POLICY BRIEF

By Alistair D.B. Cook

Differentiated Policies:
Indonesia's International Leadership
and Internal Challenges

No. 12, June 2011

Indonesia's position as a regional champion of democracy and human rights has become prominent in international forums since the resignation of President Suharto in 1998 and the subsequent period of internal democratic reform. Its proactive foreign policy culminated in the establishment of the Bali Democracy Forum in 2008 to promote and strengthen democracy and the rule of law in Asia through a process of learning and sharing. While Indonesia's proactive foreign policy continues, significant internal challenges remain. This policy brief offers an insight into one of Indonesia's longest running internal challenges, Papua, and suggests the use of the human security lens as an alternative to the dominant traditional security lens used by many policymakers, in an effort to promote conflict resolution and match developments at home with its proactive strategies abroad.

At the beginning of 2011, Indonesia began its term as ASEAN Chair and has pursued an active foreign policy agenda both in this capacity and as part of its wider foreign policy objectives. As ASEAN Chair, Indonesia has made several attempts to bolster regional mechanisms with mixed results. The most notable example to date is the effort to mediate between Cambodia and Thailand over their border dispute. Other efforts include facilitating negotiations within the region over the development of a regional peacekeeping centre,[1] and pushing human rights to the top of the ASEAN agenda. Indeed in January 2011, Indonesian Foreign Minister, Marty Natalegawa, articulated this policy agenda when he expressed the hope that the ASEAN Intergovernmental Commission on Human Rights (AICHR) would become more effective in implementing its mandate.

However, in contrast to the international advocacy by the Indonesian foreign affairs ministry, there are serious human rights issues at home that need to be addressed. Among the most significant of these are the ongoing human rights issues in Papua. It has been a year since the Papuan People's Consultative Assembly (MRP) and the indigenous people of Papua made 11 recommendations[2] on 14 June 2010 to address the socioeconomic and political issues that affect people in Papua. Broadly, these 11 recommendations focused on human security concerns including economic development, human rights and prevalence of low-level violence. Their most prominent recommendation was to 'hand back' the Special Autonomy status of Papua to the Government of the Republic of Indonesia. This was a symbolic gesture aimed at highlighting the failure to implement the Special Autonomy Law 21/2001, which would have devolved powers and recognised Papua as an autonomous entity within Indonesia. It was through this move that these issues in Papua attracted much international attention. Besides the widespread media coverage, awareness and support among politicians both from the region and across the world have been gained through the activities of organisations such as the International Parliamentarians for West Papua and the West Papua Advocacy Team.

This policy brief aims to highlight the key human security concerns of the Papuan people. Using a human security approach, it contrasts the current situation with the themes encapsulated in the 11 recommendations made a year ago by the MRP and the indigenous people of Papua. It then proposes opportunities and ways forward to address these concerns.

Economic Security

Papua is the most resource-rich province in Indonesia. According to the Indonesian National Bureau for Statistics, mining accounts for 69 per cent of the Papuan economy, followed by food production at 11 per cent. Papua is home to the Grasberg mine, the world's largest above ground copper mine, which generated more than half of Papuan gross domestic product (GDP) between 1995 and 2005.[3] The province is also home to the Merauke Integrated Food and Energy Estate (MIFEE). While these activities generate significant revenues for the national government in Jakarta, the benefits do not adequately reach those on the ground in Papua. As a result of this unequal distribution,[4] there is visible animosity between local communities and those running these projects, evidenced by incidents of low-level violence between local communities and these developments.

Alongside this unequal distribution, the region is culturally fragmented, has a low population density and, as noted by the World Bank in 2010, has distinctive physical dynamics – great distances,

steep mountains, swampy lowlands, fragile soils and heavy seasonal rainfall. These realities influence the success of any initiative. Thus while a social fund was established by the Grasberg Mine, it has had limited impact. A central concern is over land ownership in the province, which is contested largely due to complaints of local corruption in the issuance of logging permits or the development of projects like the MIFEE. In order to promote greater economic security for those in Papua, there is a need for a more accountable and transparent system to monitor the situation between external investment projects and local communities. Indeed, local communities need to be provided with opportunities for greater involvement in the decision-making processes that affect their lives and so a review of the governance structures in place needs to occur to address issues of economic insecurity in Papua.

