



# Extrajudicial Killings in Papua, Indonesia: Reflections on Violence and State Authoritarianism Toward Papuans

Aliyah Almas Sa'adah<sup>1</sup>

Received: July 19<sup>th</sup> 2022 | Accepted: October 25<sup>th</sup> 2022 | Published: December 31<sup>st</sup> 2022

## ABSTRACT

*This article aims to elaborate on and explore extrajudicial killings, i.e., the human rights violations conducted by Indonesian state security forces in Papua. Such unlawful executions are tightly intertwined with the history of torture and forced disappearance during the lengthy conflict in Papua and West Papua. Despite claiming numerous victims, security officials have never been held fully accountable for extrajudicial killings due to their “legal impunity” and the lack of political will to bring perpetrators to trial. Importantly, this article shows that the reported killings are only the tip of the iceberg, as human rights experts and scholars believe there are many more profound and severe violations of Papuans’ rights. Journalists’ limited access to documents, as well as general non-disclosure, has created speculation that numerous human rights violations have occurred but gone unreported. First, we urge the government to recognise extrajudicial killings as gross and severe human rights violations, as defined by international law. Second, the government must comprehensively review police, military, or other security officials’ fieldwork and use of firearms and physical force when arresting suspects.*

**Keywords:** *extrajudicial killing; unlawful death; human rights violations; human rights violations in Papua; Papuans; extrajudicial killings in Papua.*

---

1 Master Student, Human Rights and Democratisation Program, Mahidol University, Thailand.  
Email: aliyah.saa@student.mahidol.edu



## Introduction

This paper aims to elaborate on extrajudicial killings, unlawful killings conducted by the police and military against Papuans as a manifestation of hate, racism, and fear of separatism—the last of which is considered by the state to be a latent problem that might explode at any time—while also examining the government's ability to adhere to national and international human rights standards in protecting Papuans. Diversity has been characteristic of Indonesia throughout history and a positive asset for the nation. At the same time, diversity has had a boomerang effect on some communities (such as the ethnic Chinese and Papuans), who have faced stigma and discrimination rather than acceptance. Historical contexts, physical differences, and employment histories are common reasons for differential treatment and

racial discrimination in forms such as labelling, mocking, physical assault, and social ostracisation.

Discrimination and human rights violations have been particularly problematic in Papua. The history of the region, including the negotiations between Indonesia, the Netherlands, and the United States that resulted in its current situation, has distinguished Papuans from other Indonesians. Further exacerbating this discrimination, Papuans are physically distinct from other Indonesians; they have thus faced deep prejudices in Indonesian society. Such persistent prejudices have reduced unity and harmony in Indonesia, where government and police officials perceive Papuans as troublemakers and political activists who universally support separatism (Munro, 2019). The historical conflict in Papua has left Papuans



disappointed with development efforts in the regime, which have discriminated against Papuans and left them feeling like a minority in their own land. At the same time, land expansion and land grabbing have continued to alienate local communities.

Such disappointment and dissatisfaction have led some Papuans to articulate their belief that their lives would be better in an independent state. This fact has been understood by the central government to mean that Papuans are disloyal to the country, and thus used to justify the use of force in Papua. Many Papuans, both within and without the territory, have experienced violence, hatred, and racial discrimination, as well as significant obstacles in their search for justice and fair trials. The continued extrajudicial killings in Papua have left Indonesia's commitment to human rights questionable,

even though the country has ratified numerous international conventions that require the country to fully commit itself to protecting human rights. Furthermore, given that the right to life is non-derogable, the government is fully responsible for protecting it in all circumstances. This article, thus, argues that the Indonesian government has unlawfully violated Papuans' right to life through its continued use of extrajudicial killings and other forms of excessive force to stop peaceful protests, curb incidents of public disorder, and arrest suspected criminals. This article, thus, asks, "How have extrajudicial killings unlawfully violated the civil, political, and human rights of Papuans in Indonesia, as well as proven the Indonesian government's lack of commitment to protecting human rights in Papua?"



