

'desecration' | in a place of refuge

DIANA GLAZEBROOK

The orange film canisters showed metal rust. Luther had never processed them: the closest photo shop lay several day's journey away at Tabubil, and he had no spare cash anyhow.¹ Luther told me the images would be useful as they documented the building of the Immanuel Church in 1988. I offered to process the films and ordered two copies from each negative: one for him, one for me. I passed the films to a friend who processed them in Cairns the following weekend. The returned prints were washed with blue-pink tones, and it was not until several years later that I manipulated the tones digitally so that I could identify the church. Perhaps it was because the visual images were not explicit that inspired Luther's narrative. 'There were two Immanuel churches', he opened. 'The first was built by West Papuan refugees near Vanimo, Papua New Guinea, in 1988. It was burned to the ground during the relocation of the refugee congregation from Vanimo to a UNHCR settlement at East Awin. The second Immanuel Church was built by that same refugee congregation at East Awin.'

In this paper I explore two related questions: how does a particular site come to be perceived as sacred, and what is the impact of the destruction of something sacred when it occurs in a place of 'refuge'? This study is situated on the island of New Guinea, in the experiences of West Papuan people from the Indonesian Province of Papua (formerly Irian Jaya), living as refugees across the international border in Papua New Guinea. The inquiry is grounded in two instances involving a refugee population in a place of refuge. The first instance involves the burning of a church built by a refugee congregation, and the second involves the large-scale occupation by a refugee population of another people's land. A doubling effect is intended here. Forced migration can simultaneously render refugees vulnerable to the violence of

others, and in the process of resettlement, refugees may have no real choice but to engage in actions that violate the land of others.

My use of the term 'sacred' in the context of a church and ancestral land, and in relation to a rubric of desecration, requires explanation. During a twelve-month period of fieldwork research at the East Awin settlement in 1998–99, I did not record use of the word *tercemar*—the Indonesian term for desecration—by refugee interlocutors. This is in spite of the fact that *tercemar* is used in the Indonesian translation of the Old Testament (I Maccabees 4:38) to mention the burning and destruction of the Temple of Jerusalem, an event familiar to religious congregations at East Awin.² I did however record use of the Indonesian term *keramat*, meaning sacred and possessing supernatural qualities, by people when referring to sites like churches and ancestral land. I also recorded use of the Indonesian infinitive *rusak* meaning 'to damage' or 'to spoil', by people when referring to destruction wreaked on a site considered to be sacred. It is feasible to frame damage caused to sites designated locally as sacred in terms of a rubric of desecration. But given the qualification above, I will mainly use the phrase 'spoiling the sacred' in preference to desecration as it resembles the original sentiment more closely.

Territory is defined as sacred according to customary laws in West Papua, and to the Bible. I was told that in both Genesis and local legend, territory was granted to nations by God or a Creator figure. Annexation and occupation by outsiders severs the relation between landholders and their ancestral land, spoiling something designated as sacred or *keramat*. This is how a colonising project might be conceived as desecrating. This thinking guides West Papuans' experiences as refugees, for example in the second instance elaborated in this paper. It also guides their relations with the Indonesian state.³

Before elaborating on the burning of the Immanuel Church, and occupation of Awin land, it is necessary to understand the field in which these events occurred. West Papuan people have sought political asylum in neighbouring Papua New Guinea since Indonesian annexation in 1962. Thirteen years earlier, in 1949, the peoples of the Dutch East Indies finally won independence to become Indonesia. Indonesian nationalists claimed the boundaries of the former Dutch empire as the new nation-state, but the Dutch retained the easternmost territory of Netherlands New Guinea, and initiated a process of decolonisation. Finally in 1962, the Dutch were forced to cede this territory to Indonesia in the 'New York Agreement'. The agreement provided for a United Nations transitional authority present until 1963, and a referendum. In 1969, 1022 West Papuan delegates appointed by the Indonesian administration voted in favour of incorporation as Indonesia's seventeenth province.⁴ From occupation in 1962 until the present, various acculturation programs, transmigration programs and military campaigns have provoked armed and non-armed resistance by West Papuans, usually labelled as Free Papua Movement or OPM activity.

