

Analysis of Causes and Intervention Design for the Papua Conflict based on Structural, Accelerator, and Trigger (SAT) Model

**Arlina Alfiani Chandra¹⁾, Achmed Sukendro²⁾, Arifuddin Uksan³⁾, Pujo Widodo⁴⁾, Muhammad Riza Fathu
Anas⁵⁾**

^{1,2,3,4,5)}Peace and Conflict Resolution, Faculty of National Security, Indonesia Defense University, Indonesia

*Corresponding Author

Email: erlinaalfiani@gmail.com

Abstract

The Papua conflict remains unresolved and is one of Indonesia's enduring challenges. Special autonomy and development efforts by the government in the region have not succeeded in fostering peace. This study aims to explore the causes of the Papua conflict and provide insights into conflict intervention strategies using the Structural, Accelerator, and Trigger (SAT) Model. This qualitative research as defined by Sugiyono utilized secondary data analysis to gain comprehensive understanding of the conflict intervention design for Papua based on implications of Structural, Accelerator, and Trigger (SAT) Factors. Data was gathered from various sources including books, journals, government documents, and media articles related to the dynamics of the Papua conflict. The study found that by applying the Structural, Accelerator, and Trigger (SAT) Model, the underlying causes of the conflict can be delineated, paving the way for intervention strategies based on these causes. Structural causes such as trust issues with the government, economic inequality, and divergent interests need interventions such as trust building, sustainable economic policies, and negotiation. Accelerator causes such as mass media require interventions such as strengthening media ethics, while conflict triggers such as violence necessitate law enforcement through judicial measures to achieve sustainable peace in Papua.

Keywords: Intervention, Causes, Conflict, Papua, Structural-Accelerator-Trigger (SAT)

INTRODUCTION

Indonesia, a nation declared independent in 1945, has strived progressively and consistently to establish itself as a peaceful and secure state under the motto of *Bhinneka Tunggal Ika*, which translates to "unity in diversity" (Lutfia et al., 2021). Despite this, the potential for conflict within Indonesian territory remains undeniable. The nation's high level of heterogeneity across cultural, religious, ethnic, and other dimensions of diversity has often led to challenging frictions that threaten national integration and unity (Liata & Fazal, 2021).

The diversity of identities has resulted in a long history of conflicts since Indonesia's independence was declared. Indonesia has experienced various conflicts, both horizontal and vertical, non-violent and violent, resolved and unresolved. Among these conflicts, the situation in Papua stands out as one that continues to persist without a clear resolution. The complexity of the Papua conflict traces back to Indonesia's claim over the former Dutch East Indies territory upon independence. Specifically, the Dutch government rejected Indonesia's claim over Papua (then known as West Irian) arguing that the people of Papua did not share racial and ethnic identities with the broader Indonesian population (Rahman et al., 2023). This dispute persisted until 1962 when mediation at the United Nations (UN), with Indonesia represented by the United States, resulted in the New York Agreement declaring Papua as part of Indonesia (Zahidi & Pradana, 2020).

The struggle over Papua's political status did not end there. In 1969, a referendum known as the "Act of Free Choice" or "Pepera" was conducted to ascertain whether the Papuan people wished to remain integrated within the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia. Despite its name, this consultation process was marred by controversy, with allegations that the Indonesian

government exerted undue influence and that the Papuan people's voices were not adequately represented (Yoseph, 2015).

The controversy and dissatisfaction with the referendum results led to the formation of separatist groups opposing Indonesian authority in Papua. These groups contested government control, arguing their rights were not respected, and asserting distinct identities separate from the Indonesian populace, often advocating for independence (Sehrenneta & Retno, 2020).

One prominent separatist group in Papua is the Free Papua Movement (OPM). The OPM aims to challenge Indonesian government authority, contrasting sharply with government efforts to maintain Papua as an integral part of Indonesia. During President Suharto's era, policies characterized by quasi-repressive measures emphasized integrating Papua into the nation. The New Order policy viewed OPM as political opponents, resulting in limited open conflict but escalated military security operations. While repressive measures led to a subdued separatist movement, they also fueled deeper resentment among OPM members who felt their rights to dissent were suppressed (Nomensen, 2015).

Concrete steps taken by the Indonesian government to address the Papua conflict included granting Special Autonomy through Law No. 21 of 2001 for Papua. This legislative commitment aimed to shift from security/stability approaches, prevalent during the New Order era, to social/welfare approaches in managing Papua's conflicts (Rohim, 2015). Special Autonomy implementation included the formation of the Papuan People's Assembly (MRP), representing indigenous Papuan cultural identities with specific authority to protect indigenous rights based on respect for customs and culture, women's empowerment, and religious harmony. Despite these efforts, tensions persisted, marked by increased conflict escalation between separatist groups and the government (Katharina et al., 2012).

