POSTSCRIPT

While this volume was going to press, further developments along the border ensured that the subject continued to command attention, domestically and internationally.

In September, on the eve of Papua New Guinea's tenth anniversary of independence, there was suggestion of a major policy shift when Prime Minister Somare said that resettlement within Papua New Guinea would be 'sympathetically considered' for all those border crossers unwilling to return home (Canberra Times 16 September 1985). This generosity appears to have dissipated on more mature reflection, however; indeed shortly after this statement was made, the government forcibly repatriated twelve border crossers by plane to Jayapura, despite an attempt by Bernard Narokobi to block the deportation by legal action. Although the government described the deportees as 'criminals' (they had been previously arrested on charges involving firearms and smuggling and had later absconded from Blackwater camp, reportedly to join the OPM), it seems certain that they were OPM supporters and as such, in terms of Papua New Guinea's stated policy on 'genuine refugees', not candidates for repatriation. News of the deportation spread quickly through Blackwater camp, precipitating a protest by camp inmates who marched on Vanimo damaging the local DFAT office and overturning government vehicles before being restrained. The government's action was widely criticized, among others by Bishop Etheridge who had earlier warned of growing tension in the border camps and who described the deportation as 'disgusting and quite against all humanitarian values' (Sydney Morning Herald 14 October 1985). Over a hundred camp inmates were arrested following this incident but acting Prime Minister Momis subsequently announced that there would be no further forced repatriation.

Subsequent reports (for example, Canberra Times 24 October 1985) said that the twelve were being 'intensively' interrogated by police in Irian Jaya, who had linked their activities to the OPM. Within days of this incident Momis also announced a 'new' policy with regard to border crossers. While emphasizing that Papua New Guinea would not tolerate the use of its territory as a base for guerrilla or terrorist activities, Momis said that the government would not ignore those who crossed its borders to escape persecution as a result of political opinions; after a screening of camp inmates those granted refugee status
according to this criterion could be granted residency; UNHCR assistance would be sought in resettlement. Third country resettlement would be sought for some, but Momis challenged Papua New Guineans to help refugee families settle in villages and communities in Papua New Guinea. He also referred, somewhat cryptically, to a proposed ‘private repatriation scheme’ for camp inmates found not to be ‘genuine refugees’ (see Sydney Morning Herald 26 October 1985).

It is not obvious how far the approach outlined by the acting prime minister, and adopted by cabinet in Somare’s absence, departed from the previous government policy. Within days, however, one new direction was indicated when the acting foreign minister, Tony Bais, strongly criticized Indonesia, Australia, Holland, the United States and the United Nations for not doing enough to solve a problem largely of their making: ‘We are not satisfied with ... words of sympathy ... or token financial contributions’, Bais said, ‘We will be seeking real and financial commitment in permanently resettling the refugees that PNG is unable to resettle’ (Post-Courier 28 October 1985). In early November the subject of refugee resettlement was discussed during a visit to Papua New Guinea by the Australian foreign minister, Bill Hayden. Hayden’s response was unsympathetic. Calling on the Papua New Guinea government to take ‘resolute action’ to separate political activists [from] the vast majority of people who would like to go back’, he said, ‘... there is absolutely no evidence of any substantial policy in place to have those people returned to their homes’ (Times of PNG 9 November 1985. The statement that no substantial policy was in place appears to have found support in a comment by Momis, who told journalists that there had not been any screening of border camps - see Sydney Morning Herald 8 November 1985). Hayden suggested that Papua New Guinea had ‘plenty of room’ in which to resettle the refugees and that until this was done there was little hope of internationalizing the refugee issue. Somare was reported to have told Hayden that Papua New Guinea was capable of handling the refugee situation, but Momis pointed out that the prime minister was bound by the policy accepted by cabinet in October and proposed that Australia accept some refugees as a gesture of goodwill’. Momis was supported by foreign minister Giheno, who described his Australian counterpart’s statement as patronizing and suggested that it cast doubts on the humanitarian basis for Australian refugee policy’; Giheno pointed out that Papua New Guinea did have a policy on refugees and foreshadowed a formal request that Australia, amongst
others, accept some refugees (Sydney Morning Herald 7,8, 14 November 1985; Times of PNG 9 November 1985; Post-Courier 12 November 1985).

Before this apparent difference was resolved (and, indeed, perhaps partly because of it), in a vote of no confidence in November the Somare government was defeated. A five-party coalition, headed by former deputy prime minister Paias Wingti (who, with a number of colleagues, had split from Pangu in March 1985 to form the People’s Democratic Movement) came to office. A former DFAT officer, Legu Vagi, took up the Foreign Affairs portfolio.

