

## **THBT SEPARATIST MOVEMENT IN EASTERN INDONESIA (FOR EXAMPLE REPUBLIK MALUKU SELATAN, ORGANISASI PAPUA MERDEKA, GERAKAN SULAWESI MERDEKA) SHOULD UNITE, TAKE ARMS, AND CONDUCT A VIOLENT REVOLUTION TO SECEDE FROM THE REPUBLIC OF INDONESIA**

**Stella OG/BINUS**

We have sitted down and waited for Indonesian people to come as our white saviour.<sup>1</sup> But it will not happen.<sup>2</sup> We are still being discriminated, we are still being oppressed, anyway.<sup>3</sup> We think its time for us to send the new narratives to them, let go.<sup>4</sup> Because we are different and you will never be able to understand us anyway.<sup>5</sup>Thats why, we think its important when youre different and youll never ever become unity anyway, thats when we can have a violent revolution.<sup>6</sup>

So real point of model in opening gov.<sup>7</sup>

Firstly, we will attack in any kind of Indonesian border that we see.<sup>8</sup>

Secondly, we will also make sure that we keep reminding them on all human right violation that they have committed to us, be it killing us or our villages eventhough we are only peaceful human being just like javanese, just like chinese, just like that.<sup>9</sup> We need to remind them that we will not back down.<sup>10</sup>

And we think the question on whether or not they will unite is that they will unite mr. Madam chair.<sup>11</sup> Because these eastern indonesian people most likely shared the common characters at the stake of being colonialized by the state of Indonesia and therefore we think they will be able to unite.<sup>12</sup>

And the next step after that secede is to be discussed.<sup>13</sup> Whether or not they will make newfederal of state or whether or not they want to make independent state, thats another debate.<sup>14</sup> But the question would be, whether or not it could be effective for you to do violent revolution.<sup>15</sup> Would you think it is very important.<sup>16</sup>

My first issue, on how our current SQ will never work if you only rely on yourself or on indonesia.<sup>17</sup> My first issue on how it wont work if you work by yourself. <sup>18</sup>

The most ideal way for you to secede is to have diplomacy.<sup>19</sup> And the current ways of eastern indonesia, we have an organization called MSG which is Melanesian Spearhead Group.<sup>20</sup> Basically this is like an ASEAN, but for melanesian country (i.e : eugenia, solomon, and others like melanesian country right which have different characteristics with just our melayu).<sup>21</sup> We think like this is our very good chance to get diplomacy at economic ties.<sup>22</sup> But guess what, because indonesia right now is already being registered at msg as an observer

, papua or other eastern country cant apply independently to msg, meaning they are only rely on indonesia as their umbrella but not being able to pursue the economic ties, to pursue the diplomacy ties because simply indonesia is only a member stake, because once again indonesia is not fully melanesian, therefore the msg is reluctant to give us the full membership toward indonesia.<sup>23</sup> What does it tells you? It tells you that you cannot pursue your own diplomacy just because you are still in the same umbrella as indonesia to begin with or it is impossible for you to have a euphonic of having economic ties towards them.<sup>24</sup>Thats why in the case of first diplomacy, it cant work.<sup>25</sup>

But secondly, what have we tried as eastern indonesia people? We have tried to do non violent revolution protest, because unlike popular opinions we are uncivilised or what you want to believe in right? But what do we get after we do non violent protest by our movement? We got arrested.<sup>26</sup> Just because we have different race, just because we have different skin colour.<sup>27</sup> What does it tell you? It tells to you all the lovely excessive course not only indonesia, and in jogja for example, our love to indonesia is not being reciprocated because simply we are different from them and thats why we are always being talked like a bad thing inside of them right? It tells to you that non violent protest do not give us love back from indonesia.<sup>28</sup>Thats why we think if you rely on ourselves as eastern indonesia, you will not go anywhere.<sup>29</sup>

But we have our second hope, which is Indonesia.<sup>30</sup>But we will tell you why then it will not get your independence and your ideal economic situation if you only rely on indonesia.<sup>31</sup> The reason is simple, because indonesia always fail to see our inherent differences.<sup>32</sup> Because we are always taught about bhinneka tunggal ika that somehow, we are the same.<sup>33</sup> Guess what, people.<sup>34</sup> It is not the same.<sup>35</sup>We think this inherent characteristic is the one who fails indonesia to recognise that we are different, that may be we cannot eat rice but we eat other thing, but we think just because we are different than theirs, they are scared of us and they think that we are different and weird.<sup>36</sup> What does indonesia has do in current sq? They do two things.<sup>37</sup> Firstly they make a milenian culture festival which means to appeal us, to make sure and glorify to the world that actually Indonesia has actually doing good things toward the melanesian people, but the funny thing is that in melanian culture festival, indonesia even do not include eastern indonesian people.<sup>38</sup> Instead, they invite ntt people which is polinesian, this is another race other than melanesian.<sup>39</sup>Eventhough they look characteristically the same a little bit, but we are not the same.<sup>40</sup> But the failur of indonesia to acknowledge the melanistic culture and and characteristic shows to you that indonesia do not see us as a human being but only as an economic entity that you can use as you please but

you do not feel to understand us at the end of the day.<sup>41</sup> Therefore, we think these inherent characteristics that they fail to see is sth that makes us even more oppressed in sq because they always see that we are the same and we should be the same.<sup>42</sup> We are not.<sup>43</sup> Before that.<sup>44</sup> *Today, every provinces have right to govern themselves in their own way.*<sup>45</sup> *Even if it is not effective, but it shows you there is a way to go mam.*<sup>46</sup>

First, you have a burden of proof what is so good about government in Papua when you are still being arrested inside of it and cant do whatever you want to do inside of it, right.<sup>47</sup> We dont think so.<sup>48</sup> Thats your burden to get out.<sup>49</sup>

But secondly my second contribution why principally violent revolution is justified to back up from colonialism that happen inside indonesia.<sup>50</sup> We think, this is colonialism mr madam chair.<sup>51</sup> When you extract our freeport access and do not give us anything in return when we got guns instead to say that we need to protect ourselves.<sup>52</sup> We think it is justified under two reasons.<sup>53</sup>

