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ABSTRACT

Papua to the rest of the world is a mysterious paradise, known for its birds of paradise and its struggle for independence from Indonesia. Literatures reviewed so far show that non-Indonesian researchers tend to highlight the human rights violations and Papua’s independence struggle, whilst most Indonesian writers argue that Papua is part of Indonesia. It is difficult to find any literature or documentary film authored by indigenous Papuans or from the point of view of Papuan grassroots communities.

The main concern is that grassroots communities – especially women – in Papua, have no voice in the discussions concerning their future. Discussions and peace negotiations are mainly held outside Papua, some discussions were held in the UN. Even if the Indonesian government agreed to negotiate, it would be with UN officials or international diplomats – as in the case of Aceh in 2005. Papuans who lobby internationally are those who had left Papua and became leaders in exile. Even though their intentions are for the best of their people, the voices from women in the grassroots might not be heard.

This practice based research intends to use participatory video (PV) or participatory filmmaking to voice the opinions of Papuan women, and to include those whose lives have been affected by the conflict in the discussions to find solutions. The main question is how to find a sustainable pathway for the Papuan women whose lives had been affected by the conflict to contribute to the discussions in the peace building process using PV.

Current practice of PV tends to have standard methods which include non-indigenous facilitators introduce new equipment to indigenous communities. This research combines the indigenous methodologies and approach with PV practice. The practice of PV is tested by utilising existing human and technological capital to achieve sustainability. The PV project strives to enable the participants to use their existing equipment, knowledge and power, to produce films that can inform the public and eventually make a difference in decision making processes. The positionality of the researcher is also unique in that being a woman, half Melanesian, Indonesian and British is taken into account in the result.
The methods include literature and contextual reviews, autoethnography work, designing the PV project, field work of PV workshops with the women participants in Papua, screening of the participants' films, evaluation with the participants, editing a final documentary which at the same time functions as a reflection of the process, and writing up this critical dissertation. This practice research is using qualitative participatory methods.

The Structure of this Practice Based Thesis
Below is a guide as to how to navigate through the thesis project.

| Written thesis: “Introduction” to “Chapter Five – Participatory Video Process and field work documentation” | Throughout the written thesis there are a number of links to a portfolio of work in the forms of:
| Documentary film that featured the experience of the participants and the result of their Participatory Video (PV) journey | ➢ Blogs  
➢ Short interviews and video documentaries  
➢ Entries on my research page on Facebook |
| Written thesis: “Chapter Six – Findings” and “Chapter Seven - Conclusion, Implications and Recommendation” | This portfolio of work is to be viewed and read at reader’s discretion. A list of the portfolio of work can be accessed via the appendix. |
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Glossary of Terminologies and Abbreviations

**Act of Free Choice** (Indonesian: *Penentuan Pendapat Rakyat* or *Pepera*): held in July to August 1969, this was a referendum to decide whether Papua should become an independence country or to become part of the Republic of Indonesia. There were 1,026 men and women in Papua who were chosen to decide (Wikipedia; also see [https://www.ipwp.org/background/act-of-free-choice/](https://www.ipwp.org/background/act-of-free-choice/)).

**Melanesian Spearhead Group (MSG)**: an intergovernmental organization, composed of the four Melanesian states of Fiji, Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu, and the Kanak and Socialist National Liberation Front of New Caledonia.[2] In June 2015, Indonesia was recognized as an associate member (Wikipedia; also see [https://www.msgsec.info](https://www.msgsec.info)).

**Negara Kesatuan Republik Indonesia (NKRI), or The Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia**: the full name of the country Indonesia. (also see [https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/id.html](https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/id.html))

**Organisasi Papua Merdeka (OPM), or Free Papua Movement**: an umbrella term for the independence movement established in the Papua or Irian Jaya or West Irian or West New Guinea area which is currently part of the Republic of Indonesia as the provinces of Papua (Wikipedia; also see [https://www.globalsecurity.org/military/world/para/papua.htm](https://www.globalsecurity.org/military/world/para/papua.htm); and [http://file.understandingconflict.org/file/2015/08/IPAC_21_Papuan_Pro-Independence_Movement.pdf](http://file.understandingconflict.org/file/2015/08/IPAC_21_Papuan_Pro-Independence_Movement.pdf))

**Participatory video (PV)**: a form of participatory media in which a group or community creates their own film. The idea behind this is that making a video is easy and accessible, and is a great way of bringing people together to explore issues, voice concerns or simply to be creative and tell stories (Wikipedia; also see InsightShare [https://insightshare.org/resources/](https://insightshare.org/resources/); and [https://youtu.be/seOstch03j8](https://youtu.be/seOstch03j8))

**Tri Komando Rakyat (Trikora, or three command of the people)**: an Indonesian military combined operation which aimed to seize Papua in 1961 and 1962 (Wikipedia). The three command of the people were declared by Indonesian first president Soekarno who was a well-known nationalist. They are: 1. cancel the formation of the Papuan puppet state made in the Netherlands; 2. fly the Red and White (the Indonesian flag) in West Irian (Papua), which is part of the Indonesian homeland; 3. prepare for general mobilisation to maintain the independence and unity of the homeland and the nation.
**Tentara Nasional Indonesia (TNI, or the Indonesian National Armed Forces):** consist of three forces which are TNI-AD (*Tentara Nasional Indonesia Angkatan Darat* or the Army), TNI-AL (*Tentara Nasional Indonesia Angkatan Laut* or the Navy), and the TNI-AU (*Tentara Nasional Indonesia Angkatan Udara* or the Air Force).

**Tentara Pembebasan Nasional Papua Barat (TPNPB, or shorten to TPN) is The Papua Liberation Army**

**United Liberation Movement for West Papua (ULMWP):** was formed on 7 December 2014 in Vanuatu. ULMWP unites the three main political independence movements seeking independence for Papua (West Papua) under a single umbrella organisation (Wikipedia; see also [https://www.ulmwp.org/](https://www.ulmwp.org/))
INTRODUCTION

“We fought for our rights to independence and defeated the Dutch!” said my history teacher. Like many Indonesians, I grew up feeling the pride of an underdog nation that fought the colonial nation and won. We were David, and we defeated Goliath! This belief was shattered in 1999. Following news about East Timor, I saw for the first time that we, Indonesians, were the colonials who invaded East Timor. It was the East Timorese people’s time to demand their rights for independence. My country was the villain in this story.

After East Timor came Aceh. As a journalist, I covered the conflict and peace deal in this north western tip of the Indonesian archipelago. Following the Boxing Day Tsunami 2004, the Aceh conflict ended with a peace deal that gave Aceh a special autonomy to govern their province whilst still being part of the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia. But the image of war has been carved in my head – images of a villager’s body shattered by military bullets, of women mourning the death of their husbands, sons, fathers, brothers, crying their silent cries unheard to the rest of the world.
I. Research Problem and Its Context

I.1. The drive

People say that a journalist’s privilege is having the front row seat in a theatre called history. I carried this privilege for many years but always with a hanging question: what would happen if we reversed the view? What if the actors on the stage watch us the audience? As I interviewed women in Aceh, victims of forced eviction in Jakarta, survivors of natural disasters in the Philippines, I could not help but wonder: what do they see in us the journalists, the filmmakers, the aid workers, the rest of the world? What story would they tell on our behalf? Was I honestly telling their story, or was I telling my own story and claiming it to be theirs?

Meanwhile, Papua was waiting for their turn. East Timor received independence, Aceh achieved their peace deal. What future awaits Papua?

Growing up in Jakarta and being half Melanesian, I heard my father’s stories about his homeland, Saparua, in the Moluccas in eastern Indonesia. The people of Saparua and the Moluccas have more similarities in culture and ethnicity to the Melanesian people than with the dominant Malay or the Javanese who rule Indonesia. In 1950, when my father was 14, people of the Moluccas fought for independence from Indonesia and declared the Republic of South Maluku (Republik Maluku Selatan, RMS). My father was about to be recruited as a child soldier when his parents told him to run away. I never met my paternal grandparents and my father’s sister.

Years later after successfully making his own life, my father heard the calling of the land of Papua. I was told that having no children for seven years, my parents were about to move to Papua – a young pilot and mechanic with his wife the medical doctor, working for Associated Mission Aviation dedicating their lives for the indigenous people in the magical land of the Melanesians. Alas, I came to the picture and they stayed in Jakarta.

Maybe I inherited my parents’ dream. As a young environmentalist in high school, I dreamed of climbing Puncak Jaya, the highest mountain in Indonesia, in the island of Papua. I dreamed of meeting the indigenous Papuans and learning the wisdom of their ancestors.

As I was working as a journalist and filmmaker in Aceh, some conversations with local women left me with a question. Even in the patriarchal society where women are expected
to stay in the domestic background, many women show their leadership and brilliant ideas to alleviate their family from poverty. These women should be good leaders in a local authority, or even in national and global level – if only people listen to what they say.

There was also an important moment in Pungee Blang Cut village, Aceh, where I filmed *My Neighbour the Giant Boat* with my director and camerawoman from the University of Salford (https://youtu.be/vHlgFdq6T0M). Ani, the main character of the documentary, looked into my camera. She pointed the camera around and we saw world from behind the lens. She did not realise that she had just sown the seeds of ideas for participatory video in my head.

![Image](https://youtu.be/vHlgFdq6T0M)

*Figure 1 - Filming My Neighbour the Giant Boat (https://youtu.be/vHlgFdq6T0M) with women in Aceh gave me an idea of flipping the lens and see the world from the village women's point of view.*

### I.2. Original Contribution

#### I.2.1. Inter-disciplinary

Being inter-disciplinary, this research is using a unique methodology. I am combining participatory video (Lunch & Lunch, 2006) from the discipline of media practice, with autoethnography (Adams, Jones & Ellis, 2015; Reed-Danahay, 1997) from anthropology, with an indigenous aspect that attempts to decolonise traditional research methodology (Smith, 2012) and some influence from post-structuralism and Black feminism.

This research is trying to look at areas that people in the discipline of media practice, politics and anthropology have not looked at before. So far, research about Papua has
been covered by politics and anthropology. At the same time, participatory video (PV) as media practice has never been done by a researcher who partly belongs to the community or is half indigenous with her feet in both worlds with a decolonisation agenda.

This research lies in the field of media practice, with influence from indigenous methodologies, situated knowledge, post-structuralism, Black feminism and politics. Whilst aiming to make an original contribution to journalism, media and film, this research and its methodology hope to also make a small contribution to the practical politics of conflict resolution and peace building, decolonising solidarity as well as to autoethnography.

I.2.2. Positionality

Overall, my unique position – or the positionality of the researcher – in this research is part of my original contribution. I am hoping that this research would open more opportunities for women of colour and women from indigenous communities, to take on research that aim to benefit their communities and to share the wisdom of the indigenous people to the rest of the world.

Most PV projects are conducted by a group of people from outside the community, teaching new skills and using equipment new to the community. In Mahama (2004), the researcher was also part of the community, but the whole project was using video cameras that at the time was alien to the women participants. Her research set the ground where I departed – as a researcher who partly belongs to the community – and took it further as a peace building and social justice project.

Having some shared identity yet living in a different world involved the intersectionality (Crenshaw, 1991) of experience, culture and ‘lingo’. As the facilitator of the PV project, I shared the same gender with my participants and speak the same language without an interpreter. Being part Melanesian, I shared similar cultural background, dialect and way of thinking with the participants. There are many indigenous symbolisms and ways of thinking that are impossible to translate unless one grew up in the same culture. This is the originality and uniqueness of this research.

My identity in this research has been important in both that it is an opportunity as well as a challenge. Being a woman who is half Melanesian, I was accepted by the participants as ‘one of us’. However, being Indonesian has also sparked some challenges in terms of my involvement with wider Indonesian communities such as the Papua Study Group that was run by the Indonesian Embassy in the UK. There were questions on my ‘loyalty’. On the other hand, my participation with the International Academics for West Papua was also
questioned as most Indonesians would reject the idea of self-determination and independent West Papua that the forum is supporting.

My unique positionality places me as someone who is half Melanesian, partly Indonesian and partly British, a woman who is forever a minority – a Catholic growing up in the majority Muslim city of Jakarta, a half caste in the majority Javanese society, a woman journalist among male colleagues in war zone, an Indonesian in England. I never belong anywhere. This gives me an advantage of being the perfect observer whilst at the same time provides me the opportunity to be the ‘token one of us’ in any community I live in.

In this research, I also raise the question of ethics and morality. I started this research with all intention to be balanced, but as a human being I detest colonialism. This research journey took me to a realisation that my country of birth, Indonesia, has colonised Papua. Therefore, I can no longer take a balanced position as I am morally obliged to denounce colonialism, injustice and the marginalisation of the indigenous people. As Clare Land (2015, p.88) highlighted, “To understand one’s relations with indigenous people… is linked to an imperative for action.”

Having been through the ethical and moral question above, I believe that this research will eventually be an important original contribution in research methodologies – in a way that an indigenous approach can decolonise methodologies, and that researchers can work together with the indigenous communities and activists around the world to make a real difference. This research whilst located in an academic sphere, is also a personal project in social justice and solidarity.

I am inspired by Black feminist Audre Lorde who “grounds all of her work in her lived experience” (Nayak, 2015, p.19). Taking the position of both researcher and advocate for the rights of the grassroots and indigenous people, I believe that this research will also contribute to autoethnography.

I.2.3. Utilising existing capitals

During the research process, I found that having connections – network of friends, ex-colleagues, extended family members – in Indonesia played an important role in completing the research. Due to the political nature of the conflict in Papua, recruitment of participants could not be done using conventional methods of open recruitment and advertising in public or targeted spaces. This is where my networks helped. From my late aunty Lisa who introduced me to anthropological photographer Don Hasman who then introduced me to the Balobe Papua photographic society, to an old friend who is now a
priest and headmaster of a high school in Nabire, my existing networks are crucial in this research.

Figure 2 - My late aunty Lisa (top) introduced me to Mr Don Hasman (bottom, talking to me) anthropological photographer who then introduced me to members of Balobe Papua photographic society. Because of this network, I managed to recruit the participants in Jayapura.

Similarly, literature search in this research requires much more than database search. Being bilingual is essential as this enabled me to understand the literatures in Indonesian. The next point is that many publications in the Indonesian language are not indexed, and many important texts are not available in national libraries or book stores. Once again, utilising existing networks is an important factor. Thanks to my networks and their local knowledge, I was introduced to the chairman of the School of Philosophy and Theology (Sekolah Tinggi Filsafat dan Teologi, STFT) Fajar Timur, Fr Neles Tebay Kebadabi, who not only gave me an exclusive interview but also gave me unrestricted access to their library.
Whilst there is nothing new in using PV for community development with indigenous people (Lunch & Lunch, 2006; Mahama, 2004; Patashnick & Rich, 2005), in this research I introduce a new element which is utilising existing equipment of smart phone or camera that the participants already have and are familiar with.

Established organisations use standardised equipment and games for participatory video in many different communities they work with (Lunch & Lunch, 2006). This research started with finding out what was available – in terms of skills, technology, time and venue. This means that for one group, the PV workshop was held in someone’s house for two weeks consecutively, whilst for the other group the workshop was held in a number of different venues at times that were suitable for the participants who were working women. This also means that one group learned to film using a donated old smart phone plus my own DSLR camera, whilst the other group learned to film using their own smart phones and eventually elected a camerawoman who owned her own DSLR camera. This opens up possibilities for the next research project to utilise various different equipment, venues and variety of skills of the participants, in order to enhance their existing human and technological capitals to benefit their community.

The principle of utilising existing capitals is contributing to the practice of PV in a way that has rarely been done before, enabling PV facilitators to create projects with less external funding but more bottom up methods.

At the same time, this principle also enables the indigenous women participants or the grassroots community to exercise power instead of empowering or granting power top down. The facilitator of PV does not teach new skills, but learns with the participants of what they are able to do, then together enhance the existing skills into something more. In this research, the participants’ ideas and skills were taken to the next level, so that they could formulate their narratives and ideas into films that would be made available.
internationally. Their voices – expressed through films – will then be able to influence the decision making process in conflict resolution and peacebuilding in their land of Papua.

I.2.4. Decolonisation

“Scientific research is deeply implicated in a form of colonialism” and “academic disciplines have root in ‘orientalism’, of the other”. They need to be decolonised.

(Linda Tuhiwai Smith, 2012)

Participatory research is democratising academic research processes, introducing inclusivity and ethically no longer objectifying research participants. However, there is still a danger of the scientific community being biased towards indigenous researchers, towards non-western and non-male researchers. While attending a panel discussion on Papua in The University of Warwick in summer of 2016, I experienced this sexist and racist attitude from a European researcher who apparently was a well-known expert on Papua. I was not expecting a blatant derogatory comment from a professor of Southeast Asian history who called this participatory video research “vox pop with a bunch of village women”. The same professor announced proudly that his father was a police officer in Papua during colonial time, ‘upholding discipline to the natives’.

So, how can this research in PV claim to have an original contribution to decolonising solidarity and demythologising the concept of ‘white saviour’ and ‘foreign fetishism’? My answer is not only because this research is conducted by a half-indigenous woman, but because it also departed from the principle of exercising power instead of empowering. This research departed from my reflection and awareness that although I would need to facilitate some learning through the PV workshop, it is indeed my indigenous women participants who have the knowledge and ideas for solutions to the conflict. As a researcher, I see myself as a child who sees her world for the first time, not the all known scientist from a British university among the indigenous women and victims of conflict.

Hence in this research, I deliberately drew a line that differentiated between empowering and exercising power (Foucault, 1976 in Gordon, 1980, p.89). I believe it would be an original contribution of a PV project that also aimed to decolonise its original method. Along this research journey, I tried to apply “critical self-reflection to knowing myself, interrogating where my focus should be, and developing awareness of privilege” (Land, 2015, p.200).

This research wants to open up possibilities for PV to be utilised as a tool for decolonising solidarity, for more involvement and participation from the grassroots communities.
Stretching the role of a researcher to individual moral obligation, I hope this research will be an original contribution in setting a pathway towards the self-determination and decolonisation of the indigenous people of Papua.

1.2.5. Pathway to impact
Amid other studies on PV as parts of international development studies or participatory development (Shaw, 2017; Lunch & Lunch, 2006; White, 2003), this research endeavours to contribute to the field of Journalism, Media and Film. Coming from a journalism, filmmaker and social work background, I aim to facilitate a learning process that will give the participants enough skills to produce high quality or ‘professional standard’ films using accessible technology such as smart phones and free editing software.

The original contribution of this research also lies in the aim to test the use of filmmaking and PV project as a pathway to impacting and influencing decision making processes in conflict resolution. The research participants are specifically women whose lives have been affected by the conflict in question, who traditionally would stay within the domestic domain and far from having any voice in public diplomacy and decision making processes. Hence this research wishes to contribute to flipping the lens and enabling the women to exercise their power to make a positive contribution to their community.

1.2.6. Sustainability
Utilising the existing capitals as described above aims to achieve sustainability. It is one of the aims of this research to make an original contribution in the creation of sustainable pathways, through which grassroots communities – especially the indigenous women – can voice their input through film.

Learning from previous community development projects in Indonesia and South East Asia, a feeling of euphoria and sense of power would normally be achieved following an inspiring workshop or training course. However, the newly gained skills and enthusiasm would easily die down as the daily routine of family and work took over. This is especially the case when a new set of unfamiliar skills, habits or equipment is needed to sustain the change.

A video camera is not part of the daily lives of ordinary Papuan women, but a smart phone with camera is. Editing software that require a computer with some minimum specifications is not something that would be part of the participants’ daily lives after the workshop. However, skills such as lighting and how to optimise the video features in their own smart phones would be applicable in their daily lives. The skill to use their smart
phones to create short videos to express their opinions is indeed something that can be both powerful and sustainable. The experience of producing a film and the organisational skill that resulted from this, are transferrable to other aspects of their lives.

Hence this practice based research is not about a new form of film or documentary, but it is about a new sustainable method of doing a participatory video (PV) project at the grassroots level. This research wants to encourage practitioners in PV to utilise existing capitals – both human and technological – that would translate to less budget and more sustainable impact.
II. Aims

This research explores how PV can be developed into a tool for women in Papua, who have experienced violent conflicts and who have traditionally been excluded from conflict resolution discourses, to partake in public discourse and set up a sustainable pathway towards impacting the decision making process in peace and reconciliation.

In other words, the aim of this research is to find ways for indigenous Papuan women who have experienced conflict to make their voices heard and to have presence in the peace building and conflict resolution discussions.

The aim departed from a concern that consultations on conflict resolution and peacebuilding in Papua so far are only utilising academics and researchers from outside Papua and Indonesia, who are predominantly male. The postcolonial Indonesian government so far is still listening more to the Eurocentric and Western approach rather than their own indigenous wisdom.

Even when rejecting the Eurocentric and Western views on the conflict, the Indonesian government would use a nationalistic and doctrinal approach. In this doctrine, Indonesia stretches from Sabang in the North West of Sumatra, to Merauke in the South East of Papua. Anyone questioning this principle is a traitor to the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia (Negara Kesatuan Republik Indonesia, NKRI).

Most researchers and advisors to the Indonesian Government are male researchers. Some have not even been to Papua and have never talked to the indigenous people directly, not to mention the women. Some researchers have the attitude like the professor of South East Asian studies who derogatorily compared PV to ‘vox pop with a bunch of village women’.

Although there are efforts for dialogue involving a small number of indigenous Papuan scholars and religious leaders, so far there is no involvement of indigenous women and family members of those affected directly by the conflict. Indigenous Papuan people at the grassroots level are still treated as passive audiences – or like children (Arndt, 2018) – in their own land.
This research aims to take a new standpoint, which is finding the voices of the indigenous women who had been affected by the conflict, conducted by a researcher who is herself a woman from Indonesia, half Melanesian, who speaks the local language.
III. Research Questions
Starting from a concern that resonated with standpoint theories, feminist and black feminist’s theory, I repeated Sandra Harding (1991) in asking “Whose science? Whose knowledge?” In this research, I wanted to further ask: what is academic research?

Coming from a lifelong experience between theory and practice – between studying in universities, working to feed the family and raising a child – I have been questioning the common epistemology, about where knowledge comes from. The traditional academic view is, as pointed out by Linda Tuhiwai Smith (2012), “deeply implicated by colonialism”. Based on this common view, the general public and decision makers tend to listen to those coming from the academic world and dismiss the indigenous knowledge and wisdom as a side story.

From this observation, I ask two main questions.

First, how to bring forward the opinion and wisdom of the indigenous women whose lives had been directly affected by violent conflict into the public domain using PV or participatory media practice?

Second, how PV can be a tool to set a pathway towards impacting the decision making process in conflict resolution and peacebuilding?
IV. Objectives and Outputs

IV.1. Objectives

The main objective of this research is to create a sustainable pathway for indigenous Papuan women whose lives have been affected by conflict to have a meaningful presence and voice in peace and reconciliation discussions.

This research also wants to create skills and opportunities through participatory video (PV) projects that can be adopted by the women to benefit their community for the foreseeable future.

This research explores current PV methods and approaches as part of media practice. Following that, this research attempts to create a new sustainable model of PV that is not relying on foreign equipment, foreign workers and foreign funding sources. To achieve sustainability, this PV model utilises existing capitals – human and technological.

This research explores the concerns of black feminist and indigenous researchers, among which is power relations. This research endeavours to understand the principle differences between ‘to empower’ and ‘to exercise power’. Furthermore, this research seeks to decolonise solidarity, to demythologise ‘white saviour’ and ‘foreign fetishism’, and to enable others to exercise the power they already have rather than to empower or to give power from an assumed higher position.

In doing all the above, this research is also seeking to engage with new ways of doing autoethnography in a hybrid or inter-disciplinary setting, blending academic research with advocacy for the marginalised community.

IV.2. Outputs

The first output is a set of films by the women participants. From the first group in the city of Nabire, the women produced *Honai Perempuan untuk Perdamaian* (Women’s Honai for Peace). In addition to their main film, the group has produced three short films on the roles of women and introducing the culture of their tribe. The second group came from the city of Jayapura, where the women produced a short docu-drama called *Cerita Mama* (Mama’s Story) and a documentary where they discuss the film and its contribution to the peace building process.

The second output of this research is the main written thesis.
The third output is my documentary film of the whole process. This documentary shows the journey and the process that the women participants went through, their films which show their views on the conflict in Papua, with some commentaries about their films and on the situation in Papua.

The fourth form of output is a portfolio of works that includes: documentation of symposium, discussions and screenings; short documentaries, vlog and video interviews; articles published on my research’s Facebook page, blogs and other media; and an autoethnography work in the form of a Facebook page.

In the Appendix, the readers can find a detailed list with their links to this portfolio of works and the films produced by the participants.
V. Chapters

Chapter one explains the philosophy and methodology of this practice led research on Participatory Video. This chapter explores the role of facilitators in adult education, followed by autoethnography as a method and study on its own. One important topic throughout this research, which is indigenous methodology and indigenous research approach, will also be explained in this chapter. The chapter concludes in outlining the methods used, which are literature review, contextual review, field work and participatory video project, autoethnography works on social media and critical dissertation.

Chapter two is the literature review, which details the situated context of Papua. Beginning with the three different versions of history, chronology of facts and the actors. Chapter two concludes with the latest development on the conflict in Papua and its diplomacy process.

Chapter three consists of the contextual review of PV and autoethnography. The contextual review includes interviews with PV practitioners and how established organisations use PV in their work. This chapter also reviews autoethnography works.

Chapter four explains the process of designing the PV project for this research, the recruitment process in Papua and the decision to utilise existing equipment – the video camera versus smart phone dilemma. This chapter details the choices of various PV games to be used in this project.

Chapter five contains the PV process, field work documentation and findings from the field work. Detailing day to day activities followed by results and reflections, this chapter includes the profile of each of the participants and the dynamic of the groups. The chapter also reflects on the adjustments that had to be made during the field work, and analyses the social cultural reality of the specific Papuan communities where this research takes place.

Chapter six details the findings which are the result of the reflection and evaluation processes. This chapter includes input and feedback from participants and from audiences at the screenings. Also part of this chapter is the editing process of the final documentary, which tells the journey of the participants from their domestic existence to their public role as filmmakers. This chapter reflects on the final editing process.

Chapter seven is the conclusion, implications and recommendation. This chapter is the final part of the whole reflection and writing process.
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CHAPTER ONE – PHILOSOPHY AND METHODOLOGY

Abstract

This chapter explains the philosophy and methodology of this practice led research on Participatory Video. The chapter starts with my philosophical journey that took me to where I am today which explains my choice to apply indigenous methodology and research approach. I will then clarify the definition and parameters of this practice led research on participatory video (PV) and explore the role of facilitators in adult education.

Autoethnography as a method and study on its own will be explained. This chapter concludes by detailing the methods used which are literature review, contextual review, field work and participatory video project, autoethnography works on social media and critical reflection.

I. Indigenous methodology and research approach

Starting my higher education in Communications and Philosophy, I have always been interested in critical theories from Hegel, Marx, The Frankfurt School, Habermas, to Liberation Theology inspired by both Marx and the teaching of Jesus Christ. I then witnessed people’s power in reality in Jakarta 1998 where underground political movements resulted in the fall of the second President of Indonesia, Soeharto. By then, the regime of Soeharto had been running the country for three decades since 1966.

As my education and theoretical exploration widened, I explored feminism. Studying under the supervision of Indonesia’s feminist epistemologist and cosmologist Dr Karlina Supeli, I was introduced to the works of Sandra Harding and Donna Harraway.

Further on, as I struggled to make a living and provide for my son, I realised that women of colour are facing not just a form of discrimination, but intersectionality of oppression. I read works by black feminists such as Audre Lorde and bell hooks whilst studying Social Work under Dr Suryia Nayak who later published Race, Gender and the Activism of Black Feminist Theory: Working with Audre Lorde (Nayak, 2015).

I felt the anger of bell hook when reading her Killing Rage (1995) as if I were on the same aircraft on economy class with her. I felt the feminine weakness as tears rolled down my cheeks together with frustrated anger, as I read about the discrimination that women of colour are facing. I cannot help but recall my own interactions with Indonesian immigration officers and airline cabin crew who treated me, a non-white woman, very differently than
white European males. The same anger and tears still affect me today when I read news on victims of military violence in Papua.

However the words of Anwar Ibrahim’s daughter in a conference 18 years ago (Anwar, 2001, p.14), kept on echoing in my subconscious, “without human rights, how can we talk of women’s rights?”

Through my life experiences and various jobs in both journalism and social work, I realised that to understand others, the most important thing is to listen to their voices and to walk among the people. My brief experience of working in the emergency mental health sector, gained me an in depth understanding of mental health problems whilst the theories I read served as additions to the experience of walking with – sometimes holding the hands of – the mental health patients. This goes with the homeless, the refugees, the refused asylum seekers in the UK, as well as the oppressed in Indonesia.

Through various life experiences, I found my own pattern of epistemology: gaining knowledge based on experience, listening, taking empathic actions and sometimes linking the experience with existing theories. Lorde (1984, p.83) confirmed my instinctive epistemology, “You become strong by doing the things you need to be strong for. This is the way genuine learning takes place.”

It is at the end of my first year PhD research that I came across the work of Linda Tuhiwai Smith (2012), introduced by a researcher in Politics Studies Dr Lisa Tilley during a workshop “Getting Published in the Social Sciences Workshop for Indonesian Early Career Researchers” at the University of Warwick, 2017.

Reading Smith’s Decolonizing Methodologies (2012), I felt that indigenous methodologies and approach is the most appropriate philosophy for this research. I deliberately use the word ‘felt’ to emphasise the feminist and indigenous approach – I feel no shame in using instinct, feeling and ‘gut feeling’ to start a new line of inquiry. As a scientific method, a new line of inquiry that was opened due to instincts or feelings, would be verified and scrutinised rigorously and methodically. The result then can be verified and explained logically and compared to existing theories.

Linda Tuhiwai Smith discussed “aligning the agenda for indigenous research and indigenous activism” and contextualising “research in an explicitly decolonising, political and international framework” (2012, p.218). Smith explained that indigenous methodologies tend to approach cultural protocols, values and behaviours as an integral
part of methodologies. I agree with Smith in that scientific research should “report back to the people and share knowledge” (p.16). Having been working with the urban poor in Indonesia and the UK, I cannot help but feeling compelled to not only finding more meaning in my research, but to also find ways to give back to the community.

An indigenous research agenda according to Smith should evolve around and moving towards self-determination of the people (see Figure 4). Clare Land (2015) highlighted the importance of “decolonising ethic of attentiveness” for non-indigenous people who are working in solidarity with the indigenous people. In this research, I cannot help but place myself as a friend of the Papuan women, and walk in solidarity but with “critical self-reflection in knowing ourselves” (Land, 2015, p.200).

![Figure 4 - The Indigenous Research Agenda (Smith, 2012, p.121)](image)

In his report on Papua, Australian Peace and Justice advocate Peter Arndt (2018) described his journey with the West Papuan people who suffer oppression as walking with Christ to the cross. He said (p.31),

“solidarity with the people of West Papua means accompanying them in the midst of their great oppression, not with a view to helping them or working out a viable way forward for them, but rather with the desire to walk with them in their struggle to shape their own future as the First Peoples of their land. My solidarity acknowledges that they are the true experts on their situation and it respects their leadership of the work to overcome their oppression. In the process of my
I am also being accompanied by my Papuan sisters and brothers on the journey to reconstruct my own understanding of the world and my life and my participation in the great project of cultivating a social order founded on love.

With all these influences, I am confident in approaching the subject and the participants as both an outside researcher as well as a fellow Melanesian woman who is also seeking peace, social justice and a better future for her children.

From this approach, I became the student whilst the participants taught me about their culture, way of life and feelings. I wanted to walk together, work together, even cry and laugh together with the participants. I believe that in order to really know our fellow brothers and sisters, we must dare to offer and share a piece of ourselves and not putting up unnecessary barriers.

Through this research, I became aware of at least three issues in today’s academia and in the world of the activists and the ‘do-gooders’: exercising power vs empowering, decolonising solidarity, and white saviour complex.

### I.1. Exercising power vs empowering

Firstly, the concept of ‘empowerment’ and the term ‘empowering’ indicates an act of giving power, handing down power, from the powerful to the powerless or the less powerful. There is an indication of hierarchy and of a top down process. This difference was explained by my Social Work lecturer Suryia Nayak in 2012 when she quoted Foucault, “Power is exercised rather than possessed.”

In his lecture in 1976 (Gordon, 1980, p.89), Foucault stated that

“…power is neither given, nor exchanged, nor recovered, but rather exercised, and that it only exists in action. Again, we have at our disposal another assertion to the effect that power is not primarily the maintenance and reproduction of economic relations, but is above all a relation of force.”

This was eye opening for me! During my re-education to become a social worker from years of being a journalist, her statement was a revelation, “Empowerment discourses can lead workers to ignore the ways in which marginalised groups exercise power even though they do not ‘possess’ power.” Instead we were encouraged to “support the capacities of service users to exercise power rather than focus on their relative ‘powerlessness’.”
Hence with Michel Foucault and my social worker lecturer Suryia Nayak, I reject the term empowerment as the aim of this research and as the aim of participatory video (PV) in general. In this research – and I hope it will be in further researches to come – I use the term ‘exercising power’ instead of empowerment.

