

Analysis Strategic Palanning In Conflict Resolution In Papua

Charizatul Janna Asdi Putri¹⁾, Bambang Wahyudi²⁾, Anang Puji Utama³⁾, Pujo Widodo⁴⁾, Herlina JR Saragih⁵⁾

^{1,2,3,4,5}National Security Faculty, Republic of Indonesia of Defense University

*Corresponding Author

Email: putricharizatul@gmail.com, buangwahyu2761@gmail.com, anang.utama@idu.ac.id,
pujowidodo78@gmail.com, herlinasara78@gmail.com

Abstract

The conflict in Papua is a complex issue rooted in historical, political, social, and cultural factors. Papua has been Indonesia since 1969, but tensions persist due to separatist movements, the Free Papua Movement (OPM), and dissatisfaction with the region's development and resource management. This research aims to analyze strategic planning in conflict resolution, focusing on governmental policies and their implementation. The study adopts a qualitative approach, using in-depth interviews, observation, and a literature review. In-depth interviews were conducted with informants from local communities, experts, and academics to gain comprehensive insights into the conflict's dynamics. Observations were made to better understand social interactions and conflict resolution mechanisms, while the literature review helped frame theoretical perspectives on conflict resolution. The research finds that despite the implementation of the Special Autonomy Law (Otsus) in 2001, challenges such as lack of transparency in fund allocation and weak institutional roles, like the Papuan People's Assembly (MRP), persist. As a solution, the study suggests strengthening Special Autonomy by facilitating dialogue among all stakeholders, including neutral international mediators. It also recommends improved strategic planning in policy development, emphasizing the principles of equality, honesty, openness, and sincerity in the dialogue process to achieve effective and sustainable conflict resolution.

Keywords: *Papua Conflict, Special Autonomy, Conflict Resolution, Strategic Planning, Dialogue.*

INTRODUCTION

Legally, the Papua region has been part of the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia (NKRI) since 1969, following the implementation of the Act of Free Choice (Pepera), which was recognized by 84 countries and ratified through UN Resolution No. 2504/XXIV/1969. However, the region continues to experience tensions. Development in this area has not yet fully succeeded in eliminating violence and conflict, including the tribal lifestyle traditions of its society.

History plays a significant role as one of the underlying factors of the various violence and conflicts in Papua Province. The controversy between the Papuans and other parties began when the Dutch handed over the administration of Papua to the United Nations. In the ten-year development plan starting in 1950, UNTEA (United Nations Temporary Administration) was given responsibility by the Dutch during the transitional period. On December 1, 1961, several preparations were made, coinciding with other important moments: the Dutch government appointed local Papuan society members as 50% of the Nieuw Guinea Raad (legislature), the Morning Star flag was flown alongside the Dutch flag, and the Papuan national anthem "Hai Tanahku Papua" was introduced. However, the "New York Agreement" of 1962, which did not involve any Papuans, was made as a reference for the transfer of Nederland Nieuw Guinea (Papua) from the Dutch to Indonesia. In 1964, the Dutch-educated Papuan elite demanded that Papua should be independent, not only from the Netherlands but also from Indonesia.

In addition to historical factors, the conflict in Papua is also influenced by political factors. The integration of Papua into the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia was a political decision considered the best for the region and contained noble ideals. However, centralized governance and development have not fully met the sense of justice, public welfare, law

enforcement, and respect for human rights (HAM) in Papua, especially for the Papuan people. This has led to disparities in almost all sectors of life, particularly in education, health, economy, culture, and socio-politics. Socially and culturally, the indigenous Papuan community differs from the Indonesian society in general. While the majority of Indonesians come from the Malay race, the Papuans belong to the Melanesian group and the Negroid race in the Pacific. Socially, Papuans have unique views and ways of life, with their own authority in managing, developing needs, and solving problems based on customary law. This causes difficulties when cultural clashes occur with the majority of Indonesian society.

Discussing the conflict in Papua cannot be separated from the issue of the Free Papua Movement. The rebellion of the Free Papua Movement (OPM) began on July 26, 1965, led by Sergeant Major Ferry Awom, a former member of the Dutch-created Papua Volunteers Corps (Papua Vrijwilligers Korp). The OPM rebellion, which started in Manokwari, then spread to all districts in West Irian, namely: Biak-Nufor, Sorong, Paniai, Fak-fak, Japen-Waropen, Marauke, Jayawijaya, and Jayapura (Suryananda, 1993). Essentially, the goal of separation is the objective of the rebellion, whether to overthrow the legitimate government and replace it with a new government according to the wishes of the rebels or to join another country, which is what the Papuan people are currently doing. The conflict in Papua is multidimensional. A deep analysis will reveal economic, political, socio-cultural, defense and security, and ideological elements that shape the conflict. Due to its multidimensional nature, solutions to the problems in Papua must be formulated holistically, integrally, and comprehensively.

