

# 1. Healing a fractured transition to democracy

This chapter first outlines the ambitions—methodological and substantive—of the Peacebuilding Compared project, of which this book is the first product. It then describes the history of the crash of the Indonesian economy in 1997, followed by the collapse of the political order in 1998, then progressive unravelling of the social order for regulating violence between 1998 and 2001. It is argued that Indonesia is a resilient democratising society that has managed to restabilise all these institutions to create peace (except in West Papua) and better long-term prospects for its people. Few of the structural injustices that contributed to armed conflict have changed substantially. Even though Western investment has not yet returned to the levels enjoyed by Indonesia before 1997 (Hill 2007), its economy did resume strong economic growth at the end of its millennial conflicts, with much of the benefit flowing to the poor. In 2008, Indonesia ranked eleventh in the world in the share of income or consumption that went to the poorest 10 per cent of the population (UNDP 2008).

From being the society with the biggest terrorism problem in the world by 2002 (Kivimäki 2007:50)—a position thereafter lost to Iraq, Afghanistan and Pakistan—Indonesia became the first Muslim society with a massive terror problem to get on top of it. Indonesia showed a better path for solving it than a crude war on terror. It is hard to see Indonesia's peacemaking as having been accomplished by truth, reconciliation and tackling structural injustices, as was advocated by the senior author eight years ago when Indonesian conflict was at its height (Braithwaite 2002:Ch.6). Rather, this book finds a great deal of peace to have been secured in Indonesia through non-truth and reconciliation. While political game playing by the security forces continues to be a risk to peace in Indonesia (especially in West Papua), in most parts of the country the military has moved from being a large part of the problem to being a big part of the solution.

This book argues that between 1997 and 2004, theoretically, Indonesia experienced a period of anomie (Durkheim 1897): a breakdown of the regulatory order that secured the institutional order (the rules of the game). A security sector that pursued its own interests by taking sides instead of preventing violence from all sides was one important part of that wider problem of anomie. This will recur as a problem in the next three volumes of Peacebuilding Compared—on Bougainville, Solomon Islands and Timor-Leste. Abuses by the security forces escalated communal defiance before finally helping to bring violence under control. A Mertonian reading of anomie theory that dissects legitimate and illegitimate opportunity structures in a micro-macro way is

found to be fertile for understanding the onset of these conflicts. Emulation (modelling) of strategies for seizing illegitimate opportunities contributed to the diffusion of violence. Remarkable accomplishments of the reintegration of combatants from organisations such as Laskar Jihad, in which religious leaders showed great leadership for peace, was a feature of Indonesian peacebuilding. So was reconciliation through sharing power combined with the sharing of work (*gotong royong*) for reconstruction. The chapter then moves on to consider the complex multidimensionality of the factors that make for both war and peace. This evidence is used to argue for locally attuned multidimensionality and redundancy in peacebuilding strategy. This is the key to managing the inherent risks of violence in the gaming of transitions to democracy.

## Comparing conflict, comparing peacebuilding

The Peacebuilding Compared project hopes over more than 20 years to code 670 variables in relation to the major armed conflicts that have raged across the world since 1990. This book is a report on the first seven cases coded. It is hoped the next three volumes will appear in quick succession to cover four conflicts coded in Bougainville and Solomon Islands and then Timor-Leste. The project started with the region around the home country of the senior author simply because it was easier to learn how to do it in the region with which the research team was most familiar.<sup>1</sup> As it happens, this region experienced a great deal of armed conflict during the 1990s. It was popularly referred to as ‘the arc of instability’ around Australia. As we enter the second decade of the twenty-first century, this arc is a much more stable—though still vulnerable—region.

Peacebuilding Compared started in 2005. During the first five years of the project, the senior author managed to do some serious fieldwork across each of the sites in the four nations where these first 11 conflicts occurred.<sup>2</sup> In some cases, he was joined by co-authors or advisory panel members who had far greater knowledge of that site and its languages. Joint rather than solitary fieldwork is better, more reflexive and reliable, but often is not logistically possible. In general, we were

---

1 The senior author dabbled at the beginning of the decade in some writing on peacebuilding in Indonesia after several trips there in the 1990s before and after the fall of Suharto (Braithwaite 2002; Chapter 6) and spent time as an anthropology student living in a village in Bougainville at the end of the 1960s.

2 John Braithwaite was present for about 90 per cent of these interviews and he typed up the fieldwork notes or used voice-recognition software to record almost 90 per cent of them. The most common reason for not creating an electronic copy of fieldwork notes was that culpability for war crimes was discussed in the interview or other information was provided that might conceivably put someone in danger. The second most common reason was that there seemed so little that was truthful or valuable in them! Handwritten notes taken during such interviews were still kept, in case a changed view of their truthfulness and value emerged later. No interviews were taped. Co-researchers had often done extensive fieldwork of their own for quite separate research projects—for example, associated with their PhD theses. The latter fieldwork is not included in the interview statistics summarised in the appendices.

surprised at the level of access won to key players such as warlords, generals, foreign ministers, peace agreement negotiators and peacekeeping commanders. As is clear in the appendix to each chapter that summarises the types of players in the conflict who have been interviewed, there is, however, always uneven coverage in the types of stakeholders accessed. In every case, there were regional specialists in the study of this conflict who had secured broader access to the key players and who had talked many times to decision makers we did not manage to tap. This means it is always more important to attend to the published fruits of the fieldwork of others than to one's own fieldwork notes.

This raises the question, however, of what added value there could be in research of inferior coverage led by a researcher with an inferior background and inferior language skills<sup>3</sup> in the regions of conflict. One added value is that sometimes inferior researchers whose fieldwork engagement is thin are nevertheless lucky enough to gain superior access to some significant bits of information. Already in *Peacebuilding Compared* there have been many instances in which we have accessed generals, warlords or politicians whom our betters have not managed to get to. There have also been more than a few instances in which we have discovered that the best scholars of that case have published a claim that is wrong—not just wrong as a matter of interpretation, but incontrovertibly, factually wrong. Doubtless, there are even more howlers in this text than in theirs. In this business, we all get things wrong. There is therefore some value from our research in adding a little to the superior body of data and insights accumulated by the very best experts in these conflicts. This is not, however, the main contribution of comparative research. Its main added value is in the comparison and in the different ways of seeing that a comparative lens opens out. In each case study of *Peacebuilding Compared*, there tend to be a couple of scholars who have done the most insightful or thorough research on that case. The frequent citation of the work of these scholars in each chapter makes it clear who they are. We are deeply grateful to them. Their work remains the scholarship to read on that case; but we do hope that by standing on their books, we might be able to peer over their shoulders to begin to see more clearly a comparative landscape of patterns of conflict across the globe.

*Peacebuilding Compared* offers a different kind of comparative method than the dominant kind that is based on quantitative analysis of statistical information from databases maintained by organisations such as the World Bank, the United Nations Development Program (UNDP), the US Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) and national statistics bureaus. *Peacebuilding Compared* uses

---

3 To date, more than two-thirds of the interviews for *Peacebuilding Compared* have been conducted in English, most of the rest with an interpreter, some with a co-fieldworker fluent in the language concerned, a small number with the senior author struggling alone in another language in which he is not fluent (perhaps helped by an informant struggling with English in which they are not fluent). The last were rare and data from them were of poor quality.

these databases as well to code one-third of its 670 variables in relation to each conflict. Most codes, however, are things not available in these databases, such as whether insurgents have received training from a foreign power or whether significant numbers of the combatants are female, based on our interviews (and the published fieldwork of others). Good examples of the kinds of variables never coded in the leading quantitative research are the dynamics and shape of reconciliation processes post-conflict. This is a particularly important neglect according to some of the theoretical frameworks we address in this volume.

We also attempt to deal with two fundamental problems in the quantitative literature. One is that it is often interested only in data coded at the national level. The study of 'civil wars' dominated by the disciplines of political science and international relations is often, moreover, interested only in armed conflicts in which one of the combatants is a state.<sup>4</sup> *Peacebuilding Compared* seeks to maximise coding at the local or provincial level. Hence, the way a variable is coded for the separatist conflict in Aceh might be quite different to how it is coded for the separatist conflict in Papua, at the other end of Indonesia. Another difference is that *Peacebuilding Compared* is content to code conflicts that are many things at once. For example, *Peacebuilding Compared* codes Aceh and Papua as separatist conflicts and also as ethnic conflicts. This is different from the approach in the quantitative literature, which tends to force conflicts into one category or another. Third, as is clear from appendices at the end of each chapter, we also enter certain codes as 'consensus' codes among scholars and other expert commentators on the case, and others as 'contested but credible'.

A difference from the ethnographic/qualitative literature is that *Peacebuilding Compared* is much less engaged with adjudicating the most contested debates about the case. We just code them as contested interpretations and we report the nature of the contestation in our narrative. What we are interested in doing is ruling out non-credible interpretations. Conflict zones are teeming with them: wild unsubstantiated rumours, ridiculous theories propagated by people who

---

4 *Peacebuilding Compared* studies armed conflicts where one armed group with a command structure—even if its organisational auspices were episodic or non-institutionalised—engaged in a group attack with weapons on another armed group with a command structure. This means a clash of two warlord armies or two armed gangs may count as an armed conflict for *Peacebuilding Compared* if it passes certain other threshold conditions. For the moment, these are that two of the following three conditions are met: that at least 200 people were killed in the fighting within three years; at least 30 000 people were driven from their homes by the fighting; and an internationally sanctioned peacekeeping mission was sent to make peace in the war-torn region. Including the last condition prevents us from excluding from consideration serious armed conflicts that started but were prevented from escalating into mass slaughter by the peacekeepers (for example, the arrival of UN peacekeepers in Timor-Leste in 2006). This, however, is just a starting definition for our armed conflicts that might change as new wars occur. It sets a threshold that excludes a lot of conflicts that one might want to include. In the context of Indonesia, if we assume (probably correctly) that the attacks on the Chinese community in Jakarta resulting in some 1200 deaths in 1998 were orchestrated by the Indonesian military, this is a conflict that still would not satisfy the conditions for inclusion in *Peacebuilding Compared*. It was an ethnically targeted riot that did not escalate to armed conflict according to our definition.

spread lies to protect their culpability, clever pieces of misinformation planted by double agents and imagined histories concocted by supposed combatants with grandiose visions of their own self-importance to saving their nation. A significant level of fieldwork on the ground and in the capitals of combatant and peacekeeping states (or at UN headquarters) is needed. The intent is not to get the research team to the point where it can settle the most contested debates among the experts, but to the point where it can rule out most (hopefully all) the myriad non-credible interpretations.

This renders *Peacebuilding Compared* a distinctive form of comparativism. The approach was motivated by reading most of the best research as falling into one of two camps. The first is a large number of wonderful books on particular conflicts, or comparing a couple, written by scholars who have deep knowledge and long experience of that region. The second is the more recent quantitative tradition led by outstanding comparatists such as Ted Gurr, Jack Goldstone, Paul Collier, Anke Hoeffler, Virginia Page Fortna, James Fearon, David Laitin, Michael Doyle and Nicholas Sambanis, among others cited in the references. In choosing a method that aspires to significant fieldwork engagement that is inferior to the best ethnographic work, and is on a smaller number of cases than the best quantitative work, we are simply filling a methodological niche that has been under-exploited in the literature. We do not have the view that it is necessarily a superior method to the dominant two.<sup>5</sup> One of its demands is that it

---

5 One battleground between large-n quantitative methods and single case studies arises from the qualitative critique that quantitative methods freeze (into one code) dynamic phenomena that are one thing at one point in time and another thing at another point in an unfolding conflict. This means that case studies of single conflicts do not in fact have an n of 1. Rather, they are studies of many separate episodes of violence, some of which might be more ethnic, others more religious or involving attacks by different ethnic groups than the first episode. Hence, combining the results of X qualitative analyses of protracted conflicts is more like a qualitative meta-analysis than it is like combining X cases each with an n of 1. What we are attempting in *Peacebuilding Compared* is a unique kind of meta-analytical hybrid. John Braithwaite deploys his knowledge of the narratives of the set of episodes of violence that make up a particular case to code most variables as 'High', 'Average' or 'Low' on that variable. If there is some doubt about how to code (a common occurrence), it is coded 'Average'. So, 'Average' is given the broad meaning of 'the range on this variable where most cases of armed conflict in *Peacebuilding Compared* lie'. If there is both doubt and thinness of data that make it very hard to code, it is also coded as 'Hard to code'. Imagine coding two variables on the extent to which greed and grievance are motivations for fighting. The first point to make is that they can both be high or both low or they can have different values. The second is that if greed is highly prominent in some episodes, moderately present in most and totally absent in some, the greed variable will be coded 'Average'. So, these three-point codes are really crude summaries from a sometimes large number of data points within the single case. For some variables, such as the number of combatants on various sides and the number of refugees, we code a real number (or estimate a midpoint of a best-guess range). We code, however, both a maximum number (the high-water mark of the number of combatants or refugees across all episodes of the conflict) and a separate variable, which is an estimated average number across the various episodes of the conflict. All this is perhaps only slightly less crude than a purported single quantitative estimate for a single conflict (as in the extant quantitative literature). However crude, it is an attempt to quantitatively summarise from qualitative cases that are more than narratives of an n of 1. Moreover, this approach to aggregating from a multiple-n sensibility for each conflict is combined with really writing an episodic, dynamic narrative for that conflict. This is what we are doing in each chapter of this book. The hope is that new kinds of insights will ultimately come from the interplay between multiple case study narratives and quantitative analysis of the codes with this multiple-n sensibility.

requires one person to read very extensively on each case and to be in the room or under the tree for most of the fieldwork. Otherwise it would be impossible to code the 670 variables consistently across cases. Otherwise the thematic unity of narrative volumes such as this might offer no advance on an edited collection of haphazard comparisons, insightful though such casual comparativism can be.