The first reason is because we need to get a revenge towards indonesia.<sup>54</sup> We know that it is a very harsh way but this is what we got when we cannot do other things.<sup>55</sup> But the second reason why it is principally okay to be violent is because we think violent revolution is a really normal thing of getting independence.<sup>56</sup> This is what also indonesia did back in the colonialism of Dutch for example.<sup>57</sup> And we are allowed to do that, and you are allowed to do that.<sup>58</sup> Even you use one of papuan people in your army to do that.<sup>59</sup> Therefore, if we now have like a violent revolution, it is the same right that at least indonesia should grant to us because that is what they are taking back us from inside sq.<sup>60</sup> We think, we need to do this.<sup>61</sup> But in the very worst scenario that even if the seceding do not succeed and we loss at war, at least we send a message.<sup>62</sup> That we are not going to be shut down just because you ask us to eat rice, we do not eat rice mr madam chair.<sup>63</sup> Thats how different us it, and its important for us to recognize it.<sup>64</sup> We are very proud to propose.<sup>65</sup>

## Leidi OO/BRAWIJAYA

We agree to unite as various separatist movement in eastern indonesia but with this unification what we want, we also want independent that we want to pursue is not through violent like OG wants, but this unification can be used as a capital to build a more constructive engagement with indonesia, right? So what we are going to do as OO is that we will only stick to SQ where we are doing constructive engagement and we are going to unite, so the following actions that we are going to do is we are going to campaign to get what we want, we are going also to educate the society within this area what is actually the benefit when you are gaining independence from indonesia and we are also going to create a petition to call for a referendum which at the end it has been complemented with educating the society, the result could be a capital to show to indonesia that it is really in our demands to be independent from indonesia.<sup>1</sup>We also hate the idea of how we only used as an economic entity by indonesia but this unification has to be utilized as a way to build a constructive engagement.<sup>2</sup>

My rebuttle will be integrated in my cases.<sup>3</sup>

So firstly, im going to prove how sq will only cost us an internal and external support which prevents us furthermore to gain independence from indonesia.<sup>4</sup>

Firstly, lets talk about internal support.<sup>5</sup> We think it is also the interest of separatist group to make sure that there is internal support from the society underground which is all population who live within our area because once we gain independence, they are the one who are going to be governed by us so its better if they are in favour with us.<sup>6</sup> We want them to understand the reason why we want to gain independence.<sup>7</sup> Firstly, first characterization, there are some of them who are disagree to separate because they feel like their justification is not enough and they think it is still benefit in joining the indonesia.<sup>8</sup> We also feel bad for them because what they enjoy is only a minimum standard of living and also minimum standard of protection.<sup>9</sup>We think this people who disagree with the idea of independence would more disagree with us when we conduct the violent action just like what they want because finally it is basically better for me to stick with indonesia and vote no for referendum because my possible government in the future might violent.<sup>10</sup>

Now secondly, there are also people who are in favour with us right, we think it would also make them to turn back from us because what we do is just the same with what they do not like and what they do not like is basically the oppression and the use of violence against the certain group.<sup>11</sup> But what we do is basically reflecting the same way we do not

like to be treated.<sup>12</sup> So in their side, in the end we are going to lose all of the internal support.<sup>13</sup> What's very harmful from this? The losing of internal support and the dissenting opinion of society would only be capitalized more by the Indonesian government to show that our movement is not justified at all and that does not reflect what society wants, right?<sup>14</sup>

Secondly, let's talk about the support from the outside like what they said, MSG where we have obtained a seat as an observer.<sup>15</sup> We think it is better for us to pursue a constructive engagement because it can be used as a political capital not only for MSG but for another actor who wants to help us because they see that we are being consistent that we want independence but we hate violence and not perpetrating violence even more.<sup>16</sup> So what will you get in our side when you do a constructive engagement? It will get us internal and also external support because we have this political capital.<sup>17</sup>

*The constructive engagement is euphoric because Indonesians still need the resources they will not dare to give us a referendum for the thought of losing that particular resource.*<sup>18</sup> They also have a BOP, why then if we destroy all the things and infrastructure, finally Indonesia would want to let go of that particular resource, right?<sup>19</sup>

But at least what we are going to do even though the progress is very slow, at least we get the result of a referendum which says that we really want to separate from Indonesia.<sup>20</sup>

But secondly, I am going to prove to you why it is not worth it for us to go to full war against Indonesia and this revolution would only harm us.<sup>21</sup> Because if this is being conducted by the unification on us, it will cost so many lives and also it will cost so many distractions and it will only justify aggression even more against us because right now we are being considered as a threat toward national security, not to mention that it is an illegal armed group, right?<sup>22</sup> So in their side when we are being arrested only, in their war it is more harmful, maybe they justify to kill us because they consider us as an illegal armed group who are threatening national security so we don't think it's worth the cost.<sup>23</sup> But even though in their side they can also call for a referendum, even though the vote will also result that we want to be separate from Indonesia, we think Indonesia will be more reluctant to give us independence because they do not see us as an actor who is capable to govern people due to the nature of us which uses violence so they will argue that we are just the same or what we complain about so we do not like that, but OO has proved to you we need to create change to this, we need to win people's hearts and we think we can't do it by destroying buildings and going to full war with Indonesia. We oppose.<sup>24</sup>

## Willem OG/BINUS

We've talked about referendum in 2011 in fouders thropy, ladies and gentlemen, but that discussion stays inside the debating chamber and not outside.<sup>1</sup> The discussion doesn't go to legislative bodies, the discussion doesn't go to executive bodies.<sup>2</sup> The reason for that is not because Indonesian is good to us, the reason is that Indonesian doesn't care about us in the current SQ.<sup>3</sup> Stella already pointed out to you lots of example on how Papua is being disenfranchise by the Indo govt who are very javanese centric and sorry to say, yes thats the truth.<sup>4</sup> But what Leidi seems to say in her speech that we should be good to them because there is no other way.<sup>5</sup> We don't think that it is the path that we should stick in today's debate.<sup>6</sup> So whats basically the OO wants, they want constructive engagement.<sup>7</sup> Im going to prove to you why it doesn't work.<sup>8</sup>