The border situation quickly reemerged as an issue of major concern to the new government though not, it seemed, of general consensus. During a protracted debate in cabinet at least three ministers - Vagi, Dutton and Ramoi - appear to have supported proposals to offer resettlement to people in the border camps, and Vagi initiated a telex to provincial premiers seeking commitments on temporary resettlement of the border crossers (Post-Courier, 16, 17, 18 December 1985, 21 January 1986). But despite Wingti’s promise of greater compassion’ (Sydney Morning Herald, 16 December 1985), the policy package which emerged in January 1986 did not differ greatly from that of the Somare government. The new government announced that it would accede to the UN Convention and Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees and would welcome UNHCR involvement in the administration of border camps and in the screening of border crossers to determine their status. Those granted refugee status would be allowed to remain as permissive residents until arrangements could be made for them to be permanently resettled in third countries; others would be required to return to Irian Jaya. The number of border camps would be reduced in number and relocated away from the border (Post-Courier, 22 January 1986). Although the prime minister repeated the assurance that no border crossers would be repatriated against their will, both Wingti and Vagi expressed the view that only a few hundred of the 10,000 or so border crossers were genuine refugees’ and that most would be repatriated (Sydney Morning Herald 30 January 1986, Post-Courier 6 February 1986).

Within days of the policy announcement the new foreign minister left on his first official visit, which included Australia and Indonesia. After visiting Canberra (where he firmly declined an Australian request that Papua New Guinea accept eight Irianese refugees who had sought asylum in Australia) Vagi had talks with Indonesia’s
foreign minister, Mochtar. A subsequent communique reiterated the two countries’ commitment to closer border ties, harmonious relations, and respect for each other’s sovereignty. It also recorded that Indonesia respected Papua New Guinea’s decision to give a greater role to the UNHCR and foreshadowed a treaty of friendship and cooperation between the two countries, an extradition treaty, the exchanging of military attaches (there having been no military attache in either country since the departure from Port Moresby of Colonel Ismail in 1984 - see p. 117, 122), and a study of the feasibility of expanded trade and transportation links. And in March 1986, coincident with the departure of PNGDF commander-in-chief, Brigadier-General Tony Huai, for a visit to Jakarta, Prime Minister Wingti raised the possibility of closer military ties between the two countries (Sydney Morning Herald 14 March 1986).

Meanwhile, shortly after the Wingti government had assumed office and with its border policy still under debate, two groups of OPM leaders crossed over into Papua New Guinea to seek asylum. In the south the OPM’s regional commander, Gerardus Thommy, and two of his companions (Aries Wader and David Teimka) surrendered with eight other Irianese to government officials at the Kuiu refugee camp south of Kiunga. Five days later OPM president James Nyaro and his defence minister, Alex Donald Derey, surrendered to officials in Sandaun Province. When this volume went to press the five OPM leaders were being held in Port Moresby while the UNHCR sought third countries to take them. Meanwhile, in early February 1986 another forty-four OPM guerillas were reported to have crossed over to seek asylum. Lack of food, medical supplies and ammunition, combined with the strain of a long guerilla campaign with little to show for it, contributed to the surrender of the OPM leaders. Nyaro’s withdrawal, however, appears to have been primarily the result of opposition to his leadership within the OPM, and in the opinion of Bishop Etheridge may signify the beginning of a new, more radical phase of the movement (Pacific Islands Monthly March 1986: 12-14; see ibid. February 1986; Post-Courier 13 December 1985; Times of PNG 8 February 1986).

With the elaboration of a new policy on refugees and the conclusion of a successful diplomatic visit, and with further depletions in the ranks of the OPM leadership, there is a temptation to predict a long-term improvement in the border situation and in relations between Indonesia and Papua New Guinea. The recent (March 1986) voluntary repatriation of 213 Irianese from camps in Sandaun Province would
seem to support this prediction. But considering all things, it seems far more likely that - just as in 1979 and 1983 a similar concurrence of events prompted commentators, including myself, to make such predictions, erroneously as it turned out - the events of early 1986 simply mark another phase in the recurring cycle of tension and self-conscious cordiality which has characterized relations between the two countries for over a decade. Given the continued existence of over 10,000 border crossers and an apparent upsurge in subnationalist sentiment in Irian Jaya, this cyclical pattern of relations seems likely to continue into the foreseeable future as the government in Jakarta attempts to integrate Irian Jaya into the larger Indonesian society.