The largest influx of West Papuans into Papua New Guinea (eleven thousand people) occurred between 1984–85.⁵ Pushed by particular forces in their local area—often battles between Indonesian soldiers and West Papuan freedom fighters—they crossed at different times, as individuals and in groups, in a multitude of places along the international border.⁶ Because of the mass character of the influx, these asylum seekers were recognised by the UNHCR to be *prima facie* refugees. The PNG government acceded to the UN Refugee Convention in 1986. In a joint operation by UNHCR and PNG government officers in the following year, West Papuan refugees were relocated from camps situated on the Indonesia–Papua New Guinea border to a six thousand hectare site at East Awin in the southern lowlands of PNG. Over a period of several months in 1987, some three-and-a-half thousand refugees were resettled on eight square kilometres. With great industry they set about building, clear-felling and cultivating the site. Against this backdrop, the landholders of the UNHCR settlement site protested the stalled state of compensation negotiations by staging occasional subversive actions such as erecting road blocks and dismantling public buildings.

West Papuan refugees built nine churches at East Awin, including a Protestant Immanuel Church. The Immanuel congregation, comprising people from the north coast and islands of the Indonesian Province of Papua, built two churches in consecutive years. The first Immanuel Church built in 1988 at Vanimo is the focus of my attention. According to members of the Immanuel congregation, the first Immanuel Church was burned to the ground in 1989 by police under PNG government order. The incident occurred during an operation that saw government officials mobilise and transport the Immanuel congregation by aeroplane from their beachside settlement near Vanimo to the inland UNHCR settlement at East Awin. Relocation of the Immanuel congregation was the last in a series of exercises to resettle West Papuan refugees from informal border camps to a single site at East Awin.⁷ The rationale of relocation centred on improved service provision, enhanced food security and prospects for self-sufficiency, and segregation of refugees from the local population and military activity in the border region.⁸

In order to understand the impact on the Immanuel congregation, we need to consider the meaning given to ‘the church’ by those West Papuans who represent themselves as culturally and authentically Christian. Among West Papuan Christian congregations, faith in God is integral to a discourse of *merdeka* or political independence. Faith in *merdeka* is inextricably tied to Christian faith: people conceive independence as a state that will be brought about by God’s intervention.⁹ Refugees at East Awin often referred to the books of Genesis and Exodus to demonstrate the territorialised nature of nations. For example, it was claimed that the biblical legend of the flood in Genesis (10) substantiated a Muyu legend of creation about the territorialisation of nations: in the beginning all people evolved from the island of New Guinea, but when the flood came only Papuans could stay on Papuan land, and other

ances were carried away to other islands. The book of Exodus was paraphrased as a motif about 'people's yearning to return to or re-possess their place: every human being yearns for their land of birth'. Plainly the emphasis here is on nativism, or an almost primordial attachment to a geographical place of origin.

West Papuan theologian and anthropologist Giay has described the church as an emancipatory institution—a pillar or buffer in the journey of the West Papuan nation, and a last bastion bringing new hope to a people faced with a rigid state order.¹⁰ Giay says that West Papuan people hear the Bible according to what they want to hear, and the church both absorbs peoples' aspirations for freedom, and is itself a source of inspiration based on a perception that God supports liberation. The Bible allows congregations to imagine a world free of trickery and sorcery, intimidation and trauma. It offers a window onto another world identified by some as a liberated West Papua.

Significantly, West Papuan refugee congregations at East Awin built churches even before they had built their own houses. They gathered in these churches almost daily to read the Bible, sing gospel, and pray together. In spite of the religiously inflected struggle for *merdeka*, some congregation members disapproved of the church used as a meeting place. Political meetings that inevitably produced quarrelling were categorised as profane activity. Where a place such as a church is designated sacred through the presence of certain objects like altar or tabernacle, then actions that are considered to be profane in character are prohibited in that place.

In the process of building the Immanuel Church, congregation members participated in certain rituals to render sacred or enspirit the building made by people. When the foundation post was planted, a ceremony was held. Bible readings were made, and congregation members buried money and gifts with the post. These offerings were said to engage God's blessing of the church and congregation. After the church was burned, retrieval of soil from the foundation post symbolically recalled this history of sacrifice.