By 2030, we hope that some sort of cluster analysis or fuzzy set analysis to the best quantitative standards of that time will reveal something new about types of conflicts. We would also hope to define what might be the most important of probably a long list of risk factors that conduce to the persistence of armed conflict—and what are the most important protective factors for preserving peace. Narrative and analytical books such as this lay an important foundation for this future quantitative work. They discover new variables that are worth coding for all cases and new complexities in the dynamics among these variables that might ultimately account for why certain quantitative models will not explain much and why others might do so.

A final part of the method was to invite the people who seemed to be producing some of the best insights and writing the best books on the case to be members of an advisory panel; our thanks to Sinclair Dinnen for this idea. We asked the advisory panel to suggest important people to interview, to read our first draft and comment on erroneous insights within it and on research and lines of inquiry that needed to be pursued before the next draft. Many were internationally distinguished scholars. Others were PhD students, including a number from The Australian National University, who had the luxury of recently spending long periods in the field that senior scholars could not sometimes manage. We tried to recruit as interpreters individuals who were commended to us as having unusual levels of insight or contacts. Some were ex-combatants and one was the son of the leader of an insurgency. Sometimes we used two interpreters, one to lead us to informants on one side of the conflict, the other to the other side. Most often we sought out as an interpreter (collaborator) an academic who taught at a leading university in the area of the conflict. A number of advisory panel members made such great contributions to our work that we invited them to be co-authors of particular chapters. In many cases, they declined this invitation because they wanted to get on with their own writing rather than work on a text straitjacketed by the senior author's first draft. Or perhaps they just thought that first draft was awful! A few who helped a lot did not want to be acknowledged even as panel members because they feared being harassed by authorities.

Our ethical obligations under The Australian National University's Research Ethics Committee approval were explained to all participants. These included an obligation to report quotes and insights from each informant anonymously unless they specifically indicated that they wanted to be quoted as the source.

Wherever in the text a quote appears without a citation to some other source in the literature that is an anonymous quote from an informant interviewed for Peacebuilding Compared.

## The Indonesian conflicts

Few, if any, nations experienced a higher density of armed conflict in the late 1990s and early 2000s than Indonesia. Still, we must keep this in perspective by recognising that Indonesia is the fourth-largest nation on Earth, and the largest Muslim one, during a period of history in which armed conflict is unusually concentrated in Muslim nations. More than 90 per cent of Indonesia's villages and urban centres survived the 1990s and 2000s without losing a single citizen to armed conflict.

Nevertheless, Indonesia did suffer eight conflicts that met the Peacebuilding Compared definition of armed conflict in Note 4. Beyond the conflicts in Timor-Leste—which will be narrated in the fourth volume of Peacebuilding Compared—we started the research assuming Indonesia might have five post-1990 armed conflicts: in Aceh, Papua, Central Sulawesi, Maluku and Kalimantan. We found, however, that the conflict in North Maluku had to be coded very differently from the one in Maluku and that Central Kalimantan was a different conflict from West Kalimantan. One big difference in the last case, for example, was that the most dramatic aspect of the West Kalimantan conflict involved the ethnic cleansing of Madurese by ethnic Malays. In Central Kalimantan, there was no Malay–Madurese armed conflict, only conflict between Madurese and Dayaks. To count as separate in Peacebuilding Compared, conflicts must be separated in time or space, or both, though they may occur within the same nation. That said, it should be recognised that the same conflict can be intermittent and flare up at different points in time and space. For example, the Free Papua Movement insurgency first sprang up in one corner of Papua, then later in another corner. If the intermittent flare-ups can be coded in roughly the same way, they will be treated as part of the one armed conflict.<sup>6</sup>

## Separatist, ethnic and religious conflicts

Aceh and Papua are often described as separatist conflicts because the objective of the Free Aceh Movement (GAM) and the Free Papua Movement (OPM) was independence of their province from Indonesia. The Kalimantan conflicts are often described as ethnic. The conflicts in Central Sulawesi, Maluku and North

---

<sup>6</sup> How intermittent versus continuous a conflict is between its start date and its finish date is also something we code.

Maluku are usually described as religious wars between Muslims and Christians. While these adjectives capture the dominant thrust of each of these conflicts, the narratives in this book show that such a separatist-ethnic-religious typology is far too simple. For example, Chapter 5 shows that class conflicts of different kinds are central to understanding the West Kalimantan conflict.

Let us illustrate further with the way Chapter 3 describes the fighting in North Maluku. At first, it broke out between two ethnic groups—the Kao (with Jailolo) and Makians—over a change in subdistrict boundaries close to a goldmine and over a marginalised group (the Kao) feeling they were discriminated against by the government. In time, conflict erupted across the fault lines of a number of more enduring ethnic divides, such as between Tidorese and Ternateans, between the Ternatean ethnic traditionalism of North Ternate and the multicultural Muslim modernism of South Ternate, and many other ethnic tensions and land disputes that might or might not have been connected to ethnicity in different parts of the province. There was conflict among the military and the stirrings of democracy among students, between the police and the military, between the Sultan of Ternate's palace guards and people who felt they had been threatened or tortured by them because of their political opposition to the sultan. There was levelling rioting directed by disparate mobs at the Chinese business community. There was armed conflict between gangs hired to support different political parties. There were rioting university students and other youth who believed in democracy/*reformasi* railing against what they saw as a feudal order harnessed by Golkar (former President Suharto's party) and epitomised by the sultan. There was the movement for a jihadist Islamic turn that expanded throughout Indonesia in the 1990s versus local syncretic Islam. Indeed, the most politically decisive pitched battle opposed one Islamic force against another (one supportive of the sultan, the other opposed). There were local groups who joined the North Maluku conflict to settle scores on any number of idiosyncratic humiliations or slights that someone on the other side had inflicted on them. There were some who became highly motivated for more 'rational' reasons, such as the desire for jobs at a goldmine. There is increasing evidence from the literature on modern conflict that fights that start for even the most noble ideals attract psychopaths to the front line who seek out rape, torture and mutilation (for example, Collier 2007:29–30). Especially on the Christian side in North Maluku, a progressive yet rapid shift from capture of the conflict by a sometime ethical idealism of pastors to capture by psychopaths was evident. This is not to deny that a great deal, even most, of the human rights abuses are 'good people doing bad things'; it is just to say that psychopaths join conflicts and over time increasing numbers of traumatised and vengeful fighters model psychopathic scripts rather than follow the ethical compass that launched their struggle.

In all of the conflicts discussed in this book, revenge for relatives and friends lost in earlier phases of the conflict is one of the most important motivations for new fighters and groups of fighters joining a conflict. It would therefore be more accurate to describe many episodes in these mostly intermittent conflicts as revenge conflicts than as separatist, ethnic or religious conflicts. Some conflicts that start with motivations that are chiefly about greed, such as control of a goldmine, end being motivated chiefly by grievance over what has happened in earlier phases of fighting. Many conflicts that start chiefly with a grievance motivation end with a large component of motivation by greed as warlord armies morph into protection rackets and organised crime groups. Elements of GAM in Aceh and OPM in Papua illustrate this dynamic well (Chapters 6 and 2). In all of the conflicts in this book, elements of the Indonesian army operated as organised crime groups that ran rackets in arenas that included protection, illegal logging, drug trafficking, arms trading with insurgents and enforcement of commodity cartels. These were conflicts that were therefore many things at once and were best coded as such. Wars are often organised crime problems and crime is often organised as war. They must also be understood as many things at once if we are to grapple with what are the reconciliatory strategies that might work, or might fail because they are pitched at too truncated a vision of what a war is about. They must be studied in an integrated micro–macro explanatory framework if we are to understand the forms of bottom-up reconciliation needed and the forms of top-down and middle-out reconciliations needed to grapple with more macro-grievances.

The period 1996–99 saw some anti-Chinese rioting in West Kalimantan, Maluku, North Maluku, Central Sulawesi and even Papua to a small degree (Purdey 2006:219–20). Aceh did not seem to experience this, though Aceh had in earlier decades and centuries suffered much more extensive slaughter and had ethnically cleansed more than half its Chinese, especially in 1966.<sup>7</sup> As we will see in the next two volumes of *Peacebuilding Compared*, with the conflicts in East Timor, Bougainville and Solomon Islands as well, Chinese were targeted by violence even though they were not the central players in the conflicts concerned. Across Asia and the Pacific, as Amy Chua (2004) has argued, the Chinese are a resented ‘market-dominant minority’. As with most of the structural drivers of our Indonesian conflicts, nothing transpired in the peacebuilding to address the structural driver of the recurrent targeting of Chinese businesses. This driver was economic inequality: the fact that 80 per cent of Indonesia’s private corporate wealth was owned by Chinese and that 13 of the 15 biggest taxpayers in the late 1990s were Chinese, the other two being President Suharto’s sons

---

7 Chapter 5 also shows the Chinese factor has indirect relevance in the Dayak–Madurese conflicts in Central and West Kalimantan as Madurese immigrants sought to take over some of the economic niches that had previously been occupied by Chinese in the interior of Kalimantan, fomenting a kind of ethnic successor resentment (see Davidson 2008b).

(Purdey 2006:22). The fact that so few Chinese were killed in these conflicts compared with groups of other ethnicities, even though their properties were so often targeted, does make one wonder whether opportunistic looting could have been a bigger motivation than resentment over inequality. Another reason was that our interviews revealed a widespread philosophy of flight rather than fighting to defend property among the Chinese.

Most of the anti-Chinese rioting that occurred in Indonesia in the late 1990s was not connected with the seven armed conflicts that are the subject of this book. In addition to the upsurge in separatist violence, in ethnic cleansing and in religious battles that occurred in the three years before the turn of the millennium and the five years after it, there was an upsurge in pro-democracy and other political demonstrations that turned violent, in urban riots of other kinds connected with a quite disparate range of grievances, including food riots, in 'anti-vice' militias attacking nightclubs and other places seen as a threat to an Islamic way of life, and in terrorism. All these forms of violence declined from the middle years of the 2000s or earlier. The argument of this book is that while each form of violence that spiked around the turn of the millennium had specific, usually very local, kinds of explanations, there were also national and global factors of some general explanatory purchase across all the forms the historical spike in violence took. We focus particularly on anomie as a macro-sociological explanation that fits our early cases.

## **Descent into authoritarianism and well-ordered crony capitalism**

When the Dutch East India Company colonised what is today Indonesia, it was one of the wealthiest parts of the world. That wealth was based on highly elaborated trading networks that stretched north-east to China and north-west to the Malay Peninsula, India and the Arab world. Capitalism based on vibrant inter-town trade was as emergent across the archipelago as it was in the Hansa League in Europe. Chapters 3 and 6 provide especially pointed accounts of how the Dutch East India Company crushed these flourishing markets by using force of arms to impose corporate commodity monopolies. We will also see that in different ways in different cases, colonial ethnic politics in some places created groups with privileged access to government jobs and education, while in other cases they consciously sought to divide and conquer, forging new ethnic and religious identities that were hostile to competitors (Davidson 2008b:182–7).<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> Citing Davidson here should not be taken to imply that Davidson finds colonial history fundamental to the explanation of violence from 1997 across Indonesia; he does not. Moreover, in the case of West Kalimantan, he finds a more important causal role in the early New Order's 'destabilizing politicisation of ethnicity' (Davidson 2008b:202).

Indonesia not only suffered comparatively greater economic decline than other developing economies because of the way colonialism operated there, it had a less benign exit from colonialism than countries that were assisted to establish democracy before European masters voluntarily handed over power. Indonesia had to fight the Dutch for independence for four years between 1945 and 1949. In Aceh, this armed independence struggle has raged for most of the period since 1873 (Chapter 6).

This left Indonesia with a legacy like that of China in the sense that a rural-based people's army was the great unifying force of the new nation, and like Burma, where a politicised army was forged in a struggle to oust British colonialism (Crouch 1988; Singh 1995:8). We will argue that the military that liberated Indonesia became the font of new forms of exploitation of its people. The military took over many Dutch businesses and also became the principal source of managerial competence in the new nation for several decades. Under its 'dual role' as a 'military force' and a 'social-political force'—a philosophy installed in the unstable late years of the Sukarno presidency—the military became powerful at all levels of government (Crouch 1988; Singh 1995; Lowry 1996). Policies to bring the military under democratic control had little traction until the governments of Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono from 2004 (Mietzner 2009:360). The circumstances of anomie until then meant that, as in the rape and razing of East Timor in 1999, the military could manage crises in open defiance of the preferences of their president.

While Dutch colonialism and Indonesian military authoritarianism after independence were important elements of the deep historical structures that opened up many of the fissures in Indonesian society in the late 1990s, we will also see that they quelled a great deal of internal conflict. 'Pacification' is an odd word in the Dutch colonial lexicon for how headhunting, cannibalism, intertribal warfare and other forms of internal violence were ended across Indonesia. 'Pacification' was in fact substantially achieved at the point of a gun in many parts of the colony. Henley (2004) concluded, however, that indigenous groups across the archipelago often welcomed 'stranger-kings' when they could solve their Hobbesian problem by superior firepower and unbiased arbitration that stood above local divisions. Some ceased inter-group warfare the moment the Dutch arrived, seemingly relieved with the excuse to end the life 'dominated by fear' of feuds (Li 2001:50). Li (2001:50) quotes one of her Lauje hill farmers from Central Sulawesi expressing gratitude to the colonial and the post-colonial state: 'In the old days there was fighting because people were not afraid of the government. Now it is safe because the government is strong.'