R.J.M.
APPENDIX

BASIC AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF PAPUA NEW GUINEA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF INDONESIA ON BORDER ARRANGEMENTS

NOTING the provisions of the Agreement dated the 17th day of December one thousand nine hundred and seventy-nine and in particular Article 19 which called for a review of the Agreement upon the expiration of five years from the date of ratification;
DETERMINED to further foster co-operation, goodwill and understanding between the two countries;
DETERMINED to further co-operate in the administration and development of the Border Area for the mutual benefit of their peoples giving due consideration to the traditional rights and customs of the people in the Border Area as already done by both Governments (in the past);
RECOGNISING the need to replace the said Agreement dated the 17th day of December one thousand nine hundred and seventy-nine with a new Agreement;
As good neighbours and in a spirit of friendship and co-operation;
HAVE AGREED as follows:

ARTICLE 1
THE BORDER AREA

1. The Border Area shall consist of the Census Divisions within Papua New Guinea and the Kecamatan-Kecamatan Perbatasan within the Republic of Indonesia in respect of which the Border forms part of their boundaries.
2. The Border Area may be varied from time to time by an Exchange of Letters and maps after mutual consultations.
3. For the purposes of implementation of paragraph 1 of this Article, the two Governments shall consult and each make the necessary arrangements for the survey and demarcation of the Boundary and mapping of that part of the Border Area on their respective sides of the Border, by a mutually agreed method.
ARTICLE 2
JOINT BORDER COMMITTEE AND CONSULTATION

1. There shall be established a Joint Border Committee consisting of senior officials of both Governments.
2. The Committee shall formulate guidelines and procedures for the effective implementation of this Agreement.
3. Members of the Committee shall, as appropriate, advise and make recommendations to their respective Governments on all matters, procedures and arrangements relating to the implementation of this Agreement and to the development and review of border cooperation. The Committee shall meet at least once a year, and additionally as and when necessary, upon request by either Government. The venue for such meetings shall be by rotation in each country.
4. The two Governments may, if required, consult each other concerning the implementation and operation of this Article.

ARTICLE 3
LIAISON ARRANGEMENTS

1. To assist the Joint Border Committee there shall be established liaison meetings to discuss matters of mutual concern relating to the administration of the Border. Arrangements shall be made for regulating functions and working procedures for such meetings.
2. The liaison shall comprise officials from Port Moresby, Western and West Sepik Provinces and officials from the Province of Irian Jaya.
3. The main purpose of the liaison meetings shall be as follows:
   (i) to exchange information on all developments in the Border Area which are of mutual interest to both Governments;
   (ii) to devise, amend or establish arrangements to facilitate the practical operations, particularly at local and district levels, of the provisions of this Agreement; and
   (iii) to ensure that both Governments, through the Joint Border Committee, are kept informed of developments of significance relating to the Border Area and that their attention is drawn to any matters which may require consultation in accordance with this Agreement.
4. The liaison meetings shall take place as and when required but not
later than three months intervals.

ARTICLE 4
BORDER CROSSINGS FOR TRADITIONAL AND CUSTOMARY PURPOSES

1. Each country shall continue to recognize and permit movement across the Border by the traditional inhabitants of the other country who reside in the Border Area and are citizens of the country concerned for traditional activities within the Border Area such as social contacts and ceremonies including marriage, gardening, hunting, collecting and other land usage, fishing and other usage of waters, and customary border trade.

2. Such movement shall be the subject of special arrangements between the two Governments and normal immigration, customs, quarantine and health requirements shall not apply.

3. The Special arrangements shall be formulated on the principle that such movement across the Border shall only be temporary in character and not for the purpose of resettlement.

ARTICLE 5
EXERCISE OF TRADITIONAL RIGHTS TO LAND AND WATERS IN THE BORDER AREA

1. Where the traditional inhabitants of one country who reside in the Border Area and are citizens of the country concerned but enjoy traditional rights of access to and usage of areas of land or waters in the Border Area of the other country, that country shall permit the continued exercise of those rights subject to its existing laws and regulations on the same conditions as those applying to its own citizens.

2. The traditional rights to use land and waters referred to in paragraph 1 shall not constitute proprietary rights over the same.