The conflict continues today, evolving with the emergence of Armed Criminal Groups (KKB) intensifying violent aspects. These groups have been involved in various violent acts, including attacks on security forces and public facilities, causing harm to Papua's civilian population. Such violent acts by KKB are viewed by the Indonesian government as terrorism threats, resulting in casualties among Indonesian Armed Forces (TNI), National Police (Polri), and civilians. Over a decade from 2010 to 2020, KKB perpetrated 118 violence cases, significantly surpassing accumulated cases involving TNI and Polri with only 28 incidents (Yunus, 2021). Despite international concerns labeling Indonesia as violating human rights, Papua remains the longest-standing region in conflict with a violent dimension in Indonesia.

Researchers have previously explored the causes of violent conflicts such as those in Papua, attributing them to differing understandings, interests, and ideologies among involved actors (Kapila & Mukesh, 2012). Further studies by the Indonesian Institute of Sciences (LIPI) (2004) revealed that conflicts in Papua are triggered by fundamental differences in understanding the root issues, defending or contesting specific interests.

The Papua conflict stands as one of Indonesia's longest-running conflicts since independence. The escalating intensity and destructive implications demand proactive and structured interventions to halt damaging conflict impacts while fostering sustainable peace in Papua, essential for national security. Given its multifaceted complexity, resolving this conflict requires a multidimensional resolution framework examining structural, accelerator, and trigger aspects. Hence, this study aims to formulate an intervention design for the Papua conflict based on the Structural, Accelerator, and Trigger (SAT) model, providing insights and recommendations for conflict resolution in Papua.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study adopts a qualitative research method with a focus on secondary data analysis. As defined by Sugiyono (2008), secondary data refers to information that is not directly collected by researchers but is derived from existing records or reports prepared by others. This approach is chosen to facilitate a comprehensive and in-depth understanding of the complexities surrounding the Papua conflict, enabling the identification of key influencing factors and the formulation of recommendations using the Structural, Accelerator, and Trigger (SAT) model. The data collection process primarily involves library research, which systematically gathers secondary data from various credible and authoritative sources. These include government documents and official reports that provide insights into the administration, historical context, and ongoing management of conflicts in Papua. Additional sources encompass publications from international and local organizations detailing socio-political and economic aspects of the conflict, academic literature from peer-reviewed journals and books offering theoretical frameworks and case studies, and in-depth reports from reputable media outlets documenting recent developments and investigative insights into the causes and implications of the conflict.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Analysis of Papua Conflict Causes through the Structural, Accelerator, and Trigger (SAT) Model

The conflict in Papua between the Armed Criminal Group (KKB) and the Indonesian government is a protracted conflict characterized by conflicting interests between the parties involved. The KKB, a separatist group, aims to oppose government authority and strives for independence, thereby posing a significant threat to territorial integrity as perceived by the Indonesian government. On the other hand, the Indonesian government holds the mandate and responsibility to maintain Papua as part of the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia (NKRI). These fundamental differences in interests have fueled prolonged and violent conflict.

The Papua conflict poses a tangible threat to national defense processes. According to Law No. 3 of 2002, national defense is a state function aimed at achieving national goals, including protecting all Indonesian citizens, advancing public welfare, fostering national development, and contributing to global order based on independence, eternal peace, and social justice. The law further defines national defense as efforts to defend state sovereignty, the integrity of Indonesian territory, and the safety of all citizens from threats and disturbances to national unity and integrity. Hence, it is crucial to promptly address and resolve the Papua conflict to build sustainable peace, starting with mapping the conflict causes through the Structural, Accelerator, and Trigger (SAT) model.

Before intervening in the Papua conflict, it is essential to holistically understand it through three main elements of conflict causes: Structural, Accelerator, and Trigger (SAT) (Nurjanah et al., 2019). Structural Root Causes of Conflict are the underlying factors stemming from societal inequalities. These include issues such as trust issues towards the government, poverty, educational disparities, and longstanding political challenges that have given rise to additional conflict factors. Accelerator factors, such as international intervention and media coverage, escalate and intensify conflicts. Triggers are specific incidents that directly initiate or exacerbate conflicts, such as acts of violence.

The SAT model analysis helps comprehend the Papua conflict more comprehensively by identifying its roots, drivers, and triggers. This understanding facilitates the effective and targeted design of intervention efforts.