Leadership in public policy involves several key factors, including vision, strategy, communication, collaboration, and integrity. A public policy leader must have a clear vision of the desired policy direction and be able to formulate effective strategies to achieve these goals. A strong vision will guide the steps taken in designing policies, directing available resources, and determining indicators of success (Anugrah, 2023). With the right leadership strategy, comprehensive improvements in security policies in Papua are expected. Referring to the phenomenon of conflict in Papua, the approaches and policies taken by the government post-reformation deserve scrutiny. These approaches and policies seem to have not yet resolved the problems in Papua. Therefore, it is crucial to understand the "Analysis Strategic Planning in Conflict Resolution in Papua."

RESEARCH METHODS

This study adopts a qualitative approach utilizing several data collection techniques, namely in-depth interviews, observation, and literature review. In-depth interviews are used to gather detailed and comprehensive information from informants with direct knowledge of the conflicts occurring in Papua. The interviews are conducted with a range of sources, including local Papuan communities, academics focusing on conflict resolution studies in Papua, and experts with in-depth knowledge of the social and political dynamics of the region. According to Creswell (2013) in *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design*, in-depth interviews allow researchers to gain a more complete understanding of the phenomenon under study. The selection of informants is carried out using purposive sampling, as explained by Patton (2002) in *Qualitative Research & Evaluation Methods*, who states that informants are chosen based on their relevance to the research topic and their willingness to share valuable information.

Observation is employed to obtain more contextual and rich data regarding various events occurring in Papua, both in daily life and in activities related to conflict resolution. This observational approach aligns with Goffman's (1959) perspective in *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*, which emphasizes the importance of direct observation of social behavior to gain

insights that cannot be obtained solely through interviews. Through observation, the researcher is able to directly witness interactions between the parties involved in the conflict and the mechanisms of resolution they apply. The researcher is also engaged in various activities related to social dialogue and meetings among local stakeholders, which enables the researcher to capture a deeper understanding of the dynamics surrounding conflict resolution.

Method employed in this study is a literature review, which aims to support the findings obtained from interviews and observations. Relevant literature is used to provide a strong theoretical foundation for understanding conflict resolution in Papua. Key works referenced in the literature review include *Building Peace: Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies* by Lederach (1997), which emphasizes the importance of a constructive approach in reconciliation and peace processes. Additionally, van der Meer (2011) in *Conflict Resolution in Indigenous Communities* discusses ethnic conflict resolution, which is highly relevant to the context of Papua as a region with diverse ethnic groups. Another important reference is Galtung's (2000) *Peace by Peaceful Means*, which provides foundational theories of conflict resolution and peacebuilding. This literature review not only enriches the findings from interviews and observations but also aids the researcher in understanding various theories that can be applied to conflict resolution in the Papua context.

By employing these three methods—interviews, observation, and literature review—this research aims to provide a more holistic understanding of the conflicts occurring in Papua and their resolution. Through this approach, the study hopes to make a significant contribution to the development of both theory and practice in conflict resolution in regions with complex social and political dynamics, such as Papua.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The Free Papua Movement (OPM) rebellion is marked by sporadic military activities involving the public, such as hostage-taking, mass demonstrations, raising different flags, pasting pamphlets, acts of vandalism, and border violations. The separatist movements in Papua are quite numerous, and not all are referred to by the general term OPM as commonly known. They operate under various banners such as the West Papua National Committee (KNPB), United Liberation Movement for West Papua (ULMWP), etc. These organizations often cause conflicts in Papua (Ayuninta, 2020).

According to data from the Indonesian Coordinating Ministry for Political, Legal, and Security Affairs, OPM activities from 2012 to 2013 included 49 shootings, 4 arson attacks, 4 instances of weapon theft, 2 cases of assault, and 1 hostage-taking. Additionally, the OPM raised the Morning Star flag 14 times, held 57 demonstrations, conducted 103 press conferences, and organized religious services, meetings, declarations, socialization activities, book launches, and leaflet distribution. These activities resulted in casualties: 10 military personnel, 7 police officers, and 20 civilians. In response to OPM's activities, both internationally and nationally, the Indonesian government issued Presidential Regulation No. 65 of 2011 on the Acceleration of Development for Papua and West Papua Provinces (P4B), implemented by the UP4B in accordance with Presidential Regulation No. 66 of 2011. This regulation was issued as an effort to address the activities of armed groups (OPM) that frequently attack military/police forces and civilians in remote areas, causing casualties. It is also part of the central government's development program aimed at resolving the issues in Papua.