The narrative below is a textual representation of the events surrounding the burning of the church. It draws almost entirely on the account of Jaap, the most senior congregation member:

Between September and December 1989 we were watched by police. The police prohibited us associating with people outside our camp. They coaxed the [landholder] older Ninggra people to evict us from the land they had given us. The Ninggra people then ordered us to build a canoe to carry two hundred people. Ninggra people only know how to build small canoes called *kole-kole*. Whereas we [Biak and Serui people from northern islands off the coast of West Papua] are renowned for building large ocean outriggers. We built two canoes for them. One named Morning Star, the other Wintimbas II. We understood the canoe to

be a sort of guarantee for us on Ninggra land. Around this time Bernard Narokobi advised the Ninggra that West Papuan people were a blessing but if neglected would leave this place and with them, their blessing.¹¹ In December the police brought dogs. They were afraid they would resist. We already knew their plan. We had said to them: 'We are not thieves, why are you forcing us to leave?' The women had prepared fried fish and small cakes. Upon the police arrival we invited them to eat. The aroma was enticing. They could not force us to leave after that. The following day we prepared food again. Then the sea became rough and we could not catch fish. Instead, we gave a cuscus skin to the police commander, a Hagen man. We captured that cuscus in the tree that we felled for our church's foundation pillar. So, he commanded his unit not to use dogs or weapons or wear uniforms. For two weeks there was no action. Some police were Seventh Day Adventists. They opposed the command to burn our houses, and retreated from duty. They had observed us gathering to pray each morning and feared for their own salvation if they harmed us. Finally in December, the church was lit. We were sitting inside the church praying at the time. The police turned up their vehicle radios to drown out our prayers. A congregation leader scooped soil from around the base of the foundation pillar and holding it skywards pronounced: 'We have been evicted with violence. You must act upon this injustice.' We abandoned the church. We did not wish to see it burn. Upon reaching Vanimo we turned to see the smoke. Later a nun fetched two charred pieces to form a cross for the new church.

After their relocation, the congregation built a new church at East Awin and named it Immanuel. In 1998, I attended the tenth anniversary of the Immanuel Church at East Awin, which commemorated the burning of the original church at Vanimo. A lay preacher—himself a congregation member—read a Bible passage from Revelations, which had also been read at the time of the planting of the original Immanuel foundation post: 'And I heard a loud voice from the throne saying, see, the home of God is among mortals. He will dwell with them as their God, they will be his peoples, and God himself will be with them.'¹² Next, the preacher explained that the Immanuel congregation had built a place to worship God inspired by Jacob's revelation in Genesis. He recounted the dream in which Jacob received a revelation about salvation, and God's presence in exile: 'Know that I am with you and will keep you wherever you go, and will bring you back to this land; for I will not leave you until I have done what I have promised you'.¹³ The Immanuel congregation at East Awin read into Jacob's revelation, a kind of teleology of return to the geographical West Papuan homeland. Return to the homeland was destined, and tied to faith in God. And faith in God was most obviously demonstrated by the act of building a church before one's own home.

The combination of church burning and forced relocation was interpreted by the Immanuel refugee congregation in terms of a discourse of suffering and liberation. The burning of

the church had occurred in a place of apparent refuge. At the time, Papua New Guinea had ratified the UN Refugee Convention, and had recognised West Papuan asylum seekers as refugees (albeit with substantial reservations in relation to wage-earning, education, freedom of movement, expulsion and naturalisation).¹⁴ Some refugees interpreted the circumstances of their relocation to East Awin as a covert effort by the Papua New Guinea and Indonesian governments to break their spirit, compelling their repatriation back to Irian Jaya.¹⁵ The burning of the church was reportedly carried out by police under government order. According to my interlocutors, the PNG government ought to have acted as protectors in a place established as a refuge. The event was viewed by northerner refugees as the most recent in a litany of events of suffering endured by West Papuans in the homeland, and now in Papua New Guinea.

