

***Initiating a Peace Process in Papua: Actors, Issues, Process, and the Role of the International Community.* By Timo Kivimäki. Policy Studies 25, Washington: East-West Center, 2006. Softcover: 83pp.**

The August 2005 Helsinki Peace Agreement for Aceh demonstrates to all of us, especially the Indonesian Government, that a peace process for conflict in Papua is possible and needs to be actualized. The author, Timo Kivimäki, has scrutinized the possibilities for dialogue in order to find the formulation to promote the peace process for the conflict in Papua. Inspired by the achievement of the Helsinki Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), or Aceh Peace Agreement, Dr Kivimäki attempts to examine the possibilities of starting a peace process by promoting the process of dialogue. Through a comprehensive study of the context, construction and violent episodes of the conflict, followed by an identification of the actors involved, this book contends that, with the Aceh model in mind, dialogue as a first step towards a peaceful resolution of the Papua conflict is possible.

The author begins his book by identifying the two secessionist forces in Papua: the traditional militant fighting groups on the one hand, and the ideology-based, more democratic, less violent secessionist groups on the other. At the start of the book the author also examines different conceptual insights pertaining to conflict in general as well as those factors affecting its dynamics. The author applies several key concepts as a tool for conflict analysis. For instance “deviations”, “enemy perceptions” and “violence” specify that there has been an enemy perception within the Papuan community as a result of which Papuans see Indonesians and Asians as belligerent, arrogant, intolerant, and fanatical. From their perspective, Indonesians see Papuans as remnants of the stone-age because of their tribal clothing and nakedness. It is an undeniable fact that deviations and enemy images between Indonesians and Papuans have motivated a prolonged conflict that has been coloured by violence. The author goes on to analyse the possibilities of realizing a peace dialogue. In this regard, the author focuses the study on deciding which actors and institutions should be involved in a future dialogue. The author argues that the actors who may be relevant to a Papuan peace dialogue would be those with collective political, religious, cultural or social agendas. Therefore, the actors that should be involved in the dialogue are: 1) pro-Indonesian forces; 2) members of the resistance movement, such as OPM (Free Papua Movement) and the new type of resistance groups such as human rights organizations, environmental groups, Christian organisations;

and 3) other constituencies such as private companies and donor communities operating in Papua.

After representative actors have been identified and discussed, the author examines the grievances at the core of the violent dispute between supporters and opponents of Indonesian rule. This analysis is perhaps the best part of this book. In order to study the grievances, Timo Kivimäki classifies the groups into two categories: those that are directly linked to people's (sometimes egoistic or particularistic) motivation to use violence against the other group and those who share collective motivations for the entire Papua. The former motivation relates to loyalty to something: a parish, tribe, gender role or subjects. The latter is more fundamental, as it forms the context for the overall dispute about integration and separatism. Systematically, the writer starts with the "tolerable level of grievances", for instance: individual, collective, historical, general political grievances, and moves on to the core or "intolerable" grievances like specific political grievances, security grievances and economic grievances. It is interesting here that the discussion regarding grievances reveals several important facts that demonstrate the shaky legal basis of Indonesia's rule in Papua. Therefore, historical mistakes cannot be the foundation for decisions on Papua's future.

Dialogue aimed at resolving the conflict is not, as the author points out, a new thing. A dialogue process was begun in 1998, though it has not yet yielded any concrete results. President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono has put Papua firmly on the government's agenda and defined his position by stating that: "Now the Aceh conflict has been resolved, for the time being, at least, attention has predictably turned to Papua". This statement indicates that since the Indonesian President mentioned Aceh, where international involvement was accepted in the mediation and monitoring of the peace deal, it is unlikely that he has ruled out a similar process involving third-party mediation for Papua.

The last part of the book discusses the lessons that can be learned from the peace process in Aceh and whether they can be applied to Papua. Here the writer emphasizes that the peace dialogue for Papua cannot be a carbon copy of the Aceh process. Nevertheless, an examination of the Acehnese peace agreement makes it easier to see what is possible and what kinds of options exist for Papuan peace. The author concludes that: (1) Peace is possible in Papua, although the Papuan case will require a more complex approach than that used in Aceh. (2) Negotiations must be more open, and mechanisms must be built to facilitate communication between the negotiators and

their constituencies. (3) In constructing these mechanisms, the special autonomy consultation process is one possible model, although this process has so far failed to pacify Papua. (4) A lasting peace can only be built via a process that brings in radical secessionist elements. (5) The dialogue must establish mechanisms to monitor agreement implementation and guarantee the safety of the negotiators. (6) The dialogue process requires international facilitation.

Several factors, which are likely to hinder the peace process in Papua, such as problems inherent in the Indonesian bureaucracy (e.g. the cumbersome decision-making process and the absence of standard operating procedures) and the double standards of the Papuan elite are not given sufficient attention in this book. Overall, however, Kivimaki's work is an important contribution to the literature, and serves as a reference point not only for Indonesian decision-makers, but also for practitioners and students who wish to study conflict resolution in general and the Papuan conflict in particular.

---

I NYOMAN SUDIRA is a Lecturer at the Department of International Relations Parahyangan Catholic University Bandung Indonesia, and Ph.D candidate at Department of Political Science, University of Helsinki, Finland.