Because the bargaining power of papua inside of Indonesia is inherently going to be different because indonesia is more legitimately as a political entity compared to what she says right, compared with the Papua liberation movement, just like what they said they are being considered as an illegal armed groups.<sup>9</sup> Thats why, our constructive engagement never work because indo knows that we have a bargaining position over papua l&g.<sup>10</sup> And it is worse right, because indo have tried to deliberately like exclude papua from all of the narrative that includes indonesia.<sup>11</sup> For example when papua wants to be the member of MSG, indo steps in, and menikung those people, so that indo is being granted as an observer.<sup>12</sup> To that west papua cant directly apply again.<sup>13</sup> Indo doesn't do this because they feel like the have the melanesian identity, they just do this because they want to phase out papua, to keep them from being exposed to the international community and to keep them to be exposed to the western society, that is the thing that we don't want and it should change.<sup>14</sup>

But constructive engagement can only work better under our side of the house if you have violent separation.<sup>15</sup> Because only then, you can give them a threat.<sup>16</sup> You are going to give them a threat towards freeport, a threat toward investor, and a threat towards all the benefit that you can only gain inside the papua and other eastern Indonesian areas, l&g.<sup>17</sup> Thats the only time when constructive engagement can work because now we elevate the bargaining position of papua, that can only happen under our side of the house.<sup>18</sup> They need to proof why suddenly constructive engagement is good and can happen to begin with.<sup>19</sup>

But secondly they said, you know what, we have autonomous region already.<sup>20</sup> But the reason why autonomous region doesn't work is that inherently, after the independence, there is an inherent inequality between areas and govt of indo knows this as well.<sup>21</sup> But they keep

to turn a blind eye to this.<sup>22</sup> We are sorry but the papuan and other eastern indonesian areas are the most impoverished areas inside indo.<sup>23</sup> That doesn't happen because govt doesn't know, that happens because govt is negligence in the SQ and say it is good because you will be governed by your local leaders.<sup>24</sup> We don't think that autonomous region is a threat toward our struggle in our sq.<sup>25</sup>

But then they say, you are going to justify aggression against us and therefore it is bad.<sup>26</sup> Let's take a look on the comparative right because in the current sq indo govt has applied massive excessive courses towards all of the people who want to separate from indo.<sup>27</sup> But they don't call that aggressive is justified to begin with.<sup>28</sup> People don't care about the aggression that happens toward the papuan people, l&g.<sup>29</sup> So, in this grab we need to analyze what is good for the separatist movement.<sup>30</sup> Do we need to stay to the narratives that oppress us, that we are poor people and uneducated people compared with japanese people or do we want to change and do we want to back down the system of the govt inside the sq.<sup>31</sup> We think that our side of the house provides bettermen for this separatist movement at the end of the day because we think under our side of the house it is more likely to succeed because in the past we are used to do sporadic movement in all areas inside of indo.<sup>32</sup> This doesn't work for two reasons.<sup>33</sup> First, there is small faction inside one area so the govt can easily centralize their forces inside this one area.<sup>34</sup> Secondly, they are only categorized as people who has certain heartache and certain stabile outbreak.<sup>35</sup> Those are only characterized as an ethnic outbreak.<sup>36</sup> We think under our side, when you unite different provinces, different ethnicities inside eastern indo were already impoverished, you are going to create a narrative and you are going to create an excessive course that is against the indo govt to begin with, l&g.<sup>37</sup> That can only happen if you take up arms and you decide to be violent towards your opposition which is the indo govt in this instance, that's the moment we say, in order to achieve the goal of separatist movement, you need to do this because this is the only way we can get a force large enough to topple the indo govt at the end of the day.<sup>38</sup>

*If Indo have deployed many army, it will be completely harder for you to create a unite force and attack strategic point at one time.*<sup>39</sup>

Yea, good. That's why WCS.<sup>40</sup>

What happens if this doesn't happen and the govt retaliate?<sup>41</sup>

We think it also good to some instances because there is a balance evidence that there is a repression to the state that is systematical as opposed to the certain protest to the civil and ethnic outbreak.<sup>42</sup> Because the reason why indonesia accuses themselves in sq because they don't have enough budget for papuan for example is because they say we don't have enough

budget so we need to do budget cut or we are currently progressing, but this progress has happened during the presidency of megawati, sby, and jokowi.<sup>43</sup> We say those overpromises like building tolroad has never happened in sq and has never give direct benefit towards eastern indo people.<sup>44</sup> Under our side of the house we will create tings like civil war, we concede to that.<sup>45</sup> But at the end of the day, there will be a blow up inside of the media and there will be a blow inside the international world and finally, there will be a discourse in international society on what to do in this kind of thing.<sup>46</sup> It is how you can expose the human right violation as well towards this people because finally the sheer of civil war is not something that international society will turn their blind eye to.<sup>47</sup> But, we have told you in principle, why is this good? Because just like on how we have been colonialized by dutch, the eastern indo community has been colonialized by our people, l&g.<sup>48</sup> And the fact that we can succeed by having a shipwore with japanese, sumatranese, kalimantanese, to fight against the dutch because the dutch has oppressed us, we say that under current sq when we have been colonialized by indo govt, we should also take up arms, and do the same thing like we did beforehand.<sup>49</sup> Thank you.<sup>50</sup>



## Afdhal OO/BRAWIJAYA

Dont be fooled that it has been preented ineffective, right? because we think we also dont necessarily defend the sq because in sq we also havent united, right?<sup>1</sup> We say that we also would like to do a referendum and constructive engagement in which we already unite that it will also magnify the effectiveness of the constructive engagement which also have never been tried before in sq.<sup>2</sup>