The Papua conflict has persisted over a long period, indicating deeply rooted structural causes. Based on the background explained earlier, the Structural Factors of the Papua conflict can be analyzed as follows:

Firstly, Trust Issues among Papua's population towards the government stem from the transfer of authority over Papua from the Dutch East Indies to Indonesia. Despite some local support for Indonesian rule, many perceive the referendum or Pepera as controversial due to inadequate representation of the broader Papua population, thereby fostering mistrust towards the government (Sugandi, 2008).

Secondly, Economic Inequality is a significant conflict root cause. Research spanning from 2014 to 2019 revealed Papua Province to have the highest poverty rates among Indonesian provinces. Economic disparities contribute to conflict as local communities feel the government fails to adequately improve livelihoods despite exploiting Papua's natural resources (Indrawati et al., 2020). Another structural issue is Social Injustice. Initially, the Dutch East Indies' argument against including Papua in Indonesia was Papua's racial and ethnic differences from other Indonesians. Although the government has implemented special quotas for Papuan students in universities and government agencies, many perceive social justice remains elusive (CNN Indonesia, 2021).

Another structural factor is Divergent Interests between separatist groups and the government. The government aims to defend national sovereignty, territorial integrity, and national security. Conversely, separatist groups oppose Indonesian sovereignty and strive for independence, forming a core conflict root.

Accelerator factors exacerbate conflict intensity, including foreign intervention and media influence. While the Papua conflict is primarily a domestic issue, foreign parties can influence it through various means. Foreign narratives framing Indonesia as an oppressor worsen the conflict's international image, sometimes leading to calls for referendums (Strangio, 2022).

Triggers are specific conflict-initiating incidents, such as violence. As outlined in the introduction, violence exacerbates tensions between separatist groups and the government. While both parties engage in violence, government actions often exacerbate tensions and trigger severe reactions from Papua's population and foreign observers, accusing them of violating human rights.

Conflict Intervention Design for Papua Based on Implications of Structural, Accelerator, and Trigger (SAT) Factors

Conflict is an inevitable part of life that often arises between individuals, groups, or between communities and governments within a country. It is considered a normal occurrence due to varying interests that can lead to clashes and conflicts. However, the situation of conflict is abnormal in nature. Escalations from tensions among various parties can evolve into crises, limited violence, and ultimately trigger mass violence (Malik & Ichsan, 2017). The peak of conflict, namely mass violence, must be prevented in Papua to avoid massive detriment to the physical, psychological, moral, and material aspects of the population. To achieve this, conflict intervention is necessary, starting with comprehensive planning.

Based on the Structural, Accelerator, and Trigger (SAT) model, conflict causes are explained through three factors as elaborated above. Structural, accelerator, and trigger causes of conflict do not originate from a single source but involve various aspects such as economic, social, political, external threats, and others. Therefore, the design of conflict intervention cannot rely on a singular approach. A multidimensional approach utilizing conflict mapping obtained through the SAT model provides a suitable framework for designing conflict intervention in Papua.

The SAT model illustrates that conflict is caused by structural factors, accelerated by accelerators, and sparked by triggers. To resolve this conflict, urgent attention is needed first on trigger factors, specifically the limited violence carried out by both the Armed Criminal Group

(KKB) and state forces such as the Indonesian National Armed Forces (TNI) and Police. Additionally, foreign intervention through media poses a threat to Indonesia's territorial integrity due to narratives portraying Indonesia as an oppressor, which adversely affects global perception of Indonesian authorities. Addressing these structural issues that form the root of the problem is also essential for building positive peace in Papua.

Intervention on Trigger Factors

Law enforcement through judiciary, as advocated by Malik & Ichsan (2017), involves intervention via a socially recognized institution or authority. According to Indonesian law, violence causing injury or loss of life constitutes a criminal offense that must be adjudicated in court. To enforce the law against violence perpetrators in Papua, Indonesia can emulate South Africa's Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) (1995) to conduct official investigations with fair procedures aimed at reducing violence that often triggers conflict.

Intervention on Accelerator Factors

Intervention on accelerator factors in Papua's conflict can be achieved by developing media ethics codes. Some foreign media outlets produce articles on Papua's conflict from unbalanced perspectives favoring separatist movements. Reports framing Indonesia as a repressive state against separatist groups seeking independence exacerbate conflict. Despite reports highlighting casualties among separatist groups, proportional reporting on casualties among Indonesian forces like TNI and Police is necessary, as initially outlined. Media framing can hinder conflict resolution and escalate tensions. Media interventions must establish ethical guidelines for reporting Papua conflict news, ensuring balanced and impartial coverage.