The government has made various efforts to find solutions to mitigate unrest in Papua, including affirmative mechanisms with the issuance of Law No. 21 of 2001 on Special Autonomy (Otsus) for Papua, effective until 2021. Efforts to resolve the issues in Papua have

been ongoing since the era of Presidents B.J. Habibie, Abdurrahman Wahid, Megawati Sukarnoputri, Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono, and currently under President Jokowi. However, these policies have not yet optimally resolved the conflict, especially amidst ongoing turmoil. Effective public leadership is crucial in formulating high-quality policies, implementing them well, and generating positive impacts for society (Nurhidayat, 2023).

Strategic Planning in Resolving the Papua Conflict

Indonesia has undertaken various mechanisms to resolve the conflict in Papua, which has persisted for a long time and remains a governmental focus. Strategic planning is essential for achieving the desired peace in the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia (NKRI).

Strategic planning by the Indonesian government to resolve the conflict in Papua began in 1999, marked by President Abdurrahman Wahid's renaming of Irian Jaya to Papua and allowing the raising of the Morning Star flag as a cultural symbol rather than a sign of secession from NKRI. This was important for developing the complete identity of the Papuan people, emphasizing their self-respect and identity through regional symbols like songs, flags, and emblems.

The government also designated Irian Jaya Province as a special autonomy area, as explicitly stated in the People's Consultative Assembly Decree No. IV/MPR/1999 on the Broad Outlines of State Policy for 1999-2004, Chapter IV, letter G, point 2. Following this decree, on October 22, 2001, the House of Representatives approved and enacted the Special Autonomy Law for Papua Province, which was ratified on November 21, 2001, as Law No. 21 of 2001.

The presence of Law No. 21 of 2001 represented a struggle as it had to convince all components of Papuan society, particularly indigenous Papuans, that Special Autonomy was the most appropriate choice. During the legislative process, the government provided input in the form of a list of 471 issues. The struggle to pass Law No. 21 of 2001 was compounded by the death of Theys Hiyo Eluay, the Chairman of the Papuan Presidium Council, just days before President Megawati Soekarnoputri issued the law.

The term "autonomy" in Special Autonomy means the freedom for the Papuan people to manage their own affairs, govern themselves, and utilize Papua's natural resources for the maximum benefit of the Papuan people while supporting central and other regional governments in Indonesia. It also encompasses the freedom to determine social, cultural, economic, and political development strategies that align with the characteristics and uniqueness of Papua's human resources, natural conditions, and culture.

There have been criticisms of the implementation of Special Autonomy funds, citing a lack of transparency and poorly defined allocation. The failure in implementing these funds is evident from the misappropriation of 28 trillion Rupiahs, which were used by Papuan politicians and bureaucrats to increase their power, rather than being properly distributed to the majority of Papuan residents.

According to research by LIPI, the spirit of development in Papua following the enactment of the Special Autonomy Law has not been maximized. The long process of creating and socializing the Special Autonomy Law did not yield results commensurate with the efforts, as experienced by the people.

The establishment of the Papuan People's Assembly (MRP), a unique feature of Papua's special status, was intended to provide considerations and approvals in formulating regional policies, promoting equality and diversity, and preserving Papua's culture and natural environment. However, in practice, the MRP's role has been diminished, leading to ambiguity in its position, whether as an executive or legislative body. Consequently, the MRP has been unable to mediate conflicts or convey grassroots aspirations to high-ranking officials in Papua, the provincial legislature, or the central government.

Given the issues in implementing the Special Autonomy Law, it is essential to undertake strategic planning in policy formulation and implementation. Ideally, strategic planning should involve stakeholder approaches, including the central and local governments, and beneficiary approaches, with Papuan society as the beneficiaries of these policies.

Strengthening Special Autonomy is one of the strategic plans for conflict resolution. Learning from the Aceh conflict and other global conflicts, strategic planning for resolving the Papua conflict should involve dialogue or negotiation. Proper planning for conflict resolution in Papua through dialogue is expected to end the conflicts, similar to the well-planned dialogue between the Indonesian government and GAM, facilitated by former Finnish President, which resulted in a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU).

However, lessons must be learned from the failed 1999 National Papua Dialogue in Jakarta. Effective dialogue requires participants to understand the significance of dialogue as a process rather than a sudden mass meeting. Recognizing the need for a well-planned and strategic approach to dialogue is crucial for achieving the best outcomes. Dialogue should be a series of continuous processes requiring high tolerance and understanding of political differences between parties.