So I am going to proof to you why, firstly this is also going to increase the leverage basically to be able to engage with the central govt, objection to let us go from indonesia.<sup>3</sup> But second of all, I am also going to say that the statehood which is achieved by violent will not give us a state that we want to actually give betterless for our people in the end of the day.<sup>4</sup> But second of all, we dont think that indo will finally be seen as repressive the moment indo launch military attack against our movement in the end of the day because of in the end of the day indo will have even higher leverage since we are the one who will be seen as terrorist.<sup>5</sup> So we are the one who initiate the war, we are the one who initiate the violence and kill the citizens and officers that indo will cover as the good one and that exactly because indeed the leverage that we have right now is lower.<sup>6</sup> That indo is a state and we are the unauthorized movement.<sup>7</sup> Because of it, indo has to establish image as well that they are in already progressing to prospher eastern indonesia, just like what we have right now that jokowi does policies that focuses on the development of eastern indo and that is why indo will be having leverage to point out that basically this separatist movement are the one who are terrorist, the ones that are bad, and exactly we are not going to achieve the state that we want in the end of the day since we are going to lose so many costs of the attack from the central govt, right?<sup>8</sup>

So firstly, i am going to talk about how referendum can also be used to track interest because it seems like what the OG wants is basically leverage.<sup>9</sup>

Firstly, we think referendum is important to show the citizens that also they are like to stay and we think this is exactly what we need to show to the central govt, because the reason why this notion of our demand inside separatist movement dont go to parliament and discussion because indo always call our movement as not representing the majority of eastern indo needs, that we are the minority who want to secede from indo that you know, we are called as a terrorist.<sup>10</sup> Thats why we think this is worth to try because at least this referendum will also shows the demand of eastern indo to secede but the comparative is that they need to justify why this cost is basically justify eventhough we are going to lose the lifes of these individuals, the lifes of citizens, military.<sup>11</sup> All the important figures that we have right now

possibly l&g.<sup>12</sup> I would think that the result of the referendum is exactly like going to capitalize our constructive engagement and our effort in diplomacy because firstly, we think that indo will think that it is costly to still to put us back if we really want to secede given that the majority who want to secede it is basically wasting to still keep on providing services and helping them meanwhile they dont want to like use our help in the end of the day, they wont use our infrastructure etc, thats why in the end of the day the voice of them will also be the bargaining position that we need to create discussion inside the parliament and also finally be able to let us joining in this msg for example.<sup>13</sup> To creating statehood, thats why we think this is going to be more strategic, l&g.<sup>14</sup>

But second of all, i am going to talk about the statehood through violence because we think that this is what they depend, statehood through massive massacre over the citizens of indo and finally making indo feeling them it is basically like loosing a lot, right.<sup>15</sup> We think that this is a conventional method that have also been tried by separatists movement in indo like OPM has done before, GAM also has done before, l&g.<sup>16</sup> We think that even for example they unite, that doesnt change anything because finally we also even be seen as a bigger threat on the majority of indo, l&g.<sup>17</sup> Because they are going to create a nature that look, we are recruiting indo members to fight against the central govt.<sup>18</sup> And we dont think that it is strategic.<sup>19</sup> And this is when i would also like to justify that it is strategic to consider that there is a retaliated coming from the central govt that is exclusively happen only under their side, l&g.<sup>20</sup> Because of even if we have been precedented the central govt never does to craving us a military as well, the violent may also cost indonesian citizens.<sup>21</sup> We agree on that you might be killing the officer, for example, the citizens in the end of the day.<sup>22</sup> But this is exactly what we are talking to you about that because we are the one who starting the violence, the central government is good to be having more advantageous like being an official entity for example to might also get the foreign help for ex like the foreign through for example to also like shot our movement and that is exactly why that the cost is way too big for us as the movement that has just trusted to create statehood.<sup>23</sup> What we will lose, is that the human resources that you need to build the states because you know that there are so many people that might be killed maybe that important figures us.<sup>24</sup> This movement that you have will also be killed in the hostilities and we think that it is not exactly what we expect from the statehood, that we will get from thpis movement of separatism.<sup>25</sup> That is why we have proven to you the basic thing, we think that so og.<sup>26</sup> Indeed that your proposal coming from us and that we are never have check in before, when we wil you, that there will be politicians who will cooperate with eastern indo to say that look, this is exactly the benefit that we have, that we will get through

seceding from indo and this is the moment when if it is succesfull, the citizens of papua will also be informed and capitalizing our movement.<sup>27</sup> And in in this basically, you ara gambling under our side because you are merely forcing them to fight against indonesia and we think it is not what we want as separatist movement that we also want to create betterless for our people. So vote for us.<sup>28</sup>

## Gaby CG/UI

What does CG envision in our side? We envision first of all a new state, but even if we cannot achieve that, we envision way much better treatment from our govt.<sup>1</sup> Therefore, an additional concept mechanism, we would like to bring in this debate three things :<sup>2</sup>

First, we will explicitly unite all power, all free powers, we are gonna unite the arms, the people, the farm, like many rebel group in eastern can pleasure themselves to alleging icing for have equal resources distributed more to conduct certain revolution.<sup>3</sup>

Secondly, we also agree with OG, the affirmative will be discussed,<sup>4</sup>

Third of all, we would attack strategically the govt institutions, the media, its gonna be similar to a form of cube and therefore to be able to gain the leverage, to be able to declare that we want secession and would not taken lively by the govt.<sup>5</sup> We'll declare independence, like what we did in 1945.<sup>6</sup>

But lastly, more important thing, we are also going to coordinate and plan the attack simultaneously in every areas, l&g, I'll further explain why is it important in my contribution.<sup>7</sup>

But before proceeding to that, we think that OO is to indicate whether the current momentum is in our favor to exactly make sure our demand is being granted by the govt.<sup>8</sup> We contend that, no.<sup>9</sup> Currently wiranto is being re-elected, l&g, but the fact that OPM in Jogja is causing hazard mean its most likely for the govt to continuously shot the problem.<sup>10</sup> So we think going soft will not do in order to make sure our demands are actually being heard of.<sup>11</sup> Because exactly all of these momentum is exactly in favor in making sure that the govt is able to bring us further dawn.<sup>12</sup> That's why we argue that its best for us to just exert as much power as possible, I'll further argue why that is strategic, and therefore again the best result for us.<sup>13</sup> Look, referendum in the past was rape, never it likely to happen right now.<sup>14</sup> Anyway, its therefore important for us to regain our democracy in which many militaries were put out inside of papua and shooting gun at peoples head, telling us to you know vote for staying inside papua. It indicates to you democracies were indeed rope and you have the right to make sure that we are gaining it back right now.<sup>15</sup> Because consider the fact that we are not represented in the past, right now, the fact that we do not agree to the constitutions, to the

legal system and to the authority that is now governing us, we argue I&G that we are not represented therefore we must be able to become the representative of our own.<sup>16</sup> Because the constitution that we recite under currently, are created by oppressors, these even oppressors who are recognized by international community consider the fact that even Wiranto in 2003 was called by UN a war criminal, but he never answer the call to come to the trial, indicating to you that it is exactly the reason why we must regain it back.<sup>17</sup>