## **Extrajudicial Killings Against Papuans in Indonesia**

Human rights abuses against Papuans in Indonesia began after the West Papua Referendum of 1969 gave the Republic of Indonesia full control of the region. Since then, the government has implemented a development policy “of centralisation and Indonesianisation” (Trajano, 2010). Such politics have marginalised Papuans in their homeland, as migration programmes—undertaken in the name of “building” the region—have resulted in non-Papuans rebranding the region following government ideals without considering indigenous values (Scott, 2009). Such a development policy resulted in extensive investment and massive exploitation of resources, even as coherent large-scale human development

has been lacking for Papuans. Feeling alienated in their own homeland, some Papuans began to articulate their displeasure with their unjust treatment by the Indonesian government as well as their view that joining the Unitary Republic of Indonesia had not benefitted them. Instead, they had experienced extensive exploitation, human rights violation, and so-called “development” that has ignored local voices while taking advantage of Papuan resources for national benefit. Around this time, a group of Papuans established the Free Papua Movement (Organisasi Papua Merdeka, OPM) to express their criticism, disappointment, and protest. OPM, while demanding Papuan independence, also sought to highlight the injustices experienced by Papuans due to the Indonesian government’s activities (Trajano, 2010).



The Indonesian government wholly rejected OPM's demands. Papuans' claims were countered with arguments of state integration, Papuans' inability to realise self-development, and the promise of equitable development (Savage, 1978). At the same time, it ordered the Army (TNI-AD) to initiate military operations in West Papua. The protracted conflict that resulted, in conjunction with government arguments, resulted in negative discourses that framed Papuans as illiterate and uncivilised. The historical context of integration and development, as well as questions of racial identity and pervasive stigmas, have led to many forms of discrimination as well as unequal relations between Papuans and the Indonesian government. The Indonesian government has banned traditional attire, curtailed traditional governance, and restricted customary practices

and symbols, all of which are real forms of discrimination faced by Papuans at the hands of the government and Indonesian society at large (Surya, 2016).

Discrimination and oppression have continued to be massive problems that have hindered national integration, social cohesion, and tolerance. The perception that Papuans are threats who require careful surveillance has taken deep root among Indonesia's security forces (Al-Rahab, 2016, pp. 32–33). In essence, Papuans are no different than other Indonesians; however, they have experienced greater injustices, being disrespected by the government, losing their land and resources to government actors and foreign investors, and facing discrimination due to their physical characteristics. Papuans are trying to fight against these injustices, as they want to be treated and protected

as their peers; they want to be recognised as Indonesians both in matters of geography and identity (Asian Commission of Human Rights, 2013). However, this fight against injustice was framed by the state as a threat to nationalism and a source of disintegration. Extensive military operations were launched in several parts of Papua to arrest and detain those who were allegedly involved in “separatism” movements or OPM activities. The military and police also conducted violent operations against innocent Papuans and members of Christian churches. Many were shot dead, one was tortured to death, and the Indonesian military beheaded the rest.

The most egregious example of extrajudicial killings in the history of which occurred in the Central Highlands between 1977 and 1978, a period during which military operations

were launched that resulted in numerous killings. No official report provides an exact number of victims. However, one report by the Asian Human Rights Commission (AHRC) holds that no fewer than 4,000 Papuans were killed during the operation. This tragic crime occurred resulted in deep-rooted fear and trauma (Asian Human Rights Commission, 2013), including a memorable yet sorrowful local song that contains the lyrics:

*“Bullets slayed fathers, mothers. Children. Who will look after them? Our parents did not recognise the warplanes. They thought it was assistance promised by the OPM. They were like pigs who did not know the noise of dogs. They stood in clearings. The planes dived like eagles. Some died in their houses. Others died in the places where they stood. Others were wounded. Others hid in their houses and*



*burned to death. It was an air attack by three fighter planes.”* (translated by Glazebrook, 2001, p. 284)

Despite the severe suffering experienced by the Papuans, the Indonesian government argued that military operations were needed to counter OPM attacks. Ongoing political tensions led to gross human rights violations (Asian Human Rights Commission, 2013, p. 8) that will continue to haunt Papua in the future. Such killings not only had political motives but also non-political ones.