Northerners represented their relationship with the Ninggra people, whose land they had settled near Vanimo, in terms of a mutually satisfactory relationship of exchange. In contrast at East Awin, many refugees viewed the Awin landholders as antagonistic. Many projected that the Awin landholders of the UNHCR settlement site viewed the refugee population to be spoiling their ancestral land. The basis and affect of this perception is the subject of my inquiry, rather than the actual perceptions of the Awin landholders themselves.¹⁶ Unlike the church burning, which was viewed unanimously as an act of 'desecration', not all refugees viewed themselves as agents in a process of spoiling the ancestral land of the Awin landholders. Some articulated their relation to the Awin landholders and their ancestral land not in terms of the sacred, but in terms of a rights-based discourse. They stressed their rights as recognised refugees under international law, and the rights of PNG national landholders to claim just compensation from the government. Of the refugee population at East Awin, it was Muyu people—who sustained deep attachment to their ancestral land known as *dusun*—who tended to project themselves as spoiling the sacred character of Awin land.¹⁷

It is not coincidental that Muyu peoples are practising Catholics, who also sustain concurrent beliefs in a metaphysical realm, ascribing agency to other non-human inhabitants of the landscape. The approach of the Montfort Catholic Church of the Diocese of Daru-Kiunga (including East Awin) is syncretic. By this I mean that concurrent beliefs in custom and the gospel are accepted. For example, former East Awin resident priest Jacques Gros explained Christianity to me as a 'meta-cosmic' belief system that does not abolish 'cosmic' systems that are ancestral, but merely covers them, or lands on them like a hover plane.¹⁸

Muyu projections about spoiling Awin sacred land are entirely congruous with a conception of ancestral land as enspirited. From a Muyu world view, every place is a *dusun* possessed by the spirits of deceased landowners buried there. These ancestral spirits protect the interests of their descendants in that place, and non-descendant dwellers may be considered foreigners unless acknowledgment or compensation is arranged. According to Muyu interlocutors, the fact they were not descendant from ancestral spirits capable of acting

malevolently to people identified as foreigners was the source of their vulnerability at East Awin. Markus explained this: 'If we build a house in a particular place and members of that household are constantly sick and cannot be treated, it means there is a disturbance and it is the place of an ancestral spirit'. While Awin landholders knew of these sites and knew not to build there, Muyu people did not possess this knowledge. While some refugees feared the potential of the landholders to cause illness and death through sorcery, the inverse was also true.¹⁹

The act of giving alms respects land as enspirited. Some Muyu who sustained beliefs in ancestral spirits claimed that submission of alms was obligatory even at East Awin where the ancestral spirits were not their own. A few elderly Muyu men had made offerings of such things as betel nut, tobacco and pig meat. At the time of making the offering, they had requested garden fertility and success in hunting. One of these men, Benedictus, claimed that as foreigners, refugees ought to have approached ancestral spirits via their landholder descendants to seek permission to use land at East Awin. Otherwise, landlord spirits were empowered to render refugee gardens barren, or injure refugees as they clear-felled new gardens. Benedictus described this mediation as an 'introduction' to familiarise the parties. A formal introduction to a landlord spirit mediated by its landowner descendant would protect the refugee, and further permission was not necessary as relations had already been established between the parties. According to Benedictus:

If introductions have not been made, the landlord spirits will think: this person [refugee] is not mine, this is another person, and will be angry. But after the landowner explains that they [the refugees] are from here, are just the same, and are the landholder's people, and requests that the landlord spirits endow them with fertile soil, then the landlord spirits will welcome them and invite their presence.

The marking of a place or object as taboo or prohibited indicates its sacred character in the minds of those who designated it that way. Some refugees claimed they made a conscious effort to respect landholder taboo at East Awin, because ignoring landholder taboo amounted to spoiling what the landholders considered sacred. Several months after their arrival to East Awin refugees learned that the pale furred wallaby and the white eggs laid by the forest hen (which usually lays red eggs) were considered taboo by the landholders. The warning came too late as wallaby had been hunted until extinct inside the East Awin boundary. Other animals classified by the landowners as taboo included the long eel, the large black gabus or snakehead fish, and a type of tree possessing white resin that was not allowed to be used as firewood for cooking.