And therefore, most importantly, CG will be the one who tells you one of the biggest issue in today's debate, right?<sup>18</sup> I am gonna talk to you about why this is gonna work out at the end I&G.<sup>19</sup>

Look, we think that its gonna work out due two falls of reasons.<sup>20</sup> First, we are gonna combine our military in three different locations, not to mention others who want to secession.<sup>21</sup> We think considering the fact that our attack was scattered, but never coordinated and never conducted at the same time.<sup>22</sup> We believe that the military will then you know, have discoordination under their own, to not be able to counter all that massive power coming from us I&G.<sup>23</sup> They would not be able to see it coming.<sup>24</sup> What does it mean?<sup>25</sup> Secondly, we think that social capital therefore for our success during the ku and after the ku will be larger.<sup>26</sup> Why? Because we will be seen as a force that is unstoppable and its most likely for people to side with the winning side, I&G.<sup>27</sup> Therefore, you must understand to the characteristic of these papuan people, are that actually they are afraid of speaking out right?<sup>28</sup> Because they dont think that the people who is now representing them, OPM and so on and so forth, have the capacity to actually take back the state back.<sup>29</sup> Therefore, we contend that if we are actually uniting with all of free powers, it should be able to represent toward the society that we are going to succeed in this time.<sup>30</sup> Its not gonna be just a tool inside govt system, but it is gonna be a tool for revolution which you as the society wanted to begin with.<sup>31</sup> Because the hatred and the sentiment towards indo govt.<sup>32</sup> Is that dire, I&G.<sup>33</sup> It will most likely willing to join us on our cost, because in the past they were scared, because as simple as you know, demonstrating against govt can just keep up and put you in jail.<sup>34</sup> We think that if they are deterred, we argue that this mechanism will be able to make sure that they are able to join our military at all cost.<sup>35</sup> Because it is not just that, not during the time, right.<sup>36</sup> You've seen the example to why turkey failed, because there is no human resources there, but further we also think that a certain degree of legitimacy needs to be added to the newly state, not for us to be able to make sure indo govt.<sup>37</sup> Will not easily poke us back, and there is gonna be international recognition because people always constity on our side and depending our value, depending the cost of papua to begin with.<sup>38</sup> Therefore, considering all of these, we argue that they will be able to truely establish what we want on our own.<sup>39</sup> First

we are gonna have completely clean stake for example we want a traditional way of life that's why we hated the presence of netherlands, australian, in indonesia.<sup>40</sup>

Secondly, we'll have to control over our resources that is currently being extracted I&G.<sup>41</sup> More prosperity for our own.<sup>42</sup> But lastly and more important thing, we argued that this group gonna be able to protect the papuan inside our jurisdiction, because as what you see right now, even papuans in jogja is subject to sentiment, we contend that after all of this happens, there would most likely be more sentiment from most of parts of Indonesian who hated papuan to begin with.<sup>43</sup> Therefore we must be able to protect at least protect them even outside the jurisdiction.<sup>44</sup> For example back up and having military or having an embassy outside the stake of our nation.<sup>45</sup> That is when it will lead to success and only the parameter that is set by CG will lead into that.<sup>46</sup>

But secondly, in the scenario in which we fail.<sup>47</sup> At least our voice will significantly be heard and that's why we are very proud to begin with.<sup>48</sup> Why? Because currently the media is unwilling to show it, however this is an important thing to be discussed.<sup>49</sup> Secondly, the govt is unwilling to pursue it, look we are actually regressing in term of human rights, drug dealer is being shot, and the constitution is too weak to make sure that the oppression is not exerted toward the police extent.<sup>50</sup> That is why we argue, you must understand that the current democracy is actually shit thing, right.<sup>51</sup> Because the progressive parts in Indo are more willing to speak up.<sup>52</sup> However, we argue that the current progressive part of generation is not having its fullest capacity to do discussion on us.<sup>53</sup> Because there is always a way for you to shoot the agenda down.<sup>54</sup> But by this, we argue that the media will be willing to cover it and that agenda will be put up front, and the discourse will lead to more tangible effects.<sup>55</sup> For example decentralization, fair election, and even more budget allocation which will at the end of the day fulfill the basic needs and demands of us as in democracy society who wants the best out of democracy that Indo is offering us right now.<sup>56</sup> Then, we will be able to at least be okay with the condition of the state of Indo and all of the discourses is able to force the govt bring bettermen for us as papuan.<sup>57</sup> Thanks.<sup>58</sup>

## Aryanda CO/UGM

CO regrets and sympathize with the facts that there are violation and oppression done against some eastern indo.<sup>1</sup> We say it should not be done to begin with.<sup>2</sup> On CO, we won't have to remain silent.<sup>3</sup> We say we should pursue, make sure to attain accountability things like investigation of justice reformation and the govt of indo should enact any policies to be violent and create future harms.<sup>4</sup> We believe on CO, conducting violence means we are not making things any better for our govt system in eastern indo.<sup>5</sup> To the contrary, it would only lead into more oppression and suffering to them.<sup>6</sup>

So what is the stance and the alternative that CO offer in this debate?<sup>7</sup> Firstly,

unlike OO, we will father this separatist movement to stay in Indo.<sup>8</sup>

Secondly, in regards to violation and oppression, any movement pursue diplomatic and political approach to govt. Of indonesia.<sup>9</sup> The end goal of the approach is things like reformation of system, investigation for accountability, or in Best scenario, more regional autonomy for some eastern countries in indo would be similar to the movement in aceh.<sup>10</sup>