Furthermore, managing foreign intervention is crucial. Indonesia has faced pressure from foreign entities such as Vanuatu, Nauru, Tuvalu, the UK, New Zealand, among others, raising the Papua conflict at United Nations forums and urging the UN Human Rights Council to investigate human rights abuses in Papua. These countries have declared support for West Papua's independence movements, accelerating conflict intensity. Managing foreign involvement involves ensuring their role serves as a peace facilitator, maintaining a neutral perspective to unite separatist groups and the Indonesian government rather than fueling conflict solely supporting independence movements (CNN Indonesia, 2023).

Intervention on Structural Factors

One root cause of Papua's conflict is the lack of trust among the population towards the government due to the controversial referendum or Pepera deemed unfair and unrepresentative of Papua's views as a whole. The government, as the largest organizational unit in a nation, implements policies and programs aimed at promoting public welfare. However, distrust impedes the achievement of set goals. Therefore, intervention must focus on building trust between Papua's communities and the government. This can be achieved by establishing dialog forums between Papua's communities and the government to listen to aspirations, concerns, and hopes for the future. This will help the government identify Papua's needs to build positive peace. Reflecting on the conflict situation in Papua, filled with violence, feelings of injustice, and other issues, education programs and socialization on human rights, democracy, and justice for Papua's communities are essential interventions. These programs align perceptions between Papua's communities and the Indonesian government regarding human rights, democracy, and justice within the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia to avoid misunderstandings that could rekindle conflict. After aligning perceptions on fundamental issues such as human rights, democracy, and justice, the government must promote transparency and accountability in policies and resource allocation in Papua to prevent prejudices that could exacerbate crisis situations.

Addressing inequality and injustice is crucial to building sustainable positive peace in Papua. Papua is renowned for its abundant natural resources such as gold, copper, and oil. However, these resources have yet to significantly benefit local communities due to extensive

foreign company exploitation. This is evidenced by Papua's high poverty rates exceeding other Indonesian provinces. Interventions are needed to develop local economies and human resources in Papua. Skill training and education programs should be implemented to enhance economic and social opportunities for Papua's communities. Moreover, improving access to healthcare, education, and basic infrastructure in Papua is essential to ensure social justice, crucial for building sustainable positive peace.

Differences in interests between separatist groups and the government in Papua are a root cause of conflict. The safest and most peaceful intervention is through constructive negotiations between both parties. Negotiations must allow for civil society participation from Papua's Assembly, religious groups, indigenous communities, and separatist groups to listen and reach political agreements advocating mutual interests. If negotiations fail to find common ground among involved parties, the government should facilitate mediation by neutral or international mediators to assist in achieving satisfactory political agreements for all parties involved.

CONCLUSION

Indonesia is a nation blessed with diversity in identity, religion, race, ethnicity, culture, and language. Diversity often leads to conflicts due to differences in interests. The record of conflict in Papua, which has persisted since independence, has grown increasingly long and destructive, necessitating intervention to achieve resolution. The design of conflict intervention in Papua needs to prioritize a multidimensional approach in line with the identification of causal factors.

Through the Structural, Accelerator, and Trigger (SAT) model, Papua's conflict can be mapped based on structural factors such as distrust, economic inequality, social injustice, and divergent interests. Accelerator factors, such as foreign intervention and media influence, accelerate conflict escalation, while trigger factors include violence perpetrated by separatist groups and state authorities. Intervention designs are tailored to address these causal factors, beginning with the most pressing issues such as violence, followed by foreign intervention and media influence, and comprehensive improvement of all structural factors to build sustainable positive peace in Papua.

In addressing Papua's conflict, it is crucial to foster dialogues that promote inclusivity and understanding among diverse communities. By acknowledging and respecting Papua's unique cultural and social fabric, sustainable peace can be nurtured. Additionally, efforts to enhance economic opportunities and social justice must be prioritized to ensure equitable development across the region. Transparent governance and accountability mechanisms will also play a pivotal role in rebuilding trust between Papua's communities and the Indonesian government. These interventions are essential steps towards achieving lasting peace and stability in Papua, thereby fostering unity and prosperity within Indonesia as a whole.