For successful Papua dialogue, four fundamental principles are required: equality, honesty, openness, and sincerity. Respecting these principles reflects the recognition of issues in Papua, which is crucial for reconciliation. Ignoring these principles can render the dialogue ineffective or lead to deadlock. Due to the complexity of the issues, the Papua dialogue should be designed in stages and continued as follows: informal dialogue among Papuan elites, dialogue among Papuan community groups, national dialogue between the central government and representatives of the Papuan people, and international dialogue between the Indonesian government and Papuan representatives mediated by neutral international parties with no direct interest in the conflict. Involving neutral, reputable international mediators is crucial for the success of the dialogue.

CONCLUSION

From the perspective of the ongoing conflict in Papua, it represents a long-standing issue still felt by the Papuan community today. The conflict in Papua is rooted in several influencing factors, beginning with Papua's historical attempt to declare itself an independent country. However, the Netherlands, as the administrative authority over Papua, handed over this responsibility to the United Nations, which then transferred Papua to the Republic of Indonesia. This led to a sense of dissatisfaction among the Papuan people regarding their incorporation into Indonesia.

Additionally, political violence and human rights violations have occurred in Papua, particularly during the New Order era when Indonesia imposed a harsh presence on the Papuan community. There is also a desire for recognition of Papuan identity, which differs significantly from that of the general Indonesian population.

The Indonesian government's policies have included the implementation of Special Autonomy for Papua through Law No. 21 of 2001. Efforts to resolve the conflict through dialogue have also been made. However, neither the implementation of Special Autonomy nor the dialogues have yielded the best outcomes so far.

To resolve the conflict in Papua, strategic planning by the government is essential. This strategic approach should ensure that the implementation of policies achieves the desired outcomes for all parties involved, ultimately aiming for the welfare of the community and the integrity of Indonesia, particularly in Papua.

REFERENCES

- Anugrah, R. (2023). *Public Policy Leadership and Strategy*. Jakarta: Penerbit Aksara.
- Ayuninta, R. (2020). *Papua and the Free Papua Movement: The Historical and Political Dynamics*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Galtung, J. (2000). *Peace by Peaceful Means: Peace and Conflict, Development and Civilization*. London: Sage Publications.
- Goffman, E. (1959). *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York: Doubleday.
- Irfanuddin , Muhammad Aziz, I Gede Sumertha KY. 2021. Strategi Pencegahan Internasionalisasi Konflik Papua Melalui Track One Diplomacy Dalam Upaya Stabilitas Keamanan Nasional”. *Jurnal Damai dan Resolusi Konflik | Volume 7 Nomor 2 Tahun 2021*.
- Lederach, J. P. (1997). *Building Peace: Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies*. Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace Press.
- LIPI (Indonesian Institute of Sciences). (2015). *Papua: Challenges in Special Autonomy and Governance*. Jakarta: LIPI Press.
- Nurhidayat, Kusuma, dkk. 2023. “Menilik Politisasi Konflik Papua : Dilema Isu Keamanan Indonesia. *Jurnal Kewarganegaraan* Vo. 7 No. 1 2023.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative Research & Evaluation Methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Rohim, Nur. 2014. “OPTIMALISASI OTONOMI KHUSUS PAPUA DALAM PENINGKATAN KESADARAN HUKUM MASYARAKAT GUNA MEREDAM KONFLIK DAN KEKERASAN”. *Fiat Justisia Jurnal Ilmu Hukum* Volume 8 No. 1, Januari-Maret 2014.
- Sugandi, Yulia. 2008. “Analisis Konflik dan Rekomendasi Kebijakan Mengenai Papua”. *Friedrich Ebert Stiftung*.
- Suropati ,Laksamana Muda TNI (Purn.) Untung. 2019. “Solusi Komprehensif Menuju Papua Baru: Penyelesaian Konflik Papua Secara Damai, Adil dan Bermartabat”. *Jurnal Kajian Lemhanas RI*, Edisi 37, Maret 2019.
- Suryananda, A. (1993). *The History of the Free Papua Movement and its Rebellion*. Jakarta: Kompas.
- Taum, Yoseph Yapi. 2015. ” KEKERASAN DAN KONFLIK DI PAPUA : AKAR MASALAH DAN STRATEGI MENGATASINYA”. *Jurnal Penelitian*. Volume 19, No. 1, November 2015, hlm. 1-13.
- Van der Meer, P. (2011). *Conflict Resolution in Indigenous Communities: A Case Study of Papua*. Jakarta: Penerbit Universitas Indonesia.