I am going to explain two things in my speech.<sup>11</sup>

Firstly, I would like to softly explain our differences in this debate, not pursuing any separation means that more pragmatic,<sup>12</sup>

And secondly, why putting yourself as an enemy of the state harms the effort to achieve peace and prosperity in Indo.<sup>13</sup>

Before that, couple ones of rebuttles.<sup>14</sup>

Their arguments about the efficacy of this revolution is dubious.<sup>15</sup> Because even it can create an unified attack, in the end there is a wide gap on technological differences of army and these men.<sup>16</sup> Because no matter how in the end there would be bigger gun and bigger weapons from govt of indo.<sup>17</sup> That is unlikely to be successful.<sup>18</sup>

Secondly, what CG newly introduces is coordinative within distributed area, but having a

massive coordinated attack comes at the cost of exposing their plans into our intelligence body, and our intelligence body is relatively doing a good job that's why the attack of one long attack terrorism happening in java was exposed and not priority I&G.<sup>19</sup> So this is unlikely to be successful attack under the side of technology and intelligence body.<sup>20</sup>

But secondly, we portray the good argument from their worst scenario.<sup>21</sup> In the scenario that they fail, there will be a push of incentive for govt to change because there will be a pressure on international society.<sup>22</sup> We have two responses.<sup>23</sup> We say that international society is inherently or is prompt to be biased to indo.<sup>24</sup> Because firstly, the fact that it is violence in

itself becomes the reluctance of the international society to support the attack.<sup>25</sup> There is a reason why, as much as international society hits the reign of erdogan, that the book was that violent, they are unlikely to legitimize and authorize that particular attack, l&g.<sup>26</sup> But lastly l&g, because it has interest to indo, indo is not an isolated small countries, it is a growingly to has economic prosperity in international society, international society would be reluctant to support the small minority movement.<sup>27</sup>

Lets take a look on the first argument why our line of argument is justified and true, this going to be soft.<sup>28</sup>

Because the aim of secession is not just for secession per se, is not just for going up per se, the aim of secession is to aim for prosperity, more rights, and more peaceful in government.<sup>29</sup> So we can show you that staying in Indo and pursuing diplomatic approach can ensure its prosperity, rights, and autonomy, it is justifiable.<sup>30</sup>

Secondly, on putting yourself as the enemy of state harms efforts in achieving peace and prosperity in eastern indo.<sup>31</sup> The problem of violence and revolution is that you create a narrative of enemy of state.<sup>32</sup> That narrative is suppose to have more rights and provisions from govt, would only lead to more oppression from both government and society in term of political push from govt.<sup>33</sup> What we have to realize in the context of Jokowi's administration is a stronger presence of a strong, united, and more muscular indonesia narative, a very nationalistic approach.<sup>34</sup> Jokowi's administration will do anything in their power to maintain that value, the reason why jokowi insists on the sink the ship policy where it rather violent in bilateral to show that indo rejects the idea of foreign trade.<sup>35</sup> The reason why indo doesnt compromise on the issue of death penalty, to maintain the narrative that indo is fighting for the enemy, drug dealer.<sup>36</sup> The problem with violent revolution is that it puts the efforts to fight prosperity as a direct treat to the nationalistic value that you betray the mother of indo.<sup>37</sup> What happen in their side of the house, is just a more violent nation and oppression in response to their violent revolution.<sup>38</sup> The defensive nationalistic value is also shared among society.<sup>39</sup> What happens in their side of the house is not sympathy towards the casualties, but I believe, that further oppression is a form in purpose of self defense in papuas itself defense, l&g.<sup>40</sup> Thats what will happen in their side of the house.<sup>41</sup>

What is the comparison in our side of the house to stop the secession and to demand better treatment and accountability and autonomy and within diplomatic?<sup>42</sup>

Firstly, we do not antagonize toward government.<sup>43</sup> Our efforts to demand an accountability and autonomy would be seen as a populish action to be done by the govt.<sup>44</sup> When we allow



things like campaign about suffering of papuans, it would put the blame to the govt.<sup>45</sup> That it is the fault of the govt, that it is the negligence of the govt.<sup>46</sup> And when the govt tries to self – correct themselves, it would be seen as a noble thing to do to serve the justice.<sup>47</sup> To the contrary, the suffering of the papuan in their side of the house will be overlooked by the narrative by the enemy of the state.<sup>48</sup> That their suffering is their own doing, not cooperating with the govt., not obeying the govt l&g.<sup>49</sup>

*Yes, it is okay to have the narrative of the enemy of the state because we want to secede from the state, they need to proof to us why the separatist movement have the interest to care about the muscular job away, and lastly the violence in syria is justified by the international media, right?*<sup>50</sup>

You need to care about this because secession is only successful in soft war when you have strong power, but understanding that you are not that strong, you need to compromise that it is better to stay in indo.<sup>51</sup>

So what happens in your side of the house is that the pain and the suffering of papuan is indo failures as well.<sup>52</sup> So at best scenario, there will be granting of autonomy like in the case of GAM because we do not put ourselves as the opposition of govt.<sup>53</sup> And from that there will be more prosperity and rights from the govt.<sup>54</sup>

But what is the worst scenario?<sup>55</sup> The worst scenario is not just people dying than you have attention from international society, the WS in their side of the house is people dying, and the death of activists and the members of the movement.<sup>56</sup> This is important, because the members of the movement are the one who would further fight for the rights of papuan, but on their side of the house, top officers who understand about papuan died on their side of the house, thus the govt of indo and international society is in perception that killing these top officers is justified for the means of self defense.<sup>57</sup> For that we are very proud to oppose.<sup>58</sup>

## Aldi CG/UI

Members of the house, the root of the problem is not simply because there is one bad policy or two bad policies in the govt.<sup>1</sup> The root of the problem as identified by Gaby is the fact that we are being ripped from our democratic crack to the extent to the democratic system has always been failure in face against the favor of papuan people.<sup>2</sup> That's why the only solution to that is not to expect the democracy, the current ripped democratic system to help us, but to establish our own.<sup>3</sup> Or, to establish a momentum that huge to the extent there is a political push to change that democratic system.<sup>4</sup> That's what CG has been arguing all the time.<sup>5</sup> So, this debate goes up to three things.<sup>6</sup>