## **The Rise of Extrajudicial Killings in Papua**

Even with the recognition of extrajudicial killings in Papua, the human rights situation has stagnated. The United Nations and many human rights organisations have documented numerous cases of human rights abuse in the highlands,

including extrajudicial killings, discrimination, and torture. Special rapporteurs from the United Nations reported that, between April and November 2021, they heard allegations of extrajudicial killings (with victims including young children), enforced disappearances, torture/inhuman treatment, and the forced displacement of at least 5,000 indigenous Papuans (UNCHR, 2022). As mentioned previously, the killings of Papuans have occurred since the referendum. Military and police operations, likewise, have continued and expanded until today. However, where the extrajudicial killings of 1977/1978 were undertaken in response to claimed separatist threats from the OPM, recent killings have been driven primarily by non-political factors such as hate and presumption. These killings may not be as numerous as before, ultimately all extrajudicial

killings are violations of grave human rights and humanitarian principles. Amnesty International Indonesia (2018, p. 32) reported that, between 2010 and 2018, 60 extrajudicial killings had been reported; these included 41 that were unrelated to political/pro-independence activities that caused 56 deaths. Most of these killings were caused by the criminalisation of non-political assemblies, including religious activities and environmentalist protests. Recent examples of extrajudicial killings in Papua have included:

*First*, the shooting at PT Freeport in Timika. In October 2011, around 8,000 Freeport workers protested the mining company due to its negative environmental impact, failure to pay salaries, and alleged violations of labour rights. This protest was a peaceful assembly, with no threat to Indonesian unity; workers simply wished for

their voices to be heard, to meet corporate management, and to seek permission to visit their homes near the mining area. To ease their efforts to meet with Freeport's management, they asked the police for help. However, as found by the National Commission of Human Rights (KOMNAS HAM, 2011: p. 87), the police misunderstood the situation and issued an order to shoot protesters. Two labour union members, Leo Wandagau and Petrus Ayamiseba, were killed. No criminal investigation was undertaken, and the involved officers were released after 21 days.

*Second*, the military attack in Honelema, Wamena. In June 2012, two soldiers riding a bicycle were reported to have hit and injured a three-year-old child. Villagers who witnessed the accident chased the soldiers and stopped them. However, an unidentified individual stabbed





the soldiers and injured them; this individual was unknown to villagers, and thus was presumably not a local. Several days after the incident, two trucks full of soldiers from Infantry Battalion 756 arrived in the village and began arbitrarily shooting and stabbing the villagers; during this time, they also razed houses, public buildings, and vehicles. According to Amnesty International's interviews with the locals, many were killed—most of whom did not know what was happening (Wonda, 2017, pp. 199–200). The surviving villagers fled to avoid further attacks. The attack can be categorised as a destructive act of revenge. Although the military later sought peaceful reconciliation with the people, no compensation was given until 2013 (Amnesty International, 2018, pp. 36–37).

From these examples, it is evident that the hatred against Papuans is not caused solely

by the perceived only involved matter of separatism or other political matters. Nevertheless, these political factors contribute heavily to the security officials' stigmatisation of Papuans and the perception that all Papuans are enemies of the nation. Discussion is thus necessary to understand how the issues can be resolved by the justice system. Security officials must be responsible for actions; in the current situation, no justice is given, no consequences occur, and no compensation is offered. One could the severe consequences Papuans would face if they were involved in such activities. For example, Filep Karma was detained for more than ten years after leading a peaceful assembly that involved the raising of the Morning Star flag—which had been forbidden since 1998 (Amnesty International, 2018, p. 19). There is thus a significant gap

between the light punishments received by security forces who kill Papuans and Papuans who assemble peacefully—a right guaranteed and protected by National Law 9/1998 on Freedom of Expression and the Right to Assemble.