Kees, a Muyu schoolteacher, ignored landowner taboo. He told me that he had said to the landholders: 'These things are taboo for you, not us'. For Kees, landholder taboos were

inconsequential for people who were not related to the Awin landlord spirits that bestowed taboo. In other words, taboo had a social (not spatial) basis and occurred at the level of the lineage.²⁰ Kees explained it like this:

Alam is the [bahasa Indonesia term for] natural world and a metaphysical realm, both God's and Satan's realm. This natural, metaphysical world is occupied by deceased ancestors that died in a particular place. The relation between a person's inner spirit and *alam* is bound, and its violation brings sanction. Here [at East Awin] this relation has been broken. We have left behind our own *alam* and here there is a world that is new. The relation between inner spirit and *alam* has diminished because here there are none of our own ancestral spirits that have bequeathed taboo of their place. These ancestral spirits have been left behind.

Other refugees proposed that ancestral spirits could disturb and be disturbed by the activity of non-landholders. Conrad, a landowner from the Kanum border region of Papua, explained that ancestral spirits, known as *dema* by Kanum speakers, took the form of a particular animal and dwelled in natural landscape features.²¹ Evicted from their dwelling places, *dema* sought out places similar to the one destroyed, for example, a beringin tree or some other large old tree, a sago or bamboo stand, or large rock formation. A landowner could cultivate a flower garden, or plant a betel palm, kava plant or sago tree to entice a displaced *dema* to settle. While settled ancestral spirits offer protection and prosperity to living descendants who must offer alms in return, a wandering *dema* may threaten all people in its vicinity, especially small children.

Based on his own Kanum world view, Conrad claimed that the dwelling activities of refugees on Awin land made them vulnerable until compensation had been sorted out. He illustrated this by recounting an incident from his own experience. A Kanum person's land had been appropriated without compensation by the Indonesian government for the purposes of building a transmigration settlement. While clearing land, a bulldozer operator contracted by the government was crushed to death by a large tree. Conrad explained the incident in terms of a logic of retribution: the felled tree had been the dwelling place of an ancestral spirit or *dema*, who was now homeless and whose living descendants had not been compensated for the appropriation of the land.

Like Conrad, refugees tended to be sympathetic to the Awin landholders' compensation claim for damage and loss caused to their land on which the UNHCR settlement was sited. In 1999 the landholders put forward a claim of 1500 kina per landowner family for every year of occupation since 1987.²² This amount was claimed to compensate landowner families individually for loss of tallwood/hardwood trees, cassowaries, pigs and birds. Compensation remained unsettled in 2003 when the PNG government reported that its intended purchase of 6000 hectares from the landowners had been delayed by the issue of valuation.²³

The question ought to be asked: if the parties that orchestrated the resettlement of West Papuans at East Awin had finalised their compensation negotiations with the Awin landholders to the latter's satisfaction, and delivered on that negotiation *prior* to resettlement, how might this have differently affected refugee experiences of settling?

Refugees were generally mindful of observing so-called 'landholder rules' at East Awin. While none of the refugee interlocutors with whom I worked could elaborate how these rules were disseminated or policed, the focus of my inquiry is how refugee perceptions of Awin landholder rules influenced the activity of the former. Superficially at least, these rules appear to reflect a profane conservation ethic. But from a landholder viewpoint, the objects of these rules (sago, wild pigs, certain fish and prawns) are enspirited elements in a metaphysical landscape. My point is that these so-called rules could also function—in the minds of Awin landholders and Muyu refugees—to mitigate the risk of 'desecrating' other people's land.

One set of rules related to the planting of thick-barked, long-living trees inside and outside the East Awin boundary. Such trees included durian, rambutan, mango, citrus, breadfruit, coconut, ketapang, pandanus, soursop and sago. From a Muyu perspective, a tree planted on someone else's land was considered the possession of the planter, and descendants of the planter may inherit certain rights to the tree. Benedictus explained:

We don't want to take any of this home, we will just leave it here. Although I have planted this sago garden here, if I should return home, they [the landholders] may have it. But if my descendants come here to see what I have left behind, they may have a part. According to the past, whoever planted sago was the owner.