Governance and the Rule of Law

Since the 1969 Act of Free Choice, the Indonesian central government has viewed secessionist activities through the prism of national security and the threat that these actions pose to the integrity of the state. An implication of this particular lens being used is that the response to the situation in Papua has primarily been through the military's Special Forces, the Kopassus. Since the beginning of the democratisation process in Indonesia in 1998, citizens in Papua as well as other provinces have increasingly spoken up on behalf of those in Papua who have received undue punishment and harsh treatment by the Kopassus. In the past year, published video footage of human rights abuses suffered by Papuans at the hands of the Kopassus was acknowledged by the central government, and in response, trials were conducted with sentences of less than a year meted out. Given the nature of the abuses, these sentences have been referred to as 'relative impunity'.[5]

The central government continues to frame the situation in Papua using a traditional security lens. For the situation to improve, it is important to view the situation through a human security lens to determine the human consequences that the militarisation of the province has brought about. While the use of the judicial system to hold individuals to account is welcomed, more systematic use of and fair access to the judicial system alongside proportionate punishment for crimes committed are needed. The National Human Rights Commission (Komnas HAM) should be given appropriate powers to fully investigate all human rights cases in Papua. Indeed, the fact that there are different versions of history in Papua also needs to be recognised and responded to by the central government through the establishment of a truth and reconciliation commission as outlined in the Special Autonomy

Law. This would help to bridge the gulf between Papuan and Indonesian interpretations of events.

Health and Human Security

Beyond the consequences of violent conflict, one of the greatest longer-term human security issues is the unusually high prevalence of HIV/AIDS across the community. A report by AUSAid in 2010 found that the rate of reported AIDS cases was 1.03 per cent compared to an average of 0.17 per cent for the rest of Indonesia. The high prevalence rate is attributed to the high levels of migration, and poor public awareness and education levels. Yet, in 2011, the amount of money available for HIV/AIDS programmes in the worst-affected area halved from around 3 billion rupiah to 1.5 billion rupiah, according to Erens Meokbun, the National AIDS Commission (PPA) Chief for Mimika, a region in Papua which has the highest number of sufferers.[6] In addition to the need to provide adequate access to treatment, an increase in public awareness and education is essential, not just among the local communities in Papua but also among migrants from other parts of Indonesia and policymakers in Jakarta. Without a comprehensive commitment to prevention and treatment of HIV/AIDS in Papua, the threat to human security will remain.

Indeed, the challenge of health governance in the province feeds into the longstanding grievances at the local level in Papua. Without a shift in how the central government in Jakarta views this and other challenges in Papua, it is unlikely that these concerns will dissipate.

Recasting the Debate

Since the Act of Free Choice in 1969, the status of Papua as part of Indonesia has been contested by Papuan communities on the one hand, who advocate secession from Indonesia, and Indonesian communities on the other, who emphasise its integral position within the Republic of Indonesia. Even though 42 years have passed, the framing of this internal challenge has remained largely unchanged, with traditional security concerns trumping the human security issues faced by Papuans on a day-to-day basis. The status of Papua will remain contested so long as the central government continues to view the situation in this way. The human security lens allows for a more comprehensive approach to these issues that does not focus solely on reactive measures and offers a way in which to view the situation in Papua in a different light.

Through utilising the human security lens, the various organs of the central government that play a critical role in providing for those in Papua can approach these challenges more comprehensively and in

a spirit of greater cooperation. Each government department, whether tasked with providing education, health or economic development, has complementary roles to play in providing its own expertise to respond to the human security challenges in Papua. However, while recasting the challenges within the human security framework will bring overlooked policy areas into the debate, there are still difficult and fundamental issues associated with the governance structure that need to be addressed.