One of the objectives of this research is finding a sustainable pathway for indigenous Papuan women to have a meaningful presence and voice in peace and reconciliation discussions. In line with the principles of solidarity and encouraging participants to exercise power, I am aware of the conventional power relationship between researchers and participants, between academics and their subjects.

Therefore in the field research and in my interactions with the participants, I try to make clear what I had to offer – which are skills in filmmaking and organising – and what I need to learn or the information I needed to gather from the participants.

With this principle in mind, I can say that we – the researcher and the participants, the PV facilitator and the PV participants – exercise power together. However, in some part of this written critical dissertation, I might interchangeably use the term ‘enabling the women to exercise the power and the capital that they already have’. I am aware that the word enable (Oxford dictionary “make it possible for”) is still problematic. However, in this practice based research, until we find a better word in English that can describe the action, I shall use the term ‘enabling people to exercise power’ instead of ‘empowering’.

I.2. Decolonising solidarity

Back to my aim and objective and my awareness of colonialism within research, academia and global movements, throughout this research, I try to uphold the principle of decolonisation.

The term decolonising solidarity is borrowed from Clare Land’s book (2015) where she questions “the often fraught endeavours of activists from colonial backgrounds seeking to be politically supportive of Indigenous struggles”. In this research, I would like to draw a parallel in the theme in Land’s decolonising solidarity and Nayak’s (2015) efforts in placing the emphasis on the links between Black feminism as a social justice project and as a school of thought.

Land’s critical self-reflection in solidarity reminds me of Audre Lords writing, “the master’s tools will never dismantle the master’s house”. Lords (1984, p.113) wrote,
“I urge each of us here to reach down into the deep place of knowledge inside herself and touch that terror and loathing of any difference that lives there. See whose face it wears. Then the personal as the political can begin to illuminate all our choices.”

Two decades later Land (2015, p.35-37), a white woman supporting the cause of the indigenous Australians in the land of colonialism wrote,

“…it is necessary for non-indigenous supporters to act politically with self-understanding… interrogating our sense of interest… challenging to confront complicity… to change the system and sets implicit limits on what would be done or given up in the name of solidarity… this recognition should inform our public political action [and] reflected in the shape of our lives.”

This research links the practice of participatory video as a peace, social justice, decolonising and emancipatory project – which is practical and political in a way that I want to make a change – to the theoretical and academic sides of media practice that is influenced by indigenous methodology, indigenous approach, black feminism, decolonising methodology and solidarity.

In my refusal of being categorised to one subject or discipline and in my usage of feelings, autoethnography and instinct, I try to decolonise methodology and academic research. At the same time in the practice of PV that I use with the indigenous women of Papua, I endeavour to practice decolonising solidarity. I hope that the principle of critical self reflection, emphatic listening and decolonisation will become the norm for future researches and solidarity movements.

“Decolonisation never takes place unnoticed, for it influences individuals and modifies them fundamentally. It brings a natural rhythm into existence, introduced by new men [and women], and with it a new language and a new humanity. Decolonisation is the veritable creation of new men [and women]. But this creation owes nothing of its legitimacy to any supernatural power: the ‘thing’ which has been colonized becomes man during the same process by which it frees itself. ‘The last shall be first and the first last.’ Decolonisation is the putting into practice of this sentence” (Fanon, 1990, p.28)
I.3. Demythologising ‘white saviour’ and ‘foreign fetishism’

Although not without appreciation of the good intention many people have, I would like to bring to light the feel good effect of ‘white saviours’ going to developing or third world countries doing charities to the poor (the coloured people).

As much as I am interested about what is going on in Africa and other developing or poor countries, I felt rather uncomfortable watching BBC’s Comic Relief. Yes, I did praise the work of Oxfam in Indonesia and the Philippines during the aftermath of natural disasters, as I saw the brilliant idea of paying people to rebuild their own house after the tsunami in Aceh or flash floods in Ormoc. However, seeing a privileged white celebrity talking on camera in front of a slum area and hungry children as if the (coloured and poor) people are object, did make me cringe.

The term ‘white saviour’ was introduced to me by my son, who said that he is privileged because of his good education and because he is a male, but at the same time being non-white and bisexual place him in a rather less privileged in the UK society. The concept immediately made sense and explained so many subtle observations during my adult life both in South East Asia and the UK.

Teju Cole (2012) pointed out,

“Africa serves as a backdrop for white fantasies of conquest and heroism …. Africa has provided a space onto which white egos can conveniently be projected. It is a liberated space in which the usual rules do not apply: a nobody from America or Europe can go to Africa and become a godlike saviour or, at the very least, have his or her emotional needs satisfied. Many have done it under the banner of ‘making a difference’.

Straubhaar (2015) emphasised the need for critical consciousness in Freirean education amid “the stark reality of the ‘White Saviour’ complex”. He wrote,

“For those from oppressor classes, Freire notes that the oppressors do not perceive their monopoly on having more as a privilege… For those Western oppressor-class folk that seek out employment in development, this privilege often exhibits itself as a sense that we as Westerners have the unique power to uplift, edify and strengthen: what I here refer to as the White Saviour complex.”

Coming back to what my son pointed out, as an educated researcher living in the UK, I am indeed privileged – much more privileged than the Papuan women participants. As an Indonesian I am part of the ‘oppressor class folk’ (Straubhaar, 2015). Being aware of
these facts help my critical reflection, and therefore the most suitable method to use is an honest autoethnography.

The term ‘foreign fetishism’ is used by Rutherford (2003, p.20) to describe how people in Papua – especially Biak island – saw people coming from the outside world as sources of valuable goods and knowledge. This attitude towards foreigners is contrary to many other traditions in Indonesia that see foreigners with suspicion. Rutherford gave an example of foreign fetishism in the word ‘*amber*’ in Biak language which means foreigner but at the same time also means a prominent person or someone who does well in the community (2003, p.xviii).

My critique of ‘foreign fetishism’ is that it is a label given by a Westerner anthropologist, which takes me back to the colonial roots of anthropology. From the perspective of the indigenous women – participants of this research – their openness and welcoming nature to people from outside Papua is rooted from the their ancestor’s welcoming the first missionary (which will be explored further in my critical reflections in Chapter Five). In my opinion, how the Western researcher label indigenous people’s welcoming as foreign fetishism is – just like white saviour complex – rooted in colonialism and white supremacy views.
II. A practice led research on Participatory Video

As I stated above, I believe that in order to understand our brothers and sisters as human beings, to understand the others, one must dare to offer a piece of oneself. Hence it is only natural that in my relationship with the indigenous women of Papua, I feel that I can offer my acquired skills in journalism and filmmaking. At the same time, I am aware of the power relationship between researcher and participants, hence I try to use the principle of empathy and solidarity instead of superior saviour.

For all the above reasons, I am passionate in testing a model of participatory video (PV) that can be beneficial for the women participants even after my field research is completed. As a facilitator of learning, I would be successful if the participants no longer need me to continue their activities and growth in filmmaking and in voicing their opinion for their communities in general. The measure of success in this project is similar to that of a mother: you are successful if you are no longer needed.

This research is practice led, which means that it aims to contribute to participatory video as a media practice.

Sue Sudbury (2015, p.24) wrote:

“… for us in the West, of hearing and listening to these ‘other’ voices and thus hopefully having a greater understanding of other people’s lives and our part in the creation of their everyday realities, needs to be also acknowledged. … Participatory filmmaking developed, to some extent, to make the process of ‘data gathering’ and filmmaking more democratic and to shake off the shackles of colonialism.”

Departing from the ground set by Mahama (2004) and Sudbury (2015), this practice led research wants to continue the decolonisation agenda whilst finding a sustainable pathway through which indigenous Papuan women can voice their input through film.

As a participatory project, the centre point of this research will be the women participants and their learning process, not I the researcher. Although I have to present this research using autoethnography methods, the main documentary film that will be part of the submission will focus on the process and progress of the women participants, emerging from their domestic stereotypes to their public roles as new filmmakers and community leaders.
I agree with Cole (2012) who criticised the documentary *Kony 2012* as an example of ‘white saviour industrial complex’, hence I have no prescription for solution except that we all need to learn to listen more.

I stand with Cole (2012) and Knudsen (2003) that we need humility to start a research project, a pro-indigenous praxis (Freire, 1993; Corry, 2011; Land, 2015), or an action in solidarity with the homeless/the displaced/the failed asylum seekers or anyone else whom we think are less fortunate than us.

I understand the need for ‘bridge character’ (Kristof, 2010) so that the predominantly white privileged middle class audience can identify themselves with someone in the field or in a way place themselves in the field – bridging to sympathise. However, I feel that humans can do much better than identifying with those ‘like me’. Human beings have the capability of empathy and solidarity, of reaching out and admitting one’s privileges whilst standing together equally with our brothers and sisters who are less privileged.

Hence in this project, I take a brave stand to provoke, to be different, to point out the uncomfortable facts and to self-criticise in order to decolonise research methodology, decolonise solidarity, using participatory filmmaking.
III. The role of facilitator in adult education: teacher and student of life

In a participatory video (PV) project, the role of the facilitator is not the same as a teacher in a conventional school or university. As the person “responsible for the management of the change process in the participatory intervention” (Groot & Maarleveld, 2000, p.3), a facilitator uses what Freire (1993) called humanist and libertarian approach of education. That is, more of an equal learner who is sharing knowledge in an experiential learning environment.

The role of facilitators for adult education mainly credited to the work of Paulo Freire, Brazilian educator, philosopher and activist. Freire criticised modern education that he called “banking style of education” where the teacher teaches and students listen and memorise, like storing information in a bank.

The mainstream education system that is still widely applied in schools today – from ‘third world’ societies like Papua to the UK that is the fifth richest country in the world – tends to spoon feed students with knowledge and at the same time alienate learners from the real problems in the world. This is the banking style of education that Freire – and many of today’s activists for adult learning – criticised.

In his magnum opus, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Freire offered an alternative way, the problem-posing education where “people teach each other, mediated by the world” (1993, p.61). In Freirean pedagogy, the educator’s efforts coincide with students’ efforts to engage in critical thinking, and educators are partners of the students in a learning process (1993, p.56).

Freirean style of learning influences adult learning in developing countries in participatory development programs (Hogan, 2005). One of Freire’s most powerful principles that is used in adult education today is praxis. Praxis is the sum of action and reflection. Action without reflection is activism, and lacking of action is verbalism. The praxis wheel (Figure 5) summarise the Freirean approach.
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Facilitation is about the process and learning together. Structure sometimes becomes a second priority. This Freirean pedagogy has great influence in the context of community development, in Participatory Reflection and Action or PRA (Chambers, 2002), and in the practice of participatory video (PV). “Originated in East Africa and India as Participatory Rural Appraisal, PRA has been described as a family of approaches, behaviours and methods for enabling people to do their own appraisal, analysis and planning, take their own action and do their own monitoring and evaluation” (ibid, p.7).

In the context of Papua, there are a number of non profit or non governmental organisations and churches conducting community development training, however because this form of adult education is not integrated into the formal education system, most people would still need a degree or certificate to enter the job market.

As some areas of Papua are still difficult to reach by road, many primary and secondary schools have no teacher. In recent years, Army soldiers sometimes filled the gap and took over classrooms (Antara, 2017; CNN, 2018). A debate within some Papuan leaders and human rights organisations question the real reason for soldiers becoming teachers especially in areas that are known as strongholds of West Papuan rebel groups. There are also some concerns about the teaching methods used by soldiers and about their intention to indoctrinate the children and their families.

The positive side is that the soldiers answer the needs of teachers. However, with Indonesia’s mission to indoctrinate young Pauans to stay within Indonesia and the well-known violent methods used by members of the Indonesian Armed Forces, the lens of the world should be watching these military education projects.

Freire criticised the ‘banking style’ of education, where – in Hegelian terms – the students become alienated slaves.
IV. Autoethnography and the messy world of social life

In this research, I would like to break away from the controversy of whether documentary film is an ethnographic work or not (Sudbury, 2015; Banks, 1994). I am not an anthropologist by practice – although during my higher education I did take some modules in anthropology – and I am aware that anthropology as a discipline in social science has roots in the colonial past where Western or European explorers (colonials) gaze at the ‘other’, the exotic ‘orient’ (Said, 1978).

Here I am appropriating the method of autoethnography in Reed- Danahay’s (1997, p.2) category where anthropologists interject personal experience into ethnographic writing. I also use the autoethnography as a method (Chang, 2008) to reflect on my position in relation to the subject of my research, which is Papuan women who identify themselves as Melanesian. I want to highlight the term self-identification (Corry, 2011) here, because I do self-identify culturally as Melanesian based on the cultural heritage and genetic heritage from my father, even though I did not grow up in the Pacific islands.

My works in the field of journalism and filmmaking – in fact, in other fields that I have ventured including social work – have always been driven by something that is difficult to explain. As Knudsen (2003) described, “filmmaking is not merely some objective process of craft, but a living experience which cannot necessarily be qualified or quantified rationally.” In a way, my positionality is “suspended between cultures” as described by Knudsen (ibid).

A series of life experiences drove me to where I am now, from the bed time stories about my father’s childhood in the Melanesian land of Saparua, the year I spent in France as a daughter of an aviator, the experience of my teenage years wandering among nature and the indigenous people of Baduy in West Java, to my traumatic vision of war in Aceh.

Maybe it is only natural that learning anthropology as an undergraduate student gave me some theoretical framework to my life-long experience. However, when I visited the villages of the Baduy tribe in West Java in the 1990s and later with my son and husband in 2016, all I wanted to do was to ditch my scientific lens and to adopt the natural way of life of this indigenous people. The same feeling engulfed me when I first visited Papua: I fell in love with the people and the land. All I wanted to do was to walk with the people and even fight alongside the Papuan people, so that their culture would not be murdered by colonialism and the beauty of their land would not be tarnished by the greed of capitalism.
In describing autoethnography, Adams, Jones and Ellis (2015, p.9) acknowledge that “social life is messy, uncertain and emotional.” Hence to research social life, “we must embrace a research method that, to the best of our ability, acknowledges and accommodates mess and chaos, uncertain and emotions.”

Adams, Jones and Ellis identified the beginning of autoethnography as the crisis of representation which started in the 1970s and 1980s, which questioned the idea that researchers could separate themselves from their research experience. This crisis of representation questioned many objectives and practices of mainstream social research including “the standard use of colonialist and invasive ethnographic practices” (ibid, p.10). Their critique is in line with what many indigenous people and indigenous activists felt about how the colonialist researcher came intrusively into their lives to study their culture, disappeared and later dictated the formal education based on the colonialist point of view (Smith, 2012).

Autoethnography seems to agree with indigenous methodologies (Smith, 2012) in which the researcher’s positionality, personal experience, even emotions are taken into account. Gone is the time when researchers wore white lab coats and stern faces. Ethnographers today recognise that they could not ignore the ways emotions infuse and intertwine with physical experience and embodiment (Adams, Jones and Ellis, 2015, p.11).

This research adopts the method of autoethnography in that my positionality as the researcher is both insider and outsider. I a woman who is half Melanesian, I am Indonesian and British. As a researcher today, I am able to acknowledge my emotions in my interaction with the messiness of social life, the messiness of the Papua-Indonesia conflict.

One of my entries on my research page on Facebook (www.facebook.com/PhDAdeline) was the acknowledgement or confession that “I kept on breaking into tears when I write about The Biak Massacre (1998), Bloody Paniai (2014) and Nduga.”
V. Methods

This research started with reviewing existing literature on Papua. I used Aveyard’s (2010) literature review summary table (Figure 6) to focus my literature search. In addition to the conventional literature search using the university library’s electronic resources, I follow news and current affairs about Papua through international and Indonesian online news and through my membership of the Spirit of Papua WhatsApp group. The latter is a forum of academics, journalists, and community leaders inside and outside Papua to share and discuss issues pertaining to Papua – where sometimes I received breaking news far ahead of the mainstream media.

I also conducted a contextual review of practice and literatures on Participatory Video (PV) and Autoethnography. Throughout this written dissertation I also review certain theories in politics, conflict resolution, peace building processes, colonialism and decolonisation. As part of the contextual review, I conducted interviews with practitioners in PV and attended a one week training course in PV facilitation by an established organisation in Oxford.

Following the literature, theoretical and contextual review, I conducted field work to Papua. The first field work was to find my ground, to recruit potential participants, to conduct further literature search in a local library, and to interview local Papuan sources/experts.
Before the second field work, I designed the PV project tailored for the Papuan women participants. As I will discuss in Chapter Four, the designing of the PV project plays an important part as I planned to utilise existing capitals – human skills as well as technology. Because at this stage I had no confirmation of the venue, availability of the participants or the type of equipment available, the PV project was designed with a view options for adjustments.

The most important part of this research is the actual PV project in Papua. Locating in two cities – Nabire and Jayapura – with two groups of participants, I conducted PV workshops based on the participants’ different sets of skills, equipment and availability. To document the whole process, I recruited the skills of my husband who was a news cameraman for the BBC. During the PV workshop, he became the specialist mentor in camera work as well as my co-facilitator – although with the language barrier I sometimes had to be the interpreter, lead facilitator and researcher.

As part of autoethnography work in the digital age, I utilise a popular social media, Facebook, to publish articles, discussions, photos, video and vlogs. Utilising a Facebook page in itself will be a test of the function of multimedia and social media in autoethnography work as well as on the publication of ideas in general. However, for this research I focus on using Facebook and blogs to gather opinions from their limited audience before showcasing the participatory film to the general public in preparation to screening to decision makers.

In this research, autoethnography as a method is utilising social media as reflective and sharing platforms. The Facebook page https://www.facebook.com/PhDAdeline became my main platform for sharing the progress, the processes, and discussions about Papua and participatory video. Besides being a sharing platform, the Facebook page has become communication channel with Papuan grassroots communities and Papuan diaspora internationally.

As sharing platforms for publishing my articles, initial findings and reflections, I utilise free blog services. I shared a number of articles on https://adelinemt.wordpress.com and promote the PV project and the participants’ films on https://wewerewivesmothersdaughters.wordpress.com. Short documentaries, vlogs and interviews are published on my Youtube channel https://m.youtube.com/user/adelinemt.

People said “old habits die hard”. This shows how my journalistic instinct still sometimes screams for action. Whilst conducting this research, from time to time I sent articles to
mainstream and online mass media both in English and in Indonesian. Papuan Jubi Tabloid has published a couple of my stories from the UK, whilst an online literature site Qureta (www.qureta.com) has published my other stories and opinions.
VI. Chapter summary

This chapter started with reflections about various approaches and philosophies that influence my methodologies. I chose indigenous methodologies and approach with elements of solidarity and involvement in decolonising not only the people but also the scientific research methods. As explained in the Introduction, the positionality of the researcher plays an important part in this research. My position comes with three main principles that have to be clarified and explained: exercising power vs empowering, decolonising solidarity, and white saviour complex.

This chapter then explored the principles and philosophy of this practice led research on Participatory Video, followed by the role of facilitator in padult education, which is both teacher and student of life.

The use of autoethnography in this research is rather unique in utilising various platforms of social media – from Facebook to blog and Youtube – to share my findings, reflections, opinions, even feelings pertaining to this research. As a practice led research, the final submission will include a portfolio of articles and social media excerpts on top of the main written critical dissertation, documentary and films by the participants.
We Were Wives, Mothers, Daughters – Participatory Filmmaking for Peace Building
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CHAPTER TWO – TROUBLE IN PARADISE
A Situated Context and Literature Review of Papua

Abstract
This chapter outlines the background of Papua; from its complicated history to current events that impacted the lives of the indigenous Papuan people. Readers who want to understand Papua need to be aware of the multiple versions of history. In this chapter three versions of Papua’s history are outlined. Then there is the influence of the rise of the Melanesian nations, the anthropological approach, the roles of women and recent developments in this Papua Indonesia story.

I. History in three versions
Papua is the western side of the bird-shaped island about 250km north of Australia. The east part of the island is the independent country of Papua New Guinea. The western side as noted by Tebay (2005), “has been variously known as Irian Jaya (the Indonesian term), West Papua or simply Papua.” This review uses the term Papua as not to collude with Indonesian old regime’s term of Irian and to avoid confusion with ‘West Papua’. ‘West Papua’ has two meanings: the province of West Papua (Papua Barat) which is one of the two provinces in the region, or West Papua as the whole Western side of the island of New Guinea and the name of the independent country that the people aspire to. I choose to use the simple term of Papua, as it is also the name that is most commonly used by the Papuan people that I met so far.
With an area of 421,981 km² Papua is almost twice the size of Great Britain. According to the Indonesian census in 2000, the population of Papua is approximately 2.6 million with 66% indigenous Papuans (Sugandi, 2008, p.3-4). In the 2010 census, populations of the whole Papua are: 753 thousand people in Papua Province plus 2.78 million people in West Papua (Papua Barat) province (BPS, 2010).

Though some people believe that history is always written by the winner, for Papua and Indonesia there are multiple versions of history. Here, three versions are identified. First, the Indonesian version where the NKRI (Negara Kesatuan Republik Indonesia or The Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia) should stay as one, from Sabang in North Aceh to Merauke in South East Papua. Second, the Free West Papua (Papua Merdeka) version; and the third is what human right activists and recent scholars mostly use. While the first two are conflicting with each other, the last version seemed to make sense in the era of neoliberalism tendencies of replacing political judgement with economic evaluation (Davies, 2014).

I.1. Indonesian version - NKRI: The Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia
Indonesians who grew up under the ‘New Order’ or Soeharto regime were taught this version of history through compulsory history books. Growing up in Jakarta, I was one of the pupils struggling to memorise events in history including this version of Papua’s story. The Indonesian version is the story of heroism fuelled by the dogma of unity in diversity or Bhinneka Tunggal Ika. Here, after bravely throwing the Dutch from the archipelago with only sharpened bamboo (bambu runcing) as weapons, the Indonesian heroes saved Papua from Dutch slavery and cruel exploitation (see also Rutherford, 2012, p.93).
Heroes like Commodore Yos Sudarso in his *KRI Macan Tutul* (Indonesian naval ship called “Leopard”) fell martyr to the Dutch attack in the sea around Papua. In the end the brave Indonesians won and Papua was liberated from the Dutch.

The Permanent Mission of the Republic of Indonesia to the UN (2001) echoed what was written in Indonesian history books, “Irian Jaya [Indonesian name for Papua] is and has always been an integral part of Indonesia since the period of Sriwijaya and Majapahit Kingdom in the 12th century.” Without further reference, school books in the 1980s also described how Papuan people – who have always been part of Indonesia – were delighted to be back into the loving arms of the motherland, Indonesia. My history teacher at junior high school conveyed the logic that the Papuans are happy to be part of Indonesia, and that this feeling reflected in the 1969 Act of Free Choice where 100% of Papuan representatives chose to remain within Indonesia.

Indonesia has always considered the Papuan flag raising on 1 December 1961 as an act of treason against the NKRI (the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia). Some believe that this is the Dutch strategy to separate Papua from Indonesia so that they can continue to occupy Papua and benefit from its rich natural resources (Gere, 2015; Paharizal & Yuwono, 2016).

Gere (2015) noted that the Dutch refused to leave Papua, against the Round Table agreement 1949 in Den Haag. Then in 1961 – during the Cold War – Indonesia ‘liberated’ Papua from the Dutch using help from Soviet made aircraft in Operation Trikora (in Indonesian it is short for *Tri Komando Rakyat* or the three command of the people). This made the US worried about Indonesia-Soviet relations, thus the New York Agreement was initiated by the US on 15 August 1962.

Like in other parts of Indonesia, there were always ungrateful people who wanted to separate from the motherland (PUSPEN TNI, 2012). Just like the communists in 1965, they all failed to topple the sovereignty of the NKRI. Soeharto’s government, who called themselves The New Order, labelled The Free Papua Movement (*Organisasi Papua Merdeka*, OPM) as “thugs and terrorists who tried to turn the innocent Papuan people against their own motherland”.

This version however failed to mention the details of the 1969 Act of Free Choice (Indonesian: *Penentuan Pendapat Rakyat* or Pepera) where only one person representing 800 people of Papua could vote on their behalf. The representatives were chosen randomly by the Indonesian military personnel and allegedly voted under gunpoint. What
both Indonesian and Papua Merdeka versions agreed is that the USA had a role in supporting Indonesia due to the cold war.

The Indonesian version of history claimed to be based on the “international law principle of uti possidetis juris to ascertain the political status of Papua within Indonesia” (Gere, 2015, p.xi; Khairunnisa, 2017; Siu & Guzel, 2018). The Latin phrase means “as you possess under the law”. According to Cornell University Law School, it “is a principle of customary international law that serves to preserve the boundaries of colonies emerging as States.”

Just as Indonesian school history books from the 1970-1990s, Gere leaves no room for debate. Uti possidetis juris is now questioned internationally as a post-colonial discourse, for example in the case of Burkina Faso/Mali border or the case of ex-Soviet Union countries. Matsuno (2011, p.179-181) questioned the doctrine. Matsuno argued that if it is a legally binding or globally accepted international law, the Papuan Act of Free Choice 1969 should not have been considered, as Papua would have automatically become part of Indonesia.

**I.2. Free West Papua version: Papua Merdeka**

Merdeka is an Indonesian word means ‘freedom’ or ‘independence’. It was the cry that Indonesians used when fighting for independence from the Dutch. The same word is now used by many Papuan people to gain independence from Indonesia (see also Kirksey, 2012). The Papuan organisation that is campaigning for an independent Papua called themselves ‘Papua Merdeka’ – meaning ‘independent Papua’ or ‘free Papua’.


Drooglever (in King, Elmslie & Webb-Gannon, 2011, p.11) wrote that the Dutch “refused to hand over Papua to Indonesia in 1949 due to the Papuan population as a whole was not developed up to the point where it could determine affairs for itself.” The Dutch government according to Drooglever, began to prepare Papua for independence in the 1950s by allowing Papuan people to establish political parties. This is the start of the Free
Papua Movement (OPM) – although the OPM was not officially established until 1965. On 1 December 1961 the Papuans’ flag, the Morning Star, was raised alongside the Dutch flag in Jayapura, Papua’s capital (Tebay, 2005, p.4).

The Dutch handed over Papua to the United Nations Temporary Executive Authority (UNTEA) in 1963. This was in line with the New York Agreement in August 1962. The UNTEA then transferred Papua to Indonesia as a temporary measure while preparing for the referendum for the Papuan people to decide.

Tebay (2005, p.3) is of the opinion that, “Papua was occupied by Indonesia in May 1963. Since that time Indonesia has denied indigenous Papuans a genuine opportunity for self-determination.”

This version shows that as soon as Indonesia had their hands on Papua, they never loosened their grip. The Act of Free Choice 1969 was conducted with only 1,026 representatives of the Papuan people and under gun-point (Monbiot, 1989; Papua Merdeka & Brown, 2012; Saltford, 2000a & 2000b).

The word ‘colonisation’ was used by Ondawame to describe Indonesia’s claim over Papua (2011, p.236). Kjell Anderson (2015) also used the term colonialism to refer to Indonesia in Papua. He further stated that, “through neo-colonial policies of the Indonesian state, indigenous people in Papua have had their identity, autonomy and physical security undermined.”

Indonesia’s neo-colonialism in Papua, Kjell Anderson argues, “Appears to be genocidal, in that it aims at the disappearance of the Papuan group.” Anderson explains what most people understand as genocide is ‘hot genocide’ that is motivated by hate such as the Nazi Germany action against the Jews in World War II. What happened in Papua, Anderson continued, “is a ‘cold genocide’ that is rooted in the victim’s supposed inferiority.” Similar tone was expressed by King, Elmslie and Webb-Gannon (2011, p.8 &358-384) that Indonesia is committing ‘slow motion genocide’ through the unconstrained Indonesian settler arrivals in Papua – the move started by the Soeharto regime called transmigrasi (transmigration).

While western and Euro-centric authors focus on the gunpoint voting and Indonesia’s human right violations in Papua, many of them failed to mention the international politics of the 1960s. Moreover, not many analysed why and how the Dutch insisted on staying in Papua post 1949 Round Table.
I.3. Researcher and human rights version: the nationalist, the greedy and the coward

Literatures on Papua that were written after the fall of Soeharto or post-1998 show a more comprehensive and complex historical background (Maniagasi, 2001; Ginting, 2016; Hernawan, 2016; Paharizal & Yuwono, 2016; Tebay, 2005; King, Elmslie, & Webb-Gannon, 2011).

Many nationalist Indonesians still strongly believe the first version of history. I received a number of strong comments on this research page (www.facebook.com/PhDAdeline) when discussing Papua and how the Papuan people’s own voice need to be heard. Two comments from old friends said, “There should never be any question. Papua has always been, is and will always be part of NKRI!” This is what Benedict Anderson (2016) analysed as imagined communities – the concept of nation-states and nationalism that becomes a powerful ideology which can even be used as a tool of oppression against those who dare to differ.

Professor Benedict Anderson himself had some experience of this, when he was turned away by Indonesian immigration officers on his arrival at Jakarta airport in the 1980s. He was on the blacklist of the Indonesian government for speaking out against the regime (Hill, 1984). I remember how in the early 1990s, students in the University of Indonesia and Driyarkara School of Philosophy smuggled manuscripts by Benedict Anderson as an alternative reading to what was taught at classes.

It is widely accepted today that the Act of Free Choice was not up to the standard of modern electoral or referendum procedure. As Tebay (2005, p.7) described, “From about 800,000 Papuan population at that time, the Indonesian authority picked 1,026 people as representatives with 931 people selected without the presence of UN observers.” Tebay stands with the Papua Merdeka on “Papua was occupied by Indonesia in May 1963.”

On the economy side, Paharizal & Yuwono (2016) and Pease (1996) exposed the untold history behind the US mining company Freeport McMoran’s operation in Papua. The mining operation in Papua started with a report by Jean Jacques Dozy, a Dutch geologist, in 1936. The ‘Dozy document’ was found 23 years later by engineer Jan Van Gruisen who worked for the Dutch mining company Oost-Borneo Maatschappij. Looking for an international partner, the Dutch mining company signed contracts with a near-bankrupt company based in Louisiana, Freeport Sulphur. The joint venture became Zuid Pacific
Koper Maatschappij (South Pacific Copper Company). They conducted an exploration in Papua’s Carstensz mountain range in 1961 and found copper, nickel, silver and gold.

Even before minerals were found, the Dutch had been exploiting oil from Papua. The Nederlandshce Nieuw-Guinea Petroleum Maatschappij (NNGPM or Dutch Petroleum Company) was the highest tax-payer in the Netherlands in 1955.

Before their operation in Papua, Freeport Sulphur was struggling because their nickel mining operation in Cuba had ceased due to Castro’s nationalisation of Cuba’s assets in 1959. The Papuan mine then became their main source of profit (Paharizal & Yuwono, 2016, p.40).

Business interest is the main reason, analysed Paharizal and Yuwono (2016), that Papua was not handed over to Indonesia when the Dutch finally accepted Indonesian independence in 1949. In the meantime, the Cold War brought concerns from the USA that Indonesia inclined towards Soviet Union. Operation Trikora showed how Indonesia received Soviet help in military armaments. As Gere (2015) pointed out, the USA initiated the New York Agreement in 1962 motivated by its concern for the Indonesia-Soviet relation. By this time the Dutch gave up its share in the mining business and left the US company Freeport to operate in Papua on its own (Paharizal & Yuwono, 2016).

Freeport McMoran’s Grasberg Mine has been conducting its exploration activities in a 413,000-acre area for the last fifty years without consulting the Amungme and Kamoro people, who are the traditional landowners of the land (Hernawan, 2016).

We can only imagine what is going on around the mining sites by the scale of the security business the mining company is funding. Between 2001-2002 alone, the Indonesian operation of Freeport McMoRan, PT Freeport Indonesia, paid US$5.6 million in protection money to the Indonesian military (The Jakarta Post, 2003).

In addition to its 750 internal security personnel who are not armed, PT Freeport Indonesia had the assistance of 1,800 armed security personnel from the Indonesian military including Marine Police, Airborne Police, anti-riot troops and Indonesian Air Force to guard airports and runways (Tabuni, 2015, p.90). Hence, its security budget went up to US$22.7 in 2008 (ibid, p.90).
Pease (1996), Paharizal and Yuwono (2016) also exposed the CIA’s involvement in securing Freeport businesses in Papua and in the Indonesian power transition from Soekarno to Soeharto in 1965. Citing a book by a former CIA officer Joseph Burkholder Smith (Potrait of a Cold Warrior, 1976), Pease (1996) showed how “the CIA took it upon themselves to make, not just to enact, policy in Indonesia.” Pease also mentioned the CIA’s alleged “psychological warfare tricks to discredit Soekarno.”

Historical facts later noted that on 1 October 1965, Soekarno was replaced by Soeharto. The reason for this has two versions – the attempted coup by the Indonesian Communist Party, or the scenario designed by the CIA to support Soeharto’s regime driven by both Cold War politics as well as Freeport’s business interests.

While the USA and Indonesia were entangled in politics and business, the UN, who sent their observer in Papua to supervise a peaceful transition, had no influence. As Drooglever (2011) pointed out, the UN diplomat stationed in Papua spoke no Indonesian and no Papuan language or dialect, hence depending highly on Indonesian ‘translators and minders’. Worrying about their own careers amid the complication of languages and culture, UNTEA’s Representative Ortiz Sanz in Jayapura and American diplomats in the US Embassy in Jakarta did not report the full story to their headquarters (Paharizal & Yuwono, 2016). Tebay (2005, p.8) and Drooglever (2011, p.19-20) pointed out that there
were a number of military operations against Papuan activists and civilians who voiced their opinion towards independence not long before the Act of Free Choice 1969, however there was no report from the US diplomat or Ortiz Sanz about them.