Furthermore, we will discuss extrajudicial killings in political contexts. Since political reform began in 1998, Papuans have actively expressed and articulated their interests, demanding that their political and civil rights be fulfilled. However, the government has decided not to respect their freedom of expression and hesitated to grant Papuans their civil and political rights; they fear that, if rights are granted, the threat of separatism would increase significantly. The government has thus conducted strict surveillance, and thus consequently controlled people's activities and threatened their security. Of the 69 extrajudicial

killings reported between 2010 and 2018, 28 were political (Amnesty International, 2018, p. 43). These included the organised murder of pro-independence activists, the criminalisation of peaceful assemblies with political demands, and the killing of Papuans during security operations. Examples of political extrajudicial killings included the murders of Mako Tabuni in Abepura and Hubertus Mabel in Wamena, both of whom had led protests demanding that Papuans be allowed the right to self-determination (Wonda, 2017, pp. 202–205). The police claimed that these shootings had been in self-defence, as Mako and Hubertus had tried to fight back when the police arrested them. No independent and impartial investigation was involved, and nobody was held accountable for these shootings, despite the deaths of at least another seven activists.



Another example was the shooting of a group of activists in Aimas in 2013. Before this shooting, a group of Papuan activists had planned a prayer gathering to commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of the United Nations' handover of Papua to Indonesia according to the New York Agreement. Hearing this plan, the Sorong local police conducted a joint operation with the military to disperse the gathering, as the police were afraid that participants would raise the Morning Star flag. Based on witness reports, the police and military attacked the venue, shot at least five people, and caused three deaths. Again, no investigation occurred; the police arrested and detained seven activists for allegedly supporting Papua independence and owning firearms. In 2018, the International Coalition for Papua (ICP) released a report that documented 23

extrajudicial killings throughout the year (International Coalition for Papua, 2018). The ICP demanded that Indonesian authorities immediately conduct independent, impartial, and effective investigations of those cases.

### **“The Tip of the Iceberg”**

Despite widespread human rights violations and extrajudicial killings in Papua, many of us may never know what has happened or the difficulty of the situation. Many experts and academics argue that the situation is worse than reported due to the strict censorship and lack of press freedom in Papua. Media actors seeking to report human rights abuses and conduct advocacy have experienced significant dangers, as have non-governmental organisations and peace workers (Global Voices South East Asia, 2022). As the state is trying

to emphasise its successful infrastructure development in Papua, the exposure of human rights violations might disrupt its massive projects. Papua and West Papua have experienced the most significant violations of media freedom in Indonesia, and cases of sustained repression, journalist killings, (attempted) abductions, and physical assaults, as well as censorship by both civil and military authorities, have been commonplace. The media restrictions and limitations imposed in Papua apply not only to domestic journalists and academics, but also to foreign journalists, international NGOs, and government officials involved (Human Rights Watch, 2015). Although the government has legitimate security concerns in Papua, particularly if reports target police and security forces, foreign correspondents granted access to Papua are often the targets of surveillance,

harassment, and intimidation. Some, especially those without official permission to cover Papua—which is separate from the permissions granted to Jakarta-based accredited journalists—are even arrested and deported.

Human Rights Watch (HRW) reported that foreign and domestic journalists—even those based in Papua—commonly experience harassment, intimidation, and violation at the hands of state officials. Extrajudicial killings have likewise targeted journalists. Take, for example, the case of Adriansyah Matra'is—a former journalist with *Tabloid Jubi* (a local Papuan media outlet)—who was found dead, his body handcuffed to a tree beside the Gudang Arang River, after reporting on sensitive issues such as corruption, illegal logging, and human rights violations. Before his death, he reported receiving threatening



text messages. Although there was strong evidence of murder, the police closed the case as a suicide (Human Rights Watch, 2015).

In response to its violations of press freedoms, Indonesia has received global criticism. In 2014, Catherine Delahunty—a member of the New Zealand Parliament from the Green Party—called on President Joko Widodo to commit to realising true media freedom and promoting human rights journalism (HRJ). Particular emphasis was given to the need for international and local journalists to be free to report without risk of harassment, violation, intimidation, and imprisonment (We Need to Talk about West Papua Team, 2021, p. 61). To show its commitment to promoting human rights in Papua, in May 2015, the government of Indonesia began lifting longstanding restrictions that limited accredited foreign

journalists' ability to cover West Papua and Papua provinces. However, many scholars and practitioners continue to question the government's commitment to implementing media freedom in Papua, as the process through which foreign correspondents gain permission to report on Papua remains unpredictable and challenging. The state has likewise remained repressively intolerant of criticism, reflecting authoritarian tendencies similar to those in the former Soviet Union (Kirsch, 2002, p. 54)