Planting a long-living tree, especially sago, complicated the respective statuses of landowner and refugee. In their own *dusun*, Muyu require special permission to plant sago on another person's land because sago trees perpetually produce suckers that colonise the area of the initial planting. This process generates an enduring and ambiguous relationship between the planter and the other person's land.²⁴ At East Awin, few refugees planted sago. This could have been due to people's rule-abiding behaviour, but I would suggest it is more likely to be due to people's disinclination to be living on Awin land twelve years later at the time of harvest.²⁵

In this paper I have set out to explore, in terms of the cosmologies of the refugee subjects themselves, the view that the occupation of another people's land and the burning of a church constitute instances of spoiling something perceived to be sacred. Furthermore, the occurrence of these events in a place of said refuge generated particular effects. In the case of the West Papuan Immanuel congregation, the burning of their church acted to substantiate their sense of categorical injustice, and their religious faith. The event girded their faith in God to assist in bringing about West Papuan freedom imagined as *merdeka*. The incident also acted

to deepen refugee distrust in the aspirations of the PNG government, for such a deliberate act of desecration was thought to have been orchestrated by Indonesia.

The projection by some Muyu and other refugees of themselves spoiling the sacred character of Awin land through their mass occupation saw some refugees act to support landowner claims to just compensation from the PNG government. Others tried to minimise their impact by adapting their agricultural and hunting practices at East Awin. But the sentiment of being an agent of 'desecration' has not been conducive to a process of settling. It is one factor among several (including the absence of the staple food sago, famine during the 1997 drought, general food insecurity, and antagonistic landholders) that has tended to inhibit refugees from settling at East Awin. Among Muyu refugees particularly, the dual sense of spoiling the land of others and being displaced from their own land, sustains their yearning to return to their *dusun*. Return would allow resumption of relations with their own ancestral spirits. It would also restore their autonomy as landowners over a land remembered as predictably abundant and familiar.

Both of the instances elaborated in this paper were generated by a situation of forced migration, which was in turn brought about by the West Papuan people's experiences of violence and destruction in their territorial homeland. However, it is the perception and experience of Indonesia as a colonising and 'desecrating' force that is most profoundly unsettling for West Papuan people in the Indonesian Province of Papua, and in Papua New Guinea.

— POSTSCRIPT

In October 2004, the Filadelfia Church at Vanimo was burned during an operation overseen by PNG Government and UNHCR officials to relocate 360 West Papuan refugees to East Awin. Fearing the fate of their church, the refugee congregation had previously surrendered custody of the Filadelfia Church into the hands of the Catholic Bishop of Vanimo in a public ceremony. A UNHCR official advised PNG government officials that the church be respected as the custody of the Vanimo Diocese and that the houses in the refugee settlement be dismantled rather than burned. Government officials reported that neighbouring villagers had burned the dismantled houses, and airborne ash had ignited the thatched roof of the Filadelfia Church. Doubtless, other fallout will result when this news circulates among the Vanimo group and the wider refugee population at East Awin.²⁶

I am indebted to those Muyu and northerner West Papuans with whom I lived and interviewed at East Awin in 1998–99. My representation of their experiences forms the basis of this paper. Comments provided by several people vastly improved this paper: Jacques Gros, former resident priest at East Awin; Stuart Kirsch, anthropologist from the University of Michigan who conducted

fieldwork among Yonggom speakers on the PNG side; and two anonymous reviewers. Also to Debbie Rose and Peter Read, who organised the Symposium on Desecration that offered a forum for this research.

DIANA GLAZEBROOK is a post-doctoral research fellow at the Centre for Cross-Cultural Research at the Australian National University. She has conducted research and written about decision-making by West Papuan refugees in Papua New Guinea and Hazara (Afghani) refugee experiences of the conditions of temporary protection in Australia. <diana.glazebrook@anu.edu.au>