Likewise, in an ethnically fragmented country in the six decades since independence, the military has successfully nipped in the bud countless outbreaks of internal conflict. Only about 7 per cent of the villages in Indonesia

experienced (mostly low-level) local conflict in 2002, just past the peak of Indonesian violence, with only one-quarter of these incidents resulting in a death. Of the 3544 village-level local conflicts reported by village heads to have been resolved in 2002, in 46 per cent of the cases it was the security forces who were reported to have resolved them, with Java being the region where the security forces were most successful in driving the resolution. In Aceh, they were least effective (Barron et al. 2004:13). This must be balanced by grasping the fact that even more of the conflicts were stopped by local civil society in the village. It is also important to understand that community self-organisation of security in the form of citizen checkpoints, night watches and the like is predictive of low conflict, as is the density of places of worship (which this book repeatedly shows to be peacemaking nodes) and the presence of a democratically elected village council (which can lend legitimacy to village peacemaking) (Barron et al. 2004:27). In the big picture, however, colonial and post-colonial military forces played a huge role in creating Indonesia as a large pacified space that imposed a nation on an archipelago of cultures.

Indonesia enjoyed a comparatively short period of post-colonial republican democracy before President Sukarno installed 'guided democracy' in 1957, formally dissolving the elected parliament in 1960.<sup>9</sup> Guided democracy was really a balance of power between the president, the army leadership and the Indonesian Communist Party (the largest in the world after the Chinese and Soviet parties) (Crouch 1988:45). As inflation reached 500 per cent, an alleged communist coup attempt led to General Suharto displacing Sukarno's old order in 1965. Suharto's 'New Order' was anti-communist but authoritarian. Perhaps 500 000 people believed to be members of the Indonesian Communist Party were slaughtered in the aftermath of the Suharto takeover (Cribb 2001).

The New Order was authoritarian rather than totalitarian; it left space for a 'limited pluralism' (Aspinall 2005a:3). This limited pluralism meant political activism was possible for reforms that did not challenge the fundamentals of the regime. It was a combination of repression and constrained forms of political reformism that rendered the New Order more resilient than an unfettered totalitarianism that might have radicalised a revolutionary opposition (Aspinall 2005a). By the 1980s and 1990s, Indonesia suffered extraordinarily systematic corruption, with the Suharto family and its Javanese military and Chinese business cronies the primary beneficiaries of its 'crony capitalism'.

---

9 Guided democracy was thin on checks and balances, but did incorporate an Indonesian conception of deliberative democracy as *musjawarah*. Sukarno articulated it as traditional village democracy as practised in Java, Bali, Lombok, Sulawesi and elsewhere: 'But do they in these village meetings apply the practice of voting? Of free-fight liberalism where half plus one is always right? No my friends...Everybody says something different until at one time a compromise is achieved out of all these different opinions, without voting...There is not dictatorship in *musjawarah* and *musfakat*. That is why democracy with leadership is a true, original Indonesian democracy' (Grant 1996:126).

Nevertheless, huge Western investment for the three decades of the New Order was attracted by the stability and anti-communism of the regime combined with its geopolitical importance, rich oil, gas, mineral and other resources and impressive national investment in education. Institutional weakness in banking and many other sectors mediated by the massive corruption of crony capitalism ultimately rendered this a fragile accomplishment. Most of the international capital that had flowed to Indonesia fled overnight when the Asian financial crisis descended in 1997. This crisis affected Indonesia more than any nation and was greater than Indonesia had experienced during the decade after the Great Depression of 1929 (Hill 2007). What Indonesia suffered in 1997–98 was, in the words of Paul Krugman (2008:92), ‘one of the worst economic slumps in world history’.

## **Indonesian renaissance of peace, democracy and prosperity**

Other books have documented how the Asian financial crisis ushered in the collapse of Suharto’s New Order in May 1998 (Aspinall 2005a; Bertrand 2004; Rinakit 2005). What is relevant to this book is that all the conflicts discussed herein, plus the conflict in East Timor, escalated markedly after the New Order collapsed, even though those in Aceh, Papua, East Timor and West Kalimantan had begun before the collapse. In addition to these eight armed conflicts that each resulted in more than 1000 deaths, in many other parts of Indonesia there was an upsurge in ethnic and religious rioting—targeted mainly against Chinese—that incinerated many homes and businesses and cost thousands of lives (Lindsey and Pausacker 2005; Purdey 2006). The anti-Chinese violence peaked first in 1998, when there were at least 34 serious outbreaks around the nation, falling to only three in 1999 (Purdey 2006:219–20). While the structural inequality between Chinese and non-Chinese Indonesians was the widest one in the nation, this ethnic conflict ended first because of widespread revulsion/shame/denial over the dozens (perhaps hundreds) of rapes of Chinese women that occurred in May 1998, the shock at the loss of about 1200 lives in Jakarta (mostly of looters caught in fires) and the widespread belief that the riots, rapes and anti-Chinese hysteria had been provoked by pro-Suharto military leaders. For all kinds of violence combined, 1999–2001 was the worst period in Indonesia (Varshney et al. 2004:23). Terrorist bombings by Islamic groups, particularly Jemaah Islamiyah, were the last form of violence to fall sharply. There was considerable decline in terror after the first Bali bombing in 2002 and the second in 2005 (Table 1.1).<sup>10</sup> Nine deaths on 17 July 2009 in Jakarta hotel bombings

<sup>10</sup> By 2005, support in public opinion polls for Al-Qaeda had also fallen dramatically from 58 per cent of the population in 2002. During the second Gulf War, Saddam Hussein was the most popular name for babies

were suspected at the time of writing to be revenge attacks for the execution of the Bali bombers by a Jemaah Islamiyah splinter group masterminded by Malaysian hold-out Noordin Top, who was killed in a shootout with the police.

**Table 1.1 Terrorist fatalities recorded in the Global Terrorism Database**

1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
9	71	79	52	233	12	49	79	9	3	0

Source: Global Terrorism Database, University of Maryland and US Department of State, *Patterns of Global Terrorism* report, viewed 15 March 2009, <<http://www.state.gov/s/ct/rls/crt/s00s/pdf/index.htm>>

Note: These public databases exclude large numbers of terrorist incidents in Indonesia of which the authors are aware, but nevertheless portray accurately the *pattern* of their rise and fall.

The period 1999–2002 seemed to many commentators to forebode a break-up akin to that of the Soviet Union and the former Yugoslavia. Two leaders, President B. J. Habibie and President Abdurrahman Wahid, lost their jobs in quick succession because they were unable to control the violence more than perhaps for any other single reason. Indonesian politics had also taken a radical Islamic turn away from its traditional commitment to preserving a state based on religious tolerance. In the seven years after the fall of the New Order, Indonesia’s terrorism problem worsened dramatically, as hard as its leadership attempted to suppress news of the extent of what was going on. Few nations experienced anything like the simultaneous bombing of 38 Christian churches across Indonesia during Christmas Eve services in 2000. Only two of these incidents are recorded in the databases that generate the numbers in Table 1.1. Indeed few of the Indonesian terrorism incidents known to the authors—even one incident in which possibly 200 people perished in a mosque bombed by Christians—are recorded in the international databases. This is because their main source is searches of wire services and ‘major international newspapers’, which take little interest in remote islands of the Indonesian archipelago. Moreover, the international media was denied access to them by the army when they did show some interest at times of acute violence. Beyond terrorism, we look back with amazement at vividly filmic battles that were not reported by the international media, in which thousands of Muslim fighters were arrayed against Christian ‘armies’ led by pastors leading the faithful into battle singing *Onward Christian Soldiers*.

Beneath the surface during these terrible seven post-Suharto years, Indonesia was really renewing itself rather than disintegrating. We will see that a corrupt, violent and anti-democratic military was at the heart of Indonesia’s problems during this period—and still is today. In 2004, however, the leader of the democratic reform faction in the Indonesian military, General Yudhoyono,

---

born in Indonesia (Kivimäki 2007).

became president in an election with an 84 per cent voter turnout. That was the last year of the fighting in what had been the most deadly conflicts of the previous decade in Aceh and Maluku. Deeper reform dynamics were in play in Indonesia than simply the assumption of power by a non-corrupt president who was a democrat, a reformer of the military and a peacemaker. The lifting of New Order authoritarianism had also engaged a renewal of Indonesian civil society and business. According to a Reporters Without Borders index, Indonesia had acquired one of the freest presses in Asia and the Pacific (UNDP 2006). The devastating effects on the country of religious conflict energised widespread leadership from all faiths, but especially from Islamic *ulamas*, working for religious tolerance. This is not to argue that suddenly all was rosy in Indonesia. One interviewee expresses the change as everything moving in the right direction now but far, far too slowly. Many people see President Yudhoyono pushing for deeper democracy and freedom, but he is also seen as weak and easily deflected by opposition from ultranationalists and military conservatives who he fears—with good reason—could unseat him. We see the effects of this weakness in the president in the next chapter in his failure to confront military excess in West Papua (compared with the willingness he showed to do so in Aceh; Chapter 6). Caveats aside—and Papua is a huge one—what we have seen in the past six years is a remarkable renaissance of peace, unity, tolerance, improved governance and democracy in Indonesia. While most of these changes have been painfully gradual, the decline in violence has been remarkably sharp. These are the key elements of the renaissance.

- While few, if any, nations would have experienced more terrorist bombings than Indonesia between 1999 and 2002, the years since saw a sharp decline, though the problem was still acute until 2005.
- For the seven conflicts in this book (plus East Timor), we have seen a shift to positive peace in all but one: Papua, which at least has a (fragile) negative peace.<sup>11</sup>
- Ethnic rioting targeting Chinese homes and businesses has reduced to near zero from a remarkably widespread pattern of ethnic vilification in the 1990s (Purdey 2006).
- For the period 2000–03, Indonesia had one of the highest number of ‘Recorded Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances’ by the Geneva Declaration (2008:135)—43—declining to just one for 2004–07 (though there were unrecorded cases in West Papua in this period). As with the numbers

---

11 Negative peace means the absence of war in this project, while positive peace means a peace secured through commitment to the justice of the post-conflict institutional settlement (see Galtung 1969 for the original formulation). Also see, in turn, the foundations for this in the seventeenth-century thought of the Dutch philosopher Baruch de Spinoza: ‘Peace is not an absence of war, it is a virtue, a state of mind, a disposition for benevolence, confidence, justice’ (cited in New Internationalist 2005:82).

for terrorist attacks, this database gets the pattern right, but the absolute numbers are way too low (Hernawan 2008).

- The Indonesian homicide rate today of probably about 1 per 100 000 people is lower than that in most continental European and Anglo-Saxon societies. Between 1999 and 2005, it had the lowest imprisonment rate (28 per 100 000) in the world (Karstedt 2010), though it has probably slipped a few places since. This is a big change from the 1970s and 1980s, when unrecorded murders—particularly of citizens the military believed to be criminals—were widespread and when Indonesia maintained a vast carceral complex for unknown numbers of political prisoners. It is also a big improvement since a decade ago when people lived in acute fear of armed gangs in many parts of Indonesia.
- While corruption is still a very large problem in Indonesia, vibrant anti-corruption efforts have escalated since 2004 that have included undercover and sting operations. Since then, 317 Members of Parliament (mostly not national), three national ministers, five provincial governors and other senior officials in the judiciary, police and regulatory agencies as well as CEOs of major private companies have been prosecuted, with acquittals rare (Jasan 2009).<sup>12</sup>
- Notwithstanding sharp falls on the Jakarta stock exchange in the worldwide recession of 2009, the Indonesian economy had been recovering well before then (Hill 2007) and still grew strongly during 2009, with its banking and other institutions renewed by improved private and public governance. An example was institutional renewal of tax administration, which resulted in steep increases in voluntary compliance and in tax collected by 2008.
- Democracy has become slowly yet progressively more deeply institutionalised. Indonesia shifted in a decade from being one of the least democratic countries in South-East Asia to perhaps the most democratic, along with its former province Timor-Leste. Dissent and freedom of the press are vibrant. Not only can elected national presidents, provincial governors and district *bupatis* be defeated at election without violence, Indonesia has become an interesting experiment in bottom-up democratisation of development planning from the village and subdistrict levels upwards through the World Bank-funded Kecamatan Development Program and the Indonesian Government's *Musrenbang*. Most chapters of this book describe successes and limits of this

---

12 At the time of writing in 2009, there was concern that political support for tough corruption enforcement could be waning, with, for example, President Yudhoyono being publicly critical of sting operations against fellow politicians during the 2009 election campaign. November 2009 saw large demonstrations to push the president to step up his anti-corruption promises after allegations that the police framed and arrested two deputies of the Anti-Corruption Commission who were investigating corruption by senior police (see various articles in *The Jakarta Post* throughout November–December 2009, especially 6 December). In response, after initial vacillation, at the time of writing, the president seemed to be saying that he was firm about renewing his anti-corruption commitments.

new local participatory decision making in the part of Indonesia discussed in the chapter.

## Recovery from anomie

Amy Chua (2004:293) opined in the final paragraph of her interesting book on how democracy could unleash violence against 'market-dominant minorities' (such as the Chinese in Indonesia) that 'the results of democratisation in Indonesia have been disastrous'. Like many others, she reached a conclusion too soon. Democratic integration of 300 ethnic groups dispersed across 13 000 islands and building new institutions after four decades of autocracy are not challenges that can be met overnight. We can interpret such a sharp rise and steep fall in conflict in Indonesia before and after the millennium in anomie theory terms (Durkheim 1897; Merton 1949). The Greek etymology of 'anomie' is from 'a' (without) and 'nomos' (law). 'Norms' is a much wider concept than law today: it means customary expectations of behaviour that coordinate interactions with others. Anomie is instability resulting from a breakdown of the regulatory order that secures norms. We might also interpret the sharp rise in the size of the Indonesian underground economy at the end of the New Order (Wibowo 2001; van Klinken 2007:49) in these anomie theory terms. Karstedt (2006:55) concludes that increased homicide rates following transitions to democracy are not usually short-term results of disruption from the demise of an autocracy, but involve anomic tendencies that persist through quite a long duration of transition. We saw extremely elevated homicide rates for many years in post-communist transitions, and in South Africa, for example. Karstedt (2006:64) argues that the data show that 'when the grip of an authoritarian regime loosens, the anomic tendencies produced during the preceding period of autocracy erupt in violent conflicts and a wave of violent crime'.