REFERENCES

- Chairil, T., & Sadi, W. A. (2020, October 5). *Konflik Papua: Pemerintah Perlu Mengubah Pendekatan Keamanan dengan Pendekatan Humanis*. International Relations BINUS University. <https://ir.binus.ac.id/2020/10/05/konflik-papua-pemerintah-perlu-mengubah-pendekatan-keamanan-dengan-pendekatan-humanis/>
- CNN Indonesia. (2021). *Mahfud: Orang Papua Bisa Masuk Universitas Negeri Tanpa Tes*. CNN Indonesia. <https://www.cnnindonesia.com/nasional/20210519153249-32-644305/mahfud-orang-papua-bisa-masuk-universitas-negeri-tanpa-tes>.

- CNN Indonesia. (2023). *9 Negara Sempat Bikin RI Gerah Gegara Ada yang Dukung Papua Merdeka*. CNN Indonesia. <https://www.cnnindonesia.com/internasional/20230223104838-113-916815/9-negara-sempat-bikin-ri-gerah-gegara-ada-yang-dukung-papua-merdeka/2>.
- Indrawati, Ikke, Sudati N., Sarfiah, & Destiningsih, R. (2020). Analisis Pengaruh Pertumbuhan Ekonomi, Ketimpangan Distribusi Pendapatan, Dan Indeks Pembangunan Manusia terhadap Tingkat Kemiskinan Provinsi Papua Tahun 2014-2019. *DINAMIC : Directory Journal of Economic*, 2(4), 1068–1080.
- Kapila, & Mukesh. (2012). Conducting Conflict Assessments: Guidance Notes. In *Department for International Development (DFID)*.
- Katharina, Risha, Ardiyanti, Handini., L., D. S., Haryanti, D., & Dharmaningtias, D. S. (2012). *Kebijakan dan Implementasi Otonomi Khusus di Papua dan Aceh*.
- Liata, N., & Fazal, K. (2021). Multikultural dalam Perspektif Sosiologis. *Abrahamic Religions: Jurnal Studi Agama-Agama*, 1, 188–201. 10.22373/arj.v1i2.11213.
- Lutfia, A., R., & Dewi, D. A. (2021). Kajian Deskriptif tentang Identitas Nasional untuk Integrasi Bangsa Indonesia. *De Cive: Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan Pancasila Dan Kewarganegaraan*, 1(11), 391–397.
- Malik, & Ichsan. (2017). *Resolusi konflik: jembatan perdamaian*. Penerbit Buku Kompas.
- Nurjanah, S., Wahyudi, B., & Purwanto. (2019). Resolusi Konflik Lahan PT Kereta Api Indonesia (Persero) dengan Warga RW 12 Kelurahan Manggarai Jakarta Selatan Dalam Perebutan Lahan di Wilayah Daerah Operasi 1 Jakarta. *Jurnal Damai Dan Resolusi Konflik*, 5(2).
- Rahman, A. A., Malik, I., & Tirto, D. (2023). Analisis Manajemen Konflik Melalui Konflik Organisasi Papua Merdeka (OPM) di Indonesia. *Nusantara: Jurnal Ilmu Pengetahuan Sosial*, 10(2), 803–812.
- Rohim, N. (2015). OPTIMALISASI OTONOMI KHUSUS PAPUA DALAM PENINGKATAN KESADARAN HUKUM MASYARAKAT GUNA MENYEBABKAN KONFLIK DAN KEKERASAN. *Fiat Justisia: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum*, 8(1).
- Sitorus, G. H., Pasaribu, N., & Sukabdi, Z. (2021). KESENJANGAN SOSIAL SEBAGAI AKAR PROPAGANDA GERAKAN SEPARATIS-TERORISME DI PAPUA. *Jurnal Pertahanan Dan Bela Negara*, 11(3), 233–246. <https://doi.org/10.33172/jpbh.v11i3.1442>
- Strangio, S. (2022). *UN Experts Call Out “Shocking Abuses” in Indonesia’s Papua Region*. The Diplomat. <https://thediplomat.com/2022/03/un-experts-call-out-shocking-abuses-in-indonesias-papua-region/>.
- Sugiyono. (2008). *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif, Kuantitatif, dan RD*. CV. Alfabeta.
- Yunus, M. (2021). *Ini Data dan Fakta KKB Papua adalah Organisasi Teroris Menurut Pemerintah*. Suara Sulsel. <https://sulsul.suara.com/read/2021/05/01/050000/ini-data-dan-fakta-kkb-papua-adalah-organisasi-teroris-menurut-pemerintah?page=all>.
- Zahidi, M. S., & Pradana, H. A. (2020). Pola Relasi Hukum Internasional dan Negara pada Perundingan Masalah Papua Barat Tahun 1950-1962. *Dauliyah*, 5(1), 81–113. <https://doi.org/10.21111/dauliyah.v5i1.4275>