3. The rights referred to in paragraph 1 shall be exercised by the persons concerned without settling permanently on that side of the Border unless such persons obtain permission to enter the other country for residence in accordance with the immigration and other laws and or procedures of that country.
ARTICLE 6
BORDER CROSSINGS BY NON-TRADITIONAL INHABITANTS

1. Crossing of the Border by persons not falling under the provisions of Article 4 of this Agreement is to take place through designated points of entry and in accordance with the relevant existing laws and regulations relating to entry. Designated points of entry shall be as agreed from time to time by an Exchange of Letters after consultations.
2. Information shall be exchanged with respect to the migration laws and policies existing on each side of the Border in order to maintain more effective control of the Border Area.
3. Persons who cross the Border other than in accordance with Article 4 of this Agreement or the relevant laws and regulations relating to entry shall be treated as illegal immigrants. The preceding sentence does not apply to crossings for purposes as agreed upon by both Governments.
4. In administering its laws and policies relating to entry of persons into its territory across the Border each Government shall act in a spirit of friendship good neighbourliness, bearing in mind relevant principles of international law and established international practices and the importance of discouraging the use of border crossing for the purpose of evading justice and the use of its territory in a manner inconsistent with any provision of this Agreement. Each Government shall also take into account, where appropriate, the desirability of exchanging information and holding consultations with the other.

ARTICLE 7
SECURITY

1. In the spirit of goodwill and mutual understanding and in order to maintain and strengthen the existing good neighbourly and friendly relations, the two Governments shall continue to actively co-operate with one another in order to prevent the use of their respective territories in or in the vicinity of the Border Area as sanctuary, staging areas, bases or routes for any kind of hostile or illegal activities against the other. To this end, each Government shall maintain its own procedures of notification and control.
2. The two Governments shall keep each other informed and where appropriate consult as to developments in or in the vicinity of the Bor-
der Area, which are relevant to their security.

ARTICLE 8
BORDER CO-OPERATION

In the event of natural disaster or major accidents in the Border Area, the two Governments shall establish close contacts with one another and shall render all possible assistance, particularly in search and rescue operations.

ARTICLE 9
CUSTOMARY BORDER TRADE

1. The two Governments shall make arrangements to facilitate the continuation of customary cross-border trade by the inhabitants of the Border Area.
2. In making such arrangements the two Governments shall be mindful of the following limitations:
   (a) that such arrangements shall only apply to Papua New Guinea and Indonesian citizens who traditionally live in the Border Area;
   (b) that the cross-border trade be of a traditional nature and conducted in order to satisfy the needs of the people in the Border Area; and
   (c) that the goods traded are not prohibited by either Government.

ARTICLE 10
TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATION

The two Governments shall consider, in accordance with the normal procedures and practices:
   (a) The continuation of the operation of the existing direct trans-border telecommunication links for border-liaison purposes;
   (b) Aeronautical communication between the Air Traffic Service Units of the two countries relating to international flights;
   (c) Radio frequency co-ordination crossing trans-border areas; and
   (d) Matters relating to the improvement of communication systems and direct trans-border transport.

ARTICLE 11
CITIZENSHIP

The desirability is recognised of having a regular exchange of relevant
information regarding laws and regulations on nationality and citizenship and the two Governments shall, if either so requests, consult each other on any problem being encountered in relation thereto.

ARTICLE 12
QUARANTINE

1. The co-operation already existing in the field of health and quarantine, including mutual visits of officials and exchange of information and periodical reports, shall be continued and developed.
2. In the case of an outbreak or spread of an epidemic in the Border Area, quarantine and health restrictions on movement across the Border may be imposed, notwithstanding Article 4 of this Agreement.

ARTICLE 13
NAVIGATION AND THE PROVISION OF NAVIGATIONAL FACILITIES

1. Nationals of either country or vessels registered in either country may navigate freely throughout the boundary waters of the Fly River Bulge and the two Governments shall make arrangements for the provision of navigational facilities in the said waters.
2. Where, for the purpose of a national development project, either Government requires a right of transit navigation between two points in its territory, through a river in the territory of the other country, then the two Governments recognise that such a right may be exercised in accordance with terms and conditions to be determined by them, according to the individual requirements of that project.

ARTICLE 14
EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION ON MAJOR CONSTRUCTION

The two Governments shall keep each other informed of any proposed major construction such as roads, dams, bridges and aerodromes within a 5 kilometer zone on either side of the Border, provided such construction could affect the movement of the people from one side to the Border to the other.
ARTICLE 15
MAJOR DEVELOPMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

1. The two Governments, recognising the need which either Government may have to develop, for the benefit of its people generally, any naturally occurring resources in an area adjacent to or in close proximity to the Border, agree to keep each other informed, either by consultation or through their respective representatives on the Joint Border Committee, as to particulars of such developments or proposed developments.

2. The two Governments further recognise the need which may arise from time to time for them to co-operate in order to formalise mutually satisfactory arrangements which will assist in facilitating the establishment and continued operation of such developments in either country, in a manner consistent with the provisions of this Agreement.

3. Having regard to the provisions of this Article, the two Governments recognise in particular the Ok Tedi Mining Project as being such a major development and agree to consult as appropriate, at the request of either Government, on any matter of concern relating to that development.