Ordinary Indonesians often describe themselves as '*di antara dua dunia*'—between two worlds (of tradition and modernity). This implies a clear separation between the traditional and the modern that is too simple for the more messy reality of norms in flux, of unsettled contexts in which norms of tradition and rapidly evolving norms of modernity might evoke commitment. Indonesia in 1998 was a society in which norms were in such flux that it was hard for people to identify any semblance of a position that marked a normative constellation of the 'good citizen'.

The source of anomie in many parts of Indonesia from the late 1990s was the collapse of Suharto's New Order in conditions of uncertainty created by the Asian financial crisis. Jacques Bertrand's (2004:5) analysis was that this was a 'critical juncture' in state development: 'when institutions are weakened during transition periods, allocations of power and resources become open for

competition.’ Jemma Purdey (2006:203) articulated this in a slightly different way: ‘many Indonesians interpreted *reformasi* [post-Suharto] as a new freedom to resolve injustices, perceived or real, by means of mass mobilisation.’ The Indonesian state under Sukarno and Suharto sowed seeds of this normative flux by valorizing militias and vigilantes in defence of the ‘nation’ by its use of imagery of Pattimura and other guerrilla heroes from the struggle against Dutch colonialism (Cookson 2008). In some contexts of anomie, including many of those described in the chapters that follow, violence becomes an effective form of competition. Institutions are a society’s most embedded rules of the game. The situation in Indonesia in 1998 was that the old rules were swept away for a period. What the new rules of the game would be was up for grabs. From 2004, Mietzner (2009:377) saw a new consolidation of the polity, whereby

the norms of democratic competition were clarified in new sets of legal regulations, providing alternative institutional mechanisms to resolve disputes not only between state institutions, but also between powerful civilian groups. This, in turn, helped reduce the tendency of civilian leaders to mobilise their masses against opponents, and consequently undermined the position of the armed forces as conflict mediators.

Merton (1949) gave anomie a specific meaning in terms of the structure of institutions. The unfettering of individuals and organisations from settled norms arises in conditions where there is a discrepancy between widely shared societal goals and legitimate means to obtain them. Structural shifts in the society prevent actors from achieving valued goals legitimately, so they experience strain to resort to illegitimate means of attaining those goals. Armed violence is one such illegitimate means. Merton’s way of building on Durkheim is attractive here because what happened in Indonesia in 1997–98 was a rupture of the normative order and a rupture of the opportunity structure. Both were involved in the scramble for new kinds of illegitimate opportunities.

Anxiety and uncertainty about what the rules of the game would be in the new institutional order led to acutely defensive reactions to political events that might have been interpreted more benignly in other times. For example, among many Christians in Central Sulawesi, Maluku and North Maluku, Habibie becoming president in May 1998 was feared to be the completion of an Islamic takeover of a formerly secular state (Sidel 2008). The reason for this interpretation was that Habibie had been the leader of the Association of Indonesian Islamic Intellectuals, whose mission was to increase the influence of Islamic norms and values within the state, and political leadership by the faithful.

In some of our cases (Maluku, North Maluku, Central Sulawesi and to a lesser extent Aceh),<sup>13</sup> though not in others (Papua, West Kalimantan, Central Kalimantan), anomie was mediated by a security dilemma. The valued goal at issue for village leaders was security for the village. The legitimate means to that goal was calling in protection from the security forces. Unfortunately, in a case such as Maluku, it was often the security forces that did most of the killing. Local Christian police were killing many Muslims and the (mostly non-Malukan) military accounted for much of the slaughter of Christians. The security dilemma was that Muslim and Christian villages wanted peace, yet Christians came to believe that unless they drove out Muslims first, Muslims would attack them, and vice versa. The blockage of legitimate means to security resulted in resort to illegitimate means: forming militias and making homemade weapons to attack neighbours, burning their homes to the ground and driving them out.

The security dilemma was in turn driven by security sector anomie. The New Order had been forged by the military. When the New Order collapsed, there were various factions within the military. Some generals wanted the military to step back from its political role and submit to democratically elected leaders. Others wanted to destabilise the emerging Indonesian democracy and reassert political control by the military elite through physical intimidation. Others simply wanted to exploit the climate of instability to make money by demanding protection payments from frightened people or by selling weapons or ammunition. In Maluku, there were even military snipers who sold their assassination skills to both sides. In short, when legitimate paths to power were blocked for the military, many seized illegitimate opportunities to recoup wealth and power.

Security sector anomie played a role in all of the conflicts in this book—and in East Timor as well—as did attempts by political opportunists of various kinds to impose new rules of the game in conditions where the old rules had collapsed. Most regions, however, moved through to the new millennium without any escalation of political violence. Three factors distinguished the regions where national anomie played out as regional violence: 1) regional grievances that were structurally deep; 2) leaders with an entrepreneurial determination to connect those grievances to an identity politics that could mobilise organisations and people to violence; and 3) security sector anomie sufficiently deep (in that locality) to accelerate the violence.

The Indonesian patterns of transitional violence fit the finding from quantitative studies that semi-democracies are more likely to suffer civil war

---

<sup>13</sup> Some Javanese and Gayonese minority communities were attacked by GAM for fear they might form militias with the support of the Indonesian military.

than full democracies or autocracies (Esty et al. 1998; Hegre et al. 2001; Gurr 2000; Marshall and Gurr 2003:19–20; Fearon and Laitin 2003; Mansfield and Snyder 2007). In a case such as the initial outbreak of Kao grievances against the Makians in North Maluku (Chapter 3), the state was ‘neither democratic enough to reduce grievances by allowing greater participation nor autocratic enough to be able to suppress opposition during the early stages of rebellion’ (Doyle and Sambanis 2006:35). Indonesia also fits de Tocqueville’s (1955:182) hypothesis that ‘[u]sually the most dangerous time for a bad government is when it attempts to reform itself’ (see also Huntington 1991). Regime change triples the risk of civil war soon after the change, reducing to double the risk a year later (Hegre et al. 2001). In effect, Indonesia stumbled violently from being a stable autocracy to being an unstable semi-democracy. Ultimately, however, the resilience of its civil society and political leadership saw it through on the other side to become a society with good prospects of being a stable full democracy. It is not there yet and at the time of writing it faces the formidable challenge of surviving the 2009 world recession less violently than it did the 1997 Asian financial crisis. While 2009 saw another escalation of armed violence in West Papua, the 2009 national election campaign that re-elected President Yudhoyono was overwhelmingly peaceful and honest.

Our interviews suggested that after West Kalimantan erupted in 1997, modelling or emulation effects accelerated anomie effects on conflicts. The Central Kalimantan attempt at ethnic cleansing of Madurese involved considerable modelling of ethnic cleansing in West Kalimantan. The attempts by Muslims to cleanse Christians and vice versa in other locations also involved some emulation of Kalimantan and other provinces where this had happened. Demands for referenda backed by insurgency in Aceh and Papua involved considerable emulation of East Timor.

## The multidimensional drivers of war and peace

The simplest message of this book is about complexity.<sup>14</sup> It is that a complex of factors—structural, proximate and precipitating—are involved in the onset of these armed conflicts. Each chapter organises this complex of drivers of conflict into the structural then the proximate factors, then the precipitating events, then the types of actors that play out these events, the motivational postures

---

<sup>14</sup> One of our referees worried at the thought that complexity could be a theme of the book, calling for pruning of explanations that did not connect with the core ones of anomie, memory/forgetting and reconciliation. We suspect complexity will, however, be precisely a theme we theorise in future volumes, not necessarily in formal complexity or chaos theory terms. The discussion of redundancy in the theory of prevention in the concluding sections of Chapter 3 gives only glimpses of how this theory development is progressing. We feel we need to accumulate more complexity before we are ready to offer a theory of complexity and multidimensionality in peacebuilding.

and principles they mobilise and the strengths and weaknesses of peacebuilding in this case. While we explore our emergent overarching themes of anomie and recording of truth and reconciliation in each chapter, we also discuss all the candidates for variables that credible commentators on the case would regard as more important drivers of conflict than these. All of them are coded for future quantitative analysis.

There is also a complex relationship between the factors involved in the onset of war and those implicated in the onset of peace; some peacebuilding factors are a mirror image of war-making factors, others are not. Likewise, a diversity of actors drives the decisions that induce armed conflict. Sometimes these actors flip from war-makers to peacemakers; sometimes very different people and organisations do the peacebuilding from those who executed armed conflict and sowed its seeds. Religious leaders, political leaders and journalists in all of these cases played roles in fanning flames of conflict by propagating from their privileged communication forums bellicose interpretations of comparatively minor incidents in the early stages of the conflict. Different religious, political and journalistic leaders also became leaders in brokering and promoting peace.

Kivimäki's (2004) work discussed in Chapter 5 shows that combatant groups often have very different conceptions to their opponents of what the fighting is about. This leads to the following kind of strategic mistake. The group that thinks this is a local turf war between gangs looks at its local dominance and thinks it will win; the group that interprets it as an inter-ethnic war looks at the greater strength of its ethnic group across a whole province and decides it will win. Peace journalism has a critical role in educating gangs that are escalating a conflict because they think they will win. It challenges their understanding of why the other group is fighting. If they did understand why their enemies were fighting, they might comprehend the disaster they could bring on themselves and their families.

Each of our cases also reveals quite idiosyncratic actors playing important roles in building peace. For example, in West Kalimantan and Central Kalimantan, there were credit unions that had previously been vehicles for creating economic opportunities for disadvantaged Dayaks. Post-conflict, these credit unions started extending assistance to needy and displaced Madurese and they started employing Madurese for the first time. This was a tangible and helpful manifestation of reconciliation in these conflicts. Such micro-finance illustrates one of our main points about the importance to peace of contextual micro-leadership in resolving conflicts that have macro-structural drivers.

Some of these conflicts started as riots sparked by relatively inconsequential fights between young men, stonings of houses or even traffic accidents. While we will have something to say about dowsing sparks as one of the things a

multidimensional strategy of peacebuilding needs to accomplish, these sparks are preceded by a build-up of expectation. Hence, when the triggering incident snapped, there were sighs and cries that 'it's finally started'. So if one spark had not lit the conflagration, another might have. We concluded from these Indonesian conflicts that if an effective security sector response could not succeed in dousing all the potential initial sparks, it generally could, with time and determination, extinguish the youthful rioting and inter-gang fighting that escalated from the initial incident. The fact that it often did not was a reflection on the Indonesian security sector's anomie of the period.

In the inter-religious conflicts in Maluku, North Maluku and Central Sulawesi, when a security dilemma ensued from escalated fighting and house burning by semi-organised youth gangs, the age structure of the combatants changed.<sup>15</sup> When older men (and sometimes women) felt that the situation had deteriorated as their village descended into a dilemma of attack or be attacked, they became leaders of the conflict, organising younger fighters into disciplined units and mobilising the resources for the acquisition and production of weapons. In all of the cases that started with youthful fighting there were also older male political opportunists who saw leadership of organised combatants as a path to their personal political and economic ascendancy in a time when uncertain rules of the political game seemed to open up opportunities for opportunists. When a conflict becomes ripe for peace making as exhausted fighters find themselves in a hurting stalemate (Zartman 1985), we find the key players tend to become even older men and women. In Barron et al.'s (2004:27) study of 4872 outbreaks of local conflict across Indonesia, the presence of a female village leader was statistically associated with a lower level of conflict in rural areas. Religious and *adat* (customary) elder statesmen and women whose sermons pleading for peace pushed them to the margins of political influence when the conflict was hot were increasingly turned to as it cooled into a hurting stalemate. Again, an important role of the security forces, often not realised in these Indonesian conflicts, was to prevent such prophets of peace being assassinated at the height of tensions.

Peacebuilding Compared sets out to be radically inductive in approach to understanding the drivers of war and peace. We start with real conflicts in this volume and try to understand what makes those conflicts tick and what leads to their resolution. Writing each conflict narrative has led to the addition of new variables to our coding spreadsheet, causing us to re-interrogate the data from previously coded conflicts to see if these newly discovered drivers might

---

15 Wilson's (2008) research on North Maluku, as discussed in Chapter 3, highlights the role of youthful masculinities, the pursuit of excitement in the onset of that armed conflict. Just as a demography of a youth bulge can be important to sharp upward movements in rates of common crime, so our systematic empirical work over time might show that youth bulges are associated with increased risks of armed violence, including in some of these Indonesian cases.

have been in play there, sometimes necessitating extra interviews, emails and interrogation of documentary sources to reach a view on this. Of course, we start the projects with theoretical prejudices grounded in the social science traditions in which we have lived long intellectual lives. Some of them perhaps will prove productive prejudices; others will blinker us in stupid ways. At least we can say that our prejudices are many and contradictory and our mission is to submit them to empirical contestation not only in our data collection, but by inviting our advisory panels to challenge them. We also advise everyone we interview that our working papers will be placed on the Peacebuilding Compared web site for many months before volumes such as this appear. We give them an information sheet and a pen with the web site address on it. They too are encouraged to contest our interpretations. We regret to report that our ambitions of crafting a semi-wiki approach to case studies so far has generated limited critique, however, it is still the early days of the project.

Notwithstanding this wide-ranging inductiveness, the medium-term ambition of Peacebuilding Compared is to build new theory. Our eclecticism will be patient. In the end, it will not be just an eclecticism of building longer and longer lists of relevant factors. We will seek to generate new clusters of types of conflicts and new explanations for their differential dynamics. Each volume will focus on some emergent theoretical syntheses that seem promising, if provisional.