When the Act of Free Choice took place, the chosen Papuan representatives were, “taken out to a highly guarded boarding house for several weeks before the polling day, totally isolated from the rest of the community, under pressure and intimidation from the Indonesian military… They were warned of the risk if they decided to separate from Indonesia” (Tebay, 2005, p.7).

Being escorted from one airstrip to a polling station, to another airstrip and another polling station to observe the Act of Free Choice, UN Representative Ortiz Sanz later declared in his report to the UN that “an act of free choice has taken place” (Tebay, 2005, p.7). This sealed the fate of the Papuan people as part of Indonesia. Moreover, the decision was then formalised in the UN General Assembly Resolution No. 2054 of 1969 (see Figure 20 at the end of this chapter).

I.4. Chronology

Today’s generation of educated young Papuans are mostly well aware of the different versions of history. Even those who received their formative education in schools run by the Indonesian government seem to be able to think critically and question the official version. Especially since internet and social media are available in Indonesia and Papua, there are campaigns “against forgetting” ("melawan lupa") from hashtags on Twitter, Facebook and Instagram #melawanlupa or #againstforgetting to TV programmes with the same title.

In recent years, more books are published independently that tell the story of Papua. Some are sold in small independent bookshops in Indonesia, or distributed in person by many Papuan and Indonesian human rights activists, community leaders and students. Between 2016 and 2018 I have travelled three times to Papua and Jakarta and acquired a number of books that are not available in major Indonesian bookstores. In March 2017, I spent one week reading a number of rare books in the library of the School of Philosophy and Theology (Sekolah Tinggi Filsafat and Teologi) Fajar Timur in Jayapura, Papua.

Apart from the three versions of the history of Papua, here are some factual events which form the chronology of the Trouble in Paradise.
06 April 1961 – The Dutch representatives in Papua, or Netherlands New Guinea at that time, inaugurated 28 members of the New Guinea Council. Their duty was to discuss the way forward in terms of self-determination. British Pathe documented the event https://youtu.be/ZPXxU1v9BLE

19 October 1961 – the New Guinea Council held its first Papuan People’s Congress in Holandia, or today’s Jayapura, where they declared that “our flag be hoisted beside the Netherlands flag; our national anthem “Hai Tanahku Papua” (Oh My Homeland Papua) be sung and played in addition to the Netherlands national anthem; our country bear the name of Papua Barat (West Papua); and, our people be called the Papuan people.” (Kaisepo, 2003; Raweyai, 2002, p.16; Arndt, 2018, p.18)


19 December 1961 – Indonesia launched a military operation called Operation Trikora (Tri Komando Rakyat or the three command of the people) (https://youtu.be/nBxZk9mgQsQ; Ballard, 1999)

15 August 1962 – The New York Agreement (https://peacemaker.un.org/indonesianetherlands-westguinea62) took place. British Pathe recorded the historical event as “Dutch Pact Signed At UN Secretary Council 1962” (https://youtu.be/HoP7SABBHJg). UNSF noted, “Ratification instruments were exchanged between the two countries on 20 September 1962 and, the next day, the General Assembly took note of the agreement in resolution 1752 (XVII) of the same date, authorizing the Secretary-General to carry out the tasks entrusted to him therein” (https://peacekeeping.un.org/mission/past/unsfbackgr.html).

01 October 1962 – UNTEA would have full authority after 1 October 1962 to administer the territory, to maintain law and order, to protect the rights of the inhabitants and to ensure uninterrupted, normal services until 1 May 1963, when the administration of the territory was to be transferred to Indonesia. (UNSF, https://peacekeeping.un.org/mission/past/unsfbackgr.html)

01 May 1963 - In accordance with article XII of the NY agreement, the UNTEA Administrator transferred full administrative control to the representative of the Indonesian Government, Mr. Tjondronegoro. The ceremony was performed in the presence of the UN
Secretary General's personal representative, and the Indonesian Foreign Minister. On this occasion, the United Nations flag was taken down (UNSF, ibid).

1969 The Act of Free Choice – instead of calling it plebiscite, the UN agreed to call this event ‘The Act of Free Choice’. Drooglever (2011, p.12) described the UN’s decision, “Sure at the time of the operation there had to be a representative of the secretary general of the UN in the field, but his limited job description was to ‘advise, assist and participate in arrangements which are the responsibilities of Indonesia for the Act of Free Choice’. So at the end Indonesia had full leverage to handle the matter according to its own preferences.” In this Act of Free Choice, Drooglever (2011), Rutherford (2012) and Saltford (2000a & 2000b) agreed that the Papuans had no say at all about the agreement.

21 May 1998 – Indonesia’s second president Soeharto stepped down and replaced by BJ Habibie.

26 February 1999 – A team of 100 Papuan representatives met President Habibie in Jakarta to discuss the problems in Papua. The Papuan representatives “stated the core issues clearly and openly and peacefully expressed their demand for independence” (Sumule, 2003)

7 June 1999 – The first general election of the post-Soeharto era took place. This was considered as the first free election in Indonesia since 1955.

30 August 1999 – a referendum held in East Timor with the result of the majority voting for independence from Indonesia, East Timor came under UN administration (BBC, 2019)

4 October 1999 – President Habibie signed Law No 45 which is the legal basis for dividing up the province of Irian Jaya (Papua) into three new provinces: The Province of Central Irian Jaya, the Province of West Irian Jaya and the Province of Irian Jaya. The division into three provinces never took place. Papuan people rejected this “as another form of divide and conquer policy” (Sumule, 2003; UNPO, 2006).

20 October 1999 – Fourth president of the Republic Indonesia Abdurrahman Wahid was inaugurated.

26 February 2000 – The Great Assembly of Papuan Leaders took place resulting in the forming of the Papua Presidium Council (Sumule, 2003).
29 May–4 June 2000 – The second Papua Congress approved the Papua Presidium Council with its chairperson Theys Eluay who was later found murdered in 2001 (Sumule, 2003; Pamungkas, 2017).

July 2001– Indonesian Parliament impeached President Wahid over allegations of corruption and incompetence. Vice President Megawati Sukarnoputri was sworn in (BBC, 2019).

January 2002 – Papua was granted special autonomy by Jakarta, and its name was changed from Irian Jaya to Papua (BBC, 2019).
II. Special Autonomy

During the period after Soeharto, the conflicts in Aceh and Timor Leste were resolved. Whilst Papuan people saw this as an opportunity to demand their rights for self-determination, Indonesia tried to seek a solution similar to that in Aceh. Indonesia proposed this “as a way to address the situation in Papua by allowing the region to have more independence, while still remaining under Indonesian sovereignty” (Capriati, 2016a, p.36).

To sum up the Special Autonomy (known as Otsus or Otonomi Khusus) phenomena in Papua, Widjojo et al (2008, p.18) explained:

*Indonesian state organs after the New Order have admitted that development in Papua has failed. This is stated in point (f) of the Preamble of Law 21/2001 on Special Autonomy. This means that the political objective of the OTSUS law first and foremost was to quell Papuan demands for independence. But more important that is the objective of creating a space within the development paradigm that focuses on the needs and basic rights of the Papuan people. … OTSUS has a budget of around IDR1.3-1.5 trillion per year. In 2005, this increased to IDR1.775. The money being paid out by the central government to the regional government has not benefited the vast majority of Papuans. In fact, what has happened is that these funds have been used to cover the needs of officials…*

Many educated Papuans saw the Special Autonomy (Otsus) with its big budget as bribery from Jakarta to pacify the Papuans’ cry for independence, and many agreed that Otsus is a failure (Hernawan, 2017; MacLeod, 2016; Tabuni, 2017; Widjojo et al, 2008). One of the failures of the Otsus according to Capriati (2016a, p.17) is that “this has led to the ‘Papuanization’ of the civil service: jobs in the bureaucracy were rapidly assigned to Papuans, and little attention was paid to the competence of those hired. This policy has favoured the Papuan elites, but not the wider population.”

Once again, the lack of grassroots participation is highlighted as Capriati wrote, “Overall, many agree that one of the deepest problems with the Special Autonomy Law is the lack of democratic participation in designing and implementing the arrangements” (2016a, p.18).
III. The Melanesian influence

While Papua was internationally accepted as part of Indonesia, its Eastern neighbour Papua New Guinea declared their independence from Australia and gained recognition in 1975. Within the 1970s, other Melanesian countries gained their independence. The Melanesian Spearhead Group (MSG) was formed after an informal meeting of the head of governments of Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu and representatives of Kanak Socialist National Liberation Front (FLNKS) of New Caledonia in 1986. The MSG, as an intergovernmental organisation representing Melanesian nations and their interests, was officially founded in 2007.

In recent years, the MSG has been playing a big role in supporting Papua’s right for self-determination, and highlighting human right issues in Papua to the international community. Hernawan (2016, p.48) explained how “The 2013 MSG Summit was the first forum of its kind to officially invite Papuan representatives. They addressed the summit as official guests, equal to Indonesia and Timor Leste, which both have observer status.”

Since 2015, the United Liberation Movement for West Papua (ULMWP) was given the observer status in the MSG, while at the same time Indonesia was given the status of associate member. Free West Papua supporters saw this as an opportunity to get recognition for self-determination, in line with the core principles of the MSG that highlighted all Melanesians’ “inalienable right to self-determination”. Along with the benefits of the trade links between the Melanesian nations, the MSG is seen as “the beginning of West Papua’s future and bringing home to the Melanesian family” (Free West Papua, 2016).

Macleod, Moiwend and Pilbrow (2016, p.17) see full membership of The MSG as “a road map to peace”. They further recommend that the Pacific nations should take the initiative to lead the international movement in protecting the Papuans and intervening in the Papua-Indonesia conflict (p.31).

Most literature categorise Papuan people as part of the Melanesian ethnic group (Tebay, 2005, p.11; Macleod, Moiwend & Pilbrow, 2016; Down, 2016; Elmslie, Webb-Gannon & King, 2011), hence being a member of the MSG is sometimes seen as a key to the solution for Papua-Indonesia conflict. However a new theory is being developed that highland Papuan people are not Melanesian at all. A linguist and PhD graduate from Oxford University’s St Catherine’s College, Willem Burung explained about the different roots of the highland and coastal Papuan people. According to the lecturer and researcher from Papua University (Univesitas Papua), the coastal Papuan people are Melanesian,
sharing similar characteristics with people from the Moluccas, East Timor, Nusa Tenggara, and most of the Pacific nations who are members of The MSG. Whilst the highland Papuan people, away from the coast, do not share the Melanesian characteristics such as language, culture, and physical features.

Indonesian anthropologist Koentjaraningrat (1994, p.111) explained the physical anthropology of the Papuan people, “Among Papuans itself there are physical differences. In brief there is a tendency that the further from the coast, the shorter their physical appearances. There are also difference in the shape of their skulls: Papuans from the coastal area in general have a more oval / long skull while the Papuans from further inland tend to have wider skulls.”

In Willem Burung’s theory, if most Papuan people are highlanders and not Melanesian, their claim to join the MSG is rather weak, and to separate from Indonesia based on cultural difference is somewhat not a valid argument. However, most literature and at grassroots level most Papuans themselves refer Papuan people as ethnic Melanesian.
IV. The Leviathan and the audience

An anthropological approach was used by Kirksey (2012) and Rutherford (2003 & 2012) to understand and analyse the complexity of the conflict in Papua. Koentjaraningrat (1994) also took the point of view as an anthropologist in his description of the plurality of the Papuan Society. However, the latter is an old-school anthropological study written from the standpoint of The NKRI during Soeharto's New Order.

Both Kirksey and Rutherford use local stories and mythologies to explain in detail some Papuan cultures. Their studies are snapshots of the indigenous Papuans. Both Kirksey and Rutherford went to Biak, an island on the north of the bird’s neck coast of Papua. The culture in Biak is that of a coastal and island people, where traditions of fishermen and cargo cult influence people’s way of thinking and their everyday lives. In Willem Burung’s categories, the Biak people are Melanesians.

IV.1. The Leviathan

In her 2012 compilation of articles on the anthropology of sovereignty, Danilyn Rutherford offered an anthropological look into the Papuan struggle for independence. Through Laughing at leviathan: Sovereignty and Audience in West Papua (2012), Rutherford shows the complexity of Papua’s reality. The argument is that sovereignty, be it Indonesian or Papuan, still relies on its very complex audience. Hence the power of the Leviathan – which is a fragmented body – is actually depending on its audience, its subjects. “Sovereignty in practice entails interdependency and based on audience. The audience is sovereignty’s basis and its bane,” stated Rutherford (ibid, p.1-2).

Through her ethnography work, Rutherford (ibid, p.248) comes to the conclusion that “Dutch officials, Indonesian politicians, UN envoys, US legislators, Papuan nationalists; they all should be able to imagine others whose gaze disturbs familiar hierarchies, being reduced to ‘bare life’ who could in fact be ‘lords of life’, audiences who may have claim to sovereignty after all.”

The implication reflects what other authors recommended: that the Indonesian government as well as the Papuan leaders need to have a more thorough dialogue. They need to encourage participation from Papuan people at grassroots level and listen more to the voice of the people (Ginting, 2016; Hernawan, 2016; King, Elmslie & Webb-Gannon, 2011; Ruhyanto, 2016; Tebay, 2005). It is therefore pointless to claim sovereignty over Papua without understanding the audience, which is the people, their aspirations, their culture and their belief systems.
IV.2. The audience

As Rutherford indicated, understanding the Leviathan requires understanding the audience. Kirksey (2011 & 2012) provides a standpoint to understand the Papuan people. From his ethnography study in Jayapura and Biak, Kirksey (2012) found that most Papuan people he met are hoping for a messiah. The old folklore about the smelly old man, Manamakari, who turns out to be the saviour of the village mixed with Christianity, show how the Papuan people are waiting for someone to deliver them from poverty, from life’s misery and from Indonesia. Through his ethnography work in Papua, Kirksey saw that the messiah might be more than one person. Kirksey’s messianic multiple means a future with “multiple messianic political options which could work” (2011, p. 278-294).

During his stay in Biak, Kirksey witnessed the tail end of the 1998 Biak demonstration where people saw Filep Karma, a humble civil servant, who raised the Moring Star flag, as their messiah. This event later became well known as the Biak massacre 1998 where between 40 to 150 people were tortured, killed and mutilated (Amnesty International, 2018; Free West Papua, 2018; Kirksey, 2012; MacLeod, 2016; Rutherford, 2012). Another example is the Zakheus movement within the Ekagi people, which started as an education for indigenous people against polygamy, but with its symbolism and rituals, the movement became a new set of beliefs – a syncretic of indigenous beliefs and Christianity (Giay, 1995).

While Kirksey’s messiah (2012) came from within the Papuan people, in the scenario of messianic multiple, leaders might come from inside as well as outside Papua. In July 2016, I had a discussion with a Papuan Protestant pastor who served in the Sentani area. The pastor cannot be named for security reasons, but he agreed for the content of our discussion to be published. The pastor feels that the current social political situation in Papua – with the difference and sectarianism between the tribes of Papua itself – means that an independent Papua lead by a native Papuan is almost impossible, at least not in the near future. He saw that for the moment, the most visible future for independent Papua – if it is going to get independence at all – is to have a leader from outside Papua with a broader vision and a more balanced point of view but having greater care for the people.

Bobby Anderson (2015) and the pastor I met in Sentani identified problems of horizontal conflict between clans and the fragmented independent movements. Both the pastor and linguist Willem Burung are of the opinion that the many factions of Free West Papua organisation and different pro-independence organisations are dividing Papuan people. Chauvel (2011) called this ‘politics of pork’, where the extra finance from Indonesia’s
special autonomy strategy does not reach Papuan people on the grassroots level, instead it enriched the civil servants and local authority leaders, their clans and their families.

The hope for foreigners as saviours could explain how Papuan people “fish for foreigners” using their welcome dance and music, Yospan, in Biak airport (Kirksey, 2012). The song and dance was to welcome and to ‘lure’ international visitors on transit in Biak airport in the 1970s-1980s. Rutherford analysed this as ‘foreign fetishism’. The best example of ‘foreign fetishism’ is the concept represented in the word ‘amber’ in Biak native dialect. ‘Amber’ means a foreigner, but also means a prominent person. Hence local people who gained high status could become ‘amber’ (Rutherford, 2003).

The wait for outsiders to make a difference was clearly felt when I visited Wamena and the surrounding villages in July 2016. My guide at that time, Bernard (pictured in Figure 8), was keen in showing how poor the villagers are and how primitive their lives are, untouched by development from Jakarta. Bernard indicated how they are still waiting for the government in Jakarta to build their villages to become modern towns with modern technologies like the rest of the world.

Similar with other Melanesian cultures, within Papua there are versions of the cargo cult. Cargo cult saw ports and runways as pathways to the unknown world of wealth, while ships and aeroplanes are the carriers of the magical instruments such as lamps, radio, television which “could not be manmade” (Giay, 1995).

The pastor from Sentani said that the hope for grassroots Papuan people – or the audience in relation to the Leviathan (Rutherford, 2012) – is education and information.
There is also a possibility that when the concept of the foreign became known, the 
fetishism will end as information marks the end of mysticism (Rutherford, 2003, p.135-
136). From many other discussions during this research, I found that education is a theme 
that many agreed on as the way forward for Papua.

Kirksey (2012) analysed entanglement and interdependence as strength and weakness,
as both opportunity and threat. People like Ester Nawipa (ibid, p.2-7) who used her status 
as the mistress of the army commander to save villagers' lives shows opportunity in 
entanglement – the unlikely collaboration between the parties in this conflict.

In the case of Theys Eluay, local leaders who utilised his closeness to the Indonesian 
government while also supporting Papua independence, his entanglement marked the 
violent end of his life. Rutherford’s host Sister Sally the nurse (2003, p.234) was not a 
great supporter of Indonesia, but was very proud to show how her cousin got a job with 
the local government and made a good living.
V. The actors

Amid the complex entanglement and interdependence that describe Papuan society today, in this research I identified four actors that built the Papuan narrative. First, the freedom fighters, generalised as OPM (Organisasi Papua Merdeka or The Free Papua Movement) who are mainly men. Second, the women and their unique roles in Papuan society. Third, the foreigners in Papua today are a mix of missionaries and businessmen. The fourth categories are the Indonesian settlers.

V.1. The ‘freedom fighters’

Those who are familiar with the history of separatist movements in Indonesia might compare Fretilin (Frente Revolucionária do Timor-Leste Independente or Revolutionary Front of Independent East Timor) of Timor Leste, GAM (Gerakan Aceh Merdeka or Free Aceh Movement), and OPM (Organisasi Papua Merdeka or The Free Papua Movement). These were simplified and generalised terms referring to the three movements. The reality is much more complex.

Although known as the main opposition to Indonesia, Fretilin was only one of the major political parties in East Timor. They gained control of the area and declared independence from the Portuguese in 1975 before Indonesia occupied East Timor (Britanica, 2019). GAM or the Free Aceh Movement was the only separatist movement in Aceh, established in 1976 by Hasan Tiro (Hamzah, 2014). Whilst East Timor ended with independence after a referendum in 1999, Aceh agreed to stay as part of Indonesia with special autonomy status following a peace deal in Helsinki in 2005. Its leader Hasan Tiro came back from his exile in Sweden and finally passed away in his homeland (Hamzah, 2014).

In the case of Papua, the complexity of its freedom movement is far greater than those of East Timor and Aceh. Papua covers an area of 421,981 km², which is 28 times bigger than East Timor (14,874 km²) and seven times bigger than Aceh (58,377 km²). Whilst Acehnese people speaks Acehnese language and East Timorese people speaks Tetum, Papua has over 200 different languages – Koentjaraningrat mentioned 234 languages in Papua (1994, p.120), the Summer Institute of Linguistic (SIL) identified 275 languages and Ethnologue listed 276 languages (Lewis, 2009) – with at least 261 ethnic groups (Ananta, Utami & Handayani, 2016).

Although most Papuan people that I met have aspirations for an independent state of West Papua, the independence movement was known to be rather fractured until recently. The Institute for Policy Analysis of Conflict (IPAC) noted that since the 1970s, the story of the OPM “has been one of local commands with limited territorial control, operating
independently of one another, with periodic and largely unsuccessful efforts at unification" (2015, p.5). However, since 2014 the movement and “the political dynamics in West Papua have changed, and the West Papuans have unified under the banner of the United Liberation Movement for West Papua” (Macleod, Moiwend & Pilbrow, 2016, p.13).

Papuan leader and head of Papuan Baptist Church Rev. Dr. Socratez Yoman told me the same thing when I interviewed him in March 2019 (https://youtu.be/8xXqqMRmaO8), “Papuan people are now united under one leadership of the United Liberation Movement for West Papua (ULMWP), hence Indonesia has no more excuse to refuse dialogue.” Another Papuan religious leader who is also a well-known Papuan anthropologist, Dr. Benny Giay, also said that the ULMWP is now widely recognised as the representative of the voices of the Papuan people (https://youtu.be/oSMVXkuCOPw).

United Liberation Movement for West Papua (ULMWP) unites the three main Papuan organisations for independence which are: The Federal Republic of West Papua (NRFPB), National Coalition for Liberation (WPNCL) and West Papua National Parliament (PNWP). In June 2015, ULMWP was given observer status in the Melanesian Spearhead Group (MSG) whilst at the same time Indonesia was recognised as an associate member. For the Papuans, this is their “first diplomatic recognition, since 1963, of being recognised as a country in waiting” (Chronology of ULMWP, https://www.ulmwp.org/ulmwp).

In the meantime, inside Papua and in other parts of Indonesia, students and young people speak up their support for Papua’s self-determination through rallies, campaigns and discussions. The main organisation representing Papuan young people is the the National Committee for West Papua (Komite Nasional Papua Barat, KNPB). Hernawan (2017a) wrote that KNPB “has grown quickly as an organisation of the Papuan youth that publicly campaigns for a referendum for Papua because they believe that the first referendum or ‘the Act of Free Choice’ in 1969 was flawed and paved the way for the Indonesian state to take over and oppress Papuans”. King, Elmslie and Webb-Gannon (2010) describe KNPB as “a coordinating body for its member organisations, which serves as West Papua’s resistance ‘media’, reporting on all independence related activities in West Papua, their execution and rationale”.

KNPB was founded with principles of active non-violent movements, although in some rare occasions, demonstrators threw stones and shouted abuse to the riot police and journalists (Suara Pembaruan, 2012 as quoted by Hernawan, 2017a). The International Crisis Group portrayed KNPB as ‘militant’ (ICG, 2012) but many researchers disagreed (Hernawan, 2017a; Hernawan, 2017b; King, Elmslie and Webb-Gannon, 2010).
As they base their struggle inside Papua, many KNBP activists became targets of police and military arrests. Its founders Buchtar Tabuni and Victor Yeimo were arrested and received prison sentences of eight months and three years respectively (http://www.papuansbehindbars.org).

Amnesty International (2018, p.39) noted, “On 14 June 2012, plain clothes police officers in Waena, near Jayapura, Papua Province shot and killed Mako Tabuni, Deputy Chair of the KNPB.” The report continued, “On 26 August 2014, the body of another KNPB activist was found in a sack floating in the sea near the Nana islands in Sorong District, West Papua Province. Martinus Yohame’s injuries reportedly included a gunshot wound to his chest. Yohame, head of the Sorong branch of KNPB, had gone missing on 20 August 2014.” Of the 69 cases of suspected unlawful killings that Amnesty International documented in the report, “there are eight cases accounting for 10 lives in which the victims were members of the KNPB” (ibid, p.39). Previous Amnesty International report noted that, “At least seven KNPB activists were killed by security forces in 2012” (Amnesty International, 2013, p.123).

Outside Papua, within eight months “between January and August 2016, 4,500 Papuan men and women were arbitrarily arrested and detained for taking to the streets expressing their political views in 13 cities across Indonesia” (Hernawan, 2017b).

In addition to members of KNPB, there are many civilians who were persecuted for joining demonstrations – from flag raising gatherings to demonstrations related to national and local elections. I have difficulties categorising these people as they are mainly indigenous Papuan with aspirations for independence, whether or not they consider themselves members of organised movements. In this research, seven indigenous Papuan women tell the story of their men and how their lives were affected by the conflict in Papua. Although directly affected by the conflict and whether explicitly or implicitly indicating their aspiration for independence, none of their men were members of any organisation.

Ema’s husband had been attending a gathering with Morning Star flag raising when he was shot by a uniformed soldier from a moving civilian car. He died in an army hospital not long after. In Mama’s Story, the women told a story of an absent father due to him running away from police and army intimidation. The father was also not a member of any organisation that actively supporting Papuan independence.
In many cases, Papuan civilians who experienced intimidation and violent treatment became supporters of human rights organisations (Giy & Kambai, 2003), women’s rights organisations (Yuniar & Easton, 2015), or like Ester Nawipa (Kirksey, 2012) utilising their positions in society to defend their fellow Papuans. Most people who had experienced the violent conflict in Papua stated that they found strength through their church related activities (Giy & Kambai, 2003; Yuniar & Easton, 2015). In this majority Christian society, priests, pastors and reverends are considered community leaders and in many cases run civil and non profit organisations such as Papua Peace Network (Jaringan Damai Papua, JDP) and Fransican’s Secretariat for Justice, Peace and Integration of Creation (Sekretariat Keadilan Perdamaian dan Keutuhan Ciptaan, SKPKC). Churches in Papua play a big role in defending and promoting human rights (Tebay, 2003; van den Broek, Hernawan & Gautama 2001; Jenaru, Triharyanto & Koren, 2017).

**Table 2.1: Statistical data on civil and political rights situation in West Papua between 2012 and 2016.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data on Civil and Political Rights in West Papua</th>
<th>Reporting Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cases of Violence/Arrests/Threats against local Journalists</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases of Violence/Deportation/Intimidation/Obstruction against foreign Journalists and Observers providing coverage on Papua related issues in Indonesia</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of reported Torture/Maltreatment Cases</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of reported Torture/Maltreatment Victims</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of reported Cases of Extra-judicial Killings</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of reported Victims of Extra-judicial Killings</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosecution of Perpetrators (Police and Military)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Political Arrests</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Political Prisoners/Detainees</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Public Peaceful Assemblies/Gatherings on Papua-related issues, forcefully intervened by security forces</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence/Threats against Human Rights Defenders</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases prosecuted with Treason Charges (Article 106 and/or 110 KUHP)</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 9 - Statistical data from International Coalition for Papua (ICP, 2017, p.9)**

**V.2. Mama**

Although Papua has many different ethnic groups with many different cultures, the majority of Papuan societies are patriarchal. Unsurprisingly, the role of women is mainly in the domestic realm, although there are differences between unmarried young woman and mothers. The common term for a mature woman is ‘mama’, which does not only mean...
mother. Addressing a woman as ‘mama’ is a respectful gesture, like ‘mam’ or ‘madam’, but at the same time warm and friendly as it also indicates closeness and familiarity.

Papuan people in general respect and prioritise family and clan. I found the family in Papua has a broader meaning than British nuclear family. When someone calls another person brother, it does not necessarily mean that they are siblings from the same nuclear family. Cousins or even second degree cousins who share the same clan name sometimes call each other brother or sister.

In traditional villages, one house or ‘honai’ (house or houses in Papuan highlands) is the home of a few nuclear families. When I visited the famous Dani tribes in Baliem Valley in 2016, my guide explained that in a typical village there are at least three honai: one for the village chief and his family, one for women, and one for men (Figure 10 shows a rather larger village with more than three honai).

Supriyono (2010) describes that women in Papuan society – especially in Paniai area among the Mee and Moni tribes – are considered a form of currency due to the dowry system. A daughter is an investment, because she would bring in dowry money from her future husband. The principle of the dowry system “was a way of valuing the backbone of the children that will be born out of a woman’s womb” (ibid, p.33). However, since money became a known currency, women became commodities. This made women’s positions in
families vulnerable – with high risk of domestic violence – because husbands see their wives as possessions that they ‘bought’ from her parents.

A wife is a status symbol and power, and an elder or a community leader would get more respect the more wives he can ‘buy’. A woman is also a tool that a rich man can buy to look after his farms or vegetable patch and to sell their produce in the market. Marriage is the affair of two extended families, not just a man and a woman. When a man from one clan proposes to a woman from a different clan, the family of the woman would name a price. If the man cannot afford this, his whole clan would chip in to pay the dowry.

Besides money, many Papuans still see other goods and produce as currency. Most highland Papuans value the pig or boar as a precious possession. Besides being part of the dowry, pigs or boars are also an important part of the wedding. A party is not a party without plenty of pork meat cooked in a pit covered by grass, leaves and hot stones (‘bakar batu’ or burning stone).

There are variations of ceremonies and dowries across Papua. For example, the Moni tribe in Paniai regency – where some participants of this research came from – would ask for a necklace made of certain sea shells on top of money and pig as dowries. The Dani and Lani tribes – also from the highland areas – also use this sea shells necklace as dowry. After some discussions with the research participants and other researches who know the area, I had a guess that the sea shells are valued highly by the highland tribes due to their distance to the sea where the shells came from. From the coastal town of Nabire to Enarotali where most Moni and Mee tribes live (about 114km or 71 miles), took over eight hours. I can only imagine how many days it would take to walk, before the introduction of cars and roads.

*Figure 11 - Women from Moni tribe, clan Zonggonau showing their traditional dresses and accessories. The seashell necklace that I wear is a typical dowry for Moni tribe*
There was a practice of cutting (mutilating) a segment of a finger when a close family member passed away (Koentjaraningrat, 1994, p.280; Supriyono, 2010, p.36). The practice is mainly among the women who lost their men (Setiya, 2017; Discovery, 2018), although no sufficient research is available to confirm the gender side of the practice. An old woman from Dani tribe in Bami Valley showed me her left hand with almost no fingers as she lost her husband and sons. Although Koentjaranigrat (1994), Setiya (2017) and Discovery (2018) linked this practice with only the Dani tribe, it is also practised by other highland Papuan tribes such as the Me (Supriyono, 2010) and the Moni – as one of the women participants from Moni tribe explained to me.

In Papuan culture, ‘mama’ means much more than mother, it is also a term of endearment for older women. Recently, ‘mama’ is also associated with ‘pasar mama-mama Papua’ or Papuan mamas’ market. When I visited Jayapura, capital of Papua province in 2017, I joined a rally and an outdoor film screening where indigenous Papuan women demanded their rights to sell their produce in a traditional market that is supposed to be protected as indigenous rights for them. The rally was also in memory of Robert Jitmau, secretary of the Solidarity of Papuan Indigenous Trader (Solidaritas Pedagang Asli Papua, Solpap) who had been fighting for the rights of indigenous stall holders or traders in the traditional market in Jayapura (Costa, 2016). Robert Jitmau was killed in a hit and run incident in the early morning of 20 May 2016, which no one believes to be an accident (Jenaru, Triharyanto & Koren, 2017).

The Indonesian President Joko Widodo visited this traditional market earlier and promised to build a more modern market for the Papuan women, however as the modern market was completed, the women were not allowed to use them and instead Indonesian settlers
from outside Papua occupied the market stalls selling halal food and other commodities that are not for indigenous Papuan people. Trying to make a whole market ‘halal’ in Papua means that indigenous Papuan people cannot buy and sell pork meat (Pabika, 2017), which is very important in Papuan culture and diet, so it is also further marginalises the indigenous Papuans on their own land. One year later, the market in Jayapura was officially open, but the problem of who benefits from it, is still ongoing (Yeimo, 2018).

Among the few indigenous Papuan women who became public figures and human rights advocates is Yosepha Alomang, or Mama Yosepha, who often protested Freeport and its military security guards. She promoted local fruit and vegetables to be sold to the mining company, but the company preferred to import everything from outside Papua through Timika airport. In protest of this, Mama Yosepha led a movement to destroy the imported fruit and vegetables. When Freeport and the Indonesian government refused to listen to the concerns of local people about the abusive treatment from Freeport security, she held demonstrations at Timika airport and set fires on the airfield. She was arrested on suspicion of helping OPM rebel leader Kelly Kwalik, and was held in a container for human faeces and urine. For one month she lived in human faeces up to her knees (Giay & Kambai, 2003).

Spending one month in a cess pit did not deter Mama Yosepha from her fight for human rights. Her activities seem to be driven by her concerns for the rights of indigenous Papuans and her views on religion. Coming from the Amungme tribe and baptised as a Catholic, Mama Yosepha sees “religion as a means and source of strength to free human from the prisons built by Indonesia, traditional society, Freeport and even the Church”
(Giay & Kambai, 2003, p.xxvii). In 1999 Mama Yospeha was given the Yap Thiam Hien Human Rights Award and in 2001 she received the Goldman Environmental Prize for her resistance against Freeport and her works in defending the rights of indigenous peoples.

Today, many Papuan women in urban areas join the women’s rights movement – campaigning against domestic violence and supporting the Papuan mamas’ market. However, in the rural areas and villages, the roles of Papuan women are still mainly within the domestic area.

Figure 14 - “If you are a real man, you don’t hit women, you don’t cheat.” International Women’s Day 2018 in Jayapura where Papuan women campaigned against domestic violence. One of the research participants joined this rally (right).