Number one, should we stay or should we leave, because CO asks us to stay.<sup>7</sup> Number two, what is the likelihood of success in this policy?<sup>8</sup>

And number three, in the case that we are unable to succeed, how can we create that momentum to change as also pointed out by CO.<sup>9</sup>

Lets talk about stay or leave.<sup>10</sup> First of all, on the CO, their argument to leave is simply so that we are able to gain prosperity.<sup>11</sup> We have lots of responses for this.<sup>12</sup> Number one, we'll think that they are able to explain to us why currently that the Papuan people are able to prosper in the current moment in that?<sup>13</sup> We have responded that right now, we are not only being ripped on lots of our rights and also resources, we are also not allowed to access like the same budget for education, like how it is being given to other region.<sup>14</sup> So as the result, not only our life be hidden but we are going to be left behind because our human resources are unable to compete with that from the other side.<sup>14</sup> So we argue to you that it is not prosperous at all.<sup>15</sup> But, we don't believe that the govt. are able to arbitrarily define what prosperity means to us.<sup>16</sup> Because that is what Gaby argue to you, what they want is simple thing.<sup>17</sup> It shows to you that the definition prosperity that is pointed out by CO is nearly the definition that is pointed out by people that do not experience a life as papuan people.<sup>18</sup> They don't like to have too much industry that becoming an addiction toward the environment and who broke their culture.<sup>19</sup> So we argue to you, staying means that we are subjected to the definition of prosperity that is pointed out by people who actually do not understand the actual life of people of papua.<sup>20</sup> The solution for that from CO is complicating, regional autonomy and then we have, more independent government.<sup>21</sup> First of all, this is very inconsistent because Ayi also admit that the current Jokowi administration seats for a more unified Indonesia so we are confused what is the definition of regional autonomy.<sup>22</sup> But secondly, autonomy only means that you can have your own government.<sup>23</sup> But, it is still

subject to political election in which those election are dominated by political parties who are dominant whose major concern still relies on java for example.<sup>24</sup> They still are the member of PDI, they still are member of Golkar, whose main parts are still determined by people in java so we argue to you that staying is not an option.<sup>25</sup> But ladies and gentleman, we dont agree with the definition of jokowi's administration because we have to understand that even if jokowi has good things, he is also subject to a lot of political lobbying, the reason why that there is a lot of cabinet reshuffled, there is a lot of questionable division that jokowi made in term of appointment of ministry.<sup>26</sup> What does it show? Even if there is a substantial changes right now, it is not guaranted at all given the fact that jokowi has changed the cabinet three times during his precidency.<sup>27</sup> So it shows that we cannot trust the system right now to work in our favor and establish our own.<sup>28</sup>

Lets talk about success rate, l&g.<sup>29</sup> Gaby has told you the importance of having people on the ground.<sup>30</sup> The purpose of having people is we gain momentum.<sup>31</sup> What does it mean?<sup>32</sup> When we occupied a certain region, and have all people in that region understand and recognizes us as their legitimate leader, then it would be harder for national government to say that we are going to attack everyone of you because now people are also helping defending the movement for example, you gain the legitimacy in international community to the extent of how government will be harder to exert their power.<sup>33</sup> then we argue to you that it is important to have people supporting us on the ground.<sup>34</sup> But, the current reason why a lot of people cannot support us on the ground is because the movement is topseen as strong enough so the people would rather stay quiet and not do anything about it, l&g.<sup>35</sup> Then we argue to you that the moment we can coordinate attack not only we create a stronger attack, but we create a force that is considered as being able to win.<sup>36</sup> And as the result, the people will not be afraid anymore to say that we also supporting this movement that for example the military of Indonesia should no longer come here because there is already sufficient of our own.<sup>37</sup>

Then they say about technology, we cant even identify the attack in Sarinah so it is not as perfect as they wanted to argue to you, number one.<sup>38</sup> But number two, when we attack institution we also going to attack the military pangkalan right?<sup>39</sup> As a result, we are going to be able to get the technologies that is how military cope happened right?<sup>40</sup> We don't attack mosque, we attack the strategic location.<sup>41</sup> And when we can get the technology, we can also jam their communication system so, there is a likelihood of success.<sup>42</sup> But the only way you can do it is to have a dispersion where we are going to attack multiple cities at once.<sup>43</sup> That is the reason why, not only attack at one cities, it is easier for us to get the resources there.<sup>44</sup> But, when we attack at different areas, it is easier for us to make a distraction to the extent that

govt are unable to respond to this.<sup>45</sup> But what is govt response, l&g.<sup>46</sup> When there is already people sticking up to this movement, they would not suddenly shoot us, right?<sup>47</sup> Because the govt still believe in court proceeding, humanitarian law, that is why it is not parallel because it follows the court order l&g before prosecute people.<sup>48</sup> So we argue to you when we have people on the ground it's unlikely for you to be attack, but what about the government getting legitimacy? Look the international community is smarter than that.<sup>49</sup> They can differentiate whether or not the Palestinian are the freedom fighter or simply crazy people and they still believe that the attack is justified.<sup>50</sup> Gaby argue to you that the worst case scenario that my third clash even if we have to fail and the movement is not succeeded at the moment in that time, people can still see us as that we create that a huge of momentum l&g there would be a narrative that is more likely happened.<sup>51</sup> Therefore the momentum to change like what they argue to you is only going to happen if we show that there's a need to change.<sup>52</sup> It has happened in Orde Reformasi that requires a lot of massacre of Chinese do extend and create a momentum to change.<sup>53</sup> So, even if we fail that momentum create the necessity to change the democratic system for example that would not harm the papua people.<sup>54</sup>

But, in order to make that change, something big must happened first or else the politician would always be able to suit it under the rub,rag.<sup>55</sup> rug what they did in the last sixty years because you've never explain to us why this making the government feel responsible has been working in the past sixty years.<sup>56</sup> We argue the only y to do it is by making the message to our own l&g I'm not Papuan but I'm speaking on behalf of Papuan.<sup>57</sup>