The open-textured inductive approach to the early years of the research has led so far to a decided micro–macro interpretation of the first three volumes of cases. Structural factors in the historical background of the conflict have seemed important in each case, as have micro-factors such as individual leadership of specific kinds for war or peace. It seems a mistake to see macro-historical factors such as colonialism as slightly relevant to a long-run understanding of why a conflict is possible, but irrelevant to a contemporary understanding of how to build peace. The Aceh case (Chapter 6) illustrates how its specific history of Dutch and ‘Javanese’ internal colonialism<sup>16</sup> has framed the identities that have been at the heart of the politics of war and peace at every stage of the conflict. Shadd Maruna’s (2001) research on serious common criminals shows that when criminals put violence behind them, they do not decide that their violence was wrong so much as opt into ‘redemptive scripts’ that connote a violence that was almost unavoidable in the awful circumstances of their past. That violence was not the ‘real me’; it was, for example, the me who was recovering from abuse by my father.<sup>17</sup> Likewise, an identity politics of peace might allow combatants redemptive scripts that say things such as ‘in those times, the forces of Dutch

---

16 There is a tradition of scholarship that draws a connection between ethnic and separatist conflict and patterns of internal migration that are interpreted as ‘internal colonialism’ (Hechter 1975).

17 The operator of a gas chamber to exterminate Jews can say that was not the real me; that was the me who was terrorised by the Nazis; the Jews were lucky they had me there because I was doing my best for them

then Javanese colonialism gave us little option but to fight, but today the Helsinki peace process gives Acehnese a new opportunity to be the peaceful people we really are'. In other words, structural facts of the past often become part of a well-crafted identity politics of peace and reconciliation.

The remainder of this chapter will discuss the major findings of the book in terms of the themes of anomie and reconciliation. The next four sections give some specificity to what an opportunity-theory formulation of anomie means. First, we consider the geography of opportunity, which includes the opportunities for conflict that resources provide (a 'resource curse'?). Then we flesh out more fully how a Mertonian version of anomie theory makes sense in the Indonesian cases. The section after that considers the military opportunity structure as that site of anomie and opportunity that is particularly strategic in Indonesian conflict. Then we consider when and why military force escalates defiance rather than deters those whom the military seeks to subdue. This leads to another theoretical section on the implications of this for redundancy in peacebuilding strategy. The final sections of the chapter reveal the essence of what we have found about reconciliation, by first discussing the process for reaching peace agreements, then reintegration of combatants, then reconciliation among combatants and non-combatants across the society.

## The geography of opportunity

A perhaps banal example of a structural variable that is important to enabling and sustaining armed conflict is geography in the form of mountains to which fighters can retreat in comparative safety. The way this is explored in qualitative research such as this is different from the quantitative association that has been established between proximity of mountainous terrain and the duration of civil wars (Collier and Hoeffler 2001; Collier 2007). The importance of this variable is established by combatant leaders (and ordinary combatants) describing how important it has been to their strategy to be able to hit the enemy then run into the mountains. Aceh, Papua and Central Sulawesi particularly show the importance of this aspect of the geography of war, though it has played some part in North Maluku and Central Kalimantan as well. Geography was also a relevant structural variable in ways unique to single conflicts. The conflict in North Maluku started because Makians were forced to flee their island because of a volcano. The Kao ethnic group resented many aspects of the way Makian refugees from the volcano invaded their lands—grievances that flared in the anomic conditions of 1999. While this is a unique geographical contingency,

---

within the Nazi system; I was treating them better than they would have been treated had another guard replaced me. In other words, redemptive scripts can do remarkable work of salvaging a peaceful identity from a history of exceptionally un-peaceful conduct.

it sensitises us to the possibility that a more general cause of displacement than a volcano—rising waters from global warming—could become a growing structural driver of new conflicts. Interestingly, in Barron et al.'s (2004) quantitative analysis of 4872 local conflicts across Indonesia, there was a general positive correlation between conflict and a village being impacted by a natural disaster (see more generally Wisner et al. 2004). On the other hand, Chapter 6 shows how the tsunami in Aceh was turned into an opportunity for peace—something sadly not the effect of the same tsunami in Sri Lanka.

Another important fact in the geography of armed conflict in these cases was where natural resources such as gold, oil and gas happened to lie in the ground. While this is an enduring structural fact of the geography of these places, it often plays out as a proximate factor in conflict when the resource is discovered or commercially exploited for the first time. The data in this book give highly qualified support for the 'resource curse' thesis (Collier 2007). There are no classic instantiations of it in Indonesia in the sense of insurgents capturing a diamond mine and using the mine to fund their insurgency. This is the classic sense in which a country being blessed with a valuable, but lootable resource such as diamonds increases the incentives for insurgents to start civil wars. Ross (2003:33) and Aspinal (2007) conclude for the war in Aceh that extortion of protection money from an ExxonMobil gas project and nearby enterprises did happen and could have helped sustain the duration of that war. The 'resource curse' was not, however, the major source of funds for any side in the conflict. Aspinal (2007) sees resource politics in Aceh more in a frame of sustaining an Acehnese identity as a people whose resources have been pillaged by colonialists and imperialists, and who therefore must fight to seize back those resources. One could proffer the same kind of analysis of the significant role the US Freeport mine played in sustaining conflict in Papua. The Free Papua Movement never attempted to capture it, but at times did extort a little from it, while the Indonesian military was given an interest in sustaining the conflict by managing to extort a great deal from the mine to 'protect' it. In Papuan narratives of exploitation by the invading power from Jakarta, pillage of Papuan resources through the agency of Freeport loomed large.

The paradoxical nature of resource politics is well illustrated by the case of BP's natural gas project in West Papua. BP rejected the Indonesian military as the guarantor of its security and negotiated community-based security guarantees with local Papuan civil society and Papuan political elites. The paradox was that this created incentives for the western region of Papua around the BP project to break away from the province of Papua, creating a new province. Chapter 2 construes this new and resource-contrived partition of Papua as an important risk factor for further conflict.

More paradoxical still is the effect of the Australian Newcrest goldmine on the Kao lands in North Maluku (Chapter 3). Makian political opportunists succeeded in getting subdistrict boundaries redrawn so that the new mine would fall in lands where the population would be overwhelmingly Makian. This move was at the heart of starting a conflict that cost more than 3000 lives. Our analysis, however, accuses Newcrest of missing an opportunity for preventive diplomacy to stop this conflict before it started. We argue that it had the political connections to do that, but lacked the preventive diplomacy imagination to do so. One reason why Chapter 3 takes the resource curse argument in this paradoxical direction is that later Newcrest *did* work with the security sector to accomplish a major de-escalation of the conflict that was in fact the beginning of the end of the conflict. Resource endowments can create interests in peace just as they can constitute interests in war. Our argument becomes that diplomacy must take resource riches seriously indeed, but not in the formulaic way that the resource curse hypothesis currently projects. Second, the importance of geographical nodes of resource riches goes to the importance of preventive diplomacy as not just something foreign politicians do, but as something socially responsible businesses can do (Ford and McKenna 2008).

The data in this volume also connect resource diplomacy to Mary Kaldor's (1999) idea of protecting 'islands of civility' as a peacebuilding strategy. Chapter 3 provides two other examples where nodes of resource development motivated foreign and local business elites to work with the security forces to protect their nodes of nickel mining and oil distribution. One of these islands of resource civility became the only village on Ambon free of violence and the only place where certain peace meetings between Christians and Muslims could occur in safety. It fits Kaldor's model of an island of civility from which peacebuilding can begin to ripple.<sup>18</sup>

As with the war in Bougainville, in the Indonesian cases, the most important effect of geographically concentrated resource development in fuelling conflict

---

18 Restorative justice was one way peace was rippled out from islands of civility by the Peace Foundation Melanesia after the Bougainville civil war (Howley 2002). One village that is an island of civility extends a hand of reconciliation to a particular person in a nearby village that remains riven with hatred, violence and injustice. Perhaps they rebuild her house, which they burnt down during the war. If that woman has what Maori thinkers on restorative justice call 'mana', she can become the bridge that ripples just sensibilities out through the new village. She can be the catalyst of their local peace process. In terms of the sociology of networks, this is a 'strengths of weak ties' argument (Granovetter 1974). The idea is that justice is something that ripples out from nodes more than issues down from specialised central institutions of justice such as courts and prisons. It is a more general idea in paradigmatic shifts in sociology towards micro-macro explanation in network terms (Castells 1996). For example, Job and Reinhart (2003) find empirically that social capital does not issue mainly from associations in civil society, as Putnam's (2000) theory suggests, let alone downwards from state structures. Rather individuals learn to do things such as trust prudently and generously in the primary institutions of their families and immediate work groups. Trust ripples out from those primary group sites through various stages of trust building in intermediate institutions in civil society to ultimately construct social capital in interactions with states and markets.

was the way it encouraged influxes of immigrants from more privileged ethnic groups who obtained better jobs than locals. Sometimes migrants violated local customs and sparked conflict by sexual assaults on local women. In the imaginations of the people of Aceh and Papua, the New Order policy of transmigration, particularly of Javanese, to move from overpopulated to underpopulated regions of the nation, was a policy to colonise and dominate them, especially when the transmigrants were seen as central government agents in the theft of their richest resources. Also in Papua—even more so than in Bougainville and to a lesser but significant extent in Aceh—environmental destruction, spoiling of agriculture and fishing and displacement of villagers from their traditional lands were important sources of conflict.

Few issues are more important to understanding war and peace than resource politics. The politics of gold and timber was also important in Central Kalimantan (Chapter 5). The data in this volume suggest, however, that there might not be any simple statistical relationship that makes resources a curse (or a blessing). The third volume of *Peacebuilding Compared* will discuss how Timor-Leste has funnelled its oil and gas resources into an offshore sovereign fund for the future development of its people that would be hard for incumbent politicians or plotters of coups to loot. This also shows how institutionalised resource prudence can undercut any inevitability of a resource curse, just as does the history of a country such as Botswana in managing its diamond resource. Our interim theoretical conjecture is that resource concentrations constitute both legitimate and illegitimate opportunities in Mertonian (1949) terms. This means a more general opportunity-theory framework will prove more fertile than a resource-curse theory.

## Opportunity theory

We saw earlier how in Robert K. Merton's (1949) institutional interpretation of anomie theory, when legitimate opportunities for achieving socially valued goals were blocked, there was strain to resort to illegitimate means. Cloward and Ohlin's (1961) elaboration of Merton says not only must legitimate opportunities be blocked, illegitimate opportunities for violence must be open. So when the Kao ethnic leaders in North Maluku concluded that Makians so dominated the circuits of power in their province that civil servants, legislatures and courts would simply dismiss their grievances again and again, they concluded that legitimate opportunities were closed to them (Chapter 3; Wilson 2008). They then had to decide that the illegitimate opportunity to drive the Makians from their lands was open. To conclude this, they had to weigh whether they could mobilise superior forces and arms to drive all the Makians into the sea and whether they would then have the political clout to ensure this new fact

on the ground would be allowed to stand. They calculated rightly about the first aspect of the illegitimate opportunity as they razed all Makian villages on their traditional lands. They miscalculated, however, that their traditional support from the sultan would allow this to stand. What happened was that the Makians managed to redefine the conflict as one between Christians (the Kao) and Muslims (the Makians) rather than the ethnic conflict it was over land and resources. The Makians projected the attacks on them as Christianisation even though there were significant numbers of Muslims among the Kao forces.

We have seen that the collapse of the New Order closed off legitimate opportunities for many older elites, especially those in the military. It also, however, opened up many new illegitimate opportunities, especially because of the conditions of military and police anomie, which in some places left the security sector, or at least some factions within it, up for sale to the highest political bidder.

One of the illegitimate opportunities often supplied by the military was guns and ammunition. Arms are the most recurrently important part of the illegitimate opportunity structure for warfare. The army often found it could expand its legitimate opportunities to acquire resources to fight an insurgency while also seizing illegitimate opportunities to make money by selling arms to the enemy. Hence, for example, in some cases it used intelligence operatives or double agents to organise a contact where the military and the insurgents would arrive at the same place at the same time, feign a fight by both firing in the air, then the military would retreat leaving behind guns or ammunition to be 'captured' by the insurgents in return for cash. This kind of classically anomic security sector crime happened in most, perhaps all, of the conflict areas in the years immediately after the collapse of the New Order. Laskar Jihad, the Free Aceh Movement and the Free Papua Movement were the combatant groups that benefited most from arms supplied by the Indonesian military, but other fighting groups also benefited in smaller doses.

International diasporas are important to constituting this part of the illegitimate opportunity structure for war. The quantitative literature shows that insurgent movements that have large diasporas of support in wealthier nations sustain more persistent insurgencies (Collier and Hoeffler 2001; Collier et al. 2005:9). Such a wealthy diaspora is precisely what the Free Papua Movement lacks (Chapter 2), but the Free Aceh Movement has benefited considerably from international support from a moderately wealthy Acehnese diaspora a short boat ride away in Malaysia. While Laskar Jihad received most of its arms from the military, there was almost certainly some funding from a far-flung Islamic diaspora that included Saudi Arabia.

Gerry van Klinken (2007) has made a particularly important contribution to understanding why some parts of Indonesia have suffered more conflict

than others about the turn of the millennium. This contribution is framed in opportunity theory terms here. Van Klinken aptly characterises a number of the conflicts discussed in this volume as 'small-town wars'. He focuses on the decentralisation reforms legislated in 1999 in Indonesia that subsequently shifted control to the local level of many formerly centrally controlled resources. It shifted a lot of legitimate and illegitimate contestation, and a lot of corruption, from the national to the local level of politics. Van Klinken's imaginative empirical work reveals that armed conflict is most likely to erupt in provinces that experience the most rapid de-agrarianisation. This is not quite the same as urbanisation; it means declining dependence on agriculture as a result of penetration of town life into rural areas. West Kalimantan, Central Kalimantan, Aceh, Papua, Central Sulawesi, the Malukues and East Timor were also all provinces in the 1990s where the ratio of civil servants to non-agricultural workers was greatly higher than in the rest of Indonesia. Conflict therefore broke out where economic opportunities were shifting to small towns and particularly into government jobs in those small towns.