V.3. The foreigners, the missionaries and colonialism

I lived in Indonesia for almost 30 years, always as a minority for both my ethnic background and religion. The majority of the 262 million Indonesians are Muslim (87.2%) whilst my family was one of the 2.9% Roman Catholics (CIA World Fact Book). I was used to celebrating Christmas and Easter quietly in church, never publicly on the street. Hence I was surprised during my first visit to Papua, as I saw many crosses with purple fabric displayed on main streets of Jayapura. Friends told me that the cross on the side of the road is a local tradition to celebrate Good Friday and Easter. Papua is the only province in Indonesia with an extra public holiday: ‘the day the Gospel Enters Papua’, which is every 5th February. I was in Nabire on 5 February 2018 and observed the holiday. It is indeed unique to hear people said to each other, “Happy 163th anniversary of the Gospel enters Papua!”

Whilst the rest of Indonesia saw the Dutch colonial as an evil force that exploited the archipelago for centuries, the Papuan people saw Dutch and European people in general as friendly visitors who brought Christianity and modernity. This is probably because most
of the soldiers and administrators were based in the island of Java and other major
islands whilst the Dutch New Guinea – what today became Papua – was too far and
remote to be governed administratively. The only Europeans who reached Papua were
the missionaries who already ventured to the Philippines, the Moluccas and the Pacific
islands.

Today, Papua is still home for a number of foreign – European, American, British –
missionaries and linguists. The ambition to translate the Holy Bible to local languages
seems to attract new younger generations of missionaries. Whilst doing the participatory
video project in Jayapura in 2018, I met a few missionaries and linguists who were there
to learn some local languages to translate the Bible. There are many foreign missionaries
who have lived in Papua for years and are fluent in the local language and Indonesian.

For many years since becoming part of Indonesia, Papua has been an area closed to
foreign journalists. The limited numbers of books and documentary films about Papua by
foreign writer or producers are mainly produced by people who entered Papua as tourists,
who later wrote books or produced documentaries such as George Monbiot (1989),
Dominic Brown (Papuan Merdeka & Brown, 2012), Charlie Hill-Smith (2009), Daniel Start

In May 2015, the then newly elected President Joko Widodo announced that he would lift
the travel restrictions for foreign journalists in Papua (The Economist, 2015; The Jakarta
Post, 2014). Three years later, there was still no progress in this area. Before my field trip
to do the participatory video project, I was advised by some Indonesian friends to get
permission from the Embassy. I refused. I argued that first, the President of the Republic
of Indonesia had lifted the ban for foreign journalists; second, we were not going to Papua
as journalists as we were not working for any mass media; third, I was a postgraduate
student doing my field research and my husband accompanied me as a visitor; fourth, as I
hold an Indonesian national identity card, I have every right to be in any place in the
Republic of Indonesia and that there is no official restriction for foreign tourists or visitors
to Papua.

Whilst working on the participatory video (PV) project in Nabire February 2018, there was
news about BBC correspondent Rebecca Henschke who was arrested and detained in
Papua. At that time the eyes of the mainstream media were focusing on the malnourished
cases in Asmat regency where over 10,000 cases of malnourished were found, killing
almost 100 children in the villages. Henschke was travelling with other journalists covering
the aid delivered by the Indonesian armed forces when she tweeted a photo of supplies
sitting on a dock and said, “This is the aid coming in for severely malnourished children in Papua - instant noodles, super sweet soft drinks and biscuits.” Her other tweet said, "children in hospital eating chocolate biscuits and that's it" (ABC News, 2018; Harsono, 2018). She was released after 17 hours questioning before being expelled from Papua for “hurting Indonesian soldiers’ feelings” (The Guardian, 2018).

Amid the declaration by President Joko Widodo that Papua is open for all, foreign journalists still have difficulties entering and travelling around Papua. Moreover in small towns and villages, all foreigners could be subject to spot checks as police and soldiers cannot differentiate between journalists or charity workers or missionaries. I was warned about this by a friend in Nabire. It seems that the general consensus in the field is: foreign businessmen, charity workers and missionaries are welcome, but journalists are not.

Other categories of foreigners (non-Indonesian, non-Papuan) are business people, especially in mining and recently palm oil plantation. The area around Freeport mining operations are known to be ‘America in Papua’, or a modern western city in the middle of indigenous villages. Guarded by armed securities, the area where Freeport operates their gold and copper mines is closed to local villagers and has been a source of conflict for five decades.

Outside the giant mining corporation of Freeport, all over Papua there are small mining companies run by Indonesians, foreigners or joined Indonesian and foreign businesses. Friends told me that there are many Korean and Chinese gold miners have ventured to Papua in recent years. During my visits, I came across a number of Chinese and Korean
people in Nabire, Biak and Jayapura although the nature of their businesses are unconfirmed.

Palm oil also attracted business people from outside Papua. Hernawan (2017b) mentioned “three major palm oil companies in South Papua: the South Korean corporation Korindo Group, the Menara Group and the Malaysian corporation Tadmax Group”.

V.4. The (Indonesian) settlers

As indicated above, foreign companies in Indonesia tend to have Indonesian partners, although based on the New Investment Law No. 25/2007, Indonesia allows foreign investment to directly run a business in the country (Indonesia Investment website, https://www.indonesia-investments.com/business/foreign-investment/establish-foreign-company-pt-pma/item5739). This brought many Indonesian (non-Papuan) business people to Papua.

The migration of people from other islands into Papua started massively in the 1980s when the Soeharto government introduced the transmigration programme. Transmigasi (Indonesian for transmigration) was a government subsidised programme for people from Java, Bali and Lombok to move to less populated islands such as Sumatra, Kalimantan (Indonesian Borneo), Sulawesi and Papua. The 1980s programme and today’s voluntary transmigration were widely criticised and blamed as one of the factors responsible for marginalisation – even slow genocide – of the Papuan people and culture (Kjell Anderson, 2015; Chauvel, 2009; King, Elmslie & Webb-Gannon, 2011; Ondawame, 2011). While Widjojo et.al. (2008) saw that transmigration and spontaneous migrations “accounted for such a large proportion of migrants overtaking the indigenous Papuans who were already being marginalized.”
VI. Bloody Paniai to Nduga and the UN today

VI.1. Bloody Paniai

“On the morning of 8 December 2014, hundreds of Papuan protesters gathered near the local military and police headquarters in the town of Enarotali in Paniai District, Papua Province. The demonstration was a response to military personnel allegedly beating 11 Papuan children the day before. When protesters started throwing stones and pieces of wood at the buildings, security forces opened fire into the crowd, killing four people. At least 11 others were injured by bullets or bayonets. Witnesses told the National Human Rights Commission that they saw police officers shoot a protestor at close range after he had fallen to the ground.” (Amnesty International, 2018)

What Amnesty International described above is a well known pattern in Papua. The incident known as *Paniai Berdarah* or Bloody Paniai took the lives of four high school students – Apius Gobai (16), Alpius You (18), Simon Degei (17) and Yulian Yeimo (17) – and injured 11 other students. The perpetrators have never been prosecuted, although local witnesses were sure that they are members of the Indonesian armed forces.

Fast forward four years, the promise made by the President of the Republic Indonesia Joko Widodo – known as Jokowi – to bring the perpetrator to justice still have not been fulfilled. Many scholars, researchers, human rights activists question the progress of the investigation and Indonesia’s promise to resolve the Paniai case (Interview with Neles Tebay https://youtu.be/hts7Keei764; Jenaru Triharyanto & Koren, 2017).

President Jokowi made a number of visits to Papua and is known as the Indonesian President who has visited Papua the most frequently. However instead of resolving the cases of human rights violations and murders with impunity (Amnesty International, 2018), Jokowi focused his term on building infrastructure in Papua. The Jokowi government’s focus to build infrastructure was explained by the Ambassador of the Republic of Indonesia to UK and Ireland in a discussion in Oxford, 2018 (an excerpt of this discussion can be seen on https://youtu.be/Zzj3hU6W-Ds). Then with the intention to alleviate grievances of indigenous Papuans, he stopped the subsidised transmigration program (Asril, 2015) and started a massive infrastructure spending in Papua, including building Trans Papua roads network.

Apart from the positive promise of the Trans Papua road to help local economy, the local people were not consulted in the building of the road.
VI.2. Nduga

As the Trans Papua road building came into Nduga Regency, the local residents who were not consulted, became weary and suspicious of the work. Reports came through social media and WhatsApp group that some construction workers wore Indonesian Army uniforms. Some workers even reported to be seen carrying fire arms.

In late November 2018, the Indonesian construction company Istaka Karya was advised in writing by the regional commander of The Papua Liberation Army (Tentara Pembebasan Nasional, TPN) to cease activities on 1st December, which is the anniversary of the first raising of West Papua’s flag, the Morning Star. The local leader of TPN further advised that construction company employees should not interfere with the activities of people celebrating 1st December. However in spite of this advice, a company employee made a video of the flag-raising ceremony — an action considered very serious by the TPN. People asked him to stop but he refused to do so. For the local villagers and leaders of the TPN, the making of the video proved beyond doubt that employees of the construction company are members of the Indonesian military (Tentara Nasional Indonesia, TNI).

By Sunday, 2 December 2018, between 24 to 31 Indonesian construction workers and/or soldiers were killed. The TPN under commander Egianus Kogeya claimed responsibility (Davidson, 2018a).
Most Indonesian media that are available online told the story of ‘Nudga massacre’ from the Indonesian side. By the time this part of the dissertation was written in March 2019, *The Jakarta Post* (2019) wrote “TNI soldiers killed in clash with West Papua liberation army”. Indonesian weekly magazine *Tempo* wrote in their Indonesian version, “TNI Sends 600 Personnel to Secure Trans Papua construction” (Tempo, 2019a). Its English version translated slightly different “TNI Sends 600 Personnel to Secure Papua's Nduga Region” (Tempo, 2019b). One of Indonesia’s major newspapers, *Kompas*, quoted the Indonesian Vice President Jusuf Kalla who said that “The security operations in Papua needs to be increased, but it is not a Martial Law yet” (Hakim, 2019).

*Figure 16* - *The Jakarta Post*, Indonesian newspaper highlighted Indonesian soldiers killed

*Figure 17* - *Kompas*, Indonesia largest newspaper quoted Indonesian Vice President “The security operations in Papua needs to be increased, but it is not a Martial Law yet”
What is rarely seen in international media is news about the number of victims from local villagers and from the Papua Liberation Army (TPN). Understandably it is difficult to get the numbers because of a few factors. One, local people tend to bury their dead immediately. Two, it is not uncommon that victims of the Indonesian military disappear and their bodies are never found. Three, besides the obvious sign of carrying firearms, it is hard to differentiate between active members of the TPN or local villagers – or between combatants and non-combatants. This argument is used by the Indonesian military to claim that they had been fighting combatants whilst the reality sometimes showed that they were murdering the non-combatant villagers.

The same problem of differentiating villagers and members of the rebel army was also discussed during the Aceh conflict before the peace deal in August 2005.

As I spent more time in Papua and interacting with Papuan people through discussion groups and social media, I found that most indigenous Papuans support Papua’s independence in their hearts. I am not the first person who concluded that the majority of the Papuans wish for independence (Saltford, 2000b; Kirksey 2012; King, Elmslie and Webb-Gannon, 2011; Yoman, 2012). Whilst a few Papuans openly stated their wish for independence, others expressed their feelings to me off the record. Still, I can say confidently that 99% of indigenous Papuans that I met, have no inclination to be part of Indonesia.

Although most Papuans wish for independence from Indonesia, only a small minority actually joined an armed organisation to fight the Indonesian army. Most villagers fall under the category of non-combatants as defined by Article 51 of Protocol I to the Geneva Convention (ICRC, 1977). They do not carry weapons, and do not want to have any violent clash with the Indonesian armed forces or police (Tabuni,2015; Yoman, 2012; van den Broek, Hernawan & Gautama, 2001).

The Just War theory outlined the principle of *jus in bello* which differentiates between combatants and non-combatants and the proportionality in counterinsurgency (O’Brien, 1978). Protocol I to the Geneva Convention also expanded the scope of war to "armed conflicts in which peoples are fighting against colonial domination, alien occupation or racist regimes" (ICRC, 1977).

Unfortunately, stories about unarmed and non-combatant victims rarely reach the international mass media. I came across a number of press releases and notes on social media that detailed the stories of Papuan civilian victims (Nduga Investigation Team press
We Were Wives, Mothers, Daughters – Participatory Filmmaking for Peace Building

conference, 29 March 2019) and open letters to the Indonesian President to withdraw military troops from Nduga (reposted on my Facebook page 2 April 2019 from Papuan local leader Samuel Tabuni). The press conference by Nduga Investigation Team was published in CNN Indonesia (https://www.cnnindonesia.com/nasional/20190329202516-12-381911/tim-investigasi-duga-operasi-militer-di-nduga-langgar-ham), but not on its international news.

When I restricted the search to news in English only, a number of news from Radio New Zealand, The Guardian, Asia Pacific News, a wider theme of news from Papua appeared. The Guardian showed the conflict in Nduga by highlighting the news that Indonesia is to let the UN office of the human rights commissioner into West Papua to investigate the escalated violence (Davidson, 2019). New Zealand’s Asia Pacific Report wrote, “Papuan residents fearful as Indonesian military build up still grows” (Mambor, 2019). Radio New Zealand seems to be the only one who has been consistently broadcasting balanced news from Papua, with one of the news stated “Military approach questioned as violence worsens in Papua” (Blades, 2019). However none of these international media detailed the stories and the number of Papuan civilian victims.
VI.3. Geneva and New York today

Papuan people who live abroad – many are living in exile due to running away from persecution – are actively seeking international recognition for Papua’s rights for self-determination. In September 2017, Chairman of the United Liberation Movement for West Papua (ULMWP) Benny Wenda sought to deliver a petition signed by 1.8 million Papuan people in Papua and abroad demanding a referendum for Papua’s independence to the UN’s decolonisation committee. The petition was banned by the Indonesian Government and people in Papua who got caught signing the petition would be arrested and prosecuted whilst the online petition website was blocked. The petition demanded an internationally supervised vote or referendum, and the right to for self-determination. The petition was rejected, with the committee saying Papua was outside its mandate (Evlin, 2019).

The petition was symbolically brought to Geneva by six young swimmers in August 2017 before being rejected at UN’s decolonisation committee. The young swimmers set out on a 69km journey up the length of Lake Geneva, carrying “the bones of the people of West Papua and voice of a nation in waiting” (www.swimforwestpapua.com).

The chair of the UN Decolonisation Committee, Rafael Ramírez, said at the time that the mandate extended only to the 17 states identified by the UN as ‘non self-governing territories’, of which West Papua is not included. Pacific leaders – Vanuatu’s Prime Minister Charlot Salwai and Marshall Island’s president Hilda Heine – requested the UN to keep West Papua on their agenda, both for decolonisation and in their concerns over human rights violations (Radio New Zealand, 2018).

On 25 January 2019, Chairman of the ULMWP Benny Wenda handed the petition to the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, Michelle Bachelet in Geneva. The petition called for the UN to “put Papua back on the Decolonisation Committee agenda and
ensure our right to self-determination denied to us in 1969 is respected by holding an Internationally Supervised Vote” (UNPO, 2019).

This angered the Indonesian delegation for the UN. Indonesian Ambassador to the UN Hasan Kleib told SBS news that the Papuan and Vanuatu “deliberately deceived the High Commissioner by taking manipulative steps through the infiltration of Benny Wenda into the Vanuatu delegation” (Evlin, 2019).

In New York, during the 73rd session of the UN General Assembly or UNGA 73, Vanuatu Prime Minister Charlot Salwai on 28 September 2018 stated that decolonisation must remain on the United Nations agenda, and that the Human Rights Council must investigate the human rights abuses in West Papua (UNGA, 2018b). As the right to reply, Indonesian Vice President Jusuf Kalla said such declarations violated the principles of the UN Charter and that the Vanuatu accusation is unacceptable, “like the pot calling the kettle black”. (UNGA, 2018a). The Indonesian delegation at the UN always refer to UN General Assembly Resolution No. 2504 of 1969 regarding the agreement between Indonesia and the Kingdom of the Netherlands (see Figure 20 below).
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At the 1797th plenary meeting, on 31 October 1969, the President of the General Assembly, in pursuance of paragraph 5 of resolution A/8 of 19 November 1968, designated the members of the Committee for the Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the United Nations. The Committee is composed of the following Member States: Austria, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, China, France, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea, India, Iran, Italy, Lebanon, Madagascar, Peru, Philippines, Somalia, Sweden, Todd, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America.

2500 (XXIV). Representation of China in the United Nations

The General Assembly,

Recalling the recommendation contained in its resolution 396 (V) of 14 December 1950 that, whenever more than one authority claims to be the Government entitled to represent a Member State in the United Nations and this question becomes the subject of controversy in the United Nations, the question should be considered in the light of the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the circumstances of each case,

Recalling further its decision in resolution 1668 (XVI) of 15 December 1961, in accordance with Article 18 of the Charter, that any proposal to change the representation of China is an important question, which, in General Assembly resolutions 2025 (XX) of 17 November 1965, 2159 (XXI) of 29 November 1966, 2271 (XXII) of 28 November 1967 and 2389 (XXIII) of 19 November 1968, was affirmed as remaining valid,

Affirms again that this decision remains valid.

1808th plenary meeting, 11 November 1969.

2504 (XXIV). Agreement between the Republic of Indonesia and the Kingdom of the Netherlands concerning West New Guinea (West Irian)

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 1752 (XVII) of 21 September 1962, in which it took note of the Agreement of 15 August 1962 between the Republic of Indonesia and the Kingdom of the Netherlands concerning West New Guinea (West Irian), acknowledged the role conferred upon the Secretary-General in the Agreement and authorized him to carry out the tasks entrusted to him therein,

Recalling also its decision of 6 November 1963 to take note of the report of the Secretary-General on the completion of the United Nations Temporary Executive Authority in West Irian,

Recalling further that the arrangements for the act of free choice were the responsibility of Indonesia with the advice, assistance and participation of a special representative of the Secretary-General, as stipulated in the Agreement,

Having received the report on the conduct and results of the act of free choice submitted by the Secretary-General in accordance with article XXI, paragraph 1, of the Agreement,

Bearing in mind that, in accordance with article XXI, paragraph 2, both parties to the Agreement have recognized these results and abide by them,

Noting that the Government of Indonesia, in implementing its national development plan, is giving special attention to the progress of West Irian, bearing in mind the specific conditions of its population, and that the Government of the Netherlands, in close cooperation with the Government of Indonesia, will continue to render financial assistance for this purpose, in particular through the Asian Development Bank and the institutions of the United Nations,

1. Takes note of the report of the Secretary-General and acknowledges with appreciation the fulfillment by the Secretary-General and his representative of the tasks entrusted to them under the Agreement of 15 August 1962 between the Republic of Indonesia and the Kingdom of the Netherlands concerning West New Guinea (West Irian);

2. Appreciates any assistance provided through the Asian Development Bank and through institutions of the United Nations or through other means to the Government of Indonesia in its efforts to promote the economic and social development of West Irian.

1813th plenary meeting, 19 November 1969.

In the last UN General Assembly (18 September – 5 October 2018) however, “the Republic of the Marshall Islands, Tuvalu and the Republic of Vanuatu all spoke out in support of West Papua and the need for our cause to be returned to the United Nations. The Solomon Islands also voiced its concerns over human rights abuses and violations” (ULMWP Statement, 2 October 2018).
In 2017, ULMWP representation in the UN John Anari addressed the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (UNPFII) asking the UN look into Article 73 of the UN Charter and how West Papua was denied its right for self governance through the invalid referendum in 1969 (WPLO, 2017).

Although there is no answer from the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights yet, today West Papuan people represented by the ULMWP are making progress in New York and Geneva. It is yet to be seen how the progress can benefit the grassroots level as more and more West Papuan activists and students are being arrested for voicing their opinions.
VII. Chapter Summary

This research identified three versions of history of Papua. One version dictates Papua as part of the Unitary States of the Republic of Indonesia and that the Act of Free Choice 1969 confirmed that Papuan people chose to be part of Indonesia. Supporters of the Free West Papua sees the integration to Indonesia as an act of annexation or new colonialism where Indonesia invaded Papua and forced its people to vote in the ‘Act of No Choice’ 1969. Whilst scholars, researchers and human rights activists analyse the history as an entanglement of economic drive to exploit rich natural resources of Papua, western ignorance of the complexity of the culture, and UN’s gullibility and laziness to properly investigate and listen to the voices of the indigenous people at grassroots level.

As history continues, Indonesia’s Soeharto regime fell, Timor Leste gained their independence and other Melanesian nations became sovereign countries. More and more critical questions were raised in Papua. Educated indigenous Papuans came back from other parts of the world learning about Nelson Mandela, the history of the black Americans, and modern struggles to uphold human rights. More and more Papuan leaders in Papua and abroad questioned the situation under Indonesia.

With new developments in diplomacy in Jakarta and at international level, other nations who are members of the United Nations support Papua in raising the questions on human rights and the rights for self-determination. However throughout the history of Papua since 1950s to today, there is one clear pattern: that the voices of the grassroots people have never been included.
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CHAPTER THREE – CONTEXTUAL REVIEW OF PARTICIPATORY VIDEO AND AUTOETHNOGRAPHY

Abstract
This chapter explores the two main methods used in this research: participatory video and autoethnography. Acknowledged as started in the 1960s, participatory video has been mainly used in the setting of community and international development, and it has always combined filmmaking with a form of social political action. This chapter starts with the history of participatory video and the influence of Paulo Freire’s *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* in this subject, followed by the practice of participatory video in different researches and subjects, and reviews how established organisations use PV in various settings. The second part of this chapter explains what autoethnography is and how it has been used in research practices. This chapter concludes with how the two multidisciplinary methods are combined in this research to find a sustainable pathway for indigenous Papuan women whose lives had been impacted by conflict, towards influencing decision making processes in peacebuilding and conflict resolution.

I. PARTICIPATORY VIDEO

I.1. History of Participatory Video
There seemed to be no clear account regarding the history of the first participatory video (PV) project. As it has always been a media practice rather than theory; only recently have scholars started to review PV as a method or as an independent media production.

Existing literature (Lunch and Lunch, 2006 ; White, 2003) pointed to the direction of Fogo Island in 1968 as the root of PV. Two Canadian filmmakers Don Snowden and Colin Low pioneered the idea of using media to enable a people-centred community development approach. The small fishing community on Fogo Islands, off the eastern coast of Newfoundland, learned the art of filmmaking. Later by watching each other’s films, the different villagers on the island came to realise that they shared many of the same problems and that by working together they could solve some of them. The films were also shown to politicians, resulting in the change in government policies and actions. The techniques developed by Snowden became known as the Fogo Process (Lunch & Lunch, 2006, p.11).
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Besides the Fogo Process, Yang (2016) also recognised the Kino-Eye movement in the Soviet Union in the 1920s as the beginning of PV. Filmmaker Dziga Vertov organised people to participate in creating documentary films by recording news and events as well as in making decisions on the film distributions. The Kino-Eye movement is considered political “in that it aimed to shed light on people’s voices and bring about social change”, or in other words it is using a, “bottom-up approach to filmmaking” (Yang, 2016, p.14).

Vertov’s style influenced Jean Rouch and Edgar Morin in 1960 when producing Chronicle of a Summer. Edgar Morin then used the term Cinéma vérité to describe the style, which is a direct translation from Vertov’s Kino Pravda.

So, what is participatory video? Shirley White (2003) situates PV within a participatory approach to development. White links development participation and participatory communication. In short, PV is produced by the subjects, not filmmakers. For most practitioners in community development and empowerment, PV can be seen as using video as a powerful tool to share, communicate and expose problems – such as poverty, marginalisation of some communities, as well as war and conflict.

The International Centre for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT), a not for profit organisation, explains what PV is in a video widely available on Youtube (CIAT, 2015. https://youtu.be/P0trJloR56Q).

Figure 21 - The Fogo Process https://www.nfb.ca/playlists/fogo-island/playback/#1

Figure 22 - What is PV? https://youtu.be/P0trJloR56Q
This research attempts to extend the use of PV from sharing, communicating and exposing problems to providing a sustainable pathway towards a bottom-up solution in order to influence decision making processes.

I.2. Freirean philosophy

Colom (2010), Plush and Shahrokh (2015) and Sitter (2012) link PV with the Freirean process of conscientization where the overall objectives include raising awareness, educating both the oppressed and the oppressor, and eventually making a change for the better.


Relating PV to Freire’s pedagogy of the oppressed and the marginalised, Evans, Fosters, et al (2009, p.91) use PV firstly to “document significant elements of contemporary Métis culture and practice, as defined by the elders themselves” (p.91), and also “to expand the process of documentary by including pluralistic approaches to authorship, as well as to explore technologies for distribution and the potential for simultaneous narrative.”

They “explore the ways in which differences in technological expertise can affect the mechanics of power-sharing in terms of video production and representation, how community and researcher agendas may differ, and how broader projects of representation—not simply research itself—are tied up in the division of labour within participatory video projects”. Evans et al (2009, p.88) also recognised that the differences in technological skills can complicate the PV research process.

Founders of InsightShare – a non-governmental organization specialized in working with small communities around the world using participatory video methods – Nick and Chris Lunch describe PV as “a set of techniques to involve a group or community in shaping and creating their own film”. I agree with their ideas that “making a video is easy and accessible, and is a great way of bringing people together to explore issues, voice concerns or simply to be creative and tell stories” (Lunch & Lunch, 2006, P.10).
In a TEDx lecture even, Chris Lunch positioned the camera almost in a similar way with what I think a social worker should position herself, “This this is not a video camera, it’s an ear able to listen with empathy, without judging or interrupting! This is quite rare in day to day life. The video allows people to plan their messages clearly and share them widely in their community, speaking all the way through to the end without interruption!” (Lunch, 2013).

In their handbook, Lunch & Lunch (2006, pp.10-11) differentiate PV with documentary filmmaking in the authorship of the final documentary film. They said, “Whilst there are forms of documentary filmmaking that are able to sensitively represent the realities of their subjects’ lives and even to voice their concerns, documentary films very much remain the authored products of a documentary filmmaker. As such, the subjects of documentaries rarely have any say (or sometimes have some limited say) in how they will ultimately be represented. By contrast, in participatory video the subjects make their own film in which they can shape issues according to their own sense of what is important, and they can also control how they will be represented. Documentary films are often expected to meet stringent aesthetic standards and are usually made with a large audience in mind. The PV process on the other hand, is less concerned with appearance than with content, and the films are usually made with particular audiences and objectives in mind.”

This research was inspired by the PV movements such as InsightShare and the Challenge for Change project where film can be used to “empower and enable a community to take action to solve their own problems and to communicate their needs and ideas to decision-makers and/or other groups and communities” (Lunch & Lunch, 2006, p.10).

Paulo Freire’s *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1970/1993) has a big influence in my research journey in using PV to find a sustainable pathway towards conflict resolution in Papua, utilising the wisdom of the indigenous women who were victims of the conflict. I started using documentary film to bridge the gap of the mainstream media coverage in Jakarta 2002 when I was involved in advocacy and accompanying a poor community facing forced eviction. Documenting events surrounding the case, I learned and ended up producing a documentary film about the community and the case (“Killing the Day”, ISJ & Minima, 2003).

I.3. Different than visual anthropology

Whilst the subject of researching participatory video is connected to film study, storytelling, ethnography and sometimes visual anthropology, in this research I would like
to draw the defining line. Although the result might seem similar, which in most cases, documentary films, PV and visual anthropology differ in their aims, philosophy and ethics.

Jean Rouch’s documentary film *Jaguar* (1967) used collaboration between filmmaker and subjects “to reveal a wide range of ethnic, geographic, and cultural differences within just a small piece of the African continent, as well as the social changes and patterns of migration that defined mid-century African life” ([http://icarusfilms.com/new2012/jag.html](http://icarusfilms.com/new2012/jag.html)).

Hockings (1995) wrote that in Rouch’s Jaguar “role-playing sometimes provides the necessary stimulus.” As described on the distributor’s website, “Rouch collaborated with his three subjects on an improvisational narrative. They filmed the trip in mid-1950s, and reunited a few years later to record the sound, the participants remembering dialogue and making up commentary. The result is a playful film that finds three African men performing an ethnography of their own culture.”

The element of manipulation reminded me of Joshua Openheimer’s 2012 film about the 1965 massacre of the Indonesian communist. *Jagal or The Act of Killing* showed how perpetrators of mass murder happily and proudly re-enacted their actions in front of the camera. It is unclear how much information was shared with the subjects before filming began. After its launch, there were protests in Indonesia by the victims of the 1965-1966 massacre against the glorification of the mass murder.

I share the view of Fraser (2014) that *The Act of Killing* does not deserve an Oscar because of its questionable “aesthetic and moral premise”. Manipulating, or not fully sharing the aims of the film to the subjects, puts this film outside the category of participatory video. I strongly believe that participatory video entails full participation and understanding from the subjects or participants about what would be shown in the final
The Act of Killing might be part documentary and part fiction, but it certainly is not a PV project.

In my opinion, over exposing details of evil actions – even to show the banality of it – contributes nothing to humanity. The Act of Killing is the opposite of Hannah Arendt’s coverage of the trial of Adolf Eichmann (Arendt, 1994). While Arendt exposed the banality of evil to show the hope in human nature, Oppenheimer manipulated murderers to show how proud they were of their evil actions.

**I.4. Function and use of Participatory Video**

In general, participatory video (PV) has been used for monitoring and evaluation, for community action, for advocacy, for data gathering in research, and for community consultation. The latter, community consultation, has some similarities with this research where I intend to explore the use of PV to set a sustainable pathway for grassroots community to influence decision making processes. As most existing PV projects are conducted by an outsider practitioner or researcher, I would like to explore the indigenous methodologies (Smith, 2012; Land, 2015) and approach to achieve sustainability. This means that this research endeavours to utilise and enhance the existing skills and equipment to find a sustainable pathway towards impacting the peace process in Papua.

Today the use of PV for monitoring and evaluation is quite common among non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and not for profit organisations, especially those who operate in the developing world. Christian charity World Vision in Indonesia for example, had been using PV to get feedback from their service users about their programme in the region.

The Regional Field Content Specialist for World Vision Southeast Asia Pacific, Sally Tirtadihardja, explained her use of PV was, “To build the capacity of non-communicators, such as story writing, photography and videography skills. This was part of the C4D or Communication for Development project.” From the video, photos and written material gathered, World Vision could evaluate their programme in the 10 South East Asia and Pacific countries (Interview with Sally Tirtadihardja, 02 January 2017).

InsightShare used PV for evaluating UNICEF peacebuilding programmes in Burundi, Ivory Coast, Sierra Leone and Uganda in 2015-2016 (https://youtu.be/DyY2DZY3zv4). The organisation trained young people and local staff in the four African countries to use PV and form local evaluation teams.
As a tool for community action, PV has a role in raising awareness of a problem to policy makers and international communities. In Uganda, InsighShare used PV with the indigenous Batwa people about the forced eviction from their ancestral hunting grounds in 1992 (https://youtu.be/BrqtVZ_OhE4). Part of the film was aired on Ugandan television and screened to local and national politicians, donors and NGOs.

In her research, social worker Gillian Chowns (2013) worked with nine participating children in Berkshire who were facing the life-threatening illness of their parents. Teaming up with InsightShare, Chowns used PV to communicate the wishes and feelings of the children. Over six weeks of PV workshop and filming, the result is a video documentary titled “No – You Don’t Know How We Feel!” (https://youtu.be/qLGvjmCUgJw). The video is also being distributed to families, health and social care professionals and schools.

Sitter (2012) used PV with the disabled community for advocacy. Starting with “the visual as self-representation,” Sitter used PV, digital storytelling and participatory photography to raise awareness and then advocate the rights to love and to have healthy sexual relationships in disabled community.

Grace Abibata Mahama shows in her project with women in Tamale, Ghana (Mahama, 2004) that besides “promoting change in attitudes and social behaviour,” PV can also make a statement about the authorship of the final documentary film. Using the term “participatory video documentary”, Mahama used participatory video documentary “to empower women” to voice their narrative, to tell their story to the world (http://www.filmafrica.net/participatory.ht).

PV has also been used as for data gathering in researches such as the Natural Resources Management in the Mountain Regions of Asia (NORMA) in 2004 – 2005, where the local communities and grassroots organisations use PV to communicate their views, innovations and ideas directly to scientists, senior policy makers and donors (Lunch, 2006). The video compilation can be viewed on https://youtu.be/V32l8o4CRo8.

The use of PV for community consultation such as the ‘Cowley Road Matters’ project (https://youtu.be/RYHkI8B0Ce4) has some similarities with this research. The difference is that this research takes it further: after identifying the problems and how they implicated the lives of the participants, this research will then use PV to find solutions by the participants.
In her research, Sue Sudbury of Bournemouth University (2015, p.12) aimed “to discover, by practice, new ways in which documentary video can reveal and shed light on the everyday lives of women, living in another culture, using participatory filmmaking and video diary testimonies.” Sudbury (2016) tried to combine participatory filmmaking with traditional observational documentary techniques and video diary interviews to locate what Kaminsky (1992) and Barbara Myerhoff (Ruby, 2000, p.247) called the third voice, which is “a blending of the voice of the investigator with that of the person portrayed in such a manner as to make it impossible to know who is the author”.