1. Names mentioning West Papuan people are pseudonyms.
2. I am grateful to Jacques Gros for his insights into biblical representations of desecration.
3. Thanks to Stuart Kirsch for stressing the connection between colonisation and desecration.
4. John Saltford, 'United Nations Involvement with the Act of Self Determination in West Irian (Indonesian West New Guinea) 1968 to 1969', *Indonesia*, no. 69, pp. 87–90.
5. Rosemary Preston, 'Refugees in Papua New Guinea: Government Responses and Assistance, 1984–1988', *International Migration Review*, vol. 26, no. 3, pp. 843–76.
6. Diana Glazebrook, 'Dwelling in Exile, Perceiving Return: West Papuan Refugees from Irian Jaya Living at East Awin in Western Province, Papua New Guinea', PhD thesis, Australian National University, 2001.
7. A UNHCR-sponsored survey on refugee attitudes to resettlement concluded that across all sixteen border camps, sixty-four per cent of refugees indicated willingness to be relocated elsewhere in PNG, thirty per cent wished to remain in their border camp location, and less than seven per cent expressed the wish to repatriated (Gau in Preston, 'Refugees in Papua New Guinea', p. 863).
8. Preston, 'Refugees in Papua New Guinea'; Beverley Blaskett, 'Papua New Guinea-Indonesia Relations: A New Perspective on the Border Conflict', PhD thesis, the Australian National University, 1989, p. 231.
9. Benny Giay, *Menuju Papua Baru: Beberapa pokok pikiran sekitar Emansipasi Orang Papua, Deiyai/ Els-ham Papua*: Jayapura, p. 60.
10. Giay, *Menuju Papua Baru*, pp. 59–63.
11. A renowned human rights lawyer and politician in the Papua New Guinea Parliament, Narakobi was also an outspoken advocate of the legal rights of West Papuan refugees.
12. Revelations 21:3.
13. Genesis 28:20–22.
14. When signing these instruments, the PNG government stipulated that 'in accordance with article 42, paragraph 1 of the Convention makes a reservation with respect to the provision contained in articles 17 (1) [wage-earning employment], 21 [Housing], 22 (1) [Public Education], 26 [Freedom of Movement], 31 [Refugees unlawfully in the country of refuge], 32 [Expulsion] and 34 [Naturalisation], of the Convention and does not accept the obligations stipulated in these articles' <<http://untreaty.un.org>>. It ought to be acknowledged that Papua New Guinea is one of the few signatory states of the UN Refugee Convention in the Pacific region, and has initiated the purchase of 6,000 hectares at East Awin.
15. Diana Glazebrook, 'If I Stay Here There is Nothing yet If I Return I Do Not Know Whether I Will Be Safe: West Papuan Refugee Responses to Papua New Guinea Asylum Policy 1998–2003', *Journal of Refugee Studies*, vol. 17, no. 2, 2004, pp. 215–16.
16. In fact I decided to simplify my fieldwork (already complicated by the existence of several West Papuan political factions) by not working with the landholders at East Awin. Factions aside, I did not have facility in the local Awin language, or lingua francas Motu or Tok Pisin, to speak with the landholders.
17. *Dusun* is an Indonesian term used by West Papuans to mention a bounded area of land that has been passed down from fathers usually to sons for many generations, containing cultivated areas, naturally occurring and planted sago gardens, forested areas for hunting, as well as streams and rock pools. People are buried in their own *dusun* and the spirits of some ancestors may continue to occupy it.

18. Jacques Gros, personal communication, September 2004.
19. Stuart Kirsch, 'The Yonggom of New Guinea: an ethnography of sorcery, ritual and magic,' PhD thesis, University of Pennsylvania, 1991. Kirsch documented this in relation to Muyu refugees who had refused to relocate to East Awin, preferring to remain among fellow Yonggom speakers on the border. Prior to the international border's demarcation, these people comprised one clan, their land extending east and west across the border. Yonggom speakers on the Papua New Guinea side wanted to help the Muyu refugees due to their shared 'kinship and cultural affinity', yet they felt anger towards them for exhausting local resources, and feared the refugees' potential to cause illness and death through sorcery. (Kirsch, pp. 53–4)
20. Compare with Kirsch, 'The Yonggom of New Guinea'.
21. Compare with Jan Van Baal, *Dema, Description and Analysis of Marind Anim Culture (South New Guinea)*, Martinus Nijhoff, The Hague, 1966.
22. In 2000, 1PGK equals approximately US\$0.4 (A\$0.6).
23. International Commission of Jurists (Australian section) and Refugee Council of Australia, *Seeking Refuge: The Status of West Papuans in Papua New Guinea*, report of the January 2003 joint mission of the Australian section of the International Commission of Jurists and the Refugee Council of Australia to Papua New Guinea.
24. JW Schoorl, *Kebudayaan dan Perubahan Suku Muyu dalam Arus Modernisasi Irian Jaya*, Grasindo, Jakarta, 123.
25. Glazebrook, 'Dwelling in Exile'.
26. Personal communication, Johann Siffointe, UNHCR Liaison Officer, Port Moresby, October 2004.