In an environment where the rules of the game were up for grabs, there was often a no-holds-barred grab for political power in those towns of the Indonesian periphery. Some ambitious local politicians seized power by mobilising violence against their opponents. Sometimes they organised both support for themselves and opposition to their enemies by mobilising around religious or ethnic divisions. In many of these small towns, religious and ethnic organisations were the only well-formed organisations available for mobilisation at a time when democratic parties had yet to become strong at the local level. They were therefore coopted to projects to seize local control and thereby distribute government contracts and jobs to supporters. These political entrepreneurs 'managed to create a climate in which the only positive course of action was to support a district chief who belonged to their communal group' (van Klinken 2007:143).

In West Kalimantan in particular, van Klinken also identified a class dynamic in some of the power shifts that occurred. He pointed to the evidence that the lower middle class was unusually dominant in small towns and had more acute interests in small-town politics than upper-class elites whose gaze cast more to Jakarta. We therefore saw the lower middle class get behind projects of ethnic cleansing in West Kalimantan that enabled them to seize opportunities to control many legitimate businesses such as town transport and inter-town river transport (and to cartelise local pricing) and illegitimate businesses such as gambling, prostitution and human trafficking. We saw Malay-organised crime groups get behind cleaning out the Madurese-organised crime groups for the same reason. It was local politics by illegitimate means. In the late 1990s, there was a wave of attempts to criminalise the state at the local level, not in those

localities where legitimate business opportunities remained plentiful, but in those where they were not, and where government employment and contracting opportunities were low-hanging fruit. This seems to us the brilliant insight in van Klinken's interpretation of the pattern of armed violence. It is also important to note that van Klinken brings this conclusion together with the conclusions of those who identify a security dilemma in some of these cases: 'In each case ordinary people felt moved to action by the politics of fear, while local elites made their calculations on the basis of the politics of opportunity' (van Klinken 2007:143).

We can read van Klinken's (2007) work as showing, as van Klinken (p. 19) himself concludes from his review of the empirical research, that the explanation of ethnic and religious conflict is not to be found in the quantitative distribution of ethnic or religious fractionisation (see also Barron et al. 2004; Mancini 2005).<sup>19</sup> Rather, we read it as showing that, like resource politics, ethnic and religious politics matter in explaining violence to the extent that they open new illegitimate opportunities when legitimate economic and political opportunities close.

## The military opportunity structure

At every juncture in the history of the Indonesian state, right up to the present, the military has been the most concentrated focus of collective political power. The sharpest decline in that political power, however, was experienced in the few years after the resignation of President Suharto—the very years when armed conflict seemed to presage the disintegration of the state. The Asian financial crisis caused most of the military's business interests to become unprofitable or insolvent (HRW 2006:14), decreasing the purchasing power of the military by 30 per cent in the first year of the crisis alone (Bourchier 1999:152). The nature of these business investments was so tied to the crony capitalism of the New Order that they never recovered their former profitability. Budgets were pruned most in the far-flung regions of Indonesia where most of the violence occurred. It was here that the truncation of legitimate opportunities at first seemed so sharp that illegitimate opportunities quickly opened up for military officers working with provincial political entrepreneurs.

The decentralisation law reforms of 1999 created opportunities for the military to compensate for its loss of power in Jakarta by grabbing a large part of the action in far-flung districts of the nation. As power fragmented in Jakarta and the

---

<sup>19</sup> Barron et al.'s (2004) and Mancini's (2005) research shows, however, that areas with high unemployment, low human development index scores and differential child mortality rates between groups have more communal conflict and deadly violence in Indonesia.

military became more marginal in the institutions of the capital, they no longer had a stake 'in defending a specific political regime, either at the centre or in the regions...Accordingly, the TNI provides security services to an individual power-holder rather than offering institutional support' (Mietzner 2003:256). Whereas control of logging during the New Order was franchised to Suharto cronies from Jakarta (McLeod 2003:7), after 1998, countless local commanders in forested areas got into the illegal logging business. Smuggling was another lucrative area. When oil prices hit \$70 a barrel for the first time in the mid-2000s, global consumption of oil moderated in response to the market signal, yet it surged in Indonesia. The reason was that the navy responded to the price signal by increasing its smuggling of oil purchased at the government-subsidised price, sold into the Singapore market at twice that price, then sold back to Indonesia. Business regulatory challenges in Indonesia must be understood more than in other nations as challenges for the Minister for Defence rather than, as in this example, challenges simply for an anti-cartel, competition regulator or some other civilian regulator.

## **The puzzle of military force and defiance**

In every conflict narrative in this book, the Indonesian security forces and the moves they have made are at the heart of turns towards war and peace. In every conflict, the security sector made mistakes or committed crimes that made the conflict worse. In Papua, Aceh and Maluku—the three most deadly conflicts—murder, brutality and human rights abuses by the military were very major factors in conflict escalation. They were also major factors in escalation in Central Sulawesi. In the six conflicts that have ended, the effective application of Indonesian military force has been a critical factor in bringing it to an end. Aceh is perhaps the least convincing of these five critical contributions of central government force to the ultimate peace. In 2003 and 2004, Indonesian counterinsurgency was much more sophisticated, better resourced and effective than it had ever been in Aceh. It displaced GAM from control of most of the villages it had previously controlled and killed perhaps 20 per cent of GAM's fighters, leaving GAM so exhausted and devoid of hope of victory that the situation became ripe for peace talks. The paradox was that those peace talks recognised that the military was a cause of, a solution to and a risk factor for reignition of the conflict. Unarmed foreign soldiers and police therefore came in as the Aceh Monitoring Mission to oversee the withdrawal of most Indonesian troops as part of the peace deal.

A peace agreement of this kind is probably what is needed if Papua is to achieve a positive peace. It is the seventh case where military force has been a major causal factor in the conflict. The military, however, never became a causal factor in

producing a credible peace. We will see in Chapter 2, however, that tactics such as sabotage on Freeport pipelines were abandoned by the Free Papua Movement at various stages of the conflict because they feared a repeat of reprisals in the form of slaughter in villages where the insurgents were believed to have come from. In the context of Aceh, however, at least until 2003–04, such reprisals against civilians served only to strengthen the insurgency by increasing hatred of the military, defiance and a will to revenge. Partly this was connected with a GAM recruitment strategy of training the sons of partisans murdered by the military. Partly it was about the centrality to Acehnese identity of vindicating the sacrifices of past generations who had struggled for *merdeka* (freedom) for Aceh from infidels and colonial oppressors.

We hypothesise in Chapter 2, however, that something more general is needed to theorise the contexts in which military force increases conflict and where it reduces it. We argue that punitive military force almost always has a deterrent effect and almost always has a defiance effect, which runs in the opposite direction. The deterrent effect of the deployment of force reduces future violence; the defiance effect increases it. Our interviews with many combatants in Papua and Aceh clearly suggest deterrence and defiance effects have been in play in both places; it is just that the deterrence effects were less and the defiance effects greater in Aceh (at least until 2004) for the reasons outlined above. We rely in Chapter 2 on the body of experimental psychological research marshalled by Brehm and Brehm (1981) that reveals the shape of the deterrence curve and the defiance curve that arises in response to the use of force. In short, there is an evidence base for arguing that at low levels of force, defiance effects exceed deterrence effects, so force in fact makes things worse. There is a point, however, at which force becomes so overwhelming that the deterrence effect exceeds the defiance effect. Past this point military force succeeds in crushing resistance.

The importance of these dynamics is also why every chapter of this book diagnoses the conflicts in terms of Valerie Braithwaite's theory of motivational postures. It shares with Brehm and Brehm's (1981) theory a grounding in considerable psychological research on micro-encounters with state authority. That research reveals a more nuanced set of motivational postures driven by an individual's morality, greed and grievance. Moral considerations, a sense of grievance and a desire to profit at the expense of an authority all often increase simultaneously after a punitive encounter with an authority (Braithwaite et al. 2007). How these sensibilities balance out shapes the motivational posturing of individuals. One response is capitulation, when the citizen gives in without committing to the legitimacy of the authority. The second is commitment, when the citizen yields to state authority and also grants legitimacy to it. Commitment, we argue in Chapter 2, is the dominant posture of positive peace, of triumph

over anomie—as in most of Indonesia today. Capitulation is the posture of negative peace and is widespread in Papua today. Few indigenous Papuans are committed to the legitimacy of the Indonesian state, but they overwhelmingly capitulate to it in the current phase of that very long conflict. Resistance to Indonesia, however, also continues to be widespread, with a huge proportion of Papuans being secret supporters of the Free Papua Movement. Other Papuans manifest the motivational posture of disengagement from politics. This is the most classically anomic reaction to distasteful authority. We might say that in Durkheim’s (1897) foundational work on anomie theory, the ultimate manifestation of disengagement in the face of normlessness or meaninglessness is suicide. Other extreme forms of it are drug addiction and alcoholism, which are not uncommon among the traumatised Papuans we have met. The most common form of disengagement, however, is political alienation whereby many Papuans take no interest in politics. They are in Papuan political society but not of it, living a daily existence in the village that opts out of a Papuan political situation that seems too awful to contemplate.

Finally, there are the game players. These actors are quintessentially in and of the political game. They see political awfulness as creating opportunities. The most consistently important game players in the conflicts in this book are the Indonesian military and police. In each conflict zone, however, there are also plenty of civilians who game the military’s gaming by becoming agents and double agents, by working with the military to profit from illegal logging and other criminal enterprises or simply by grabbing local political power—often by being a stooge for a local military commander. Just as we see Mertonian opportunity theory as a useful elaboration of Durkheim’s anomie, so we conceive Valerie Braithwaite’s motivational postures as putting specificity of content into the form anomie takes. Normlessness can mean withdrawing interest in the normative order (disengagement), intense interest in bending and manipulating norms (game playing), resistance to norms or capitulation to norms while spreading contempt for their legitimacy (capitulation).

Chapter 2 describes in some detail how we see motivational posturing playing out in Papua, with each subsequent chapter giving a shorter insight into how we interpret this more nuanced form of coding than simply coding deterrence and defiance. Our plan is to code the five motivational postures for all future conflicts in terms of their salience during the conflict and post-conflict. Valerie Braithwaite (2009) has a number of hypotheses about what works in resolving conflicts driven by different kinds of posturing. While resistance is the most classically defiant posture, Valerie Braithwaite’s (2009) prior research concludes that it is easiest to reverse through dialogue and responsive institutional change, to flip it to commitment. We see some evidence of this phenomenon in post-

conflict Aceh today, where many former GAM members—Governor Irwandi being a key example—are committed to making the new institutional order work (Chapter 6).

Those who capitulate or disengage in response to a peace process can be a bigger problem in the long term. A disturbing result we report in Chapter 6 is that half of the children of GAM fighters are not attending school. This generates a considerable risk of a generation of alienated youth who lack commitment to anything much, with poor future prospects in the world of legitimate work. Such young people are receptive to scripts that justify illegitimate paths to ‘easy money’ by, for example, becoming fungible operatives of organised crime groups—thugs for hire, ganja dealers for hire—as many are doing in Aceh today. They are also vulnerable fodder for enrolment in any future insurgency on any side that will reward them well. Some young people who have been most traumatised by the war or by the family violence of their ex-combatant fathers count among the psychopaths who might join future conflicts for sadistic motivations of human domination.

Valerie Braithwaite’s (2009) previous research suggests that for resisters, dialogue followed by responsive institutional reform can rebuild commitment quickly. For those who are ‘dismissively defiant’—the disengagers and game players, in fact all those who have low levels of commitment to a legitimate political order—power sharing is, however, more likely to be the productive remedy.<sup>20</sup> Power sharing was needed in Aceh because the people of Aceh had become so committed to GAM, so dismissively defiant of the Indonesian state and so weak in commitment to its legitimacy. ‘Special autonomy’ as a purely institutional reform (that kept GAM out of power) did not work in Aceh and is not working in Papua, which is consistent with Valerie Braithwaite’s theory. Power sharing was also needed in the districts afflicted by Muslim–Christian armed conflict, because Christians would have been dismissively defiant towards a Muslim-dominated government in those districts, and vice versa. This is not to say that consociational political solutions—in which constitutional guarantees are provided for so many Christian seats and so many Muslim seats in a legislature—are a good idea. Power sharing might be needed only for long enough to replant the seeds of political commitment. We saw in the 2005 elections in Poso, Central Sulawesi (Chapter 4), that all five political parties contesting the election agreed to have balanced slates of Christian and Muslim candidates. This doubtless will break down in future decades when religious identity might cease being an issue in Poso’s electoral politics. Ad hoc temporary power-sharing deals such as Poso’s might do better by long-run democratic politics than a constitutionalised

---

20 See also Hutchens (2009) applying motivational postures to fair trade organisations.

consocialism that ossifies identities in the contorted form they manifest at war's end. A healthy democratic politics of the long run is one that fosters crosscutting identities (Krygier and Mason 2008).

The idea is that because it is so hard to persuade disengagers and game players that a reformed institutional order is not just another illegitimate opportunity structure for a new team of elite gamers of the system, the best response is to bring the dismissively defiant into the game of politics. The hope is that then the game will become legitimate because of its participatory qualities. This is why we see promise, even in the face of flawed implementation, in the bottom-up participatory reforms of the World Bank's Kecamatan Development Program and the Indonesian Government's *Musrenbang* (both discussed throughout our chapters) as peacebuilding strategies that share post-conflict power across a broad base of the politically uncommitted, right down to the village level. At this stage of the 20-year journey of this project, these are just hypotheses to explore as we code variables such as institutional transformation, power sharing and motivational postures as meaningfully as we can.