While using the human security approach would help to reduce the tensions in Papua, successful conflict resolution lies in the commitment of the parties involved to moving forward in a spirit of cooperation. While the consolidation of the processes of democratisation continues across Indonesia, there remain significant challenges to the legitimacy of the institutions that have been created. Without tackling corruption in Papua, the human security challenges will remain and so too will the conflict.

There has to be political will at the national level, across the various government departments and branches of government, to address the internal challenges in Papua. Without this commitment, Indonesia's effectiveness as a champion of human rights, in the region and further afield, will be limited.

Notes

[1] 'ASEAN to Create Regional Defence Industry', 2011, *The Brunei Times*, 20 May. http://www.bt.com.bn/news-asia/2011/05/20/asean-create-regional-defence-industry

[2] *Recommendations*, Papuan People's Consultative Assembly (MRP) in Consultation with the Indigenous Leaders of Papua on 10–11 June 2010.

[3] Hernawan, J. Budi, 2009, *Terror, Resistance and Trauma in Papua (Indonesia)*, Centre for International Governance and Justice Issues Paper 14, Canberra: Australian National University. http://cigj.anu.edu.au/cigj/link_documents/Publications/JBudi.pdf

[4] An example of this inequality is the recruitment of workers for the Grasberg mine. Only 7 per cent of employees are from local communities, with the vast majority recruited from outside Papua, according to figures by Freeport McMoRan Copper & Gold, Inc. For a more detailed account of the unequal distribution of benefits to the Papuan local population, please refer to Cook, Alistair D.B., 2010, 'Investing in Papua: The Dual Challenges of Governance and Development', *NTS Perspectives*, No. 2, Singapore: RSIS Centre for Non-Traditional

Security (NTS) Studies. http://www.rsis.edu.sg/nts/HTML-Newsletter/Perspective/Perspective_2.html

[5] Primanita, Arientha, 2011, 'More Talk, Less Military Needed in Papua: Activists', *Jakarta Globe*, 1 June. http://www.thejakartaglobe.com/news/more-talk-less-military-needed-in-papua-activists/444400

[6] 'Mimika Allocates Rp1.5 Billion for HIV/AIDS Program', 2011, *Antara News*, 26 May. http://www.antaranews.com/en/news/71970/mimika-allocates-rp15-billion-for-hivaids-program

About the Author

Alistair D.B. Cook is Post-doctoral Fellow at the Centre for Non-Traditional Security (NTS) Studies, S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS), Nanyang Technological University (NTU), where he coordinates the Internal and Cross-Border Conflict Programme, and the NTS-Plus Programme which focuses on emerging non-traditional security issues such as transnational crime, migration and cyber security. His research interests focus on conflict prevention, management and resolution strategies, and he is currently working on a project analysing such strategies in Asia. Dr Cook is also co-editing a forthcoming volume on *Non-Traditional Security in Asia: Issues, Challenges and Frameworks for Action* (Singapore: ISEAS).

Terms of Use

About the Centre

The RSIS Centre for NTS Studies, NTU, was inaugurated by the ASEAN Secretary-General, Dr Surin Pitsuwan, in May 2008. The Centre maintains research in the fields of Food Security, Climate Change, Energy Security, Health Security as well as Internal and Cross-Border Conflict. It produces policy-relevant analyses aimed at furthering awareness and building capacity to address NTS issues and challenges in the Asia-Pacific region and beyond. The Centre also provides a platform for scholars and policymakers within and outside Asia to discuss and analyse NTS issues in the region.

In 2009, the Centre was chosen by the MacArthur Foundation as a lead institution for the MacArthur Asia Security Initiative, to develop policy research capacity and recommend policies on the critical security challenges facing the Asia-Pacific.

The Centre is also a founding member of and the Secretariat for the Consortium of Non-Traditional Security (NTS) Studies in Asia (NTS-Asia). More information on the Centre can be found at www.rsis.edu.sg/nts.