Based on the media situation discussed above, we can see that the government has been persistently hesitant to disclose the actual situation in Papua. The human rights violations perpetrated against journalists by government officials and security forces have shown how human rights remains under-realised in Papua (Aqil, 2022). The lack of media freedom has



limited the quality and quantity of information that can be given to the public. As such, the media has failed to play its role as an alternative means of advocating human rights and promoting peace in the face of prolonged torture and enforced disappearances. Many scholars argue that the reported violence and killings in Papua are just the tip of the iceberg, with many more violations remaining unreported.

## **Challenges in Criminalising Extrajudicial Killings**

Nationally and globally, it remains challenging to hold the perpetrators of extrajudicial killings accountable. Though extrajudicial killing is described as one of the cruelest crimes against humanity, law enforcement officials have granted themselves legal impunity, and thus their crimes remain hidden, unreported, and

unjudged. Extrajudicial killings are commonly associated with enforced disappearances and torture, as all three are frequently perpetrated during times of civil conflict, war, or other security/political crises.

The community of nations has put into place several laws to protect people from disappearance and torture and to hold perpetrators accountable. These include the United Nations Conventions against Torture (CAT), which entered into force on 26 June 1987 and has been ratified by 173 states as of April 2022, and the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance (CPED), which entered into force on 23 December 2010 and has been ratified by 67 countries as of February 2022 (United Nations Treaty Collection, 2022). Both examples establish absolute prohibitions against enforced



disappearances and have been accepted as a principle of customary international law. However, unlike torture and disappearance, no convention regulates extrajudicial killings. The only regulation addressing extrajudicial killings is the Minnesota Protocol (2016), a set of international guidelines for the investigation of suspicious deaths, particularly when the involvement of a State is suspected. Even though this protocol does have impressive implications for addressing extrajudicial killings, it is nonetheless a non-binding protocol that cannot compel a country to commit to ending unlawful death by state actors. Holding perpetrators accountable requires political willingness and strong law enforcement, especially when states' legitimacy is on the line.

Another issue is dealing with impunity. Numerous countries have a criminal code that is not applied to national security agencies, and thus the perpetrators of extrajudicial killings are not punished. International criminal and humanitarian laws do not strictly regulate the process of conducting investigations and prosecuting the perpetrators of extrajudicial killings. Civilians can only claim their right to be protected from arbitrary killings during times of war; as such, when a state is engaged in an internal armed conflict, its power to kill civilians might be circumstanced (Creegan, 2020, p. 193). This means that extrajudicial killings can be prosecuted as war crimes, but only if committed during an armed conflict. Nonetheless, the UN Special Rapporteur has held that extrajudicial killings and other killings of persons by government authorities without

any judicial proceeding are severe violations of criminal procedure law. All persons accused of committing a crime have a right to a fair trial with the allegations against them tested (United Nations Media Center, 2022). Such rights, obviously, cannot be protected when the accused are killed before their trial can commence.

Given global concerns about unlawful and arbitrary killings, Indonesia has extensive homework for criminalising the perpetrators of extrajudicial killings. To start, many of the extrajudicial killings by Indonesia's security officers are firearms abuses. Under Indonesian law, police officers may use firearms in some circumstances to incapacitate offenders. Regulation of the Chief of Indonesian National Police (Perkapolri) No. 1 of 2009 (Perkapolri 1/2009) outlined the circumstances in which police

officers may use their firearms. According to Article 5, Point (1), of the law, officers must first take preliminary actions such as verbal warnings, blunt weapons, and chemical weapons (lachrymators). Only after such efforts have failed, and only in life-threatening circumstances, may police officers may use their firearms to stop suspects from committing a crime (Erniyati, 2018). In other words, police officers may only use their firearms as a last resort, and even then the goal is to incapacitate (rather than kill) the suspects.