Just as we see motivational postures as potentially more nuanced and empirically attuned concepts for understanding the politics of war and peace than deterrence and defiance, so we see it as more nuanced than the influential model of juxtaposing greed and grievance as motivations for war (Collier and Hoeffler 2004). This does not mean that we find deterrence versus defiance and greed versus grievance to be lenses without value for seeing conflict. We in fact found them valuable correctives to previous generations of analysis that were obsessed either with deterrence to the neglect of defiance or with grievance to the neglect of greed. We think, however, that a motivational-postures lens sometimes helps us see a more fine-grained picture. Moreover, we can apply to greed and grievance the finding from the motivational posturing empirical work that after a bruising conflict with authority, a sense of wanting to profit at the expense of others (greed) will often rise at the same time as a rise in a sense of victimisation (grievance) and a lift in the sense of wanting to establish credentials as a good person; the outcome is a function of which motivational posturing increases most in response to provocation (Braithwaite et al. 2007). Warfare is a condition in which there is more greed and more grievance, more deterrence and more defiance. Outcomes depend on which predominates in a particular situation. In none of our cases did we discover many situations in which pure greed or pure grievance explanations had much purchase. Greed and grievance were very often intertwined in ways that made it difficult for peacebuilders to come to terms with one without comprehending the other. This was because grievance often excused greed and the greed of some often coopted the grievances of others.

## Redundancy in peacebuilding strategy

Five of the seven conflicts in this book (the exceptions being the separatist conflicts in Aceh and Papua) were ethnic or religious riots or gang fighting of young men that escalated into organised armed conflict. This led in these five cases to temporary or permanent ethnic cleansing. In the concluding sections of Chapter 3, we discuss the evidence from cases of rioting and 'people power' throughout history that major political change never occurs in this way when the security forces are determined enough and organised enough in their use of force to clear the streets. Moreover, very few of the countless ethnic and religious riots that have occurred throughout history have resulted in the loss of dozens of lives, let alone hundreds or thousands (as in our cases), if the security forces act decisively to stop them before they get out of hand.

Using the Maluku and North Maluku conflicts as a backdrop, Chapter 3 argues that it does not follow from this that the efficient strategy for foiling ethnic conflict is simply to get the security sector working properly. Our narratives demonstrate that there are many reasons why the security sector fails to do its job. Sometimes these are more complex in their politics than the reasons for the ethnic conflict itself. Without tackling the political problems that produce security sector anomie, there can be no guarantee that the security sector will 'work' in nipping violent rioting in the bud before it escalates to civil war. Without grappling with the drivers of security sector grievance and greed, the peacemaker cannot count on the military and police to control the violence born of the grievance and greed of others. And when the military, or large factions within it, shares the same grievances as the rioters, and seeks to seize complementary entrepreneurial opportunities to make money out of the disorder, the military, far from supplying the solution, can become the largest part of the problem. This is what happened in Maluku (Chapter 3).

An argument of Chapter 3 is that because empirically there are many reasons why security forces fail under pressure, it is best we limit the frequency with which they have to face down mobs throwing bombs. We try to show how much better it might have been in a number of our cases if the security sector had never been put to this test (and then failed it). How much better it might have been in North Maluku, for example, if management of the Newcrest goldmine had used its knowledge of what was happening on the ground around its mine to mobilise the preventive diplomacy that was within its power. Why rely on a fallible last line of defence when earlier lines of social defence are available? Redundant defence, we argue in Chapter 3, works best when radically different kinds of peacebuilding strategies are attempted. The theory is that redundancy in prevention works best when weaknesses of one preventive strategy are covered by the strengths of another. This means societies should invest in resolving

structural causes at the root of the conflict—such as discrimination against an ethnic group—as well as proximate causes, and in addition they need effective community policing that smothers sparks that could ignite conflicts. As a last resort they need the capability to halt riots and out-gun rampaging militias. Societies strong in all these capabilities might be less likely to experience civil war—at least, that is a hypothesis we will explore in our empirical work.

While we do not assume that the factors that make for peace will be the opposite of those that made for the war, an important discipline in diagnosing a case is to scan the peacebuilding strategies to assess if they are tackling many of the factors that drove the war. Just as our starting theory is that a multidimensional understanding is needed of what leads societies into war, so it is that unidimensional peacebuilding strategies have less prospects of success than multidimensional ones (Ricigliano 2003). The latter is indeed partly an empirically grounded theoretical prejudice, as evident in the work of Doyle and Sambanis (2000, 2006), showing that multidimensional peacekeeping operations with extensive civilian peacebuilding components achieve greater success than peacekeeping with narrowed military objectives. A more specific question we hope to test in *Peacebuilding Compared* is: when the strands of a particular multidimensional intervention tackle the specific structural, proximate and precipitating drivers of that conflict, is peace more likely to be sustained? Put another way, the hypothesis here is that a multidimensionality that simply tackles a standard set of World Bank good governance templates that are not necessarily connected with conflict risks will be less effective. Another variable we measure is how many of the specific future or emergent risk factors identified in the literature on the case are remedied in the peacebuilding intervention.

The reason we systematically list structural factors, proximate factors and precipitating incidents for each conflict is not that we think these distinctions are analytically fundamental. As seen above in the discussion of why the ‘resource curse’ can be sensibly viewed as either a structural or a proximate factor, it is a distinction that is not precise or reliable. Moreover, there are cases such as Aceh where precipitating incidents do not seem important at all to understanding the conflict (see Appendix 6.1). The discipline of listing the different kinds of variables is more a pursuit of the methodological virtue of checking that in our natural inclination to focus on factors that are proximate in time to the conflict and that change during its unfolding we do not ignore deeper structural factors that have long been creating a structural context more conducive to sparks igniting. In disciplining ourselves to look at whether there are precipitating incidents, we make ourselves attend to the most micro-aspects of the violence, which supports our micro–macro methodological ambition with a modicum of

structured scanning. An even more banal reason is that the consistent grouping of factors in these appendix tables makes it easier to scan them in search of points of comparison.

## Peace agreements

One reason why formal peace agreements such as the Malino accords (that partially settled Poso and Maluku) and the Helsinki agreement that settled Aceh were major turning points was that until they were signed local peace activists felt unsupported by their national leaders. The feeling, and a lot of the reality, was that politicians in Jakarta left questions of war and peace in provincial wars under the control of military leaders who they did not dare second-guess. Vice-President Jusuf Kalla's and President Yudhoyono's leadership in changing the front-stage politics of peacebuilding empowered a much more energised backstage politics of reconciliation after the accords were sealed.

Another of Gerry van Klinken's (2007) contributions was to apply a 'dynamics of contention' model to most of the conflicts considered herein. Recent scholarship in this tradition finds a synergy between such collective action theories and classical Mertonian strain (opportunity) theories (Buechler 2004). The five key processes of the dynamics of contention are identity formation, escalation, polarisation, mobilisation and actor constitution (McAdam et al. 2001). Van Klinken does not, however, follow these dynamics through to the extinction of the conflicts. This book begins to explore what a 'dynamics of contrition' looks like when it reverses a 'dynamics of contention'. In Chapter 3, we use the Maluku case to show a reformation of a syncretic Christian–Muslim identity, de-escalation, depolarisation, demobilisation for war and mobilisation for reconciliation (an institutionalised peace system), de-constitution of Laskar Jihad and Laskar Kristus as organisations, peaceful reconstitution of violent street gangs and constitution of new pro-peace organisations. Likewise in Aceh (Chapter 6), we can identify the transformation of a monarchical Islamic Acehese identity among GAM into a democratic secular Acehese–Indonesian identity amalgam, de-escalation as Helsinki was negotiated and the Aceh Monitoring Mission oversaw destruction of GAM's weapons and the departure of Indonesian troops, depolarisation as reconciliation ceremonies were held to welcome returning fighters from both sides back to their villages, demobilisation of GAM and pro-military militias as fighting units and reconstitution of GAM as a political party and a welfare organisation for reintegration of combatants (and sadly as an organised crime network).

This book seeks to show the dynamics in play in both escalation to war and de-escalation to peace. In the process, some of our starting hypotheses have

been refuted. Our previous work on restorative justice in business regulation revealed the value of a strategy of widening the circle when agreement could not be reached with a corporate law breaker to repair the harm and commit to compliance policies that might prevent re-offending. A first meeting with the executives directly responsible for an alleged breach of the law by the regulator and other stakeholders (for example, harmed consumers) could run into a brick wall. Instead of the regulator responding by immediately launching a prosecution, another meeting is set up, with the responsible executive's boss invited into the circle. When that fails, there is another meeting to which the boss's boss is invited. In some cases, regulators kept expanding the circle right up to engagement of the chairman of the board. The theory is to keep widening the circle until the most senior person in the circle is moved by corporate social responsibility concerns rather than combative motives.

The dynamics of the Aceh peace process described in Chapter 6 at one level show what an inapplicable model this is to peace processes following armed conflict. On the other hand, the Aceh dynamics do reveal the centrality of wisdom of getting the right players into the circle to make peace work. Chapter 6 argues that had Jakarta stuck with an earlier strategy of cutting the Stockholm-based leaders of GAM out of the negotiations, or had Jakarta persisted with having military leaders present at the negotiations, the peace could have disintegrated. It could be that a comparatively narrow, democratically suboptimal set of principal players in the war must hammer out an initial agreement. Those players need not represent all factions or all warlords, but they need sufficient legitimacy to speak for the various factions and bring them along with the deal. The probability of success with peacebuilding following civil wars almost halves as the number of fighting factions increases from two to three, halves again when factions increase from three to four and again when increased to five. With more than six fighting factions on the ground, the prospects for peace are virtually zero (Doyle and Sambanis 2006:126). William Zartman (1995) argues that a first step for peacemaking is a reconcentration of power whereby either the most powerful are recognised as legitimate or the legitimate are made the most powerful.

Some potential spoilers (Stedman 1997) probably had to be kept away from the table at Helsinki, but then a process for engaging the potential spoilers to the inevitability of the peace had to be tackled quickly and authoritatively. International diplomacy and peacekeeping support (as with the Aceh Monitoring Mission) can be important here. Peace agreements then need to be open textured enough to leave space for civil society groups that were excluded from the negotiation of the peace agreement to have a genuine voice in fleshing out the implementation of the new agreement and a transformed set of democratic institutions. Again, that was accomplished moderately well with

the engagement of a wide section of Acehnese civil society in the drafting of the Aceh consensus draft Law on the Governing of Aceh. The problem was that the military elites and their ultranationalist supporters in the Indonesian legislature fought back from their exclusion from the Helsinki talks by scuttling the Aceh draft. We look forward to the challenge of gathering further cases to test the options for getting the balance right between a peace agreement that will hold and a democratic politics that does not exclude most of the stakeholders (including victims of the war). Victims in particular deserve a voice in the institutional terms of the peace.

## Reintegration of combatants

For all the major ethnic and religious conflicts in this book, once the security forces were fully mobilised and did their job, combatants were eventually brought to heel. It was generally not necessary to offer combatants reintegration payments or other benefits to get them to put down their arms and return to their villages. In the case of Laskar Jihad, cutting off payments to them was part of a sophisticated strategy for persuading them to put down their weapons that included the threat of arrest and persuasive appeals by their home and host religious leaders to end the jihad (Chapters 3 and 4).<sup>21</sup> An exception was the longer-term hold-out jihadists in Poso, who were given considerable reintegration benefits to abandon their bombing campaigns and other means of terrorising Christians in Central Sulawesi (Chapter 4). In the much longer-running separatist insurgencies in Aceh and Papua, insurgents had normally been cut off from legitimate opportunities for many years living in the mountains and really wanted and needed reintegration support in exchange for their surrender. Free Aceh Movement and Free Papua Movement leaders who renounced the armed struggle were given real opportunities to share local power. In Aceh, many former GAM leaders have become major figures in Aceh's shadow economy of government contracting, protection rackets and other semi-organised crime (Chapter 6; Aspinall 2009). In West Kalimantan, leaders of Malayan semi-organised criminal gangs who led the seemingly permanent ethnic cleansing of Madurese in Sambas have taken over Madurese organised crime, becoming bigger, more organised criminals with stronger links to the local state (Chapter 5).

---

21 Of course it would have been better had they been prevented from ever arriving in Christian areas, as happened in 1999 when the first 300 of what was said to be a contingent of 800 Laskar Jihad were intercepted and sent back by police on their way to Manado in Christian Northern Sulawesi (the source for this is an undated manuscript by David Henley, Mieke Schouten and Alex Ulaen entitled 'Preserving the peace in post-New Order Minahasa').

There was some concern in Poso that terrorists who persisted with bombing campaigns until January 2007 and had a degree of integration into national and international Islamic terror networks were bought off with generous reintegration deals and were now corrupting government contracting in Poso, establishing themselves as organised criminals. Chapters 3 and 4 discuss the considerable success of the remarkably non-punitive, reintegrative approach in Indonesia to assisting serious terrorists to find opportunities in the worlds of legitimate work and business. Again, families and religious leaders received a lot of financial assistance to assist in reintegrating terrorists into a life of non-violence.

At one level, we have to be impressed by Indonesia's success in hugely reducing all forms of political, ethnic and religious violence, including terrorism. In international comparative terms, Indonesia has become a low-violence, low-terrorism society, falling from being one of the nations in the world most riven with deadly violence and terrorism in the years around the turn of the millennium. At their peak in 2002, Indonesian terrorism deaths accounted for one-third of global deaths due to terrorism (Kivimäki 2007:50). It is hard to resist the conclusion that the utterly inconsistent policies of the Indonesian state in 'doing what it takes', with kindness and understanding, to persuade perpetrators of politicised violence to renounce it have played a significant role in securing their desistance. At the same time, we have seen that not all of the perpetrators of political violence have been reintegrated into legitimate businesses. Some have been reintegrated into semi-organised crime and the underground economy, solving one social problem by contributing to another.

## Reconciliation

As a research team that has long been interested in restorative justice, we have come to the literature on the post-1990 conflicts struck by how little attention the question of post-conflict reconciliation has attracted—this when Indonesian approaches to reconciliation seem so distinctive. For example, *gotong royong*, a core tenet of Indonesian philosophy meaning mutual aid or 'joint bearing of burdens' (Geertz 1983b), is a widespread modality of healing. The military, whose actions in fuelling the conflict in Poso, and whose inactions in preventing it, caused so much resentment on both sides, participated widely in *gotong royong* by rebuilding Poso houses that had been lost to victims on both sides. One reason why reconciliation has been less studied in Indonesia than elsewhere is perhaps that little of it has been done by national elites or even provincial elites. The politics of reconciliation that matters happens from the bottom up

as a micro-politics massively dispersed among thousands of leaders of villages, clans, churches, mosques and subdistricts. In a limited way, we try to remedy the literature's neglect of reconciliation modalities in the pages that follow.