Whilst Sudbury’s research aimed to study the lives of women from different cultures, Myerhoff’s film (1976) and book (1978) *Number Our Days* focused on her interaction with a community which she herself partly identified with. In *Number Our Days* (1976), Myerhoff used reflexivity and narrative ethnography to show her interaction with the elderly Jewish community living in California (Kaminsky, 1992). Myerhoff who was a Jewish woman herself clearly stated where she positioned herself by looking at the camera and said, “Someday I will be a little old Jewish lady” (Prell, 2009).

This research has its similarities with Myerhoff’s work in that I partly identify myself with the Papuan women. Having Melanesian heritage from my father, I grew up in Jakarta, which is in the island of Java, being the different one among my childhood friends who are Javanese. Although I never lived in Papua, my understanding of their Melanesian culture is more inherent than a researcher with no Melanesian heritage.

Having some elements of raising awareness, consultation and advocacy, this research wants to move further and use participatory filmmaking to set a sustainable pathway towards problem solving. The problem that the women participants and the Papuan people are facing is more complex than the conflict between the Papuan independence movements and the Indonesian armed forces. This is why many top-down initiatives had been tried and failed, as there is no evidence that the Indonesian government is listening to the grassroots communities, especially family members of the pro-independence or victims of violence.

This research endeavours to use participatory filmmaking to communicate possible solutions from the mothers, daughters and wives of victims of the conflict. The women participants would be invited to tell their stories, and contribute to finding solutions to the conflict and how to achieve peace. Through participatory filmmaking, I would like to find a sustainable pathway for the women to influence decision and policy makers on conflict resolution.
I.5 Video intervention/prevention assessment (VIA)

Patashnick and Rich (2005) used a method called “Video Intervention/Prevention Assessment” (VIA) in working with patients in Boston Children’s Hospital. They explained VIA as “patient-centred health research method where patients teach their clinicians about living with a chronic condition through the creation of visual illness narratives.”

In their research, Patashnick and Rich gave patients video cameras to “represent and document themselves and their experiences” (2005, p.105). Participants who are patients at the Children’s Hospital Boston were asked to “teach your doctor what it is like to live with a chronic condition.” Each participant was given one video camera unlimited video tapes, and the freedom to choose how and how long their message would be. The researchers then recruited specially trained loggers in their visual data analysis. Loggers watched all the footage and recorded each scene and dialogue. They also used specialised software called NVivo “for the management, analysis, and structuring of qualitative data” (2005, p.107).

The difference between VIA and participatory filmmaking is mainly in the spectator of the final video. Whilst VIA’s result is intended for doctors in the specific hospital, participatory filmmaking is conducted with intention to show the final film to the general public. Participatory video documentary by Mahama and the women of Tamale was shown in some African television programmes and is available online.

I.6. Digital storytelling and life story work

While Sitter (2012) used the term digital storytelling together with PV for their work with the disabled community, Hammond and Cooper (2013) used the term digital life story work in their psychological research with looked after children. Both researches have elements of therapeutic process with vulnerable participants – disabled adults and looked after children – and both used methods similar to PV.

In 2007 – 2010, Fostering Network used PV to evaluate young people’s participation in fostering services and to identify models of good practice. The participants were children and young people aged 25 and under who are on the edge of care, have experience of or an interest in care, including the sons and daughters of foster carers across the UK.

In Indonesia and some other developing countries, a similar method to PV called Reality Check Approached is used to gather data from the community. Using digital storytelling, researchers stay within communities for a period of time and build a relationship with their
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The difference with PV is that the filming process is not necessary and participants can choose any medium to express their opinions (Interview with Debora Tobing 23 January 2017 and http://www.reality-check-approach.com).

I.7. Established organisations using PV in various settings

In November 2016, I interviewed Nick Lunch, co-founder of InsightShare about their projects and the process of participatory video. This short interview was conducted on my mobile phone with an additional microphone as part of my experiment in equipment. The interview is available on Youtube (https://youtu.be/rPs8KZdVxrw).

Figure 24 - interview with Nick Lunch, co-founder of InsightShare https://youtu.be/rPs8KZdVxrw

To further review current practices, in January 2017 I interviewed Sally Tirtadihardja, regional field content specialist for World Vision Southeast Asia Pacific. I asked her about the process of participatory video, recruitment of participants, how World Vision conducted the workshop on the field, and how they do the final editing.

Tirtadihardja explained that the recruitment was the responsibility of each country office. As the Regional Field Content Specialist, she then conducted the training with staff, youth groups, women groups, volunteers and local volunteer candidates. Each country office was given the freedom to choose their own goal and strategy according to their level of understanding on how the filmmaking skills can benefit them.

The training lasts three to four days with one or two days of field practice. “They would have to immediately practice what they had learnt in a real community settings. On day four, participants view their works and evaluate. Editing was normally optional and in some communities, we had no time to go this far. Some of the communities had never seen any camera or mobile phones before,” explained Tirtadihardja.

World Vision started the process with storytelling, followed by the technical skills of using captions, picture stories or videos. This was followed by facilitators showing videos about
other communities doing their Communication for Development (C4D), before going into
the technical skills, field work and evaluation. Unlike InsightShare’s process that might last
the full year or more, World Vision’s PV training runs between three to four days.

This research takes the long term capacity and relationship building of InsightShare, but
would have to wrap up the filming part within three to four weeks for each group. This is
due to the time limit of a PhD project and the limited resources of time and funding for me
with a cameraman to stay in Papua.
II. AUTOETHNOGRAPHY – seeing the world from my point of view

“Autoethnography? Is it a new form of study? A genre? A sexy new postmodernism branch? A joke?” These are common comments when I mention the term autoethnography to fellow scholars in social sciences.

Deborah Reed-Danahay (1997, p.9) defined autoethnography as “A form of self-narrative that places the self within social context.” A researcher doing autoethnography is someone who is never at home, but always finds a second home wherever she goes. An autoethnographer is a boundary-crosser, a person with dual – or multiple – identities.

Jones, Adams, and Ellis (2013) explain Autoethnography as “the use of personal experience and personal writing to purposefully comment on or critique cultural practices, to make contributions to existing research, to embrace vulnerability with purpose, and to create a reciprocal relationship with audiences in order to compel a response”.

Reed-Danahay tried to explore autoethnography and find its position in the modern academic world. Her book compiles ethnographic works as a response to debates about representation and the trend of self-reflexivity. Relevant to the condition in Papua and Indonesia is autoethnography as a political resistance. David Kideckel shows how an ethnographer’s notes of self, family and community became political during an enforced public silence (in Reed-Danahay, 1997, p.69). Pnina Motzafi-Haller’s reflection examined her own dual experience as a “native” and “foreign” scholar within the same frame (ibid, p.198), which was intriguing for me.

The two topics above have provoked further reflection about the duality of the autoethnographer’s identity. As a recurring topic within the book, the dichotomy of insider-outsider and native-foreign are discussed and debated. This reminded me of a chapter about ‘border’ by Ngugi wa Thiong'o (2000) that suggested “rather than a barrier, a border can be seen as a shared space between two regions or between the inside and outside”. The border between insider or native ethnographer and outsider or foreign scholar can then become a shared space in an autoethnographer’s position when researching one’s own people or society that one is familiar with. What seemed to be a conflicting position can then become a unique vantage point in observing and analysing a community – or even further, to influence and enhance.

Reed-Danahay’s Autoethnography as a political act of representation shows how a politically engaged pro-indigenous anthropologist is more important than the anthropologist’s origin or whether they are indigenous or not indigenous or mixed. This
becomes relevant when applied to the situation in Papua where indigenous Papuans are walking together with outsiders who support their fight for self-determination.

In July 2016, I had a discussion with a Papuan Protestant pastor – who will not be named to protect his identity – in the Sentani area. The pastor was of the opinion that a leader who is an outsider but had immersed themselves in the community might be what Papuan people need. The unique position of a native scholar in Papua and Indonesia today has become an important issue as there are more and more graduates and scholars coming back to Indonesia – and Papua – with a fresh new perspective of how to develop the country.

Reed-Danahay’s book serves as an inspiration for positioning myself in this research as both native and foreign, being half Melanesian but also Indonesian.
III. Chapter Summary

In this chapter, we have explored the history, definitions and usage of participatory video (PV) in various settings. Most existing research and publications explore the use of PV to work with communities outside my own culture, with various aims from empowering the community members to studying the lives and cultures of the community.

This research is unique in that I am both an outsider or independent researcher, but at the same time I am an Indonesian woman with Melanesian heritage. This puts me as the researcher in a position of both insider and outsider, both native and foreign amongst the Papuan women.

Acknowledging my unique point of view brought me to the approach of autoethnography where the self is placed within social context (Reed-Danahay, 1997) and personal experience is allowed to comment on practices, make contributions and embrace vulnerability. In other words, I intended to be among my participants as both a researcher and a friend, as a facilitator and a fellow woman and use my experience and interaction to critique and contribute to the practice of participatory filmmaking. This is in order to find a sustainable pathway for the women in grassroots communities towards influencing decision making process.
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CHAPTER FOUR – PARTICIPATORY VIDEO PROJECT DESIGN AND RECruitment

Abstract
After exploring the practice of participatory video (PV) and autoethnography in the last chapter, this chapter describes the recruitment process of participants, designing the PV workshop, defining the parameter of this research, plans for data collection and analysis. This chapter includes the report from my first trip to Papua to recruit potential participants, followed by a week in Oxford to explore the standard PV workshop, and the dilemma of choosing the right equipment for the Papuan women.

I. Recruitment process of the participants
I.1. Before the first field work
Before the first field trip to Papua, a criteria for participants and recruitment brochure was prepared. Shown below are the criteria (Figure 25) and recruitment brochure (Figure 26). The Indonesian version of the recruitment brochure has also been printed and duplicated to be brought to Papua.

Criteria for Participants
1. Woman
2. Over 18
3a. Either direct family members (wives, mothers, sisters, or daughters) of combatants from either sides
3b. Or, has first-hand experience of violence as a result of the Papua-Indonesia conflict
4. Willing to freely participate, go through the process of workshop/capacity building
5. Has an opinion rooted in actual experience regarding the Papua-Indonesia conflict and willing to share it with the public in accordance with the project participant guideline

Figure 25 - Criteria for Participants
There are six steps identified for the participatory video (PV) process. The first step was identifying the participants, who are indigenous Papuan women whose lives had been affected by the violent conflict related to political situation in Papua. They should be adults, and although Indonesian age for a consenting adult is 17, for ethical reasons I used the UK age of adulthood which is 18.

The second step is introducing the potential participants to the project, followed by step three which is a structured discussion to identify the issues. The fourth step is to design the project brief. The fifth step is the technical training in video shooting. The final step is documenting the challenges and analysing the process through editing. These steps are shown in Figure 27.

**Who I am...**
My name is Adeline Cooke. I am a research student at the University of Central Lancashire, a journalist and documentary filmmaker. I am interested in working with Papuan women to produce a documentary together and try to influence the Indonesian government on conflict resolution and peace building in Papua.

To do this, I need your help. I am hoping to recruit four women in your village who either have experienced the impact of conflict themselves or have family members who have experienced the impact of conflict. By conflict here I mean the dispute between the people of Papua and the Indonesian government. You will have your voice heard not only on national level but also internationally.

**About this project...**
This research is about finding ways of including the voices of Papuan women in peacebuilding process using participatory video. So, you will learn how to produce, direct, film and edit a documentary film about your experience, opinions, wishes and feelings on the conflict and how to achieve peace. You will go out and film on locations of your choice, using a smartphone or small camera. With help from experts, you will learn how to edit your footage, and put together a good documentary. You will also learn how to plan, produce, and direct a documentary.

**What if telling my story makes me upset?**
I will also be working closely with counsellors or pastoral support who will be available to have a chat with you if needed.

**How can I get in touch?**
You can call or text me on: +62 812 1033 5275 (Indonesia mobile)
Or email me: ACOoke@uclan.ac.uk

I am hoping to hear from you soon. Thank you

**Some questions that you may have**
* Do I have to say "yes" to participate? No. It is fully your choice.
* Do I have to appear on camera and identify myself? Not necessarily. If you do not want the audience of the documentary film to identify you, you can stay anonymous. There are special techniques to disguise your identity. For example we can "bloom" your face, use only silhouette or your shadow, or your voice over a general view, or even use graphics and animation.

**Figure 26 - Recruitment brochure for potential participants**

In total the project will run about 12 months. We will start with two workshops about documentary film production. After the second day workshop, we will start filming - the time and place will depend on you. After all participants are happy with all the video footage, we will start editing.
I.2. The first field work (March – April 2017)

As explained in Chapter Three, there are a number of considerations in participants recruitment. To start with, I chose locations where I had at least one contact person to start the recommendation based informal recruitment. The second consideration is accessibility – where there is adequate transport in and out of the location. Another consideration is being a non-Papuan who would travel with a British cameraman, I have to choose locations that are relatively safe with easy access to leave in the unlikely event of armed conflict or threats to our lives.

With the above considerations, I chose two cities: Jayapura and Nabire. Jayapura has been the capital of Papua since before it was divided into two provinces. It is now the capital of the province of Papua in the Eastern side, with the other province confusingly called Papua Barat (West Papua) with the capital of Manokwari on the Western side of the island. Being the gateway to Papua, Jayapura has the most chance of meeting potential participants, not to mention that I had been introduced to some contacts who would assist me in recruitment.

I chose Nabire as my second base because of several contacts that I know, plus the city offers access to inland Papuan villages such as Enarotali where there were several known incidents including the ‘Bloody Paniai’ mentioned in Chapter Two. Although there is no direct flight to Nabire from other main airports in Indonesia, access in and out of the city is relatively safe with a number of regional airlines and even boats.

I had a contact in the village of Mindiptana – in Boven Digoel Regency near the border to Papua New Guinea – who is a medical professional in a small clinic run by the Indonesian

---

**Participatory Video process has been identified as the following steps:**

1. Identify the women and put them into groups
2. Introduce the participants to the project
3. Have a structured discussions – in order to identify issues
4. Through these issues, design the project brief:
   a. Give history of the community (narrate the history)
   b. Introduce personal history
   c. What happened to their men
   d. What would they like to see happen
   e. How would they like to see it happen
   f. Is there a way of wrapping all these up into a [traditional] story [that connect to their culture]
5. Technical training in [video shooting]
6. Document the challenges and analyse the process through editing

*Figure 27 - Six steps of PV process identified for this research*
Army. However in 2016 when I started to arrange the trip, there was no flight into the area. The only access to the village was an overnight minibus ride from another small town. This would not only took time but also pose higher security risk as the area is well known to witness many armed contact between the Indonesian military and Papuan rebel groups.

Departing from Manchester, UK, on 16 March 2017, I arrived two days later in Nabire, where the first group of women was identified. On 26 March 2017 I left Nabire and arrived at Jayapura, the capital of the Papua Province, where I identified two groups of women as potential participants.

By 6 April 2017, as I arrived back in Manchester, I had completed the first three steps of the plan. In the two cities of Nabire and Jayapura, I identified 10 women and grouped them into three groups. There is one group of four women in Nabire, and two groups in Jayapura consisted of two and four women.

With each of the three groups of women, I had a structured discussion about the aim of this research, identifying the issues faced by the women and the history of their communities, and what happened to each of their men respectively.

The two cities of Nabire and Jayapura are shown in the map on Figure 28.

![Map of Papua](image)

*Figure 28 - Papua in the map looks like their native birds, the bird of paradise. The city Nabire is located in the middle (known as the neck of the bird), and Jayapura is in the East, near the border to Papua New Guinea.*

The recruitment of the research participants was conducted through my network in Indonesia. It was decided from the beginning that there would not be any public
recruitment for security reasons. Even though the newly elected President of the Republic of Indonesia Joko Widodo announced a year before this research began that Papua is open to all national and international journalists and researchers (BBC, 2015; Crispin, 2015), there are still concerns that in practice, members of the Indonesian armed forces and police are still very suspicious of non-Papuans in their area. For this reason, I only explained my research aims to trusted people and my network of friends, and although I still hold an Indonesian identity card, I was very careful in revealing my identity as a researcher and ex-journalist.

The recruitment strategies include:

- Contacting a network of colleagues and friends in Papua who would be able to refer and help to recruit potential participants. This includes people who are: working for the Indonesian government specialising in West Papua affairs, journalists, working for Jesuit missions in Papua, staff of Freeport’s company social responsibility team, activists of the Free West Papua in England.
- Contacting journalists and activists who would be able to recommend potential participants.
- Contacting old colleagues from Angkasa Aviation Magazine who have connections with members of the Indonesian Armed Forces to access wives/mothers/sisters of soldiers assigned in West Papua.
- Once the potential participants were identified, group meetings were conducted and potential participants were presented with the aims and objectives of the research.
- Distributing recruitment brochures through my network of friends and colleagues to potential participants.
- For security reasons, recruitment of participants was not conducted in public but mainly relied on networking and recommendations.

Following the recruitment strategies, I started by asking friends and old colleagues from Angkasa Aviation Magazine who have connections to members of the Indonesian Armed Forces especially the Air Force. Unfortunately this line of recruitment effort failed, due to the nature of most military wives and families which is separating their men’s career and their domestic roles.

Through friends from the Jesuit community, I got back in touch with an old friend, Fr Aria Prabantara, SJ, who is now the headmaster of Adhi Luhur High School. Through Fr Prabantara I found potential participants in the city of Nabire and distributed the recruitment brochure to a selected group of women.
Another successful recruitment channel was through Balobe Papua Photography. I was introduced to members of Balobe Photography by a well-known Indonesian ethnographic photographer Don Hasman. I had an informal meeting with Pak Don Hasman in summer 2016 before I received the offer for this postgraduate research by UCLan. The word *pak* or *bapak* means sir or dad or mister in a friendly way. Hence people who knows him call him Pak Don.

Figure 29 - Meeting with Indonesian ethnography photographer Don Hasman

Pak Don introduced me to a number of people in the Balobe Papua Photography club. One important contact was a pastor in Sentani, Jayapura, whose father was part of the 1990s political prisoners. For security reasons, I agreed not to name the pastor. This pastor agreed to introduce me to a group of women whose men were imprisoned for their political views against the Government of Indonesia.

Also playing an important part in this research is Dave Lewerissa, the Secretary of Balobe Papua Photography, who introduced me to Naomi and Yuli, two sisters who had relevant stories to tell.

Figure 30 – Balobe Papua Photography & its Secretary Dave Lewerissa
I owe all these encounters to my Aunty Lisa Kasid who organised my first meeting with Pak Don. She was my angel who sadly passed away the night I told her that I got an offer from University of Central Lancashire.

I.2.1. Nabire: recruitment and the first field trip

In Nabire, I started by visiting Fr Prabantara, an old friend who is now a Jesuit priest and headmaster of Adhi Luhur High School. Fr Prabantara introduced me to writer and lecturer Petrus Tekege whose book is about Papuan women (original title in Indonesian: *Perempuan Papua*).

The first group in Nabire was formed. Initially, it consisted of four women. The first was Ema, who was introduced by Petrus Tekege, the writer and lecturer in a local college. Ema lost her husband in 2001. Her husband was shot in his leg by the Indonesian Army during a gathering in Nabire’s public square, *Taman Gizi*. He was brought to an Army hospital but later died in the hospital. Being a qualified nurse, Emma did not believe that...
the wound to her husband’s leg could be fatal. Ema suspected some kind of blood poisoning that was not coincidental. Today Ema continues her career as a nurse and midwife while raising her son Hirfan on her own.

Ema introduced me to three more women: Vero, Monika, and Agustina. Vero had lost her father around the same time as Ema lost her husband. Vero’s father was involved in the Papua’s People Assembly in 2001 and was attending a meeting in Merauke – another major town in Papua – when he died of poisoning. Vero said she would be happy to tell her story, but without appearing on camera to protect her job as a civil servant.

The next women in the group is Monika. Everyone calls her “Mama Monika” as she is a mature and motherly lady. The word ‘mama’ in Papuan culture is equivalent to “mam” or “madam” in English, and it is used to address a mature woman as a term of respect. Using the word "mama” also indicate friendliness and understanding of the local culture.

Monika had been arrested, beaten and imprisoned by the Indonesian police. She was attending a local demonstration in 2008. Students and the local community were protesting the corruption behind the local election at that time. Monika joined in the rally as she was passing on her way to the market. Unlucky for her, she was arrested and was beaten in front of many people. She was thrown into jail and sentenced without a fair trial.
Next, Ema took me to the house of Agustina, who lost her son Abraham in 2010. Both Agustina and her husband Leo tried to investigate and searched for Abraham but never found him nor his body. Local witnesses told them that he was killed by the Indonesian Army in Enarotali, a village further inland, South of Nabire. Agustina agreed to participate in the project, to tell the story of her son, and to find a solution for the conflict together with the other women participants.

I spent two days at Ema’s house in Nabire discussing the project with the four potential participants. In this early stage, the group’s idea was to dig into their tribe’s tradition of peace. All four women came from the Moni tribe. Lead by Ema who is also a fashion designer specialising in traditional Papuan noken weaving, this group planned to tell their stories and ideas while also promoting Papuan traditional craft and dresses. They showed me their noken, which is the Papuan traditional bag, hand made by weaving or crocheting tree bark or nylon yarn.
During the first field work in Nabire, I completed the first four steps of the PV process: identifying the participants and putting them into groups, introducing the participants to the project, having a structured discussion to identify issues, and loosely designing their project brief which includes the history of the community, each individual personal history, what happened to their men, what would they like to see happen and how to tell a story in their traditional culture (see Figure 27).

The women started discussing their personal history, narrated what happened to their men, and what they would like to happen. We also started the discussion on to how they would like things to get better, and the group also identified some wisdom from their tribe’s peace tradition.

1.2.2. Jayapura: recruitment and first field trip
The next group was formed in Jayapura, the capital of Papua. A group of two sisters – Naomi and Yuli – talked about their distant relatives whose father was kidnapped, held in jail and tortured for something that he had not done. The two sisters were planning to express their ideas on achieving peace through traditional Papuan song.

Figure 35 - Naomi (right), Yuli (middle) and their cousin. The family has a singing group and would like to contribute their ideas through music video

Although rather reluctant to tell the story of their distant relative, Naomi and Yuli agreed to touch on the history in order to move on to a peace solution. Naomi’s ideas are also influenced by the recent campaign by non-governmental organisations and religious leaders to transform Papua into “The Land of Peace” (Tebay, 2005; also see interview with Neles Tebay https://youtu.be/hts7Keei764). Through dialogues and the promotion of Papuan traditions and cultures, this movement wanted to end the conflict.
Naomi and Yuli are interested in putting across opinions of local leaders as well as summarising their own concept of peace through a music video. Their initial idea was to combine a music video and interviews with local leaders and peace makers.

The third group are women whose men were political prisoners. Mina and Oma Matui had their husbands imprisoned in Java for over 10 years. The word oma means grandmother in Dutch. Everyone in this group calls this old woman Oma out of respect and endearment. Mina’s husband was present during the meeting and was happy for Mina to tell the story of her struggle raising her children alone during the time he was held as political prisoner in Java in the 1990s.

The elderly Oma Matui was present in the background as we were using her garden as a meeting place and headquarters for this group. Her husband had passed away a few years ago, but Oma Matui agreed to tell her story together with this group.

Yosina is the youngest in this group. When we had this meeting in March 2017, her husband Yunus was still in prison for treason. He was accused of supporting the rebels, the Free West Papua movement. Yosina came to the meeting with her husband’s brother Aipanus who openly told me that he is an active member of the Free West Papua Army.

![Figure 36 - Yosina (left) and Merry (right) both had their men imprisoned for voicing their political opinions](image)

The most vocal member of the group is Merry. Merry’s father was one of the political prisoners from the 1990s, and Merry remembers vividly the night her father was arrested. Merry spent her teenage years and early adolescence without her father and felt the hardship her mother had been through. Merry had an idea of re-enactment to tell the story of the men in this group.
During the discussion, the whole group agreed to tell their story in detail so that what they had been through would not get lost in history.

I.3 Recap of potential participants from the first trip

In total, there are ten women in three groups who initially agreed to participate in this research project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>mother</th>
<th>daughter</th>
<th>wife</th>
<th>sister</th>
<th>self</th>
<th>rep</th>
<th>note</th>
<th>opinion</th>
<th>confidence</th>
<th>side</th>
<th>opinion description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emma Z</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>very</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wanting to use native culture to talk about conflict and peace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vero Z</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No appearance on camera due to her work as a civil servant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monika Z</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>very</td>
<td></td>
<td>Enthusiastic to tell her story and to find peaceful solutions (but wanting independence first)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agustina W</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Need encouragement, husband should not be present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naomi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peace through songs. Not wanting to talk about independence (to be more diplomatic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuli</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Telling story of her relatives (who were daughters of a man who was imprisoned by the Army)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mine P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Telling story of her relatives (who were daughters of a man who was imprisoned by the Army)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merry K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Re-enactment might be useful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yosita W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In the background</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 37 - Mina (left), her husband Paiki (next to her) attended the meeting to discuss this project

Figure 38 - Table showing list of participants
II. Designing the Participatory Video workshop

II.1. Utilising existing network to deliver technical training

Having found and recruited the participants, introduced the project and briefly discussed the underlying issues, the next step was structuring a project brief that should be standardised for all three groups. Although I had an initial discussion around step four with Ema’s group in Nabire, the brief needed to be standardised so that all three groups would have the same tasks.

For the technical training in video shooting or step six, I identified potential support from Balobe Papua Photography. On my visit in March 2017, Balobe Photography were about to start a free workshop on videography for beginners. They kindly agreed to enrol four women from the two groups in Jayapura. Balobe planned to hold the workshop in July 2017, and the organiser said that they would be in touch about the exact dates.

![Balobe Photography Workshop](image-url)

*Figure 39 - Balobe Photography Workshop. Four participants are offered a place in the next videography workshop which will equip them with video shooting skills*

However as there is no photography group in Nabire, I had to find something that can be applied with same parameters to all groups. At this stage, I planned to duplicate the workshop material in video shooting that would be given to the groups in Jayapura, to apply to the group in Nabire. Alternatively, I would need to find a similar photography society in Nabire to arrange for the same workshop for the Nabire group.

The next trip to Papua was planned to be in January 2018 where I should complete the standardised step four and step five. The whole process was going to be filmed by the cameraman, who is also my husband Andy Cooke. This process will then be evaluated.
and analysed through the viewing and editing process. At this stage, I was also applying for various external film funding to afford the transport, accommodation, and expenses while working with the women in Papua.

II.2. Learning from existing PV process by established organisation
In September 2017 I attended a Participatory Video Facilitation Training in Oxford, conducted by InsightShare. InsightShare is an organisation established in 1999 specialising in “improving and shaping the use of Participatory Video in all its forms, and building a grassroots movement of practice to sustain its role as a powerful community engagement tool” (https://insightshare.org/about/). The organisation has trained many facilitators, founded community video ‘hubs’ and produced free resources on PV for grassroots communities.

The six days training was full of practical skills to facilitate a PV project, which I summed up in a short video blog (https://youtu.be/f2UE3cJzOqI ). It was also a week full of personal learning, inspiring story sharing, solidarity and friendship. The facilitators and all participants seemed to be able to maintain a positive energy for the whole week. I intended to take this to Papua, aiming for all participants as well as for me and the cameraman, to feel equal with no boundary between the observer and the observed (Knudsen, 2018, p.9). I would like to bring in a feeling of sisterhood with emotional support and positive energy.

Having years of experience conducting PV projects with many different communities in the UK and internationally, InsightShare has a number of standard games to facilitate learning technical skills. I took home a number of games that would be appropriate and relevant to the participants. For example, an exercise in group empathetic listening will be useful for this research as the core and beginning for the participants to tell their stories.

II.3. Equipment dilemma: smartphone or video camera?
Before embarking on this research journey, I contemplated the use of equipment in telling a story to the world (https://adelinemt.wordpress.com/2016/11/13/simple-equipment-for-participatory-video-project/) and thought about using smartphones as the main equipment for participatory filmmaking. Then during the PV Facilitation Training, I had a brief discussion with InsightShare founder Nick Lunch about the use of a video camera to get good quality film footage.

I was debating this aspect of the research from all sides – practicality, affordability, sustainability of the skills, also the safety of the participants when filming in public places.
On the one hand, I agree with the need to learn the skills of filming with a video camera and the quality it would guarantee. On the other hand, I also wanted to test the project using available technology, assuming that most participants would have smartphones with camera facilities.

Using a smartphone would be the safer option in Papua as well as in other places where freedom of information is still threatened by some forms of authoritarian government and military regimes. As also discussed in the PV Facilitation training, the presence of a video camera and a tripod is like an alien landing in a small remote village. It will attract curiosity and could make those being filmed uncomfortable as a tripod makes the subjects more aware of their existence in front of a camera.

Knowing the Papuan situation and the wider Indonesian culture, I could predict how the use of video camera would make the participants stand out in the crowd, attracting not only the general public who associate a tripod with television, but most dangerously it would also get the attention of the armed forces or police to the participants. Whilst the use of smartphones has become widely common in Papua, where people have been embracing the modern culture of capturing personal moments and sharing photos on social media.

It is therefore much more reasonable in both social acceptance as well as individual learning curves, to utilise the existing smartphones for this function.

Deciding to use existing equipment of smartphones or tablets, I then embarked on a task to adapt the technical skills: how to film good quality footage using the available equipment. There is also the task on how to use add on equipment to enhance the quality of the film – such as microphone, lights and tripods – with the existing smart phones or tablets. The next task would be wrapping these skills into the PV workshop for the Papuan women participants.

After some discussion with my supervisor and with my cameraman, I decided to use smartphones and tablets or iPads. One of the challenges at this point is not knowing what kind of smartphone or tablet the participants have – or not have. The other challenge is the lack of external filming funding. Hence, to back up this plan, I launched an appeal asking friend, families, colleagues, friends of friends and anyone who was kind enough to donate their unused smart phones or tablets or iPads that have a camera for this project (Figure 40).
Another way to resolve the dilemma between quality and accessibility is to use both smartphones and an additional audio recording system, which meant that as a team we can use a good microphone connected to a second smartphone or tablet to record the audio simultaneously whilst the main video is recorded using the smartphone. In this way, we will still achieve good quality pictures and audio using accessible equipment and technology.

I identified another challenge. Established organisations normally employ two facilitators for a PV workshop, but in this research I was the only facilitator. I would be travelling with my husband who is also my cameraman, however I would be the only one who speaks both English and Indonesian.

There was a possibility of recruiting someone from a local organisation such as Balobe Papua Photography to assist the workshop and facilitation, but this will entail two more problems. One is commitment from the local facilitator who most likely would have their own job/occupation/regular activities. Two, recruiting a local facilitator would mean that I would need to train the local facilitator on PV facilitation and explain the whole research brief. Both options translated to extra budget and time – two resources that are very limited in this research.
II.4. Initial Participatory Video project design

Coming back from the PV Facilitation Training by InsightShare, I took home an initial project design based on the games learned from the training (Figure 41). I also learned activities and games that would be good for the project.

The first game that I decided to use for all groups is the ‘name game’ as an introduction to filming (Figure 42). I also decided to combine the use of PV for therapeutic conflict resolution and for advocacy. The first technique is to tell their individual stories, and the second is to pass their message of how to resolve the conflict to the decision makers and wider public.
III. The Brief: guide and data collection methods

III.1. Methods and process

III.1.1. Identifying steps for this research
Before the first trip to Papua, I had identified six steps for this research (see Figure 27 in section I.1). As the first trip completed in March 2017, I identified the women participants and put them into groups. This is part of step one. The participants were then introduced to the project (step 2), followed by structured discussions to identify their issues (step 3). This meant that the first three steps had been completed.

Through the issues identified, I would need to facilitate the women participants so that their film would include the history of their community, their own personal history, what happened to their men, what would they like to see happen, how would they like to see it happen, and then find ways of wrapping their narratives into a traditional story that connects to their culture.

III.1.2. Information data collection, and research outcome
This research is based on two main research questions. First, in what way women who have experienced conflicts can have a voice and can potentially shape decision making processes in conflict resolution? Second, how participatory video or filmmaking can be a tool to open up a sustainable pathway towards influencing the decision making process in conflict resolution and peacebuilding?

To answer these questions, this research uses these following methods. First, literature review to understand the context of this research. The literature review includes textual and historical analysis on Papua, the 50 year conflict between Papuan separatists and Indonesian government, and the current efforts for peace building and resolution.

Searching literatures for the subject of conflict in Papua is more complicated than a database search because most sources in Indonesian language are not indexed. Hence I spent some time at the library of the School of Philosophy and Theology (Sekolah Tinggi Filsafat and Teologi) Fajar Timur in Jayapura, Papua, in March 2017 and was assisted by their librarians. I obtained sources in Indonesian language from Papuan Human Rights organisations and activists, as well as from a number of independent bookshops in Indonesia.

The second method used in this research is a contextual review of existing participatory video (PV) projects. The contextual review takes the form of a written review, video interviews with PV practitioners and a video blog. As mentioned in section II.2. above, I
took part in the PV facilitation training course in September 2017. A reflection on the training, skills gained and comparison to this research would also be part of this written submission. To start with, I have compiled my experience of attending the PV facilitation training in a short video blog (https://youtu.be/f2UE3cJzOqI).

