofyan Socrates. (2011). *West Papua Persoalan Internasional*. Cendrawasih Press : West Papua.
- _____. (2011). *Gereja & Politik Di Papua Barat*. Cendrawasih Press: West Papua
- Sydney Morning Herald. (2015). *Joko Widodo Says Abolishing Death Penalty*

- Possible But Not For A Long Time. March 9, 2015. It accessed from <http://www.smh.com.au/world/joko-widodo-says-abolishing-death-penalty-possible-but-not-for-a-long-time-20150308-13y6ve.html> on 28 August 2019.
- Tebay, N. (2005). *West Papua: The Struggle for Peace with Justice*. London, UK: Catholic Institute for International Relations.
- The Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination-CERD. (1997). Summary Record of the 1218th Meeting: Philipines, UN Doc CERD/C/SR.1218 (1997). *Process and Resolution of the Papua Problem*
- The Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination-CERD. (1996). Review of the Implementation of CERD: Lao People's Democratic Republic. UN Document: A/51/18, pp.452-455.
- The Guardian. (2019). Outcry as Indonesia seeks to arrest renowned West Papua rights lawyer. 5 September 2019. It accessed from <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2019/sep/05/outcry-as-indonesia-seeks-to-arrest-renowned-west-papua-rights-lawyer> on 6 September 2019.
- The National Security Archive. (2004). Indonesia's 1969 Takeover of West Papua Not by "Free Choice". Document Release Marks 35th Anniversary of Controversial Vote and Annexation. 9 July 2004. It accessed from <https://nsarchive2.gwu.edu/NSAEBB/NSAEBB128/#1> on 12 October 2019.
- The United Nations. The Charter of The United Nations, 26 June 1945. It accessed from <https://www.unmultimedia.org/classics/asset/C106/C1065/> on 3 September 2019.
- The United Nations General Assembly. (1993). Declaration on Minorities. UN GA Resolution Number 47/135, UN GAOR, 47th Session, 92nd Plenary Meeting, Annex, UN Document A/RES/47/135 (1993) ('Declaration on Minorities').
- The United Nations General Assembly. (2017). Human Rights Council Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review Twenty-seventh session 1-12 May 2017: Indonesia National Report. A/HRC/WG.6/27/IDN/1. Accessed from file:///C:/Users/USER/Downloads/Indonesia_natioanlreport_3rdUPRCycle.pdf on 1 September 2019.
- The United Nations Human Rights Committee. (1997). *Lovelace v Canada*, HRC, Communication No 24/1997, UN Doc CCPR/C/13/D/24/1977 (30 July 1981); *Lubicon Lake Band v Canada*, HRC, Communication No 167/1984, UN Doc CCPR/C/38/D/167/1984 (26 May 1990); *Kitok v Sweden*, HRC, Communication No 197/1985, UN Doc CCPR/C/33/D/197/1985 (2 December 1985); *Ilmari Länsman v Finland*, HRC, Communication No 511/1992, UN Doc CCPR/C/52/D/511/1992 (26 October 1994); *Hopu v France*, HRC, Communication No 549/1993, UN Doc CCPR/C/60/D/549/1993/Rev.1 (29 July 1997).
- The United Nations Treaty Series. (1962). No.6311 INDONESIA and NETHERLANDS Agreement (with annex) concerning West New Guinea (West Irian). Signed at the Headquarters of the United Nations, New York, on 15 August 1962. It accessed from <https://treaties.un.org> > Publication > UNTS > volume-437-1-6311-English on September 7, 2019.
- The United Nations Working Group Report on Arbitrary Detention on its visit to Indonesia, 31 January to 12 February 1999. (1999). Commission on Human Rights, 56th Session, Item 11a, E/CN.4/2000/4/Add.2. It accessed from <https://www.daccess-ods.un.org/TMP/4112580.71660995.html> on August 25, 2019.
- UNDANG-UNDANG REPUBLIK INDONESIA NOMOR 21 TAHUN 2001

CEJISS
4/2019

- TENTANG OTONOMI KHUSUS BAGI PROVINSI PAPUA. Jakarta, Indonesia, 21 November 2001.
- Xanthaki, A. (2003). Land Rights of Indigenous Peoples in Southeast Asia. January 2003. Brunei University, London, U.K. It accessed from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/49401125_Land_Rights_of_Indigenous_Peoples_in_South-East_Asia on September 1, 2019.
- Wangge, Y.R., Hipolitus. (2019). Siklus Kekerasan Tak Berkesudahan di Papua. KOMPAS, 6 September 2019.
- Wibawa, T. (2019). Why Nearly 2 Million People are demanding an independence vote for West Papua Province. ABC NEWS, August 2019. Accessed from <https://www.abc.net.au/news/2019-01-30/west-papuans-fight-for-another-independence-referendum/10584336> on September 8, 2019.
- Wilson, G.G. (1939). International Law, 3rd Edition. St. Paul, West Publication Company, U.S.