The Criminal Code (KUHP) does not provide sanctions for law enforcement officers who make procedural mistakes during the investigation process. This is indeed problematic, as officers cannot be held legally accountable for their actions, and this contradicts the presumption





of innocence that requires all suspects to be considered innocent until proven guilty in a court of law.

Exacerbating this situation, several factors limit the possibility of perpetrators being held accountable for extrajudicial killings: the public does not understand legal matters; pretrial legal remedies in shooting cases have not been socialised extensively; and information/mechanisms for requesting compensation and rehabilitation are opaque (Jumardi, 2022). Further complications come from the physical threats, inconsistencies between versions, and the failure to do reconstructions at the scene (due to security factors). Overcoming such problems requires two things: internal coordination (preparing adequate personnel at the crime scene) and external

coordination (educating the public about the importance of pretrial legal remedies) (Jumardi, 2022, p. 107).

Article 52 of the Criminal Procedure Code explains that suspects may provide information freely to investigators or judges. Conversely, where suspects fail to provide information, there are no consequences; other evidence must be used. When completing the Minutes of Investigation, a reconstruction must be used to provide deeper insight into the crime. This reconstruction provides investigators with an overview of the evidence and actors, as well as the locations of witnesses. Obstacles to investigators' efforts to reconstruct crimes consist of internal and external barriers. Internal obstacles occur when suspects provide complicated or contradictory information and sully the reconstruction (Anisah, 2020). External barriers,



meanwhile, may occur when witnesses refuse to participate, when suspects are angry and threatening, or when locations are inconducive. However, despite these protections, the facts on the ground show that officers do not hesitate to use violence arbitrarily. One release from KontraS mentions that police officers are prone to committing violence that violates civilians' human rights when acting to prevent crimes in the field (KontraS, 2018).

The use of extrajudicial killing must be questioned, as applicable legal mechanisms do not allow security forces to act beyond their delegated authority. Intentional extrajudicial killings, carried out at the behest of or involving state officials, are prohibited. International law requires such crimes to be prevented, with cases investigated and prosecuted by the state; victims, likewise,

must receive reparations. However, regulations limit the possibility of investigating extrajudicial killings. Although they can be deemed contrary to the procedures for criminal investigation, it is unclear whether extrajudicial killings are recognised by Indonesia as human rights violations that can be tried in a human rights court (Komisi Nasional Hak Asasi Manusia, 2019).

Victims and human rights NGOs are thus actively awaiting the Indonesian government to take serious steps toward eradicating extrajudicial killings and investigating previous cases (Amnesty International, 2018). Such killings have been symptomatic of Indonesian governments since the New Order, particularly in the vulnerable regions of Papua and West Papua. However,



even today, state accountability remains constrained by the principles of proceedings that are no longer relevant.

Equality before the law and the protection of suspects' rights are some indicators of justice; however, neither has been realised in Indonesia. Likewise, competent, independent, and impartial judicial principles, whereby all suspects are assisted by legal advisors, are lacking in human rights enforcement. Article 42, paragraphs 1 and 2, of Law No. 26 of 2000 concerning the Human Rights Court, explain that Human Rights Court also has jurisdiction over security forces—both the military and the police. The culture of impunity, therefore, needs to be abolished to protect victims of extrajudicial killings (Anisah, 2020, p. 29).

## **Demanding State Accountability**

The state is responsible for guaranteeing and protecting the civil and political rights of all individuals, regardless of ethnicity, gender, race, religion, and political beliefs. Moreover, the state is responsible for protecting non-derogable rights at any cost, especially the rights to life and survival. Despite Papua's political instability, law enforcement officials must not take the lives of any Papuans. We recognise that the police and military have a right to defend themselves while doing their duty of guaranteeing public safety. However, this right must be carried out responsibly, without derogating the fundamental rights of civilians—including those accused of crimes. State actors' use of force must be done in accordance with human rights, as stipulated by the UN Code of Conduct for Law Enforcement



Officials (1979). Force may only be used when necessary. Indonesia, likewise, has several national instruments that prohibit police officers and military actors from using their weapons arbitrarily. For example, Article 47 of the Regulation of the Chief of the Indonesian National Police (Perkap) on the Implementation of Human Rights Principles and Standards in Police Duties holds, “Firearms can only be used if truly intended to protect human life.” Per this regulation, weapons cannot be used to threaten civilians or commit murders. However, this has not been true in Papua, where civilians have died because of the irresponsible use of police and military power.