The third tool used in this research is autoethnography and reflection. This means recognising my own standpoint, being a woman from East Indonesia – or half Melanesian. This method is based on the realisation that my own experience and background play an important role and is impacting the standpoint of this research. Being aware of standpoint theories (Harding, 1991; Harraway, 1988) and indigenous methodologies (Smith, 2012), I routinely write a reflective journal in the form of a Facebook page (http://facebook.com/PhDAdeline). On this social media page, I also publish interviews, video blogs, reviews of recent news, opinions and journal articles that might have some impact in this research.

The fourth method is the main process to answer the research question “how PV can play a role in conflict resolution and peacebuilding in Papua?” To do this, I would conduct a PV project in Papua with the indigenous women as participants. I started with designing the recruitment process using ethical standards, applying for ethical approval and conducting the recruitment. I designed the PV project, with the questions and discussion topics to be used with the participants. While doing this, I was kept aware that there is a whole spectrum of PVs from the fully free style narrative to the structured or directed and almost interview-like. When meeting the participants for the first time, I explained this project,
explained what PV is and informed the participants of many different ways of visual story telling that they can use.

The outcomes for this research are my final documentary, this written dissertation, films by the women participants (Honai Perempuan untuk Perdamaian / Women’s Honai for Peace by the Nabire Group; Cerita Mama / Mama’s Story and Di Balik Cerita Mama / Behind Mama’s Story by the Jayapura Group), and a portfolio of works. The latter includes documentation of screenings and discussions, short documentaries and video interviews, articles published on various platforms, and autoethnography work in the form of a Facebook page (http://facebook.com/PhDAdeline). Figure 44 summarises the research outcome.

The outcome of this research:
1. PV by the women (participants)
2. Critical dissertation
3. Adeline’s documentary of the whole process
4. Portfolio that might include:
   a. Documentation of the symposium and screening(s)
   b. Short documentaries / video interviews
   c. Articles published on FB page or elsewhere
   d. Autoethnography work in the form of a FB page

III.1.3. Data collection
For the field trip and PV workshop, I planned a full PV workshop for the three groups of women participants. Based on the example learned from PV Facilitation Training course by established organisation InsightShare, I planned a six day workshop for each group (see Figure 45 below).

In principle, the workshop would need to include an introduction and social contract or agreement. The participants would learn the roles and functions of producer, director, camera person and editor. Each participant would also learn camera operating skills.

The second part of the workshop would be the equivalent of an editorial meeting. As the facilitator, I would help the group to identify and analyse the story they want to tell and choose a method or format of narrative (Heath, 1993; Lunch&Lunch, 2006).
The third part of the workshop is audio visual data gathering where the participants and I would go out filming on locations. The participants would film each other on locations of their choosing.

The fourth and last part of the workshop would be reflection discussion and editing. Participants would review all their footage, and decide which footage to choose in the final documentary. At this point, participants would decide to give or withhold consent for which footage would be included in the final documentary for the public (Chowns, 2013, p.565). When all participants are happy about their choices of footage, the final editing would begin.

III.1.4. Analysing the data
First of all, based on phenomenology that “knowledge and awareness of the world are always someone’s knowledge and awareness”, (Matthews, 2006, p.5) the data gathered is the narrative of the participants and their perceptions of their lives that are affected by conflict. The data came in the form of their discussions and video footage during the participatory video workshop. The input by the participants would then be compared with existing literature reviews and mass media news to form a more holistic picture of the situation in Papua.

The second form of data is the data from the whole process of participatory video documentary, where the process will be analysed through feedback and discussions with the participants (Chowns, 2013; Mahama, 2004). I would analyse the whole journey from participant recruitment, workshops, screenings and discussion, as part of her contribution to the practice of participatory video (PV) or participatory filmmaking.

At the theoretical level, I would use the data, knowledge and opinion gathered by participants to develop the practice of participatory video and participatory filmmaking, and building a pathway towards influencing decision making processes. Ideally, I would screen the documentary together with some participants – if logistically possible – in the capital city of Jakarta to the government and decision makers. However if this is not achievable in this part of the research, this research would set a pathway towards dialogue with decision makers and those in power. This process tests my hypothesis that participatory video documentary can be a tool for transformation and conscientization (Freire, 1993).
III.2. Adding types of games to be used to the key parameter in the PV process

Following the process through the six steps (Figure 27 and detailed in section III.1.1), the next task was to identify suitable PV games or activities to each step. Figure 45 shows the correlations between each parameter and the PV game or activity to deliver the goal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY PARAMETER IN PV PROCESS</th>
<th>PV GAME TO BE USED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Identify the participants and put into groups</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Introduce participants to the project</td>
<td>Contract / Rule of the Game</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Structured discussions –identifying issue</td>
<td>Problem tree, Devil’s Advocate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Design project brief:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a. narrate the history of the community</td>
<td>Community Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b. introduce personal history</td>
<td>Empathetic Listening, River of Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c. what happened to their men?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4d. what would they like to see happen?</td>
<td>Margolis Wheel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4e. how would they like to see it happen?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4f. is there a way of wrapping all these up into a [traditional] story [that connect to their culture]?</td>
<td>Searching for Beauty, Comic Strip / Story Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Technical training in [video shooting]</td>
<td>Question in a Circle, Name Game, Show &amp; Tell, Disappearing Game, Vox Pop, Video Soup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Document the challenges and analyse the process through editing</td>
<td>Participatory Editing, Participants Feedback</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 45 - Key parameters and PV game to be used*

To (re)introduce participants to the project, the plan was to use a simple activity such as ‘contract’ or ‘rule of the game’. This involved revisiting the aim of the whole project, participants’ consent in the research, their consent to be named and to appear in the final documentary.

To introduce themselves as well as learning how to use a camera, I would use what InsightShare called ‘Name Game’ (Lunch & Lunch, 2006, p. 23). However, I planned to adapt this game by using a smartphone instead of a video camera. Hence instead of introducing how to open the screen or where the zoom in and out button is, I would utilise their smartphones and assist each participant to familiarise themselves in using their equipment. The ‘Name Game’ is shown in Figure 42 and Figure 46.
Next, I planned to use ‘Problem Tree’ and ‘Devil’s Advocate’ games to elicit a structured discussion on the issues of conflict in Papua among the participants. The ‘Problem Tree’ (Figure 47) encourages participants to draw a tree with a big trunk, then to write the problems they identified on the trunk. The roots are spaces for writing the causes, and the branches of the trees are the effects. The participants would then discuss possible solutions and stick the solutions on the branches.
Another game to discuss the many different point of views relating to an issue is the ‘Devil’s Advocate’. Like the name, the game involves dividing participants into two groups of for and against, and during the exercise each should argue their case, even if personally they are more inclined to the other side of the argument (Figure 48).

The game ‘Community Mapping’ was going to be used to narrate the history of the community. *Vox Populi* was going to be used to get the story from the community as well as to practice their technical interview skills (Figure 48).

To exercise empathetic listening, a game called ‘Think and Listen’ (Lunch & Lunch, 2006, p.40) would be used. As explained in the PV handbook (Figure 49), participants would go in pairs and tell each other their personal story. For this research, with only 2-5 participants in each group, there would be no need to divide the participants. The ‘Think and Listen’ exercise could be done with the whole group, with each participant taking turns to tell their story to the group.

The game ‘Margolis Wheel’ (Lunch & Lunch, 2006, p.41; Chambers, 2002, p.50-51 and p.94) has been used in many community development programmes to discuss challenges and potential solutions. During the PV Facilitation Training, we talked about the benefits, challenges and solutions of cycling. I would adapt this game for the Papuan women participants to talk about what is good or positive in their community, challenges they face and possible or realistic solutions. Guidance for this activity (Lunch & Lunch, 2006, p.41) is shown in Figure 49.
The exercise ‘River of Life’ was tested during the PV Facilitation Training. In this game, participants were asked to draw a river that would signify their lives. Each participant then added significant events of their lives into the river, as shown in Figure 50. For the Papuan women participants, the ‘River of Life’ could play quite an important role to help them narrate their personal history and what happened to their men.
To find ways to wrap up their narratives in a traditional story that connected to their culture, I prepared to use a game called ‘Searching for Beauty’ (Figure 51). In the game ‘Searching for Beauty’, participants would be divided into two groups, each would be given a word that the other group would not know. Each group then needs to find and film something that represented the word. For example, group A would be given the word ‘BEAUTY’ and group B given the word ‘CUTE’. This exercise would be appropriate to showcase participants’ culture and concept of peace.

For technical training in video shooting, a game called ‘Question in a Circle’ (Figure 51) would be suitable. In this game, participants sit in a circle, and taking turns in filming and asking questions to the person in front of them without moving or changing position. Their result would be then used to discuss about camera position and sources of light as well as other technical camera skills that participants themselves would recognise. This game could be adapted for the workshops in Nabire and Jayapura depending on the location and the dynamics of the participants.

‘Storyboard Technique’ would be an appropriate tool for participants to design how to tell their story (Figure 52). Similarly, an exercise called ‘Comic Strip’ (Figure 53) would also
help participants to plan their storytelling. This, along with ‘Searching for Beauty’ could be adapted to facilitate how the participants can wrap up their traditional stories that connect to their culture.

Figure 52 - Story Board technique or ‘Comic Strip’ (Lunch & Lunch, 2006, p.28-31)

Figure 53 - Video Comic Strip (Lunch & Lunch, 2006, p.33)
A game of ‘Show and Tell’ (Figure 54) would be a good exercise in both technical camera skills, speaking in front of camera as well as a chance for the participants to introduce something from their culture that they like to share. The types of shots that was featured in *Insights Into Participatory Video – a Handbook for the field* (Lunch & Lunch, 2006, p.33) would also be a good handout after the exercise. Hence I planned to take a few enlarged copies of the types of shots for the participants.

During the Participatory Video Facilitation Training, I learned some interesting games that might or might not be suitable for the women participants: ‘Twist in Frame’ and ‘Disappearing Game’ (Figure 55). I would consider the participants’ characters before introducing these games.

![Figure 54 - Show and Tell with types of shot for handout (Lunch & Lunch, 2006, p.33)](image)

![Figure 55 - Disappearing Game & Twist in Frame (Lunch & Lunch, 2006, p.26-27)](image)
One particular handout that would be useful but would need adapting to Papuan culture is the ‘Video Soup’ (Figure 56), which is a standard recipe for a film. My idea was to adapt this ‘recipe’ to a local Papuan dish and to facilitate a discussion on how to cook the dish compared to how to ‘cook’ a film.

To facilitate participants’ learning about editing, I planned to use paper editing skills that are used by InsightShare in their PV programmes around the world. Figure 57 shows an example that was used in my group whilst participating in the PV Facilitation Training course in September 2017. Paper editing does not need to contain any words. Hence this way, even participants who could not read and write could still actively participate by drawing the scene.
III.3. Detailed plan for the PV workshops

With all the Key parameters in this research process identified with the relevant PV game or exercises to use, the next task for the research was to design the whole PV workshop package which should be standard for all groups in Nabire and Jayapura.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PV FOR PEACE IN PAPUA – WORKSHOP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong> Nabire &amp; Jayapura (Papua)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participants:</strong> women, over 18, affected by armed conflict either through their men or directly, willing to participate through workshop, has opinion about achieving peace rooted in actual experience and willing to share with the public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target audience:</strong> policy makers, international NGOs, political scientists/academia, general public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aim:</strong> understanding conflict in Papua through personal experiences of the participants; 2. finding solutions to the conflict/how to achieve peace; 3. affecting policy makers to take actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partners:</strong> Adeline (researcher/producer), Andy (volunteer cameraman), Ana Ombin (Nabire/Balobe), Donald (Jayapura/Kelas Pagi/Papua)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpreter:</strong> N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time:</strong> 26 days Nabire (21/01 – 15/02) + 27 days Jayapura (23/02 – 21/03) Jayapura + 4 days traveling + 4 days rest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY 1 (Technical Day)</th>
<th>DAY 2 (Story building)</th>
<th>DAY 3 (Story building &amp; start filming)</th>
<th>DAY 4 (Filming)</th>
<th>DAY 5 (Editing)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intro&amp;Welcome Consent</td>
<td>Video Soup</td>
<td>Community Map</td>
<td>Searching for Beauty</td>
<td>Recap of workshop / finishing group planning &amp; writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract/Rule of the Game</td>
<td>Show &amp; Tell</td>
<td>Empathetic Listening</td>
<td>Comic Strip / Story Board</td>
<td>Paper Editing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film styles (talk about favourite films, what works, what can be changed etc)</td>
<td>Vox Pop</td>
<td>River of Life</td>
<td>Reminder of Video Soup</td>
<td>Filming (* can be more than one day especially if filming on different locations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question in a Circle</td>
<td>Disappearing Game</td>
<td>Margolis Wheel, Devil’s Advocate</td>
<td>Group writing / story planning</td>
<td>Computer Editing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Game</td>
<td>Problem tree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watch the day’s footage &amp; Reflection</td>
<td>Watch the day’s footage &amp; Reflection</td>
<td>Watch the day’s footage &amp; Reflection</td>
<td>Sharing &amp; reflection</td>
<td>Sharing &amp; reflection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 58 - PV design and games to use for six days workshop*
A six day workshop seemed to be an effective standard workshop as shown in Figure 58. However, I had full anticipation for variation depending on: participants' skills, personalities, time and location. Being realistic that I had no organiser to prepare a timetable and venue, I allocated two to three weeks for each city. This way, there would be enough time to gather the participants, find locations and agree on the timetable. Then the length of the workshop could be adjusted to more than six days to include filming or travel to different locations, depending on the wishes of the participants.

With this detailed plan, the next step was to book the flights to depart to Nabire and Jayapura.
IV. Chapter Summary

The first trip to Papua resulted in recruitment of 10 potential participants who met the criteria for this research. The potential participants formed three groups – one group of four women in Nabire, and two groups of four and two women in Jayapura. The recruitment of participants took place in an informal way through my existing network of old colleagues and friends, avoiding public advertising for security reasons. At this stage, I met and discussed the project with all 10 women and they gave their consent to participate in this research.

A parameter of the research was decided, in which the participants would need to narrate the history of their community, introduce their personal history and what had happened to their men, discuss what solution would they like to see happen and how, and wrap all these in a traditional story that connected to their culture. The next step in this research was designing the participatory video workshop which included technical training in filmmaking.

To learn and compare existing participatory video methods, I attended a participatory video facilitation training held by an established organisation. In deciding the method to use in this research, I debated about using smartphones or a video camera. I finally decided to use existing equipment in order to achieve sustainability.

Before embarking on the field work, I designed the participatory video workshop for all three groups. The challenge was to design a basic workshop that would be suitable in different venues to participants with various different technical skills, equipment and level of understanding. At this stage, there was no certainty about the venue to be used and the time table or availabilities of the potential participants.
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CHAPTER FIVE – PARTICIPATORY VIDEO PROCESS AND FIELD WORK DOCUMENTATION

Abstract
Having recruited potential participants and designed the participatory video workshop to be used, I embarked on my main field trip to Papua to work with the participants. This chapter introduces all the women participants, the participatory video processes in both cities – Nabire and Jayapura, the results, the challenges, the adjustments made from the original plan, and the reflections from working with each group. This chapter describes in detail the field work process and concludes with reflections from the two field works.

I. Nabire (21 January – 8 February 2018)
I.1. The participants
Ema lost her husband Willem Manimwarba in 2000. He was one of the victims shot at a public park (Taman Gizi) in March 2000 during a flag raising and peaceful demonstration. He was shot on the leg but then died in hospital. As a trained nurse, Ema questioned his death but this had never been investigated formally.

Monika had been arrested and tortured after a demonstration in 2009. She did not intentionally join the demonstration, she was going to the market when the group of demonstrators held their rally. Monika watched and joined in, as she agreed with their concerns regarding the local election process at that time. She was arrested, taken to the police station where she was beaten and kicked about the head. Without given any chance to access appropriate legal consul, she was tried, convicted and spent 2.5 years in prison. Whilst Monika was serving in prison, her husband passed away, unable to cope with the pressure of life without her. Monika took half a day to bury her husband and then returned to prison. Because of this experience, Monika developed a strong opinion that Papua should be given its rights of self-determination and self-governed, independent from Indonesia.

Damela’s story was a rather different in a way that she was a victim of domestic violence. However if we see the context of her life, it is almost clear that the political pressure and violence towards indigenous Papuan people resulted in the high number of domestic violence cases as in other conflict and post-war communities (Francis, 2004). Off the records, there are so many cases like Damela. However when it came to evidence and scrutiny in the Eurocentric common law style, no Papuan woman would come forward and give evidence in public not to mention in the court of law. In this case, I agreed to broaden
her criteria to include Damela as she is one of a very few number of Papuan women who agreed to tell their experience at the receiving end of domestic violence.

I.2. PV Workshop process

An adjustment had to be made in regards of the participants in Nabire. Among the four women recruited during the researcher’s first visit in March 2017, two women – Vero and Agustina – pulled out and another woman joined the group. Agustina, whose son was allegedly killed and mutilated by members of the Indonesian armed forces was unable to attend the workshop due to her poor health. Another participant Vero whose father died due to poisoning after attending the Papuan People Council cancelled her participation due to her work commitments as a civil servant.

The new member of this group, Damela, is a woman who had experienced domestic violence. Although the topic of domestic violence was initially excluded from participants’ criteria, I decided to accept this additional member together with suggestions from the two existing participants to expand the topic into empowering women to be agents of peace in Papua.

I decided to expand the topic for three reasons. Firstly, the security of the participants. Talking about violent conflict between Indonesian armed forces and Papuan people would mean talking about their desires for independence. While the topic is widely discussed around the world, in Papua itself and for indigenous Papuan participants, discussing the topic might compromise their safety.

Secondly, the reality of the social political situation in Papua means that talking about the conflict, referendum and possibility of independence would only result in stalemate. Hence the main issue to address is the roots of the cry for independence, which is social and economic injustice for indigenous Papuan people.

Thirdly, Damela experienced domestic violence amid the heat of the political situation and violent conflict in her area. Her husband the perpetrator had been involved and bore witness to the violent conflict surrounding their daily lives. As McWilliams and Doyle (2017) reported, domestic violence “is shaped by the socio-political and cultural factors that exist within a given society. A key factor is the presence of violent conflict.”

Before the first day of the workshop, I had a discussion with Ema who was the leader of the group, about the three issues. Together we agreed to expand the theme so that not only wider community of indigenous Papuan can relate to the issues, but also to
contribute to the national and international dialogues about the livelihood and future of the indigenous Papuan people.

The participatory video workshop was conducted at Ema’s house in Nabire. After the main learning process, the group went to a village in Paniai area, 115km from Nabire or about a seven hour drive due to the road condition. The group filmed a number of scenes for their PV for peace as well as a number of additional scenes which later became the participants’ next project about the culture and history of their tribe.

Figure 59 - Researcher’s diary for January 2018

I.2.1 Day One (22 January 2018)
The participatory video (PV) workshop started with introduction, reminders of the project brief, and participants’ consent. Day one of the PV workshop continued with familiarisation of the smartphone camera with a game called the ‘Name Game’. The first game introduced the participants to basic functions of the camera whilst using it to film each other introducing themselves and stating their favourite film. The game was followed by
watching their results and discussing what they liked and did not like – in other words, the participants learned about lighting, camera positioning and angle, and camera movements. The second activity for day one was the use of tripod and how to ask a question, which was based on ‘Question in a Circle’ game.

During day one, the participants were also asked to discuss about their favourite films in order to help them think about film styles. However, the topic did not lead them into discussion about existing films, instead they continued to talk about the kind of film that they want to make and the messages they want to convey. I managed to facilitate a discussion about two films: Rambo (Monika’s favourite film), and Bollywood soaps in general which was Ema and Damela’s favourite.

Monika seemed to see herself as Rambo, the brave hero revenging all the wrongs done by Indonesian soldiers. Ema – determined to tell stories about her experience and her tribe – came up with an imaginary film that she wished to produce about Queen Zitugumina, the Goddess who – legend said – had led the Moni tribe from the dark age to prosperity.

At the end of day one, the participants reflected on their first encounter of camera and tripod, as well as types of films and what made a film interesting to watch.

I.2.2 Day Two (23 January 2018)

The day started with a game called ‘River of Life’ (Figure 50, 61 and 62) where each participant drew a river representing their lives. Participants recalled their life story, the

Figure 60 Interesting Films - the participants identified a number of elements that are interesting for them in a film, which are: songs and dance, culture, war (struggle and strategy element), content/message, and also the figures (i.e. John Rambo & Jim Reeves)

I.2.2 Day Two (23 January 2018)

The day started with a game called ‘River of Life’ (Figure 50, 61 and 62) where each participant drew a river representing their lives. Participants recalled their life story, the
point in their lives when they experienced violent conflict, and shared their story to each other.

Later Damela said that this is the first time she had told her experience of domestic violence openly and received support from others. Ema shared her upbringing, how she met her husband, how her husband was shot and died in hospital the next day (The Jakarta Post, 4 March 2000; Amnesty International, 2000). Monika described how she was arrested, tortured and imprisoned for false allegation of treason in 2011.

Due to the emotional content, I conducted this session with care and provided ample emotional support. In this session, I utilised my experience as a mental health crisis worker. The group had a short break with refreshment after the ‘River of Life’ session.

Second session of day two started with ‘Show and Tell’ (see Figure 63) where participants were asked to find objects that were meaningful for them and to speak in front of the camera about it for two minutes or less. While one participant did her presentation, the others set up the tripod and camera and filmed the presentation. The game was both technical training as well as preparing participants to talk about their culture on camera.
In the ‘Show and Tell’, participants proudly presented root vegetables that are their staple food, and Papuan traditional woven bag *noken*, which is used to carry everything – from vegetables to and from the market, their babies, even piglets.

After lunch, the participants identified positive points of Papua, the challenges they are facing, and the possible solution to the challenges. This was based on the ‘Margolis Wheel’ game (Figure 6). Participants identified strength or positive aspects in Papua and their community, the challenges they were facing, and the possible and realistic solution.

In the discussion about strengths, challenges and solutions, participants came up with an idea of *Honai Perempuan* (women’s house or council) where indigenous Papuan women from different tribes could gather to discuss matters such as indigenous rights, women’s rights, and contribute to the politics in Papua. The word *honai* means Papuan traditional house, which symbolically also means an institution where people gather to resolve matters, a place where grassroots democracy takes place.

Day two ended with the participants planning an interview with Head of Women’s Empowerment for Nabire Yufinia Mote, who was also the wife of the Mayor of Nabire. Ema planned to invited Ms Mote to a session on day three.
Figure 63 - Show and Tell with Nabire group

Figure 64 - An exercise based on 'Margolis Wheel' about identifying Positive, Challenges and Solution for Papua
I.2.3 Day Three (24 January 2018)

The planned visit by Yufinia Mote was cancelled due to her other commitments. Instead, the group had a visit by two young women who work for the Department of Rural Development supporting small farming groups in Nabire and surrounding areas. The participants continued their plan to conduct an interview – Ema asking the questions while Monika and Damela, working with cameraman Andy, filmed the interview.

The second session of day three was in practice the start of Honai Perempuan, where the participants invited the two guests and women from the neighbourhood to sit in a circle and discuss their stories of violent conflict and the challenges faced by indigenous Papuans.

Day three resulted in two short videos by the group – a short interview on small enterprise farming (https://youtu.be/1J1mwBmp4A0), and a discussion on domestic violence (https://youtu.be/tY-RXsybdO4). Due to lack of internet facility in Nabire, I had to do the fine editing and uploading into YouTube later.
I.2.4 Day Four (25 January 2018)
On day four and day five, the participants explored their cultural background by interviewing their tribe’s elder, arranging a traditional dance performance and telling Ema’s story through a traditional song. Participants learned about the technicalities of film production – from on camera action, directing each other, camera positioning, camera movement, lighting and sound – while at the same time working on their story.

On day four, a group of men, women and children arrived in their traditional dresses. We filmed their song *Ugapa* which tells a story of a person coming home from working away to find their family had gone. They walked around the village asking people but could not find their family. The participants decided to use this song to tell the story of Ema, who came back from her duty as a nurse and midwife in Enarotali to find that her husband Willem Wanimwarba had been shot.

![Figure 67 - on Day Four the participants prepared a number of people from their clan to perform traditional music instruments and traditional song and dance](image)

I.2.5 Day Five (26 January 2018)
Continuing the filming plan from the previous day, on day five, the group went to visit the house of their tribe’s elder Mr Louis Zonggonau. Having been practising their camera skills, Monika and Damela took turns in filming the interview. Ema turned out to be a natural TV presenter, throwing critical questions to elicit the elder’s answers about their almost forgotten traditions. The interview was conducted in both Indonesian and Moni language.
Day five ended with half a day picnic to a local waterfall where the participants continued to educate me about their traditional beliefs, their tribe’s way in resolving disputes, a few words in the Moni language, and how to put on a grass skirt.

I.2.6 Day Six (29 January 2018)
By day six, I decided not to use the following exercises or PV games: ‘Searching for Beauty’, ‘Comic Strip’, ‘Disappearing Game’ and ‘Twist in Frame’. This was due to the cultural difference and participants’ age – no one would be able to twist in frames like in the game of twister – and because the aims of ‘Searching for Beauty’ and ‘Comic Strip’ had been reached without the need to use the game. The participants in Nabire were hard working women who were very keen to learn new skills, so that by this stage they were ready with planning their film.

The group decided that Ema – who turned out to be a natural public speaker and presenter – should address the President of the Republic of Indonesia about their stories, the problems they were facing, what solutions they wished to happen and what contribution they could contribute to the solutions. By midday, Ema had done two takes of
In the second half of the day, I introduced the concept of paper editing, and the participants designed their film using this method (Figure 70). I then revisited what we had done so far and facilitated a reflection and feedback session. Following this, we made a plan to visit the village where participants came from. Participants called their relatives and arranged to hire a minibus for the next day to go to Enarotali and Bibida village, about 115km away from Nabire.

I.2.7 Day Seven (Tuesday, 30 January 2018)

With the minibus booked and the participants getting ready to go to Enarotali, they decided to take the morning off for preparation. With my cameraman, I took this chance to visit Adhi Luhur High School in Nabire, where the year before I held a trial one day PV training programme (https://youtu.be/mwzyszRvRwl)
The students were very keen to learn about filmmaking using simple equipment. This year they invited us to their school to give feedback to their students’ films as part Value Education.

Although not directly part of the research, the sessions with Adhi Luhur High School evidenced what I had been searching to explore: that simple equipment such as smartphone could be enough to create a good quality film. The headmaster, Fr. Aria Prabantara, SJ., was keen to introduce the skills and encouraged the students to utilise filmmaking as tools for contributing to society, information flows and small local campaigns such as traffic safety and environmental awareness.

In the evening, we set off to Enarotali. The minibus was full with three participants, cameraman Andy and I, and a woman from the Moni tribe who insisted on coming. The 115km journey took eight hours due to the road condition.

Even though the President of the Republic of Indonesia Joko Widodo had announce in 2015 that Papua is open to all international journalists and visitors, the reality in the villages was different. Foreign citizens were still advised to report to the local police station when staying overnight in rural areas or villages, even though there is no formal regulation about this. For this reason, I had obtained a reference letter from Andy’s place of work. The letter stated that as Support Worker for a charity, he was due back in the UK on a set date. The letter was to be carried in his wallet all the time whilst in Papua.

With this local knowledge that was not published in UK’s Foreign Office website or in any official publications, we were ready to travel inland to Enarotali and Bibida, taking a foreign national on board. As an extra precaution, whenever the minibus passed a police station or Army checkpoints, the participants warned Andy to put his head down and I covered his head with a jacket or small bag. We travelled in the cover of the dark to avoid random spot checks by Indonesian soldiers or police.

The minibus passed the spot where four students were killed by member of the Indonesian armed forces in 2014 – known as the ‘Bloody Paniai’. The participants pointed to the spot, but due to the obvious security reason the driver was instructed to continue the journey. We arrived in Bibida at around one in the morning and had a few hours sleep at Ema’s house.
I.2.8 Day Eight (Wednesday, 31 January 2018)
As the morning sun reached the village of Bibida, it showed the beauty of the surrounding area (Figure 71). We agreed to get as much stock footage as possible of the place and of the activities – from the morning swim in the river, Ema cooking in her traditional stove, to children playing and a local elder talking about their village.

The participants wanted to do some extra filming in their own language to show the history and significance of certain places in the village and its surrounding area. Monika and Damela by this time had become confident camera women as they position themselves and directed Ema to talk in front of historical backgrounds.

We visited Lake Paniai where the local market was held and many people travel by small boats to the other side of the 150km² lake. After another eight hours’ drive, we arrived back in Nabire in the evening. We said thank you in prayers, as we all arrived back in Nabire in one piece, with no trouble from the local police or soldiers.

*Figure 71 - The view from Ema's house in Bibida and Lake Paniai where Monika filmed Ema introducing local history in Moni Language*
I.2.9 Day Nine (Thursday, 1 February 2018)
On day nine, most participants took a rest while I did the rough edit. Later that day together with Ema I met up with a local journalist from *Jubi Tabloid*, one of the few trustworthy media outlets in Papua. The local journalist – sharing the concerns about social justice and the future indigenous Papuans in their own land – agreed to discuss ways to collaborate.

I.2.10 Day Ten (Friday, 2 February 2018)
Back to the regular venue at Ema’s house on day ten, I showed all participants and some neighbours the first draft of their documentary. With no laptop for participants to learn hands on editing, I demonstrated the basics of *iMovie* software and explained the principles of editing in line with their paper editing before.

As we watched the end of their film, I noticed a few tears and sobs. Monika gave me a big hug while tissues were distributed. All participants were happy for the film to be finalised.

The local journalist from *Jubi Tabloid* visited our session and was introduced to all participants. Everyone was happy to network and share information for the foreseeable future.
I.2.11 Day Eleven (Monday, 5 February 2018)

In the afternoon we gathered in a local nursery school for the public screening of Honai Perempuan untuk Perdamaian (Women’s Honai for Peace). Attended by members of the local community, congregations from local parishes, teachers, students, local journalists and family members of the participants, the first public screening was a success.

I sat back and let the participants take the lead in introducing the film and moderating the discussion after. I helped in setting up the equipment – using a projector and laptop from the venue – but most of the organising was conducted by the participants. This showed their capabilities in organising events, publications, promotions, greeting the audience and moderating the discussion.

The event was covered by local journalists and appeared in local papers and a community website (https://brochank.wordpress.com/2018/02/06/honai-perdamaian-perempuan-papua/).

![Figure 72 - Public screening of Honai Perempuan untuk Perdamaian (Women’s Honai for Peace) in Nabire, February 2018](image)

I.2.12 Day Twelve (Wednesday, 7 February 2018)

My last day in Nabire was utilised to facilitate the participants to network with more local partners to enable them to continue what they have started. Ema and I met up with owner of Nabire Cyber – the famous and fastest internet café in the city – to discuss possibilities of screening the film at the venue. As this was my last day, it was left to Ema and the women of Honai Perempuan to continue the work in distributing their film and producing more work towards peace in their land.

As a surprise on this day, Andy and I were invited to Ema’s house where the women had prepared an official banner of their organisation. They informed me that the previous day they went to a local notary to officially register “Lembaga Suara Perdamaian Perempuan..."
“Zitugumina” (Zitugumina Women’s Peace Voice) as a non-profit organisation. The women then conducted a short opening ceremony and presented me with their traditional headdress.

Figure 73 - Launch of Honai Perempuan’s new non-profit organisation

Figure 74 shows the modifications and adjustments of the initial PV workshop plan.

![Figure 74 - PV Workshop plan for the Nabire group with all its adjustments and changes](image-url)
I.3. Result

I.3.1 Main film
From the twelve days of intensive workshop and facilitation process, the participants produced their main film: *Honai Perempuan untuk Perdamaian* (Women’s Honai for Peace). The film was screened in public for the first time in Nabire on Monday, 5 February 2018. It was later uploaded to Youtube (https://youtu.be/SDYYWMW2VCw). The second public screening and discussion was held in Jayapura on Friday 2 March 2018 with a group of Papuan artists, musicians and performers. I gave a talk about the project together with Lusi, the new member of the Nabire group who is Ema’s younger sister.

I.3.2. Short videos produced by Honai Perempuan
A secondary result by the Nabire group were two short videos about the women’s farming group and domestic violence. Both are now available on youtube (https://youtu.be/tY-RXsybdO4 and https://youtu.be/1J1mwBmp4A0) After I left, the group produced another two vlogs about their traditional *noken* bag (https://youtu.be/7p0ezea8JCk and https://youtu.be/JA3A8H-Rn7s).

I.4. Reflection

I.4.1. Shifting issues
Looking deeper into the social political situation in Papua – through literature and discussions with networks of scholars, activists, local leaders and educators – I saw that to achieve peace or even to get into the topic of peace, many layers of other social political problems must be revealed.

Since 2016 I have been following news and discussions on Papua through local, national and international media, academic journals as well as through my network of friends and colleagues in Papua. I joined The Spirit of Papua social media group consisting of academics, Papuan community leaders, religious leaders, Papuan people in local governments and a number of Indonesians who share concerns about indigenous Papuans in their own land. I am also a member of the Papuan Study Group (*Lingkar Studi Papua*) that is part of the Indonesian student association in the UK. The two groups have different political views, but often discussed the same issues from different standpoints.