## Noi CO/UGM

This is the structure of my speech.<sup>1</sup>

First I'm going to explain to you why their goal is better achieved in our proposal.<sup>2</sup>

Second I'm going to prove to you why it's only worsen in their proposal if we go to the war  
l&g.<sup>3</sup>

1<sup>st</sup> by following their proposal it's only give preety and self

govern<sup>4</sup> There is a line of acceptable and rejectable right to govern.<sup>5</sup>

Some things like jogjakarta and aceh are acceptable.<sup>6</sup> Jogjakarta has its constitutional monarchy.<sup>7</sup> Jogja has its own law, culture, and a way of life which is can never be intervened by the central govt.<sup>8</sup> It is acceptable bcs you are not separating toward indo but at the same time you can do whatever the way of life you want.<sup>9</sup> Look, we have been indoctrinated since our children.<sup>10</sup> That nkri harga mati, that it is ok to kill the wall for the sakeof keeping them in indo.<sup>11</sup> But at the same time, we were indoctrinated that bhinneka tunggal ika, that is the reason why people in indo can accept that aceh has its special autonomy, jogja has its special autonomy, way of life and such, but they are still a part of indo.<sup>12</sup> We think it is time for us to change our strategy.<sup>13</sup> If we keep fighting, which is already happen in sq, negotiating but on behalf that you want to separate from indo, it will never be tolerated.<sup>14</sup> Its time for us to change the strategy that we want a more autonom region.<sup>15</sup> We want a way of life that cannot be intervened by the central govt which proven acceptable.<sup>16</sup> Look, eastern indo they dont want jakarta alike development.<sup>17</sup> That is the reason why they want to separate, they have no self belonging and so on and so forth which can be achieved in our proposal.<sup>18</sup> After you have a special region, you can choose your own leader democratic or any ways that you want, your own law and your own money.<sup>19</sup> In fact in aceh, they can distribute and own money without central govt intervention and they own 90% of the money which sth that papua govt wants.<sup>20</sup> The reason why papua hates freeport bcs freeport is negotiated with the central govt.<sup>21</sup> Bcs only a matter of time before we can get that it is the right of eastern indo to negotiate, to take investment or not.<sup>22</sup> We are more than willing to give you a right to do so.<sup>23</sup> Thats why, the prob with the sq this never heard bcs you put yourself as the enemy of the state.<sup>24</sup> And you make that you are negotiable, you are not in the hand of indo, but you are people outside indo.<sup>25</sup> It is different when we change our strategy that we are protecting indo and we want to negotiate. Go.<sup>26</sup>

*Number one, the first principle of you stance is independence.<sup>27</sup> But number two, gam in aceh and jogja is different cases bcs they are not colonized by us.<sup>28</sup> It is different by us who*

*colonized by dutch to the extent that indo dont have a reason to give us special autonomy that political momentum will not happen.*<sup>29</sup>

First, i dont think that colonializing is really matters because if you want to and you want to give veto it is ok. It is sth legal and easy things to go.<sup>30</sup> Look, there is difference between special region and independence.<sup>31</sup> *Special region* owns every local law that you have which is the urgency of papua.<sup>32</sup> Independence means you have the rights to do diplomacy to intl society which we admit if we put the special region, eastern indo will have right to diplomacy to outside indo.<sup>33</sup> It have to through central govt.<sup>34</sup> But it is fine as long as they can govern with their own way of life, their own law and their own leader.<sup>35</sup>

Now, going out to my second part of my speech.<sup>36</sup> Why idea to secede will worsen the condition of papua, maluku, and so on.<sup>37</sup> To understand that it is useless to fight for independence and we will be success we can get prosperity, bcs even if it success, no prosperity.<sup>38</sup> First, this is unbearable war.<sup>39</sup> Under UN charter govt has right to defend themselves.<sup>40</sup> It is justify for indo to counter attack and suppress you.<sup>41</sup> Look, we allow other intl society for turqs to attack kurdistan separatist.<sup>42</sup> We allow chinese govt to attack uyghur separatist bcs there is a line l&g.<sup>43</sup> Look, you want to create an armed citizens which is count to the category of combatant, which is under intl law indo has full right to attack them.<sup>44</sup> Look, if we go to the sq we use demonstration or civilian fighting for right, which is our proposal, and it is being killed, you got intl recognition.<sup>45</sup> But if you go to armed attack, and you will be killed, you will not get intl recognition bcs thats not a crime under intl law.<sup>46</sup> If we lead into a full war, where indo has far better more in number and more in experience troops.<sup>47</sup> Even if at best, the separatists are helped by msg, it is easily broke and isolated understanding the fact that maluku and papua are blocked by sea which is easy for indo to stop the sending of weapon toward the papuans and maluku themselves.<sup>48</sup> Thus its unbearable harm.<sup>49</sup> But why indo separatist will not end like libya and egypt when intl society intervenes them.<sup>50</sup> Egypt and libya is intervened bcs there is crimes against humanity.<sup>51</sup> Killing civilian in an excessive number which is justified under intl law.<sup>52</sup> Indo separatist should go into category like kurds in turkey or uyghur in china which no killing of civilian in a massive number.<sup>53</sup> Even if there is media discourse, look the same goes to kurds in turkey.<sup>54</sup> No progress at all.<sup>55</sup> Or uyghur in china, no progress at all.<sup>56</sup> The case of palestine, look in palestine we still fighting, it is an endless war l&g.<sup>57</sup> I dont get why their example is even better.<sup>58</sup> We think injustice is better than war.<sup>59</sup> Even if they successfully secede it will not give you prosperity.<sup>60</sup> Independence does not mean prosperity, south sudan got independence from sudan, no prosperity.<sup>61</sup> Why this case is likely to end the same? Bcs they

are highly depending on indo in food, oil energy and so on.<sup>62</sup> if you separate indo will easily block you.<sup>63</sup> Second, even if there is msg, new guinea is align with indo in economy, which indo can stop negotiate and help for msg.<sup>64</sup> Thus it will only lead into unprosperity where you fail to govern yourself and will lead to another atrocities, thank you.<sup>65</sup>