Moreover, the state’s inadequacy in investigating and fairly trying the perpetrators of extrajudicial killings has resulted in further human rights violations, leaving people to live in legal uncertainty. The government

must implement an effective accountability system, whereby criminal investigations involve external independent surveillance mechanisms and transparent processes, as well as civil code mechanisms for rehabilitation, compensation, and prevention. None of the perpetrators of the sixty-nine extrajudicial killings reported by Amnesty International has been held accountable. No independent institutions have conducted criminal investigations and perpetrators have not received fair and transparent trials (Amnesty International, 2018, p. 58). Victims’ families still expect state actors to be held accountable for their actions and be punished according to Criminal Code. However, as of writing, the state has shown no political will to admit that these killings are human rights violations; it has only repeated its claims of self-defence endlessly.



To end the extrajudicial killing of Papuans, the government must recognise these killings as gross and severe human rights violations according to international law. Secondly, the government must comprehensively review police, military, and other security officials' use of firearms and physical power when arresting suspects and ensure that they abide by the principles of human rights. Finally, it is necessary to ensure the immediate independent, impartial, and effective investigation of extrajudicial killings by an independent body, with all findings reported to the public. Accountability should be demanded of perpetrators and other officials.

## **Conclusion**

The extrajudicial killing of Papuans is a serious violation of human rights, as the police

and military have arbitrarily taken the lives of civilians. Extrajudicial killings began to counter the threat of separatism, and this in turn resulted in suspicion and hatred of all Papuans—regardless of their activities. For decades, Papuans have lived in the shadow of insecurity and endless surveillance, facing state distrust and at times being killed for merely expressing their views. Papuans face continued disappointment and sacrifice, as the perpetrators of extrajudicial killings are never held accountable by independent and impartial investigators. Such injustices must be ended. Law enforcement officials must abide by the principle of human rights, independent and impartial investigation must be undertaken, and fair and transparent trials must be conducted when extrajudicial killings occur. From this previous discussion, we can see that extrajudicial



killings are clear evidence that the Indonesian government has failed to address human rights issues in Papua, even though it is a party to multiple human rights conventions. These killings stem from the arbitrary and excessive use of lethal power, arrests, and torture. Addressing the human rights violations in Papua has also become a challenge for non-governmental actors, such as NGOs and journalists, due to the difficulty accessing the region and strict surveillance.

Furthermore, many scholars and experts believe that the world has only borne witness to the tip of the iceberg of human rights violations in Papua; the real situation may be far worse.



## References

- Al-Rahab, A. (2016). Pelanggaran HAM yang berat di Papua: konteks dan solusinya. *Jurnal HAM*, 12(1), 21-51.
- Amnesty International. (2018). *'Sudah, kasi tinggal dia mati': pembunuhan dan impunitas di Papua*. Jakarta: Amnesty International Indonesia.
- Anisah, B. R. (2020). Quo vadis equality before the law: darurat penegakan HAM atas extrajudicial killing di Indonesia. In E. I. Briliawan Gama Rahmatullah (ed.), *Antologi esai hukum dan HAM: afiliasi hukum dan HAM dalam mewujudkan perlindungan hak asasi* (pp. 23–30). Malang: UMM Press.
- Aqil, A. M. (2022, 10 July). Indonesian press freedom still on edge especially in Papua, observers say. *The Jakarta Post*. Retrieved from <https://www.thejakartapost.com/indonesia/2022/05/20/indonesian-press-freedom-still-on-edge-especially-in-papua-observers-say.html>.
- Asian Human Rights Commission. (2013). 1977–1978 atrocities in the central highlands. In J. S. Sloan (ed.), *The Neglected Gonecide* (pp. 7–19). Hong Kong: Asian Human Rights Commission.
- Creegan, E. (2020). Criminalizing extrajudicial killings. *Denver Journal of International Law & Policy*, 41(2): 185–223.
- Erniyati, T. (2018). Extrajudicial killing terhadap terduga pelaku tindak pidana terorisme dalam perspektif asas praduga tak bersalah. *Badamai Law Journal*, 3(1): 99–118.