Since arriving in Nabire and working with the first group of participants, I found that topics of discussions debated and analysed in the Papuan Study Group and The Spirit of Papua are parallel to the topics discussed by the participants. Although the comparison was only between three groups, this strengthened my hypothesis that grassroots indigenous
women have the same ability to form theories and opinions as scholars and politicians. It seems to me at that time, the only difference is the use of jargon. This shows that most people at the grassroots level do understand the issues and challenges that Papuan people are facing.

While most Papuans still hold the dream of a free and independent country outside Indonesia, many started to realise that there are more pressing issues to address than the stalemate dichotomy of staying within Indonesia or independence. The Papua Peace Network (Jaringan Damai Papua) had been trying to facilitate dialogues, but after almost two years, only progressed with defining the term “dialogue” and an agreement that the Indonesian government should investigate and prosecute perpetrators of human rights violation in four specific cases. In practice, the investigation did not go anywhere and the four cases were only tiny drops of water in the ocean of human rights violations in Papua.

Recent news, academic journals and social media articles also point at broader issues than the dilemma of staying with Indonesia or independence. One of the common themes that arose was how indigenous Papuans can be the masters on their own land? The question covered social, political and economic aspects. Arriving in the first location of this research, Nabire, I found similar themes through my interactions with the participants and through discussions with community leaders.

The problem of non-Papuan migrants dominating businesses was identified by both The Spirit of Papua group and the research participants. Other problems identified by the participants, The Spirit of Papua group and local newspapers are: the dying culture diluted by transmigration from other islands of Indonesia; lack of appropriate education facilities and teachers in Papua especially in highlands and remote areas; deforestation that caused the lack of natural food sources; and the shift of staple food from indigenous root vegetables to Indonesian rice.

During the PV workshop and implied in many discussions during breaks, the participants in Nabire expressed their desire to be recognised by their own identity. There is a strong sense of refusing the “Indonesianisation of Papua” (King, Elmslie, and Webb-Gannon, 2011).

Another major topic of discontent is the exploitation of Papua’s natural resources by foreign and Indonesian companies whilst leaving the Papuans impoverished, untouched by modern education and technology, and even in danger of malnutrition and famine – such as the recent case in Asmat (https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-asia-42985439).
The elephant in the room – Freeport mining operation in the highland areas of Tembagapura, Mimika – had caused political social and economic divides between those who profit from it and those who suffer. Unsurprisingly, the local indigenous people had very little if no benefit from the giant mining operations since it was opened in the 1960s.

I.4.2. Two sides of colonialism

While the rest of Indonesia saw the Dutch colonials as villains, Papuans saw the Dutch and most white or European people as saviours. This is because most of the Europeans who arrived in Papua were missionaries, bearers of The Good News.

I grew up in the capital city of Jakarta, in the island of Java, where the Dutch and Japanese colonials were pictured as white men in pith helmets with whips, forcing native Indonesians to be slaves and torturing those who did not obey. Indonesian films in the 1970s and 1980s depicted these colonials using actors who are mixed Indonesian and white with fake Dutch accents. They were ‘the bogey men’ of Indonesian children. History lessons also featured economic exploitations of national resources and slavery by the VOC (Verenigde Oost-Indische Compagnie) as the evil of colonialism.

However, Papuan people saw the Dutch and white people in general as the kind missionaries who brought the modern world, education, and Christianity. The warm feeling towards Europeans was felt even stronger in the highlands and remote areas.

While visiting Enarotali and the villages of Bibida and Kugapa with the participants, I witnessed the importance of missionaries in the highlands. The participants and local leaders told me stories about the first Catholic missionary Fr. Tilemans who in 1935 – 1936 walked from village to village. They told me how the elders of their tribe welcomed this ‘holy man’. The thick rain forest of Paniai without today’s modern buildings and asphalt roads reminded me of a scene from the 1987 Academy Award winner for Best Picture The Mission (Fernando Ghia / David Puttnam / Roland Joffe’s, 1986).

As the main colonial administration during the 350 years of Dutch occupation was concentrated in Java, not many Dutch administrators, traders or soldiers went to the far east of Papua. History books also noted that the Dutch government in the Dutch East Indies (now Indonesia) claimed Papua as their land through the Sultan of Ternate, but never set foot on Papua. Only the missionaries and the bush pilots who ventured further East and entered the thick rain forest of Papua.
Through this research journey, I saw the other side of colonialism that the Papuans saw: the kind missionaries. This is totally the opposite to colonialism that I knew, which is the cruel and exploitative face of the same beast.

I.4.3. A few adjustments
As mentioned above, the participants had a plan to interview the Head of Women’s Empowerment for Nabire Yufinia Mote. However, as she was unable to attend on the day, I found help from a good friend who works for the Department of Rural Development. She agreed to be interviewed. Hence the participants could continue their plan to conduct an interview. Ema adapted the questions she had prepared on women’s empowerment, linking it to small enterprise farming and women’s roles in agriculture.

Learning from the PV model used by InsightShare, most PV projects require standard equipment that at the end of the project would be left behind for the participants to develop their new skills. The difficulty in this research was finding such equipment, and the concerns on security of filming in public using obvious equipment. Hence I decided to use a donated Samsung Galaxy S19 with a tripod.

With this limitation I relied on my own camera Sony A6300, iPhone SE smartphone, MacBook laptop, tripod, microphones and SD cards. I planned to gather existing resources such as participants’ own smartphones, tablets and laptops, but in Nabire there was none.

Having to work with participants’ limited equipment and skills, I used the donated Samsung Galaxy S19 and tripod for the participants to learn basic camera work. We then faced the dilemma between quality and accessibility or participants’ learning process.

Another adjustment was widening the topic to include Damela who experienced domestic violence. The justification for this as mentioned in section I.1. above are: first, without the two initial participants we would have difficulties working as a group; second, domestic violence in social political conflict area can be related (McWilliams and Doyle, 2017); and third, for the safety of the women participants, the topic of domestic violence is less suspicious than political violence.

I.4.4 Local reactions
Group leader Ema had briefed the rest of the participants about the time and location. She had also informed her local community about the plan to establish a women organisation
or a film club to raise the issues faced by their community. On day one in the middle of a session we were visited by a local leader and human rights activist with his wife.

The session was stopped for introductions where I explained the aim of this activity to the visitors. I saw this as part of indigenous methodology (Smith, 2012) where consent is not a matter of participants signing forms, it is more a consensus from the community and a dialogue to benefit both the research as well as the community. The couple gave us their blessings and reminded us about the importance of uncovering human rights violations in Papua as well as the importance of protecting the safety of the participants.

Following this visit I repeated the discussion about consent and participants’ safety. I made clear that as a researcher, I would leave Papua and return to the UK once this research is completed. I explained my concerns about the safety of the participants, especially Monika who had been very vocal about her desire to live in a free independent Papua. The participants and I discussed the potential repercussions and how to prevent them.

The discussion progressed to the importance of being open and honest about one’s feelings and opinions, but at the same time being realistic about possible solutions and how to communicate messages that are inclusive to all audiences – from Papuans, the rest of Indonesia, to the rest of the world. Everyone agreed about finding realistic solutions to the problems that Papuan people are facing, so that the film should be a positive contribution for the future and not a lamentation of the past.

On day seven, four inquisitive visitors who are not indigenous Papuan arrived in front of Ema’s house on motor bikes. They did not enter the premises but they looked around and stared at us. Monika came out and asked them what they wanted. Their conversation seemed long. At the time we were filming Damela’s story. Filming stopped and we waited for the men to leave. Monika said that the four men claimed to be from an NGO supplying clean water and wanted to inspect the water supply in the house. None of the participants believed this, as they identified the four men as members of the police intelligence in plain clothes.

I.4.5. Challenges

Bearing in mind the sustainability of the groups’ activity as filmmakers, I endeavoured to pass on useful skills such as camerawork, simple editing, maintaining a blog or website, and uploading videos onto Youtube. However these targets were unrealistic for the Nabire group.
The first obstacle is the lack of equipment for video editing. As I messaged my supervisor on day six:

*It’s day 6 of PV project today. The ladies are keen, but we have no tablet or laptop for them to continue practicing their editing skills. So, I am trying to encourage them to do one shot films that can later be uploaded on YouTube… But the next challenge is that the internet in Nabire can hardly cope with YouTube. This is still work in progress.*

Although considered one of the major cities in Papua, Nabire has very little internet coverage. The city is covered by Vsat for data and internet. Even in WiFi hotspots, the internet speed was very slow, and many times even non-existence. Uploading videos to YouTube was a huge task in my experience. For example, to upload a short video of about 90 seconds, I waited for three hours before giving up – it stuck on 7% in three hours.

The next challenge was a smaller problem: the participants had very little computer and internet skills. They needed to learn the basics of computer, internet, email, website, and then how to upload their films onto video sharing websites. Although considered a challenge, this obstacle could be overcome by introducing a volunteer to teach and support the participants.

During the public screening, the participants met an amateur photographer who volunteered to support them in video editing and internet skills. Another help was provided by the additional member of the group who arrived on the day of the public screening. Lusi, Ema’s younger sister came to Nabire to support the group. Living in Bali, Lusi had access to a better internet connection once she left Nabire.

*Figure 75 - indigenous methodology included being accepted as part of the tribe, which sometimes translates to wearing grass skirt*
Last challenge was the cultural difference and personal relationship, which means I had to keep peace due to working with my husband who is also the cameraman. It was different then working as a journalist and fixer with international colleagues. In this setting, sometimes I found it challenging to juggle between four roles: facilitator of the PV workshop, producer, editor, and interpreter for the cameraman who is also my husband.

The cultural differences and language barriers are not only Indonesian and English, but added local tribe’s language and culture. There were times when balancing the professional standards and the personal became difficult due to working with a husband who came from privileged white male background in a remote place where with different customs and language. In all three cultures – Indonesian, Moni Tribe and even British culture – men are immediately seen as leaders, even when they are not. Many times, I had difficulties setting the objectives and leading the process when my cameraman – being a white male – received the privilege of being listened to and directed the filming process to his own ways.

Still, the last challenge gave me an insight that no other researcher had: balancing one’s own point of view, indigenous methodologies, and understanding the standpoint of the privileged white European male standpoint at the same time.

By day six, I reflected that the project might end up like InsightShare’s first project about Cowley Road in Oxford (https://youtu.be/RYHkl8B0Ce4) where the facilitators do most of the filming and editing whilst participants had more of a say of the content and conducted interviews. As the project continued, the participants successfully completed the paper edit process so that I edited the film based on what they dictated.

I.4.6. The miracle of networking

As the film went into the editing stage, I started asking around for friends of friends or acquaintances who might be able to help the participants with video editing and uploading to Youtube using only an old smart phone. The local journalist I met was not only a keen and idealist journalist, but also an activist with concerns about the rights of the indigenous Papuans.

He attended the participants’ internal screening and gave a talk to the participants about journalism in Papua. They discussed the efforts to open information to the world. As a result, the participants agreed to network with local media in covering stories relevant to the rights of indigenous Papuan women. There was also a talk about further networking with Papuan women market vendors (mama-mama pasar).
After two weeks of learning, filming and conducting paper editing, the participants were ready for a public screening. Through their network of friends and church, we secured a free place for their first public screening in a local Nursery School. Attended by over 30 people including journalists from local television, the screening was followed by an interactive discussion.

Among the audience was a school teacher whose father was a policeman. In the discussion, she shared her story of violent conflict between the police and the Indonesian Army, and between the police and the locals. Her story moved the participants and formed a new understanding among the two sides. The three participants – Ema, Monika and Damela – agreed unanimously that their group, Honai Perempuan, will include women of all backgrounds in Nabire, not only the indigenous Papuan.

This screening was also an opportunity for further networking where the participants met an amateur photographer who volunteered to teach them about simple video editing. They also networked with a volunteer who organises Papuan women market vendors (mama-mama pasar).

After the first public screening, I asked the participants to reflect on their PV journey. We agreed that what started as a challenge – i.e. lack of equipment – had become the strength for this group. The lack of equipment and external funding had driven the group to network with those who have these assets and in time formed a constructive partnership.

Before I left Nabire, we met the owner of Nabire Cyber – the major internet café in the city. Having secured themselves as a legal organisation, the participants agreed to have their second screening at Nabire Cyber in the near future. This would be followed by discussions and networking with other voluntary organisations.

My journey with the participants in Nabire was the implementation of indigenous methodology (Smith, 2012) where a research did not start with a formal written consent and did not end with a simple goodbye. This research became an activity that was accepted by the whole community and tribe, and hopefully concluded with something that would benefit the whole community. The bird of paradise headdress was a small cross to bear when I entered a UK airport and had to answer to conservationists and animal lovers.
II. Jayapura (23 February – 15 March 2018)

II.1. Participants

Naomi and Yuli are sisters who grew up in a village where people were in fear of the Indonesian armed forces. Since very young, they were aware of a distant relative who grew up without a father. Suspected of supporting Papuan independence, the father had been arrested and questioned a number of times by Indonesian soldiers before deciding to hide in the thick jungle of Papua. Naomi and Yuli told us that the story of their relative has been haunting them for as long as they could remember. The group decided to tell this story, because it was a common experience in many Papuan families. They call this “Mama’s Story”.

Frida is a young woman from the highland tribes of Papua. Frida and her family have witnessed many violent incidents towards indigenous Papuans, including how the police deliberately let ariot happen in Jayapura, 2015.

Maria’s grandfather and grandmother were part of the original people who took part in the Act of Free Choice 1969. Although it was not a free choice. Instead, they were held under gunpoint to sign the ballot that say they wanted to be integrated to the Republic of Indonesia. When the story of her grandmother was told on public radio, her grandparents’ home was visited by soldiers and police, intimidating the family to keep quiet.

II.2 PV Workshop

![February 2018 Calendar](calendar-image)
II.2.1. Day One (Monday, 26 February 2018)
Introduction, welcome and consent followed by screening the film produced by the participants in Nabire. This first introduction took place in Kelas Pagi Papua, a community photography class run by its founder Donald Kamarea, who is also a lecturer in film studies at the Papua’s Institute of Arts.

As planned, on the first session I explained the research, followed by a discussion about consent and identities of participants. In this session, I also introduced the participants to Donald who would be assisting me in delivering some technical training. The participants also met a number of amateur photographers, students and alumni of Kelas Pagi Papua and some members of Balobe Papua Photography. As most participants worked, this was a half-day session finishing at lunch time so that everyone could get back to work.

II.2.2. Day Two (Tuesday, 27 February 2018)
At a different venue – outside a youth club – day two consisted of ‘Name Game’ and ‘Favourite Film’. All four participants have their own smartphones, with Frida who later appointed the camera person, using her DSLR camera. As discussed in Chapter Four, participants were encouraged to utilise what they have – smartphones or DSLR camera.

In ‘Name Game’, we sat in a circle and the participants took turns to film each other introducing themselves, their motivations and hopes in this PV workshop. They then filmed each other in stating their favourite films, but in a location of their choosing.

Interestingly, part of the day’s unplanned discussion was how to transfer videos from their smartphones into a laptop – in this case we were using my Apple MacBook. As everyone
was using Android based smartphone, the challenge of transferring video to an incompatible operating system became relevant. The result was that everyone including myself learned some tricks in using microSD card and connecting Bluetooth from Window to Apple and vice versa. The participants also learned from each other – and I learned about Android based smartphones – on how to set their camera application to shoot in the best quality.

Figure 76 - Participants wrote their favourite films and their hopes in attending this PV workshop
II.2.3. Day Three (Wednesday, 28 February 2018)

Another half-day session, day three started with ‘Show and Tell’ at an outdoor venue, followed by a discussion about types of shots. The latter was conducted using participants’ footage from day two and day three.

Day three was particularly short due to the late start. We planned to start at 09:30, however among the four participants, only one arrived at 10:00. The rest arrived between 10:30 to 11:00. Hence the plan to finish at 11:30 changed and we finished at 13:00.

II.2.4. Day Four (Thursday, 1 March 2018)

Even though we had not had any full day sessions as we did in Nabire, the learning pace of the participants in Jayapura seemed to be progressing well. By day four, participants took turns to share their personal stories where everyone practiced their empathetic listening. This emotional session was followed by a short break where we shared snacks and soft drinks.

We then moved on to the game ‘Margolis Wheel’ where participants wrote down their thoughts about positives of Papua, challenges that they are facing, and realistic solutions that they want to put forward to decision makers.
Before getting into the last activity of day three, participants discussed what story and message they want to convey in their film and what format. As facilitator, I only needed to remind them about their favourite films and why they liked them by displaying the result from previous days and the positives-challenges-solutions that they had just completed. I also reminded participants of the brief that we had discussed on the introduction day. Everyone agreed that they wanted to tell the story of Naomi and Yuli’s father. The next task was how to tell the story without revealing their identity on camera. This was
answered quickly and unanimously by choosing a docu-drama or re-enactment and to discuss the story in a form of ‘behind the scene’ documentary.

To help the participants design their story, I introduced the ‘Comic Strip’ or ‘Storyboard’ activity. This appear to be very effective as participants could divide their story in six (Figure 78) – later developed into eight (Figure 79) – scenes and we draw each scene in a box.

Figure 78 - Final story board with eight scenes. 1. In front of Army/Police station, father and a uniformed man; 2. House in town – father leaving, pat elder son’s shoulder, hugs mother (who is pregnant); 3. Dirt Road with forest in the background – father walks alone to the forest; 4. Village scene – kids playing; 5. Soldiers marching carrying guns; 6. Village scene – a soldier asked a villager about father’s whereabouts; 7. Village scene – mum grabs the kids, mum and kids run; 8. Village scenery, sad music.
II.2.5. Day Five (Monday, 5 March 2018)

In the morning, I interviewed Dr Benny Giay, Papua’s leading anthropologist whose research was on the culture of his own people – Me people from Paniai Regency. I invited participants to join me as part of a crew, however everyone was busy with their own job. The interview can be viewed on [https://youtu.be/oSMVXkuCOPw](https://youtu.be/oSMVXkuCOPw).

In the afternoon, the participants continued to work on their storyboard, look around some potential locations and discussed how they would rehearse some parts of the story. At this point, they were still debating on who should play Mama, the mother in the story. Their first choice was Naomi, however on day five they decided that Naomi would better direct the film and chose Maria instead. Frida proposed her relative to play the part of father, and everyone agreed after being shown his photo. Naomi and Yuli said that they have nephews and nieces to play the role of the children.

![Image of March 2018 calendar]
II.2.6. Day Six (Tuesday, 6 March 2018)
By day six I learned that agreeing on an exact time for a session was pointless, hence I
happily set the venue at the guest house we stayed – with permission from the owner.
Whilst waiting for the participants to arrive, I started editing the interview with Dr Benny
Giay from the previous day (https://youtu.be/oSMVXkuCOPw).

Eventually Frida, Maria and Yuli arrived, then Naomi texted us her apology. We continued
with film planning and decided together that Yuli will be co-director in the absence of
Naomi. We had a short walk to a nearby field as a recce for the village and father’s forest
scene. We decided that the porch of the guest house would be perfect as the house in
town for scene two (See the storyboard, Figure 79). Another location near Maria’s home
was also chosen as the village scene. Maria knew some neighbours’ who would be happy
for their children to appear as extras.

II.2.7. Day Seven (Wednesday, 7 March 2018)
Filming on location in the rural area where participant Maria lives. Maria is also the actor
playing mama in this film, she recruited children of her relatives and neighbours as extras.

This was the first time Frida used her DSLR camera to film some real actions and she was
a fast learner.
II.2.8. Day Eight (Friday, 9 March 2018)

Filming continued to the next location, which was near the guest house where Andy and I stayed. Here we filmed the scene where the father said goodbye to Mama and to his eldest son. The father played by Frida’s relative Lewi, and the eldest son played by Zet, who is Yuli and Naomi’s nephew. We used a microphone connected to my DSLR camera for sound track where dialogues were important.

We moved to an empty field nearby to film Father walking away to the forest and soldiers asking a villager the whereabouts of Father. The group found some cassavas on the field and decided that the villager was tending her crop when two soldiers came asking for Father. The two soldiers were played by Naomi’s driver Simon and Donald (also known as Eli) – founder of Kelas Pagi Papua. A friend from Balobe Papua Photography, Ana, played the role of the villager.
II.2.9. Day Nine (Saturday, 10 March 2018)
The participants, cameraman Andy and I attended a session with Kelas Pagi Papua where Andy was asked to share his experience in photography and videography. Facilitated by Donal Kamarea, this batch of Kelas Pagi Papua had five students. This was an extra lesson for the women participants, as they were all enthusiastic to learn photography techniques.

II.2.10. Day Ten (Sunday, 11 March 2018)
We gathered at Kelas Pagi Papua on day ten for an editing lesson with Donald. As none of the participant has Final Cut Pro or iMovie, we learned editing using Adobe Premiere. Utilising existing capital which is equipment from Kelas Pagi Papua and Donald as film lecturer, the participants learnt editing skills. This one day session was the beginning of a continuous learning process for all participants, as most of them enrolled with Kelas Pagi Papua for the next batch of students.
II.2.11. Day Eleven (Monday, 12 March 2018)
With two camera persons – Frida and Andy – I arranged an interview with the leader of the Papua Baptist Church and well known Papuan leader Rev. Dr. Socratez Yoman. The day before, we prepared Frida for her first real interview job. We reminded her to be punctual. On the day, Frida arrived early!

The result of the interview is available on Youtube (https://youtu.be/8xXqqMRmaO8 and https://youtu.be/2G0caTjtNOY )

II.2.12. Day Twelve (Tuesday, 13 March 2018)
As the main film Cerita Mama (“Mama’s Story”) was completed, we aimed to film a discussion behind the scenes to help viewers understand the context and the messages that the participants want to convey. For this, we decided to do a panel discussion. Without any script, the participants decided that Yuli would take the role of the moderator. They discussed on camera about the significance of their film, the background story and their hopes and contributions for the future.
Overall, the Jayapura group had the most adjustment in terms of activities, venues and time schedule. However, this group had learned so much in the short period of time that the PV design (Figure 81) served no justice to the reality.
**PV FOR PEACE IN PAPUA – WORKSHOP**

**Location:** Nabire & Jayapura (Papua)

**Participants:** women, over 18, affected by armed conflict either through their men or directly, willing to participate through workshop, has opinion about achieving peace rooted in actual experience and willing to share with the public.

**Target audience:** policy makers, international NGOs, political scientists/academia, general public

**Aim:** 1. Understanding conflict in Papua through personal experiences of the participants; 2. Finding solutions to the conflict/how to achieve peace; 3. Affecting policy makers to take actions

**Partners:** Adeline (researcher/producer), Andy (volunteer cameraman), Ana Ombin (Nabire/Balobe), Donald (Jayapura/Kelas Pagi Papua)

**Interpreter:** N/A

**Time:** 26 days Nabire (21/01 – 15/02) + 27 days Jayapura (23/02 – 21/03) Jayapura + 4 days traveling + 4 days rest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY 1 (27/12/18)</th>
<th>DAY 2 (Technical Day)</th>
<th>DAY 3 (Story building)</th>
<th>DAY 4 (Story building &amp; start filming)</th>
<th>DAY 5 (Filming)</th>
<th>DAY 6 (Editing)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intro &amp; welcome Consent ✓</td>
<td>Video Soup ✓</td>
<td>Community Map</td>
<td>Searching for Beauty</td>
<td>Recap of workshop/finishing group planning &amp; writing</td>
<td>Paper Editing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract/Rule of the Game ✓</td>
<td>Show &amp; Tell ✓</td>
<td>Empathetic Listening</td>
<td>Comic Strip / Story Board ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film styles (talk about favourite films, what works, what can be changed etc)</td>
<td>Vox Pop</td>
<td>River of Life</td>
<td>Reminder of Video Soup ✓</td>
<td>Filming (* can be more than one day especially if filming on different locations) ✓</td>
<td>Computer Editing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question in a Circle ✓</td>
<td>Disappearing Game</td>
<td>Margolis Wheel, Devil’s Advocate ✓</td>
<td>Group writing/story planning ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Game ✓</td>
<td>Problem tree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watch the day’s footage &amp; Reflection ✓</td>
<td>Watch the day’s footage &amp; Reflection</td>
<td>Watch the day’s footage &amp; Reflection</td>
<td>Sharing &amp; reflection ✓</td>
<td>Sharing &amp; reflection ✓</td>
<td>Sharing &amp; reflection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 80 - PV design with games/activities that was used for participants in Jayapura*
Day 12 ended with a gathering in a local café – owned by a student of Kelas Pagi Papua – where all participants, Donald and his family, Andy and I, had what was equivalent to a leaving drink. The only difference was that there was no alcoholic drinks involved due to the restriction on alcohol all over Indonesia.

II.3. Result

II.3.1 Main films: *Cerita Mama* and *Di Balik Cerita Mama*

The main film resulted from Jayapura is a docu-drama or re-enactment of a true story. The women in Jayapura called themselves *Anggrek Hitam Papua* (The Papuan Black Orchids). In the story called *Cerita Mama* (Mama's Story), a woman with her children had to say goodbye to her husband, take her children away to a village and even separating her children in order to safeguard them. The story began with Mama's husband being arrested and then running away to the forest due to being accused as a separatist rebel (https://youtu.be/IAVk0U0zA2s )
This docu-drama depicted a true story that happened in late 1970s in a village in West Papua. There are many similar narratives of indigenous Papuan families who experienced intimidation, persecution, accusation and even imprisonment. Being labelled as ‘rebels’ mean that they might never see their family again.

The Papuan Black Orchids (Kelompok Anggrek Hitam Papua) chose to tell this story as an effort to fight general amnesia in West Papua. With many other similar stories, there are deep wounds within the heart of many indigenous Papuans.

The group hoped that the short film can represent the many untold stories of ordinary Papuan families. The group also hoped that learning from the past means that this story would not be repeated in the future.

“By telling the story of the past, we are hoping that the wounds can gradually be healed and reconciliation can really take place,” said Director Naomi.

Her statement and the discussion ‘behind the scene’, was published as their second film: *Di Balik Cerita Mama* (Behind the scene of Mama's Story, https://youtu.be/prmKPENH3mM)
II.3.2. Collaboration with Kelas Pagi Papua

Another result from the Jayapura PV workshop was a strong connection with Kelas Pagi Papua. Following this project, the participants continued to attend lessons on video and photography and Donald the founder of Kelas Pagi Papua became their mentor and good friend. We all continue to communicate through social media – Facebook and WhatsApp group.

![Behind the Scene of Mama's Story](image)

**Figure 82 - Kelas Pagi Papua continues to provide photography and videography lessons**
II.4. Reflection

This was my email to Erik Knudsen my supervisor about Day One in Jayapura:

After a rather tense wait for the Jayapura group to gather, we finally started the first session. It was a very good start. This is originally a group of two sisters, but somehow we got additional two ladies who are as keen to participate. The other group is still unknown, but at least this group of four seems to have a very good start.

The difference with the Nabire group is that this group is a couple of decades ahead in terms of technology. As you can see in the photos attached, each member has her own mobile phone. One participant even has a good DSLR.

Day one filming is not very good for the audio as we were outdoor next to a basketball court. Still, this is part of their learning too. Day one was in the afternoon to early evening as most of the participants work. So this group might not be as intensive as the Nabire group, we’ll just have to adjust the time to accommodate everyone. Tomorrow we’re going to have two hours in the morning.

II.4.1. Adjustment in time

As indicated in my report to my supervisor on day one, we made many time adjustments for the PV workshop in Jayapura. Three participants have full time jobs, and Frida the camerawoman had responsibilities in helping her mother selling food and produce in the market. Hence as described in the daily activities (section II.2.), we had 12 days programme, many of which are half-day sessions, and we utilised weekends and evenings to accommodate everyone’s busy schedule.

Besides their busy schedule of work and families, I realised that most of the participants have the stereotypical Papuan – and Indonesian or even Asian – laid back style where punctuality is not as important as commitments to family. There is an expression in the Indonesian language: jam karet or rubber watch. It simply means not being on time.

Whilst this habit might be seen as an indicator of unprofessionalism in the Western world, for the Papuans this simply is prioritising their family over work or other matters. Most of the reason for being late is family related.

Frida the camerawoman often arrived late because her mother, who makes a living by selling food and produce in the market, asked her to help. Having no one else in the family
who own a motorbike and being the eldest child in the family where father is absent, Frida’s main duty in life is helping her mother.

Naomi and Yuli are both family woman with full time jobs, and although they managed to get a few hours off from work, their children required their attention. Similar to Maria, who in her enthusiasm and commitments to human rights and especially women’s rights, sometimes double booked herself to a couple of meetings, not to mention her commitment to her husband who is an inter-city bus driver, which means that Maria felt free to do all her activities when her husband is away. However when he is home, she would feel compelled to be by his side in attending family related functions and social events.

II.4.2. Adjustment in participants
As mentioned in Chapter Four about recruitment, there was a second group in Jayapura. However they decided to cancel their participation in this research due to their other commitments as well as their concerns about telling their story to the public.

The Jayapura group that initially consisted of two sisters Naomi and Yuli had additional members: Frida the camerawoman and Maria the actor playing Mama. I met Frida and Maria only a few days before the PV workshop started, and I considered these meetings a God-sent solution.

Maria works for the Franciscan Secretariat of Justice, Peace, Integrity of Creation (Sekretariat Keadilan, Perdamaian, Keutuhan Ciptaan or SKPKC Fransiskan). I met her as I was visiting their office to gather data and to discuss this research with Fr Aventinus Jenaru, OFM, the director of SKPKC. Small talk became a serious discussion when Maria expressed her interest in learning to use filmmaking for peace and conflict resolution.

Frida was one of Kelas Pagi Papua students from a previous class. She had been interested in photography and film, but had no channel to gain experience. As soon as she heard about this research, she decided to take part. Coming from a family who mainly support Papuan independence, Frida was no stranger to violent conflict.

II.4.3. Adjustment in the PV workshop
Unlike the first group in Nabire, this Jayapura group started with some skills in using a smartphone camera. What they lack in time due to their work commitments, they made up in skills and fast learning. Compared to the initial PV design, there were many games and activities that I did not use. I combined a few games into one activity, and I explained some technical skills without using any game.
One adaption that the participants found useful was the recipe of the ‘Video Soup’ (Figure 84) into traditional Papuan dish of *Ikan Kuah Kuning* (Fish in yellow stew) in Figure 85.

*Figure 83 - ‘Video Soup’ recipe for good video compared to cooking a good soup*

*Figure 84 - Adaptation of the ‘Video Soup’ for Papuan culture: recipe for the famous Papuan fish dish (Ikan Kuah Kuning)*
III. Legacy
The three main films resulting from this project are as follow.

First, the women in the Nabire group who called themselves Honai Perempuan (Women’s House or Women’s Council) produced a documentary called Honai Perempuan Untuk Perdamaian (Women’s Honai for Peace, https://youtu.be/SDYYWMW2VCw)

Second, a docu-drama or re-enactment of a story by the women in Jayapura/Sentani who called themselves the Anggrek Hitam Papua (Papuan Black Orchids). This docu-drama is based on a true story that the director had been told since she was a child. In the story called Cerita Mama (Mama’s Story), a woman with her children had to say goodbye to her husband, take her children away to a village and even separating her children in order to safeguard them. The story began with Mama’s husband being arrested and then running away to the forest due to being accused as a separatist rebel https://youtu.be/IAVk0U0zA2s.
To explain the story and their opinions about the situation, the Anggrek Hitam Papua (Papuan Black Orchids) also produced a documentary, Di Balik Cerita Mama (Behind the scene of Mama’s Story, https://youtu.be/prmKPENH3mM)

![Behind the Scene of Mama’s Story](https://youtu.be/prmKPENH3mM)

Figure 87 - *Di Balik Cerita Mama* (Behind the Scene of Mama’s Story) [https://youtu.be/prmKPENH3mM](https://youtu.be/prmKPENH3mM)

Whilst my task is still far from over with the reports and screenings, the two groups continue their journeys. Honai Perempuan Nabire continue to promote Papuan culture and heritage through media and performance ([https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCN4CjymzqOTZwln6jvgrK7Q/videos](https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCN4CjymzqOTZwln6jvgrK7Q/videos)).

![Honai Perempuan Channel](https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCN4CjymzqOTZwln6jvgrK7Q/videos)

The Anggrek Hitam Papua (Papuan Black Orchids) had started talking about their next project by the time I arrived back in the UK.
III.1. Nabire legacy

After we left Nabire, the group continue to produce two more short films featuring their culture. A number of short films of Ema telling the history of their village in Moni language have been filmed and are currently awaiting editing.

It is difficult to get in touch with Ema, Monika and Damela as they have no means of communication except their regular mobile phone. Data reception in Nabire is very slow. The only person who could stay in touch was the new member of the organisation, Lusi, who lived outside Nabire. However, not being present in the original PV workshop and discussion process, Lusi seemed to be more interested in promoting Papuan crafts rather than discussing the peace process. She helped the group to produce their two new short films about traditional Papuan woven bag or noken (https://youtu.be/JA3A8H-Rn7s).

III.2. Jayapura legacy

In late 2018, one of the Jayapura participants Yuli ran for local MP for the Indonesian election 2019. At the time of this dissertation being written, I had not received any news of her result.
Since late 2018, Frida has been working in Timika but continues to document local stories and observed potential programme with local women who lost their men due to tribal wars. Frida also told me that she witnessed some military personnel arriving to enforce ‘security’ in Nduga which for Papuan people means intimidating the indigenous. However due to the poor network quality in Timika, she was unable to send me her videos.