4. If any single accumulation of liquid hydrocarbons or natural gas, or if any other mineral deposit on land or subsoil thereof, extends across the Border, and the parts of such accumulation or deposit that is situated on one side of the Border, is recoverable wholly or in part from the other side of the Border, the two Governments will seek to reach agreement on the manner in which the accumulation or deposit shall be most effectively exploited and on the equitable sharing of the benefits derived from such exploitation.

ARTICLE 16
PROTECTION OF THE ENVIRONMENT

When mining, industrial, forestry, agricultural or other projects are carried out in areas adjacent to, or in close proximity to the Border, the Government responsible for such development shall ensure that all necessary precautionary measures are taken to prevent or control pollution of the environment across the Border.
ARTICLE 17
UTILISATION AND CONSERVATION OF NATURAL RESOURCES

The two Governments shall, as appropriate and at the request of either Government, consult each other on matters regarding the utilisation and conservation of such natural resources as fresh water and forest resources (including wildlife) in areas adjacent to, or in close proximity to the Border, with a view to preventing the adverse effects which might arise from the exploitation of such resources.

ARTICLE 18
FAUNA AND FLORA

Each Government shall use its best endeavour, and shall enhance mutual co-operation to protect species of indigenous fauna and flora that are or may become threatened with extinction, in and in the vicinity of the Border Area.

ARTICLE 19
COMPENSATION

1. Each Government shall pay due compensation for damages caused intentionally or otherwise to the other Government for acts and related activities within its responsibility in the Border Area.
2. Damages in the Border Area caused by acts of each other’s citizens, except by elements hostile to each other’s country may be compensated in accordance with traditional and customary practices, under the supervision of both Governments, without limiting the right of each Government to consult directly.

ARTICLE 20
PROMOTION OF THE AGREEMENT

The two Governments shall promote amongst their people, particularly those in the Border Area, an understanding of the Agreement in order to develop a stable and harmonious border regime, reflecting the good-neighbourly relations between the two countries.
ARTICLE 21

1. The two Governments shall, if so required, consult each other on the implementation, operation and scope of this Agreement.
2. This Agreement shall be reviewed upon the expiration of a five year period, or earlier with the approval of both Government beginning from the date of the exchange of instruments of ratification.
3. The members of the Joint Border Committee may make recommendations to their respective Governments on any matters concerning border arrangements not specifically regulated by this Agreement.
4. Upon receiving of information that an influx of border crossings or other border crossings have taken place other than border crossings under Articles 4, 5 and 7, the two Governments shall consult immediately at liaison level. The two Governments shall agree to meet at higher levels if the need arises.

ARTICLE 22
SIGNATURE AND RATIFICATION

1. This Agreement is subject to ratification in accordance with the constitutional requirements of each country, and shall enter into force on the day on which the instruments of ratification are exchanged.
2. On the day this Agreement enters into force, it replaces the Basic Agreement between the Government of Papua New Guinea and the Government of the Republic of Indonesia on Border Arrangements dated the 17th day of December one thousand nine hundred and seventy-nine.
IN WITNESS WHEREOF the undersigned, being duly authorised by their respective Governments, have signed this Agreement.
DONE IN DUPLICATE at Port Moresby this twenty-ninth day of October one thousand nine hundred and eighty-four, in English.

FOR THE GOVERNMENT OF PAPUA NEW GUINEA

[signed]
Rabbie Namaliu

FOR THE GOVERNMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF INDONESIA

[signed]
Mochtar KS
REFERENCES


Department of Foreign Affairs (Australia), 1978. Treaty between Australia and the Independent State of Papua New Guinea concerning sovereignty and maritime boundaries in the area between the two countries known as Torres Strait and related matters. Canberra.

Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (Papua New Guinea), 1976. Universalism. Port Moresby: Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade.


Herlihy, J.M., 1981. 'Always we are last: a study of planning, development and disadvantage in Melanesia', unpublished doctoral dissertation, Australian National University.


Hinchliffe, K., 1976. 'An overview of provincial planning in Papua


Meliaia, R.K. Sembiring, 1983. 'Transmigration program in Irian Jaya should be given a special treatment so that it could help solve security problems'. Cenderawasih: Territorial Defence Command – IV, Regional Military Command XVII. Typescript.


Nangoi, R., 1982. 'Indonesia-Papua New Guinea Relations', *Indone-


Savage, P., 1978a. ‘The national liberation struggle in West Irian:
from millenarianism to socialist revolution', *Asian Survey* 18(10): 981-998.


West Sepik Province, 1976. *Border Development Proposals*. West
Sepik Provincial Office. Mimeograph.