- GlazeBrook, D. (2001). *Dwelling in exile, perceiving return: West Papuan refugees from Irian Jaya living at East Awin in Western Province, Papua New Guinea*. Canberra : Australian National University.
- Global Voices South East Asia. (2022, 10 July). Does Indonesia have a healthy free press? Not according to West Papua. *Global Voices*. Retrieved from <https://globalvoices.org/2022/05/09/does-indonesia-have-a-healthy-free-press-not-according-to-west-papua/>.
- Human Rights Watch. (2015). *Something to hide? Indonesia's restrictions on media freedom and rights monitoring in Papua*. Washington DC: Human Rights Watch.
- International Coalition for Papua. (2018). *23 victims of extra-judicial killings in West Papua throughout 2018*. Wuppertal: International Coalition for Papua Secretariat.
- Jumardi, A. (2022). *Penerapan sanksi pidana terhadap pelaku unlawful killing di Indonesia*. Tarakan: Fakultas Hukum Universitas Borneo Tarakan.
- Kirsch, S. (2002). Rumour and other narratives of political violence in West Papua. *Critique of Anthropology*, 22(1): 53-79. DOI: 10.1177/0308275X020220010301.
- Komisi Nasional Hak Asasi Manusia. (2019). *Laporan tahunan komnas HAM 2018*. Jakarta: KOMNAS HAM.
- KOMNAS HAM. (2011). *Laporan pemantauan dan penyelidikan peristiwa kekerasan di Papua*. Jakarta: National Commission of Human Rights Indonesia.





- KontraS. (2018). *HAM tidak dapat tempat: catatan hari hak asasi manusia tahun 2018*. Jakarta: KontraS.
- Munro, J. (2019). Let's talk more about racism in Indonesia. *The Conversation*. Retrieved from <https://theconversation.com/lets-talk-more-about-racism-in-indonesia-123019>.
- Savage, P. (1978). The nationalist struggle in West Irian: the divisions within the liberation. *Journal of Sociology*, 14(2), 142–156. DOI: 10.1177/144078337801400205.
- Scott, J. C. (2009). *The art of not being governed: an anarchist history of upland Southeast Asia*. New Heaven: Yale Agrarian Studies Series.
- Surya, Y. W. (2016). "The Blacks of Indonesia" : the articulation of Papuan ethnic identity on social media. *Media and Jurnalismo*, 16(2), 93–110. DOI: 10.14195/2183-5462\_29\_6.
- Trajano, J. C. (2010). Ethnic nationalism and separatism in West Papua, Indonesia. *Journal of Peace, Conflict and Development*, 16: 12–35.
- UNCHR. (2022, 18 June). *Indonesia: UN experts sound alarm on serious Papua abuses, call for urgent aid*. United Nations: The Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights. <https://www.ohchr.org/en/press-releases/2022/03/indonesia-un-experts-sound-alarm-serious-papua-abuses-call-urgent-aid>.



United Nations Media Center. (2022, 2 July). *Indonesia: UN experts sound alarm on serious Papua abuses, call for urgent aid.* United Nations: The Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights. Retrieved from <https://www.ohchr.org/en/press-releases/2022/03/indonesia-un-experts-sound-alarm-serious-papua-abuses-call-urgent-aid>.

United Nations Treaty Collection. (2022, 18 July). *Status of treaty.* United Nations Treaty Collections. Retrieved from <https://treaties.un.org/Pages/ParticipationStatus.aspx>.

Wonda, Y. (2017). Law enforcement against serious human rights violation in Papua: a restorative justice perspective. Makassar: Hasanuddin University.

We Need to Talk about West Papua Team. (2021). *We Need to Talk About West Papua; Internationalization of Free Papua Issue.* We Need to Talk about West Papua.