Reconciliation is a word that can mean many things. We can see the point of view of some restorative justice scholars who think it is a concept with too little precision (Parmentier and Weitekamp 2007:109–44). Some research suggests that restorative justice can be more effective in changing hearts than in changing minds (Braithwaite 2002). This includes Californian research showing that after restorative justice encounters between Palestinian and Jewish people, empathy for the suffering of the other increases, but political views about the politics of Israel do not change. Changing hearts, changing minds, forgiveness, apology, helping one another through *gotong royong*, former enemies shaking hands and agreeing to put the past behind them—these are all very different things. We do, however—perhaps unproductively, perhaps not—lump them together in a discussion of types of reconciliation.

There are two definite patterns to post-conflict reconciliation in Indonesia. One was that while the Indonesian legislature passed a law to establish a Truth and Reconciliation Commission in 2004 (which was declared unconstitutional in 2006) and made this an important term in peace agreements with combatants, the post-Suharto pattern was one of non-truth and reconciliation. At first, we found the low level of political commitment to high-integrity truth seeking at all levels of politics and in most civil society networks disturbing, especially when non-truth meant not just forgetting, but lying. The most common kind of lie was widespread blaming of 'outside provocateurs' for atrocities that were committed mostly by locals against locals. To some degree, the provocateur script came up in all of our cases, mostly, though not always, in contexts in which its truth value for really explaining events was limited.

The senior author has been associated with the development of a theory of restorative justice in which high-integrity truth seeking is central and temporally prior to reconciliation (Braithwaite 2002, 2005). There is an alternative view that forgetting and moving on are easier ways for people to cope with atrocities and for political systems to rebuild after them. This is not the stage of this project to rejoin that debate. It is a time, however, for reflection on the data in this book and to question the centrality of a sequence from truth to reconciliation.<sup>22</sup> So how was reconciliation without truth accomplished in

---

22 Maria Ericson identifies three elements in securing reconciliation:

- The establishment of safety, including bodily integrity, basic health needs, safe living conditions, financial security, mobility, a plan for self-protection, safe and reliable relationships, and social support.
  - Remembrance and mourning, telling the story of one's trauma.
  - Reconnection with ordinary life. (Ericson, paraphrased in Daly and Sarkin 2007:47)
- On reflection, none of these requires learning the truth of the root causes of the conflict.

most of these cases?<sup>23</sup> Thousands of meetings across these conflict areas in the early 2000s were called reconciliation meetings. Some included only a dozen or so leaders; quite a number had hundreds of participants, some had more than 1000. The most common number was more like 30 people who were key players from two neighbouring villages or the Christians and Muslims from the same village, who had been at war with each other not long before. Other meetings were called inter-faith dialogues, others *adat* rituals bearing various customary names for reconciliation meetings among the ethnic groups of that locality.

Sorrow, even remorse, for all the suffering was commonly expressed at these meetings. Tears flowed and there were often deeply sincere hugs of forgiveness. No-one ever, in any of the reports we received of these meetings, admitted, however, to specific atrocities that they or their group perpetrated against the other. Most of the agenda was dominated by practical concerns of rebuilding and reintegration. Sometimes the ethnic group that ended with control of the village would invite back only a small number of trusted families of the ethnic other as a first step towards rebuilding trust. Much of the discussion at these reintegration meetings was with government officials and humanitarian agencies who attended to offer practical assistance with the resettling of people into their old villages. A common gesture of practical reconciliation was for a Christian community to start rebuilding a mosque they had burnt down or a Muslim community to start rebuilding a church they had razed. The cleansed group might be invited back to the village to see this for themselves as a sign of the sincerity of the desire for reconciliation and to give advice on how to do the rebuilding. They might then do some work together on the project.

When the cleansed group returned, their former enemies would often organise a moving welcome ceremony for them. Former enemies who, before the conflict, had also been friends and neighbours, would shower them with gifts of food and other necessities in a steady stream of visits to their home. The point of this summary narrative is not to say this always happened. There were also bitterness, unpleasant exchanges and people who were shunned. The point of our narrative will be to give a sense of how reconciliation without truth worked when it did work, which was quite often. When a mosque substantially built by Christian hands was opened, the Christian community would be invited and Christian prayers would sometimes be said inside the mosque. We also found rituals of everyday life to be important to reconciliation. Christians attending the funeral of a respected Muslim leader and embracing Muslims soon after the conflict were sites of reconciliation. So were Christians being invited to the celebration of Mohammed's birthday, Muslims to Christmas celebrations, to *halal bi halal* (a forgiveness ritual among neighbours that occurred at the end of the fasting month of Ramadan), and so on. In our interviews, we were told

---

23 Papua and West Kalimantan are the cases where the least reconciliation has been secured.

of simple acts of kindness that were important for building reconciliation from the bottom up: an *ulama* who picked up an old Christian man in his car and dropped him at the market, the loan of a Muslim-owned lawnmower to cut the grass of the Christian church. In Chapter 3, we will see that peace zones where peace markets can operate to reopen old trading relationships have been central to the trust building of the Baku Bae reconciliation movement in Maluku. All these were included among the great variety of locally creative and meaningful ways that people reconciled without ever speaking the truth to one another about who was responsible for crimes.

Compared with governments in other post-conflict societies, the Indonesian state was also rather consistently generous in helping even those who had been the state's most ardent separatist enemies. They were given financial assistance to rebuild destroyed homes (of which there were hundreds of thousands across the conflicts in this book), schools, churches and mosques (of which thousands were razed). State-supplied building materials helped greatly for poor people who wanted to show the ethnic other that they could be trusted and could live and work together again. For all this evidence of reconciliation being real, and for all the statements in our fieldwork notes that informants believed it contributed greatly to what they expected to be the likelihood of long-term peace in their communities, our theoretical prejudice was still to believe that while non-truth and reconciliation were so much better than no reconciliation, truth and reconciliation would be an even more solid foundation for the future; truth, justice and reconciliation would be better still.<sup>24</sup> This is not only because of the contribution truth and justice can make to reconciliation, but because truth and justice can promote 'contentious coexistence' (Payne 2008:4)—a more resiliently democratic form of sociality. Our findings implied that we should be open to the possibility Susanne Karstedt (2005, Forthcoming) discovered in post-World War II Germany: the creation of a space for 'moving on' based on a non-truth that just those in Hitler's inner circle who were convicted at Nuremberg were culpable. That distorted truth, however, laid a foundation for subsequent testimony that gave voice to victims of the Holocaust. Victim testimony from the 1960s ultimately became a basis for an acknowledgment of

---

24 The justice enforcement effects in this book also deepen rather than resolve the puzzles of truth, justice and reconciliation. North Maluku (Chapter 3), like Bougainville in the second volume of *Peacebuilding Compared*, is a case where everyone involved in the conflict has been amnestied—a condition for peace demanded by militia leaders. A contrast was Central Sulawesi (Chapter 4), where there were a considerable number of criminal prosecutions and even executions for war crimes, but where the feeling on both sides was that scapegoats rather than the major elite criminals of the conflict were put on trial. With the exception of thousands of arrests of GAM members in Aceh during that war (almost all amnestied in compliance with the Helsinki peace accord), impunity was overwhelmingly the justice norm across these conflicts. Impunity was mostly accepted by elites and ordinary people alike as part of the spirit of a non-truth and reconciliation that put the horror behind them and saw them move on. Successive governments have therefore had the same philosophy as the current president of a 'general disinclination to prosecute past abuses, which the president had made explicit on a number of occasions' (Mietzner 2009:316).

the full, terrible truth. Deeper reconciliation between the German people and their former enemies and victims then occurred. Karstedt's (2005:4) message is that it is the 'longue durée' of truth and memory through victim narrative that matters.

In some ways, the need for high-integrity truth seeking seems greater in Indonesia than elsewhere, given the centrality of the 'narrative of the broken promise' (Birchok 2004) to the motivation of many war-makers and the perception of the Indonesian state among its citizens of failing to make commitments that are credible. Peter King (2004:69) more pointedly suggests that it is 'a moot point whether there is an Indonesian learning curve on Timor, Aceh and Papua—or only a forgetting curve'. Nevertheless, we can only listen to the local voices when they say in effect that given their traditions, reconciliation without truth is what they can manage for now.

If non-truth is the first pattern of Indonesian reconciliation we have identified, *gotong royong* manifests the second. This has already become apparent in many of the examples above. Healing happens through sharing in community work projects, in building that mosque or school together. Indonesians are good at having fun when they work together; they bond through work more than Westerners do partly because the division of labour in village society is less differentiated but also because sharing communal work and community welfare burdens is overlaid with cultural meanings of *gotong royong*. Backbreaking work that must be done to rebuild might be seen as a burden on reconciliation in the West, infused with resentment as people struggle to do it. In Indonesia, it is much more a resource for reconciliation. Valerie Braithwaite (2009) thinks power sharing is a way to transcend disengagement and dismissive defiance more broadly. Perhaps *gotong royong* offers prospects of a different form of re-engagement through doing, through sharing in work rather than sharing in power.

For some village folk who have limited interest in sharing even local political power, there can be a kind of empowerment through work, in deciding where and how the mosque will be rebuilt. This can be confidence building and ultimately commitment building by other (rural Indonesian) means, especially when the military also joins in the *gotong royong*, as it has done from Aceh and Poso to Papua. Again, this could be a virtue of the vision (if not always the practice) involved in the Kecamatan Development Program and the *Musrenbang*. This virtue is that the radically bottom-up nature of the vision enables a more intimate connection of local power sharing with local work sharing. Power sharing and work sharing together enable a dual assault on post-conflict disengagement and game playing. To make this more concrete, a village forum envisions what their village would look like in 20 years if they choose to use the planning resources they are empowered to spend to build a bridge at a particular

spot. That is what they then decide to spend their local infrastructure money on. Then, together, in a spirit of *gotong royong*, with some outside engineering help, they build it. Deciding together and doing together can weave a stronger fabric of peace.

The intertwining of sharing power and sharing rebuilding work through *gotong royong* that we can take to be a lesson of reconciliation in Indonesia can also be important as a means of restoring dignity. All our Indonesian cases pulsate with assaults on people's dignity as drivers of conflict. Talk to fighters who are Acehnese, Papuan, Dayak, Madurese, Kao, Laskar Kristus or Laskar Jihad and one is struck by the way they see their armed struggle as a stand for the dignity of their people and their faith, dignity that had been trampled under the feet of their enemies. Indeed, we can conceptualise many of these wars as moral panics that construed colonising, Christianising or Islamising others as folk devils. The moral panics led those folk devils to strike back at their stigmatisation (Cohen 1972 see further Chapter 5, this volume). We give dignity back to people who feel a loss of it when we agree to share power with them and when we pitch in to work with them on projects that they are empowered to shape and that they care about more than we do. We hope our readers will learn something about the politics of indignity and the reconciliatory politics of dignity from our telling of this recent history of Indonesia.

## 'Indigenous peacemaking versus the liberal peace'

The ancient Thucydidean, Machiavellian and Hobbesian trinity of fear, honour and interest as a motive for war (Donnelly 2008:43) is evident in this book. It is, however, evident in uniquely Indonesian form. The heading of this conclusion is the title of an article by Roger MacGinty (2008). He argues that Western peace support has become non-reflexive, uniform and off-the-shelf—'peace from IKEA: a flat-pack peace made from standardized components' (p. 145). This description does not fit the distinctively Indonesian approaches to crafting peace that we will describe in the chapters that follow. In fact, much of the reconciliation work was indigenous, pre-Islamic and not especially 'Indonesian'; it was to a degree *pela-gandong* in Maluku, *hibua lamo* in Halmahera, *maroso* in Poso and *peusijuek* in Aceh, among other local reconciliation traditions that were even more variegated among Dayaks and Papuans.

An ambition of the Peacebuilding Compared project is to learn from diversity. We fear, however, that MacGinty is right that an indigenous diversity in peacebuilding of disparate strengths and weaknesses is being coopted by templated Western orthodoxy ('the liberal peace'). MacGinty warns, however,

against romanticising indigenous or traditional peacemaking of the kinds we describe, particularly in the sections of the chapters of this book on 'reconciliation'. The awful continuing suffering in Papua that we describe in the next chapter makes it difficult to romanticise Indonesian peacebuilding. During questions after presentations we have given on this work at certain centres of intellectual excellence in the West, there has, however, been evident distaste for illiberal aspects of Indonesian peacebuilding that can close minds to seeing its strengths. Truth, justice, electoral politics and the rule of law can be romanticised as well. We hope this book might qualify that romance, promoting contemplation of more contextually crafted negotiations of paths towards republican democracy.

## **Structure of the remaining chapters**

All the chapters begin with a sequence of subheadings on the history of the province that sets a context for the conflict. Some readers might choose to skip these sections. The next major heading describes how the conflict began and continued as armed conflict in the 1990s and 2000s. Following this descriptive half of the chapter is a more interpretative half. The interpretation of the case attempts to summarise the structural factors at the root of the conflict, proximate factors and triggering incidents. It also catalogues who were the key war-making actors, the key peacemaking actors and what were their motivational postures. Peacebuilding strengths and weaknesses are then considered, leading to an interpretation of the most important lessons from the conflict. At the end of each chapter is an appendix table summarising much of the foregoing material. Some readers might choose to consult this appendix first to judge which sections are most worthy of being read.

This text is taken from *Anomie and Violence: Non-truth and Reconciliation in Indonesian Peacebuilding*, by John Braithwaite, Valerie Braithwaite, Michael Cookson and Leah Dunn, published 2010 by ANU E Press, The Australian National University, Canberra, Australia.