Maria continued her film training. In early 2019 she told me that she was attending classes in video editing whilst preparing a script for a documentary about Papuan women whom she worked with. She was also actively involved in the Indonesian 2019 General Election as a member of the Election Monitoring Committee (Komisi Pemilihan Umum, KPU).

Naomi, who is the executive director of the Association for the Study and Empowerment of Indigenous Peoples (Perkumpulan terbatas untuk Pengkajian dan Pemberdayaan Masyarakat Adat, Pt.PPMA) Papua continues her work with indigenous Papuan groups advocating indigenous rights. Naomi also continued actively involved in “Papua Film Maker” group and had recently recorded a song (https://youtu.be/YUUCFkPzMcU)
The group submitted their film *Cerita Mama* (Mama’s Story) to the Papuan Film Festival and was one of the ten films nominated for best film (https://papuanvoices.net/2018/08/08/10-films-nominated-for-the-2nd-papuan-film-festival-pffii.html).
IV. Chapter Summary
This chapter detailed the participatory video (PV) project in the two cities: Nabire and Jayapura. The chapter started by introducing the participants followed by day to day activities, their results and reflection of the process. There are a number of adjustments in participants where the initial recruited women cancelled for various reasons, and a number of new participants decided to join the PV project.

The chapter concluded with the legacy after the programme, where the Nabire group expanded their activities by networking with other organisations and individuals and the Jayapura group continued their personal developments in various occupations in support of indigenous rights.

As Chapter Five concluded, this is the point where I would suggest readers to watch my documentary film that shows my research journey and the journey of the women participants.
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As part of the submission for this practiced based research, I present:

**Documentary film We Were Wives, Mothers, Daughters – Participatory Filmmaking for Peace Building by Indigenous Papuan Women.**

The film features the experience of the participants and the result of their Participatory Video (PV) journey.

Available on [https://youtu.be/HrMNIk4CVQs](https://youtu.be/HrMNIk4CVQs)

This documentary features films by the research participants:

**Honai Perempuan untuk Perdamaian (Women’s Honai for Peace)**
by the Honai Perempuan Zitugumina Group of Nabire

**Cerita Mama (Mama’s Story)**
by The Papuan Black Orchid Group of Jayapura

**Di Balik Cerita Mama (Behind the Scene of Mama’s Story)**
by The Papuan Black Orchid Group of Jayapura
CHAPTER SIX - FINDINGS

Abstract

Beginning this research journey with my philosophy and methodology followed by situated context of Papua, contextual review of participatory video (PV) and autoethnography, we arrived at my initial design of the PV project and concluded with the field work – the process and journey that I experienced together with the participants.

It was at this point – after reading Chapter Five – that I suggested the readers to watch my documentary film that shows the process, from the personal story and interests that brought me into this research, to the participants’ experience. The three films that the participants produced are also showcased in full. It concludes with short interviews and commentaries that summed up my findings.

As outlined in Introduction, the aim of this research is to find ways for indigenous Papuan women who have experienced conflict to make their voices heard and to have a presence in the peace building and conflict resolution discussions.

This research asks two main questions. First, how to bring forward the opinion and wisdom of the indigenous women whose lives had been affected by violent conflict into the public domain using PV? Second, how PV can be a tool to set a sustainable pathway towards impacting decision making process in peacebuilding?

This chapter explores my findings which are the result of the reflection and evaluation process, including my reflection on editing my final documentary.
I. Emergence

It is a fact that women’s rights and equality in Papua are still far behind that in the rest of the world (Yuniar & Easton, 2015; ICJT et al., 2010; Jones, 2015). Women mainly inhabit the domestic sphere, hidden from public matters. This PV project endeavoured to offer an alternative to the stereotype. Through the PV workshop, filming process and screenings, the women participants – especially those residing in a smaller town or rural area around Nabire – emerged from their hidden domestic context. For the Jayapura group where most of the women are working, this research project elevated their status further into the public sphere as they appeared in public screenings and film festivals.

As noted in Chapter Five, the Nabire group continued to network and work together with various women’s organisation and local journalists to promote the rights of the indigenous people especially women, exposing social injustice and demanding more dialogues between grassroots communities and local authorities.

Participants from the Jayapura group had emerged and journeyed further. They submitted their film Cerita Mama (Mama’s Story, https://youtu.be/IAYk0U0zA2s) to the Papuan Film Festival and was one of the ten films nominated for best film (https://papuanvoices.net/2018/08/08/10-films-nominated-for-the-2nd-papuan-film-festival-pffii.html).

Since the festival, Maria continued to develop her skills in film editing and script writing, Yuli ran for member of parliament, and Frida started a new career in Timika. Naomi, whilst continuing her career as the director of the Association for the Study and Empowerment of Indigenous Peoples (Perkumpulan terbatas untuk Pengkajian dan Pemberdayaan Masyarakat Adat, Pt.PPMA) also joined a filmmakers club and went to record a number of songs professionally.

As I stated in the beginning of this reflective thesis, I do not believe in empowerment as giving power top down. Instead I prefer to provoke the realisation that each participant had the capacity and the power to be leaders, to share their experiences, ideas, opinion and to contribute some solutions to the conflict that took away their men.

Their emergence to further public domain – where they continue to address the issues of conflict and indigenous rights in Papua – is not because I have empowered them. Their emergence and successes are due to their own strength, the power inside, the human capitals that were inherent within them. My role was a facilitator of learning, a friend, a
fellow human who walked together and shared a small part of my life with these wonderful resilient women.

The role of PV or participatory media in general here is a tool to open up the potentials, to assist people discover the human capital to exercise power and make a difference. In this case, PV had stimulated the participants’ emergence into their further careers and roles in society.
II. Organise
The participatory approach enabled the women to engage with the public sphere, to organise themselves to achieve one common goal or target. Besides learning about film production and the impact of media to their community, the Nabire group found out about organisation, organising events and networking with other organisations.

I found that most of the participants had ideas about resolving the conflict in their own communities and within Papua in general. Through organising – their daily schedules, their friends and family, their community – they found that the goal is achievable.

The Nabire group also practice their negotiation, promotion and marketing skills. After I left the community, they continue to establish a legal women’s organisation and promote local produce through media and social media.

The Jayapura group learned about time management, organising and scheduling their agenda whilst each member continues to further their career.

With more technological skills and capital, the Jayapura group had a steep learning curve. They obtained some new filming skills – from planning, script writing, directing, camera work and editing – whilst putting these into practice at the same time.

However the process that I found most precious was the habit of arriving on time. At the beginning of the process, time keeping was a major issue – especially for me and cameraman Andy as we are used to punctuality. However I would not label this laidback attitude towards timekeeping as a weakness. As I get to know the Papuan culture more, I
realised that they were being in the moment. No appointment is too important to cut short family matters. However when having an appointment to interview a prominent leader, they proved to be more than capable of being on time, even early.

I have no doubt that when the need to be professional and on time arose, the participants and Papuan people in general, would be able to adapt and prioritise. At the same time whilst Western people learn Mindfulness, learn to meditate to appreciate the surrounding, the indigenous Papuan has been living in the moment and appreciating their Mother Nature for centuries. Whilst some indigenous people need to learn to adapt to modern management system, the rest of the world needs to learn their wisdom.
III. Preserving cultural heritage

Part of the key parameter in this PV process was finding a way of wrapping the participants’ projects into a traditional story that connects to their culture (see Chapter Four). In the process, we found that engaging in media activity – that is, filming – inspired the women participants to document and show their cultural heritage. This was clearly the case with the first group in Nabire where they went to interview their clan leader in his home. The Nabire group also proudly showed their traditional song and dance. They talked about their indigenous staple food in the ‘Show and Tell’ exercise.

After the PV workshop was completed, the group continued to use their simple smart phones to produce a short video that promote their culture. They explained ‘noken’ – Papuan traditional bag – to the world as shown in the YouTube short video below (https://youtu.be/7p0ezea8JCk)

![Video of a woman holding a noken](https://youtu.be/7p0ezea8JCk)

A participatory video (PV) project can enable communities – in this case indigenous Papuan women – to engage with their own culture, preserving their heritage and communicating their ways of life to the world using media. The use of social media is also important, although this should be strengthened with adequate technical skills and technological capital.
Through PV, the women participants found a new means of preserving their traditional heritage and engaging their culture with the wider world.
IV. Presence

Through this PV project, the voices of the women participants have become a presence in local and global media. As mentioned in Chapter Five (section III Legacy), the participants of the two groups produced three main films. The three films narrate the history of the communities, some personal histories, what happened to their men, what changes they would like to happen and how. In their own ways, the two groups wrapped their messages into stories that connect to the Papuan culture. This achievement shows how the participants are more than capable to follow the project brief and interpret it into their own styles.

Since producing the films, these women have set their presence in the world and made their mark. The films were screened in public and widely available on YouTube.

*Figure 89 - Honai Perempuan untuk Perdamaian (Women’s Honai for Peace) [https://youtu.be/SDYYWMW2VCw](https://youtu.be/SDYYWMW2VCw)*

*Figure 90 - Cerita Mama (Mama’s Story) [https://youtu.be/IAVk0U0zA2s](https://youtu.be/IAVk0U0zA2s)*
The film produced by the Nabire group – who called themselves Zitugumina Group – has been screened in a number of occasions in both Nabire and Jayapura. The film by the Black Orchid Group from Jayapura was nominated for best film in Papuan Film Festival (https://papuanvoices.net/2018/08/08/10-films-nominated-for-the-2nd-papuan-film-festival-pffii.html).

Outside Papua, I have presented the participants’ films on two occasions in 2018. In May 2018, I screened Honai Perempuan untuk Perdamaian at Jesus College, Oxford, as part of a discussion on Development in East Indonesia. The short discussion that followed the screening is available on https://youtu.be/Zzj3hU6W-Ds. In July 2018 I screened Mama’s Story at Coventry University as part of Indonesian Scholars International Convention (http://isic2018.ppiuk.org/875-2/).

Both received positive feedback in terms of the result that the participants achieved. However, the ambassador of the Republic Indonesia at the time made a comment personally after the discussion. He said to me, “There is nothing new about women becoming victims in conflict!” I felt that I needed to reply that just because it is not new, does not mean that it is alright to do nothing about it – and that therefore you need to listen more. However, he left to do his official duties without letting me say a word.
We Were Wives, Mothers, Daughters – Participatory Filmmaking for Peace Building
The women’s stories are now known locally and globally through screenings, film festivals, and the internet. Through this participatory video (PV) project, the narratives and the stories the women told are now ‘out there’. Their stories became a new independent entity ready to be shared online all over the world.
V. Less is more

Whilst existing and standardised methods of PV have a set of steps, equipment, and methods, this research started with a lack of standardised equipment and relied on participants’ willingness to invest their own time. Thus, the process of this PV project did not follow the step by step or standardised process and method that established organisations would do.

In Nabire, the participants invested their time and using one of the participants’ house as a base, the group learned together using available equipment. This group had no computer for editing and no internet access.

The Jayapura group consisted of four busy career women, so that the sessions were sporadic in time and venue depending on their availability. As each member of this group has a smart phone, we focused the learning process on optimising the use of camera feature in their smart phones. One member of the group has a DSLR camera. Hence for their film project, they used this as main camera.

In both groups, each participant made an investment in giving up their own free time, using their own equipment, and some contributed in providing drink and snacks during the workshop sessions. The result is that each participant has a deep sense of ownership of the project and did their best to make it work.

As Pierce, Kostova and Dirks (2001) explained in their psychological ownership theory, “control over and intimate knowing of the target, along with investment of the self into the target, are three major ‘routes’ through which feelings of ownership for a particular object emerge”.

Furthermore, O’Driscoll, Pierce and Coghlan (2006, p.389) found that “unstructured work environments provide organizational members with opportunities to exercise more control in the work environment. With increased feelings of control over the target of ownership, the latter becomes more and more a part of the extended self.”

With the participants having control over the time, venue and most importantly the target, the films that they produced through this PV project become something that belong to us all. As our project together, each and every one of us invested ourselves – human capitals and technological capitals – in the work. I use the word ‘us’ because as the researcher and facilitator, I was accepted as part of the group. Our common goal was to tell our stories to the world and to influence the peace process.
With this sense of belonging, both groups were more than happy to work on their projects without any extra funding or better equipment. The lack of external funding was transformed into a sense of independence and having full control.

I believe that this sense of ownership makes the impact of this PV project sustainable, probably more than a standardised workshop that is organised ‘professionally’ and supported by bigger funds and grants. This is because the participants and even I, as the researcher and facilitator, only felt responsible for our common target, with no concerns about other agendas from funding organisations.

All the way through this research journey I remember the title and the content of E.F Schumacher 1973 book: Small is Beautiful. Small enterprise, small group of women, utilising existing capitals, independent and determined. For us – the women participants and I – this is what decolonisation is about. We determined our own target and how to achieve it – while still looking after our families, feeding our children and keeping our husbands happy. By using less or minimum equipment and minimum funding, we achieved more sustainability and skills that can realistically be implemented in participants’ daily lives in the future.
VI. Indigenous and decolonising approach

As discussed above, not only ‘less is more’ in the project’s sustainability, but the lack of institutional funding and [Western or European] influence also translated to an independent mind set amongst the participants. Amid the neo colonialism mind set – the ‘white saviour complex’ – of many community development projects (Straubhaar, 2015; Cole, 2012), I believe that my approach is liberating and decolonising.

As Linda Tuhiwai Smith pointed out, indigenous methodology means having a local approach to critical theory. “An indigenous research should be related to being indigenous people; connected to its native philosophy and principle; taking the validity and legitimacy of its people, language and culture; and concerned with the struggle for autonomy over Western/European cultural well-being” (2012, p.187).

The whole PV process highlighted indigenous approach in a neo-colonialism era. This project was by women of indigenous heritage, for the indigenous women and their community, and non-dependent of any neo-colonialist or non-indigenous support or funding.

This includes having minimum influence from Indonesian culture and politics. As Papua is still part of Indonesia and amid the fear of expressing honest opinions for persecutions and being labelled ‘traitor’ and ‘rebel’, we agreed upon freedom of expression within the groups. We then agreed what was to be shared publicly and what discussions should remain private amongst us and off the record.

In this research, Indigenous methodology means that not only was I immersed in the culture of the participants and subject, but I also was – or became – part of the community of Papuan/Melanesian women in Indonesia. Again, this means that the research is independent of the dominant European-white-male research culture. This also translated into the absence of a controlling funding organisation with headquarter thousands of miles away who dictated the structure of the programme. (Smith, 2012; Land, 2015)

During the PV workshops, participants feedback and opinion were far from shallow. In my interactions with participants – and later as I revisit these discussions during my final editing process – I felt that I had found evidence of my hypothesis that the women participants with their experiences have knowledge and analytical skills equal to academics, politicians and ‘experts’.
As I used the game ‘Margolis wheel’ to analyse strengths or benefits, challenges and solutions, all participants could point out issues in Papua – not much difference than analysis by scholars, experts, politicians (see Chapter Five). The only difference is the language – terminology and structure – they used.

In *Di Balik Cerita Mama (Behind the Scene of Mama’s Story)*, the women participants from Jayapura talked about addressing trauma from the past. Revisiting their discussion one year later as I edited the final documentary, I felt like I was sitting in a mental health crisis centre where my role as the social worker was taken over by the Papuan women.

Naomi then said, “When someone is wounded, if we offered them something good, even when we offered them gold or feed them with delicious food, all that we offered are not good for them. What needs to be done is a healing process” [https://youtu.be/prmKPENH3mM](https://youtu.be/prmKPENH3mM). None of the women studied psychology or counselling. The discussion showed me that indigenous wisdom can be equal to structured science.

The Nabire women who were far behind in terms of modern technology and access to global information, told me that deforestation is a big problem. Furthermore, Ema identified that local forests are guarded by soldiers and questioned the legality of the ownership of the land. In her final statement in the film *Honai Perempuan untuk Perdamaian (Women’s Honai for Peace)*, Ema was well aware about the law on indigenous rights, hence she implored the President of the Republic of Indonesia to return these rights to the Papuan people [https://youtu.be/SDYYWMW2VCw](https://youtu.be/SDYYWMW2VCw).

It is interesting for me that whilst the rest of Indonesia hated the experience of colonialism under the Dutch, Ema suggested an educational reform to go back to the system introduced by the Dutch [European] missionaries: dormitory and vocational education. She then continued to say that the vocational education should include agriculture, fishery and animal husbandry that is relevant to Papua.

Fortunately, I knew Ana who works for International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) and shared the group’s concern about small enterprise farming and roles of women in small economy. Ema interviewed Ana as both part of interviewing exercise as well as their own learning process. As a result, the group produced a short video on this topic [https://youtu.be/1J1mwBmp4A0](https://youtu.be/1J1mwBmp4A0).
I would not imagine small networking and coincidence like this would play a role in a [Western or European] standard research, however all Papuan people I met believe in Divine intervention connected to their land. I first met Ana in Jayapura, which is almost two hours flight from Nabire. Her job required her to be relocated to Nabire just before the PV project started, so she was more than happy to help.

Similar coincidences happened in Jayapura, where friends turned up just in time to assist us as supporting actors in *Cerita Mama (Mama’s Story)*. Again, my friend Ana was a great help as she took her annual leave and met us in Jayapura. She visited our filming session just at the right moment as we were looking for an actor to play a woman in the village.

All participants and my friends in Jayapura believe what the Dutch missionary and teacher Isaak Samuel Kijne said: “Whoever works in this land with honesty, faith and willing to listen, he will get one sign of wonder followed by other signs of wonder.” They pointed to how my research project went well with many coincidences (small miracles?) and told me that I was blessed due to my love to the land and the people.

*Figure 92 - Whoever works in this land with honesty, faith and willing to listen, he will get one sign of wonder followed by other signs of wonder.”* [https://kumparan.com/akmal-nasery-basral/papua](https://kumparan.com/akmal-nasery-basral/papua)
Many Papuans see Isaak Samuel Kijne like a prophet. The Dutch missionary was an educator who believed in the potentials of the Papuan people. He wrote a songbook which includes the song *Hai Tanahku Papua (Oh My Land Papua)* that in 1961 became the national anthem of West Papua (Glazebrook, 2008; van den Berge, 2019). Kijne famously said, “On this rock, I put the Papuan Civilization. Even though people have high intelligence, reason and wisdom but cannot lead this nation, this nation will rise up and lead itself.”

I am not sure about Kijne’s status as a prophet, however I do agree that a nation should rise up and lead itself. Ironically for Papua, the statement is in line with the Preamble of Indonesian Constitution (see Introduction) stated “Whereas independence is the inalienable right of all nations, therefore, all colonialism must be abolished in this world as it is not in conformity with humanity and justice.”

*Figure 93 - I.S. Kijne, “On this rock, I put the Papuan Civilization. Even though people have high intelligence, reason and wisdom but cannot lead this nation, this nation will rise up and lead itself.”*
VII. Personal journey and researcher’s honesty

As I completed my field work in March 2018, I became a convert on the Papuans’ right for independence. Not because of what my participants said, but because of the evil in colonialism and the rights of self-determination that I believe should be part of human rights. One factual finding that convinced me is the many journal articles that show how The Act of Free Choice 1969 was conducted (among others: House of Common, 2019; Monbiot, 1989; Papua Merdeka & Brown, 2012; Saltford, 2000a & 2000b).

I must emphasise again as I wrote on my Student Declaration Form (5. Opinion) at the beginning of this thesis that:

The topic of conflict in Papua has been a very sensitive issue in Indonesia, and the word ‘Merdeka’ or independent a taboo, and those discussing this risk prosecution under the Indonesian Law. Hence I ascertain that none of my participants and sources – who either appeared in audio video material or quoted in this thesis – intended to incite rebellion or treason against the Republic of Indonesia. Some participants discussed the issue of independence to break the taboo and to address the roots of the cause. Should this thesis or my documentary film or any of the portfolio material indicated the rights of self-determination, they are solely my own opinions based on my findings. I take all responsibilities politically for all the work in this research.

This research journey made the question – that certainly has been asked many times before by other researchers – personal to me: is there such thing as neutrality or even a balanced standpoint when we are all humans? I do believe in a balanced argument. As in journalism, it is important to find balance in one’s sources and to try to look at an issue from both sides of the argument.

However there is a clear moral line in how colonialism exploits and undermines human rights, and at this point I have to take use my Occam’s razor and take the simplest explanation. Simply put, "what quacks like a duck, swims like a duck and looks like a duck, is most likely a duck." In the narrative of the conflict in Papua, colonialism is the duck. After dissecting the issues from many sides, my Occam’s razor shows that Jakarta colonised Papua. The Act of Free Choice was an act of no choice as many Papuan people call it (Robinson, 2012; Cordell, 2013).

During this research journey I came across Franz Fanon and with him “I believe in the possibility of love; that is why I endeavour to trace its imperfections, its perversions” (1967, p.42). With this I shall say that I still love Indonesia, the country where I was born.
This does not mean that I close my eyes to its perversions, its disregard to human rights and its compliance to torture and killing with impunity. As quoted in the end of my documentary, Ben Anderson said, “No one can be a true nationalist who is incapable of feeling ashamed if his or her state or government commits crimes including those against their fellow citizens.”

I am also with Knudsen (2018, p.9) in that we “need a methodology which did not put up boundaries between observer and observed, but encouraged a collective immersion in the questions being addressed.” In this research, I immersed myself in the subject and in the lives of the participants. By becoming ‘one of the women’, I empathised with their loss and grief. My goal to find a sustainable way to include their voice in the peace process became something that they internalised and embraced. Hence we worked together as a group – participants and researcher blend in as friends – to achieve our target: telling their stories through filmmaking.

I started this journey with a mind set of an impartial researcher and a balanced journalist. Yet I left with a deep sense of belonging and responsibility to continue the fight for justice for the community, for the women participants who lost their men, for my good friends.

At the beginning, I tried to balance my sources and my writings equally between Papua belonging to Indonesia and West Papua’s struggle for independence. Towards the end of this research, I strongly believe that Indonesia’s presence in Papua is a form of colonialism, and therefore West Papua deserve their rights for self-determination and independence. I believe that as human beings, researchers have moral values and obligations to incline toward the truth, toward justice and upholding human rights.
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CHAPTER SEVEN – CONCLUSION, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This practice based research in media practice endeavoured to make an original contribution in the new sustainable method of carrying out a participatory video (PV) project at the grassroots level. The aim of this research was not on achieving a new form of film or documentary, instead it was aimed at the practice of PV or participatory media. The new practice of PV that this research delivered is in utilising existing capitals – human and technological – in the community.

I. Conclusion: exercising power = utilising existing capitals

The principle of utilising what we already have – human and technological capital – in my opinion is equal to the principle of exercising power and not empowerment (Foucault, 1976 in Gordon, 1980, p.89).

Conventional PV projects tend to empower people, teaching people to use new equipment, new techniques and at the end of the process leaving (giving) the equipment to the community. This is empowering, giving power (tools).

This research project added to the practice of PV, the element of indigenous methodology and decolonisation by utilising the existing capitals and encouraging the participants to exercise power rather than empower.

The novelty in the PV project that I use in this research is the use of existing equipment – or in the case where there is nothing to start with, introducing minimum equipment that is known in the community. In this case, a smartphone is relatively more familiar compared to a video camera or camcorder. In human capital, the shape of the PV project can be adjusted and adapted to existing knowledge and skills of the participants.

Taking further conventional PV project objectives, this research shows that PV combined with indigenous methodology enables communities to exercise power and utilise their existing capitals – human and technology – in order to sustainably make an impact for the better.

Specifically amongst the indigenous Papuan women whose lives had been affected by conflict, this PV project became their tool to exercise power. Their life experience – seeing violent conflict first hand and losing their men – had become their source of knowledge
and wisdom. Through this PV project and facilitation, they were able to shape this knowledge and wisdom. Added with their indigenous wisdom that was passed from their parents and ancestors, these women should be able to stand as equals to experts, academics and politicians in setting up a pathway towards finding solutions to the conflict in their Land. Participatory media can be an effective channel to make and impact to the policies that affect their future.

This practice based research in participatory video (PV) and filmmaking opened up a sustainable pathway towards impacting policy and decision making processes in conflict resolution and peacebuilding processes.

Further research is needed to take this process further to the decision and policy makers at regional and national level – such as Papuan local authorities, Indonesian national government or the future West Papuan national government.
II. Implications

In the process of decision and policy making, there is a possibility for a real participation by the grassroots community using participatory media projects. This research opened a pathway to impacting the policy making process through the use of participatory video project.

This research shows that it is possible for grassroots communities to exercise their power in shaping the policies without the need to invest in expensive technology or even formal higher education.

I strongly believe that life experiences and the ancestral wisdom of the indigenous people are equal sources of knowledge to that of formal academic which traditionally is based on Western or European colonial system. It takes me two postgraduate studies and this PhD research project to confidently say that epistemologically, the indigenous knowledge and wisdom should be seen as equal to that of formal education.

This means that we can learn from the wisdom of the indigenous people and from life experiences of others and of ourselves, in order to shape our future. The next step is to include politicians and policy makers to embark on this participatory democracy project to resolve conflict, for peace building. I believe that the biggest challenge for everyone is how to listen.

Another implication of this research is the democratisation of participatory media – in particular the practice of participatory video. Furthermore, this practice has the potential to democratisate filmmaking and media practice. As mentioned above, this can be achieved by adapting the principle of utilising existing capitals.
III. Recommendations
III.1. Further research
Further research is needed to take the opinions, wishes, feelings and suggestions from the indigenous women whose lives have been affected by conflict to the policy makers. The narratives of the Papuan women from Nabire and Jayapura need to be taken to Jakarta, the UN, and international communities.

In practice, this is what I propose as further steps for this research in PV for peacebuilding in Papua. First, there needs to be a screening followed by discussions with decision makers from the Indonesian central government, the women participants – or representatives of the seven women – Indonesian academics and experts on Papua. Ideally the President of the Republic of Indonesia Mr Joko Widodo who has been re-elected in 2019, needs to be present. Each film would be screened by the women participants, followed by a discussion session. This first national screening could take place in Jakarta, the capital of Indonesia, or another city in the Indonesia where all key figures can attend.

Second, a further screening and discussion with local authorities of the two provinces – Papua and Papua Barat. The chief of regional police and armed forces should also be invited, along with Papuan community and religious leaders as well as Papuan academics. This second screening can be held in any city in Papua, and ideally all seven research participants should be present. The screening should be followed by discussion and a session of drafting concrete action plans. Similar PV games that was used in the initial research project can be utilised in the sessions following the screening.

Third, similar patterns of screening and discussions need to be conducted with key figures of the pro-independence movements. The venue could be outside Indonesia as many pro-independence Papuans are living abroad as refugees and hence unable to enter Indonesia without the risk of arrest.

The last step would be summarising the three screening and discussion sessions. The report summary could be in the form of a new documentary featuring the sessions accompanied by a written report in both English and Indonesian languages. I would like to propose further involvement of the women participants in this research in the summarising process. This is to sustain their involvement in the decision making processes in peacebuilding as well as part of the rights of self-determination for the indigenous Papuan people. The report will then need to be disseminated widely in Papua and Indonesia in
general to educate the public about the issues in Papua and how the active involvement of the indigenous Papuan women in finding solutions to the conflict.

III.2. A lesson in active Listening
As the women participants pointed out, the taboo needs to be broken and the trauma needs to be healed. Papuan people need freedom of expression and human rights violations with impunity need to be stopped. Instead of imprisoning those who expressed their discontent, the Indonesian central government needs to Listen (with capital ‘L’) to the voices from the grassroots level and Learn the culture of the Papuan people before making any important decisions.

As Naomi, one of the participants of this research said, “A wounded person would not respond well to the gift of development or money.” Before building big ambitious infrastructures such as the Trans Papua road, the powers that be in Jakarta need to spend a few weeks at Ema’s home, carry vegetables from the market in a ‘noken’, and see the real impact of palm oil plantations to her life.

Participatory video or participatory media projects can be effective tools for Listening to the voices of the communities at the grassroots level. There is no need for big funding and technological advanced equipment. What is needed is for the facilitator to know the participants and their community, so that the existing capitals can be utilised to reach a common goal.

The common goal needs to be established well amongst the participants, so that a sense of belonging and ownership can be developed. A facilitator needs to be flexible and ready to deconstruct his/her own preconceptions. This includes letting the participants make mistakes and learn from them, being flexible about something like punctuality and ready to understand their different ways of life and thinking.

Indigenous methodology means that a researcher should learn and apply the community’s standpoint. Decolonising methodology means that a researcher needs to be aware of the colonial origins of academic research, ready to learn from the indigenous communities, chose what is best for the indigenous communities and not what is best for the developed world – or companies or funding organisations.

In summary, my recommendation for researchers – as well as for politicians, decision and policy makers – is to start with learning from the communities of their research participants, from the indigenous peoples of the world. As Stephen Schwartz expressed in
the lyrics he wrote for a popular film, before deciding what we think is best for others, we need to learn to “see the colour of the wind”.

You think you own whatever land you land on
The earth is just a dead thing you can claim
But I know every rock and tree and creature
Has a life, has a spirit, has a name
You think the only people who are people
Are the people who look and think like you

But if you walk the footsteps of a stranger
You’ll learn things you never knew you never knew
Have you ever heard the wolf cry to the blue corn moon
Or asked the grinning bobcat why he grinned?
Can you sing with all the voices of the mountain?
Can you paint with all the colours of the wind?
(written by Stephen Schwartz for Pocahontas, 1995)
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APPENDIX – Portfolio of Works

I. Films by the women participants

I.1. Nabire group
The first group from Nabire produced *Honai Perempuan untuk Perdamaian* (Women’s Honai for Peace) [https://youtu.be/SDYYWMW2VCw](https://youtu.be/SDYYWMW2VCw)
Information on this documentary is now available on IMDB [https://www.imdb.com/title/tt8571838/](https://www.imdb.com/title/tt8571838/)
They have created a YouTube channel that also showcase their other films that were produced after our participatory video (PV) workshop [https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCN4CjymzgOTZwIn6jvgrK7Q/featured](https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCN4CjymzgOTZwIn6jvgrK7Q/featured)

I.2. Jayapura group
The four women from Jayapura produced two films:
First, a short docu-drama called *Cerita Mama* (Mama’s Story) [https://youtu.be/IAVk0U0zA2s](https://youtu.be/IAVk0U0zA2s)
Second, a documentary where they discuss the film and its contribution to the peace building process called *Di Balik Cerita Mama* (Behind the Scene of Mama’s Story) [https://youtu.be/prmKPENH3mM](https://youtu.be/prmKPENH3mM)
The cameraperson from this group, Frida, conducted her own interview with prominent figure and Papuan leader The Rev Dr Socratez Yoman [https://youtu.be/2G0caTjtNOY](https://youtu.be/2G0caTjtNOY)

II. Thesis
This thesis will be available at the University of Central Lancashire’s library after my examination

III. Documentary film
My documentary film is an audio visual evidence of the process that the participants went through. *We were Wives, Mothers, Daughters: Participatory Filmmaking for Peace Building by Indigenous Papuan Women* [https://youtu.be/HrMNIk4CVQs](https://youtu.be/HrMNIk4CVQs)
IV. Portfolio of works
The portfolio of works shows the use of Autoethnography in practice where I wrote my reflection throughout this research journey.
The portfolio includes:

IV.1. Audio visual
All my short documentaries, vlogs and video interviews are on my Youtube channel https://www.youtube.com/user/adelinemt

IV.1.1. Documentation of symposium, discussions and screenings
Screening of Honai Perempuan untuk Perdamaian followed by discussion on the issues in Papua in Jesus College, University of Oxford, 12 May 2018 https://youtu.be/Zzj3hU6W-Ds
Participatory Video Facilitation course by InsightShare that I attended in September 2017 https://youtu.be/f2UE3cJzOqI

IV.1.2. Interviews
My interview with Papuan leaders:
1. The Rev. Dr. Socratez Yoman – Head of Baptist Church in Papua https://youtu.be/8xXqqMRmaO8
2. Dr Benny Giay – Anthropologist, Theologian and Papuan community leader https://youtu.be/oSMVXkuCOPw
4. Benny Wenda - Chairman of the United Liberation Movement for West Papua (ULMWP), leader of Free West Papua who is now a refugee in the UK https://youtu.be/FMjk kd2X0NM (in English) and https://youtu.be/i0-kl3LMkRk (in Indonesian)
My interview with Nick Lunch, founder of InsightShare https://youtu.be/rPs8KZdVxrw

IV.1.3. A short video blog (vlog)
On using simple equipment for filmmaking or video documentary https://youtu.be/Jc4rZbcI6jw

The making of Honai Perempuan untuk Perdamaian https://youtu.be/URfpQC9N7JY
Demonstration at Cendrawasih University in Jayapura https://youtu.be/Y0DjOCX-ds
Prayer for West Papua in commemoration of the Biak Massacre https://youtu.be/FObUrGS3T-8
“Den” a short documentary on my father’s homecoming to the island of Saparua. My father’s experience of running away from war in East Indonesia had been the drive and inspiration that eventually took me to Papua and to focus on the conflict there
https://youtu.be/s2fjU4DjxNE

IV.2. Written articles
Some were published on my research blog
https://wewerewivesmothersdaughters.wordpress.com
More articles and reflections since the start of my research journey
https://adelinemt.wordpress.com/category/papua/

IV.3. Autoethnography on social media
My research page on Facebook
https://www.facebook.com/PhDAdeline/